

SAN DIEGO METROPOLITAN TRANSIT SYSTEM

BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING

MARCH 11, 2004

BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING ROOM, 10TH FLOOR
1255 IMPERIAL AVENUE, SAN DIEGO

MINUTES

1. Roll Call

Chairman Williams called the meeting to order at 9:09 a.m. A roll call sheet is attached listing Board member attendance.

2. Approval of Minutes

Mr. Clabby moved to approve the minutes of the February 26, 2004, Board of Directors meeting. Ms. Atkins seconded the motion, and the vote was 11-0 in favor.

PUBLIC SPEAKERS ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

3. Public Comment

Clive Richard – Mr. Richard said that the College Area Community Group had never had a discussion with Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) staff regarding the new routing of buses through the college area in light of the opening of Mission Valley East Light Rail Transit (LRT) extension. He said that the College Area Community Plan shows Route 115 going in a direction that it has never gone, and yet it's a part of the Community Plan. When this was brought up, the response was that the Plan would not change every time a route is changed. However, this route never went the way it is shown, and yet was adopted as part of the plan. He thought MTDB was moving in a new direction, and that the new head would be more interested in keeping the community apprised of issues it is facing. He would like to invite the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) to participate or contact the president of the Community Council to move the Board in a direction of cooperation.

Mr. Williams said that he knows personally that there has been a lot of contact. Mr. Jablonski said that he would welcome the opportunity to talk to the community. He added that planning issues would involve the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG). He expects that MTS would be involved but, ultimately, any public hearings regarding these issues would be conducted at SANDAG.

Ms. Atkins said it has been her experience that any time a Community Planning Committee or individual has brought an issue to the City Council members' attention, someone would be scheduled to go out and discuss that issue. She noted that MTDB has always been quick to respond when asked.

Chuck Lungerhausen – Mr. Lungerhausen said that he still had his fund-raising information with him. The Multiple Sclerosis (MS) Walk/Swim has taken place, but there is still time to donate. To date, he has collected over \$5,000. With returning a \$400 gift certificate and turning in any uncollected donations, he could exceed \$6,000. Any amount is welcome. Checks should be made out to the National MS Society. On another note, Mark Thomsen of San Diego Transit Corporation (SDTC) called him to thank him for raising concerns about the early evening suspension of services on Route 11. As a result, Mark was able to have the time extended from 7:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m. and possibly with no suspension at all. Mr. Lungerhausen was glad something could be worked out.

CONSENT ITEMS

4. Webb Properties, LLC: Request for Easement

Action would authorize the CEO to execute an easement to Webb Properties, LLC, to install permanent tieback anchors within railroad right-of-way on the east side of the property south of Sassafras Street as part of the Park-and-Ride Parking Structure Project.

5. Performance Trends Quarterly Report (OPS 920.5, PC 30103)

Action would receive the Performance Trends Quarterly Report.

6. December 2003 Quarterly Investment Report (FIN 310, PC 30100)

Action would receive the quarterly investment report.

7. Trapeze Paratransit Scheduling Software (OPS 980.5, PC 30206)

Action would authorize the CEO to execute a contract amendment with Trapeze Software Group, Inc., to establish a reimbursement schedule for maintenance fees.

8. Mission Valley East LRT Project: General Environmental Planning Consultant Work Order for Wetland Mitigation Maintenance and Monitoring (CIP 10426.9)

Action would authorize the CEO to approve a work order to the General Environmental Planning Consultant contract for the maintenance and monitoring of the Mission Valley East Light Rail Transit (LRT) Project wetland mitigation.

Motion on Recommended Consent Items

Mr. Rindone moved to approve Consent Agenda Item Nos. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9. Ms. Atkins seconded the motion, and the vote was 11-0 in favor.

NOTICED PUBLIC HEARINGS

There were no public hearing items.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

30. Five-Year MTS First Cut Consolidated Operating Budget and a Review of Initial Board Policy Choices for FY 05

Ms. Hafner said that we were at the Board to talk about the first cut of the operating budget and possible policy choices. MTS operating projections include San Diego Trolley, Inc. (SDTI), SDTC, MTS Contract Services, Chula Vista Transit, National City Transit, and the Coronado Ferry. The goal is to operate a sustainable level of service and eliminate reliance on one-time nonrecurring revenues.

