

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

June 16, 2006

AGENDA ITEM NO.: **1**

Action Requested: APPROVE

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE DISCUSSION AND ACTIONS MEETING OF JUNE 2, 2006

The meeting of the Transportation Committee was called to order by Chair Joe Kellejian (North County Coastal) at 9:09 a.m. See the attached attendance sheet for Transportation Committee member attendance.

1. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Bob Emery (Metropolitan Transit System [MTS]) and a second by Councilmember Phil Monroe (South County), the Transportation Committee approved the minutes from the May 18 and 19, 2006, meetings. Councilmember Jim Madaffer (City of San Diego) abstained from this vote.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

Chuck Lungerhausen, a member of the public, said he attended SANDAG's Subcommittee for Accessible Transportation (SCAT) meeting and wanted to notify the Transportation Committee that a certain city in the North County Transit District (NCTD) jurisdiction has refused to provide accessible bus stops. It has been over 16 years since the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) was signed into law. During these passing years, almost every other city has come forward to provide access. How can this city that is home to many Marines and wants to provide a home for the Chargers come up with an excuse of unfunded mandates for not providing accessible bus stops for NCTD bus service? He thought that we have one of the most accessible regions in the country. It appears that the City of Chula Vista would prefer to pay for having the Chargers relocate there rather than put in sidewalks. Councilmember Rindone has championed public transportation in his community, but funds are not allocated for accessible improvements for transit.

Don Stillwell, a member of the public, distributed a map of the routing of MTS bus Routes 13 and 14. He showed the bus operations surrounding Kaiser Hospital. After nine years of service, he believes the Route 13 bus passengers will be shocked to have to transfer to another route with up to a 30-minute wait for the Route 14 bus. He said that more congestion will occur at the Crawford Street bus stop as a result of this timing disparity, and disabled passengers will be inconvenienced. He didn't understand the reluctance to continue Route 14 1,250 feet to the Grantville Trolley Station.

REPORTS (3 through 4)

3. BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN NETWORK AND LINKAGES AND PROJECT SELECTION CRITERIA (DISCUSSION)

At its May 19, 2006, meeting, the Transportation Committee considered proposed selection criteria for Transportation Development Act (TDA) and *TransNet*-funded bicycle and pedestrian projects. The criteria

would be used to identify projects for funding through the TDA allocation. Prior to approving the criteria, the Transportation Committee requested further analysis and information regarding existing bicycle and pedestrian network gaps and incomplete links on regional bikeway corridors. Due to the TDA allocation timing requirement, this report suggests an approach for providing the requested information and recommends allocating the TDA and *TransNet* funds into reserves (under Agenda Item No. 4) to allow adequate time to address the issues related to the criteria prior to allocating funding for specific projects.

Stephan Vance, Senior Planner, indicated that the issue before the Committee today from the last meeting is project selection criteria. The Transportation Committee has asked staff to answer questions about gaps in the bicycle network. There was an issue with making a decision about TDA funds to meet a July 1 deadline. That requirement can be met by putting funds in a reserve and designating projects later. At a follow-up meeting, more background information can be provided on the bicycle/pedestrian funding program at SANDAG and the development of the project selection criteria. Then the gaps in the bicycle network can be addressed. There are two networks: local and regional. Also, there is an issue of how SANDAG can best facilitate the development of regional bikeway corridors. This report is proposed to be brought back to the Transportation Committee on July 21. SANDAG recently received a state planning grant for a bicycle master plan for the region. The Transportation Committee will have an opportunity to give staff direction on how SANDAG should implement the bicycle program around the region.

Councilmember Madaffer said that one issue is that the City of San Diego has submitted projects based on the existing criteria. If the criteria are changed, then we might have submitted different projects. He suggested that for the current round of funding, we use the existing criteria and then have more time to change the criteria for the 2008 release of funds.

Larry Van Wey, City of San Diego Planning Department, said that they fully support the proposed criteria revisions, but they spent a lot of time in putting this year's projects together based on the criteria that were in place at that time. If the Transportation Committee recommends to the SANDAG Board approval of the current criteria and funding for this year, then we could all work to revise the criteria for the next funding cycle.

Councilmember Madaffer stated that it seems reasonable given this short amount of time that we should move forward and not change course mid-stream.

Councilmember Toni Atkins (City of San Diego) agreed that jurisdictions have spent a lot of time putting these projects forward, but communities have worked with the jurisdictions and have participated in this process as well. So, it's not just the jurisdictions but also the communities that will be affected if the criteria change. She agreed with the suggested adjustments but felt it was imprudent to make those adjustments at this point in time.

Councilmember Druker clarified that what we discussed at the last meeting was not changing the criteria but the weighting of the criteria. This is not a major change in terms of what we are doing. We were asking for the weights to be changed to give priority to those projects that fill the gaps.

