

# TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

November 12, 2004

AGENDA ITEM NO.: **1**

**Action Requested: APPROVE**

## TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE DISCUSSION AND ACTIONS MEETING OF OCTOBER 15, 2004

The meeting of the Transportation Committee was called to order by Chair Joe Kellejian (North County Coastal) at 9:03 a.m. See the attached attendance sheet for Transportation Committee member attendance.

### 1. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

Action: Upon a motion by Vice Chair Mary Sessom (East County) and a second by Councilmember Jim Madaffer (City of San Diego), the Transportation Committee approved the minutes from the October 1, 2004, meeting.

### 2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

Chuck Lungerhausen, a member of the public, referred to his letter that was published in the *San Diego Union-Tribune* newspaper on Sunday, October 10, 2004, rebutting the editorial that chided SANDAG for adding the \$2,000 exaction fee for new home development starting July 1, 2008. He said this fee is 0.44 percent of the average San Diego home cost, which is very small in the scheme of things. He didn't think a new homeowner would be happy if there were no roads from his new home to his place of employment. A "yes" vote on Proposition A would ensure that that road would be built. He mentioned that in 1977 he commuted from Huntington Beach to San Diego for a three-month period. He didn't think anyone would want that commute today with the congestion on Interstate 5 (I-5). He expressed his appreciation for the public transportation service available to him. He acknowledged that his commute to places on public transportation is getting longer due to the traffic congestion on local roads. He said that we cannot build our way out of congestion. Mr. Lungerhausen also expressed concern about Allan Hoffman's comments that public transit services are not helpful. He has found them to be very helpful.

### CONSENT ITEMS (3 through 5)

Chair Kellejian pulled agenda item 3 from the Consent Calendar.

4. TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT (TDA) CLAIM AMENDMENT (APPROVE)

The Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) annually submits one claim on behalf of all transit operators in its service area. The City of El Cajon has requested an amendment to the claim to use \$158,693 from its unallocated TDA reserve for various improvements at numerous bus stop locations and other transit facilities in the city. The Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) Board at its October 7, 2004, meeting approved amending the claim to reflect the request from the City of El Cajon. The Transportation Committee is asked to approve the claim amendment.

5. FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION ENHANCEMENT ACTIVITIES (TEA) PROGRAM: QUARTERLY PROGRESS REPORT (INFORMATION)

The Transportation Committee receives a progress report for the nine TEA-funded projects on a quarterly basis. This report covers the period July to October 2004. The entire \$23.2 million in TEA funds that were apportioned to our region have now been obligated. This will be the final separate report for the TEA program. Staff will continue to report on the status of the remaining TEA projects through the quarterly Progress Report on Transportation Projects.

Action: Upon a motion by Mayor Corky Smith (North County Inland) and a second by Supervisor Ron Roberts (County of San Diego), the Transportation Committee approved Consent Items 4 through 5, including Resolution No 2005-09, approving the TDA Claim Amendment.

3. 2004 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (RTIP) AMENDMENT NO. 1 (APPROVE)

At its meeting on July 23, 2004, the SANDAG Board adopted the 2004 RTIP, the five-year program of major transportation projects in the San Diego region covering the period from FY 2005 to FY 2009. SANDAG has received requests to include new capacity-increasing projects as well as to revise existing projects in the 2004 RTIP. The addition of capacity-increasing projects to the approved RTIP requires a new regional emissions analysis. SANDAG updated the regional emissions analysis and released a draft report for public review on August 30, 2004. This report summarizes the final Air Quality Emissions Analysis on the additional capacity-increasing projects, and summarizes other revisions to existing projects. The Transportation Committee is asked to adopt Resolution No. 2005-09, approving Amendment No. 1 to the 2004 RTIP.

Sookyung Kim reported that the SANDAG Board adopted the 2004 RTIP. Amendment No. 1 would add several capacity-increasing projects, and staff has received direction from various jurisdictions to revise several projects. As a result, a new air quality emissions analysis was conducted as well as an additional fiscal constraint analysis for Amendment No 1.

