



401 B Street, Suite 800
 San Diego, CA 92101-4231
 (619) 699-1900
 Fax (619) 699-1905
 www.sandag.org

MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

MEMBER AGENCIES

- Cities of
- Carlsbad
- Chula Vista
- Coronado
- Del Mar
- El Cajon
- Encinitas
- Escondido
- Imperial Beach
- La Mesa
- Lemon Grove
- National City
- Oceanside
- Poway
- San Diego
- San Marcos
- Santee
- Solana Beach
- Vista
- and
- County of San Diego

ADVISORY MEMBERS

- Imperial County
- California Department of Transportation
- Metropolitan Transit System
- North County Transit District
- United States Department of Defense
- San Diego Unified Port District
- San Diego County Water Authority
- Southern California Tribal Chairmen's Association
- Mexico

EMPLOYMENT LAND INVENTORY TASK FORCE

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

Thursday, April 30, 2009

9:30 – 11:30 a.m.

SANDAG, 8th Floor Conference Room A
 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

- DRAFT MAPS FOR PUBLICATION AND SUMMARY SHEET
- CO-LOCATION

*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.

ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION
1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS	
+2. SUMMARY OF THE MARCH 12, 2009, MEETING	INFORMATION
<p>The March 12, 2009, meeting notes/summary is attached for Task Force review. Staff will go over the changes that were suggested by the Task Force at the March meeting.</p>	
3. DRAFT MAPS FOR PUBLICATION AND SUMMARY SHEET (Marney Cox, Monika Clark)	DISCUSSION
<p>The Task Force will have the opportunity to see the entire collection of draft maps to be included in the publication, along with samples of the summary sheet that will accompany each map. The Task Force is encouraged to provide feedback on the layout and presentation of the information.</p>	
4. CO-LOCATION (MARNEY COX)	DISCUSSION
<p>Staff will provide a presentation on the relationship between the region's economy and basic employment, the status of basic employment sites affected by co-location trends (jobs next to housing), and possible planning strategies to create an acceptable alternative. The Task Force is encouraged to comment on the information and discuss if some of the information should be included in the final report.</p>	
5. ADJOURNMENT AND NEXT STEPS	INFORMATION
<p>The next meeting is a Joint meeting of the Employment and Residential Land Inventory on Thursday, June 4, 2009, at 9:30 a.m. At this meeting, the Joint Task Force will review the progress of each effort (Employment and Residential) to date, discuss how they fit together, and determine what sort of information may be provided on the online Web application – the Regional Economic Development Information System (REDI).</p>	

+ next to an item indicates an attachment

San Diego Association of Governments
EMPLOYMENT LAND INVENTORY TASK FORCE

April 30, 2009

AGENDA ITEM NO.: **2**

Action Requested: INFORMATION

SUMMARY OF THE MARCH 12, 2009, MEETING

FILE NUMBER 2001100

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Co-chair Hon. Robert Campbell, City of Vista, led the self-introductions, and thanked everyone for their time and dedication to this important task force.

2. SUMMARY OF THE JANUARY 22, 2009, MEETING

Monika Clark, SANDAG, asked the team members if there were any questions about the summary notes from the last meeting.

Ms. Clark then reviewed the action items that were requested by the Task Force during the last meeting. Market Status Codes VPL and VPR were moved from their own category to the "Vacant Land - Immediately Available" category and their definitions were made more detailed.

Ms. Clark explained that since the codes are used to reflect the timeframe in which development can take place, the Redevelopment category was expanded from one broad category into three separate categories. The new categories reflect redevelopment that could occur in the long term and short term and redevelopment that could convert employment land to non-employment land. Redevelopment – Long-Term includes redevelopment in a coastal location or outside a Redevelopment Area. Redevelopment – Short-Term is redevelopment in a Redevelopment Area.