Councilmember Monroe clarified that the discussion he started was more than changing the criteria; it was about changing the policy to emphasize regional bikeways. We should have a dialogue about building a regional bike network.

Supervisor Ron Roberts (County of San Diego) said the one piece of information that we were asking for was how many missing links are there in the bicycle network. That information was not available. He

said that we were not trying to overturn projects that were out there. We need to put a priority on creating a network. To have such a low rating for essential pieces should be changed. We really were not talking about rearranging the criteria, just reevaluating and weighting.

Councilmember Madaffer supported the idea of making sure that there is time for gap identification, but we are less than a month out from the next fiscal year. Even if there is a different weighting, it is still a change to the criteria. It seems to make sense that we start with a clean slate. He asked what the fiscal impact would be if we were to move forward with the current structure and weighting.

Gary Gallegos, Executive Director, suggested that we could meet the July 1 timeline by putting money into a reserve.

Councilmember Madaffer asked if the Board has a list of projects and if a preliminary analysis of the projects has occurred.

Mr. Vance stated that when you establish criteria for project selection, everyone tries to submit projects that meet those criteria. Unless you make a significant change in the overall criteria, changing the weights may not have a significant change in the projects selected.

Councilmember Madaffer stated that this organization has a solid reputation of not changing things in the middle of a process. He asked if there is a precedent for having a process established and then changing it. Mr. Vance responded that this is an unusual circumstance for SANDAG. Mr. Gallegos said that this is the Committee's criteria to adopt.

Councilmember Dave Druker (North County Inland) said the question is: does the Committee agree with the criteria? The Committee did agree that the criteria were correct, but it questioned some of the weightings. We don't have any idea as a Committee what these projects are.

Councilmember Atkins noted that there are submissions that have been given for the next fiscal year. Projects will be pitted against one another and because of changing criteria, projects could be dropped from the list.

Councilmember Monroe said that we don't have to take points away as there is no set number. If this group wants to add emphasis, we could just increase point weight.

Chair Kellejian agreed that we should move forward with the projects that are before us now.

Mr. Gallegos stated that funds become available with the next fiscal year. Perhaps it is a better idea to bring this back and have it apply to future funding and hope that the projects submitted have the linkage that we're interested in seeing.

Councilmember Madaffer asked if the bike and pedestrian working groups have already made project recommendations based on the existing criteria. Mr. Vance replied affirmatively.

Supervisor Roberts asked if the Transportation Committee has ever approved the criteria. Mr. Gallegos answered that that is why this is presented to the Transportation Committee.

Supervisor Roberts stated that we can't have staff anticipating what the Transportation Committee should act on. This body should have approved the criteria in advance of this happening. It was clear last week that the Transportation Committee has not approved the criteria. He doesn't have a problem with

going ahead with this process, but we ought to correct it and have some significant work done on those links, as they are the most important pieces and should have a high priority in the funding.

Councilmember Madaffer said that the issue is that the Transportation Committee previously endorsed the criteria used by the working group. Mr. Vance clarified that the Transportation Committee had not approved the criteria. Mr. Gallegos added that that is why we wanted the Transportation Committee to adopt them now. We learned recently that we have been successful in obtaining a Caltrans grant to develop a regional bicycle master plan. We will spend the next year developing that regional bicycle plan and criteria and not leave it up to an advisory committee.

Councilmember Monroe asked for clarification on today's action.

Chair Kellejian said that there is no action in front of us. The question is whether staff is going in the right direction, or if the Transportation Committee wants to interrupt the process at this point to increase the weights for linkages.

Mr. Gallegos said that on June 16, staff would bring the list of projects submitted in this year's process, present the recommendations for awarding funding for this year's projects based on the existing criteria and bring back proposals for revised criteria and a schedule for achieving a final master plan at a future date.

4. FY 2007 TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT (TDA) ALLOCATIONS AND PRODUCTIVITY IMPROVEMENT GOALS (RECOMMEND)

Sookyung Kim, Program Manager, reported that as the regional Transportation Planning Agency (TPA), SANDAG administers the TDA program, is responsible for the allocation of funds, and approves the productivity improvement goals. TDA comes from the one-quarter percent sales tax assessed in the region. The County Auditor estimates that \$128 million is available for FY 07. There are four articles in TDA. 2007: Article 3 funds are designed for bicycle and pedestrian projects, Article 4 funds are used to provide general public transit services, Article 4.5 funds are designed for community transit services, and Article 8 funds support specialized services such as express bus and ferry services. Ms. Kim reviewed the claims of MTS, NCTD, and SANDAG. She pointed out some outstanding issues. In order to receive TDA funds, an agency must have completed its fiscal year audit. The allocation for MTS is contingent upon its submittal of the 2004 and 2005 audits. The allocation for bicycle/pedestrian projects will be placed in a reserve. The allocation for the Coordinated Transportation Services Agency (CTSA) will be placed in reserve pending execution of a contract with a designated CTSA and resolution of a State Transit Assistance (STA) Claim for NCTD. She noted that this last issue has been resolved. There was a question about NCTD wanting to use its STA for operating purposes. In order for that to be approved, the operating purposes must pass one of two eligible criteria, which are based on the cost per service hour, exclusive of certain costs such as fuel. Our legal counsel has determined that those exclusion costs are allowable under the law, and NCTD can use those funds as requested. Ms. Kim stated that SANDAG is also responsible for the productivity improvement program.

