REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION AND ACTIONS
MEETING OF APRIL 6, 2007

Due to the absence of the Chair and Co-Chair, the meeting of the Regional Planning Committee was called to order by Mayor Lori Holt Pfeiler (North County Inland) at 12:11 p.m. See the attached attendance sheet for Regional Planning Committee member attendance.

Acting Chair Holt Pfeiler asked Committee Members to introduce themselves, as many changes had occurred in membership.

1. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

   Action: Upon a motion by Mayor Lesa Heebner (North County Coastal) and a second by Supervisor Pam Slater-Price (County of San Diego), the Regional Planning Committee approved the minutes from the January 5, 2007, meeting.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

   There were no public comments/communications/member comments.

CONSENT ITEMS

3. SPRINT SMART GROWTH WORKING GROUP UPDATE

   Action: This item was presented for information only.

4. REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE STRUCTURE AND WORKING GROUPS

   Coleen Clementson (SANDAG) presented an update on the Regional Planning Committee Working Groups. She explained that the main focus of the Regional Planning Committee (RPC) is to work on the implementation of the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP). There are eight Working Groups that report to the RPC:

   - **Shoreline Preservation Working Group** is chaired by Mayor Anne Kulchin (City of Carlsbad). The group advises the RPC on the implementation of the Shoreline Preservation Strategy. Shelby Tucker (SANDAG) provides staff support to this group.
• **Regional Housing Working Group** is co-chaired by Councilmember Toni Atkins (City of San Diego) and Duane Roth, CEO of CONNECT (a non-profit organization focused on assisting small start-up companies in San Diego). The RHWG serves as a forum for the discussion of regional housing issues and the development of regional housing solutions. Susan Baldwin (SANDAG) provides staff support to this group.

• **Regional Energy Working Group** is co-chaired by Councilmember Henry Abarbanel (City of Del Mar) and Mayor Art Madrid (City of La Mesa). The RHWG advises the RPC on the Regional Energy Strategy. Susan Freedman (SANDAG) provides staff support to this group.

• **Environmental Mitigation Working Group** is chaired by Councilmember Carrie Downey (City of Coronado) and Tom Oberbauer (County of San Diego). This working group was established with the TransNet Extension and is responsible for making recommendations on the Environmental Mitigation Program (EMP) implementation, such as how habitat management and monitoring funds shall be spent and establishing regional priorities for the expenditure of the EMP funds. Keith Greer (SANDAG) supports this group.

• **Regional Planning Technical Working Group** is chaired by Niall Fritz, Planning Director of the City of Poway, and is composed of the region’s planning directors that provide input on most items that come before the RPC that relate to the RCP. The Regional Planning Technical Working Group holds an advisory position on the RPC. Staff support to this group is provided by Carolina Gregor (SANDAG).

• **Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group** is chaired by Mayor Crystal Crawford (Del Mar) and holds an advisory position on the RPC, and is responsible for providing input on key RCP initiatives such as the Smart Growth Concept Map and RCP Monitoring Report. Their main focus for the rest of the calendar year will be on providing input on the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Update. Carolina Gregor (SANDAG) supports this group. The RPSWG will sunset once the RTP is adopted.

• **Smart Growth Urban Design Guidelines Ad Hoc Working Group** was formed to advise staff and the RPC on the development of the smart growth urban design guidelines to illustrate smart growth planning principles. The focus of the group so far has been on developing the Request for Proposals to hire a consultant. Periodic reports will be made to the RPC as the Guidelines are developed.

• **SPRINTER Smart Growth Working Group** is chaired by Jerry Backoff, Planning Director for the City of San Marcos. The group includes planning and public works directors from the jurisdictions with SPRINTER stations as well as major employers within station areas. This working group provides a forum to share information on Smart Growth development and is supported by Susan Baldwin (SANDAG).

Mayor Heebner asked if the working groups report regularly to the Committee, if they are working on specific projects that have an end time, and if they can be accessed for reports to Council.
Ms. Clementson responded that the working groups will provide regular reports to the RPC. Additionally, some of the working group members have attended local City Council meetings, along with SANDAG staff, to make presentations on various topics.