Last June, the MTD Board of Directors approved a Sustainable Level of Service Plan. The Plan contained five major components: spend \$6.4 million in FY 04 and \$5.6 million in FY 05 from contingency reserves; use \$23.2 million in federal capital funds for preventative maintenance for operations; institute fare increases in FY 05 and FY 06; have a greater use of *TransNet* funds for operations; and initiate annual service reductions and operational efficiencies of \$1 million in subsidy savings each year.

Actions taken for FY 04 included operating efficiencies of \$0.7 million in annual subsidy savings, service reductions for a \$300,000 annual subsidy savings, and fare adjustments for \$2.9 million in additional revenue. To balance last year's budget, we used \$6.4 million in reserves, increased the use of federal capital funds for operations to \$23.2 million, and used \$4.0 million in additional *TransNet* funding in FY 04.

For the coming year's budget, we will focus on status quo budget levels for the operating entities and discuss in detail the projections for the future. This year is no different from the past 10 years. We still cannot obtain a sustainable level of service. The amounts presented did not include administrative overhead costs.

MTS operating expenses include a projected FY 05 deficit of \$5.8 million to \$9.0 million, approximately 3 percent to 5 percent of total operating expenses. Costs are rising faster than recurring revenues. This includes a 5.2 percent increase in costs projected for FY 05, excluding MVE start-up and service; a fare revenue increase of \$1.5 million compared to FY 04 mid-year; flat growth for Transportation Development Act (TDA) revenue; and the start-up of Mission Valley East LRT operations in FY 05.

Mr. Elliot Hurwitz presented the revenue sources and assumptions. Fare revenue has always been our largest source of revenue equating to about 36 percent of the budget, or about

\$67 million. TDA is derived from state sales tax. It provides about 33 percent of our revenue. Federal funds amount to about 13 percent of our operating budget. Other sources include State Transit Assistance (STA) and *TransNet*, our local sales tax.

We are assuming about a 1 percent growth in fare revenue for FY 05, which includes a fare adjustment on passes in June 2004 and June 2005. For the later years, we are assuming a range of 2 percent to 3 percent growth rate.

The County of San Diego and SANDAG are projecting a 1.3 percent growth for TDA in FY 05, and 2.5 percent to 4.5 percent annually thereafter. We are using a range of 2.0 percent to 4.5 percent after FY 05.

The state has proposed a 2.7 percent increase for STA, for a total of \$4.9 million. This could be affected by the state budget. We will be watching this closely and will return to the Board as more information becomes available.

TransNet must be used for the Senior/Disabled and Youth reduced pass program, which is capped at \$5.5 million. This leaves \$9.7 million for operations. In 2009, these funds will not be available unless the voters approve the *TransNet* initiative.

Federal formula funds are being assumed at \$23.2 million for operations. Capital project deferral could eventually translate into increased operating costs. We need to seek out discretionary federal and non-federal capital funds for rail infrastructure, bus and vehicle replacement, and bus facility needs.

FY 05 operating budget expense categories include: personnel, our largest expense, 46 percent of the budget; purchased transportation, 28 percent of the budget; energy, 11 percent of the budget; outside services, 8 percent of the budget; with materials and risk management rounding out the remaining budget.

We will assume the status quo for service levels, with the exception of Mission Valley East, which should have a May or June 2005 startup. New or reduced service changes will be a policy decision for the Board.

Personnel expenses are largely a function of labor contracts. We have budgeted for the status quo on current positions.

Purchased transportation accounts for 28 percent of expenses. These are competitively bid services operated by private contractors. There are three years left on the MTS and Chula Vista Transit contracts. There is a 3 percent annual increase for most contracts. The benefit is these costs are known, and there should be no surprises.

With the recent increase in gas prices, everyone has felt the cost pressures with regard to energy expenses. For FY 05, we have assumed an average price of \$1.10 per gallon. Every 1-cent variance in the cost for fuel equates to \$33,000. We have assumed 90 cents per therm in FY 05 for compressed natural gas (CNG), with a 3 percent increase for FY 06 to FY 09. Every 1-cent variance equates to \$75,000 in the budget.

Electricity has been stable. We have assumed a range of 16 cents to 18 cents per kilowatt-hour (kWh) for FY 05 through FY 09. We will most likely end up at 16 cents for FY 04. Every 1-cent variance in electricity costs equates to \$470,000.