Toni Bates, Division Director of Transit Planning, stated that SANDAG is required to evaluate transit operating performance, and performance goals are set annually. SANDAG assesses both achievement and effort. The transit agencies must make a reasonable effort to achieve the goals or risk losing TDA money. Performance goals include productivity, service efficiency, quality of service, and service effectiveness. Both MTS and NCTD were evaluated individually. She reviewed the challenges and the actions taken by the transit operators. SANDAG staff concludes that they have made reasonable efforts toward meeting the performance goals. Ms. Bates said that there are ongoing issues such as fuel prices, traffic congestion, and fluctuations in the economy that affect transit operating performance.

Ms. Bates said that for the FY 07 performance goals, staff has worked with the transit agencies and identified a set of performance goals that are at or above the FY 06 goals. As we move into the future, we want to enhance the performance improvement program. In coordination with the transit agencies, we plan to develop a new evaluation process that: (1) will be incorporated into the Short-Range Transit Plan (SRTP) process, (2) will base the evaluation on a full year of results, and (3) will continue to work with the transit agencies to redefine goals and targets.

Councilmember Madaffer noted that there is no claim being filed at this point for the community transit services coordination but asked if there will be at some point. Ms. Kim replied that staff is in negotiations with an agency to be designated as the CTSA. The newly designated CTSA must come forward with a budget and schedule. The CTSA does not directly provide service but coordinates specialized community services provided by MTS, NCTD, and various social service and non-profit agencies. The CTSA is also a clearinghouse for resources and information for specialized transportation service providers. Ms. Bates added that SANDAG is providing this service until the end of the fiscal year, and we are hoping to have the contract signed with the designated CTSA on July 1 to take over this responsibility.

Councilmember Jerry Rindone (South County) asked if SANDAG is working with the two transit operators to have a consistent budget format. Renee Wasmund, Finance Director, replied that they have been working together toward that end. The reports presented this year are more consistent than last year. She noted that it is up to the two operators to work together. Mr. Gallegos commented that we have talked about developing a checklist for the transit operators to ensure consistency on how the budget information is laid out and presented.

Councilmember Rindone said he is not trying to hinder either organization but to aid those who review the documents. He suggested that SANDAG continue to provide oversight of the process regarding consistency.

Councilmember Madaffer commented that between the two operators, the performance report is really outstanding.

Councilmember Monroe asked how the goals are established. Ms. Bates answered that each year SANDAG and the transit agencies meet to discuss and develop the proposed goals, and the Transportation Committee adopts them.

Councilmember Monroe asked if these goals go to the MTS and NCTD Boards for approval. Karen King, NCTD Executive Director, replied that NCTD proposes standards that its Board has reviewed and adopted. If SANDAG doesn't find them acceptable, they would be brought back to the NCTD Board for further discussion. Ms. Bates stated that staff will work with the transit operators to develop more meaningful goals and those would go through the transit agency Boards.

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Madaffer and a second by Councilmember Monroe, the Transportation Committee unanimously recommended that the SANDAG Board of Directors approve the final FY 2007 TDA allocations and the FY 2007 productivity improvement goals at its June 23, 2006, meeting. The allocations for MTS are contingent upon the issuance of the final FY 2004 and FY 2005 fiscal audits.

Chair Kellejian called for a break at 10:08 a.m., and reconvened the meeting at 10:14 a.m.

Regional Planning Committee (RPC) Chair Lori Holt Pfeiler convened the RPC meeting at this time.

Chair Kellejian asked for self-introductions of Committee members and a designation of which committee each represents.

CONVENE MEETING WITH THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

CONSENT (A)

A. APPOINTMENT OF NEW MEMBERS TO THE REGIONAL PLANNING STAKEHOLDERS WORKING GROUP (RECOMMEND)

In November 2004, the SANDAG Board approved the creation of the Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group (SWG) to review and provide input into key activities associated with the implementation of the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) and the update of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Several members of the SWG have resigned recently and need to be replaced. Regional Planning Committee Chair Lori Holt Pfeiler and Transportation Committee Chair Joe Kellejian, in consultation with Crystal Crawford, Chair of the SWG, have reviewed potential replacement candidates from the original list of candidates. The Regional Planning and Transportation Committees are requested to forward the following recommendation to the SANDAG Board of Directors for approval: (1) amend the SWG charter to designate a specific position on the SWG for a tribal representative; (2) appoint James Justice, Joe Silverman, and William Micklin to fill current vacancies on the SWG (of these, appoint Mr. Micklin as the designated tribal representative); and designate Terry Allison as a backup candidate in the event that an additional vacancy arises on the SWG.

