

# TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

February 4, 2005

AGENDA ITEM NO.: **1**

**Action Requested: APPROVE**

## TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE DISCUSSION AND ACTIONS MEETING OF JANUARY 21, 2005

The meeting of the Transportation Committee was called to order by Chair Joe Kellejian (North County Coastal) at 9:05 a.m. See the attached attendance sheet for Transportation Committee member attendance.

1. **APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES**

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Jim Madaffer (City of San Diego) and a second by Supervisor Ron Roberts (County of San Diego), the Transportation Committee approved the minutes from the January 7, 2005, meeting.

2. **PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS**

There were no public comments.

### CONSENT ITEMS (3 through 5)

Chair Kellejian noted that Item No. 4 would be pulled from the Consent Agenda.

3. **2004 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (RTIP) QUARTERLY AMENDMENT (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 2004/05 to FY 2008/09; and the Federal Highway Administration/Federal Transit Administration ((FHWA/FTA) approved the 2004 RTIP on October 4, 2004. SANDAG processes amendments to the RTIP on a quarterly basis. This amendment includes changes as requested by member agencies and also includes projects that received funding from the federal FY 2005 appropriations. The Transportation Committee is asked to adopt Resolution No. 2005-13 approving Amendment No. 3 to the 2004 RTIP.

5. **JANUARY 2005 TRANSIT SERVICE CHANGES (INFORMATION)**

Changes to bus, trolley, and Coaster service are generally implemented three times a year: in the fall, winter, and summer. The next scheduled dates for implementing transit service changes are January 16, 2005, for North County Transit District (NCTD) and January 30 and

31, 2005, for Metropolitan Transit System (MTS). There are minor service changes proposed by both transit agencies. More significant service changes for MTS are pending results from the Comprehensive Operational Analysis currently underway. This report provides the Transportation Committee with information on the January 2005 service changes.

Action: Upon a motion by Deputy Mayor Bob Emery (Metropolitan Transit System [MTS]) and a second by Councilmember Madaffer, the Transportation Committee approved Consent Items 3 and 5, including Resolution No. 2005-13.

Councilmember Phi Monroe (Coronado) stated that he voted on the consent calendar in place of regular member, Chula Vista Councilmember Jerry Rindone.

#### 4. GUIDING PRINCIPLES AND OBJECTIVES FOR DEVELOPMENT OF FY 2006 TRANSIT OPERATING BUDGETS (APPROVE)

Gary Gallegos, Executive Director, reported that SANDAG as the Regional Transportation Planning Agency, it is the responsibility of SANDAG to approve regional transit agency operating and capital budgets for funding. To meet this need, it is recommended that the Transportation Committee approve a set of guiding principles and objectives to be used to prepare the FY 2006 transit operating budgets and five-year projections. Mr. Gallegos said that this is a tight schedule but we will make every effort to get the fund estimates to the operators in February in time for them to prepare their budgets.

Mr. Gallegos noted that item No. 6 of the proposed guiding principles and objectives indicates "preserve current service levels,..." He said that as MTS enters into its Comprehensive Operations Analysis (COA) and tries to balance service levels, it may not be able to keep all of the levels in all areas. When it comes to determining capital needs, the operators will need to make that decision based on available funding.

Councilmember Monroe questioned whether the word "preserve" will send an incorrect signal if we have to make changes to current service levels. Mr. Gallegos suggested that the word "consider" be used rather than "preserve."

Paul Jablonski, MTS Chief Executive Officer, stated that we should try to maximize service to the public but within budget levels.

There was discussion among Transportation Committee members about the meaning of "preserving current service levels."

#### Public Comment:

Robert Hoffman, representing SMART, said that on page 2, in the next to the last paragraph from bottom, there is a phrase stating that public hearings will be held regarding the fare ordinance in April 2005. He agreed this is a way for people to provide input, but he suggested that the public be provided full disclosure on the complete cost of the service including the amount of subsidy.

Action: Upon a motion by Deputy Mayor Emery and a second by Mayor Mary Sessom (San Diego County Regional Airport Authority), the Transportation Committee unanimously approved the Guiding Principles and Objectives for use in preparing the FY 2006 transit operating budgets and the five-year projections, with one change to replace the word "preserve" with the word "consider" in item 6.

Councilmember Jerome Stocks (North County Coastal) mentioned that the North County Transit District (NCTD) Board expressed a specific desire to use the word "preserve."

