



**Metro**

Metropolitan Transportation Authority

One Gateway Plaza  
Los Angeles, CA 90012-2952

213.922.2000 Tel  
metro.net

August 30, 2005

**TO:** BOARD OF DIRECTORS

**THROUGH:** ROGER SNOBLE   
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

**FROM:** CAROL INGE   
INTERIM CHIEF PLANNING OFFICER

**SUBJECT:** SUMMARY OF CTC-RELATED MEETINGS HELD  
IN SACRAMENTO ON AUGUST 17-18, 2005

**ISSUE**

Countywide Planning and Development staff participated in the regular monthly meetings of the California Transportation Commission (CTC), the Self-Help Counties Coalition (SHCC), and the Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPA), which were held on August 17 and 18, 2005 in Sacramento. The following summarizes the key topics and issues addressed at these meetings.

**DISCUSSION**

**1. CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION**

**Draft 2006 STIP Fund Estimate: Over \$800 million at Risk for Los Angeles County**

The Commissioners approved the request by the CTC staff to delay the State Transportation Improvement Plan (STIP) Fund Estimate until the September CTC meeting, highlighting the following outstanding issues with funding assumptions that affect the estimate:

- Uncertainty of the Tribal Gaming Compact for General Fund Loan Repayments to transportation (Assembly Bill 687);
- Safe, Flexible and Efficient Transportation Equity Act- A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) federal transportation funds re-authorization impact on California;
- Any new STIP capacity appears to be wholly dependent on Transportation Investment Fund (TIF) transfers and PTA spillover revenues, which are less discretionary in law and specifically related to public transit improvements; and
- The Toll Bridges funding contribution schedule and forecasts has yet to be completed.

*In total, Los Angeles County stands to lose up to \$500 million or gain up to \$300 million in the upcoming legislative processes surrounding the use of Proposition 42 sales tax on gas revenues. That is a total difference of \$800 million considered at risk, which Countywide Planning will closely monitor and report on impacts as developments occur.*

### **CTC Approves \$86.8 Million for Commuter/Inter-City Rail Improvements**

The CTC approved the Traffic Congestion Relief Program (TCRP) Project #35.2, -a triple track inter-city rail line within Los Angeles County. The \$86,785,000 project calls for the construction of approximately five miles of third main track and construction of a grade separation. In addition, new run-through-tracks through Los Angeles Union Station will dramatically improve safety, access and reliability. Caltrans, as the project sponsor, requested the project approval.

### **STIP Amendments**

The CTC approved Metro's request for \$21,979,000 in previously approved AB 3090 Replacement Project funding (PPNOs 3554,3702 and 2705). This revenue-neutral programming adjustment will now occur in FY 2008-09 and be designated for Construction on the I-5 Widening Project (PPNO 2808).

### **Proposed 2006 Meeting Schedule**

The CTC released its proposed dates and locations for its 2006 meetings (see attached). On April 5, 2006, they plan to meet in Los Angeles, where they expect to conduct the South 2006 STIP Hearing.

## **2. REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AGENCIES**

The Regional Transportation Planning Agencies' (RPTAs) meeting reported on the SAFETEA-LU Committee formed by the various RTPA participants, including Countywide Planning staff, to discuss the implementation of SAFETEA-LU in California (see copy of issues and process proposal attached as provided by Caltrans). In addition, the RTPAs discussed the continuing issues described in the following summaries.

### **Obligation Authority**

The Caltrans Local Programs representative announced that out of the \$1 billion in local Obligation Authority (OA) of federal funds available in Federal FY 2005, only 15% of \$1.0 billion or approximately \$150 million had been obligated so far. An RTPA committee presented various redistribution options that they are considering to present to the CTC as a means for providing better accountability of these funds. The option to redistribute any unused funds back to the region based on existing 2004 formulas was the most preferred by the RTPAs.

*Los Angeles County, in contrast, delivered almost 130% of its Federal FY 2004 target, and Countywide Planning is again seeking to exceed the Los Angeles County target in Federal FY 2005.*

### **Planning, Programming and Monitoring (PPM) Funding**

The RTPA Planning, Programming and Monitoring (PPM) Committee has been developing a consensus-based approach to bring more certainty to PPM funds for the local agencies. The CTC has been concerned in the past about allocating PPM funds, given their inability to fully allocate freeway maintenance work in the SHOPP. *Countywide Planning, as do other RTPA planning departments, uses this funding source to ensure STIP project delivery within the county.* The RTPAs voiced their commitment to keep the PPM funding a priority and will be developing a proposal that ensures a more equitable and accountable methodology for distribution. Countywide Planning staff has been working closely with this committee.

