

DRAFT

SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS MINUTES OF October 3, 2007

BOARD MEMBER PRESENT:

Katcho Achadjian, Fourth District, County of San Luis Obispo
Paul Brown, City of San Luis Obispo (*Alternate*)
Tony Ferrara, City of Arroyo Grande
Bruce Gibson, Second District, County San Luis Obispo (*left @ 11:27 a.m.*)
Tom O'Malley, City of Atascadero
Harry Ovitt, First District, County of San Luis Obispo (*arrived @10:08 a.m.*)
James Patterson, Fifth District, County of San Luis Obispo (*President*) (*arrived @ 9:50 a.m.*)
Janice Peters, City of Morro Bay (*arrived @ 8:45 a.m.*)
Mary Ann Reiss, City of Pismo Beach
John Shoals, City of Grover Beach (*Vice President*)
Fred Strong, City of Paso Robles

ABSENT: Jerry Lenthall, Third District, County of San Luis Obispo

STAFF PRESENT: Ronald De Carli, Steve Devencenzi, Peter Rodgers, James Worthley, Lisa Quinn, Mike Harmon, Eliane Guillot, Philip Chu, Richard Rojas, Jessica Berry, Jaime Hill, Aida Nicklin, Penelope McCullough, and Wyatt Cash (Legal Counsel).

The following action minutes are listed as they were acted upon by the San Luis Obispo Council of Governments and as listed on the agenda for the meeting held October 3, 2007, together with staff reports and related documents attached thereto and incorporated therein by reference.

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL: Vice President John Shoals called the meeting to order at 8:34 a.m. Roll call was taken.

PUBLIC COMMENTS (ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA): Mr. Jerry Bunin, Government Affairs Director, Home Builders Association, stated he is very disappointed about the way the first Housing Methodology Committee meeting was scheduled. He noted the need for public input, bringing to attention that the date of the Committee's first meeting scheduled on October 14, 2007, is not a good day for him (it is the same day as the California Building Association meeting, which he is committed to attend). He reminded the Board that the Home Builders Association is a key stakeholder on the housing issue, representing builders, architects, land use planning firms, and engineering firms. He requested moving this meeting to another date when majority of the public can participate.

Mr. Eric Greening, Atascadero, thanked SLOCOG staff for working with the County Planning Commission on the efforts to integrate Smart Growth concepts into the Land Use Planning process.

SLOCOG staff will be presenting to the Planning Commission on November 8, 2007, the Performance Indicators Report as it relates to Smart Growth. **Mr. Greening** urged all member jurisdictions to be on the same page – to participate in the effort to implement *Smart Growth Policies*, integrating them into their respective Land Use Plans, and making certain that they coordinate with SLOCOG staff relative to the SLOCOG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) update.

Mr. Adam Fukushima, Executive Director, San Luis Obispo (SLO) County Bicycle Coalition, briefly updated the Board on the Coalition's ongoing campaign for Bike safety. He then announced that the new phase of the Coalition's "*Share the Road*" campaign would be hitting the airwaves starting this week (a set of TV spots to broadcast countywide). The new public service announcements, which include flyers, hope to encourage civility among bicyclists and motorists, and to educate the public on safe and responsible behavior on the roadways. **Mr. Fukushima** then ran the new ads on the Boardroom screen, noting that the same ads are available for public viewing (on the YouTube website) at slobikelane.org/sharetheroad.htm.

(Board Member Janice Peters arrived at 8:45 a.m.)

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT: **Mr. Ronald De Carli** responded to Mr. Bunin's comments, saying he concurs about the role and importance of the Home Builders Association in the community. He concurred with Mr. Bunin's request to move the Housing Methodology Committee meeting to another date. He requested the Board to authorize staff to change the meeting date to a date when majority of the Committee members can attend. **The Board concurred.** **Board Member Tony Ferrara** commented he supports rescheduling this Committee meeting because it is critical that all key stakeholders are on the table.

Mr. De Carli thanked Mr. Fukushima for his presentation of the TV ads. He then distributed a handout on *Proposition 1B Local Street and Road Improvement Funds*, and briefly updated the Board on the State Budget -- \$4.2B for Transportation was adopted; \$1.3B cuts in public transit. He noted that the California Transportation Commission (CTC) filed a lawsuit contending that those cuts violate the provisions of Proposition 116. SB 88, a trailer bill that clarifies allocation and oversight for Proposition 1B local streets and roads funding, was passed. A total of \$950 million Proposition 1B funds will go to streets and roads for cities and counties -- \$400m to counties & \$550m to cities. **Mr. De Carli** pointed out that since the agendas were distributed, staff has found out that SB 375 has been significantly amended. It is now a two-year bill and is yet to be reviewed by the League of California Cities (LCC) Policy committees and the Californian State Association of Counties (CSAC). Therefore, staff recommends continuing Consent Agenda Item *E-6, 2007 State Legislation – SB 445 and SB 374* to the next meeting, in order to allow time for staff to review and respond to any action that CSAC, the League of California Cities, and California Association of Councils of Governments (CALCOG) would be taking. **Board Member Ferrara** stated, "It is wise for us to wait and see what the League of California Cities would do relative to SB 375."

Mr. De Carli announced that Ms. Jessica Berry (San Luis Obispo Regional Rideshare Bike Program Coordinator) is now working with SLOCOG Administration Director Peter Rodgers as Transit Planner (Intern). Ms. Berry has a Bachelors degree and is currently working on a graduate program at Cal Poly. **Mr. De Carli** then introduced Ms. Jaime Hill, the new Bike Program Coordinator (replacing Ms. Berry). Ms. Hill came from the City of San Luis Obispo as Associate Planner. She has an extensive background on Land Use Planning and has a Masters Degree in Planning from Cal Poly. "We are pleased to have both Ms. Berry and Ms. Hill join the SLOCOG team."

CALTRANS DISTRICT 5 DIRECTOR'S REPORT: **Mr. Rich Krumholz**, Caltrans District 5 Director, brought to attention that included in the agenda packet is the Caltrans Report, which shows the District's ongoing projects as well as the upcoming projects. He noted three separate projects that were not included in the Report:

- 1) Hwy 41/101 Interchange construction will be starting in Atascadero. The SLOCOG Board is invited to join the Atascadero Mayor, the SLOCOG Executive Director, and SLOCOG Board President in the ground breaking ceremony on October 12, 2007, at 11:00 a.m. in Atascadero. This project's estimated completion date is 2010 (the Contractor is Granite Construction).
- 2) A \$3.3 million *Reconstruction* project (an ongoing project) on Santa Rosa Street in San Luis Obispo. This includes curb gutter work, sidewalks, concrete work, etc. There will be no lane closures during peak hours and the work crew will be working some nights.
- 3) Southbound climbing lane from Avila Beach Drive going up the hill to Pismo Beach will start construction in November. This project will take a little over a year. Some Interchange improvements are also being done on the northbound ramp at Avila Beach Drive. The cost of these operational improvements projects is \$5m.