Mr. Gallegos pointed out that these are guiding principles for the operators to use in developing their budgets.

## REPORTS

Chair Kellejian stated that he was revising the order of the agenda as follows: 9, 8, 6, and 7.

### 9. TRANSNET EARLY ACTION PROGRAM (RECOMMEND)

Chair Kellejian stated that the public wants congestion relief and they want it now. To that end, and with the urging of the Chair and Vice Chair, staff was directed to develop a list of Early Action projects. We want to get the Transportation Committee's buy-in an affirmative action to move it forward to the SANDAG Board.

Chair Cafagna said that in the past, Projects are usually constructed one behind another. What we have been talking about us changing the procedures to concurrently construct projects in a more broad basis so we are accelerating what we have promised to do with *TransNet*. We have a revenue stream from *TransNet* for bonding purposes that provides this opportunity.

Mr. Gallegos added that if the Transportation Committee and SANDAG Board concur with this Early Action Plan, we can proceed in the first week of February.

Craig Scott, *TransNet* Project Manager, said that at the December SANDAG Board meeting, a *TransNet* work program was approved. The work tasks that are currently underway include the Plan of Finance Update, establishment of an Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee (ITOC), the Regional Transportation Congestion Improvement Program that requires a nexus study related to the private developer finding requirement, and the Environmental Mitigation Program (EMP). He noted that the eligibility for the Local Streets and Road program in the *TransNet* Extension is different than that in the original measure. We will be working through the City/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) on the Local Streets and Road program.

Jack Boda, Director of Project Implementation and Mobility Management, reported that transportation projects typically take several years to design and construct. Therefore staff is proposing to develop a *TransNet* Early Action Plan with two tiers of projects. Tier 1 projects are those that are remaining on the existing *TransNet* program. We are committed to finishing those projects. Tier 2 is to complete work on two corridors for construction or to

be construction ready, and to complete two environmental documents on two other corridors. Starting with Tier 1, the first item is the widening of State Route (SR) 76 in two phases, the first phase is between Melrose to Mission and the second phase is from Mission to Interstate 15 (I-15). Both phases would be underway concurrently. The second project in the Tier 1 is to purchase the necessary right-of-way to relocate residents and businesses for SR 52. The third project is the Mid-Coast Light Rail Transit (LRT) extension from Old Town to University City.

Tier 2 projects would be complete within 5-7 years, and we will start work on two environmental corridors. The fourth project is the I-15 Managed Lanes both the north and south extensions. The fifth project in the Early Action Plan is the SR 52 high-occupancy-vehicle (HOV) managed lanes (reversible). The sixth project is the I-5 North Coast Corridor – Environmental Effort, and the seventh project is the I-805 Corridor – Environmental Effort (North and South Phases). Many of these corridors include various transportation mode projects. We are currently working to develop project schedules and cash-flow needs.

Pedro Orso-Delgado, Caltrans District 11 Director, stated that in anticipation of *TransNet* passage, he has had dedicated staff working on various corridors and Caltrans has been working closely with SANDAG.

Mr. Gallegos said that we recognize Caltrans has limited resources so Mr. Orso-Delgado has indicated his willingness to use consulting teams to assist in this work.

Councilmember Madaffer commented that in light of the state's budget situation, the people of San Diego need to be grateful that *TransNet* passed. We would not be doing any of these projects without it. He asked about the gap funding. Mr. Gallegos responded that we will have a challenge in trying to get matching funds from the state and federal governments. *TransNet* will allow us to get ready but it doesn't take away from the fact that we do need some help from the state. We have been working with the California Transportation Commission (CTC) on creative ideas such as advancing the cash and having the state pay us back with the dollars that would come to the San Diego region. We are also encouraging the Commission to move forward on the Grant Anticipation Revenue Vehicle (GARVEE) bond proposal. In our effort to streamline the environmental work in I-5 we are working with the federal government and there is a potential to use a "TIFIA" (a transportation innovation finance pool). Mr. Orso-Delgado explain that this is similar to a GARVEE bond but the repayment period is a little more lenient. This is currently being used on the SR 125 toll road. This funding pool has been underutilized. We had some federal Department of Transportation (DOT) representatives here and encouraged us to look into this possibility.

Councilmember Madaffer asked if we are foreclosing the opportunity for matching dollars from the state because we are accelerating projects. Mr. Gallegos responded that we are not foreclosing on any opportunity.