### **“Go California” Campaign**

Caltrans staff announced that events have been planned as part of the State’s “Go California” campaign. The events have a preliminary schedule for the following locations, with details to follow soon:

- October 4 Bay Area
- October 25 San Bernardino
- October 26 Riverside
- *October 27 Los Angeles*

## **3. SELF-HELP COUNTIES COALITION**

### **Red Tape Implementation Committee**

In April 2004, the Self-Help Counties Coalition (SHCC), in association with Caltrans, commissioned “Project Red Tape Attack.” The initiative was to outline numerous inter-agency difficulties encountered between Caltrans and the counties during project planning, development, and construction. Implementation of the initiative was expected to generally explore observations of the problems and potential solutions around the State and places the findings into twenty discrete Problems, Issues and Recommendations that fall into six categories: Communication and Cooperation, Making Solutions Available, The Key: Primacy of Project Management, Predictability and Stability, Internal Caltrans Issues, and Role of FHWA and Resource Agencies.

The Red Tape Implementation Committee, which includes various Caltrans staff and their district directors, and representatives from various agencies, requested that the SHCC members bring examples of the “red tape” problems that they have encountered while doing business with Caltrans. The committee continues to prepare the “Red Tape Implementation

Committee Report,” which will provide tangible solutions to the issues raised by the committee, including recognizing and rewarding red tape cutting by Caltrans staff and others.

### **“Rescue Transportation” Proposal**

Another major effort that the SHCC is sponsoring is the “Rescue Transportation” Proposal. This effort considers a constitutional amendment on the November 2006 statewide ballot. The most recent version deletes the revenue-raising authority of the CTC, having recognized the difficulty of creating such authority. Rescue Transportation seeks to address the following problems: diversion of transportation revenues; a cumbersome project delivery process; general inefficiencies; the increasing politicization of Caltrans; and the growth of travel demands and its negative effects on sustaining reasonable mobility in California.

### **Focus on the Future Conference**

The SHCC’s 2005 Focus on the Future Conference will be held October 16-18 at the Renaissance Parc 55 Hotel, 55 Cyril Magnin Street, in San Francisco (see copy of draft program from SHCC meeting agenda attached). Final program and other details will be shared at next month’s meeting, but in the meantime some other information may be obtained from the SHCC’s website at *www.selfhelpcounties.org*.

### **NEXT STEPS**

Countywide Planning and Development staff will continue to monitor and update the Board of Directors on the 2006 STIP Funding Estimate, and will continue to participate in the regular monthly meetings of the CTC, the SHCC, and the RTPAs.

Proposed  
2006 Meeting Schedule  
California Transportation Commission

Month	Dates	Location
January	No Meeting	
February	February 1 and 2	Sacramento
<b>March</b>	<b>March 15 and 16</b> (North STIP Hearing)	<b>Sacramento</b>
April	April 5 (South STIP Hearing)	Los Angeles
	April 26 and 27 (STIP Adoption)	Fresno
May	No Meeting	
June	June 7 and 8	Sacramento
July	July 26 and 27	San Francisco
August	No meeting	
September	September 13 and 14	Santa Barbara
October	No meeting	
November	November 1 and 2	Sacramento
December	December 13 and 14	Sacramento