Board Member Ferrara said he just came back from a trip to Chicago. He noticed a highway there that is similar to California's U.S. 101. He noted that the big difference between that highway and U.S. 101 is that the one in Chicago is pristine/clean, adding that obviously, there is a cultural difference between people. *"It is amazing to see the amount of litter (weeds, leaves, debris, etc.) on 101. Even the Madonna Road sign is clumped with leaves or weeds."* **Board Member Ferrara** stressed the need for Caltrans staff to check on this problem, noting that people need to be reminded to keep our roads/highways clean. He also mentioned about utilizing Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) changeable message signs to get the message across. **Mr. Krumholz** brought to attention that Caltrans conducted a statewide litter abatement and trash cleanup day last year. Caltrans spends \$40 million annually to pick up trash. However, it is not enough. *"There is still a need to have a very comprehensive grassroots broad based program that would encourage people to stop dumping trash on our highways. The program must also focus on education and enforcement."* **Board Member Tom O'Malley** indicated he has similar concerns and that he is disappointed that this problem is not addressed regionally, particularly the reluctance by law enforcement agencies to be active on fixing this problem. He stressed the need to coordinate with law enforcement and get their help.

A. PUBLIC HEARING ITEM:

A-1 Coordinated Human Services - Public Transportation Plan: **Ms. Eliane Guillot** introduced Ms. Heather Menninger, AMMA (Consultant), noting that Ms. Menninger will be presenting the San Luis Obispo Coordinated Human Services - Public Transportation Plan. **Ms. Menninger** stated that the *Coordinated Human Services-Public Transportation Plan* complies with the *Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act – A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU)* requirement (per May 2007 Federal guidelines). She discussed the Plan noting that this sets the stage for a joint "Call for Projects" for three transit grants that are geared to serving low income individuals (Federal Transit Administration [FTA] Section 5316 – Job Access & Reverse Commute), persons with disabilities (Section 5317 – New Freedom), and seniors and persons with disabilities (Section 5310). **Ms. Menninger** highlighted the Vision for the Plan (improved mobility for San Luis Obispo Region's seniors, persons with disabilities, and persons of low income) and the three Goals (Coordinating infrastructure and leadership, increased capacity to meet individualized needs, and information portals), which are supported by fifteen (15) objectives and 53 strategies for implementation. The first action needed to implement coordination infrastructure and leadership is to establish a *Regional Mobility Manager (RMM)* position. An RMM will offer regional leadership and promote communication between transit/transit operators and human services agencies. AMMA consultants recommend housing the RMM function under SLOCOG – within the Regional Rideshare Program. **Ms. Menninger** pointed out that SLOCOG, with Caltrans (whose role is yet to be refined) will undertake the *Call for Projects*. Projects will come from interested, willing, and able strategic partners. Technical assistance will be provided to agencies as they develop projects derived from the Plan. **Ms. Guillot** noted that the staff recommendation for this item is for the Board to adopt the Plan; integrate the findings into the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP); forward to Caltrans and send out *Call for Projects*; and designate Regional Rideshare for Regional Mobility Management function.

Mr. De Carli remarked that staff and the consultant, in working with the advisory committees, did a good job on this Plan. The Plan is very well prepared and very comprehensive.

Board Member Bruce Gibson thanked the Consultant and SLOCOG staff for their efforts, and noted that at almost every meeting of the Social Services Policy Council (in which he sits as a member), people always ask the question about how to get the right transit services for different groups of people (i.e., low income, people with disabilities, etc.). He said he hopes that staff will keep track of the results once the *Regional Mobility Manager (RMM)* function is established.

Relative to RMM, **Board Member Fred Strong** inquired if there is any way for RMM to coordinate and integrate already existing local services (e.g., the Senior Citizens Center in Paso Robles offers special services for seniors). **Ms. Menninger** explained that the RMM function will be done at several different levels, and with regards to integration, already existing local services could be enhanced by providing support services, driver training, maintenance, etc. She noted that it would take some creativity and leadership, stressing the need to encourage the senior center to look at possibilities. **Mr. De Carli** pointed out that SLOCOG is currently providing, as an ongoing effort, a senior transportation training program to educate senior citizens how to use transit.

Board Member Ferrara noted that this Plan provides definition and structure.

Board Member O'Malley emphasized the need for coordinated efforts for all organizations involved in transportation, mentioning the importance of considering other services such as children services.

Vice President Shoals called for any public comments. **Mr. Greening** expressed thanks to Ms. Menninger and SLOCOG staff for all the good work done on the Plan, noting that this is an excellent Plan and that Ms. Menninger worked well with the advisory committees. He brought to attention that any strategic oversight committee should include not only agencies but also senior citizens, low income people, and people with disabilities living independently. **Mr. Greening** turned attention to Agenda page A-1-3, Exhibit 4, a Table showing the *San Luis Obispo Region Target Population Transportation Needs, Resources and Possible Responses*. He suggested adding "Fixed-route transit" to the list of Transportation Modes for the Target Population – Persons with disabilities. Fixed-route transit could be a preferential option for people with disabilities, as some of them are living independently. **Mr. Greening** also suggested removing the same mode (Fixed-route transit) from the Target Population – Persons with Behavioral Disabilities. This group should be in specialized transit services because having them in fixed-route transit can be very challenging for the fixed-route bus drivers. **Ms. Menninger** pointed out that what is being provided on this page is a suite of options. **Board Member Ferrara** said, *"There is no way we can restrict someone from using fixed route transit. I do not mind adding the 'Fixed-route transit' option under 'Persons with disabilities.' I do not support the second suggestion to remove the same option from 'Persons with Behavioral disabilities,' simply because we cannot control what service this group of people want to use."* **The Board concurred.**

Board Member Ferrara moved to approve the staff recommendation, including an *amendment* to Exhibit 4 on Agenda page A-1-13, per Mr. Greening's first suggestion (see underlined below):

- A) Adopt the 2007 Coordinated Plan;
- B) Integrate Findings into the Regional Transportation Plan Update;
- C) Forward to Caltrans and Send Call-for-Projects; and
- D) Designate SLOCOG - Regional Rideshare for housing the Regional Mobility Management function.

Amendment to Exhibit 4: Add "Fixed-route transit" under Transportation Modes for the Target Population – Persons with disabilities.

Board Member Strong seconded, and the motion carried on a voice vote, in the absence of Board Members Lenthall, Ovitt, and Patterson.

B. PRESENTATION ITEMS:

B-1 Central Coast Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Implementation Plan and Video: **Mr. James Worthley** gave a brief presentation overview, noting that Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) is the application of advanced transportation technologies to increase the safety and efficiency of the transportation system. The Central Coast ITS Implementation Plan is a multi-county effort to update the 2000 ITS Strategic Deployment Plan (SDP). The Draft ITS Plan defines a list of technological applications and project concepts specific to the Central Coast. **Mr. Worthley** brought to attention that the full draft Plan is posted for review on the SLOCOG website at www.slocog.org. In addition to the Plan, the Consultant (Transcore) has produced informational brochures and a 10-minute video. **Mr. Worthley** then introduced Mr. Chuck Dankocsik, the lead consultant on this project. **Mr. Dankocsik** reviewed the ITS Implementation Plan, highlighting the following:

- *Operational & Safety Benefits of ITS (i.e., increase roadway capacity & improve travel time, decrease congestion, increase driver safety & comfort level, etc.).*
- *Typical ITS Benefits (Traffic control systems and signal coordination; Incident management systems; Freeway management systems; and Transit management systems).*
- *Central Coast ITS Existing projects (Caltrans District 5 Transportation Management Center and regional activities; CCTV cameras, roadway sensors, Motorist Call Box System, traffic signal control, advanced crosswalks, etc.).*
- *Central coast ITS Planned projects (Enhance California Highway Patrol & emergency response radio systems, increase the availability & quality of multi-modal traveler information; expand cellular phone coverage, install additional CCTV, roadway sensors, and ramp meters along the corridors; expand ITS along US 101, SR 1, SR 41, SR 46, & SR 227; Motorist Aid Call Box System – SR 227; 511 Traveler Information Systems; etc.).*
- *Central Coast Intelligent Transportation Systems (CCITS) – Next Steps (CCITS Implementation Plan Approval; SLOCOG's continued participation within the CCITS Coordinating/Implementation Group; Identification/Authorization of ITS Project funding; and Continue deployment of ITS projects identified in the CCITS Implementation Plan.*

Mr. Worthley noted the staff recommendation to adopt the Draft Implementation Plan and integrate changes; Direct staff to maintain the ITS Architecture (or Framework) for Federal compliance; Direct staff to include policies and projects from the Implementation Plan in future planning documents; and Promote ITS awareness through video rebroadcast by AGP Video. He further noted that at the Board's prerogative, AGP Video could integrate the ITS Video into the broadcast of the Board meeting about three times in a year.

Board Member Peters asked if the video of this meeting will be an ongoing broadcast or released to local TV channels as well. **Mr. Worthley** replied that AGP Video tapes this meeting for broadcast on a local Cable channel. Staff will provide each member jurisdiction a copy of the ITS Video.

Board Member Gibson queried about funding sources, priorities, and any sequencing plan relative to the ITS Implementation Plan. **Mr. Worthley** indicated that funding for this Plan comes from a variety of different sources (e.g., Transit funding will go to the transit portion). **Mr. Dankocsik** said some are Federal earmarks, noting that the main thing is to try to mainstream ITS projects into the Regional Transportation Plan and then into the statewide improvement plan. He further noted that sequencing was actually one of the topics brought up at a recent meeting with Caltrans. Prioritizing, collaborative projects, protocol, and methodology were the other topics discussed at that meeting.

Mr. De Carli pointed out that this is an update of an existing Plan. Each area will be addressed as each funding source becomes available. This Plan currently does not have specific earmarks, just various funding sources.

Mr. Krumholz noted that for Caltrans, "detection" is a real priority; hence, the importance of ITS cameras (with infra-red detectors). ITS technology is a tool for Caltrans to get real time data to inform the public via broadcast on the Internet or TV. This is a fundamental part of the Governor's Strategic Growth Plan, to

maximize the performance and to sustain the transportation system. He also noted that the ITS cost benefit has a 15/1 ratio.

Vice President Shoals asked if the "Priorities" would be coming back to the Board in a future meeting. **Mr. De Carli** responded that *Priorities* would be presented to the Board as the opportunity arises.

Vice President Shoals called for any public comments; there were none.

Moved by Board Member Katcho Achadjian and seconded by Board Member Strong, the motion to approve the staff recommendation (as outlined below) passed on a voice vote, in the absence of Board Members Lenthall, Ovitt, and Patterson.

- A) Adopt Draft Implementation Plan and Integrate changes.
- B) Direct staff to maintain the ITS Architecture (or Framework) for Federal compliance.
- C) Direct staff to include policies and projects from the Implementation Plan in future planning documents.
- D) Promote ITS awareness through Video rebroadcast by AGP Video.

B-2 Motorist Aid (Call Box) Program Update and Next Steps: **Mr. Philip Chu** updated the Board on the Motorist Aid Program, noting what is considered as "Motorist Aid" (*Intelligent Transportation System such as changeable message signs and traffic monitoring devices; 511 Travel Information System; Signal Preemption; Freeway Service Patrol; Mobile Call Box Program*) and the "Next Steps" (Provide funding for motorist aid projects for FY 07/08, and Implement Mobile Call Box Program for FY 08/09). Staff will also be looking at each individual call box sites for possible relocation of some call boxes to other locations such as State Route 227 and Los Osos Valley Road. He also noted the staff recommendation – "Direct staff to program motorist aid projects as part of the 2008 Transportation Programming Cycle, and to support the Mobile Call Box Program (with implementation in FY 08/09)."

(Board Member Strong temporarily left the boardroom at 9:42 a.m.)

Board Member Achadjian brought up the need to install call boxes at locations that have little or no cell phone coverage. **Mr. Chu** indicated that one of the things staff would be looking into in terms of relocating call boxes is to assess what locations have good and bad cell signals. For example, U.S. 101 has very good coverage; staff is considering removing some of the call boxes from some locations on 101 and relocated them to State Route 227.

Note: There were no public comments.

Board Member Achadjian moved to receive the Report, direct staff to program motorist aid projects as part of the 2008 Transportation Programming Cycle, and support the Mobile Call Box Program. Board Member Ferrara seconded, and the motion carried on a voice vote, in the absence of Board Members Lenthall, Ovitt, Patterson, and Strong.

B-3 Funding Workshop for the Regional Transportation Plan Update: **Mr. Richard Murphy** stated that this is a kickoff towards updating the Regional Transportation Plan. He acknowledged the presence of (in the audience) and welcomed Ms. Michelle Noch, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) representative. He discussed the RTP update, highlighting the required RTP Elements and the *Key Issues* for the update (i.e., public participation practices). He provided some examples of project cost escalation such as the Santa Maria River Bridge Project (cost has escalated from \$43m to \$58m). **Mr. Murphy** noted that the consultant, Mr. David Grannis of Planning Company Associates, Inc. would be conducting the workshop and presenting information relative to funding, including topics regarding the current funding situation, the future of federal and state funding, regional and funding options, etc.

(Board Member Strong returned at 9:46 a.m.)

(President James Patterson arrived at 9:50 a.m.)

Mr. David Grannis gave the general statement of the situation, discussing the current Federal and State conditions (current national & statewide needs; solvency of the federal trust fund; efficacy of the state transportation account), Global trends in material costs, Management & Delivery of projects. **Mr. Grannis** brought to attention that discussion about resource and needs is happening at boardrooms everywhere in the state and nationwide. Jurisdictions are struggling to address funding issues, aging infrastructure, population growth, increase in *Vehicle Miles of Travel (VMT)*, etc. He said he views these issues as an opportunity for jurisdictions, organizations, and stakeholders to work together to find solutions at different levels. Generally, at the federal level, it has been estimated that there is approximately \$10B to \$100B worth of needs and there is only 40% to 50% of funding available to pay for those needs. **Mr. Grannis** discussed the Future Federal and State Funding:

- *Future Federal Funding.* The Gas Tax is the primary source of funding for highways at both the federal and state levels. However, it is declining on an annual basis. Fuel taxes account for 91% of the federal highway trust fund revenue, but it has not increased since 1993. Purchasing power has been losing ground due to increasing needs, increasing costs and inflation. In the last Federal Appropriations, Congress has cut 50% of the total number of earmarks. The reality is that there would not be as many earmarks in the next round because of increased accountability and disclosure requirements. The earmarks will also be generally lower in dollars. Potential approaches to address the fact that the *General Trust Fund* is insolvent, were discussed by National Commissions on Revenue/Finance --- 1) *Raise the gas tax*; 2) *One-time bonding to provide \$50m for transportation infrastructure projects*; 3) *Expand Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act of 1998 (TIFIA)*; 4) *Target Private Activity Bonds (PABs)*; 5) *Public Private Partnerships (PPPs)*.