Ms. Hafner said we are projecting very small increases for liability insurance. We are also assuming small increases in property insurance. While there has been a higher per-case cost for workers' compensation, the overall caseload is lower. Health insurance is expecting double-digit increases.

Pension costs for SDTC are still being reviewed. A more detailed discussion of unfunded actuarial accrued liability will be provided for the May 2004 Budget Workshop.

Policy choices for the Board include obtaining a sustainable level of service. Some components to achieve this goal are efficiency improvements, budget and cost reductions, and service adjustments of low-productivity segments and low-performing routes. Another policy choice is the use of nonrecurring revenue, which could include use of the MTDB Contingency Reserve and use of federal Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funds for the Mission Valley East operations for FY 05-FY 08. Other considerations for the Board are the start date for Mission Valley East, new service proposals, and funding of the Liability Claims Reserve, which is assumed at \$2 million for FY 05.

Our next steps will be an intensive review of the individual budgets, which is currently underway. At the May 8, 2004, Finance Workshop, we will review the FY 05 budget details and provide a discussion of policy choices for balancing the FY 05 budget.

Mr. Mathis said it appears the unfunded deficits for future years did not include the consideration of a *TransNet* extension. He said it would be useful to add one additional column on the anticipated amount, should the extension be approved, to make clear what the problem would be if it were not passed. He also noted that the presentation showed the startup of Mission Valley East revenue service for next year. He thought it would not begin revenue service until FY 06. Ms. Hafner stated that we are in process of fine tuning the budget amounts. Also, although Mission Valley East may not begin revenue service, we would incur expenses as the new cars begin arriving. Mr. Mathis asked if the assumptions included using the CMAQ funds. Ms. Hafner said they did.

Ms. Atkins said that staff estimated a \$700,000 increase in fare revenue along with \$700,000 for regional growth. She asked if staff was equating a growth in the general population to a growth in ridership and whether this was a conservative estimate. Mr. Hurwitz said we were. It is also based on FY 04 mid-year adjustments. We are optimistic with the spring opening of PETCO Park. We would like to return in May with a better idea of what to expect. Ms. Atkins asked if the rising gas prices meant more money in taxes. Mr. Hurwitz said that, on the state level, there are more tax funds as gas prices increase; however, whether we receive those increases in revenue is dependent on how the state chooses to allocate the funds.

Ms. Atkins asked which capital projects had committed funds, and if they could be considered maintenance in nature. Mr. Hurwitz said there was a long list of infrastructure projects. Ms. Hafner added that the projects were a combination of both types. Mr. Jablonski said that the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) is part of the budget process. As funds are being cut for these projects also, we are looking closely at what items could be switched to operations.

Some new projects already have funds committed. The majority of the projects are for infrastructure replacements.

Ms. Atkins noted that there has been an ongoing discussion at SANDAG about the flexibility of *TransNet* funds for operations. She asked if there had been any movement in the discussion about an increase. Mr. Jablonski said that the amount for operations is still 13 percent of the total *TransNet* amount. He added that any future new capital projects would include an operating component. We are also trying to introduce flexibility for new project funds, in that if they are not consumed in the project, they can be flexed back into the 13 percent account.

Mr. Mark Lewis said that he understood that all fare increase issues were transferred to SANDAG. He asked how that works into the projections. He also asked if the fare increase was for everything across the board. Ms. Hafner said that for what has been approved, we will be able to work through the details. The fare increase applies to everything except taxicabs. The taxicabs are under a separate regulatory consideration. Mr. Mark Lewis said that he heard that San Diego State University (SDSU) might participate in a ridership fare that would be charged through the student ASB card. This is to encourage use of the system. Ms. Hafner said that we are working with SDSU to have some type of University pass structure. We would return to the Board with any information as it becomes available. SDSU would like to pursue this, and it would be a win-win situation for all involved.

Mr. Mathis asked for a distinction between maintenance and capital. He felt the Board needed a clear understanding of what constitutes maintenance and what is a capital improvement project. Mr. Jablonski said that capital funds would be used to take care of certain infrastructure replacements, i.e., replacing rail and vehicles. Maintenance projects would be ongoing maintenance and repair.

Mr. Monroe said it would be helpful to know the difference between new projects and deferred maintenance. Mr. Jablonski said that some time before May we would give a presentation of capital improvement projects. Mr. Monroe said that things at SANDAG are really tough and it's the wrong time to have this tough battle. We need a decision of the *TransNet* initiative to place in front of voters. We may have to wait until 2006. The problem with 2006 is it doesn't give a second chance to have the measure pass. He said that transit is under attack at SANDAG. We need to put together an initiative the voters will pass. Mr. Jablonski noted that transit did take a cut in the latest version with new projects coming off the capital list, as well as additional refinements of the operation.

