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REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

Friday, April 6, 2007
12 noon to 2 p.m.
SANDAG Board Room
401 B Street, 7th Floor
San Diego

AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

- REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE STRUCTURE AND WORKING GROUPS
- ENERGY WORKING GROUP (EWG) CHARTER AMENDMENTS
- RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE SHORELINE PRESERVATION WORKING GROUP
- STATUS REPORT ON PROPOSITIONS 1C AND 84

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.
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 JANUARY 5, 2007, MEETING MINUTES

APPROVE

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

Members of the public will have the opportunity to address the Regional Planning Committee (RPC) 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.

3. SPRINTER SMART GROWTH WORKING GROUP UPDATE (Susan Baldwin)

INFORMATION

The SPRINTER Smart Growth Working Group has held its first two meetings: a kickoff meeting on January 31, 2007, and a tour of the SPRINTER rail line and stations/smart growth areas (one in each jurisdiction) on March 14, 2007. Jerry Backoff, San Marcos Planning Director, was selected to chair the group, and Michael Shanahan, architect for Palomar Pomerado Health, was selected as vice chair. A second representative of North County Transit District (NCTD) was added as a voting member of the group. Periodic updates regarding the work of the group will be made to the RPC.

4. REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE STRUCTURE AND WORKING GROUPS

INFORMATION

(Coleen Clementson)

The Regional Planning Committee (RPC) is responsible for providing policy recommendations to the SANDAG Board on Regional Comprehensive Plan development and implementation. There are eight working groups made up of interested individuals and organizations that report to the RPC and provide their suggestions or offer advice and work products for RPC consideration. Staff will provide an overview of the roles, responsibilities, and work efforts underway with each of the working groups that report to the RPC. A chart is attached that illustrates the RPC and working group structure.

5. ENERGY WORKING GROUP (EWG) CHARTER AMENDMENTS (Susan Freedman)

APPROVE

The RPC is asked to approve an amendment to the EWG Charter that would expand the EWG membership from 22 to 25 members, institute an attendance policy and technical edits. The three new member categories are an Independent Power Producer, San Diego Renewable Energy Society, and South County Economic Development Council. The EWG Charter states that the RPC must approve membership changes. The EWG and staff recommendations are explained in the attached report.
RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE SHORELINE PRESERVATION WORKING GROUP (Shelby Tucker)

The Shoreline Preservation Working Group (Working Group) advises the RPC on issues related to implementation of the Shoreline Preservation Strategy and the Regional Comprehensive Plan. In October 2006, the RPC was provided an update on regional shoreline management activities and a copy of the Shoreline Preservation Strategy. The RPC is asked to consider the following recommendations and information.

A. California Coastal Commission Memorandum of Agreement. The RPC is asked to recommend that the Board of Directors authorize SANDAG’s Executive Director to enter into a Memorandum of Agreement with the California Coastal Commission to establish a process for the administration of the newly established Public Recreational Beach Impact Mitigation Fund.

B. Coastal Regional Sediment Management Plan. The RPC is asked to recommend that the Executive Committee amend the FY 07 OWP and Budget to include the Coastal Regional Sediment Management Plan. Additionally, the RPC is asked to recommend that the Executive Committee authorize SANDAG’s Executive Director to enter into the revenue agreement with the California Department of Boating and Waterways and to procure a consultant for development of a Coastal Regional Sediment Management Plan for the San Diego region.

C. Regional Beach Replenishment Cost-Benefit Analysis. A cost-benefit analysis will be prepared to determine the feasibility of future regional beach replenishment by quantifying the economic benefits and impacts and by looking at the recreational value added when beaches are widened. This study will be funded by the region’s coastal cities. This is presented to the RPC for information.

7. PROPOSITIONS 1C AND 84: STATUS REPORT (Susan Baldwin and Keith Greer)

The RPC received a report at the January 2007 meeting regarding statewide bond funds generated by Propositions 1C (The Housing and Emergency Shelter Trust Fund Act of 2006) and 84 (The Safe Drinking Water, Water Quality and Supply, Flood Control, River and Coastal Protection Bond Act of 2006) that could be used to support smart growth and housing. Statewide and regional discussions underway regarding implementation guidelines for these propositions are now focused in two areas: (a) housing and infrastructure to support smart growth, and (b) land conservation and water conservation/quality. SANDAG staff will provide an update on the discussions underway and anticipated next steps.
At the January 5, 2007 joint meeting of the RPC and Regional Housing Working Group, staff was asked to report back on Proposition 63 funds that may be available for affordable housing. Proposition 63 (known as the Mental Health Services Act (MHSA)) was passed in November 2004, and imposes a 1 percent tax on persons with incomes over $1 million to fund expanded mental health services and programs. Each county is required to undertake an extensive community planning process to identify individuals and communities that currently are unserved or underserved. A portion of the MHSA funds have been designated to support the creation of housing. The County of San Diego is in the process of considering how the Prop. 63 funds should be spent. Attached is a fact sheet prepared by Corporation for Supportive Housing.

The next Regional Planning Committee meeting is scheduled for May 4, 2007, at 12 noon.

+ next to an item indicates an attachment
The meeting of the Regional Planning Committee was called to order by Chair Lori Holt Pfeiler (North County Inland) at 12:09 p.m. See the attached attendance sheet for member attendance.

1. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

   Action: Upon a motion by Toni Atkins (City of San Diego) and a second by Vice Chair Jerry Jones (East County), the Regional Planning Committee approved the minutes from the November 3, 2006, meeting.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

   Duncan McFetridge of Save Our Forests and Ranch Lands (SOFAR) expressed concern over the imbalance between road building and infrastructure and its impact on land use in San Diego County. He asked that everyone pay close attention to the Independent Transit Peer Review Report, as it combines the issue of transit infrastructure and affordable housing. He noted that the affordable housing crisis can be solved by proper planning. He said we have to stop funding roads and start funding transit. He also introduced an article from Portland, Oregon, which explains how to build affordable housing units in transit areas without parking.

CONSENT ITEMS

3. PROGRESS REPORT ON BOARD POLICY NO. 033: IMPLEMENTATION GUIDELINES FOR SANDAG REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT (RHNA) MEMORANDUM (INFORMATION)

   Action: This item was presented for information only.

4. 2007 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN (RTP): ENERGY WHITE PAPER (INFORMATION)

   Ms. Freedman explained that many changes have been made addressing energy use. Presently, the State of California’s focus is on the transportation sector, which is the largest emitter of greenhouse gases. The Governor has signed an executive order creating a cap on greenhouse emissions and reductions. Also AB32, the California Global Warming Solutions Act, was signed into law in September 2006.
Locally, the Cities of San Diego, Del Mar, and Chula Vista have signed on to the U.S. Mayors Agreement to reduce their emissions. The City of Coronado is a member of the California Climate Action Registry, which calls for benchmarking greenhouse gas emissions and taking steps to mitigate them.

The 2007 RTP suggests and recommends that energy and greenhouse gas emission impacts from the various travel choices and the Smart Growth efforts be included in the Plan. One aspect of the Energy White Paper is the examination specifically of alternative transportation fuels and vehicles. The 2007 RTP may also serve as a framework for updating the Regional Energy Strategy in FY 08.

Matt Hall, City of Carlsbad (North County Coastal), advised that in order to be successful the public must receive education and communities must support the effort.

Ms. Freedman replied that one aspect of the White Paper includes how to develop and create an open public education process. She cited the Climate Smart Group, which has begun a monthly series of climate change educational workshops in Balboa Park at the Natural History Museum.

Supervisor Pam Slater-Price (County of San Diego) added that this is an unparalleled opportunity in which San Diego County can work with the State to emphasize and realize benefits for the region.

