REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

Friday, April 4, 2008
12 noon to 2 p.m.
SANDAG Board Room
401 B Street, 7th Floor
San Diego

AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

• RECOMMENDATION ON TransNet ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION PROGRAM LAND MANAGEMENT GRANT PROCESS AND CRITERIA

• PRESENTATION ON THE SOLARA ENERGY-EFFICIENT APARTMENT COMMUNITY IN POWAY

• SAN DIEGO UNITED WAY PRESENTATION ON THE 10-YEAR PLAN TO END CHRONIC HOMELESSNESS

PLEASE TURN OFF CELL PHONES DURING THE MEETING

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

MISSION STATEMENT

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

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

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

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), SANDAG will accommodate persons who require assistance in order to participate in SANDAG meetings. If such assistance is required, please contact SANDAG at (619) 699-1900 at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting. To request this document or related reports in an alternative format, please call (619) 699-1900, (619) 699-1904 (TTY), or fax (619) 699-1905.

SANDAG offices are accessible by public transit. Phone 1-800-COMMUTE or see www.sdcommute.com for route information.
+1. APPROVAL OF THE MARCH 7, 2008, MEETING MINUTES  
APPROVE

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

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

CONSENT (Items 3 through 5)

+3. REGIONAL HABITAT MANAGEMENT AND FIRE SAFETY FOLLOW-UP (Keith Greer)  
INFORMATION

The SANDAG Board of Directors requested the Environmental Mitigation Program Working Group (EMPWG) host a forum to discuss how the region can better accommodate fire safety zones in areas where the habitat preserve interfaces with urban development. The EMPWG held the forum on March 11, 2008. This report summarizes the discussion at the forum.

+4. STATUS REPORT ON THE TECHNICAL UPDATE OF THE SMART GROWTH CONCEPT MAP (Carolina Gregor)  
INFORMATION

In anticipation of the call for projects for the TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program (SGIP), the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG) has been working with SANDAG staff to provide technical updates to the Smart Growth Concept Map. The attached report summarizes the changes to date. The TWG will review the draft map once again at its next meeting for final accuracy, and make a recommendation to the RPC. The staff report provides a summary of the status of the technical update for information purposes. Next month, the Regional Planning Committee will be asked to recommend that the SANDAG Board of Directors accept the map for use in the TransNet SGIP and for planning purposes.

+5. STATUS REPORT ON THE TransNet SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM (Stephan Vance)  
INFORMATION

The first call for projects for the TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program is expected to be issued this summer. Staff has been working with an ad hoc working group to develop the program guidelines and project selection criteria. This report provides an overview of progress to date. It is anticipated that the Regional Planning Committee will be asked to make a recommendation to the SANDAG Board of Directors on the program guidelines and project selection criteria in June.
REPORTS (Items 6 through 8)

-6. TransNet ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION PROGRAM (EMP): PROCESS AND CRITERIA FOR FY 2008 LAND MANAGEMENT GRANTS (Keith Greer)

On February 22, 2008, the SANDAG Board of Directors approved funding of $2.9 million for land management activities related to improving the regional habitat conservation plan preserve areas. The distribution for the $2.9 million would be through a competitive grant process. The eligibility and prioritization criteria for the grant process are requested to be reviewed by the Regional Planning Committee and a recommendation provided to the SANDAG Board prior to a request for proposals.

7. SHOWCASING SMART GROWTH AROUND THE REGION: SOLARA ENERGY SELF-SUFFICIENT APARTMENT COMMUNITY IN POWAY (Ingrid Alverde, Housing Manager, City of Poway; Mary Jane Jagodzinski, Senior Project Manager, Community Housing Works)

From time to time, the Regional Planning Committee has heard presentations on smart growth planning efforts underway in local jurisdictions. Today’s presentation focuses on the Solara apartment development in Poway, the first apartment community to be fully powered by the sun. This project, which consists of 56 affordable housing units in 6 two-story residential buildings, a 2,100 square-foot community center, and 2,100 square feet of office space on 2.5 acres, won a smart growth award from the local chapter of the Urban Land Institute (ULI) last year. A joint presentation will be made by the housing manager from the City of Poway and the project developer.

8. The 10-YEAR PLAN TO END CHRONIC HOMELESSNESS (Councilmember Toni Atkins; Doug Sawyer, United Way San Diego)

On November 27, 2007, the Regional Housing Working Group received a presentation on and discussed the 10-Year Plan to End Chronic Homelessness and recommended that the Plan be presented to the Regional Planning Committee for discussion and possible action.

9. UPCOMING MEETINGS

The next meeting of the Regional Planning Committee is scheduled for May 2, 2008, at 12 Noon.

10. ADJOURNMENT

+ Next to an agenda item indicates an attachment
The meeting of the Regional Planning Committee was called to order by Chair Jerry Jones (East County) at 12:04 p.m. See the attached attendance sheet for Regional Planning Committee member attendance.

1. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Toni Atkins (City of San Diego) and a second by Councilmember Jerry Kern (North County Coastal), the Regional Planning Committee approved the minutes from the February 8, 2008, meeting. Mayor Lori Holt Pfeiler (North County Inland) abstained.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

Chair Jones announced that Jim Janney (South County) accepted the position of Vice Chair of the RPC, and thanked Councilmember Atkins for her contribution serving as the Vice Chair for the last year.

Dave Druker (NCTD) announced the SPRINTER opening on March 9, 2008.

Dan Biggs, South County Economic Development Council, requested to make his comments regarding Item No. 5 in advance, as he had a conflicting meeting. He wanted to correct an error made at the recent Energy Working Group subcommittee meeting. He stated that his organization should have voted against the motion and that their intention was to support the Sunrise Powerlink.

Action: There were no public comments/communications/member comments.

CONSENT ITEM (#3)

3. STATUS REPORT ON I-PLACE’S PROJECTS (INFORMATION)

Action: This item was presented for information only.
REPORT ITEMS (#4 through #11)

4. FUNDING METHODOLOGY FOR STATE FUND MATCH FOR REGIONAL BEACH SAND REPLENISHMENT PROJECT AND UPDATE ON REGIONAL SHORELINE MANAGEMENT EFFORTS (RECOMMEND)

Shelby Tucker, Associate Planner (SANDAG), reported on the large- and small-scale replenishment activities, which include: funding opportunities and allocations for a beach sand replenishment project; Sand Compatibility and Opportunistic Use Program; Coastal Regional Sediment Management Plan; and Tijuana Estuary Science Study (TESS). She announced that project proponents for the Tijuana Estuary, along with the Shoreline Preservation Working Group, are also requesting a letter of support from SANDAG as a way to reflect local support for TESS.

Regarding the funding allocation for a regional beach replenishment project, Mr. Druker said the Del Mar City Council supported the allocation; however, they believe ultimately this is a regional project in which the inland cities should also participate.

Councilmember Atkins favored forwarding the item to the SANDAG Board and Executive Committee for further discussion; however, she asked that it be noted on the record that Mayor Jerry Sanders may have some questions and comments about the methodology.

Supervisor Pam Slater-Price (County of San Diego) reiterated that the responsibility for beaches belongs to all residents and informed the RPC that TESS is important to understand whether there is flexibility in using captured sand.

Councilmember Kern inquired if TESS was ongoing or if it was assigned a definite period of time.

Ms. Tucker responded that it was presently in Phase I, and Phase II funding will be addressed in May 2008 at the Ocean Protection Council. Sand placement is set to begin in the winter, with completion of sand placement in early 2009.

Councilmember Kern asked when data would be available.

Ms. Tucker replied that the sand will begin to be placed this year, with monitoring to occur this year and next.

Councilmember Kern asked if there was an option of a broad-based revenue source approach for sand replenishment in the future.

Gary Gallegos, Executive Director (SANDAG), discussed the Quality of Life Initiative which would include four infrastructure areas, of which this is one.

Mayor Lesa Heebner (North County Coastal) expressed her support and informed the RPC that the City of Solana Beach Council unanimously supported Option C, as they are committed to this being a regional approach in both cooperation and contribution. She said Solana Beach and Encinitas beaches are the worst in the region and, as a result, they have begun self-help efforts by increasing their TOT and originating other projects and studies.
Supervisor Slater-Price stated that funds secured from the TOT increase will also be directed toward beach sand preservation, nourishment, and clean-up.

Vice Chair Janney added that the programs will make beach nourishment more cost-effective for all.

**Action:** Upon a motion by Supervisor Slater-Price and a second by Councilmember Kern, the Regional Planning Committee unanimously recommended that: (A) the Board of Directors adopt the State fund match allocation methodology based on Option C, a 60/10/30 split among amount of sand received/miles of coastline restored/population; and, (B) that the Chair of the Board of Directors submit a letter of support for TESS.

5. **ENERGY WORKING GROUP TRANSMISSION PROJECTS ANALYSIS (RECOMMEND)**

Chair Jones announced that prior to the staff presentation, SANDAG General Counsel Julie Wiley would address conflict-of-interest issues.

Ms. Wiley stated that conflict-of-interest laws apply to this item and instructed those with issues to recuse themselves and leave the room during the discussions. Campaign contributions for purposes of this particular matter would not cause a conflict, as the statute that covers conflict of interest with regards to campaign contributions only covers decisions by bodies that are making decisions concerning permits, land use decisions, contracting, etc., and this particular issue does not rise to the level of triggering that statute.