Richard Sparks, CB Richard Ellis (CBRE), asked if the inventory would be dated January 1, 2008, or January 1, 2009, as changes have been made that reflect development or construction after January 1, 2008. Mr. Sparks requested to change the date of the report from "2008 Employment Land Inventory" to "2009 Employment Land Inventory" because the 2008 information has been updated.

Ms. Clark reminded the Task Force members that they can request a meeting with Richard Sparks of CBRE or Mike Philbin of Cushman & Wakefield about any questions regarding the maps.

3. CLASSIFYING REDEVELOPMENT IN THE DRAFT CODING SCHEME

Ms. Clark explained that this iteration of the Employment Land Inventory would take into account redevelopment which was not reflected in detail in the 1998 or 2000 reports. Ms. Clark also explained that the Residential Task Force decided that, for their purposes, all redevelopment would be considered long-term, regardless of whether the parcel was inside a Redevelopment Area or outside. Ms. Clark asked the Task Force if the Employment Land Inventory should make that same distinction, or if the existing separation of short-term and long-term redevelopment of employment land should remain.

Ed Batchelder, City of Chula Vista, stated that Redevelopment Areas and agencies act as advocates for redevelopment and can speed up the timeframe of redevelopment for an area. In contrast, Linda Greenberg, Otay Mesa Chamber of Commerce, stated that some Redevelopment Areas require extensive work due to blight, demolition of existing buildings, and environmental constraints that may push the redevelopment into the long-term timeframe.

Mr. Batchelder agreed that the timeframe depends upon the area and the project, but also believed redevelopment can be accomplished faster in Redevelopment Areas because of Master Environmental Impact Reports (EIR).

Mr. Campbell suggested that each jurisdiction should decide if redevelopment could be long-term or short-term and that it should be site specific. He indicated that whether a parcel was inside or outside of a Redevelopment Area should not be used to place parcels in a respective timeframe.

Buddy Bohrer, HG Fenton Co., suggested that all redevelopment should be long-term because of the extensive planning process and the need to “up zone” the land to make it financially viable for developers to raze buildings and redevelop.

Jay Paul, City of Escondido, suggested that there is land that can be redeveloped in the short term because it is currently “underutilized,” such as land currently used as outdoor storage that would require very little preparation.

Mr. Philbin suggested keeping the short-term and long-term categories even if nothing falls into the short-term category because future Inventories may have short-term redevelopment and it could serve to alert local jurisdictions of issues that prevent redevelopment from falling into the short-term category.

Mr. Batchelder suggested that using Redevelopment Areas as triggers between short-term and long-term timeframes should not be used. Instead, input from each jurisdiction about what land they believe to be short-term or long-term redevelopment should be used.

Mr. Batchelder stated that particular information was given in the Series 12 Forecast; however, “Redevelopment” was defined to also include infill and underutilized land. Ms. Clark stated that the definition could be changed to include underutilized land that could have increased intensity and infill land. The task force agreed to the change.

Short-Term and Long-Term Redevelopment designations are to be kept; each local jurisdiction will decide what redevelopment land is short-term and long-term. The definition of Redevelopment will be changed to include redevelopment as infill and increased intensity. The Task Force members agreed to the changes.

Mike Strong, City of Encinitas, asked for clarification on the terms used in the definitions, specifically “entitlements.” Mr. Philbin stated that similar questions were asked in a meeting with the City of Poway. Mr. Philbin clarified that **“entitlements” are major infrastructure improvements such as roads and utility lines, as well as approval by the jurisdiction for density.**

4. NET/GROSS ACRES

Russ Gibbon, City of San Diego, presented the City of San Diego's Industrial Land Database and discussed his experience with "net-to-gross" figures, or what proportion of an employment land parcel typically develops into the intended use.

Mr. Gibbon stated that City of San Diego staff looked at recently developed parcels of land to extrapolate a general net-to-gross ratio for given communities and areas. They determined the net-to-gross yield by subtracting the amount of land actually built (net acreage) from the total amount of land on a given parcel when vacant (gross acreage).

