REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

Friday, October 3, 2008
12 noon to 2 p.m.
SANDAG Board Room
401 B Street, 7th Floor
San Diego

AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

- 2008 RCP MONITORING REPORT
- TransNet SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM
- PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO BOARD POLICY NO. 033
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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.
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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>APPROVAL OF THE AUGUST 1, 2008, MEETING MINUTES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**CONSENT (Items 3 and 4)**

+3. DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS FROM CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION BEACH SAND MITIGATION FUND (Shelby Tucker)

As an offset to the potential adverse impacts of shoreline protective devices, the California Coastal Commission (CCC) has established a Beach Sand Mitigation Fund supported by fees collected by the CCC through its coastal development permit process. The mitigation fees are deposited in an interest-bearing account managed by SANDAG to be used solely to implement projects which place sand on the applicable city’s beach. The City of Encinitas is requesting funding from the Beach Sand Mitigation Fund for an opportunistic beach nourishment project in the City of Encinitas. SANDAG’s role is administrative. The CCC requires that SANDAG approve the release of funds prior to their consideration of the City of Encinitas’ request. The Regional Planning Committee is asked to recommend that the SANDAG Board of Directors approve this distribution of funds.

+4. FOLLOW-UP TO REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE COMMENTS REGARDING THE SANDAG SMART GROWTH TRIP GENERATION AND PARKING DEMAND GUIDELINES (Christine Eary)

Staff has prepared the attached memo in response to comments raised by the Regional Planning Committee regarding the SANDAG Smart Growth Trip Generation and Parking Demand Guidelines at its June meeting. The report provides information about methodologies used to determine parking at transit stations, and refinements that are being made to the SANDAG transportation model.
ITEM # | RECOMMENDATION
--- | ---
**REPORTS (Items 5 thru 8)**

- **5.** AMENDMENTS TO THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO NON-DISPOSAL FACILITIES ELEMENT (Rob Rundle; Lisa Wood, City of San Diego) **RECOMMEND**

The Regional Planning Committee is asked to recommend that the Board of Directors, which serves as the Countywide Integrated Waste Management Task Force, recommend that the San Diego City Council approve proposed amendments (including deleting, adding, and moving facilities) to the City of San Diego Non-Disposal Facilities Element.

- **6.** REGIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN: 2008 ANNUAL PERFORMANCE MONITORING REPORT (Christine Eary) **ACCEPT**

The Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP), adopted in 2004, provides a consensus statement of the region’s vision, goals, key issues, and needed actions. The Plan also calls for ongoing monitoring to track progress toward implementation. The Regional Planning Committee is asked to accept and authorize release of the draft 2008 RCP Performance Monitoring Report for a 30-day public review period.

- **7.** TransNet SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM AND AMENDMENTS TO BOARD POLICY NO. 001 (Stephan Vance) **RECOMMEND**

At its August meeting the Regional Planning Committee recommended that the SANDAG Board of Directors accept the eligibility and evaluation criteria for capital projects and planning projects for use in the first TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program two-year funding cycle. At its August meeting the RPC asked that staff work with the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG) to evaluate possible changes to the matching fund criteria. The attached report summarizes the TWG discussion and recommendation that no changes be made to the matching fund criteria at this time.

The Regional Planning Committee is asked to recommend that the SANDAG Board of Directors: (1) Approve the project selection criteria for capital and planning grants (Attachment 1) for use in the first two-year funding cycle of the TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program (TSGIP); (2) Authorize a call for projects for the TSGIP based upon the recommended eligibility and project selection criteria; and (3) Revise Board Policy No. 001 to give the Regional Planning Committee authority to recommend projects for funding and to implement the “use it or lose it” provisions for the TSGIP.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM #</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+8.</td>
<td>ANNUAL REVIEW OF BOARD POLICY NO. 033: IMPLEMENTATION GUIDELINES FOR SANDAG REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT MEMORANDUM (Susan Baldwin)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staff has prepared an annual review of Board Policy No. 033. Several amendments are being discussed by the Regional Planning Technical Working Group and Regional Housing Working Group. The attached report provides an overview of the issues under discussion for RPC information. Staff will bring back a report for Regional Planning Committee recommendation next month.

9. UPCOMING MEETINGS

The next meeting of the Regional Planning Committee is scheduled for November 7, 2008, at 12 noon.

10. ADJOURNMENT

+ next to an agenda item indicates an attachment
The meeting of the Regional Planning Committee was called to order by Chair Jerry Jones (East County) at 12:02 p.m. See the attached attendance sheet for Regional Planning Committee member attendance.

1. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

Action: Upon a motion by Supervisor Pam Slater-Price (County of San Diego) and a second by Mayor Lori Holt Pfeiler (North County Inland), the Regional Planning Committee unanimously approved the minutes from the July 11, 2008, meeting.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

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

CHAIR’S REPORT

3. RECOGNITION OF MAYOR ART MADRID AND COUNCILMEMBER HENRY AARBANALE, CHAIRS OF THE ENERGY WORKING GROUP (EWG) (INFORMATION)

Chair Jones thanked Mayor Art Madrid and Councilmember Henry Abarbanel for their contributions while serving on the EWG and presented them with certificates of appreciation.

Mayor Madrid expressed his gratitude for the opportunity of serving on the EWG. He acknowledged Councilmember Abarbanel for his vision, leadership, and intellect, and praised the commitment and expertise of the EWG members.

Councilmember Abarbanel commented on the complexities involved and commended SANDAG, members of the RPC, and the Board for assembling the group.

Chair Jones recognized other members of the EWG and presented them with certificates of appreciation. He announced that Councilmember Carrie Downey (City of Coronado) would be taking over as the Chair of the committee.
Councilmember Downey thanked the RPC and Board of Directors and recognized the EWG’s efforts in helping to set energy policy for San Diego. She informed on the EWG reorganization and invited continued member participation due to the frequent changes in the energy field.

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

**REPORT ITEMS (#4 through #9)**

4. ENERGY WORKING GROUP (EWG) CHARTER AMENDMENTS (APPROVE)

Carrie Downey, Chair of the Energy Working Group, stated the EWG will begin meeting in September and one of the objectives of the reorganization is to make the EWG more representative of the different regions. So far only two of the six area sub-region’s elected officials have been appointed. She will be contacting each of the cities within the sub-regions to have them appoint representatives for the EWG.

Susan Freedman, Senior Energy Planner (SANDAG), informed the amendments reflect changes approved by the Executive Committee at its June 13 meeting. The EWG restructuring was based on recommendations made by the RPC and new EWG Chair. The EWG Charter reduces member categories to 20, removes a mandatory attendance policy, and makes technical edits, which include language updated by SANDAG’s General Counsel.

**Action:** Upon a motion by Mayor Holt Pfeiler and a second by Vice Chair Jim Janney (South County), the Regional Planning Committee unanimously approved an amendment to the EWG Charter that would reduce member categories, remove mandatory attendance policy, and make technical edits.

5. SMART GROWTH DESIGN GUIDELINES (INFORMATION)

Stephan Vance, Senior Planner (SANDAG), informed on the program schedule and said the purpose of the document is to serve as a useful resource for local agency staff in the development of local plans and design guidelines as well as private professionals in the design and development communities. One of the aspects of the project is to refine the design components of the Smart Growth Place Types, which will assist with the implementation of the Smart Growth Concept Map and help evaluate projects under the Smart Growth Incentive Program. He introduced lead consultant Tom Ford of Design Community and Environment.

Mr. Ford reported their firm will be assisted by Solimar Research, Kimley-Horn & Associates, and KTU&A. He presented a project his firm recently completed for the Association of Bay Area Governments implementing their Smart Growth Place Types and said they will be producing a heavily graphic-oriented document for SANDAG, which many communities can use to fashion along their own lines. He also presented a Smart Growth project from sub-consultant Kimley-Horn produced for the City Council of Menlo Park. KTU&A, a local firm with experience in landscape architecture and transit-oriented planning, will conduct two
public outreach workshops in order to receive input from developers, the public, architects, and planning staff. The workshops will include a series of stations that will cover topics relating to Smart Growth along with an interactive exercise which will serve as a mechanism for receiving feedback from meeting attendees. Solimar has developed a scorecard to assist in the assessment of design guidelines and new projects as to how well the projects meet the principles addressed in the guidelines.

Mr. Vance added Smart Growth visual simulations will be included as part of the document and will be accessible from the Web site.

Councilmember Lesa Heebner (North County Coastal) said she was extremely pleased with the beginnings of the document and appreciated the content sensitivity. She asked for the name of the expert.

Mr. Ford said his name was James Daisa of Kimley-Horn.

Councilmember Heebner requested additional information regarding the finished product and how it would be used.

Mr. Vance replied the document would describe in detail the key features of the different elements of good design such as site design, building orientation, and multimodal street design. It will be widely distributed and available on the Web.

Councilmember Heebner asked if the developer would be the end-user.

Mr. Vance said the end-user could include a developer, planner, planning commissioner; or, provide information to the layperson, elected officials, and planning and design professionals.

Coleen Clementson, Committee Coordinator, informed the Regional Planning Technical Working Group is providing input also to ensure the document’s versatility when used by cities.

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

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

Mr. Vance stated several issues were raised at the July meeting regarding the criteria for selecting capital projects under the program and addressing the distribution of funding between capital and planning projects. The first issue involved the criteria for selecting capital projects and how it should encourage a mix of uses in Smart Growth areas that include the important land uses such as grocery stores. The community design criteria on the urban design characteristics has been modified to include consideration for the context and existing mix of uses, and will also provide some clarification within the program guidelines to ensure the issue is considered by the project evaluation team. The second issue involved important natural and cultural community resources. A reference has been added under the quality of project criteria, which addresses project area needs in order to evaluate how well a project preserves, and, where appropriate, integrates these important resources into the
proposed project. A third issue involved points to be awarded for “acquired” and “rehabilitated” housing. Language will be added to the programs that “acquired” and “rehabilitated” housing would qualify for the points to be awarded for new affordable housing.

An option which could be included in the criteria, should the Committee wish, would relate to the size of local agencies when considering awarding points for matching funds. An alternative has been suggested which divides the original 20 points into two categories: 10 points based on the relationship of the matching funds for the total project cost; and, 10 points resulting from dividing the matching funds by the local agency population to adjust for city size. This could be brought back to the Committee with the program guidelines in order to provide details on how the computation would work.

Two components of the proposed planning criteria are eligibility criteria for screening projects and project evaluation criteria for judging the quality of a proposed project. The eligibility criteria do not require any prior feasibility work. They include: the project has to be related to Smart Growth and improve land use transportation coordination, it is located within an existing/planned or potential Smart Growth area, grants could be funded in potential Smart Growth areas which would lead to changes that would enable those areas to qualify for existing plan status, the applicant would have an approved housing element as required by Policy No. 33, and a resolution from the local agency receiving the grant and authorizing their commitment to matching funds is required. The eight planning project area evaluation criteria include: transit, the development potential, objectives, proposed method of meeting the objectives, proposed outcomes, evidence of local commitment and community support, matching funds, and affordable housing production as required by Policy No. 33.

The program guidelines should be completed in September, with a complete package submitted to the Committee for recommendation in October. If accepted, it will proceed to the Board in October, with a call for projects in November, and recommendations on the first cycle of projects in January 2009.

Chair Jones inquired where the matching “option” part of the consideration for the 10 points adjusted for population would fit in under the recommendations.

Mr. Vance replied it would be part of the program guidelines to be presented in October. The actual methodology requires fine-tuning, should the Committee direct staff to do so.

Ms. Clementson clarified that the RPC may direct staff to refine how the matching fund option would work, and incorporate it into the program guidelines. This option is not currently included in the staff recommendations. The option, however, is available should the RPC decide to include it in the recommendation.

Chair Jones asked if it would be a separate motion should it be the Committee’s choice.

Julie Wiley, General Counsel (SANDAG), informed it could be a separate motion; or, instead of making a motion for staff recommendation, a motion different from the staff recommendation that is in the box in the report could be made.
Chair Jones commented he would see how the Committee got to that.

Bill Anderson, Chair (Regional Planning Technical Working Group), asked for a conceptual explanation of what staff’s intentions are in terms of normalization for population size.

Mr. Vance reported the basic idea is to divide population into the matching funds and then divide the result by the total grant size. The basic question is what percentage of the total project cost is covered by matching funds. The original proposal was matching funds divided by total grant size to get a percentage. Under this proposal, half of the points would be awarded after the matching funds were divided by population and then divided by total project cost.

Mr. Anderson commented a single project anywhere in the county has some limitations on size, which means a limitation on development cost total and the amount of matching funds. He asked that when dividing by total population size, whether it is the intent that the larger jurisdictions would have a very small ratio compared to the smaller jurisdictions.

Mr. Vance said that has been identified as a potential problem. For instance, for the City of San Diego, a match less than $1.3 million would divide out to less than one.

Mr. Anderson added there are some limitations on project sizes not necessarily related to the city’s or jurisdiction’s total population size because the projects are evaluated more on a community by community level within the larger jurisdictions.

Supervisor Pam Slater-Price (County of San Diego) remarked it seems as though a larger jurisdiction would find it hard to meet the standards and asked if there was a way to be more equitable across the board so each jurisdiction would have more of a fair option.

Mr. Vance replied this had been addressed by dividing the category into two so that half the points would address what the match was and the other half adjusted for population.

Supervisor Slater-Price said there should be a way to develop a method that would be less divisive and rate the projects on their merit and ability to serve the public.

Mr. Vance responded that perhaps this is not the best solution. The criterion in and of itself is not going to preclude any jurisdiction from being able to compete.

Bob Leiter, Director of Department of Land Use and Transportation Planning (SANDAG), remarked Mr. Anderson’s comment is well taken. There may be other ways to normalize instead of using just population. One could be to break the jurisdictions up into small, medium, and large cities and give a higher weighting to small cities, but not at the scale where 1.3 million (for the City of San Diego) to 4,500 (for the City of Del Mar) becomes the differential. He suggested that should the Committee desire to pursue the idea of doing normalization, the item could be referred back to the Planning Directors Technical Working Group for them to develop more specific alternatives.

Councilmember Heebner said Mr. Leiter’s suggestion was a good one and asked what the difference was between a “potential” and “existing” site.
Mr. Vance replied that in order to be “existing/planned,” the adopted plans have to meet the thresholds for density, and the necessary transportation services would have to be in place for public transit. “Potential” areas are places where local jurisdictions have identified some potential for future development, but existing plans do not allow development at those threshold densities and/or public transit service does not exist nor is it in the plan.

Councilmember Heebner remarked that if one of the objectives is to give incentive dollars to ready-to-go projects, it seems “potential” projects should not be considered. Once they become “planned” they will eventually rise up to that level, and should be considered at that time and not at this time. She asked how a rural village with no transit could be classified as Smart Growth.

Mr. Vance explained the contribution that rural villages make to the overall Smart Growth strategy is that they provide a more compact, walkable downtown, which focuses around a village core, and preserves open space and restrains the very low-density sprawl which can occur in rural areas.

Councilmember Heebner commented she was unsure whether it should be incentivized.

Ms. Clementson clarified there are seven Smart Growth Place Types in the RCP as the Board decided Smart Growth was not “one size fits all.” Rural villages serve people who live in low-density areas so they do not have to commute into town and assist in reducing vehicle miles traveled (VMT). These small town centers are created where there is already existing development, with some mixed-use development and some higher-density development, and are set up in such a way that they could accommodate public transit should it come to the area.

