

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

April 15, 2005

AGENDA ITEM NO.: **1b**

Action Requested: APPROVE

JOINT MEETING OF TRANSPORTATION AND REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEES DISCUSSION AND ACTIONS

Meeting of April 1, 2005

The joint meeting of the Transportation and Regional Planning Committees was called to order by Transportation Committee Chair Joe Kellejian (North County Coastal) at 9:34 a.m. The attendance sheets for the meeting are attached.

Chairman Kellejian (Transportation Committee [TC]) reminded everyone that this meeting is being broadcast on the Web site. He requested that members of both Committees introduce themselves. Self-introductions were made.

PUBLIC COMMENTS (A)

A. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS (INFORMATION)

None.

CONSENT ITEM (B)

B. STATUS REPORT ON THE NEW REGIONAL PLANNING STAKEHOLDERS WORKING GROUP (INFORMATION)

Action: Upon a motion by Chair Holt Pfeiler (Regional Planning Committee [RPC]) and a second by Deputy Mayor Davis (South County), the Committees voted to approve Consent Item B. The motion passed unanimously.

REPORTS (C-F)

C. WORK PROGRAM FOR THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN (RTP) UPDATE (ACCEPT)

Staff noted that this report provides an overview of the work program and schedule for updating the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). A technical RTP update is expected in 2006 to meet the requirements of the normal three-year update cycle. A more comprehensive RTP update is anticipated in 2007. This 2007 update, which will be based on an updated 2030 Regional Growth Forecast, will incorporate the results of the Independent

Transit Planning Review and the strategic initiatives from the adopted Regional Comprehensive Plan. The last RTP update was completed in 2003, resulting in our current RTP, MOBILITY 2030. According to federal law, the next update is due March 2006, however, a pending bill could extend that due date to 2007. A comprehensive 2007 RTP will be prepared whether or not an update is required in 2006. The Regional Planning and Transportation Committees are asked to accept the proposed work program and schedule.

Staff provided a brief description of the work program for the RTP and discussed in detail Attachments 1 through 5 which include the 2006 Schedule, the 2007 Schedule, Issue Papers, an Outline of the Work Program, and Milestones. Staff noted that the issue papers can be categorized into four major groups, based on the themes of MOBILITY 2030: System Development; Land Use/Transportation Connection; Demand Management, and Systems Management.

Chairman Kellejian noted that a revised version of Attachment 3, which includes several additional issue paper topics that could be explored during the development of this RTP, has been distributed to the Committees. He added that today is not the day to debate the issues one by one. The purpose of today's presentation is to accept the schedule and discuss the issues at a later date.

Councilmember Feller (North San Diego County Transit Development Board) asked regarding the Demand Management Issue paper, if the intention is to put pipelines underground to reduce truck traffic. *Staff responded that the intent is to explore the possibility of using transportation corridors to put transmission lines underground to provide for joint use of the right-of-way.*

Councilmember Feller questioned if the Independent Transportation Planning Review is going to last for only one year. *Staff replied that the review is expected to be completed by the end of the year.*

Chairman Kellejian noted the blue handout of an updated list of Issues Papers that was distributed by staff. *Staff stated the issue of pipelines in the Regional Freight Strategy is a new issue that would be evaluated.*

MOTION

Councilmember Peters (City of San Diego) made the motion to accept the staff recommendation. Councilmember Feller seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION ON THE MOTION

Mayor Madrid (East County) asked who is taking the lead on development of the Smart Growth Concept Map. *Staff noted that SANDAG staff is working with local planning staffs from each jurisdiction for input.*

Mayor Madrid questioned where the funding will come from for Homeland Security issues. *Staff stated that has not yet been determined.*

Chairman Kellejian thanked the Regional Planning Committee Stakeholders Working Group (SWG), as well as the SANDAG staff, for putting this item together.

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Peters and a second by Councilmember Feller, the Committees voted to accept the RTP work program, schedule, and issues papers. The vote passed unanimously.

D. PROGRESS REPORT ON PILOT SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM (COMMENT)

Chairman Kellejian asked if this issue will go back to the respective working groups and Committees, and then to the SANDAG Board in May for discussion.