Carrie Downey, City of Coronado (South County), asked that information be dispersed to each community regarding the amount of greenhouse gas produced in that particular community.

Lesa Heebner, City of Solana Beach (North County Coastal), commented that in addition to looking at alternative vehicles, the use of shuttles at smart growth transit sites and even the elimination of vehicles is a positive step forward.

Dave Druker, NCTD, asked if in the future Ms. Freedman would present different scenarios that could be examined by the Transportation and Regional Planning Committees.

Ms. Freedman responded that she will be working with staff to examine greenhouse gas emissions and alternative fuels, and begin mapping and modeling a course for the future.

Mr. Druker replied that in order to educate the public, scenarios must be presented to prove the need to reduce greenhouse gas from transportation. He asked that the Transportation and Regional Planning Committees validate the scenarios.

Ms. Freeman said that San Diego Gas and Electric has begun its alternative vehicle program again, and would be happy to work with both committees on that.

Action: This item was presented for information only.
**JOINT MEETING WITH THE REGIONAL HOUSING WORKING GROUP**

RPC Chair Lori Holt Pfeiler convened the Joint Regional Housing Working Group (RHWG) and Regional Planning Committee meeting at 12:32 p.m.

Chair Holt Pfeiler asked for self-introductions of those seated and noted that Toni Atkins, who also serves on the RPC, Co-Chairs the RHWG with Duane Roth.

Chair Atkins (RHWG) was pleased about the joint meeting and suggested the Transportation Committee be included also at a later date.

5. PRESENTATION ON THE STATE OF THE REGION’S REAL ESTATE MARKET (INFORMATION)

Susan Baldwin (SANDAG) introduced Mr. Russ Valone, President and CEO of MarketPointe Realty Advisors, an expert in economic and real estate analysis for the Southern California housing market as well as a leading authority on Southern California issues. He specializes in residential projects ranging from infill high-density residential projects, both for sale and for rent, to standard subdivisions and large-scale, master-planned communities.

Mr. Valone stated probably the best word to define the real estate market is “schizophrenic” due to the following reasons:

- Sales are slowing despite the fact that the economy seems to be moving along quite well.
- Those waiting for pricing stability or reduction are hesitant to buy as there may be more reductions in the future.
- The conversion market has had a significant impact in terms of inventory.
- The rental market is going in direct opposite of the new home market.
- Most of the new home demand is coming as a result of the county growing naturally as opposed to migration.
- Unsold inventory is trending up, coupled with the drop in sales, and the sales decline is regional.
- Detached single-family dwellings no longer dominate the market.
- Attached is the new paradigm in terms of the reality of the housing market of the future.

He stated that it is Important to recognize that the future of San Diego County is in medium-density attached, as high-density attached does not produce an affordable housing unit. Also, one of the major issues is parking.

Sanford Goodkin of the Urban Land Institute (ULI) asked about speculation and land pricing.
Mr. Valone answered that the times of speculation in Southern California are over. Speculators have had a negative impact on the marketplace and are partially responsible for driving up the prices.

Chair Holt Pfeiler asked Matt Adams of the Building Industry Association (BIA) if the building industry has the same expectation for supply and demand.

Mr. Adams replied yes, and one of the challenges as a region is what can be done to maximize the efficiency of both the government and private sectors to meet the demands of San Diego and the workforce housing market.

Mr. Valone stated that workforce households are favoring medium density over condominiums because even though condominiums are good from a price point standpoint, they don’t always represent the quality of lifestyle that people are looking for.

Gary Knight (San Diego North Economic Development Council) cited a newspaper article survey which pointed out that most developers are pre-selling homes and decreasing their inventory. He asked what this would do to the affordability.

Mr. Valone replied that there is presently a window of opportunity; however, more land and density must be brought in. As people will not give up their cars, parking must be reconfigured. Tandem parking would serve as an alternative.

Mr. Knight stated it’s an exceptional point he’s making on the parking. As a region, we have to start putting faith in these types of designs because ultimately it helps house the citizens of San Diego.

Mr. Valone added that there are thousands of units in San Diego that have been built with tandem parking along the transportation corridor.

Kathy Keehan (RPSWG) asked if there is a possibility to sell housing units and parking spaces separately.

Ms. Downey said the citizens of Coronado would not favor the separation. Tandem parking has been experimented with, however. Coronado requires two covered parking spaces per house. Broader parking options should be offered to make it more palatable.

Mr. Valone said parking is more difficult with infill within a city. When addressing large-scale subdivisions, such as townhomes, it is impossible to provide all the off-street parking. It is important to recognize that tandem parking is not reduction, as people are able to get two parking spaces.

Ms. Slater-Price commented that San Francisco has tandem parking in order to provide more units. They also market parking spaces. Tenants pay extra for parking spaces because people not living in the building are allowed to rent the spaces. Some of the new product may have two parking spaces but they’re not located on the site. The idea
of a parking space becoming a market item is in an urban, highly dense setting where you can actually use public transit.

Doris Payne (San Diego County Aging and Independence Services Advisory Council) asked about “for sale” housing and workforce rental housing.

Mr. Valone replied that the average rent in San Diego today is about $1,600 per month, with a 1.8% vacancy rate. There has been a significant drop-off countywide in new apartment construction.

Ms. Payne asked about the possibility of new construction for the people of the workforce who can’t afford $1,600 or $2,400.

Mr. Valone answered that some sort of government subsidy would probably be necessary in order to bring rents down. The conversion market is weakening, however, thus increasing the inventory of rentals. There are a lot of projects that got started and are now closing and reverting back to rentals. There will not be a lot of increases in terms of new rental product in San Diego over the next couple of years.

Mr. Druker asked about the amount of time there is to build medium attached housing along transit corridors so people can have access to public transportation.

Mr. Valone said in terms of the supply, there is probably six months of supply in the actively-selling projects today that are released for sale. There is probably about 12 - 14 months of inventory before San Diego returns to having 1 - 2 months of supply in 2007. In terms of land, most of it is attached, but a lot of it is in the master-planned communities. Regarding housing along transportation corridors, the information is unknown; however, it can be obtained as the information is geocoded.

Jim Schmidt, retired banker and attorney, distributed an article that he wrote. He explained that he is an affordable housing advocate and his article explained that at one time there was a one-year time limit for building permit processing. Now it is 3 - 4 years. He believes growth is coming from immigration and people living too long. He asked that action be taken to solve the affordable housing problem.

Chair Holt Pfeiler thanked Mr. Valone for the information presented.

Mr. Valone added that he would be available in the future should his services be needed.

Action: This item was presented for information only.

6. SAN DIEGO HOUSING FEDERATION CIVIL SOCIETY GRANT FROM THE SAN DIEGO FOUNDATION (INFORMATION)

Tom Scott, working with the Housing Committee of the Chamber of Commerce, stated that when addressing the housing crisis, there is a need to educate the public and promote smart growth as a great lifestyle. Presently, the predominant attitude opposes
Smart Growth due to high density and poor infrastructure. The Committee discovered that other cities developed a civic leadership organization to generate movement on some of the more controversial issues. Models have been identified in other cities and the Committee has begun to interview civic leaders for their opinion and to identify potential leaders. The Committee hopes that the organization will involve, labor, environmental, and government leadership in the county that will advocate Smart Growth and ways the community can support the effort.

Chair Holt Pfeiler commented that this is just the education component and then asked for questions or comments.

Toni Atkins said she wants to support affordable and low-income housing. She noted how complex the issue is and offered her help and to use her communities as a testing ground. She stated that communities have many concerns regarding density and low-income housing and there is a definite need to address their concerns as transit and parking options are limited.

