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REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

Friday, October 6, 2006
12 noon to 2 p.m.
SANDAG Board Room
401 B Street, 7th Floor
San Diego

AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

• REPORT ON REGIONAL SHORELINE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES

• SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE INDEPENDENT TRANSIT PLANNING REVIEW PANEL RELATED TO LAND USE AND THE SMART GROWTH CONCEPT MAP

• SMART GROWTH URBAN DESIGN GUIDELINES

• SPRINTER STAKEHOLDERS WORKING GROUP

• PUBLIC HEALTH IMPACTS OF LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION PLANS

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.
ITEM # | RECOMMENDATION
---|---
+1. APPROVAL OF AUGUST 4, 2006, 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.

CONSENT ITEMS (Items 3 and 4)

+3. ADDITIONS TO SMART GROWTH CONCEPT MAP (Carolina Gregor) | RECOMMEND

Based on the most recent iteration of the Otay Mesa Community Plan update, the City of San Diego is requesting the addition of two potential smart growth areas to the Smart Growth Concept Map for analysis in the 2007 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The additions include a Potential Urban Center in the core of the Otay Mesa community and a Potential Special Use Center for a Southwestern College Satellite Campus. The letter from the City requesting these additions is attached. The Regional Planning Committee is asked to recommend that the SANDAG Board of Directors approve the proposed additions to the Smart Growth Concept Map for use in the 2007 RTP.

+4. AMERICAN PLANNING ASSOCIATION’S INAUGURAL “NATIONAL COMMUNITY PLANNING MONTH” (Susan Baldwin) | APPROVE

During October, the American Planning Association (APA) is celebrating “National Community Planning Month” in recognition of the achievements of planning. This annual event will help raise the visibility of planning and recognize the contributions of the planning profession and the individuals who work to make our communities enjoyable, endearing, and valuable. This year’s theme is “Making Great Communities Through Planning.” The Regional Planning Committee is asked to adopt the attached proclamation that recognizes Community Planning Month in the San Diego region. SANDAG, the San Diego Section of APA, and the Planning Directors Association will work together over the coming year to recognize local achievements in planning during the October 2007 celebration.
CHAIR’S REPORT (Item 5)

5. CHAIR’S REPORT (Mayor Lori Holt Pfeiler)  

INFORMATION

a. Introduction of new Planning Department staff: Four new staff members joined the Planning Department recently and will be introduced to the Regional Planning Committee.

b. Fred Kent DVD: *Creating Public Spaces*: Since the Fred Kent DVD was shown at the Regional Planning Committee meeting in June, several copies have been distributed to meeting attendees and the DVD has been shown in a variety of venues.

c. Regional Blueprint Learning Network: The state Business, Transportation, and Housing (BT&H) Agency established the Regional Blueprint Learning Network to work with metropolitan planning organizations and councils of government to further advance regional planning. This effort has included a series of meetings with stakeholders throughout the state. Mayor Holt Pfeiler attended the most recent meeting in Oakland and will provide an update.

REPORTS (Items 6 through 10)

+6. REPORT ON REGIONAL SHORELINE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES  
(Shelby Tucker)  

INFORMATION

Staff will present an overview of the Regional Beach Sand Project, which was completed in 2001, and provide an update on what has occurred in the past five years. Additionally, staff will report on the condition of the region’s coastline today, recommended next steps for preserving and restoring the region’s beaches, and report on a coastal habitat study prepared by the City of Encinitas.

+7. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE INDEPENDENT TRANSIT PLANNING REVIEW PANEL RELATED TO LAND USE AND THE SMART GROWTH CONCEPT MAP  
(Coleen Clementson)  

INFORMATION

At its meeting of June 23, 2006, the SANDAG Board of Directors accepted the draft Independent Transit Planning Review report for planning purposes for the 2007 RTP. Many of the recommendations in the report are related to land use and smart growth and have been organized into the attached tables for information. Staff will provide an overview of the content to the Committee. Staff is also discussing the recommendations with the Regional Planning Technical Working Group for consideration with respect to the Smart Growth Concept Map and the preparation of the Smart Growth Urban Design Guidelines.
The Regional Comprehensive Plan calls for the preparation of urban design guidelines to illustrate and further define how smart growth should occur in the San Diego region. Earlier this year the Regional Planning Committee approved the formation of the Urban Design Ad Hoc Working Group to provide input on the development of the guidelines. The Working Group has met and provided input on a general scope of work and document outline. Staff will provide a status report and ask the Regional Planning Committee for feedback and comments on the draft outline.

At the March 2006 Regional Planning Committee meeting, Supervisor Pam Slater-Price suggested the formation of a working group consisting of planning directors and public works directors from jurisdictions served by the SPRINTER rail line. The purpose of the group will be to serve as a forum to share information and ideas related to the implementation of smart growth around the SPRINTER stations. A draft charter for the group that identifies the group’s purpose, membership, and meeting time and location is attached.

Childhood obesity is a significant and growing health concern that has reached epidemic proportions. The San Diego County Childhood Obesity Action Plan addresses this challenge through multiple strategies and domains. Tracy Delaney from County of San Diego Health and Human Services (Maternal, Child & Family Health Services) will discuss childhood obesity and the emerging connections between public health and urban design.

The next meeting of the Regional Planning Committee is scheduled for Friday, November 3, 2006, at 12 noon.
Regional Planning Committee (RPC) Chair Lori Holt Pfeiler convened the Joint Regional Planning and Transportation Committee meeting at 11:12 a.m.

CONSENT (A)

A. 2007 COMPREHENSIVE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN WHITE PAPER: ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION PROGRAM (INFORMATION)

A number of white papers are being developed for the 2007 Comprehensive Regional Transportation (RTP). The TransNet Environmental Mitigation Program is intended to improve the preservation of habitat areas associated with regional transportation projects. The information in this paper will be used in the development of the 2007 RTP.

Action: The Transportation and Regional Planning Committees accepted Consent Item A for information.

REPORTS (B and C)

B. PILOT SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM: ADDITIONAL FUNDING AND STATUS REPORT (APPROVE)

Chair Holt Pfeiler introduced this status report on the Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program regarding potential additional funding and a status report.

Stephan Vance, Senior Regional Planner, explained that this item included two parts. The first being the recommendation of the $4.3 million in additional funding available for the Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program (PSGIP) and the second part is to provide a brief update on the status of the projects that were previously approved.
The Regional Planning Committee (RPC) and Transportation Committee (TC) jointly approved $19 million in federal Transportation Enhancement (TE) program funds for the PSGIP in September 2005. That action funded 14 projects out of a list of 33 projects. The projects were ranked based upon the criteria (shown in the matrix in Attachment 1 of the staff report) and the evaluation process developed by the Working Groups and approved by the RPC and TC.

Since then, an additional $4.3 million in TE funds has become available in the 2006 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). The STIP has two years of funding capacity—FY 2010 and FY 2011. Since the original call for projects included more good projects than were able to be funded, the staff recommendation is to use the original project priority list to fund two additional projects, as well as to fully fund two projects that were partially funded.

The two partially funded projects were the Old Palm Avenue Streetscape Improvement Project (City of Imperial Beach) and the Maple Street Pedestrian Plaza (City of Escondido). The original allocation for the Old Palm Avenue Streetscape Improvement Project was $685,000, and the recommendation is to add $315,000, giving the City the $1 million originally requested. The Maple Street Pedestrian Plaza (City of Escondido) was originally awarded $647,000. This action would add $298,000, for a total of $945,000 as originally requested.

The two new projects recommended for funding are the 25th Street Renaissance Project (City of San Diego) and the Grand Avenue/El Mercado Streetscape Project (City of Escondido). The 25th Street Renaissance Project would receive $1,425,000 to improve a six-block area north of State Route (SR) 94 along 25th Street with traffic calming and streetscape improvements. This commercial area in Golden Hill has high-frequency transit service. The Grand Avenue/El Mercado Streetscape Project (City of Escondido) would receive $1,320,000 for pedestrian scale lighting, enhanced sidewalks, and curb extensions. This project would also improve the connection between Escondido's downtown and the Escondido Transit Center.

