REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

Friday, August 1, 2008
12 noon to 2 p.m.
SANDAG Board Room
401 B Street, 7th Floor
San Diego

AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

• TransNet SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM
• TransNet ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION PROGRAM

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 the SANDAG 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 511 or see 511sd.com for route information.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM #</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+1.</td>
<td>APPROVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**APPROVAL OF JULY 11, 2008, MEETING MINUTES**

**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.

**CHAIR’S REPORT**

**RECOGNITION OF MAYOR ART MADRID AND COUNCILMEMBER HENRY AABARABANEL, CHAIRS OF THE ENERGY WORKING GROUP (EWG)**

Mayor Art Madrid of the City of La Mesa and Councilmember Henry Abarbanel of the City of Del Mar have served as co-chairs of the EWG since it was formed in 2004. SANDAG thanks Mr. Madrid and Mr. Abarbanel for their commitment and leadership in local and regional energy planning.

**REPORTS (Items 4 thru 9)**

**ENERGY WORKING GROUP (EWG) CHARTER AMENDMENTS (Susan Freedman)**

The Executive Committee approved changes to the EWG structure at its June 13, 2008, meeting. The Regional Planning Committee is asked to approve an amendment to the EWG Charter to implement working group structure changes.

**SMART GROWTH DESIGN GUIDELINES (Stephan Vance)**

The Regional Comprehensive Plan calls for the development of Smart Growth Design Guidelines to illustrate and provide guidance on how smart growth development can be designed in a variety of settings. Work is underway on the Guidelines and the attached staff report provides an overview of the process to develop the Guidelines, including a timeline and draft outline for the document. This item is being presented to the Regional Planning Committee for information.
-6. TransNet SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM (Stephan Vance) RECOMMEND

The TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program (TSGIP) is based on policy objectives contained in the Regional Comprehensive Plan - using funding incentives to encourage coordinated regional planning to bring transit service, housing, and employment together in smart growth development. Funded through the local TransNet half-cent sales tax program, it is estimated that there will be $10.2 million available for capital and planning grants in the first two-year funding cycle. Requests for grant funds will be evaluated through a competitive process using criteria recommended by the Regional Planning Committee (RPC) and approved by the SANDAG Board of Directors. The RPC is asked to recommend that the SANDAG Board of Directors accept the eligibility and evaluation criteria for capital projects and planning projects for use in the first TSGIP two-year funding cycle. In addition, the Committee is asked to recommend that planning grants constitute up to 20 percent of the funding in each funding cycle, and that the maximum planning grant size be $400,000.

-7. TransNet ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION PROGRAM (EMP): LAND MANAGEMENT GRANTS (Keith Greer) RECOMMEND

The SANDAG Board of Directors allocated $2.9 million for competitive land management grants. Grant proposals were solicited and evaluated by a panel of the EMP Working Group members not applying for grants. The proposed list of projects and their ranking will be presented to the Regional Planning Committee for recommendation to the Board of Directors.

-8. TransNet ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION PROGRAM (EMP): UPDATE OF FIVE-YEAR FUNDING STRATEGY AND FY 2009 ACTIVITIES (Keith Greer) RECOMMEND

On December 15, 2006, the SANDAG Board adopted a five-year funding strategy for management and monitoring funds under the TransNet Program. This strategy has been updated by the EMP Working Group in light of the 2007 wildfires. In addition, the EMP Working Group is recommending proposed management and monitoring activities for FY 2009 consistent with the five-year funding strategy and available funding under the TransNet Environmental Mitigation Program. The Regional Planning Committee is asked to recommend that the SANDAG Board of Directors approve the updated five-year funding strategy and funding for FY 2009 activities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM #</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>TransNet ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION PROGRAM (EMP): ADVANCE MITIGATION GUIDELINES (Keith Greer) RECOMMEND</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The TransNet EMP has made funds available for the early mitigation of land for Regional Transportation Plan projects. Staff will present the process and criteria for how specific acquisitions and restoration opportunities will be determined under the TransNet EMP. The Regional Planning Committee is asked to recommend that the SANDAG Board of Directors approve the proposed process and criteria.

| 10     | UPCOMING MEETINGS INFORMATION |

There will be no Regional Planning Committee meeting in September. The next meeting is scheduled for October 3, 2008, at 12 noon.

| 11     | ADJOURNMENT |

+next to an item indicates an attachment
The meeting of the Regional Planning Committee was called to order by Chair Jerry Jones (East County) at 12:03 p.m. See the attached attendance sheet for Regional Planning Committee member attendance.

1. **APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES**

   **Action**: Upon a motion by Mayor Lori Holt Pfeifer (North County Inland) and a second by Chair Jones, the Regional Planning Committee unanimously approved the minutes from June 6, 2008, meeting.

2. **PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS**

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

**CONSENT ITEM #3**

3. **PROGRESS REPORT ON LOCAL I-PLACE®S PILOT PROJECTS (INFORMATION)**

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

   Chair Jones welcomed Bill Anderson, Chief Operating Officer for City Planning and Development for the City of San Diego, as the new representative for the Regional Technical Working Group.

   Chair Jones announced that the order of the agenda would be revised as follows: Item No. 6, and then Item No. 5.
4. AMENDMENTS TO THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO NON-DISPOSAL FACILITY ELEMENT (RECOMMEND)

Wayne Williams, County of San Diego, informed the Non-Disposal Facility Element (NDFE) has been updated to identify several new or modified solid waste facilities in the County of San Diego as required by state law, and requested the Committee make its recommendation to the Board of Directors.

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Lesa Heebner (North County Coastal) and a second by Mayor Pfeiler, the Regional Planning Committee recommended that the Board of Directors, as the Countywide Integrated Waste Management Task Force, approve transmittal of the amendments to the County of San Diego NDFE of the Integrated Waste Management Plan to the California Integrated Waste Management Board for review and approval.

6. SMART GROWTH VISUAL SIMULATIONS (INFORMATION)

Carolina Gregor, Senior Planner (SANDAG), provided a brief background on the Smart Growth Map and Toolbox. She introduced Steve Price, President of Urban Advantage Inc., to present the 11 customized local Smart Growth Visual Simulations he developed while working closely with local planners in order to exhibit local design guidelines and standards. She explained the goal of the simulations is to provide ideas for discussion in local communities, showcase different levels of Smart Growth in the place types on the Smart Growth Map, and generate greater support for Smart Growth in the region.

Mr. Price informed on the technique of photo re-imaging used to create the visual ground-level simulations, which incorporated all the implementation components of Smart Growth. While presenting visual simulations of each location, he also informed on other enhancement techniques such as bulb outs, lighting, widening of sidewalks, street furniture, multi-way boulevards, parking structures that mimic traditional buildings, landscaping, crosswalks, pedestrian refuges, and infill development.

Councilmember Steve Gronke (North County Inland) asked if all the sites were located within redevelopment areas.

Mr. Price replied he took direction from local planning staff regarding the varied sites and often did not know site specifics.

Councilmember Gronke asked about the cost of a parking structure which was featured.

Mr. Price responded he was unable to give any details regarding costs; the particular idea was from a previous project in Walnut Creek.

Councilmember Gronke asked what the rationale was for showing elevated transit in Chula Vista.
Ms. Gregor responded that this particular trolley line is slated for grade separation and the image was produced to show that as a place intensifies, transportation improvements can be explored in the Smart Growth mode.

Councilmember Gronke asked if there was a pre-existing agreement with the transit authority to do that.

Ms. Gregor responded that it’s slated in the RTP, and this was only one conceptual way of showing it. No determination has been made whether it will be underground or overhead. It was simply a simulation of what could happen with some improvements to the transportation network.

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

5. **TransNet SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM (RECOMMEND)**

Stephan Vance, Senior Planner (SANDAG), presented information regarding the proposed capital project evaluation criteria under the new TransNet-funded Smart Growth Incentive Program. He provided an overview of the criteria and objectives, and reported on concerns expressed about the criteria which included: Too much emphasis being placed on proximity to transit; more emphasis should be placed on public transit; a strong relationship to transit should be included; focus should be on infrastructure needs where there’s existing development with infrastructure deficits; more attention should be given to new development; develop criteria relative to the scale of projects; too much emphasis is given to community design; and Policy No. 33 points, which are awarded for affordable housing production. Mr. Vance stated additional information regarding draft criteria for selecting planning projects and program guidelines would be presented at the August meeting; and the entire program would be submitted to the Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee for comment in September. Should everything proceed as planned, the program would be taken to the Board for adoption in October, and a call for projects would begin in November.

Councilmember Heebner asked when, in the local process, the applications come to SANDAG for this program. She hoped that it would be after environmental review and public input.

Mr. Vance replied the proposed capital improvement project would be scored on where it is in the process, so the farther along it is, the better. SANDAG will be evaluating only the capital improvement.

Councilmember Heebner said it’s important not to give the impression that the entity is asking for approval from the agency before they receive money.

Mr. Vance commented that this is a common concern, as the projects themselves are typically connected to some related private or public land development. Evaluations will be conducted on the capital improvement projects located in the public right-of-way and public realm. So, if it is a $3 million project and the entity is going to provide $1 million in matching funds, the entity is committed to providing those funds.
Councilmember Jerry Selby (East County) asked what would be considered as new affordable housing development.

Mr. Vance stated they are subsidized units.

Councilmember Selby asked if they have to be truly newly built or newly created through an acquisition and a rehab.

Mr. Vance remarked this is a detail that should be included in the program guidelines and a clarification in the definition will be made.

Councilmember Selby concurred.

Chair Jones announced SOFAR had submitted three speaker slips.

Mr. Duncan McFetridge clarified that he would be giving an organized presentation. He requested Diane Nygaard speak before him.

Chair Jones stated that as an organization, he would give Mr. McFetridge six minutes and Ms. Nygaard would have three minutes.

Ms. Diane Nygaard, representing Preserve Calavera, urged the Committee to make additional corrections to the map and criteria before proceeding, stating the Independent Transit Review Committee found that fewer Smart Growth sites were necessary and focus should be in the urban core area. She expressed concern the program criterion does not have assurances protecting natural resources and does not focus on the priority objectives of Smart Growth. Ranking needs to focus on the priorities; and the criteria should include a threshold for minimum size and include penalties if density is increased in one project and then reduced in others. She said there is a significant increase in public transit mode split, and no threshold for reasonable access to transit. She suggested increasing the points for overall transit and adding measures that relate to traffic congestion.

Mr. McFetridge, Chairman of Save Our Forests and Ranchlands (SOFAR), expressed his concerns related to the consequences of unsustainable growth. He asked that priority be given to projects in urban areas near transit, with the greatest potential for walking and biking. He introduced a new document entitled “Driven to the Brink,” which he wrote and asked the Committee to read. He also said hard numbers are necessary to make a true evaluation of the Smart Growth communities.

Chair Jones clarified SANDAG does not have land use authority; the cities and the County have land use authority. The Smart Growth Map is an incentive map meant to assist those with land use authority.

Councilmember Toni Atkins (City of San Diego) stated she wanted community design to remain a part of the criteria and suggested that the various community visual simulations be distributed to neighborhoods in order to promote the acceptance of density along transit corridors, which lends to the quality of life. She expressed her desire for good quality design in the inner city areas, the urban core, and affordable housing. She requested staff review
Ms. Nygaard’s comments and clarify the definition of “new development” versus “affordable development,” which Councilmember Selby mentioned. She also expressed concerns regarding Policy No. 33 and affordable housing in the City of San Diego, as their RHNA numbers are large.

Councilmember Heebner commented on the importance of community design in order to provide a feeling of uniqueness to each community. She requested open space be added to the list under “Quality Proposed Capital Improvement Project.” To encourage Smart Growth in the right places, she requested extra points be given to those projects close to existing transit and COASTER or trolley lines. She also recommended having a grocery store included in the mix of uses to ensure residents’ ability to walk or bike everywhere. She asked that Ms. Nygaard’s comments be referred to staff and proposed the City of San Diego’s RHNA numbers could be considered by district.

Mr. Vance stated regarding transit priority, higher points will be given to existing transit services, with lesser points for projects that are planned but not yet programmed.

Councilmember Heebner asked where that was on the matrix.

Mr. Vance said it was located at 1D, “Transportation Characteristics” - Relation to Transit,” which shows a maximum of 12 points.

Councilmember Heebner asked where it said “programmed.”

Mr. Vance read, “if the project abuts or is on-site to a regional or corridor transit service.”

Councilmember Heebner asked if it said whether or not it was funded.

Mr. Vance stated it is noted in the footnotes.

Councilmember Heebner responded that was all right, as long as it is there and it is clear.

Mr. Vance commented that it is complex and a reflection of what a complex concept Smart Growth is.

Mr. Dave Druker (NCTD) remarked staff did a pretty good job in reflecting all the changes. He asked for clarification regarding RHNA numbers and having an approved housing element.

Chair Jones stated it is two things.

Coleen Clementson, Committee Coordinator (SANDAG), clarified that it happens in two places. In order to be eligible to apply for funds, a jurisdiction must have an adopted housing element. Also, each jurisdiction will be awarded points based upon its progress toward meeting its RHNA goal.

Chair Jones asked if it had to do with permits pulled.
Ms. Clementson responded she would have to check; however, she believed it was permits issued.

Chair Jones informed it was an issue his staff brought up as they have had a shift from a fiscal year to an annual year recently.

Mr. Druker stated Del Mar’s housing element is approved through subsidizing individuals rather than construction.

Chair Jones remarked there are two component pieces.

Mr. Druker agreed and suggested the future Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) include specific numbers in terms of how many people are going to take transit to specific areas in town.

Chair Jones requested clarification regarding Item B, “Existing Proposed Land Development Around Proposed Capital Project and Proposed Development Within a Quarter Mile Radius.”

