MEETING NOTICE
AND AGENDA

EMPLOYMENT LAND INVENTORY
TASK FORCE

The Employment Land Inventory Task Force may take action on any item appearing on this agenda.

Thursday, March 12, 2009
9:30 to 11:30 a.m.

SANDAG, 8th Floor Conference Room
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101-4231

Staff Contact:
Monika Clark  (619) 699-1925  mcl@sandag.org
Marney Cox  (619) 699-1930  mco@sandag.org

AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

• CLASSIFYING REDEVELOPMENT IN THE DRAFT CODING SCHEME

• NET/GROSS ACRES

• REVIEW OF SELECT NORTH CITY AND CENTRAL AREAS

SANDAG offices are accessible by public transit. Phone 1-800-COMMUTE or see www.sdcommute.com for route information.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), SANDAG will accommodate persons who require assistance in order to participate in SANDAG meetings. If such assistance is required, please contact SANDAG at (619) 699-1900 at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting.

To request this document or related reports in an alternative format, please call (619) 699-1900, (619) 699-1904 (TTY), or fax (619) 699-1905.
## EMPLOYMENT LAND INVENTORY TASK FORCE

**Thursday, March 12, 2009**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM #</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2.     | SUMMARY OF THE JANUARY 22, 2009, MEETING  
**INFORMATION**

The January 22, 2009, meeting notes/summary is attached for Task Force review. Staff will go over the changes to the coding scheme suggested by the Task Force at the January meeting.

| 3.     | CLASSIFYING REDEVELOPMENT IN THE DRAFT CODING SCHEME (Marney Cox)  
**DISCUSSION/POSSIBLE ACTION**

Staff will review the discussion on redevelopment that took place during the January 29 and March 5 meetings of the Residential Land Inventory Task Force, particularly, how redevelopment will be represented in the inventory. The Employment Land Task Force will be asked to consider using the same classifications for parcels coded as “redevelopment” as will be used for the Residential Land Inventory.

| 4.     | NET/GROSS ACRES (Russ Gibbon, City of San Diego)  
**DISCUSSION/POSSIBLE ACTION**

Russ Gibbon will discuss the City of San Diego’s Industrial Land Database and the city’s experience with “net to gross” figures, or what proportion of employment land parcels actually develop into the intended use (not into roads, gas stations, etc.). The Task Force will be asked to agree on a method by which the Employment Land Inventory could reflect a “net” figure, for example, by applying a reduction factor to all parcels.

| 5.     | REVIEW OF SELECT NORTH CITY AND CENTRAL AREAS (Marney Cox, Monika Clark)  
**DISCUSSION**

Maps of the North City and Central areas will be available to review. Task Force members are encouraged to comment on the maps and associated codes in the geographies they are most familiar with. Mike Philbin and Rick Sparks, who did the initial review and coding, will be available for questions. Staff also will present summary statistics for each code by geography.

North City and Central areas include: the Cities of Coronado, Del Mar, Lemon Grove, National City, and Poway; and City of San Diego Community Planning Areas: 32nd Street Naval Station, Balboa Park, Barrio Logan, Black Mountain Ranch, Carmel Mountain Ranch, Carmel Valley, Centre City, Clairemont Mesa, College Area, Del Mar Mesa, East Elliott, Encanto Neighborhoods, Fairbanks Country Club, Greater Golden Hill, Greater North Park, Harbor,
Kearny Mesa, Kensington-Talmadge, La Jolla, Linda Vista, Lindbergh Field, Los Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve, Mira Mesa; Mid City: City Heights, Mid City: Eastern Area, Midway-Pacific Highway, Miramar Air Station, Miramar Ranch North, Mission Bay Park, Mission Beach, Mission Valley, Navajo, North City Future Urbanizing Area Subarea II, Normal Heights, Ocean Beach, Old San Diego, Pacific Beach, Pacific Highlands Ranch, Peninsula, Rancho Bernardo, Rancho Encantada, Rancho Peñasquitos, Sabre Springs, Scripps Miramar Ranch, Scripps Reserve, Serra Mesa, Skyline-Paradise Hills, Southeastern San Diego, Tierrasanta, Torrey Highlands, Torrey Hills, Torrey Pines, University, and Uptown.

6. ADJOURNMENT AND NEXT STEPS INFORMATION

The next meeting date for the Employment Land Task Force is Thursday, April 30, 2009, at 9:30 a.m. At this meeting the Task Force will review information from the East County and South Suburban areas of the region.

+ next to an item indicates an attachment
SUMMARY OF JANUARY 22, 2009
EMPLOYMENT LAND INVENTORY TASK FORCE MEETING

Agenda Item #1: INTRODUCTIONS

Marney Cox, Chief Economist, SANDAG, gave a brief introduction and explained that Task Force co-chair Hon. Phil Monroe, City of Coronado Councilmember, will no longer be participating in the Task Force and staff is in the process of filling the vacancy with another SANDAG Board member.

