Speaker slips will be available. Please fill out a slip and give it to the Chair prior to the meeting if you wish to speak to an item on the agenda. The Board may take action on any item listed on the Consent or Action agenda.

Introductions and Announcements.- New Board Members

Approval of the Minutes of October 17, 2008

Executive Directors Report

Public Comment

This portion of the agenda provides an opportunity for members of the public to address the Board on items of interest within the jurisdiction of the Board and not appearing on today's agenda. Comments relating to items on today's agenda are to be taken at the time the item is heard. Pursuant to the Brown Act, no action shall be taken by the Board on public comment items.

CONSENT

1. Adopt Resolution Applying to Resources Agency for Environmental Enhancement Mitigation Program (EEMP) Grant Funds (page 3)

2. Renew Agricultural Lease on Former Boudreau Property (page 6)

ACTION

3. Nominating Committee Recommendations for JPA Board Chair and Vice-Chair for 2009 (page 8)

4. Award Contract for Green Valley Creek Bridge Replacement (page 11)

5. Award Contract for Santa Fe Valley and Highland Valley Bridge Replacements (page 13)

6. Award Contract for Del Dios Gorge Trail Construction (page 15)
7. San Dieguito Lagoon Sign on I-5 in Caltrans Right-of-Way (page 17)

8. Lake Hodges Recreational Trust Fund Request (31)

INFORMATION

9. Coordination Reports (oral)
   a. San Dieguito River Valley Conservancy
   b. Friends of the San Dieguito River Valley
   c. Volcan Mountain Preserve Foundation
   d. San Dieguito Lagoon Committee

10. Status Reports (Oral)
    1. Fire Recovery
    2. River Park Projects
       a. Status of Boardwalk “Donate a Plank” Program

11. Jurisdictional Status Reports
    An opportunity for the Board members to report on actions taken within their jurisdictions to further the park planning process, or on problems which have arisen.

12. Communications
    a. Letter from Del Mar Foundation re investment management fees, 11/20/08 (page 39)
    b. Letters to Former Boardmembers Scott Peters and Brian Maienschein 11/20/08 (page 42)

THE NEXT REGULAR JPA MEETING IS SCHEDULED FOR FRIDAY, JANUARY 16, 2009.

If you have any questions, please call Dick Bobertz at (858) 674-2270.

****Due to the high cost of printing and mailing the JPA and CAC agendas, the JPA has converted to an email distribution of both agendas. Please advise the office at 858 674-2270 if you do not have an e-mail address and want other arrangements will be made. Full packets will continue to be mailed free of charge to JPA and CAC members upon request. For others, the cost of the full agenda, with backup material, is $45 per year, and the cost of the agenda without backup material is $10 per year. The agenda and minutes are available at no cost on the San Dieguito River Park web site at www.sdrp.org****
TO:           JPA Board
FROM:         Staff
SUBJECT:      Application for State Environmental Enhancement and Mitigation Program (EEMP) Grant

RECOMMENDATION:

Adopt attached resolution applying for EEMP grant funds for the Lake Hodges Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge and Bikeway Access Project.

SITUATION:

A. Summary and Recommendation

The Environmental Enhancement and Mitigation Program (EEMP) was established by the Legislature in 1989. It offers a total of $10 million each year for grants to local, state, and federal governmental agencies and to nonprofit organizations for projects to mitigate the environmental impacts caused by new or modified state transportation facilities. State gasoline tax monies fund the EEMP. Applicants are not required to be a transportation or highway related organization to submit an application and receive funding. Applicants may apply for these funds to undertake environmental enhancement and mitigation projects that are directly or indirectly related to the environmental impact of modifying existing transportation facilities, or for the design, construction or expansion of new transportation facilities. The related transportation facility must be modified or constructed in 1990 or later and the EEM project must be over and above the required mitigation for the related transportation project. The grant program funds three types of projects: Highway Landscape and Urban Forestry, Resource Lands, and Roadside Recreation. Roadside Recreation means projects which provide for the acquisition and/or development of roadside recreational opportunities, including parks and greenways, roadside rests, scenic overlooks, trails, and snow-parks. Grants are generally limited to $350,000.

Your staff recommends submitting a grant application by the deadline of December 22nd seeking $350,000 for the roadside recreation category. The funds would go toward the Lake Hodges Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge and Bikeway Access Project. (For further information on this subject, please see Agenda Item 8). The intention would be to use the funds to complete the bridge funding gap if needed, or to apply the funds to the next phase of the project, the cantilever and bike path along West Bernardo Drive if the gap is filled in other ways. $350,000 is not enough to fund that phase of the project alone, but it would be valuable as a match for other potential grants. The related transportation facility would be the San Diego I-15 Managed Lanes Project.
Resolution No: _______________

RESOLUTION OF THE

Board of Directors of the San Dieguito River Valley Regional Open Space Park Joint Powers Authority approving the application for grant funds for the Environmental Enhancement and Mitigation Program under the section 164.56 of the streets and highways code for the following project:  Lake Hodges Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge and Bikeway Access Project

WHEREAS, the Legislature of the State of California has enacted AB 471 (Chapter 106 of the Statutes of 1989), which is intended to provide $10 million annually for a period of 10 years for grant funds to local, state and federal agencies and nonprofit entities for projects to enhance and mitigate the environmental impacts of modified or new public transportation facilities; and

WHEREAS, the Resources Agency has established the procedures and criteria for reviewing grant proposals and is required to submit to the California Transportation Commission a list of recommended projects from which the grant recipients will be selected; and

WHEREAS, said procedures and criteria established by the Resources Agency require a resolution certifying the approval of application by the applicant's governing body before submission of said application to the State; and

WHEREAS, the application contains assurances that the applicant must comply with; and

WHEREAS, the applicant, if selected, will enter into an agreement with the State of California to carry out the environmental enhancement and mitigation project;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

1. Approves the filing of an application for the Environmental Enhancement and Mitigation Program for grant assistance.

2. Certifies that said applicant will make adequate provisions for operation and maintenance of the project.

3. Appoints Dick Bobertz, Executive Director, as agent of the San Dieguito River Valley Regional Open Space Park Joint Powers Authority to conduct all negotiations, execute and submit all documents, including, but not limited to applications, agreements, amendments, payment requests and so on, which may be necessary for the completion of the aforementioned project.

Approved and Adopted the ________ day of ____________________, 2_____________.

I, the undersigned, hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution Number _______________ was duly adopted by the Board of Directors following roll call vote:
Ayes:

Noes:

Absent:

______________________________________
Pam Slater-Price, Vice-Chair

______________________________________
Jan Lines, Office Manager
TO: JPA

FROM: Staff

SUBJECT: Consider Agricultural Lease on Former Boudreau Property

RECOMMENDATION:

Approve one-year agricultural lease on the former Boudreau property and authorize Executive Director to take appropriate action.

SITUATION:

The 77-acre Boudreau property located on El Camino Real is under lease to an agricultural producer (Leslie Farms, Inc) until the end of December. Since acquiring the property in June, 2004 the River Park has continued a lease that was in effect when the property was purchased.

The property will eventually be used for mitigation credit and made part of the Wetland Restoration Project. But obtaining sufficient funding and acquiring permits will take more than a year. The State grant funding used to purchase the property specifically allows the property to be used for agriculture in the meantime. The lease rate has been increased 3% annually since the JPA acquired the property. With a 3% increase from this year’s lease rate, the annual lease rate for 2009 would be $25,242 to be paid in twelve monthly installments of $2,103.50.