Mr. Vance replied the section is intended for improvement to areas where there is existing density, but infrastructure deficits.

Chair Jones expressed concern that perhaps more weight is being given to existing projects rather than new projects; and as an incentive, the idea is to build new projects.

Mr. Vance asked what he would like to suggest.

Chair Jones replied he was suggesting shifting the weight in the two categories. Presently, there are six points for both existing and proposed. Perhaps it should be changed to two points for existing and four points for proposed. There needs to be some consideration; however, it should not be an advantage.

Ms. Clementson clarified that an area with existing Smart Growth development adding extra Smart Growth development would most likely receive the most points. Areas of new development would be on an equal playing field with those areas with existing development. This was based on input received from this group, which was to not forget about areas with existing development and reward new development. There is flexibility, however, should this group want more weight for one than the other.

Chair Jones commented some cities do not have density around their transit centers and don’t want to be at a disadvantage when applying for grants. Whereas, the City of San Diego has the advantage as they have density around their transit centers. It should be an even playing field. If the goal is to improve density around transit centers, then everyone should have the ability to apply for these grants.

Councilmember Heebner requested clarification on how it is acknowledged that some communities have already done something and want to enhance the area to make it work right. She said that right now, it seems it puts everything on an equal footing if you have both. It would be nice if it had the existing and you’re adding to it.
Mr. Druker stated these criteria are for the next set of projects, not projects for the rest of the life of TransNet. One of the concepts was to get some projects on the ground immediately and use the existing places as quickly as possible. The next set of criteria, because this is a 30-year project, could be designed to start balancing those places that are not “existing density.” The idea was to get something on the ground as quickly as possible, show people that Smart Growth is a reality, and have workable projects that are on the ground.

Chair Jones asked Mr. Druker if projects in already dense areas are going to have a better chance of being built or going to be built a little faster.

Mr. Druker responded perhaps this first time through. He reiterated the criterion is for the next set of grants, not the whole life of TransNet.

Chair Jones commented that the document will be a moving target as the projects are done.

Mr. Druker informed that one of the reasons the criteria was changed was because some grants went to projects without transit-oriented development. He suggested developing criteria for the next set of projects, which would include plans, as the current criteria is for capital improvements only.

Chair Jones asked if planning was included in the present document.

Mr. Vance replied that the ordinance specifies funding for both capital improvements and planning projects. The criteria for selecting planning projects most likely will be presented next month and the Committee will be asked how it would like monies to be divided up between capital and planning projects. Presently, it is being recommended that a significant portion be given to capital projects.

Chair Jones stated he did not want the incentives limited to already dense areas. Regarding Policy No. 33, the County and the City have a unique situation when providing matching funds. He suggested the RHNA numbers be reviewed and considered by either districts or communities.

Mr. Vance responded he will convey the message to the individuals reviewing the policy to make sure they give it consideration.

Chair Jones requested clarification regarding “Quality Proposed, Capital Improvement Projects - Addressing Project Area Issues.”

Mr. Vance responded each area is going to have specific critical needs, which need to be addressed. The idea is to encourage projects that address the critical needs for the area and review how well they are being addressed by the project.

Chair Jones asked if redevelopment funds or monies from developers would be included in the matching funds portion of the plan.
Mr. Vance replied that this will be specified in the program guidelines. Presently being considered are city revenues, developer-proposed revenues, and in-kind contributions from local jurisdictions. Basically, anything that is contributing toward the cost of completing the project, which are firm, committed funds. Then the highest percentage of matching funds would receive the highest percentage of points.

Chair Jones commented his city has pushed through three density projects within a year and placed a substantial amount of redevelopment funds into the projects. He suggested some weight be given to the match and smaller cities have the ability to have equity.

Ms. Clementson asked if the in-kind service helped as it is anticipated that if a grant is provided, project management would be at the city level.

Chair Jones replied he thought so.

Mayor Pfeiler commented every city will be supporting it, so that it will all be about the same amount.

Councilmember Heebner asked Chair Jones for clarification of what he would like considered as matching funds.

Chair Jones replied there needs to be some sort of equity. The City of San Diego has the ability to put a higher percentage of funding into its projects than smaller cities.

Councilmember Heebner asked if he was suggesting weighting it.

Chair Jones stated possibly.

Mr. Vance informed that this issue has come up, and as yet, staff has not been able to resolve it.

Chair Jones commented the same problems are experienced by school districts regarding discretionary funds.

Mr. Vance stated it’s not just one item that will make a project competitive. It will be the balance of many in the overall project. During the Pilot Program, projects in both big and small cities were funded. If it is a strong project in a good area, it will be able to compete. The project may not hit all the points, but these criteria will have the ability to pick projects in a variety of settings around the region. He offered to make some corrections, should the Committee desire. He reminded the Committee that this will be presented to them as a complete package once the program guidelines are completed in October.

**Action:** The item will be brought back to the next meeting as a quorum was not present.
Brian Holland, Associate Planner (SANDAG), presented an overview of the RCAP, which focuses on transportation, electricity, and natural gas, which account for 83% of the region’s emissions. He provided detailed information and results of the Greenhouse Gas Analysis for the transportation sector to reduce VMT. Next steps included developing a tool that will measure Smart Growth effects more accurately, improving modeling capabilities for things that couldn’t be modeled such as congestion pricing and ridesharing, and refining the transportation policies.

Councilmember Heebner asked if it was correct that as a result of the analysis only 17% and 6% reductions were achieved.

Mr. Holland replied she was correct; somewhere around 23% from regional measures.

Councilmember Heebner requested further clarification.

Mr. Holland stated when adding in the other state measures, alternative fuels, and fuel efficiency, the result is closer to the target.

Councilmember Heebner asked how charging for parking will decrease greenhouse gases.

Mr. Holland replied the theory behind the idea is that increasing the operating costs of driving influences people’s decisions on what mode to take.

Councilmember Heebner asked if there was actual transit frequency that people could use.

Mr. Holland replied there is more access and increased frequencies.

Councilmember Heebner asked for further clarification.

Mr. Holland replied there may have been more of an effect in certain areas than in others, so there wasn’t a visible shift in the opportunity areas, which aren’t as transit accessible; however, it may be different in the downtown core area.

Councilmember Heebner responded she now understood the concept.

Mr. Druker suggested the next RTP include specific goals in terms of creating a transit system in order to begin charging for parking.

Councilmember Gronke commented that charging a 20-cent gas increase should not begin until prices have decreased. He suggested solar cell technologies should be part of the discussion and investigated.

Mr. Holland replied that investigation has begun on solar cells and it will be included in the analysis for the electricity and natural gas sectors, and included in the Regional Energy Strategy Update.
Councilmember Gronke stated the agency should do some lobbying to the state and federal levels.

Mr. Holland informed that it is included in the Regional Energy Strategy, should the Committee decide it is a priority.

Mr. Druker asked what type of assumption is being made regarding the typical vehicles in 2030.

Mr. Holland said this analysis was technologically neutral due to the uncertainty; however, prospective fuel and vehicle alternatives have been reviewed outside the analysis.

Mr. Druker inquired what would the results be if 90% of the cars were assumed to be fueled either electrically or by a hydrogen cell.

Mr. Holland replied there might be a more significant reduction than shown in the analysis. The CEC developed the low carbon fuel standard to be “ambitious but plausible.”

Chair Jones announced speaker Ms. Donna Tisdale.

Ms. Tisdale, of Boulevard, California, stated she supported Item No. 9, but felt it important to address this issue as it provides an opportunity to reduce greenhouse gas production. Although most attention is given to carbon dioxide, methane is actually 20 times more damaging. Landfills are the largest source of man-made methane emissions in California and most of what is disposed of in landfills can be recycled, composed, or made into alternative fuels. She asked for increased recycling in order to reduce methane and reduce greenhouse gas.

Chair Jones announced due to time constraints Item No. 8 would not be presented. The item could be presented at the next meeting, should the Committee request it.

Mr. Druker commented that regarding Item No. 8, SANDAG needs to take a position with the MTS and NCTD to identify and plan for the next generation alternative fuel vehicles.

Chair Jones asked if Item No. 8 should be brought back for discussion.

Mr. Druker said that it should be discussed at some point.

Chair Jones replied that Item No. 8 will be brought back to the Committee in August.

8. REPORT ON ALTERNATIVE TRANSPORTATION FUELS (INFORMATION)

Action: This item was postponed for future discussion.
9. PRESENTATION FROM THE INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ZERO WASTE STRATEGIES (INFORMATION)

Richard Anthony and Richard Flamer of the Citizens Advisory Committee reported on the significance of recycling in San Diego and the gap in leadership in terms of regional planning in this area. It has been determined that there is a need to recycle 75% of the waste in order to avoid creation of a new landfill. Discarded materials can be recycled and provide opportunities for new businesses and jobs. Information was provided on resource recovery parks, zero waste communities, and the zero waste regional plan. It was suggested that SANDAG, along with the cities, create a new regional body for public education and planning to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and conserve resources.

Action: This item was presented for information only.

10. UPCOMING MEETINGS

The next meeting of the Regional Planning Committee is scheduled for August 1, 2008, at 12 noon.

11. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Jones adjourned the meeting at 2:09 p.m.
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>San Diego Unified Port District</td>
<td>Laurie Black</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Michael Najera</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>Harry Mathis</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bob Emery</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jerry Rindone</td>
<td>Temporary Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>NCTD</td>
<td>Dave Druker</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ed Gallo</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG)</td>
<td>Bill Anderson</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jonathon Brindle</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBREGIONAL AREA</td>
<td>JURISDICTION</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>MEMBER / ALTERNATE</td>
<td>ATTENDING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>Southern California Tribal Chairmen’s Association</td>
<td>Johnny Hernandez (Iipay Nation of Santa Ysabel)</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Allen Lawson (San Pasqual)</td>
<td>Alternate</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>Environmental Mitigation Program Advisory Member</td>
<td>California Department of Fish and Game</td>
<td>Ed Pert</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Mitigation Program Advisory Member</td>
<td>US Army Corps of Engineers</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Mitigation Program Advisory Member</td>
<td>US Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Mitigation Program Advisory Member</td>
<td></td>
<td>Susan Wynn</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ENERGY WORKING GROUP (EWG) CHARTER AMENDMENTS

Introduction

The SANDAG Board requested a review of all working groups during its retreat in January 2008. In response, the Executive Committee assessed all SANDAG working groups and approved the deletion, combination, or restructuring of several. At its June 13, 2008, meeting the Executive Committee voted to restructure the EWG based on recommendations from the RPC and EWG Chairs. The changes were made effective immediately. Staff was directed to amend the EWG charter to reflect the approved restructuring and bring the charter to the RPC for approval.

Overview

EWG membership was reduced from a maximum of 25 to 20 members in order to ensure a quorum, improve geographic representation, enhance transportation sector representation, and reduce duplicative member categories. In addition to reducing membership, the mandatory attendance requirement for this voluntary working group has been eliminated. Elected official representation on the EWG has not changed.

The SANDAG Board heard the restructuring report at its June 27 meeting. Afterward, the Hon. Carrie Downey, City of Coronado and Chair of the EWG, mailed letters to all EWG members to inform them of the restructuring.

Recommendation

The Regional Planning Committee is asked to approve an amendment to the EWG Charter that would reduce member categories, remove a mandatory attendance policy, and make technical edits.

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

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

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

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

LINE OF REPORTING
The EWG reports to the Regional Planning Committee (RPC), which reports directly to the SANDAG Board of Directors. In addition, the SANDAG Board recognized that the EWG may request that a policy advisory committee make comments on proceedings at the California Public Utilities Commission and California Energy Commission. Due to the time limitations on many of these proceedings, the Board approved an alternate reporting structure which enables the EWG to obtain an approval from the Executive Committee to take action on issues with deadline constraints. The RPC approves changes to the EWG Charter.

EWG members serve at the discretion of the RPC and EWG service is voluntary.

RESPONSIBILITIES
The EWG provides input and comments to the RPC related to the development and implementation of the SANDAG Regional Energy Strategy and Regional Energy Planning Program, as prioritized by the Board of Directors in the Overall Work Program (OWP). The EWG may be asked to provide input on a variety of energy issues to the RPC and Board of Directors. The EWG will ensure that regional energy planning activities align with the objectives of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP), and the Regional Economic Prosperity Strategy (REPS). The EWG will bring stakeholders together to develop ideas on state and federal energy matters and bring them forward through the RPC and the Board. The EWG also will work with various stakeholders at the local level to discuss the best ways to provide energy-saving programs and services as they relate to the implementation of the RES and then provide feedback to the RPC.

MEMBERSHIP
The EWG will have a maximum of 20 voting members. Membership will include a diverse group of regional stakeholders. Elected officials serving on the EWG are appointed by the six subregions they represent (North County Coastal, North County Inland, East County, South Bay, the City of San Diego, and the County of San Diego). Members of the Working Group and their alternates are selected by the bodies they represent.

In the event that an elected official cannot serve, a subregion can appoint a non-elected government employee to serve in place of an elected in the primary or alternate member position.
MEETING TIME AND LOCATION

The Energy Working Group generally meets from 11:30 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. on the fourth Thursday of the month. Meetings are normally held in the 7th floor conference room at SANDAG offices.

SELECTION OF THE CHAIR

The EWG chair is selected by the Regional Planning Committee and should be rotated on a periodic basis unless otherwise determined by the Chair of the Board.