**SAFETEA LU Statewide Implementation  
Issues and Process Proposal  
August 16, 2005**

---

**1) Identification of Issues**

- a) **New Programs:** Some of these programs can be handled within existing state law. However, in some cases, state law will need to be amended either to correct changed references in federal law, or to reflect agreements on internal state fund distribution. In other cases, fund distribution may be an administrative process and local consensus will be needed to agree to ensure that the process is equitable.
  - i) **Highway Safety**
    - (1) Highway Safety Improvement Program
    - (2) High Risk Rural Roads Safety
    - (3) Strategic Highway Safety Plan
    - (4) Safe Routes to School
  - ii) **Goods Movement:**
    - (1) Coordinated Border Infrastructure Program
    - (2) Truck Parking Facility Grants
    - (3) Freight Intermodal Pilot Grants
    - (4) Earmark implementation
  - iii) **Transit**
    - (1) New Freedoms Initiative
    - (2) Growing State's Program
    - (3) 5310 Operating Assistance Pilot Program
    - (4) Alternative Transportation in Public Parks
    - (5) Small Intensive Urban Areas Program
    - (6) Clean School Bus Program
    - (7) Jobs Access Reverse Commute
  - iv) **Toll Programs**
    - (1) Interstate Construction
    - (2) Value Pricing Program
    - (3) Express Lanes Demonstration Program
  - v) **CMAQ**
    - (1) Phase out for attainment areas
    - (2) Diesel retrofit priority
- b) **Planning and Programming Changes**
  - i) RTP Cycles
  - ii) Conformity Analysis
- c) **State Funding**
  - i) Equity Bonus Distribution
  - ii) Local streets and roads hold harmless
  - iii) Increase distribution to regions
  - iv) High Priority Project Borrowing Program
  - v) Funding Flexibility Provisions
  - vi) Inactive obligation authority and apportionment use
- d) **Project Delivery Issues**
  - i) NEPA Delegation Program

- 2) **Process**
  - a) **Prioritization:** What can we agree upon quickly and possibly implement in the remainder of the legislative cycle versus what issues do we not have enough information on to act quickly or will require?
    - i) Only one identified so far – RTP Cycle) but recognize that there probably will not be enough time in the remainder of the cycle to enact anything.
  - b) **Education:** Create a balanced and informed analysis representing the viewpoints of those most affected by the issue.
    - i) Drafted by small teams that include appropriate Caltrans Staff and Consensus Group partners
    - ii) Identify issues and propose alternative solutions for implementation that can be vetted by the larger group.
  - c) **Consensus Building:** Convene larger group to discuss papers and agree to a single approach on each issue.
    - i) For some issues, there may be sufficient consensus to go directly from the paper to either a legislative or administrative process change.
  - d) **Legislative Language Changes**
    - i) Coordinated through Caltrans Legislative Unit
- 3) **Timeline**
  - a) **Education**
    - i) Complete by October 30, 2005
  - b) **Consensus Building**
    - i) Mid-November meeting or meetings
  - c) **Legislative Language Changes**
    - i) Begin drafting in mid-November
    - ii) Finalize for January 2006 when the State Legislature reconvenes
    - iii) Probably include urgency clauses so that changes can be made effective in the current State fiscal year.



## AGENDA

Self-Help Counties Meeting  
August 17<sup>th</sup>, 3:00-4:30pm  
Caltrans Headquarters  
1120 N Street, Room 2116  
Sacramento

### A. Caltrans Report. Mark Leja

1. Status: Coop Agreement Committee. Mark Robinson
2. Other issues

### B. Legislation

1. SCA 15 and ACA 22 regarding condemnation. Eric Haley. Are these bills constructed so narrowly as to cause problems? See attached.
2. AB 267 and AB 462. Status report.
3. Other legislation

### C. Red Tape Reminder. This group and others are reminded to complete the attached form summarizing issues you have encountered, even those you have eventually worked through, that delayed delivery and could benefit from a statewide fix.

### D. Recognizing Excellence Committee Report. Bob McCleary

### E. Office Engineers Picnic.

1. Are we satisfied with this event? Does anyone have ideas to update or improve it?
2. They wanted to have it in the fall this year. Dates?

### F. Focus on the Future.

1. Approve registration price, late registration price, Caltrans registration price. See attached.
2. Agenda. See attached. Comments?
3. Hotel reservations. Make as soon as possible. The best rooms are filling up. Go to our website [www.selfhelpcounties.org](http://www.selfhelpcounties.org) or call 1.800.697.3103 and ask for the Focus on the Future rate.
4. Golf
  - a. The tournament filled up the last two years so make reservations on our website as soon as possible.
  - b. I need someone to help with golf. May I ask one of the private sector folks? No luck soliciting our members this year.
5. Sponsorships. Solicitation emails went out to former and possible new sponsors. Count as of 8.15.05 was 47 sponsors.
6. Save the Date Postcard was mailed.