Deputy Mayor Dave Druker (NCTD) stated that Councilmember Henry Abarbanel (City of Del Mar) requests that the Energy Working Group have a seat on the RPC because energy is very important to planning and that it may be necessary to have this representation on a full-time basis.

Mayor Holt Pfeiler stated that this could be a future agenda item.

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

5. ENERGY WORKING GROUP (EWG) CHARTER AMENDMENTS

Susan Freedman (SANDAG) cited the proposed EWG charter amendments which include:

- Expanding the voting membership from 22 to 25 members. The three additional members would be the Independent Power Producer (IPP), the San Diego Renewable Energy Society (SDRES), and the South County Economic Development Council (SCEDC).

- Limiting membership to 25 voting members.

- Instituting an attendance policy.

- Including technical edits that would include language to align energy planning activities with the RCP and RTP, clarify subregional representation, and update outdated language on working group duration.

Mayor Jim Janney (South County) asked about regional elected officials and their alternates.

Ms. Freedman answered that presently, all the subregions are represented. The South County representative is Councilmember Steve Castaneda (Chula Vista). When unable to attend, his staff person with expertise in energy issues, Linda Wagner, has been serving in his place. The County of San Diego has been sending their energy advisor, Jose Cervantes, to serve in place of an elected official. As this is not a standard practice for all working groups, it is necessary to call this out; that when an elected official is not able to attend, they can still have representation from their subregion.

Mayor Heebner questioned the third new phrase to be added (Attachment 1, under Responsibilities), “the EWG should ensure that regional energy planning activities align with the objectives of the RTP, the RCP, and the REPS.” She said she understood the intention, however, as the EWG actually informs the RPC. She asked what would happen if they had some new information that may not align with what is currently known. She questioned the word “align” and stated it may not be the right word.

Ms. Freedman clarified that the intent is not to exclude any type of planning activities. It was meant to recognize that since the EWG was formed, the RCP was developed and
adopted and there is no reference to that, and a lot of times what the EWG is doing is advising on issues that will assist in the implementation of the RCP and RTP. The intent is to recognize this.

Acting Chair Holt Pfeiler added that it would be possible to use the words “related to,” however, the EWG has been a sensitive subject for the Executive Committee. She expressed the importance of knowing the particular goal and that the working group assists in achieving that goal. The concern is that SANDAG is trying to do too much and it is important to keep the EWG focused on the priorities. She said “align” may have been the right word; however, it could be changed to “related.” It should relate to the goals of SANDAG.

Mayor Heebner stated “related” would make sense to her.

Supervisor Slater-Price asked if most of the 22 members attended most of the time.

Ms. Freedman replied yes, there are a handful of members that attend sporadically; however, the majority of the members attend every meeting. There was a desire to ensure, through an attendance policy, that quorum issues not be experienced with the additional members.

Supervisor Slater-Price asked if a member was unable to attend, had they been asked to provide an alternate.

Ms. Freedman stated that all members are encouraged to appoint an alternate. Nearly half of the members have a named alternate and, at the next meeting, the others without alternates will be asked to provide one.

Supervisor Slater-Price asked that the intent of the EWG be explained.

Gary Gallegos (SANDAG) stated that its broadest responsibilities are to advise the Board on the implementation of measures that conform to the Regional Energy Strategy (RES) that the Board has adopted. The RES is part of the overall Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) and that’s why it is important that all of these are aligned so that you don’t have a committee doing something the Board hasn’t adopted as a strategy.

Supervisor Slater-Price asked if, in terms of the intent, maybe the word “align” is actually what is intended.

Mayor Heebner stated that she brought the issue up due to the Sunrise Powerlink since they are informing the Committee on an issue which is “somewhat” controversial, she was not sure if the word “align” was correct. She preferred having access to their expertise and having the ability to rely on people who have time to focus on the issues and inform the Committee, so that an informed opinion could be made that would then “align” with the rest.

Acting Chair Holt Pfeiler agreed, and in terms of the Powerlink, it is important that comments be made in the context of what the regional goal is. The regional goal of the RES
is planning for enough power for the region. So the Committee is able to discuss the Powerlink and is not inhibited due to that piece of it.