DURATION OF EXISTENCE

EWG status is that of a standing working group. An evaluation of the group’s work will be conducted annually as part of the SANDAG Executive Committee’s annual committee/working group review process.
### SANDAG ENERGY WORKING GROUP

#### GEOGRAPHICAL AREA/ORGANIZATION | MEMBER/ALTERNATE*
--- | ---
**SANDAG Subregional Representation**
South County | City of Coronado
 | City of Chula Vista
North County Coastal | City of Del Mar
 | Alternate City
North County Inland | City of San Marcos
 | Alternate City
East County | Member City
 | Alternate City
City of San Diego | Member
 | Alternate
County of San Diego | Member
 | Alternate

#### Regional Transit Agencies

| Regional Transit Agencies | Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) | North County Transit District (NCTD)** |
--- | --- | --- |

#### Regional Investor Owned Utility (IOU)

| San Diego Gas & Electric (SDG&E) | Member | Alternate |
--- | --- | --- |

#### Regional Business Groups

| San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce | Member | Alternate |
--- | --- | --- |

| Economic Development Councils | North County Economic Development Council | South County Economic Development Council** |
--- | --- | --- |

#### Regional Energy Expertise

| California Center for Sustainable Energy (formerly San Diego Regional Energy Office) | Member | Alternate |
--- | --- | --- |

<p>| Energy Policy Initiative Center (EPIC) | Member | Alternate |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GEOGRAPHICAL AREA/ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>MEMBER/ALTERNATE*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Public Agencies</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port of San Diego</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alternate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego County Water Authority</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alternate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego Universities</td>
<td>University of California San Diego (UCSD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>San Diego State University (SDSU)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego Schools (K-12)</td>
<td>San Diego Unified School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alternate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Alternative Fuels Groups</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Alternative Fuels Groups</td>
<td>San Diego Clean Cities Coalition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional Sustainability Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clean Transportation Committee**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Environmental Groups</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alternate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Health Coalition</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alternate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The member and alternate can switch positions on an annual basis

** Represents the alternate
SMART GROWTH DESIGN GUIDELINES

Introduction

The Regional Comprehensive Plan chapter on urban form created a framework for smart growth planning and development in the region by focusing on where and how the region could support its growing population in a sustainable way. The RCP includes an action item to “develop an urban design best practices manual as a tool for local agencies that addresses walkability, compatibility with public transportation, crime prevention, universal design, and accessibility, as well as other urban design features.” Work is underway to prepare smart growth design guidelines that will describe how smart growth can be realized in a way that responds to the character and climate of the San Diego region. It also offers an opportunity to refine the definitions of the smart growth place types in terms of design and scale. Designing for Smart Growth, which is the working title for the document, should be a useful reference for local planners and designers as we move forward with implementing new plans and projects in the smart growth opportunity areas around the region.

An Ad Hoc Working Group that consists of members from the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG), Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC), and the Stakeholders Working Group from the last Regional Transportation Plan update has been established to guide and provide input on the content. This report provides an overview of the proposed form and content of the document and discusses the public outreach component of the process. A presentation on the guidelines will be made by the consultant team at the meeting.

Discussion

SANDAG has contracted with the firm of Design Community and Environment (DC&E) from Berkeley, California, to assist in preparing the Designing for Smart Growth document. Their team includes Kimley-Horn and Associates (KHA) for the multimodal transportation component of the work. KTU+A will provide a local perspective on planning and the smart growth place types and will assist with the public outreach effort. Finally, William Fulton of Solimar Research, which was recently acquired by DC&E, will assist with development of a smart growth scorecard. The scorecard will be an informational tool for SANDAG and local agencies when reviewing or considering smart growth development proposals.

Design Guidelines Outline

One of the first tasks for this project has been to develop a detailed outline for the design guidelines. Design is a complex and multifaceted subject. If the document is to be accessible and
useful, it is critical that it focus on the key issues related to smart growth and deal with them in a complete but succinct manner. The guidelines are envisioned as both a general reference for policymakers and the public, and as a technical reference for designers and planners. The annotated outline attached to this report reflects those objectives in its structure with an introduction to smart growth and design in the San Diego region, and detailed chapters on key urban design elements. A key objective is to ensure the guidelines reflect the unique circumstances and character of the San Diego region. Toward that end, the guidelines will address design in the context of the smart growth place types developed in the Regional Comprehensive Plan.

Public Outreach

The scope of work for the project includes two public outreach efforts that are scheduled to take place in October, about midway through the document development process. The public meetings are envisioned as an opportunity to get feedback from design and planning professionals in the region and from interested members of the public. Planning commissioners and community planning group members are an especially relevant audience for the workshops. The format of the workshops is still being developed, but the preliminary concept is to have two meetings, one in the south central portion of the county and one in the north county. Each workshop could be in the form of an open house that runs from late afternoon into the evening to provide an opportunity for both the professionals and the public to come to the workshops, see what is being proposed for the document, and offer input. Participation from Regional Planning Committee members would, of course, be welcome.

Project Schedule

The consultant team has been meeting with the Ad Hoc Working Group on a monthly basis since May. Over the coming months they will be bringing detailed discussions of the different topic areas in the document, along with refinements to the plans for the public outreach component to the group. The schedule calls for the first draft of the document to be completed by next November, with distribution of a draft for public comment in December. A final draft is scheduled to come back to the RPC in early 2009, with the final document going to the SANDAG Board of Directors for acceptance in April.

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachment: 1. Designing for Smart Growth - Draft Outline

Key Staff Contact: Stephan Vance, (619) 699-1924, sva@sandag.org
DESIGNING FOR SMART GROWTH: 
CREATING GREAT PLACES IN THE SAN DIEGO REGION
JUNE 2008 DRAFT DOCUMENT OUTLINE
REVISED BY AD HOC WORKING GROUP

Design, Community & Environment (DC&E) and its consultant team have prepared this outline for the Smart Growth Design Guidelines project, based on an earlier version created by SANDAG staff and representatives of local jurisdictions. This version of the outline reflects comments from the project’s ad hoc working group, which reviewed the draft outline at its June 2008 meeting. The outline will be refined further as the Design Guidelines are developed.

I. INTRODUCTION

SANDAG’s Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP), adopted in 2004, offers a vision for San Diego County that strongly emphasizes sustainability and smart growth. It also emphasizes the importance of high-quality urban design to achieving the principles of smart growth. The RCP acknowledges that infill development can win acceptance with members of the public only if it is designed well, noting that good design “can be the difference between a sense of overcrowding and a feeling of vibrancy.” To ensure that new development in the smart growth opportunity areas has high-quality design, the RCP calls for SANDAG to prepare smart growth design guidelines for the region.

In response to the threat of global warming, which will have significant negative impacts on California’s environment and economy, the State of California is pioneering the effort to fight global warming with the passage of the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006. This legislation sets the stage to implement a number of strategies to significantly reduce the State’s greenhouse gas emissions. An important strategy to achieving the goals of this legislation is shifting development patterns from sprawling suburbs relying on the automobile to compact smart growth communities. The smart growth model
of creating walkable communities with convenient pedestrian, bicycle and transit access between home, work and play will reduce the amount of greenhouse gases emitted by decreasing the number of automobile trips. The guidelines in this document will highlight how smart growth naturally promotes sustainability and the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions.

Designing for Smart Growth is intended to serve as an inspiration for developers, designers, local governments and citizens throughout the San Diego region. It will also serve as a tool that SANDAG can use to evaluate projects for potential funding through the TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program. Although it does not replace existing local design guidance in the region, jurisdictions are encouraged to use it as a starting point for their own planning efforts, as well as a reference to help them understand the key principles of creating great places.

A. Urban Design and Smart Growth

B. Purpose of the Guidelines

C. Relationship to Other Plans and Policies
   1. Regional Comprehensive Plan
   2. Smart Growth Concept Map
   3. Planning and Designing for Pedestrians
   4. Local Plans and Guidelines

D. Overview of the Guidelines

II. Designing for the San Diego Region

San Diego County is a unique region with its own distinctive climate, topography and culture. New development in smart growth opportunity areas must reflect this unique context, while also drawing from broader principles
of high-quality urban design and ideas from other communities. In addition, each of SANDAG’s smart growth place types has distinct design requirements that must be considered, so that development is designed in an appropriate manner for its location. Finally, because so much of the region is built out, special attention is needed to transform existing single-use neighborhoods, auto-oriented shopping centers and isolated civic uses into places that reflect the principles of smart growth.

A. Components of Great Places
1. Well-Defined Neighborhoods, Districts and Corridors
2. Mixed Land Uses
3. Foot Traffic
4. High-Quality Architecture
5. Complete Streets
6. Places to Work and Shop
7. Parks, Plazas and Open Space
8. Public Art

B. Distinctive Qualities of the San Diego Region
1. Beaches and Coastline
2. Climate and Precipitation
3. Hills, Mesas and Canyons
4. Multicultural Population
5. International Setting

C. High-Quality Design in San Diego County
1. Smart Growth Place Types
2. Examples of High-Quality Design

D. Global Warming and Sustainable Development

E. Transformation of Existing Places
This section will include SANDAG’s photo simulations.
III. Site Design

Creating more livable, desirable, economically successful and environmentally sustainable communities requires site design that contributes positively to the public realm. The public realm is the publicly accessible environment that everyone shares and uses on a daily basis, including sidewalks, streets and public spaces. It is structured both by the design of these public spaces and the edges it shares with adjacent private development.

Given this relationship, projects with well-designed sites have the potential to contribute positively to the comfort, safety and accessibility of the public realm. A successful site design would coordinate with, and integrate into, the public realm by orienting the building towards the street and sidewalk, responding to the existing built context and natural environment, and catering to the needs of the pedestrian.

A. Building Siting and Orientation
1. Location and Orientation
2. Setbacks
3. Building Mass
4. Buildings in Prominent Locations
   a. Corner Sites
   b. Neighborhood Entrances
   c. Highly-Visible Sites
5. Entrances
6. Pedestrian Orientation
7. Plazas and Open Space
8. Outdoor Seating
B. Neighborhood Context
1. Location
2. Compatibility
3. Views
4. Coordination with Adjacent Properties

C. Connectivity
1. Universal Access
2. Pedestrian Connections
3. Links to Transit Stops

D. Resource Conservation and Reuse
1. Green Stormwater Solutions
2. Climate Appropriate Landscape Design

E. Parking
This section will include a general discussion of parking and link to Chapter IX, which will contain a more in-depth discussion of parking.

F. Form-based Codes

G. Crime Prevention through Environmental Design

IV. BUILDING DESIGN

Site design alone cannot achieve the principles of smart growth. Successful building design is also needed, so that each development can enhance the character and beauty of a community and make it a more comfortable and desirable place to live.

Buildings need architectural features that reflect the local architectural vernacular, respond to the local culture and are appropriate to the area’s climate. They must fit gracefully within the context of the surroundings, taking cues
from the existing buildings and local environment. Features such as large storefront windows and well-designed entrances can help to make buildings visually and physically accessible.

A. Building Organization
1. Organization of Use
2. Universal Access
3. Building Rhythm

B. Building Frontage
1. Articulation
2. Horizontal Massing
3. Proportion
4. Scale of Detailing
5. Entries, Doors and Windows
6. Building Materials
7. Awnings, Canopies and Arcades

C. Resource Conservation
1. Water Conservation and Reuse
2. Energy Production and Conservation
3. Green Building Certification
4. Building Rehabilitation and Renovation

D. Roof
1. Form
2. Roof Lines
3. Detailing
4. Materials
5. Green Roofs
E. Landscaping

1. Coverage
2. Function
3. Layout
4. Materials
5. Fences and Walls
6. Urban Forest

F. Signage

V. Multimodal Street Design

Streets are our cities’ largest public open spaces and provide the framework upon which cities are built. They serve many functions for many users, ranging from mobility to where people meet and interact. Historically, streets have served as multimodal conduits of transportation, land access, and places where people lived, conducted business, socialized and participated in all forms of street life. With the advent of the automobile, however, the design of streets shifted to emphasize the movement of automobiles at high rates of speed. With sprawling land use patterns, the automobile not only became a necessity but also an American cultural symbol. A result of this engineering design paradigm was that the accommodation of pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users became secondary to high “levels of service” for the automobile.

The design of multimodal streets emphasizes balance—the appropriate allocation of often-limited public rights-of-way to share between the multiple functions and users of the street. The design of streets should be sensitive to the context in which they exist, and respond to the surrounding context as well as shaping the context and defining places. In multimodal street design, conventional street design criteria of traffic volume, speed and level of service are augmented with community values, along with the goals of safety, mobility and accessibility for everyone.
A. Street Networks and Connectivity
   1. Benefits of Connectivity
      a. Pedestrian Safety
      b. Improved Emergency Response Times
   2. Network Planning Principles for Different Scales

B. Hierarchy of Streets
   1. Functional Classification and Transportation Planning
   2. Overlaying Vehicle, Transit, Bicycle and Pedestrian Networks
   3. Street Hierarchy Models

C. Contextual Street Design
   1. How Context Affects Street Design
   2. Defining the Context
   3. Examples in the San Diego Region
   4. Auto-Oriented and Pedestrian-Oriented Streets
   5. Context-Sensitive Solutions
   6. A Framework of Context in the San Diego Region

D. Accommodation of All Users
   1. Balancing User Needs
   2. Restructuring Policies and Standards
   3. Complete Streets
   4. Designing for Pedestrians
   5. Designing for Bicyclists
   6. Designing for Transit
   7. Multimodal Intersection Design

E. Solutions to Street Design Issues
   1. Beyond Level of Service: Alternative Performance Measures
   2. Accommodating Emergency Access and Trucks
   3. Managing Stormwater Runoff
   4. Multimodal Street Design on State Highways
F. Traffic Calming
   1. Principles of Traffic Calming
   2. Traffic Calming for Major Thoroughfares
   3. Traffic Calming for Local Streets

VI. Designing Transit Facilities

Until recently, sprawling suburbs that depend on the automobile have been the typical American pattern of new development. In contrast, smart growth seeks to offer people diverse and attractive options to live, work and play within lively, compact, walkable communities. One key to achieving this objective is the availability and accessibility of transportation options that provide convenient alternatives to the personal automobile.