Chair Cafagna stated that we will need to talk about the size of the contracts and contractors. He thought that we should meet with the Associated General Contractors (AGC). The mega contractors are not in town any more and these large projects will require a co-op between more than one contractor or out-of-town contractors. Mr. Gallegos said

that staff has been talking with the AGC about this issue. He said that there would be plenty of work for local as well as outside contractors. The improvements that we are proposing to make on the freeways will require the replacement of overcrossings on the interchanges. If we can move on these Early Action Projects, we may be in the position to let out a series of small contracts for these interchanges before we let the large freeway improvement contracts. This would provide opportunities for smaller and local contractors to participate. He suggested that that contracting industry consider partnering and forming joint ventures.

Deputy Mayor Emery asked if the project 4 in Tier 2 related to the I-15 corridor will include the whole corridor. Mr. Gallegos replied that the goal is to get the whole 20 miles completed.

Councilmember Jack Feller (NCTD) expressed his appreciation that SR 76 is at the forefront of the projects. He asked about the time frame on these projects. Mr. Gallegos answered that we will bring this information back to the Board. On SR 76, the Caltrans work will be augmented with consultants. Caltrans will continue to manage the highway pieces. We are also considering the creation of an ad hoc committee of North County mayors or councilmembers to keep a focus on this project.

Councilmember Peters asked if SR 76 is under construction. Mr. Gallegos said that only first part is under construction, and we would assist Caltrans with the design of the next segment.

Councilmember Peters asked the Tier 2 projects were selected. Mr. Gallegos said that staff looked at project readiness and traffic congestion relief.

Councilmember Peters asked what obligation is there at the state to payback the money we advance. Mr. Gallegos said that the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) process is embodied in law and driven by formula. The formula is based on population and road miles. What we are trying to do by advancing the *TransNet* monies is to accelerate project progress.

Councilmember Peters asked about the status of the Nobel Drive Coaster Station. Mr. Gallegos stated that we are continuing to work with the City staff. The issue is the cost or value of the necessary property. We are working to reach resolution on this matter.

Councilmember Peters asked about the shortfall amount. Mr. Boda said that there has been a project cost increase related to access over the track, grade separations, and security issues, and the real estate value has gone up in that areas. The cost difference is in the \$4 million range. Mr. Gallegos noted that this project is in the existing *TransNet* program.

Councilmember Monroe asked Mr. Scott which group is looking at the Local Streets and Road Program. Mr. Scott replied the area public works directors and planners on the City/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) are involved. He added that the new *TransNet* Ordinance has different requirements for the Local Streets and Road Program, and that difference will need to be reviewed with CTAC.

Councilmember Jerry Rindone (South County) expressed his support of this proposal. He noted that the South Bay was a major contributor to the positive vote of *TransNet*. He said that when we look to expand service in areas currently without it, he asked that the Board consider the eastern area of Chula Vista. Mr. Gallegos said that staff hopes to come back with another set of projects, and key to that is using freeway shoulder lanes for buses. If our pilot project is successful, our goal would be to advance transit service in the smart growth areas adjacent to I-805 in the South Bay.

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Jack Dale (East County) and a second by Supervisor Roberts, the Transportation Committee recommended that the SANDAG Board of Directors authorize staff to proceed on the Early Action Projects.

8. TEA-21 REAUTHORIZATION AND FY 2006 APPROPRIATIONS FUNDING REQUESTS (RECOMMEND)

Ellen Roundtree, Director of Governmental Relations, reported that our federal help is an important piece of the financial puzzle. Last January the Transportation Committee recommended a list of projects for the Transportation Equity Act for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (TEA-21) or for full funding authorization. The multi-year bill is still pending, and the latest extension is due to expire in May 2005. Last year, we were successful and received over \$154 million. Last week we were notified that we need to submit a new list of projects for the next multi-year transportation bill. To begin to work with congressional staff, we propose the following recommended actions: reaffirm last year's project list with modifications resulting from funding received or project deletion, add new projects as submitted by MTS and NCTD, authorize staff to send letters of support for projects requested by the Port of San Diego, and authorize staff to submit letters of support for the Shoal Creek Pedestrian Bridge in the City of San Diego. Ms. Roundtree noted that a number of Board members and staff will go to Washington, D.C. to work with congressional staffs on the funding requests.

Chair Kellejian noted that the bus rapid transit (BRT) project on I-805 to serve the eastern end of Chula Vista is part of this request.