Chair Jones mentioned it is almost the opposite of past planning. Before, roads were built, and housing was built around the roads. Now, houses are built and transit is planned around it.

Councilmember Heebner requested clarification regarding “administrative approval of development project” as noted on page 8 of the report.

Mr. Vance informed a master EIR that covers the community plan and projects consistent with that plan can get approval without having to do an individual environmental impact report.

Mayor Pfeiler asked if the first application process had been looked at to see if there were any problems with the small cities in how the points for matching funds were given.

Mr. Vance said the pilot program has been used as a reference throughout the development process. It was found that it did not seem to be a determining factor as projects were funded throughout the region to cities of different sizes.

Mayor Pfeiler asked whether the ability of a small city to get points, or a large city to provide more funds and get all the matching points as far as the matching funds that each city put up, was skewed.
Mr. Vance replied it was not, as some projects scored well without any matching funds due to other criteria.

Mayor Pfeiler commented that the issue is not as big as once thought.

Mr. Vance stated she was correct.

Supervisor Slater Price said the County is attempting to make intelligent decisions when it comes to constraints of infrastructure. The rationale behind rural villages is not to have a replication of what is in the backcountry now. In order to accept growth in the backcountry where small towns have been long-standing, leave open spaces available and at the same time, use the intelligent planning decisions. The rural village concept should be implemented even though transit is not available at this time.

Councilmember Jerry Kern (North County Coastal) commented the Oceanside Transit Center probably has the most potential of receiving some help and asked when this would be complete in order to submit an application.

Mr. Vance reported the hope is to have a completed package ready for adoption by the Board by the end of October, with funding available after the first of the year.

Councilmember Kern asked at what point a development partner should be brought in on a project.

Mr. Vance stated it would not be necessary to have a developer in order to submit a project as restrictions will not be placed on the level of development and consideration will be given to what is on the horizon for development and implementation of the project. The real question is how well-suited the area is for Smart Growth development, what is being proposed to make that development happen, and the kind of proposed implementation.

Councilmember Kern stated the City of Oceanside is doing that for the whole area.

David Druker, North County Transit District (NCTD), informed that the work regarding the Oceanside Transit Center is beyond planning, and the conceptual plans are being completed. This was accomplished through a grant from Caltrans. The next step will be to have NCTD work with the City of Oceanside to obtain a developer that will create the actual improvement.

Councilmember Kern said he wanted to avoid planning for a small area.

Mr. Druker stated the Oceanside Transit Center would not change very much. There is land that is owned by NCTD, the City of Oceanside, and private development, which is being considered with the grant from Caltrans.

Chair Jones announced there are three public speakers.

Vice Chair Jim Janney (South County) asked what would be the percentage of points of vehicle miles traveled (VMT) versus transit.
Mr. Vance said the evaluation process would measure the proximity to transit, not VMT reduction.

Vice Chair Janney asked if the VMT equation is based on transit.

Mr. Vance said they would not measure or try to predict the impact on VMT directly because it cannot presently be done at the community level. The criterion includes an assessment of the number of land uses in the vicinity of the project, measures the walkability of the project area based on the kind of activity of the pedestrian network, and measures the level of transit service. All of these things will be reviewed as part of the process in determining if the project is worth investing incentive program funds.

Mr. Jones announced the first public speaker, Mr. Duncan McFetridge, representing SOFAR.

Mr. McFetridge said this is an interesting discussion, which is a continuation of a very lively discussion from the Board meeting. It boils down to your land use duties in your local areas and your regional obligations. Some people thought that you would come here and rubber-stamp whatever you did at your city to get roads to your favorite project in your city. This, to me, is the whole ball of wax. When you come here, your job changes. Supervisor Slater said it quite well. How do you make a resolution of the discussion that you’re having today about how to weigh criterion? It’s very simple, Supervisor Slater-Price said, merit and service to the public. As regional decision-makers, you’re responsible not for your local consequences but for regional ones. What are they? They are enormous. What is the consequence that the San Diego region is 17th in the foreclosure crisis in the nation? What is the consequence of the high price of gasoline because we don’t have a transit-based community? These are your consequences now. You’re not a land use person anymore. You just concluded this agreement about the criterion and the language in Section U of this agreement from the Attorney General’s letter stating, “When developing criteria for eligibility, SANDAG will give priority when ranking projects to areas near transit with the greatest potential for increasing walking, biking, and shortening vehicle trips.” There is a way to measure vehicle trip reduction. We’ve got the Downtown Transit Draft Plan. How can there not be performance standards on transit? You will solve this regional thing if you just simply answer those questions about performance standards mode split; it can be done. I suggest getting the numbers. I handed out “Driven to the Brink.” Committee members, ask your staff to “google” Oregon transit-based community. They’re one of the lowest foreclosure rates in the country and have affordable housing. Why? Because they have transit-based communities. Transit ridership has increased dramatically and they have not cut rates or service. There is a measurable regional way of evaluating what you’re doing. I suggest that staff do that too because they’ll find transit mode split. I suggest getting some numbers, some performance standards, and you will solve your local versus regional problems because you’ll see that transit is always regional in consequence.

Chair Jones commented to think locally and act regionally. There has been some reference regarding a letter from the Attorney General. This is part of an ongoing negotiation.

Ms. Wiley responded that the negotiations are complete. The item is incorporated into the settlement agreement that SANDAG has with SOFAR and other parties with regard to the RTP EIR.
Chair Jones asked if it directly affected this policy.

Ms. Wiley said the language from the Attorney General’s letter is incorporated into the settlement agreement that SANDAG is bound to comply with.

Chair Jones asked if there is anything before the Committee which is in violation of that.

Ms. Wiley replied there is not.

Chair Jones added this is our policy to make, and our decision on this piece and the negotiation is separate, and we comply with that.

Ms. Wiley replied that as long as this group believes it has given priority to projects in accordance with the language in the settlement agreement, then yes, it is in compliance.

Chair Jones announced Mel Vernon, representing the San Luis Rey Band of Mission Indians.

Mr. Vernon said he was at the Board meeting last Friday talking about the quarry site, where Highway 76 and College come together. The waterfall is there, and it’s designated as a sacred site. There are cultural sites along the corridor along the Buena Vista Creek. There’s a quarry site that’s going through reclamation right now and that’s part of a reclamation that’s going to be passed along from the current owner to McMillan, who proposes a 500- to 600-home development there. I’d like to say that that valley should not be developed at all. It should be left alone as an open space. That is an open space already, and some of the problems that face us all here today as a group is what to do with preserving open space and not creating sprawl. Well, this seems to me to be something that can be avoided right now. It is building these homes in that valley would destroy what we have left as a natural resource. Also, the understanding here is that the cultural issues haven’t been addressed with this proposed system. I’ve seen numbers, and I think when it comes to culture, that’s probably given the least amount of any number on anything I see. This is something that’s been passed along in San Diego County. And I can say that a lot of times the culture has contributed to the economic development of the county through its resources of museums, libraries, teaching, and artifacts. But the culture itself doesn’t get acknowledged. I want to say that there are cultural corridors coming up along different places like Highway 76 and other places. I’m not trying to stop development on any other place, I’m talking specifically about this site, the quarry site. I’m not trying to stop development or progress. I’m trying to stop what I think is a mistake. I’m trying to address that mistake here, with you. And this has been talked about long enough with SANDAG to realize that it’s a bottom up. Well, I am from the bottom up and I’m on the top down. Last meeting there were people here saying they were very helpless to do anything. Then I go to the bottom and they say they are the ones that control everything.

Chair Jones announced speaker Michele Fahley, representing the San Luis Rey Band of California Indian Legal Services.

Ms. Fahley, an attorney with California Indian Legal Services, said her office represents the San Luis Rey Band of Mission Indians. First and foremost, we’ve heard that the criterion have been updated to take into account historical and cultural resources for projects seeking
Mr. Vernon alluded to the fact that it’s a minute consideration when we’re looking at these projects and specifically looking at the quarry site or the falls area. This is a significant historical component, as well as a sacred site, as well as the presence of multiple cultural resources up and down that river area. So what we would request is that the Committee consider a stronger consideration of the impact on historical and cultural resources; specifically, if there are these kinds of sites located within a specific project that would make it automatically ineligible for funding. This site in particular has specific issues, which go back to 2006, when it was originally designated as a potential site. But this is also a broader scope for cultural resources, not just there but all around the county that those resources warrant more consideration than what has been given here. One other point, if a project is proposed, whether or not it gets funding under the Smart Growth Incentive Program, that there is a mechanism under the California Environmental Quality Act to actually comment and work through those issues. But sometimes these projects, looking at the Smart Growth funding, projects that are going to reach a point of opposition such as the quarry site, will, I guarantee, not just be opposed by tribal concerns, but there are environmental and historical issues that are going to come up again and again. And that isn’t a Smart Growth idea when you know that these projects are actually going to be facing such opposition. Therefore, maybe funding is better allocated to another project that won’t have those resources and won’t have that fight.

Chair Jones clarified that SANDAG does not have land use authority. Thinking locally, he would fight to the end to retain the land use authority for his city. He expressed his concern when people get confused about what can and cannot be done at SANDAG, and understood their concerns. He explained projects must proceed through a process before SANDAG receives them; therefore, the extremely sensitive projects have a remote chance of being considered.

Mr. Druker commented the planning criterion creates a huge argument in terms of whether low-income housing is important or transit is important. Based upon the criterion, a plan could be submitted for low-income housing that would not be by a transit facility or have any transit, and would win. The transit points and weight factors should be a whole lot bigger than what they are. Regarding the concerns of the last two speakers, one of the criteria could and should be whether the plan is in an environmentally sensitive area. If it’s in an environmentally sensitive area, then it should be ranked low. There should be some criteria added, and the implementation and evidence of local commitment changed a little to address whether there are potential environmental factors that may not allow that plan to go swiftly through.

Supervisor Slater-Price said that he made a good point.

Councilmember Heebner commented she agreed with Mr. Vernon that the site is extremely environmentally sensitive. The reason she voted not to take it off the map was due to local land use authority. The process in place right now is such that a jurisdiction asks to have something put on the map. The site is “potential,” and because of this it will not receive incentive dollars and will have to go through an EIR. She expressed concern that the definition of Smart Growth is getting diluted, and the Smart Growth moniker is being
Mr. Leiter informed a “potential” Smart Growth area would not qualify for capital improvement funds. They could apply for planning grants to develop a plan and that would in turn require an environmental impact report. The way to allow cities to address cultural and environmental issues is to clarify that those are in most cases “potential” areas, and the cities should resolve those issues and would have to resolve those issues before applying for capital grants through this program.

Councilmember Al Ovrom (South County) commented the percentage given to affordable housing is way out of proportion.

Supervisor Slater-Price asked how affordable housing received such a high percentage.

Ms. Wiley informed Board Policy No. 33 requires this type of program receive at least 25 percent of the points in the evaluation criterion and be allocated toward whether the housing element has been completed.

Mayor Pfeiler added Policy No. 33 applies to discretionary funds.

Ms. Clementson stated Policy No. 33 would be presented at the next meeting; however, Policy No. 33 has two components. To be eligible to submit a grant application, a jurisdiction must have an adopted housing element and the points given would be based on how well the jurisdiction is addressing its lower-income RHNA goals. Policy No. 33 is specific that 25 percent of all discretionary funding programs be tied to the incentive of meeting RHNA goals, and it is not negotiable.

Mayor Pfeiler commented that the concept of Policy No. 33 is not up for discussion. When Policy No. 33 was created, it was not known how it would play out, so it is expected that the percentage will cause some discussion.

Chair Jones recommended becoming familiar with Policy No. 33 as it affects other discretionary funds.

SCTCA Chairman Johnny Hernandez (Santa Ysabel) stated a tribal nation is still required to answer to other surrounding communities when doing business. As a regional committee, you too have to take those into consideration. This is a real touchy situation and an emotional issue for tribes. Having been moved so much in the past, those places are still part of our culture. As a regional planning committee, you have to look at other cities and take that under advisement. Your decisions are what affect the whole county. The Southern California Tribal Chairmen’s Association will be sending a letter soon regarding this issue.

Councilmember Kern said he thought this would go back to staff to rework the numbers.

Mr. Leiter clarified it had been suggested only on the issue regarding normalizing matching funds for population. It was not suggested that the entire matter be sent back; however, the Committee does have that choice. Should the Committee choose to send back the entire
matter, it would be good to have some specific direction about the areas you want staff to focus on, as the discussions cover many different issues.

Councilmember Kern replied he was getting the sense not everyone was happy with the way the numbers break down.

Supervisor Slater-Price suggested reworking the numbers.

Mr. Druker agreed, especially if Policy No. 33 would be presented at the next meeting.

Mayor Pfeiler said the Policy No. 33 numbers set points. It seems there has been some great discussion and some great consensus, and the Committee should move forward because we want to be able to apply for funds and begin projects in January. She moved that the Committee accept this recommendation and move it to the Board of Directors.

Councilmember Kern stated he could not support a motion at this point, as he did not think the Committee had come to a consensus.

Mayor Pfeiler asked him what he thought was missing.

Chair Jones reminded the Committee that there was a motion on the floor and asked if there was a second for discussion.

Vice Chair Janney said he would make a second on the motion because he personally agrees with what staff has put together. The Committee has concerns; however, the concerns are at a 2 percent level and don’t have a large impact on the projects. The majority of the numbers are based on transit and the point system emphasizes the purpose of Smart Growth.

Supervisor Slater-Price stated she agreed with Mr. Janney’s comments; however, she asked for it to go back as the issues regarding how the matching fund points would be weighted, and an environmental checkpoint, still needed to be addressed.

Mayor Pfeiler asked Mr. Leiter to describe the process further. She said capital projects already have the environmental work completed. If the project were sensitive, it would not be allowed to compete. This process has to protect the entire region on projects to be funded through Smart Growth, not just one particular site.

Mr. Leiter reiterated “potential” projects could not qualify under these criterions for grants for building capital projects. They could only qualify for a planning grant, which could be for a master plan and an environmental impact report. The EIR would be a complex extensive evaluation, and the only way the city could apply for a capital grant would be if it could address all the environmental issues.

Mr. Druker said the problem is if the project is going to go through a lot of environmental to get an EIR out, why is SANDAG giving money for planning?
Supervisor Slater-Price asked why planning money would be invested on something that would require a lot of time.

Mr. Leiter responded this could be incorporated into the planning grant criterion. He thought they were referring to an environmental criterion for the capital grants.

Supervisor Slater-Price replied that it was for the planning.

Mr. Leiter stated he thought staff could incorporate a criterion under the planning grant criteria that would provide some initial evaluation of the levels of environmental issues that would have to be addressed in the recommendations.

Ms. Clementson offered it would be possible to implement questions into the planning criterion located in sections E and F. Questions could address whether the area is environmentally sensitive or would require a lot to get the plan done; whether there is an updated general plan; and if there is a specific plan in place for the area. It depends on what the Committee thinks is appropriate.

Chair Jones asked if she was saying it would go back.

Ms. Clementson said it could easily be added at the Committee’s recommendation.

Mayor Pfeiler said she would amend her motion to include that as part of the planning piece of it.

Councilmember Kern commented on his concerns regarding low-income housing located away from transit, which could be weighed more than almost anything else; and the new wording regarding culturally and environmentally-sensitive sites.

Chair Jones asked Ms. Clementson to respond.