### G. 06 Measures. Sarah West

**Draft List of Counties Considering 06 Measures.** Please make me aware of any errors or omissions. Orange, Kern, Tulare, Nevada, Placer, Merced, Napa, Solano, San Joaquin, Stanislaus, Santa Cruz, Fresno, Madera, Monterey, SLO, and Santa Barbara, *Santa Clara, Imperial*

### H. New Business

926 J Street, Suite 815, Sacramento, CA 95814

(916) 442-7195 FAX (916) 442-7198

[www.selfhelpcounties.org](http://www.selfhelpcounties.org)

BILL NUMBER: ACA 22      INTRODUCED  
BILL TEXT

INTRODUCED BY    Assembly Member La Malfa  
(Principal coauthor: Senator McClintock)  
(Coauthors: Assembly Members DeVore, Garcia, La Suer, Maze, McCarthy, Aghazarian, Benoit, Blakeslee, Bogh, Cogdill, Emmerson, Haynes, Shirley Horton, Houston, Huff, Leslie, Mountjoy, Nakanishi, Negrete McLeod, Parra, Plescia, Sharon Runner, Spitzer, Strickland, Tran, Umberg, Villines, Walters, and Wyland)  
(Coauthors: Senators Ackerman, Ashburn, Battin, Campbell, Cox, Denham, Dutton, Florez, Hollingsworth, Maldonado, Margett, Morrow, and Poochigian)

JULY 13, 2005

A resolution to propose to the people of the State of California an amendment to the Constitution of the State, by amending Section 19 of Article I thereof, relating to eminent domain.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

ACA 22, as introduced, La Malfa Eminent domain: condemnation proceedings.

The California Constitution authorizes governmental entities to take or damage private property for public use only when just compensation, ascertained by a jury unless waived, has first been paid to, or into court for, the owner. It also authorizes the Legislature to provide for possession by the condemnor following commencement of the eminent domain proceedings upon deposit in court, and prompt release to the owner, of the money determined by the court to be the probable amount of the just compensation.

This measure would add a condition that private property may be taken or damaged by eminent domain proceedings only for a stated public use and only upon an independent judicial determination on the evidence that the condemnor has proven that no reasonable alternative exists. The measure would require that the property be owned and occupied by the condemnor, except as specified, and used only for the stated public use.

This measure would also provide that if the property ceases to be used for the stated public use, the former owner or a beneficiary or an heir, who has been designated for this purpose, would have the right to reacquire the property for the compensated amount or its fair market value, whichever is less, before the property may be sold or transferred.

Vote: 2/3. Appropriation: no. Fiscal committee: yes.  
State-mandated local program: no.

WHEREAS, This measure shall be known and may be cited as "The Homeowner and Property Protection Act"; and

WHEREAS, Eminent domain has been subject to widespread abuse in California, whereby local governmental entities have condemned property and transferred it, by sale, lease, or otherwise, to the control, management, or exploitation of private entities for private

use and profit on the theory that generalized public benefits will flow therefrom; and

WHEREAS, The United States Supreme Court, in *Kelo v. City of New London*, \_\_\_ U.S. \_\_\_ (2005), has held that the United States Constitution does not prevent the transfer of property, seized through eminent domain, to private entities for private profit; and

WHEREAS, The rights guaranteed in the California Constitution are not dependent on rights guaranteed under the United States Constitution (Section 24 of Article I of the California Constitution), and the California Constitution should protect the property rights of Californians to a greater degree than does the United States Constitution; nor should the term "public use" in the California Constitution be construed as identical to that phrase as employed in the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution; and

WHEREAS, It is the intent of the people of the State of California that private property shall not be taken or damaged for the use, exploitation, or management of any private party, including, but not limited to, the use, exploitation, or management of property taken or damaged by a corporation or other business entity for private profit, as is currently permitted under the United States Constitution under *Kelo v. City of New London*, \_\_\_ U.S. \_\_\_ (2005); and

WHEREAS, It is not the intent of this amendment to prevent the rental of space in a government building or any other government-owned property for incidental commercial enterprises, including, but not limited to, gift shops, newsstands, or shoeshine stands; and

WHEREAS, This amendment shall apply only to condemnation actions that are completed after this amendment goes into effect; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly, the Senate concurring, That the legislature of the State of California at its 2005-06 Regular Session commencing on the sixth day of December 2004, two-thirds of the membership of each house concurring, hereby proposes to the people of the State of California, that the Constitution of the State be amended as follows:

That Section 19 of Article I thereof is amended to read:

SEC. 19. (a) Private property may be taken or damaged for a stated public use only when just compensation, ascertained by a jury unless waived, has first been paid to, or into court for, the owner. ~~The~~  
Private property may not be taken or damaged for private use.

