REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

Friday, December 2, 2005
12 noon to 2 p.m.
SANDAG Board Room
401 B Street, 7th Floor
San Diego

AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

• REPORT FROM THE ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION PROGRAM WORKING GROUP ON TransNet’s REGIONAL HABITAT CONSERVATION FUND

• STATUS REPORT ON DRAFT SMART GROWTH CONCEPT MAP

• STATUS REPORT ON THE REGIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN (RCP) MONITORING PROGRAM

PLEASE TURN OFF CELL PHONES DURING THE MEETING

YOU CAN LISTEN TO THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING BY VISITING OUR WEB SITE AT WWW.SANDAG.ORG

MISSION STATEMENT
The Regional Planning Committee provides oversight for the preparation and implementation of the Regional Comprehensive Plan that is based on the local general plans and regional plans and addresses interregional issues with surrounding counties and Mexico. The components of the plan include: transportation, housing, environment (shoreline, air quality, water quality, habitat), economy, borders, regional infrastructure needs and financing, and land use and design components of the regional growth management strategy.

San Diego Association of Governments · 401 B Street, Suite 800, San Diego, CA 92101-4231 · (619) 699-1900 · Fax (619) 699-1905 · www.sandag.org
Welcome to SANDAG. Members of the public may speak to the Regional Planning Committee on any item at the time the Committee is considering the item. Please complete a Speaker’s Slip, which is located in the rear of the room, and then present the slip to Committee staff. Also, members of the public are invited to address the Committee on any issue under the agenda item entitled Public Comments/Communications/Member Comments. Speakers are limited to three minutes. The Regional Planning Committee may take action on any item appearing on the agenda.

This agenda and related staff reports can be accessed at www.sandag.org under meetings on SANDAG’s Web site. Public comments regarding the agenda can be forwarded to SANDAG via the e-mail comment form also available on the Web site. E-mail comments should be received no later than noon, two working days prior to the Regional Planning Committee meeting.

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.

SANDAG offices are accessible by public transit. Phone 1-800-COMMUTE or see www.sdcommute.com for route information.
1. APPROVAL OF OCTOBER 7, 2005, MEETING MINUTES  
APPROVE

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

Members of the public will have the opportunity to address the Regional Planning Committee on any issue within the jurisdiction of the Committee. Speakers are limited to three minutes each and shall reserve time by completing a “Request to Speak” form and giving it to the Clerk prior to speaking. Committee members also may provide information and announcements under this agenda item.

The Regional Planning and Transportation Committees unanimously approved 14 projects recommended by SANDAG staff for Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program funding at their joint meeting on September 2, 2005. During the meeting, Steve Otto of the San Ysidro Business Association and Scott Kessler of the San Ysidro Business Improvement District raised concerns about the project scoring methodology. The attached memorandum responds to the issues raised.

ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION PROGRAM (EMP) REPORT

3. REPORT FROM THE ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION PROGRAM WORKING GROUP ON TransNet’s REGIONAL HABITAT CONSERVATION FUND (Janet Fairbanks)  
RECOMMEND

The Environmental Mitigation Program Working Group developed a “Regional Preserve Implementation Assessment” as a way of identifying implementation tasks eligible for the TransNet Regional Habitat Conservation Fund. The Working Group also developed criteria for prioritizing the allocation of available funds, procedures for allocating the funds, and a process to consider immediate funding requests. The Working Group then reviewed the assessment to determine tasks and/or projects that would be eligible for this year’s funding. This report outlines recommended expenditures for this year’s funding and the criteria for eligible management projects. The Regional Planning Committee is asked to recommend that the SANDAG Board approve: (1) a budget for FY 2006 funds, (2) a process for allocating FY 2006 funds, and (3) criteria for eligible management projects.
The Regional Planning Technical and Stakeholders Working Groups have been working with SANDAG staff on the Smart Growth Concept Map, one of the key strategic initiatives from the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP). The Map will be used in relation to two significant initiatives: the comprehensive 2007 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) update and when determining eligibility to participate in the long-term smart growth incentive program (SGIP) funded by TransNet. The Regional Planning Committee is asked to provide input on the issues being raised in relation to the map and on the process to seek public input on the Concept Map.

The RCP includes a set of performance indicators to monitor the region’s progress toward achieving the goals and objectives of the RCP. The monitoring program consists of two components: a baseline monitoring report, and the establishment of short- and long-term targets to track the region’s progress over time. Staff will provide an update on the status of this work and anticipated next steps.

The next meeting of the Regional Planning Committee is scheduled for 12 noon to 2 p.m. on Friday, January 6, 2006.
The Regional Planning Committee meeting was called to order at 12:07 p.m. by Committee Chair Lori Holt Pfeiler (North County Inland). The attendance sheet for the meeting is attached.

Chair Holt Pfeiler thanked and welcomed all for attending today’s meeting.

1. APPROVAL OF SEPTEMBER 2, 2005, MEETING MINUTES

   Action: Upon a motion made by Supervisor Horn (County of San Diego) and a second made by Councilmember Jones (Lemon Grove), the Committee voted to approve the minutes of the September 2, 2005, meeting.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBERS COMMENTS

   None.

ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION PROGRAM (EMP) REPORT

3. APPROVE AN AMENDMENT TO TransNet’s ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION PROGRAM WORKING GROUP CHARTER AND REVIEW THE WORK PROGRAM (APPROVE)

   Staff noted that on July 1, 2005, the Regional Planning Committee (RPC) approved the Charter for the Environmental Mitigation Program Working Group (EMPWG), which included appointing 16 organizations to the Working Group. At that meeting, staff was asked to consider adding members and to return to the RPC with recommendations. The first group that was evaluated was the California Coastal Conservancy. The California Coastal Conservancy works in partnership with local governments, other public agencies, nonprofit organizations, and private landowners to protect and improve coastal resources. Membership on the Working Group would enhance partnership opportunities among the Conservancy, SANDAG, and Caltrans as the Working Group moves forward in identifying coastal resources that could mitigate transportation projects and potential land acquisitions and dedications that will help implement the habitat conservation plans. The second group that was evaluated was the San Diego Foundation. The San Diego Foundation manages over 1,000 funds, helping to make decisions on the expenditures of those funds based on the
goals and objectives of the fund sponsors. Their membership would provide an opportunity for SANDAG to work in concert with the Foundation to advance common goals of completing the habitat conservation plans, identifying mitigation opportunities, leveraging funds with the private sector, and increasing public participation in open space protection efforts. The third group is the Alliance for Habitat Conservation (AHC), which is a nonprofit organization of large landowners, who work in concert with local, state, and federal jurisdictions on the development of habitat conservation plans. AHC played a significant role in the passage of TransNet. Their participation on the working group would continue dialogue among SANDAG and Alliance members as the TransNet extension is implemented. Staff recommended deferring membership of the International Community Foundation at this time because representation on the EMPWG from the nonprofit charitable giving community can be achieved through the membership of the San Diego Foundation. However, as the working group begins discussions on border-related environmental issues, representatives from the organization should be invited to the working group meetings as their expertise could be a resource to SANDAG.