Action: Upon a motion by Mayor Holt Pfeiler (North County Inland) and a second by Councilmember Madaffer, the Transportation Committee and Regional Planning Committees unanimously approved this consent item.

REPORTS (B and C)

B. RESULTS OF THE SMART GROWTH WORKSHOPS AND RECOMMENDATION TO THE SANDAG BOARD ON THE SMART GROWTH CONCEPT MAP (RECOMMEND)

Carolina Gregor, Senior Planner, reported that the RCP was adopted by SANDAG in 2004. It consists of the following areas: urban form, transportation, housing, healthy environment, economic prosperity, public facilities, and borders. There are three themes of the RCP: (1) better connect land use and transportation, (2) use our plans to guide public facility and environmental investments, and (3) make it happen through incentives and collaboration. The current RTP, MOBILITY 2030, served as the first step toward development of the Smart Growth Concept Map. The Smart Growth Concept Map shows where smart growth is planned; plans for infrastructure investments that support smart growth for transportation, public facilities, and environmental; and provides a basis for incentives. The RCP smart growth place types include metropolitan center, urban center, town center, community center, mixed-use transit corridor, special use center, and rural village. She showed the adopted regional transportation network, the existing and planned regional transit corridors, and the regional scale concept map.

Ms. Gregor thanked the two working groups for their efforts in this process. She reviewed the public outreach process, which included holding eight workshops across the region last April. She expressed her appreciation for the high level of participation by the elected officials. The workshop objectives were to generate greater awareness of smart growth and transportation links, update the public on the RCP and the RTP, and obtain input on the draft concept map and the upcoming update of the RCP. Attachments

to the package indicated the feedback received from these efforts. Ms. Gregor reviewed the major outcomes of the public outreach process: transportation received the highest number of comments; there was support for more infrastructure; there were differing opinions on growth; the needs in housing, public transit, and natural resources were recognized; and the roles in the planning process were clarified. She noted that the comments provided by the SWG were included with the agenda report. Additional correspondence received following agenda mailout has been distributed to Committee members at their places on the dais. She noted that we will consider their input as the map is refined. She noted there were a total of ten changes to the concept map: two new areas, six boundary refinements, and two consolidations. The summary of findings was 200 smart growth areas in total; about 40 percent are existing or planned areas, and 60 percent are potential areas.

Ms. Gregor reviewed four uses of the Concept Map: (1) to develop and evaluate alternative land use and transportation scenarios for the 2007 RTP, (2) update current transit networks in response to the Independent Transit Peer Review (ITPR), (3) support the transportation project evaluation criteria for the 2007 RTP, and (4) implement the *TransNet* Smart Growth Incentive (SIG) program. The *TransNet* SIG consists of capital improvements and planning grants. She reviewed the next steps of this effort.

Chair Kellejian noted that there were four requests to speak on this item.

Teresa Quiroz and Patty Vaccariello, members of the Euclid Avenue Revitalization Action Program, stated that in low-income and minority communities, environmental justice is the most important part of any transportation and land use planning. Yet in the Smart Growth Concept Map, SANDAG designated Euclid Avenue as a potential mixed-use transit corridor. She said that the MTS Comprehensive Transit Analysis (COA) has made Fairmont Avenue the transit corridor. Euclid Avenue is only 36 feet wide and has parking on both sides. City buses could not travel along Euclid Avenue, and it cannot be widened. The sidewalks on Euclid Avenue are narrow to nonexistent, and the buildings have no setback. The only way to widen this road would be to condemn properties. In addition, transit corridors create transit-oriented development. Euclid Avenue is zoned as low-density residential and commercial and would not provide the density needed for a transit corridor. The community has worked hard to put in place documents that make it possible to see their vision for Euclid Avenue come true. That vision does not include large buses storming down this residential street. Making the determination that Euclid Avenue will be widened to accommodate a transit corridor and rezoned to allow for high-density, mixed-use commercial most definitely predetermines the outcome of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) documents. They requested that the potential mixed-use transit corridor designation for Euclid Avenue be removed.

Mel Vernon, San Luis Rey Band of Mission Indians, said that he attended the Tribal Summit meeting in March and spoke then about cultural sites and the preservation of cultural sites. He pointed out that native people have been in the area for 10,000 years and that their creation stories are here. He requested that the Quarry Creek corridor be removed from the Smart Growth Concept Map.