Ms. Roundtree added that several BRT projects and the technology enhancements are included in various funding request categories.

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Dale and a second by Councilmember Madaffer, the Transportation Committee recommended that the SANDAG Board of Directors approve the federal transportation project funding requests for use in the ongoing multi-year TEA-21 reauthorization and the FY 2006 appropriations process according to the recommendations contained in the agenda report.

6. MTS/NCTD JOINT PRESENTATION ON TRANSIT INFRASTRUCTURE (INFORMATION)

Karen King, NCTD Executive Director, stated that they made presentation to Joint Committee on Regional Transit (JCRT). She said that the significant capital infrastructure needs to be protected and preserved. A question to be resolved is how are we going to serve that public asset as we move forward to expand the system.

Tom Lichterman from NCTD stated that NCTD has many capital needs that greatly exceed the capital resources available. He introduced Rich Walker, NCTD's Manager of Maintenance of Way to present the report.

Mr. Walker provided a snapshot of their responsibility in the rail corridor which is between the Orange County line and downtown San Diego. He provided statistics about the operation. NCTD's responsibility includes safety of operations, operational reliability, regulatory compliance, and life cycle maintenance. He also provided information on rail infrastructure and its key components including age, type, past maintenance, condition, and loading. He also reviewed the maintenance status of the wood cross ties, turnouts, road crossings, the signal system, and bridges and culverts. The "State of Good Repair" consists of identifying the life cycle costs, prioritizing projects, and justifying the expenditures, which are about \$14 million per year. He said that NCTD includes \$1 million to \$2 million in its annual budget, leaving about a \$12 million shortfall in capital maintenance needs. The risks in not meeting the capital needs include: unreliable operating conditions, reduced operating speeds, the potential of noncompliance with regulatory agencies, and loss of ridership. The next steps are to define the "State of Good Repair," obtain additional resources for adequate life cycle replacement, and seek out new funding resources.

Chair Kellejian asked if the wood ties are being replaced with concrete ones. Mr. Walker said that they are replacing what they have. He added that once you go to concrete ties you have to replace all of the wood ties, because you cannot mix wood and concrete ties.

Chair Cafagna asked if there was money being set aside for these capital needs. Mr. Lichterman replied that there is about \$1 million - \$2 million included each year in the budget. He noted that in addition to capital replacement costs there is the ongoing routine railroad maintenance of \$4 million - \$5 million per year. Ms. King clarified that to cover all of the capital maintenance needs they would need \$12 million to \$13 million annually.

Chair Cafagna asked what part of the *TransNet* infrastructure replacement component we can provide for this purpose. Mr. Gallegos stated that unfortunately, the TransNet Extension will only fund new projects. There are no dollars for replacement of existing infrastructure. As a region, we need to stay focused and do a better job of protecting the investment we have already made. Our best source of funding for this purpose is discretionary federal dollars.

Mr. Gallegos asked if the bridges needing replacement would fall under a seismic retrofit program. Mr. Walker replied that the only seismic evaluation that has occurred is when a bridge has been replaced. Mr. Gallegos said that SANDAG will work with NCTD to pursue seismic retrofit funding. He said that there are federal bridge replacement funds for making seismic compliance a priority.

Councilmember Madaffer asked if the Margarita Bridge in Camp Pendleton has any historical value. Mr. Walker replied negatively.

Councilmember Feller asked how long would it take to replace the bridge most needing replacement. Mr. Lichterman said that the design is underway and they hope to complete it this year. Construction is about a 12-month period.

Councilmember Monroe commented how we can expand when there is no money to maintain the system. Mr. Gallegos agreed that we will need to make better decisions about this on a regional basis. We need a plan to ensure we are keeping up with those investments and continue to move forward.

Mr. Jablonski provided a report on the MTS aging infrastructure and capital needs. He reviewed the light rail transit (LRT) infrastructure categories. He said that the impacts of an aging infrastructure include safety and service reliability, increased maintenance intervals and the level of effort, increased staffing and equipment, and adverse regulatory compliance impacts. He provided information about the current infrastructure status of both the LRT and bus systems. He stated that the estimated annual need is about \$50 million per year.

Public Comment:

Clive Richard, a member of the public, referred to a report published by the federal Department of Transportation (DOT), "A Status of the National Highways, Bridges, and Transit," which talks about maintaining conditions. The aging infrastructure problem is occurring throughout the country.