Public Comment:

Mel Hinton, representing the San Diego Audubon Society, stated that the issue they are concerned about is the selection of an alternative to address the north-south

traffic in University City. He served on the University City North-South Public Working Committee. This is a very controversial issue--how to resolve traffic in University City. The Committee was tasked with developing four or five alternatives and ranking them. However, because of controversies within the Committee they could not rank them. Instead they ranked the criteria by which the alternatives should be judged. The Committee sent a report to the City of San Diego. The City has been drafting an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and during that process added two more criteria. The main issue is the bridge versus other alternatives. The Audubon Society opposes any bridge construction. By the Transportation Committee selecting the bridge alternative, you are preempting the natural process given to the City to select a project. The San Diego City Council has the authority to make the decision. He asked if the bridge is not chosen as the alternative—is that money tied up for other alternatives.

Chair Kellejian clarified that Mr. Hinton is referring to the Regents Road project on page 22.

Debra Knight, representing the Friends of Rose Canyon and UC Golden, indicated that both organizations are deeply involved in the Regents Road Bridge Project and alternatives that the City of San Diego is now actively considering. For ten years this project has been highly controversial. Councilmember Scott Peters established a process that would fully and equally evaluate this project. An EIR is underway that is studying seven alternatives. Four of the seven alternatives would have the Regents Road Bridge never being built. The draft EIR for the UC North-South Transportation Corridor Study is due out in a couple of weeks. It has taken a year and \$1.5 million to complete. A lot of time, money, and community time has gone into a fair, open, and equal consideration for all of the alternatives. If you would put money towards one alternative, you would undermine this two-year process. It would send a message that this project would be built despite community concern. In requesting these funds for the Regents Road Project, the City is double dipping as this project was fully funded with Federal Transit Administration (FTA) monies for North University City. In June the city updated the project's costs and then raised developer fees to pay for it. She asked that this item be removed or the project name changed to the University City North-South Transportation Corridor Study, and that money is allocated to the alternative that the City selects.

Ms. Kim explained that the *TransNet* program is divided into thirds, one of which is local streets and roads. Each city and county determines the type of projects for which it will use *TransNet* funds. Although SANDAG provides oversight for highway projects, it does not provide oversight for local projects unless asked. SANDAG is not providing funds for this particular project. We anticipate that the City will provide sufficient community input and environmental clearance. We don't dictate to the cities how they use their funds.

Gary Gallegos, Executive Director, stated that at some point if the City concludes that it will pursue another alternative, the STIP will be amended to reflect that change.

Councilmember Madaffer said that the comments of the speakers should be taken into consideration. If this project is not considered and there is another project looked at, the City can do another amendment and the funds can be programmed at that time.

Mayor Pro Tem Phil Monroe (South County) asked if it would be possible to change the name of the project. Councilmember Madaffer responded that until we see another project specifically identified the current title is okay as a placeholder.

Chair Kellejian said that it is up to the City of San Diego to change the project.

Leon Williams, MTS Board Chair, said that sometime members of the public interpret things differently and we should not send a negative symbol. They are asking that we not send a signal that can be misinterpreted.

Councilmember Madaffer said that he would not oppose revising the project name to the Regents Road/North-South Corridor, but SANDAG can't change the project title. This would have to be done at a future meeting.

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Madaffer and a second by Mayor Pro Tem Monroe, the Transportation Committee adopted Resolution No. 2005-09, approving Amendment No. 1 to the 2004 RTIP.

## REPORTS

### 6. COMMENTS ON LOS ANGELES-TO-SAN DIEGO PROPOSED RAIL CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENT STUDIES DRAFT PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT/ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT (PEIR/EIS) (APPROVE)

Linda Culp, Senior Planner, introduced Pat Merrill, Manager, Capital Projects, South, Caltrans Division of Rail, (the state is the lead agency for document), and Steve Schibuola with the IBI Group, the consultant on this project.

