



401 B Street, Suite 800
 San Diego, CA 92101-4231
 (619) 699-1900
 Fax (619) 699-1905
 www.sandag.org

MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

MEMBER AGENCIES

- Cities of
- Carlsbad
- Chula Vista
- Coronado
- Del Mar
- El Cajon
- Encinitas
- Escondido
- Imperial Beach
- La Mesa
- Lemon Grove
- National City
- Oceanside
- Poway
- San Diego
- San Marcos
- Santee
- Solana Beach
- Vista
- and
- County of San Diego

ADVISORY MEMBERS

- Imperial County
- California Department of Transportation
- Metropolitan Transit System
- North County Transit District
- United States Department of Defense
- San Diego Unified Port District
- San Diego County Water Authority
- Southern California Tribal Chairmen's Association
- Mexico

ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION PROGRAM WORKING GROUP

The Environmental Mitigation Program Working Group may take action on any item appearing on this agenda.

Tuesday, April 8, 2008

1 to 3 p.m.

SANDAG, 7th Floor Conference Room
 401 B Street, Suite 800
 San Diego, CA 92101-4231

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

AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

- CONSERVED LANDS DATABASE STATUS
- WETLANDS RECOVERY PROGRAM
- FIVE-YEAR STRATEGIC PLAN UPDATE

*SANDAG offices are accessible by public transit.
 Phone 1-800-COMMUTE or see www.sdcommute.com for route information.*

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.

ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION PROGRAM WORKING GROUP

Tuesday, April 8, 2008

ITEM #		RECOMMENDATION
1.	WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS (Chair, Mayor Pro Tem Carrie Downey, City of Coronado)	
+2.	SUMMARY OF MARCH 11, 2008, MEETING Review and approve the meeting summary of the March 11, 2008, meeting.	APPROVE
3.	PUBLIC COMMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS Members of the public will have the opportunity to address the Environmental Mitigation Program Working Group (EMPWG) on any issue within the jurisdiction of the Working Group. Speakers are limited to three minutes each.	COMMENT
4.	STATUS UPDATE ON THE STATUS OF LAND MANAGEMENT GRANT CRITERIA (Keith Greer, SANDAG) Mr. Greer will provide a status update on the Regional Planning Committee's recommendations on the land management grant criteria and any direction resulting from the Fire Forum Workshop.	INFORMATION/ DISCUSSION
+5.	CONSERVED LANDS DATABASE STATUS (Keith Greer, SANDAG) The EMPWG recommended, and the SANDAG Board approved, funding to develop a comprehensive database on lands conserved in the region. Mr. Greer will provide a status report on the conserved lands database. He will present a brief background, current status, challenges, and solicit input for future direction to complete this project.	INFORMATION/ DISCUSSION
6.	SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA WETLAND RECOVERY PROJECT PRESENTATION (Mary Small, Coastal Conservancy) Ms. Mary Small will present information on the Southern California Wetlands Recovery Project, including the proposed Buena Vista lagoon restoration project.	INFORMATION/ DISCUSSION

ITEM #

RECOMMENDATION

- +7. FIVE-YEAR STRATEGIC PLAN UPDATE
(Susan Wynn, USFWS)

INFORMATION/
DISCUSSION

On December 15, 2006, the SANDAG Board adopted a Five-Year Funding Strategy for *TransNet* EMP Funding related to land management and monitoring. This strategy will be reviewed and a process for revisions will be discussed by the EMPWG members.

- 8. ADJOURN

INFORMATION

NOTE: May meeting has been cancelled. The next EMPWG meeting is scheduled for June 10, 2008, from 1 to 3 p.m.

+ next to an item indicates an attachment

San Diego Association of Governments
ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION PROGRAM
WORKING GROUP

April 8, 2008

AGENDA ITEM NO.: **2**

Action Requested: APPROVE

SUMMARY OF MARCH 11, 2008, MEETING

File Number 3002700

Members in Attendance:

Carrie Downey (Chair), City of Coronado
Tom Oberbauer (Vice Chair), County of San Diego
Jeanne Krosch, City of San Diego
Mike Grim, City of Carlsbad
Bruce April, Caltrans
Marissa Lundstedt, Chula Vista, South County
Kevin Mallory, City of Santee
David Mayer, Department of Fish and Game
Susan Wynn, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Bill Gallup, Wildlife Conservation Board (alt)
Carlton Rochester, USGS (for Fire Forum Only)
Patti Brindle, City of Poway (for Fire Forum Only)
Kathy Viatella, TNC (for Fire Forum Only)