Staff brought the Committees up to date on the status of the Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program (SGIP). Staff reviewed the guidelines associated with the SGIP, including the use-it-or-lose-it policy, and indicated that two key issues revolving around the draft project evaluation criteria remain. At the Joint Transportation/Regional Planning Committee meeting in January 2005, a general list of criteria was provided. That list did not include weighting or scoring. This version includes scoring mechanisms. The criteria are divided into project screening criteria and project evaluation criteria. Also at the meeting in January, the Committees requested that staff add a criterion for projects that are associated with affordable housing; such a criterion has been included. Other significant changes are the action the Board took in February regarding the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) numbers and low income household bonus points, which are different from the affordable housing points. The local jurisdictions that qualify for those points are included in the staff report.

Staff noted that the evaluation criteria were presented to the Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC), which recommended approval. When the criteria were presented to the Regional Planning Committee Technical Working Group (TWG), some members requested that the Ad Hoc Working Group re-assess the weighting associated with the Intensity of Development criterion, recommending that the weighted factor be increased to 3 or 4. Another issue was the fact that low income household bonus points may affect the ready to go projects. Next steps will be to go back to the TWG for their recommendation, refer that recommendation back to the Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group (SWG) for their comments, and return to these two Committees for input. After that, a call for projects will be issued, and staff will work with the evaluation group, return to each Committee separately, and forward a recommendation to the SANDAG Board for consideration.

Chairman Kellejian announced that he was approached by two members of the Committees regarding the color of money and noted that these funds are not allowed for developing parking structures. Maybe the smart growth incentive funds in the future will make provisions for that.

Regional Planning Committee (RPC) Chair Holt Pfeiler (North County Inland) mentioned that the RPC has discussed this issue and has debated whether to limit the project amount to \$2 million or whether not to have any monetary cap.

Councilmember Monroe (South County) commented that staff did a great job in leading the work of the committees and working groups for the results presented today. He also added that the representatives from the City of San Diego on this working group showed leadership and consensus. He reminded the Committees that this is a pilot project that only involves \$17 million. Therefore, the Committees need to get this going, move forward with the ready to go projects, and award funding to those projects that are ready. Some areas will qualify and some won't because of the smart growth evaluation criteria. He commented that it would be nice to have several projects from several jurisdictions.

Councilmember Peters (City of San Diego) agreed with the \$2 million limit which would allow at least nine projects to be completed. He expressed concern about the project readiness criterion and mentioned that he has had conversations with Caltrans regarding this issue. He added that receiving federal funds requires National Environmental Protection Agency (NEPA) work, which Caltrans is reluctant to do. If there is going to be a problem with the project having a NEPA document, it needs to be known now. *Staff commented that even though it would be helpful, if a ready to go project does not have a NEPA document, it won't be disqualified. However, all approved projects will eventually need to have NEPA clearance in order to be funded.*

Chairman Kellejian stated that he would like to gain consensus from the Committees regarding the \$2 million cap.

Regional Planning Committee Vice Chair Davis (South County) commented that the Intensity for Development criterion needs to be increased to a weighting factor of at least 3 or 4. She would prefer that the projects be limited to \$2 million, but the Committees should have the flexibility to approve a project that is more.

Councilmember McCoy (South County) asked how much funding is allocated to the projects, and how much would be allocated to overhead. *Staff responded that the entire \$17 million is allocated to the pilot projects – there should be no overhead.*

Councilmember Rindone (South County) commented that a \$2 million cap on projects is not smart. He suggested that the \$2 million amount be used as a general guideline or range and added that the quality of project also should be considered.

Chairman Kellejian asked Councilmember Rindone what the limit should be. *Councilmember Rindone indicated that the limit should be increased to up to \$4 million per project, and the projects should be based on merit. If the project range was \$2 to 4 million, there could be at least 4 to 5 projects.*

Mayor Madrid stated that some jurisdictions have programs where they have the resources available and can afford to build larger projects because they have more staff. The smaller cities would not be able to compete on that level. He agreed with the \$2 million cap and added that if the larger cities have projects that are viable, they can match them with their own funding. All jurisdictions should be given the chance to compete for the funding.