(b) Private property may be taken by eminent domain only for a stated public use and only upon an independent judicial determination on the evidence that the condemnor has proven that no reasonable alternative exists. Property taken by eminent domain shall be owned and occupied by the condemnor or may be leased only to entities that are regulated by the Public Utilities Commission. All property that is taken by eminent domain shall be used only for the stated public use.

(c) If any property taken through eminent domain after the effective date of this subdivision ceases to be used for the stated public use, the former owner of the property or a beneficiary or an heir, if a beneficiary or heir has been designated for this purpose, shall have the right to reacquire the property for the compensated amount or the fair market value of the property, whichever is less, before the property may be sold or transferred.

(d) The Legislature may provide

for possession by the condemnor following commencement of eminent domain proceedings upon deposit in court and prompt release to the owner of money determined by the court to be the probable amount of just compensation.

BILL NUMBER: SCA 15 INTRODUCED  
BILL TEXT

INTRODUCED BY Senators McClintock and Florez  
(Principal coauthor: Senator Hollingsworth)  
(Principal coauthor: Assembly Member La Malfa)  
(Coauthors: Senators Aanestad, Ackerman, Ashburn, Battin,  
Campbell, Cox, Denham, Dutton, Maldonado, Margett, Morrow, and  
Poochigian)  
(Coauthors: Assembly Members Aghazarian, Benoit, Blakeslee, Bogh,  
Cogdill, DeVore, Emmerson, Garcia, Haynes, Shirley Horton, Houston,  
Huff, Keene, La Suer, Leslie, Maze, McCarthy, Mountjoy, Nakanishi,  
Negrete McLeod, Parra, Plescia, Sharon Runner, Spitzer, Strickland,  
Tran, Umberg, Villines, Walters, and Wyland)

JULY 13, 2005

A resolution to propose to the people of the State of California  
an amendment to the Constitution of the State, by amending Section 19  
of Article I thereof, relating to eminent domain.

#### LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

SCA 15, as introduced, McClintock Eminent domain: condemnation  
proceedings.

The California Constitution authorizes governmental entities to  
take or damage private property for public use only when just  
compensation, ascertained by a jury unless waived, has first been  
paid to, or into court for, the owner. It also authorizes the  
Legislature to provide for possession by the condemnor following  
commencement of the eminent domain proceedings upon deposit in court,  
and prompt release to the owner, of the money determined by the  
court to be the probable amount of the just compensation.

This measure would add a condition that private property may be  
taken or damaged by eminent domain proceedings only for a stated  
public use and only upon an independent judicial determination on the  
evidence that the condemnor has proven that no reasonable  
alternative exists. The measure would require that the property be  
owned and occupied by the condemnor, except as specified, and used  
only for the stated public use.

This measure would also provide that if the property ceases to be  
used for the stated public use, the former owner or a beneficiary or  
an heir, who has been designated for this purpose, would have the  
right to reacquire the property for the compensated amount or its  
fair market value, whichever is less, before the property may be sold  
or transferred.

Vote: 2/3. Appropriation: no. Fiscal committee: yes.  
State-mandated local program: no.

WHEREAS, This measure shall be known and may be cited as "The  
Homeowner and Property Protection Act"; and

WHEREAS, Eminent domain has been subject to widespread abuse in  
California, whereby local governmental entities have condemned  
property and transferred it, by sale, lease, or otherwise, to the

control, management, or exploitation of private entities for private use and profit on the theory that generalized public benefits will flow therefrom; and

WHEREAS, The United States Supreme Court, in *Kelo v. City of New London*, \_\_\_ U.S. \_\_\_ (2005), has held that the United States Constitution does not prevent the transfer of property, seized through eminent domain, to private entities for private profit; and

WHEREAS, The rights guaranteed in the California Constitution are not dependent on rights guaranteed under the United States Constitution (Section 24 of Article I of the California Constitution), and the California Constitution should protect the property rights of Californians to a greater degree than does the United States Constitution; nor should the term "public use" in the California Constitution be construed as identical to that phrase as employed in the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution; and