Gary Gallegos stated that it would “align” from the perspective that one of the several strategies in the RES is to increase transmission capacity. Hopefully the group would bring advice on which specific line is best. However, it is in “alignment” with the fact that one of the strategies is to add transmission capacity into the region’s portfolio. And that’s part of the strategy that the Board has adopted and it gets updated on a regular basis. So, in the next update, for example, if the strategy changed a little bit, the desire is that this Committee stay “aligned” with the strategy given to them and that they’re not working on something that’s out of “alignment.”

Supervisor Slater-Price asked if the Sunrise Powerlink has sought endorsement from SANDAG.

Gary Gallegos said that they had come to SANDAG seeking a determination. The Board stated that the strategy calls for more transmission capacity; however, they were not prepared, based on advice from this Committee, to specifically give an opinion as the environmental work had not yet been performed. The Board informed them that it would be examined later once more information was received.

Supervisor Slater-Price asked if options are being considered between having such a large infrastructure project and having more localized smaller energy plants such as the ones in Escondido and South Bay.

Acting Chair Holt Pfeiler stated it was necessary to have the Energy Working Group work on this issue.

Gary Gallegos remarked on the importance of the Energy working Group and its role in the update of the Strategy.

Mayor Heebner stated that with this information, she is aligned with “align.”

**Action:** Upon a motion by Lesa Heebner and a second by Supervisor Pam Slater-Price, the item was approved unanimously.

6. **RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE SHORELINE PRESERVATION WORKING GROUP**

Shelby Tucker (SANDAG) explained that the Shoreline Preservation Working Group (SPWG) advises the RPG on issues related to the implementation of the Shoreline Preservation Strategy. The Strategy proposes an extensive beach building and maintenance program for the critical shoreline erosion areas in the region and contains recommendations on the Beach Building Program and its financing and implementation. It also provides guidance on methods available to reach the goal of protecting and restoring beaches in the San Diego region. A major priority for the SPWG is the continuation of support for regional ongoing and future beach nourishment efforts.
A. California Coastal Commission Memorandum of Agreement

Ms. Tucker informed that the California Coastal Commission recently created a Public Recreational Beach Impact Mitigation Fund. The funds will be used to mitigate adverse impacts on public recreational uses of beaches within the region. SANDAG's role will be to collect the funds for each jurisdiction and work with the jurisdiction to process the requests for funds. The use of funds requires local jurisdiction, Commission, and SANDAG approval.

Councilmember Carrie Downey (City of Coronado), representing the Shoreline Preservation Committee, heartily endorsed the item as it is a way to pass money on to the cities.

Deputy Mayor Druker asked about the amount of money and if it is by jurisdiction, or for the whole County.

Ms. Tucker responded that there will be two separate funds and each fund will be organized by jurisdiction.

Deputy Mayor Druker stated that it is purely by jurisdiction.

Ms. Tucker replied that he was correct. It is mitigation occurring in that jurisdiction.

Deputy Mayor Druker added that it is funds coming from that jurisdiction.

Ms. Tucker said that funds are coming from landowners who are required to mitigate for impacts within a jurisdiction.

Deputy Mayor Druker asked why, if the money is for the jurisdiction and is coming to the jurisdiction.

Ms. Tucker clarified by saying that it basically has to do with ease of access in getting to the funds. A mechanism was not in place at the Coastal Commission to deal with this type of scenario, so they asked SANDAG to take on this role.

Deputy Mayor Druker stated that he thought the money was regional money and not jurisdiction money. He explained that the City of Del Mar has visitors that come from various areas, and expressed concern that Del Mar will not be able to tap into the money as no development is occurring in the area.

Councilmember Downey responded that one of the goals of the Committee is to find out how to deal with the entire shoreline infrastructure, how to obtain beach sand, and other issues. The fund is earmarked and the reason that SANDAG is doing it is because the Coastal Commission does not want to monitor it. They are just a neutral third party.

Gary Gallegos added that he believed that for the Coastal Commission, it is sort of retail versus a wholesale-type argument. Should they give it to the jurisdictions, it involves many jurisdictions. However, should they give it to SANDAG, it becomes SANDAG’s job.
Supervisor Slater-Price said that actually, that is one of the persuasive elements of the argument because all of the coastal cities are member cities of SANDAG, so you will not have to go to Sacramento for the funds.