Chair Jones limited the speaker time to two minutes due to the number of public speakers.

Brian Holland, Assistant Planner (SANDAG), presented the Energy Working Group’s (EWG) evaluation of the Sunrise Powerlink and Talega-Escondido/Valley-Serrano (TE/VS) transmission projects. He explained the EWG did not reach a consensus over its recommendation, and staff’s recommendation differs from the EWG’s recommendation. The Board made it clear that the scope of the analysis was to be limited to whether the projects are consistent with the Regional Energy Strategy (RES). It did not want an evaluation of the relative merits of the projects nor whether to support or oppose the projects.

Mr. Holland gave brief descriptions of the two projects, various goals, and the provisions of the RES. He stated staff found that both projects are consistent with the RES, are necessary to meet reliability requirements over the next decade, and meet the renewable portfolio standard. He informed that the key difference between the staff recommendation and the EWG recommendation was that the EWG found that the transmission projects may not be necessary to meet the goals of reliability, renewables, and low-cost supply.

Henry Abarbanel, EWG Co-Chair, relayed the challenges the EWG experienced. First, they debated whether the projects were consistent with the goals of the RES. The EWG recommendation was that the projects were inconsistent with the goals of the RES. Second, they issued a proposed motion which recommended the project that represents the most efficient uses of resources and value to the taxpayers and has the minimum impact on community health and the environment.
Mr. Abarbanel informed that due to disagreements among EWG members on the first issue, a minority report was developed. The minority report, along with a letter of support for the minority opinion from San Marcos Councilmember Rebecca Jones, reflected the difficulties experienced by the EWG when addressing the issue of priority. The Board of Directors did not ask the EWG to address priority; however, as the EWG acts as advisory to them, they felt it necessary to offer their advice should the Board choose to prioritize.

Mr. Abarbanel offered as a sidebar that should the Board of Directors wish the EWG to evaluate another project, they should work with the Executive Director to determine the resources available in order to give the future EWG the ability to evaluate EIRs, perform economic analyses, and act as the San Diego branch of the Public Utilities Commission. He stated as SANDAG has made it clear that it does not want to be an intervener with the PUC, perhaps the Board will choose not to evaluate specific future projects.

Ed Gallo (NCTD) requested clarification regarding the EWG voting process.

Mr. Abarbanel stated Counsel indicated that should abstaining members remain in the room, a vote tally could not be taken, as it was not a majority. The abstaining members were asked what they wanted to do. They chose to leave. The abstaining members were: representatives from USD, UCSD, and SDSU; Carrie Downey; the Executive Director of the California Center for Sustainable Energy; and the Port of San Diego.

Mr. Gallo remarked that he had never heard of this happening before.

Ms. Wiley read a passage from Robert’s Rules of Order regarding the situation.

Chair Jones reiterated the members that left the meeting were not coerced to do so; they did so voluntarily.

Mayor Heebner requested clarification regarding the goals of the RES and their relevance.

Mr. Abarbanel explained the goals and their relevance.

Mayor Heebner asked if staff believed all the goals were relevant.

Mr. Holland replied that it was staff’s belief that all are relevant; however, goals 1, 6, 7, 8, and 9 are not relevant to the issue.

Mr. Abarbanel informed on new issues which did not exist when the RES was developed, which have to do with the relation of energy consumption with transportation fuels and infrastructure security.

Councilmember Kern asked if the abstaining members had entered into the discussion before the abstention.

Mr. Abarbanel responded that none of the six abstaining members participated.
Ms. Wiley clarified the distinction between recusal and abstention, and stated the conflict-of-interest laws do not apply to the EWG, even though they do apply to the Regional Planning Committee.

Councilmember Kern asked if it was possible to abstain without stating a reason.

Ms. Wiley replied he was correct.

Chair Jones inquired which goal was on page seven of the staff report.

Mr. Holland said that it was Goal 5.

Chair Jones invited public comment.

Those supporting the Sunrise Powerlink were: Scott Barnett, President of the Taxpayers Advocate; Faith Picking, representing BIOCOM; Joni Low, Executive Director of the Asian Business Association of San Diego; Chris Cate, representing the San Diego County Taxpayers Association; Andrew Poat, representing the San Diego Regional Economic Development Corporation; Scott Alevy, Vice President of the San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce; Warren H. Savage, representing the Santee Chamber of Commerce; Patti Krebs, representing Industrial Environmental Association Board of Directors.

Those opposed to the Sunrise Powerlink were: Donna Tisdale, Chair of the Boulevard Planning Group; Laura Copic, Member of the Carmel Valley Community Planning Board; Denise Morse, representing the Community Planning and Sponsor Group Alliance; Diana Lindsay, Vice President of Environmental Affairs for the Anza-Borrego Foundation and Institute.

Denis Trafecanty, Poway business owner, recommended supporting the recommendation of the EWG.

Lisa Cohen, CEO of the Chula Vista Chamber of Commerce, urged the RPC to vote that the Sunrise Powerlink is needed and is consistent with the RES.

David Kates, representing the Nevada Hydro Company, requested the RPC support the TE/VS transmission line project.

Bill Powers of Powers Engineering, representing the Sierra Club on the EWG, urged the RPC to support the EWG motion in the form presented.

Michael Shames, Director of Utility Consumers Action Network (UCAN), recommended the EWG consider additional alternative projects before delivering its recommendation to the Board of Directors. He stated the Sunrise Powerlink, at best, would only satisfy one of the goals of the RES and could undermine the other five goals.

Micah Mitrosky, representing the Sierra Club, urged the RPC to support the EWG motion that the Sunrise Powerlink and LEAPS project are inconsistent with the full set of RES goals.
Carolyn Morrow, representing Communities United for Sensible Power (CUSP), urged the RPS to support the findings of the EWG that the project is inconsistent with the full set of RES goals.

David Geier, Vice President of Electric Distribution for SDG&E and voting member of the EWG, stated the Sunrise Powerlink is consistent with the RES and urged the RPC to support the Sunrise Powerlink.

Diane Conklin, representing Mussey Grade Road Alliance and Coordinator of CUSP, stated opposition of the Sunrise Powerlink and asked that energy be kept local.

Stephen Zolezzi, representing the San Diego County Food and Beverage Association and voting member of the EWG, stated the minority report answers the RPC’s mandate to the EWG and supported the recommendation of the EWG Subcommittee, which met on February 12, 2008, and the staff recommendation which was presented on February 28, 2008.

Janelle Riella submitted a request; however, was not present when called.

Curtis Douds, Ph.D., stated the Sunrise Powerlink will act against the implementation of in-basin renewable energy.

Grazyna Krajewska, representing THCC, stated support for renewable energy.

Chair Jones explained the two issues before the Committee were first, the determination of whether a power line is consistent with the RES; and second, the Sunrise Powerlink.

Vice Chair Janney commented he views transmission as being one of the major goals of the RES.

Councilmember Steve Gronke (North County Inland) agreed and did not think in-region generation could occur due to a lack of political will and fiscal opportunity to generate solar energy. He suggested a review of the list of goals focusing solely on transmission lines as an opportunity to produce energy within the region does not exist.

Mayor Holt Pfeiler stated her city has an operating power plant and agreed the process was very difficult. She said transmission is one of the goals which should be supported as it provides reliability.

Councilmember Kern concurred that a power line is consistent and that it would be very difficult to build a power plant.

Supervisor Slater-Price did not want to address the issue of transmission as it is very debatable and recommended consideration be made of the alternatives. She agreed San Diego needs a line; however, not a massive transmission line.
Councilmember Atkins agreed with Supervisor Slater-Price, stating she was not ready to vote on the subject and therefore would abstain.

Chairman Johnny Hernandez (Iipay Nation of Santa Ysabel), representing the Southern California Tribal Chairmen’s Association (SCTCA), informed the RPC that the SCTCA opposes the Sunrise Powerlink and urged further evaluation of the subject.

Chair Jones said the RPC can form an opinion to be sent to the Board.

Mr. Gallo suggested one of the recommendations could be that all jurisdictions in San Diego County have to provide in-basin generation.

Councilmember Gronke asked what the RPC’s obligation was to the Board in regards to this recommendation.

Mr. Holland replied the CPUC is planning to make its decision in the fall and TE/VS would be in 2009.

Councilmember Gronke stated that as a group there is still some time.

Mr. Gallegos informed that the issue of timing is related to the Board’s desire for closure and the receipt of a determination of whether the two transmission lines are consistent with the RES.

Councilmember Gronke inquired if SANDAG has the capacity to find an alternative to transmission which is reliable and produces the type of energy that is needed by the region.

Mr. Gallegos responded no, as SANDAG does not have the capacity to perform the complicated work.

Councilmember Gronke inquired about information from a particular attachment.

Mr. Holland replied the information was provided by Nevada Hydro.

Councilmember Al Ovrom (South County) said, “It seems to me that the question that you’re asking is if we are working with a three-legged stool or working with a four-legged stool? By that, I mean the four-legged stool has the four goals on it. And as to the first question, the answer is whether we are really working with that; or, are we going to recommend that they do away with one of those legs. And all the rest of the discussion after that seems to me to be that you have to come up with that answer first.”

Chair Jones stated he was correct.