Attachment: Property Map
EXHIBIT A-2
[Map of the Northern Property]

Total Acreage of Property = 77.13 Acres
TO: JPA Board
FROM: Staff
SUBJECT: Nominating Committee Recommendations for Chair and Vice-Chair for 2009

RECOMMENDATION:

Approve Nominating Committee’s Recommendations for JPA Chair and Vice-Chair for 2009

SITUATION:

A. Summary and Recommendation

In accordance with JPA Board Rule #1, Election of JPA Board Officers, a nominating committee comprised of Phil Pryde, Dianne Jacob and Richard Earnest was appointed at your 10/17/08 meeting, with Board member Pryde named as Chair. The nominating committee is to present to the Board of Directors for your consideration, a proposed slate which includes nominations for the two officers (Chair and Vice-Chair). The Committee has prepared a recommended slate of officers for the Board’s review and approval: Vice-Chair Pam Slater-Price is recommended to be Chair for 2009 and Board member Betty Rexford is recommended to be Vice-Chair for 2009.

In addition, your Board appoints members annually to serve on the ad hoc Land Use Committee, Acquisition & Financing Strategies Committee, Budget/Administration/Policy Committee and Wetland Advisory Committee. Each Boardmember should review last year’s list of committee assignments (attached) and advise the Committee or staff if changes are desired. A new list of committee assignments for 2009 based on Boardmember response will be presented for your approval at your January meeting.

B. Citizens Advisory Committee Recommendation – This item has not been reviewed by the CAC.
C. Issues – No issues have been identified.

ALTERNATE ACTIONS

1. Approve the slate of officers recommended by the Nominating Committee.
2. Do not approve the Nominating Committee’s slate and elect a slate using an alternate procedure.

Respectfully submitted,

Dick Bobertz
Executive Director
POLICY OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE SAN DIEGUITO RIVER VALLEY REGIONAL OPEN SPACE PARK JOINT POWERS AUTHORITY

ELECTION OF JPA BOARD OFFICERS

PURPOSE

The San Dieguito River Park Joint Powers Authority (JPA) was formed to create, preserve and enhance the San Dieguito River Valley Regional Open Space Park (Park). The Joint Powers Agreement provides for the Board to select its officers from among the members. The purpose of this policy is to provide direction on the selection of officers.

POLICY

The success of the JPA in fulfilling its functions as authorized by its member agencies and in carrying out its programs to serve the people of San Diego County is in the hands of its Board members and most importantly its officers. Therefore, it is the policy of this Board to select officers who are enthusiastically supportive, willing and able to promote the San Dieguito River Park and its goals and objectives, and to implement the will of the Board.

OFFICERS/TERMS

The Joint Powers Authority officers shall consist of a Chair and a Vice-Chair who will serve one year terms. In January of each year, customarily the Vice-Chair from the previous year will assume the Chair’s office. At any time during the year should the Chair resign or be unable to serve in the function of Chair, the Vice-Chair will assume the Chairmanship. An effort shall be made to rotate the Chair and Vice-Chair positions among the various jurisdictions.

NOMINATING COMMITTEE

A nominating committee will be appointed by the Chair in October of each calendar year. The nominating committee shall present to the Board of Directors for their consideration at the next JPA meeting a proposed slate which includes nominations for the two officers and membership on the Land Use Committee, Acquisition and Financing Strategies Committee and the Budget/Administration/Policy Committee. These committees will meet as needed to accomplish the business of the JPA. The Board may accept the recommendations of the nominating committee or amend them by a majority vote.

REMOVAL FROM OFFICE

An officer of the San Dieguito River Park JPA may be removed by a majority vote of the Board of Directors.
JPA AD HOC COMMITTEES, 2008

December 12, 2008

**Land Use Committee**
Richard Earnest  
Pam Slater-Price  
Betty Rexford  
Scott Peters  
1st Alternate: Dick Daniels  
2nd Alternate: Dave Roberts

Duties: 1) Review CAC and staff recommendations on pending projects, when warranted. Make project recommendations to JPA Board.  
2) Consider planning and environmental issues that relate to the San Dieguito River Park.

**Acquisition and Financing Strategies Committee**
Dave Roberts  
Pam Slater-Price  
Phil Pryde  
Betty Rexford  
1st Alternate: Richard Earnest  
2nd Alternate: Dianne Jacob

Duties: 1) Review staff recommendations and advise staff on property negotiation. Make acquisition recommendations to JPA Board.  
2) Serve as “Investment Committee”. Responsibilities as Investment Committee include review of internal and external endowment funds, preparation of annual analysis and report to the Board, and rebalancing of assets in internal fund as appropriate.

**Budget/Administration/Policy Committee**
Scott Peters  
Dick Daniels  
Richard Earnest  
Dave Roberts  
1st Alternate: Betty Rexford  
2nd Alternate: Brian Maienschein

Duties: 1) Review draft budget and work program and present recommendations to JPA Board  
2) Executive Director Performance Review  
3) Make recommendations regarding standing or ad hoc committees and membership  
4) Review and set JPA policies and by-laws

**Wetlands Advisory Committee**
Pam Slater-Price  
Richard Earnest  
Dave Roberts  
Phil Pryde  
Jacqueline Winterer, Public Member

Duties: Review and recommend policies and plans relating to the San Dieguito Lagoon Wetland Restoration Project

**Representation on 22nd District Agricultural Association Master Plan Committee**

Richard Earnest  
Dave Roberts, Alternate
TO: JPA Board
FROM: Staff
SUBJECT: Award Contract for Installation of Green Valley Creek Bridge Replacement

RECOMMENDATION:
Award Contract to Erreca’s Incorporated, the lowest responsible bidder, and authorize the Executive Director to execute the contract and other documents as may be necessary.

SITUATION:
Summary and Recommendation

In the October 2007 Witch Fire, the fiberglass bridge at Green Valley Creek on the Piedras Pintadas Trail was substantially damaged and must be replaced. It is a 71’ long x 8’ wide bridge. The existing concrete abutments will be reused for the new bridge. The remains of the fiberglass bridge will be salvaged for a future project. At your September Board meeting, your Board awarded the contract for the fabrication and delivery of the replacement bridge to Contech Bridge Solutions for $52,400. Your Board also elected to replace the bridge with a pre-fabricated steel bridge instead of fiberglass. Bids were subsequently advertised for a contractor to take the bridge from the truck when it is delivered to the job site, assemble the pieces and install it. Bid opening was December 3rd. Three contractors bid on the job, Erreca’s Inc., Western Rim Contracting, and Kip Incorporated. The bids were $41,200, $89,000 and $72,000 respectively. Staff recommends that your Board award the contract to the lowest responsible bidder, Erreca’s Inc., for $41,200.

The cost to replace the bridge will be paid for with a $50,000 donation from Northrup Grumman (which has already been received), with additional funding as needed from FEMA.

Citizens Advisory Committee Recommendation – This item has not been reviewed by the CAC.

Issues – No issues have been identified.

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATION
None - construction costs will be reimbursed.

ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS
1. Award the contract to the lowest responsible bidder.
2. Award the contract to another bidder.
3. Do not award the contract and give staff other direction.

RECOMMENDATION

Award contract to lowest responsible bidder, Erreca’s Inc.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan Carter
Deputy Director
TO: JPA Board
FROM: Staff
SUBJECT: Award Contract for Santa Fe Valley and Highland Valley Bridge Replacements

RECOMMENDATION:

Award Contract to Bellfree Contractors, the lowest responsible bidder, and authorize the Executive Director to execute the contract and other documents as may be necessary.