Chair Cafagna stated that as we move forward on new projects, we need to do a better job of preserving money for capital replacements in the future. We need to change our policies from this point forward.

Action: This report was presented for information .

7. TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM FUNDING UPDATE (INFORMATION/POSSIBLE ACTION)

Chair Kellejian postponed this item to the next meeting.

Kellejian convened the meeting for a comfort break at 10:50 a.m. The meeting was reconvened into the joint Transportation Committee/Regional Planning Committee meeting.

10. UPCOMING MEETINGS

The next meeting of the Transportation Committee is scheduled for February 4, 2005.

Attachment: Attendance Sheet

**\*\*CONVENE JOINT MEETING WITH THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE\*\***

**CONFIRMED ATTENDANCE  
SANDAG TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MEETING  
JANUARY 21, 2005**

GEOGRAPHICAL AREA/ ORGANIZATION	JURISDICTION	NAME	MEMBER/ ALTERNATE	ATTENDING	COMMENTS
North County Coastal	City of Solana Beach	Joe Kellejian (Chair)	Member	Yes	
	City of Encinitas	Jerome Stocks	Alternate	Yes	
North County Inland	City of Poway	Mickey Cafagna	Member	Yes	
	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 Chula Vista	Jerry Rindone	Member	Yes	
	City of Coronado	Phil Monroe	Alternate	Yes	
City of San Diego	----	Jim Madaffer	Member	Yes	
	----	Scott Peters	Alternate	Yes	
		Dick Murphy	Alternate	No	
County of San Diego	----	Ron Roberts	Member	Yes	
	----	Pam Slater-Price	Alternate	Yes	
	----	Dianne Jacob	Alternate	No	
Metropolitan Transit Development Board	City of Poway	Bob Emery	Member	Yes	
	MTDB	Leon Williams	Alternate	Yes	
North County Transit Development Board	City of Oceanside	Jack Feller	Member	Yes	
	City of Vista	Judy Ritter	Alternate	Yes	
	City of Del Mar	Dave Druker	Alternate	No	
San Diego County Regional Airport Authority	City of Lemon Grove	Mary Sessom	Member	Yes	
	Governor's Appointee	Xema Jacobson	Alternate	Yes	
ADVISORY/LIAISON Caltrans	----	Pedro Orso-Delgado	Member	Yes	
	—	Bill Figge	Alternate	No	

## **JOINT MEETING OF TRANSPORTATION AND REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEES DISCUSSION AND ACTIONS**

Meeting of January 21, 2005

The joint meeting of the Transportation and Regional Planning Committees was called to order by Regional Planning Committee Chair Lori Holt Pfeiler (North County Inland) at 11:17 a.m. The attendance sheet for the meeting is attached.

Chair Holt Pfeiler indicated that this meeting is a good moment in SANDAG history in that it is the first joint meeting of the Transportation and Regional Planning Committees since the adoption of the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP). She added that because SANDAG is moving into RCP implementation, she anticipates that there will be additional joint meetings in the future.

Chair Holt Pfeiler requested that members of both Committees introduce themselves.

### **REPORTS**

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

Chair Holt Pfeiler commented that there was a lot of interest from the public wanting to participate on the new Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group. She stated that Councilmember Jim Madaffer (City of San Diego) will lead this discussion.

Councilmember Madaffer noted that in November 2004, the Regional Planning and Transportation Committees recommended to the SANDAG Board that a new Stakeholders Working Group be appointed to advise the Transportation and Regional Planning Committees, SANDAG staff, and the Board on matters pertaining to the Regional Transportation Plan update and the RCP strategic initiatives.

A selection committee, which included members from both the Transportation and Regional Planning Committees, was appointed to review the applications. Selection committee members included: Supervisor Pam Slater-Price, Councilmembers Jim Madaffer, Maggie Houlihan, Phil Monroe, Jack Dale, and Mayor Lori Holt Pfeiler. Additional committee members included Fred Leudtke, representing the City/County Transportation Advisory Committee and Nancy Bragado, representing the Regional Planning Technical Working Group.

The Selection Committee met twice and made selections based upon a set of criteria including skills and abilities, experience with regional planning issues, and a demonstrated commitment to serve. The Committee wanted to ensure that a broad array of interests were represented, and that the working group had balanced geographical representation from around the region. The Committee recommended a slate of 26 members and asked that both Committees recommend that the SANDAG Board appoint the proposed slate. In addition, the Selection Committee requested that a member from either the Transportation or the Regional Planning Committee serve as chair of the new working group.