In general, high yields occur in relatively flat areas. As the terrain becomes steeper and the topography becomes rougher, yields quickly diminish. Otay Mesa was used as an example of a high yield, flat, developable area and North County was used as an example of a low yield, steep topography area.

Mr. Sparks and Mr. Philbin stated that their inventory in 2000 used a 75 percent net-to-gross ratio countywide, whereas Mr. Gibbon's research and data have shown a countywide average net-to-gross yield of 62 percent. Mr. Gibbon stated that his staff estimated the yield on vacant parcels; yields on all other parcels that were planned, proposed, or under construction were determined from input from the developer.

Mr. Gibbon stated that the information from his Database was given to local jurisdictions to be reviewed and sent back to him, but he is still waiting for feedback from several jurisdictions.

Ms. Greenberg asked if existing Multiple Species Conservation Plan (MSCP) and Multiple Habitat Conservation Plan (MHCP) overlays were used to find a net-to-gross yield for vacant parcels in more rural areas. Mr. Gibbon stated that information was not available and is the missing link in the data.

Mr. Batchelder expressed an interest in having data on the amount of employment land absorbed for non-traditional employment uses, such as banks, retail, restaurants, and hotels. He indicated that it would be useful to track that information to know the rate of absorption, compared to how much employment land is used for actual employment uses.

Deanna Weeks, East County EDC, asked if Mr. Gibbon's data excluded non-traditional use of employment land. Mr. Gibbon stated that he did not exclude non-traditional uses from the data but included footnotes for those parcels.

Ms. Clark asked the team how they would like the net-to-gross yield reflected in the Inventory data, either through a percentage yield for the total, or for each category. Mr. Sparks stated that an absolute net acreage number exists for land that is coded as Vacant, Entitled, and Improved (VEI), and a separate column next to VEI could have that net number. Mr. Strong suggested having a range that would depict a best-case/worst-case scenario, since each parcel without infrastructure improvements and entitlements will be different.

Mr. Campbell suggested that a net number needs to be incorporated to ensure that the information is not misleading. Mr. Bohrer suggested that the gross data be listed and published, and the net-to-gross yield should be applied to the whole total for the region for parcels where the net acreage is not known. This would prevent misleading information being supplied to potential developers.

Mr. Bohrer expressed concern that placing net-to-gross yields for each individual parcel could present misleading and incorrect information that could discourage potential developers.

It was suggested that Mr. Gibbon flag the data that was obtained by estimation only, so as to not include it in the net-to-gross information (all properties that are not coded as VEI). The Task Force members agreed this was reasonable.

The Task Force agreed to use the net-to-gross information for the properties that are known in the VEI code, and to apply a net-to-gross range of 62 percent to 75 percent to the total of vacant land outside of the VEI category.

5. REVIEW OF SELECT NORTH CITY AND CENTRAL AREAS

Ms. Clark led the team in reviewing the tables and maps for North City and Central Areas. Ms. Clark noted the shaded areas were of particular importance. Ms. Clark pointed out that several geographies had 100 percent of their employment land as developed.

Mr. Gibbon and Mr. Sparks noted some concerns about the data, particularly the communities of Carmel Mountain Ranch, Carmel Valley, and Kearny Mesa. The numbers appeared to be substantially higher than the data that they had collected. Ms. Clark stated she would like to meet with Mr. Sparks, Mr. Philbin, and Mr. Gibbon to correct the conflicting information on the market areas in question.

Mr. Batchelder requested to have a meeting with SANDAG staff, Mr. Sparks, and Mr. Philbin about their maps. **Ms. Clark told the team that if anyone wanted to review maps with staff, Mr. Sparks, and Mr. Philbin, they should request a meeting.**

6. ADJOURNMENT AND NEXT STEPS

The next meeting date for the Employment Lands 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.

Requests to review maps and data, and clarify definitions should be arranged through Monika Clark, SANDAG.