SITUATION:

Summary and Recommendation

In the October 2007 Witch Fire, seven bridges on the Santa Fe Valley Trail (aka Crosby Estate) were destroyed. Each of them was approximately 20 feet long. We will be able to re-use a number of the pin pier foundations. In addition, one 25-foot-long bridge on the Highland Valley Trail was destroyed. The original abutments were wood, and were destroyed in the fire. FEMA is funding the replacement of all of the bridges. Staff combined the projects into one for bidding purposes.

Bid opening was December 3rd. Two contractors bid on the job, Bellfree Contractors and Marathon Construction. The bids were $154,000 and $170,000 respectively. Staff recommends that your Board award the contract to the lowest responsible bidder, Bellfree Contractors, for $154,000.

Citizens Advisory Committee Recommendation – This item has not been reviewed by the CAC.

Issues – No issues have been identified.

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATION

None - construction costs will be reimbursed.

ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS

1. Award the contract to the lowest responsible bidder.
2. Award the contract to another bidder.
3. Do not award the contract and give staff other direction.
RECOMMENDATION

Award contract to lowest responsible bidder, Bellfree Contractors.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan Carter
Deputy Director
TO: JPA Board

FROM: Staff

SUBJECT: Award Contract for Construction of Del Dios Gorge Trail

RECOMMENDATION:

Award Contract to New Century Construction, the lowest responsible bidder, and authorize the Executive Director to execute the contract and other documents as may be necessary.

SITUATION:

Summary and Recommendation

This project is the construction of approximately 700 feet of the remaining Del Dios Gorge Trail in Del Dios Highway road right-of-way. It will connect on the east with the existing North Shore Lake Hodges Trail, above the Lake Hodges Dam. This contract will utilize the remaining funds from a Recreational Trails Program (State Parks) grant that was used in conjunction with other State grants to install the 180-foot-long Del Dios Gorge steel bridge and build about two miles of trail. After this stretch is completed, there will be one final 800-foot-long segment of the Del Dios Gorge Trail that will require retaining walls, and for which your Board authorized two grant applications at your last meeting.

Bid opening was December 3rd. Three contractors bid on the job, New Century Construction, Marathon Construction and Errecas, Inc. The bids were $94,500, $97,990, and $101,510 respectively. Staff recommends that your Board award the contract to the lowest responsible bidder, New Century Construction, for $94,500.

Citizens Advisory Committee Recommendation – This item has not been reviewed by the CAC.

Issues – No issues have been identified.

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATION

None - construction costs will be reimbursed.

ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS

1. Award the contract to the lowest responsible bidder.
2. Award the contract to another bidder.
3. Do not award the contract and give staff other direction.
RECOMMENDATION

Award contract to lowest responsible bidder, New Century Construction.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan Carter
Deputy Director
TO: JPA Board

FROM: Staff

SUBJECT: San Dieguito Lagoon Sign on I-5

RECOMMENDATION:

Authorize the Chair to send a letter to Pedro Orso-Delgado appealing CALTRANS staff determination that permission for freeway signing for the San Dieguito River and Lagoon cannot be granted.

1. SITUATION:

A. Summary and Recommendation

Interest has been expressed by the JPA Board Chair and River Park supporters to place a sign on I-5 to identify the San Dieguito River and Lagoon. Staff met with the Branch Chief of District 11 – Traffic Operations Office to request permission for such a sign but was denied based on CALTRANS staff determination that it would not comply with standards in the controlling regulations of the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices for Streets and Highways (CA MUTCD).

Staff believes the determination cannot be supported by the cited regulations and is based on a questionable interpretation combined with a CALTRANS staff view biased against any freeway signs not specifically necessary for traffic control.

Staff recommends that the Board authorize the Chair to send a letter to appeal the CALTRANS staff determination. (Attachment 3).

B. Issues

1. The CA MUTCD states that Freeway and Expressway signs may indicate access to scenic and recreational areas and miscellaneous guide signs may be used to point out geographical features such as rivers. (Attachment 1)

2. CALTRANS staff based their denial on a separate section of the regulations related to annual number of visitations to built facilities which has no relation to the section on miscellaneous guide signs. (Attachment 2)

C. Environmental Review

None required
2. **ANALYSIS:**

   A. Section 2E.02 Freeway and Expressway Signing Principles of the CA MUTCD states that “The development of a signing system for freeways and expressways is approached on the premise that the signing is primarily for the benefit and direction of road users who are not familiar with the route or area.” That section continues to define one of the purposes of Guide Signs as indicating access to scenic and recreational areas (Section 2E.02F)

   Section 2E.55 Miscellaneous Guide Signs stipulates that Miscellaneous Guide signs are used to point out geographical features, such as rivers. This Section also references Section 2D.48 for examples of appropriate signs, one of which is a sign identifying a river (Figure 2D-12, I-3).

   This section continues to provide the following Guidance: “Miscellaneous guide signs should not be installed unless there are specific reasons for orienting the road users or identifying control points for activities that are clearly in the public interest.” Staff believes that orienting road users to the opportunity to observe or visit a tidally flushed lagoon system, one of the rarest natural habitats in the world, is clearly in the public interest.

   B. In denying permission for a San Dieguito River and Lagoon sign on I-5, CALTRANS staff cited a separate section of CA MUTCD which controls built facilities and sets standards based on annual visitations (Section 2D, Table 2D-104). Those standards are not relevant to scenic and recreational areas or geographical features and cannot rationally be applied as controlling standards for their signage, much less as standards that supersede all other sections of the regulations.

   River Park staff appreciates the need and desire of CALTRANS staff to limit signage on I-5 and to resist setting precedents that could result in sign clutter. However, in Southern California there are only eight other river/lagoon habitats in a distance of over 100 miles. Signing all of them would not produce a discernable impact.

3. **CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:**
   This item has not been reviewed by the CAC.

4. **FISCAL IMPACT:**
   None identified.
5. **ALTERNATIVES:**
   a. Authorize the Chair to send a letter of appeal to CALTRANS for the denial of permission to sign the San Dieguito River and Lagoon.
   b. Provide staff with additional direction

---

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Authorize the Chair to send a letter to Pedro Orso-Delgado appealing CALTRANS staff determination that permission for freeway signing for the San Dieguito River and Lagoon cannot be granted.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dick Bobertz,
Executive Director

Attachments:
1. CALTRANS Staff denial of signage for the San Dieguito River and Lagoon on I-5.
2. CAMUTCD standards.
3. Draft letter appealing CALTRANS staff denial.
Dick Boertz

From: Charles Gray [charles_gray@dot.ca.gov]
Sent: Friday, October 31, 2008 2:45 PM
To: dboertz@sdrp.org
Cc: 'Roberts, David'; 'Shauna Anderson'
Subject: Re: I-5 sign meeting follow up

Dick,

Good afternoon. It was a pleasure meeting you yesterday. You are correct in that section 2E.55 of the CA MUTCD includes the following language: "Miscellaneous Guide signs should not be installed unless there are specific reasons for orienting the road users or identifying control points for activities that are clearly in the public interest."

The Department considers all applicable factors when evaluating signing requests. One of these factors is trip generation with respect to motorist safety and the operational needs of the freeway. Installation of such signing would only be warranted if facility visitations were great enough to impact the operations of the freeway and or surrounding roadways. Based on the facts presented during yesterday’s meeting the Department has determined miscellaneous freeway guide signing for the San Dieguito River cannot be granted while no application is needed for such signing requests.