Trade Infrastructure or Goods Movement is a source for General Fund revenue; there is no way of leveraging the benefits of that revenue back into the transportation system. In California alone, \$50B to \$60B infrastructure needs exist statewide. Some of the options being considered to fund the “gap” -- Fees to provide “debt service” and Tax credits.

- *Future State Funding.* The State Transportation System is declining and costs are increasing (pavement costs and bridges). There is a significant increase in VMT creating congestion (1300 new cars per day). The bottom line for the State is that there is a lot more pressure now on the State & Local systems. *“We either bite the bullet and create more revenue or look at less ownership (meaning – more partnerships).”* Relative to the State Highway Account (SHA), the Federal and State gas tax revenue is now fully consumed by Caltrans overhead and *State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP)*. The State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), a funding source for highway expansion, now depends on Proposition 42 and Public Transportation Account (PTA) funds for new programming. A 10-year projection of statewide transportation needs is estimating the need to be \$220B, and 45% of that is on maintenance and goods movement/trade infrastructure. The strategic focus is to maintain the assets and the trend is how to meet the need. Transportation in the State of California is funded by a variety of state, local, and federal sources. Together, these sources provide roughly \$20B a year for transportation purposes. Local funds account for almost one-half of ongoing transportation funding. Some of the *Revenue* options to be considered are congestion pricing/tolling; Public, Private Partnerships; Raise and index Gas Tax; Design-Build contracting; Mileage Based Fees; and Bond funding.

(Board Member Harry Ovitt arrived at 10:08 p.m.)

Mr. Grannis said he would now entertain any questions from the Board and would resume his presentation after recess, wherein he will be discussing Regional, Local, and Private Funding and the Next Steps.

Members of the Board, staff, and the public gave the following comments, and Mr. Grannis responded:

- **Board Member Ferrara:** *“Looking at earmarks and the earmark process, and as you indicated that there might be some cultural change relative to the use of earmarks, is there going to be some process or cultural shift that would minimize the abuse of earmarks? Relative to the Revenue Options list of cost savings strategies, one thing that is missing is the utilization of recycled materials. The State Waste Board has programs on this issue. Do we look at this issue in state infrastructure (not just the use of rubberized asphalt but also recycled aggregate and recycled concrete)? We really need to focus on the development and processing of recycled materials.”*

Mr. Grannis responded affirmative that there is a cultural shift, noting that because of the new federal disclosure requirements and new procedures, fewer earmark requests will be submitted in the next reauthorization. Those who submit earmark requests are now held accountable and are required to attach their names to it, including the information on what the earmark is for. On the question about the utilization of recycled materials, **Mr. Grannis** indicated there are different bodies of work or studies conducted on this issue. One example is the Interstate 405 Program (at U.S. 101). 405/101 is a big interchange, with lots of problems and noise issues. Caltrans did a test and found a reduction in the noise profile by putting in rubberized pavement. He said, “This issue should absolutely be a part of a long term strategy. However, I would like to defer to Caltrans Director the discussion about developing and processing recycled materials. Recycled materials are not something that has been adopted as standard by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) or the State.”

Mr. Krumholz pointed out a good example of recycled materials utilization in San Luis Obispo County and part of Santa Barbara County -- the major rehabilitation of State Route (SR) 166, a \$20m project. In this project, Caltrans used what they call “Co-foam” paving, which is taking and grinding the existing road and then adding in fresh asphalt. This project shows Caltrans’ efforts and commitment to reuse/recycle materials, not only for economical purposes but also environmental.

- **President James Patterson:** *“There is no mention in the Revenue Options about applying a Vehicle License Fee.”*

Mr. Grannis indicated that the list is not intended to be comprehensive nor exhaustive. It was not left out intentionally; the consultant was just focusing on big ticket concepts. Vehicle License Fee (VLF) has been used regionally and has been proven effective at the state level.

- **Board Member Peters:** *“An issue regarding Harbor Maintenance Tax Fund was brought up at the recent California Marine Affairs and Navigation Conference. This Fund is sitting in the national budget and is being used to allocate against other budget items. It should be used for what it is intended for – harbor maintenance. The Marine Affairs Group is now looking at potentially freezing the Fund as it exists today, in order to balance the national budget, and perhaps use any future income to do marine/harbor maintenance (using the California portion of the fund for California maintenance). My questions are --- Can we isolate what California contributes to that Fund? If we partner with the Marine Affairs Group, do we have a better chance to convince Congress to look at this option?”*

Mr. Grannis pointed out a similar idea that was presented to Congress – Customs Revenue. It was found that customs revenue is a viable source of funding; therefore, a proposal was made in 2001, 2002, and 2003. Yes, there is a way to breakdown what California is contributing to the federal treasury in a way of customs revenue. What was proposed was to keep the base and the increment above, and then give California a revenue stream to fund the rebuilding of infrastructure and transportation maintenance. Unfortunately, it did not receive good reception by Congress. Teaming up with the Marine Affairs Group is a good idea. Right now, anything is possible because the needs are huge and people's frustration is evident.

- **Mr. De Carli:** *“Congress is now starting the debate on new appropriations. Please elaborate the direction that Bill would be going and how it will affect this region. I believe that the focus of expected expenses/targets would be goods movement, infrastructure, and maintenance.”*

Mr. Grannis said that now, there would be proposals to increase the gas tax. However, there is not enough to do new types of programs without looking at other means. He noted that he has not heard of any proposal on indexing that was received and taken seriously. The Tax credit, however, could make an appreciated difference on goods movement. Yes, the State's focus would be goods movement, infrastructure, and maintenance. Local jurisdictions should start the dialogue now with the State Secretary's Office because the State program can be consumed by the needs.

Mr. De Carli commented that SLOCOG has been actively involved in the past two years on reauthorization. This region's stakes are high, but the opportunity to influence the decisions at the State level is small. SLOCOG staff is working with their counterparts around the state and with Caltrans as one voice to get a united front from this region's congressional delegates. He noted that effort is just now starting and that the Board will be updated on any new information in the future.

- **Public Comments: Mr. Greening:** *“Thank you President Patterson for raising the Vehicle License Fee issue. Any option that confronts a person upfront to make decisions is not viable. Can you tell me how many years since the Governor deleted the Vehicle License Fee (VLF)?”*

Mr. Grannis stated he does not have the date when the Governor eliminated the VLF, noting his concurrence that it is not fair that a hole was blown in the revenue, which the future generation would be paying overtime. He stressed that not one of these options is a single solution, further noting the importance of understanding the nature of the problem, namely: aging infrastructure, high costs, and the need to rethink the management system approach.

FUNDING WORKSHOP BREAK: *The Board meeting was recessed at 10:44 a.m. and reconvened at 10:57 a.m.*

“RESUME ITEM B-3, FUNDING WORKSHOP: **President Patterson** took over the seat as chair of the meeting, thanking Vice President Shoals for leading the meeting this morning and for getting it underway.

Mr. Grannis resumed his presentation, discussing the following:

- **Regional & Local Funding.** Self-Help Counties, counties that have sales tax measures, generate almost one-half of all annual transportation revenues spent in California (19 of 58 counties in the state are self-help counties). Sales tax measures are the most flexible, dependent, and robust funding mechanisms that can leverage funds as well as finance and design-build projects.