SANDAG Staff in Attendance:

Keith Greer, SANDAG
Kevin Wood, SANDAG

1. Welcome and Introduction

Hon. Carrie Downey, Chair, called the meeting to order at 11:08 a.m. and welcomed the group. Staff informed the group that they would have a quorum for the meeting minutes and the fire forum, but due to possible conflicts of interest, a quorum would not be available to make a recommendation on the land management grant criteria.

2. Public Comments and Communications

Members of the public had the opportunity to address the Environmental Mitigation Program Working Group (EMPWG) on any issue within the jurisdiction of the Working Group.

Mr. April announced that his organization had now signed the Environmental Mitigation Program Memorandum of Agreement.

No other public comments were made.

3. February 12, 2008, Meeting Summary

Bruce April, Caltrans, motioned to approve the February 12, 2008, meeting minutes. Mike Grim, City of Carlsbad, seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

4. FY 2008 Land Management Grants: Eligibility and Prioritization Criteria

Keith Greer, SANDAG said that since the group could not make a recommendation on criteria, he would seek input from the members, but would develop a SANDAG staff recommendation. Members not present were invited to send any comments they might have to Keith via an e-mail. The agenda packet contained the previous criteria for the allocation of grant funds, and he asked if members had any suggestions for changes to this criteria. He also asked for comments regarding the process of prioritizing projects for multiple fiscal years. The call for projects takes several months, and it may be more efficient to ask for projects to the next fiscal year, so everything would be ready to go July 1st. A small sub-group of individuals without conflicts can work on prioritizing projects to be funded, which can then be approved by the full group (provided a quorum could be reached).

Working group members said this process worked quite well in the past. The previous evaluation committee, which included people of various levels of experience, was able to talk through the projects and select the ones that worked best.

Susan Wynn, USFWS, said that having projects ready to go for the new fiscal year was a good idea, but that she was concerned that there was not yet a Program Developer or a strategic plan for regional management to make sure that the funds allocated really advance regional goals. Last time, the proposal process worked well since certain groups were encouraged to submit applications dealing with specific subjects. In the absence of a plan, SANDAG staff was encouraged to limit the current funding to the current FY 2008 funding of \$2.9 million and wait to decide on the FY 2009 funding process.

Mr. Greer said more weight could be given in the criteria to multi-jurisdictional projects. Diane Nygaard had sent a comment suggesting that projects show economy of scale, and this seems to be a reasonable approach. Suggestions were made that the RFP could ask that applicants show they are part of some larger plan, like an already existing watershed plan. It also could ask that a project could support some priority species like a cactus wren.

The currently allocated \$2.9 million includes fire recovery and restoration, access control and management, and invasive species removal. These categories are lumped and any projects fitting one of these areas can be funded. The attitude of the group seemed to be that the group should not allocate any more funds for land management beyond the current \$2.9 million until a program developed is hired and a strategic plan is developer. While money could be allocated more efficiently if it was all done at once, it might be cost-effective if more time is taken to develop a strategy. In the interim, the group needs to decide how to divide management and monitoring for FY 2009 and could work on an updated five-year plan.

Individuals felt the keeping to the same process of a call for projects, with adjustments to the grant criteria based upon past experiences, and limiting the funding to the FY 2008 allocation was best for the program.

5. Fire Forum

The forum included six panel members that addressed habitat management and fire safety from the legislative, regulatory, fire science, fire safety and building code standpoint. A summary of their presentations is as follows:

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 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 Fire Chief's Association, and Fire District's Association of San Diego County. 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 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 foot (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 – 135 feet) which occurs 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 residence and fire safety personnel - saddles between mountains, chimney

canyons and ridgelines are dangerous fire areas. Building design must address material 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 foot 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 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 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; 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 residence to reduce fuels around their homes to reduce a fire – need to instruct residence 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 cause of many new fires during 2007. Fire safety personnel will triage houses based upon resources available. Proactive action by residence to help reduce fire risk prior the fire will increase 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, maintain surrounding vegetation, provide tempered glass or double pane windows, provide 1/8" mesh to cover openings in structure, and evacuations planning. New products such as fire resistant gels are also being tested. The Palomar Mountain community was aware of their risk of fire and 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 the 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 then 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 the surrounding vegetation is in compliance with the new State standards.

