2008
Board of Directors Retreat
Borrego Springs
January 30 - February 1
January 24, 2008

TO: Retreat Participants

FROM: Gary Gallegos, Executive Director

SUBJECT: 2008 Board Retreat – January 30, 31, and February 1

The final details for the 2008 annual SANDAG retreat have been completed. Nearly six dozen of your colleagues will be attending the retreat.

For your information, I have enclosed the agenda and background materials. From these retreat discussions, we can develop ideas for the future direction of the agency, and indicate priorities for the new year. Please bring the agenda and background materials with you.

As mentioned in your invitation, the retreat atmosphere and attire are casual. At this time of year, mornings can be cool and afternoons windy in the Anza Borrego Desert where the resort is located. A map with driving directions to La Casa Del Zorro Resort is enclosed for your reference.

Questions regarding your resort accommodations may be directed to Joy DeKorte at (619) 699-1950, or jde@sandag.org; questions regarding the retreat agenda may be directed to Colleen Windsor, our Communications Director and retreat facilitator, at (619) 699-1960 or cwi@sandag.org. I look forward to a productive retreat.

GGA/cwi/mwo

Endosures
How to get to the Retreat . . .

See other side for detailed driving instructions

La Casa Del Zorro
3845 Yaqui Pass Road
760-767-5323
www.lacasadelzorro.com

Driving Time from Metro San Diego = 2 hours
How to get to the Retreat . . .

At Dudley’s Bakery (1), turn left onto Highway 79. Follow 79 to S2 (2) and turn right. Proceed on S2 and make a left onto S22 (3). Follow S22 through Borrego Springs and turn right on S3 (4), which is Yaqui Pass Road.

La Casa Del Zorro
3845 Yaqui Pass Road
760-767-5323
www.lacasadelzorro.com
2008 ANNUAL RETREAT
THEME: THE MEANING OF QUALITY OF LIFE FOR OUR REGION

January 30 and 31, February 1
La Casa del Zorro
Borrego Springs, California
(760) 767-5323

AGENDA

Wednesday, January 30

4 – 5:30 p.m.  Hotel check-in

3 – 4:45 p.m.  TEAM-BUILDING – Adding Balance to our Lives
(Croquet Lawn)

5 – 6 p.m.  BASICS FOR NEW BOARD/
ALTERNATE MEMBERS
(Kiva Room)

• What does SANDAG do and why?
• What are your roles and responsibilities as a SANDAG Director,
  Board Alternate, or Advisory member?
• How do you get the most out of the agency for your jurisdiction
  and the region?
• How do you contribute to get the most out of the retreat?

6:30 p.m.  DINNER
(De Anza Room)

Thursday, January 31

8 a.m.  BUFFET BREAKFAST
(De Anza Room)

8:45 – 9:30 a.m.  RETREAT PARTICIPANT INTRODUCTIONS
AND ORIENTATION
(De Anza Room)
Thursday, January 31 – continued

9:30 – 11:15 a.m.  
**EXAMINING SUCCESSFUL QUALITY OF LIFE MEASURES**  
(De Anza Room)

**B**  
- Andrea Mackenzie, General Manager, Sonoma County Agricultural Preservation and Open Space District  
- Adi Liberman, Vice Chair of the City of Los Angeles’ Proposition O Oversight Advisory Council

11:15 – 11:25 a.m.  
**PREPARING TO BREAK OUT**  
(De Anza Room)

11:35 a.m. – 12:35 p.m.  
**BREAKOUT SESSIONS – FIRST ROUND**

**C**  
**WATER QUALITY**  
(De Anza Room)

Facilitators: Chair Mayor Mary Teresa Sessom and Mayor Pro Tem Carrie Downey  
Staff: Shelby Tucker

Water bodies within the region are among our most valuable resources. But the quality of the region’s water bodies is affected by pollution. Three cost options for the implementation of a regional water quality management program aimed at pollution prevention and controlling point and non-point source discharges in stormwater and other urban runoff will be discussed.

**D**  
**PUBLIC TRANSIT**  
(Zorro Conference Center – Room 4)

Facilitators: Second Vice Chair Mayor Jerome Stocks and Councilmember Toni Atkins  
Staff: Dave Schumacher

Operating deficits continue to affect local transit agencies. In order to ensure an efficient and reliable transit system, and to meet growing demand, an ongoing, sustainable level of funding is needed. In addition, it is now the time to consider “next level” transit services and consider alternative solutions for non-urban core areas.
Thursday, January 31 - continued

E  
HABITAT CONSERVATION
(Zorro Conference Center – Room 1)

Facilitators:  First Vice Chair Mayor Lori Holt Pfeiler and Supervisor Greg Cox
Staff:  Keith Greer

San Diego County has been grappling with the conflict among growth, development, and economic prosperity, and the conservation of native species and their habitats. Today we consider breaking the cycle of the piecemeal approach toward habitat conservation planning and developing a cost-effective regional approach. The long-term success of these proposed plans relies upon the cooperative development of a secure, regional funding source by the cities and county.

F  
SHORELINE PRESERVATION
(Zorro Conference Center – Room 2)

Facilitators:  Mayor Jim Janney and Mayor Mark Lewis
Staff:  Rob Rundle

The Shoreline Preservation Strategy (SPS) outlines a long-term approach to addressing the region’s shoreline erosion problems. The SPS identified beach replenishment as the most environmentally sensitive approach to restoring the region’s beaches while maintaining the recreation and property protection qualities of beaches. Two cost options for long-term beach sand replenishment and possible construction of permanent sand retention structures will be discussed.

12:35 – 1:35 p.m.  
LUNCH
(Rose Garden)

1:45 – 2:45 p.m.  
BREAKOUT SESSIONS – SECOND ROUND

C  
WATER QUALITY
(De Anza Room)

Facilitators:  Chair Mayor Mary Teresa Sessom and Mayor Pro Tem Carrie Downey
Staff:  Shelby Tucker

Water bodies within the region are among our most valuable resources. But the quality of the region’s water bodies is affected by pollution. Three cost options for the implementation of a regional water quality management program aimed at pollution prevention and controlling point and non-point source discharges in stormwater and other urban runoff will be discussed.
Thursday, January 31 - continued

**D**

**PUBLIC TRANSIT**  
(Zorro Conference Center – Room 4)

Facilitators: Second Vice Chair Mayor Jerome Stocks and Councilmember Toni Atkins  
Staff: Dave Schumacher

Operating deficits continue to affect local transit agencies. In order to ensure an efficient and reliable transit system, and to meet growing demand, an ongoing, sustainable level of funding is needed. In addition, it is now the time to consider “next level” transit services and consider alternative solutions for non-urban core areas.

**E**

**HABITAT CONSERVATION**  
(Zorro Conference Center – Room 1)

Facilitators: First Vice Chair Mayor Lori Holt Pfeiler and Supervisor Greg Cox  
Staff: Keith Greer

San Diego County has been grappling with the conflict among growth, development, and economic prosperity, and the conservation of native species and their habitats. Today we consider breaking the cycle of the piecemeal approach toward habitat conservation planning and developing a cost-effective regional approach. The long-term success of these proposed plans relies upon the cooperative development of a secure, regional funding source by the cities and county.

**F**

**SHORELINE PRESERVATION**  
(Zorro Conference Center – Room 2)

Facilitators: Mayor Jim Janney and Mayor Mark Lewis  
Staff: Rob Rundle

The Shoreline Preservation Strategy (SPS) outlines a long-term approach to addressing the region’s shoreline erosion problems. The SPS identified beach replenishment as the most environmentally sensitive approach to restoring the region’s beaches while maintaining the recreation and property protection qualities of beaches. Two cost options for long-term beach sand replenishment and possible construction of permanent sand retention structures will be discussed.

3 - 3:15 p.m.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS**  
(De Anza Room)
Thursday, January 31 - continued

3:15 – 5:15 p.m.  **BREAKOUT WRAP UP AND DISCUSSION**  
(De Anza Room)

All retreat participants will regroup and discuss priorities and direction identified in the four breakout sessions. This session affords everyone an opportunity to finalize actions to move forward in water quality, public transit, habitat conservation, and shoreline preservation.

7 p.m.  **DINNER**  
(De Anza Room)

Friday, February 1

8:30 a.m.  **BUFFET BREAKFAST**  
(De Anza Room)

9 – 10:30 a.m.  **A LOOK AT THE LEGISLATIVE YEAR AHEAD: HON. CHRISTINE KEHOE**  
(De Anza Room)

- How can the San Diego region best advocate for its infrastructure and funding priorities during a difficult budget year?
- What should the role of SANDAG be in pending statewide legislation concerning climate change?
- What are other key legislative priorities for the region and the state this legislative session?

10:30 – 11 a.m.  **RETREAT SURVEY**

11 – 11:15 a.m.  **PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS**  
(De Anza Room)

12 – 2 p.m.  **LUNCH AND KEYNOTE SPEAKER**

- Ron Sims, King County Executive – Climate Change and Quality of Life

**I**  
**OTHER RESOURCE INFORMATION**

2 p.m.  **RETREAT CONCLUDES**

SANDAG Communications Director – Colleen Windsor – will serve as our retreat emcee.
BASICS FOR NEW BOARD AND ALTERNATE MEMBERS

- What does SANDAG do and why?
  → What is SANDAG?
  → Who are the Board of Directors, Alternates, and Advisory Members?
  → How is the voting accomplished?
  → How do the five Policy Advisory Committees work?
  → What are our milestones in regional decision-making?
  → What are our major mandates and designations?
  → How does SANDAG use its flexibility and latitude?
  → What are our limitations?

- What are your roles and responsibilities as a SANDAG Director, Board Alternate, or Advisory member?

- How do you get the most out of the agency for your jurisdiction and the region?

- What is this retreat all about; what are the topics; and how do you get the most out of the retreat?
**Agenda Item #11**

Senate Bill 10: Airport Authority Reform Act of 2007

**Action:** AGREE WITH INTENT/ CONVEY CONCERNS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JURISDICTION</th>
<th>VOTE</th>
<th>TALLY</th>
<th>WEIGHT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carlsbad</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronado</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County B</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Mar</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Cajon</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encinitas</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Beach</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Mesa</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemon Grove</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National City</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poway</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego B</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santee</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solana Beach</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(11%) (4%)

Failed
### Agenda Item #11
Regional Comprehensive Plan: 2007 Annual Performance Monitoring Report

**Action:** ACCEPT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Abstain</th>
<th>NP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carlsbad</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronado</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Mar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Cajon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encinitas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Beach</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Mesa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemon Grove</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National City</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poway</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solana Beach</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** 18 (100%) Yes, 98 (100%) No

Board of Directors Meeting, December 21, 2007

- Y: Yes
- N: No
- A: Abstain
- NP: Not Present
WHAT IS SANDAG?

The 18 cities and county government are SANDAG, the San Diego Association of Governments. This public agency serves as the forum for regional decision-making. SANDAG builds consensus, makes strategic plans, obtains and allocates resources, plans, engineers and builds public transportation, and provides information on a broad range of topics pertinent to the region’s quality of life.

On January 1, 2003, a new state law (SB 1703) consolidated all of the roles and responsibilities of SANDAG with many of the transit functions of the Metropolitan Transit Development Board (now Metropolitan Transit System) and the North San Diego County Transit Development Board (now North County Transit District). The consolidation allowed SANDAG to assume transit planning, funding allocation, project development, and construction in the San Diego region in addition to its ongoing transportation responsibilities and other regional roles.

SANDAG is governed by a Board of Directors composed of mayors, council members, and county supervisors from each of the region’s 19 local governments (with two representatives each from the City of San Diego and the County of San Diego). Voting is based on membership and the population of each jurisdiction, providing for a more accountable and equitable representation of the region’s residents. Supplementing these voting members are advisory representatives from Imperial County, Caltrans, Metropolitan Transit System, North County Transit District, the U.S. Department of Defense, San Diego Unified Port District, San Diego County Water Authority, the Southern California Tribal Chairman’s Association, and Mexico. The Board of Directors is assisted by a professional staff including planners, engineers, and research specialists.

