

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

December 10, 2004

AGENDA ITEM NO.: **1**

Action Requested: APPROVE

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE DISCUSSION AND ACTIONS MEETING OF NOVEMBER 12, 2004

The meeting of the Transportation Committee was called to order by Chair Joe Kellejian (North County Coastal) at 9:06 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 Judy Ritter (North San Diego County Transit Development Board [NCTD]), the Transportation Committee approved the minutes from the October 15, 2004, meeting.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

Chuck Lungerhausen, a member of the public, wondered if the opposition to Proposition A realizes how much worse our congestion will be with a two-year delay until the next elections in 2006. He said that Alan Hoffman's opinion/editorial in the October 29, 2004, issue of the *San Diego Union-Tribune* is flawed with disinformation. SANDAG did conduct public surveys to understand what people would vote for and stated as much at its public meetings which he and other members of the public attended. He noted that it is unusual for elected mayors and council members from 18 cities in the county to agree on anything, but they did unanimously agree on Proposition A.

Chair Kellejian asked Mr. Gallegos to give an update on Proposition A. *Gary Gallegos, Executive Director, said that as of this morning the measure is leading by 66.68 percent, or about 208 votes more than we need for approval. He added that there are still 61,000 absentee and provisional ballots yet to be counted.*

CONSENT ITEM

3. REPROGRAMMING OF FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION (FTA) CAPITAL FUNDS/TRANSIT CAPITAL PROJECT BUDGET AMENDMENTS (RECOMMEND)

As part of an annual grants review, SANDAG staff and Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) staff have identified approximately \$1.2 million from completed projects that can be

transferred to new projects which would include the rehabilitation/painting of light rail transit vehicles, the rehabilitation of traction motors, the renovation of MTS office space, and implementation of the MTS Comprehensive Operational Analysis (COA). The funds for the COA would supplement existing budget and a newly approved Caltrans grant for this purpose. The Transportation Committee is requested to recommend that the SANDAG Board: (1) approve proposed budget amendments and reprogramming of older grant funds; (2) adopt Resolution No. 2005-10, authorizing the Executive Director to receive the Caltrans grant for the MTS COA; and (3) authorize the Executive Director to execute a Memorandum of Understanding to transfer funds to MTS for payment of costs associated with the COA.

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Ritter and a second by Mayor Corky Smith (North County Inland), the Transportation Committee approved Consent Item 3.

REPORTS

4. INTERSTATE 5 (I-5) NORTH COAST HIGH-OCCUPANCY-VEHICLE (HOV)/MANAGED LANES PROJECT UPDATE (INFORMATION/POSSIBLE ACTION)

Richard Chavez, Senior Transportation Engineer, introduced Arturo Jacobo, with Caltrans to assist with this presentation.

Mr. Chavez discussed the funding uncertainties for this project. He noted that the *TransNet Extension*, if approved, would make up a good portion of the project funding. The total project cost estimate is \$1.4 billion (2002 dollars). SANDAG has programmed over \$12 million for the engineering and environmental document, and Caltrans has spent \$11 million to date. Caltrans has estimated that it will cost about \$22 million to complete this work.

Mr. Jacobo described the project parameters, the need and purpose, project features, alternatives, public concerns, opportunities, and the schedule.

Mayor Pro Tem Monroe asked if the traffic numbers presented by Caltrans are for work day or average daily trips. *Mr. Jacobo replied that they use numbers for weekdays, Tuesday through Thursday.*

Mr. Gallegos emphasized that this project is not high-occupancy-vehicle (HOV) lanes but managed lanes. The managed lanes can be used as truck-only and special event lanes. He said it is important to be able to manage the lanes to meet our needs in the future.

Chair Kellejian said that one of the reasons for I-5 was as a national highway for defense purposes. It is important to the security of our country for the movement of troops in case of disaster, and it should be noted that there is no other way to get down to San Diego without this highway. He suggested that this importance should be included in future staff reports about this project.