Consideration for building design include – roofing material (Class A), debris in gutters, screens in attic vents, lap joints on exterior siding, tempered and double paned windows, decking materials. Types of building construction and materials are 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 losses of structures. Selection of plants around structures is important – low growing plants with minimal litter reduces 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 the low cost and high benefits 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) has done some work on standards, but more research is needed. There is no current basis for extrapolation of fuel management to 300 feet.

Increased wildfire 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 – 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 (100 ft), providing education, training, and monitoring for fuels/vegetation treatments to residents, cross-training for professionals, and monitor wildfire recovery after repeated wildfires.

At the conclusion of Ms. Fege's testimony, Ms. Downey opened the floor for questions and comments by members of the Working Group, followed by public testimony. Kevin Mallory, City of Santee, asked if there was any evidence that houses in developments covered by Home Owner's Associations (HOAs) that had an organized effort to manage defensible space, fared any better than single homeowners. Panel members said that newer developments had survived well because they followed newer standards, but that ongoing maintenance is important. Many places that burned did not have proper maintenance of vegetation, although there was not data to show that HOA had better maintenance. It is important for a community to be educated and band together as group to ensure safety. Ms. Spehn said Senator Kehoe supported a bill that encouraged homeowners to make improvements to their property to bring their homes up to current building standards.

Kathy Viatella, The Nature Conservancy, asked if an improved early warning system could be implemented to discourage activities during extreme weather that might lead to fire. Mr. Lucia said that they were making strides, and that the reverse 911 system had been very effective, but that it had its limits. Community groups are very valuable to communicate problems, and neighbors can support neighbors to avoid introducing methods of ignition to the backcountry during red-flag warnings (high fire warning days).

Peter Saint Clair, California Native Plants Society, said that his group supports all efforts to protect lives and property, as long as they are proven effective and efficient. There are already management plans for public open space that deal with fire safety, but these plans need funding. Non-native weeds and flammable plants should be removed for public lands. In order to reduce public fears, we need to make sure that we consistently support responsible, professional fuel management.

Diane Conklin, Mussey Grade Road Alliance, said that she and her husband had taken proactive measures and saved her house from fire, but her group is currently fighting the Sunrise Powerlink project because it would add another ignition source to the backcountry. The wind conditions that spread fire are the same that can take down power lines. Her group has intervened in the California Public Utilities Commission ruling regarding liability for fires and brush clearance along lines and she encourages the public to educate themselves on these issues.

Greg Rubin, California Native Landscape Design, said that he has done landscaping in over 500 homes in the county with native plants and has not lost a single house to fire. Clearance is critical, but over clearing does not protect homes. Native landscapes can be made to be fire resistant, since they singe, but not burn. They perform incredibly well and should be encouraged throughout the region. Mr. Hasley said there was lots of anecdotal evidence of the benefits of native plants, and he thanked Mr. Rubin for his work. There is still a lack of comprehensive scientific research on how native plants performed. The group should support scientific projects, so we can get answers on what happens.

Marty Leavitt of the Resource Conservation District and Fire Safe Council of San Diego County, said the county had 68 fire-safe councils, representing 40 percent of all the councils in the state. These councils had been very successful, but they need continued funding to continue their success. Funding is in danger of being cut do to uncertainty in the state and federal budget. The work done by volunteers was key to holding back the recent fires, but there are simply not enough resources to support the continued activities of the councils.

Patti Brindle, City of Poway, said that her city has continued to work on fire-related issues. The city had recently had a community workshop on fuel management around homes, and had adopted the Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) code. They also have worked with federal officials to ensure compliance with their Habitat Conservation Program while ensuring proper brush clearance to protect homes. Ms. Downey noted that although the City of Coronado did not face the threat of wildfires, it still needed to keep its building codes current. All cities contributed crews to fight the fire, and that urban structures were at risk when all the resources were in the backcountry.