Mr. Merrill stated that the objective of this project is to review opportunities in the rail corridor, to set a vision for the corridor, and to see the opportunities to improve rail operations, safety, and traffic circulation at grade crossings.

Mr. Schibuola provided information on the process, study area, and the two alternatives studied: No-Action/No-Project Alternative (No-Project) and Rail Improvements Alternative. The No-Project Alternative is the baseline for comparison of the Rail Improvements Alternative. It represents the Los Angeles – San Diego (LOSSAN) region's transportation system (highway and conventional rail) as it would be following the implementation of programs or project currently programmed in the RTPs, funded for implementation, and expected to be in place by 2020. The Rail Improvements Alternative is trying to accomplish four major objectives: eliminate remaining single-track segments resulting in a multiple-tracked corridor, allow for maximum operating speeds, reduce at-grade crossings and use state-of-the-art safety and signal systems, and address and mitigate community and environmental issues.

Mr. Merrill reviewed the projects in San Diego County: in the City of Carlsbad, the City of Encinitas, the City of Del Mar, the City of San Diego – University City, and City of San Diego – Old Town to Santa Fe Depot.

Mr. Merrill stated that the Rail Improvements Alternative would significantly reduce travel time when compared with auto, existing conditions, and the No-Project Alternative. In the future, even with a broad range of improvements in the I-5 corridor, the automobile time is topping above three hours. The No-Project Alternative will improve travel time a little, but it will be short of a major improvement. Rail improvements are one to two hours, which will be competitive with a single-occupant automobile.

Mr. Merrill reviewed the advantages of the Rail Improvement Alternative over the No-Project Alternative as follows: increased capacity and average speed, significant reduction in travel time, increased reliability, enhanced multimodal opportunities, operational flexibility, reduction of vehicle/rail conflicts, and benefits to all corridor traffic (intercity rail, commuter rail, and freight service).

Mr. Merrill noted there were several issues in San Diego County including the coastal lagoons, the Coastal Rail Trail project, downtown San Diego grade separations, and Del Mar/Torrey Pines – Camino Del Mar and Penasquitos Bypass Tunnel options.

Mr. Merrill provided information about the LOSSAN public meetings that were held. He said that the comments received were generally supportive. He also went over the remaining project schedule.

Ms. Culp provided the six comments recommended by staff: (1) SANDAG appreciates the detailed work by Caltrans and the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) on the release of this document and the high level of public and agency involvement; (2) SANDAG recommends that Caltrans and the FRA select the Rail Improvements Alternative as the preferred alternative; (3) SANDAG recognizes that specific projects included in either the Low Build or High Build option of the Rail Improvement Alternative require more detailed, project-level analysis; (4) the document should discuss the potential impacts to San Diego's existing Coaster commuter rail stations at Carlsbad Village and Encinitas relative to trenching and at Sorrento Valley relative to tunneling; (5) relative to proposed mitigation strategies, consider SANDAG's comments on Land Use (S-19)), Biology/Wetlands (S-20), and Growth Inducement (S-22); and (6) the region's vision includes a continuous 44-mile Coastal Rail Trail between the Oceanside Transit Center and the Santa Fe Depot, and that the project lead agency work with SANDAG, the coastal cities, the North County Transit District (NCTD) and MTS on relocation efforts to ensure the continuity of the Coastal Rail Trail.

Chair Kellejian noted that he had received a phone call on October 14 from a Del Mar City Councilmember notifying the Transportation Committee that on October 18, 2004, the Del Mar City Council will discuss its comments on this document. He wanted to let SANDAG know that it will be rejecting both of the alternatives that were presented here today. The Del Mar City Council is looking to completely take the railroad out of Del Mar and have passenger rail be diverted to I-5 and freight rail diverted to I-15.

Councilmember Jack Feller (North County Coastal) noted that the City of Oceanside has every form of public transportation, and he asked that it be included in consideration for a trench. He added that there are five rail crossings in downtown Oceanside.