Mayor Heebner reiterated the difficulty and confusion related to the issue of determining whether a transmission line is necessary with regard to the relevant goals of the RES. She suggested making comments about the rest of the strategies should it be determined the transmission line is necessary. Mayor Heebner expressed concern over the number of strategies and the fact that should they concur a transmission line is consistent with the RES, it could be misconstrued and other strategies disregarded.
Supervisor Slater-Price asked why they were asked to vote on the transmission line only.

Chair Jones responded that the Board made the request of the EWG.

Supervisor Slater-Price asked Mr. Abarbanel if his understanding was to vote on whether the transmission line is consistent with the RES.

Mr. Abarbanel stated originally that no one envisioned the EWG would be asked to comment on specific projects; however, the Board of Directors requested they review the two projects.

Supervisor Slater-Price indicated she probably would vote against the item as they are being asked to vote on just one of the shared elements.

Mr. Gallegos explained the goal of the Board is to update the RES, not to choose which of the lines is better. The Board’s desire is to address the issue of consistency with the strategy.

Supervisor Slater-Price said the line is being addressed because the two lines are the only things occurring right now.

Mr. Gallegos confirmed that as Sunrise evolved, the LEAPS project was added, and then the Board requested the EWG to review both projects.

Mr. Abarbanel responded affirmatively.

Supervisor Slater-Price agreed that some type of transmission was necessary; however, would not endorse Sunrise.

Mr. Gallegos clarified the Board’s desire to know whether the two specific projects were consistent with the strategy.

Supervisor Slater-Price asked if they were to vote on the issue of the necessity for transmission lines of some type.

Chair Jones replied affirmatively.

Mr. Gallegos reiterated the Board’s desire to know if the projects are consistent with the strategy and relayed the differing opinions of the EWG, which found they are not consistent; and staff, which found that on balance they are consistent.

Councilmember Kern remarked that a transmission line is necessary and said discussions regarding individual projects should take place later; and the EWG should not have had to determine the validity of the projects.

Mr. Druker commented on the EWG’s recommendation which allows support for transmission projects.

Mayor Holt Pfeiler pointed out that although the Committee was unable to make all of the detailed findings, the projects should continue through the process in order for the proper findings to be made.
Vice Chair Janney concurred that power should be made available, although the route has yet to be determined, and requested clarification of the specific lines referred to in the motion.

Mayor Holt Pfeiler responded the two projects were Sunrise and TE/VS.

Councilmember Atkins agreed that the projects should move through the process and reiterated her abstention.

Mr. Gallegos said that the Board did not desire a decision regarding routes; it only wanted to know whether the projects were consistent with the strategy.

Mayor Heebner requested staff review the chart prepared by Nevada Hydro.

Mr. Gallegos stated the information would be vetted through the PUC process and recommended that staff continue to monitor the PUC process and make periodical reports to the Committee on the PUC findings.

Supervisor Slater-Price stated that as she was unable to find that it met the low-cost supply portion of Goal 5, she would oppose the motion.

**Action:** Upon a motion by Mayor Holt Pfeiler and a second by Councilmember Kern, the Regional Planning Committee recommended that the Board of Directors find that transmission is consistent with Goal 5 of the Regional Energy Strategy (to increase transmission capacity). Abstained: 1 (Councilmember Atkins).

**Action:** Upon a motion by Mayor Holt Pfeiler and a second by Councilmember Kern, the Regional Planning Committee recommended that the Board of Directors find that both the Sunrise and TE/VS projects are consistent with RES Goal 3A (to increase renewable generation) and Goal 5, and that both projects should continue to move through the CPUC process. Opposed: 1 (Supervisor Slater-Price). Abstained: 1 (Councilmember Atkins).

6. **THE 10-YEAR PLAN TO END CHRONIC HOMELESSNESS (DISCUSSION/POSSIBLE ACTION)**

This item was continued to the next meeting.

7. **UPCOMING MEETINGS**

The next meeting of the Regional Planning Committee is scheduled for April 4, 2008, at 12 Noon.

8. **ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Jerry Jones adjourned the meeting at 2:15 p.m.
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<td>MEMBER / ALTERNATE</td>
<td>ATTENDING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Mitigation Program Advisory Member</td>
<td>Wildlife Conservation Board</td>
<td>John Donnelly</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Debbie Townsend</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Mitigation Program Advisory Member</td>
<td>California Department of Fish and Game</td>
<td>Don Pert</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>David Mayer</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Mitigation Program Advisory Member</td>
<td>US Army Corps of Engineers</td>
<td>Mark Durham</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jeannette Baker</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Mitigation Program Advisory Member</td>
<td>US Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
<td>Therese O’Rourke</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Susan Wynn</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REGIONAL HABITAT MANAGEMENT AND FIRE SAFETY FOLLOW-UP

Introduction

At its December 21, 2007, meeting, the SANDAG Board of Directors discussed regional habitat management and fire safety. The Board directed staff to facilitate a forum of regional stakeholders, including Regional Planning Committee members, to discuss how the region can better accommodate fire safety zones in areas where the habitat preserve interfaces with urban development.

Discussion

On March 11, 2008, the Environmental Mitigation Program Working Group (EMPWG) held a forum which included fire safety officials, interested stakeholders, and members of the public. The public forum addressed: (1) pending state legislation to address wildland fire safety in Southern California, (2) the existing requirements under the regional habitat conservation plans for managing habitat for fire safety, and (3) a panel discussion of expert fire science and fire safety officials who presented their experiences from the 2003 and 2007 wildfires.

The forum included the following topics and speakers:

- **Legislative Actions**: Deanna Spehn, Senior Policy Advisor for Senator Kehoe – Summary of proposed legislative actions related to wildland fires, including bills introduced by Senator Christine Kehoe.

- **Habitat Conservation Plans**: Susan Wynn, USFWS – Summary of agreements reached by the wildlife agencies with the Fire Chiefs’ Association through a February 1997 Memorandum of Understanding, and the subsequent requirements of the regional habitat conservation plans.

- **Fire Science**: Rick Halsey, California Chaparral Institute – Fire ecology, vegetation management, and reducing fire risk along the urban-wildland interface.

- **Fire Safety**: George Lucia, Sr., Fire Marshal, Valley Center Fire Protection District – Fire safety, defensible space, and what can be done around existing structures to reduce fire risk and protection of fire safety personnel.
- **Fire Safe Structures**: Brad Remp, Assistant Director/Deputy Building Official of Planning and Building, Chula Vista - Fire safety for existing and new buildings and structures, and new state fire-related building code regulations.

- **Summary**: Dr. Anne Fege, San Diego Fire Recovery Network – A systems approach towards fire protection and the cost-benefit of various approaches.

A discussion by members of the Environmental Working Group and members of the public followed the panel discussion. The message that emerged from the discussion was the importance of addressing fire safety as a system that requires a multi-pronged approach to create defensible space around existing structures, maintenance and/or removal of trees and flammable objects around existing structures, fire-resistant features on new structures, community education, and additional research to gain a better understanding of fire science.

SANDAG staff is proposing to track the 41 fire-related bills currently introduced into the State’s legislature cycle and modifying SANDAG’s 2008 legislative program, if necessary, to address these bills as they move through the legislative process. Further, it was suggested by the panelists that the focus for future wildfire safety should be on how structures ignite and how to reduce wildfire risks in a systems approach through careful planning of the location of new structures, fire-resistant building design, and fuel management (both native and ornamental vegetation maintenance) around existing and new structures.

A summary of the panel presentation is attached. The panelist presentations are posted on the SANDAG Web site at [www.sandag.org/fireforum](http://www.sandag.org/fireforum).

BOB LEITER
Director, Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachment: 1. Meeting Summary

Key Staff Contact: Keith Greer, (619) 699-7390, kgr@sandag.org
The following is a summary of the presentations made by the panelist that addressed the Environmental Mitigation Program Working Group (EMPWG) members and the public on the subject of habitat management and fire safety.

The forum included six panel members that addressed habitat management and fire safety from the legislative, regulatory, fire science, fire safety, and building code standpoints.

**Legislative Actions: Deanna Spehn, Senior Policy Advisor for Senator Kehoe**
Forty-one fire-related bills have been drafted statewide. Twenty-one bills were introduced by the San Diego delegation, including eight bills by Senator Kehoe. The San Diego delegation has taken a leadership role to address public safety related to wildfires. Most hearings on these bills will occur over the last week of March. The State Rules Committee will then assign bills to appropriate committee for consideration. Language will be finalized through the hearing process. The Governor has proposed $1.3 billion for fire-suppression costs in proposed budget. The State Senate Committee on Nature Resources and Water and Government Organization held a joint information hearing on fire safety in San Diego on March 7, 2008, entitled “Can Improved Fire Prevention Reduce Catastrophic Fires in California” to gather more information on how to address wildfires. Ms. Spehn noted staff should track the bills as they move through the state legislative process and get amended and modified, so that the surviving bills reflect the direction that the region wants to support.

**Habitat Conservation Plans: Susan Wynn, Biologist, USFWS**
After the Laguna and Riverside fires in the late 1990s, a Memorandum of Understanding was signed in February 1997 by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, California Department of Fish and Game, California Department of Forestry, San Diego County Fire Chiefs’ Association, and San Diego County Fire Districts Association. The MOU allows impacts to endangered species (California gnatcatcher, arroyo toad, and Stephens’ kangaroo rat) if fuel management is consistent with MOU and the terms and conditions of the Biological Opinion. The MOU allows removal of vegetation 100 feet from structures. On unimproved property, fuel breaks can be installed if deemed necessary by fire chief in high-fuel areas with a 10-day notice to the wildlife agencies. The MOU requires avoidance of riparian areas.