After funding these projects, staff recommends that the remaining $942,000 be held in reserve as contingency for future uses either in this program or in future TE-eligible projects.

Attachment 3 of the staff report provides a brief update on the status of the projects that were previously funded.

In order to spend the funds that are awarded in this program, each project has to receive an allocation vote from the California Transportation Commission (CTC). The CTC recently voted on two projects that this program is funding: the Bird Rock Area Traffic Management Plan (City of San Diego) and the National City Boulevard Streetscape Enhancement Project (City of National City). These two projects can now move forward with construction.

Staff will continue to monitor all the projects over the next year and will return to the RPC/TC with a lessons learned report as the process to develop guidelines for the $280 million long-term TransNet-funded SGIP is initiated.
Councilmember Monroe made the motion to approve the staff recommendation, and Chairman Horn seconded the motion.

Deputy Mayor Lesa Heebner (North County Coastal) asked if the projects that have already been funded are identified on the Smart Growth Concept Map (SGCM). Mr. Vance responded that these projects were funded in advance of the SGCM being developed but they all fall into smart growth areas on the SGCM.

Deputy Mayor Heebner suggested that there be further discussions in the future regarding disincentives for sprawl growth as well as incentives for smart growth. She suggested that disincentives should be the other side of the equation.

Chair Holt Pfeiler commented that the approach in the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) is to use carrots, not sticks, and to continue to use carrots until they do not work.

Councilmember Dave Druker (North County Transit District [NCTD]) expressed concern that some of the projects on the list are sending the message that they are about smart growth but they are really pedestrian enhancements. There are two projects that he is aware of: the Solana Beach Mixed Use Development (NCTD) and the San Luis Rey Transit Center at North River Village (NCTD) that include high-density development along with the Transit Center. These projects are rated very low and are just the type of development that the Committees should be incentivizing. As this program moves into the next phase, it is extremely important that this be taken into consideration. In addition, the Committees are going to have to look at ways to notify builders that if projects are being built outside of the Smart Growth Areas, the builders will have to pay a fee.

Chairman Kellejian noted that there was quite a bit of discussion regarding this issue when the project selection criteria were being developed. One of the facts is the color of money. TE money can only be used for specific types of projects. The other fact is that 22 points were given to projects that had low-income housing, and that does not provide opportunities for cities that are built out. As the $280 million TransNet Smart Growth funds become available, the criteria and requirements, hopefully, will be different.

Gary Gallegos, Executive Director, added that there also will be new Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) numbers to consider.

Councilmember Druker commented that he understands the color of money but, as this program moves forward, the Committees need to ensure that the message being sent to the public is that those areas that are growing smart will be incentivized.

Councilmember Monroe stated that there were a lot of good ideas discussed when the project selection criteria for the PSGiP were being developed. He is glad to see that new projects can be picked up.

Councilmember Toni Atkins (City of San Diego) pointed out that the North Park community has supported the density in the urban core because it is getting some of the amenities that local government promised along with the density. Amenities such as lights, sidewalks, and pedestrian orientation need to be connected to transit to convince the communities that...
intensification and densification can be a benefit if done correctly. If some of the infrastructure and amenities are not put in place in advance, it will take longer to work with communities to have them understand that it can be okay. She commended staff for doing a good job with an almost impossible set of criteria.

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Monroe and a second by Chairman Horn, the Transportation and Regional Planning Committees unanimously approved $4.3 million in additional Transportation Enhancement program funding for the Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program as described in the Discussion section of the staff report.

C. REGIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN: DRAFT BASELINE REPORT FOR PERFORMANCE MONITORING (ACCEPT)

Chair Holt Pfeiler stated that staff will discuss the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) - Draft Baseline Report for Performance Monitoring. She commented that SANDAG is truly good at providing quality information. The hope and expectation is that local jurisdictions use this information to make different decisions that support the RCP. This is the first Baseline Report and it contains a lot of good information.

Coleen Clementson, Principal Regional Planner, provided the TC and RPC members with the first draft Baseline Report for the RCP. Assembly Bill (AB) 361 (Kehoe) mandated that the RCP be prepared and that SANDAG monitor progress toward RCP implementation through realistic and measurable indicators. The RCP discusses how to approach monitoring in Chapter 8 and includes the 39 indicators to monitor progress over time. This report establishes a baseline for future performance monitoring that can be used over time to see how well SANDAG is doing. The report explains the significance of each of the 39 indicators, it reports findings for the most recent data available (in most cases the report covers at least five years of data and includes data from 2005), and provides a discussion of SANDAG’s work efforts underway that may influence performance over time.

The report indicators are organized into six categories, which are subject areas that are in the RCP: Urban Forum and Transportation, Housing, Healthy Environment, Economic Prosperity, Public Facilities, and Borders. Staff presented the Committees with one example to illustrate how the report is organized.

It is known that many of the actions and the paradigm shifts proposed in the RCP will take years to implement and fund, and that some of the short-term impacts may be subtle and difficult to recognize. In general, there appear to be areas where the region is moving in the right direction. Nearly one-third of the new housing units built in 2005 were located within the Smart Growth Opportunity Areas on the Draft Smart Growth Concept Map; transit ridership has increased significantly with population growth over the last several years, and the transit mode share has remained at nearly 4 percent; crime has decreased; beach closures adjusted for weather have declined; the days where there have been air quality issues have gone down significantly; the workforce is increasingly more educated; and the energy produced from renewable sources has increased substantially.

The report also identifies some areas for improvement. Housing affordability continues to be an issue. In 2005, only 9 percent of the region’s population could actually afford a
median-priced home, which compared with 1995 data where 38 percent of households could purchase a home. Congestion on most roads and freeways has increased over the last ten years, as well as the amount of time that people are sitting in traffic. This is an area where progress can be monitored as the Early Actions in TransNet are constructed and hopefully, over time, there will be some reduction in these areas. There are a number of impaired water bodies in the region. Several of our beaches are losing sand, and most of the region’s job growth (59 percent) remains in low-wage industries.

Next steps include a 60-day public review and comment period. During that time, the report will be presented to the Regional Planning Technical and Stakeholders Working Groups. Any adjustments needed will be made and staff will bring the document to the Board of Directors for consideration in October.

Supervisor Pam Slater-Price (County of San Diego) expressed appreciation for the staff report. She indicated that she is cautious when hearing housing statistics because they don’t ring true when you have housing developments that open up and the houses are pre-sold or there are lines around the block to purchase the homes. She pointed out that if you were to look at homeownership throughout the county it would be much higher than 50 percent. She feels that these numbers need to be adjusted because saying that no one can afford a home defies reality and the numbers need to be put in context with the actual home sales of both existing and new homes, as well as the condominium shares and re-sales. She admitted that homes are pricey in San Diego because the region has a lot to offer. She made the motion to approve the staff recommendation.

Councilmember Emery seconded the motion.

Chairman Kellejian asked if the 4 percent of increased transit use reflected all modes of transportation. He asked what time of the day does the ridership increase. Ms. Clementson noted that the ridership increase is home-to-work trips, which is considered peak period.

Councilmember Bob Emery (Metropolitan Transit System [MTS]) questioned if that was regionwide. Ms. Clementson responded that that is a regionwide number and does not identify the specific corridors.

Councilmember Emery commented that if you put those numbers on the major transit corridors, you’d get a much higher number—that needs to be identified.

Chairman Kellejian stated that when these numbers are distributed, they need to be specific. There isn’t transit in many of the areas and a lot of areas have good density but don’t have the ability to be serviced by public transit. Ms. Clementson commented that the report also discusses that the next indicator in line is travel times in key corridors. However, that data isn’t available for this report. Discussions have been held about where to make the transit investment and what the return on the investment would be.

Councilmember Druker mentioned that he is happy to have the report. His main concern is setting the targets and what will happen if those targets are not met, especially for smart growth. Specific targets need to be met, and if they aren’t being met, a decision needs to be made as to what is going to be done.
Mr. Gallegos pointed out that the key to that issue is that elected officials in the region are the land use decision-makers. It has a lot to do with what the local jurisdictions do with their general plans. In looking at the Smart Growth Concept Map, 40 percent of the areas are in adopted local plans; the other 60 percent require changes to local plans to make them happen.