Feel free to contact me if you have questions relating to this response or if you need additional information. Thank you and have a wonderful upcoming weekend.

Sincerely,

Charles Gray, P.E.
Thanks for the time you and Joe spent with me yesterday.

In reviewing my notes and the manual I stumbled over language that I don’t think we discussed. That is under Section 2E.55 Miscellaneous Guide Signs. The support paragraph stipulates that miscellaneous guide signs may be used to point out geographical features such as “rivers”. This seems to clearly qualify such a sign on an expressway if it is judged to be consistent with the guidance.

The Guidance stipulates that there must be “specific reasons for orienting the road users or identifying control points for activities that are clearly in the public interest”.

That seems to pretty much limit the decision to a judgment call as to “specific reasons for orienting road users” or “activities that are in the public interest” regardless of annual attendance or use numbers.

You can see where I am going with this. Unless there is some other section of the manual that controls, I am going to need a formal determination on that judgment call because my Board will undoubtedly want to appeal a negative determination. Is there a formal application process to obtain that determination? Please advise.

Dick
California
Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices
for Streets and Highways

PART 2
Signs
CHAPTER 2E. GUIDE SIGNS – FREEWAYS AND EXPRESSWAYS

Section 2E.01 Scope of Freeway and Expressway Guide Sign Standards

Support:

These standards provide a uniform and effective system of highway signing for high-volume, high-speed motor vehicle traffic on freeways and expressways. The requirements and specifications for expressway signing exceed those for conventional roads (see Chapter 2D), but are less than those for freeway signing. Since there are many geometric design variables to be found in existing roads, a signing concept commensurate with prevailing conditions is the primary consideration. Section 2A.01 includes definitions of freeway and expressway.

Guide signs for freeways and expressways are primarily identified by the name of the sign rather than by an assigned sign code. Guidelines for the design of guide signs for freeways and expressways are provided in Chapter 8 (Design Guidelines) of the "Standard Highway Signs" book (see Section 1A.11).

Standard:

The standards prescribed herein for freeway or expressway guide signing shall apply to any highway that meets the definition of such facilities.

Section 2E.02 Freeway and Expressway Signing Principles

Support:

The development of a signing system for freeways and expressways is approached on the premise that the signing is primarily for the benefit and direction of road users who are not familiar with the route or area. The signing furnishes road users with clear instructions for orderly progress to their destinations. Sign installations are an integral part of the facility and, as such, are best planned concurrently with the development of highway location and geometric design. For optimal results, plans for signing are analyzed during the earliest stages of preliminary design, and details are correlated as final design is developed. The excessive signing found in many major highways usually is the result of using a multitude of signs that are too small and that are poorly designed and placed to accomplish the intended purpose.

Freeway and expressway signing is to be considered and developed as a planned system of installations. An engineering study is sometimes necessary for proper solution of the problems of many individual locations, but, in addition, consideration of an entire route is necessary.

Guidance:

Road users should be guided with consistent signing on the approaches to interchanges, when they drive from one State to another, and when driving through rural or urban areas. Because geographical, geometric, and operating factors regularly create significant differences between urban and rural conditions, the signing should take these conditions into account.

Guide signs on freeways and expressways should serve distinct functions as follows:

A. Give directions to destinations, or to streets or highway routes, at intersections or interchanges;
B. Furnish advance notice of the approach to intersections or interchanges;
C. Direct road users into appropriate lanes in advance of diverging or merging movements;
D. Identify routes and directions on those routes;
E. Show distances to destinations;
F. Indicate access to general motorist services, rest, scenic, and recreational areas; and
G. Provide other information of value to the road user.

Section 2E.03 General

Support:

Signs are designed so that they are legible to road users approaching them and readable in time to permit proper responses. Desired design characteristics include: (a) long visibility distances, (b) large lettering and symbols, and (c) short legends for quick comprehension.

Standard:

Standard shapes and colors shall be used so that traffic signs can be promptly recognized by road users.
Enhanced reference location signs shall have a minimum mounting height of 1.2 m (4 ft) to the bottom of the sign in accordance with the mounting height requirements of delineators (see Section 3D.04), and shall not be governed by the mounting height requirements prescribed in Section 2A.18.

The distance numbering shall be continuous for each route within any State, except where overlaps occur (see Section 2E.28). Where routes overlap, enhanced reference location sign continuity shall be established for only one of the routes. If one of the overlapping routes is an Interstate route, that route shall be selected for continuity of distance numbering.

The distance measurement shall be made on the northbound and eastbound roadways. The enhanced reference location signs for southbound or westbound roadways shall be set at locations directly opposite the enhanced reference location signs for the northbound or eastbound roadways.

Guidance:

The route selected for continuity of distance numbering should also have continuity in interchange exit numbering (see Section 2E.28). On a route without enhanced reference location sign continuity, the first enhanced reference location sign beyond the overlap should indicate the total distance traveled on the route so that road users will have a means of correlating their travel distance between enhanced reference location signs with that shown on their odometer.

Standard:

Except as provided in the option below, enhanced reference location signs shall be installed on the right side of the roadway.

Option:

Where conditions limit or restrict the use of enhanced reference location signs on the right side of the roadway, they may be installed in the median. In urban areas, Intermediate Reference Location signs may be installed on the right side of the roadway, in the median, or on ramps to replace or to supplement the reference location signs. Enhanced Reference Location signs may be installed back-to-back in median locations.

Support:

Section 2D.46 also applies to freeways and expressways.

Section 2E.55 Miscellaneous Guide Signs

Support:

Miscellaneous Guide signs are used to point out geographical features, such as rivers and summits, and other jurisdictional boundaries (see Section 2D.48).

Option:

Miscellaneous Guide signs may be used if they do not interfere with signing for interchanges or other critical points.

Guidance:

Miscellaneous Guide signs should not be installed unless there are specific reasons for orienting the road users or identifying control points for activities that are clearly in the public interest. If Miscellaneous Guide signs are to be of value to the road user, they should be consistent with other freeway or expressway guide signs in design and legibility. On all such signs, the design should be simple and dignified, devoid of any tendency toward flamboyant advertising, and in general conformance with other freeway and expressway signing.

Support:

Section 2D.48 also applies to freeways and expressways.

Section 2E.56 Radio Information Signing

Option:

Radio-Weather Information (D12-1) signs may be used in areas where difficult driving conditions commonly result from weather systems. Radio-Traffic Information signs may be used in conjunction with traffic management systems.
Guidance:

The Traffic Signal Speed (I-1) sign should not display a speed above the posted speed limit because of the enticement to exceed that posted speed limit. Refer to CVC 22401.

Section 2D.48 General Information Signs (I Series)
Support:

Of interest to the traveler, though not directly necessary for guidance, are numerous kinds of information that can properly be conveyed by general information signs (see Figure 2D-12). They include such items as State lines, City limits, other political boundaries, time zones, stream names, elevations, landmarks, and similar items of geographical interest, and safety and transportation-related messages. Chapter 2H contains recreational and cultural interest area symbol signs that are sometimes used in combination with general information signs.

Guidance:

General information signs should not be installed within a series of guide signs or at other equally critical locations, unless there are specific reasons for orienting the road user or identifying control points for activities that are clearly in the public interest. On all such signs, the designs should be simple and dignified, devoid of any advertising, and in general conformance with other guide signing.

Option:

An information symbol sign (I-5 through I-8, I-11) may be used to identify a route leading to a transportation or general information facility, or to provide additional guidance to the facility. The symbol sign may be supplemented by an educational plaque where necessary; also, the name of the facility may be used if needed to distinguish between similar facilities.