Pedro Orso-Delgado (Caltrans) asked what is meant by transportation characteristics. *Staff responded that the RCP Smart Growth Matrix in the staff report describes those definitions,*

which relate to characteristics such as freeway connections, corridor or regional transit service characteristics, park-and-ride facilities, regional arterials, shuttle services, local transit connections, and other related characteristics.

Councilmember Ritter (North County Inland) indicated that projects should be considered on a case-by-case basis, and the quality, not just the quantity, of the project also should be evaluated. She noted that she would be okay with the proposed \$2 to \$4 million range.

Councilmember Feller agreed that the cap should be no more than \$2 million.

Chairwoman Slater-Price (County of San Diego) stated that to start a pilot program and increase the amount of the award would be going in the wrong direction. The purpose of this project is to encourage everyone to come forward with projects. Jurisdictions should be looking for matching funds from developers and private sources.

Councilmember Stocks (North County Coastal) supported the \$2 million cap and noted that matching funds is only 15 percent of the total project evaluation. Selecting smaller projects would give the region more bang for the buck. He mentioned that the Committees could always revisit this issue if the funding cap becomes a problem.

Councilmember Rindone indicated that the issue is not just about the projects, but about flexibility for staff. The salient point is not about the cap amount but about flexibility. If staff is expected to make good judgment, then they shouldn't have to have one arm tied behind their backs.

Councilmember Feller mentioned that if a project is valuable to a community, then the community should pay for it.

Mayor Pro Tem Jones (East County) requested clarification on what the funding can be used for.

Chairman Kellejian noted that the project activities eligible for funding include bicycle and pedestrian paths and bridges; on-street bike lanes; pedestrian plazas; pedestrian street crossings; streetscape enhancements such as median landscaping, street trees, lighting, street furniture, traffic calming design features such as pedestrian bulb-outs or traffic circles; transit stop amenities, way-finding signage; and gateway features. Other project types such as parking also may be eligible provided the Transportation Enhancement (TE) funds can be swapped for another funding source.

Mayor Pro Tem Jones stated that it appears that the money that is going to be spent on this pilot program will be a small percentage of a larger project. However, this funding could make a difference on whether or not a small project would be built. He commented that there could be some type of compromise on projects that are \$2 million or less.

Transportation Committee Vice Chairman Madaffer (City of San Diego) stated that this pilot program is a good foundation and the criteria are appropriate for the moment.

MOTION

Vice Chairman Madaffer made the motion to have a \$2 million cap on the projects submitted for this pilot program. Mayor Madrid seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION ON THE MOTION

Chairman Kellejian mentioned that this action would be advisory only.

Chairwoman Slater-Price noted that if a jurisdiction is using the \$2 million for the projects listed, it would only serve to supplement other project funding.

Supervisor Horn (County of San Diego) commented that he didn't see any credit for farm workers and housing in his area. He expressed concern that if this pilot program becomes the basis for eligible projects in the future, low-income housing and any other criteria will outweigh and eliminate projects that the unincorporated area could come up with.

Chair Holt Pfeiler indicated that the proposed criteria are test for a future program. She added that there are a different set of standards for the unincorporated areas than the more urban areas.

Supervisor Horn stated that the \$2 million is minimal considering that a NEPA document alone would cost, at a minimum, \$250,000.

Chair Holt Pfeiler commented that the "Smart Growth and Land Use Characteristics" category currently comprises 33 percent of the total points, and that within that, the Intensity of Development criterion accounts for 7 percent of the total points. If the weighting of the Intensity of Development criterion was increased to a 3 or a 4, she estimated that those points would account for approximately 10 percent or 12 percent of the total points, which would not be excessive. She expressed support for increasing the weighting factor for the Intensity of Development criterion to a 4. *Staff mentioned that if there are good projects in the region, the rural areas will be eligible to compete for the funding.*

Deputy Mayor Emery (Metropolitan Transit System [MTS]) stated that if the Committees take the vote on this issue today, there will be no need to discuss it at future individual Transportation and/or Regional Planning Committee meetings, because the Board will have the final say.