Ms. Clementson clarified that the points in the Smart Growth Incentive Program regarding Policy No. 33 are not evaluating an affordable housing project within the smart growth area. Rather, criteria “H” in the planning grant criteria is just a matter of points that every jurisdiction will or will not get based on how well they’re doing in achieving their RHNA goal. The methodology on how to calculate the points is being worked on and will be presented at the next meeting as part of the discussion on Policy No. 33.

Councilmember Kern commented he would support the motion.

Chair Jones added it is a complicated process. It is important to act regionally and remember that this set of criterion is good; it can be changed and lasts for two years.

Councilmember Heebner suggested placing the environmental considerations in the project eligibility criteria at the beginning. She asked for confirmation that criteria “H” deals with how well a city is meeting the RHNA numbers.

Ms. Clementson said she was correct.
Chair Jones asked for a clarification of the motion.

Mayor Pfeiler said the motion is the recommendation that’s on the box on the front, including the environmental-sensitivity point for the planning grants only.

Ms. Wiley asked if that included the normalization of the numbers, the population issue.

Mayor Pfeiler responded yes, it does.

**Action:** Upon a motion by Mayor Pfeiler and a second by Vice Chair Janney, the Regional Planning Committee recommended 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 recommends 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 (RECOMMEND)**

Keith Greer, Senior Planner (SANDAG), introduced Susan Wynn of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and David Mayer of the California Department of Fish and Game. He stated the Board of Directors allocated $2.9 million for eligible projects. Eligible projects included invasive species control, post-fire recovery, habitat restoration, and access control. An evaluation committee was established to rank the projects, and 13 projects were unanimously recommended for funding by the EMP Working Group on July 8, 2008.

Supervisor Slater-Price complimented the group and stated the projects were well selected.

**Action:** Upon a motion by Supervisor Slater-Price and a second by Vice Chair Janney, the Regional Planning Committee recommended 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.


Mr. Greer briefly informed the Committee on the recommendations.

**Action:** Upon a motion by Supervisor Slater-Price and a second by Mayor Pfeiler, the Regional Planning Committee recommended that the SANDAG 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.
9. TransNet ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION PROGRAM (EMP): ADVANCE MITIGATION GUIDELINES (RECOMMEND)

Mr. Greer informed on the progress of the EMP and the approved MOA with the wildlife agencies, Caltrans, and SANDAG. He provided information on the proposed guidelines and reviewed the seven required criteria staff would be using in order to make written findings. A report will be given in February regarding assurances on specific properties.

Mr. Druker asked if this would exclude friendly condemnation, as sometimes property owners do it for tax purposes.

Mr. Greer replied that condemnation had not specifically been discussed and perhaps this is something to be brought before the Board of Directors when the property owners are willing to sell but want to do it through friendly condemnation.

Supervisor Slater-Price expressed her support and noted that much of this is similar to County standards, which allow for friendly condemnation.

Councilmember Kern inquired about the mitigation for Highway 76.

Mr. Greer responded they are working on it. Their major efforts have been in searching for wetlands sites to acquire and restore. They have one offer and are currently working with that property owner. They are also seeking other alternatives should it fall through.

Chair Jones recognized the other EMP members and thanked them for their hard work and patience.

**Action:** Upon a motion by Supervisor Slater-Price and a second by Councilmember Kern, the Regional Planning Committee recommended that the SANDAG 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.

10. UPCOMING MEETINGS

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

11. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Jerry Jones adjourned the meeting at 2:08 p.m.
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DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS FROM CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION
BEACH SAND MITIGATION FUND

Introduction

The City of Encinitas is requesting funding from the California Coastal Commission Beach Sand Mitigation Fund administered by SANDAG for an Opportunistic Beach Nourishment Project. Allocation of funds from a coastal jurisdictions account requires that jurisdiction’s formal approval through resolution by the City Council. Resolution No. 2008-55 from the City of Encinitas is included as Attachment 1.

Additionally, prior to allocation of any funds, the proposal must be reviewed by the Shoreline Preservation Working Group (Working Group), adopted by SANDAG, and submitted to the Executive Director of the Commission for review and approval. The Working Group will be reviewing this request at their October 2, 2008, meeting and no issues are anticipated. Pending their recommendation, SANDAG staff recommends the Regional Planning Committee forward the request to the Board of Directors for approval.

Discussion

In 1996, SANDAG and the California Coastal Commission (Commission) entered into a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) which outlines the administration of the Beach Sand Mitigation Fund (Mitigation Fund). The Mitigation Fund consists of fees collected by the Commission through its coastal development permit process pursuant to special conditions of various permits as mitigation for the adverse impacts of shoreline protective structures, such as seawalls and revetments, on beaches within the region. Mitigation fees are deposited in an interest-bearing account created and managed by SANDAG. Only projects that involve sand replenishment for beaches in the San Diego region will be considered for funding.

The City of Encinitas plans to use $133,621 in mitigation funds to place approximately 37,100 cubic yards of sand from the Pacific Station project underground parking structure onto the northernmost section of Batiquitos Beach. The City will use these funds for trucking the sand to the beach, preparing the site, and providing public safety. These uses are consistent with the SANDAG Shoreline Preservation Strategy objectives, policies, and recommendations that relate to beach building and maintenance. Furthermore, the project meets the eligibility criteria laid out in the MOA.
The Pacific Station project, located on Hwy 101 and E Street in Encinitas, consists of plans to develop a condominium subdivision, mixed-use development with 47 residential units, approximately 10,000 square feet of restaurant space, and two floors of underground parking.

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachment: Resolution No. 2008-55 to request funding from the California Coastal Commission Beach Sand Mitigation Fund administered by SANDAG for an Opportunistic Beach Nourishment Project

Key Staff Contact: Shelby Tucker, (619) 699-1916, stu@sandag.org
RESOLUTION 2008 - 55

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ENCINITAS, CALIFORNIA, TO REQUEST FUNDING FROM THE CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSIONS BEACH SAND MITIGATION FUND ADMINISTERED BY SAN DIEGO ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS (SANDAG) FOR AN OPPORTUNISTIC BEACH NOURISHMENT PROJECT.

WHEREAS, the Beach Sand Mitigation Fund consists of fees collected by the California Coastal Commission through its coastal development permit process pursuant to special conditions of various permits, as mitigation for the adverse impacts of shoreline protective structures, such as seawalls and revetments, on the beaches within San Diego County; and

WHEREAS, the mitigation fees are deposited in an interest bearing account created at SANDAG, with all interest earned payable to the account for purposes stated below; and

WHEREAS, the purpose of the account is to provide a beach sand mitigation fund to aid local governments, working cooperatively through SANDAG, in the restoration of the beaches within San Diego County; and

WHEREAS, the funds shall be solely used to implement projects which provide sand to the region's beaches; and

WHEREAS, the Pacific Station project will add 37,100 cubic yards of sandy material to the Batiquitos Receiver Site along the northern section of the coastline in Encinitas; and

WHEREAS, the developer will incur additional costs of $133,621 for hauling the sand to the beach, site preparation and public safety; and

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Encinitas, California as follows:

1. That the foregoing recitations are true and correct.

2. According to the Memorandum of Understanding between the California Coastal Commission and SANDAG the Beach Sand Mitigation Funds are eligible for projects that move sand to the beach;

3. That the City Council approves the request for funding from the Beach Sand Mitigation Fund for $133,621.
4. That SANDAG's Shoreline Preservation Working Group will evaluate the proposed beach replenishment project and determine if the money from the fund should be allocated to this project.

5. After adoption by SANDAG's Shoreline Preservation Working Group the request must be submitted to the Executive Director of the Commission for review and approval.

PASSED AND ADOPTED at a regular meeting of the City Council of the City of Encinitas, California, held on the 27th day of August 2008, by the following vote:

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the City Council of the City of Encinitas, California this 27th day of August 2008, at a regularly scheduled meeting of the City Council of the City of Encinitas, California, by the following vote:

AYES: Barth, Bond, Dalager, Houlihan, Stocks.

NAYS: None.

ABSTAIN: None.

ABSENT: None.

Jerome Stocks
Mayor, City of Encinitas

ATTEST:
Deborah Cervone, City Clerk
MEMO

October 3, 2008

TO: SANDAG Regional Planning Committee
FROM: Bob Leiter
SUBJECT: Response to Regional Planning Committee Inquiry Regarding Determination of Parking Demand at Transit Stations

SANDAG staff provided the Regional Planning Committee with an update on the Smart Growth Trip Generation and Parking Demand Study at its meeting on June 6, 2008. During the meeting, Councilmember Lesa Heebner inquired about the study’s role in determining parking demand at public transit stations.

To project parking demand at future transit station facilities, such as the I-15 Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) stations, SANDAG examines Regional Transportation Travel Forecasting Model outputs such as projected patronage for the transit routes (based on factors such as travel time, cost, demographics), and mode of access (walk, drive, transit). This data is supplemented with observations of actual observed travel behavior throughout the region, such as at COASTER and trolley stations. In determining the amount of parking to supply at transit stations, land availability and the cost of providing parking are also considered. For example, with parking structures costing approximately $30,000 per space, SANDAG is investigating alternatives to fund such facilities through financing strategies such as public/private development.

Data collected in the Smart Growth Trip Generation and Parking Demand Study could potentially factor into the above analysis, by providing supplemental information about the number of residents at transit-oriented developments that walk or bike to nearby transit stations. This data could be applied to future transit stations with joint development.

In addition, through its Smart Parking study, SANDAG is examining how existing parking supply can be more efficiently managed with the application of smart parking technology at several COASTER stations. The study will determine how the technology’s use of real-time parking information and parking pricing methods may help to maximize utilization and management of parking at transit stations. This study is planned to be completed the summer of 2010 and is being coordinated through the Transportation Committee.
Also, as part of the Mid-Range Transit Plan and Guidelines being developed by SANDAG transit planning staff and a consultant, we will be refining the procedures for evaluating parking needs at BRT stations, as well as estimating parking demand by both transit users and car/vanpoolers. Periodic updates on both studies will be provided to the RPC.

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Key Staff Contact: Christine Eary, (619) 699-6928, cea@sandag.org
AMENDMENTS TO THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO NON-DISPOSAL FACILITIES ELEMENT  

Introduction

Each local jurisdiction in the region is required by state law to prepare a Non-Disposal Facilities Element (NDFE) pursuant to Public Resources Code section 41730 et seq. Non-Disposal Facilities Elements must describe new or modified solid waste facilities needed by the jurisdiction to implement the jurisdiction’s Source Reduction and Recycling Element.

Recommendation

The Regional Planning Committee is asked to recommend that the Board of Directors, which serves as the Countywide Integrated Waste Management Task Force, recommend that the San Diego City Council approve the amendments to the City of San Diego Non-Disposal Facilities Element.

Discussion

The SANDAG Board of Directors, acting as the County of San Diego Integrated Waste Management Local Task Force (LTF), is asked to recommend approval of amendments to the City of San Diego Non-Disposal Facilities Element (NDFE). These NDFE amendments would make the document more accurately reflect existing and proposed facilities. SANDAG’s recommendation is required before the amended document can be presented to the City Council and then the Integrated Waste Management Board for action. The proposed changes to the NDFE include:

- Deleting a proposed City Material Recovery Facility that was listed in Section 2.3.4 in the sixth amendment.

- Moving the Allan Company facility from Section 2.4.1 to Section 2.3.4 because Allan Company applied for a Full Solid Waste Facility Permit for a large volume Transfer/Processing Facility.

- Adding facilities that are used to implement the City’s Source Reduction and Recycling Element but are located outside of the City, including: EDCO Waste and Recycling Services CDI, Escondido Resource Recovery Transfer, Ramona MRF and Transfer, and SANCO Resource Recovery.

- Updating the information in Section 2.3.3 about a proposed City Resource Management Facility.

- Updating information on other facilities and locations.
Following a recommendation of approval by the SANDAG Board of Directors, the NDFE amendments would be presented to the San Diego City Council and the California Integrated Waste Management Board for approval.

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachments: 1. Executive Summary Sheet
2. Integrated Waste Management Plan – NDFE for the City of San Diego
3. Integrated Waste Management Technical Advisory Committee

Key Staff Contact: Rob Rundle, (619) 699-6949, rru@sandag.org
DATE ISSUED: REPORT NO: 
ATTENTION: Council President and City Council 
ORIGINATING DEPARTMENT: Environmental Services 
SUBJECT: Amendment to the City of San Diego Nondisposal Facility Element 
COUNCIL DISTRICT(S): All 
CONTACT/PHONE NUMBER: Amy Havens (858) 627-3302 

REQUESTED ACTION: Adopt the 7th Amendment to the Nondisposal Facility Element (NDFE) and authorize the submittal of the 7th Amendment of the Nondisposal Facility Element to the California Integrated Waste Management Board. 

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approve the requested actions. 

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: In 1989, the State Legislature adopted the Integrated Waste Management Act (AB 939) codified as Public Resources Code (PRC) sections 40000 et seq. PRC section 41780 requires the reduction of waste disposed of in landfills by 50% by the year 2000 and thereafter. PRC section 41730 also requires the preparation of NDFEs describing new or modified solid waste facilities that divert at least five percent of the material received by the facility and require solid waste facility or composting permits. NDFEs are intended to serve as planning documents for infrastructure needed to achieve waste diversion from landfill disposal. 

This amendment of the NDFE deletes a previously proposed City Materials Recovery Facility, and modifies a planned City Resource Management Facility. This version also modifies an Allan Company facility description, adds planned recycling operations at Sycamore and Otay landfills, and includes four additional facilities that are located outside of the City, but process some waste generated inside the City: EDCO Waste and Recycling Services CDI, Escondido Resource Recovery Transfer, Ramona MRF and Transfer, and SANCO Resource Recovery. 

On October 24, 2008, the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG), acting as the Local Task Force, recommended approval of these amendments to the City of San Diego NDFE. 

FISCAL CONSIDERATIONS: This is a planning document required by the State. No costs, other than those necessary for the preparation of the document itself, are associated with it. 

PREVIOUS COUNCIL and/or COMMITTEE ACTION: Council resolution R301268/R-2006-617 adopting Sixth Amendment to the Nondisposal Facility Element Regarding Waste Reduction; and Authorizing its Submittal to the California Integrated Waste Management Board. 

COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION AND PUBLIC OUTREACH EFFORTS: The document has been submitted to the following organizations for review and comment: 
- Integrated Waste Management Technical Advisory Committee 
- Integrated Waste Management Citizens' Advisory Committee
- San Diego Association of Governments, acting as the Local Task Force for the San Diego Region

KEY STAKEHOLDERS AND PROJECTED IMPACTS: This is a planning document. No impacts are anticipated.

Chris Gonaver,  
Environmental Services Director

Elmer L. Heap, Jr.  
Deputy Chief/Chief Operating Officer
Nondisposal Facility Element

Seventh Amendment

Prepared by
City of San Diego
Environmental Services Department

September 2008
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PREFACE

This Nondisposal Facility Element (NDFE) has been prepared to comply with Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 41732 et seq. It is a general description of the solid waste facilities needed to implement the City’s waste reduction (source reduction, recycling, and composting) activities necessary to meet the mandates established by the PRC and its implementing regulations. The NDFE may include existing, planned, or proposed facilities and addresses potential expansions to existing facilities. Facility descriptions contain information that was available at the time of preparation of the NDFE. However, this document is not typically intended as a limitation on the design, capacity, or throughput of a facility. Therefore, a facility may be larger or smaller than described in the NDFE based on project economics or permit requirements and still be consistent with the NDFE.
1.0 INTRODUCTION

On September 29, 1989, Governor Dukemajian signed the California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989, incorporating it into State law as Public Resources Code (PRC) 40000 et seq., but sometimes referred to by its bill number, AB939. This act shifted the focus of waste management in California from landfill disposal to “integrated waste management” with an emphasis on source reduction, recycling, and composting as primary strategies to reduce the State’s dependence on landfill disposal of waste.