Deputy Mayor Druker stated he understood the reasoning.

Supervisor Slater-Price stated she understood his concerns; however, this is not the source of funding to address his complaint.

Councilmember Steve Gronke (North County Inland) asked why the sediment dredged from Oceanside harbor was not put onto the beaches. He asked why they chose this, and if SANDAG had a role in the decision.

Ms. Tucker responded that SANDAG was not involved in the decision, and her understanding from staff was that the sediment was going to be placed on the beach.

Councilmember Gronke asked if SANDAG will have an opportunity to work with those agencies in making that decision in the future.

Ms. Tucker asked if the decision was in regard to where the sand goes.

Councilmember Gronke replied yes.

Ms. Tucker stated that issues such as this would be discussed at the Shoreline Preservation Group meetings; however, that particular decision is up to Oceanside.

Councilmember Gronke asked if it is a local jurisdiction decision.

Ms. Tucker replied affirmatively.

Councilmember Gronke brought up a second question, pertaining to the sum of the monies of the mitigation. He asked if there are trails along waterways, if there would be an opportunity to receive funds.

Ms. Tucker replied yes, the new fund that is being created is a broader fund. It has a recreational component, so the money can be used for building a trail or for improvements to restrooms or other facilities that pertain to the recreation aspects of beaches.

Councilmember Gronke asked if it has to be beaches, or if it could include inland.

Ms. Tucker responded that it is for beaches.

**Action:** Upon a motion by Supervisor Slater-Price and a second by Mayor Janney, the RPC unanimously recommended the Board of Directors authorize SANDAG’s Executive Director to enter into an MOA with the California Coastal Commission.
B. Coastal Regional Sediment Management Plan

Ms. Tucker announced that SANDAG recently received a grant from the California Department of Boating and Waterways (DBW) to prepare a Coastal Regional Sediment Management Plan for the San Diego region. The amount of the contribution was $150,000, with an in-kind contribution being provided through staff support. The Management Plan is intended to formulate consensus-driven regional sediment management guidance and policy. The final product will discuss how regional management of sediment targeted at coastal erosion can be implemented in an expeditious, cost-effective, and resource-protective manner throughout the region.

Mayor Heebner asked for information, as she understood that in the State budget the DBW did not add money for its own salaries for work on sand issues. She asked Steve Aceti of the California Coastal Coalition to clarify.

Mr. Aceti said that the DBW had been in charge of the program since the passage of AB 64, which created the Beach Restoration Program, and helped pay for the 2001 Regional Sand Project in the San Diego region. Every year since 1999, the DBW has funded the Public Beach Restoration Program. Monies come from the Harbors and Watercraft revolving fund, which receives monies from recreational boater license fees and a gas tax. The boaters have not been happy with the DBW as they believe that their money is being used for beach restoration. The legislature has told the boaters that they should consider this as mitigation for the damage that is done to the shore from harbors, ports, and marinas. This year, DBW made a policy decision internally to not fund this program. They did, however, fund the salary of the manager of the program. The Resource Secretary notified DBW about two weeks ago that they will fund the program in FY 07/08. The DBW produced a finance letter to finance the program. The Coastal Coalition has been working with Senator Ducheney's office and the Coastal Conservancy to move the program from DBW to the Coastal Conservancy. Mr. Aceti felt the funding will be obtained and the program will be moved to the Coastal Conservancy.

Action: Upon a motion by Supervisor Slater-Price and a second by Mayor Heebner the RPC unanimously recommended that the Executive Committee amend the FY 07 Overall Work Program (OWP) and Budget to include the Coastal Regional Sediment Management Plan and enter into the revenue agreement with California DBW and procure a consultant for project development.

C. Regional Beach Replenishment Cost-Benefit Analysis

Ms. Tucker informed that the SPWG has been discussing the potential for implementing a beach sand replenishment project similar to the one in 2001, named the Regional Beach Sand Project. To compete for state and federal funds, a feasibility study must be completed. There are five components to the feasibility study, and the estimated cost for the study is $40,000 and will be funded by the region’s coastal cities. Should the coastal jurisdictions determine that they wish to continue with the project, the SPWG will make a recommendation to the RPC and final approval will be made by the Board of Directors.
Councilmember Downey stated that the coastal cities have tentatively said that they will fund the initial part; however, when the actual decision of how to fund the project, it is the Shoreline Preservation Committee’s concern that the coastal cities should not have to fund the project by themselves, as people come from other jurisdictions to use the beaches. She asked for participation from others regarding this item.