- Regional/Local Impact Fees. Some counties added comprehensive “impact fees” to sales tax measures (e.g., Riverside & San Bernardino Counties. San Bernardino County requires its local jurisdictions to adopt their own fee structure to receive sales tax money). Impact fees provide added revenue, leverage and flexibility during “up” economic cycles. However, these fees have been linked to vagaries to development cycles.
- Other options/Combinations. Other Options include County-specific gas tax, County vehicle registration fee, and Joint Powers Authority (as a “stand-alone” construction authority with “design-build” authority, which should be in concert with *Public Private Partnerships [PPPs]*).
- Private Infrastructure Funding – Options and Opportunities. The prerequisites for private infrastructure funding include revenue stream and private return (e.g., Orange County Toll Roads, Alameda Corridor). This type of funding is also effective on goods movement. Private funding are partnerships at state and federal level that local jurisdictions can pursue. One example is an innovative program in Portland (Oregon) – the Portland Streetcar. The cost is 60% funded with private money.
- Next Steps. The next steps involve the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) update. The fact is regions can no longer rely on federal appropriations or the STIP or Caltrans SHOPP cycles, without a more comprehensive strategy. *“We need to look at the whole picture and assess local options. Focus on Scenario Planning (overall federal funding scenarios, California reauthorization scenarios, regional options, and aggregate scenarios).* From a Scenario Planning Process, San Luis Obispo region must determine its principles for Federal Reauthorization, look at the State funding approach, as well as the State Legislative approach.

As part of the next steps, **Mr. Grannis** suggested establishing a future Transportation Funding Steering Committee of the SLOCOG Board, to undertake Scenario evaluations, develop funding/finance approaches and strategies, and develop delivery approaches and strategies. He stressed the need to start a dialogue to support the State as part in the federal appropriation process.

Board Member Ovitt questioned if what Mr. Grannis is recommending is for SLOCOG Board members to start an individual lobbying effort. **Mr. Grannis** clarified that a better way is to do the lobbying regionally/interregionally as well as locally, stressing the need to look at an overall strategy. **Board Member Gibson** inquired how that relates to the Blueprint effort. **Mr. Grannis** said that Blueprint is going to be a part of the future and is more important at the regional level. However, the big question is -- what will the region look like in 20 years? He emphasized the importance of assessing this regionally.

Public Comments:

Mr. Allen Settle, City of San Luis Obispo Council Member, advocated for approval of the funds to match the funding for the Los Osos Valley Road Interchange project. He noted that the City has done all the necessary work to move this project forward. He stressed the importance of this project -- this interchange is a major bottleneck and completion of this project would improve circulation.

Mr. Greening remarked that any funding source that is transportation specific activates the need to tackle the cost. He said he hopes that if this region becomes a self-help region, it would be multi-modal and in partnership with local jurisdictions’ VLF and gas tax. He asked about putting a non-motorized component into the list of options, stressing the importance of pedestrian and bicycle safety. **Mr. Grannis** indicated that would be within the Board’s power, adding the need to structure the approach on how they want it.

President Patterson thanked Mr. Grannis and concurred forming a Steering Committee to look at not only the next steps but also transportation funding.

Board Member Peters stated that the whole presentation is very informative, noting, "There is so much work ahead of us. We need to work together at both the State and Federal level. I support forming a Steering Committee to discuss the next steps, and I suggest we identify ways to dialogue with the State.

The Board selected their representatives to the Steering Committee, which consists of five members: Two representatives from the County Board and three from the cities (representing the Coast, the South County, and the North County). The Steering Committee Members are the following: *Harry Ovitt (County of San Luis Obispo), James Patterson (County of San Luis Obispo), Janice Peters (City of Morro Bay), John Shoals (City of Grover Beach), & Fred Strong (City of Paso Robles).*

Board Member Ovitt moved to approve the staff recommendation to establish a steering committee to identify the next steps; Schedule the Steering Committee meetings, and report back to the Board in the next meeting. The Steering Committee is composed of five members: *Harry Ovitt (County of San Luis Obispo), James Patterson (County of San Luis Obispo), Janice Peters (City of Morro Bay), John Shoals (City of Grover Beach), & Fred Strong (City of Paso Robles).* Vice President Shoals seconded, and the motion carried on a voice vote, in the absence of Board Member Lenthall.

C. TRANSPORTATION ITEMS:

C-1 2008 Transportation Funding and Programming Cycle: **Mr. Murphy** reviewed the staff report, noting the direction the Board gave at the August meeting – 1) Assess the California Transportation Commission [CTC] draft programming targets; 2) Assess funding shortfalls for currently programmed [committed] projects; 3) Assess "major project" capital needs; and 4) Confirm programming policy direction approved by the Board in August based on numbers 1 through 3 above. **Mr. Murphy** discussed Tables 1, 2, and 3 (Agenda pages C-1-2 thru C-1-4), which respectively show the 2008 Programming Cycle – Programming Targets, Funding shortfalls for currently programmed projects, and "major project" capital needs. He pointed out that Table 1 has been revised to reflect \$24.3m funding target for Highway, Streets, and Roads Program and that under the Programming Policies on Agenda page C-1-6, a provision is added to reduce the "Set Asides" proportionally. He noted the staff recommendation to reaffirm the programming policies as modified (outlined on agenda pages C-1-5 through C-1-7) and adopt the revised programming targets and adoption schedule (Table 1).

Mr. Murphy turned the discussion over to Mr. Peter Rodgers for review of the programming of Proposition 1B funds for transit. **Mr. Rodgers** pointed out that this is a draft and that the advisory committees have talked about a couple of criteria and some issues relative to local match for 1B funds. Staff is recommending to push the 1B application deadline to fall after the December 5th Board meeting (December 12, 2007. Note: Staff has since found that the State deadline has been established to be November 30th), to allow a thorough review of the applications and criteria. Staff will work with the Technical Transportation Advisory Committee (TTAC) & Citizens Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) members to develop the criteria. No State criteria have been released at this time.

(Board Member Gibson left the meeting at 11:27 a.m.)

Mr. De Carli brought to attention that the overall purpose now is to further refine the target list with member jurisdictions' staff, to make certain that member jurisdictions are aware of all competing projects and the tight funding that is available. He noted that the funds would be scheduled for programming in February 2008 to meet the State requirements (CTC's) and for State action in April 2008. (Note: Transit Funding Allocation will now be on December 7, 2007).

Board Member Strong stressed the need for the Board to be cognizant of the fact that Proposition 1B has separate little pots (e.g., 1B funding for transit oriented projects has a caveat – it must have a transit line that has a 15-minute frequency or more during peak hours). **Mr. Rodgers** clarified that Proposition 1B funds for transit would be distributed by the State Controller and that there are no such requirements. The 1B funding for transit, however, is just for capital, not for operations.

Board Member Ferrara requested staff to clarify the project title for Arroyo Grande's project in the queue for funding (Agenda page C-1-3), to change it from *AG Brisco Rd/Grand Ave. Interchange Improvements* to "AG Brisco Rd/101 Interchange Improvements." Staff concurred with the requested change. **Board Member Ferrara** inquired about the timeline for Proposition 1B funds relative to the \$100K Transit Capital for Arroyo Grande (Table 3, Agenda page C-1-4). **Mr. Rodgers** noted that some of the projects in Table 3 are placeholders. **Mr. De Carli** added that the funds would come in a five-year plan; approximately \$2.5m per year based on needs.