Councilmember Ritter asked when this project will be built. *Chair Kellejian replied that construction will begin in 2009 and completed is anticipated in 2014.*

Councilmember Ritter asked if there is any way to speed up that time frame. *Mr. Gallegos said that this is a complex project. A lot of the timing has to do with community consensus. We are going over very sensitive lagoons and issues of communities with noise, aesthetics, and visual impacts.*

Mr. Jacobo commented that the importance of this freeway to national security is one reason why the federal government approved it for the environmental streamlining.

Mayor Smith asked if the concrete barriers will move back and forth. *Mr. Jacobo said that the directional traffic split is 50/50 on this freeway so the concrete barriers are fixed with multiple access points.*

Mayor Smith asked why the barriers would be fixed rather than moveable like the ones on Interstate 15 (I-15). *Pedro Orso-Delgado, Caltrans District 11 Director, responded that there is a directional split in the morning and afternoon on I-15. We are also trying to maintain the median landscaping on I-5.*

Mayor Pro Tem Monroe asked how the managed lanes would work if there is a concrete barrier. *Mr. Gallegos replied that with a fixed barrier, you would manage the use of the lanes rather than move the lanes themselves.*

Mayor Pro Tem Monroe asked if there are any cities along this freeway that are opposed to this project. *Mr. Orso-Delgado answered that, in general, each city supports the project but they all have individual concerns. Noise is the number one concern; right-of-way impacts is another significant concern. We are developing a scheme where we will work with the city managers to come up with a community-type forum. We are trying to look at the entire corridor from a regional point of view.*

Public Comment:

Marion Dodson, a member of the public and former mayor of Solana Beach, provided background information on this project. She said that she served on a mid-county transportation study in the late 1980s and on a committee overseeing North Coast studies in the 1990s. The question she asked numerous times at these meetings was if there would be any taking of private property. The answer was no, and that all alternatives were within existing right of way. Now we see the taking of private property. Community groups stated that the taking of private property was of utmost concern to them.

Councilmember Guerin (North County Coastal) expressed surprise that with the concern about private property takes, Caltrans is continuing to try to keep landscaping in the median. She wondered why alternatives without the median landscaping were not presented. *Mr. Jacobo responded that one of the elements that make the corridor unique is the median planting, but he acknowledged that they are not married to that idea. When the environmental documents are completed that information will be shared with the*

affected cities and community groups. He noted that we need to balance the needs of the community with the needs of the corridor.

Councilmember Guerin said she hoped that in the studies Caltrans considers eliminating the green in the middle in favor of eliminating property takes.

Councilmember Guerin asked which alternatives would require the taking of private property. *Mr. Jacobo replied that it varies from city to city; the 8+4 alternative will take less property than the 10+4 alternative. By the spring of 2005 there will be a footprint for each of those alternatives, and that information will be shared with the affected communities. Mr. Gallegos added that in all of the alternatives, while some may have right-of-way takes, they are not total takes. None of them require taking someone's house. Most of them are easements to build retaining walls.*

Mr. Orso-Delgado noted that one of the things we are going to look at is the enhancement of private property to provide more usable land than before the project. Communities are still concerned because the freeway alignment is shifted closer to private property.

Chair Kellejian commented that this was a huge issue in past community meetings. The consensus Ms. Dodson talked about had a number of conditions that had to occur including getting 20-minute headways on the Coaster, opening up arterials between cities, implementation of an aggressive bus system, and expansion of the freeway. If one of these conditions was not met, then the plan would not work. When we talked about the expansion of the freeway, we agreed with the plan as long as there was no property takes, with two exceptions of commercial property. Solana Beach is very concerned about the property takes with this project.