Mr. Goodkin expressed concern about population growth and making housing a moral and leadership obligation on the part of the County and the City. He suggested borrowing some of the proven solutions from other areas such as Japan.

Mr. Adams said builders and developers from the private sector should be consulted. Working together, common goals can be established and other housing funding sources can be explored. One of the few solutions is government-subsidized affordable housing units; however, there will never be enough to meet the needs of the community. The citizens must be educated in order to break stereotypes and learn a positive way to move forward.

Action: This item was presented for information only.

7. UPDATE ON REGIONAL HOUSING ACTIVITIES (INFORMATION)

Susan Baldwin (SANDAG) stated that the report was to provide an update to the RPC on projects the Regional Housing Working Group (RHWG) and SANDAG staff has been working on to improve housing choices and affordability in the region.

The RHWG has met to review and discuss a number of housing-related projects including the Smart Growth Concept Map, the Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program, the I-15 Interregional Partnership Housing Strategy, and the 2030 Regional Growth Forecast. Currently, a subcommittee of the RHWG is planning a Spring Forum with the assistance of the National Conflict Resolution Center (NCRC), a local non-profit that will demonstrate the best practices for conducting successful public meetings on housing projects in the form of a mock community meeting.

SANDAG staff has been working with a number of housing-related groups such as the San Diego Chamber's Housing Committee and the San Diego Housing Federation's Policy Committee. SANDAG staff has also assisted with the Campaign for Affordable Housing, the California Housing Consortium, and the University of San Diego. An educational
A brochure was published in June 2006 entitled “Homes For All San Diegans – the State of Housing Affordability in the Region.”

The SANDAG Board adopted the Regional Housing Needs Assessment Policy that provides incentives to jurisdictions that produce housing for low- and very low-income households and ties funds to housing element completion and annual reporting on units produced.

Housing is an important component in the I-15 Interregional Partnership with Riverside. The goal is to get more workforce housing built around the stations along the SPRINTER line. The Otay Mesa–Mesa de Otay Binational Early Action Plan provides information on border-related housing issues and recommends collaboration with the City of San Diego on the potential to convert industrial land to residential use and promoting well-planned housing developments in Baja California.

SANDAG’s Baseline Monitoring Report includes a number of housing-related indicators that help track progress toward meeting the housing goals of the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP). These indicators include the Housing Affordability Index of the California Association of Realtors, which shows that only about 9% of the region’s households can afford a median-priced home.

SANDAG staff and the RHWG plan to prepare and publish a brochure with the San Diego Housing Federation to develop the initial components of a Regional Housing and Smart Growth Financing Strategy, prepare a report on affordable housing production in the region, and initiate work on the Regional Housing Needs Assessment for the 2010/2015 Housing Element cycle.

Action: This item was presented for information only.

8. STATEWIDE PROPOSITIONS SUPPORTIVE OF HOUSING AND SMART GROWTH (INFORMATION)

Susan Baldwin informed the RPC and the RHWG on the statewide propositions: Proposition 1C (The Housing and Emergency Shelter Trust Fund Act of 2006) and Proposition 84 (The Safe Drinking Water, Water Quality and Supply, Flood Control, River and Coastal Protection Bond Act of 2006), which passed and provide funding for affordable housing and infrastructure supportive of housing development and Smart Growth and SANDAG’s role in the implementation of these funds.

Proposition 1C has two basic categories of funding:

- $1.5 billion for affordable housing programs that includes home ownership and the construction for acquisition or rehabilitation of affordable rental housing units. These funds will be allocated by the California Department of Housing and Community Development and the California Housing Finance Agency. A large part will be given to non-profit and for-profit developers typically to provide new funding for Proposition 46 programs.
• $1.35 billion for programs that provide funding for infrastructure, such as parks, transit stations, sidewalks, and other housing-supportive capital improvements.

Most of these funds will require implementing legislation, and SANDAG is working with the League of California Cities, California State Association of Counties (CSAC), and California Council of Governments (CALCOG) to influence this legislation.

San Diego has received about 8% of the Proposition 46 funds to date. Approximately $120 million in additional funding to build, acquire, and rehabilitate additional low-income units is expected. To date, approximately 1,500 rental units and about close to 1,000 shelter beds have been funded by Proposition 46.

With respect to the Proposition 84, the breakdown is as follows:

• $580 million for the Sustainable Communities and Climate Change Program;
• $400 million for local and regional parks;
• $90 million for urban greening projects, which include joint use facilities with schools; and
• $90 million for planning grants and incentives for the development of local and regional land use plans that focus on infill, energy, water conservation, and natural resource protection.

SANDAG’s efforts are on influencing the implementing legislation that will effect how many of these funds will be distributed. SANDAG’s intention is to make sure that the legislation helps this region meet the goals for Smart Growth in housing to the maximum degree possible.

Myrna Pascual, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), asked if any of the funding included the mental health services.

Ms. Baldwin said it is not covered in Proposition 1C.

Ms. Pascual asked if the report will be amended later to include the unexpected multimillionaire money, or the Mental Services Act.

Ms. Baldwin offered to examine those funds also and the opportunities to influence those funds well, as they are available to the San Diego region.

Ms. Pascual added she would like a report on any appropriated and upcoming funding coming to our jurisdiction.

Gary Gallegos suggested Proposition 63 be brought back at a later date.

Mr. Hall asked Ms. Baldwin about the expected timeframe these funds would become available and if there was anything that local jurisdictions, with the support or help of the private sector, could do in advance to prepare, as fierce competition from Los Angeles and San Francisco/Sacramento area is expected.
Ms. Baldwin answered that some of the multifamily housing program money will be released very soon. It is subsidized money that allows affordable units to be built or acquired and rehabilitated using state subsidies.

Mr. Hall expressed the importance of unanimity in order to acquire funds.

Vice Chair Jones suggested that participation continue in order to ensure funding.

Mr. Gallegos added that he had received direction from the Board to develop an advocacy group that would deal with other bond possibilities.

**Action:** This item was presented for information only.

**ADJOURN JOINT MEETING WITH THE REGIONAL HOUSING WORKING GROUP**

9. **UPCOMING MEETINGS**

The next meeting of the Regional Planning Committee is scheduled for Friday, February 9, 2007, at 12 noon.

10. **ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Lori Holt-Pfeiler adjourned the meeting at 1:53 p.m.
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<td>Member</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jim Sandoval</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBREGIONAL AREA</td>
<td>JURISDICTION</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>MEMBER/ALTERNATE</td>
<td>ATTENDING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group (SWG)</td>
<td>Kathy Keehan</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gary Nordstrom</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sandor Shapery</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Mitigation Program Advisory Member</td>
<td>Wildlife Conservation Board</td>
<td>John Donnelly</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Debbie Townsend</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>X</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>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>David Mayer</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>X</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>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jeannette Baker</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>X</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>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Susan Wynn</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JURISDICTION</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>ATTENDING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>Hon. Toni Atkins</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONNECT</td>
<td>Duane Roth</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North County Coastal - Carlsbad</td>
<td>M. Pierce for Debbie Fountain</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North County Inland - Escondido</td>
<td>Bev Peterka</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East County - Lemon Grove</td>
<td>David DeVries</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South County - Chula Vista</td>
<td>Amanda Leeter for Mandy Mills</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D. Housing Commission</td>
<td>Todd Phillips</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>Bill Levin</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>Dixie Switzer</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Planning and Land Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Housing and Community Development</td>
<td>David Estrella for Hugo Mora</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>Michael Nagy</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego North Economic Development Council</td>
<td>Gary Knight</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Industry Association</td>
<td>Matthew Adams</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego Association of Realtors</td>
<td>David Rehmann</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego Apartment Association</td>
<td>Michele Miller</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Housing Council of San Diego</td>
<td>Mary Scott Knoll</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego Housing Federation</td>
<td>Tom Scott</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego County Aging and Independence Services</td>
<td>Doris Payne</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Housing Advocates</td>
<td>Catherine Rodman</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>League of Conservation Voters</td>
<td>Nico Calavita</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Task Force on the Homeless</td>
<td>Hannah Cohen</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego Countywide Alliance of Tenants</td>
<td>Corazon Dulay</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Land Institute</td>
<td>Sanford Goodkin</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development</td>
<td>Myrna Pascual for Frank Riley</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Department of Housing and Community Development</td>
<td>Cathy Creswell / Paul McDougall</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ENERGY WORKING GROUP (EWG) CHARTER AMENDMENTS