SANDAG’s highest priorities during 2008 are building highway and transit projects using TransNet sales tax dollars; implementing the TransNet Environmental Mitigation Program; securing San Diego’s fair share of California infrastructure bond funds for transportation, goods movement, and housing projects; partnering with our neighbors to enhance border planning; developing the ARJIS Enterprise System; expanding the Service Bureau; and enhancing the 511 traffic information system.

SANDAG Board and Policy Committee meetings provide the public forums and decision points for significant regional issues such as growth, transportation, environmental management, housing, open space, air quality, energy, fiscal management, economic development, and public safety. SANDAG Directors establish policies, adopt plans, allocate transportation funds, and develop programs for regional issues. Citizens as well as representatives from community,
civic, environmental, education, business, other special interest groups, and other agencies are involved in the planning and approval process by participating in committees as well as by attending workshops and public hearings.

During the past year, SANDAG made new strides in the areas of energy, regional planning, traffic management, criminal justice research, and public safety collaboration, while continuing to provide regional leadership in the areas of transportation, housing, open space, and growth management. These interdependent and interrelated responsibilities permit a more streamlined, comprehensive, and coordinated approach without the need to create costly new government.

Each year, SANDAG adopts an overall work program and budget with federal, state and local funds to support the Agency’s regional responsibilities. The fiscal year 2008 program budget, covering the period July 1, 2007, through June 30, 2008, totals $359 million, and includes major items, such as building highway and transit projects using TransNet sales tax dollars.

In 2004, the Automated Regional Justice Information System (ARJIS) merged with SANDAG. The SANDAG Public Safety Committee oversees the functions of ARJIS and SANDAG’s Criminal Justice Research Division.

SANDAG continues to enhance the Service Bureau that consolidates the services and expertise formerly offered through the Local Technical Assistance program (for SANDAG member agencies), SourcePoint (for non-member agencies and the public), and the Assistance to Transit Operators and Planning (ATOP) under one umbrella. Services include compiling and analyzing demographic and economic information, custom mapping, transportation modeling and analysis projects, and survey design and analysis.

For more information about SANDAG policies and bylaws please visit our Web site at www.sandag.org/legal.
The 18 cities and county government are SANDAG serving as the forum for regional decision-making. SANDAG builds consensus; plans, engineers, and builds public transit; makes strategic plans; obtains and allocates resources; and provides information on a broad range of topics pertinent to the region’s quality of life.

CHAIR  
Hon. Mary Teresa Sessom

FIRST VICE CHAIR  
Hon. Lori Holt Pfeiler

SECOND VICE CHAIR  
Hon. Jerome Stocks

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR  
Gary L. Gallegos

CITY OF CARLSBAD  
Hon. Matt Hall, Councilmember  
(A) Hon. Bud Lewis, Mayor  
(A) Hon. Ann Kulchin, Mayor Pro Tem

CITY OF CHULA VISTA  
Hon. Cheryl Cox, Mayor  
(A) Hon. Jerry Rindone, Deputy Mayor  
(A) Hon. John McCann, Councilmember

CITY OF CORONADO  
Hon. Phil Monroe, Councilmember  
(A) Hon. Carrie Downey, Mayor Pro Tem  
(A) Hon. Al Ovrom, Councilmember

CITY OF DEL MAR  
Hon. Crystal Crawford, Deputy Mayor  
(A) Hon. David Druker, Mayor  
(A) Hon. Richard Earnest, Councilmember

CITY OF EL CAJON  
Hon. Mark Lewis, Mayor  
(A) Hon. Jillian Hanson-Cox, Councilmember

CITY OF ENCINITAS  
Hon. Jerome Stocks, Mayor  
(A) Hon. Teresa Barth, Councilmember

CITY OF ESCONDIDO  
Hon. Lori Holt-Pfeiler, Mayor  
(A) Hon. Ed Gallo, Councilmember  
(A) Hon. Sam Abed, Mayor Pro Tem

CITY OF IMPERIAL BEACH  
Hon. Jim Janney, Mayor  
(A) Hon. Patricia McCoy, Councilmember  
(A) Hon. Mayda Winter, Mayor Pro Tem

CITY OF LA MESA  
Hon. Art Madrid, Mayor  
(A) Hon. David Allan, Councilmember  
(A) Hon. Mark Arapostathis, Councilmember

CITY OF LEMON GROVE  
Hon. Mary Teresa Sessom, Mayor  
(A) Hon. Jerry Jones, Councilmember  
(A) Hon. Jerry Selby, Councilmember

CITY OF NATIONAL CITY  
Hon. Ron Morrison, Mayor  
(A) Hon. Frank Parra, Councilmember  
(A) Hon. Louie Natividad, Councilmember

CITY OF OCEANSIDE  
Hon. Jim Wood, Mayor  
(A) Hon. Jerry Kern, Councilmember  
(A) Hon. Jack Feller, Councilmember

CITY OF POWAY  
Hon. Mickey Cafagna, Mayor  
(A) Hon. Robert Emery, Deputy Mayor  
(A) Hon. Don Higginson, Councilmember

CITY OF SAN DIEGO  
Hon. Jerry Sanders, Mayor  
Hon. Jim Madaffer, Councilmember  
(A) Hon. Anthony Young, Council President Pro Tem  
(A) Hon. Scott Peters, Council President

CITY OF SAN MARCOS  
Hon. Jim Desmond, Mayor  
(A) Hon. Hal Martin, Vice Mayor  
(A) Hon. Rebecca Jones, Councilmember

CITY OF SANTEE  
Hon. Jack Dale, Councilmember  
(A) Hon. Hal Ryan, Councilmember  
(A) Hon. John Minto, Councilmember

CITY OF SOLANA BEACH  
Hon. Lesa Heebner, Councilmember  
(A) Hon. Dave Roberts, Deputy Mayor  
(A) Hon. Mike Nichols, Councilmember

CITY OF VISTA  
Hon. Judy Ritter, Councilmember  
(A) Hon. Bob Campbell, Councilmember  
(A) Hon. Steve Gronke, Councilmember

COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO  
Hon. Greg Cox, Chairman  
Hon. Dianne Jacob, Vice Chairwoman  
(A) Hon. Pam Slater-Price, Chair Pro Tem  
(A) Hon. Bill Horn, Supervisor

IMPERIAL COUNTY  
(Advisory Member)  
Hon. Victor Carrillo, Chairman  
(A) Hon. David Ouzan, Councilmember

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
(Advisory Member)  
Will Kempton, Director  
(A) Pedro Orso-Delgado, District 11 Director

METROPOLITAN TRANSIT SYSTEM  
(Advisory Member)  
Harry Mathis, Chairman  
(A) Hon. Jerry Rindone, Vice Chairman  
(A) Hon. Robert Emery, Board Member

NORTH COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT  
(Advisory Member)  
Hon. Ed Gallo, Chairman  
(A) Hon. Jerome Stocks, Planning Committee Chair  
(A) Hon. David Druker, Monitoring Committee Chair

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE  
(Advisory Member)  
CAPT Steve Wirsching, USN, CEC, Southwest Division Naval Facilities Engineering Command  
(A) CAPT Robert Farley, USN, CEC, Southwest Division Naval Facilities Engineering Command

SAN DIEGO UNIFIED PORT DISTRICT  
(Advisory Member)  
Laure Black, Commissioner  
(A) Mike Najera, Commissioner

SAN DIEGO COUNTY WATER AUTHORITY  
(Advisory Member)  
Marilyn Dailey, Commissioner  
(A) Mark Muir, Commissioner  
(A) Gary Croucher, Commissioner

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA TRIBAL CHAIRMEN’S ASSOCIATION  
(Advisory Member)  
Chairman Robert Smith (Pala), SCTCA Chair  
(A) Chairman Allen Lawson (San Pasqual)

MEXICO  
(Advisory Member)  
Hon. Remedios Gómez-Arnau  
Cónsul General of Mexico

As of January 24, 2008
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board of Directors - Policy or Business</th>
<th>Board of Directors - Business</th>
<th>Transportation Committee</th>
<th>Regional Planning Committee</th>
<th>Executive Committee</th>
<th>Public Safety Committee</th>
<th>Borders Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Normally second Friday, 10 a.m. to 12 noon)</td>
<td>(Normally fourth Friday, 9 a.m. to 12 noon)</td>
<td>(Normally first and third Fridays, 9 a.m. to 12 noon)</td>
<td>(Normally first Friday, 12 noon to 2 p.m.)</td>
<td>(Normally second Friday, 9 to 10 a.m.)</td>
<td>(Normally third Friday, 1 to 3 p.m.)</td>
<td>(Normally fourth Friday, 12:30 to 2:30 p.m.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 8, 2008</td>
<td>February 22, 2008</td>
<td>*February 15, 2008 (Only one meeting due to Board Retreat)</td>
<td>*February 8, 2008 (Second Friday; meeting moved due to Board retreat)</td>
<td>February 8, 2008</td>
<td>February 15, 2008</td>
<td>February 22, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 9, 2008</td>
<td>May 23, 2008</td>
<td>May 2, 2008</td>
<td>May 2, 2008</td>
<td>May 9, 2008</td>
<td>May 16, 2008</td>
<td>May 23, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*November 2008 (To be scheduled only if needed)</td>
<td>*November 21, 2008 (Third Friday; meeting moved due to Thanksgiving)</td>
<td>*November 7, 2008 (Committee only meets once due to Thanksgiving)</td>
<td>November 7, 2008</td>
<td>November 14, 2008</td>
<td>*November 14, 2008 (Second Friday; meeting moved due to Thanksgiving)</td>
<td>*November 21, 2008 (Third Friday; meeting moved due to Thanksgiving)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 5, 2008 (First Friday; meeting moved due to holiday)</td>
<td>*December 19, 2008 (Third Friday; meeting moved due to holiday)</td>
<td>*December 12, 2008 (Second Friday; Committee only meets once due to holiday)</td>
<td>December 5, 2008</td>
<td>December 5, 2008 (First Friday; meeting moved due to holiday)</td>
<td>*December 12, 2008 (Second Friday; meeting moved due to holiday)</td>
<td>*December 2008 (To be scheduled only if needed)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Changes to normal meeting schedule shown in **bold**.
- February meetings changed to accommodate Board Retreat scheduled for January 30-February 1, 2008.
- August meetings will be held if needed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FRIDAYS AT SANDAG CALENDAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FIRST FRIDAY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 a.m. – 12 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 p.m. – 2 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Planning Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SECOND FRIDAY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 a.m. – 10 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 a.m. – 12 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Directors – Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>THIRD FRIDAY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 a.m. – 12 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 p.m. – 3 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOURTH FRIDAY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 a.m. – 12 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Directors – Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30 p.m. – 2:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borders Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Milestones in SANDAG Regional Decision-Making

1966 • Local governments create the Comprehensive Planning Organization (CPO) as a long-range planning department within the San Diego County government under a state authorized joint powers agreement.

1970 - 1979 • Governor designates CPO as the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) to assure areawide coordination and to serve as the technical and informational resource for local governments. • State further designates CPO as the Regional Transportation Planning Agency; Airport Land Use Commission; and Areawide Clearinghouse for federal/state grant reviews. • Local governments establish CPO as an independent Joint Powers Agency. • CPO develops & adopts the first ever Regional Transportation Plan. • Lemon Grove becomes a city and joins CPO. • CPO establishes the Criminal Justice Research Division. • CPO helps establish the Automated Regional Justice Information System (ARJIS). • CPO is jointly designated with the county government to implement federal & state Clean Air Acts. • State designates CPO to prepare the Regional Housing Needs Assessment.

1980 - 1989 • CPO renames itself as the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG). • Poway and Santee become cities and join SANDAG. • SANDAG creates SourcePoint as a nonprofit corporate subsidiary to customize and sell research products. • Encinitas and Solana Beach become cities and join SANDAG. • State designates SANDAG as the Regional Transportation Commission. • Voters countywide pass Proposition A — the local half-cent transportation sales tax measure known as TransNet, a $3.3 billion program for highways, transit, local roads, & bicycles. • Voters countywide pass an advisory measure calling for creation of a Regional Planning and Growth Management Board. • Cities/County designate SANDAG as the Regional Planning and Growth Management Review Board.