Councilmember Monroe stated that he enjoyed this report and it included a lot of information. He noted that power is being added to data when time is included. He mentioned that the Committees need to look at what industry standards are and/or what other areas are doing to set targets. He concluded that this is a great report with a great format and was very well done.

Supervisor Slater-Price announced that on Wednesday, August 2, the County Board of Supervisors (BOS) looked at the circulation element for its General Plan update 2020 and in that process they changed a lot of their road designations from four lanes to two lanes in the more outlying rural areas, reducing the potential cost for the County by more than $7 billion, but also increased the capacity of roads that are closer in. The BOS also voted to put several roads that are currently shown on the Parkway Plan onto the map.

Chair Holt Pfeiler questioned whether the purpose of the 60-day review is to establish baseline information and then test the logic or is it just to collect data from various organizations. Ms. Clementson replied that there is a lot of data in the report and staff wants to make sure the information is easy to understand and accurate because this is a document that will be used for many years to come. Staff is looking to interested parties and the region’s experts to weigh in on it and allow staff time to consider the suggestions received.

Action: Upon a motion by Supervisor Slater-Price and a second by Councilmember Emery, the Transportation and Regional Planning Committees unanimously voted to accept the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP): Draft Baseline Report for Performance Monitoring and authorized the release of the draft report for a 60-day public review and comment period.

**ADJOURN JOINT MEETING WITH THE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE**

Chair Holt Pfeiler adjourned the joint portion of the meeting at 11:43 a.m.
The Regional Planning Committee meeting was called to order at 11:44 a.m. by Committee Chair Lori Holt Pfeiler (North County Inland). The attendance sheet for the meeting is attached.

1. APPROVAL OF JULY 2, 2006, MEETING MINUTES

   Action: Upon a motion made by Councilmember Jerry Jones (East County) and a second made by Mayor Pro Tem Matt Hall (North County Coastal), the Regional Planning Committee voted to approve the July 2, 2006, meeting minutes.

   Councilmember Carrie Downey (South County) requested that a change be made to the minutes. She noted that she was reporting on behalf of the Chair of the Shoreline Preservation Working Group, she is not the Chair of that Committee.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

   There were no public comments, communications, or member comments.

3. UPCOMING MEETINGS

   The meeting scheduled for Friday, September 1, 2006, has been cancelled. The next meeting of the Regional Planning Committee is scheduled for 12 noon to 2 p.m. on Friday, October 6, 2006.

4. ADJOURNMENT

   Chair Holt Pfeiler adjourned the meeting at 11:45 a.m.
## CONFIRMED ATTENDANCE
SANDAG REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING
June 2, 2006 - 10:00 a.m. to 11:45 a.m.

| GEOGRAPHICAL AREA       | JURISDICTION                        | NAME                                | MEMBER/ALTERNATE | ATTENDING
|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|-----------
| North County Inland     | City of Escondido                   | Lori Holt Pfeiler, Chair            | Member           | Yes       |
|                         | City of Vista                       | Steve Gronke                        | Alternate        | Yes       |
| South County            | City of Coronado                    | Carrie Downey                       | Member           | Yes       |
|                         | City of Imperial Beach              | Patricia McCoy                      | Alternate        | Yes       |
| North County Coastal    | City of Carlsbad                    | Matt Hall                           | Member           | Yes       |
|                         | City of Solana Beach                | Lesa Heebner                        | Alternate        | Yes       |
| East County             | City of Lemon Grove                 | Jerry Jones, Vice Chair             | Member           | Yes       |
|                         | City of La Mesa                     | Barry Jantz                         | Alternate        | Yes       |
| City of San Diego       | ----                                | Toni Atkins                         | Member           | Yes       |
|                         | ----                                | Jerry Sanders                       | Alternate        | Yes       |
| County of San Diego     | ----                                | Pam Slater-Price                    | Member           | Yes       |
|                         | ----                                | Bill Horn                           | Alternate        | Yes       |
| Advisory Members        | Caltrans, District 11               | Pedro Orso-Delgado                  | Member           | Yes       |
|                         |                                     | Bill Figge                          | Alternate        | Yes       |
| Advisory Member         | San Diego County Water Authority    | Howard Williams                     | Member           | Yes       |
|                         |                                     | Vacant                              | Alternate        |           |
| Advisory Member         | Department of Defense               | Susanah Aguilera                    | Member           | Yes       |
| Advisory Member         | San Diego Unified Port District     | William Hall                        | Member           | Yes       |
|                         |                                     | Bill Briggs                         | Alternate        | Yes       |
| Advisory Member         | MTS                                 | Harry Mathis (Chairman)             | Member           | Yes       |
|                         |                                     | Bob Emery                           | Alternate        | Yes       |
| Advisory Member         | NCTD                                | Dave Druker                         | Member           | Yes       |
|                         |                                     | Vacant                              | Alternate        |           |
| Advisory Member         | Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG) | Niall Fritz | Member | Yes |
|                         |                                     | Jim Sandoval                        | Alternate        | Yes       |
| Advisory Member         | Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group (SWG) | Bill Anderson | Member | Yes |
|                         |                                     | Sandor Shapery                      | Alternate        | Yes       |
| Environmental Mitigation Program Advisory Member | Wildlife Conservation Board | John Donnelly | Member | Yes |
|                         |                                     | Al Wright                           | Alternate        | Yes       |
| Environmental Mitigation Program Advisory Member | California Department of Fish and Game | Michael Mulligan | Member | Yes |
|                         |                                     | David Mayer                         | Alternate        | Yes       |
| Environmental Mitigation Program Advisory Member | U.S. Army Corps of Engineers | Mark Durham | Member | Yes |
|                         |                                     | Jeannette Baker                     | Alternate        | Yes       |
| Environmental Mitigation Program Advisory Member | U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service | Therese O’Rourke | Member | Yes |
|                         |                                     | Susan Wynn                          | Alternate        | Yes       |
Action Requested: RECOMMEND

ADDITIONS TO SMART GROWTH CONCEPT MAP

File Number 3000200

Introduction

On June 23, 2006, the SANDAG Board of Directors accepted the Smart Growth Concept Map for planning purposes for the 2007 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The Smart Growth Concept Map will assist in generating alternative land use and transportation scenarios that will be considered as part of the environmental assessment for the comprehensive 2007 RTP update.

Discussion

Requested Addition of Two Smart Growth Areas

The City of San Diego has requested the addition of two potential smart growth areas in the Otay Mesa community: a potential urban center in the core of the community and a potential special use center where a Southwestern College satellite campus is planned. These areas were not included in the Smart Growth Concept Map that was presented to the SANDAG Board in June because of the timing and status of the community planning process at that time. However, now that the planning process is further along, the City has requested, and SANDAG staff has expressed support for, the inclusion of these potential smart growth areas in the smart growth land use scenario for analysis in the 2007 RTP.

Land Use Scenarios

Staff anticipates at least the following two land use scenarios for the 2007 RTP.

1. Existing Plans and Policies Land Use Scenario: This scenario would reflect local inputs into the regional growth forecast, including local inputs on the Existing/Planned smart growth areas.

2. Enhanced Smart Growth Land Use Scenario: This scenario would build upon the Existing Plans and Policies Land Use Scenario described above, and in addition would incorporate certain land assumptions for the Potential smart growth areas.

Recommendation

The Regional Planning Committee is asked to recommend that the SANDAG Board of Directors approve the proposed addition of two potential smart growth areas in Otay Mesa to the Smart Growth Concept Map for use in the 2007 RTP. The additions are requested by the City of San Diego. The proposed additions will be presented to the SANDAG Board at its October 13, 2006, meeting.
Next Steps

The enhanced smart growth land use scenario will be used for transportation modeling purposes in the environmental document for the 2007 RTP. If the Regional Planning Committee and SANDAG Board of Directors concur with the City of San Diego’s request, the two additional potential smart growth areas in Otay Mesa would be included in the analysis. Staff will develop a series of transportation and transit alternatives to test under the two land use scenarios.