Ms. Fege said that fire education for professionals and residents is very valuable and was still available. She has organized classes covering fire science, building codes, and land clearance. She is currently pursuing grants to make sure the classes can continue and are affordable to all who are interested.

No recommendation was made by the Working Group on this item.

6. Adjourn

Ms. Downey adjourned the meeting at 3:02 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled for April 8, 2008, from 1 to 3 p.m.

San Diego Association of Governments
ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION PROGRAM
WORKING GROUP

April 8, 2008

AGENDA ITEM NO.: **5**

Action Requested: INFORMATION/DISCUSSION

CONSERVED LANDS DATABASE STATUS

File Number 3002700

On December 16, 2005, the SANDAG Board approved funding for the development of a comprehensive conserved lands database for the region. Mr. Greer, SANDAG, will provide a status report on the conserved lands database. He will present a brief background, current status, challenges, and future objectives.

Attachments:

1. Regional Conserved Lands Database Project Description
2. Proposed Attributes for Conserved Lands Database
3. Sources of Existing Digital Information

Key Staff Contact: Sue Carnevale, (619) 699-1981, sca@sandag.org or, Keith Greer, (619) 699-7390, kgr@sandag.org

April 8, 2008

**Regional Conserved Lands Database
for both NCCP Permitted Areas and Non-NCCP Permitted Areas
for the San Diego Region**

Objectives of the conserved lands database:

- To provide a comprehensive inventory of land in the region that is conserved for the purpose of protecting open space and natural habitats including lands inside and outside of NCCP areas;
- To assist in identifying gaps in conservation;
- To provide general information on the status of land management ;
- To assist in identifying land areas that need land management plans; and
- Designed to be consistent and integrateable with existing and future regional databases.

Definition of conserved land to be included in the regional database:

Conserved lands are those lands that are legally conserved to:

- *Protect natural habitats, species, and open space (including agricultural lands that are important components of the regional habitat preserve design);*
- *Contribute to the existing and planned regional habitat preserve system; and*
- *Managed to protect the open space or natural resources into the future.*

The conservation occurs through public or private acquisitions, conservation easements, land dedications, mitigation, mitigation banks, covenants, or other mechanisms that ensure the land will be not be developed. In order to be part of the regional conserved lands database, lands must meet two of the three criteria identified above.

Definition of conserved lands mapping unit:

The geographic extent of each unit of conserved land to be mapped and tracked will be defined by the primary land owner.

Conserved Lands Attributes and Data Sources are provided as attachments 2 and 3.

DRAFT**Proposed Attributes for Conserved Lands Database**

April 8, 2008

Bold text indicate proposed information (attributes) to be collected for each conserved land area.
Italicized text indicate the valid values for the attribute, a pick list, no free form entry of information.

Status (*Conserved, Pending, Undergoing Restoration/Revegetation*)

Tracking Number/Unique ID

Name of Conserved Land Area

Owner

Jurisdiction

Date of Conservation

Type of Conservation (*Acquisition, Easement, Dedication, Covenant, Mitigation Bank, Restoration/Revegetation, In-Lieu Fees*)

Management Responsibility (*Federal, State, Local, Private, Non-Profit, Mixed, Unknown, Other*)

Management Agency

APNs of Project (automatically generated by spatial overlay)

Acres (automatically calculated from spatial data)

Date Information Entered (automatically generated by computer)

Date Information Modified (automatically generated by computer)

Information Source

Name of Preserve Unit

Generalized Land Ownership (*City, County, Other Local (Water/Sewer), State, Federal, Non-Profit, Land Conservancy, Homeowners Association, Other*)

Does Property Have a Land Management Plan (*Yes, In-Progress, No, Not Applicable*)

Date of Land Management Plan

Dedicated Funding for Land Management (*Yes, No*)

Type of Management Funding (*Endowment, Annual Appropriation, Mixed, Other*)