Subsequent to MOU, several jurisdictions entered into regional habitat conservation plans with their own strategies for addressing fuel management. The City of San Diego has a two-zone brush management program (zone 1: 35 feet irrigated, zone 2: 65 feet of thinned and pruned vegetation). The County of San Diego incorporates Fire Chief’s MOU by reference, as well as establishing fire management plans for some of their open space areas. The City of Poway allows 100’ fuel modification for new development, with an additional 35 feet (up to a total of four acres if required by fire chief and approved by wildlife agencies). The City of Chula Vista has very specific fuel modifications related to individual developments. New development in Chula Vista has three zones of fuel modification (100 feet to 135 feet), which occur outside of the identified preserve area. The City of Carlsbad requires 60 feet of clearing for development, with new development...
requiring the clearing to occur outside of the preserve. Each City adopted a unique strategy, but the
fire chiefs retain the ability to work with wildlife agencies on fire safety concerns.

**Fire Science: Rick Halsey, California Chaparral Institute**

How to reduce fire risk is not a one-answer question: where you locate structures, the building
design, and fuel management are equally important. Location of where housing is constructed is
critical for the safety of residents and fire safety personnel—saddles between mountains, chimney
canyons, and ridgelines are dangerous fire areas. Building design must address materials and
standards that are less prone to burn. New development has done a good job at addressing this
issue. Fuel management, if done properly (35-foot irrigation and 65 feet of thinned vegetation), is
adequate. In the thinned area you must maintain the area or else the exotic grasses will invade—
grasses can carry fire and be dangerous. Embers can light ornamental landscapes such as Mexican
fan palms, which can travel blocks away from the fire front. During the 2007 wildfires most of the
houses were ignited by embers, not by direct flames (several photographic examples were
provided). Large, infrequent wildfires are a natural part of the chaparral ecosystem. Properly
maintained plants and trees around a home can reduce fire risk.

We need to create sustainable, fire-safe environments for our homes by starting from the house
out, rather than from the wildland in. Community responsibility is a controversial issue, but a group
of trained community volunteers could have saved several of the homes that were lost in
Rancho Bernardo.

**Fire Safety: George Lucia, Sr., Fire Marshal, Valley Center Fire Protection District**

It is easier to prevent fires than to put them out; the best fire protection is prevention. It is more
efficient to provide the information necessary for improving the survivability of a structure,
primarily homes, before a fire starts. Education and awareness of what residents can do now,
before a fire occurs, is critical to this success. Fuel, weather, and topography are the physical
elements that drive a fire. We want to focus on houses and the fuels around the houses. There are
things that can be done by residents to reduce fuels around their homes to reduce a fire—need to
instruct residents on how to maintain their yards to reduce fire risk by actions such as trimming up
dead and dying vegetation around your backyard.

Fire-spotting (ignition of new fires from embers blown downwind) was the cause of many new fires
during 2007. Fire safety personnel will triage houses based upon resources available. Proactive
action by residents to help reduce fire risk prior to the fire will increase the chances of structures
being protected. Triage decision factors for structures include surrounding fuels, fire behavior,
available resources, and firefighter and citizen safety.

There are things that can be done now such as reducing flammable roofs, maintaining surrounding
vegetation, providing tempered glass or double-pane windows, providing 1/8-inch mesh to cover
openings in structures, and evacuation planning. New products such as fire-resistant gels are also
being tested. The Palomar Mountain community was aware of its risk of fire and the citizens got
together to work with fire safe councils and coordinated fire breaks, fuel reductions, and forest
management. Not a single structure was lost at the top of Palomar Mountain during the 2007 fires.
Fire-Safe Structures: Brad Remp, Assistant Director/Deputy Building Official of Planning and Building, Chula Vista

New State building code standards have been adopted for building along the urban-wildland interface. Historically, building officials have not been involved in wildfire safety, but that is now changing. Stopping embers from igniting fires is key to structural survival; exposure to embers is much longer than the flames from the fire front. The new State code only applies to new construction, not existing structures or additions. This represents a challenge.

Fire Hazard Severity Zones (FHSZ) have been mapped by CAL FIRE (OSFM Fire Resource and Assessment Program [FRAP]); these are great resources for local officials. The new State standards will apply to local cities only if the jurisdictions adopt the basic State standards. Building officials must then certify the plans for the building and surrounding vegetation is in compliance with the new State standards.

Consideration for building design includes roofing material (Class A), debris in gutters, screens in attic vents, lap joints on exterior siding, tempered and double-pane windows, and decking materials. Types of building construction and materials are an important feature for fire safety—details count for the fire protection of structures.

Summary of the System and Science: Dr. Anne Fege, San Diego Fire Recovery Network

We must continue to focus on how houses ignite—by radiation, from burning plants or structures; by conduction, from embers that land on combustible material; and by convection, as fires move uphill or ahead. Fire Science requires a systems approach to address the factors that contribute to the catastrophic loss of structures. Selection of plants around structures is important—low-growing plants with minimal litter reduce maintenance cost and fire risk. Planting location is important to reduce “fuel ladders” that can carry flames into trees and rooflines. Pruning and maintenance of vegetation around structures is also critical.

The goal of fuel management is defensible space to: reduce flame length and keep those flames from touching structures, reduce radiant heat that the structures are exposed to, allow emergency personnel room to maneuver, and reduce adverse effects on native habitats. Fire protection should start with the house, and move out. A matrix of the cost of the types of fire protection techniques and the benefits for fire protection was provided. We should focus on low-cost-and-high-benefit methods such as landscape maintenance, removing trash and combustibles, and vent screens and removal of wooden fences near house.

The science of the 100-foot defensible space is an expert-based accepted standard. The International Wildland-Urban Interface Code (2006) and State of California (2004) have done some work on standards, but more research is needed. There is no current basis for extrapolation of fuel management to 300 feet.

Increased wildfires will convert the vegetation from native habitat to exotic grasses, which do not provide any more protection from wildfires (as seen from the areas that burned in 2003 and again in 2007). Fifty-three percent of the coastal sage scrub burned in either 2003 or 2007. We need to protect these areas for 20 to 30 years for the health of these areas. It is just as important as a historical structure. We need science-based monitoring, especially in an era of climate change, which is expected to increase fire frequency in the future.
Closing thoughts: Fire protection needs a systems approach: Focus on how houses ignite and how to reduce property risks; this includes building design, materials, retrofits, landscape types and maintenance, and location of new development. The fire science should focus on assessing the effectiveness of defensible space (100 feet); providing education, training, and monitoring for fuels/vegetation treatments to residents; cross-training for professionals; and monitoring wildfire recovery after repeated wildfires.

The EMPWG asked the panel members a series of clarifying questions and heard public testimony. No recommendation was made by the Working Group on this item.
STATUS REPORT ON THE TECHNICAL UPDATE OF THE
SMART GROWTH CONCEPT MAP

Introduction

In June 2006, the SANDAG Board of Directors accepted the Smart Growth Concept Map for planning purposes for the 2030 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Now that the SANDAG Board has adopted the Final 2030 RTP and in anticipation of a call for projects for the TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program (SGIP), SANDAG has initiated the process for technical updates to the Smart Growth Concept Map.

Over the past two months, SANDAG staff and members of the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG) have been working together to incorporate land use and transit changes to the Smart Growth Concept Map resulting from recent updates to local land use plans and the 2030 RTP. This report summarizes the changes made to the map to date and lists issues that need further evaluation. The TWG will review the draft map once again at its next meeting for final accuracy, and make a formal recommendation to the RPC at that time. Next month, the Regional Planning Committee will be asked to recommend that the SANDAG Board of Directors accept the map for use in the Smart Growth Incentive Program and for ongoing planning purposes.

Discussion

The Smart Growth Concept Map played an important role in the preparation of the 2030 RTP. The current map identifies two types of designations for smart growth areas: “Existing/Planned,” or “Potential.” These designations are based on whether the areas meet certain housing, employment, and transportation targets identified in the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP).

Several smart growth areas had previously been designated as “Potential” areas based on their lack of existing or planned high-frequency local or regional transit service, even though they met the land use targets identified in the RCP. During the preparation of the 2030 RTP, SANDAG used the map to prioritize the placement of regional transit and high-frequency local transit in these areas. As a result, the status of most of these areas has changed from “Potential” to “Existing/Planned.” These areas are listed further below in this report.

In addition, SANDAG staff has been working with TWG members to identify any additions, deletions, and/or boundary changes to areas in their jurisdictions, and to incorporate any recent updates to local land use plans. The boundary changes requested by member agencies are also listed below.
The technical update of the Smart Growth Concept Map is important because the updated map will be used as a basis for determining local jurisdictions’ eligibility to compete for smart growth incentives from the upcoming TransNet SGIP. While the criteria for the SGIP are still being developed, it is likely that “Existing/Planned” smart growth areas may qualify to compete for both capital infrastructure and planning grants, while “Potential” smart growth areas may be limited to competing for planning grants only.

Summary of Changes to the Smart Growth Concept Map

Areas that have changed from “Potential” to “Existing/Planned” due to the addition of planned transit service in the 2030 RTP

The new transit networks included in the Reasonably Expected scenario of the 2030 RTP have been added to the Smart Growth Concept Map. Previously, several smart growth areas had been designated as “Potential” areas based on their lack of existing or planned transit service, even though they met the land use targets identified in the RCP. Due to the addition of planned transit to these areas, the designation of the following “Potential” areas has changed to “Existing/Planned,” since these areas now meet both the land use and transit targets in the RCP.