The EMPWG held its first meeting on September 13, 2005. They reviewed the Charter and asked for two changes to help clarify their responsibilities. The first change clarifies that the EMPWG will identify organizations to perform monitoring, management, and acquisition activities identified in the needs assessment. All organizations will be considered and the working group will not be limited to any list of specific organizations which may have already been considered. The second change adds Phase II funding to the list of EMPWG responsibilities. The group will work with SANDAG to identify additional regional funding mechanisms to meet the long-term requirements for implementing habitat conservation plans in the San Diego region.

The EMPWG appointed Tom Oberbauer, Chief MSCP Division, Department of Planning and Land Use, County of San Diego, to serve as Vice Chair of the group. The group reviewed the work program and decided to appoint a subgroup to begin work right away on two of the work program tasks. The subgroup will report back to the EMPWG at its next meeting scheduled on October 11, 2005. The group concluded the meeting by reviewing a draft needs assessment, highlighting the implementation activities of the habitat conservation plans. The group will discuss and recommend revisions at its next meeting.

Councilmember McCoy (Imperial Beach) asked if there were a list of the members and agencies that were considered for membership. Staff stated that information is included in the staff report.

Jeanette Baker (US Army Corps of Engineers) asked if the recommendations for additional membership would come through the EMPWG. Chair Pfeiler noted that staff was asked by the Regional Planning Committee to look at the addition of the members being discussed at today's meeting.

Ms. Baker questioned if the EMPWG would be doing the work analysis in the future. Chair Pfeiler stated that the way it works is that the RPC would direct the EMPWG to work with staff to investigate issues. The EMPWG would be the group that would do the work and staff would report back to the RPC with the group’s recommendations.
Action: Upon a motion made by Councilmember Jones (East County) and a second by Councilmember McCoy (South County), the Committee voted to approve an amendment to the Environmental Mitigation Program Working Group Charter by appointing the California Coastal Conservancy, the San Diego Foundation, and the Alliance for Habitat Conservation to the Working Group.

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE (RPC) REPORTS

4. UPDATE ON ENERGY WORKING GROUP (INFORMATION)

Chair Pfeiler introduced Councilmember Henry Abarbanel, co-chair of the Energy Working Group (EWG), and invited him to provide the Regional Planning Committee (RPC) with an update on the EWG’s efforts.

Councilmember Abarbanel noted that he reports to RPC periodically on the activities of the EWG, highlighting some items listed in the staff report. Councilmember Abarbanel announced that he has been visiting city councils to generate input and report on EWG activities. The primary work of the EWG is to participate in preparation of the Long Term Resource Plan (LTRP) that will be submitted by SDG&E to the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC), which is due next summer. He mentioned that SDREO has purchased the MRW Energy Resource Tool, an energy resource database, and has hired a UCSD student to assist with the development of a cost-based model that would enable better cost-benefit analysis. He will report back to the RPC early next year on the progress of that project.

Councilmember Abarbanel reported that as a result of the applications received for the EWG’s Energy Efficiency Pilot Program, the EWG chose to work with the City of Carlsbad. The energy audit that went along with the program indicated a cost savings of $150,000 to the City of Carlsbad. He also mentioned that he attended a meeting to discuss the status of the Borders Energy Issues Group (BEIG), which addressed the importance of energy in Baja California and how it will affect the border region. Due to staff and budget constraints, the work of the BEIG will be put on hold until the completion of the LTRP. However, funding may be available at the state level now to work on these issues at the international border, and the EWG will be applying for some of that funding to continue its work. He stated that a series of energy workshops will be held. The first will be a legislative forum to be held on October 17, 2005, with Senators Kehoe and Morrow as moderators. He encouraged all members to attend. On October 14, 2005, there will be a lunch meeting with Dian Gruenich, a member of the CPUC. A Climate Change workshop co-hosted by the Industrial Environmental Association (IEA) will be held on December 14, and in March 2006, a workshop may be held on nuclear energy, which is extremely important to illuminate the pros and cons of nuclear power plants.

Regarding membership, there are stakeholders that have been identified originally that have dropped out of the group who could address the issues of water and wastewater. Water transportation is approximately 10 percent of energy throughout the state. Ignoring that aspect would be remiss on the EWG’s part. The focus on transportation is also important. Councilmember Abarbanel would like to add a member of Caltrans, the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS), or the North San Diego County Transit Development Authority to the EWG’s membership.
Board (NCTD). There are potential renewable resources in the region, including Imperial Valley, and he would also like to have a member of the Imperial Irrigation District (IID) participate on the EWG. There is also no representation from the Farm Bureau, and he would also like to see them on board, as well as a representative from Baja California.

Howard Williams (San Diego County Water Authority) questioned why the representative from CWA was not participating on the EWG. Councilmember Abarbanel stated that the SDCWA Chair indicated to him that the SDCWA does not expend the water; the local water purveyors do that. He felt that those types of agencies would be a better fit for the EWG.

Mr. Williams noted that he will follow up on this issue.

Councilmember Druker (NCTD) commented that it would make sense that MTS be the transit agency representative because electricity is being used on the trolley more so than by NCTD transit operations. Councilmember Abarbanel stated that he would be happy to approach MTS to see if they would be interested in participating on the EWG.

Chairwoman Slater-Price (County of San Diego) recommended that Caltrans also be asked to join the group.

Chair Pfeiler indicated that staff would need to update the EWG’s Charter to include the list of proposed members.

Staff stated they will put this item on the agenda for the next EWG meeting.

Councilmember Abarbanel noted that the CPUC does not consider Northern Baja California as part of the San Diego region and will not include their energy facilities as available resources.

Councilmember Jones mentioned that the lack of an energy / transportation component was identified by REPAC, the stakeholder group that oversaw the preparation of the Regional Energy Strategy. He asked whether there is going to be a transportation component included in future energy plans. Staff replied that work is included in the work program for the next update of the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) and Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Staff added that an issue paper on transportation/energy will be drafted and presented to the Transportation Committee, the Regional Planning Committee, as well as the Energy Working Group.