Mayor Corky Smith asked if more information will be forthcoming from Caltrans to SANDAG. Mr. Gallegos replied that this is our response to the Draft Programmatic EIR/EIS that Caltrans and the FRA have released for public comment. Staff is recommending that SANDAG select the build alternative as the option but is suggesting that the agencies not select between the High and Low Build options but wait until the project level environmental documents are completed.

In response to Councilmember Feller's request related to trenching, Mr. Merrill stated that this is the first time a trench has been brought up specifically for Oceanside. Due to the layout of Oceanside, building roads over the railroad is a possibility but trenching would be more difficult. One of the advantages of a Programmatic EIR/EIS process is that it sets the big picture and then comes back with project specific work.

Councilmember Feller commented that the City of Oceanside would like to build a bridge to a project on Mission Avenue but he didn't know if you could build a bridge over that rail corridor.

Chair Kellejian suggested that Councilmember Feller meet with Mr. Merrill and Mr. Schibuola regarding the City of Oceanside's concerns.

Karen King, NCTD Executive Director, said that the issue Councilmember Feller raised has been discussed at an NCTD Board meeting. The cities that have largely been double tracked have not received benefits of the new thinking behind this new Programmatic EIR. In the past, grade separations and trenching were not considered an option. As this moves forward and we look at project segments there will be the opportunity to do an analysis and decide how to address those issues. There is more development and a more active community than there were a few years ago when this study was initiated. There is a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between all of the agencies along the corridor that this Programmatic EIR/EIS would serve as our long-range view and plan for this corridor, and we would all work to support those findings. As segments are prioritized and funded, the actual project segment analysis would be done and something different could come out of it.

Supervisor Roberts questioned the possibility of trenching in San Diego. He thought the only segment that has been looked at is between Sassafras Street and Cedar Street. He has had discussions with the Centre City Development Corporation (CCDC) and understands there is interest in an extension of that trench. Mr. Schibuola responded that the study area for this document did not extend south beyond the Santa Fe Depot.

Supervisor Roberts also expressed concerns about how a possible expansion of Lindbergh Field, along with changes that could occur in the area of Washington Street, that would impact the rail corridor grade crossings in the vicinity of the airport. He asked if we have established standards for grade crossings to evaluate potential grade crossing projects in an equitable manner throughout the county. In the intercity area, every time a 60-car

train comes through it creates an incredibly dangerous situation. Emergency vehicles cannot cross these intersections for about ten minutes. The Grape and Hawthorn Streets area is a potential site for trenching. There needs to be some standards and consideration given to what else is happening in this corridor. The wait for the train causes traffic congestion and creates a safety issue.

Chair Kellejian mentioned that we are developing criteria to rate grade separations all across San Diego County.

Mr. Gallegos noted that when the RTP was last adopted there were funds highlighted for constructing grade separations. The Transportation Committee directed staff to develop some regionwide criteria that this Committee would recommend for adoption by the SANDAG Board to use to help prioritize our investments. We will be bringing draft criteria to this committee to consider for that purpose.

Supervisor Roberts stated whatever we are doing it should leave us flexibility to respond to the environment in downtown San Diego through to areas like Washington Street due to other expansion plans such as with the airport.

Mr. Gallegos noted that today's recommendation is for the Build alternative. We will have the possibility of going further as we do detailed project EIRs. The goal is to have Caltrans develop the programmatic document on which we can base future decisions.

Vice Chair Sessom said that the Airport Authority has started the process of master planning for Lindbergh Field and it is looking at several options for terminal locations. Moving to Pacific Highway is only one option. We won't have that process done until June 2005.

Mayor Smith asked if Oceanside and Del Mar will make a decision about this at their councils. Mr. Gallegos replied that the idea was to encourage the cities to comment on this draft document.

Action: Upon a motion by Mayor Smith and a second by Councilmember Madaffer, the Transportation Committee approved forwarding the comments to Caltrans and the FRA by October 25, 2004, to include the comments recommended by staff, the comments made about grade separation criteria, and support for the Build option.