1990 - 1999 • State designates SANDAG as the Integrated Waste Management Task Force. • SANDAG helps start the San Dieguito River Valley Park Joint Powers Authority. • Member agencies designate SANDAG as the Congestion Management Agency. • State designates SANDAG as the San Diego-Coronado Bridge Toll Authority. • SANDAG helps form a five-county rail coalition, and purchases rail right-of-way from Santa Fe Railway for the COASTER, and the SPRINTER rail commuter services. • TransNet opens SR 52 East to Santee, widens SR 54 in the South Bay, opens SR 56 East in the North City area, and completes improvements to SR 78/I-15 interchange in the North County. • The Freeway Service Patrol begins under a cooperative arrangement among SANDAG, Caltrans, and the California Highway Patrol. • SANDAG approves the first ever Regional Economic Prosperity Strategy. • At the request of Caltrans, SANDAG assumes the management of Commuter Computer and transforms the operation into the RideLink service. • The San Diego County Water Authority joins SANDAG as an advisory member. • SANDAG plays a major role in bringing together all participants in the San Diego County Investment Fund. • SANDAG starts the I-15 FasTrak Program to improve traffic flow, and expand bus and rideshare services in the corridor. • The National Institute of Justice lauds SANDAG for its outstanding work on Drug Use Forecasting. • TransNet provides more than half the funds for the Mission Valley West trolley line between Old Town San Diego and QUALCOMM Stadium. • SANDAG Committee on Binational Regional Opportunities holds public forums on cross border planning in transportation, environment, education, water supply, and economic development. • Halfway through the 20-year TransNet program, 68% of the highway projects, 55% of the transit projects, and 53% of the local street program are completed.
2000 • MTDB and NCTD become advisory members; SANDAG joins the Joint Committee on Regional Transit.

2001 • Using $14.7 million in federal and state funds, SANDAG puts sand on badly eroded beaches.
• Working in close cooperation with MTDB, NCTD, and Caltrans, SANDAG approves the Regional Transit Vision.

2002 • SANDAG eliminates tolls from the San Diego - Coronado Bridge.
• Directors launch effort to develop a Regional Comprehensive Plan, a long-term planning framework.

2003 • With the passage of state law (SB 1703), SANDAG becomes the consolidated regional agency and is responsible for transit planning, programming, project development, and construction.
• Imperial County joins SANDAG as an advisory member.
• SANDAG adopts the $42 billion, Mobility 2030 Regional Transportation Plan.

2004 • ARJIS is consolidated into SANDAG. Directors create the Public Safety Policy Committee.
• The Regional Comprehensive Plan is adopted.
• Voters extend the TransNet sales tax program for 40 years to generate $14 billion to help fund highway, transit, and local street improvements.
• State Route 56 is completed, linking the east and west portions of the highway, and connecting Interstates 15 and 5.

2005 • SANDAG jump-starts highway and transit projects using new TransNet dollars by launching the Early Action Program.
• The Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee (ITOC) is formed in accordance with the TransNet ordinance to monitor program operations.
• Mission Valley East Green Line trolley from QUALCOMM Stadium under SDSU to La Mesa begins service.
• SPRINTER commuter rail begins construction to link Oceanside, Vista, San Marcos, and Escondido.
• Service Bureau launched to provide demographic and economic information, custom mapping, transportation modeling and analysis projects, and survey design and analysis to public and private entities.

2006 • Construction on the I-15 managed lanes project continues with the middle segment nearing completion and construction underway on the northern segment.
• Supplemental environmental work begins on the 11-mile Mid-Coast Trolley extension from Old Town north to UCSD and University Towne Centre.
• Progress continues on implementing the Regional Comprehensive Plan. All jurisdictions identify opportunities for smart growth development in a new concept map.
• SANDAG Public Safety Committee identifies interoperability and communications as a top priority in enhancing and protecting the region's security.
• SANDAG launches website with interactive Dashboard feature to track schedule and cost information for TransNet projects.
• ARJIS, in collaboration with the District Attorney’s Office, launches new San Diego County Regional Crime Mapping Application for Public Safety (MAPS)

2007 • SANDAG awarded $432 million in state infrastructure bond dollars for transportation improvements.
• Board adopts $57 billion 2030 Regional Transportation Plan.
• Southern California Tribal Chairman’s Association joins SANDAG as advisory member.
• Construction continues on I-15, I-5, I-805, and SR 52.
• California Energy Commission awards $450,000 to SANDAG for energy planning.
• SANDAG and the City of Tijuana approve the Otay Mesa-Mesa de Otay Binational Corridor Strategic Plan.
• SANDAG launches 511 – a free phone and Web service for transportation information.

2008 • SANDAG competes for state infrastructure bond dollars for transportation and goods movement.
• Compass Card brings “smart card” technology to transit passes.
• First stretch of I-15 Managed Lanes to open.
• Construction begins on SR 52 extension from SR 125 to SR 67.
• Progress continues on SR 905 at the U.S./Mexico border.

As of 1/23/08
The Board of Directors carries out a variety of responsibilities which are either mandated by federal or state law or regulation, or delegated to SANDAG through local agreement. Some of the most important designations and most critical responsibilities are listed below.

OVERALL AUTHORITY

San Diego Regional Consolidated Agency (State)
Senate Bill 1703 created a consolidated agency on January 1, 2003, to strengthen how regional public policy decisions are made. The law mandates membership in the consolidated agency from the area’s 18 cities and county government. It consolidates transit planning, programming, project development, and construction into the new agency, leaving responsibilities for day-to-day operations with the existing transit operators. Assembly Bill 361 called for the preparation of a Regional Comprehensive Plan.

Regional Transportation Planning and Fund Allocation Agency (State)
Adopt Regional Transportation Plan (long-range plan) and Regional Transportation Improvement Program (five-year programming of state and federal transportation funds). Allocate Transportation Development Act (TDA) funds (¼ cent sales tax for transit support, approximately $120 million per year).

Metropolitan Planning Organization (Federal)
Allocate federal transportation revenues and meet comprehensive planning requirements of SAFETEA-LU in order to be eligible for funds. More than $140 million a year directly allocated by SANDAG.

San Diego County Regional Transportation Commission (State and Voter Approval)
Administer ½ percent sales tax, TransNet, (approximately $250 million per year) for transportation purposes.

Congestion Management Agency (State and Local)
Adopt congestion management plan, oversee preparation of deficiency plans, and monitor local agency compliance.

Co-lead Agency for Air Quality Planning (Federal and State)
Carry out air quality planning mandates in cooperation with the APCD. Determine conformity of transportation projects with air quality plan.

Integrated Waste Management Task Force (State and Local)
Recommend actions to member agencies regarding the major elements of the state-mandated Integrated Waste Management Plan.

Housing (State)
Determine each jurisdiction’s share of the regional housing need and establish performance criteria for self-certification of housing elements.
**Areawide Clearinghouse**  
(Federal and State)  
Review projects with regional impacts under California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

**Manages and Administers the North County Multiple Habitat Conservation Program**  
(Local)  
Undertaken on behalf of North County cities.

**Other**  
(Local)  
Regional Criminal Justice Clearinghouse, Automated Regional Justice Information System (ARJIS), Regional Census Data Center, Regional Information System development and maintenance, local planning activities pursuant to agreements with Navy, Caltrans, State Office of Planning and Research, MTS, NCTD, APCD, CWA, the Airport Authority, Cities and the County, and others; SourcePoint/Service Bureau.

**OPERATIONAL**

**San Diego County Regional Transportation Commission**  
(State and Voter Approval)  
Construct TransNet sales tax highway and public transit projects.

**Freeway Service Patrol Administration**  
(State and Local)  
Provide service for stranded motorists on various highways.

**Regional Transportation Demand Management Program Administration**  
(Local)  
Provide and administer regional program (RideLink) consisting of carpool, vanpool, and transit programs, Flexcar, bike locker program, and others.

**Interstate 15 Congestion Pricing and Transit Development Program**  
(State)  
Implement FasTrak® program to allow single occupant vehicles in Interstate 15 Express Lanes for a fee. Fees support additional bus rapid transit services in corridor.

**Regional Beach Sand Replenishment Program**  
(Local)  
Administer the regional program in coordination with federal, state, and local agencies.

**FLEXIBILITY AND LATITUDE**

1. SANDAG can be viewed as a flexible extension of local government capable of being modified to carry out any appropriate function. SANDAG can assume functions requested by its member agencies, and those established by federal and state law and regulation.

2. SANDAG is a good example of streamlined government. With one agency, it is able to respond to most federal and state mandates that apply to regions, and to most locally-generated mandates that have to be taken care of regionally.

3. Decision-making at SANDAG is by local governments acting together. Its decisions primarily affect allocation of revenues, transportation development, and wide ranging environmental issues.
4. Good regional decisions, by definition, also must be good for the region’s local communities. The policy of using local elected officials to make regional decisions helps ensure that regional and local decisions are consistent and complementary.

LIMITATIONS

The limitations of SANDAG’s ability to carry out new or existing functions are:

1. Certain consolidated agency roles and responsibilities would require a change/modification to state law (SB 1703).

2. Any change to governing structure would require approval by the voters (AB 361).
EXAMINING SUCCESSFUL QUALITY OF LIFE MEASURES

Ms. Andrea Mackenzie
General Manager, Sonoma County Agricultural Preservation and Open Space District

In September 2000, Andrea Mackenzie was appointed by the Sonoma County Board of Supervisors as General Manager of the Sonoma County Agricultural Preservation and Open Space District. The District preserves agricultural, greenbelt, natural resource, and recreational lands for future generations and has permanently protected over 75,000 acres since its creation in 1990. Andrea has worked for the District since 1996 and was the Senior Planner/Project Manager for the District’s Acquisition Plan 2000. In November 2006, Ms. Mackenzie led a successful effort to reauthorize the District’s voter-approved sales tax for another 20 years, through 2031.

Before coming to Sonoma County, Ms. Mackenzie worked as a Park Planner for the East Bay Regional Park District in Oakland, California, which operates the nation’s largest regional park and open space system. Ms. Mackenzie has also worked as an environmental planner for the City and County of San Francisco and as a consultant to State Resource Conservation Districts and non-profit conservation organizations. She brings a passion for land preservation and a strong professional interest in addressing regional conservation issues at the urban/rural edge.

Ms. Mackenzie has a Bachelor’s Degree in Environmental Studies from the University of California at Santa Barbara and a Master’s Degree in Urban Planning and Natural Resources from the University of California at Los Angeles.
EXAMINING SUCCESSFUL QUALITY OF LIFE MEASURES

Mr. Adi Liberman
Principle, Adi Liberman Associates

Adi Liberman serves on the California Coastal Commission and is Vice-Chair of the City of Los Angeles’ Prop. O Oversight Advisory Council, which determines how $500 million will be spent to address water pollution issues. In 2004, Mr. Liberman chaired the campaign to put Prop. O on the ballot. Mr. Liberman is the Principle and Founder of Adi Liberman Associates. Prior to starting his own firm in 2006, Mr. Liberman was Executive Vice President and led the Public Affairs & Issues Management practice at the Edelman Public Relations Worldwide Los Angeles office.

Mr. Liberman also served as Executive Director for Heal the Bay, one the nation’s most effective and well-respected environmental advocacy organizations, compelling the region’s sewage plants to comply with environmental laws and creating public support for $4 billion in infrastructure improvements.

Mr. Liberman has more than two decades of experience providing high-level strategic counsel on environmental issues to corporations, non-profit organizations and government agencies. He has worked for the U.S. Department of Energy, the California State Legislature, the Los Angeles City Council, private sector corporations and non-governmental advocacy organizations. He has directed successful programs for corporate recycling in Los Angeles County and water conservation and recycling in the City of Los Angeles.

Mr. Liberman has a Bachelor’s Degree from Pitzer College and a Master’s Degree in Public Affairs from Princeton University’s Woodrow Wilson School.
WATER QUALITY

- Should the jurisdictional permit obligations be paid for or off-set by regional funds? If so, how much or at what percent?
- Are capital improvements a necessary component?
- Should regional monitoring include more than permit requirements?
- Should a water quality effort and funding be included in a quality of life initiative?