Steve Aceti of the California Coastal Coalition informed the RPC on the Coalition’s membership and history. He cited other regions such as Ventura and Orange County that are following SANDAG’s example. He stated that the SPWG is working now to find funds to proceed with replenishment projects. It now may be up to the region and the State to fund the projects, as funds are not available from the federal government.

Councilmember Gronke asked for clarification regarding the cost-benefit analysis. He understood cost, but as far as benefit, he asked if its aesthetics as much as commercial values.

Mr. Aceti replied that it had to do with a whole host of things including tax benefits, revenue that’s generated by beach visits, quality of life to the region, and the improvement of beach habitat.

Councilmember Gronke stated that he understood that the federal government will not provide monies and so replenishment like the one in 2001 may not occur.

Mr. Aceti said that 2001 was a one-time opportunity where the Coastal Commission ordered the Navy to provide mitigation funds. As California does not have a dedicated funding source for mitigation, it is very important to examine ways to get one.

Supervisor Slater-Price provided information on the Coastal Coalition and its effectiveness in working with the legislators in Sacramento and Washington, DC. She reiterated the need for inland residents to become involved in the issue and how the State has a financial interest and should allocate funding due to tourism generated by beaches. She commented that the State has control over how revenue is generated; therefore, the State should fund the program. It is in the interest of all to advocate for sand replenishment, beach cleanup, safe beaches, and adequate lifeguard service.

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

7. PROPOSITIONS 1C AND 84: STATUS REPORT

Susan Baldwin (SANDAG) provided an update on the Smart Growth and housing aspects provided through Propositions 1C and 84. The Sustainable Communities portion of Proposition 84 will provide developers and local jurisdictions funding for lower affordable housing, transit oriented development, infill development and infrastructure and planning funds that support these types of projects. She explained that a number of programs contained in these bonds require the adoption of implementing legislation or guidelines that will establish principles and criteria for how the bond funds will be spent.
Proposition 1C will provide $2.85 billion for affordable housing and infrastructure projects. The bond has two major components: affordable housing programs that provide additional funding made available through Proposition 46, and development programs that will provide grants for parks and other infill-related infrastructure and capital improvements and loans for transit-oriented housing developments. As implementation legislation is required to determine how the funds will be spent, there are at least 26 state bills that have been introduced that are now associated with Proposition 1C.

Other funding which is directed toward infrastructure and planning for more sustainable infill and compact development is $580 million available statewide in Proposition 84. These are additional funds that support housing and Smart Growth.

There are a number of opportunities for providing input on the implementing legislation and development of the guidelines through group meetings both local and statewide. Some of the proposals are:

- Geographic allocation of funds in which northern California would receive approximately 40% of the funds and southern California would receive 60%.
- Allocation of funds by the State by the Department of Housing and Community Development and Parks and Recreation Department, which is the general consensus at this time.

There are a number of ranking criteria with respect to the allocation of these funds. Ranking criteria being considered include:

- Housing-related
- Proximity to public transit/other services
- Project location
- Local leveraging of funds
- Project readiness
- Maximum award amounts to ensure funding in multiple jurisdictions
- Use of same/similar criteria for bond programs

Stakeholder meetings are being conducted to develop a regional proposal and consensus on types of regional criteria and guidelines that could be included in trailer legislation. Final proposals will be taken to a local delegation meeting of the state legislators for consideration.

What is important to the members of the RPC is that these funds are going to be available to the local jurisdictions. Members of the RPC should identify projects that could be funded through these funds.

Keith Greer (SANDAG) provided an update on Proposition 84, focusing on what funds from Proposition 84 would most directly benefit the San Diego region and the key stakeholder groups that would assist in maximizing funding directed to the region.
Proposition 84 would generate $5.4 billion for water supply and quality, flood control and flood protection, natural resource protection, and park land improvements. Half of the funding would go to water-related projects and half to land conservation. Most of the Proposition 84 funds provide an infusion of funding directly to the state departments. San Diego will not be eligible for the flood protection monies; however, will have access to both direct allocations and the opportunity for competitive grants.