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachment: 1. Letter from City of San Diego requesting the addition of two Potential Smart Growth Areas in Otay Mesa to the Draft Smart Growth Concept Map

Key Staff Contact: Carolina Gregor, (619) 699-1989, cgr@sandag.org
September 6, 2006

Mr. Robert Leiter, AICP, Director
SANDAG
Land Use and Transportation Planning
401 B Street Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101

Dear Mr. Leiter:

Subject: Draft Smart Growth Concept Map/Otay Mesa

This letter is to request that the San Diego Association of Government (SANDAG) add two potential smart growth centers to the draft Smart Growth Concept Map for Otay Mesa. Specifically, the City of San Diego (City) is requesting the addition of a potential Urban Center along Airway Road between Heritage Road and Britannia Boulevard and a potential Special Use Center southwest of the future interchange of Interstate 905 and La Media Road.

City Planning & Community Investment staff is working on an update of the Otay Mesa Community Plan. When SANDAG originally contacted the City for input into the Smart Growth Concept Map for Otay Mesa, work on the Otay Mesa Community Plan land use plan was in its early stages. Thus, the City elected to propose a single potential community center in the western portion of Otay Mesa, as shown on the existing community plan land use map.

Since that time, work on the Otay Mesa Community Plan Update has progressed and the City is now analyzing three alternative land use scenarios in addition to the no project alternative. At a meeting last week with SANDAG staff, City staff considered whether to add one or more smart growth centers to the draft Smart Growth Concept Map to reflect the draft scenarios. It was determined that two potential centers are common to all three scenarios and are likely to be included in the approved plan. These include a potential Urban Center along Airway Road between Heritage Road and Britannia Boulevard and a potential Special Use Center southwest of the future interchange of Interstate 905 and La Media Road.

The potential Urban Center along Airway Road is intended to be a regional center due to its central location within this border community. In addition, the availability of land along major transportation corridors provides an excellent opportunity to provide a vibrant Urban Center with higher density residential and employment uses complemented by supportive commercial and civic uses. SANDAG’s generic Urban Center density assumptions would be applied to this area. The potential Special Use Center is targeted for the Southwestern College site which is
anticipated to have a future student population of 5,000. In addition to educational uses, this area is anticipated to support a mixture of complementary uses and would be highly supportive of transit. The City is requesting the two centers be added to the draft Smart Growth Concept Map. The boundaries of these centers have been provided to SANDAG staff.

Thank you for your consideration of this request. Please contact Mary Wright, Program Manager, at 619-533-4528 if you have any questions regarding this letter.

Sincerely,

William Anderson, FAICP, Director
City Planning and Community Investment

WA/MPW/ah

cc: Carolina Gregor, Senior Planner, SANDAG
Mary Wright, Program Manager, City Planning and Community Investment
Theresa Millette, Senior Planner, City Planning and Community Investment
Tait Galloway, Senior Planner, City Planning and Community Investment
PROCLAMATION
Community Planning Month

WHEREAS, change is constant and affects all cities, communities, counties, rural areas, and other places; and

WHEREAS, community planning and plans can help manage this change in a way that provides better choices for how people work and live; and

WHEREAS, community planning provides an opportunity for all residents to be meaningfully involved in making choices that determine the future of their community; and

WHEREAS, the full benefits of planning requires public officials and citizens who understand, support, and demand excellence in planning and plan implementation; and

WHEREAS, the month of October is designated as National Community Planning Month throughout the United States of America and its territories; and

WHEREAS, the American Planning Association and its professional institute, the American Institute of Certified Planners, endorse National Community Planning Month as an opportunity to highlight the contributions sound planning and plan implementation make to the quality of our settlements and environment; and

WHEREAS, the celebration of National Community Planning Month gives us the opportunity to publicly recognize the participation and dedication of the members of planning commissions, elected officials, and other citizen planners who have contributed their time and expertise to the improvement of the San Diego region; and

WHEREAS, we recognize the many valuable contributions made by professional community and city, county, and regional planners of the San Diego region and extend our heartfelt thanks for the continued commitment to public service by these professionals;

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the month of October 2006 is hereby designated as Community Planning Month in the San Diego region in conjunction with the inaugural celebration of National Community Planning Month.

Adopted this 2nd Day of October, 2006.

______________________________________ (SEAL)
Chair, Regional Planning Committee

______________________________________
Clerk
REPORT ON REGIONAL SHORELINE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES

Introduction

In September 2001, SANDAG completed construction of the Regional Beach Sand Project (RBSP), which placed 2.1 million cubic yards of clean, beach-quality sand at 12 eroded beaches from Imperial Beach to Oceanside. Over five miles of new beach was created using sand dredged from six offshore sites. Construction of the project took six months.

The $17.5 million project was funded by the U.S. Navy and California Department of Boating and Waterways. Support for the project was provided by members of our state and federal legislative delegations. The region’s coastal cities provided funds for the regional monitoring program as well as invaluable support and coordination in obtaining funding for the project.

The project was a first-of-its-kind regional pilot sand restoration project for the West Coast. Its main objective was to get sand on the region’s eroding beaches to start the process of restoring this priceless centerpiece of our environment and economy. An equally important objective for the project was to demonstrate that cost-effective beach restoration technology could be successfully implemented in the San Diego region.

To measure the results of this pilot project, post-construction monitoring was required to answer the following questions:

- How will the sand move from the beach placement sites and how long will it benefit the coastline?
- Will the sand negatively affect nearshore reefs and kelp beds, our coastal lagoons?

SANDAG worked with state and federal regulatory agencies to design monitoring programs to provide answers to these questions, which are laid out in the Discussion section below. Additionally, outlined below are conclusions and next steps regarding future beach replenishment in the San Diego region.

Discussion

The questions outlined above were answered by SANDAG’s post-construction monitoring program, which included shoreline monitoring and offshore biological resource monitoring.

Sand Monitoring Program

The RBSP monitoring program included surveying 60 beach profiles and five lagoon entrances twice annually to document changes in the region’s sandy coastline. The monitoring program also
included semi-annual diving surveys of 18 nearshore reef locations and kelp forest habitat typically located further offshore. The monitoring program was completed in June 2005. Listed below are some of the findings from the four-year monitoring period, fall 2001 to fall 2005.

Beach Condition

- Sand volumes tended to increase over the four-year RBSP monitoring period. The primary cause of these gains appears to have been the RBSP beach fills, and the relatively mild wave conditions that prevailed throughout the monitoring period.

- In the majority of cases, the receiver beaches experienced an increase in both shoreline position (beach width) and shorezone volume (sand depth). In many cases, dispersal of the fill material was accompanied by shorezone volume gains on the downdrift beaches.

Lagoon Entrance Condition

- The two jetty-stabilized lagoon entrances (Agua Hedionda and Batiquitos) remained open to the full range of tidal exchange with only minor variations in water depth following the RBSP.

- Of the three unstabilized entrances, San Elijo entrance channel remained open to tidal exchange for a greater percentage of time than the pre-RBSP average, the San Dieguito channel remained open for a lesser percentage of time, and the Los Penasquitos channel remained open for a comparable percentage of time.

Biological Monitoring

The biological monitoring program was initiated to determine the eventual impact of the RBSP sand nourishment to marine resources. These resources included rocky intertidal platforms, shallow subtidal reefs, and kelp beds. SANDAG established 36 monitoring locations prior to project construction predominately in the locations where both (1) sand transport modeling indicated sedimentation would most likely occur, and (2) sensitive marine biological resources were located. Most of the sites were in the vicinity of a receiver site, either offshore or downcoast of a receiver site. These monitoring locations were sampled in the spring and fall of each year through spring 2005.

Biological Benefits of Sand Replenishment

Although SANDAG’s biological monitoring efforts were focused on the identification of negative impact from the project, the City of Encinitas commissioned a Coastal Beach Habitat study, which showed the widening of the beaches through the RBSP had a positive impact on the sandy beach habitat. The study compared the habitat and biological resources that existed before and after the project on receiver sites as well as nonreceiver sites. Overall, the study showed that the City of Encinitas benefited from the RBSP two to four years after the completion of the project. According to the study completed by Science Applications International Corporation (SAIC), “there was an improvement in habitat quality and biological resource use of beach habitat at receiver sites after the SANDAG Project.” A summary of the study’s findings is included as Attachment 1.