Chairman Kellejian reminded the Committees that the vote would be advisory and not binding and questioned if all members, including the advisory members, will be able to vote. He requested clarification from the General Counsel. *SANDAG General Counsel replied that all Committee members, including Advisory Members, are eligible to vote because the vote is not binding.*

Action: Upon a motion by Vice Chairman Madaffer and a second by Mayor Madrid, the Committees voted for a \$2 million cap on the projects submitted for this pilot program. The advisory motion passed.

Chair Holt Pfeiler requested to have an advisory vote on weight of 4 for Intensity of Development criterion.

Chairman Kellejian requested confirmation that the smaller cities that are built out will get credit for their efforts. *Staff responded that the program will recognize smart growth development that has already occurred.*

Councilmember Stocks requested clarification if the issue is the weight number or the percentage. Chairman Kellejian confirmed that the issue being considered is the weight number.

Action: Upon a motion by Chair Holt Pfeiler and a second by Vice Chairman Madaffer, the Committees voted to increase the weight number for the Intensity of Development criterion to 4. The advisory motion passed.

E. SHOWCASING LOCAL SMART GROWTH PROJECTS: SMART GROWTH IN SOLANA BEACH (INFORMATION)

Chairman Kellejian noted that at the last joint meeting, the Committees were briefed on smart growth projects in La Mesa. This month, the Committees will be briefed on a smart growth project in Solana Beach.

Barry Johnson, City Manager for the City of Solana Beach, noted that this presentation is called the "Super Smart Growth Project." He introduced Greg Shannon, from the Sheadona Company, to make the presentation to the Committees.

Greg Shannon, representative for Sheadona, a partnership of Shea Properties and Sedona Pacific Corporation, the developers for the NCTD/Solana Beach Mixed Use Project, provided the Committees with an overview of the project. Mr. Shannon mentioned that public/private partnerships are always difficult to implement. He noted that transit-oriented developments need to make transit convenient and exciting. Parking availability is critical and there are two factors working in tandem to make this project successful – freeway congestion and convenient parking. And, if parking can be covered, that provides an extra convenience. Mr. Shannon commented that the City of Solana Beach and NCTD have been working on this project since 1991. NCTD put out the Requests for Proposals for developers to create a project that would satisfy several goals, including parking and the SANDAG Regional Growth Management Strategy's Land Use Development Element principles. The project also needed to include smart growth as well as consider the concerns of the residential community.

Mr. Shannon stated that the majority of the project is a 500-space parking structure which will be underground and will include covered bicycle parking. NCTD will build the parking structure and will issue a bond to finance the project. The developer will enter into a ground lease with NCTD for the rights to build on top of the parking structure. The lease would pay for approximately one-half of the cost of the parking garage. Through the NCTD garage, parking structures will be carved out of the existing retaining wall and will allow quick walking access to the Coaster. Cedros Plaza, a mixed-used building to include

live/work lofts over retail space, will be considered the entry way to Solana Beach. It also will reduce traffic congestion. The North Coast Repertory Theatre also will be rebuilt in downtown Solana Beach and will be a 27,000 square foot facility. The total project cost is \$48 million.

The City of Solana Beach is currently going through the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) process. The schedule is to start groundbreaking on the parking garage in April 2006, with garage completion in June 2007, and Cedros Plaza being completed in February 2009. In summary, this project will provide the following benefits to the City of Solana Beach: transit parking, affordable housing, traffic reduction, beach sand replenishment, public art (North Coast Repertory Theatre), transit-oriented development, reduced traffic generation, and pedestrian orientation and beach access.

Chairman Kellejian noted that NCTD provided the property and created a good relationship with the City of Solana Beach to promote the project.

Karen King, Executive Director of NCTD, stated that this joint effort is subsidy dependent, but provides a long-term revenue stream and is an important project for NCTD. She complimented Mr. Shannon for coming on board with this project when there wasn't a lot of community support. She mentioned that future projects need to move more quickly and added that NCTD is currently undertaking the design phase for the parking structure which should be completed soon.

Chairman Kellejian indicated that with assistance from the developers and Congressman Cunningham, the project is lacking only approximately \$4.5 million in funding.