Chair Pfeiler stated that the RPC can make the recommendation to the Executive Committee for the EWG to move forward.

Chairwoman Slater-Price noted that Lindon Blue improved the way that nuclear reactors have been run in the past.

Councilmember Abarbanel stated that there have been significant improvements in design and reactors, but issues are still apparent when it comes to waste regarding the reactors.
Councilmember McCoy asked who is providing grants for the borders energy issues. Councilmember Abarbanel replied that funding has been made available from the California Energy Commission.

Councilmember McCoy made the motion to recommend that the Executive Committee create a Borders Issues Group. Councilmember Jones seconded the motion.

Staff reminded the RPC that the existing BEIG was put on hiatus by the Executive Committee.

Councilmember Abarbanel stated that the EWG is currently applying for funding and will begin to work on these binational energy issues in June if and when funds become available.

Chair Pfeiler thanked Councilmember Abarbanel for the update and told him to keep up the good work.

**Action**: The Regional Planning Committee accepted this report as information.

5. **REGIONAL HOUSING WORKING GROUP (RHWG): CHARTER AND MEMBERSHIP (APPROVE)**

Staff stated that in May 2005, the SANDAG Executive Committee voted to approve the continuation of the Regional Housing Task Force (RHTF) as the Regional Housing Working Group (RHWG). As part of its approval, the RHWG was directed by the Executive Committee to provide updates to the RPC on a regular basis. The purpose of the RHWG is to serve as a forum for the discussion of regional housing issues and the development of regional housing solutions, and to advise the RPC on housing-related issues that affect the region. The RHWG will review and/or make recommendations on the following tasks in SANDAG’s Overall Work Program: forums on housing issues of local and regional interest; implementation of a program to educate the public and elected officials about regional housing issues and solutions; the final report to the state legislature on the implementation of the pilot housing element self-certification program; select state and federal housing-related legislation; and housing information on SANDAG’s Web site. The membership of the Working Group was a significant topic of discussion during the past several RHWG meetings. Originally a group that totaled 42 members, it is recommended that the working group be pared down to 25 people with subregional representation by housing staff. The proposed list of members of the Working Group is included in the staff report. Currently the co-chairs of the RHTF would like to continue as the co-chairs of the RHWG. A Vice-Chair would be selected in the event that neither of the co-chairs was able to attend. Staff noted that the recommendation today is for the RPC to approve the Charter, allow Duane Roth and Deputy Mayor Patty Davis (South County) to continue as co-chairs, and approve the work program.

Bill Anderson (Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group) recommended that the City/County Reinvestment Task Force be added to the Working Group. Staff indicated that a representative of that group could be solicited.
Chair Pfeiler stated that she likes the idea of the Charter moving forward; the RHWG could serve as a think tank on housing issues for the RPC.

Action: Upon a motion made by Councilmember Jones and a second made by Supervisor Horn (County of San Diego), the Committee voted to approve the draft Charter for the RHWG. The Committee also voted for Duane Roth (CONNECT) and Deputy Mayor Patty Davis (South County) to continue to co-chair the group, and approved the RHWG work program.

6. SHOWCASING LOCAL SMART GROWTH PROJECTS: CHULA VISTA URBAN CORE SPECIFIC PLAN (INFORMATION)

Mary Ladiana, Planning and Housing Manager with the City of Chula Vista Community Development Department, stated that Chula Vista is the second largest city in San Diego County and one of the fastest growing in the nation. Currently, the population is 210,000, and SANDAG projects that to increase to 280,000 by the year 2030. The west side of Chula Vista is faced with many underutilized commercial areas and housing stock that is reaching maturity. Additionally, development interest is on the rise particularly due to the over saturated and escalating land prices in neighboring areas like San Diego. This combination makes the area a good candidate to accommodate growth and at the same time reap the benefits of revitalization.

Aware of the opportunities on the west side, Chula Vista decided to embark upon two concurrent planning efforts, a General Plan Update and a Specific Plan, to implement the evolving vision established for the Urban Core. The Specific Plan effort kicked off last summer with the creation of an 18-member advisory committee, a two-day charrette, a visual preference survey, and community workshop. To build upon the evolving vision being set in the General Plan Update, one of the first planning endeavors was to create a series of district or neighborhood level “vision plans” to further evoke the image and potential for the urban core.

There were 10 key planning principles to guide the plan for the Urban Core. Those include: develop a vibrant, distinct urban atmosphere with a day to evening environment; build on and enhance Chula Vista’s cultural and historic traditions and diversity; foster visible cultural and civic amenities, such as urban parks, outdoor dining opportunities, and civic promenades; establish a hierarchy of building forms with greatest densities at key nodes; connect and integrate the Bayfront, east Chula Vista, and individual focus areas within the urban core; create lively and pedestrian-friendly environments through a concentration of activities in a compact, mixed-use setting; transition new development to minimize impacts on existing residential neighborhoods; provide creative parking strategies, including parking districts, structures, and reductions; define unique identities for focus areas through individualized streetscape design and public spaces; and restore the historic street grid layout in order to maximize transportation choices and increase mobility and circulation opportunities for pedestrians, transit, and automobiles.

Next steps will be to draft a specific plan by fall 2005; continue with the Public Facilities Plan underway; distribute an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) by early fall 2005; and finalize the approval process in the winter of 2005.
Chair Pfeiler asked how much sensitivity there is in the community to height restrictions. Ms. Ladiana responded that height has created a lot of sensitivity, and this issue is being addressed through transition zones. She also indicated that the limits are up to eight stories and are categorized as low-rise, mid-rise, and high-rise.

Councilmember Jones mentioned that parking in this area has always been a problem and he would be interested in seeing how this development will take place. He asked why E Street was not included in the planning process. Ms. Ladiana noted that E Street has been included in the plans along Third Avenue, which is the area where the traditional traffic problems have existed.

Councilmember Jones stated that in Lemon Grove, the residents have not objected to increased heights in the downtown area.

Chair Pfeiler stated that during the planning of projects there is usually an interest in parking, and there are almost always complaints. She thanked Ms. Ladiana for coming to the RPC and sharing this information.

**Action:** The Regional Planning Committee accepted this item as information.

7. **UPCOMING MEETINGS**

The next meeting of the Regional Planning Committee is scheduled for 12:00 noon to 2 p.m. on Friday, November 4, 2005.