Water bodies within the region, including groundwater, lakes, reservoirs, rivers, streams, lagoons, estuaries, vernal pools, bays, and the ocean, are among our most valuable resources. They provide a wide range of “beneficial uses,” or the uses of water necessary for the survival or well being of humans, plants, and animals. Beneficial uses of water serve to promote both tangible and intangible economic, social, and environmental goals. For example, the beaches and coastline provide places to relax and play, and they attract tourism, which stimulates the regional economy. Regional reservoirs provide a needed water supply and emergency storage function. Water bodies also provide habitat for many of the region’s rare, threatened, and endangered species, while serving as an important part of an overall healthy environment.

The quality of the region’s water bodies is affected by pollution. In recent years, water pollution from point sources like industrial waters from factories has been greatly reduced. The majority of water pollution now occurs from non-point sources, which originate from diffuse sources and are the result of man’s uses or disturbances of land.

Urban and stormwater runoff are primarily caused by non-point source pollutants and have been identified under local, regional, and national research programs as the principle cause of water quality problems in most urbanized regions. Runoff from precipitation or human activities flows over the land untreated into our waters and often contains a host of contaminants, such as trash and debris, bacteria and viruses, oil and grease, sediments, nutrients, and metals from sources such as cars leaking oil, fertilizers from farms and gardens, failing septic tanks, pet waste, and residential car washing.

Several federal, state, and local government entities are responsible for monitoring and/or regulating water quality within the region. Additionally, numerous laws provide a basis for water quality and establish the goals and objectives that guide the region’s water quality programs.

To address pollution in the San Diego region, the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) issued a National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit in 1990 to regulate the discharge of point and non-point source pollution. This permit was renewed in 2001 and most recently in 2007.\(^1\) The current permit was issued to the 18 incorporated cities within San Diego County, the County of San Diego, the

\(^1\) NPDES Order No. R9-2007-0001
San Diego Unified Port District, and the San Diego County Regional Airport Authority. These agencies, with the County of San Diego as the lead agency, are collectively known as the “Copermittees.” The permit ordered the Copermittees to collaborate to control waste discharges in stormwater and other urban runoff from the Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (MS4) that drain into the watersheds of the region.

The Permit requires in part, that the Copermittees develop and implement three water quality programs to address the pollution found in urban stormwater runoff: the Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program, the Watershed Urban Runoff Management Program, and the new Regional Urban Runoff Management Plan.

The NPDES permits also require regular water quality monitoring. Assessments must be completed to ensure compliance with the permit standards. There are several local jurisdictions and government agencies throughout the San Diego region that perform water quality assessments. In addition, there are non-profit organizations and other interested parties that routinely assess water quality.

SANDAG adopted the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) in 2004. The RCP included a Healthy Environment chapter that discussed the issue of water quality in the region. SANDAG staff has developed three cost options for the implementation of a regional water quality management program aimed at pollution prevention and source control to protect the health of the water bodies and watersheds within the region.

Option A - Capital Improvements, Contribution Toward Jurisdictional Costs, and Funding for Regional Monitoring

This option includes costs for a capital improvement program that is included in the Integrated Regional Water Management Plan, one-third of the reoccurring Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Plan implementation, and annual monitoring, education, and membership fees.

At the State level, an innovative approach to water management that evolved out of Proposition 50 (Water Security, Clean Drinking Water, Coastal, and Beach Protection Act [2002]) was the Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) planning process. The IRWM planning process is a local water management approach aimed at securing long-term water supply reliability within California by first recognizing the inter-connectivity of water supplies and the environment and then pursuing projects yielding multiple benefits for water supplies, water quality, and natural resources.

Local IRWM planning efforts are being led by the Regional Water Management Group, a partnership of the County of San Diego, the City of San Diego and the San Diego County Water Authority. It was formed in 2005 to develop an IRWM plan for the San Diego region and to ensure the region is eligible for future state grant funding. Regional stakeholders, including SANDAG, make up the Regional Advisory Committee (RAC) that advises the Regional Water Management Group. The RAC has approximately 22 members who provide expertise in the areas of water supply, wastewater, recycled water, stormwater and urban runoff, natural resources, and environmental stewardship. The San Diego IRWM was finalized in October 2007.

Through Proposition 50, grant funds are available for projects identified in adopted IRWM plans. The application process requires
a prioritized list of regional projects, which was created through a project prioritization process implemented by the RAC. The projects came from a regional application and project submittal process. They were then ranked and screened based upon approved criteria. This process resulted in lists of Tier 1 and Tier 2 projects. This option focuses on the cost to implement Tier 1, which would cost approximately $649 million (2008 dollars).\(^2\) These funds would be phased over 40 years.

This estimate of Tier 1 IRWM plan costs may be refined over the next year as the region waits to hear about possible funding from Propositions 50 and 84. If funding becomes available there would be excess funding that could be used for Tier 2 projects. Additionally, the IRWM plan process only considers projects that were submitted during the call for projects phase. Therefore, excess funds could be used on new regional projects that were not originally included in the IRWM but meet IRWM criteria.

This estimate also includes one-third of the cost associated with implementing the Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Plans (JURMP) annually. The JURMP, which is developed and implemented by each municipality, describes what the jurisdiction is doing within its own borders to reduce the pollution levels found in their MS4 to the maximum extent practicable.

Building upon a model used for regional habitat conservation plans that requires one-third of revenues for habitat conservation to be paid by the local jurisdictions, the estimate for reoccurring costs for the annual JURMP implementation was divided by one-third. These funds would be provided directly to the region's jurisdictions to off-set some of the costs associated with implementing the municipal permit. The goal is to enhance water quality, not relieve the jurisdictions of their responsibilities under the permit. One-third of the cost to implement the JURMP is $48.6 million (2008 dollars).

Lastly, this option includes the cost of a regional monitoring program, education and outreach, and membership in the California Stormwater Quality Administration (CASQA). This estimate includes the cost for regional stormwater Copermittee monitoring and education and outreach, as well as Baykeeper's regional monitoring program. These costs are approximately $4.1 million (2008 dollars) per year.

This estimate only includes water quality monitoring that is required by the permit and efforts that currently are underway by Baykeeper. This does not include certain types of monitoring such as wet weather monitoring and only looks at certain types of pollutants. As progress is made in addressing pollution in the region, the focus of monitoring efforts likely will change and expand over time. Table 1 reflects the costs of Option A.

\(^2\) Please note that some of the Tier 1 projects and all of the Tier 2 projects did not have costs associated with them. This cost reflects available Tier 1 costs.

---

**Table 1**

**Annual and Cumulative Cost for Option A**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual</strong></td>
<td>$16.2 million</td>
<td>$48.6 million</td>
<td>$4.1 million</td>
<td>$68.9 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>40 Years</strong></td>
<td>$648.9 million</td>
<td>$1.9 billion</td>
<td>$164.8 million</td>
<td>$2.7 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(2010 - 2050)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Option B - Non-Capital Improvements

This option focuses primarily on complying with the NPDES permit requirements that require the Copermittees to reduce the discharge of pollutants to the maximum extent practicable\(^3\) with the goal of ultimately achieving compliance with water quality standards. A study prepared in January 2004 for the California State Water Resources Control Board, prepared by Office of Water Programs, California State University, Sacramento (CSUS) used NPDES compliance costs for sample cities to establish compliance costs per household or the amount each household would contribute toward NPDES compliance. That cost per household was determined to be $38 annually, which was multiplied by the SANDAG estimate for the number of households within the San Diego region for each year through 2050. The annual cost estimate is approximately $50.5 million (2008 dollars)\(^4\).

This estimate may be imperfect. The study completed by CSUS did not account for activities, such as street sweeping and trash collection, that are not considered permit compliance costs by the RWQCB, but which are accounted for in many jurisdictional programs. Additionally, the per household cost did not account for requirements under the 2007 NPDES permit. Table 2 reflects the costs of Option B.

Option C - Capital Improvements, Jurisdictional Costs, and Funding for Regional Monitoring

Option C is a variation of Option A. This option includes costs for a capital improvement program that is included in the Integrated Regional Water Management Plan, the reoccurring Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Plan implementation, and annual monitoring, education, and membership fees.

Table 2
Annual and Cumulative Costs for Option B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Option B (2008 $)</th>
<th>Reoccurring Costs Annual Non-Capital Improvements</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$50.5 million</td>
<td>$50.5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>40 Years (2010 - 2050)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2 billion</td>
<td>$2 billion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^3\) Maximum extent practicable (MEP) is a dynamic performance standard which evolves over time as urban runoff management knowledge increases. Copermittee urban runoff management programs must continually be assessed and modified to incorporate improved programs, control measures, best management practices, etc. in order to achieve the evolving MEP standard.

\(^4\) The NPDES Stormwater Cost Survey looked at five municipalities and one metropolitan area within California that are demonstrating meaningful progress toward MEP compliance. Therefore, the mean of the six values for each of the cities in the survey was used to estimate. The mean value of $35 was used in 2005 and escalated at three percent through 2030 for a value of $38 per household.
This option also includes the cost to implement Tier 1 of the IRWM Plan $648 million (2008 dollars), but all in the first ten years. Option A allocates the funds over 40 years. Additionally, this option includes all of the reoccurring costs associated with implementing the JURMP, which is $145.9 million (2008 dollars). Option A only allocates one-third of the yearly JURMP costs.

Lastly, this option includes the same reoccurring regional monitoring program, education and outreach, and CASQA membership costs as in Option A ($4.1 million). Table 3 reflects the costs of Option C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option C (2008 $)</th>
<th>One-time Costs</th>
<th>Reoccuring Costs</th>
<th>Reoccuring Costs</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capital Improvements Phase I Projects</td>
<td>Annual JURMP Implementation</td>
<td>Annual Monitoring, Education and CASQA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual</strong></td>
<td>$16.2 million</td>
<td>$145.9 million</td>
<td>$4.1 million</td>
<td>$166.2 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>40 Years (2010 - 2050)</strong></td>
<td>$648.9 million</td>
<td>$5.8 billion</td>
<td>$164.8 million</td>
<td>$6.6 billion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals**

The table below includes totals for Options A, B, and C for the annual costs, as well as all 40 years, 2010 through 2050.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Totals (2008 $)</th>
<th>Option A</th>
<th>Option B</th>
<th>Option C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual</strong></td>
<td>$68.9 million</td>
<td>$50.5 million</td>
<td>$166.2 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>40 Years (2010 - 2050)</strong></td>
<td>$2.7 billion</td>
<td>$2 billion</td>
<td>$6.6 billion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

---

5 These costs do not reflect an offset to address inflation and retain the current 2008 purchasing power.
PUBLIC TRANSIT

Introduction

A central component to the SANDAG Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) is creating better communities by making land use decisions that focus on smart growth developments near public transit facilities. The 2030 Regional Transportation Plan: Pathways to the Future (RTP) implements this strategy by focusing transit investments in the urban core areas of both the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) and North County Transit District (NCTD) service areas in order to provide mobility choices.

Three guiding principles underlie an initial transit funding concept:

- **Create a sustainable funding source for existing transit services** - MTS and NCTD are projecting short and long term operating deficits as costs outside the agencies control, such as fuel, energy, and insurance, continue to rise. Funding from traditional sources such as the state Public Transportation Account also are diverted to other needs. And the volatile effects of economic cycles contribute to transit funding uncertainty. An ongoing, sustainable level of funding is needed to help supplement existing funding sources to ensure adequate operations and maintenance of the existing system and create a strong basic system in the urban core areas. In addition, increased funding for senior/disabled transportation, including improved coordination of social service agency transportation, can better utilize existing resources and help offset the need for costly new services.

- **Implement improvements aimed at taking transit to the “next level”** - Building off the TransNet program of major capital improvement projects designed to improve transit connectivity along the key regional travel corridors, these “next level” infrastructure improvements and services would increase the attractiveness of transit and serve to tap new rider markets.

- **Develop other alternative solutions** - In some areas, other strategies can be more cost-effective in providing alternatives to the automobile. The focus here would be on implementation of Transportation Demand Management measures such as vanpooling and shuttles, along with pedestrian and bicycling enhancements to improve the access to transit stops.