Councilmember Feller commented that this project is great news and is encouraging for future projects throughout the region.

Councilmember Monroe questioned where the major revenue stream will come from. *Mr. Shannon replied that the majority of the revenue will come from the ground lease revenues, which is 10 percent of the gross revenues of the rents received.*

Councilmember Monroe asked if the parking will be free. *Mr. Shannon indicated that parking will be free for the Coaster riders.*

Chairman Kellejian stated that if parking is not free, people may begin to park in the residential areas in lieu of paying the parking fees.

Chairwoman Slater-Price asked if the housing units will be available for sale. *Mr. Shannon stated that all apartments will be for rent, and many will be designated as low-income and affordable housing.*

Supervisor Horn mentioned that he worked on the NCTD committee for this project, and it is a good project for the region. He added that they should consider including a major department store in the development plans.

Councilmember Peters stated that he would like to see this type of project happen throughout the region and congratulated the City of Solana Beach for its efforts, especially by bringing on Greg Shannon as the developer.

Councilmember Monroe encouraged Mr. Shannon to coordinate with SANDAG's Shoreline Preservation Committee to put the sand on the beach from this project.

Action: The Committee received this item for information.

F. BUS RAPID TRANSIT OVERVIEW (INFORMATION)

Chairman Kellejian noted that Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) is a transit service type that will soon be implemented in San Diego through our various BRT projects.

Staff reported that BRT is a new concept in the San Diego region and is an integral part to transportation planning. For that reason, SANDAG contracted with Bill Lieberman, to do research on other areas that currently have BRT systems in place to learn both the good and bad parts of existing BRT systems and to assess the applicability of the different types and various components of BRT in the San Diego region.

Bill Lieberman, Transit Planning and Design, and consultant to SANDAG, explained that BRT is a package of improvements for bus transit which includes frequent service, infrequent stops, priority in traffic, upscale buses and stops, coordination with land use planning, and branded service (vehicles and stops/stations) as a premium way to travel. He added that reasons to develop BRT would be to attract more riders by offering a higher level of bus service, similar in many respects to rail transit and to improve service in corridors not suited to rail transit. There were seven BRT systems that were studied: East Bay Area (California), Los Angeles (California), Boston (Massachusetts), Rouen (France), Houston (Texas), Sydney (Australia), Brisbane (Australia), and Adelaide (Australia). He noted that he selected locations based on areas that he has visited in the past and those that he felt had similarities to the San Diego region. The systems fall into three categories: (1) on-street in mixed traffic; (2) on-street in reserved lanes; and (3) off-street. He described in detail the differences of the systems in each category. He noted that BRT should be adapted to the travel patterns of San Diegans; radial bus ways are less appropriate here because we already have radial rail lines; and busway segments may be useful in certain parts of the region to bypass congested roadways. BRT utilizing streets or freeways seems most promising here.

There were ten lessons that he learned about Bus Rapid Transit.

1. BRT has many forms, the common trait is priority over general traffic;
2. Application of BRT strategies from other nations must be tempered by our own limitations in governmental authority;
3. BRT needs to have an upscale image to attract the more demanding market segments;
4. Use the different forms of BRT where they are best suited – a fluid system is more cost-effective than one confined by rigid standards;

5. Reserved bus lanes in city streets are a cost-effective, high-profile strategy requiring lots of cooperation from local jurisdictions;
6. Freeways can be efficiently utilized for BRT, but the stations should not be isolated;
7. In most instances, BRT is not a substitute for light rail, but rather one of several elements in a multimodal system;
8. The more that BRT emulates light rail, the smaller the difference in development costs;
9. The fewer the physical facilities involved, the more important are the other attributes of BRT; and
10. Simple route structures are better understood by the occasional traveler.

Chairman Kellejian noted that the Transportation Committee will need to begin to look at some of these different systems because they will be making decisions soon on various projects. He thanked Mr. Lieberman for his report.