Guide signs for commercial service airports and noncarrier airports may be provided from the nearest Interstate, other freeway, or conventional highway intersection directly to the airport, normally not to exceed 25 km (15 mi). The Airport (I-5) symbol sign along with a supplemental plaque may be used to indicate the specific name of the airport. An Airport symbol sign, with or without a supplemental name plaque or the word AIRPORT, and an arrow may be used as a trailblazer.

Standard:

Adequate trailblazer signs shall be in place prior to installing the airport transportation or general information facility guide signs.

Support:

Location and placement of all airport transportation or general information facility guide signs depends upon the availability of longitudinal spacing on highways.

Standard:

When a sign is used to display a safety or transportation-related message, the display format shall not be of a type that would be considered similar to advertising displays. Messages and symbols that resemble any official traffic control device shall not be used on safety or transportation-related message signs.

Option:

Political jurisdiction logos may be placed on the political boundary general information signs. The logo may have different colors and shapes but should be simple, dignified, and devoid of any advertising.

Standard:

Except for political boundary and scenic by-way logos and signs, general information signs shall have white legends and borders on green rectangular-shaped backgrounds.

Option:

The Recycling Collection Center (I-11) symbol sign may be used to direct road users to recycling collection centers.

Guidance:

The Recycling Collection Center symbol sign should not be used on freeways and expressways.
Figure 2D-12. General Information Signs

- I-1: Signals Del. 25 MPH
- I-2: Texas State Line
- I-3: Brazos River
- I-5: Airport
- I-6: Bus Station
- I-7: Train Station
- I-8: Library
- I-11: Recycling
- D9-14: Police
- D12-1: Weather Info
- D12-2: Car Pool Info
- D12-3: Michigan State Police Monitors CB Channel 9
- D12-4: Emergency
- D12-5: Dial 911
- D13-1: Crossover 1/4 Mile
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Standard:

If used on freeways or expressways, the Recycling Collection Center symbol sign shall be considered one of the supplemental sign destinations.

Unincorporated Community and City Limit (CA Code G9-2 and G9-5) Signs

Standard:

The Unincorporated Community (G9-2(CA)) and City Limit (G9-5(CA)) signs shall be used to mark the limits of cities and to identify unincorporated towns. The G9-5 (CA Code) sign shall be placed on the right, at the outer city limits of incorporated cities, facing traffic entering the named city. The G9-2(CA) sign shall be used similarly for unincorporated towns.

Option:

The population may be obtained from:

A. Federal census
B. California Dept. of Finance
C. County Board of Supervisors
D. County Planning Commission

The elevation shown may be that of the courthouse, post office, railroad station, or benchmark in the central district of the city.

Standard:

See Section 101.1 of the Streets and Highways Code, which makes these changes mandatory, and Section 101.2 and 101.4, which provides that the Department of Transportation, under certain conditions, shall replace any city limit signs.

Guidance:

If a city or community desires to install a distinctive type city limits or "Welcome" sign on conventional highways at its city limits in place of the standard G9-6(CA) sign, the following criteria should be followed:

Standard:

1. The signs shall be installed by local authorities at no expense to the State, and an approved encroachment permit will be obtained prior to installation. They shall be maintained by the permittee to the satisfaction of the permittee.
2. Such signs shall be installed in accordance with current Department practices.
3. Signs shall be of reasonable size and proportional to other guide signs in the area.
4. Signs shall be positioned so they do not obstruct the view of official traffic control devices.
5. No moving or flashing displays or advertising of any kind will be permitted.
6. No sign shall encroach over the highway.

Option:

7. Political jurisdiction logos may be displayed on the city limit signs, but the predominant characteristics of the sign will be white legend on a green rectangular shaped background. Distinctive type city limit signs not conforming to the above may remain in place until normal replacement is required.

County Line (G10(CA)) Sign

Guidance:

The County Line (G10(CA)) sign should be used at the point where the county boundary line crosses the State highway. The G10(CA) sign should be placed on the right facing traffic entering the named county.

Welcome to California (G10B(CA)) Sign

Guidance:

The Welcome to California (G10B(CA)) sign should be used to indicate the California State line. The sign should be placed on the right near the State boundary facing traffic entering the State.

River Name (I-3) Sign

Option:

The River Name (I-3) sign may be used to identify bridges or structures across rivers and creeks and provide motorist orientation that is not otherwise included in the primary signing.
Guidance:
The I-3 sign should be used on freeways to identify major river crossings.

**Elevation (G16(CA) and G17(CA)) Signs**

**Option:**
The Mountain Pass Elevation (G16(CA)) sign may be used at the summit to inform the public of a mountain pass name and elevation.

**Guidance:**
The G16(CA) sign should be placed facing traffic in each direction on the right.

**Option:**
The Elevation (G17(CA)) sign may be used to inform motorists of changes in elevation. Feet will be shown in multiples of 1,000 feet above sea level, and multiples of 100 feet below sea level.

**Guidance:**
The G17(CA) sign should be placed facing traffic in each direction on the right.

**EMERGENCY CALL 9-1-1 (G81-61(CA) and G81-62(CA)) Signs**

**Option:**
The EMERGENCY CALL 9-1-1 (G81-61(CA)) sign may be placed below all new Unincorporated Community (G9-2(CA)), City Limit (G9-5(CA)) and County Line (G10(CA)) signs. The G81-61(CA) may also be placed below the existing G9-2(CA), G9-5(CA) and G10(CA) signs when they are changed for other purposes, such as updating population figures. The G81-61(CA) sign panel may be shorter than the G9-2(CA), G9-5(CA) and G10(CA) sign panel under which it is placed.

**Guidance:**
The G81-61(CA) sign panel should not be longer than the G9-2(CA), G9-5(CA) and G10(CA) sign panel under which it is placed.

**Standard:**
The letter size used in the G81-61(CA) sign shall not exceed that of the words "City Limit" on the G9-5(CA) sign or the words "County Line" on the G10(CA) sign.

**Option:**
The EMERGENCY CALL 9-1-1 (G81-62(CA)) sign may be installed on all State highways at state entry points.

**Guidance:**
The G81-62(CA) sign should be installed as a separate installation in an appropriate location following the Welcome To California (G10B(CA)) sign.

**Option:**
The G81-62(CA) sign (particularly the smaller version) may be used in place of the G81-61(CA) sign in installations requiring a shorter sign panel.

**Conventional Airport (G94-1(CA)) Sign**

**Support:**
The Conventional Airport (G94-1(CA)) sign typifies smaller conventional type aircraft.

**Guidance:**
The G94-1(CA) sign should be used in lieu of the Airport (I-5) sign to direct to airports, which do not accommodate large commercial jet aircraft.

**Coastal Access (SG28(CA)) Sign**

**Option:**
The Coastal Access (SG28(CA)) sign may be used to identify only those improved coastal access points selected by the Coastal Commission in accordance with the agreement between the California Coastal Commission and Department of Transportation dated April 30, 1980.