Ruth Calac, Rincon Indian Reservation, requested that the Buena Vista Creek Cultural corridor be taken off of the Smart Growth Concept Map. She said that a new law, Senate Bill 18, requires that native tribes be consulted in land use planning issues. She noted that there have been numerous meetings held and they have not been consulted. The Rincon Reservation has written letters to the cities of Carlsbad and Oceanside. The letter to Oceanside was to thank the city for holding Buena Vista Creek area as open space and protecting it from being desecrated. The letter to Carlsbad about the Quarry Creek project was to request that this area not be included in the Smart Growth Concept Map. We are asking that you take this area off of the Smart Growth Concept Map.

Mr. Gallegos said that in the Committee report, SANDAG highlighted a meeting that would take place between Oceanside and Carlsbad. That meeting did take place, and Oceanside Deputy Mayor Shari Mackin and Carlsbad Mayor Pro Tem Matt Hall and their city managers attended. We will work with these jurisdictions to develop a work plan to analyze the traffic impacts associated with the potential smart growth areas that have been designated.

Mayor Pfeiler agreed that's how this map will be used. If there are any issues, that's how we will proceed.

Mr. Gallegos added that this is a bottoms-up approach and will be addressed on an individual basis.

Councilmember Emery said that there is a great emphasis on infilling and higher densities in the urban core. He has looked at the designation of a future urban center at the Riverside border. He wondered how this would come about as there is no transit in this area.

Ms. Gregor said that staff worked with all of the jurisdictions for where they thought there would be smart growth, using certain density and employment thresholds and where transit service was specified in MOBILITY 2030. If an area met those criteria they would be included in the existing/planned areas; if not, they would be placed in the potential smart growth area because the transportation network does not provide service to that area.

Councilmember Emery noted that there are a number of proposed large scale developments that will become a reality long before the criteria will take place.

Councilmember Monroe expressed an interest in hearing from the City of San Diego about the Euclid Avenue situation.

Councilmember Madaffer said he understood the comments and continued concern for this area. No decision has been made on the City's general plan related to Euclid Avenue.

Councilmember Atkins said that that particular issue will be discussed at the San Diego City Council. Being on this map does not mean this is assured. A lot more discussion needs to occur.

Supervisor Pam Slater Price (County of San Diego) said that she received a letter from the Pacific Beach area. The message being perceived is that you are moving ahead with planning documents that have not yet been approved by the local governing boards. She did attend one of the smart growth workshops, and she did not feel there was much support for the Smart Growth Concept Map, especially in the north coastal areas. We cannot get too far ahead of what residents want in their communities. We should look at these comments as being helpful but not adopt anything that is pending in a jurisdiction. She thought smart growth was a community that had walkable access rather than dense urban centers located along a freeway and a community that responded to the residents.

Chair Pfeiler recommended that this item be moved on to the SANDAG Board. There has been a tremendous amount of work on this, and we need to acknowledge that this is one step toward implementation. We need to have a plan to deal with our growth and start planning for it. This is a tool, and it will continue to be refined as each jurisdiction becomes more sophisticated.

Councilmember Lesa Heebner (North County Coastal) watched the smart growth workshop on videotape and agreed with Supervisor Slater-Price. She didn't see how we included input in this map.

Ms. Gregor said that this report summarizes the comments from the workshop but a more detailed summary of the public outreach input is on the SANDAG Web site.

Councilmember Emery stated that we had two speakers who commented about Native American sites. He asked how we address those and SB 18, a bill that requires there be consultation with the native tribes.

Coleen Clementson, Principal Planner, responded that the sites they mentioned were areas designated as "potential." Any proposed development in those locations will go through a review with the local area. What actually is built is a local jurisdiction issue.

Bob Leiter, Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning, said that there is a law that requires consultation with native tribes in the planning process. We could put these concerns on the record as part of the action to move this forward and ensure that the affected cities receive this information. He assured Committee members that these concerns are considered before any action is taken.

Councilmember Patricia McCoy (South County) noted that the true issue is sustainability: water, clean air, and land availability. She thought that we are ignoring this issue. We only have so much finite resources available to us. She asked how we are addressing these issues. She would like to see the issue of true sustainability raised as it is an integral part of the planning process.

Mr. Leiter said that as we indicated in the staff report, the recommendation is to accept the Smart Growth Concept Map for planning purposes. We would develop alternatives to be studied in the update of the RTP that would look at these issues. These kinds of impact issues would be evaluated before any Board decision on the final RTP. Those areas are designated as potential areas.

Councilmember Jerry Jones (East County) reiterated that this is a planning document. It doesn't change zoning nor does it address the particulars in an individual neighborhood. This map was developed in cooperation with each of the cities. It is only what could be done, not what will be done. What this map gives us is an opportunity to apply the carrot rather than the stick approach in terms of dealing with our future growth. This is the basis for the incentives of where we move in the future. This is a good place to start. We should move forward.

Councilmember Gronke agreed with Supervisor Slater-Price when she said that concerns of the constituents are key. This document speaks for itself. SANDAG does not have the jurisdiction over land use. SANDAG has put out a blueprint for the future and for transportation. We want to put our residents near the transportation corridors. We should move forward.