After the Board appoints the proposed members to the working group, staff will send letters to all applicants notifying them of the final decision. Letters also will be sent to the new members with information about the meeting schedule, staff contacts, and the agenda for the first meeting.

#### MOTION

Councilmember Peters (City of San Diego) made the motion that the proposed slate be approved. Transportation Committee Chairman Councilmember Kellejian (North County Coastal) seconded the motion.

#### DISCUSSION ON THE MOTION

Councilmember Peters requested that background information on proposed members be distributed.

Councilmember Madaffer agreed that the slate of names and a bio sheet should be forwarded to the full SANDAG Board for its information.

Councilmember Feller (North County Coastal) pointed out that this a large list of names. He asked is this a typical size working group?

Chair Holt Pfeiler responded that it was a difficult task to get the group down to this small size. Over 100 applications were received.

Mayor Madrid (East County) requested that staff prepare a matrix of where the proposed members come from, from a geographical perspective. He stated that all areas of the region should be represented on this working group.

Councilmember Madaffer mentioned that those comments were made at the Selection Committee meeting. This list brings a fresh perspective to SANDAG and is representative of both specialty areas as well as a regional balance. There are 3 people from the North County Coastal area; 5 people from the North County Inland area; 4 people from the East County area; 3 people from the South County area; and 11 people from the Central San Diego area.

Councilmember Monroe noted that each candidate listed their individual area of interest, which the Selection Committee also tried take into consideration. The Committee eventually got the list down to 40 people and struggled to get the list down to 26.

Mayor Smith (North County Inland) asked if this group would serve as a planning commission to the full Board.

Staff responded that this is a stakeholder group that would complement the existing working groups. The group would provide input into the update of the RTP and the implementation of the RCP. This group would provide much needed input to the Transportation and Regional Planning Committees.

Supervisor Horn stated that he only recognizes 4 names on the list, and none of them represent the unincorporated area.

Chair Holt Pfeiler reiterated that all geographical regions are represented on this working group, including several members representing the unincorporated areas.

Councilmember Rindone also expressed concern regarding regional balance on the working group. He asked that if there were the need to have any selected participants replaced that they be replaced from the same geographical area. He added that he knows of other eager and fresh names that were submitted but were not selected.

Chair Holt Pfeiler pointed out that there will be strict attendance requirements for the working group that will be enforced, and that the replacement suggestion will be considered.

Supervisor Slater-Price mentioned that there weren't a lot of choices for candidates from South County or North County Coastal. She was surprised at the limited number of people from those areas that applied for the working group.

Action: Councilmember Peters (City of San Diego) made the motion to approve the proposed slate of names for the new Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group and Councilmember Kellejian (North County Coastal) seconded the motion. The vote passed unanimously.

#### B. PILOT SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM UPDATE (DISCUSSION)

Mayor Holt Pfeiler noted that this effort is one of the first opportunities since the adoption of the RCP to better connect transportation, transit, and land use.

Staff provided the Committees with an update on the \$17 million Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program. An ad hoc working group, which includes members of the Transportation Committee, Regional Planning Technical Working Group, and Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC), has been meeting to develop program administrative requirements and project selection criteria. The primary goal of the Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program is to implement a set of demonstration projects that, when complete, will serve as examples for smart growth development consistent with the RCP. The pilot program will provide valuable experience in selecting and implementing capital improvement projects that are intended to have an impact on land development and transportation choices in the project area. Lessons learned from the pilot program will be used to help develop the longer-term Smart Growth Incentive Program funded through the *TransNet* Extension.

Staff noted that the ad hoc working group has held three meetings to date. The working group agreed on a draft list of evaluation criteria and divided the criteria into two categories:

1. Screening criteria that determine basic program eligibility; and
2. Project evaluation criteria that determine funding priority.

The purpose of the criteria is to ensure that candidate projects meet the Transportation Enhancements (TE) funding requirements and can be implemented in a short time frame (i.e., are "ready to go" projects). The specific criteria also are intended to help select projects that are well-designed, encourage multiple transportation modes, and otherwise support the smart growth development goals of the RCP.

Once a consensus has been developed on the criteria and their relative weighting, the *ad hoc* working group will develop recommendations regarding the project selection process. A recommendation for approval of this pilot program is expected in February/March 2005 with a call for projects anticipated in March/April 2005. Staff will come back before both Committees in March with an update.