Transit Project Components and Funding Estimates

Using each of these guiding principles as a starting point, staff proposes a number of project components and funding estimates.
for possible inclusion in this Transit Funding Concept. Cost estimates were developed from the Reasonably Expected Funding scenario in the recently adopted RTP. Since this discussion represents an initial concept on the types of projects that could be included, cost ranges (in 2008 dollars) were developed based on the RTP costs and then adding 20 percent. Based on discussion and direction at the SANDAG Board of Directors retreat, a more detailed funding plan will be developed as the next phase of analysis.

1. Basic Transit System

Local Services. One of the components of the Transit First network strategy is local bus services that provide not only basic transit trips but also serve as important connectors to and from regional services such as trolley and commuter rail and Bus Rapid Transit. These services also would be based on the priority corridors identified by MTS, NCTD and SANDAG, which seek to develop a system of 10-15 minute, all-day service corridors. This funding component focuses on completing that network and further enhancements that would allow for 10-minute frequencies in key corridors where justified based on demand ($14 million to $17 million annually).

Arterial Rapid Bus Service. Rapid Bus offers a high speed, limited-stop service that supplements local bus service in key arterial corridors for riders making longer distance trips. A system of frequent and relatively low capital Rapid Bus services would be created in the urban core areas ($41 million to $49 million annually).

Transit Priority Measures. There are a number of low-cost capital improvements that can be made to increase transit speeds and reliability, to make it more competitive with the automobile. Transit signal priority and queue jumpers at busy intersections allow the bus to get ahead of traffic in the main lanes and increase the attractiveness of transit as a result ($6 million to $8 million annually).

Senior and Disabled Transit Service. As our population ages, the region’s challenge to provide safe, affordable, and convenient transit services for our senior and disabled populations will increase. There are a variety of alternatives to address the needs of this population, including a RTP goal to double the TransNet mini-grant program, which provides grants to community-based transit providers, and to increase funding for social service provider coordination and mobility management. Successful implementation of these types of solutions, and other solutions to be developed could ensure a more productive service system and potentially reduce the financial commitment to our region ($8 million to $10 million annually).

System Capital Maintenance. Replacement vehicles and infrastructure rehabilitation are needed to provide long-term support for both the existing system and improvements outlined above. ($68 million to $82 million annually).

2. “Next Level” Transit System

Regional Service Improvements. The RTP makes investments in transit projects and services that are intended to open new markets in key transit corridors. These include implementation of limited stop commuter express services in existing corridors for riders traveling long distances (e.g., along the South Bay I-5 corridor to complement the Blue Line), construction of dedicated BRT transitways to improve travel speeds in highly congested areas (e.g., between Downtown and Kearny Mesa, and in University City-Sorrento Mesa), and completion of a University City rail tunnel that will increase travel speeds and enable higher frequent COASTER and Amtrak service ($90 million to $108 million annually).
“Last Mile” Services. Shuttle services are needed to provide key “last mile” connections from regional services (trolley, COASTER, SPRINTER, and BRT services) into key regional job centers, similar to the existing COASTER Connection Shuttles. Key regional job centers would include: downtown San Diego, Sorrento Mesa, Kearny Mesa, Otay Mesa, Palomar Airport Road, and the East Urban Center. Alternative funding sources, such as partnerships with private employers, would be pursued ($6 million to $8 million annually).

Transit Station/Stop Improvements and Park-n-Ride Facilities. A key component of the RCP and RTP is making enhancements to the walk and wait environment at transit stops, providing up-to-date “Next Bus” information signs at stations, and providing additional Park-n-Ride capacity at major transit stations ($6 million to $8 million annually).

3. Alternative Solutions

Transportation Demand Management (TDM). TDM measures, such as vanpools and shuttles, can provide a more appropriate and cost effective service in certain corridors such as the long commute on the I-15 corridor from Riverside County. In addition, alternatives, such as last-mile vanpool or station cars, could be developed to connect BRT and rail stations to suburban job centers that are not cost-effective for conventional transit service ($2 million to $3 million annually).

Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements. Allocate additional funding to promote bicycling and pedestrian usage that facilitates access to transit services through small-scale infrastructure improvements ($1 million to $2 million annually).

Summary of Cost Estimates

The estimated costs for the various project components outlined above can be summarized as follows:

Table 1
Annual and Cumulative Cost for Transit Enhancements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(2008 $millions)</th>
<th>Base Transit System</th>
<th>“Next Level” Transit System</th>
<th>Alternative Solutions</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>$137 million to $166 million</td>
<td>$102 million to $124 million</td>
<td>$3 million to $5 million</td>
<td>$242 million to $295 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Years (2010 – 2050)</td>
<td>$5.4 billion to $6.6 billion</td>
<td>$4.0 billion to $4.9 billion</td>
<td>$120 million to $200 million</td>
<td>$9.6 billion to $11.8 billion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key Staff Contact: Dave Schumacher, (619) 699-6906, dsc@sandag.org
San Diego County is internationally recognized for its climate and geographic diversity of beaches, canyons, mountains, and deserts. San Diego also is an international hotspot for endemic species; containing more endangered species than any other county in the continental United States. As a growing metropolitan mega-region, San Diego has been grappling with the conflict between growth, development, and economic prosperity, and the conservation of native species and their habitats. Historically this conflict has led to an increase in the number of species being listed as endangered by the federal and state wildlife agencies, creating increased delays for development, including critical public infrastructure projects, and resulting in regional economic instability. Fortunately, San Diego County also stands at the forefront of the nation in attempting a proactive solution to address this tension by balancing growth and habitat conservation.

As described in the July 13, 2007, SANDAG Policy Board Workshop on Habitat Conservation, all of San Diego County is included in one of four habitat conservation planning areas that have been approved or are in the approval process: the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) South (approved in 1998), the Multiple Habitat Conservation Program (MHCP) (approved in 2003), and the North and East County MSCPs, which currently are being developed.

These plans fall under the umbrella of the State of California Natural Communities Conservation Planning Program, enacted as law in 1991, which provides a method to proactively identify areas necessary for species conservation and those areas more suitable for development. These plans break the cycle of the piecemeal approach toward habitat conservation planning that historically has led to an increased number of species being listed as endangered and the economic ramifications that result from those actions. The goal of these conservation plans are to proactively identify, conserve, and manage an interconnected network of habitat for the protection of native species, and accommodate planned growth resulting in greater economic stability for the region. The certainty provided by these plans assists in the timely and cost-effective development of critical regional infrastructure, local public infrastructure, and private development.

- Should a standardized management plan be developed with base costs for the purposes of estimating regional funding needs?
- Should a regional funding source include an endowment for perpetual management and monitoring?
- Should the jurisdictions be required to maintain their current level of effort regarding open space management?
- Should a habitat conservation effort and funding be included in a quality of life initiative?
As described in an economic analysis prepared by SourcePoint\textsuperscript{1} (the SANDAG Service Bureau) the San Diego region’s economy would fare much better under regional habitat conservation plans. The result would be more property and sales tax, higher personal income, and higher retail sales due to increases in land use certainty and development permit streamlining. Habitat preservation may be viewed as an investment; a way to ensure the opportunity for uninterrupted economic growth.

The long-term success of these habitat plans relies upon the cooperative development of a secure, regional funding source by the cities and county. In November 2004, the voters adopted the TransNet Extension Ordinance which included an Environmental Mitigation Program (EMP) to mitigate impacts of future transportation projects identified in the 2030 Regional Transportation Plan. The EMP was a significant first step toward successful long-term implementation of the habitat conservation plans, but it was always recognized that additional funding would be required for the region to successfully complete the plans and secure the benefits for future growth and conservation. To this end, the TransNet Extension Ordinance includes a provision that states:

“\textit{SANDAG agrees to act on additional regional funding measures (a ballot measure and/or other secure funding commitments) to meet the long-term requirements for implementing habitat conservation plans in the San Diego region, within the timeframe necessary to allow a ballot measure to be considered by the voters no later than four years after passage of the TransNet Extension. In the event that such future funding measures generate funding to fully meet regional habitat acquisition and management requirements, SANDAG is authorized to reallocate excess funds included in the ‘Regional Habitat Conservation Fund’ to local transportation projects. (TransNet Environmental Mitigation Program Principle 10).}”

In addition, SANDAG adopted the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) in 2004. The RCP included a Healthy Environment chapter that discussed the topic of habitat conservation in the region. SANDAG staff has developed three cost options for the implementation of the regional habitat conservation plans.

### Option A - Habitat Conservation, Land Management Regional Monitoring, and Program Administration

This option includes all the costs to implement the basic requirements of regional conservation plans as currently approved or proposed by the jurisdictions. All of the regional habitat conservation plans require four components for their successful implementation: (1) acquisition of habitat for conservation\textsuperscript{2} and one-time start up costs (e.g., trash removal, restoration, fencing), (2) the active management of lands to maintain their habitat values, (3) a regional monitoring program to determine the effectiveness of those lands at conserving species and natural processes, and (4) a structure for program administration.

Since 1993, SANDAG staff has been working with the jurisdictions on estimating the costs for the regional habitat conservation programs. This work, initially prepared as part of the RCP, was updated for inflation and new information in preparation for the October 12, 2007, SANDAG Policy Board meeting.

It is estimated that a total of 17,657 acres are needed to be acquired by the local jurisdictions to comply with the requirements.

---


\textsuperscript{2} This would only include the acquisition of land identified as that required to meet the local contributions, not the required federal, state, or private contributions of land identified in the plans.
of the existing and proposed habitat conservation plans. While the North and East County MSCPs have not been adopted, the County of San Diego staff has provided estimates and timelines on the acquisition needs within their planning areas. The total land acquisition costs based upon updated land values and the one-time start up cost would be approximately $465 million (2008 dollars).

The long-term management of the conserved lands and monitoring to ensure program effectiveness are required under the regional habitat conservation plans. This is similar to other regional infrastructure efforts which require periodic management and monitoring of the system to ensure that the investment in the infrastructure is being maintained and programs are functioning as expected. In our highway infrastructure system, this translates into roadway repair, lane re-striping, and ramp metering; and its effectiveness is assessed in cyclical reports such as the SANDAG “State of the Commute” report.

Management under the habitat conservation plans consists of general land management activities or stewardship (e.g., fire management, trail maintenance, fencing, signage, enforcement, litter removal), and biological management (e.g., invasive removal, predator control, habitat restoration). Monitoring consists of statistically robust, quantitative monitoring to establish regional status and trends of species and vegetation communities.

The habitat conservation plans assume that each jurisdiction will prepare management plans and activities to establish the specific management requirements for preserve areas based upon the size of the preserve area, the vegetation types and species, and type and intensity of adjacent land uses. Most of these management plans still are being developed and/or do not have itemized cost estimates for management activities. In general, wetlands are more expensive to manage than uplands, and larger, isolated lands are less expensive than small lands near urban areas. But beyond those generalities, management costs are area specific, which represents a challenge in determining regional cost estimates for lands that do not have area specific management directives.

In order to establish regional cost estimates for land management and monitoring, SANDAG staff worked with the Cities of San Diego and Carlsbad and the County of San Diego and reviewed the draft Santee Fanita Ranch management plan. These agencies have the largest and/or most current information on land management costs. Staff also has worked with USFWS and CDFG which are actively updating the regional monitoring plans to reflect an increased scientific understanding on regional monitoring developed over the last ten years. The total costs based upon these recent estimates for land management and monitoring is approximately $1 billion (2008 dollars). This cost would cover the management and monitoring on all existing public lands and those lands acquired to meet the local share of habitat acquisition.
Finally, Option A assumes the need for Program Administration to implement the habitat conservation plans. This was assumed to be ten percent of the annual reoccurring cost – this is consistent with other habitat conservation programs that were examined. The total program administration cost is estimated at approximately $102.9 million (2008 dollars). Table 1 reflects the costs of Option A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option A (2008 $)</th>
<th>One-time Costs Land Acquisition, Restoration and Start Up</th>
<th>Annual Reoccurring Costs Habitat Management and Monitoring</th>
<th>Program Administration</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual</strong></td>
<td>$11.6 million</td>
<td>$25.7 million</td>
<td>$2.5 million</td>
<td>$39.9 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>40 Years (2010 - 2050)</strong></td>
<td>$465 million</td>
<td>$1 billion</td>
<td>$102.9 million</td>
<td>$1.6 billion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Option B - Habitat Conservation, Land Management, Regional Monitoring, Program Administration, Contingency and Endowment

Option B builds on the basic requirements of the regional habitat conservation plans outlined in Option A, and provides for a contingency for management and monitoring and a perpetual endowment. Most infrastructure types have a contingency to address unforeseen events. For habitat conservation, the contingency was suggested as a funding method to address unexpected changes in the conditions of the conserved lands (e.g., large scale wildfires, exotic species invasion). The proposed contingency was based on ten percent of the annual management and monitoring costs. The costs for providing a ten percent management and monitoring contingency are estimated at approximately $102.9 million (2008 dollars).