Introduction

The Energy Working Group (EWG) seeks to expand its voting membership from 22 to 25 members. (The current membership list is attached.) The three additional member categories are an Independent Power Producer (IPP), the San Diego Renewable Energy Society (SDRES), and the South County Economic Development Council (SCEDC). Each would supplement the EWG’s advisory function by bringing an expertise and/or geographic perspective that is not currently represented. The EWG and staff also recommend limiting the membership to 25 voting members and instituting an attendance policy. The EWG Charter states that the Regional Planning Committee (RPC) must approve membership changes.

Recommendation

The RPC is asked to approve an amendment to the EWG Charter that would add three new voting member categories, an attendance policy, and technical edits.

Proposed New Member Categories

At its January 25, 2007, meeting, the EWG recommended two new members: an IPP and SDRES. In addition, an ad hoc subcommittee was formed to evaluate EWG membership policies and current representation. The subcommittee agreed upon several recommendations including a size limit to the EWG, an attendance policy, and the requirement for named alternates. A third voting member, the SCEDC, was recommended to the EWG at its March 22, 2007, meeting, and the EWG supported this recommendation. The proposed three new member categories are as follows:

Independent Power Producer (IPP)
An IPP refers to any entity that owns or operates an electric generating facility that is not included in a utility’s rate base. An IPP is a private entity that generates electricity and sells it to other businesses including utilities. With their investment, the IPPs provide a marketplace check and balance to the regulated utilities.

San Diego Renewable Energy Society (SDRES)
SDRES is a chapter of the American Solar Energy Society (ASES), which is a national non-profit organization that started in 1954 and currently has 10,000 members with 23 chapters in 34 states. The local San Diego chapter, SDRES, is dedicated to increasing the intelligent use of renewable energy technologies and energy efficiency in San Diego County, educating the public about the
near and long-term applications and benefits of renewable energy, and providing expertise for public and government institutions regarding renewable energy resources and projects.

South County Economic Development Council (SCEDC)
SCEDC, a non-profit organization, was formed in 1989 by a group of South San Diego County business and community leaders. The North County EDC and San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce are represented on the EWG. The South County EDC was originally on the Board’s list of members.

Proposed Attendance Policy

The proposed attendance policy would require EWG members to name alternates and not miss more than two consecutive meetings or three total within a 12-month period without losing voting rights. The purpose of the attendance policy is to achieve regular attendance and quorums at EWG meetings.

The proposed attendance policy also would identify that only in the event that an elected official cannot serve, a subregion can appoint a non-elected government employee to serve in their place as either the primary or alternate member. The County of San Diego has had an energy staff person participate in place of an elected official since the EWG was formed. The South Bay subregion has a staff member serve as the alternate to the elected representative.

Proposed Technical Edits

The proposed technical edits would include language that aligns energy planning activities with the RCP and RTP, clarifies subregional representation, and updates out-dated language on working group duration.

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachments: 1. Revised EWG Charter
2. EWG Membership List

Key Staff Contact: Susan Freedman, (619) 699-7387, sfr@sandag.org
WORKING GROUP CHARTER
Energy Working Group

PURPOSE
The Energy Working Group (EWG) advises the Regional Planning Committee (RPC) and the SANDAG Board on issues related to the coordination and implementation of the Regional Energy Strategy (RES), adopted by the SANDAG Board of Directors in July 2003. The EWG was formed based on the recommendation of the Energy Task Force, which had been established to advise the board on the best way to implement the RES. The Energy Task Force recommended that SANDAG would be the most appropriate agency to implement the RES and that an Energy Working Group, comprised of a diverse group of stakeholders, should be formed to advise the Regional Planning Committee and Board of Directors on energy issues.

LINE OF REPORTING
The EWG reports to the Regional Planning Committee (RPC), which reports directly to the SANDAG Board of Directors. In addition, the SANDAG Board recognized that the EWG recommends comments on many proceedings at the California Public Utilities Commission and California Energy Commission. Due to the time limitations on many of these proceedings, the Board approved an alternate reporting structure which would enable the EWG to report to the Executive Committee for input on issues with deadline constraints.

RESPONSIBILITIES
The EWG advises on the implementation of the Regional Energy Strategy (RES), which was adopted by SANDAG in 2003. The EWG is part of the SANDAG decision making structure, and will be asked to make recommendations on a variety of energy issues to the RPC and Board of Directors. The EWG should ensure that regional energy planning activities align with the objectives of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP), and the Regional Economic Prosperity Strategy (REPS). The EWG will operate at the policy planning and coordination level to develop consensus in the region on energy matters that go before State and Federal agencies. The EWG will also work with various stakeholders at the local level to reach consensus on the best ways to provide energy programs and services, and address energy facility issues as they relate to the implementation of the RES.

MEMBERSHIP
The EWG will have a maximum of 25 voting members. Established in 2004, the EWG has 21 voting members, which will include a diverse group of regional stakeholders. Elected officials serving on the EWG have been appointed by the subregions they represent (North County Coastal, North County Inland, East County, South Bay), the City of San Diego, and the County of San Diego. Voting members of the Working Group and their alternates are selected by the bodies they represent.

In the event that an elected official cannot serve, a subregion can appoint a non-elected government employee to serve in place of an elected in the primary or alternate member position.
With the exception of the subregional representation, if a voting member misses two consecutive meetings or three total over the course of one calendar year, then they will be considered as advisory members. After one year, advisory members may petition the EWG for consideration as a voting member again. Members of the RPC are able to appoint and recommend members to the EWG. Elected officials already on the EWG are also able to recommend additional considerations for membership to the RPC for approval.

**MEETING TIME AND LOCATION**

The Energy Working Group generally meets from 11:30 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. on the fourth Thursday of the month, and more often as needed. Meetings are normally held in the 7th floor conference room at SANDAG offices.

**SELECTION OF THE CHAIR**

The EWG’s chair is selected based on the recommendation and approval by vote of EWG members and rotated on a periodic basis. In the case of the Energy Working Group, there are two co-chairs instead of a chair and vice-chair.

**DURATION OF EXISTENCE**

The EWG is currently funded through June 30, 2006, but is pursuing long-term funding that would enable the EWG to continue their work. The EWG will provide advice to the RPC for the duration of the SANDAG energy planning program.

Attachment: EWG Membership List
## ENERGY WORKING GROUP

### MEMBERSHIP

The Energy Working Group advises the Regional Planning Committee on issues related to the coordination and implementation of the Regional Energy Strategy adopted by the SANDAG Board of Directors in July 2003. The Working Group consists of elected officials from the City of San Diego, County of San Diego and the four subareas of the region. In addition to elected officials, the Working Group includes stakeholders representing business, energy, environment, economy, education, and consumer interests.