Mitigation Obligations

Mitigation funds were set aside in the project budget to address any significant environmental impacts that might be identified by project monitoring. Mitigation included paying the costs of
keeping lagoon mouths open, dredging sediment from lagoons, and restoring reef habitat if long-term significant impacts on nearshore reef habitat occurred.

Earlier this year, SANDAG made its final payment for lagoon mitigation and was not required to expend funds to create offshore reef habitat since the project monitoring determined that there were no long-term biological impacts associated with the RBSP.

Conclusions and Next Steps

Given the project results, the Shoreline Preservation Working Group (SPWG) is working to determine the feasibility of implementing additional sand replenishment. The Shoreline Preservation Strategy for the San Diego region, adopted by the SANDAG Board in 1993, places an emphasis on beach replenishment to preserve and enhance the environmental quality, recreational capacity, and property protection benefits of the region’s shoreline. Although these objectives were met with the RBSP, continued maintenance of the region’s shoreline will be required to continue meeting these objectives.

The RBSP was a pilot project and has demonstrated the feasibility of beach replenishment in the San Diego region. The monitoring results for the RBSP confirmed the project’s expectations that sand from the project would provide benefits to the region’s coastline and have little or no adverse environmental effects. However, continued monitoring of the region’s beaches has demonstrated that beaches widths are returning to pre-RBSP conditions and continued nourishment is needed.

There have been efforts undertaken by local jurisdictions, such as the City of Encinitas and most recently the City of Solana Beach, to dedicate funding for beach nourishment. As mentioned above, the RBSP was funded by federal and state funds. Since funding for additional beach nourishment has not been identified at the state and federal levels, the SPWG is working with the local jurisdictions to identify local sources of funds that could be leveraged with potential state and federal funding.

Understanding the many positive attributes associated with beach replenishment in the San Diego region and the long-term and ongoing commitment required to maintain and restore the coastline, the SPWG believes now is an appropriate time to explore the feasibility of identifying options for additional beach replenishment. Once these options have been determined, the SPWG will seek approval from the Regional Planning Committee and the SANDAG Board to pursue these options.

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachment: 1. Summary of City of Encinitas Coastal Habitat Study

Key Staff Contact: Shelby Tucker, (619) 699-1916, stu@sandag.org
Introduction

In 2001, the San Diego Association of Governments began work on the San Diego Regional Beach Sand Project (RBSP). The scope of work involved the placement of approximately 2.1 million cubic yards (cy) of sand at 12 locations along the coast between Oceanside and Imperial Beach.

The 2001 RBSP included a monitoring component which compared beach profiles before and after sand placement. The SANDAG RBSP monitoring component did not address sandy beach habitat. The City of Encinitas sought to examine the affects of the RBSP’s sand placement on sandy beach habitat. A coastal habitat study was approved by the City of Encinitas and Science Applications International Corporation (SAIC) was contracted to conduct the study in early 2003. The study examined biological resource use of Encinitas beaches after sand nourishment from the 2001 SANDAG RBSP (SAIC 2006), which placed 455,000 cy of sand on four beach sites in Encinitas.

Discussion

One challenge the survey faced was the limited amount of data collection prior to the commencement of the RBSP. Because of this reason, it was decided that the study would include three sites that did not receive sand placement, along with the four sites that did receive sand placement during the 2001 RBSP. This allowed for a comparison of effects on both beach habitats and biological resources as a result of sand placement.

The study sought to show potential influence and effects on beach habitat and biological resources two to four years after the RBSP. It included an examination of physical characteristics of beaches, marine invertebrates living in beach sands, bird use at the beaches, and potential for beaches to support grunion spawning (SAIC 2006).

The study revealed many promising discoveries. Physical improvement was seen in beach habitat quality for biological resources at Batiquitos, Cardiff, and Moonlight receiver sites after sand placement. For example, Cardiff has been transformed from a cobble-laden beach to one of sand. Other beach sites experienced deeper sand depths, remaining fairly consistent through seasons.

Marine Invertebrates

The study showed that the RBSP’s “influence on biological resources was substantial at beach sites where sand nourishment resulted in a change in physical habitat characteristics from cobble to sand” and “provided habitat for invertebrates to develop” (SAIC, 29).

Beach Habitats

Study results revealed above-normal sand depth measurements on one or more surveys, providing evidence of indirect nourishment at Leucadia and Seaside nonreceiver sites (SAIC 2006). Findings further indicate that both receiver and nonreceiver beach sites in Encinitas showed marked improvement in sand nourishment after the RBSP sand placement.
Bird Use
The study indicated that the RBSP improved bird habitat at the receiver sites in Encinitas. Prior to the RBSP, few, if any, birds were observed at cobble beach sites. The sand placement provided suitable habitat for invertebrates to thrive, resulting in higher prey levels for birds.

Conclusion
The City of Encinitas’ Coastal Habitat Study showed the positive effects sand placement has on surrounding sandy beach habitats. In addition to improving recreational benefits for the region, the RBSP provided improvements to surrounding beach habitats.
SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE INDEPENDENT TRANSIT PLANNING REVIEW PANEL RELATED TO LAND USE AND THE SMART GROWTH CONCEPT MAP

Introduction

At its June 23, 2006, meeting, the SANDAG Board of Directors voted to accept the draft Independent Transit Planning Review Services report for planning purposes for the 2007 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

In an effort to facilitate an understanding of the Transit Review Panel’s recommendations related to land use and the Smart Growth Concept Map, staff has organized those recommendations into the attached tables for the Regional Planning Committee’s information. These recommendations have also been shared and discussed with the Regional Planning Technical Working Group at its meeting of September 14, 2006. These recommendations will be considered as part of the RTP process and also have applications in other work efforts underway including the Smart Growth Urban Design Guidelines, the Smart Growth Incentive Program, and the Housing Work Program.

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachments: 1. Recommendations Related to Land Use
              2. Recommendations Related to the Smart Growth Place Types

Key Staff Contact: Coleen Clementson, (619) 699-1944, cd@sandag.org
Recommendations Related to Land Use
Independent Transit Planning Review (ITPR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use/Housing</strong></td>
<td>1. Managing non-smart growth is as important as managing smart growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Parking policy and pedestrian oriented site designs are very important to transit patronage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Smart Growth definitions lack spatial factors (linear and network distribution) that are very important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Encourage mixed use density clusters that will facilitate efficient and convenient public transit service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Except for small neighborhood serving uses, other larger retail employment, medical, educational, and government land uses should be located near arterial and major collector streets served by public transit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Designate five to ten urban centers located at the junction of principal transit corridors where major development projects would be encouraged to cluster.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. New auto-oriented land uses should be prohibited by zoning codes along principal transit corridors; and the conversion of existing auto-oriented development to transit oriented land uses should be encouraged. Transit oriented land uses include: employment centers, schools, medium and high density residential development, senior housing, medical centers, shopping centers, and entertainment uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Desirable destination land uses (employment, retail, and education) should be sited along corridors to directionally balance peak period travel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Approval of specific plans, subdivision, and planned development projects should require transit-efficient and pedestrian friendly arterial and collector street patterns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. Discourage leapfrog development in outlying areas and encourage in-fill development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. Use transit patronage potential and VMT as tools to coordinate development approvals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. Promote transit oriented development in areas around the Coaster, Sprinter and Trolley stations, and along high frequency service transit corridors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. Minimum residential densities of 20-30 dwelling units/net acre should be implemented in transit corridors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14. Integrate supporting retail into residential and employment developments to help minimize dependence on automobile use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transit</strong></td>
<td>1. Take a top-down transit planning approach – network first followed by corridor level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Transit investments should be located in areas with the best potential for new ridership and should not ignore current high usage markets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Highway investments as well as transit investments should support livability objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Identify principal transit corridors and station areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Transit level of service investments should be coordinated with the RCP and the Smart Growth Concept Map.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Managed lanes are effective but will likely promote decentralized auto oriented growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Operating speeds, headways, reliability, stop spacing, technology, and customer amenities can all attract ridership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>GPS real time passenger information and real time service monitoring should be a high priority.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Urban Design**

1. Pedestrian access to transit is as important as development density.
2. Consider pedestrian circulation, site access, and transit access.
3. Consider pedestrian and transit overlay plans for large employment and special use areas.
4. Park-and-rides need to be designed so that they are pedestrian friendly and in turn allow the pedestrian to access transit.
5. The use of ¼ or ½ mile radius coverage station areas should be adjusted where topography and natural barriers reduce the effective walk-shed area.