President Patterson asked for any public comments. **Mr. David Lilly** brought up the fact that some jurisdictions use 100% of their Transportation Development Act (TDA) funds on transit. He urged the Board to direct SLOCOG staff to develop a method to award 1B funds to member jurisdictions that spent all their TDA funds on transit. This could be done by apportioning based on the amount of TDA they spend on public transit. **Mr. Rodgers** indicated that the intent is to consider local match (whether TDA or local funds). **Mr. De Carli** noted that staff would develop the criteria in December. They will assess the requirements and present the projects in December for programming action in February 2008. **Board Member O'Malley** expressed concern about this approach and request that the options be further reviewed.

The Board went into a brief discussion on the concern Board Member O'Malley raised. During the discussion, **Board Member Ferrara** echoed the same concern and noted the need for a degree of flexibility to use the TDA funds on streets & roads or transit or both at the same time. **Board Member Paul Brown** suggested looking at the intent of the message, which is the fact that in individual communities, jurisdictions have a lot of tough decisions to make. He stressed the need to take seriously the funds coming into this region and use them for the purpose they are intended for. **Board Member Strong** also opposed the aforementioned approach, noting that jurisdictions in this county have various age cities, with various age infrastructures, and different various needs. He stated that the value of the project is more important than its history. **Board Member Peters** said she thinks this can be worked out, stressing the importance of taking into account that it will be an individual issue city-to-city. **President Patterson** reminded the Board that the purpose of TDA funds is for use for public transit.

Board Member Ovitt moved and **Vice President Shoals** seconded, to reaffirm the programming policies as modified (outlined on agenda pages C-1-5 through C-1-7) and adopt the revised programming targets and adoption schedule (Table 1). The motion carried on a voice vote, with **Board Members Lenthall** and **Gibson** absent.

President Patterson announced that due to time constraints, Item C-2 would be continued to the next meeting.

C-2 Comparison of Recent Shuttle Performance – Regional Senior Shuttle, Shandon Shuttle, Templeton Shuttle, Five Cities Shuttle, and Nipomo Mesa Shuttle: Due to time constraint, this item was continued to the next meeting.

C-3 Public Opinion Survey: **Mr. Worthley** summarized the staff report, noting that the focus of the Public Opinion Survey is to assess public opinions concerning elements of regional programs – the *Community 2050 Blueprint Planning Program* and the *2009 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)*. He highlighted the efforts, schedule, and the staff recommendation for the Board to approve the Methodology

and Survey Instrument, and to provide policy direction on Questions 17 & 18 and the Additional Questions on Agenda pages C-3-2 & C-3-3. **Mr. Worthley** noted that for Question 17, staff recommends Option C, “Concentrate the majority of new job growth in San Luis Obispo and Paso Robles, or Spread the new job growth throughout the region” (see Options A, B, & C on Agenda page C-3-1). For Question 18, staff recommends Option D, “Question has nominal benefit. Remove” (See Options A-D on Agenda page C-3-2). (Board Member Ovitt temporarily left the boardroom at 12:00 p.m.)

Board Member Ferrara said Question 17 is county-specific, noting that he does not understand the value of this question.

Board Member Peters asked if deleting Question 18 and adding another question would decrease or increase the timing of the questionnaire (15 minutes). **Ms. Robyn Letters**, President of Opinion Studies (the consultant), indicated she has not tested the questionnaire but a question or two would undertake approximately one or two minutes.

President Patterson asked for any Board/public comments. **Mr. Greening** inquired if the Air Pollution Control District (APCD) questions could be changed. He stressed that under Question 30, the question - “What do you already do?” should be added.

The Board went into an extensive discussion, and the following comments were given:

- **Board Member Ferrara:** *“Question 17 continues to trouble me. How is it really going to affect things? Most jurisdictions have already adopted ‘Smart Growth Principles.’ We cannot legislate where people live or do business. I am pleased to see that Question 11 has been reworded. I am hoping that there will be a clear delineation on this questionnaire between the SLOCOG questions and the APCD questions. The interviewer must identify that this survey is a two-part survey. At our last city council meeting (City of Arroyo Grande), I asked our representative to the APCD Board about this issue and he said he could not recall any APCD Board approval of the survey questions. Based on this information, I recommend that the APCD questions go back to the APCD Board for approval.”*
- **Board Member Peters:** *“I would support deleting Questions 17 & 18, and add Additional Question 1 in place of Question 17. The survey must determine how public transportation is currently being used in this region.”*
- **Board Member Strong:** *“I also agree to delete Questions 17 & 18 and separate the two groups of questions (APCD & SLOCOG). On Mr. Greening’s comments, to add the question – What do you already do? – Additional Question #6 accomplishes that. Therefore, perhaps, add Additional Question 6 instead.”*
- **Board Member Achadjian:** *“The APCD should have been here today to respond to any questions, because the Board needs to make the final decision on this item today.”*
- **Mr. De Carli:** *“APCD staff indicated they are not willing to make any changes. Any comments here, SLOCOG staff will bring directly to the APCD.”*
- **Board Member O’Malley:** *“I concur with Board Members Ferrara and Achadjian. I am just concerned that APCD staff seems to have more influence on these questions than the APCD Board. On the Additional questions, I think Additional Question 1 might be more useful.”*
- **President Patterson:** *“The reason for having a joint survey with APCD is to get a better sampling and to reduce the overall cost. We cannot tell the APCD Board, we can only request them to approve the questions.”*
- **Board Member Brown:** *“I have an issue about notifying survey recipients that there are two separate portions on this survey.”*

- **Vice President Shoals:** *“I support having two separate surveys and the suggestion to delete Question 18. However, for Question 17, I think Option A (Encourage development in local communities so that jobs and housing are closer to each other, or allow development of jobs and housing regardless of location or proximity to each other) is more appropriate.”*
- **Ms. Letters:** *“There should be no problem designating the front part of the questionnaire as SLOCOG and the other part as APCD. However, there would be a technical problem in terms of programming if we re-number these questions into two separate groups.”*

After further discussion, the Board agreed to have two separate motions, as outlined below.

(Board Member Ovitt returned at 12:23 p.m.)

Board Member Peters moved to approve the Methodology and Instrument, and delete Questions 17 and 18. Add Additional Question 1 (Agenda page C-3-2), and combine Additional Questions 5 and 6 (Agenda page C-3-3), with the goal of determining how public transportation is currently being used; and include the differentiation between the two surveys (SLOCOG & APCD). Board Member Achadjian seconded, and the motion carried on a voice vote, with Board Member Ovitt abstaining, and Board Members Gibson and Lenthall absent.

Board Member Achadjian moved to have the APCD questionnaire go back to the APCD Board for final approval. Board Member Peters seconded, and the motion carried on a voice vote, with Vice President Shoals voting “no” and Board Members Gibson and Lenthall absent.