The Energy Working Group generally meets at 11:30 a.m. on the fourth Thursday of the month.

Staff contact: Susan Freedman, (619) 699-7387; sfr@sandag.org

### MEMBERS

**Co-Chair: Art Madrid**  
Mayor, City of La Mesa  
(representing East County)

**Gary Matthews**  
University of California San Diego  
(UCSD)

**Co-Chair: Henry Abarbanel**  
Councilmember, City of Del Mar  
(representing North County Coastal)

**Irene Stillings**  
San Diego Regional Energy Office  
(SDREO)

**Bob Campbell**  
Councilmember, City of Vista  
(representing North County Inland)

**Dr. Alan Sweedler**  
San Diego State University  
(SDSU)

**Steve Castaneda**  
Councilmember, City of Chula Vista  
(representing South County)

**Marty Hunter**  
San Diego – Imperial Counties Labor Council

**Donna Frye**  
Councilmember, City of San Diego

**Dave Geier**  
San Diego Gas & Electric

**Jose Cervantes**  
County of San Diego

**Bill Hays**  
Port of San Diego

**Steve Zolezzi**  
Food and Beverage Association (Small Business)

**David Deiranieh**  
U.S. Navy

**Laura Hunter**  
Environmental Health Coalition

**Bill Powers**  
Sierra Club

**Mike Evans**  
San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce

**Patti Krebs**  
Industrial Environmental Association

**Paul O'Neal**  
North County Economic Development Corporation

**Sharon Cooney**  
Metropolitan Transit System

**Scott Anders**  
Energy Policy Initiatives Center

---

Continued
ALTERNATES

Rick Van Schoik  
San Diego State University Foundation

Pat Zeutonian  
County of San Diego

Melanie McCutchan  
Environmental Health Coalition

Dave Weil  
University of California San Diego (UCSD)

Andrew McAllister  
San Diego Regional Energy Office

Gary Simon  
U.S. Navy

David Grubb  
Sierra Club

J.C. Thomas  
San Diego Gas & Electric

Rob Anderson (2nd Alternate)  
San Diego Gas & Electric

Dave Carey  
Port of San Diego

Gregory Parks  
San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce

Jim McCollum  
Industrial Environmental Association

Revised: March 16, 2007
RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE SHORELINE PRESERVATION WORKING GROUP

File Number 3002800

Introduction

The Shoreline Preservation Working Group (Working Group) advises the Regional Planning Committee (RPC) on issues relating to the implementation of the Shoreline Preservation Strategy and the Regional Comprehensive Plan. In October 2006, the RPC was provided an update on regional shoreline management activities and a copy of the Shoreline Preservation Strategy.

The Working Group has been working on several issues, which are presented below for RPC consideration. These include preparing a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between SANDAG and the California Coastal Commission, obtaining funding for the preparation of a Coastal Regional Sediment Management Plan for the San Diego region, and planning for the preparation of a regional beach replenishment cost-benefit analysis.

Recommendation

A. The RPC is asked to recommend that the Board of Directors authorize SANDAG’s Executive Director to enter into a MOA between SANDAG and the California Coastal Commission in substantially the same form as the attached MOA (Attachment 1).

B. The RPC is asked to recommend that the Executive Committee amend the FY 07 Overall Work Program (OWP) and Budget to include the Coastal Regional Sediment Management Plan. Additionally, the RPC is asked to recommend that the Executive Committee authorize SANDAG’s Executive Director to enter into the revenue agreement with California Department of Boating and Waterways and procure a consultant for project development.

Discussion

A. California Coastal Commission Memorandum of Agreement

At the December 7, 2006, and March 1, 2007, Working Group meetings, the Working Group reviewed and discussed the draft MOA between SANDAG and the California Coastal Commission (Commission). SANDAG staff and the Working Group recommend the RPC recommend that the SANDAG Board of Directors approve the MOA.
Background

In 1996, SANDAG and the California Coastal Commission (Commission) entered into a Memorandum of Agreement which outlines the administration of the Beach Sand Mitigation Fund. The Beach Sand Mitigation Fund consists of fees collected by the Commission through its coastal development permit process pursuant to special conditions of various permits as mitigation for the adverse impacts of shoreline protective structures, such as seawalls and revetments, on beaches within the region. Only projects that involve sand replenishment for beaches in the San Diego region will be considered for funding.

Recently, the Commission set up a Public Recreational Beach Impact Mitigation Fund, which consists of fees collected by the Commission as mitigation for the adverse impacts on public recreational use of the beaches within the region. The Public Beach Impact Mitigation Fund is a separate fund from the Beach Sand Mitigation Fund. Monies from the Public Beach Impact Mitigation Fund shall be solely used to implement projects that provide public recreational improvements which may include, but are not limited to, public beach accessways, blufftop access, viewing areas, public restrooms, public beach parking, and public trail amenities.

The Commission is requesting SANDAG and the Commission enter into an additional Memorandum of Agreement to establish a process for the administration of funds from the Public Recreational Beach Impact Mitigation Fund.

Next Steps

After final approval, SANDAG staff will continue to work with the Commission on the administration and oversight of this fund. Additionally, staff will work closely with the coastal jurisdictions on the use of funds, providing information and guidance as necessary.

B. Coastal Regional Sediment Management Plan

This item was discussed at the Working Group’s March 1, 2007 meeting. SANDAG staff and the Working Group recommend that the RPC make a recommendation to the Executive Committee to amend the FY 07 OWP and Budget to include this work and budget authorization. Additionally, the RPC is asked to recommend that the Executive Committee authorize SANDAG’s Executive Director to enter into the revenue agreement with California Department of Boating and Waterways and procure a consultant for project development.

Background

DBW is funding three pilot Coastal Regional Sediment Management Plans (Management Plan). In December 2006, California Department of Boating and Waterways (DBW) requested letters of interest from coastal regions throughout the state. SANDAG staff submitted a letter of interest and was chosen to prepare a Management Plan for the San Diego region. The award is for $150,000 with a 10 percent in-kind contribution for project management.

SANDAG staff has worked successfully with DBW on many projects. Most recently, funds were provided by DBW for the preparation of the Sand Compatibility and Opportunistic Use Program. Additionally, DBW was a partner in the implementation of the 2001 Regional Beach Sand Project.
Next Steps

After final approval, SANDAG staff will prepare a Request for Proposals, contract with a qualified consultant, and begin work on Management Plan preparation. Participation and input from the Working Group will be vital to the success of the project. The Management Plan should be completed by summer 2008.

C. Regional Beach Replenishment Cost-benefit Analysis

This item was discussed at the Working Group’s meeting on March 1, 2007. This item is provided to the RPC as information. SANDAG staff will return to the RPC to provide additional information and request potential action in the future.

Background

Discussions at previous Working Group meetings have reflected a desire to move forward with a determination of the feasibility of implementing a replenishment project similar to the 2001 Regional Beach Sand Project (RBSP).

The purpose of the feasibility study is to allow SANDAG to request funds from state and federal sources for project implementation. One element of SANDAG’s Regional Shoreline Management work program is to develop funding strategies to enable continuing implementation of the restoration of eroded beaches on a regional basis and to continue to implement the goals and objectives outlined in the Shoreline Preservation Strategy and Regional Comprehensive Plan.