Transit systems, including transit routes, service frequency and transit modes, must be planned in conjunction with all aspects of the community and accommodate a variety of technical needs and requirements. A well-designed transit system will coordinate with surrounding land uses and connect with other types of transportation. It will also help to reduce the number of vehicle trips that people must make.

A. Transportation Centers
   1. Passenger Waiting Areas
   2. Amenities Near the Center
   3. Park and Ride Areas
   4. Pedestrian Access Within the Station
   5. Vehicle Parking

B. Intermodal Transit Links
C. Design Requirements of Transit
   1. Conventional Bus Service
   2. Bus Rapid Transit
   3. Rapid Bus Routes
   4. Light Rail

D. Accommodation of Bicycles

E. Universal Design of Public Transit
   1. Accessible Transit Stations and Vehicles
   2. Clear Signage
   3. Barrier-Free Transit Platforms

VII. Siting and Designing Civic Uses

Civic uses, especially those that meet public needs and foster a sense of community, are valuable assets to the community and should be located and designed to maximize their value. In the early 1920s, Clarence Perry developed the idea of the neighborhood unit, a planning concept that influenced the design of many American “new towns,” but was largely lost with the advent of suburban sprawl. Perry’s idea of the neighborhood unit includes many ideas that are precursors to the principles of smart growth. His goal was to create walkable neighborhoods that include housing and retail and are centered around a civic use, typically a school and park.

As Perry’s concept shows, civic uses have the potential to function as the heart of a neighborhood or community. Civic spaces are not only an interface between the government and the people, but places to create stronger relationships among community members and encourage more investment into the success of the neighborhood from within the community. In smart growth opportunity areas, it is important to take the utmost care when locating and designing civic uses in order to realize their full potential.
A. Locating Civic Uses
   1. Accessibility
   2. Convenience
   3. Comfort

B. Integration of Civic Uses into the Community
   1. Schools
   2. Libraries
   3. Community Centers
   4. Recreation Centers
   5. Government Centers

C. Civic Uses as Community Assets
   1. Gathering Places
   2. Combination of Civic Uses
   3. Combination of Civic Use and Parks
   4. High Quality Design of Civic Uses

D. Universal Design of Civic Uses
   1. Access and Circulation
   2. Clear Signage
   3. Connections between Public Areas

VIII. Parks, Public Space and Open Space

The availability of parkland and public spaces contributes to the attractiveness and vibrancy of a neighborhood, increases local environmental quality and helps to create healthy, active communities. Parks and public spaces, including plazas and other hardscaped public space, have the ability to provide much-valued open space within compact communities. They can also provide a venue for communities to recreate and gather, fostering a sense of community identity. In addition to enhancing the community’s social environment, parks and public spaces also add to the sustainability of the com-
munity’s natural environment by combating air pollution, reducing water pollution, mitigating urban “heat islands” and creating habitat for local plants and animals.

A. Park Types and Location

B. Integration of Parks into the Community

C. Universal Design of Parks and Public Spaces
   1. Access and Circulation
   2. Access to Natural Areas

D. Ecological Design
   1. Resource Conservation
   2. Climate Appropriate Vegetation

IX. Vehicle Access and Parking

(Note that this chapter will incorporate the results of SANDAG’s Trip Generation and Parking Study, which is being prepared separately. The outline for this chapter may be revised based on the direction of the Study.)

A primary goal of smart growth is to enable people to modify their travel behavior by using alternate modes of travel, reducing trip length and combining trips. As a result, communities that reflect the principles of smart growth will have a reduced number of vehicle trips and vehicle miles traveled. However, not all vehicle trips will be replaced by transit, walking or bicycling trips. A well-designed place must accommodate all modes of travel, including the automobile.

Because smart growth is meant to facilitate reductions in vehicle use, special attention must be paid to the amount of parking that is provided. If too
much parking is provided, the project will not result in trip reductions. However, if too little parking is provided, drivers may occupy too much of the street parking in surrounding neighborhoods. The challenge for designers is to provide a parking supply that is slightly constrained but does not deter customers, frustrate tenants or create problems for nearby residents.

A. Vehicle Access
1. Conflicts with Pedestrians and Bicyclists
2. Visibility and Safety

B. Parking Design
1. Minimum Parking Standards and Exceptions
2. Surface Parking Design
   a. Off-Street Parking
   b. On-Street Parking
3. Structured Parking Design
4. Bicycle Parking
5. Integration with Architecture and Landscaping
6. Universal Design of Parking

C. Parking Demand Management
1. Shared Parking
2. Pricing Strategies
3. Parking Priority for Vehicles that Reduce Demand
   a. Van Pools
   b. Car-Sharing Programs

X. Smart Growth Scorecard

The Smart Growth Scorecard is a tool that will enable SANDAG to evaluate projects for funding under the TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program. It will also help local jurisdictions to determine whether a project incorporates
the most fundamental principles of smart growth design, as well as provide a straightforward way to compare different projects with one another.

The Scorecard will include a set of more than 40 questions about a project’s land uses, proximity to transit, accessibility and other important characteristics. Projects will be scored by tallying the answers to each question. Although the Scorecard will reflect a model developed by DC&E for the Smart Growth Leadership Institute, a national organization, it will be tailored to the specific needs of the San Diego region and the requirements of existing SANDAG policies.

A. Scorecard Goals

B. Scorecard Use

C. Smart Growth Topics
   1. Location and Service Provision
   2. Density and Compactness
   3. Diversity of Use
   4. Accessibility, Mobility and Connectivity
   5. Pedestrian Safety, Streetscapes and Parking
   6. Environmental Protection
   7. Community Needs and Local Development
Introduction

The TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program (TSGiP) is based on policy objectives contained in the Regional Comprehensive Plan - using funding incentives to encourage coordinated regional planning to bring transit service, housing, and employment together in smart growth development. Funded through the local TransNet half-cent sales tax program, it is estimated that there will be $10.2 million available for capital and planning grants in the first two-year funding cycle. Requests for grant funds will be evaluated through a competitive process using criteria recommended by the Regional Planning Committee (RPC) and approved by the SANDAG Board of Directors.

The RPC discussed draft criteria for funding capital improvement projects at the July meeting. The Committee provided feedback on several components and asked staff to consider refinements. This report proposes options for RPC consideration and also responds to other comments made at the meeting.

This report also presents proposed criteria for funding planning projects. The Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG) reviewed the planning project selection criteria at its June meeting and suggested modifications to the points distribution between several criteria. The draft criteria presented for RPC consideration reflects those requested changes.

Discussion

The TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program is a provision in the TransNet Extension Ordinance that provides funds to help implement the smart growth objectives established in SANDAG’s Regional Comprehensive Plan. The ordinance (Section 2(C)(3)) states:

Smart Growth Incentive Program: An estimated $280 million will be allocated to the Smart Growth Incentive Program to provide funding for a broad array of transportation-related infrastructure improvements that will assist local agencies in

Recommendation

The Regional Planning Committee is asked to recommend that the SANDAG Board of Directors accept the eligibility and evaluation criteria for capital projects (Attachments 1 and 2) and planning projects (Attachment 3) for use in the first TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program two-year funding cycle. In addition, the Committee is asked to recommend that planning grants constitute up to 20 percent of the funding in each funding cycle, and that the maximum planning grant size be $400,000.
better integrating transportation and land use, such as enhancements to streets and public places, funding of infrastructure needed to support development in smart growth opportunity areas consistent with the Regional Comprehensive Plan, and community planning efforts related to smart growth and improved land use/transportation coordination. These funds shall be allocated on a regional competitive grant basis. It is intended that these funds be used to match federal, state, local, and private funding to maximize the number of improvements to be implemented. The Commission shall establish specific project eligibility criteria for this program.

Because the ordinance specifies a competitive grant program that funds both capital and planning projects, two sets of eligibility and evaluation criteria have been developed to select these two project types.

**Capital Project Eligibility and Evaluation Criteria**

In response to the comments received from the RPC at the July meeting, staff has revised the project evaluation criteria for prioritizing capital projects. Specifically, the Urban Design criterion (Part I, E, 1) now includes a reference to the need for an appropriate mix of uses to emphasize the importance of providing necessary destinations within walking distance. In addition, Part II, D, Addressing Project Area Needs, now emphasizes the importance of respecting natural and cultural resources in the project area. Additionally, staff is preparing administrative guidelines that will set forth the process for administering the program, and provide guidance on evaluating projects. Staff will incorporate other comments provided by the RPC into this document. For example, the guidelines will specify that housing units made affordable through acquisition/rehabilitation will be considered as part of the New Affordable Housing criterion in Part I.

Some RPC members expressed concern that the “Matching Funds” criterion places jurisdictions with smaller budgets at a disadvantage, and asked staff to develop a proposal for how the matching funds criterion could take this into account. Under the current draft evaluation criteria, 20 points would be awarded based on the amount of matching funds provided by the applicant as a percentage of the total project cost. If the RPC prefers to revise this criterion based on the above concern, the following approach could be considered:

- Of the 20 points devoted to matching funds,
  - 10 points would be awarded based on the amount of matching funds provided by the applicant as a percentage of total project cost;
  - The remaining 10 points would be derived from the applicant’s matching funds as a percentage of total project cost, normalized by that jurisdiction’s population.

**Planning Grant Eligibility and Evaluation Criteria**

The TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program can support a wide variety of planning projects that would develop community support for smart growth development. Examples of project types include:

- Planning processes that lead to land use changes such as specific plans
• Development of design guidelines or form-based codes
• Community enhancement plans that identify the public improvements needed to attract private investment in redevelopment and infill areas
• Traffic calming and multimodal mobility plans
• Parking management plans that reduce the impact of parking demand
• Feasibility studies for smart growth-related infrastructure projects

This list should not be considered exhaustive. It is meant to suggest the type and scope of projects that could be supported under the program. Because the project types could be so diverse, the criteria proposed by the Ad Hoc Working Group are qualitative and general.

Project Eligibility Criteria - Similar to the criteria for capital projects, eligibility criteria have been developed that any planning project application would have to meet in order to compete for funding. These criteria are based on the language in the TransNet ordinance and the framework for smart growth incentives established in the Regional Comprehensive Plan. Under the proposed eligibility criteria shown in Attachment 3, projects must be consistent with the TransNet Ordinance and be in an Existing/Planned or Potential Smart Growth Area. The sponsoring agency must qualify under the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA)/Policy 33, and the application must include a resolution or minute order committing the matching funds and resources necessary to complete the project.

Projects would be screened by SANDAG staff prior to submitting the applications for evaluation under the project evaluation criteria in the second portion of the criteria.

Project Evaluation Criteria - Once a planning grant application qualifies under the eligibility criteria, the project would be evaluated based on the criteria in Part II of Attachment 3. These criteria were developed to identify the best projects in the best locations. The first two criteria refer to the proposed planning area. They evaluate the proposal based on how well the planning effort relates to regional transit, and on the potential for smart growth development in the project area. The next three criteria evaluate the proposed planning effort. They consider how well the proposed planning project objectives support smart growth principles, the quality of the proposed planning process, and strength of the proposed outcomes from the project. Next the criteria look at evidence of a local commitment to supporting smart growth development based on existing plans and policies, and the amount of matching funds in the project budget. Finally, under Board Policy No. 33, 25 percent of the available points would be awarded based on the agency's production of affordable housing relative to its RHNA target.

Planning Grant Funds

Based on feedback provided by the RPC at the June meeting, staff proposed to the TWG at its July 10, 2008, meeting that planning grants constitute 15 to 20 percent of the program funds, and that the maximum grant award should be $300,000. In response, the TWG expressed concern that a higher percentage of the funding should be allocated toward planning efforts, and that the maximum grant size should be increased. The TWG recommended that SANDAG staff propose 20 percent of the program funds for allocation toward planning grants, and that the maximum grant award should be $400,000.
**Next Steps**

SANDAG staff will continue to work with the Ad Hoc Working Group to complete administrative guidelines for the TSGIP. The guidelines will detail the process and application requirements and establish the obligations of SANDAG and the grant recipients under the program. The RPC will be asked to recommend approval of the guidelines in early October. The Board of Directors will be asked to approve both the guidelines and project selection criteria and authorize a call for projects at its October meeting.

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

**Attachments:**
1. TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program Draft Capital Project Eligibility Criteria
2. TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program Draft Capital Project Evaluation Criteria
3. TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program Draft Planning Project Eligibility and Evaluation Criteria

**Key Staff Contact:** Stephan Vance, (619) 699-1924, sva@sandag.org
A. **Consistency with TransNet Ordinance**
   The project must be eligible under the TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program guidelines.

B. **Smart Growth Opportunity Area Designation**
   Project is located within an existing/planned Smart Growth Opportunity Area, as designated on the Smart Growth Concept Map.

C. **Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA)/Policy 33 Compliance**
   The applicant’s jurisdiction must have an adopted housing element that has been found in compliance with state law by HCD or self-certified, and submitted its annual report to SANDAG regarding actual housing unit production by income category.

D. **Local Funding Commitment and Authorization**
   The application must include a resolution or minute order from City Council, County Board of Supervisors, or Board of Directors authorizing the application, confirming that the project is consistent with the existing local plan, and committing to allocate the resources necessary to implement and complete the proposed activities and outcomes within the schedule identified in the project application.