Chair Kellejian asked if there would be auxiliary lanes the entire length of the corridor on both sides. *Mr. Jacobo responded that there will be auxiliary lanes for most of the freeway length.* Chair Kellejian asked if there will be auxiliary lanes from Loma Santa Fe to Manchester Boulevard. *Mr. Jacobo replied affirmatively.*

Councilmember Jack Feller (NCTD) asked if the new bridges in this project would allow for possible rail in the future. *Mr. Chavez said that the one bridge at the southern end at Voigt Avenue at the University of California at San Diego (UCSD) campus is a location for a direct access ramp to the managed lanes. That is also the planned location for the light rail crossing for the Mid-Coast Project. It is the only location that is planned to include rail.*

Councilmember Feller wondered if there was space planned for high speed rail along this corridor. *Mr. Gallegos said that high speed rail is not being proposed along I-5, but rather on the I-15 corridor.*

Councilmember Guerin asked if Supervisor Slater was a member of that past committee that was mentioned previously. *Chair Kellejian replied affirmatively. He noted that the input at that time served as the basis for the MOBILITY 2030 plan.*

Councilmember Jack Dale (East County) said that in previous reports, one of the causes of traffic problems on freeways is that we were using them as a substitute for local streets. He

asked if that is what we are doing with auxiliary lanes. *Chair Kellejian agreed that is happening because we don't have good arterial roads to get from one city to another.*

Councilmember Dale asked if there was a way to encourage the state and federal government to direct their agencies to complete their reviews in a timely fashion. If there are state and federal rules that are causing constraints, we should talk with them to streamline this process. *Chair Kellejian said that this project was identified as one of six highways for environmental streamlining by the federal government. Mr. Orso-Delgado added that a significant time killer is going back and forth with the resource agencies. At the U.S. Department of Transportation, one of their undersecretaries, who will be the champion for this project, will be working at that level with all of the other resource agencies to make sure that when issues come up they get resolved quickly. They are not cutting time from the process. They are assuring us that they will meet the timelines on the project. We have some very strong environmental rules and regulations that dictate what we have to do.*

Supervisor Ron Roberts (County of San Diego) said this project is not a solution to the problem. He expressed concern about having only 2 lanes out of 14 where you can pull over if you have a problem.

Councilmember Jerry Rindone (South County) agreed with Supervisor Roberts' comments. He said this project is the best argument for mass transit.

Councilmember Guerin noted that there is a certain portion of our population that will want to expand the freeway. Obviously there are some that realize that they need mass transit. You can't tell people what choices to make. You have to give them the choice. We are to represent what our constituents want.

Chair Kellejian commented that we have a balanced plan and we need to move forward on that plan and continue to give people travel choices.

Action: The Transportation Committee received this report for information.

5. PROPOSED APPROACH FOR INTEGRATING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE REGIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN (RCP) AND THE UPDATE OF THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN (RTP) (ACCEPT)

Bob Leiter, Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning, stated that this report provides an overview of the RCP vision and policy framework, core implementation strategies, and next steps. The RCP vision statement laid out a policy framework on three basic themes: Theme 1 – the RCP provides a framework for coordinating land use and transportation planning at the local and regional level; Theme 2 – we would use our combined land use and transportation plans to guide our other plans; and Theme 3 is making it happen through incentives and collaboration.

Mr. Leiter said that the RCP laid out a series of strategic initiatives that are recommended to implement the plan including land use/transportation, housing, economic development, a healthy environment, public facilities, borders, performance monitoring, and analytical

tools. The report focused on the six core initiatives that specifically deal with connecting land use and transportation including: the smart growth incentive program, regional housing needs assessment (RHNA), performance indicators and targets, the smart growth concept map, an updated regional growth forecast, and an updated regional transportation plan. He reviewed the goals and implementation steps for each of these core initiatives.

Mr. Leiter reported that staff expects SANDAG to adopt a revised Regional Transportation Plan in February 2007. He noted that there is an issue of timing of the RTP update and existing federal law which requires an update every three years. Given the number of issues, we have a concern that this time frame would not allow a look at all of the issues. If the law changes, we can shift to the four-year cycle.

Mr. Leiter identified issues that need to be looked at through technical reports. He described the next steps: to prepare detailed work programs for the core initiatives, establish a stakeholders group, organize subregional staff teams at SANDAG to collaborate with local agencies, and implement the work programs by early 2007.