The PRC requires each city and county within California to prepare and implement Source Reduction and Recycling Elements (SRREs) that will reduce wastes disposed of in landfills by 50 percent by the year 2000, and in subsequent years, compared to 1990 base year tonnages. The SRREs, as updated in annual reports, describe the programs, activities, and strategies that the cities and counties plan to carry out to achieve the mandated waste reduction.

In 1992, the requirement to prepare a Nondisposal Facility Element (NDFE) was added to the PRC. NDFEs describe new or modified solid waste facilities needed by cities and counties to accomplish PRC requirements. As defined by PRC section 40151, a “nondisposal facility” is any facility that is required to obtain a Solid Waste Facility Permit (SWFP) or composting permit, other than disposal or transformation facilities. Section 41733 specifies that amendments to include facilities recovering less than five percent of the material processed do not require California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) approval, although at the local level, such facilities may be found not to provide a satisfactory contribution to waste diversion. NDFE amendments are specifically exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act.
1.1 When is an NDFE Amendment Required?

This City of San Diego NDFE is intended to be a proactive planning document, and **facilities that are consistent with this document will not require an NDFE amendment.** ESD will review the application and determine if an NDFE amendment is needed. Changes in the tonnages processed at a facility should be evaluated, but may not need an NDFE amendment, particularly if there is no reduction in the amount of material diverted from disposal. If a reduction in the tonnage diverted is accompanied by an improvement in the beneficial use, or is related to waste reduction, then an amendment may not be required. An amendment may be processed for new facilities, and for modifications to existing facilities, if these modifications affect the City’s or the region’s integrated solid waste management program. In some cases, even a new facility may be found to be consistent with this NDFE. ESD will analyze the facility for consistency with the NDFE and will determine if an amendment is required. Facilities that do not require a SWFP or composting permit do not require an NDFE amendment, but these facilities are an important part of the City’s program so they have been included in this document. The list of recycling facilities that do not require a permit from the CIWMB may not be all-inclusive and may include businesses that have gone out of business since the time this update was approved.

1.2 Goals

The City of San Diego intends to use the NDFE to plan and consider the effects of infrastructure on waste reduction efforts, with the goal of minimizing the amount of material that requires disposal. Careful consideration will be given to short- and long-term effects of projects on the waste stream and other waste reduction programs. San Diego generally supports infrastructure that provides for reduction in solid waste, and for the diversion of solid waste from landfills to productive uses that are not environmentally damaging. The following solid waste management questions will be considered by ESD when deciding if an amendment to the NDFE is necessary:

- Is the facility diverting the maximum amount possible from disposal in landfills, to the most beneficial use possible, keeping in mind that waste reduction is emphasized before diversion?

- Does the new or modified facility significantly disrupt other waste management efforts?

- Does a facility that diverts less than five percent of the throughput from disposal have any negative effect on the City’s PRC compliance efforts?

Other standards will be used for local land use considerations, and inclusion in the NDFE does not guarantee approval of a project when it comes forward for land use consideration, nor does it require the Local Enforcement Agency (LEA) to issue a SWFP or composting permit.
LEAs regulate tonnages handled at solid waste facilities according to tonnage limits provided in SWFPs and composting permits; however, for the tier that some nondisposal facilities fall within, LEAs may not condition SWFPs to specify a diversion rate (PRC section 50001). Local land use permits may specify diversion rates, but the land use planning process is not designed for regular inspections after permits are issued, and enforcement is difficult. The descriptions of the facilities in the NDFE are for general planning purposes, and there is no enforcement mechanism to verify diversion standards. Thus, there is no way to ensure diversion claims made by facilities will be maintained. In considering whether to amend the NDFE to include or to modify a facility description, this shortcoming will be considered.

1.3 Changes to the NDFE

The seventh amendment deletes a proposed City Material Recovery Facility that was listed in Section 2.3.4 in the sixth NDFE amendment. It moves the Allan Company facility from Section 2.4.1 to Section 2.3.4 because Allan Company applied for a Full SWFP for a large volume Transfer/Processing Facility. In addition, this amendment adds facilities that are located outside of the City, but that divert waste generated within the City. These include: EDCO Waste and Recycling Services, Escondido Resource Recovery Transfer, Ramona MRF and Transfer, SANCO Resource Recovery. It also adds proposed facilities at the Sycamore Landfill and Otay landfills for construction and demolition (C&D) debris recycling. This amendment also updates information on a proposed City Resource Management Facility in Section 2.3.3, and other facilities.
2.0 FACILITIES

2.1 Composting Facilities

Approximately 20.3 percent of the San Diego waste stream is composed of organic wastes. The majority of this waste is from food (8.3%) and yard waste (8.1%). Overall composition of organic waste is provided in Table 1 and Figure 1, detailing the composition of the organic constituents. Because a fifth of the waste disposed of is organic, there is a large potential amount of material that could be diverted and composted. ESD has several programs aimed at diverting green waste from the landfill. In addition to the collection programs and composting operation described in section 2.1.2, the City provides subsidized bin sales and educational programs about backyard composting. Information is provided on how to build bins, where to buy materials, and how to start and troubleshoot compost piles. Classes to become a Master Composter are offered once a year and compost workshops are offered throughout the year.
Table 1: Composition of Organic Waste Disposed of in San Diego

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organic Material</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Tons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>139,762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaves &amp; Greens</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>70,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prunings &amp; Trimmings</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>50,336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branches &amp; Stumps</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>15,661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manures</td>
<td>&gt;0</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textiles</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>22,754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diapers</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>19,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remainder/Composite Organic</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>23,227</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Organic Composition**  20.4  341,874


Figure 1. Composition of Organic Waste Disposed of in San Diego. Data were used from Table 1, City of San Diego Waste Composition Study 1999-2000.

The following composting facilities support the City’s efforts to divert organic waste from the landfill.
2.1.1 EVERGREEN NURSERY

This facility processes 16,500 to 22,000 tons annually, with approximately 5,500 tons stored onsite at any one time. The material is used by the nursery as a soil amendment for container plants and is sold to landscapers. This facility serves organic waste generators in the City of San Diego and surrounding jurisdictions and diverts at least 95 percent of the green waste accepted. Modifications to expand this facility would not be expected to trigger the need for an NDFE amendment.

| Location of Facility: | 7150 Black Mountain Road  
                    | San Diego, CA 92130 |
|-----------------------|-------------------------|
| Facility Permit Number: | 37-AB-0005 |
| Date of Permit Issue: | February 8, 2005 |
| Date of Permit Review: | February 8, 2010 |
| Volume of Material Handled (peak loading): | 10,000 cubic yards |
| Annual Loading: | 37,500 cubic yards |
| Days and Hrs of Operation: | Monday through Saturday 7:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. |
| Facility Size: | 3 acres |
| Operating Area Size: | 90 acres |
| Incoming Waste Material: | 40 vehicles per day |
| Outgoing Waste Material: | 5 vehicles per day |
| Estimated Diversion Rate | 95% of total throughput |
2.1.2 MIRAMAR GREENERY COMPOSTING FACILITY

This facility at the Miramar Landfill processes yard trimmings into compost and mulch. This facility currently diverts 100,000 tons (or more) of yard trimmings (and other organics) per year from the Miramar Landfill. This facility primarily serves organic waste generators in the City of San Diego, although loads from other jurisdictions are also accepted. Currently, there are plans for an expansion of the Miramar Greenery in an effort to decrease the amount of compostable material going into the landfill. The facility occupies about 30 acres, though it is expected to be expanded by approximately 45 more acres. Additional information regarding the expansion is listed below. Furthermore, additional, future modifications to expand the facility beyond its permitted capacity, to increase acceptable organic feedstocks, and to relocate it are anticipated. These changes would not be expected to trigger the need for an NDFE amendment. This facility serves several of the City’s waste diversion programs:

- **ESD Christmas Tree Recycling Program.** This program diverts 130,000 trees per year from the landfill, approximately 1,100 tons per season. The program has 16 drop-off locations across the City and trees are collected for almost four weeks.

- **Food Waste Composting Program.** This program began in partnership with the Marine Corps Recruiting Depot (MCRD). Pre- and post-consumer food waste is currently trucked from MCRD, Petco Park and Point Loma Nazarene University, San Diego State University, Sea World, San Diego Convention Center, and the San Diego County Fair to the Miramar Greenery where it is mixed in with green waste. Currently, 1,000 tons per year are diverted. Drywall is also accepted in limited quantities.

- **Curbside Yard Waste Collection Program.** The City collects curbside yard waste on a biweekly basis at no charge from the majority of single-family residences in the City. This service will continue to be expanded as funding and resources allow. Additionally, the City distributes educational materials to encourage homeowners to leave grass clippings on lawns as fertilizer.
| Location of Facility:  | 5180 Convoy St.  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>San Diego, CA  92111</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Facility Permit Number: | 37-AB-0003  
| Date of Permit Issue:  | September 28, 2007; new permit pending  
| Date of Permit Review:  | September 28, 2012  
| Site Capacity:  | 1,000,000 cubic yards  
| Daily Peak Loading:  | 690 tons  
| Annual Loading:  | 341,000 cubic yards  
| Days and Hrs. of Operation:  | Monday to Friday: 7:00 am – 4:30 pm  
|                        | Saturday and Sunday 7:30 am – 4:30 pm  
| Facility Size:  | 75 acres  
| Operating Area Size:  | 75 acres  
| Outgoing Waste Material:  | Produces soil amendment.  
| Estimated Diversion rate:  | The facility accepts primarily source-separated feedstocks and is therefore is expected to achieve a greater than 95% diversion rate.  |
2.1.3 MIRAMAR WHOLESALE NURSERIES

Miramar Wholesale Nurseries, A TruGreen LandCare Company, processes approximately 20,000 cubic yards of green waste per year with a maximum of 10,000 cubic yards stored on site at any one time. All green waste used in Miramar Nursery’s operation is generated internally, and exclusively by TruGreen LandCare landscape branches in the San Diego area. When the compost becomes a finished product, it is used as a soil amendment for the nursery’s containerized stock, and is sold to landscapers for commercial use. Relocation of the operation within the leased area would not be expected to trigger a need for a NDFE amendment.

Location of Facility:  5400 Governor Drive
San Diego, CA  92122

Facility Permit Number:  37-AB-0011
Date of Permit Issue:  October 2007
Date of Permit Review:  October 2012

Site Capacity:  10,000 cubic yards
Daily Peak Loading:  50 cubic yards
Annual Loading:  20,000 cubic yards

Days and Hrs of Operation:  7:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., 7 days a week

Facility Size:  180 acres (approximately)
Operating Area Size:  3 acres (approximately)
Incoming Waste Material:  25 vehicles per day
Outgoing Waste Material:  5 vehicles per day
2.2 Facilities Diverting Less than Five Percent of Throughput

Although facilities diverting less than five percent of the throughput do not make a significant contribution to waste reduction, they are integral to solid waste management by increasing disposal options, and they may have effects on the solid waste system of a region.

2.2.1 EDCO RECOVERY AND TRANSFER STATION

This existing facility is located in the Barrio Logan neighborhood of San Diego. Bay Cities Services, Inc. requested permits in 1992 to operate a 200-ton-per-day (maximum) transfer station for non-putrescible materials. The current operator is EDCO Disposal Corporation, which has modified and expanded the facility to handle 1,500 tons per day of mixed waste. Less than five percent of the throughput is diverted via the hazardous material screening process. This facility also accepts documented loads of mixed C&D debris for transfer to a certified mixed C&D processing facility under the City of San Diego’s C&D Ordinance. The diversion rate assigned to these transferred mixed C&D loads is based upon the certified diversion rate of the destination facility(ies) that the material is transferred to. The facility handles waste from Coronado, La Mesa, Nation City, Lemon Grove, Chula Vista, and portions of the City of San Diego’s commercial waste stream. Because of the effect that the movement of the mixed waste stream can have on diversion programs, modification to this facility could require an NDFE amendment.

| Location of Facility: | 3660 Dalbergia Street  
| San Diego, CA  92113 |
| Facility Permit Number: | 37-AA-0105 |
| Date of Permit Issue: | December 16, 2003 |
| Date of Permit Review: | December 16, 2008 |
| Site Capacity: | 1,500 tons per day |
| Daily Peak Loading: | 1,500 tons per day |
| Annual Loading: | Not available |
| Days and Hrs of Operation: | 6:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. Monday - Saturday |
| Facility Size: | 1.6 acres |
| Operating Area Size: | 1.6 acres |
| Incoming Waste Material: | 1,506 Passenger Car Equivalent Vehicles (PCEV) per day (total in/out combined) |
| Outgoing Waste Material: | Included in 1506 PCEV per day count |
2.3 Facilities Diverting More than Five Percent of Throughput

There are two major types of waste handling facilities that may divert more than five percent of the throughput (as opposed to recyclable material handling or composting facilities). One type of facility includes transfer stations that receive both source separated recyclable materials and mixed municipal waste. There are two such facilities that serve generators in the San Diego City area. The other type of facility is sometimes called a dirty materials recycling facility or “dirty MRF.” Dirty MRFs require little responsibility on the part of the waste generator to reduce wastes or separate recyclables from the waste stream, relying instead on separation after-the-fact. They can be used to facilitate recycling and/or composting from waste streams where removing materials at the point of generation is difficult. Whether this option is appropriate depends on the nature of the waste generator and the nature of the waste stream. Waste streams high in recyclable or compostable material, where removing the material at the point of generation is difficult, are most appropriate for this technology. It can also used as the “front end” of incinerators to ensure that recyclables are recovered and inappropriate materials are not burned. Plans for one such facility proposed in the City of San Diego are described in Section 2.3.3 below.
2.3.1 UNIVERSAL WASTE REMOVAL TRANSFER STATION

This Waste Management Inc. facility is permitted to transfer mixed municipal waste to large trucks for transportation. In addition, source separated loads of commingled recyclables are transferred to large trucks for transportation to shipping or recycling facilities. This facility recently nearly doubled its 20,000 square foot building and installed processing equipment to mechanically sort mixed C&D debris. It is expected that this facility will become a certified mixed C&D processing facility under the City of San Diego’s C&D Ordinance. This facility is not located in the City of San Diego, but serves commercial waste generators in the City, as well as El Cajon, Santee, Poway, and unincorporated areas of San Diego. Modifications to expand this facility would not trigger the need for a City of San Diego NDFE amendment because the facility is not located in the City.