Councilmember Madaffer concurred with Councilmember Jones' comments. SANDAG has been viewed as a leader around the state for using the incentive approach. There are no less than 10-15 bills pending in the Legislature that affect county and city land use control. Those bills do less to help us and more to put the decision out of the hands of the neighborhood and into the hands of the state capitol. This is a blueprint and talks about what can be done and should be considered. The reality is that the state will continue to grow, and we will need to get transportation and transit dollars into this region. We have to make infrastructure and housing investments and incentives along those transportation corridors. We also need to make sure we are not sprawling. SANDAG needs to be commended for what it is doing.

Councilmember Atkins agreed that our focus really needs to be on transportation infrastructure and housing, and this is a tool to make those things happen. We need to leave the decision of zoning issues of certain projects to the jurisdictions.

Councilmember Monroe noted that in the Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO) report it said that SANDAG does not have land use authority. The better we can plan and put this blueprint to work as a region the better off we will be.

Chair Kellejian agreed that we don't want the state to dictate our land use decisions.

Councilmember Jerome Stock (NCTD) thanked Councilmember Jones for refining the discussion. He agreed with his comments. This is a concept map and from his perspective the concept of smart growth for each community. This is a really useful tool for transportation planning for the future based on possible land use decisions as the planning directors and stakeholders see it. We should move forward.

Councilmember Heebner asked if we are approving the place type names on this map or if there is a period of time where they will be reviewed and input will be taken into consideration. Mr. Leiter said this map would be moved forward for planning purposes and, during review, there would be an opportunity to review place types and make decisions about the transit service to these areas. It can and will be refined through an Environmental Impact Report.

Councilmember Druker agreed with moving forward on this issue. This will allow us to go to the next step, which is transportation planning. He asked what happens if there are major developments that are outside these areas. Chair Pfeiler said that we have to acknowledge that we cannot provide services to those kinds of developments.

Councilmember Carrie Downey (South County) asked if the detailed comments from the workshops could be sent to the individual communities.

Jim Sandoval, Chairman of the Technical Working Group (TWG) said that this is the next logical step if we are serious about tying transportation and land use together. We need to establish a common vernacular. It has been helpful to planners and will help the region in the long run. He thanked Mr. Gallegos and SANDAG staff for the many hours in the technical committee meetings, subcommittee meetings, and the regional workshops. Staff made themselves available to meet with individual cities to ensure we are treated equally in this process. He agreed with moving forward.

Mr. Gallegos stated that legal counsel suggested the vote be taken by one committee at a time.

Action: Upon a motion by Chair Pfeiler and a second by Councilmember Madaffer, the Transportation Committee unanimously recommended that the SANDAG Board of Directors accept the draft Smart Growth Concept Map dated June 2, 2006, for planning purposes for the 2007 RTP update. Final action on the map would take place by the SANDAG Board at the time of adoption of the final 2007 RTP.

Action: Upon a motion by Chair Pfeiler and a second by Councilmember Madaffer, the Regional Planning Committee unanimously recommended that the SANDAG Board of Directors accept the draft Smart Growth Concept Map dated June 2, 2006, for planning purposes for the 2007 RTP update. Final action on the map would take place by the SANDAG Board at the time of adoption of the final 2007 RTP.

C. INDEPENDENT TRANSIT PLANNING REVIEW REPORT (RECOMMEND)

Mr. Gallegos said that passage of the *TransNet* extension triggered a commitment to conduct an Independent Transit Planning Review (ITPR) of the transit element of the 2030 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) to help determine the most cost-effective and cost-efficient service and infrastructure plan for the region. This review process included the hiring of a technical consultant and the formation of a Peer Review Panel of transit and land use experts from across North America to help develop the set of issues

to be addressed and guide the review. Wilbur Smith and Associates was hired to conduct the technical analysis and inform and manage the Peer Review Panel. The two transit operators were also involved in this process.

Chair Kellejian asked for self-introductions of the Peer Review Panel and thanked them all for their hard work.

- John Bonsall, with McCormick/Ranking, former head of OC Transpo, the transit authority in Ottawa, Canada
- Richard Feder, Director of Transit Planning, Pittsburgh Port Authority of Allegheny County, Pennsylvania
- Dave Mieger, Director of Westside Planning for the Los Angeles Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LAMTA)
- Robert Cervero, Professor and Chair of the City Planning Department at the University of California, Berkeley
- Phil Selinger, Director of Project Implementation, Tri-County Metropolitan Transportation District of Oregon (TRI-MET)
- Linda Cherrington, Program Manager for Texas Transportation Institute's Transit Mobility Program
- Peter Martin, Project Manager, Wilbur Smith and Associates
- Gary Banks, Wilbur Smith and Associates

Mr. Martin described five basic issue items: integration of the Regional Transit Vision and Land Use Vision, transit level of investment strategy, bus rapid transit (BRT) and trolley operating cost model, operating strategies, and transportation model. The Peer Review Panel's recommendations fell into six different areas: general, managed lanes, the Mid-Coast corridor, parking policy, transportation model, and individual transit corridors. He reviewed the specific recommendations under each area, and several of the Peer Review Panelists provided additional comments.