Mr. Cox explained that this will be the third time SANDAG has updated the Employment Land Inventory, the purpose being to determine the quality of employment land, as well as the amount available in the short- and long-term. The inventory could look into the absorption of employment land by residential and retail establishments as well.

Mr. Cox explained that a parallel Task Force will evaluate the short-term inventory of residential land and its proximity to employment land for the first time. At the end, both Task Forces will share data on their subject. The purpose is to be able to pass information about employment and residential land and its availability, and to encourage smart growth strategies.

Mr. Cox then led the meeting in self-introductions.

Mr. Cox mentioned that SANDAG is conducting an update to Regional Growth Forecast concurrently with the Employment and Residential Land Inventory Task Force, and that the efforts are interested in similar information, but about different time frames. The Regional Growth Forecast will be looking into the long-term growth of the region while the Residential and Land Inventory Task Force will be looking at a short-term perspective.

Agenda Item #2: REVIEW OF CODING SCHEME AND SUMMARY STATISTICS

Mr. Cox introduced Mike Philbin of Cushman & Wakefield and Rick Sparks of CB Richard Ellis, consultants who helped with the inventory data and coding/category system.

Mr. Cox explained that the coding scheme is used to place vacant parcels into different categories based on availability. Mr. Cox explained that this information is being verified by the different local jurisdictions and some land has been classified “undevelopable” with input from local jurisdictions and the development community. Land deemed undevelopable are characterized by constraints that adversely impede development, from environmental issues to topographical or size concerns.

Mr. Philbin and Mr. Sparks went over the coding scheme, explaining the need for an accurate inventory based on the time frames that employment land could be available for development. This information can then be accessed by local jurisdictions and the private sector to determine where businesses might be able to develop in the short-term. Parcels need to be accurately placed into categories so local jurisdictions can make sound land use decisions and the private sector can have accurate availability information.
Mr. Cox explained that Russ Gibbon from the City of San Diego has created an overlay data of “net developable” land, which is the amount of each parcel that is actually available to build on. Mr. Gibbon is attempting to create a standard “net to gross” factor to use for the Inventory. This topic will be discussed in future meetings and possibly incorporated into the data.

Matt Adams, Building Industry Association of San Diego, asked if environmental and other building constraints were going to be incorporated into the data, such as proximity to a Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) /Multiple Habitat Conservation Program (MHCP) area, which may prevent all acres of a parcel from being developed. Mr. Sparks and Mr. Philbin explained that more information from local jurisdictions and the development community would be needed to take into account environmental constraints.

Mr. Cox explained that SANDAG has some information about sensitive species habitat area and information on slopes, however, more information from local jurisdictions and input would be helpful to get closer towards an accurate “net developable” number.

Mr. Cox went on to explain that this Inventory is going to focus more attention on redevelopment than earlier versions, since local jurisdictions have increased interest in intensity of redevelopment. Mr. Cox explained this will affect the capacity of employment land through land use changes or changes in intensity on already developed parcels.

Barbara Redlitiz, City of Escondido, proposed refining the Redevelopment coding into sub-groupings based on land use change or intensity changes. Mr. Philbin has considered using a “mixed use” code/category to account for changes in intensity of “re-developable” land.

Mr. Cox noted that the Inventory process is open and flexible to changing definitions and categories but that issues need to be presented before the next meeting to prevent delays in finishing the project.

He further explained that redevelopment parcels in the Inventory were considered to be short-term if they were located in a Redevelopment Area. Redevelopment or infill that falls outside of Redevelopment Areas will be placed into the long-term redevelopment category. Mr. Cox explained that local jurisdictions would be needed to help identify parcels in short-term or long-term redevelopment categories.

Beth Jarosz, SANDAG, further explained that information on Redevelopment Areas were identified by local jurisdictions through the Regional Growth Forecast process. Ms. Jarosz elaborated that local jurisdictions identified parcels where future land use changes or intensity changes were desired and are being included as long-term redevelopment in the Regional Growth Forecast models.

A question was asked how mixed-use parcels that include retail would be classified in terms of capacity and intensity. Mr. Cox explained that retail/residential mix use would not be included in the employment inventory because the focus is on economic drivers of the region. Mr. Cox also stated that retail or service based employment could be viewed as a separate category that reduces employment land capacity.
Ms. Jarosz explained that SANDAG’s Regional Growth Forecast model has taken into account reducing capacity according to slope, environmental constraints, and setbacks, among other things, for individual parcels. The accuracy of the information is verified by working with individual jurisdictions. Ms. Jarosz also stated that perhaps the Inventory could look into reducing capacity for mixed-use employment land that will be taken up by retail based on the comments made during the meeting; a tiered model could perhaps work.