Mr. Rindone noted that if the *TransNet* initiative does not pass, the option is no funds at all. That is not an acceptable option. Without the passage, we would see situations that are unmentionable. Passage is critical. We have to be united. Mr. Rindone noted that the fare increases are not three separate fare increases, but a compromise of one fare increase phased over three years. He also asked the Board members to place the May 8, 2004, Budget Workshop meeting on their calendar. We need everyone's participation. He added that the Board agreed to consider new service areas. Whether we can afford to fund new services is a different issue. He noted that vast areas of our region are growing and expanding. This is a tough time, and we need to stay focused.

Mr. Clabby noted that the basic fundamental portion of our line is the oldest portion. This section is going to be heavily involved with maintenance costs. There will be a heavier amount of maintenance required, not only on the line, but also with the vehicles. Many of the vehicles

are 20 years old. When the new line opens, maintenance costs should be lower, but there would still be maintenance costs required.

Mr. Ryan asked if the unfunded deficits for the pension system are included in the projections. Ms. Hafner said that they are included in terms of what is needed to move forward. The issue is how the Board wants to deal with the prior reserve issue. Ms. Hafner said that SDTC is preparing a report to present to the Board prior to the May 8, 2004, Budget Workshop.

Mr. Roberts said that a two-thirds vote is extremely difficult to obtain. There are issues that remain to be resolved. Someone recommended extending the tax for 40 years. We need to continue to reach a point where we can be sure everything works at our level. We need to decide whether the ultimate goal is to provide service or jobs. He doesn't want to be pessimistic, but obtaining a two-thirds-majority vote is very difficult.

Public Comment

Peter Warner – Mr. Warner asked if the budget is going to project for the overlap of the Padres and the Chargers seasons. Also, there are other special events, i.e., Mardi Gras, New Year's Eve, and Oktoberfest that need to be considered when making projections. We need to figure these things into the budget. He noted a misconnection he recently had with the Coaster.

Action Taken

Ms. Atkins moved to receive a report on the five-year MTS first cut consolidated operating budget and review of initial Board policy choices for FY 05. Mr. Mark Lewis seconded the motion, and the vote was 11-0 in favor (Mr. Ryan was temporarily out of the meeting).

31. Transit Workshop: Policy Review (ADM 110.2, PC 30100)

Ms. Lorenzen presented the next series of policies, No. 27 through No. 31, for review. She reminded the committee that the purpose of the review was to eliminate unnecessary or obsolete policies following consolidation.

Policy No. 27, "Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Program," encourages participation of disadvantaged businesses in federally funded MTDB contracts and projects. The recommendation is to retain this policy indefinitely, with typographical changes.

Policy No. 28, "Weighted Vote Procedure," codifies the provisions of the Public Utilities Code regarding majority and weighted vote procedures. The recommendation is to retain this policy indefinitely.

Policy No. 29, "Fare Setting," establishes a single policy regarding the development of a San Diego-area equitable fare structure. The recommendation is to retain this policy until the SANDAG policy is finalized; return to the Board, if necessary; and make minor typographical changes.

Policy No. 30, "Attendance at Transit-Related Conferences," sets forth guidelines for budgeting Board member and employee attendance at transit-related conferences. The recommendation is to retain this policy indefinitely, and make minor typographical changes.

Policy No. 31, "Investments," establishes an investment policy for surplus funds consistent with state law and prudent money management techniques. The recommendation is to retain this policy indefinitely and make minor typographical changes.

Mr. Mark Lewis asked if a single member from the City of San Diego could call for a weighted vote, or if it requires a second, and if a weighted vote would be called for after the initial vote. Ms. Lorenzen said that she believes it would only require one member, and it could be called after the majority vote. Mr. Monroe said that in accordance with No. 28.1, it takes two representatives, one of whom is not a City of San Diego representative, and that it is called after voting on a particular item.

Mr. Charles Lewis asked if going to a semiannual DBE reporting basis would affect the award of contracts. Ms. Lorenzen said that the Federal Transit Administration requested the semiannual reporting as it was having difficulty getting the full amount of information in quarterly reports.