WHEREAS, It is the intent of the Legislature that private property shall not be taken or damaged for the use, exploitation, or management of any private party, including, but not limited to, the use, exploitation, or management of property taken or damaged by a corporation or other business entity for private profit, as is currently permitted under the United States Constitution under *Kelo v. City of New London*, \_\_\_ U.S. \_\_\_ (2005); and

WHEREAS, It is not the intent of this amendment to prevent the rental of space in a government building or any other government-owned property for incidental commercial enterprises, including, but not limited to, gift shops, newsstands, or shoeshine stands; and

WHEREAS, This amendment shall apply only to condemnation actions that are completed after this amendment goes into effect; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate, the Assembly concurring, That the Legislature of the State of California at its 2005-06 Regular Session commencing on the sixth day of December 2004, two-thirds of the membership of each house concurring, hereby proposes to the people of the State of California, that the Constitution of the State be amended as follows:

That Section 19 of Article I thereof is amended to read:

SEC. 19. (a) Private property may be taken or damaged for a stated public use only when just compensation, ascertained by a jury unless waived, has first been paid to, or into court for, the owner. ~~The~~ Private property may not be taken or damaged for private use.

(b) Private property may be taken by eminent domain only for a stated public use and only upon an independent judicial determination on the evidence that the condemnor has proven that no reasonable alternative exists. Property taken by eminent domain shall be owned and occupied by the condemnor or may be leased only to entities that are regulated by the Public Utilities Commission. All property that is taken by eminent domain shall be used only for the stated public use.

(c) If any property taken through eminent domain after the effective date of this subdivision ceases to be used for the stated public use, the former owner of the property or a beneficiary or an heir, if a beneficiary or heir has been designated for this purpose, shall have the right to reacquire the property for the compensated amount or the fair market value of the property, whichever is less, before the property may be sold or transferred.

(d) The Legislature may provide

for possession by the condemnor following commencement of eminent domain proceedings upon deposit in court and prompt release to the owner of money determined by the court to be the probable amount of just compensation.

## **PROBLEM STATEMENT**

For Submission to The

### **EXECUTIVE PARTNERSHIP COMMITTEE FOR IMPROVING STATEWIDE PROJECT DELIVERY Not to Exceed Two Pages**

**I. PROBLEM OR ISSUE NUMBER**

(Leave Blank)

**II. PROBLEM TITLE**

A suggested title, in as few words as possible

**III. PROBLEM STATEMENT**

A statement of general problem or issue – one or more paragraph explain the problem or issue that needs the Team's attention/discussion/investigation. Is this problem/issue related to the functions of project management, program/funding, R/W, project development procedures (cooperative agreement, preliminary engineering, environmental and project approval, final design and PS&E), construction, or operations and maintenance? Describe prior events, activities, and process that led to the problem. How important is this issue to a certain local jurisdiction or self-help county or region? Who and/or what is suffering from this problem/issue? How widespread is the problem and who is affected? Provide example of the consequence of the problem.

**IV. POLICY RESEARCH SUMMARY**

Describe past efforts to resolve the problem or address the issue and the resultant of the efforts. Site any known existing policies, procedures, statutes, principles, and current practices that are not compatible with potential resolution of the problem/issue. List the parties that were involved in past efforts to resolve the problem.

**V. DESIRED OUTCOMES AND BENEFITS**

Describe the objective and desired outcomes as a result of the Team's problem solving. Include a statement that further describes the anticipate product(s) or deliverables from the Team (e.g., revised policy, new procedures, recommended actions to others, legislations, assignment of special staff to continue to work on the matter, etc.). Describe the benefits/payoff if the problem is solved.

**VI. PROPOSED FACILITATOR AND TEAM MEMBERS**

Provide information of the person(s) and/or agencies (name, title, address, phone number, email, etc.) that developed the problem in all its details. If possible provide a recommendation to the Team as to who should be assigned to facilitate/research/monitor the progress of the problem resolutions.

**VII. DATE AND SUBMITTED BY**

Show date of submission and by whom the problem is submitted

**Draft 8.16.05**  
**2005 Focus on the Future Agenda**  
\* = speaker not yet confirmed

**Sunday October 16**

- 10:00 **Golf at the Presidio.** Tee times from 10:00 – 12:00. Register Online at [www.selfhelpcounties.org](http://www.selfhelpcounties.org)
- 6:00 pm **Reception** at the Renaissance Parc 55 Hotel.