Under DBW guidelines, there are several activities that need to be completed as part of the feasibility study, these include:

- Statement of the problem
- Analysis of project alternatives
- Defined scope of the project
- Proposed preliminary design
- Favorable benefit-to-cost analysis

As discussed at the Working Group meeting on March 1, 2007, the preparation of a cost-benefit analysis is the first step. The allocation of costs to complete the study will be the same formula as the Regional Shoreline Monitoring Program, which as been paid for by the coastal cities since 1996. The allocation is based upon each jurisdiction’s proportion of shoreline miles of sandy beach, excluding federal lands. Below is the allocation for payment by each coastal jurisdiction.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Miles</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carlsbad</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>14.90%</td>
<td>$5,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronado</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>7.10%</td>
<td>$2,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Mar</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.90%</td>
<td>$2,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encinitas</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>13.30%</td>
<td>$5,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Beach</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>6.20%</td>
<td>$2,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>8.30%</td>
<td>$3,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>39.80%</td>
<td>$15,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solana Beach</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.50%</td>
<td>$1,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>43.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
<td><strong>$40,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next Steps

Additionally, SANDAG staff and the Working Group recommend staff identify the costs associated with the preparation of the additional requirements for the feasibility study listed above. Once costs are identified, SANDAG staff will work with staff from the coastal jurisdictions to determine if payment is feasible. If it is determined by the coastal jurisdictions that they would like to move forward, the Working Group would need to provide input on the allocation of costs among the participating cities. The Working Group would make a recommendation to the RPC. Final approval will be made by the SANDAG Board of Directors.

BOB LEITER

Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachment: 1. Draft Memorandum of Agreement between SANDAG and the California Coastal Commission

Key Staff Contact: Shelby Tucker, (619) 699-1916, stu@sandag.org
Memorandum of Agreement Between

the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG)

and the California Coastal Commission

Establishing a Process for the Administration of the

Public Recreational Beach Impact Mitigation Fund

Whereas, the Public Recreational Beach Impact Mitigation Fund consists of fees collected by the California Coastal Commission (“Commission”) through its coastal development permit process pursuant to special conditions of various permits, as mitigation for the adverse impacts on public recreational use of the beaches within San Diego County from development along the beach or shoreline including but not limited to, shoreline protective structures such as seawalls, revetments, and bluff retaining walls;

Whereas, the mitigation fees are deposited in an interest-bearing account created at SANDAG, with all interest earned payable to the account for the purposes stated below;

Whereas, the purpose of the account is to establish a Public Recreational Beach Impact Mitigation Fund (“Fund”) to aid local governments, working cooperatively through SANDAG and the Commission, in providing recreational improvements designed to enhance public recreational beach use within San Diego County;

Whereas, the funds shall be solely used to implement projects that provide public recreational improvements which may include but are not limited to, public beach accessways, blufftop access, viewing areas, public restrooms, public beach parking, and public trail amenities, and not to fund operation, research, maintenance or planning studies;

Whereas, the Fund shall be allocated as provided for in this Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between SANDAG and the Commission, setting forth terms and conditions to assure that the mitigation fees will be expended in the manner intended by the Commission;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that it is the intent of the Commission and SANDAG to participate in the administration of the Fund as follows:

1. Fund Administration

The Commission and SANDAG agree that the mitigation fees collected will be held by SANDAG in a trust fund maintained and operated by SANDAG, and known as the Fund. However, SANDAG agrees to establish a separate accounting for monies within the Fund for each coastal jurisdiction in the San Diego County region. Mitigation fees collected from approved shoreline projects within each coastal jurisdiction shall be accounted for by jurisdiction.

Money from a coastal jurisdiction’s account cannot be spent without having that local jurisdiction’s formal approval through resolution by City Council or Board of Supervisors.

The money in the Fund shall be invested by SANDAG in accordance with applicable law. Income and/or interest shall be credited to each coastal jurisdiction’s account on a prorated basis. A copy of the accounting review shall be submitted annually, upon completion, to the Executive Director of the Commission (“Executive Director”).
Memorandum of Agreement
Public Recreational Beach Impact Mitigation Fund

Up to a maximum of 15 hours at a rate not greater than $105.00 per hour (loaded rate) per request will be used to reimburse SANDAG staff time. Reimbursement will occur when funds are allocated. Reimbursable activities include but are not limited to the preparation of agendas, reports, presentations at meetings, and other necessary activities in support of fund allocation. Reimbursement will be taken from funds reserved for the local jurisdiction(s) requesting fund allocation and should be included in a jurisdiction’s formal funding approval.

2. Fund Allocation

The Commission and SANDAG agree that the Commission and the region’s coastal jurisdictions, working together with the Shoreline Preservation Working Group, shall evaluate proposed public recreational improvement projects and will recommend how much, if any, money from the fund should be allocated to a project and how much of the total allocation should come from each jurisdiction’s account. No funds shall be allocated from a local jurisdiction’s account without the jurisdiction’s formal approval through a resolution by City Council or Board of Supervisors.

The Commission and SANDAG agree that, prior to allocation of any funds, the recommendation of the Shoreline Preservation Working Group, after recommendation for approval by the Regional Planning Committee and approval by the SANDAG Board of Directors, must be submitted to the Executive Director for review and approval. The Executive Director must provide written concurrence with each allocation, before any allocation occurs.

The Commission and SANDAG agree that each disbursement shall only be made to the recipient with conditions that guarantee that the disbursement is issued as intended by the Shoreline Preservation Working Group and approved by SANDAG and the Executive Director. Any portion of the disbursement that is not used shall be returned to the Fund and accounted for in the contributing coastal jurisdiction’s account(s) on a pro-rated basis.

3. Eligible Projects

Only projects which meet all of the following will be considered by the Commission and the Shoreline Preservation Working Group and SANDAG for funding:

a. Only projects that are recommended to the Shoreline Preservation Working Group and approved by SANDAG and the Executive Director, by formal action of a local coastal jurisdiction, may be considered for funding. Projects may be carried out by the local jurisdictions themselves, by other agencies, including, but not limited to, the Army Corps of Engineers, the United States Navy, the California Coastal Conservancy, the California Department of Parks and Recreation or the California Department of Boating and Waterways; and/or non-profit organizations.

b. Only projects that involve public shorefront recreational improvements for beach and beach-related public access which may include but are not limited to, public beach access stairways/ramps, blufftop access, viewing areas, public benches/bicycle racks, public restrooms, public beach parking, and public trail improvements, in San Diego County will be considered for funding. Because the fees that will go into the Fund are intended to mitigate for the loss of and/or impact to public recreational beach value resulting from construction of shoreline protective structures or other forms of development that have adverse effects on the beach or shoreline, only projects that provide public recreational improvements shall be supported by the fund.

c. Only capital projects may be considered for funding. Mitigation fees shall not be used for operations, research, maintenance or planning studies. The Shoreline Preservation Working
Group may recommend that funds be allocated to engineering or permitting (e.g., environmental documentation) costs directly related to the implementation of a capital project, under limited circumstances, and only if necessary to secure supplemental funds from another source.

d. Any project considered for funding must obtain Coastal Act authorization from the local government having jurisdiction, and/or the Commission, prior to initiation of construction.

4. Project Funding Criteria

The Commission and SANDAG agree that mitigation fees generated within a coastal jurisdiction shall be used only for projects affecting that same coastal jurisdiction but may include regional projects that span and affect multiple jurisdictions;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that it is the intent of this Memorandum of Agreement to assure consistency in the administration and allocation of mitigation fees from the Public Beach Recreational Impact Mitigation Fund.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this Memorandum of Agreement may be altered, changed or amended by mutual consent of the parties hereto. Either party may terminate this MOA by providing written notification 30 days prior to termination.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that in the event of termination of this Memorandum of Agreement by either party, any and all remaining funds shall be transferred by SANDAG to the Commission or a Commission-approved alternate entity consistent with the principles set forth in this Memorandum of Agreement.