Option B also includes provisions for the establishment of a perpetual endowment to fund management and monitoring after 40 years. If an endowment is desirable, it is recommended that the endowment be built up with annual payments over 40 years which then could generate funding in perpetuity starting in year 41. The estimated cost of the endowment is $996.5 million (2008 dollars) consisting of annual payments of $24.9 million. Table 2 reflects the costs of Option B.

Option C - Habitat Conservation, Land Management, Regional Monitoring, Program Administration, Contingency, Endowment, and Management of Private Dedicated Lands

During discussions at the Environmental Mitigation Program Working Group on regional funding, a disagreement arose over the need for public funding to provide basic land management of private land dedicated to the jurisdictions in exchange for land development rights (i.e., exactions). Each jurisdiction has developed a separate approach to address this issue ranging from requiring no additional funding for basic land management from land owners seeking development entitlements to the establishment of a benefit assessment district or individual endowments. The previous

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option B (2008 $)</th>
<th>Option A Costs</th>
<th>Contingency (10%) on Management and Monitoring</th>
<th>Perpetual Endowment</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>$39.9 million</td>
<td>$2.6 million</td>
<td>$24.9 million</td>
<td>$67.4 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Years (2010 - 2050)</td>
<td>$1.6 billion</td>
<td>$102.9 million</td>
<td>$996.5 million</td>
<td>$2.7 billion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2
Annual and Cumulative Cost for Option B

3 Pursuant to the signed Implementing Agreement contracts associated with the regional habitat conservation plans, all land acquired during the life of the habitat plans would require perpetual management and monitoring even after the regulatory permits associated with those plans have expired.

Session E – Habitat Conservation
options did not include the additional cost of basic land management, or the increase in the required amount of the endowment, for these privately dedicated lands (estimated at 140,000 acres). The estimated additional cost for managing these future dedicated lands is $1.1 billion (2008 dollars). Table 3 reflects the costs of Option C.

### Table 3

**Annual and Cumulative Costs for Option C**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option C (2008 $)</th>
<th>Option B Costs</th>
<th>Land Management on additional Private Lands</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>$67.4 million</td>
<td>$26.4 million</td>
<td>$93.8 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Years (2010 – 2050)</td>
<td>$2.7 billion</td>
<td>$1.1 billion</td>
<td>$3.7 billion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals**

Table 4 includes totals for Options A, B, and C for the annual costs, as well as the cumulative cost for 40 years, 2010 through 2050.

### Table 4

**Comparison of Annual and Cumulative Costs for Options**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Totals (2008 $)</th>
<th>Option A</th>
<th>Option B</th>
<th>Option C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>$39.9 million</td>
<td>$67.4 million</td>
<td>$93.8 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Years (2010 – 2050)</td>
<td>$1.6 billion</td>
<td>$2.7 billion</td>
<td>$3.8 billion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key Staff Contact: Keith Greer, (619) 699-7390, kgr@sandag.org

---

4 These costs do not reflect an offset to address inflation to retain the current 2008 purchasing power.
SHORELINE PRESERVATION

- Should the San Diego region implement beach sand retention efforts?
- Should sand retention structures be built in the San Diego region?
- How often should beach replenishment occur?
- Should a beach sand replenishment effort and funding be included in a quality of life initiative?

In 1993, the SANDAG Board of Directors adopted the Shoreline Preservation Strategy (SPS) which outlines a long-term approach to addressing the region’s shoreline erosion problems. The SPS identified beach replenishment as the most environmentally sensitive approach to restoring the region’s beaches and maintaining the recreation and property protection qualities of beaches. In 1996, SANDAG initiated a comprehensive Shoreline Monitoring Program (Monitoring Program) which measures beach width and shorezone volume (sand depth) along the region’s coastline. The ongoing Monitoring Program provides important information that is used for decision making and planning for beach replenishment activities.

In 2001, SANDAG completed the first major beach replenishment project in the region by placing 2.1 million cubic yards of sand on 12 beaches from Oceanside to Imperial Beach. The Regional Beach Sand Project (RBSP) was considered the first pilot project to determine the feasibility of regional beach sand replenishment and was designed to determine if beach sand replenishment could be implemented in the region without damaging sensitive marine resources.

The Monitoring Program results indicate that the RBSP provided measurable increases in beach for four years in the Oceanside and Silver Strand Cells (2001–2004), and five years in the Mission Beach Cell (2001–2005). The shorezone volume gains that occurred in the Oceanside and Mission Beach Cells following the RBSP persisted through 2007. In the Silver Strand Cell, the shorezone volume decreased following the RBSP, and remained below the pre-RBSP value until after the non-RBSP nourishment activities were conducted in 2005.

While the beach width gains were diminished after four to five years, it is important to highlight that shorezone volume gains were largely retained. Although the recreational beach benefits have been largely lost, the storm protection benefits afforded by the shorezone volume gains have persisted. Furthermore, the unexpected beach width gains that were noted in 2006 may not have occurred without the shorezone volume gains derived from the RBSP. Before the project was built, it was expected that the project would provide benefits to the shoreline for at least five years.

SANDAG staff has developed two cost options for long-term beach sand replenishment. While both options include sand replenishment and the costs for the Regional Shoreline Monitoring Program, Option A also includes assumptions regarding construction of permanent sand retention structures.
Option A - Sand Retention Structures with Regional Beach Sand Replenishments Every Ten Years

This option includes costs for regional sand retention structures as well as regional sand replenishment and monitoring program activities.

SANDAG staff used the Regional Beach Sand Retention Strategy, prepared by Moffat and Nichol in 2001, to determine the costs of potential retention structures that could be placed throughout the region for Option A. The report primarily looks at the potential for groins and artificial reefs to be placed in various locations throughout the region. For the purpose of this estimate, it was assumed that reefs would be built in Carlsbad, Encinitas (2), Solana Beach, and San Diego and groins would be built in Oceanside and Coronado. The estimated total cost for the reefs and groins would be $94.6 million. These structures last 50 years and this estimate assumes the structures would be built in 2015 at the time of the first replenishment.

The consulting firm of Moffatt and Nichol prepared an estimate outlining the detailed costs associated with implementing a beach sand replenishment project similar to the RBSP. The Moffatt and Nichol information was used to prepare this estimate which assumes that regional replenishment would occur every ten years beginning in 2015. Because structures are being built during the time of the first replenishment, the sand placed on the beach will remain longer and replenishment can occur less frequently. The total cost for each replenishment in 2008 dollars is $22.6 million for a total 40-year cost of $90.3 million (four proposed replenishments).

Additionally, this estimate includes the yearly Monitoring Program costs of $103,975. The results from the Monitoring Program, as described above, were utilized to plan and implement the RBSP.

Building sand retention structures will require the region to address additional environmental issues that were not analyzed as part of the RBSP. Additional analysis specific to retention structures could include the probability of success, environmental consequences such as downcoast impacts, impacts on surfing and living resources, upfront and down-the-road costs, aesthetics, construction disruptions, and legal considerations. Addressing all of these issues will help determine the “best” structures for the sites selected.

However, even if it is determined that a structure should be built in a particular site, a structure in that city may not be politically feasible. In the past, there has been strong opposition to any type of structure for various reasons such as aesthetics, harmful environmental impacts, and increased down-coast erosion. However, as sand becomes more expensive and growth and development continues to cut off the natural supply of sand to beaches, structures have become more palatable, particularly submerged reefs.

At the December 2007 Shoreline Preservation Working Group meeting, Marco Gonzalez from the Surfrider Foundation stated that the organization is interested in retaining sand with submerged reefs, but would be opposed to groins or hard structures. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers also seems to favor the submerged reef. The Corps is building a pilot reef in Ventura.

---

1 The Regional Beach Sand Retention Strategy included a list of the preferred retention method as requested by each coastal city. The retention method would be carefully evaluated prior to implementation.
Recent research and information regarding the retention of sand has resulted in more options. And, as these new types of structures are implemented and tested around the world, they may become options for future placement in the San Diego region. Table 1 reflects the costs of Option A.

Option B - Regional Beach Sand Replenishments Every Five Years

This cost estimate for Option B assumes that regional replenishment would occur every five years, starting in 2015, rather than every ten years as assumed in Option A. The total cost for each beach replenishment is the same as above, $22.6 million (2008 dollars) for a total 40-year cost of $180.7 million (eight proposed replenishments).

Additionally, the cost for the Monitoring Program is the same as above, $103,975. The Monitoring Program showed that the RBSP had benefits to the region’s beaches overall. However, there are some beaches that did not retain sand as well as others. Additional replenishment plans will need to closely examine the type of material that is placed on each beach. And, because there are no structures, material likely will not stay as long and replenishment will need to occur more frequently. Table 2 reflects the costs of Option B.

### Table 1
Annual and Cumulative Cost for Option A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>One-time Costs Capital Improvements 50-year Cycle</th>
<th>Annual Reoccurring Costs Beach Sand Replenishment 10-year Cycle</th>
<th>Reoccurring Costs for Annual Monitoring</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option A (2008 $)</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>$2.4 million</td>
<td>$2.3 million</td>
<td>$103,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40 Years (2010 - 2050)</td>
<td>$94.6 million</td>
<td>$90.3 million</td>
<td>$4.2 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2
Annual and Cumulative Cost for Option B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Annual Reoccurring Costs Beach Sand Replenishment 5-year Cycle</th>
<th>Reoccurring Costs for Annual Monitoring</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option B (2008 $)</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>$4.5 million</td>
<td>$103,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40 Years (2010 - 2050)</td>
<td>$180.7 million</td>
<td>$4.2 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Totals

Since the completion of the RBSP, the Shoreline Preservation Working Group (Working Group) has been working to identify investment levels and funding options to enable future beach sand replenishment projects to be implemented. In December 2007, the Working Group discussed the options presented above and favored Option A. Table 3 includes annual totals for Options A and B as well as costs for the entire 40-year program.

### Table 3
Comparison of Annual and Cumulative Costs for Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Totals (2008 $)</th>
<th>Option A</th>
<th>Option B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual</strong></td>
<td>$4.7 million</td>
<td>$4.6 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>40 Years (2010 - 2050)</strong></td>
<td>$189.1 million</td>
<td>$185 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key Staff Contact: Rob Rundle, (619) 699-6949, rru@sandag.org

---

2 These costs do not reflect an offset to address inflation and retain the current 2008 purchasing power.
A LOOK AT THE LEGISLATIVE YEAR AHEAD: HON. CHRISTINE KEHOE

- How can the San Diego region best advocate for its infrastructure and funding priorities during a difficult budget year?
- What should the role of SANDAG be in pending statewide legislation concerning climate change?
- What are other key legislative priorities for the region and the state this legislative session?

Senator Christine Kehoe (D-39th District) will be on hand to provide an outlook on the 2008 California legislative session and discuss legislative priorities with retreat participants.

Senator Kehoe is Chair of the Senate Energy, Utilities, and Communications Committee and is a member of the Senate Budget and Fiscal Review, Local Government, Natural Resources and Water, Transportation, and Housing Committees.

CALIFORNIA’S BUDGET DEFICIT

This year California is facing an estimated $14.5 billion budget deficit. With this projected shortfall, Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger and the Legislature will likely dedicate a significant amount of the legislative year discussing the budget.