## 7. REGIONAL FARE POLICY (RECOMMEND)

Toni Bates, Division Director of Transportation Planning, reported that at last meeting, the Committee endorsed a regional fare policy with one exception related to fares for special event service. The Committee asked staff to come back with revised language for the fare policy that states these services should cover costs and perhaps generate a profit. Proposed language has been developed that reflects this direction. In Section 29.5.7 of the draft policy was split the section in two, with one section for special event services and the second section, in Section 29.5.8, dealing with fares for temporary promotional services. The Committee's direction was to reflect fares for exclusive services provided to special events to meet the costs of operation or to make a profit. The draft policy was reviewed by the transit agencies. NCTD had several alternative suggestions, which are reflected in shaded

parts of the Policy that included sponsorship fees as revenues for covering the cost of special event operation and other goals for special event services such as congestion relief or improved access to special events. Ms. Bates asked the Committee to: (1) select an option for this policy related to special event fares, (2) approve the revisions made to Sections 29.5.3 and 29.5.5 related to the public hearing process and the role of the Transportation Committee, and (3) recommend that the SANDAG Board of Directors adopt the Regional Fare Policy as revised.

Chair Kellejian asked for clarification with regard to meeting community goals such as congestion reduction as this is an ongoing goal. Ms. King responded that NCTD is not wed to that specific language but the concepts are important. The language SANDAG staff has proposed is acceptable, but she suggested that the words "Chargers" and "Padres" be deleted to make the events more generic. These fares for Chargers and Padres games could be looked at as seasonal rather than special events. The Coaster service to baseball games at Petco Park is costly to operate. If we charged fees that would cover the operating costs for bus service from North County to events like the Chargers games it would be cost prohibitive. However, this service would reduce congestion going to such an event. The NCTD Board endorsed the language contained in the original draft policy.

Mayor Pro Tem Monroe expressed his preference for the SANDAG option over the NCTD one. His issue is that we shouldn't be using public funds to facilitate public transit services for people to attend events where the owners make money at the expense of being able to provide regular transit services. The idea that the service provided should break even or make a profit, or the event organizers should subsidize the transit they need to make public access to an event easier. He liked the idea that additional transit service that is added to regular service to meet the demand for special events be exempt. He suggested that the sentence in Section 29.5.8 stating that the "special event fares should not adversely affect a transit agency's budget" be deleted. The issue is the project not the budget.

Councilmember Madaffer wondered why special event fares would not require a public hearing. Ms. King replied that many times we work to get a promotional fare for event service and it is only for one weekend, or it is very temporary, and we set the fare that takes into account the sponsorship fee. There are multiple scenarios, temporary and short-term, and we are trying to be responsive to the public and the desire to have public transportation serve a particular event. It is not necessary for the special event fares to be predetermined in advance.

Councilmember Madaffer was satisfied with that reasoning. He suggested that the words "temporary nature" be added after "these fares." Ms. King noted that service changes do go through the public hearing process.

Councilmember Madaffer said that the reality is there are 60,000 people wanting to move from one part of the community to another and, if this is going to cause a problem, the public agencies have to be responsive to facilitate the movement of people, including the subsidizing of public transportation. We need to look at everything in the aggregate.

Paul Jablonski, Chief Executive Officer of MTS, said that sometimes congestion is not the right term to use; it might be public safety. Usually any kind of special fares would go to

the local transit board for public comment. The issue that he sees is that there could be any number of special events that come up. Trying to provide language with specificity is dangerous. MTS and NCTD will have different special events. The special event fares should be a matter for the local transit board to decide.

Councilmember Judy Ritter (NCTD) added that if people are not using transit for special events, they are contributing to traffic congestion and air pollution. We ran the Coaster to Petco Park on Friday evenings. She was not sure that we received totally cost recovery for that operation, but it relieved traffic and parking. She didn't think we were in the business to make a profit.