E. **Project Readiness**
   The applicant must have completed a project feasibility study that identifies right-of-way/environmental constraints and preliminary costs.
TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program Proposed Capital Project Evaluation Criteria

I. LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION CHARACTERISTICS OF THE AREA AROUND THE PROPOSED CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT

A. Intensity of Planned Development in the Project’s Smart Growth Opportunity Area (maximum 6 points)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Possible</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>% of Score</th>
<th>% of Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AND

B. Existing and Entitled Land Development Around the Proposed Capital Project (maximum 6 points)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Possible</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>% of Score</th>
<th>% of Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AND

C. New Affordable Housing Development (maximum 3 points)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Possible</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>% of Score</th>
<th>% of Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Transportation Characteristics (in walking distance of proposed capital improvement project)

1. Relation to Transit (maximum 12 points)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Possible</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>% of Score</th>
<th>% of Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Walkability measured by intersection density (up to 4 points)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Possible</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>% of Score</th>
<th>% of Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Mix of Uses (maximum 3 points)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Possible</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>% of Score</th>
<th>% of Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV. QUALITY OF PROPOSED CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT

A. Support for Public Transit (maximum 5 points)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Possible</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>% of Score</th>
<th>% of Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Providing Transportation Choices (maximum 5 points)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Possible</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>% of Score</th>
<th>% of Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Community Enhancement (maximum 5 points)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Possible</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>% of Score</th>
<th>% of Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Addressing Project Area Issues (maximum 5 points)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Possible</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>% of Score</th>
<th>% of Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V. MATCHING FUNDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Possible</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>% of Score</th>
<th>% of Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VI. POLICY POINTS (affordable housing production)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Possible</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>% of Score</th>
<th>% of Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL PROJECT SCORE

1 Transit station or hub qualifies if corresponding implementation or construction funding has been programmed in the RTP.
2 Transit hub will be defined as an intersection of three or more bus routes, where at least one route has a minimum scheduled headway of 15 minutes from 7 a.m. to 7 p.m.
3 Regional service is defined as COASTER or freeway-based Bus Rapid Transit.
4 Corridor service is defined as SPRINTER, Trolley, and arterial-based Rapid Bus.
5 4/8 day is defined as 7 a.m. to 7 p.m.
6 Mix facilities shall be defined as bike lanes, bicycle boulevards, or a designated bike path.
7 TOD strategies can include transit pass programs for employees or residents in the area, vanpool/carpool programs, parking cashout programs for employees, car or bike sharing programs, or shuttle services to rail stations or major destinations.
8 Support is defined as endorsement of community planning groups, business associations, and community development corporations in the project area.
9 Score to be computed by SANDAG based on current land use and transportation databases.
I. Project Eligibility Criteria

A. Consistency with TransNet Ordinance
   The project must be eligible under the TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program guidelines.

B. Smart Growth Opportunity Area Designation
   Project is located within a potential or existing/planned Smart Growth Opportunity Area, as designated on the Smart Growth Concept Map.

C. Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA)/Policy 33 Compliance
   The applicant’s jurisdiction must have an adopted housing element that has been found in compliance with state law by HCD or self-certified, and submitted its annual report to SANDAG regarding actual housing unit production by income category.

D. Local Funding Commitment and Authorization
   The application must include a resolution or minute order from City Council, County Board of Supervisors, or Board of Directors authorizing the application, and committing to allocate the resources necessary to implement and complete the proposed activities and outcomes within the schedule identified in the project application.

II. Project Evaluation Criteria

A. Relation of Proposed Planning Area to Regional Transit (weight factor: 3, maximum points: 15, 7.5%)
   Transit Infrastructure and Service within proposed plan area
   1. SGOAs with existing regional or corridor transit infrastructure (5 points)
   2. SGOAs with programmed regional or corridor transit infrastructure or existing high frequency local transit infrastructure and service (3 points)
   3. SGOAs with planned regional or corridor transit infrastructure, or programmed or planned high frequency local transit infrastructure and service (1 point)

   Note: Rural Villages would not be scored on this criterion because the place type does not require transit service. Consequently, Rural Village scores would be normalized to the total 200 points available to other place types.

   The following criteria will be scored on a 5-point scale as follows: 5 – excellent, 4 – very good, 3 – good, 2 – adequate (some deficiencies), 1 – marginal benefit, 0 – no benefit. Guidance on how to apply the criteria to applications will be provided for the evaluation panel in the program guidelines.
B. Development Potential of Proposed Planning Effort Area (weight factor: 4, maximum points: 20, 10%)

Evidence of opportunities to develop smart growth plans or projects in the proposed planning area: Can the area appropriately accommodate smart growth? Is there land available for redevelopment or rezoning? Would the existing urban form support smart growth development? How well does the proposed planning effort support development at or above the intensity of use targets for the area's smart growth place type?

C. Planning Project Objectives (weight factor: 3, maximum points: 20, 10%)

How well do the proposed project objectives support smart growth development in the project area? Would the plan result in a project that increases transportation and housing choices?

D. Proposed Method of Meeting Project Objectives (weight factor: 5, maximum points: 30, 15%)

How does the proposed project plan to accomplish stated objectives? How well does the proposed project scope of work facilitate meeting project objectives? Does the scope of work include significant public outreach?

E. Implementation (weight factor: 5, maximum points: 35, 17.5%)

Will the proposed planning process lead to timely change in the project area? Is the planning process ready to go? Will it result in regulatory mechanisms that facilitate smart growth or lead directly to an implementable development or capital project? In particular, is a plan in place, or will the project develop a plan that will facilitate smart growth development through a master EIR or other mechanism that allows for administrative approval of development projects?

F. Evidence of Local Commitment (weight factor: 4, maximum points: 10, 5%)

How has the jurisdiction or agency demonstrated a commitment to implement smart growth? This commitment may be demonstrated through existing ordinances, policies, or incentives.

G. Matching Funds (up to 20 points, 10%)

The project will receive points in proportion to the percentage of proposed matching funds to total project cost.

H. Percentage of Lower Income Housing Units per RHNA (up to 50 points, 25%)

Up to 25 percent of total allowable points, based on amount of affordable housing produced as a percentage of the agency’s annualized affordable housing target.

Total points available equals 200.
TransNet ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION PROGRAM (EMP):
LAND MANAGEMENT GRANTS

Introduction

On April 25, 2008, the SANDAG Board of Directors approved a process and criteria for funding eligible land management activities under the TransNet Environmental Mitigation Program (EMP). A total of $2.9 million was made available in FY 2008 for land management activities related to invasive species control, post-fire recovery, habitat restoration, and/or access control and management. Pursuant to the Board of Director’s approval, a “call for projects” was issued on May 5, 2008, and 32 applications totaling over $8.5 million were received. An ad hoc selection committee of the EMP Working Group was established to review and rank the projects and recommend a proposed allocation of the $2.9 million of available funds (Attachment 1). The EMP Working Group reviewed the recommendations of the ad hoc selection committee and supported their recommendation on July 8, 2008.

Discussion

On April 8, 2008, the EMP Working Group appointed a selection committee to review the land management grant applications, which were received by SANDAG on June 5, 2008. This ad hoc committee consisted of EMPWG representatives from Caltrans, the cities of San Diego and Santee, County of San Diego, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and the California Department of Fish and Game, as well as three outside, independent biologists with natural resource management experience. These outside experts included Mr. Bill Tippets of the County Water Authority, Ms. Dawn Lawson from Camp Pendleton, and Ms. Shea O’Keefe of the USDA-Natural Conservation Resources Service. On June 6, copies of the 32 applications were sent to each committee member, who ranked them according to the criteria approved by the SANDAG Board on April 25, 2008. The selection committee met on June 12. Individuals were asked to select their top five projects for funding based on the selection criteria. Individual projects within the collective top five and subsequently those outside were discussed; evaluating the merits of the proposal based on the ranking criteria and individual funding requests. The selection committee formulated the following philosophy in evaluating the projects:

Recommendation

The Regional Planning Committee is asked to recommend that the Board of Directors: (A) approve the prioritized list of land management projects and funding allotments (Attachment 1), and (B) authorize staff to enter into contracts for the selected grants in the proposed allocations totaling $2.9 million.
• Allocate only FY 2008 funding ($2.9 million) and allow projects not selected or funded at less than their requested amount to resubmit in FY 2009

• Invest in “on the ground” land management activities and not research

• Address the regional decline of coastal cactus wren from wildfires

• For invasive control projects, attempt to fund more than one year of effort to allow a secure source of funds for the grantees to leverage with other state and federal grant programs

• Continue to reinvest in projects funded by prior EMP land management grants that could be at risk of degrading (e.g., invasion by exotic species) without additional funds

As such, some of the projects that were numerically lower than others using the selection criteria are being recommended for funding to address the most pressing regional needs. The rationale for this is mentioned in the attached spreadsheet. In some cases the entire request is being recommended for funding. In other cases the EMPWG is recommending a reduced amount.

The resulting recommended list of projects described in Attachment 1 are geographically distributed in the region and well represented by various types of organizations from larger agencies and jurisdictions to small non-profit land managers. It was the selection committee’s intent that projects not receiving funding or less than the requested amount will resubmit for the next grant cycle.

The EMP Working Group concurred with the selection committee and is recommending to the Regional Planning Committee the following 13 projects for funding (Attachment 1).

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachment: 1. Funding Recommendations for Proposed Land Management Grant Projects

Key Staff Contact: Keith Greer, (619) 699-7390, kgr@sandag.org
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tracking #</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Summary Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Requested Funding</th>
<th>Recommended Funding</th>
<th>Activities Proposed / Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mission Resource Conservation District</td>
<td>112.75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$744,600</td>
<td>$354,300</td>
<td>Invasive control project in two large watersheds. Proven success. Fund for four years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>San Dieguito River Park Joint Powers Authority</td>
<td>108.71</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$881,768</td>
<td>$347,090</td>
<td>Important regional corridor and linkage. Submitted a line item budget for invasive control, restoration and access management. Fund select items.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>City San Diego Water Department Pecutor Valley Access Control</td>
<td>106.14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$325,754</td>
<td>$325,754</td>
<td>Key access area for unstaffed off-highway vehicle (OHV) access. Needed to protect vernal pools and access to federal and state refuge land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Southwest Wetlands Interpretive Association Tijuana River Valley Invasive Removal</td>
<td>105.75</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$497,900</td>
<td>$149,437</td>
<td>Important area not large enough to fund. Proven success. Large funds requested for one year. Funding reduced with recommendation to submit for future years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>San Eljo Lagoon Foundation Carlsbad Hydrologic Unit</td>
<td>104.56</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$450,450</td>
<td>$279,950</td>
<td>Invasive control project. Large area. Proven success. Fund for three years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>United States Geological Survey (USGS) Pond Turtles Restoration</td>
<td>102.83</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$151,463</td>
<td>$151,463</td>
<td>Key declining covered species. Request the USGS work with tribes to gain access to additional enhancement areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Sweetwater Authority</td>
<td>101.43</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$170,170</td>
<td></td>
<td>Restoration of creek damaged by wildfires. Design work only. No implementation. Recommend reapply next year for design and implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Lakeside River Park</td>
<td>98.38</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$86,702</td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,518,670 $2,900,000 Invasive species removal from a 4-acre area and restore with native shrubs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>City of Chula Vista Cactus Wren Restoration</td>
<td>96.25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$373,048</td>
<td>$373,048</td>
<td>Coastal cactus wren project. High priority area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>County San Diego Salt Creek Recovery</td>
<td>93.00</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>Coastal cactus wren project. High priority area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fairbrook Land Conservancy Manganta Peak Preserve</td>
<td>92.13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$19,950</td>
<td>$19,950</td>
<td>Small funding request. Very cost effective project to control OHV use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Back Country Land Trust Wrights Fields</td>
<td>91.43</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$98,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Primary impact of illegal OHV use eliminated through access control from previous TransNet funds. Proposed activities focused on restoration of eroded habitat. Risk of immediate degradation not critical. Recommend reapply next year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>San Pasqual River Restoration</td>
<td>91.12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>Small requested amount. 300% of matching funds. Critical corridor. Need funds to complete project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Ground Works Chula Creek Cactus Wren</td>
<td>89.52</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$240,700</td>
<td>$240,700</td>
<td>Coastal cactus wren project. High priority area - extant populations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Friends of Petasquitos Cactus Wren Recovery</td>
<td>86.87</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$71,604</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coastal cactus wren project. Not in High priority area. [Note: subsequently funded by NRCS grant.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SDNWR Shinnaraha Vernal Pools</td>
<td>85.75</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$308,238</td>
<td>$308,238</td>
<td>Continuation of existing vernal pool project. Needs continued steering to weeding weeds from invasive vernal pools. Thirty new pools to be created.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>The San Diego River Foundation</td>
<td>84.83</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$55,318</td>
<td></td>
<td>Invasive plant removal within the 52-acre Mission Valley Preserve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>City San Diego River</td>
<td>83.86</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$189,741</td>
<td></td>
<td>Invasive species removal in the San Diego River and Sycamore tributaries in the City of Santee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>County of San Diego Rancho Grasslands</td>
<td>83.00</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Annual treatment of invasive species of concern in the Rancho Grasslands County Preserve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Center for National Lands Management Preserves</td>
<td>82.43</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>$240,224</td>
<td></td>
<td>Invasive plant removal on approximately 20 acres distributed over three preserves (Manchester, Rancho La Costa, and TET Meadowlark) in San Diego County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>County San Diego Otay River Valley Park</td>
<td>82.29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Invasive species in approximately 50 acres of land in the Otay Valley River Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>San Diego Natural History Museum Rancho Jamul</td>
<td>78.92</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>$698,279</td>
<td></td>
<td>Research to determine how grasses compete with San Diego Ambrosia and transplanting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>County San Diego Lasanders Creek</td>
<td>71.73</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$258,200</td>
<td></td>
<td>Post-fire recovery of Lasanders Creek by weed prevention, access control, and culvert construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>County San Diego Barrett Ranch</td>
<td>71.73</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>$213,060</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nest restoration techniques being developed at Barrett Ranch on a larger scale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Mission Trails Foundation Ambrosia</td>
<td>67.43</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>$114,378</td>
<td></td>
<td>Research to determine how grasses compete with San Diego Ambrosia and transplanting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>County San Diego Del Dios Preserve</td>
<td>65.00</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Removal of 200 Eucaliptus trees in a 4-acre area and restore with native shrubs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>County San Diego Escondido Creek</td>
<td>64.83</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Removal of 120 Eucaliptus trees along Harmony Grove Road and restore with native shrubs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Los Petasquitos Lagoon Foundation</td>
<td>64.17</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>$275,743</td>
<td></td>
<td>Invasive species removal from a 4-acre zone along the north side of Los Petasquitos Lagoon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SDNWR Mother Miguel Mountain</td>
<td>61.25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$1,188,110</td>
<td></td>
<td>Invasive species removal from a 95-acre area in the U.S. National Wildlife Refuge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Helhole Canyon</td>
<td>60.75</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>$47,547</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pivasive species mapping, removal of old fencing, remnant housing, and access control.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Friends of Petasquitos Back Mountain</td>
<td>59.63</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>$147,653</td>
<td></td>
<td>Restore 0.7 acres of an abandoned road to a native chaparral.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Description of Recommended Land Management Grants

1. **Mission Resource Conservation District (MRCD), Weed Management Area Program**  
   (Recommended Funding: $354,300)

   The MRCD is proposing invasive species control, access control and post-fire recovery in the Santa Margarita and San Luis Rey Watersheds. Specifically, they have requested eight years of funding for maintenance of previously treated Arundo donax along 100 miles of river and tributaries; access control along a one-mile section of the San Luis Rey River, which has four illegal access points; and three years of funding for post-fire recovery of within a 54-acre area burned in 2007. Their total request grant funding is for $744,600.