Contact Name of Land Manager

Contact Address of Land Manager

Contact Phone Number of Land Manager

Contact E-mail Address of Land Manager

October 24, 2007

**Sources of Existing Digital Information for the
Conserved Lands Database**

Existing Sources	Data Source Code	Format	Date of Data	Parcel Aligned or Parcel Based	Notes
SANDAG Land Use (Passive Parks and Beaches, Open Space Parks)	LUOWN	Digital	Extract on 9/25/2006	Yes	LU Codes 7603 (Open Space Parks, Preserves, Etc) and 7605 (Passive Beaches). Extracted parcel boundaries as well
SANDAG Land Ownership (Non-Urban Public Land)	LUOWN	Digital	Extract on 4/21/2006	Yes	Own codes 10, 20, 26, 27, 28,29, 30-34, 43-46 (All Public Land except Fire/School District, Military, and Indian Reservations) and LU codes 9101 (vacant)
HabiTrak Data (Gains/Conserved Lands)	HT06	Digital	2005	No, Not all	City of SD, City of CV, County of San Diego
City of Carlsbad Draft Open Space Management Plan	CBOSMP	Digital	2006	Yes	
County of SD Parks and Rec - List of Properties Owned (w/ Names and APNs)	COUNTY	Table	2007	APN list by Property	Very good data source.
City of San Diego Shapefile of Parks	SDPARK	Digital	2006	No	Useable source of data for Names of Properties in the City HT data, and also type of OS or Park

**Sources of Existing Digital Information for the
Conserved Lands Database**

TNC Owned Properties	TNC	Digital	2006		Good data source. Used to verify inventory of TNC owned properties
USFWS Refuge Database	NA - Only used to verify land use data	Digital	2007	Yes	Lands owned by FWS, used to verify information in LandCore and to ensure we had all FWS owned properties
Center for Natural Lands Management	CNLM	Digital	2007	Yes	Very good source to verify lands owned and managed by CNLM
The Environmental Trust	TET	PDF documents	Unknown	NA	Very helpful in verifying existing TET properties
<i>SanGIS Parcels with Open Space Land Use Code (86)</i>	<i>P86</i>	<i>Digital</i>	<i>Copied on 04/10/2006</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Some appear to be developed or urban OS types, road ROWs</i>
<i>SanGIS Open Space Easements</i>	<i>ESMT</i>	<i>Digital</i>	<i>Updated weekly</i>	<i>Mostly</i>	<i>Some appear to be developed or urban OS types, parcels are split, older data may be missing, 1989 (1997?) onward</i>
<i>SanGIS County Parks</i>	<i>COPKS</i>	<i>Digital</i>	<i>2004</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>County owned/managed parks, may contain developed type parks, some data in this database are not in SANDAG's LU database</i>
<i>SanGIS Parks</i>	<i>PKS</i>	<i>Digital</i>	<i>2005</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Database put together for mapping purposes only, data has problems, much of the data is also in SANDAG's LU database, contains errors (MSCP preserve lands, etc)</i>

**Sources of Existing Digital Information for the
Conserved Lands Database**

<i>Thomas Bros Open Space Parks</i>	<i>TB</i>	<i>Digital</i>	<i>2006</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Have access to digital data for internal use only, Lots of info replicated in other data sources. Don't recommend using this source</i>
<i>CBI Protected Lands Database</i>	<i>CBI</i>	<i>Digital</i>	<i>2004/2005 ?</i>	<i>Some Areas</i>	<i>Database not documented. Many areas not attributed. Looks like it was put together from multiple sources (SANDAG Land Use, HabiTrak data, etc...). Much info is duplicated in data sources above.</i>
<i>TNC Protected Lands Database</i>	<i>TNC</i>	<i>Digital</i>	<i>2005</i>	<i>Some Areas</i>	<i>Database not documented. Many areas not attributed. Looks like it was put together from multiple sources (SANDAG Land Use, HabiTrak data, etc...). Much info is duplicated in data sources above.</i>

Notes: Data sources grayed back and shown *in italics* were not used extensively. These data generally overlapped other more complete, documented databases and generally were not well documented or completely attributed thereby limiting its usefulness.

San Diego Association of Governments
ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION PROGRAM
WORKING GROUP

April 8, 2008

AGENDA ITEM NO.: **7**

Action Requested: INFORMATION/DISCUSSION

FIVE-YEAR STRATEGIC PLAN UPDATE

File Number 3002700

On December 15, 2006, the SANDAG Board approved a Five-Year Funding Strategy (Attachment 1). Annual allocations are approved by the SANDAG Board and have been summarized below. The Environmental Mitigation Program Working Group will discuss the need to update the Five-Year Funding Strategy and identify the process for developing a recommendation to the Regional Planning Committee.