D. REGIONAL RIDESHARE PROGRAM:

D-1 San Luis Obispo (SLO) Regional Rideshare Program Update: Rideshare Week: **Ms. Lisa Quinn** briefly updated the Board on the SLO Regional Rideshare Program activities, announcing that October 15-19, 2007 is the annual *“Rideshare Week.”* This year’s theme is *“Make the Change, Make a Difference.”* *Rideshare Week* is supported by the County, the Air Pollution Control District (APCD), SLO Transit, Ride-On Transportation, Regional Transit Authority (RTA), Cal Poly, and new this year – the California Pizza Kitchen and the Food Bank Coalition of San Luis Obispo County. **Ms. Quinn** said people could log on to www.rideshare.org and register with *TipLink* to pledge to share the ride (carpool, walk, take the bus or bike). Participants are advised to use the commuter calculator on the website to track the amount of money they save for not driving alone. They will be encouraged (via a direct link on the website to the Food Bank website) to turn their fuel savings into food for people in the region. Also, to add excitement and as an incentive, a random drawing from the *TipLink* database will be held, with prizes ranging from an Island adventure for two (the Grand Prize), to weekly prizes – Bike package (\$100 bike gear, bike calendar, \$20 Jamba Juice card), Carpool package (Jiffy Lube certificate, carwash voucher, etc.), Transit Rider package (iPod Nano, SLO Transit pass, RTA punch pass, etc.), and Walker package (Pedicure certificate, iTunes download card, etc.). There will also be a prize – catered breakfast or lunch – for the winning display on vanpool vans (vanpool groups are encouraged to decorate their vehicles with the theme). **Ms. Quinn** noted the presence of Mr. John Webster (SLO City Transit Manager) and Ms. Susan Rains (Cal Poly Commuter Services Coordinator) in the audience. She then asked Board members for a photo op (photos were taken with Board members posing behind a big bus poster advertising the Rideshare Week event).

Board Member Peters said she would announce this event at their council meeting and inquired if all information is available on the Rideshare/TripLink website. **Ms. Quinn** responded affirmative.

Board Member Strong thanked Rideshare and complimented Ms. Quinn and the Food Bank Coalition for appearing at the city council meeting to promote this event.

President Patterson noted that the Regional Rideshare Program is working based on the positive results (every year, there is more participation and the events are successful).

Board Member Ferrara requested the information that was presented to the Board regarding *TripLink*. **Ms. Quinn** said she would provide the information to all Board members via email.

Mr. De Carli brought to attention the need for the Board to adjourn the SLOCOG meeting to SLORTA after addressing the Consent Agenda items, because the original reservation for this boardroom for today's meetings is only until 1:00 p.m. (another group/County agency will be setting up at 1:00 p.m. for their meeting at 1:30 p.m. or 2:00 p.m.). After SLORTA, the SLOCOG meeting will then be reconvened and the Board will go into closed session. **The Board concurred.**

E. CONSENT AGENDA: **President Patterson** called for any comments from the Board and the public. There were no comments from the Board.

Referring to Consent Agenda Item *E-9, Rural Transit Funds (RTF) Call for Projects – FY 2008/09*, **Mr. Greening** expressed concern about a discrepancy between SLOCOG and RTA numbers relative to the Rural Transit Funds (RTF) amount for RTA maintenance facility tenant improvements. The SLOCOG staff report (Agenda page E-9-1) shows \$304,256, while the RTA Reso (RTA Agenda page C-2-2) shows \$497,000. He noted that RTF could also be used for operations. He stressed the need to look at any flexibility in using RTF. **Mr. Rodgers** clarified that the SLOCOG staff report is about the RTF *Call for Projects* for FY 2008/09, while RTA's staff report is the Resolution for the RTA Board to authorize RTA to submit application for RTF funding. RTA can apply for as much as they can get. The \$304,256 is the amount of RTF already approved for the RTA maintenance facility tenant improvements for FY 2007/08.

Consent Agenda Items:

- E-1** SLOCOG Minutes – September 12, 2007 (Approve).
- E-2** Notification of Grant and Funding Opportunities and Deadlines (Information).
- E-3** Correspondence and News Articles (Information).
- E-4** Follow up to 05/06 Triennial Performance Audits: South County Area Transit, South Bay Dial-A-Ride and Paso Robles City Area Transit Service (Find visible progress made by SCAT in two areas; bring back status of local public involvement and fleet maintenance program in April 2008. Find progress made by the RTA and need for closer attention to the SBDAR financial performance; monitor administrative changes and report back in April 2008. Find adequate progress made by the City of Paso Robles; report back in April 2008 on pending changes).
- E-5** Triennial Performance Audits Scope for the Regional Transit Authority, San Luis Obispo Transit and the County transit program (Approve the Scope of Work and authorize the Executive Director to award contract).
- E-6** 2007 State Legislation – SB 445 and SB 375 (Oppose unless amended).
- E-7** 2008/09 Unmet Transit Needs Methodology and Definitions (Approve Resolution adopting methodology, definitions and criteria; Adopt the 2008/09 Unmet Transit Needs Schedule).
- E-8** 2007 Commute Profile (Survey Results) Tri-Counties (Information).
- E-9** Rural Transit Funds (RTF) Call for Projects – FY 2008/09 (Approve Monday, December 3, 2007, as the application deadline for the 2008/09 RTF cycle).
- E-10** SLOCOG Public Participation Plan – Notification of Intent to update (Circulate for Comments and Schedule for Update in February).
- E-11** Transit Operator Schedule Coordination (Refer to Transit Operator's Group).
- E-12** Safe Routes to School Workshop & Federal and State Safe Routes to School Grant Notification (Encourage Local Jurisdictions to attend Safe Routes to School Workshop & Apply for Funding).

Ms. Aida Nicklin inquired if the Board action on the Consent Agenda today would include continuing (per Executive Director's note during his presentation of the Executive Director's Report) Item *E-6, 2007 State Legislation – SB 445 and SB 375* to the next meeting. **The Board confirmed affirmative.**

Board Member Achadjian moved to approve the Consent Agenda as presented, and as amended to continue Item E-6 to the next SLOCOG meeting. Board Member Brown seconded, and the motion carried on a roll call vote, in the absence of Board Members Gibson and Lenthall.

F. BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS: There were no comments.

Lunch Break: The Board went into a very short break to allow time for lunch distribution among members of the Board.

ADJOURNMENT TO SLORTA BOARD MEETING: *The SLOCOG Board meeting was adjourned to the SLORTA Board meeting at 12:36 p.m.*

RECONVENE SLOCOG BOARD MEETING: *The SLOCOG Board meeting was reconvened at 1:00 p.m.*

G. CLOSED SESSION:

G-1 Closed Session: Personnel: Executive Director's Annual Performance Evaluation (Government Code Section 54954.5):

G-2 Closed Session: Conference with Labor Negotiator, Agency Negotiation: Unrepresented Employees: All Positions (Government Code Section 54957.6):

The Board went into Closed Session at 1:02 p.m. and returned to Open Session at 1:32 p.m.

OPEN SESSION: Mr. Wyatt Cash reported out of Closed Session, noting that the SLOCOG Board met in closed session on the Closed Session items listed on the Agenda. The Board conducted the annual evaluation for the SLOCOG Executive Director and authorized a compensation adjustment for the Executive Director that will be finally approved at a later SLOCOG Board open session. No further public report is required because no other final actions were taken.