Councilmember Guerin asked for a copy of the PowerPoint presentation. *Staff agreed to send the presentation to Transportation Committee members.*

Action: Upon a motion by Mayor Smith and a second by Councilmember Dale the Transportation Committee unanimously accepted the proposed approach for integrating the RCP and RTP activities outlined in this report.

Chair Kellejian called a five-minute break at 10:32 a.m. and reconvened the meeting at 10:38 a.m.

6. CREATION OF A NEW REGIONAL PLANNING STAKEHOLDERS WORKING GROUP (RECOMMEND)

Chair Kellejian stated that one of the items mentioned in the previous report was the establishment of a new Regional Stakeholders Working Group. The Regional Planning Committee (RPC) took action to recommend that the Board establish such a group, and appointed Mayor Maggie Houlihan (North County Coastal) and Pam Slater-Price (County of San Diego) to the selection committee.

Chair Kellejian asked for confirmation of the following people representing the Transportation Committee to that selection committee: Councilmember Jim Madaffer (City of San Diego), Mayor Pro Tem Monroe, and Councilmember Dale.

Mike Hix, Principal Transportation Planner, said that the selection committee would present a slate to the SANDAG Board. This Working Group would meet for two years until the Board adopts the update of the RTP. It would advise both the Transportation and the Regional Planning Committees on this matter. Following approval of this item by the Board on November 19, 2004, staff will send out requests for applications so that in January 2005 the Board can approve the slate recommended by the selection committee. Mr. Hix mentioned that the Regional Planning Committee suggested that the people participating

in this Working Group could only miss two meetings in a row or three meetings in a year before being replaced.

Public Comment:

Robert Hoffman, representing SMART, said that it is an obvious intent to have this Working Group for a political purpose, not a practical one. He said that the smart growth incentive program is nothing but a focus on public transit. Smart growth is a design to get a transit system built. He didn't think that transit would be used any more effectively than it is right now.

Board Member comments:

Mayor Pro Tem Monroe thought the Working Group should be balanced, but he didn't see any representation of new theories. He thought that there should be some theoretical thinkers in this group.

Councilmember Rindone agreed with Mr. Hoffman's concern that the composition of the Working Group would be political appointments. He also agreed with Mayor Pro Tem Monroe that the Working Group needs to have some background in new thinking. He didn't want people who just represented established groups. His hope was to have individuals with a high level of education and who may offer alternative thinking.

Chair Kellejian noted that with regard to recruitment for this Working Group, there will be a posting in community newspapers.

Councilmember Guerin thought that with consolidation we would be more focused on having fewer working groups. She suggested that we eliminate some of the overlapping working groups. *Mr. Gallegos mentioned that at the last Executive Committee meeting where the Committee looked at updating the Bylaws there was extensive discussion about that topic. It was determined that these types of groups should have a start date and end date, have a particular purpose, and a member replacement scenario. The Executive Committee will also conduct an annual review of all of the committees.*

Mayor Smith said he had a problem with the County representative being on the selection committee. *Chair Kellejian noted that the Regional Planning Committee appointed the County Supervisor to the selection committee.*

Councilmember Ritter indicated her preference for a North County representative on this ad hoc working group.

Supervisor Roberts said that there should also be a representative of the unincorporated area of the county.

Chair Kellejian reminded Committee members that the action today is to appoint representatives to the selection committee, not to the Working Group.

Mr. Leiter stated that the selection committee will be charged with nominating a balanced slate for the Working Group, but the final decision would be made by the Board of Directors.

Action: Upon a motion by Supervisor Roberts and a second by Mayor Smith, the Transportation Committee recommended that the SANDAG Board of Directors approve the creation of a new Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group to provide interested citizens with a direct mechanism for early and continuous involvement in RCP implementation and the RTP update, and appointed the following members to the Stakeholders Working Group selection committee: Mayor Pro Tem Phil Monroe, Councilmember Jim Madaffer, and Councilmember Jack Dale.