- PW-2 – Poway – Pomerado Hospital
- SD-MM-6 – San Diego – Mira Mesa – Camino Santa Fe and Carroll Canyon Road
- SD-OB-1 – San Diego – Ocean Beach Commercial Core – Between Niagara Ave. and Santa Monica Ave.
- SD-OM-3 – San Diego – Otay Mesa – Southwest corner of State Route 905
- SD-PA-1 – San Diego – Peninsula – Rosecrans Street from Talbot Street to Laning Road/Russell Street
- SD-PA-2 – San Diego – Peninsula – Voltaire Street from Chatsworth Blvd. to Catalina Blvd.
- SD-SM-1 – San Diego – Serra Mesa – Gramercy Drive, Ruffin Road, Village Glen Drive, and Glencolum Drive

Areas where boundaries have changed (no change in status)

None of the jurisdictions requested the addition of new areas or the deletion of existing areas on the map. However, several jurisdictions requested boundary changes, as listed below. These requests did not result in changes of status from Existing/Planned to Potential, or vice versa.

- ES-1 – Downtown Escondido: Expanded boundaries of Downtown Specific Plan to the west, north, and east
- LG-3 – Downtown Lemon Grove: Expanded boundaries westward
- NC-1 – Downtown National City: Expanded boundaries westward
- NC-2 – National City: Replaced previous potential Filipino Village Community Center with a new potential Mixed Use Transit Corridor along Plaza Boulevard from D Avenue to Euclid Avenue
- NC-3 – National City: Extended Highland Avenue Mixed Use Transit Corridor to include Highland Avenue and the Sweetwater Road Transit Corridor
- PW-1 – Poway: Expanded boundaries of Town Center area in various directions to better reflect local planning efforts
- ST-2 – Santee: Moved this potential Community Center eastward
- VS-5 – Vista: Replaced VS-5 potential Community Center at North Santa Fe Avenue and Bobier Avenue with a potential Mixed Use Transit Corridor along North Santa Fe Avenue from Orange Street to Weston Street

Addition of military employment areas

Based on previous direction from the Regional Planning Committee, staff has incorporated the urbanized areas of the region’s military facilities onto the map as “major employment areas.”

Areas for further evaluation

As part of the technical update of the map, staff has identified three issue areas which need further evaluation or clarification.

The first pertains to the status of the “Rural Villages” in the County of San Diego. Most of the Rural Villages on the current map (the map that was accepted for planning purposes by the SANDAG Board in 2006) are shown as “Existing/Planned” based on an assumption made at that time that the County Board of Supervisors was nearing adoption of General Plan 2020 (GP2020), and that the rural core areas in GP2020 contained moderate densities supportive of smart growth principles, as identified in the RCP. Based on delays to the adoption of the County General Plan Update, SANDAG may need to change the “Existing/Planned” Rural Villages to “Potential” areas as part of the technical update of the Concept Map. Staff is working with County planning staff regarding this issue, and expects to gather enough information to resolve this issue before the map is presented to the Regional Planning Committee next month.

The second issue pertains to the transit service requirements for “Community Centers.” While the RCP calls for this place type to be served by regional or commuter transit service, during the formulation of the Smart Growth Concept Map it was decided that high-frequency local bus service could, in certain cases, provide a sufficient level of transit service for this place type. Subsequently, the recently updated RTP has further refined the types of transit service that are included in the Transit Network plan, to include both “Arterial Rapid Bus” service and high-frequency local bus service. Staff is currently evaluating the applicability of these service types to the “Community Center” place type, and will bring forward recommendations to the TWG and the RPC on this issue at future meetings. This issue affects two areas listed above as areas that have changed from Potential to Existing/Planned due to the addition of transit service in the 2030 RTP. (One is in Ocean Beach and the other is in Serra Mesa.)

The third issue pertains to discussion regarding whether to remove “Potential” areas from the map that fail to meet both the land use and transit targets identified in the RCP. During the preparation of the 2030 RTP, SANDAG used the map to prioritize the placement of regional transit and high-frequency local transit to as many smart growth areas as possible. However, about a dozen areas did not receive transit service and do not meet the land use targets. At its last meeting, the TWG
discussed this issue, and many TWG members recommended against removing these Potential smart growth areas from the map as part of the technical update, citing the resulting disincentive to plan for smarter growth in these areas if they are removed from the map, and the inability to receive SGIP planning grants to pursue planning efforts in these areas. TWG members also pointed out the importance of keeping these areas on the map so that future transit service could be directed toward these areas once local jurisdictions change the land use plans to allow smarter growth. Based on discussion by the TWG, and based on the bottom-up, cooperative approach taken to formulate the map, staff recommends retaining these Potential areas on the map.

**Conclusion**

The draft Smart Growth Concept Map and updated site descriptions were distributed at the March 2008 TWG meeting for TWG review, and are currently posted on the SANDAG Web site. TWG members confirmed that the staff report captured most of the changes, although several jurisdictions indicated that they are considering a few additional boundary changes that they will forward to staff. A revised draft map and corresponding site descriptions will be presented to the TWG at its April 10, 2008, meeting for a formal recommendation. The updated map will then be presented to the Regional Planning Committee and SANDAG Board of Directors in May 2008 for formal action, in advance of the call for projects for the TransNet SGIP.

Once the SANDAG Board accepts the updated Smart Growth Concept Map, the revised map and corresponding site descriptions will be used in the TransNet SGIP, and will be posted to the SANDAG Web site in an “interactive” format, as currently available on-line. In an effort to promote smart growth opportunities and incentives in these areas, local jurisdictions will be encouraged to provide this information on their local Web sites and through their local planning documents.

In addition, once the 2-D and 3-D visual simulations and the smart growth photos being developed as part of the Smart Growth Tool Kit become available, they will be linked to the updated on-line Interactive Smart Growth Concept Map.

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

Key Staff Contact: Carolina Gregor, (619) 699-1989, cgr@sandag.org
STATUS REPORT ON THE TransNet SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM

Introduction

Work is well underway to develop program guidelines and project selection criteria for the competitive TransNet-funded Smart Growth Incentive Program that will begin earning revenue under the TransNet Extension Ordinance in July 2008. Last December, staff provided a preliminary report to the Regional Planning Committee (RPC) so that the committee could provide early input into the program development process. Since then, an ad hoc working group, which includes members from the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG) and the Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC), has been meeting to develop recommendations for how the program should be structured and administered. To date, the group has discussed the program objectives, grant size and funding cycles, the types of projects that should be funded, and the criteria that could be used to select capital projects for funding. Their discussions have been informed by the Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program, input from the Independent Transit Peer Review Panel Report (ITPR), the 2030 Regional Transportation Plan, and by what has been learned from similar programs conducted by other regional agencies in the state.

This report presents preliminary information about the program features and suggestions from the ad hoc working group. A more detailed report will be brought to the RPC for feedback in May including suggested project evaluation criteria.

Discussion

Developing the TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program (TSGIP) began from the base of experience gained with the 2005 Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program, which was funded through the federal Transportation Enhancements (TE) program. Because this new program is funded with local TransNet funds, there is an opportunity to reshape the program to take advantage of the flexibility and local control that the TransNet program offers. With this in mind, the ad hoc working group started its work with a review of the program objectives, as articulated by the RPC last December, and has been working its way through the details of the program. Those program objectives may be summarized as follows:

- Fund projects that are “ready-to-go” to put good examples of smart growth development on the ground as catalysts for further development.
- The projects should influence land development by improving the public realm and encouraging private smart growth projects that, in combination, create great places.
• The projects should contribute to the reduction of greenhouse gases by encouraging travel by means other than private automobile. In particular, the projects should support public transit usage by being within areas served by transit, and by improving access to transit.
• The projects should support housing development at densities appropriate for its place type.
• The projects should provide good examples of smart growth in a variety of settings in the region.

Progress to Date

The issues that the working group has been discussing include funding levels, funding cycles, project types, screening and eligibility criteria, project evaluation criteria, and the project evaluation process. Each of these areas is discussed briefly below. The program development process has been dynamic, so it is anticipated that the program will continue to evolve as the process continues.

Funding Levels and Funding Cycles. SANDAG currently estimates the funding available for the first year of the program will be approximately $5 million. The Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program was able to award $23.5 million to 14 projects by combining six years of federal TE funds. The working group agreed that the TransNet program would have more impact if each call for projects combined two years of funding. This will make approximately $10.2 million available for the first funding cycle. The working group has also discussed establishing a cap on individual grant amounts as a means of ensuring a minimum quantity of projects are selected in each cycle, providing an opportunity to fund a variety of projects in a variety of areas around the region. Funding caps for individual capital project grants ranging from $1 million to $2 million have been discussed, but developing a consensus on this question remains a challenge. A cap on planning grants on the order of $200,000 is being considered.

Project Types. The TransNet Ordinance authorizes expenditures for both capital improvements and planning projects. The RPC expressed a clear preference for “bricks and mortar” projects, so the working group has been discussing how the program could focus on capital improvements, while also allowing for some planning activities. The working group expressed strong support for including planning grants in the program because the planning process is often the time when the community develops consensus about smart growth development. At the same time, local agencies often find it difficult to identify funding for this kind of planning activity. The working group has discussed a program structure where planning projects compete with capital projects for funds, but planning grants are capped at ten percent of the total available funds for each cycle.