The Governor’s budget proposal includes the following: issue more deficit financing bonds ($3.3 billion); suspend a supplementary payment in FY 2008-2009, which would have helped pay off outstanding deficit-financing bonds ($1.5 billion); accrue tax revenues received in FY 2009-2010 to FY 2008-2009 ($2 billion); reduce K-14 education spending in the current year ($400 million) and suspend the Proposition 98 minimum guarantee to FY 2008-2009 ($4 billion). Additionally, the Governor has proposed a 10 percent cut across the board for state agencies that would take effect on March 1, 2008.

The Governor also has proposed to introduce new legislation, including a “Budget Stabilization Act” as well as new bonds for water, K-12 education, higher education, the court system, and modifications to the High Speed Rail bond.

The Governor has declared a fiscal emergency and called a special session of the Legislature to address the budget crisis. With the passage of Proposition 58 (2004), the Legislature has 45 days to act on the measure that the Governor has proposed, or it is prevented from acting on any other bills or adjourning from session.

CLIMATE CHANGE

California has been focused on climate change since the passage of Assembly Bill (AB) 32 (Nunez), the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006. AB 32 established a statewide greenhouse gas (GHG) emission limit that would reduce emissions to 1990 levels by 2020 – a reduction of about 25 percent below current levels. AB 32 directs the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to monitor and regulate GHG emissions in pursuit of this goal, in coordination with all relevant state agencies.
Since the passage of this legislation, there have been a number of bills that were introduced during the first year of the 2007-2008 legislative session. A key climate change related bill that is pending is SB 375, which was introduced last year by Senator Darrell Steinberg (D-Sacramento) and is co-sponsored by the California League of Conservation Voters and the Natural Resources Defense Council. SANDAG currently has an oppose position on the bill.

SB 375 would create new provisions for the preparation of regional transportation plans (RTP). Among the bill’s provisions are new requirements for RTPs to include a sustainable communities strategy (SCS) in order to achieve greenhouse gas reduction targets set by the state and to preserve significant resource areas and farmlands. A key goal of the legislation is to reduce vehicle miles traveled as part of how California addresses greenhouse gas emissions.

Amendments to SB 375 that have been discussed by the SANDAG Executive Committee include providing an alternative that would allow regions like SANDAG that have adopted regional comprehensive plans and habitat conservation plans to use those plans as a framework for developing the SCS required by the bill. Rather than focus solely on transportation, the SANDAG alternative would provide a more integrated approach to addressing greenhouse gas emissions in the region through land use and transportation related measures.

Other amendments include ensuring the bill’s approach to reducing GHG emissions is consistent with the statewide approach that is currently underway to implement AB 32; revising how the bill defines “significant resources areas” and “significant farmlands;” and identifying meaningful incentives that will encourage better climate change planning by local governments and regional agencies.

SB 375 is currently on the Assembly Appropriations Committee suspense file. Senator Steinberg’s staff and the bill sponsor have indicated that they intend to move SB 375 as early as February.

Implementing the Regional Comprehensive Plan

During the retreat, participants will discuss the region’s infrastructure needs and priorities, and learn from a statewide panel about the necessary steps in developing a successful quality of life measure. At break out sessions, members will discuss water quality, public transit, habitat conservation, and shoreline preservation. Providing the necessary resources in these areas would enable SANDAG to implement the vision outlined in the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP).

Senator Kehoe, who authored the SANDAG RCP legislation, has tentatively agreed to carry a state measure to help address the region’s various quality of life needs and priorities.

Statewide Infrastructure Bond Measures

The Governor’s proposed budget includes additional allocations for Proposition 1B ($4.7 billion) and Proposition 1C ($771 million). SANDAG will continue to work with the Governor and members of the legislature to ensure that the region’s infrastructure needs are addressed in the various bond measure funds.
CLIMATE CHANGE AND QUALITY OF LIFE

Mr. Ron Sims
King County Executive

King County Executive Ron Sims has built his career in public service around the progressive principles of social justice, good government and environmental stewardship. He has a national reputation for boldness and vision, and is a champion of reforming government processes to better serve the people of the dynamic, forward-thinking Puget Sound region.

Mr. Sims has been a regional leader on managing growth in the economically booming King County region by driving smart, comprehensive strategies to reduce traffic congestion. The county links land use planning with creating communities that encourage active lifestyles and less use of automobiles. He is a respected advocate for new solutions to moving people in the 21st century. He is widely credited with turning around Sound Transit, an agency that is on track to reduce congestion with a voter-approved light rail system, expanded regional bus service and commuter train service to surrounding communities. He has pushed for more use of new fuel technologies resulting in Metro Transit being one of the greenest large transit agencies in the nation and the county being the largest purchaser of biofuels in the state.

In 1985, Mr. Sims was first elected to the King County Council. In 1996 Ron was appointed King County Executive after then-Executive Gary Locke was elected governor. Easily winning election the following year, Sims was reelected by wide margins in 2001 and 2005.

Mr. Sims graduated from Central Washington University.
UPDATE ON SANDAG CLIMATE CHANGE PLANNING ACTIVITIES

File Number 3003002

Introduction

In the last several years, climate change issues have taken on increasing importance at both the federal and state level. In particular, over the past two years, new state laws and state agency regulations have required regional transportation planning agencies, such as SANDAG, to address climate change in the planning activities we oversee. The attached white paper (Attachment 1) provides background information regarding these issues.

SANDAG has been proactive in addressing climate change planning issues in the San Diego region by entering into an innovative partnership with the California Energy Commission to update the 2030 Regional Energy Strategy and preparing a Climate Change Action Plan for the San Diego region. Both of these efforts, along with commitments made in the recently adopted 2030 Regional Transportation Plan, are opportunities to address climate change measures that can be implemented in the region.

Discussion

California Energy Commission (CEC) Partnership

In July, 2007, SANDAG and the California Energy Commission entered into a partnership to accomplish several tasks. The four major tasks included in the partnership include the following.

- Updating the 2030 Regional Energy Strategy to ensure that the goals and actions in the document reflect the current state of energy planning such as energy procurement requirements, energy efficiency standards, and greenhouse gas considerations;

- Preparing the first Climate Change Action Plan that will identify strategies for SANDAG and local jurisdictions to implement greenhouse gas reduction measures through land use planning, transportation considerations, and green building techniques;

- Expanding the ‘Sustainable Region’ program to provide technical assistance to two local jurisdictions to maximize energy savings through existing building retrofits and new building design considerations; and

- Preparing an Alternative Fuels toolkit to ensure the region is adequately prepared to maximize opportunities for use of alternative fuel vehicles with public vehicle fleets and for the public.
2030 Regional Transportation Plan

In November, 2007, the SANDAG Board of Directors adopted the 2030 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and certified the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the 2030 RTP. In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act, SANDAG notified interested agencies, organizations, and individuals that an EIR was being prepared and provided opportunities to express input on what should be included in the document. In response to comments from the California State Attorney General, SANDAG included a rigorous analysis of the greenhouse gas emissions that would be expected to result from adoption of the plan. While the plan did identify measures to reduce GHG emissions, adoption of the plan did result in cumulatively significant unmitigated impacts to climate change.

SANDAG is currently discussing aspects of the 2030 RTP with the Attorney General’s office as well as two other interest groups that expressed concern with the adoption of the plan. SANDAG staff will keep the Board of Directors informed on the outcome of those discussions.

The attached white paper provides an overview of climate change legislation that affects planning activities at SANDAG, as well as ongoing efforts of SANDAG to work with lawmakers to ensure that new laws and regulations in this area can be implemented effectively by the region.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Attachment: 1. White Paper of SANDAG Climate Change Planning Activities

Key Staff Contact: Bob Leiter, (619) 699-6980, ble@sandag.org
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White Paper on Climate Change Planning Issues
SANDAG Board of Directors Meeting, January 25, 2008

INTRODUCTION

Earlier this year, a major scientific report was released by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, an international group that was established to provide decision makers with objective information on climate change. The “Fourth Assessment Report” expressed the consensus of its 1,250 academic authors that climate change is occurring, and that urgent action is needed to avoid its worst effects. Potential adverse effects of climate change in the San Diego region include a reduction in the quality and supply of water from the Sierra snow-pack and the Colorado River Basin, a rise in sea levels resulting in the displacement of coastal businesses and residences, damage to the marine environment and other ecosystems, and an increase in the incidence of infectious diseases, asthma, and other human health-related problems. Over the past several years, this challenge has received increased attention at every level of government. In the United States, Congress is deliberating over several legislative proposals, including most prominently the Lieberman-Warner Climate Security Act of 2007, which would reduce emissions to 1990 levels by 2020.

In California, Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger and the State Legislature have recognized that climate change poses a serious threat to the economic well-being, public health, natural resources, and environment of California. GHG reduction legislation was signed by the Governor in 2006, and climate change mitigation strategies that will affect local and regional entities in the public and private sectors are being established by state regulatory agencies. This white paper provides background on state actions concerning climate change and information about current SANDAG efforts to address climate change at the regional level.

BACKGROUND

SANDAG has jurisdiction over activities that contribute to climate change, and is recognizing its responsibility to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. SANDAG has received direction from the state that it is obligated to address climate change in its planning activities. Both the Governor and the Legislature have acknowledged the threat of climate change and have enacted laws and regulations intended to address it, while various regulatory agencies also have responsibilities in the climate change arena, developing new standards and guidelines that will affect SANDAG operations.

Executive Order S-3-05

In 2005, Governor Schwarzenegger issued Executive Order S-3-05, which established statewide greenhouse gas emissions reduction targets:

- By 2010, reduce GHG emissions to 2000 levels
- By 2020, reduce GHG emissions to 1990 levels
- By 2050, reduce GHG emissions to 80 percent below 1990 levels
Executive Order S-3-05 directed the California Environmental Protection Agency to form a Climate Action Team composed of representatives from relevant state agencies, including the Business, Transportation and Housing Agency, the Department of Food and Agriculture, the Resources Agency, the Air Resources Board, the Energy Commission, and the Public Utilities Commission. The Climate Action Team was tasked with implementing GHG emission reduction programs and reporting on the progress made toward meeting the statewide greenhouse gas targets that were established in the executive order.

**Assembly Bill 32 - The California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006**

In September 2006, GHG emission reduction targets were established in AB 32 (Nunez), the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006. AB 32 was signed into law, establishing a statewide GHG emissions targets that will reduce emissions to 1990 levels by 2020—a reduction of approximately 25 percent below current levels. AB 32 directs the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to monitor and regulate GHG emissions in pursuit of this goal, in coordination with all relevant state agencies.

AB 32 directs CARB to monitor and regulate GHG emissions in order to reach the legislation’s GHG reduction target. The bill mandates the following approach:

- By June 30, 2007, CARB will develop a list of early action measures that can be implemented by January 1, 2010. The list of early action measures has been published. While no measures fall directly under SANDAG jurisdiction, some are related to SANDAG transportation and energy activities, including port electrification, trucking efficiency, and the Low-Carbon Fuel Standard.

- By January 1, 2009, CARB will prepare and approve a scoping plan for achieving the maximum technologically feasible and cost-effective reductions in GHG emissions by 2020.

- By January 1, 2011, CARB will adopt regulations to achieve the maximum technologically feasible and cost-effective reductions in greenhouse gas emissions in furtherance of achieving the statewide greenhouse gas emissions limit, to become operative beginning on January 1, 2012. Regulations may include emission reduction mandates, alternative compliance mechanisms, monetary and non-monetary incentives, voluntary actions, and market-based mechanisms such as a cap-and-trade system.

The Scoping Plan will contain the primary strategies California will employ to reduce GHG emissions. The plan, which is currently under development, will have a range of GHG reduction actions, including direct regulations, alternative compliance mechanisms, monetary and non-monetary incentives, voluntary actions, and market-based mechanisms such as a cap-and-trade system.

The Scoping Plan is expected to include strategies for regulating emissions resulting from land use and transportation plans. A draft of the plan is scheduled for release in June 2008, and the final plan must be adopted by January 1, 2009. SANDAG staff is following the plan development process and participating in stakeholder workshops on a regular basis.
Climate Action Team—Land Use Subcommittee

The Climate Action Team is an interagency group established under Executive Order S-3-05. It is organized into several subgroups, one of which is a Land Use Subcommittee (LUSCAT) that is tasked with coordinating efforts in cross-cutting areas related to local government and land use activities. Specifically, LUSCAT is developing land use and transportation-related recommendations for the Scoping Plan, and will submit these recommendations to CARB in February 2008. The goal of these recommendations is to reduce vehicle miles traveled.