7. PILOT SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM (APPROVE)

Stephan Vance, Senior Regional Planner, reported that MOBILITY 2030 calls for the development of an initial, five-year, \$25 million pilot smart growth incentive program. The use of approximately \$17 million of Transportation Enhancement (TE) funds is proposed to fund this incentive program. Ultimately, a longer-term smart growth incentive program would be funded through the *TransNet Extension*, if approved.

Mr. Vance said that this program has not yet been implemented due to uncertain funding. The California Transportation Commission (CTC) authorized regional agencies like SANDAG to program the TE funds, and these funds can be used for various projects. In the last cycle, the Board decided to focus this funding on four key policy initiatives: projects that support transit-oriented development, regional corridor and feeder bikeways, scenic viewshed or wildlife corridor acquisitions, or corridor or gateway enhancements.

Mr. Vance said that staff proposes this focus be changed to smart growth projects. This approach has been presented to a number of groups and they have concurred. The direction being proposed by staff is to use these monies to fund ready-to-go projects and for a pilot program for the longer-term program as part of *TransNet*.

Mr. Vance stated that the next step in the process is to form a short-term ad hoc working group to meet over the next month to determine the project selection criteria and proceed with a recommendation on how the selection process should occur. He said that staff could report back to the Transportation and Regional Planning Committees in January 2005 for a recommendation for a pilot program and to issue a call for projects in February. Staff would then report back to the Transportation and Regional Planning Committees by April 2005 with a recommendation for projects.

Mr. Vance mentioned that the rules of TE funding have changed at the state level; this time around, these projects are to be sent to Caltrans headquarters for review and to the CTC for funding approval. He noted that the CTC has a strong "timely use of funds" policy. With this review and approval process, funding would not be available until the beginning of the next fiscal year.

Public Comment:

Robert Hoffman, representing SMART, said that he would like to have someone point out the features of smart growth. He thought this pilot program would be a waste of money and time.

Board Comment:

Mayor Pro Tem Monroe said that in past years, these funds have gone for projects that have enhanced existing transit corridors. With smart growth, we are talking about adding transit opportunities to areas that have gone into smart growth. He wondered if this proposal will take the place of other enhancements. *Mr. Vance said that the incentive program is focusing on the public places around existing transit centers. As you intensify development there is a need for a better walking environment and better access to transit. Rather than a broad array of projects, we will focus in smart growth areas.*

Councilmember Guerin asked what kind of projects you are talking about. *Mr. Vance replied that streetscape enhancements and traffic calming projects are examples of smart growth projects.*

Supervisor Roberts stated his preference that we select only specific projects that have measurable goals. He said that the project goals have to have a direct nexus for improving the transit system. He didn't think this money should be used for neighborhood improvements. *Mr. Gallegos stated that specific criteria with measurements need to be developed and brought back to the Committee and to the Board for adoption.*

Mr. Leiter said that there are more specific criteria included in Attachment 1. There is a list of the types of specific improvements that would qualify as infrastructure improvements related to smart growth. The projects will have to demonstrate how the improvement relates to the transit system.

Councilmember Bob Emery (Metropolitan Transit System) suggested that language be added that specifies that these projects are related to transit and to assist the functionality of transit.

Mayor Pro Tem Monroe stated that this is a major policy decision and he was not sure the Committee was prepared to take that action today. *Mr. Gallegos said that the enhancement funds are supposed to be used for items over and above what you were doing with a transportation project. He agreed that staff is bringing a recommendation of a policy shift into the smart growth area to meet the goal of the RTP.*

Councilmember Guerin said that some of the items on the list of federal eligible projects do not enhance transit. *Mr. Gallegos said that included in the federal act is a set-aside allocation of funding. We have been given broad discretion on how to use those funds.*

Councilmember Guerin clarified that SANDAG as an agency can make the project criteria more stringent. *Mr. Gallegos agreed that SANDAG can limit the kinds of projects eligible for these funds, but the funds have to be used for enhancement purposes.*

Councilmember Guerin expressed her hope that this money can be used for parking lots that can assist the transit system.