For capital projects, the working group is recommending that the TSGIP fund the same type of transportation-related improvements as the Pilot Program (streetscape enhancements, bicycle and pedestrian access improvements, and transit access improvements, for example), with some additions that take advantage of the flexibility in using local TransNet funds. This flexibility could make funding available for projects that create public spaces such as public plazas and common neighborhood green space that are important components of good smart growth places.

Capital projects, including preliminary plans and studies leading to capital projects, would be eligible only in areas designated as Existing/Planned on the Smart Growth Concept Map. Projects in Potential smart growth areas would only be eligible for funding to support planning activities to build local consensus for smart growth and make any necessary changes to local plans and zoning.
The working group has focused a great deal of its effort on the project screening and evaluation criteria for capital projects. Criteria for planning projects have yet to be developed.

Project Eligibility Criteria. Screening criteria are needed to ensure the projects considered for funding meet the basic objectives of the program. The working group has developed screening criteria to identify projects that are fully eligible under the program, and that demonstrate a level of commitment on the local level that indicates the project’s viability. Proposed criteria include:

- Eligibility under the TransNet Ordinance
- Projects must be located within an appropriate Smart Growth Opportunity Area
- Applicants must be eligible under SANDAG Policy No. 33, Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) Compliance
- Local commitment to allocate the resources necessary to implement and complete the proposed activities and outcomes within the schedule identified in the project application
- Project Readiness, as evidenced by the completion of a project feasibility study that demonstrates the project can be started during the period for which funding is being requested, and there is a sound basis for the project cost estimate.

Project Evaluation Criteria. As with the Pilot Program, the working group is developing project evaluation criteria that address the multifaceted nature of smart growth development. They will be recommending criteria that evaluate the setting of the proposed project as an appropriate place for smart growth investment, the project’s relation to existing and planned public transit investments, the degree to which it supports existing and proposed smart growth land development within the vicinity of the proposed project, and the quality of the proposed capital improvement itself. As much as possible, the criteria utilize objective measures of smart growth such as intensity of development (relative to place type), proximity to transit, and walkability measured in terms of the connectivity of the walking network. Finding objective criteria for evaluating the quality of project design is proving to be a challenge, however. The solution to that problem may lie in developing a project selection process that utilizes an independent review panel with the specialized knowledge needed to evaluate the projects.

Project Selection Process. The working group has considered several alternatives for how the evaluation criteria should be used to score the grant applications. They reviewed the processes used by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission in the Bay Area for its Transportation for Livable Communities program, and the Sacramento Area Council of Governments’ Community Design program. The process initially developed by the working group would involve establishing a review panel consisting of staff from SANDAG and local agencies. Consideration is also being given to include experts in planning and design from local universities on the selection panel. The working group has also suggested that the project rankings should be reviewed by the TWG and CTAC prior to consideration by the RPC and final action by the SANDAG Board of Directors.

Next Steps

The ad hoc working group will continue to work through April to complete recommendations for the project selection criteria and selection process. As they develop consensus on the details of the program, SANDAG staff will be preparing guidelines to govern the administration of the program. The results of this work will be brought back to the RPC at its May meeting for review and
comment. A report on the program also will be made to the Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee for its review and comment, and to the Transportation Committee for its information. Based on comments received through this review process, final draft program guidelines and project evaluation process will be prepared for the RPC's consideration in June. The RPC will be asked to recommend to the Board that it approve the guidelines and evaluation process and authorize SANDAG to issue the first call for projects. Once approved, the call for projects could be issued this summer, and a recommended list of projects for funding could be ready for RPC consideration in the fall.

BOB LEITER
Director, Land Use and Transportation Planning

Key Staff Contact: Stephan Vance, (619) 699-1924, sva@sandag.org
Introduction

The TransNet Extension Ordinance and Expenditure Plan, as approved by the voters on November 2, 2004, includes an Environmental Mitigation Program (EMP), which is a funding allocation category for the costs to mitigate habitat impacts for regional transportation projects. The EMP is a unique component of the TransNet Extension in that it goes beyond traditional mitigation for transportation projects by including a funding allocation for habitat acquisition, management, and monitoring activities as needed to help implement regional habitat conservation plans.


Consistent with previous Board action on December 16, 2005, staff is proposing a competitive grant process for the allocations of these land management funds and evaluation criteria to rank projects which are submitted for consideration.

Discussion

On February 22, 2008, the SANDAG Board allocated $2.9 million of TransNet EMP funds for land management projects that: (1) reduce existing or emerging invasive species, (2) promote natural recovery of post-burn areas, (3) provide habitat restoration on post-burn and other degraded habitat lands to promote recovery of native species and vegetation communities, and/or (4) control access to managed trails to reduce unintended impacts from recreational use.

Consistent with Board action in December 2005 as part of the first round of EMP land management grant funds, SANDAG staff is recommending that a competitive grant project be used to solicit proposals from existing land managers. The proposals would be ranked against a set of eligibility and prioritization criteria. The proposed criteria are consistent with those adopted by the SANDAG
Board on December 15, 2006, with slight modifications from experience gained in administering the FY 2006 land management grant process. The EMP FY 2008 Land Management Grant Program Overview and Instructions are provided as Attachment 1 to this report.

In general, land management proposals would be rated based upon their biological significance, the urgency of the land management action, leveraging of existing funding, and working to implement strategic management plans with multiple stakeholder groups. A selection committee will be made up of EMP Working Group members and/or other qualified individuals who do not have an affiliation with any of the proposed projects. The selection committee would include people with knowledge of the regional preserve system and land management.

During its March meeting, a quorum could not be reached by the EMP Working Group to take action upon this item due to the disqualification of many members that will be seeking to compete for grant funding.

**Next Steps**

If the RPC concurs with the recommendations, this item will be forwarded to the SANDAG Board for consideration. If approved by the SANDAG Board, a call for projects would be issued in May, along with the attached grant process guidelines and supporting material (Attachments 1-4). Projects would be reviewed and prioritized in June, and a list of prioritized projects would be provided to the RPC for consideration in July.
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               4. Project Eligibility Evaluation and Ranking

Key Staff Contact: Keith Greer, (619) 699-7390, kgr@sandag.org
ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION PROGRAM (EMP) FISCAL YEAR (FY) 2008 LAND MANAGEMENT GRANTS – PROGRAM OVERVIEW AND INSTRUCTIONS

Program Description

The TransNet Extension Ordinance and Expenditure Plan, as approved by the voters on November 2, 2004, includes an Environmental Mitigation Program (EMP), which is a funding allocation category for the costs to mitigate habitat impacts for regional transportation projects. The EMP is a unique component of the TransNet Extension in that it goes beyond traditional mitigation for transportation projects by including a funding allocation for habitat acquisition, management, and monitoring activities as needed to help implement regional habitat conservation plans.

On February 22, 2008, the SANDAG Board of Directors approved land management and monitoring activities and a budget for FY 2008. The board approved $2.9 million for land management projects related to Invasive Control, Fire Recovery, Habitat Restoration, and Access Control and Management.

Eligible Activities

The SANDAG Board has allocated $2.9 million to address invasive species control, recovery and protection of resources damaged by the recent wildland fires, restoration of degraded habitat areas, and management to preclude unintended damage caused by recreation use. This is especially critical due to the potential for the establishment of invasive species in areas burned by the 2007 wildland fires, and the need for recovery and protection of areas until they naturally recover from the burns. It is envisioned that the $2.9 million would be part of a multi-year strategic approach to: (1) control key exotic species, (2) promote fire recovery, (3) provide habitat restoration, and (4) provide access control and management in the regional preserve system. The proposed activities could include active land management efforts that include one or more of the following activities:

1. **Invasive Control** - Projects that reduce existing or emerging invasive species that threaten endangered and/or other sensitive species.

2. **Fire Recovery** - Projects that promote natural recovery of post-burn areas such as erosion control features (e.g., silt fences), fiber rolls or straw wattles, straw or wood chip mulching, hydro-seeding and hydro-mulching, the strategic identification of potential target areas for restoration efforts, and sources of plant materials for current and future restoration activities.

3. **Habitat Restoration** - Projects that engage in active habitat restoration on post-burn and other degraded habitat lands to promote recovery of native vegetation communities and/or threatened, endangered, and other sensitive species habitat.

4. **Access Control and Management** - Project that controls access to managed trails and enforces legal use of the open space areas to allow these areas to recover as soon as possible to their pre-burn conditions. This includes signage (both interpretive and cautionary), education, patrolling public use, and law enforcement.
Land management activities will be determined based on the needs of each property within the preserve. Projects that are not ready to start within 12 months of submission to SANDAG would not be eligible for funding.

**How Much Funding Is Available?**

On February 22, 2008, the SANDAG Board of Directors approved $2.9 million for FY 2008 land management activities. Additional funding may be available in FY 2009 as approved by the SANDAG Board.

**Process for Allocating the Funds**

The SANDAG Board of Directors is requesting project proposals from land managers in San Diego County to benefit regional conservation planning under the Natural Communities Conservation Planning Program. The applicant must own the land, or be designated to manage the land by the land owner. The land owner and land manager must be identified on the application form and be authorized in writing to enter into a contract agreement with SANDAG.