   The selection committee is recommending four years of invasive species control funding and funding for access control totaling $354,300.

2. **San Dieguito River Park Joint Powers Authority (SDRPJPA)**  
   (Recommended Funding: $347,090)

   The SDRPJPA is requesting funds for invasive species control, natural recovery, habitat restoration, and access management in the Lake Hodges (Bernardo Bay, Bernardo Mountain and Del Dios Gorge), San Pasqual Valley, and Santa Ysabel areas of the San Dieguito River Valley. Specifically, they have requested five years of funding for maintenance of Arundo donax, Lepidium latifolium, eucalyptus, and tamarisk; an on-site full-time invasive species manager; data collection devices; bullfrog trapping and mapping. Their proposal also includes funds for equipment for natural recovery, habitat restoration, and access control. Their total request grant funding is for $881,768.

   The selection committee is recommending funding for invasive species control, bullfrog trapping and equipment for natural recovery, habitat restoration, and access control totaling $347,090.

3. **City of San Diego Water Department Proctor Valley**  
   (Recommended Funding: $325,754)

   The City of San Diego Water Department is seeking funds for the fabrication and installation of an off-highway vehicle barrier along both sides of a 1.3-mile section of Proctor Valley Road. The off-highway vehicles (OHV) use has created severe erosion problems due to vegetation loss and negatively impacted habitat. In addition to the damage caused by the vehicles’ movement over the terrain is the associated petroleum products leaking from vehicles into the watershed, soil compaction, noise, and dust associated with OHVs, conveyance of exotic seeds, trash left behind by OHV users, and illegal dumping of trash along the road. The Water Department will install interpretive educational signs in conjunction with the barrier, and will provide staff for enforcement of trespassing all other illegal activity. Their total request grant funding is for $325,754.

   The selection committee is recommending full funding for this project totaling $325,754.
4. **Southwest Wetlands Interpretive Association (SWIA) Tijuana River Valley Regional Park** (Recommended Funding: $149,437)

SWIA is seeking funds for the removal of Arundo, salt cedar, and castor bean in the County of San Diego’s Tijuana River Valley Regional Park. The main goals of the project are to kill these invasive species and promote the spread of native species while the problem is still manageable and the damage reversible. It is likely that if these invasive species are not treated now, they will quickly spread to cover >50% of the site and this will severely degrade the site for listed bird species. They have requested $497,900 for a one-year effort.

The selection committee is recommending $149,437, with a recommendation to apply for subsequent funding.

5. **San Elijo Lagoon Conservancy Carlsbad Hydrologic Unit** (Recommended Funding: $279,950)

The San Elijo Lagoon Conservancy is seeking funds to provide invasive species control throughout the Carlsbad Hydrologic Unit in the form of re-treatments of areas previously treated with other funding sources and some small initial treatments on areas surrounding previously treated areas to ensure control of the invasive populations and protect the initial State investment of the control program (which is currently over $5,000,000). The Conservancy is seeking five years of funding totaling $450,450.

The selection committee is recommending three years of funding totaling $279,950.

6. **U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) Riparian Restoration of the Sycuan Peak Ecological Reserve for Southwestern Pond Turtles** (Recommended Funding: $151,463)

The US Geological Survey in conjunction with the San Diego Zoological Society and the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) would like to continue the work done on the southwestern pond turtle by USGS in 2002 to 2005 within the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) area. The proposal would enhance and restore the population at the Sycuan Peak Ecological Reserve as this is the largest population within the MSCP but has little or no recruitment. The restoration effort would focus on removing the majority of the non-native predators that are negatively impacting the turtles. Subsequent trapping for turtles would be included in this project in order to determine the success that removing predators has had on increasing recruitment and to evaluate the overall health of the population. Additionally, a new collaborative effort would be initiated. This effort includes establishing a reserve population of southwestern pond turtles at the San Diego Zoo to support future head-starting of juveniles in this and other reserves within the MSCP. The USGS is seeking funding totaling $151,463.

The selection committee is recommending full funding for this project totaling $151,463, with the recommendation that the USGS works to seek additional enhancement opportunities on tribal lands to the east.
7. **San Diego National Wildlife Refuge Cactus Wren Recovery** (Recommended Funding: $180,070)

The following four separate projects (referenced in this attachment as numbers 7-10) address the recovery of Coastal Cactus Wren post-wildfires. These areas are considered critical for coastal cactus wren recovery in areas impacted by the 2003 and 2007 wildfires. These areas contain(ed) critical populations of cactus wren that make up the southern San Diego metapopulation of coastal cactus wren. Over 224 acres of habitat restoration would occur under these proposals using techniques successfully proven by RECON and other habitat restoration specialists. The funding requests are $180,070, $373,048, $125,000, and $240,700 respectively for efforts that range from 2-5 years.

The selection committee is recommending full funding for these projects totaling $918,818. It is recommended that these efforts coordinate their activities to maximize their efficiencies and standardize their techniques. The Conservation Biology Institute has provided guidelines that are being used in the San Pasqual River Valley for cactus wren recovery to assist in standardization. The County of San Diego Salt Creek Recovery grant is also contingent on a recovery plan approved by the U.S Fish and Wildlife Service and California Department of Fish and Game.

8. **City of Chula Vista Cactus Wren Restoration** (Recommended Funding: $373,048)

See discussion under number 7, above.

9. **County of San Diego Salt Creek Recovery** (Recommended Funding: $125,000)

See discussion under number 7, above.

10. **Ground Works Chollas Creek Cactus Wren Recovery** (Recommended Funding: $240,700)

See discussion under number 7, above.

11. **Fallbrook Land Conservancy Margarita Peak Preserve** (Recommended Funding: $19,950)

The primary goal of this project is to control access to 1,206 acres of managed open space, which would allow for the recovery of an area with significant natural resources that was burned in the 2003 wildfires. The proposal includes blocking vehicular access with two heavy-duty gates, fencing, and vehicle stops. Also proposed is the installation of cautionary signage, and to educate the public on appropriate use of the preserve by informational material and hikes led by the preserve manager or a biologist. Surveys of the flora and fauna on the preserve are currently underway as part of a grant from the San Diego Conservation Resource Network to develop a management plan.

The selection committee is recommending full funding for this project totaling $19,950.

12. **San Pasqual River Restoration** (Recommended Funding: $45,000)

The focus of this project is the herbicide treatment of large, re-emergent patches of non-native species in the Santa Ysabel Creek and San Dieguito River on land leased for the last 20 years by Earnest Klemm. Specifically, the herbicide treatment will focus on giant reed, pepperweed, salt
cedar, castor bean, and tree tobacco. Three years of matching funds totaling $140,625 are being provided from a Natural Conservation Resources Service grant.

The selection committee is recommending full funding for this project totaling $45,000.

13. **San Diego National Wildlife Refuge Shinohara Vernal Pools** (Recommended Funding: $308,238)

In February 2006, SDNWR received a grant from the Transnet funds to initiate restoration of the Shinohara vernal pools. The entire site has been de-thatched and exotic vegetation removed to bare soil. Thirty-two pools were restored onsite and ten artificial nest boxes for burrowing owls were constructed. The current proposal would continue with the restoration of this site by performing weed control, collection of seed and propagules, re-contouring an additional 30 pools, monitoring and fencing over a three-year period. The requested funding is for $308,238.

The selection committee is recommending full funding for this project totaling $308,238.
TransNet ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION PROGRAM (EMP):
UPDATE OF FIVE-YEAR FUNDING STRATEGY AND FY 2009 ACTIVITIES
File Number 1200201

Introduction

On December 15, 2006, the SANDAG Board approved a Five-Year Conceptual Funding Strategy for management and monitoring activities under the TransNet Environmental Mitigation Program (EMP). This conceptual funding strategy was designed to chart a course for the funding of land management and monitoring activities under the EMP. Funding allocations were envisioned to be made by the Board of Directors for specific activities consistent with the funding strategy on an annual basis.

As a result of the 2007 wildfires and the adoption of the TransNet EMP Memorandum of Agreement (MOA), the Environmental Mitigation Program Working Group (EMPWG) has proposed an update to the Five-Year Conceptual Funding Strategy, as well as the allocation of funding for FY 2009 ($4.0 million) pursuant to the adopted TransNet EMP MOA.

Discussion

Pursuant to the TransNet EMP MOA adopted by the SANDAG Board on February 22, 2008, $4 million would be available annually for land management and monitoring activities. These activities would be utilized to implement a five-year strategy to promote the land management and monitoring in the regional habitat preserves.

The adopted Five-Year Conceptual Funding Strategy is proposed to be updated to address changes from the 2007 wildfires that impacted several sensitive species and increased the potential for invasion by exotic grasses and weeds. The EMPWG has proposed an Updated Five-Year Conceptual Funding Strategy (Attachment 1) for consideration by the RPC and the SANDAG Board. In addition, Table 1 below summarizes the recommended distribution of those funds for FY 2009 and the recommended approach for implementation.

Recommendation

The Regional Planning Committee is asked to recommend that the Board of Directors: (A) approve the updated Five-year Conceptual Funding Strategic Plan; (B) approve the proposed management and monitoring activities and budget for FY 2009 totaling $4 million, and authorize staff to solicit proposals and develop contracts for activities pursuant to the recommendations; and (C) adopt the same process and evaluation criteria for land management grants for FY 2009.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Funding Allocated Prior Yrs</th>
<th>Proposed Funding FY 09</th>
<th>Recommended Approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REGIONAL COORDINATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Developer</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>Fund through existing contract.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS Specialist</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>Fund through contract.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conserved Lands Database</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Regional Coordination</strong></td>
<td>$275,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REGIONAL MANAGEMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Coordinator</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>Fund through contract.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Management Implementation</td>
<td>$3,650,000</td>
<td>$1,630,000</td>
<td>Solicit proposals from land managers to protect, enhance, and restore native habitat and post-burn areas. Use same evaluation criteria as FY 2008.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invasive Species Mapping</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>Fund through contract.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Updated Vegetation Mapping</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>Fund through contract or MOU with California Department of Fish and Game, which has enforcement capability on native open space lands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$220,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Regional Management</strong></td>
<td>$4,150,000</td>
<td>$2,200,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REGIONAL MONITORING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring Coordinator</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>Fund through contract.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Fire Monitoring</td>
<td>$1,175,000</td>
<td>$550,000</td>
<td>Amend existing contract with U.S. Geologic Survey to continue this monitoring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetation Monitoring</td>
<td>$145,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>Amend contract with San Diego State University to continue monitoring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rare and Endemic Plant Monitoring</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>Fund through contract.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Gnatcatcher Monitoring</td>
<td>$740,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Coastal Cactus Wren Monitoring &amp; Recovery</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>Fund through contract.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burrowing Owl Monitoring</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>Fund through existing contract.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rare Butterfly Monitoring</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>Fund through contract.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife Corridor Monitoring</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>Fund through contract.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Regional Monitoring</strong></td>
<td>$2,575,000</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL FUNDING STRATEGY</strong></td>
<td>$7,000,000</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Some activities will require implementation over multiple years.
Due to the number and quality of proposed land management grants that were received as part of the 2008 land management grant process, it is also being recommended that the same process and evaluation criteria be used for the FY 2009 land management grants, with the following two additions: first, that the applications be limited to no more than 10 pages; and second, that the first page contain an executive summary of the project. If adopted by the Board in September, a “call for projects” could be issued in late October or early November.