Councilmember Guerin expressed a concern about forming another working group. *Mr. Gallegos said that the members of the proposed working group are technical people who will do the legwork. Ultimately, everything comes back to the Transportation Committee. We will take the direction provided by the Committee.*

Councilmember Rindone said that the Transportation Committee should be involved in the process early on, and not at the end.

Mayor Smith commented that we should use the federal funds for project enhancements so that other sources can be used for project construction.

Mr. Gallegos pointed out that members of this Working Group will be the planning and public works staffs at the cities.

Action: Upon a motion by Mayor Smith and a second by Councilmember Dale, the Transportation Committee approved the proposed approach for the Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program and appointed Mayor Pro Tem Phil Monroe and Councilmember Judy Ritter to serve as liaisons from the Transportation Committee to the ad hoc working group.

8. FREEWAY SHOULDER LANES DEMONSTRATION PROJECT (INFORMATION/POSSIBLE ACTION)

Dave Schumacher, Principal Transportation Planner, reported that MOBILITY 2030 includes a number of bus rapid transit (BRT) lines, many of which will operate along freeway corridors. The question is how these bus lines get priority measures to bypass congestion. In the 2030 MOBILITY the solution is managed lanes, however, these are long-term projects. Given the fact that we have a number of existing express bus routes in operation today, we have a need for an interim solution. Staff researched a program for using shoulder lanes along freeway corridors that has been in operation in Minneapolis, Minnesota, since 1992. This concept now has over 200 miles of transit-only shoulder operation, and the cost has been only \$100,000 per mile, and with 14 routes and 400 buses, they have had no major safety problems.

Mr. Schumacher reviewed the existing program in Minneapolis, and noted that highway, transit, and state highway police officials have a team format. He also described the lessons learned from this experience. He said that surveys of passengers there indicated that they thought there was more of a time savings than actually occurred. He said this program will encourage people to use public transit.

Staff is proposing a demonstration project in the SR 52/I-805 corridor between Kearny Mesa and University Towne Centre (UTC). He noted that current law does not allow the use of shoulder lanes as a travel lane. To address this restriction, we can pursue a demonstration project in which the shoulder lanes are converted to transit-only lanes.

The intent of this demonstration project is to gain local operational experience with the conversion of the existing shoulder lanes to transit lanes during the peak periods. In turn, this experience will help define the physical elements required to successfully operate freeway transit-only lanes in other freeway corridors where existing express services and future BRT services will operate. The demonstration project will address five key objectives: safety, bus travel time and reliability, bus and auto driver and bus passenger perception, maintenance, and the physical improvements that would be required for permanent implementation.

Mr. Schumacher stated that next steps would: develop an operating concept (SANDAG lead), conduct design work (Caltrans lead), construct improvements (Caltrans lead), implement the demonstration project (SANDAG/Caltrans), and monitor the results (SANDAG lead). He thought that the demonstration project would be operational next summer or fall.

Public Comment:

Clive Richard, a member of the public, said he was supporting this action but in a cautious way. He agreed that we should try it. He expressed some confusion about the number of accidents that occurred on the Minneapolis program. Mr. Richard also expressed concern that state law does not allow this practice. He stated that some bus drivers have told him that the large buses don't ride well on asphalt. He asked that this be investigated. *In response to Mr. Richard's concern about accidents with the transit-only shoulder program, Mr. Schumacher stated that in Minneapolis there have been only a few minor accidents since this program's inception in 1992.*

Supervisor Roberts expressed his support for this concept. The only concern he had was how to implement it earlier. *Mr. Orso-Delgado replied that he thought this demonstration project could be implemented in 6-8 months.*

Councilmember Emery asked if we are identifying other corridors for this type of a project. *Mr. Gallegos responded that we are looking at I-805 to the south.*

Councilmember Guerin commented that a citizen asked her why we are not already using the freeway shoulder lanes in peak times for transit. She said that in Los Angeles when certain other projects were under construction they did use the shoulders. We can use this as a way to convince Caltrans headquarters to allow this to be done.

Mayor Pro Tem Monroe pointed out that our bus drivers will need to be trained on this concept. He suggested that this report be presented to the MTS Board.