Three key programs for San Diego are:

- **Water Supply and Quality** through the Department of Water Resources and the State Water Resources Control Board, who are developing integrated strategies to provide a reliable source of quality drinking water and stormwater runoff. Ninety-one Million Dollars has been allocated to San Diego directly for the completion and implementation of an integrated regional water management plan.

- **Habitat Conservation** through the California Wildlife Conservation Board and California State Parks, and the Prop. 84 Ad Hoc Habitat Stakeholder Group, all who are working to acquire lands and other actions that will, in turn, will implement San Diego’s regional preserve system.

- **Coastal Resource Protection** through the Coastal Resource Protection, State Water Resources Control Board, California Ocean Protection Trust, and the Shoreline Preservation Working Group, who will conduct activities directed at stormwater management that affects the beaches, beach access, and other beach preservation projects.

Deputy Mayor Druker asked if the $135 million for coastal preservation and access from the Coastal Conservancy was specifically for the San Diego area.

Mr. Greer answered that the amount was to be distributed statewide.

Deputy Mayor Druker asked if the access programs are more than just for trails, etc., and would include facilities.

Mr. Greer responded it is his understanding that it includes a number of items and is more than just coastal access and could include linear trails along the beaches.

Deputy Mayor Druker expressed his concern for Del Mar and some type of facilities services that could be provided but are not due to the lack of funds. He wondered if this could be part of Proposition 84.

Mr. Aceti said that he thought it could be.

Deputy Mayor Druker added that it would be nice to see some type of criteria based upon the proportionality of visitors to the beach versus residents.

Mr. Aceti stated that the Ocean Protection Council is in a position of being a fairly new State entity which just received a lot of money that isn’t spoken for yet.
Deputy Mayor Druker reiterated his support of criteria that would rank a small city with many outside visitors arriving on a daily basis to their beach as having the benefit of a higher ranking than a large city.

Supervisor Slater-Price agreed with Deputy Mayor Druker. She added that even though it sounds self-serving, it is factual. Coastal cities with very small populations and tax bases are inundated with visitors from the outside that do not contribute directly to the economy.

Councilmember Gronke offered that it might be a good idea when SANDAG meets with interest groups; it takes the message of the smaller cities. He asked if the legislative would directly pass that money to the agencies or would there be some sort of pass-through through SANDAG or other agencies.

Mr. Greer stated that depending upon state agency which is allocating the funds, they would determine whether there is going to be a direct allocation or a competitive grant process. The majority will be competitive grant processes.

Councilmember Gronke said the direct allocations are already predetermined by the State legislation and that means the competitive portion of the priorities may be determined by the Stakeholders. So as a region, we may compete as a city jurisdiction under the guidelines of what the Stakeholders have determined.

Mr. Greer stated he was correct.

Bob Leiter (SANDAG) added that in the area of housing and Smart Growth infrastructure, SANDAG staff is working with the Stakeholders groups, the planning directors of the cities and the County through the Regional Planning Technical Working Group, and also keeping city managers apprised on the programs. All are encouraged to prepare projects and be ready to apply for the funds. In the area of environmental funding, in addition to working with the Stakeholders groups, SANDAG staff will be conducting a series of workshops at the Policy Board meetings during the next three months. The first one will be on May 11. The topic will be water quality and stormwater management. In June, the topic will be habitat conservation, and in July, the topic will be beach sand and shoreline preservation. SANDAG will also conduct discussions about some of the broader aspects of the environmental issues. After making the members of the RPC aware of the meetings, he encouraged everyone to attend.

Councilmember Teresa Barth (North County Coastal) asked if some of the funding would be available for items such as water testing.

Mr. Greer responded yes, however, the State wants to develop a Strategic Plan for supply and what enters the pipe and what leaves the pipe. Their goal is to align the Plan with the regional and State priorities. A list of projects will be developed to implement the priorities. The IRWMP is designed to develop a Strategic Plan to address water.