The current version of the LUSCAT recommendations takes the form of four broad themes:

- **State Preparations.** The state should add GHG considerations to internal programs related to state-owned facilities and infrastructure and to programs related to state-assisted infrastructure and land use planning, design and development.

- **Providing Structure.** The state should provide regional and local governments with clear guidance on how to inventory GHG emissions within their jurisdiction and on best practices for reducing GHG emissions.

- **Setting the Targets.** The state should define a land use-related GHG emissions target for the state and separate targets for each region for a specified target year. Regional agencies would be responsible for allocating these targets down to the local jurisdictions within their regions. This approach would be similar to the allocation process for the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA). CARB should establish these state and regional targets by January 1, 2011.

- **Measuring Progress.** The state should collect inventories of GHG emissions from local governments to track progress towards targets.

SANDAG staff is monitoring developments in the LUSCAT through participation in the LUSCAT stakeholder advisory group.

California Transportation Commission—Regional Transportation Plan Guidelines Update

In January 2007, Senate Pro Tempore Don Perata requested that the California Transportation Commission (CTC) review current state guidelines for preparation of Regional Transportation Plans to incorporate climate change emission reduction measures and to ensure that models used in the preparation of RTPs accurately measure the benefits of transportation and land use strategies aimed at reducing vehicle trips. The CTC established an RTP Guidelines Working Group to assist in developing recommendations for the guidelines. SANDAG staff participated in the working group meetings, which were divided into three subsections: Climate Change, Smart Growth/Land Use, and Transportation Modeling and Analysis.

The Working Group recommendations were provided to the CTC and Senate Pro Tempore Perata in December 2006, and were accepted by the CTC on January 11, 2008. The RTP Working Group’s recommendations will be provided to Caltrans for incorporation into the currently approved RTP Guidelines. The CTC will continue to review the RTP Guidelines as new statutory requirements are enacted and policies regarding climate change emission reductions are adopted.
CEQA requires that “cumulatively considerable” impacts be analyzed in environmental documents. Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, published by the Office of Planning and Research (OPR), provides guidance on how to evaluate these impacts. Currently, the CEQA Guidelines do not provide direction on evaluating climate change impacts, resulting in significant uncertainty on the part of lead agencies in preparing their CEQA documents.

Senate Bill 97 (Dutton), which was signed into law by the Governor on August 24, 2007, addresses the current lack of guidance concerning addressing climate change under CEQA. SB 97 directs OPR to draft CEQA guidelines for analyzing climate change impacts and to submit them to the State Resources Agency for adoption by January 1, 2010. These guidelines will be utilized by SANDAG in drafting its future CEQA documents when they become available.

**Attorney General CEQA Actions**

Since the passage of AB 32, the State Office of the Attorney General has monitored and commented on the climate change component of both programmatic and project-level environmental impact reports (EIRs), including that of the recently adopted SANDAG 2030 RTP. The Attorney General’s office holds that climate change is a cumulatively considerable impact that must be analyzed and mitigated in CEQA documents. Though CEQA Guidelines do not provide a methodology for assessing climate change impacts, the Attorney General’s office has provided guidance on this subject through comment letters on an ad hoc basis. More than 20 comment letters have been delivered to lead agencies across the state, recommending an approach to environmental analysis that includes GHG inventories and low significance thresholds. The Attorney General’s office also has provided a detailed fact sheet with climate change mitigation best practices.

**REGIONAL PLANNING IMPLICATIONS**

The emergence of climate change as a high priority issue in state law affects regional planning in a number of ways. SANDAG responsibilities under AB 32 remain undefined at this point, but are likely to revolve around the influence of the regional transportation system in the growth of vehicle miles traveled (VMT). VMT is closely correlated to land use plans and the transportation system, which is tied to transportation fuel consumption and GHG emissions. In addition, SANDAG is currently working in the areas of alternative fuels, energy efficiency, and renewable energy through its energy planning activities, all of which will play a role in meeting AB 32 goals.

Currently, the largest contributor of greenhouse gas emissions in the state is the transportation sector, accounting for approximately 40 percent of all emissions. Transportation emissions can be affected over time through a combination of fuel efficiency, alternative fuels, and VMT reduction. Electricity is the second largest contributor in the state. The following figure illustrates the relative share of greenhouse gas emissions from various sectors of the economy.
The role of regional land use, transportation, public facilities, and environmental planning in the climate change arena is currently a topic of debate, with many questions still unanswered. For example, how should climate change impacts be addressed in CEQA documents? How should emission reduction goals be incorporated into long-range regional transportation plans? How should the state regulate GHG emissions from automobiles and light trucks, which account for such a large percentage of emissions statewide? And what can local and regional agencies do to slow the growth of per capita vehicle miles traveled? These questions are being addressed by SANDAG, in collaboration with state and local agencies, in order to achieve the goals of AB 32 while preserving local authority, protecting the economy, and improving quality of life in the region.

**SANDAG EFFORTS TO ADDRESS CLIMATE CHANGE**

**Regional Climate Action Plan**

In June 2007, SANDAG entered into an agreement with the California Energy Commission to develop a Regional Climate Action Plan. SANDAG staff is currently developing the Plan, which will translate the state GHG reduction targets under AB 32 to the regional level. The SANDAG-CEC agreement also includes an update of the Regional Energy Strategy, the expansion of the “Sustainable Region” local government energy efficiency pilot program, and an Alternative Fuels Toolkit for Local Governments.
In addition to satisfying the requirements of the CEC agreement, the Regional Climate Action Plan also was included as a mitigation measure in the RTP 2030 EIR. The plan will be drafted in the following four steps:

- **Regional GHG Inventory.** The plan will catalogue existing conditions in the region’s contribution to GHG emissions. An inventory will be performed that records GHG emissions by sector, from baseline 1990 levels to 2005 levels. The inventory will be performed in accordance with the methodology set up by the California Climate Action Registry, which is a state standard.

- **Business-as-Usual Forecast.** GHG emissions from the transportation and energy sectors will be projected to 2020 and 2030. In the transportation sector, the forecast will be based on the 2030 RTP, while the energy sector forecast will be based on SDG&E’s long-term procurement plan. Both forecasts will include adopted state goals and policies that will influence emissions levels.

- **GHG Reduction Scenarios.** Regional land use and transportation plan alternatives will be drafted and analyzed for their GHG emissions. These alternatives will vary in their assumptions about land use intensities and mixes, redevelopment possibilities, and relative levels of investment in highway and transit infrastructure. The GHG emission levels will be compared to potential GHG reduction targets to illustrate the political and financial feasibility of land use-driven climate change strategies. Scenarios for the energy sector will differ in their relative levels of fossil fuel generation, renewable generation, and energy efficiency.

- **Policy Planning and Implementation.** Goals, objectives, policies, and implementation strategies will be developed based on the outcomes of the scenario analysis and on an estimated GHG reduction target for the transportation and energy sectors.

The inventory, business-as-usual forecast, and draft emission reduction scenarios are scheduled for completion by June 30, 2008. These analytical tools will give the Regional Planning Committee and Board of Directors a basis on which to then guide SANDAG policy planning for climate change.

The Regional Climate Action Plan and other SANDAG climate change activities are designed to comply with existing laws and regulations and to prepare the agency for a new paradigm in planning that is emerging from the state level. State climate change goals are ambitious and will require good faith efforts and evolution in every major sector of the economy if they are to be achieved. Staff will continue to follow developments at the state and federal levels and will ensure that the Board of Directors is kept well-informed of these developments and of SANDAG climate change activities and work products.

### 2030 Regional Transportation Plan Environmental Impact Report (EIR)

The updated 2030 San Diego Regional Transportation Plan was adopted by the SANDAG Board of Directors on November 30, 2007. Updated every four years, the 2030 RTP is the public policy blueprint for how people and goods will move around the San Diego region during the next 23 years. The RTP features a section on transportation fuels and climate change, describing SANDAG initiatives to encourage alternative fuels and update the Regional Energy Strategy. The RTP also
identifies a variety of projects and policies to encourage smart growth development patterns and transportation options.

On June 27, 2007, SANDAG received comments on the RTP EIR Notice of Preparation from the State Attorney General’s office, which requested that SANDAG “evaluate the GHG impacts of priorities and projects in the Transportation Plan and discuss feasible alternatives and mitigation measures to avoid or reduce those impacts.” In preparing the EIR, SANDAG analyzed the plan’s climate change impacts, identified them as “significant and unavoidable,” and established mitigation measures to address them. As part of the analysis, GHG emissions resulting from the 2030 RTP were quantified.

On November 29, 2007, the Attorney General’s office submitted comments on the RTP EIR stating that SANDAG did not fully analyze climate change impacts and should adopt additional mitigation measures to reduce these impacts. The Attorney General’s office letter included the following statements:

- The SANDAG Smart Growth Concept Map misguided includes suburban and rural areas that can not be served efficiently by transit. The Smart Growth Incentive Program will not be effective in reducing GHG emissions if it directs funds to all of these areas, as concluded by the Independent Transit Review panel.

- The EIR fails to consider a reasonable alternative that would substantially reduced investment in new freeway lanes and allocate funding to projects such as expanding public transit to shorten or eliminate vehicle trips, and increase biking and walking.

- The EIR does not adequately evaluate and identify the impacts of the numerous freeway widening projects (including many new freeway/highway lanes and some ML and HOV lane projects) that are included in the proposed RTP.

- SANDAG could adopt a more comprehensive policy to require all funded projects to mitigate GHG impacts from construction.

- SANDAG could have a significant impact on climate change by implementing a program to educate, encourage and assist jurisdictions in developing safe routes to school programs.

SANDAG has responded to these comments, and has offered to meet with the Attorney General’s office to discuss our responses.

**SENATE BILL 375**

Senate Bill (SB) 375 was introduced last year by Senator Darrell Steinberg (D-Sacramento) and is co-sponsored by the California League of Conservation Voters and the Natural Resources Defense Council. SB 375 is a two-year bill that, if passed, would create new provisions for the preparation of regional transportation plans (RTPs). Among the bill’s provisions are new requirements for RTPs to include a “sustainable communities strategy” in order to achieve greenhouse gas reduction targets set by the state and to preserve significant resource areas and farmlands. A key goal of the legislation is to reduce vehicle miles traveled as part of how California addresses greenhouse gas emissions.

As currently amended, SB 375:
• Requires the California Transportation Committee (CTC) in consultation with the CARB to adopt guidelines for travel demand models used in the development of RTPs by July 1, 2008.

• Requires transportation agencies to report to the CTC about the relationship of projects included in the regional transportation improvement program (RTIP) to the RTP and the sustainable communities strategy supplement.

• Requires regional agencies to prepare a sustainable communities strategy (SCS) to meet greenhouse gas emissions targets by 2020 and 2035, as provided by CARB. In the event that the SCS does not reach the targets, requires the Metropolitan Planning Organization/Regional Transportation Planning Agency to submit a supplement that would achieve the targets through alternative development patterns or additional transportation measures.

• Requires the action element of the RTP to describe all transportation projects proposed for development during the life of the plan to be consistent with the SCS.

• Provides for a streamlined CEQA process for projects that are located within jurisdictions whose general plans are consistent with an SCS and that meet specific requirements.

SANDAG currently has taken an “oppose” position on the bill. However, the SANDAG Executive Committee has provided direction to staff regarding possible amendments that could allow SANDAG to modify its position.

Amendments discussed by the Executive Committee include providing an alternative that would allow regions like SANDAG that have adopted regional comprehensive plans and habitat conservation plans to use those plans as a framework for developing the sustainable communities strategy required by the bill. Rather than focus solely on transportation, the SANDAG alternative would provide a more integrated approach to addressing greenhouse gas emissions in the region through land use- and transportation-related measures.

Other amendments include ensuring the bill’s approach to reducing GHG emissions is consistent with the statewide approach that is currently underway to implement AB 32; revising how the bill defines “significant resources areas” and “significant farmlands;” and identifying meaningful incentives that will encourage better climate change planning by local governments and regional agencies.