Chair Kellejian commented that this will be an example to show the public that we are doing something to improve public transportation.

Action: The Transportation Committee received this report for information.

9. STATE AND FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM FUNDING UPDATE
(INFORMATION/POSSIBLE ACTION)

Jose Nuncio, Senior Transportation Engineer, reported that Congress approved the ethanol fix, which changes the way the tax on fuels is treated for the Highway Trust Fund. As a result of this action, the state stands to gain about \$2.7 billion; unfortunately, this will not provide near-term relief as this money won't come into California for about two years. Mr. Nuncio noted that Congress failed to reauthorize the federal transportation bill but it did pass a continuation bill through May 2005.

Mr. Nuncio stated that on the state side, the CTC has continued the suspension on State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) allocations due to the low cash Highway Account balance, the uncertainty related to the reauthorization of the federal transportation bill, the viability of the tribal gaming compact bonds for the Traffic Congestion Relief Program (TCRP) and the State Highway Account, and the approach of the winter season. All of these issues may affect any additional allocation for the remainder of the year. He noted that the 2004 STIP only contains one San Diego project: the Planning, Programming, and Monitoring project.

Mr. Nuncio reported that subject to the successful resolution of the current cash-flow problems, the CTC is still committed to implementing the GARVEE bond financing tool and has recommended setting aside programming capacity for \$500 million in bonds. The CTC has established three tiers to categorize the various GARVEE bond candidates:

- Tier 1 – major projects that improve corridors and gateways for interregional travel and goods movement that are ready to go or will be ready to go by the first quarter of calendar year 2005. The CTC did not place any San Diego region projects in Tier 1. Approximately \$238 million in bonds would fall under the Tier 1 definition.
- Tier 2 – major projects that improve corridors and gateways for interregional travel and goods movement that will be ready to go within one year after the first quarter of calendar year 2005. The CTC placed SR 905 in this tier. Staff has continued to argue that this project should be included in Tier 1. About \$488 million in GARVEE bond proceeds fall within this tier.
- Tier 3 – projects that are more focused on regional corridors that are ready to go. Although SR 52 was included in this tier, CTC staff indicated that this project does not appear to be ready to go. Some CTC commissioners have strong reservations about using GARVEE bond proceeds for right-of-way acquisitions instead of for construction projects. Approximately \$253 million in potential bond proceeds have been identified for this tier.

Mr. Nuncio said that the schedule calls for recommendations on which projects to proceed with GARVEE bonding by this December; however, the GARVEE decision is contingent on the funding from gaming compacts negotiated by the Governor. Unfortunately, there has

been a lawsuit challenging the legality of the gaming compacts, and the state Treasurer's office will not issue bonds until the legal issue is resolved. The CTC cannot allocate money until the legal challenge has been resolved. Staff will continue to monitor the situation, and if it is not resolved within the next 6-9 months, will have to come back to the Transportation Committee for action to prioritize projects within the limited funding available.

Mr. Gallegos commented that this action speaks to the importance of *TransNet* funding.

Action: The Transportation Committee received this report for information.

10. UPCOMING MEETINGS

The next meeting of the Transportation Committee is scheduled for December 10, 2004.

9. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Kellejian adjourned the meeting at 12:05 p.m.

Attachment: Attendance Sheet

**CONFIRMED ATTENDANCE
SANDAG TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MEETING
NOVEMBER 12, 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	Yes	
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	Yes	
	City of Santee	Hal Ryan	Alternate	No	
South County	City of Coronado	Phil Monroe	Member	Yes	
	City of Chula Vista	Jerry Rindone	Alternate	Yes	
City of San Diego	----	Dick Murphy (Vice Chair)	Member	No	
	----	Jim Madaffer	Alternate	No	
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	Yes	
	MTDB	Leon Williams	Alternate	No	
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	Attending an airport retreat
	City of Lemon Grove	Mary Sessom	Alternate	No	Attending an airport retreat
ADVISORY/LIAISON Caltrans	----	Pedro Orso-Delgado	Member	Yes	
	—	Bill Figge	Alternate	No	