Councilmember Barth asked if SANDAG or the State would be proposing the specific projects.
Mr. Greer clarified that the entire region will be identifying projects and they will be inserted into the appropriate category of the State priorities. There will be competition between projects internally within our region.

Gary Nordstrom (Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group) mentioned that relative to affordable housing, with respect to these funds, wouldn’t it be appropriate to install tankless water heaters which conserve gas, electricity, and water instead of traditional water heaters. Secondly, the City of San Diego requires the conversion of all the toilets to low flow. It is not presently a requirement with the other cities. He asked if this is something SANDAG should pursue with the other jurisdictions.

Susan Baldwin (SANDAG) said it was true that his suggestion of sustainable practices and resource protection practices could be used as criteria for the use of affordable housing funds, and she would keep his suggestion in mind as discussions about the funds progress as green practices are becoming more of an issue.

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

8. PROPOSITION 63 – MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES ACT (MHSA) FUNDS

Susan Baldwin (SANDAG) introduced Simonne Ruff and Charles Corrigan of the Corporation for Supportive Housing, who presented information on Proposition 63, the Mental Health Services Act funds.

Ms. Ruff, explained that the Corporation for Supportive Housing is a national organization focusing on the development of deeply affordable housing with services for special needs populations. They have supported the development of over 800 units of supportive housing in San Diego. The purpose of Proposition 63, also known as the “Millionaires Tax,” was to transform the mental health system and provide services for those who are unserved or underserved. It’s an income source that is not subject to appropriations at the State level and is a guaranteed source of income. The Corporation for Supportive Housing advises San Diego County Health on the use of housing funds. They will be creating an Implementation Plan which outlines what this type of housing may look like and how to leverage funds. They are also compiling an inventory of all housing inventories for people with mental illness and are exploring ways to increase access to housing.

Mr. Corrigan stated that recently they had eight focus groups with special needs clients throughout every region in the County. They have also had several months of Stakeholders meetings, mostly through the Mental Health Services Housing Council, which is a group of service providers, housing funders, and development groups. Through these meetings, they have been able to create a draft Implementation Plan which is presently being reviewed by County Mental Health. Regarding the housing funds, the MHSA has $115 million dedicated statewide each year for housing of MHSA clients. The guidelines for the state program were announced in March and are presently being revised, with an expected arrival date of July 2007. All applications for funds will be processed through County Mental Health.

Ms. Ruff informed on the next steps, which are determining how to manage and implement the funds through the Implementation Plan, and how to work in the region to identify...
opportunities to create new housing for the MHSA target population. And how to get the maximum leverage with other sources of funds such as Proposition 1C tax credits and other federal dollars.

Acting Chair Holt Pfeiler commented that this program may assist with the homeless problem.

Ms. Ruff said that it will definitely make a dent. It is the first time that there are services, operating, and capital monies all together in a coordinated fashion.

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

9. **UPCOMING MEETINGS**

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

10. **ADJOURNMENT**

Acting Chair Holt Pfeiler adjourned the meeting at 1:50 p.m.
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<td>Member</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Lemon Grove</td>
<td>Jerry Selby</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Toni Atkins, Vice Chair</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Jerry Sanders</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Pam Slater-Price</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Bill Horn</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Members</td>
<td>Caltrans, District 11</td>
<td>Pedro Orso-Delgado</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bill Figge</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>San Diego County Water Authority</td>
<td>Howard Williams</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>Department of Defense</td>
<td>Susanah Aguilera</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>San Diego Unified Port District</td>
<td>Michael Bixler</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Emeritus William Hall</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>Harry Mathis</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bob Emery</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>NCTD</td>
<td>Dave Druker</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ed Gallo</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG)</td>
<td>Niall Fritz</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBREGIONAL AREA</strong></td>
<td><strong>JURISDICTION</strong></td>
<td><strong>NAME</strong></td>
<td><strong>MEMBER/ALTERNATE</strong></td>
<td><strong>ATTENDING</strong></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>Alternate</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>Southern California Tribal Chairmen’s Association</td>
<td>Johnny Hernandez</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Allen Lawson</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>Wildlife Conservation Board</td>
<td>John Donnelly</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>Debbie Townsend</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td>US Army Corps of Engineers</td>
<td>Mark Durham</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jeannette Baker</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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>
</tbody>
</table>