A comment was made that MSCP and MHCP could also be used as a tool for establishing capacity of land. Ms. Jarosz stated that the SANDAG Regional Growth Forecast has used this to determine capacity of land and that this method will also be applied in the Residential Land Inventory process; this would be more of an issue for the residential inventory because land most constrained by environmental issues is zoned for residential purposes. Local jurisdictions for the most part have incorporated slopes and habitat conservation into their land use plans.

A suggestion was made to place “Under Construction” into the Developed code category because by the time the report is published the project would most likely be finished. Mr. Philbin and Mr. Sparks stated that the goal was to have a “snap shot in time” of what was happening. Parcels placed in the “Under Construction” category are considered “unavailable” in the inventory and the sub-definitions are used to get an idea of how land is being absorbed at the time the Inventory is undertaken.

Stephen Haase, National Association of Industrial and Office Properties, asked for further explanation of the “VEI” (Vacant, Entitled, and Improved) category and “VPL” (Vacant, Planned). Mr. Sparks explained that “VPL” are multi-phased projects where some construction has been completed while other phases have been planned but are not currently under construction. Mr. Sparks stated that “VEI” is land that has been improved and is entitled but final plans have yet to be completed but some kind of conceptual project has been proposed.

A question was asked if underutilized or nonconforming parcels would be included in the Inventory and placed into the long-term available categories. Mr. Cox explained that the Inventory would only look at vacant land and not look into details of already developed land.

Monika Clark, SANDAG, led the team in explaining the Employment Lands Inventory Planning Area Tables and statistics.

Mr. Cox asked the team members to look over the numbers and see if anything appears to be incorrect. Mr. Philbin pointed out the rapid rate employment land has been absorbed since the last inventory in the year 2000.

Mr. Haase asked if the inventory had data about how the land was absorbed, either for employment use or rezoned and used for retail or residential projects. Mr. Philbin and Mr. Sparks did not know what the absorbed land was used for, but that the intent of the exercise was to determine how much employment land had been taken away since 2000, regardless of what it was used for.

There was then some discussion about moving the “Vacant Land – Planned/Proposed” acreage (VPR and VPL) to either “Under Construction” or “Immediately Available.” Mr. Haase suggested that
“VPR” (Vacant, Proposed) and “VPL” (Vacant, Planned) should not be placed in the “Under Construction” category since the land is not under construction and could still be available from a marketing standpoint, or construction could be years away.

Mr. Philbin and Mr. Sparks agreed that “VPL” and “VPR” codes could be moved into the “Immediately Available” heading when displayed on maps.

A differing opinion was that it would be useful to see “VPL” and “VPR” as “Under Construction” for policy makers since the land will soon be unavailable and under construction.

Buddy Bohrer, HG Fenton Company, suggested that the land is still available to potential buyers who may want to buy land with the proposed plans. From the perspective of developers or potential buyers, the land is still available. Mr. Sparks and Mr. Philbin agreed. Mr. Cox indicated that staff will move “VPR” and “VPL” to the “Immediately Available” category from the “Vacant Land-Planned/Proposed” category.

**Agenda Item #3: REVIEW OF NORTH COUNTY MAPS**

Ms. Clark then led the team in going over the North County maps for the respective jurisdictions, and City of San Diego and County of San Diego Community Planning Areas.

Jane McVey, City of Oceanside, suggested that each city take maps home, review the data/maps on their own time, and return them for the next meeting. Mr. Cox suggested that the team review the maps for Oceanside as an example on what issues to look for and how to mark maps and suggest changes.

John Hofmockel, SANDAG, reminded the members that the maps are to reflect January 1, 2008 when making changes. Suggestions were made that the maps should reflect as of January 1, 2009 because otherwise the maps and data could be outdated. It was pointed out during the Oceanside review that several parcels were considered vacant as of January 1, 2008 but have since been constructed and are no longer available.

**Agenda Item #4: NEXT STEPS**

Mr. Cox told the team that maps would be mailed out to the members after staff makes copies of the originals. Mr. Cox encouraged team members to review the maps and data and make any changes or mark discrepancies on the maps in another color. Mr. Cox would like the marked changes and maps to be returned by the next Employment Lands Inventory meeting.

Mr. Cox told the team members to contact Monika Clark if they have any questions. Mr. Philbin and Mr. Sparks told the Task Force that they are also available for any questions about parcels or data.

Mr. Cox told the Task Force to bring any suggestions about redevelopment characteristics to the next Employment Lands Inventory Meeting. Mr. Cox also suggested a possible conference call to work out the details about the coding and category system before the next Employment Lands Inventory meeting.