Mr. Bonsall agreed with the conclusions that there were certain key issues if SANDAG's objectives related to transit and smart growth are to be achieved. He stated that highway investment will not address this objective as you cannot build your way out of congestion. If San Diego wants the future outlined in the RCP you need to go "cold turkey" on building new highway links. The updated RTP needs to adopt a new strategic Transit Vision that favors public transit over all forms of road projects. This strategy should be coupled with a top-down planning effort. You need to have measurable goals. The transit mode share target should be a natural outcome of this favored strategy. You need to consider a higher-end BRT to attract riders and, coupling this with the Transit First strategy would be a good starting point. He said that San Diego is at a crossroads; this area is subject to enormous pressure to continue its past trends and is challenged to go in a different direction. If you are not prepared to make those tough decisions, you should stop worrying about improving your transit system.

Mr. Feder said that this is not a top-down planning approach in terms of providing a choice of transportation for the public. There is a growing market for walkable communities, for communities with mixed uses, and for economic development along the transit system. San Diegans deserve the best

transportation system, which means an electronic communication system for the bus system, good alternative-fueled vehicles, and safe and attractive transit stations and bus waiting areas.

Ms. Cherrington stated that in the initial review of the RTP, she was struck by the very generous application of managed lanes. It seems they are being touted as the solution for the growth that is being projected in the region. She also noted that managed lanes were portrayed as transit solutions for guideway or BRT. The concept of managed lanes is not a panacea. Managed lanes are not transit solutions. They do not provide a hospitable environment or access to transit, and do not support land use investments. She suggested that SANDAG take another look at the Interstate 805 (I-805) corridor. When managed lanes are used in a corridor, the design and operating plans should support transit investment. She suggested SANDAG also revisit the I-15 managed lanes to ensure that the operating plan will give priority to transit, buses, vanpools, and 3+ carpools. She thought that managed lanes are more likely to encourage sprawl and not manage the area of urban growth. Managed lanes will work against infill.

Mr. Meiger said that the panel loved the Mission Valley East line. When we looked at the Mid-Coast corridor from Old Town to the University of California, San Diego (UCSD) and University Towne Centre (UTC), we didn't find much in between; this is primarily an industrial area, with wetlands, and highway and railroad corridors. There are not a lot of intermediate locations of transit-supportive density. There could be more applications for bus service in this corridor. They liked the Super Loop. They saw a lot of congestion at the merger of I-5/I-805. Mr. Meiger suggested that upgrades of the COASTER in cooperation with a major bus investment in this corridor be looked at to mitigate congestion. You may go with light rail, but you should consider bus service. He encouraged SANDAG to look at all the options for that corridor including BRT and commuter rail .

Mr. Cervero felt that when it comes to parking around transit stations, SANDAG should set a climate where it seriously thinks about being adaptable and flexible. Studies conducted of people who live around transit stations found that they own a fewer number of cars. SANDAG should discard standard zoning for parking and work with the marketplace to be more resourceful and economical to make parking more viable. Parking detracts from the quality of the neighborhood and place. If you use a car as part of the transit trip you negate much of the air quality benefits. SANDAG should try to encourage more folks to walk, bus, and bike to transit. SANDAG can use parking lots as a clever way of land banking. SANDAG should learn to be strategic, innovative, and adaptable with parking.

Mr. Martin made two key points: the SANDAG model is a good model, but it is relatively weak when looking at transit patronage demand. There needs to be some additional way of looking at smart growth in the update of the RTP.

Mr. Selinger said that transit cannot be an afterthought and needs to be optimized based on good investment for the user (comfortable, safe, and convenient), optimized transit operations (minimal travel time and delay), and leveraging the development opportunities around transit investments. There may be an opportunity to start now to upgrade the San Diego transit system in order to improve ridership and the image of communities. This includes improving bus stops and station investments, keeping vehicles clean, having better access to transit, installing signal priority treatments, and implementing intermediate service levels with branding.

Supervisor Slater-Price expressed her appreciation for the panelists' points of view. She questioned the comments about the I-15 managed lanes. We have cross-county travel. The options we had were to continue to widen the freeway or do something like managed lanes. We didn't have the densities sufficient to implement light rail in this corridor. The people in the northern area have asked for light rail, but there isn't sufficient demand.

Ms. Cherrington agreed that overall, managed lanes may be an appropriate investment in some corridors. She cautioned that it is not the only solution and may have some negative affects as well. In corridors that support transit investment another mode may be better.