BOB LEITER  
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachment: 1. Updated Five-Year Conceptual Funding Strategy

Key Staff Contact: Keith Greer, (619) 699-7390, kgr@sandag.org
## CONCEPTUAL FIVE-YEAR FUNDING STRATEGY

### Updated 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGIONAL COORDINATION</th>
<th>Prior YRs</th>
<th>YR-1</th>
<th>YR-2</th>
<th>YR-3</th>
<th>YR-4</th>
<th>YR-5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY06-08</td>
<td>FY 09</td>
<td>FY 10</td>
<td>FY 11</td>
<td>FY 12</td>
<td>FY 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Program Developer</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Program Administrator</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Administrative Support</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 GIS Specialist</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Database Specialist</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 GIS/Database Technician</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$130,000</td>
<td>$130,000</td>
<td>$130,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Conserved Lands Database Development</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Regional Coordination</strong></td>
<td><strong>$275,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$300,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$540,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$770,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$770,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$770,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGIONAL MANAGEMENT</th>
<th>Prior Yrs</th>
<th>YR-1</th>
<th>YR-2</th>
<th>YR-3</th>
<th>YR-4</th>
<th>YR-5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 Management Coordinator</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Land Management Implementation</td>
<td>$3,650,000</td>
<td>$1,630,000</td>
<td>$1,740,000</td>
<td>$1,640,000</td>
<td>$1,645,000</td>
<td>$1,540,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Invasive Species Mapping</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Updated Vegetation Mapping</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Enforcement</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$220,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Regional Management</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,150,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,200,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,040,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,790,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,795,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,690,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGIONAL MONITORING</th>
<th>Prior Yrs</th>
<th>YR-1</th>
<th>YR-2</th>
<th>YR-3</th>
<th>YR-4</th>
<th>YR-5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13 Monitoring Coordinator</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Biologist</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Post Fire Monitoring</td>
<td>$1,175,000</td>
<td>$550,000</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
<td>$325,000</td>
<td>$325,000</td>
<td>$325,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Vegetation Monitoring</td>
<td>$145,000</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$165,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Rare and Endemic Plant Monitoring</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$295,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 California Gnatcatcher Monitoring</td>
<td>$740,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Coastal Cactus Wren Monitoring</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Burrowing Owl Monitoring</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Nest Monitoring</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Gnatcatcher Monitoring (including genetic studies)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$395,000</td>
<td>$245,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Other Monitoring (priority 2 species)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Regional Monitoring</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,575,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,500,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,420,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,440,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,435,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,540,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TOTAL FUNDING STRATEGY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Prior Yrs</th>
<th>YR-1</th>
<th>YR-2</th>
<th>YR-3</th>
<th>YR-4</th>
<th>YR-5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>$7,000,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,000,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,000,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,000,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,000,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,000,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,000,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Some activities will require implementation over multiple years.
TransNet ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION PROGRAM (EMP): File Number 1200201
ADVANCE MITIGATION GUIDELINES

Introduction

The TransNet Extension Ordinance and Expenditure Plan, approved by the voters in November 2004, includes an Environmental Mitigation Program (EMP) which provides funding to mitigate habitat impacts from regional transportation projects. The EMP is a unique component of the TransNet Extension Ordinance in that it goes beyond traditional mitigation for transportation projects by including a funding allocation for habitat acquisition, management, and monitoring activities to help implement the regional habitat conservation plans. This funding allocation is tied to mitigation requirements and the environmental clearance approval process for projects outlined in the Regional Transportation Plan.

Discussion

On February 22, 2008, the SANDAG Board of Directors authorized the Executive Director to enter into a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), and the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), which outlines the roles and commitments of these agencies regarding the implementation of the TransNet EMP.

As discussed at the February 8, 2008, Regional Planning Committee meeting, one of the next steps was to develop guidelines to implement the Conservation and Mitigation Strategy, which is included in the MOA. The process and criteria have been established for Board of Director consideration to guide SANDAG and Caltrans staff with the identification and acquisition of advance mitigation when implementing the TransNet EMP (Attachment 1). These guidelines were developed in conjunction with the other signatories of the MOA (USFWS and CDFG).

The proposed guidelines consist of five parts: (1) a background describing the purpose of the guidelines, (2) the strategy for securing assurances for obtaining advance mitigation for various types of habitat, (3) a flowchart to illustrate the process for securing advance mitigation, (4) seven criteria which must be met and documented, and (5) a budget and project cash flow consistent with the adopted TransNet Plan of Finance.

Recommendation

The Regional Planning Committee is asked to recommend that the Board of Directors: (A) approve the proposed Guidelines for Implementation of the TransNet Environmental Mitigation Program Conservation and Mitigation Strategy, and (B) direct the SANDAG Executive Director to utilize these Guidelines in the acquisition and restoration of property for advance mitigation under the TransNet EMP.
If approved by the Board of Directors, staff will follow these guidelines when implementing advance mitigation under the TransNet EMP. The EMP Working Group unanimously supported the approval of the Guidelines on July 8, 2008. Discussion (no formal action was taken) at the Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee on July 16 was supportive, with the stated desire to be as creative as possible when acquiring land for advance mitigation.

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachment: 1. Guidelines for the Implementation of the TransNet Environmental Mitigation Program Conservation and Mitigation Strategy

Key Staff Contact: Keith Greer, (619) 699-7390, kgr@sandag.org
Guidelines for the Implementation of the TransNet Environmental Mitigation Program
Conservation and Mitigation Strategy
August 1, 2008

1. Background

The TransNet Extension Ordinance and Expenditure Plan, approved countywide by voters in November 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 annual funding allocations for habitat acquisition, management, and monitoring activities as needed to help implement the regional habitat conservation plans. This funding allocation is tied to mitigation requirements and the environmental clearance approval process for projects outlined in the Regional Transportation Plan.

On March 19, 2008, San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG), California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), and the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) entered into a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA), which outlines the roles and commitments of these organizations regarding the implementation of the TransNet EMP.

Included in the MOA is the commitment to implement a conservation and mitigation strategy which will: (1) identify conservation opportunities for habitat acquisition, creation, and restoration that promote regional habitat conservation planning; and (2) align these opportunities in such a way to fully mitigate the range of potential wildlife habitat, natural communities, fisheries, and sensitive species impacts resulting from transportation projects.

The following process and criteria have been established by the SANDAG Board to guide SANDAG and Caltrans staff with the identification and acquisition of mitigation property when implementing the TransNet EMP.

2. Conservation and Mitigation Strategy

Compensatory mitigation for Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) projects will require the following general types of habitats: coastal wetlands, freshwater wetlands, and uplands. During the development of the TransNet EMP, a planning level estimate was made for the amount of acres to be acquired, restored, and managed for these habitat types and an estimated cost. In addition, depending on the number of regulatory permits and size of expenditures, various levels of assurances will be required. The following outlines the process and criteria for advanced mitigation; an illustrative flowchart is provided (see Section 3). Those transportation projects included in the Regional Transportation Improvement Plan (RTIP) that have identified or are in the process of identifying environmental mitigation through various regulatory permitting processes are not subject to the process and criteria set out in this document, and therefore, will not be postponed.

1 Pursuant to the TransNet EMP MOA, the RTP referenced in these guidelines is Mobility 2030 (2004). Projects may be substituted in future RTP updates following the provisions of Section 14 of the MOA.
Identification Opportunities

a) SANDAG, Caltrans, USFWS, and CDFG will work on identifying opportunities that meet the mitigation needs of future RTP projects per the TransNet EMP MOA.

b) The above agencies will be working with outside organizations (e.g., local jurisdictions, non-profits, private land owners, consultants) to identify opportunities and will develop a strategic alliance with the State Wildlife Conservation Board and California Coastal Conservancy to leverage funding and achieve larger mutual goals while providing advanced mitigation for RTP Projects.

Strategy for Mitigation of Coastal Wetlands

a) SANDAG, Caltrans, USFWS, and CDFG have agreed that the mitigation solution for the projects in the coastal zone will require a unique approach. The agencies, along with partners from California Coastal Commission, Coastal Conservancy, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and local stakeholders will seek to develop a Comprehensive Coastal Wetland Mitigation Agreement which will complement a public works plan for projects in the coastal Interstate 5 (I-5) Corridor. This approach will consist of a strategy that looks at the existing ecological health of the coastal wetlands in San Diego County, and the opportunities for “ecological lift” by creation/restoration, enhancement, and capital improvement activities that improve the ecological functioning of the wetland. These activities will be assigned mitigation credits equivalent to the ecological lift resulting from the action compared to existing conditions of the wetlands. This may include acquisitions for the creation of wetlands where possible.

b) An agreement will be entered into by SANDAG, Caltrans, and the regulatory agencies to implement the Comprehensive Coastal Wetland Mitigation Agreement.

c) Acquisition of property could occur prior to the signing of an agreement provided that all parties agree in writing that the site would become part of the coastal wetland mitigation strategy and agree to the value of mitigation credits.

d) This Comprehensive Coastal Wetland Mitigation Agreement would be brought to SANDAG Board of Directors for approval.

Strategy for Mitigation of Non-Coastal Wetlands and Uplands

e) SANDAG and Caltrans will seek assurances through a standard wetland mitigation bank agreement, conservation agreement, or alternative agreements as determined to the satisfaction of SANDAG and Caltrans.

f) A letter of concurrence and commitment from USFWS and CDFG stating that a property is suitable for mitigation will be required prior to an appraisal of the property.

g) It is the intent of SANDAG to have all assurances from the regulatory agencies in place prior to expenditures of any funds necessary for acquisition. SANDAG may rely upon a letter of concurrence and commitment from the wildlife agencies to secure the property in fee title, easement, option or lease. Restoration, if necessary, would come after additional assurances

---

2 Ecological lift is defined as the ecological improvement in wetland habitats from existing conditions. Several existing metrics and methodologies are available to assess the lift.
(e.g., mitigation bank agreement, approved restoration plans) from the regulatory agencies are in place.

**Process and Criteria for Mitigation**

SANDAG and Caltrans staff will pursue mitigation opportunities consistent with the Strategies above and secure opportunities as illustrated in Section 3. Section 4 describes the criteria that will guide SANDAG and Caltrans staff in the acquisition of conservation opportunities. SANDAG and Caltrans staff will formalize in writing how the proposed acquisition/restoration of the proposed property conforms to these criteria.

Pursuant to Section 8 of the TransNet EMP MOA, “the focus of the initial mitigation efforts under the Conservation Mitigation Strategy (CMS) will be on those RTP projects identified and approved by the SANDAG Board as Early Action Projects (EAP) followed by projects that are included in the “revenue constrained” scenario of the RTP. Mitigation opportunities for the remaining transportation projects will be initiated if the signatories of this MOA agree that an environmental mitigation opportunity has arisen to satisfy a non-EAP project.”
3. Conceptual Implementation Flow Chart

To be used for acquisition/restoration of properties for advanced mitigation

SANDAG, Caltrans, USFWS and CDFG will work on identifying opportunities that meet the mitigation needs of future RTP project per MOA

Opportunities Reviewed against Evaluation Criteria (Sec. 4)

SANDAG and CALTRANS staff will use the criteria to formalize in writing the rationale for the acquisition/restoration of proposed property

Project consistent with criteria?

YES

SANDAG Executive Director or designee PROCEED to secure property and with regulatory assurances

SANDAG staff report back annually on status of acquisitions to ITOC and Board

NO

SANDAG Executive Director consults with SANDAG BOD chair and chair of RPC

Based upon Executive Director’s consultation

SEEK DIRECTION from SANDAG Board for acquisitions that require policy decisions.

Additional assurances, if necessary

Additional assurances are described in Section 7 of the TransNet EMP MOA and include but are not limited to advance mitigation agreements, mitigation banks, and programmatic consultations.
4. TransNet EMP Mitigation Evaluation Criteria

a. **RTP Mitigation**: The property will satisfy one or more RTP project as identified in TransNet EMP MOA with a focus on projects identified as EAP followed by those included in the “revenue constrained” scenario of the RTP. Mitigation opportunities to meet other RTP projects and local street and road projects will be considered under the terms of the TransNet EMP MOA. The regulatory agencies will be required to provide assurance in the form of a letter of concurrence and commitment that the land is adequate for mitigation prior to appraisal of the property. Additional assurance such as conservation or mitigation bank agreements may be required prior to execution of a purchase agreement and/or the restoration of the property.

b. **Jurisdictional Land Use Plans**: Use of the site as habitat mitigation/open space is consistent with the long-range land use and transportation policies of the local jurisdiction. If the use of the site as habitat mitigation/open space is not consistent, the jurisdiction does not object to the site being purchased for mitigation.

c. **Willing Seller**: Owner of the property is a willing seller with clear title to the property and any hazardous material identified in a Phase I environmental site assessment has been evaluated and addressed.

d. **Appraisal**: The property must be appraised by a qualified licensed appraiser in accordance with established acquisition and appraisal standards and the first written offer will reflect the fair market value of the property.

e. **Promotes NCCP**: The proposed mitigation will contribute to the success of the San Diego regional NCCP by acquiring, restoring unique habitat areas, key populations of endangered species, lands adjacent to existing conserved habitat lands and promoting wildlife linkages with the goal of establishing mitigation ratios in subsequent agreements pursuant to the adopted habitat conservation plans.

f. **Owner/Manager**: Perpetual ownership of the land has been identified, as well as a qualified land manager. The identified owner is willing to provide a conservation easement or deed restriction to SANDAG or Caltrans upon transfer of title that contains a reversionary clause back to SANDAG or Caltrans if the land is not being managed and monitored pursuant to a Resource Management Plan acceptable to the wildlife agencies. SANDAG, Caltrans and the land manager have agreed upon the annual cost to manage the land and the method for funding the annual management costs.
g. **Cost:** The cost of the mitigation is consistent with the estimates established under the TransNet Extension Ordinance as adjusted for inflation in the TransNet Plan of Finance. The Executive Director or their designee shall have the authority to expend funds for mitigation up to 10 percent above the planning level estimates. Staff shall track and monitor any cost savings on a program-wide basis. The Executive Director shall have the authority to approve expenditures of funds for mitigation above 10 percent of the planning level estimates if there is enough cost savings accumulated on a program-wide basis to cover the expected costs as verified through an analysis prepared by staff and verified by the TransNet Program Manager. Expenditures for mitigation that exceed the planning level estimate by 10 percent and above any accumulated programmatic cost savings would require approval by the Board of Directors to precede. SANDAG staff will track the expenditures and cost savings of the mitigation and provide an annual report to the Independent Tax Oversight Committee (ITOC) and SANDAG Board of Directors with any recommendations for adjustments to ensure that the program-wide costs are consistent with the estimates established under the TransNet Extension Ordinance.
5. Budget and Phasing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SANDAG CIP Number:</th>
<th>CIP Project Name: TransNet EMP Biological Mitigation Fund</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1200200 (V07)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Project Description

Environmental Mitigation Program for the early mitigation of TransNet transportation projects. This will include habitat acquisition, restoration, creation, enhancement, management and monitoring necessary for meeting project mitigation.