Councilmember Monroe emphasized that this is a pilot project where the funding is available now and should be spent quickly. That is the reason that ready to go projects were high on the list of priority projects. He recommended approval of this item.

Chair Holt Pfeiler brought attention to a letter from Tom Scott of the San Diego Housing Federation, which indicated that there is no inclusion of affordable housing in this program. The letter also expressed his disappointment that he wasn't appointed to the new Stakeholders Working Group.

Councilmember Emery (North County Inland) agreed with the letter from Mr. Scott that affordable housing needs to be included as a part of the criteria for funding. It is important that specific reference to affordable housing be added to the criteria.

Mayor Cafagna (North County Coastal) also agreed.

Councilmember Kellejian stated that there were several meetings held in the past regarding smart growth, and smaller cities or built out cities agreed that part of the program should recognize existing contributions to smart growth. He asked if that direction was taken into consideration with the current criteria. *Staff indicated that the ad hoc working group will be considering both existing and planned smart growth projects.*

Councilmember Kellejian questioned where in the criteria would that be located? Staff responded that criteria would be included in the group of smart growth land use characteristics.

Councilmember Kellejian asked for an explanation of a "human-scale built environment." Staff explained that there is a lot that goes into a human-scale urban design: it basically means that it is a scale that is oriented toward the pedestrian, and that structures are built to the sidewalk and oriented toward street frontages versus large parking lots.

Councilmember McCoy noted that she didn't see any definition of housing affordability in the criteria. It is a question that should be addressed. She noted that she also didn't see any criteria that addressed affordability.

Mayor Holt Pfeiler mentioned that the working group can have that discussion and bring it back to the Committees.

Councilmember Peters asked if the criteria would preclude spending monies in areas that were built out and would not be changing. Will the criteria for funding insist that changes be made?

Staff responded that it could either be that an area is increasing its densities and needs additional funding for infrastructure enhancements, or is already an intense area and is in the process of upgrading infrastructure and requires additional funding.

Supervisor Horn asked if any project that needs voter approval will be ineligible as a "ready to go" project.

Staff pointed out that there are different levels of project readiness.

Chair Holt Pfeiler stated that ready to go means just that. If an election needs to happen prior to a project being built, then it would not be considered ready to go.

Councilmember Monroe asked if there is a limit to the amount of funding that a project could apply for.

Staff responded that currently, there is no funding limit request, but that the ad hoc working group had been considering whether funding for each project should be capped at \$2 million or some other limit.

Councilmember Monroe commented that one of the challenges will be how to pare down the projects so as to maximize the available funding.

Councilmember Kellejian asked if there is a use it or lose it rule that will apply to this funding. He mentioned that there need to be criteria developed for that.

Staff indicated that the Transportation Committee has an existing use-it-or-lose-it policy for TE funds.

Councilmember Ritter (NCTD) stated that projects that could only receive \$2 million would be more like a peanut butter approach. Wouldn't it be good to do a few really good "wow" projects?

Staff responded that in researching this issue, an average cost of a project is approximately \$1 to 2 million. That could include a total of eight good projects.

Mayor Madrid asked if the funding distribution criteria are geographically based.

Mayor Pro Tem Jones (Lemon Grove) expressed concern with the wording regarding the matching funds bonus. Criteria should be based on the quality of a project. He hopes that the smaller projects will be eligible to qualify for some of the project funding.

Chair Holt Pfeiler noted that this should be enough information for staff to move forward.

Staff reiterated that this information will be taken back to the ad hoc working group for discussion, then to the Regional Planning Technical Working Group and CTAC, and then will come back before the Regional Planning and Transportation Committees before going to the Board for approval.

Action: The Committee discussed this item and received it for information.

C. SHOWCASE LOCAL EXAMPLES OF SMART GROWTH: SMART GROWTH IN LA MESA (INFORMATION)

Dave Witt, Assistant City Manager for the City of La Mesa, made a presentation to the Committees about local smart growth planning and development activities taking place in the City of La Mesa. He pointed out that the City of La Mesa recently finished conducting a General Plan update. A primary objective of the update was to look at older commercial corridors that had shifted to larger retail outlets and were deteriorating. The update focused on future options for these areas, including possibilities to accommodate new growth and replace the deteriorating commercial uses with higher-intensity residential and mixed land uses.