**Adopt-A-Highway Program Signs (S32(CA) Series)**

**Support:**
Refer to Streets and Highways Code Section 91.5 and Department of Transportation's Maintenance Manual. See Section 1A.11 for information regarding this publication.
### Table 2D-104 (CA). Criteria for Supplemental Destination Signs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Destination</th>
<th>Specific Criteria</th>
<th>Major Metropolitan Areas</th>
<th>Urbanized Areas</th>
<th>Rural Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post Secondary School, Public or Private</td>
<td>Minimum Enrollment (&lt;br&gt;(Single Campus Locations, See Note 5).&lt;br&gt;Maximum Miles from a Freeway (See Note 6).</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum, Zoo, Stadium or Sports Arena</td>
<td>Public Owned and Non-Profit.&lt;br&gt;Minimum Annual Attendance.&lt;br&gt;Maximum Miles from Highway (See Note 2).</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convention Center</td>
<td>Public Owned and Non-Profit.&lt;br&gt;Minimum Annual Attendance.&lt;br&gt;Maximum Miles from Highway (See Note 2).</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Base</td>
<td>Number of Employees and Permanent Garrison.&lt;br&gt;Maximum Miles from Highway.</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Guard Armory</td>
<td>Only Emergency Center in the Area.&lt;br&gt;Easy Access to Primary Evacuation Route. (See Note 2).</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairgrounds</td>
<td>Publicly Owned and Operated.&lt;br&gt;Temporary Sign Only, Unless There are Year Round Activities.&lt;br&gt;Minimum Annual Attendance.&lt;br&gt;Maximum Miles from Highway (See Note 2).</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal or State Hospitals and Prisons</td>
<td>Maximum Miles from Highway (See Note 2).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Centers</td>
<td>Number of Employees.&lt;br&gt;Maximum Miles from Highway (See Note 2).</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Welcome Centers</td>
<td>Easy Access from Nearest State Highway. (See Notes 2 and 7)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airports</td>
<td>Maximum Miles from Highway (See Note 2).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail and Light Rail Stations</td>
<td>Easy Access from Nearest State Highway. (See Note 2).</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES:**

1. Meeting the above criteria does not guarantee placement of a sign. Limitations on the spacing between signs and the number of messages permitted, specified in Sections 2A.16, 2D.07 and 2D.53, shall be observed and eligible destinations must compete for signing on the basis of traffic service.

2. Follow-up signing, if necessary, shall be installed by local agencies before signs are placed on the State Highway.

3. If a stadium is located at a school campus for which signs are already provided, separate stadium sign will not be placed.

4. Definitions of Area Classifications:
   - **A. MAJOR METROPOLITAN AREA** - An urbanized area, population density of at least 1,000 inhabitants per 2.6 km² (1 mi²), not necessary related to county boundaries, with a total population of at least 1,000,000 and an included central city with a population of at least 250,000.
   - **B. URBANIZED AREA** - An urbanized area with a total population of at least 50,000 and an included central city with no minimum population.
   - **C. RURAL AREA** - All areas outside of an urbanized area.

5. Minimum enrollment is 1,000 or more full-time students or average 1,000 or more different part-time students for each week the school is in session during the normal school year. A part-time student is defined as one who is attending one or more classes at the institution in a given week. A part-time student attending more than one class is counted as one student.

6. No signs to school will be erected until funds from private sources covering the cost of the sign and their installation. If a school, which previously had signs, relocates to contribute to the improvement of the school (as determined by the California Department of Transportation), signs will be erected at the new location at no cost to the school.

7. The California Department of Transportation will charge the Welcome Center directly for the cost of the signs and their installation on the State Highway. Cost for sign installation on local roads is the responsibility of the Welcome Center and the local agency.
Pedro Orso-Delgado, District 11 Director  
CALTRANS  
4050 Taylor Street  
San Diego, CA 92110

Dear Pedro,

As you know, the massive San Dieguito Wetland Restoration Project along the San Dieguito River is nearing completion and soon over 700 acres of restored lagoon and upland habitat on both sides of I-5 will provide striking scenic views to I-5 travelers and new recreational and educational opportunities for the general public. Over the years of development of this project, JPA Board members and staff have received many calls and questions from people who have viewed the area with alarm during their I-5 travels. Most of them were concerned because they assumed the extensive grading meant commercial or residential development in one of the last open space areas remaining in many miles along the San Diego County coast.

Recently, JPA staff has consulted with CALTRANS District 11 Traffic Operations staff to request permission to install a sign on I-5 to identify the area as the San Dieguito River and Lagoon for the benefit and direction of road users. Although the controlling standards of the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices for Streets and Highways clearly identifies and even provides examples of such signage, CALTRANS staff denied the request.

Enclosed is the JPA Board agenda report containing specific information regarding the denial of San Dieguito River and Lagoon signage. I request that you review this denial and hope that you will find that our objective to identify one of the most unique habitats in the world, that happens to be spectacularly visible from I-5, is beneficial to the public.

Sincerely,

David W. Roberts  
Chairman, JPA Board
TO: JPA Board

FROM: Staff

SUBJECT: Lake Hodges Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge Funding

---

RECOMMENDATION:

Authorize Chair to Send Attached Letter Requesting the City of San Diego to Provide Funds from the San Pasqual/Lake Hodges Recreational Trust Fund to the JPA for the Lake Hodges Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge.

---

SITUATION:

Summary and Recommendation

At your 9/19/08 meeting, your Board discussed the Lake Hodges Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge funding situation and discussed various options available to fill the funding gap. That staff report is attached for your reference. We continue to be hopeful that the land mitigation option will provide significant timely income for that purpose. The other source with good potential was the City’s San Pasqual/Lake Hodges Recreational Trust Fund. At the September meeting, the Executive Director reported that the Deputy City Attorney had opined that the fund was not legal to use for recreational purposes because it was part of the Water Department Enterprise Fund. Counsel Brechtel said that opinion may not be correct. Specifically, Mr. Brechtel did not believe it was correct to say that none of the funds could be used for recreation, since the motion creating the fund and allocating 25% of the Hodges Golf Improvement Center’s rent revenue to the fund was a condition of approval for the project by the City Council. Your Board directed Counsel Brechtel to discuss the issue further with the City Attorney. Executive Director Bobertz and Counsel Brechtel subsequently met with the Deputy City Attorney who issued the opinion to discuss it further. They will report on the outcome of the discussion at today’s meeting.

It is staff’s recommendation that your Board should formally request the transfer of those funds to the JPA for use on the Lake Hodges Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge and also request that the City Auditor verify that all funds have been put into the account that should have been since its establishment in 2001.

We believe that the Lake Hodges Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge project is a worthy and appropriate use for those City funds for the following reasons:

- The Lake Hodges Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge is a high priority project in the City’s Bicycle Master Plan;
- The Council’s intention for the Recreational Trust Fund was for use for recreational projects in the Lake Hodges/San Pasqual area;
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- The Lake Hodges Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge is listed as a project in the adopted San Pasqual Valley Plan;

We would note also, that the JPA, by obtaining all of the rest of the funding from other sources, has made a $10 million gift to the residents of the City

Citizens Advisory Committee Recommendation – This item has not been reviewed by the CAC.

---

**RECOMMENDATION**

Approve Attached Letter Requesting the City of San Diego to Provide Funds from the San Pasqual/Lake Hodges Recreational Trust Fund to the JPA for the Lake Hodges Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge.

---

Respectfully submitted,

Dick Bobertz  
Executive Director

Attached:
1. Staff Report from JPA Meeting 9/19/08
2. Draft Letter to Water Department Director Jim Barrett
TO: JPA Board

FROM: Staff

SUBJECT: Lake Hodges Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge Shortfall

RECOMMENDATION:

Consider the potential opportunities for funding the Lake Hodges Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge and provide direction to staff.