8. **ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Holt Pfeiler adjourned the meeting at 1:09 p.m.
## CONFIRMED ATTENDANCE
### SANDAG REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING
October 7, 2005
12:00 p.m. to 2:00 p.m.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GEOGRAPHICAL AREA</th>
<th>JURISDICTION</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>MEMBER/ALTERNATE</th>
<th>ATTENDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North County Inland</td>
<td>City of Escondido</td>
<td>Lori Holt-Pfeiler, Chair</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Vista</td>
<td>Judy Ritter</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South County</td>
<td>City of Chula Vista</td>
<td>Patty Davis, Vice Chair</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Imperial Beach</td>
<td>Patricia McCoy</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North County Coastal</td>
<td>City of Carlsbad</td>
<td>Matt Hall</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Carlsbad</td>
<td>Bud Lewis</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East County</td>
<td>City of Lemon Grove</td>
<td>Jerry Jones</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of La Mesa</td>
<td>Barry Jantz</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Scott Peters</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Jim Madaffer</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Bill Horn</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Pam Slater-Price</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Members</td>
<td>Caltrans, District 11</td>
<td>Pedro Orso-Delgado</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bill Figge</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>San Diego County Water Authority</td>
<td>Howard Williams</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>Department of Defense</td>
<td>Susanah Aguileria</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>San Diego Unified Port District</td>
<td>William Hall</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bill Briggs</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>Leon Williams (Chairman)</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>NCTD</td>
<td>Dave Druker</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG)</td>
<td>Gail Goldberg</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group (SWG)</td>
<td>Bill Anderson</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Mitigation Program Advisory Member</td>
<td>Wildlife Conservation Board</td>
<td>John Donnelly</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Al Wright</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Mitigation Program Advisory Member</td>
<td>California Department of Fish and Game</td>
<td>Michael Mulligan</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>David Mayer</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Mitigation Program Advisory Member</td>
<td>US Army Corps of Engineers</td>
<td>Mark Durham</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jeannette Baker</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Mitigation Program Advisory Member</td>
<td>US Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
<td>Therese O’Rourke</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Susan Wynn</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Regional Planning and Transportation Committees unanimously approved the 14 projects recommended by SANDAG staff for Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program funding, at their joint meeting on September 2, 2005. During the meeting, Steve Otto of the San Ysidro Business Association and Scott Kessler of the San Ysidro Business Improvement District raised concerns about the project scoring methodology. Specifically, they took issue with the “Intensity of Development” criterion and believed that the San Ysidro Project should be given credit for residential densities proposed in a pending community plan amendment. In their testimony, they asserted that other projects were evaluated and scored based upon anticipated residential densities that resulted in a “double standard” scoring process.

SANDAG staff met with Mr. Otto and Mr. Kessler to discuss the issues they raised at the September 2 meeting. This discussion helped us better understand the basis for their comments at the Regional Planning and Transportation Committees joint meeting and clarified for them the process we used to score the projects. Knowing that community plan amendments were being processed in a number of the proposed project areas, they had assumed we would be using the proposed densities in these communities to score the Intensity of Development criterion. When they saw the scores, and that their project was not given credit for the densities in the pending San Ysidro community plan amendment, they assumed we were not scoring the projects consistently.

Staff explained that all projects were evaluated according to the same standards and that the process for determining “Intenisty of Development” included two steps.

1. First, staff examined the residential and employment densities of the areas within a quarter-mile radius of each project, based on data in SANDAG’s Series 10 Forecast. Densities included in the SANDAG Series 10 Forecast are based on each jurisdiction’s general plans and community plans as of 2001.

2. Second, staff compared the resulting densities to the densities prescribed for that smart growth place type, as defined in the Regional Comprehensive Plan. The closer the project was to meeting the densities prescribed for its place type, the higher the score awarded for “Intensity of Development.”
Staff further explained that this analysis, and the reliance on the SANDAG Series 10 Forecast, was necessary to ensure that residential and employment densities for all project areas could be determined efficiently and consistently. Densities stated in general plan and community plan amendments adopted after 2001 were not used to arrive at the “Intensity of Development” score for any of the applicants. It was also noted that projects like the San Ysidro proposal were awarded points based upon projected residential and employment densities in the “Related Land Development” criterion. In this category, all of the projects where approvals for higher densities and densities were in process received some additional credit.

After this exchange of information, Mr. Otto and Mr. Kessler agreed that the process for evaluating the projects was consistent, though they continued to assert that more credit should have been given to proposed increases in density. Staff will incorporate these comments into the forthcoming “Lessons Learned” report and work with the San Ysidro community when future funding opportunities arise to help them develop an effective project application.
REPORT FROM THE ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION PROGRAM
WORKING GROUP ON THE TransNet REGIONAL HABITAT
CONSERVATION FUND

Introduction

On September 24, 2004, the SANDAG Board of Directors approved implementation guidelines for the TransNet Extension Environmental Mitigation Program (EMP). The Environmental Mitigation Program, which is included in the TransNet Extension Ordinance and Expenditure Plan approved by the voters in November 2004, established the Transportation Project Mitigation Fund (TPMF) for mitigation of projects outlined in the Regional Transportation Plan (MOBILITY 2030), as well as the Regional Habitat Conservation Fund (RHCF) for habitat acquisition, biological monitoring, and land management based on economic benefit of achieving specified assurances with State and Federal regulatory agencies through the environmental review and approval process. One of the implementation guidelines approved by the Board in September 2004 provides that $1 million for management and monitoring implementation activities should be allocated in FY 2005-2006.

In May 2005, the Board of Directors approved the creation of the Environmental Mitigation Program Working Group and assigned them and the Regional Planning Committee responsibilities for making recommendations on the implementation of the Environmental Mitigation Program by SANDAG. The EMP Working Group has now prepared an initial “Regional Preserve Implementation Assessment” to identify short- and long-term activities necessary to implement the region’s habitat conservation plans. Activities include biological monitoring, land management, and land acquisition. The assessment evaluates existing responsibilities and available funding for performing these activities. Based on this assessment, the working group developed a draft recommended budget for FY 06 expenditures, criteria for prioritizing the allocation of land management funds, and a procedure to consider funding requests for FY 2006. This report sets forth the EMP Working Group’s recommendations.

Recommendation

That the Regional Planning Committee recommend that the SANDAG Board of Directors approve: (1) the proposed budget for FY 2006 EMP expenditures, (2) the proposed process for allocating FY 2006 EMP funds, and (3) the proposed criteria for eligible land management activities and rating system for considering funding requests.