Location of Facility: 1180 W. Bradley
El Cajon, CA 92020

Facility Permit Number: 37-AA-0929
Date of Permit Issue: September 2008

Daily Peak Loading: 2,000 tons per day
Annual Loading: Not available
Anticipated Diversion Rate: 8% or more of total throughput

Days and Hrs of Operation: 4:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. Monday - Friday
4:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. Saturday - Sunday

Facility Size: 13 acres
Operating Area Size: 5.3 acres
Incoming Waste Material: 1,822 PCEVs per day (total in/out combined)
Outgoing Waste Material: Included in 1,822 PCEV per day count
2.3.2 EDCO STATION

This facility, located in La Mesa, is primarily a mixed waste transfer station. This facility hosts a public buy-back center. Recovery activities involve primarily sorting methods. This facility also accepts documented loads of mixed C&D debris for transfer to a certified mixed C&D processing facility under the City of San Diego’s C&D Ordinance. The diversion rate assigned to these transferred mixed C&D loads is based upon the certified diversion rate of the destination facility(ies) the material is transferred to. It is not located in the City of San Diego, but serves commercial waste that is generated in the City as well as El Cajon, Lemon Grove, La Mesa, and the unincorporated area. This facility diverts an estimated five percent of the total throughput. Modifications to expand this facility would not trigger the need for a City of San Diego NDFE amendment since the facility is not located in the City.

Location of Facility: 8184 Commercial Street
La Mesa, CA 91942

Facility Permit Number: 37-AA-0922
Date of Permit Issue: July 16, 1997

Daily Peak Loading: 1,000 tons per day
Annual Loading: 312,000 tons
Anticipated Diversion Rate: more than 5% of total throughput

Days and Hrs of Operation: 7:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. Monday - Saturday

Facility Size: 4.1 acres
Operating Area Size: 1.6 acres
Incoming Waste Material: 1214 PCEVs per day (total in/out combined)
Outgoing Waste Material: Included in 1214 PCEVs per day count
2.3.3 CITY RESOURCE MANAGEMENT FACILITY

The Resource Management Facility (RMF) was referred to as a City Material Recovery Facility in the NDFE sixth amendment. The RMF is proposed to be located southerly of the existing Metro Bio Solid Center on an approximately 18 acre site. The main building is currently planned as a two story building with approximately 250,000 square feet of floor space. Processing areas at the facility are expected to be enclosed. The facility is planned to process up to 5,000 tpd of solid waste and recyclable materials. This public facility is expected to be open seven days a week. The majority (over 90%) of the customers are expected to be residents and businesses from within the City of San Diego.

Location of Facility: 5180 Convoy St.
San Diego, CA 92111

Site Capacity: 5,000 tons/day
Annual Loading: 1,825,000 tons
Anticipated Diversion Rate: More than 5% of total throughput

Days and Hrs of Operation: Anticipated that it may be 24 hours, 7 days a week

Facility Size: 18 acres
Operating Area Size: 18 acres
Incoming Waste Material: Not available
Outgoing Waste Material: Not available
2.3.4 ALLAN COMPANY MRF AND TRANSFER STATION

This facility is operating as a Large Recycling and Processing Facility, but Allan Company has applied for a Full SWFP for a Large Volume Transfer/Processing Facility. This facility is located on a rail line for long-distance transport of materials. This facility accepts, separates, and prepares for transport materials with California Redemption Value, paper, and scrap materials. The Allan Company operates three recycling centers in San Diego. The facility on Consolidated Way processes one half of the material collected in the City’s curbside recyclable materials program.

The site will continue to be used for processing source-separated recyclables from commercial accounts, curbside recycling programs, multi-family programs and other programs from any city or county area within a 25-mile radius. It may also accept loads of commingled source separated recyclables containing higher levels of contamination. Of the material processed, it is expected that 50-75% will be diverted from disposal. Modifications to expand this facility would not be expected to trigger the need for an NDFE amendment. One of the other Allan Company facilities is described in Section 2.4.3.

Location of Facility: 6733 Consolidated Way
San Diego, CA 92121

Facility Permit Number: Pending
Date of Issue: Pending
Date of Review: TBD

Size Capacity: 1,000 tons/day
Daily Peak Loading: 1,000 tons/day
Annual Loading: 365,000 tons/year
Anticipated Diversion Rate: 50-75% of total throughput

Days and Hrs of Operation:
Receiving: 24 hours a day, 7 days a week
Public Tipping: 5 a.m.-10 p.m., 7 days a week
Processing: 24 hours a day, 7 days a week
Transferring: 24 hours a day, 7 days a week
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facility Size</td>
<td>3.58 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Area Size</td>
<td>2.5 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incoming Waste Material</td>
<td>194 vehicles per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outgoing Waste Material</td>
<td>64 vehicles per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees and Visitors</td>
<td>40 vehicles per day</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2.3.5 EDCO WASTE AND RECYCLING SERVICES RECYCLING FACILITY

This facility, located in San Marcos, is primarily a mixed construction, demolition, and inert (CDI) recycling facility. This facility hosts a public buy-back center. Recovery activities include floor sorting. This facility also accepts documented loads of mixed C&D debris for processing both directly from job sites, and also from the Escondido Resource Recovery Transfer Station (Section 2.3.6, below). It is not located in the City of San Diego, but serves commercial waste that is generated within the City. The facility diverts an estimated 72% of the total throughput as documented through certification of the facility for the City of San Diego’s C&D Ordinance. Modifications to expand this facility would not trigger the need for a City of San Diego NDFE amendment since it is not located in the City.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of Facility:</th>
<th>224 S. Las Posas Rd.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>San Marcos, CA 92078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Permit Number:</td>
<td>37-AA-0953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Capacity:</td>
<td>Not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Peak Loading:</td>
<td>174 tons per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Loading:</td>
<td>54,288 tons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit Date:</td>
<td>August 6, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days and Hrs of Operation:</td>
<td>8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. Monday – Friday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. Saturday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Size:</td>
<td>Not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Area Size:</td>
<td>Not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incoming Waste Material:</td>
<td>Not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outgoing Waste Material:</td>
<td>Not available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3.6  ESCONDIDO RESOURCE RECOVERY TRANSFER STATION

This facility, located in Escondido, is primarily a mixed waste transfer station. This facility hosts a public buy-back center. Recovery activities involve primarily floor sorting methods. Loads observed to be high in recyclable content are floor sorted for recyclables. This facility also accepts documented loads of mixed C&D debris for transfer to a certified mixed C&D processing facility under the City of San Diego’s C&D Ordinance. The diversion rate assigned to these transferred mixed C&D loads is based upon the certified diversion rate of the destination facility(ies) the material is transferred to. It is not located in the City of San Diego, but serves commercial waste that is generated within the City. The facility diverts an estimated 5% of the total throughput. Modification to expand this facility would not trigger the need for a City of San Diego NDFE amendment since the facility is not located in San Diego.

Location of Facility:  1044 W. Washington Ave.  
Escondido, CA 92025

| Facility Permit Number:  | 37-AA-0906 |
| Site Capacity:          | Not available |
| Daily Peak Loading:     | 2,500 tons per day |
| Annual Loading:         | 912,500 tons |
| Permit Date:            | July 31, 2002 |
| Days and Hrs of Operation: | 7:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. Sunday – Saturday |
| Facility Size:          | 59,000 ft² |
| Operating Area Size:    | 59,000 ft² |
| Incoming Waste Material: | Not available |
| Outgoing Waste Material: | Not available |
2.3.7 RAMONA MRF AND TRANSFER STATION

This facility, located in Ramona, is primarily a mixed waste transfer station. This facility hosts a public buy-back center. Recovery activities involve primarily floor sorting methods. Loads observed to be high in recyclable content are floor sorted for recyclables. This facility also accepts documented loads of mixed C&D debris for transfer to a certified mixed C&D processing facility under the City of San Diego’s C&D Ordinance. The diversion rate assigned to these transferred mixed C&D loads is based upon the certified diversion rate of the destination facility(ies) the material is transferred to. It is not located in the City of San Diego, but serves commercial waste generators in the City. The facility diverts an estimated 5% of the total throughput. Modifications to expand this facility would not trigger the need for a City of San Diego NDFE amendment because the facility is not located in the City.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of Facility:</th>
<th>324 Maple St.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ramona, CA 92065</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Permit Number:</th>
<th>37-AA-0925</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Capacity:</td>
<td>Not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Peak Loading:</td>
<td>700 tons per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Loading:</td>
<td>218,400 tons</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permit Date:</th>
<th>August 1, 2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Days and Hrs of Operation:</td>
<td>7:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. Monday – Saturday</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Size:</th>
<th>9,300 ft$^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating Area Size:</td>
<td>9,300 ft$^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incoming Waste Material:</td>
<td>Not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outgoing Waste Material:</td>
<td>Not available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3.8 SANCO RESOURCE RECOVERY

The SANCO Resource Recovery Facility is co-located with the EDCO Recycling Facility (Section 2.4.1, below) in Lemon Grove. It is a large volume construction, demolition, and inert material processing facility. This facility handles a variety of materials such as wood, concrete, dirt, drywall, carpet, asphalt, metals, cardboard and rock. This facility is currently open to the public six days a week, but may operate seven days per week, and is permitted for 24-hour operation. This facility accepts documented loads of mixed C&D debris for processing from the EDCO Recovery and Transfer Station (Section 2.2.1, above), EDCO Station (Section 2.3.2, above), Escondido Resource Recovery Transfer Station (Section 2.3.6, above), and Ramona MRF and Transfer Station (Section 2.3.7, above). It is not located in the City of San Diego, but serves commercial waste that is generated within the City. The facility currently diverts an estimated 57% of the total throughput as documented through certification of the facility for the City of San Diego’s C&D Ordinance. Modifications to expand this facility would not trigger the need for a City of San Diego NDFE amendment because the facility is not located in the City.

Location of Facility: 6750 Federal Blvd.
Lemon Grove, CA 91945

Facility Permit Number: 37-AA-0956
Site Capacity: Not available
Daily Peak Loading: 1,000 tons per day
Annual Loading: 365,000 tons

Days and Hrs of Operation: 6:30 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. Monday – Friday
7:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. Saturday

Facility Size: 40,000 ft²
Operating Area Size: 40,000 ft²
Incoming Waste Material: Not available
Outgoing Waste Material: Not available
2.3.9 SYCAMORE LANDFILL RECYCLING FACILITY

The Sycamore Landfill is a class III landfill located in the City of San Diego. The facility is owned by Allied Waste Services. As with the Miramar Landfill, waste diversion and resource reuse opportunities are often ideally located at the disposal facility. Allied has planned a Construction and Demolition/Inert (CDI) debris processing facility to process up to 1,000 tons per day of commingled and source separated construction and demolition/inert debris. The anticipated diversion rate for this operation is 75%. If developed, it is expected that this facility will become a certified mixed C&D processing facility under the City of San Diego’s C&D Ordinance. It is expected to serve Carlsbad, Del Mar, El Cajon, Encinitas, Escondido, La Mesa, Lemon Grove, Oceanside, Poway, San Diego, San Marcos, Santee, Solana Beach, Vista and San Diego County unincorporated communities.

Location of Facility: 8514 Mast Boulevard, Santee, California 92071

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Permit Number:</th>
<th>TBD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date of Issue:</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Review:</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Capacity:</th>
<th>1,000 tons/day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual Loading:</td>
<td>301,600 tons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated Diversion Rate:</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Days and Hrs of Operation:</th>
<th>6:00 a.m. – 8:00 p.m. (Monday through Friday)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facility Size:</td>
<td>520 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Area Size:</td>
<td>5 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incoming Waste Material:</td>
<td>Not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outgoing Waste Material:</td>
<td>Not available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3.10 OTAY LANDFILL RECYCLING FACILITY

The Otay Landfill is a class III landfill located in the unincorporated area of southern San Diego County near the City of Chula Vista. It is presently permitted to accept 5,830 tons per day of municipal solid waste. The facility is owned by Allied Waste Services. Allied has planned a Construction and Demolition/Inert (CDI) debris processing facility to process up to 1,100 tons per day of commingled and source separated construction and demolition/inert debris. The anticipated diversion rate for this operation is 75%. It is expected that this facility will become a certified mixed C&D processing facility under the City of San Diego’s C&D Ordinance. It is expected to serve Chula Vista, Coronado, El Cajon, Imperial Beach, La Mesa, Lemon Grove, National City, San Diego, and unincorporated areas of the County of San Diego.

Location of Facility: 1700 Maxwell Road, Chula Vista, California 91912

Facility Permit Number: TBD
Date of Issue: TBD
Date of Review: TBD

Site Capacity: 1,100 tons/day
Annual Loading: 331,760 tons
Anticipated Diversion Rate: 75%

Days and Hrs of Operation: 6:00 a.m. – 10:00 p.m. (Monday through Saturday)

Facility Size: 464 acres
Operating Area Size: 5 acres
Incoming Waste Material: Not available
Outgoing Waste Material: Not available
2.4 Clean Materials Recovery Facilities and Recyclers

An emphasis on measuring diversion makes it difficult to emphasize source reduction, even though that approach is at the top of the waste management hierarchy. Measuring reduction in tonnage disposed, rather than measuring tons recycled, is the easiest way to ensure that source reduction is encouraged. However, various management, planning and regulatory issues sometimes make it necessary to measure diversion. As evidenced by this document, this measurement is complicated by transfer of materials between facilities. Furthermore, most recycling facilities do not require a SWFP permit, and therefore do not require inclusion in the NDFE, despite the fact that such facilities are the backbone of the measurable diversion of most local governments’ waste diversion programs.

Public sector source reduction and diversion programs alone will not accomplish waste reduction on the scale required by law. They must be complemented by private sector efforts. Local governments can encourage such efforts through eased zoning codes, Recycling Market Development Zones, and other methods.