Summary of TransNet Management and Monitoring Funding			
April 8, 2008			
Activity	Funding Allocated FY 06 ¹	Funding Allocated FY 07 ²	Funding Allocated FY 08 ³
Regional Coordination			
Program Developer		\$150,000	
Regional Management			
Management Coordinator		\$150,000	
Year 1 Land Management Activities	\$750,000		
Invasive Control/Fire Recovery/ Restoration/Access Control and Management		\$600,000	\$2,300,000
Regional Monitoring			
Monitoring Coordinator		\$150,000	
Conserved Lands Database	\$125,000		
Updated Vegetation Mapping and Database		\$150,000	
Pilot Testing and Refinement of Vegetation Monitoring			\$145,000
Rare Plant Monitoring Protocols		\$50,000	\$50,000
Gnatcatcher Monitoring		\$300,000	\$440,000
Post-fire Monitoring	\$125,000	\$400,000	\$650,000
Invasive Species Mapping		\$50,000	\$150,000
Cactus Wren Habitat Mapping			\$150,000
Burrowing Owl Distribution			\$65,000
Rare Butterfly Surveys			\$50,000
SUBTOTAL	\$1,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$4,000,000
TOTAL	\$7,000,000		

¹ Approved by SANDAG Board on December 16, 2005.

² Approved by SANDAG Board on December 15, 2006. Note \$1.3 million was not released until February 22, 2008.

³ Approved by SANDAG Board on February 22, 2008.

Attachment: Conceptual Five-Year Funding Strategy

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

Conceptual Five-Year Funding Strategy

	YR-1	YR-2	YR-3	YR-4	YR-5	
REGIONAL COORDINATION						
1	Program Developer	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
2	Program Administration/Support	\$0	\$0	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000
	Subtotal Regional Management	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000
REGIONAL MANAGEMENT						
3	Management Coordinator	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$150,000
	Regional Management Implementation					
4	Implement invasives control and removal	\$600,000	\$1,500,000	\$1,000,000	\$500,000	\$500,000
5	Implement habitat restoration	\$0	\$0	\$1,000,000	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000
6	Other management needs	\$0	\$350,000	\$350,000	\$350,000	\$350,000
	Subtotal Regional Management	\$750,000	\$2,000,000	\$2,500,000	\$2,500,000	\$2,500,000
REGIONAL MONITORING						
7	Monitoring Coordinator	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$150,000
8	GIS Specialist	\$0	\$0	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$150,000
9	Administrative Assistant	\$0	\$0	\$90,000	\$90,000	\$90,000
10	Biologist	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$150,000	\$150,000
11	Database Specialist	\$0	\$0	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$150,000
12	GIS/Database Technician	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$130,000
	Regional Data Bases					
13	HabiTrak Conserved Lands Data Base	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
14	HabiTrak Application	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
15	Conserved Lands (Funded from Transnet FY 2006)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
16	Habitat Preserve Planning Area	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
17	Ownership Database	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
18	Species Databases	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
19	Vegetation database	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$0	\$0
20	BIOS	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
21	Data Mining	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Protocols Development					
22	Pilot testing and refinement of protocols (SDSU)	\$0	\$145,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000
23	Plant monitoring plan revisions (USGS)	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$0	\$0
24	Animal monitoring plan revisions (USFWS)	\$0	\$0	\$50,000	\$0	\$0
25	Protocol training/establishment of monitoring sites	\$0	\$0	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000
	Regional Monitoring Implementation					
26	Gnatcatcher monitoring	\$300,000	X	X	X	X
27	Post-fire monitoring	\$400,000	X	X	X	X
28	Other regional monitoring		\$1,305,000	\$1,360,000	\$1,460,000	\$1,330,000
	Subtotal Regional Monitoring	\$1,100,000	\$1,850,000	\$2,250,000	\$2,250,000	\$2,250,000
TOTAL REGIONAL MANAGEMENT AND MONITORING		\$2,000,000	\$4,000,000	\$5,000,000	\$5,000,000	\$5,000,000
	TransNet Funding	\$2,000,000	\$4,000,000	\$5,000,000	\$5,000,000	\$5,000,000
	Other Funding Sources**	X	X	X	X	X

**USFWS, CDFG, USGS, jurisdictions, private foundations, etc.