SITUATION:

Summary and Recommendation

On June 15, 2007, your Board awarded the Phase Two construction contract for the Lake Hodges Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge to FCI Contractors for the base bid of $6,142,595.57, plus the railing and lighting alternative for $536,680.00. At the same time, your Board awarded the Contract for Construction Management of Phase Two to T.Y. Lin International for $234,282.

In making your decision, your Board was aware that the FCI contract amount exceeded the available funds by $1,025,309. (This was comprised of $488,629 shortfall in the base bid plus $536,680 for the railing and lighting additives.) Your Board determined that if the shortfall funds were not obtained through grants or donations by the time they were due, that your Board would either assess its member agencies to cover the shortfall or obtain a mortgage on the San Dieguito River Park office. Immediately afterward, a grant for $347,000 was received from the Resource Agency which lowered the shortfall to $678,309.

Staff subsequently identified several additional ways to reduce construction costs, including switching from SDG&E electric to solar power (to avoid the lengthy trenching that would have been necessary) and changing the railing type to reduce the number of pickets necessary and eliminating the painting of the railing. Unfortunately, there were almost an equal number of unavoidable construction increases. The net decrease was minimal.

The table below shows the funds received, and the construction costs to date.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funds Received</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans SHOPP TE</td>
<td>$3,061,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANDAG STIP TE</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANDAG Transnet 1</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANDAG Transnet 2</td>
<td>1,875,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources Agency Prop 13</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| Resources Agency Prop 40              | 625,000 |
| Resources Agency Prop 40 (2)         | 347,000 |
| Total                                | $9,908,000 |

**Costs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Engineering, Environmental</td>
<td>1,182,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitting</td>
<td>108,289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Inspecting, Resources Monitoring – Phase One</td>
<td>53,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Management – Phase One</td>
<td>156,713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction – Phase One</td>
<td>2,122,684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Management – Phase Two</td>
<td>234,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Inspection, Resource Monitoring (Est.) – Phase Two</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction – Phase Two</td>
<td>6,679,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Orders (Increase)</td>
<td>86,972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Orders (Decrease)</td>
<td>(135,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining work by others</td>
<td>37,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>10,575,391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHORTFALL</strong></td>
<td>$ 667,391</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OPPORTUNITIES TO INCREASE FUNDING**

Staff has explored (and is continuing to explore) a variety of ways to fund the shortfall, as described in more detail below.

**Lake Hodges Recreational Trust Fund**

On April 10, 2000, the San Diego City Council approved the Hodges Golf Improvement Center. The motion by Councilmember Barbara Warden included the following: “To direct the City Manager to establish a San Pasqual/Lake Hodges Recreational Trust Fund within the Water Department's Enterprise Fund, and to deposit 25% of the lease revenues from the Hodges Golf project and the unanticipated sales of city-owned land from within the Lake Hodges/San Pasqual communities for the creation of a permanent recreational improvement fund to enhance public recreation and cultural preservation on Water Department properties within the area.” There is currently $440,000 in that fund. Executive Director Bobertz was scheduled to meet with Water Department Director Jim Barrett on Friday, September 12 to discuss the possibility of the Water Department making those funds available to the JPA for the Lake Hodges Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge.

**Private Donations**

Due to the size of the shortfall, staff determined that the most likely source of funds would be corporate donors instead of individual donors. (See the brochure that was developed to hand out to potential corporate sponsors). Whether corporate or individual, a means of giving donor recognition is necessary. At today’s meeting staff will hand out some concepts for construction of a donor recognition area at the north entrance to the bridge that are being developed by
Spurlock Poirier & Associates.  The donor recognition “plaza” will include a seating area, donor recognition tiles, interpretive signage, a roofed pavilion to hold solar panels, and a vault for battery storage.  Estimated cost for the donor recognition plaza is $100,000.  This amount is not included in the shortfall shown in the table above.

**Condition of Development**

With the assistance of San Dieguito River Valley Conservancy Boardmember Bill Proffer, staff identified several development projects that may have considerable impacts on public streets.  These included a major expansion of the Westfield Shoppingtown at North County Fair and a new Sony building in Rancho Bernardo.  Unfortunately, in the case of the mall expansion, the City of Escondido determined that the nexus was not strong enough to justify requiring the developer to contribute toward bicycle facilities (i.e., the Lake Hodges Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge).  And in the case of the Sony building, staff learned that it was a ministerial project and the City would not be requiring any mitigation.  Staff also learned that the Rancho Bernardo Community Facilities Financing Plan, which could have been useful if mitigation or other conditions were to be imposed, had been recently updated, and it did not include the Lake Hodges Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge.  Staff requested that the Plan be updated again to add the bridge and cantilever (the bike path from the bridge up West Bernardo Drive to the Bernardo Bay Natural Area), but City staff declined.

**Income from Sale of Mitigation Credits**

In the last few months, the JPA has been approached by two parties interested in donating their natural open space property to the River Park.  These donations are currently in process and expected to come to your Board for approval in the near future (see Agenda Item 5).  Such property is expected to contain quality habitat that has not been used for mitigation purposes and could be marketed for that purpose.  Staff has had some early discussions with potential mitigators to gauge their interest in purchasing mitigation credits.  Cash from the sale of the mitigation credits could be used for any purpose, including for the Lake Hodges Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge.

**Line of Credit/Loan**

Executive Director Bobertz met with a representative of The Bank of Escondido who was formerly with the bank that gave the JPA a short-term million dollar loan when we were purchasing Bernardo Mountain several years ago.  He has agreed to provide a line of credit convertible to a mortgage on the River Park’s office which is shortly to begin construction using insurance proceeds.

**Citizens Advisory Committee Recommendation** – This item has not been reviewed by the CAC.

---

**RECOMMENDATION**

Consider the potential opportunities for funding the Lake Hodges Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge and provide direction to staff.
Respectfully submitted,

Dick Bobertz
Executive Director
Dear Mr. Barrett:

SUBJECT:  San Pasqual/Lake Hodges Recreational Trust Fund

The Board of Directors of the San Dieguito River Valley Regional Open Space Park Joint Powers Authority (JPA) respectfully requests that the funds in the San Pasqual/Lake Hodges Recreational Trust Fund, which was established at City Council direction in 2001, be made available to the JPA for use on the Lake Hodges Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge. We would also request that you have your auditor establish that the transaction record is complete and that all deposits that should have gone into the account, were in fact recorded. If use of the funds requires City Council action, we request that you docket this item for the next available City Council meeting.

As you know, the Lake Hodges Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge has been a long time in the planning, but now construction is nearly complete. As portions of it were built on Water Department property, the JPA has worked closely with your Department and other City departments to ensure that the project meets all City standards. Conditions of approval for the bridge and many design considerations were imposed to help protect important water department resources. The JPA has raised $9,908,000 in local, State and Federal funds for this project. Final payment to the contractor will be due in March 2009. We still need to raise $675,000 to complete the funding package. The funds in the Recreational Trust Fund would go a long way toward meeting that objective.

We understand that initially the Deputy City Attorney had concerns that the Recreational Trust Fund could not be used as the City Council had intended. However, it is our understanding that after further consideration and discussion with our attorney, Wayne Brechtel, he may have reached a different opinion.

We propose that the Lake Hodges Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge is a worthy and appropriate use of the funds in the Recreational Trust Fund because:

- The Lake Hodges Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge is a high priority project in the City’s Bicycle Master Plan;
- The Council’s intention for the Recreational Trust Fund was for use for recreational projects in the Lake Hodges/San Pasqual area;
- The Lake Hodges Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge is listed as a proposed project in the adopted San Pasqual Valley Plan;
- The motion creating the Recreational Trust Fund and allocating 25% of the Hodges Golf Improvement Center’s rent revenue to the Fund was a condition of approval of the
The Board of Directors is proud that the JPA, by obtaining all of the rest of the funding from other sources, has made a nearly $10 million gift to the residents of the City. Your help is needed so that we can finish the project on time and enable hikers and bicyclists to use it.