Discussion

1. Proposed Budget for FY 2006 EMP Funds

On November 8, 2005, the EMP Working Group recommended that the FY 2006 EMP funds be allocated for the following purposes:
a. Develop a database of conserved lands for the San Diego region that would include the following tasks:

- Prepare a Conserved Lands Database (which includes land that is part of the habitat conservation planning areas and other conserved land)
- Maintain GIS database for future land management activities

The database will provide a complete picture of lands conserved in the San Diego region and will be used to determine how the habitat preserve planning area is being assembled under all the subregional habitat conservation plans in the region, assist with determining lands that should be managed and monitored, as well as assist in determining priorities for land acquisitions.

If this expenditure is approved by the SANDAG Board, SANDAG staff, with assistance from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), will prepare a detailed scope of work including responsible agencies for each task. SANDAG will then enter into an agreement with the USFWS to complete the work.

Estimated Cost: $100,000 to $125,000

b. Conduct post wildfire monitoring in response to the 2003 wildfires

This project has been funded to date by U.S. Geologic Survey (USGS) and the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) but is in need of additional funding to continue the surveys.

Southern California has been identified as the region in North America with the greatest density of threatened and endangered species and at greatest risk for biodiversity loss. In October and November 2003, fires consumed approximately 750,000 acres of mostly wildlands in southern California. This includes almost 300,000 acres in San Diego County from the Cedar and Otay fires, and 91,000 acres in the San Bernardino Mountains from the Old Fire. These large fires will have short- and long-term impacts on many native wildlife communities and many native plants and animals.

Existing and planned preserve areas designated in the Multiple Species Conservation Plan (MSCP) were seriously damaged by two of the fires. Concern over the recovery of these habitats and the covered species that occur in these landscapes was discussed among the wildlife agencies, and it was determined that post-burn monitoring should become a priority for several years within this preserve. The threats and challenges to maintaining biodiversity and ecosystem function within urbanizing landscapes are not well known and require an understanding of the success and failure of critical assumptions of preserve design in this region.

The California Department of Fish and Game’s Resource Assessment Program (RAP) provided funding to begin post-fire monitoring of select vertebrates, invertebrates, and plants in previous study areas that were wholly or partially burned in the Cedar and Otay fires. Additionally, substantial USGS funding was redirected to this work to continue the scheduled surveys.
If this expenditure is approved by the SANDAG Board, USGS staff, with assistance from the USFWS, will prepare a detailed scope of work including responsible agencies for each task. SANDAG will then enter into an agreement with the USGS and the USFWS to complete the work.

Estimated Cost: $100,000 - 150,000.

c. Fund on-site land management

The implementing agreements for the habitat conservation plans require that the preserve system be managed. Land management activities are determined based on the needs of each property within the preserve. Land management activities can include: removing exotic species, picking up trash, maintaining trails, building and repairing fences, weeding vernal pools, and erosion control.

The EMP Working Group recommends that approximately $750,000 be spent on key components of the regional preserve system in need of land management. The process for allocating the funds is outlined in Section 2 of the report.

Estimated Cost: $750,000

TOTAL PROPOSED BUDGET:

a. Develop a database of conserved lands for the San Diego Region $100,000 – 125,000
b. Conduct post wildfire monitoring in response to the 2003 wildfires $100,000 – 150,000
   c. Fund on-site land management up to $750,000

   Total not to exceed $1,000,000

2. Proposed process for allocating FY 2006 EMP funds for land management activities

The EMP Working Group reviewed three alternative procedures for allocating FY 2006 EMP funds for land management activities and recommends support for the third alternative (Alternative “C”) by the RPC.

a. Develop a program by which jurisdictions, habitat land managers, and other entities can apply for the funds once a year, based upon set criteria.

   Keeping with the discussion above, the criteria should be designed to advance the MSCP and the MHCP including priorities identified within each category (land acquisition, land management, and biological monitoring) and the program as a whole. Based upon established criteria, entities would apply for the funds in response to an annual “call for projects.”

b. Allocate the EMP funds to projects identified by the EMP Working Group based upon set criteria.

   This alternative would differ from the “call for projects” alternative by giving responsibility to the EMP Working Group to recommend to the Regional Planning Committee and SANDAG Board how the funding should be distributed. For example, the working group could recommend a project or projects that demonstrate how a regional conservation
program could function. The draft needs assessment identifies several tasks that need to be performed in order to have a true regional biological monitoring program.

c. For FY 2006 EMP funds, the EMP Working Group makes recommendations to the Regional Planning Committee on land management activities through a “call for projects,” based upon the criteria for eligible land management projects (attached). For FY2007 and beyond, the EMP Working Group would make recommendations to the SANDAG Board on criteria, a process, and procedures, based on the Regional Preserve Implementation Assessment and the availability of RHCF funds.

This alternative recognizes the time constraints for this year’s funding. After the criteria and process are approved, EMP Working Group members and the cities and the county would submit projects for FY 2006 land management funding. The EMP Working Group would recommend a list of projects based on the criteria. Future funding allocations (FY 2007 and beyond) would be determined after the needs assessment is completed and as the availability of funds is determined.

3. Criteria for eligible land management projects (FY 2006)

The Working Group is recommending that the attached flow chart and weighting criteria (Attachments 1 and 2) be approved and used to evaluate land management proposals. The flow chart will be used to develop an allocation process including quantitative criteria for ranking projects.

In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15300, the activities described above are exempt from the requirement of CEQA to prepare an environmental document. Specifically, the activities described above are exempt from CEQA Sections 15301(h,i) (existing facilities) and 15306 (information collection).

Next Steps

If the Regional Planning Committee gives its recommendation, the SANDAG Board would consider the recommendation at its December 16, 2005, meeting. If the Board approves the recommendation, a call for projects would be sent to the member agencies and EMP Working Group members and posted on the SANDAG Web site. Staff would recommend that a selection committee (made up of EMP Working Group members and/or other qualified individuals who do not have an affiliation with any proposed project) rank the projects in accordance with the diagram and weighting criteria. The Regional Planning Committee would then approve a list of projects at its February 2006 meeting; and the Board would ratify the list at its February 2006 meeting. Also, if the Board approves the recommendation, contracts will be signed with the USFWS to prepare the conserved lands database, and the USGS to conduct post wildfire monitoring.