**Parking**

1. Parking can play a significant role in influencing transit ridership.
2. Charging for parking can be used to manage demand and encourage ridesharing to transit stations.
3. Revise off-street parking requirements so that they are consistent with trip reduction objectives.

**Implementation Tools**

1. Achieving Smart Growth requires three major stakeholders: local governments, developers, and community stakeholders.
2. Policies should streamline and simplify project approvals.
3. Local jurisdictions should define infill and priority growth areas for five year periods.
4. Planned land uses must be adopted through General Plans and implemented through zoning.
5. Developers should be offered incentives/disincentives to encourage investment in redevelopment and infill projects.
6. Distribute General Plans, smart growth, transit/pedestrian design guidelines to major developers.
# Recommendations Related to the Smart Growth Place Types

## Independent Transit Planning Review (ITPR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Metropolitan Center</th>
<th>Urban Center</th>
<th>Town Center</th>
<th>Community Center</th>
<th>Mixed-Use Transit Corridor</th>
<th>Special Use Center</th>
<th>Rural Village</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use/Housing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Quantitative measure of retail uses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Increase station area densities to ½ mile station area instead of ¼ mile radius.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Add minimum population / employment threshold in addition to density criteria.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transit</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Multi-modal &quot;centroid&quot; to serve as primary transit center.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Use transit priority traffic measures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Identify priority transit service corridors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Incorporate a transit modal split.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transit</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Multi-modal station with a variety of amenities should be stipulated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Incorporate a transit modal split target.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- Land Use/Housing: Multimodal "centroids" should be used in place of traditional transit centers. Mixed-use hubs should be created around transit stations.
- Transit: Multi-modal stations should include centrally located, multimodal transit centers. Designations should include centrally located, multi-modal transit centers. There should be a transit mode split. Support efficient movement of transit vehicles through traffic engineering; Ex. Short signal cycles, left turn prohibitions, and transit signal priority. Areas will be difficult to serve with transit if they are located more than three miles from a major development area.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Metropolitan Center</th>
<th>Urban Center</th>
<th>Town Center</th>
<th>Community Center</th>
<th>Mixed-Use Transit Corridor</th>
<th>Special Use Center</th>
<th>Rural Village</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parking</strong></td>
<td>1. Add parking program such as paid parking ration, parking maximums, rate surcharges for long term commuter parking, requirements for shared parking.</td>
<td>1. Should have density bonuses for structured parking.</td>
<td>2. Policies should promote “unbundled” parking and have the parking user pay the full cost of parking.</td>
<td>1. Parking guidelines should include paid parking schemes, possible shared parking, and parking design standards.</td>
<td>1. Include parking guidelines.</td>
<td>1. Induce parking guidelines.</td>
<td>1. There should be a provision for shared use park-and-ride lots.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Specific Recommendations** | 1. Escondido or Oceanside should be considered for Urban Center designation. | 1. Add Town Center to:  
  ▪ I-15 between Kearny Mesa and Escondido;  
  ▪ Between La Mesa and Downtown San Diego, near Sabre Springs and Euclid Avenue Station. | 1. Should proposed community centers be consolidated into fewer larger centers? | 1. Addition of the airport (Lindbergh Field) and the Navy Station as a special use center. |  |  |  |
SMART GROWTH URBAN DESIGN GUIDELINES — STATUS REPORT

Introduction

Earlier this year, SANDAG established an ad hoc working group to assist with the development of the urban design guidelines called for in the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RPC). The working group consists of members of the Stakeholders Working Group (SWG), Technical Working Group (TWG), and the Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC). The Working Group has had one meeting, and has begun by discussing the content of the guidelines and the project schedule. This report discusses a proposed outline for the guidelines, provides a summary of the comments received to date from the working group, and requests feedback from the RPC on the initial direction of this project.

Discussion

The initial discussion of the Urban Design Guidelines Ad Hoc Working Group focused on a draft outline of the document and project schedule. An annotated version of the draft outline is attached. The outline proposes to organize the document around a general discussion of urban design principles in smart growth areas, followed by detailed technical appendices on specific technical issues. This structure would allow the guidelines to serve as both an overview and primer on urban design for policymakers and the public while also providing more in-depth technical details for planners and engineers. In general, comments form the working groups have supported this approach.

A detailed project schedule has not been developed as yet. However, the general approach is to bring a consultant team on board by the end of the calendar year, and to complete a draft of the document by March 2007.

Staff is seeking input from the Regional Planning Committee on the structure and content of the guidelines. To make this effort worthwhile, the guidelines should help local agencies address the issues they face when implementing smart growth development in their communities.

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning


Key Staff Contact: Stephan Vance, (619) 699-1924, sva@sandag.org
DRAFT OUTLINE
PLANNING AND DESIGNING FOR SMART GROWTH:
URBAN DESIGN GUIDELINES FOR THE SAN DIEGO REGION

1. Introduction
The introduction will address the question of why good urban design is important to creating smart growth communities. It will explain how the document should be used and how it supports the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP). In addition, the introduction will explain the relationship between the guidelines and existing design standards used within the region.

2. Designing for the San Diego Region
This section will define urban design for smart growth areas as it applies specifically to the San Diego region. In particular, it will discuss the differences between smart growth development in urban, suburban and rural settings, relating directly to the smart growth place types identified in the RCP. It also will discuss how urban design in smart growth areas addresses the opportunities and challenges presented by the climate and topography of the region, and how urban design could reflect the region’s cultural diversity.

3. Development and Redevelopment
Developing smarter, more sustainable communities will involve some changes in the way local jurisdictions and developers do business. This section will provide examples of how these changes could be facilitated. In particular, it will include a discussion of how conventionally developed suburban areas could redevelop into smart growth places, including photo simulations for the various place types.

4. Creating Great Public Places – the key to livable communities
How we feel about our communities can be significantly influenced by the quality of the public realm. This section will discuss what makes for great public places, touching on such subjects as the importance of foot traffic; making our parks and plazas active places; establishing successful main streets, public markets, and shopping districts; and the benefits of providing street furniture, public art, and other amenities.

Technical Appendices:
A. Site Design
The placement and orientation of buildings is critical to defining a community as a walkable and people-oriented place. This section will describe the essential components of good site design in smart growth areas.

B. Multimodal Street Design
Street design plays a critical role in the livability of smart growth areas. This section will address how street design and function changes in smart growth areas with an emphasis on context-sensitive design and multimodal access. These design changes inevitably lead to concerns about traffic and mobility, so the guidelines will also need to address how the concept of level of service would apply in smart growth areas. Other specific topics that will be covered could include accessibility, emergency and large vehicle access, and traffic calming.
C. Parking
Along with traffic, parking is one of the concerns most often raised in the discussion of smart growth development. This section will discuss parking demand in smart growth areas with good multimodal transportation systems, how parking should be sited and designed in smart growth areas to ensure good access and preserve walkability, and how market forces can be used to influence parking demand.

D. Siting and Designing Civic Uses
Public facilities can be significant focal points in communities, so how they are sited and how they are designed are important factors in establishing a sense of place. This section will discuss how schools, government buildings, parks, and recreation centers can be fitted into the community to ensure they will be accessible and are community assets.