Action Taken

Mr. Charles Lewis moved to approve changes to MTD Board Policies and Procedures No. 27 through No. 31. Mr. Monroe seconded the motion, and the vote was 12-0 in favor.

32. Year-End MTS Security Report (January – December 2003) (OPS 970.11, 960.13, ADM 121, PC 40021, 30100)

Mr. Burke presented the year-end MTS Security Report. The Terrorism Alert Response Program (TARP) was activated four times this year due to heightened security alerts. TARP deployments augment standard coverage.

Operation Weld was the second of three planned drills. The functional tabletop exercise was held on October 2, 2003, and a full-scale exercise was held on October 25, 2003. A 60-second clip of the 15-minute training film being produced from these exercises was shown to the Board. Mr. Burke said that he was very pleased with the cooperation received from the different municipalities and service agencies. There were nearly 100 people involved. All involved agencies in El Cajon participated and found it beneficial. The transit team working on these disasters could provide expertise throughout the state. A third drill is scheduled for the spring and will be done in Chula Vista at the Bayfront/E Street Station.

As part of an agreement with the San Diego Police Department, on August 1 we began prisoner bookings. There were a total of 96 bookings that included: public drunkenness, felony warrants, and domestic violence. The agencies involved include the County Jail, Las Colinas Detention Center, and juvenile hall.

The Special Enforcement Unit (SEU) provides concentrated enforcement at various stations at different days and times. The SEU issues warnings for some situations. Citations are issued to repeat offenders. Our Transit Watch Program determines the repeat offenders. The Revenue

Department is present at the SEU exercises to give offenders the opportunity to purchase a fare or upgrade. It relieves overcrowding in the courts and provides additional revenue. There are extensive fines for repeat offenders. The SEU exercises have found that 96.9 percent of patrons are in compliance and 3.1 percent of patrons are not in compliance with regard to fare purchases. Two audits of this information are being performed to ensure that the amounts being presented to the Board are accurate.

Closed-circuit television (CCTV) systems are functioning at Euclid Avenue, Qualcomm Stadium, Old Town Transit Center, Fashion Valley, and 47th Street. The newest station to receive CCTV is the El Cajon Transit Center. Our CCTV has been helpful to local law enforcement. An example of the picture the CCTV system provides was presented. A video was also shown of a crime in progress that assisted local law enforcement in obtaining a conviction.

The number of Part 1 incidents per passenger, which include theft and robbery, has declined in the past year. Fare evasion incidents increased slightly. Some reasons could include the Super Bowl, where we used patron-friendly policing; the expansion of TARP; as well as the scaffolding incident and substation fire, where officers were used in a different mode to keep passengers moving in the right direction around the accident sites.

Public Comment

Peter Warner – Mr. Warner said that he got off an Amtrak train and could not find a location to purchase a bus pass. He claims he was wrongfully cited and would like to have the citation dropped. He added that he tried to purchase a round-trip disability fare, and the fare machine wrongly printed a regular one-way fare. He noted the citation was issued at the Bayfront/E Street Station, yet indicates the Palomar Station. This needs to be dealt with for the accuracy of reporting. Mr. Williams told Mr. Warner that this was a court issue, not a Board issue. Ms. Lorenzen added that fare evasion matters are handled in traffic court.

Ms. Sterling said that this was an excellent report. She asked about the chances of CCTVs being installed at the Spring Street and Amaya Stations. Mr. Burke said that they would look into it and make a budget request. Unfortunately, there are no funds currently available.

Mr. Rindone also said that this was an excellent report. He was concerned about a three-hour delay in getting a response from the enforcement agencies. Mr. Burke said that when a call was made, the San Diego Police Department (SDPD) would prioritize it. Now, with the agreement in place, we can take the person directly for processing. This frees up our officers' time as well as SDPD's time. Mr. Rindone said he would like to know if there is a similar problem with the Chula Vista Police Department. Mr. Rindone added that the footage shown indicates the importance of a security system. He would not only support additional cameras for La Mesa, but anywhere else in the system as well.

Mr. Monroe offered his compliments for the Operation Weld exercise. He said he heard a brief given by a Federal Transit Administration (FTA) official about the September 11 crisis. There were around 80,000 people in the subway system when the tragedy occurred, and all got out without injuries. The director of the system gave total credit to the real-life exercises. The rescue workers involved were well trained.