The city developed a new land use category – the “mixed use urban” designation. The mixed use urban designation allows for a mix of commercial and residential development densities up to 40 dwelling units per acre. The mixed use urban designation was applied to the major transit corridors within the city.

The City hired a team of architects, planners, and real-estate experts to identify potential areas with opportunities for mixed use development through a feasibility study. The city then involved property owners, business owners, and prospective developers. The result was a set of design guidelines that support smart growth principles. The key to making the change to smart growth was capitalizing on the community's desire to improve the blighted commercial areas.

Mr. Witt noted that a significant conclusion of their work is that requiring a commercial component in every “mixed use urban” project is unrealistic and prevents profitable development. The City left all zoning in place, and added a Mixed Use Overlay Zone to the Mixed Use Urban designation, allowing developers the flexibility to build either mixed use with retail or simply higher density multifamily housing. The city currently has six projects in the development process. The design review process includes a Design Review Board to ensure an appropriate pedestrian realm.

Mr. Witt highlighted the key findings, which were that none of this could have been done without the citizens in the community and the support of the elected officials. He concluded that only time will tell if this effort will be a success.

Mayor Madrid commented that was an excellent overview of a project that has taken approximately 21 years. He suggested that La Mesa be used as an example in the future when referring to building smart growth and transit oriented development projects. He

added that there are approximately 1,500 units currently under construction in the city and they anticipate an additional 2,500 transit oriented development units in the near future.

Chair Holt Pfeiler asked if the community of La Mesa supported the plan update.

Mayor Madrid responded that the community embraced it.

Councilmember Feller asked if there are any height restrictions in the new zone.

Mr. Witt responded that the zoning has the flexibility to increase heights but would have to go through a discretionary review. The bottom line is the parking. To increase height you would have to consider if enough parking could be built to sustain the units being built.

Mayor Cafagna asked if the units would be considered for sale or rent. He also asked why there isn't an affordable housing component considered.

Mr. Witt indicated that there wasn't a bias regarding for sale or rent. One part of the City's overall program is to include affordable housing, which has been considered at other locations.

Councilmember Stocks stated that the City of La Mesa should be commended for its smart growth projects. He asked how the city has planned for the increase in traffic with the proposed increase in housing densities.

Mr. Witt responded that the transportation networks have been built as if the projects were commercial projects. Since commercial projects generate more traffic than residential projects, traffic increases are not foreseen.

Action: The Committee received this item for information.

## 11. ADJOURNMENT

Regional Planning Committee Chair Holt Pfeiler adjourned the joint meeting at 12:19 p.m.

**CONFIRMED ATTENDANCE  
JOINT MEETING OF THE TRANSPORTATION AND  
REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING  
JANUARY 21, 2005  
11:00 A.M. TO 12:00 P.M.**

GEOGRAPHICAL AREA	JURISDICTION	NAME	MEMBER/ ALTERNATE	ATTENDING	
				Yes	No
North County Inland	City of Escondido	Lori Holt-Pfeiler, Chair	Member	✓	
	City of Vista	Judy Ritter	Alternate	✓	
South County	City of Chula Vista	Patty Davis, Vice Chair	Member	✓	
	City of Imperial Beach	Patricia McCoy	Alternate	✓	
North County Coastal	City of Carlsbad	Matt Hall	Member	✓	
	City of Carlsbad	Bud Lewis	Alternate		✓
East County	City of Lemon Grove	Jerry Jones	Member	✓	
	City of La Mesa	Barry Jantz	Alternate		✓
City of San Diego	----	Scott Peters	Member	✓	
	----	Jim Madaffer	Alternate	✓	
County of San Diego	----	Bill Horn	Member	✓	
	----	Pam Slater-Price	Alternate	✓	
Advisory Member	Caltrans, District 11	Pedro Orso-Delgado	Member	✓	
		Bill Figge	Alternate	✓	
Advisory Member	San Diego County Water Authority	Howard Williams	Member	✓	
Advisory Member	Department of Defense	Susannah Aguilera	Member		✓
Advisory Member	San Diego Unified Port District	William Hall	Member		✓
		<i>Vacant</i>	Alternate		
Advisory Member	MTDB	Leon Williams (Chairman)	Member	✓	
		Bob Emery	Alternate	✓	
Advisory Member	NCTD	Dave Druker	Member	✓	
		<i>Vacant</i>	Alternate		
Advisory Member	Regional Planning Technical Working Group	Gail Goldberg	Member		✓