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachments: 1. Criteria for Eligible Land Management Projects (FY 06)
2. Weighting Criteria for Funding Requests

Key Staff Contact: Janet Fairbanks, (619) 699-6970, jfa@sandag.org
**EMP Criteria For Eligible Management Projects (FY 06 Funding)**

**Is the project biologically significant?**
For example:
- Does it support natural vegetation in a core area?
- Is the project important and contribute to the NCCP regional preserve system?
- Is it a linkage or regional wildlife corridor?
- Are there (or were there) significant populations of covered species or species proposed for coverage by a habitat conservation plan?

| NO | YES |

**Is the project area at risk of further degradation if no management is provided?**
For example:
- Does the site suffer from human or domestic animal disturbance (e.g., ORV use, grazing)?
- Do exotic, invasive species threaten the preserve?
- Uncontrolled erosion?

| NO | YES |

**Is funding necessary to complete the project as verified by the Wildlife Agency?**

| NO | YES |

---

**ELIGIBLE PROJECT:** Prioritization of eligible projects. Factors for consideration:
- Sites that support rare vegetation types or populations of narrow endemics (e.g., Tier 1 habitats, vernal pools)
- Critical linkage parcels or regional wildlife corridor
- Success of management activities is likely (e.g., Arundo removal at the top of a watershed will receive higher priority than a site in the middle)
- Lack of management on the site may affect continued coverage of species
- Dedicated staff (agency, jurisdiction, NGO) willing to assume long-term management
- What percentage are matching contributions available to complete the project?
## Project Evaluation Criteria for FY 06 Land Management Requests

*(EMP Criteria for Eligible Management Projects Weighting Criteria as recommended by the EMP Working Group for SANDAG RPC and BOARD consideration)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Point Range</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Maximum Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sites support rare vegetation types or populations of narrow endemics.</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical linkage parcels or regional wildlife corridor.</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success of management activities is likely.</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of management on the site may affect continued coverage of species.</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated Staff (agency, jurisdiction, NCO) willing to assume long-term management.</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What % are matching contributions available to complete the project.</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL:** 110
R CP presents policy objectives and actions aimed at improving transportation and land use coordination. A key recommendation is to identify smart growth opportunity areas and place a higher priority on directing transportation facility improvements and other infrastructure resources toward those areas.

The R CP defines seven categories of smart growth “place types,” ranging from “metropolitan center” to “rural village.” In addition, the R CP recommends that smart growth development be planned near existing and future transit stations, as well as other appropriate locations such as rural community village cores, which can provide a focal point for commercial and civic uses that serve surrounding rural areas.

One of the R CP’s key actions is the development of a Smart Growth Concept Map illustrating the location of existing, planned, and potential smart growth areas. The Concept Map will be used in relation to two key SANDAG initiatives:

1. Updating the 2030 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), where it will help in the prioritization of transportation infrastructure investments and deployment of transit services to support smart growth development, and

2. Determining eligibility to participate in the long-term Smart Growth Incentive Program (SGIP) funded by TransNet.

Last July, the Regional Planning Committee (RPC) reviewed a preliminary draft Smart Growth Concept Map and a series of accompanying subregional maps. Since then, SANDAG staff and the local planning directors, through the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG), have continued to work on refining the smart growth areas and addressing a number of issues that have arisen from the mapping process.

In addition, the TWG and the Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group (SWG) have provided input on an “illustrative” version of the Concept Map that could be used during the public input process. The illustrative map is more conceptual than the preliminary map reviewed by the RPC last July. While the illustrative map still needs additional work, it will be circulated at the RPC meeting for review and comment.
The Regional Planning Committee is asked to comment on the key issues described in this report and provide input on the sample illustrative map to be circulated at the meeting.

Discussion

Uses of the Map

The Smart Growth Concept Map will be used in relation to two key SANDAG initiatives: updating the comprehensive 2007 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and determining eligibility for the long-term TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program (SGIP). The map will be used to develop the land use scenarios for the RTP, including the Regional Growth Forecast (Existing Plans and Policies) and an Enhanced Smart Growth scenario. These scenarios will be used in the environmental analysis of the RTP. The map also will be used in the update of the transportation project evaluation criteria that will occur as part of the RTP work program. These criteria are used to determine priorities for transportation funding.

In addition to the RTP, the map also will be used to determine eligibility to compete for future funding from the long-term TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program. The intent of the program is to provide incentives to plan and provide for the infrastructure to support smart growth development in our communities.

The map will be updated periodically to reflect ongoing general plan amendments and updates. Regular updates to the map will ensure accurate land use inputs into future growth forecasts and RTP updates and will allow active participation by local jurisdictions in the future SGIP.

Mapping Effort

The seven smart growth place types identified in the RCP fall into two distinct categories – “Existing and Planned Smart Growth Areas” and “Potential Smart Growth Areas.” The RCP includes recommended land use characteristics, intensity targets, and transportation system and public transit service characteristics for each of the seven place types.

Existing and planned smart growth areas are places where existing development and/or planned land uses are consistent with the recommended residential and employment land use intensities and characteristics described in the RCP’s Smart Growth Matrix, and are (or will be) served by appropriate levels of public transit. Potential smart growth areas are places where there are opportunities for smart growth development, if local land use plans and/or regional plans for transportation and transit service are changed.

The designation of smart growth areas as either Existing/Planned or Potential is important because it will affect the kind of funding that areas will be eligible to compete for in the long-term SGIP. As previously discussed with the Regional Planning Committee, Existing/Planned smart growth areas will be eligible for both planning and infrastructure grants while Potential smart growth areas will be eligible for planning grants only.

The TWG has been serving as the lead advisory group in preparing the Concept Map. Last spring, city and county planning staffs identified areas within their jurisdictions that they believed could be
classified as either Existing/Planned or Potential smart growth areas. These areas were shown on the preliminary draft map reviewed by the RPC last July.

During the summer, SANDAG staff evaluated the areas for consistency with the land use intensity thresholds and transit service levels included in the RCP Smart Growth Matrix, using SANDAG’s land use database. This verification process, as discussed in Attachment 1, has resulted in a number of questions related to the broader policy issue of what degree of flexibility should be allowed in making final determinations with respect to identifying the Existing/Planned smart growth areas, and in the recognition that the development of the Concept Map needs to be more closely related to the 2007 RTP update, the Comprehensive Operational Analysis (COA) currently underway by the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS), and the work of the Independent Transit Planning Peer Review Panel.