Councilmember Emery said that he hoped we would consider these comments and the conclusions contained in this report. He hoped the SANDAG Board will refer this back to the transit agencies. Another key factor and the biggest challenge is that as we grow in population, where will we get the funding to grow the transit system at the same time? He expressed his appreciation for the report.

Chair Kellejian mentioned that the transit agencies are scheduling this report on their agendas.

Councilmember Monroe said that there were three projects not completed from the first *TransNet* measure. One of them was light rail from Old Town to UTC. The panel clearly recommended that that be reconsidered. He asked if that was a unanimous recommendation of the panel.

Mr. Feder said that light rail may not be the best mode for that corridor. You would get more versatility with BRT and improved COASTER service. He suggested that something be done on the land use side at UTC because it is very auto-oriented.

Councilmember Monroe stated that in a couple of transit systems around the world there is a dual situation where both light rail tracks and buses share right-of-way.

Mr. Bonsall said while that is theoretically possible, he was not sure this corridor would support the rail side, but you could design a BRT to receive an LRT upgrade at some future date.

Councilmember Gronke thanked the panel for their recommendations. He asked what the minimal amount of housing units would be to support a light rail hub.

Professor Cervero said there is no exact number. You need to have the density to generate enough riders to justify the cost of the system. However, there is a benchmark range of 20-30 residential units per acre, but a number of factors can sway those numbers.

Councilmember Downey said that related to parking, we need to change people's attitudes toward using transit. As soon as we make transit easier that's when we'll get people out of their cars. We won't get out of using parking to get to transit.

Mr. Cervero commented that if we put the parking at the entrance to the transit station, it will cast the die. Where you site parking matters. He suggested that bicycle access be included wherever you have parking. Multimodal, inclusive transportation needs to be embraced.

Mr. Selinger said that in Portland they persuaded developers to help pay for parking structures for transit.

Councilmember Druker said he was happy with this report. We are going to have to make sure that transit has the highest priority rather than roads. In his opinion, we should never build another lane of freeway. The Mid-Coast corridor in Sorrento Valley is vastly underserved by transit. We need to have a better plan for this area.

Councilmember Atkins expressed her appreciation for the report. She agreed that we need to put more money toward public transit and operations. Until we do this, people will still need their cars. Even with

a deficiency in parking, people are still not taking public transit. We need more frequent and efficient service.

Councilmember Heebner said that increased public transit services is what it will take for smart growth to work. She asked what higher-end BRT means. Mr. Bonsall explained that it would be a fully grade separated BRT, not one that operates on regular arterial roads or managed lanes.

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Stocks and a second by Supervisor Slater-Price, the Transportation Committee unanimously recommended that the SANDAG Board of Directors accept the Independent Transit Planning Review report for planning purposes for the 2007 RTP update.

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Stocks and a second by Supervisor Slater-Price, the Regional Planning Committee unanimously recommended that the SANDAG Board of Directors accept the Independent Transit Planning Review report for planning purposes for the 2007 RTP update.

ADJOURN JOINT MEETING WITH THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

5. UPCOMING MEETINGS

The next two meetings of the Transportation Committee are scheduled for Friday, June 16, 2006, and Friday, July 7, 2006, at 9 a.m.

6. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Kellejian adjourned the joint portion of the meeting at 12:19 p.m.

Attachment: Attendance Sheet

**CONFIRMED ATTENDANCE
SANDAG TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MEETING
JUNE 2, 2006**

GEOGRAPHICAL AREA/ ORGANIZATION	JURISDICTION	NAME	MEMBER/ ALTERNATE	ATTENDING	IN	OUT	COMMENTS
North County Coastal	City of Solana Beach	Joe Kellejian (Chair)	Member	Yes			
	City of Del Mar	David Druker	Alternate	Yes			
North County Inland	City of Escondido	Lori Holt Pfeiler	Member	Yes			
	City of Vista	Bob Campbell	Alternate	No			
East County	City of Santee	Jack Dale	Member	Yes			
	City of La Mesa	Art Madrid	Alternate	No			
South County	City of Coronado	Phil Monroe	Member	Yes			
	City of Chula Vista	Jerry Rindone	Alternate	Yes			
City of San Diego	----	Jim Madaffer	Member	Yes			
	----	Toni Atkins	Alternate	Yes			
	----	Jerry Sanders	Alternate	No			
County of San Diego	----	Bill Horn	Member	Yes			
	----	Ron Roberts	Alternate	Yes			
	----	Greg Cox	Alternate	No			
Metropolitan Transit Development Board	City of Poway	Bob Emery	Member	Yes			
	MTS	Harry Mathis	Alternate	Yes			
North County Transit District	City of Encinitas	Jerome Stocks	Member	Yes			
	City of Carlsbad	Norine Sigafoose	Alternate	No			
	City of Solana Beach	Lesa Heebner	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			