Applicants will provide a 3-5 page proposal (not including attachments) and complete a project submission form (Attachment 2), which will outline the overall project, the scope of work, timeline, and costs. **Applicants must clearly identify their proposed tasks in the scope of work, funding requested by tasks (please identify staff hours and cost separately), start and end dates of the tasks, and deliverables.** Applicants are encouraged to identify phasing in their proposal in case full-funding for the project is not available.

All project proposals will be reviewed for eligibility, ranked, and prioritized through the criteria in Attachments 3 and 4. A list of recommended projects will be submitted for consideration to the EMP Working Group and the Regional Planning Committee (RPC), and ratified by the SANDAG Board.

Successful applicants will then be eligible to enter into a contract with SANDAG for grant funding. Successful applicants would be required to submit quarterly reports on their progress and a final summary report of the project’s contribution to promote habitat conservation in the region along with the final invoice.

**Who Will Score The Projects?**

A selection committee will be made up of EMP Working Group members and/or other qualified individuals who do not have an affiliation with any of the proposed projects. The selection committee would include people with knowledge of the regional preserve system and land management.
Proposed Schedule

**May 7, 2008** – A call for projects is provided to EMP Working Group members and other interested stakeholders. A call for projects will also be posted on SANDAG’s Web site.

**June 4, 2008** – Applications are due to SANDAG.

**June 2008** – The selection committee will review and rank projects following the criteria in Attachments 3 and 4, and forward to the EMP Working Group for recommendation.

**July 2008** – The RPC will be asked to approve a list of land management projects.

**July 2008** – The SANDAG Board of Directors will be asked to ratify the list of projects.
PROJECT SUBMISSION FORM
For Consideration for TransNet Environmental Mitigation Program (EMP) Funding for Land Management (Fiscal Year 2008 Funding Only)

General Information on the Property (Click on the fields below to begin typing. Please use as much space as is needed. Attach to front of Proposal).

Applicant Name:
Address:
Name of Property:
General Location:
Jurisdiction:
Total Acres:
Acres Requiring Management:
Owner(s) of Property:

Land Manager(s) of Property (include name(s), years of experience managing habitat lands, existing land management responsibilities, and references):

** If the applicant is not the landowner, please submit a letter from the landowner granting permission to perform the land management duties as outlined in the application. Failure to provide the letter will lead to disqualification of the application.

Proposal and Scope of Work: Please provide a 3-5 page proposal and scope of work (not including attachments) identifying the goals of the project, proposed tasks to implement these goals, funding requested by tasks (please identify staff hours and cost separately for consultants and material), start and end dates of the tasks, deliverables and dates of deliverable. Please provide a page-sized map showing the general location of the property and a copy of the habitat management plan, if available. Applicants are encouraged to identify phasing in their proposal in case full-funding for the project is not available.

Funding Needs
1. How much money is being requested for this year? $

2. Are there matching funds available? ☐ Yes or ☐ No
   If yes, please provide the source of funds and dollar amount: $
3. What management activities will be done on the property? Please list each activity and its associated cost, and an implementation schedule including time frames for each activity (you may reference the project’s scope of work):

4. Are there any federal or state permits required for these activities? □ Yes or □ No
   If so, are there associated costs for these permits? □ Yes or □ No
   If so, are the permit costs included in the request? □ Yes or □ No

**Biological Significance**

1. Does the property support or did it support natural vegetation in a core area? □ Yes or □ No
   If yes, list the habitats contained on the property:

2. Does the property contribute to the Natural Communities Conservation Program regional preserve system? □ Yes or □ No

3. Is the property a linkage or regional wildlife corridor? □ Yes or □ No

4. Are there, or were there, significant populations of covered species or species proposed for coverage by a habitat conservation plan? □ Yes or □ No
   If yes, please list the species:

**Risk**

1. Does the site suffer from natural, human, or domestic animal disturbance (e.g., off-road vehicle use, grazing, fire, flooding, and/or feral cats)? □ Yes or □ No
   If yes, list the type(s) of disturbance:

2. Do exotic, invasive species threaten the preserve? □ Yes or □ No
   If yes, list the species:

3. Is there uncontrolled erosion? Uncontrolled access? □ Yes or □ No
   If yes, identify the source if possible:

4. Is immediate action needed to address a problem, or else the site would degrade further? Would the further degradation potential affect covered species?
   □ Yes or □ No
   If yes, explain:

**Cost-Effectiveness**

1. Does the proposal use efficient and proven methods and/or strategies to address the land management needs that would result in a high likelihood of success and reduce future land management costs? (e.g., control of small outbreak of aggressive exotic species, fencing to prevent damage to rare plant populations)
   □ Yes or □ No
   If yes, explain:
2. Does the proposal implement a strategic approach which covers large geographic areas (e.g., watershed or subwatershed extent) involving multiple partners and providing multiple benefits (e.g., part of a larger coordinated effort) (i.e., High Economy-of-Scale)? □ Yes or □ No

   If yes, explain:

3. How would the project result in measurable biological success to implement the Natural Communities Conservation Program regional preserve system? What measurable results would be used to determine success of the project? explain:

4. Would the project involve the public outreach/public participation to identify the land management activities being funded and promote awareness of grant funded project? □ Yes or □ No

   If yes, explain:
EMP Criteria for Eligible Management Projects (FY 2008 Funding)

Is the project biologically significant?
For example:
- Does it, or did it, support natural vegetation in a core area?
- Is the project important? Does it contribute to the Natural Community Conservation Planning regional preserve system?
- Is it a linkage or regional wildlife corridor?
- Are there, or were there, significant populations of covered species or species proposed for coverage by a habitat conservation plan?

Yes

Is the project area at risk of further degradation if no management is provided?
For example:
- Was the site affected by the 2003 and/or 2007 wildfires and requires land management to recover?
- Does the site suffer from human or domestic animal disturbance (e.g., off-road vehicle use, grazing)?
- Do exotic, invasive species threaten the preserve?
- Uncontrolled erosion? Uncontrolled access?

No

STOP PROJECT INELIGIBLE

Yes

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

No

ELIGIBLE PROJECT: Prioritization of eligible projects. Factors for consideration:
- Sites that support rare vegetation types, rare endemics, or cover species at risk of extirpation (e.g., Tier 1 habitats, vernal pools, cactus wren).
- Critical linkage parcel or regional wildlife corridor.
- Success of management activities is likely with clear measurable positive results (e.g., Arundo removal at the top of a watershed will receive higher priority than a site in the middle).
- Lack of management on the site may affect continued coverage of species.
- Dedicated staff (agency, jurisdiction, non-governmental organization) willing to assume long-term management.
- Percentage of matching contributions available to complete the project.
- Urgent action is needed to address a problem, or else the area would degrade further.
- Projects that propose to implement a strategic approach which covers large geographic areas involving multiple partners and multiple benefits (e.g., watershed approach for exotic species removal).
- Projects that promote public awareness of grant activity through public outreach and participation.
## Project Eligibility Evaluation and Ranking

Note: Do not fill out this section. This section is to be used by the project evaluation committee.

Name of Property:  
Name of Reviewer:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Point Range</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Maximum Score Possible</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of management on site may affect coverage of species.</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site supports rare vegetation types, populations of narrow endemics or species at risk of extirpation (e.g., Tier 1 habitat, vernal pools, cactus wren).</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical linkage parcels or in regional wildlife corridor.</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long term success of management activities is likely with clear measurable positive results which will reduce future land management costs. High Cost-Effectiveness</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urgent action is needed to address a problem or else the site would degrade further.</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated staff (agency, jurisdiction, non-government organization) willing to assume long-term management.</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project part of a larger strategic effort which covers a large area with multiple partners and multiple benefits? High Economy-of-Scale.</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient matching funds available to complete the project.</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project promotes public awareness of sustainable land management through public outreach and participation.</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>155</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Environmental Mitigation Program (EMP): Process and Criteria for FY 2008
Land Management Grants

Process and Criteria for FY 2008 Land Management Grants

- Invasive Species Control
Process and Criteria for FY 2008 Land Management Grants

- Fire Recovery

Process and Criteria for FY 2008 Land Management Grants

- Habitat Restoration
Process and Criteria for FY 2008 Land Management Grants

- Access Management

Land Management Grants FY08

- Competitive Call for Projects
- Criteria for Eligibility and Prioritization
- Ranked by Selection Committee
- Reviewed by EMPWG and RPC
- Ratified by SANDAG Board
Requested RPC Actions

**Recommend that the Board of Directors approve:**

1. The proposed process for allocating FY 2008 EMP land management funds; and

2. The proposed criteria for eligible land management activities and rating criteria for considering grant proposals
SOLARA
First Apartment Community in California
Fully Powered by the Sun

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE
April 4, 2008

- 56 Units
- Very Low Income
- 2-Story
- Wood Construction
- Rents
  - $388-$1,075 / Month

SOLARA
Poway, CA
What Makes SOLARA So *Green*

- **Site Selection**
- **Indoor Air Quality**
- **Recycled Materials**
- **Water / Energy Conservation**
- **Energy Generation**

- **Location**
  - Infill
- **Zoning**
  - Residential MF
- **Proximity**
  - Park
  - Shopping
  - Transportation