Supervisor Roberts stated that the word "profit" has no meaning in government. We should let the operating agencies do their job. For special event services we should encourage full cost recovery of operational expenses.

Mayor Smith asked Ms. King if special event transportation has a negative effect on regular transportation. Ms. King responded that this last season we reduced the amount of service to sporting events on Friday evenings because we needed the vehicles for rush hour services. We only use surplus capacity for special events.

Mayor Smith agreed that the transit agencies should have more flexibility to decide on what is going on. He recommended that we send both of these options and let the SANDAG Board make the decision.

Mayor Pro Tem Monroe agreed to accept Supervisor Roberts' suggestion. He asked that something be added to the effect that when we get into the fare structure we look at service priorities. He personally would rather provide lifeline services than he would for people to go to a ballgame.

Motion: Upon a motion by Supervisor Roberts and a second by Mayor Pro Tem Monroe the Transportation Committee approved the Regional Fare Policy with the following revisions: (1) insert the following language into Section 29.5.7 "for special event services we encourage the transit agencies to achieve full recovery for their operational expenses" (2) in Section 29.5.8, the reference to the budget was deleted, (3) the revisions made to Sections 29.5.3 and 29.5.5 related to the public hearing process and Transportation Committee role, and (4) recommended that the SANDAG Board of Directors adopt the Regional Fare Policy as revised.

#### 8. REGIONAL BIKEWAY DEVELOPMENT PROGRESS REPORT (INFORMATION)

Stephan Vance, Senior Regional Planner, reported that over the past decade SANDAG has programmed over \$28 million in federal transportation funds towards bikeway improvements on this network and some of them are about to reach major milestones including the Bayshore Bikeway, Coastal Rail Trail, the Inland Rail Trail, and State Route (SR 15) Bikeway.

Mr. Vance said that through the Bayshore Bikeway working group, we have been able to encourage development along the bayfront. Currently there are 13 miles of bike path

along the route; the remainder consists of bike lanes and bike routes. The most significant recent achievement was the Sweetwater River Crossing project. The bridge was named for Gordy Shields, a longtime bicycle advocate. The Western Salt project will connect the bike path along the Imperial Beach bayfront to Main Street in Chula Vista. This project will be built primarily on old San Diego and Arizona Eastern (SD&AE) Railway right-of-way and dikes constructed as part of the salt pond. An EIR is being developed and final design is expected to begin with construction in September 2005. Last June, SANDAG provided funding for the plan update. He reviewed several areas for improvement. This project would provide us a continuous bike path from Chula Vista to Coronado. The study is to be completed some time this spring. The Rainbow Spur bids came in over budget. Imperial Beach has had to defer that project and . will look to reduce the project scope to fit the bid amounts or redefine the project.

The concept for the Coastal Rail Trail was to build a continuous 44-mile bike lane from Oceanside to the Santa Fe Depot. In some areas along the corridor it is not possible to build a separate bike path due to right-of-way constraints though we may have some opportunities through grade separations. About \$13.8 million has been programmed for this project, but that does not fully fund the project. The project study report made some assumptions that may be changed and could result in cost reductions. This project will be built in segments, with each city being responsible for building its own section.

The first segment will be built in Solana Beach. This 1.7-mile project is nearly completed, and the ribbon cutting is scheduled for October 24, 2004. The cost of this project was \$2.2 million. Phase 1 in Oceanside costs about \$557,000 and will be done in December 2004. Phase 2 in Oceanside, will go north to the Oceanside Transit Center. Work has begun on this project and it is expected to be ready for construction in September 2005.

Carlsbad has gone out to bid for its first phase which is estimated to cost \$1.76 million. The second phase will take trail to the Poinsettia Coaster Station. There are some constraints with future double tracking and the only link along the trail with a lagoon crossing. The right-of-way also goes through the Encino power plant property. This project has no funds obligated for construction.