H. ADJOURNMENT: President Patterson adjourned the meeting at 1:34 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Aida Nicklin
Executive Secretary

“DRAFT”

SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

October 17, 2007

SLOCOG

Members Present: James Patterson, President
John Shoals, Vice President

Staff Present: Ronald De Carli, Executive Director (SLOCOG)
Wyatt Cash, Legal Counsel (SLOCOG/SLORTA)
Aida Nicklin, Executive Secretary (SLOCOG)

Also Present: David Lilly, Regional Transit Manager (SLORTA)
Eric Greening, Citizens' Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC)
Representative
Bud Henry Newman, Atascadero resident

1. Call to Order and Roll Call: President James Patterson called the meeting to order at 9:51 a.m. silent roll call was taken.

2. Public Comments: Mr. Eric Greening, Atascadero, stated he is thankful to SLOCOG Board and staff for making the *Funding Workshop* possible. He noted that during recess (funding workshop break, October 3rd SLOCOG Board meeting) he asked the Consultant - David Grannis if it would be feasible to change the *Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ)* requirements, so that clean air counties (such as San Luis Obispo County) would not be penalized; thus be eligible to receive CMAQ funds. Mr. Grannis indicated that it is actually over due, and that with enough interest from local jurisdictions, it might happen. Mr. De Carli brought to attention that campaigning for this issue would not be done until the next reauthorization. SLOCOG staff will definitely track this issue and will work closely with member jurisdictions. Staff is currently working with their counterparts in Sacramento. Mr. Greening stressed the need to at least lay the ground work now.

3. Executive Committee Minutes, September 12, 2007: Vice President Shoals moved and President Patterson seconded the motion to approve the minutes of September 12, 2007. The motion carried in the absence of Past President Ferrara.

4. Introduction: Glenn, Burdette, Phillips & Bryson, Fiscal Auditors: Mr. De Carli apologized for an oversight on his part, for not following up with the fiscal auditors if they would be able to attend this meeting. He had talked to them at the October 3rd meeting and got a confirmation, but they must

have some conflict (hence their absence today). **Mr. De Carli** said the plan was to have them introduced here, which would open up the process. **Mr. Lilly** noted that the fiscal auditors are planning to meet with at least one Board member from the SLOCOG Board, Regional Transit Authority (RTA) Board, and South County Area Transit (SCAT) Board. He further noted that by coming to the Executive Committee meeting, the fiscal auditors would be accomplishing that plan because Vice President Shoals is a SCAT Board member. **The Executive Committee directed staff to reschedule the introduction of the fiscal auditors to the next Executive Committee meeting in November.**

5. Upcoming Proposed SLOCOG Board Meetings: **Mr. De Carli** noted that SLOCOG and RTA both have a pile of work and have discussed shifting items around. **President Patterson** asked if there would be an RTA meeting in December. **Mr. Lilly** indicated that staff would be presenting Bid Packages D and E for Board approval in December. This item will be a discussion item and will have a Resolution. **Mr. De Carli** said SLOCOG would have a November meeting (to address a few continued items from the October meeting), a December regular meeting, and a February regular meeting. With the current workload and with RTA planning to have a December meeting, staff recommends conducting a January meeting (which will include election of officers for 2008). The February agenda will be a very full agenda (programming of \$40m, unmet transit needs hearing, etc.). **President Patterson** reminded the Committee about the need to discuss an RTA-related issue when something is resolved with Ride-On Transportation (relative to the joint maintenance facility). He then stressed the need for SLOCOG and RTA staff to coordinate and make certain that the Board would be informed ahead of time about the duration of each meeting (in order to prepare Board members to plan their schedules accordingly).

Following a brief discussion on the timing of the meetings, **the Committee concurred having SLOCOG start at approximately 10:00 a.m. on November 7th, following the RTA meeting (RTA will start at 8:30 a.m.).**

Mr. De Carli brought to attention that staff is uncertain at this time if an update on Community 2050 should be presented at the November or December meeting. **President Patterson** commented that the past presentations of Community 2050 seemed rushed, suggesting staff should allow at least 30 minutes for the presentation; therefore, it should be scheduled in November.

Public Comments: **Mr. Greening** inquired if this time there would be an outreach to population not previously included in the past workshops. **Mr. De Carli** clarified that this update is to present the general direction of the program and that future workshops will be conducted. **President Patterson** added, "We will take this program on the road. It will be presented to member jurisdictions."

The Committee discussed scheduling the first Transportation Finance Steering Committee meeting and unanimously agreed to have the meeting on November 8th. Staff will check on the availability of each steering committee member and will make room reservation for this meeting.

6. Draft SLOCOG November 7, 2007 Agenda: **Mr. Ronald De Carli** briefly reviewed the draft SLOCOG November 7, 2007 agenda, noting the timing allotted for each discussion item.

Transportation Item:

A-1, Comparison of Recent Shuttle Performance – Regional Senior Shuttle, Shandon Shuttle, Templeton Shuttle, Five Cities Shuttle, and Nipomo Mesa Shuttle: This is a continued item from the October meeting. Time allotted for this item is approximately 10-15 minutes.

Presentation Item:

B-1, Draft Ride-On Transportation Strategic Plan: **Mr. De Carli** said he would check with Ride-On Transportation Director Mark Shaffer, to see if this item is ready to go for presentation in November. **Ms. Nicklin** brought to attention that in her conversation with Mr. Shaffer last Monday (October 15th), Mr. Shaffer indicated he would be finalizing the draft Plan and will submit it to Mr. De Carli for review by Tuesday, October 23rd.

Mr. De Carli noted that an Item B-2 would be added to the November agenda. It will be a brief update on the San Luis Obispo Regional Rideshare Program (10-15 minutes). He also noted that an Item B-3, Community 2050 Update, would be added to the agenda as directed. **President Patterson** reiterated his suggestion that staff should plan at least 30 minutes for this item, stressing the need to focus on policy issues and next steps.

Consent Agenda Items: *No discussion occurred.*

Closed Session: An item on Employee Retirement Health Benefits would be discussed in closed session at the November meeting. *No discussion occurred.*

7. Focus on the Future Conference: **Mr. De Carli** inquired if there is any interest from the Committee on sending one representative to this conference. **President Patterson** said he has reviewed the conference agenda items, but would not be able to attend. **Vice President Shoal** expressed interest in attending and said he will check his calendar and will confirm with Mr. De Carli later today.

8. Late Breaking News: **Mr. De Carli** brought attention to a request staff recently received from Mr. Nick Alter of the Strategic Energy Alliance (SEA-Change) steering committee, regarding SEA-Change's request for SLOCOG to sponsor the next *Energy Conference* that is scheduled on November 30th. He recommended approving \$2,000 to sponsor this conference. The Committee concurred sponsoring this conference (see action below).

Vice President Shoals moved to approve SLOCOG sponsor the next SEA-Change "Energy Conference" on November 30, 2007, for \$2,000. **President Patterson** seconded, and the motion carried in the absence of Past President Ferrara.

Mr. De Carli announced that the State now has the draft guidelines on Proposition 1B Transit funds. A State workshop will be conducted next week. **President Patterson** stressed the need for staff to update the Board. **Mr. De Carli** noted that staff is preparing local guidelines and will adopt the transit allocation in December.

9. Executive Committee Member Comments and Adjournment: There were no Committee Member comments.

President Patterson adjourned the meeting at 10:20 a.m.

Minutes prepared by Aida Nicklin

H:\2007-2008 Overall Work Program\0400 Agency Adm. & Support\EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE\Exec Com Minutes - October 17, 2007.doc