The next meeting date for the Employment Land Inventory Task Force is Thursday, March 12, 2009, at 9:30 a.m. The meeting will focus on the North City and Central areas of the region. A schedule of remaining meeting dates for both Task Forces follows on the next page.
Employment and Residential Land Inventory Task Force
2009 Meeting Schedule (anticipated)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>January 2009</th>
<th>February 2009</th>
<th>March 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Su Mo Tu We Th Fr Sa</td>
<td>Su Mo Tu We Th Fr Sa</td>
<td>Su Mo Tu We Th Fr Sa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 R 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td>8 9 10 11 12 13 14</td>
<td>8 9 10 11 E 13 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 H 17 18 19 20 21</td>
<td>22 23 24 25 26 27 28</td>
<td>22 23 24 25 26 27 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 H 20 21 E 23 24</td>
<td>25 26 27 28 R 30 31</td>
<td>29 30 H</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>April 2009</th>
<th>May 2009</th>
<th>June 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Su Mo Tu We Th Fr Sa</td>
<td>Su Mo Tu We Th Fr Sa</td>
<td>Su Mo Tu We Th Fr Sa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>1 2 3 J 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 6 7 8 R 10 11</td>
<td>3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>7 8 9 10 11 12 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 11 12 13 R 15 16</td>
<td>14 15 16 17 R 19 20</td>
<td>21 22 23 24 25 26 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 20 21 22 23 24 25</td>
<td>17 18 19 20 21 22 23</td>
<td>28 29 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 27 28 29 E</td>
<td>24 H 26 27 28 29 30</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“E” indicates an Employment Task Force meeting
“R” indicates a Residential Task Force meeting
“J” indicates a Joint meeting
“H” indicates a SANDAG holiday

All meetings take place on a Thursday from 9:30am-11:30am.

March 5, Residential
March 12, Employment
April 9, Residential
April 30, Employment
May 14, Residential
June 4, Joint
June 18, Residential (if needed)
Net/Gross Yields within Industrial Subdivisions

Industrial Subdivisions - Flat Formerly Agricultural Land (Otay Mesa)

*Siempre Viva Industrial Park (Kearny Real Estate)*

- Gross Acres: 50.00
- Net Acres: 32.30
- N/G Yield: 65%

*Britannia Industrial Park (Kearny Real Estate)*

- Gross Acres: 40.00
- Net Acres: 32.08
- N/G Yield: 80%

*Otay Pacific Business Park (Wohl Properties)*

- Gross Acres: 62.50
- Net Acres: 56.07
- N/G Yield: 90%

*Brown Field Technology Park (Murphy Development Corp.)*

- Gross Acres: 80.00
- Net Acres: 53.50
- N/G Yield: 67%

*Piper Ranch Business Park (Brown Collarusso, & LeBeau)*

- Gross Acres: 80.00
- Net Acres: 68.04
- N/G Yield: 85%

**Average Net-to-Gross Yield in Otay Mesa:** 77%
Industrial Subdivisions – Rough Terrain (Various North City Communities)

**Fenton Technology Park** (H.G.Fenton Co.)

Gross Acres: 130.90  
Net Acres: 60.38  
N/G Yield: 46%

**Scripps Northridge Business Park** (Robert & Raedene Curry)

Gross Acres: 122.80  
Net Acres: 51.00  
N/G Yield: 41%

**Scripps Gateway Industrial Park** (Jerry Elder Development)

Gross Acres: 39.00  
Net Acres: 23.00  
N/G Yield: 59%

**Nobel Research Park** (Collins Development Corp.)

Gross Acres: 42.60  
Net Acres: 31.40  
N/G Yield: 74%

**Torrey Pines Science Center** (Chevron Land Development)

Gross Acres: 291.86  
Net Acres: 150.40  
N/G Yield: 52%

**Corporate Research Park** (City of San Diego)

Gross Acres: 117.00  
Net Acres: 35.00  
N/G Yield: 32%

**Eastgate Technology Park** (City of San Diego)

Gross Acres: 281.00  
Net Acres: 119.78  
N/G Yield: 43%

**Average Net-to-Gross Yield in North City:** 50%
Industrial Subdivisions – Rough Terrain (Various North County Cities)

**Escondido Regional Technology Center** (JRM Land Company)
- Gross Acres: 200 (estimated)
- Net Acres: 100 (estimated)
- N/G Yield: 50%

**Carlsbad Raceway Park** (H.G. Fenton Co.)
- Gross Acres: 150.00
- Net Acres: 76.00
- N/G Yield: 51%

**Carlsbad Oaks North** (Techbuilt Corp.)
- Gross Acres: 367.00
- Net Acres: 147.00
- N/G Yield: 40%

**Pacific Coast Business Park** (AMB Corp.)
- Gross Acres: 124.31
- Net Acres: 119.78
- N/G Yield: 96%

Average Net-to-Gross Yield in North County: 59%

Average Net-to-Gross Yield

in

San Diego County: 62%