*Site Location Supports Smart Growth Principles*
Development Concessions Support Smart Growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Standard</th>
<th>City Requirement</th>
<th>Approved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On-site Parking</td>
<td>129 spaces</td>
<td>90 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carport Parking Size</td>
<td>10 feet by 20 feet</td>
<td>9 feet by 18.5 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retaining Wall Height</td>
<td>6 feet maximum</td>
<td>9 feet maximum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance Between Buildings</td>
<td>15 feet minimum</td>
<td>12 feet minimum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Open Space</td>
<td>10% of unit area</td>
<td>8% minimum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setback from adjacent RR-C zoning</td>
<td>50 feet minimum</td>
<td>10 feet minimum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Setback</td>
<td>15 feet minimum</td>
<td>10 feet minimum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Side Yard</td>
<td>15 feet minimum</td>
<td>10 feet minimum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Coverage</td>
<td>40% maximum</td>
<td>50% maximum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Recreational Amenity</td>
<td>Swimming Pool</td>
<td>No Swimming Pool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape Planters in Parking Area</td>
<td>One every 8-10 spaces</td>
<td>Substitute tree wells at same rate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indoor Air Quality

**Design**
- Site Plan
- Bldg Type
- Cross Ventilation
- Fans / Lights Timed

**Materials / Procedures**
- Recycled
- Chemical Free
- Sealed Ducts
- Maintenance Manual
Recycled Materials

**Tot Lot** – Rubber Tires

**Pathways** – Glass, Fly Ash

**Play Equipment** – Milk Cartons

**Wood** – Trex Decking

**Site Furnishings** – Plastic Bottles, Haworth

**Computer Room** – Homasote Tackable Surface

- **Fixtures**
  - Dual Flush Toilets
  - Faucets
  - Showers

- **Landscape**
  - Native Plants
  - No Mown Grass
  - Bioswale

Landscape and Special Fixtures
Conserve Water
Exceeds Today’s Title 24 by **17%**

- **Site**
  - Cheapest and Easiest

- **Building**
  - Radiant Barrier,
  - Balconies, Windows

- **Mechanical**
  - Tankless Water Heaters
  - Interior Heating and Cooling

- **Lighting**
  - Pin Florescent
  - Low Sodium

- **Appliances**
  - Energy Star

- **Grid**
  - Feeds
  - Pulls

- **Generation**
  - 142 kw
  - 63 Arrays
  - 836 Panels

- **Design**
  - Not Visible
  - Fire Code

**Property Fully Powered by the Sun**
Lack of Understanding Limiting PV Usage in Multifamily Developments

- Cost
  - Rebates
  - Tax Credits
- Regulations
  - Utilities
  - Guidelines
- Unknowns
  - Technical
  - Financial
  - Entitlements
  - Construction
- Awareness

Financing *Green* is Doable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Photovoltaic Costs Offset by Rebates / Credits</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Photovoltaic Costs</td>
<td>$1,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Energy Commission Rebates</td>
<td>$409,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Tax Credit Equity</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income Housing Tax Credit</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,009,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Green Elements add 1%-2% to Development Budget*
SOLARA’s Carbon Footprint Reduction = 95%

Equivalent to

PLANTING OVER 5,400 TREES/YEAR

OR

REMOVING 300 CARS / YEAR

Questions?

PRESENTED BY:

MARYJANIE JAGODZINSKI
Senior Project Manager
Community HousingWorks
619-282-6647 X309
mjjag@chworks.org

INGRID ALVERDE
Housing Manager
City Of Poway
858-668-4562
ialverde@ci.poway.ca.us
Plan To End Chronic Homelessness (PTECH) in the San Diego Region

The Leadership Council

Dene Oliver – Chair
Doug Sawyer – Vice Chair

Fred Baranowski
Paul Brenner
Judge Robert Coates
Steve Escobosa
Mary Herron
Ernie Linares
Suzanne Lindsay
Mike Madigan
Bill Maheu
Pat McQuater
Bob Morris
Rene Santiago
Judith Yates
Hannah Cohen (Consultant)
**Our Vision**

All previously chronically homeless individuals will have access to safe, decent, affordable housing along with the necessary support services throughout the San Diego region by 2012.

---

**History of PTECH**

- **January 2003:** Bush Administration challenged 100 cities to create their own 10-year plans to end chronic homelessness
- **June 2004:** City, County & United Way signed Memorandum of Agreement to create plan
- **October 2004:** The Leadership Council was formed and a consultant was hired
- **June 2005:** 17 cities in the region signed Covenant of Partnership
- **September 2005 - March 2006:** Draft of plan is completed and revised
- **October 2006:** Plan presented to San Diego City Council and endorsed
Letter of Support: Mayor Jerry Sanders

[Image of Mayor Jerry Sanders' letter]

Letter of Support: Philip Mangano

[Image of Philip Mangano's letter]
**Chronic Homeless**

“Unaccompanied homeless individual with a disabling condition who has either been continuously homeless for a year or more OR has had at least four episodes of homelessness in the past three years”*

*Definition of chronic homeless according to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development*

---

**14% of Homeless Population in San Diego are Chronic Homeless**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Homeless</th>
<th>Number of Chronic Homeless</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Image of a homeless person holding a sign.*
Over 50% of Resources are spent on Chronic Homeless

Key Elements of PTECH

**Housing First/Housing Plus:** Provides homeless individuals with housing first, and then offers them the support services they need.

**Prevention:** Provides support services before individuals become homeless.
Steps to Housing First/Housing Plus

1) Identify and secure sufficient permanent housing
2) Develop Housing Plus wrap-around model
3) Strengthen intervention, outreach and case management
4) Implement data collection, evaluation and sharing
5) Establish regional access and intervention centers (i.e., intake facilities)

Steps to Prevention

1) Strengthen programs that serve at-risk populations
2) Improve discharge planning
3) Address employment issues
4) Address tenant-landlord issues
5) Develop mental health courts
PTECH Goals

- Dramatically reduce the number of chronically homeless
- Increase permanent supportive housing opportunities to meet the needs of the chronically homeless population
- Implement Regional Access Centers (i.e., Intake Facilities)
- Increase employment opportunities
- Increase funding from State, Federal, private and corporate sources to provide permanent supportive housing that is currently unavailable

Potential Funding Sources: FEDERAL

- HUD Super NOFA
- Substance Abuse & Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA)
- Department of Labor
- TANF
- U.S. Department of Veteran Affairs
- Tax Credits
- Federally Qualified Health Centers (FQHC)
- Housing Opportunities for People with AIDS (HOPWA)
### Potential Funding Sources: STATE

- Governor’s Homeless Initiative
- Mental Health Services Act (MHSA)
- Multifamily Housing Program – Supportive Housing Program
- Proposition 1C: Housing and Emergency Shelter Trust Fund Act
- Emergency Housing and Assistance Program
- State Tax Credits
- Bond Financing
- Transitional Housing Program (Youth Housing)
- Special Needs Affordable Housing Lending Program

### Potential Funding Sources: LOCAL

- MHSA Community and Support Services
- CDBG Section 108 Loans
- HOME
- Redevelopment Funds
- Inclusionary Housing Funds
- Project-Based Section 8 (County’s primary focus)
- Private Philanthropy/Corporate Partnership
PTECH Implementation Committees

Implementation & Executive Committees: Oversee implementation of PTECH.

Discharge Planning Committee: Analyze discharge policies and protocols. Research policies and protocols from other communities to identify best practices. Develop recommendations to strengthen and close gaps in discharge system.

Resource Committee: Identify housing resources and create a plan to secure them. Analyze existing needs and facilities. Research availability of federal, state, county and city land.

PTECH Implementation Committees

Justice Systems Committee: Research and analyze the feasibility of developing a Mental Health Court based on the SIP model.

Outreach & Case Management Committee: Develop timeline and recommendations for establishing a web-based data system, outreach/intervention/case management teams and regional centers. Identify barriers and solutions to employment issues.

Data & Outcomes Committee: Review 10-year plan and determine measurable outcomes and indicators. Establish baseline statistics.

Intake Committee: Develop recommendations on services needed in an intake facility.
PTECH: Next Steps

- ✔ Endorse the Plan
- ✔ Serve on PTECH Committees

Contact Information

Sara Lantz, MSW  
Community Impact Manager  
Homeless Outreach & Prevention  
United Way of San Diego County  
4699 Murphy Canyon Road  
San Diego, CA 92123  
858-636-4153  
slantz@uwsd.org
### Federal Programs
- **Prop 1C MHF Youth Supportive Housing**
  - Funding: $65,000
  - Year: 2005
  - Requirement: 10% of units (minimum 5 units) must serve 11 years old

- **Prop 1C MHF Supportive Housing**
  - Funding: $45,000
  - Year: 2005
  - Requirement: 10% of units (minimum 5 units) must serve 11 years old

- **Prop 1C MHF General**
  - Funding: $20,000
  - Year: 2005
  - Requirement: 10% of units (minimum 5 units) must serve 11 years old

### State Programs
- **Other Local Funds**
  - Funding: $20,000
  - Year: 2005
  - Requirement: 10% of units (minimum 5 units) must serve 11 years old

- **CDC**
  - Funding: $10,000
  - Year: 2005
  - Requirement: 10% of units (minimum 5 units) must serve 11 years old

### Local Programs
- **Prop 1C MHF Supportive Housing**
  - Funding: $65,000
  - Year: 2005
  - Requirement: 10% of units (minimum 5 units) must serve 11 years old

### Available Funding:
- **Year**: 2007
- **Total Funding**: $65,800,000
  - Operations: $14,000,000
  - Development: $51,800,000