**Process to Refine the Concept Map**

While the TWG and the SWG have been the most actively involved advisory groups in the preparation of the Concept Map, staff has also met with the Independent Transit Planning Peer Review Panel to discuss the Concept Map on two occasions. The meetings with the Peer Review Panel have been very helpful and have led to the recognition that the various land use and transit planning efforts currently underway need stronger coordination. For example, while the current draft Concept Map relies on the transit networks included in the adopted RTP, the final Concept Map should reflect revised transit service concepts that are being recommended in the COA, the Independent Transit Planning Review, and other input into the updated Regional Transportation Plan.

In addition, various members of the Peer Review Panel have suggested that the Concept Map be less inclusive and instead focus on areas planned for significant land use intensity where major regional transit investments have already been made. This approach would maximize the region’s use of existing investments in its transit system and provide additional incentives for increased development around existing and planned transit stations before expanding the transit system to areas that may generate less transit ridership.

As a result of these discussions, and in coordination with the 2007 RTP update, staff believes that it would be useful to develop several alternative “enhanced smart growth” land use / transportation scenarios based on variations of the Concept Map and transit service concepts, and to test the transportation, housing, land consumption, and environmental effects of those alternatives through the development of the 2007 RTP update.

The current Smart Growth Concept Map includes all Existing/Planned or Potential smart growth areas identified by local jurisdictions. Understanding that the region will lack sufficient funding to complete transportation improvements or provide smart growth incentive funds to all of those areas by the year 2030, the Regional Planning Committee could provide policy direction on these alternatives, which could range from the existing, all-inclusive map, to a map that focuses exclusively on areas along existing/planned red and yellow car transit service, to a map that includes areas only along the yellow transit service lines, to a combination of these. Staff could develop performance measures to test which of the alternatives best implements the RCP policy objectives associated with housing, transportation, urban form, and the environment, such as affordable housing, mode share, transit ridership, air quality, land consumption, and others.
SANDAG could also use the upcoming public workshops to obtain input on these alternative land use/transportation scenarios related to different combinations of smart growth and transit in the draft RTP and also obtain public input on the transportation networks connecting the smart growth areas.

Because of the additional coordination necessary between SANDAG, the local planning staffs, MTS, North County Transit District (NCTD), and the Independent Transit Planning Peer Review Panel, it is anticipated that the workshops will be held sometime this spring. Holding the workshops this spring will allow staff, the Regional Planning Committee, and the working groups time to address remaining issues; provide the opportunity to more fully engage the city/county managers and members of the SANDAG Board of Directors in discussions on the Concept Map before the workshops; and allow better integration of the Smart Growth Concept Map with the various efforts described above.

**Next Steps**

Based on the approach to public outreach and integration with other planning programs as outlined above, the following are the proposed next steps:

- Joint briefing with local city managers and planning directors: January 2006
- Revised illustrative map to TWG and SWG: January 2006
- Initial discussion with SANDAG Board members at Board retreat: Early February 2006
- Presentations to local City Councils / Board of Supervisors and other groups: February / March 2006
- Refinements to Concept Map and alternatives based on public input: April / May 2006
- Board action on draft Concept Map and alternatives for use in RTP update: June / July 2006

BOB LEITER  
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachment: 1. Overview of Process Used to Develop the Draft Smart Growth Concept Map

Key Staff Contact: Carolina Gregor, (619) 699-1989, cgr@sandag.org
Overview of Process Used to Develop the Draft Smart Growth Concept Map

Over the past year, staff has been working with the local planning directors in the region to identify the initial list of smart growth areas for inclusion on the Smart Growth Concept Map. The planning directors were asked to identify areas in their jurisdictions that exemplified the characteristics of the smart growth place types contained in the RCP and listed below. The planning directors also were asked to estimate whether the areas should be classified as "Existing/Planned" smart growth areas or "Potential" smart growth areas based on whether they meet the residential and employment targets contained in the table below, and whether they meet certain transit service characteristics contained in the RCP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Smart Growth Place Type</th>
<th>Minimum Residential Target based on RCP</th>
<th>Minimum Employment Target based on RCP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Center</td>
<td>75 du/ac</td>
<td>80 emp/ac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Center</td>
<td>40 du/ac</td>
<td>50 emp/ac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Center</td>
<td>20 du/ac</td>
<td>30 emp/ac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Center</td>
<td>20 du/ac</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Village</td>
<td>10.9 du/ac</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Use Center</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>45 emp/ac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Corridor</td>
<td>25 du/ac</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once the planning directors identified the areas and estimated their status (Existing/Planned or Potential), staff initiated a "verification" process to determine whether the areas met the residential and employment targets, and the associated transit service levels. (The verification process did not include analysis of urban design characteristics at this stage.)

The verification process is based on data included in SANDAG’s geographic information system (GIS) databases. The information in our GIS databases is updated on a periodic basis as part of the regional growth forecast update. SANDAG is in the process of updating the regional growth forecast, and has been working with local jurisdictions to obtain local land use inputs based on their most recently updated local general plans and policies. The criteria for verifying the smart growth areas is based on:

- Projected net residential densities in 2030,
- Projected net employment densities in 2030, and
- Existing/planned transit service levels included in the existing RTP, MOBILITY 2030.

Over the summer, SANDAG staff "ran the numbers" for the smart growth areas. Initial results indicated that approximately one-fifth of the areas identified by the planning directors qualified as "Existing/Planned" smart growth areas based on the criteria listed above.

SANDAG held subregional working sessions with local planning staff members to discuss their areas; consider the addition, deletion, or modification of any areas; verify their data; and identify remaining policy and technical issues. SANDAG currently is in the process of resolving remaining issues.
STATUS REPORT ON REGIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN (RCP) MONITORING PROGRAM

Introduction

The Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP), which was adopted by the SANDAG Board of Directors in July 2004, is now moving into the implementation phase. Chapter 8 of the RCP describes using performance indicators as a tool to track our progress in implementing the plan. Many of the strategies and actions recommended in the plan will take years to develop and fund. Therefore, it is important to have a consistent and valid set of indicators that can reflect the sometimes subtle changes that occur over the long run. Future annual reports on these indicators will be used to assess the degree to which RCP implementation is having a positive impact on the region.

Monitoring our progress in implementing the RCP is both a recommendation of the RCP and a legal requirement. Assembly Bill 361 included the specific requirement that SANDAG monitor progress through “realistic measurable standards and criteria, which must be included in the RCP itself and made available to the public.” The preliminary list of indicators was published as part of the RCP.