A significant portion of the City of San Diego’s waste stream contains recyclable materials, warranting concerted diversion efforts. A summary of the composition of waste disposed of in the City of San Diego is provided in Table 2, and Figure 2 shows additional recycling potential.
Table 2: Composition of Waste Disposed of in San Diego (calculated at 90% confidence interval).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Tons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paper</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>356,591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncoated Corrugated Cardboard</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>85,299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waxed Corrugated Cardboard</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>9,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>61,961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper Bags</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>9,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magazines and Catalogs</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>15,602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Ledger Paper</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>20,046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colored Ledger Paper</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>4,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Paper</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Office Paper</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>6,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remainder/Composite Paper</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>82,984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone Books and Directories</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>5,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Paper</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>54,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>34,626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRV Clear Bottles</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>7,757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-CRV Clear Bottles and Containers</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>5,869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRV Brown Bottles</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>3,923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-CRV Brown Bottles and Containers</td>
<td>&gt;0</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRV Other Colored Bottles</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>5,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-CRV Other Colored Bottles</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1,449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flat Glass</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>7,362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reaminder/Composite Glass</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>86,682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tin/Steel Cans</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>9,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Appliances</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Ferrous Metal</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>43,526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRV Aluminum Cans</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2,558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-CRV Aluminum Cans</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Non-Ferrous Metal</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>4,863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite Metal</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>25,273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plastic</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>98,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRV HDPE Containers</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>3,915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-CRV HDPE Containers</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1,391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRV PETE Containers</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-CRV PETE Containers</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>4,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Plastic Containers</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>6,383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film Plastic</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>46,651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durable Plastic Items</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>15,358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remainder/Composite Plastic</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>18,533</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Tons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organic</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>341,874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>139,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaves and Grass</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>70,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prunings and Trimmings</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>50,334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branches and Stumps</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>15,661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manures</td>
<td>&gt;0</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textiles</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>22,754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diapers</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>19,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remainder/Composite Organic</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>23,226</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Tons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Demolition</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>586,157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>69,435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asphalt Paving</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>8,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asphalt Roofing</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>41,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Treated Lumber</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>63,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treated Lumber</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>89,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gypsum Board</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>43,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock, Soils, and Fines</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>157,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contaminated Soil, Street Sweeping, Etc.</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>18,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpet and Carpet Padding</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>50,463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remainder/Composite C&amp;D</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>43,927</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Tons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Household Hazardous</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2,232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paint</td>
<td>&gt;0</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle and Equipment Fluids</td>
<td>&gt;0</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used Oil</td>
<td>&gt;0</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batteries</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remainder/Composite Household Hazardous</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>841</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Tons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special Wastes</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>155,954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ash</td>
<td>&gt;0</td>
<td>478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewage Solids</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>120,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Sludge</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>3,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treated Medical Waste</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2,073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulky Items</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>21,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tires</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1,771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remainder/Composite Special Waste</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>6,578</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Tons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Residue</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>17,562</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Tons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1,680,211</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. Summary of the composition of waste disposed of in the City of San Diego. Data are from Table 2, City of San Diego Waste Composition Study 1999-2000.
2.4.1 **IMS RECYCLING SERVICES, INC.**

IMS provides several recycling services including operation of the Boston Avenue facility. This facility accepts, separates, and prepares for transport one half of the recyclable materials collected by the City’s curbside program, and also material from other sources. Commingled materials are separated using CP Manufacturing, Inc. equipment. Modifications to expand this facility would not be expected to trigger the need for an NDFE amendment.

| Location of Facility: | 2740 Boston Avenue  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>San Diego, CA  92113</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Capacity:</td>
<td>4,000 tons per month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Peak Loading:</td>
<td>Not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Loading:</td>
<td>48,000 tons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days and Hrs of Operation:</td>
<td>7:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Monday - Friday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Size:</td>
<td>60,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Area Size:</td>
<td>60,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incoming Waste Material:</td>
<td>40 vehicles per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outgoing Waste Material:</td>
<td>10 vehicles per day</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**2.4.2 EDCO RECYCLING**

EDCO provides several solid waste services in the region including operation of the EDCO Recycling Facility in Lemon Grove. EDCO has a contract with the City to accept, separate, and prepare for transport recyclable materials collected at City Park and Recreation locations. Recycling drop-off bins are located at most of the City’s parks. This facility accepts and processes approximately 1,300 tons of recyclable materials per year from the City Park and Recreation program. Modifications to expand this facility would not be expected to trigger the need for an NDFE amendment.

**Location of Facility:** 6700 Federal Blvd.  
Lemon Grove, CA  91945

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Capacity:</th>
<th>Not available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily Peak Loading:</td>
<td>Designed to process an average 600 tons of source-separated and single stream recyclables per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Loading:</td>
<td>Not available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Days and Hrs of Operation: | 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. Monday - Friday  
8:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. Saturday |
| Facility Size: | 40,000 ft\(^2\)       |
| Operating Area Size: | 40,000 ft\(^2\)       |
| Incoming Waste Material: | Not available          |
| Outgoing Waste Material: | Not available          |
2.4.3 MIRAMAR RECYCLING FACILITY

The City promotes diversion via a public/private partnership with a facility located at the entrance to the Miramar Landfill. This location is important in assuring convenient access and emphasizing the ethic that recyclable materials are not trash. The Miramar Recycling Facility is located at the landfill entrance and is operated by Allan Company, which leases the land from the City. CRV materials, fibers, scrap metals, mattresses, toilets, and tires are accepted. This facility serves the San Diego area. Modifications to expand this facility would not be expected to trigger the need for an NDFE amendment.

Location of Facility: 5165 Convoy Street
San Diego, CA 92111

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Capacity: 200 tons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily Peak Loading: 60 tons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Loading: 12,000 tons</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Days and Hrs of Operation:
7:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. Monday - Friday
7:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. Saturday-Sunday

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Size: 2 acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating Area Size: 2 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incoming Waste Material: 175 vehicles per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outgoing Waste Material: 4 vehicles per day</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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2.4.4 OTHER FACILITIES

The City promotes many recycling companies by listing them on the City’s Recycling Guide. The larger recycling facilities are run by the following companies: Regan Recycling, Allan Company, California Metals, Cactus Recycling, Fibre Resources, Unlimited, Inc., Pacific Steel, Inc., San Diego Fibres, San Diego Pallet, EDCO Recycling, and Waste Management, Inc.

Many of the facilities listed in the City’s brochure are small operations that collect primarily CRV materials. Several companies, such as 20/20 Recycling Co. and Tomra Pacific Recycling, operate many small recycling centers throughout the region. These small companies sell the recyclable materials to larger companies, which process and ship the materials to end-users. The following list includes these smaller operations:

A-1 Alloys                  Old Town Recycling
AB Recycling                Otay Landfill
Allan Company               Pacific Beach Mobile Recycling
Aluminum Cans Plus          Pacific Coast Recycling
American Recycling          Pacific Steel Inc.
ARC International Corporation Palm Avenue Recycling
Ashford Recycling Center    Recycle San Diego, Inc.
Bay Ho Recycling            Regan Recycling
Can Depot                   San Diego Fibers Corp.
EDCO Recycling              San Diego Wild Animal Park
Escondido Recycling Yard    Save the Planet Recycling Center Inc.
E-World Recyclers           Southwest Recycling
IMS Recycling               Spring Recycling
J&R Recycling               Stadium Market & Recycling
Linda Recycling             The Recycling Depot
Main Street Recycling       Tomra Pacific Recycling
Mike's Recycling
Nexcycle
OB Recycling
The City’s brochure also promotes companies that collect recyclable material directly from businesses. With the implementation of the City Recycling Ordinance, this brochure was reformatted to distinguish the City’s franchised waste haulers and certified recyclable material collectors from non-certified recyclers. These companies collect materials such as computer/white office paper, colored paper, mixed office paper, newspaper, cardboard, CRV aluminum, CRV glass, scrap glass, tin and steel cans, CRV (polyethylene terephthalate, or PET) plastic, high-density polyethylene (HDPE) plastic, industrial plastics, cooking oil, polystyrene, wood pallets, and green waste. They include the following companies:

### Franchised Waste Haulers and/or Certified Recyclers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Franchised Waste Haulers</th>
<th>Certified Recyclers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allan Company</td>
<td>Legacy Fibers International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allied Waste Services</td>
<td>Sani-Tainer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cactus Recycling</td>
<td>Tayman Industries Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coast Waste Management</td>
<td>Ware Disposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debris Box</td>
<td>Waste Management Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependable Disposal</td>
<td>Webco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDCO Waste &amp; Recycling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Express Waste &amp; Recycling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Non-Certified Recyclers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Certified Recyclers</th>
<th>Non-Certified Recyclers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrow Recycling Inc.</td>
<td>Recall Secure Destruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Metals</td>
<td>Resource Management Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fibre Resources Unlimited Inc.</td>
<td>San Diego Fibres Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Earth Recycling</td>
<td>San Diego Pallet Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klein Metals &amp; Recycling</td>
<td>Summit Corrugated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North County Grease SVC</td>
<td>Urban Corps of San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Town Recycling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prime Plastics Products</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The City also has included in the recycling guide facilities that collect construction and demolition debris and yard waste. With the implementation of the City’s C&D Ordinance on July 1, 2008, this guide was reformatted to only display facilities that have been certified by the City for the C&D Ordinance. These facilities are divided into three categories: Certified Mixed C&D Processing Facilities, Certified Mixed C&D Transfer Stations, and Source Separated Recycling Facilities. The Source Separated Recycling Facilities accept materials such as metals, clean wood, concrete, asphalt, clean fill dirt, mixed inerts (i.e., concrete, asphalt, dirt, rock, brick etc.), corrugated cardboard, carpet, carpet padding, textiles, building materials for reuse, green waste, land clearing debris, toilets (stripped), brick, block, ceramic tile, industrial plastics, and/or polystyrene (no peanuts). The following are the companies that are currently listed:

Certified Mixed C&D Processing Facilities:

EDCO Waste and Recycling Services
CDI Recycling (Section 2.3.5)
SANCO Resource Recovery
(Section 2.3.8)

Certified Mixed C&D Transfer Stations:

EDCO Recovery and Transfer Station
(Section 2.2.1)
Escondido Resource Recovery
Transfer (Section 2.3.6 (above))
EDCO Station (Section 2.3.2)
Ramona MRF and Transfer (Section 2.3.7)

Certified Source Separated Recycling Facilities:

Allan Company, Consolidated Way
Allan Company Miramar Recycling
Allan Company, Mast St
Cactus Recycling
EDCO Recycling Center, San Diego
EDCO Recycling Center, La Mesa
EDCO Recycling Center, Lemon Grove
EDCO Recycling Center, Ramona
Ennis Incorporated
Escondido Sand and Gravel
Habitat for Humanity ReStore
IMS Recycling Services, Boston Ave.
IMS Recycling Services, Main St.
Inland Pacific Resource Recovery
JCloud Inc./Hester’s Granite Co.
Miramar Greenery
Pacific Steel, Inc.
Rimrock CA, LLC
Romero General Construction Corp.
Vulcan Carol Canyon Landfill
The following non-certified facilities also accept Construction and Demolition debris:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agri-Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Salvage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battle Lumber &amp; Hardware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Commercial Asphalt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpet Pad Collections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3D Carpet Covering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D &amp; D Recycling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat Restore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanson Aggregates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.E. Morrison Sand &amp; Gravel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeside Land Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moody Excavating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ReRock Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romero General Const Corp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior Ready Mix Concrete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulcan Materials - Western Div.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.5 Facilities Deleted from the NDFE

This section lists all facilities that are no longer in operation or no longer planned and therefore have been deleted from the City’s planning effort. Currently there is one such facility.

#### 2.5.1 CITY MATERIAL RECOVERY FACILITY

This Material Recovery Facility was planned for the Miramar Landfill to reduce the amount of waste, especially construction and demolition debris buried in the landfill. The MRF would have incorporated mechanized and manual sorting of incoming loads to separate the maximum amount of recyclable materials possible. Diverted recyclables would have included construction and demolition waste, metals, cardboard, and green waste.
2.6 Map of NDFE Facilities
August 7, 2008

Mr. Rob Rundle, Principal Regional Planner
San Diego Association of Governments
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, California 92101

Dear Mr. Rundle

RE: City of San Diego Non-Disposal Facility Element – Seventh Amendment

The Integrated Waste Management Technical Advisory Committee (IWMTAC) is hereby recommending that SANDAG, while acting in its role as the Solid Waste Local Task Force, recommend to The City of San Diego (City) to transmit the City’s proposed Non-Disposal Facility Amendment (NDFE) – Seventh Amendment to the California Integrated Waste Management Board for review and approval.

This revised NDFE will replace the City’s current Sixth Edition, and will facilitate changes including, but not limited to, deleting a previously proposed City Material Recovery Facility which would have processed mixed construction, demolition, and inert (CDI) debris but is no longer needed, moving the Allan Company Consolidated Way facility description to reflect Allan Company applying for a Full Solid Waste Facility Permit for a large volume Transfer/Processing Facility, adding proposed CDI recycling operations at Sycamore Landfill and Otay Landfill, and adding existing facilities which handle and/or process CDI debris: EDCO Waste and Recycling Services CDI, Escondido Resource Recovery Transfer, Ramona MRF and Transfer, and SANCO Resource Recovery.

These proposed changes will help the City in meeting its State AB 939 mandated diversion goal.

Sincerely,

Barbara Kraber, City of Lemon Grove
August 2008 Chair
San Diego Association of Governments

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

October 3, 2008

AGENDA ITEM NO.: 6

Action Requested: ACCEPT

REGIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN: 2008 ANNUAL PERFORMANCE MONITORING REPORT File Number 3000200

Introduction

Chapter 8 of the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) describes how SANDAG will use performance indicators as a tool to track the region’s progress in meeting the goals and policy objectives of the plan. In 2006, SANDAG released The Regional Comprehensive Plan: Establishing a Baseline for Performance Monitoring (Baseline Report). The report discusses the significance of each of the 39 indicators that were established in the RCP, provides preliminary findings for each indicator where data were available, and includes a discussion of SANDAG work efforts underway that could influence performance over time. The Baseline Report serves as a reference and benchmark for all future monitoring reports.

Monitoring our progress in implementing the RCP will occur on an annual basis. The attached 2008 Annual Performance Monitoring Report (2008 Monitoring Report) represents the second annual RCP monitoring report since the Baseline Report was accepted by the SANDAG Board of Directors in October 2006.

Discussion

The 2008 Monitoring Report follows the same format as last year’s annual performance monitoring report: it sets forth results for the most recent one-year reporting period (which in most cases is calendar year 2007) and describes the data for the most recent year relative to trends observed in previous years.

2008 Report Highlights

There are areas where the region appears to be moving in the right direction and others where improvement is needed.
Moving in the Right Direction

- The share of new housing units built in Smart Growth Opportunity Areas increased.
- Annual hours of traffic delay per traveler have decreased.
- Transit ridership continued to increase.
- The regional crime rate continued to decrease.
- The percent of solid waste that was recycled in 2006 was close to achieving the state-mandated target.
- Recycled water use continued to increase substantially.

Areas for Improvement

- Housing production in the very low-, low-, and moderate-income categories did not keep pace with above-moderate housing production: 42 percent of the above-moderate income housing goal identified in the RHNA has been met, while less than 10 percent of the very low-, low-, and moderate-income housing goal has been met. Overall, only 21 percent of the the RHNA housing production goal has been met during the first half of the housing element cycle.
- Region-wide, the share of total commutes made by transit, walking, bicycling, and carpool/vanpool has not increased substantially since 2000.
- Following beach width increases at all beaches in 2006, beach widths declined in 2007; for several beaches, widths were even smaller in 2007 than they were in 2005.
- Unemployment increased for the first time in three years.
- Per capita energy usage in the region continued to increase, moving further away from the target established in the Regional Energy Strategy.
- Plans estimate that the region will reach physical landfill capacity in 2016, but unless proposed permit changes are implemented, permitted capacity could be reached prior to 2016.

Next Steps

This report will be presented to the Regional Planning Technical Working Group in October for review and comment. Once the 30-day public comment period is complete, the final report will be prepared and forwarded to the Board of Directors for consideration and acceptance as the 2008 Annual RCP Performance Monitoring Report.

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning
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The Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP), adopted by the SANDAG Board of Directors in 2004, is the long-term planning framework for the San Diego region. It defines a vision and lays out goals, key issues, and needed actions in areas ranging from urban form and transportation to public facilities and borders. It summarizes where we were in 2004, where we want to be by 2030, and what we need to do to get there. The RCP also calls for ongoing monitoring to track progress toward meeting the goals outlined in the Plan.

In 2006, SANDAG released the Regional Comprehensive Plan: Establishing a Baseline for Monitoring Performance (Baseline Report), to be used to benchmark progress on an annual basis. The 2008 Regional Comprehensive Plan Annual Performance Monitoring Report (2008 Monitoring Report) is the second since the Baseline Report was accepted by the Board in October 2006.

The 2008 Monitoring Report includes the most recent data available for each indicator, typically from 2007. For some indicators, there is a one year delay in reporting; in these cases, data from 2006 are included. For all indicators, the most recent data are provided and related to the Baseline Report.

Based on the data collected for the 2008 Monitoring Report, the indicators illustrate those areas in which the region appears to be moving in the right direction and those in which improvement is needed.

**Moving in the Right Direction**

- The share of new housing units built in Smart Growth Opportunity Areas increased.
- Annual hours of traffic delay per traveler have decreased.
- Transit ridership continued to increase.
- The regional crime rate continued to decrease.
- The percent of solid waste that was recycled was close to achieving the state-mandated target.\(^1\)
- Recycled water use continued to increase substantially.