E. Designing for Transit
In 1993, the Metropolitan Transit Development Board published Designing for Transit to “help planners, developers, architects, and engineers understand the physical requirements of public transportation” and to “be of value to elected officials and city administrators in formulating transit-supportive policies.” The guidelines will update this document to be consistent with current public transit technology and state of the practice.

F. Sustainable Development
This section will address how emerging “green building” standards can be incorporated into smart growth areas, and how street design and urban forestry practices can improve the urban environment, especially with regard to storm water and water quality control.

G. Designing for Universal Access
This section will discuss how to make the urban environment accessible to all persons, regardless of their physical abilities, through the principles of universal design.

H. Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED)
One of the objectives of smart growth development is to create a vibrant public realm. With increased street activity, however, can come concerns about public safety and security. Including a discussion of CPTED principles in the guidelines will show how to avoid unwanted activity and protect public safety in smart growth areas.

I. Implementing Good Design through Form-Based Codes
Form-based codes are a way to regulate development that focuses more on the shape and scale of development than the particular uses. Communities around the country like National City are finding that form-based codes are a useful tool for building consensus about how the community should develop or redevelop. The guidelines will provide a primer on the emerging planning tool.
SPRINTER STAKEHOLDERS WORKING GROUP

Introduction

The SPRINTER rail line is a new mobility link that is under construction by North County Transit District (NCTD) and is scheduled to start operation in late 2007. Fifteen stations will serve the cities of Oceanside, Vista, San Marcos and Escondido, and the County of San Diego.

At the Regional Planning Committee meeting in March 2006, Supervisor Pam Slater-Price suggested the formation of a working group to help implement and coordinate smart growth activities in the areas around the SPRINTER stations.

Discussion

The Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) and the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG) discussed the formation of this working group at their September 2006 meetings. The group will consist of planning and public works representatives (CTAC and TWG members) from each of the jurisdictions along the SPRINTER line (listed above), NCTD staff, and representatives of other stakeholders in the area such as California State University-San Marcos, Palomar College, Palomar Pomerado Health, San Diego North Economic Development Council (EDC), and the Transit Alliance for a Better North County. The group will provide a forum to share information on smart growth implementation tools and projects that are being undertaken around stations on the SPRINTER line, and to help implement the land uses and densities associated with the Smart Growth Concept Map that was accepted by the SANDAG Board for planning purposes on June 23, 2006.

A draft of the group’s charter is attached and will be reviewed and finalized at its first meeting. It is anticipated that the group will meet quarterly or semi-annually in North County. The chair will be chosen from the group’s membership. SANDAG staff will provide administrative support to the group. Periodic reports will be made to the TWG, CTAC, and the Regional Planning Committee on the work of the group.

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachments:  1. SPRINTER Stakeholders Working Group Charter

Key Staff Contact:  Susan Baldwin, (619) 699-1943, sba@sandag.org
COMMITTEE/WORKING GROUP CHARTER
SPRINTER Stakeholders Working Group

PURPOSE
The purpose of the group is to help local jurisdictions along the SPRINTER line and other stakeholders implement smart growth in the areas around the 15 SPRINTER stations. The group will provide a forum to share information on smart growth projects that are being developed and implementation tools and best practices that are being used around stations along the SPRINTER line, and to help implement the land uses and densities associated with the Smart Growth Concept Map that was accepted by the SANDAG Board for planning purposes on June 23, 2006.

LINE OF REPORTING
The SPRINTER Stakeholders Working Group will make periodic reports on an as needed basis to the Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC), the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG), and the Regional Planning Committee (RPC).

RESPONSIBILITIES
The primary responsibility of the SPRINTER Stakeholders Working Group is to discuss and share information regarding smart growth projects and implementation tools that may be useful or of interest to other members of the group.

MEMBERSHIP
The SPRINTER Stakeholders Working Group will be comprised of 11 voting members, including two staff representatives (one from the Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) and one from the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG)) from each jurisdiction along the SPRINTER line representing the cities of Oceanside, Vista, San Marcos, and Escondido, and the County of San Diego, as well as one staff representative from the North County Transit District (NCTD). Representatives of other public and private stakeholders in the area will be invited to participate as advisory members, and will be so appointed upon a majority vote of the Working Group. Alternates also may be designated and will be selected by the appointing entity.

MEETING TIME AND LOCATION
The SPRINTER Stakeholders Working Group is expected to meet quarterly or semi-annually in North County.

SELECTION OF THE CHAIR
The group will nominate a chair and vice chair.

DURATION OF EXISTENCE
The working group is expected to meet for one year. The continuation of the group will be evaluated at the end of the first year.
Smart Growth
Urban Design Guidelines

Status Report

Ad Hoc Working Group

• Technical Working Group
  – Linda Niles, Del Mar
  – Rosemary Rowan, County of San Diego
• City/County Transportation Advisory Committee
  – Greg Humora, La Mesa
  – Kris Shackelford, City of San Diego
• Stakeholders Working Group
  – Kristen Kjaero
  – Elaine Cooluris
Designing for Smart Growth

Purpose of the Guidelines

- Introduction and Overview
- Technical Support and Documentation

Introduction to Urban Design

Why good urban design is important
How the guidelines relate to existing planning documents and design standards
Designing for the San Diego Region

Metropolitan Center
Urban Center
Town Center
Community Center
Mixed Use Transit Corridor
Special Use Center
Rural Community

Smart Growth Place Types

Metropolitan Center
Urban Center
Town Center
Community Center
Transit Corridor
Special Use Center
Rural Community
Development and Redevelopment

Image by Urban Advantage

Development and Redevelopment

Image by Urban Advantage
Development and Redevelopment

Image by Urban Advantage

Creating Great Public Places

Photos: Dan Burden
Technical Appendices

- Site Design
- Parking
- Multimodal Streets
- Siting and Designing Civic Uses
- Designing for Transit
- Sustainable Development
- Universal Access
- Crime Prevention through Environmental Design
- Form Based Codes

Site Design
Site Design

Multimodal Street Design
Multimodal Street Design

Photo: Dan Burden

Parking
Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design

- Natural Surveillance
- Natural Access Control
- Territorial Reinforcement

Images: www.designcentreforpted.org

Good Design Through Form-Based Codes

www.conted.vt.edu
www.charrettecenter.net
www.newurbannews.com
**Next Steps**

- Complete scope of work and schedule
- Advertise for consultant assistance
- Begin document development
  - Feedback from RPC and Working Groups
  - Opportunity for public input
- Additional funding through Blueprint Planning Grant
Regional Shoreline Management Activities

Regional Beach Replenishment

• Background
• Regional Beach Sand Project (Project)
• Shoreline Monitoring
• Biological Monitoring
• Conclusions
• Next Steps
San Diego County Shoreline

Mission Beach Cell

Silver Strand Cell

Regional Beach Sand Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>1,000 cy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Oceanside</td>
<td>421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. North Carlsbad</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. South Carlsbad</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Batiquitos</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Leucadia</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Moonlight Beach</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Cardiff</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Fletcher Cove</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Del Mar</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Torrey Pines</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Mission Beach</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Imperial Beach</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,104</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Shoreline Monitoring Program

Objectives
- Measure Changes in Shorezone
- Monitor RBSP Beach Fills

Components
- Beaches
- Lagoon Entrances

Beach Width Changes: Fall 2000 to Fall 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>MSL Shoreline Change (m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mission Beach Cell
Silver Strand Cell
Oceanside Cell
Historical Beach Nourishment 1993–2000

- **Oceanside Cell**
  - Volume: 2,752,000 cu yd
  - Rate: 393,000 cu yd/yr

- **Mission Beach Cell**
  - Volume: 12,000 cu yd
  - Rate: 2,000 cu yd/yr

- **Silver Strand Cell**
  - Volume: 514,000 cu yd
  - Rate: 73,000 cu yd/yr

Beach Width Changes: Fall 2000 to Fall 2005
Beach Width Changes: Fall 2000 to Fall 2005