Staff is scheduled to release a draft first annual RCP performance monitoring report in spring 2006. This report will consist of a baseline report, targets for certain indicators, and analysis that will begin to assess where we are, and where we want to be in 5 years, 10 years, and 25 years. Staff is assembling data for the baseline report and identifying the indicators where there is a mandated or otherwise established target. The next steps are to draft the baseline report and to identify initial targets that will be included in the first annual monitoring report.

Discussion

Role and Relationship of RCP Monitoring to Other SANDAG Monitoring Reports

In addition to monitoring the Regional Comprehensive Plan, SANDAG undertakes three other performance monitoring programs on a regular basis:

- The Regional Transportation Plan
- The State of the Commute Report
- The Sustainable Competitiveness Index

These programs are currently maintained independently, but work is underway to coordinate and integrate the above four performance monitoring programs. Integration of the programs will result in greater consistency at a policy level and improved efficiency of data collection at an administrative level.

In integrating the programs, the RCP will provide the overarching framework for all performance monitoring at SANDAG. Staff members who are responsible for each monitoring program are
currently working to refine and integrate the programs, streamline the indicators required by each program, and perhaps even combine some of the reports or the indicators included therein.

**Baseline Monitoring Report**

In preparing the RCP, SANDAG’s Regional Planning Committee, the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG), and the previous Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group (SWG) discussed and developed a set of performance indicators to monitor the region’s progress toward achieving the goals and objectives of the RCP. Attachment 1 shows the resulting list of indicators. A primary prerequisite for all of the annual indicators was that they must be based on data that are available, consistent, and reliable.

The first annual RCP performance monitoring report is scheduled for release next spring. The report will include data and analysis for most indicators, and status updates for those indicators where data is not currently available.

**Establishing Initial Targets**

Staff is recommending that the initial set of targets be related to existing laws and adopted plans which already set forth quantitative targets. The following table outlines the targets that have been identified so far:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RCP Area</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Target Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Commute mode share</td>
<td>10% transit</td>
<td>Mobility 2030: The Regional Transportation Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Environment</td>
<td>Air Quality Index</td>
<td>Attainment of 8-hour ozone standard by 2009</td>
<td>Federal Clean Air Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Facilities</td>
<td>Share of energy produced in the region vs. imported</td>
<td>65% by 2010; 75% by 2030</td>
<td>Energy 2030: The San Diego Regional Energy Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Facilities</td>
<td>Share of energy produced from renewable resources</td>
<td>15% by 2010; 25% by 2020; 40% by 2030</td>
<td>Energy 2030: The San Diego Regional Energy Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Facilities</td>
<td>Percent of waste that is recycled</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>AB 939</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, staff is working toward establishing targets for:

- Housing supply, using the Regional Housing Allocation goals,
- Habitat conserved within designated preserve areas, based on Multiple Species Conservation Program/Multiple Habitat Conservation Program goals, and
- Beach widths, based on goals set forth in the Shoreline Preservation Strategy for the San Diego Region.

Staff is continuing to review existing plans and policies to identify any other mandates for inclusion as targets in the first annual RCP performance monitoring report.

The first report will include a discussion on our progress in meeting the initial targets described above. For the remaining indicators, the direction and general approach for setting targets in the
future will be discussed in this report as well. Once the first annual monitoring report is released, staff will work with the TWG, the SWG, and the Regional Planning Committee to develop targets for additional indicators for inclusion in future annual monitoring reports.

**Next Steps**

Between now and spring 2006, staff will be developing the first annual RCP performance monitoring report, in conjunction with overall performance monitoring coordination. Staff will provide a copy of the first annual report to the TWG and the SWG for review and comment prior to presenting the report to the Regional Planning Committee.

**BOB LEITER**
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachment: 1. Annual Indicators for Monitoring the Regional Comprehensive Plan

Key Staff Contact: Christine Eary, (619) 699-6928, cea@sandag.org
### ANNUAL INDICATORS FOR MONITORING THE REGIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

#### 1. URBAN FORM / TRANSPORTATION

- A. Share of new units and jobs located in Smart Growth Opportunity Areas
- B. Share of new housing units within County Water Authority water service boundary
- C. Annual weekday transit ridership
- D. Commute mode shares (single-occupancy vehicles, carpool, transit, walking, biking, etc.)
- E. Travel times and volumes for key auto corridors and key transit corridors
- F. Miles of deficient roads on Congestion Management Program network
- G. Annual hours of delay per capita
- H. Regional crime rates

#### 2. HOUSING

- A. Housing Affordability Index (compares median home ownership costs to median income)
- B. Percent of households with housing costs greater than 35 percent of income
- C. Ratio of new jobs to new housing units
- D. Share of new and existing units by structure type (single family, multifamily) and income category
- E. Vacancy rates
- F. Percent of households living in overcrowded conditions
- G. Number of households on the waiting list for Section 8 (housing assistance) Vouchers

#### 3. HEALTHY ENVIRONMENT

**Natural Habitats**
- A. Habitat conserved within designated preserve areas (acres and percent of preserve area)
- B. Percent of preserve area actively maintained (removal of invasive species, trash removal, fence repairs)

**Water Quality**
- A. Number of beach closures and advisories per rainfall inch measured at Lindbergh Field
- B. Impaired waterbodies (miles or acres) based on Federal Clean Water Act 303(d) criteria

**Shoreline Preservation**
- A. Beach widths
- B. Lagoon health (salinity, dissolved oxygen levels)

**Air Quality**
- A. Air Quality Index (number of days "unhealthy for sensitive groups" with AQI > 100)

#### 4. ECONOMIC PROSPERITY

- A. Regional unemployment rate compared to state and nation
- B. Real per capita income
- C. Regional poverty rate compared to state and nation
- D. Employment growth in high-wage economic clusters
- E. Educational attainment (Share of adult population with high school, college, and graduate education)
5. PUBLIC FACILITIES

**Water Supply**
- A. Water consumption per capita and total
- B. Diversity of water supply (share of regional water supply, by source)
- C. Amount of reclaimed water used

**Energy**
- A. Kilowatt hours of electricity used per capita at peak hours
- B. Share of energy produced in the region vs. imported
- C. Share of energy produced from renewable resources

**Waste Management**
- A. Percent of waste that is recycled
- B. Landfill space available

6. BORDERS

- A. Border wait times for Secure Electronic Network for Travelers Rapid Inspection (Sentri) lanes, and non-Sentri lanes
- B. Interregional commute volumes into San Diego from surrounding counties and Baja California
- C. Participation in Sentri Lanes, pedestrian commuter program, Free and Secure Trade (FAST) program