SAN DIEGO ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS    CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION

_________________________________    ___________________
Executive Director                Executive Director

____________________    ___________________
Date                                Date
Mental Health Services Act Background

In November 2004, California voters approved Proposition 63, the Mental Health Services Act (MHSA). This act instituted a 1% income tax on persons with incomes over $1 million to be used for mental health care. The MHSA’s overall purpose was to “transform the mental health system” in California toward one that is more client-centered and oriented toward wellness and recovery. The MHSA draws on the successes of the Assembly Bill 2034 (AB 2034) program, which serves individuals with mental illness who are homeless or at risk of homelessness.

Each county is required to undertake an extensive community planning process to identify individuals and communities that currently are unserved or underserved. Once identified, these priority populations will be served by Full Service Partnerships, or FSPs. Full Service Partnerships involve a team of practitioners that provide an array of services to meet the individual client’s needs. In San Diego County, four nonprofit service providers have the contracts for the five FSPs serving adults, older adults, and transition age youth. FSP clients are individuals with serious mental illness who are homeless or at risk of homelessness. As in the AB 2034 program, FSPs will assist clients with finding and maintaining housing.

The State MHSA Housing Program will provide $115 million annually in capital and operating funds to create affordable housing with services for MHSA clients. Draft guidelines for this program have just been released. In addition, San Diego County Mental Health Services has made a local commitment to housing capital and operating funds. As the housing technical consultant, the Corporation for Supportive Housing (CSH) has facilitated a planning process with mental health stakeholders and housing funders to develop a Housing Implementation Plan for MHSA clients.

A draft of the Housing Implementation Plan is currently under review by the County Mental Health Services Administration. The Plan will provide a road map for the creation of new housing opportunities over a six year timeline. Housing opportunities will be developed through new construction, acquisition / rehabilitation, and master leasing strategies. For new construction and acquisition / rehabilitation projects, sponsors are expected to leverage State and local MHSA housing funds with a variety of other sources, including Low Income Housing Tax Credits (9% and 4%), State Proposition 1C Multifamily Housing Program (MHP) funds, federal HUD homeless McKinney Vento programs, and locally administered sources such as HOME, redevelopment funds, and housing trust funds.

This Housing Implementation Plan seeks to meet the needs of clients through the provision of housing opportunities throughout the county. In addition to mental health clients and service providers, the San Diego Housing Commission and County HCD were integral to the first phase of the planning process. CSH seeks to discuss the proposed housing guidelines and development strategies with agencies across the region. We look forward to providing background and receiving input on the future of housing for mental health clients in San Diego County.
San Diego County MHSA Housing Implementation Plan: 
Frequently Asked Questions and Answers

What is the Mental Health Services Act (Proposition 63)?
The Mental Health Services Act (MHSA) was passed in November 2004 by the voters of California as Proposition 63. The Act includes a 1% income tax on millionaires that provides funding dedicated to serving individuals with mental illness. Please see accompanying one page handout titled, “Mental Health Services Act Background.”

What is the San Diego County MHSA Housing Implementation Plan?
A Plan for the creation of housing opportunities for Full Service Partnership (FSP) clients in the San Diego region. The Plan sets housing targets to be developed over a six year timeline, and guidelines for the housing that is developed.

What was the planning process for the Housing Implementation Plan?
The Corporation for Supportive Housing (CSH) is working as the Housing Technical Consultant for San Diego County Mental Health Services (SDMHS). In this role, CSH and its consultants held a series of 8 client focus groups with transition age youth, adults and older adults throughout the county. CSH also facilitated a series of stakeholder consultations through the Mental Health Services Housing Council to develop housing guidelines, financial models, and recommendations for the Plan. The Plan also builds on existing documents, including the 2001 San Diego County Strategic Housing Plan for Low-Income Persons with Psychiatric Disabilities (commissioned by SDMHS), and the Plan to End Chronic Homelessness in the San Diego Region.

What does the MHSA have to do with housing?
Many unserved and underserved persons with mental illness are homeless or living in unstable or inappropriate housing. Addressing their mental health needs appropriately requires also getting them into stable housing. MHSA funds can be used to create and/or operate supportive housing.

Feedback from client focus groups indicated a high preference for affordable housing with supportive services. A portion of the housing opportunities for MHSA clients is expected to be permanent supportive housing, defined as deeply affordable housing in which tenants receive supportive services to help them maintain stability.

How is supportive housing created and operated?
Supportive housing is usually created by dedicated not-for-profit housing developers or service providers who build or lease houses or apartments. Funding for supportive housing comes from a variety of local, state and federal sources to pay for both the development or rehabilitation of buildings (capital costs) and for operating costs (the costs of a lease or of maintaining housing units over time.) Because tenants of supportive housing have very low incomes and their rents are kept low to be affordable, ongoing operating support is usually needed to make supportive housing work.
Who will the San Diego MHSA housing be for?
The Plan provides a roadmap for the development of develop housing opportunities for adults, older adults and transition-age youth (18-24) who are homeless or at risk of homelessness, and who have serious mental illness. All of the dedicated MHSA housing units will be for clients enrolled in Full Service Partnerships.

What are the proposed guidelines for MHSA housing developments?
The Plan includes extensive feedback from clients and stakeholders. Clients living in MHSA housing units will not share bedrooms, and the preference is for each individual client to have her own apartment. All clients will have access to bathrooms and kitchen facilities in their units. Units are expected to be at least 350 to 400 square feet for individual clients, and larger for family units. MHSA units will be in buildings with only units dedicated to FSP clients and also in mixed tenancy buildings that include general affordable housing units.

Where will the money come from for the housing units?
SDMHS has dedicated approximately $9.4 million in one-time MHSA funds for developing housing opportunities and nearly $2.2 million annually in ongoing to help fund operations. These funds are expected to leverage local, state, federal and private funding to develop and operate the units. The Housing Implementation Plan includes financial models that include leveraging Low Income Housing Tax Credits, State Proposition 1C Multifamily Housing Program (MHP) funds, the State MHSA Housing Program, federal HUD homeless McKinney Vento programs, and locally administered housing dollars.

What is the State MHSA Housing Program?
The State is dedicating $115 million annually for permanent supportive housing for MHSA clients. The draft guidelines for this program were recently released by the California Department of Mental Health (http://www.dmh.ca.gov/mhsa/Housing.asp), and the funds will be made available later this summer. The State MHSA Housing Program includes $75 million for new construction or acquisition and rehabilitation developments, and $40 million for operating costs. These funds are available to housing projects for MHSA clients that are approved by County Mental Health Services.

How much will San Diego County receive from the State MHSA Housing Program?
San Diego County is expected to receive between $6 to $7 million annually in capital funds and $3 million in operating funds. These funds will be disbursed directly from CalHFA for each project, on an over-the-counter basis.