Mr. Roberts said that the security footage shown was compelling. He asked if we had a rating of the different stations by incidents, so that if money were available, we would know where to best place additional cameras. Mr. Burke said that through Transit Watch we could determine where cameras were most needed. Mr. Roberts added that the cost seems rather large. Mr. Burke explained that the majority of the cost is for digital recorders; every station has its own digital recorder. Mr. Roberts wondered if there might be some less expensive way to obtain the same results. He would also like a list of the top 10 stations.

Mr. Tereschuck said that SDTI took the direction from the Board very seriously and is very proud of this system. We have budgeted within the CIP to expand the CCTV network. However, as a result of reduced funding, the project does not make it above the funded line. Mr. Rindone noted that this is a policy decision. The Board needs to make some tough decisions. Staff should bring it forth and allow the Board to review it.

Mr. Roberts said that an earlier system was not very good. He is impressed with the clarity and zoom capabilities of this system. This is an incredible improvement. He likes what we're doing, but we need to assign a priority to the remaining system.

Ms. Sterling said that she would like to see where La Mesa falls on the list. She noted the large amount of activity in the La Mesa area. Many people use the trolley. The cameras are important where there is a high amount of activity.

Mr. Ryan asked about the cost to activate TARP. Mr. Burke said that the cost would fall under overtime for Code Compliance and Security personnel. It is activated to maintain vigilance above our normal patrol. Staff could provide the costs involved. Mr. Ryan noted that aggravated assaults have increased. He asked if that included assaults around the transit system. Mr. Burke said that if it is reported on Transit Watch, it occurred on transit property. Mr. Ryan said he would like to see a history of these issues for comparison. He also wanted to know where we were with placing cameras on the buses. Ms. Claire Spielberg said we have cameras on some buses, but not all. She is not comfortable with the quality. Mr. Ryan would like the security report to be expanded to include incidents on the bus system. He would also like to consider a policy to upgrade and enhance the cameras on the buses. He asked if funds have been allocated for this. Ms. Spielberg said there currently are no funds allocated for cameras on buses.

Ms. Sterling asked if we were receiving funds from the Department of Homeland Security to assist when TARP needs to be activated. Mr. Tereschuck said the only money allocated was a small amount to establish TARP. There is no funding to support an enhanced security effort.

Action Taken

Mr. Rindone moved to receive the year-end MTS Security Report and have staff return with a report on security upgrades for the trolley and buses. Mr. Roberts seconded the motion, and the vote was 11-0 in favor.

44. Chairman's Report (ADM 110.1)

Mr. Williams said that he attended the American Public Transportation Administration (APTA) Legislative Conference in Washington, D.C. He noted that there is some confusion regarding the reauthorization of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21). The Senate has come forward with a funding amount. The Administration has a lower funding amount and threatened to veto any higher amount. There is talk about a two-year bill with a lower allocation. He added that the group visited with the representatives from this area. TEA-21 is important for transportation.

Mr. Jablonski said that TEA-21 reauthorization is the biggest issue on everyone's agenda. A six-year bill might be possible; however, a two-year bill is also on the table. It was felt that it might be better to take a two-year bill with a lower allocation, than a six-year bill with no funds.

Mr. Mathis noted that these are simply authorization bills, not appropriations. It will still be dependent on a year-to-year basis how much money will be actually allocated.

45. Chief Executive Officer's Report (ADM 121.7, PC 30100)

The Chief Executive Officer had nothing to report.

46. Board Member Communications (ADM 110, PC 30100)

There were no Board member communications.

47. Additional Public Comments on Items Not on the Agenda

There were no additional public comments.

48. Closed Session Items (ADM 122)

There were no closed session items.

49. Oral Report of Final Actions Taken in Closed Session (ADM 122)

There were no closed session items.

50. Next Meeting Date

The next meeting is scheduled for March 25, 2004, at 9:00 a.m. in the Board of Directors Meeting Room, 10th Floor, 1255 Imperial Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101-7490.

51. Adjournment

Chairman Williams adjourned the meeting at 11:22 a.m.

Chairman
San Diego Metropolitan Transit System

Filed by:

Approved as to form:

Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Diego Metropolitan Transit System

Office of the General Counsel
San Diego Metropolitan Transit System

PSmith
BD-04MAR11.PSMITH
3/17/04

Attachments: A. Roll Call Sheet
B. AI 45, March 11, 2004, Chief Executive Officer's Report