Councilmember Rindone mentioned that long delays usually discourage riders. He asked whether there were any express services utilized at any of the systems that he studied. *Mr. Lieberman responded that in Australia, there were some systems that made every stop and some that provided express service.*

Councilmember Rindone questioned if there has been any analysis done with the frequency of service between BRT and light rail transit. *Mr. Lieberman stated that generally, the more frequency, the better. He mentioned that a bus-based service generally needs to have higher frequency to provide the same capacity as a rail system. Higher frequency leads to higher operating costs, and we have found that its hard to obtain clear operating costs for some of the BRT systems.*

Councilmember Rindone stated that the concept that not one size fits all must be maintained in San Diego County. The Transportation Committee must keep that awareness to tailor services to communities. He added that the whole purpose of the BRT system is to reduce congestion on the highways. The public wants frequency and uncomplicated schedules.

Councilmember Peters pointed out that the Transportation Committee should recognize that there is going to be a role for BRT in the San Diego region. He mentioned that there are approximately five major development projects in his jurisdiction that will need BRT to support them. He noted that he is willing to have developers contribute to the cost and requested that staff assist and educate him on the potential systems coming to the region. He requested that BRT be given the same attention as light rail transit (LRT). *Staff responded that BRT and LRT work together and noted that both systems should be thought out for coordinated implementation.*

Chairman Kellejian noted that during the *TransNet* campaign, the voters were surveyed regarding different types of transit systems. The consensus was that they liked the concept of BRT, but they also preferred rail.

Action: The Committee received this item for information.

Chairman Kellejian pointed out that there was a mistake on the agenda regarding the next meeting date and time for the Transportation Committee. The next meeting of the Transportation Committee will be held at 9:00 a.m. on Friday, April 15, 2005, at the SANDAG offices.

D. ADJOURNMENT

Transportation Committee Chairman Kellejian adjourned the joint meeting at 11:53 a.m.

**CONFIRMED ATTENDANCE FOR
TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MEMBERS
SANDAG JOINT TRANSPORTATION AND
REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING
APRIL 1, 2005
9:30 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.**

GEOGRAPHICAL AREA	JURISDICTION	NAME	MEMBER/ ALTERNATE	ATTENDING	
				Yes	No
North County Coastal	City of Solana Beach	Joe Kellejian (Chair)	Member	✓	
	City of Encinitas	Jerome Stocks	Alternate	✓	
City of San Diego	----	Jim Madaffer (Vice Chair)	Member	✓	
	----	Scott Peters	Alternate	✓	
	----	Dick Murphy	Alternate		✓
North County Inland	City of Poway	Mickey Cafagna	Member		✓
	City of Vista	Judy Ritter	Alternate	✓	
South County	City of Chula Vista	Jerry Rindone	Member	✓	
	City of Coronado	Phil Monroe	Alternate	✓	
East County	City of Santee	Jack Dale	Member	✓	
	City of La Mesa	Art Madrid	Alternate	✓	
County of San Diego	----	Ron Roberts	Member		✓
	----	Pam Slater-Price	Alternate	✓	
	----	Dianne Jacob	Alternate		✓
Metropolitan Transit System	City of Poway	Bob Emery	Member	✓	
	MTS	Leon Williams (Chairman)	Alternate	✓	
North San Diego County Transit Development Board	City of Oceanside	Jack Feller	Member	✓	
	City of Vista	Judy Ritter	Alternate	✓	
	City of Escondido	Ed Gallo	Alternate		✓
San Diego County Regional Airport Authority	City of Lemon Grove	Mary Sessom	Member		✓
	Governor's Appointee	Xema Jacobsen	Alternate		✓
ADVISORY MEMBER/ Caltrans	-----	Pedro Orso-Delgado	Member	✓	
	-----	Bill Figge	Alternate	✓	

**CONFIRMED ATTENDANCE FOR
REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE MEMBERS
SANDAG JOINT TRANSPORTATION AND
REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING
APRIL 1, 2005
9:30 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	✓	
Advisory Member	Metropolitan Transit System	Leon Williams (Chairman)	Member	✓	
		Bob Emery	Alternate	✓	
Advisory Member	North San Diego County Transit Development Board	Dave Druker	Member		✓
		<i>Vacant</i>	Alternate		
Advisory Member	Regional Planning Technical Working Group	Gail Goldberg	Member	✓	
Advisory Member	Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group	<i>Vacant</i>	Member		