How do I learn more about MHSA housing in San Diego?
Please contact Charlie Corrigan at the Corporation for Supportive Housing, 619-232-1982, or charles.corrigan@csh.org. We look forward to discussing the MHSA Housing Implementation Plan with stakeholders and receiving their input and concerns.
Regional Shoreline Management Activities

Regional Planning Committee
April 6, 2007
Regional Shoreline Management Activities

- Background
- California Coastal Commission Memorandum of Agreement
- Coastal Regional Sediment Management Plan
- Regional Beach Replenishment Cost-benefit Analysis
Background

• Working Group advises Regional Planning Committee
• Provides yearly updates
• Makes recommendations when applicable
A. California Coastal Commission MOA

- Fund created by California Coastal Commission (CCC)
- New MOA similar to existing for administration of Beach Sand Mitigation Fund
- SANDAG role is administration and oversight
- Use of funds requires local jurisdiction, CCC, and SANDAG approval
A. Recommendation

- RPC recommendation to Board of Directors
- Authorize SANDAG Executive Director to enter into MOA
B. Coastal Regional Sediment Management Plan

- Funded by California Department of Boating and Waterways
- Award for $150,000 with an in-kind contribution provided through staff support
B. Recommendation

- RPC recommendation to Executive Committee
- Amend FY 2007 budget and OWP
- Authorize SANDAG Executive Director to enter into revenue agreement and procure a consultant
C. Regional Beach Replenishment Cost-Benefit Analysis

Background

- Implement Shoreline Preservation Strategy and RCP
- Determine feasibility to compete for state and federal funds
- Cost-benefit analysis is first step
- Funded by coastal cities

Next Steps

- Procure consultant for cost-benefit analysis preparation
- Identify costs of additional feasibility requirements
Proposition 1C

The Housing and Emergency Shelter Trust Fund Act of 2006

$2.85 billion
PROP. 1C
Affordable Housing Programs - $1.5 billion

$ Millions

Homeownership 625
Multifamily Housing 590
Homeless Shelters and Farmworker Housing 185
Affordable Housing Innovation Fund* 100

*Requires implementing legislation
PROP. 1C
Development Programs - $1.35 billion

$ Millions

Regional Planning, Housing, and Infill Account 850
($200M for parks)*

Housing Urban-Suburban-and-Rural Parks Account* 200

Transit-Oriented Development Account (Administered by HCD) 300

* Requires implementing legislation
PROP. 84 - $580 million
Parks, Urban Greening, Planning Grants

$ Millions

Local and regional parks  400  (Administered by CA Dept. of Parks and Recreation)
Urban greening projects  *  90
Planning grants and incentives for regional/local land use plans  *  90

* Requires implementing legislation
Regional Comprehensive Plan

Smart Growth Concept Map

Smart Growth Areas

- Metropolitan Center
- Urban Center
- Town Center
- Community Center
- Rural Village* (with core area)
- Mixed Use Transit Corridor
- Special Use Center

*Note: Rural Village areas marked with an asterisk are considered as potential locations for future development.
Opportunities for Input

• Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD)

• California Legislature
  – Implementing legislation
  – Budget process

• Governor’s Office
  – Budget process (May revise)
Prop 1C Bond Meetings – Local & Statewide

- SANDAG CA Bond Stakeholders Mtg. – 1/31/07
- Legislative committees – Sacramento
- California Association of Councils of Governments (CALCOG)
- League of CA Cities/CA State Association of Counties (CSAC)
- HCD Meetings – 3/6/07 and 3/12/07
- Regional Stakeholders Mtg. on Proposition 1C and Proposition 84 Sustainable Communities – 3/15/07
Groups Proposing Guiding Principles/Criteria

- SANDAG and regional stakeholders
- City of San Diego
- CALCOG, League of CA Cities, and CSAC
- Housing California
- Planning and Conservation League
- California Housing Consortium
- HCD
- State Legislature – 26 bills introduced
Funding Allocation/Implementing Legislation Proposals

- Geographic allocation of funds – North/South split (40/60 percent)
- Allocation of funds by state – HCD and Parks & Recreation
- Ranking criteria
Ranking Criteria

- Housing-related
  - Certified housing element/annual report compliance
  - Affordable housing component
  - Level/duration of affordability
  - Progress toward meeting RHNA goals
  - Number of units constructed
  - Minimum residential densities
Ranking Criteria (cont.)

• Proximity to public transit/other services; urban design
  – Located within ¼ mile of transit
  – Proximity to parks and other services/amenities
  – Joint use project
  – Good urban design
  – Pedestrian-friendly project

• Project location
  – Consistency with Smart Growth Concept Map
  – Located in low/moderate income Census tract
  – Located in park deficient area (for park funds)
Ranking Criteria (cont.)

- Local leveraging of funds
- Project readiness
- Maximum award amounts to ensure funding in multiple jurisdictions
- Use of same/similar criteria for bond programs
Next Steps

- One or two more Regional Stakeholders meetings
- Finalize proposal(s) for criteria and principles
- Local delegation meeting – May 2007
- Present regional proposal to key legislators
- Monitor/influence implementing legislation and regulations for consistency with regional proposal(s)
Time Line

- Develop consensus on principles and criteria/monitor implementing legislation – March 2007 to August 2007
- Implementing legislation approved – October 2007
- Notices of Funding Availability (NOFA) – January 2008
- Local jurisdictions develop project lists/apply for funding – October to March 2008
## PROP. 84 - $ 5.4 billion

Water Quality, Safety and Supply, Flood Control, Natural Resource Protection, Park Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount ($ Millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safe drinking water, water quality, and other water projects</td>
<td>1,525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection of rivers, lakes, and streams</td>
<td>928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood control</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable communities</td>
<td>580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaches, bays, and coastal water</td>
<td>540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State parks and nature education &amp; research</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forests and wildlife conservation</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide water management and planning</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Prop 84 Funding

• Roughly 50% water, 50% land conservation
• Water supply and quality, habitat protection, coastal resources preservation
• Most allocations to continue existing programs
• Most allocations fund existing state programs and priorities
• Competitive grants to emphasize leverage for all bond funds
Key Programs and Departments for San Diego

Water Supply and Quality

- **Department of Water Resources**
  - $91 M to San Diego for Integrated Water Management
  - $80 M loans for Water Pollution Prevention

- **State Water Resources Control Board**
  - $80 M Stormwater Protection Matching Grant
  - $90 M Clean Beach Matching Grants
Key Programs and Departments for San Diego

**Habitat Conservation**

- **California Wildlife Conservation Board**
  - $275 M Habitat Protection, NCCP, and Working Landscapes

- **California State Parks**
  - $400 M for expansion and restoration of State Parks
Key Programs and Departments for San Diego

**Coastal Resource Protection**

- **California Coastal Conservancy**
  - $27 M for San Diego Bay Watershed
  - $135 M Coastal Preservation and Access
- **State Water Resources Control Board**
  - $90 M Clean Beach Matching Grants
- **California Ocean Protection Trust**
  - $90 M for Marine Resource Protection
Existing Stakeholder Groups - Water

• Integrated Regional Water Management Plan
  – Lead by CWA, City and County of San Diego
  – Tasked with development of an IRWM Plan including competitive projects.
  – SANDAG is one of 22 Advisory Members
  – Draft IRWM Plan out in Spring for Public Review
  – Prop 84 help to implement projects in IRWM
Existing Working Groups - Habitat

- Prop 84 Ad Hoc Habitat Stakeholder Group
  - Organized by Endangered Habitat League
  - Self tasked with review and coordination
  - 4 NGOs, Wildlife Agencies County of San Diego, SANDAG
    - Support Acquisitions in existing CAAPs
    - Work with Departments on Budget appropriations and future grant program
    - Link funding to future acquisition needs
Existing Working Groups – Coastal Resources

- Shoreline Preservation Working Group
  - California Coastal Conservancy
  - Boating and Waterways
  - California Coastal Coalition (Cal Coast)

Determine priorities and use of funds
Help establish allocation process
Propositions 1C & 84
Statewide Infrastructure Bonds

Regional Planning Committee Meeting

April 6, 2007
Regional Planning Committee
Structure

April 6, 2007
Board of Directors

Regional Planning Committee

- Shoreline Preservation Working Group
- Regional Housing Working Group
- Regional Energy Working Group
- Environmental Mitigation Program Working Group

Regional Planning Technical Working Group

- Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group
- Smart Growth Urban Design Guidelines Ad Hoc Working Group
- SPRINT Smart Growth Working Group