### Phasing for Mitigation Efforts

The focus of the initial mitigation efforts will be on those projects identified and approved as Early Action Projects (EAP) followed by those identified as "Revenue Constrained (RC)" under the RTP. Mitigation opportunities for the remaining transportation projects will be initiated if the signatories of the MOA agree that an environmental mitigation opportunity has arisen to satisfy a non-Early Action Project.

### Project Features

On March 19, 2008 SANDAG entered into Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with Caltrans, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and California Department of Fish and Game to implement the EMP Program. This includes the capacity to fund $440 million dollars over the next 10 years to meet future project mitigation requirements.

### Annual Reporting on Progress

On no less than an annual basis, SANDAG staff will present a status report on the progress of mitigation efforts under the TransNet Environmental Mitigation Program. The progress report will outline what properties have been acquired and/or restored, and how the program is meeting the objectives outlined in the ordinance.

### MOA Funding Plan ($ Millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 08</th>
<th>FY 09</th>
<th>FY 10</th>
<th>FY 11</th>
<th>FY 12</th>
<th>FY 13</th>
<th>FY 14</th>
<th>FY 15</th>
<th>FY 16</th>
<th>FY 17</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td>$10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity per POF 4</th>
<th>Expended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 Capacity pursuant to TransNet Plan of Finance and consistent with the provisions of the MOA. In millions, nominal dollars.

### Projected Expenditures ($ Millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>70</th>
<th>100</th>
<th>100</th>
<th>70</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY</td>
<td>FY</td>
<td>FY</td>
<td>FY</td>
<td>FY</td>
<td>FY</td>
<td>FY</td>
<td>FY</td>
<td>FY</td>
<td>FY</td>
<td>FY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-76</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-76</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-55</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>$173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-55</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-55</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Mitigation for other regional RTP projects and local streets and roads</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ANNUAL TOTAL: $16 $154 $100 $70 $30 $15 $15 $15 $15 $10 $440

5 This is an estimated cash flow for programming purposes. Actual expenditures may vary annually, but can not exceed the annual capacity cap. Unused funds will roll over into the next year. In millions, nominal dollars.

6 This includes the environmental mitigation for Coastal Rail Doubletracking.
Energy Working Group Charter Amendments

Carrie Downey, EWG Chair and Mayor Pro Tem, City of Coronado
Susan Freedman, SANDAG

Regional Planning Committee
August 1, 2008

Working Group Assessment Process

• Executive Committee conducts annual assessment of SANDAG working groups
• Executive Committee approved elimination, merging or restructuring of several Working Groups at its June 13, 2008 meeting
Energy Working Group (EWG) Assessment

• Reduce membership to:
  – Reduce duplicative member categories
  – Enhance transportation expertise
  – Enhance geographic representation
  – Ensure quorum
• Remove mandatory attendance policy
• Make technical edits

Follow Up to Executive Committee

• Executive Committee tasked staff with updating EWG charter to reflect changes
• The RPC approves changes to EWG Charter
Recommendation for the RPC

The Regional Planning Committee is asked to approve an amendment to the EWG Charter that would reduce member categories, remove a mandatory attendance policy, and make technical edits.

Energy Working Group Charter Amendments

Carrie Downey, EWG Chair and Mayor Pro Tem, City of Coronado
Susan Freedman, SANDAG

Regional Planning Committee
August 1, 2008
Planning and Designing for Smart Growth
Guidelines for the San Diego Region

Purpose and Uses for Smart Growth Design Guidelines

“The quality of a neighborhood’s design can be the difference between a sense of overcrowding and a feeling of vibrancy… What sets the good apart from the bad is the quality of building architecture and the way public spaces like parks and streets are designed and maintained.”

- Regional Comprehensive Plan
Purpose and Uses for Smart Growth

Design Guidelines

- Reference document for local agencies and professionals
- Support for local plans and design requirements
- Refine place type definitions

Consultant Support

- Design, Community & Environment
- Solimar Research Group
- Kimley-Horn & Associates
- KTU+A
Ad Hoc Working Group

- Technical Working Group
- Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee
- Stakeholders Working Group

Guidelines Development Process and Schedule

- Monthly *ad hoc* working group meetings
- Periodic reports to RPC, TWG and CTAC (August 2008, March 2009)
- Public outreach effort (October 29/30, 2008)
- RPC release of draft document (January 2008)
- Public feedback (January – March 2009)
- Final document (April 2009)
Design, Community & Environment

- Urban Design
- Smart Growth
- Comprehensive Planning
- Landscape Architecture
- Environmental Review
- Transportation Planning
- Public Participation

Bay Area Regional Smart Growth Strategy
KTU+A Local Experience

Oceanside Transit Center TOD

Carlsbad Village Transit Center TOD

Solimar and Smart Growth Scorecard

20. Are frequently visited uses within ½ mile of the proposed project?

Frequently visited uses include the following:
- Housing
- Grocery/convenience shopping
- Restaurant/entertainment
- Significant office
- Recreational
- School/day care
- Religious or other institutional

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>None or only one frequently visited use is within ½ mile of the majority of the project. Or, there are physical barriers that effectively prevent access to frequently visited uses without use of a car (such as high speed roadway or highway).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Two to four frequently visited uses are within ½ mile of the majority of the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>Five or more frequently visited uses are within ½ mile of the majority of the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Five or more frequently visited uses are within ¼ mile of the majority of the project and most are accessible on foot.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Check appropriate box.
Format of Public Outreach Meetings

- Two open house meetings
- Held during business hours and after work
- Stations focusing on design and development topics
- Interactive exercises to identify design solutions by place type

Public Outreach Meetings

[Images of people interacting at public outreach meetings]
Planning and Designing for Smart Growth
Guidelines for the San Diego Region
Project Evaluation Criteria

Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program

Program Objectives

- Projects ready to go
- Smart growth in a variety of settings
- Support public transit
- Reduce VMT and GHG emissions
- Support housing development
- Create great places
Issues from the July RPC Meeting

- Appropriate mix of uses
- Protecting important community resources
- Rehabilitated affordable housing
- Matching funds options

Proposed Planning Project Criteria

- Eligibility Criteria
- Project Evaluation Criteria
Planning Project Eligibility Criteria

- Consistent with *TransNet* Ordinance
- Within Existing/Planned or Potential Smart Growth Opportunity Area
- Approved Housing Element (Policy No. 33)
- Local Funding Commitment and Authorization

Planning Project Evaluation Criteria

- Relation to Transit (15 points)
- Development potential of proposed planning area (20 points)
- Planning Project objectives (20 points)
- Method of meeting project objectives (30 points)
Planning Project Evaluation Criteria

- Implementation (35 points)
- Evidence of local commitment and community support (10 points)
- Matching funds (20 points)
- Percentage of low income housing units produced per Policy No. 33 (50 points)

Funding Levels

- Staff recommendation:
  - 15%-20% of funds
  - $300,000 maximum grant
- Technical Working Group recommendation:
  - 20% of funds
  - $400,000 maximum grant
Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program

Next Steps

• Complete Program Guidelines
• ITOC review (September)
• RPC Recommendation (October)
• Board Approval (October)
• Call for projects (November)
• Approve projects (January)

Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program

Recommendation

• Recommend the eligibility and evaluation criteria for capital and planning projects for use in the first TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program two-year funding cycle.

• Recommend that planning grants constitute up to 20 percent of the funding in each funding cycle, and that the maximum planning grant size be $400,000.
TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program

Program Development Issues
July 31, 2008

Honorable Councilmember Jerry Jones, Chair,
SANDAG Regional Planning Committee
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101

Re: TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program

Dear Chairman Jones and Committee Members,

I regret that I, as well as my alternates, am unable to attend the August 1, 2008
SANDAG Regional Planning Committee (RPC) meeting. Please accept this letter on
behalf of the City of San Diego in support of SANDAG's recommended project
evaluation criteria and scoring matrixes for the TransNet Smart Growth Incentive
Program (SGIP).

We would like to request that the following comments be included in the administrative
record:

- We concur with the additions to the Urban Design criterion and the
  specification that affordable housing units include acquisition/rehabilitation
  projects.
- As an alternate to staff's recommended matching fund criterion, we would be
  inclined to support the consideration of matching funds as a percentage of the
  total project.
- We would like to emphasize the importance of including points for existing
  development. The existing allocation of points incentivizes areas that have
  already made an investment in density and transit and allows them to
  continue to grow given infrastructure deficits.
- We support the existing allocation of points toward community design as an
  important component to maintaining community character.
- We recommend that up to 20% of program funds be allocated to planning
  grants, and that the maximum grant award be $400,000. Additionally, we
  support the criteria approved by the Regional Technical Working Group and
  proposed by staff.
The SGIP is an integral component to implementing the Regional Comprehensive Plan, as such we want to ensure that the criteria used to allocate this funding calls for the best possible projects consistent with smart growth principles. We would like thank SANDAG staff for all their efforts in synthesizing the work of the RPG and look forward to future discussions.

Sincerely,

TONI ATKINS
Councilmember, Third District
City of San Diego

TA: ab

Cc: Gary Gallegos, Executive Director, SANDAG
    Coleen Clementson, Regional Planning Committee Coordinator
    Honorable Jim Janney, Mayor, Imperial Beach
    Honorable Jerry Kern, Councilmember, Oceanside
    Honorable Lori Holt Pfeiler, Mayor, Escondido
    Honorable Pam Slater-Price, Supervisor, County of San Diego
Item 7: Background

- BOD approved competitive process for land management grants on April 25, 2008
- $2.9 million for eligible projects:
  - Invasive species control
  - Post-fire recovery
  - Habitat restoration
  - Access control
- Call for projects issued on May 5, 2008
Item 7: Results

- 32 grants received - $8.5 million
- Evaluation committee
  - Six members of EMPWG and three outside experts
  - Recommended 13 projects for funding (Attachment 1)
- Some higher ranking projects not recommended due to some limitation in proposal
- Recommended projects – geographically wide-range and diverse types of organizations
- EMP Working Group approved July 8, 2008

Item 7: Recommendations

- Recommend approval of the prioritized list of land management projects and funding allotments, and
- Authorize staff to enter into contracts for the selected grants in the proposed allocations totaling $2.9 million dollars
Item 8 - Background:

- BOD approved a Five-Year Conceptual Funding Strategy for management and monitoring on Dec 15, 2006
- An Update is recommended to address changes from 2007 wildfires (Attachment 1)
- Funding for FY 09 activities proposed (Table 1)
- Recommend same process and criteria for land management grants be used for FY 2009
Item 8 - Recommendations:

• Recommend approval of the updated Five-year Conceptual Funding Strategic Plan,
• Recommend approval of the proposed management and monitoring activities and budget for FY 2009 totaling $4 million, and authorize staff to solicit proposals and develop contracts for activities pursuant to the recommendations, and
• Recommend adopting the same process and evaluation criteria for land management grants for Fiscal Year 2009.
“The intent is to establish a program to provide for large-scale acquisition and management of critical habitat areas and to create a reliable approach for funding required mitigation for future transportation improvements thereby reducing future costs and accelerating project delivery. This approach would be implemented by obtaining coverage for transportation projects through existing and proposed multiple species conservation plans. (Section D)”
Approved Memorandum of Agreement

Conservation and Mitigation Strategy

Mitigation 1 or More Projects

Opportunities

Budget $440 Million / 10 Years

RTP Projects and Local Roads

Plan of Finance (POF)

Assurances

Obtained

Release of Funds for Mitigation

Proposed Guidelines – Overview (Attachment 1)

• Background (Section 1)
• Strategy for the identification of conservation opportunities (Section 2)
• Mitigation for transportation projects (Section 2)
• Flowchart of process (Section 3)
• Criteria for advance mitigation (Section 4)
• Phasing, cash flow and reporting (Section 5)
Proposed Guidelines – Process (Section 3)

- Identify opportunities and leveraging of funding
- Agency agreement on mitigation for RTP
- Review against evaluation criteria
- Projects consistent with criteria
  - Executive Director proceeds to secure property
- Projects NOT consistent with criteria
  - Requires BOD approval
- Annual reporting required

Proposed Guidelines – Criteria (Section 4)

- Property must satisfy RTP mitigation
- Consistent with local jurisdiction’s plans
- Willing Seller – no condemnation
- Appraisal – fair market value
- Promotes regional conservation planning
- Owner and manager identified
- Costs within estimated budget
Next Steps

- Implement conservation and mitigation strategy
  - EMPWG and ITOC July
  - RPC (Aug.) and BOD (Sept.)
- Work on project specific assurance and acquisitions
- Report back on status of implementation
  - February 2009

Item 9 - Recommendations

- Recommend approval of the proposed Guidelines for Implementation of the TransNet Environmental Mitigation Program Conservation and Mitigation Strategy, and
- Direct the SANDAG Executive Director to utilize these Guidelines in the acquisition and restoration of property for advance mitigation under the TransNet EMP
## Proposed Cash Flow

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>70</th>
<th>100</th>
<th>100</th>
<th>70</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>440</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Projected Expansions (FY)</td>
<td>FY</td>
<td>FY</td>
<td>FY</td>
<td>FY</td>
<td>FY</td>
<td>FY</td>
<td>FY</td>
<td>FY</td>
<td>FY</td>
<td>FY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>($ Millions)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-MW Freshwater Wetlands</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-MW Uplands</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-J Coastal Wetlands</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-J Freshwater Wetlands</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-J Uplands</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Mitigation for other regional RTP projects and local streets and roads</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ANNUAL TOTAL:</strong></td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>$154</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>$440</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>