Sincerely,

David W. Roberts
Chair, San Dieguito River Park

cc: Councilmember District 1, Sherri Lightner
 Councilmember District 5, Carl DeMaio
Mr. David Roberts, Chairman
Joint Power Authority
San Dieguito River Valley Regional Open Space Park
18372 Sycamore Creek Road
Escondido, CA 92025

Dear Mr. Roberts:

Thank you for your letter to the Del Mar Foundation (DMF) dated September 19, 2008.

History and Background
The DMF has worked diligently to invest wisely the long term endowment funds (the Fund) that the Joint Power Authority (JPA) entrusted to us in 2004. The DMF is especially interested in the long term safety and growth of this endowment because in approximately 30 years, it will be an essential source of funding for the maintenance and protection of the lagoon that is now being rehabilitated. We consider the San Dieguito lagoon restoration project and its future maintenance to be of utmost importance to our community and its quality of life. It is principally this strong interest in the successful long term maintenance of the project that led to the DMF to undertake the management of the Fund.

From the outset, with the concurrence of the JPA, the DMF has managed the Fund with the assistance of the Del Mar Foundation Investment Advisory Committee. This volunteer group has developed the investment strategy and relationships necessary for the investment of the Fund over the next 30 years, recognizing that it will undergo market volatility and more than a generation of investment challenges before withdrawals will be needed for the long term purpose of maintaining the restored lagoon and wetlands. The committee meets regularly, at least once each quarter and more frequently as required, to ensure that the Fund is invested wisely and in a manner that is prudent under prevailing market conditions. The committee is comprised investment professionals and individuals who are experienced investors or business managers.

Fees
In order to administer and maintain the Fund, the DMF has established investment accounts with Citibank Smith Barney (SB), one of the nation’s leading investment firms. The choice of SB was made after interviewing several similar entities, the San Diego Foundation and other potential administrators to determine the best available entity with regards to investment advisory services (including research, reporting and custodial services); competitive fees and other costs; and, a willingness to work effectively on a relatively small account ($500,000 at inception), with a unique long term investment and withdrawal pattern. The DMF selected SB because of its willingness to work at reduced fees for this non-profit purpose while at the same time providing the full range of services that normally would only be available to significantly
larger endowment funds. Based upon the IAC’s review of the market, the SB fees (.95%, and being renegotiated to .75%) are well within the norm for an endowment fund of this size.

In addition to the SB fee, the DMF charges a 1.00% annual fee for the administration of the Fund, a current cost to the Fund of approximately $5,000-$6,000. While the absolute amount of this fee is not large, we certainly understand your point that fees are important. However we feel that long term investment performance, net of fees is of paramount importance.

This fee arrangement was agreed to by the JPA and the DMF when we began this relationship. This fee roughly compensates the DMF for its costs associated with the service provided. These costs include the time and materials expended by DMF staff in administering the Fund, such as ensuring that the DMF Board of Directors and DMF Investment Advisory Committee are provided with the necessary information, accounting and reporting services necessary to comply with DMF internal requirements, as well as California and Federal tax and reporting requirements. In addition, we believe that the time and expertise contributed by the IAC members adds substantial value to the management of the Fund.

We do not believe that a fee reduction is appropriate at this time. The relatively small size of the Fund results in a modest annual fee. To the extent that the Fund grows over time, or additional contributions to the Fund increase its size, we will be pleased to negotiate a lower percentage fee, provided the absolute amount of the fee is commensurate with the real costs incurred by the DMF.

**Active, vs. Passive Investment Management**

In addition to the SB and DMF fees discussed above, your letter refers to the mutual fund and other investment advisory fees incurred by our use of active managers for the Fund. The IAC has spent considerable time discussing the alternatives of managing the Fund using active managers or through the use of index funds. Our analyses have indicated that over time, qualified active management represents an opportunity to increase yields without a significant increase in risk. We believe that the after-fee returns of actively managed funds can exceed the after-fee returns of passive investment in index funds over full market cycles. Of course reasonable minds can differ on this topic, and we are willing to discuss this matter with you and your investment advisors.

**Asset Allocation**

A crucial determinant of long term investment success will be the appropriate asset allocation over the investment period. As discussed with the JPA from the outset, because of the nature of the Fund, the DMF chose to invest 100% in equities. This all-equity allocation does expose the Fund to periods of volatility and disruption, such as we have recently experienced, but, based on history, it also provides the greatest opportunity for long term growth and return on investment.

**Investment Analysis**

With respect to the investment analysis you provided, we would like to discuss it with you to ensure we understand it and the conclusions that you draw from it. As a general point, we feel that it is important to judge investment management and strategy over a sufficient time period to
allow for a full market cycle. This is particularly important in an extraordinarily tumultuous market such as what we have experienced over the last several months. Performance and benchmark comparisons over periods less than 5 years, or less than full market cycles, while they are all we have, are imperfect measures of a portfolio designed for a 30 year period.

**Conclusion**
We value our relationship with the JPA and we hope to continue it on a long and successful basis. Our goals are congruent with the JPA’s and we share with the JPA a great sense of stewardship and care for the San Dieguito Lagoon and wetlands that the Fund is intended to support and protect. We also appreciate that our relationship with the JPA strengthens the bond of this community to the ambitious and admirable goals of the JPA.

We do not feel that it is appropriate to negotiate a lower DMF fee now, but we will work with the JPA to reduce this fee over time. We will also continue to negotiate with the third parties necessary to carry out our investment strategy in order to get the very best fee arrangements available to us in the market.

We would welcome the opportunity for the IAC to meet with you and your investment advisor to discuss the fees, the investment performance, the investment strategy, and actions we are contemplating regarding investment managers and in response to this difficult market situation. We hope that such discussions will be productive in making this relationship work for the mutual benefit of both the JPA and the DMF.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Joel O. Holliday  
President  
Del Mar Foundation Board
Councilmember Brian Maienschein
The City of San Diego
City Administration building
202 “C” Street
San Diego, CA 92101

Dear Brian:

I am writing to express the appreciation of all the San Dieguito River Park Board members for your help over the last eight years in accomplishing the goals of the River Park. Serving on numerous boards is a responsibility that goes with the territory of being an elected official, but I hope your time with the River Park has been as rewarding and an experience as it has been for most of our board members. In particular, River Park Board Members and River Park supporters appreciate your extensive efforts and success in promoting the long term preservation of the San Pasqual Valley.

We wish you continuing success and good luck in all your future endeavors.

Sincerely,

David W. Roberts
Chairman
November 20, 2008

Councilmember Scott Peters
The City of San Diego
City Administration building
202 “C” Street
San Diego, CA 92101

Dear Scott:

I am writing to express the appreciation of all the San Dieguito River Park Board members for your help over the last eight years in accomplishing the goals of the River Park. Serving on numerous boards is a responsibility that goes with the territory of being an elected official, but I hope your time with the River Park has been as rewarding an experience as it has been for most of our board members. In particular, River Park Board Members and River Park supporters appreciate your help in dealing with the difficult budget issues faced by the River Park over these years.

We wish you continuing success and good luck in all your future endeavors.

Sincerely,

David W. Roberts
Chairman