There are two parts for the trail in Encinitas. The first part is under design and there are several areas of constraint. It is hoped to be under construction next fall. Completion of the second phase will depend on resolution of future double tracking alignments and completion of grade separation studies underway.

In San Diego the trail will go along the railroad right-of-way through the loop. The original project study report and environmental document did not include this alignment. The bike path was constructed within the right-of-way in Sorrento Valley and most likely will go through University City on city streets to the Nobel Station, then into Rose Canyon as far as Gilman Drive. This current study will complete preliminary engineering and prepare the environmental document for the project, with a scheduled completion by spring 2006.

The Inland Rail Trail project was made possible by the purchase of right-of-way. It will construct a bike path from Escondido to Oceanside; San Marcos is the lead agency. Construction of Phase 1 in Escondido and San Marcos will be done as part of the Sprinter

construction. The opening of this trail depends on the phasing of the Sprinter. The next phase takes it west through the unincorporated portion of the right-of-way to Vista. San Marcos is about to award a contract for design.

The SR 15 bikeway will restore access to bikes along this north-south corridor. Bike access was eliminated when the SR 15 freeway was built. \$2.5 million has been programmed for this project. The City of San Diego expects to move forward with environmental design and be ready for construction by next summer.

Chair Kellejian thanked Mr. Vance for the report.

Mayor Smith asked if we know how many people use the bike lanes. He said that having this information would help to make the argument to spend this money. Mr. Vance replied that we haven't done any recent counts, but they have been done in the past. He estimated that peak period counts on the Bayshore Bikeway are on the order of 30-50 cyclists per hour, then you would add midday and weekend recreation trips. He recognized that we need to do a better job of monitoring these projects; however, bike counts are labor intensive.

Mayor Pro Tem Monroe expressed appreciation from the cities of Coronado and Imperial Beach for this committee being patient with the Bayshore Bikeway project. He said that it really is important that we start the process and get an updated plan. He added that Admiral Bettencourt has committed the Navy to this project.

Action: This report was presented for information only.

9. UPCOMING MEETING

The next meeting of the Transportation Committee is scheduled for November 12, 2004.

10. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Kellejian adjourned the meeting at 10:52 a.m.

Attachment: Attendance Sheet

**CONFIRMED ATTENDANCE  
SANDAG TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MEETING  
OCTOBER 15, 2004**

GEOGRAPHICAL AREA/ ORGANIZATION	JURISDICTION	NAME	MEMBER/ ALTERNATE	ATTENDING	COMMENTS
North County Coastal	City of Solana Beach	Joe Kellejian (Chair)	Member	Yes	
	City of Encinitas	Christy Guerin	Alternate	No	Out of town
North County Inland	City of Poway	Mickey Cafagna	Member	No	
	City of San Marcos	Corky Smith	Alternate	Yes	
East County	City of Santee	Jack Dale	Member	No	Out of town
	City of Santee	Hal Ryan	Alternate	Yes	
South County	City of Coronado	Phil Monroe	Member	Yes	
	City of Chula Vista	Jerry Rindone	Alternate	No	Out of town
City of San Diego	----	Dick Murphy (Vice Chair)	Member	No	
	----	Jim Madaffer	Alternate	Yes	
County of San Diego	----	Ron Roberts	Member	Yes	
	----	Dianne Jacob	Alternate	No	
	----	Bill Horn	Alternate	No	
Metropolitan Transit Development Board	City of Poway	Bob Emery	Member	No	
	MTDB	Leon Williams	Alternate	Yes	
North County Transit Development Board	City of Vista	Judy Ritter	Member	Yes	
	City of Oceanside	Jack Feller	Alternate	Yes	
	City of Del Mar	Dave Druker	Alternate	No	
San Diego County Regional Airport Authority	City of Oceanside	Terry Johnson	Member	No	
	City of Lemon Grove	Mary Sessom	Alternate	Yes	
ADVISORY/LIAISON Caltrans	----	Pedro Orso-Delgado	Member	No	
	—	Bill Figge	Alternate	No	