Fall 2002

Fall 2003
Beach Width Changes: Fall 2000 to Fall 2005

Fall 2004

Fall 2005
Oceanside

Before

After

Stone Steps, Encinitas
April 2001 and May 2006

Sand Level in May 2006

April 2001: Pre-Nourishment

May 2006: +5 Years
Biological Monitoring

Objectives
- Determine RBSP Impacts on Marine Resources

Components
- Rocky Intertidal Platforms
- Shallow Subtidal Reefs
- Kelp Beds

Lessons Learned
- No Long Term Biological Impacts
- Biological Benefits
- Healthy Beaches will Require Continued Replenishment
Next Steps

Working Group Determine Feasibility of Additional Sand Replenishment
  • Determine Funding Sources
  • Use the Project as a Model for Future Projects

Seek Guidance from RPC and Board on future replenishment options

Regional Shoreline Management Activities

Regional Beach Replenishment
Public Health and Community Design

Tracy Delaney, Ph.D., R.D.
Acting Chief
Chronic Disease and Health Disparities
County of San Diego
Health & Human Services Agency
Maternal, Child & Family Health Services

Overweight is Epidemic Rates in Adults

- 2/3rds of American adults are overweight
- In 1991 rates were 45% (almost 50% increase in 15 yrs)
Obesity Trends* Among U.S. Adults
BRFSS, 1985

(*BMI ≥30, or ~ 30 lbs overweight for 5’ 4” person)

No Data  <10%  10%–14%

Obesity Trends* Among U.S. Adults
BRFSS, 1989

(*BMI ≥30, or ~ 30 lbs overweight for 5’ 4” person)

No Data  <10%  10%–14%
Obesity Trends* Among U.S. Adults
BRFSS, 1993

Obesity Trends* Among U.S. Adults
BRFSS, 1997

(*BMI ≥30, or ~ 30 lbs overweight for 5’ 4” person)
Obesity Trends* Among U.S. Adults
**BRFSS, 2000**

(*BMI ≥30, or ~ 30 lbs overweight for 5’4” person)

Obesity Trends* Among U.S. Adults
**BRFSS, 2002**

(*BMI ≥30, or ~ 30 lbs overweight for 5’4” person)
Obesity Trends* Among U.S. Adults
BRFSS, 2004

(*BMI ≥30, or ~ 30 lbs overweight for 5’ 4” person)

Our Kids are At Risk

- The rate of overweight in kids has doubled since 1970’s
- 70% chance of being overweight/obese as adults
- 1 in 3 will be diabetic

1st generation of kids in the US that aren’t expected to live as long as their parents
Health Implications

- Cardiovascular
- Endocrine (Hormonal)
- Orthopedic
- Pulmonary
- Hepatic
- Psychosocial

Adding up the concerns

Kids

- Each year, more American children are killed by obesity than by gun violence
  (U.S Surgeon General’s Call to Action)

- Obese children suffer from:
  - depression more than pediatric chemotherapy pts
  - "low quality life" at 5x the rate of non-obese children
  - More missed school days and lower academic performance
    (JAMA, April 2003)
Explaining the Epidemic

- Not genetic or biological changes
- Lifestyle and environmental changes
Leading Causes of Obesity

- Poor Nutrition: Taking in too many calories
- Inactivity: Burning off too few calories

“My doctor told me to stop having intimate dinners for four--unless there are three other people.”

--Orson Welles
Physical Inactivity

- 25% of adults are sedentary
- 60% of adults not active enough
- 78% of kids don't meet physical activity requirements.


Inactivity

- Electronic Media & Kids
  - Average 5-1/2 hrs / day (2 hrs + if computer/TV in room)
  - More time than anything else, besides sleeping.
  - Preschoolers spend as much time with screen media as they do playing outside.

- Less Physical Activity
  - In School
    - 8% of elementary schools have daily PE
    - 6% of middle schools have daily PE
  - After School
    - 62% of kids ages 9-13 spend any time in organized activity outside of school
    - 23% of kids report no physical activity during free time
The disappearing walk to school

- Only 10% of these trips are made by walking and bicycling
- 1 in 4 trips made by 5-15 year olds are for the journey to and from school
- Of school trips one mile or less, about 28% are walk-based and less than 1% are bike-based

Walking replaced by driving

- 42% decline in walking
- 90% of trips done by car; less than 6% on foot
- 25% of all trips are one mile or less, but 75% of these trips are made by car
30 Minutes-Most Days

- There are substantial health benefits with accumulating just 30 minutes of moderate activity throughout the day

It doesn’t take much... to make a big difference

- 3 minute bouts of physical activity for a total of 30 minutes throughout the day lowers triglycerides to the same extent as one 30-minute workout

(Miyashita et al., 2006)
QUESTION: IS OBESITY PREVENTION A PERSONAL OR SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY?

1% NO OPINION
16% BOTH (VOLUNTEERED)
30% PERSONAL ISSUE
53% COMMUNITY ISSUE

Source: Center for Prevention and Health Services, National Business Group on Health

Ecological Model

Individuals
Families
Neighborhoods
Businesses
Policies and Laws
Neighborhood environment is one of the strongest predictors of whether a person will be physically active.

(Brownson, et al. 2001)

The built environment can facilitate or constrain physical activity.

(TRB/IOMReport, 2005)

![Diagram](image_url)

Community Design Policies Work!
The Task Force on Community Preventive Services concluded that:

- Community-scale policies & design are effective:
  - Zoning for compact, mixed-use development
  - Transit-oriented development
  - Policies related to street design & connectivity
- Street-scale policies & design are effective:
  - Traffic calming
  - Street lighting
  - Improving street crossings

New Area of Research: Growing Body of Evidence

- San Diego study: 70 minutes more physical activity/week among residents in walkable neighborhood; 35% vs. 60% overweight
  (Saelens, Sallis, et. al. 2003)
- 6 lb weight difference in sprawling vs. compact counties
- King County study: 5% increase in neighborhood’s “walkability index” correlated with 32% increase in active transportation; 0.23 point reduction in BMI
  (Frank, Sallis, et. al. 2006)
Pedestrian improvements get more kids walking to school

- Marin, Co SR2S evaluation: 64% increase in number of kids walking to school with safety & traffic calming improvements & encouragement
- CA SR2S evaluation: 15% of kids walked to school more often after physical improvements (vs. 4% when no improvements)

(Designing to Reduce Childhood Obesity. ALR, February 2005)

RE - Integrating Health into Community Design

The challenge facing those with responsibility for assuring the health and quality of life of Americans is clear. We must integrate our concepts of ‘public health issues’ with ‘urban planning issues’. Urban planners, engineers, and architects must begin to see that they have a critical role in public health. Similarly, public health professionals need to appreciate that the built environment influences public health as much as vaccines or water quality.

Jackson & Kochtitzky, 2001
The Public Health Impacts of the Built Environment

- Physical activity
- Obesity & chronic disease
- Pedestrian injuries/death
- Asthma & respiratory disease
- Crime & violence
- Social capital
- Elder health & mobility
- Water quality & quantity
- Mental health
- Health disparities

CALL TO ACTION
San Diego County
Childhood Obesity Action Plan
2006
Health as a General Plan Goal in King County, WA

- Health & Transportation departments collaborated
- Commissioned study on health/transportation links
- The first Comprehensive Plan with physical activity/health as a goal and policies in the Urban Form and Transportation Elements

King County Comprehensive Plan

- “King County supports land use and zoning actions that promote public health by increasing opportunities for every resident to be more physically active. Land use and zoning actions include: concentrating growth into the Urban Area, promoting urban centers, allowing mixed-use developments, and adding pedestrian linkages.” U-107

- “King County should seek to improve pedestrian safety both within residential areas and at arterials near pedestrian activity centers such as schools, retail centers, concentrations of housing, transit facilities and trails.” (T-322)
You Are Invited!
County\City Government Domain Meeting

Guest Speaker
Dr. Jim Sallis
Director, Active Living Research

November 6, 2006
9 am-12 pm
Health Services Building
3851 Rosecrans Street
San Diego, CA, 92186-5222
Coronado Room

We look forward to your suggestions!

Tracy Delaney, Ph.D., RD
Acting Chief, Chronic Disease and Health Disparities
County of San Diego: H&HSA, MCFHS
619-542-4041
tray.delaney@sdcounty.ca.gov

Thank you!