**Areas for Improvement**

- Housing production in the very low, low, and moderate income categories did not keep pace with above-moderate housing production: 42 percent of the above-moderate income housing goal identified in the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) has been met, while less than 10 percent of the very low-, low-, and moderate-income housing goal has been met. Overall, only 21 percent of the RHNA housing production goal has been met during the first half of the housing element cycle.
- Regionwide, the share of commutes made by transit, walking, bicycling, and carpool/vanpool have not increased substantially.
- Following beach width increases at all beaches in 2006, beach widths declined in 2007; for multiple beaches, widths are even smaller in 2007 than they were in 2005.
- Unemployment increased for the first time in three years.

---

\(^1\) The percent of solid waste that was recycled in 2006 is based on a preliminary estimate; it is anticipated that when this estimate is revised, it will be higher than originally estimated and show that the region actually has achieved or exceeded the state-mandated target.
• Per capita energy usage in the region continued to increase, moving further away from the target established in the Regional Energy Strategy.

• Plans estimate that the region will reach physical landfill capacity in 2016, but unless proposed permit changes are implemented, permitted capacity could be reached prior to 2016.

Throughout the 2008 Monitoring Report, indicator data are in certain cases related to growth in population, housing, or jobs, as shown in Table 1. Between 2006 and 2007, the region grew by 34,156 people, and added 13,466 housing units, and 6,500 jobs.

Table 1
Population, Housing Units, and Job Growth in the San Diego Region, 2000 to 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>2,813,833</td>
<td>3,064,113</td>
<td>3,098,269</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Units</td>
<td>1,040,149</td>
<td>1,118,283</td>
<td>1,131,749</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs</td>
<td>1,205,200</td>
<td>1,312,500</td>
<td>1,319,000</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: SANDAG Annual Population and Housing Estimates; California Department of Finance; California Employment Development Department; Bureau of Labor Statistics

Many of the indicators included in this report use the American Community Survey (ACS) as their data source. ACS is the United States (U.S.) Census Bureau’s new program for collecting and disseminating demographic, socio-economic, and housing data on an annual basis. Approximately one out of 40 addresses (2.5 percent of the population) is surveyed each year, which equals about three million addresses a year. In San Diego County, one out of 40 equates to about 28,800 addresses each year.

Please note that ACS is not designed to count the population, but rather to collect person and household characteristic information. The official Census (short form), which counts the entire population, still will be conducted every ten years, with the next Census taking place in 2010.

Annual indicators were selected as part of the RCP. Due to changes in federal air quality standards, progress toward meeting the federal standard for 8-hour ozone will now replace the Air Quality Index to report Air Quality.
### Annual Indicators for Monitoring the Regional Comprehensive Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban Form and Transportation</th>
<th>1. Share of new housing units and jobs located in Smart Growth Opportunity Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Share of new housing units within County Water Authority water service boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Annual transit ridership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Commute mode shares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Travel times and volumes for key transportation corridors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Miles of deficient roads on Congestion Management Program network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Annual hours of traffic delay per traveler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Regional crime rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>9. Housing Opportunity Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. Percent of households with housing costs greater than 35 percent of income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. Ratio of new jobs to new housing units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. Share of new and existing housing units by structure type and income category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. Vacancy rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14. Percent of households living in overcrowded conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15. Number of households on the waiting list for Section 8 vouchers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Environment</td>
<td>16. Habitat conserved within designated preserve areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17. Percent of preserve areas actively maintained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18. Number of beach mile closure days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19. Impaired waterbodies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20. Beach widths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21. Lagoon health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22. Air Quality Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Prosperity</td>
<td>23. Labor force educational attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24. Employment growth in high-wage economic clusters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25. Regional unemployment rate compared to California and the United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26. Real per capita income compared to California and the United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27. Regional poverty rate compared to California and the United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Facilities</td>
<td>28. Water consumption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29. Diversity of water supply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30. Recycled water use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31. Per capita electricity consumption and peak demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32. Share of energy produced in the region versus imported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33. Share of energy produced from renewable resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34. Percent of solid waste that is recycled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35. Landfill space available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borders</td>
<td>36. Interregional traffic volumes into San Diego from surrounding counties and Baja California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37. Border wait times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38. Participation in SENTRI Lanes, Pedestrian Commuter Program, Free and Secure Trade (FAST) Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Urban Form and Transportation

Our land use and urban design decisions determine how well our communities serve us in our daily lives, including the quality of our travel choices and our personal safety. The Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) encourages urban development with an appropriate mix of uses designed to create safe and healthy communities. In addition, the relationship between regional transportation plans and local land use plans and policies is crucial to ensuring that the region’s transportation system efficiently connects our communities. The Urban Form and Transportation indicators track progress toward achieving these goals.

Share of New Housing Units and Jobs Located Within Smart Growth Opportunity Areas

In 2006, 19,000 new housing units were built in the region. Of these, almost 6,000, or 31 percent, were built in Smart Growth Opportunity Areas, as shown in Figure 1. This represents an increase in the share of new housing units built in Smart Growth Opportunity Areas, from 13 percent in 2005.

At the time of publication, new data regarding job growth in Smart Growth Opportunity Areas are unavailable. The Smart Growth Opportunity Areas experienced a net loss of 2,394 jobs, representing a 5 percent decrease between 2004 and 2005, while the region as a whole experienced an increase of 21,500 jobs during the same time period. As of 2005, 33 percent of the region’s jobs were located in Smart Growth Opportunity Areas.

With only three years of data for this indicator, it is unclear how many new housing units and jobs can be anticipated annually in Smart Growth Opportunity Areas, and which factors may be influencing growth in these areas. Continued monitoring is required to identify trends.

Figure 1
Share of New Housing Units in Smart Growth Opportunity Areas, 2004 to 2006

Source: SANDAG Current Estimates Program

2 SANDAG, working closely with the local jurisdictions, developed a Smart Growth Concept Map in 2006, that includes approximately 200 existing, planned, and potential locations for smart growth development based upon land use density and associated transportation service targets in the RCP. The Smart Growth Concept Map was used in the development of the 2007 Regional Transportation Plan, and to determine eligibility for participation in the TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program.
Share of New Housing Units Within County Water Authority Water Service Boundary

In 2007, the share of new housing units built within the San Diego County Water Authority service boundary increased slightly, to 97.3 percent, as shown in Figure 2. These data signify progress toward the RCP goal of focusing population and job growth away from rural areas and closer to existing and planned job centers and public facilities.

Figure 2
New Housing Units in the County Water Authority Service Area, 2006 to 2007

![Diagram showing the share of new housing units built within the County Water Authority service area from 2006 to 2007.]

Source: SANDAG Current Estimates Program

Annual Transit Ridership

Regional transit ridership continued to increase, continuing an upward trend since 2003; ridership grew 2 percent between 2006 and 2007. There were 97 million transit riders in the San Diego region in 2007, as shown in Figure 3.

This upward trend over the past three years is expected to continue in the near future with the opening of the SPRINTER rail line this year and increasing gas prices.

Figure 3
San Diego Regional Annual Transit Boardings, 2000 to 2007

![Diagram showing the annual transit boardings in the San Diego region from 2000 to 2007.]

Sources: Annual Boardings Data, Metropolitan Transit System and North County Transit District; SANDAG

Commute Mode Shares

As shown in Figure 4, the regional mode split remains stable. The share of commuters driving alone to work has not significantly changed. Year-to-year fluctuations in the data may be the result of sample differences and may not reflect true year-to-year changes. In future years, this data will be reported at a corridor level.
The data suggest that the proportion of workers driving alone has dropped, and that working at home and bicycle or walk commutes have increased. However, these trends may be as much a result of new data collection methods in the American Community Survey (ACS) as they are of actual trends. Beginning in 2006, the ACS includes data on residents of group quarters facilities, whose commute patterns may differ from those of the household population. Therefore, data from prior years are not directly comparable. Trends may be better analyzed in next year’s report.

Additionally, in future years, this data will be reported at a corridor level.

Figure 4
Regional Commute Mode Shares, 2000 to 2006

Travel Times and Volumes for Key Transportation Corridors

The RCP includes the goals of reducing traffic congestion on freeways and arterials and developing a network of fast, convenient, high-quality transit services that are competitive with drive-alone travel times during peak periods. Progress toward these goals can be measured by evaluating travel times and volumes for key auto and transit corridors.

Travel time and volume data on freeways are provided by the Performance Measurement System (PeMS), a Web-based tool used for reporting and monitoring the performance of the freeway system. Freeway detector stations collect volume and lane occupancy information every 30 seconds.

Improvement of PeMS has been ongoing since its initial development and the release of the first PeMS system version in the late 1990s. Key PeMS enhancements generally have focused on assessing and improving the quality of the data and performance measures that PeMS provides. Specific enhancements currently being developed for the San Diego region under the PeMS multimodal project will allow PeMS to incorporate real-time transit and arterial data. Through this effort, PeMS will have the ability to measure usage and travel time data for both transit and arterials, including the estimation of on-ramp
wait times. This additional data will better approximate “door-to-door” travel times. PeMS analysis of key performance measures also will be enhanced by reporting an estimated travel time reliability factor. Once these PeMS enhancements are completed, they will be incorporated in future monitoring reports.3

Travel times shown in Table 2 differ from those presented in the 2007 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) for two reasons:

- RTP travel times are model-based, whereas the reported travel times represent actual observed data. The San Diego Regional Transportation Model estimates travel time on each arterial or freeway link, taking into account the configuration of the road, volume of traffic assigned, and any intersection controls. The modeled travel times are not observed data, as they are derived from a series of programs designed to forecast travel demand on the transportation system.

- RTP travel times represent “door-to-door” commute times that include trip time on arterial streets, whereas the travel times listed below only include trip time once on the freeway. However, as indicated above, PeMS will have the ability to measure arterial travel times, to approximate RTP door-to-door travel times for future reports.

Travel times have not increased nor decreased substantially in most corridors. The Interstate 15 (I-15) southbound a.m. and I-805 southbound p.m. commutes experienced the greatest decrease in travel time, dropping seven minutes, respectively from 2006 to 2007. Between 2006 and 2007, commute times in most corridors either decreased slightly or remained the same.

### Table 2

#### Travel Times in Key Auto Corridors, 2005 to 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Corridor</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>A.M. Peak Period</th>
<th>P.M. Peak Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>L-5</td>
<td>Oceanside to Downtown San Diego (SD)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>Escondido to Downtown SD</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SR 78</td>
<td>Escondido to Carlsbad</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SR 94</td>
<td>El Cajon to Downtown SD</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>L-8</td>
<td>El Cajon to Downtown SD</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>SR 52</td>
<td>Santee to Sorrento Valley</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>Mid-City to Sorrento Valley</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>Chula Vista to Sorrento Valley</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>Chula Vista to Downtown SD</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>L-5</td>
<td>San Ysidro to Downtown SD</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>El Cajon to Sorrento Valley</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Freeway Performance Measurement System (PeMS Version 9.0), Caltrans

Notes: (a) The a.m. peak period is based on a departure time of 7:30 a.m., and the p.m. peak period is based on a departure time of 4:00 p.m. (b) The a.m. direction is listed; the p.m. is the reverse direction of travel. (c) Corridor limits are listed for the a.m. direction and are approximately the same for the p.m. direction. (d) Data are reported for commutes on Tuesdays, Wednesdays, and Thursdays.

3 Additionally, travel times and volumes reported for previous years in the 2008 Monitoring Report may differ from those reported in last year’s report, as recent enhancements to PeMS include improved travel time calculations that more accurately reflect the start and end points of the designated freeway segments. Travel volumes for specific corridors may reflect different monitoring stations from previous reports in order to better reflect the travel characteristics or modal services within that corridor. Also, a different monitoring station may be used for a given report if a station is unavailable or unreliable due to highway construction, maintenance, or roadway incidents that might otherwise skew the data.
Map 1
Key Auto Corridor Travel Times, San Diego County, 2007
As shown in Table 3, travel volumes decreased slightly in most corridors in 2007. Observed decreases in travel times, and travel volumes in particular in 2007, may likely be attributed to the increase in gas prices and the state of the economy. However, a number of freeway improvements have been completed since 2005, which also may account for subsequent increases in mobility. For example, declining traffic on northbound I-5 may be the result of the opening of the northbound I-5/I-805 bypass lanes in spring 2005. These new bypass lanes divert traffic from the general purpose lanes, decreasing delay, and improving overall corridor travel times. It is anticipated that southbound traffic on I-5 also will decrease with the opening of the southbound bypass lanes in summer 2007; this anticipated decrease may be reflected in next year’s monitoring report. More detailed analysis relative to these improvements and specific corridor monitoring will be provided in the SANDAG State of the Commute Report, to be published in spring 2009.

Table 3
Travel Volumes in Key Auto Corridors, 2005 to 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Corridor</th>
<th>Average Number of Vehicles Passing Monitoring Stations on a Weekday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Northbound/Eastbound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I-5 Oceanside to Downtown SD</td>
<td>108,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I-15 Escondido to Downtown SD</td>
<td>97,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SR 78 Escondido to Carlsbad</td>
<td>77,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SR 94 El Cajon to Downtown SD</td>
<td>75,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I-8 El Cajon to Downtown SD</td>
<td>114,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>SR 52 Santee to Kearny Mesa</td>
<td>39,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I-805 Mid-City to Sorrento Valley</td>
<td>104,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I-805 Chula Vista to Sorrento Valley</td>
<td>104,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I-805 Chula Vista to Downtown SD</td>
<td>108,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I-5 San Ysidro to Downtown SD</td>
<td>83,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I-8 El Cajon to Sorrento Valley</td>
<td>114,900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Freeway Performance Measurement System (PeMS Version 9.0), Caltrans

Notes: (a) Data are reported for commutes on Tuesdays, Wednesdays, and Thursdays. (b) Traffic data obtained from monitoring stations may be subject to atypical operating conditions due to active highway construction. Volumes for I-805 Mid-City to Sorrento Valley and I-805 Chula Vista to Sorrento Valley are the same as those for Chula Vista to Downtown San Diego because they share the same screenline.

As PeMS continues to be developed and refined, it will eventually incorporate real-time transit data. In the meantime, the 2008 Monitoring Report includes transit volume information from FY 2005 through FY 2007 based on SANDAG Passenger Counting Program data. Transit passenger volumes are measured at key locations (screenlines) selected within each corridor. For each corridor, transit passenger volumes are listed by screenline in Table 4.