**Monday October 17**

- 8:15 **Welcome – Jose´ Luis Moscovich**, Executive Director, SFCTA and Moderator, Self-Help Counties Coalition.  
Welcome - San Francisco Elected Official.

**Delivery Versus Delay: Calculating the Cost.**

Moderated by **Suzanne Wilford**, Executive Director, Sonoma TA. This session explores the impacts of the state's abdication of much of its responsibility for funding transportation -- a two-tiered STIP; the impending fiscal crisis of transit operations -- and the resulting choices sales tax agencies face on what to backfill. We also learn what the administration and others can do to help. Speakers include **Sunne McPeak\***, Sec. BTH; **Gary Gallegos**, Executive Director, SANDAG; **Diane Eidam**, Executive Director, CTC; **Rusty Hammer\***, President of the LA Chamber of Commerce, **Tom Margro\***, BART and more.

- 9:45 Break

- 10:15 **Strategic Planning and Other Mechanisms for Delivering on the Promise of Your Expenditure Plan.**  
Moderated by **Maria Lombardo**, Deputy Executive Director, **SFCTA**. This is a show and tell about our innovative programs including the set of 20 five-year prioritization plans adopted by San Francisco TA, AB 3090s, short and long term borrowing, swapping funds from different pots and more. Speakers would be members of the Coalition and possibly **John McCray Goldsmith\*** of Lehman Brothers.

- 11:15 **Onsite Breakouts**
- **Cutting Red Tape and Other Structural Improvements to Delivery Reported by the Red Tape Reduction Implementation Committee.** Moderated by **Bill Grey**, President, Grey-Bowen, Inc. Speakers include **Rick Land**, Caltrans, and more.
  
  - **Making the Case for Transportation Improvements While Not Campaigning.** Moderated by **Daryl Halls**, Executive Director,

Solono Co. TA. Speakers include Supervisor **Steve Kinsey\***; **Gary Gallegos**, SANDAG; **Rita Haskin**, Chief Communications Officer, San Mateo Co. TA, and more. This session tells you what you need to know about communicating your transportation needs and your agency's successes to your constituents. How does polling fit in? How consultants can help? What have other agencies spent?

- **Public Private Partnerships.** Moderated by **Barney Allison**, Partner, Nossaman, Guthner, Knox & Elliott. Explore how tolled express lanes, concession agreements and asset sales/leases have succeeded.

12:30 **Lunch. Senator Jackie Speier\***, mother of the Baby Bullets, or **Congressman on TEA 3.**

2:00 **Offsite Breakouts:**

- **Baby Bullet Express Train Tour and Presentation**
- **Bay Bridge West Access Tour and Presentation.**
- **Golden Gate Bridge Walk and Presentation** on the bridge's design and management and the replacement of the South Access.
- **Cable Car Museum Tour and Presentation**

**Tuesday, October 18**

8:30 **Reconfiguring the Team**

Moderated by **Bob McCleary**, Executive Director, CCTA. Learn how SANDAG, OCTA and San Francisco are creating teams of Caltrans, Locals and the Private Sector in new ways. Examples include the "super project manager" in San Diego, the new management team of CCTA and Caltrans for the Caldecott Tunnel and the Doyle Drive Project in San Francisco. Speakers include: **Paul Maxwell**, Chief Deputy Director, CCTA; **Jack Boda**, Director Mobility and Project Implementation, SANDAG; **Pedro Orso-Gonzales**, Director Caltrans District 11, and more.

9:30 **2006 Sales Tax Measures – Who's Planning What**

We may have as many as 13 transportation sales tax measures on the ballot in 2006. We give you everything in one place: projects and programs, expected revenue, length of tax, developer fees, administrating agency and more.

10:00 Break

10:30 **Design Sequencing and Design Build: Lessons Learned**

Moderated by **Ann Mayer**, Deputy Director, RCTC

- 11:30 Onsite Breakout Sessions
- **At Risk Design.** Moderated by **Jack Collins, SCVTA**
  - **Context Sensitive Design.** Moderated by **Lee Saage, SFCTA**
- 12:30 **Lunch. Orienting a New Board Member.** **Andy Chesley**, Interim Director, San Joaquin COG.
- 1:30 adjourn