Transit volumes largely have remained consistent since 2005 along most corridors. The largest increase, in the I-8 El Cajon to Downtown San Diego corridor, is associated with the opening of the Green Line Trolley in 2005. The Green Line Trolley opening resulted in the addition of more than 4,000 passengers each way along the corridor, on an average weekday. A similar increase is expected along the SR 78 Escondido to Carlsbad corridor in FY 2008 due to the SPRINT line opening in March 2008.
## Table 4
Transit Passenger Volumes in Key Transit Corridors at Specific Screenline Locations, 2005 to 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Corridor</th>
<th>Screenline(s) and Corresponding Transit Service</th>
<th>Northbound/Eastbound</th>
<th>Southbound/Westbound</th>
<th>Total – Both Directions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I-5 (Oceanside to Downtown SD)</td>
<td>Sorrento Valley</td>
<td>2,852</td>
<td>2,945</td>
<td>2,762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>COASTER</td>
<td>Route(s): 101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I-15 (Escondido to Downtown SD)</td>
<td>Poway</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Route(s): 20, 810, 820, 850, 860</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Miramar</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>958</td>
<td>797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Route(s): 20, 210, 810, 820, 850, 860</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SR 78 (Escondido to Carlsbad)</td>
<td>Vista</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Route(s): 320</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Route(s): 320</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SR 94 (El Cajon to Downtown SD)</td>
<td>Euclid Trolley Station</td>
<td>4,888</td>
<td>4,780</td>
<td>4,703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Orange Line Trolley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I-8 (El Cajon to Downtown SD)</td>
<td>Fashion Valley Trolley Station</td>
<td>1,224</td>
<td>5,396</td>
<td>6,372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Green Line Trolley</td>
<td>Route(s): 11, 14, 44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SDSU</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>3,043</td>
<td>3,737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Green Line Trolley</td>
<td>Route(s): 11, 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>SR 52 (Santee to Kearny Mesa)</td>
<td>Santee</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Route(s): 870</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I-805 (Mid-City to Sorrento Valley)</td>
<td>University City</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>1,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Route(s): 50, 105, 150, 960</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I-805 (Chula Vista to Sorrento Valley)</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I-805 (Chula Vista to Downtown SD)</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I-5 (San Ysidro to Downtown SD)</td>
<td>San Ysidro/Tijuana Trolley Station</td>
<td>13,234</td>
<td>13,835</td>
<td>13,941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Blue Line Trolley</td>
<td>Route(s): 929 and 932</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12th and Imperial Trolley Station</td>
<td>10,904</td>
<td>10,654</td>
<td>10,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Blue Line Trolley</td>
<td>Route(s): 929</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I-8 (El Cajon to Sorrento Valley)</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SANDAG Passenger Counting Program
It is anticipated that systemwide transit travel volumes likely will continue to increase, while freeway travel times and volumes likely will continue to decrease in 2008. These predictions are made in light of multiple factors, such as the economic slowdown, further increases in gas prices, as well as infrastructure improvements, such as the opening of the SPRINT light rail service along the SR 78 corridor and freeway improvements that should improve mobility within specific segments.

Miles of Deficient Roads on Congestion Management Program Network

Between 2005 and 2007, the miles of Congestion Management Program (CMP) deficient arterials, highways, and freeways decreased. Improvement was most pronounced among the region’s arterials: only 8 percent of the CMP network arterials were considered deficient in 2007, as compared to 22 percent in 2005. The miles of deficient freeways on the CMP network also decreased, from 36 percent in 2005 to 23 percent in 2007, as shown in Figure 5.

Figure 5


Annual Hours of Traffic Delay per Traveler

Annual hours of traffic delay per traveler increased in 2004, and then decreased slightly in 2005, as shown in Figure 6. Delay is defined as the extra travel time it takes travelers to complete a trip during peak periods (6 to 9 a.m. and 4 to 7 p.m.) as a result of congestion.

Figure 6
Annual Hours of Traffic Delay per Traveler During Peak Periods, 2000 to 2005

Source: Annual Urban Mobility Report, Texas Transportation Institute
Regional Crime Rate

As shown in Figure 7, the rate of crime in the region continues to decline, and in 2007 reached its lowest rate since 2000.

Figure 7
FBI Index Crimes per 1,000 People, 2000 to 2007

Source: SANDAG Criminal Justice Research Division (data provided by local law enforcement agencies)

Conclusion

As of 2007, the region made progress toward achieving some of the urban form and transportation goals listed in the RCP, but not others. The continued increase in annual transit ridership is an encouraging sign that the region’s residents increasingly are traveling by public transit. It is anticipated that this trend likely will continue in light of increasing gas prices and with the opening of the SPRINT rail line. Future monitoring is required to fully understand our progress toward improving mobility. When examining travel times and volumes in key auto and transit corridors, this indicator suggests that the region is reasonably managing congestion, as freeway travel times and volumes mostly have decreased between 2006 and 2007.
Despite the sharp fall in housing prices during the last year, the lack of affordable housing continues to be one of the major issues facing the San Diego region today. The Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) calls for more housing choices—more apartments, condominiums, and single family homes in all price ranges. How much housing we build, what type of housing we build, and where we build it are some of the most important decisions we can make in shaping our region’s future. The Smart Growth Opportunity Areas located on the Smart Growth Concept Map identify 200 sites throughout the region where new housing can be located near jobs and transit—thus providing more housing and transportation choices.

**Housing Opportunity Index**

Data from 2007 indicates that the downward trend in housing affordability since 2000 finally may be reversing. During 2007, there was a doubling (from 5% in 2005 and 2006 to 10% in 2007) in the percentage of homes sold that are affordable to a household earning the regional median income, as shown in Figure 8. This change is likely the result of the mortgage lending crisis and increase in foreclosures that have affected the region, as well as the country as a whole. Housing, however, is still out of reach for many households in the region. The median price of all homes (resale houses, resale condominiums, and new houses/condominiums and condominium conversions) dropped by 25 percent from $495,500 in June 2007, to $370,000 in June 2008 (DataQuick Information Systems). The current median home price is almost six times the regional median household income of $68,388. Historically, the median price of a home has been three to four times the median income.

**Figure 8**

**Housing Opportunity Index, 2000 to 2007**

Since 2000, an increasing percentage of households in the region have been paying more than 35 percent of their income toward housing costs. This trend may be stabilizing, because the change between 2005 and 2006 is not statistically significant, as shown in Figure 9. Year-to-year fluctuations in the data may be the result of sample differences and may not reflect true year-to-year changes.
Another indicator of affordability problems in the region is the income a household must earn to afford the rent for an apartment at the Department of Housing and Urban Development’s Fair Market Rent of $1,355 for a two-bedroom unit. In 2007/2008 that amount was $54,200 annually or $26 per hour (assuming that no more than 30 percent of its income is spent on housing), as shown in Figure 10.

In California, the minimum wage in 2008 is $8.00 per hour; the average wage earned by renters in the San Diego region is $15.64 per hour. Therefore, a household must include over three minimum wage earners working forty hours per week year-round, to make a two-bedroom fair market rent affordable.

**Ratio of New Jobs to New Housing Units**

The ratio of new jobs to new housing units has fluctuated since 2001, and in 2007 experienced a threefold decline compared to 2006. In 2007, there were 0.5 new jobs for every new housing unit in the region, indicative of the economic slowdown and associated decline in job growth, as shown in Figure 11.
Figure 11
Total New Jobs per New Housing Unit Ratio, 2001 to 2007

![Graph showing the ratio of new jobs to new housing units from 2001 to 2008.](image)

Sources: SANDAG Annual Population and Housing Estimates; California Employment Development Department

Share of New Housing Units by Income Category

A total of 22,816 building permits for new housing units were issued in the region between July 2005 and December 2007 (2.5 years of the five-year housing element cycle), including 1,250 very low-income, 1,475 low-income, 1,258 moderate-income, and 18,833 above moderate-income housing units, as shown in Table 5. Based on the 2005 – 2010 Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) adopted by SANDAG in February 2005, the region achieved 5 percent of the very low-income, 8 percent of the low-income, 6 percent of the moderate-income, and 42 percent of the above moderate-income housing needs established in the RHNA. The data show that the above moderate-income housing needs established in the RHNA are closer to being met, while the housing needs for very low-, low-, and moderate-income households are not. The subsidies needed to build very low-and low-income housing in the region are inadequate to meet the region’s lower income RHNA goals despite the approval of the statewide affordable housing bonds in 2002 and 2006. Few moderate income units were built because of the high costs associated with land and construction materials and the requirement to use most financial resources to build lower income units. Building permit issuance has dropped off during the past year, so the construction of above moderate-income units may slow over the next two years.

Overall, the region has met only 21 percent of its RHNA housing goal of 107,301 units during the first half of the housing element cycle.

Table 5
Share of New Housing Units by Income Category, July 1, 2005 – December 31, 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Above Moderate</th>
<th>Total for All Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Housing Units Produced</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>1,475</td>
<td>1,258</td>
<td>18,833</td>
<td>22,816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Housing Units Permitted</td>
<td>24,143</td>
<td>18,348</td>
<td>20,280</td>
<td>44,530</td>
<td>107,301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Goal Permitted</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units Left to Permit</td>
<td>22,893</td>
<td>16,873</td>
<td>19,022</td>
<td>25,697</td>
<td>84,485</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data compiled from building permits issued by local jurisdictions in the San Diego region

Vacancy Rates

Vacancy rates have remained relatively stable since 2000, at approximately 4.5 percent as shown in Figure 12. Year-to-year fluctuations in the data may be the result of sample differences and may not reflect true year-to-year changes.
Figure 12
Vacancy Rates, 2000 to 2007

Percent of Households Living in Overcrowded Conditions

As shown in Figure 13, the percentage of households living in overcrowded conditions in the region continues to decline. Fluctuations in the data between 2005 and 2006 may be the result of sample differences and may not reflect true year-to-year changes.

Figure 13
Overcrowding in the Region, 2000 to 2006

Number of Households on the Waiting List for Section 8 Vouchers

In 2008, there are approximately 49,700 households on the Section 8 waiting list, down from approximately 65,600 households in 2007 and 73,500 households in 2006. The reduction is likely the result of the periodic purging of the lists undertaken by the Section 8 jurisdictions. The jurisdictions that issue Section 8 vouchers are Carlsbad, Encinitas, National City, Oceanside, the City of San Diego, and the County of San Diego.

Conclusion

Housing affordability continues to be a problem for the region; however, the above data indicate that the rapid decline in affordability (i.e., increase in housing costs) may have slowed for the time being. Much of this change has been due to the decline in housing prices, resulting from the large number of foreclosures experienced both in the region and nationwide. Nevertheless, progress toward meeting RHNA goals has been slow, particularly in the lower and moderate income categories.
Healthy Environment

To ensure a healthy environment, the region must protect its key open spaces and sensitive habitat areas, ensure that the air and water are clean, and restore the eroding beaches. Viable natural habitats, water quality, a well-managed shoreline, and air quality are critical components to the health and well-being of residents, as well as to the overall economic prosperity of the region.

Habitat Conserved Within Designated Preserve Areas

Of the jurisdictions with approved conservation plans and signed implementing agreements, 58 percent of land has been conserved within the habitat preserve system, as shown in Figure 14. This includes 6,090 acres preserved to date within the City of Carlsbad.

Additionally, the City of San Diego and County of San Diego have indicated that an additional 15,400 acres and 12,200 acres, respectively, have been obligated for habitat conservation under approved discretionary development entitlements or conservation banks, but have not yet been conserved through formal legal mechanisms (e.g., easement, dedication in fee title to jurisdictions).

Figure 14
MSCP South County and MHCP Land Conservation by Year, 1997 to 2031

The region is engaging in the implementation or development of four subregional habitat conservation plans: the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) South, finalized in 1998; the Multiple Habitat Conservation Program (MHCP), finalized in 2003; the North County MSCP, anticipated for completion in 2009; and the East County MSCP, anticipated for completion in 2010. Map 2 shows the location and boundaries of these plans.
Six jurisdictions, including a portion of the unincorporated area of the County, have approved habitat conservation plans and signed implementing agreements (covering 20% of the region). Seven jurisdictions are working on approval of their implementing agreements, (covering 73% of the region), and seven jurisdictions are not pursuing implementing agreements due to limited habitat in their jurisdictions (covering 1% of the region). The remaining area (covering 6% of the region) consists of land owned by the U.S. military.

**Percent of Preserve Area Actively Maintained**

Based upon the estimates of land conserved in the region described in the previous section, over one million acres in the region are managed as open space with dedicated land managers. This includes land in North and East County MSCP that are federal, state, and locally owned and conserved for open space and habitat. There is currently no regional database that tracks the lands under active management or the activities that have been conducted on these lands. As part of SANDAG participation in regional habitat conservation planning, a conserved lands database is being developed to serve as a baseline for tracking this information. SANDAG currently is working to provide the draft data to local jurisdictions and federal and state land managers for verification. Updated data should be available within six to nine months.

**Number of Beach Mile Closure Days**

The number of beach mile closure days fluctuated between 2000 and 2004, but has been relatively stable since 2004, as shown in Figure 15. The number of beach mile closure days increased slightly from 2006 to 2007.

Despite the slight increase, the Beach Report Card 2007-2008, published by Heal the Bay, reported that 96 percent of San Diego county beaches attain grades of “A” or “B” during dry weather, compared to 87 percent of beaches statewide. Heal the Bay’s findings regarding wet weather trends in 2006 and 2007 for San Diego beaches appear consistent with the beach closure data reported above—during wet weather, 70 percent of San Diego beaches received grades of “A” or “B” in 2006, and in 2007 this number dropped to 67 percent.
Figure 15
Weather-Adjusted Beach Mile Closure Days, 2000 to 2007

Beach Widths

Despite all beaches having more sand in 2006 than they did in 2005, likely due to wave conditions, all beaches lost sand in 2007, as shown in Table 6. Wave conditions in the summer of 2006 were more conducive to the onshore transport of sand than those in the summers of 2005 and 2007. As predicted in last year’s report, the unanticipated increase in beach width that occurred between 2005 and 2006 quickly was reversed by less favorable wave conditions. At the time of the 2005 survey, three consecutive years of shoreline retreat had diminished the beach widths at most locations to such an extent that they were equal to or less than pre-Regional Beach Sand Project values (prior to 2001). The area-wide shoreline advance that occurred in 2006 was sufficient to restore the beach widths to levels not observed since the first two years following the Regional Beach Sand Project (RBSP). In 2007, some beaches exceeded their target widths.

Table 6
Beach Widths and Targets of Shoreline Segments San Diego Region (in feet), 2000 to 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall Averages</th>
<th>1998</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2010 Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Silver Strand Upland Cell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Beach</td>
<td>218.0</td>
<td>218.0</td>
<td>308.0</td>
<td>218.0</td>
<td>217.0</td>
<td>221.0</td>
<td>229.0</td>
<td>307.0</td>
<td>234.0</td>
<td>238.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver Strand State Beach</td>
<td>480.0</td>
<td>481.0</td>
<td>481.0</td>
<td>481.0</td>
<td>481.0</td>
<td>481.0</td>
<td>481.0</td>
<td>481.0</td>
<td>481.0</td>
<td>481.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronado</td>
<td>759.0</td>
<td>758.0</td>
<td>767.0</td>
<td>784.0</td>
<td>767.0</td>
<td>768.0</td>
<td>764.0</td>
<td>737.0</td>
<td>750.0</td>
<td>784.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Beach Upland Cell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean Beach</td>
<td>283.0</td>
<td>284.0</td>
<td>283.0</td>
<td>295.0</td>
<td>259.0</td>
<td>264.0</td>
<td>260.0</td>
<td>305.0</td>
<td>284.0</td>
<td>220.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific and Mission Beaches</td>
<td>238.5</td>
<td>273.0</td>
<td>286.0</td>
<td>277.3</td>
<td>279.3</td>
<td>282.3</td>
<td>283.7</td>
<td>268.3</td>
<td>301.7</td>
<td>254.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Jolla</td>
<td>182.0</td>
<td>141.0</td>
<td>192.0</td>
<td>213.0</td>
<td>183.0</td>
<td>229.0</td>
<td>219.0</td>
<td>224.0</td>
<td>223.0</td>
<td>183.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>194.3</td>
<td>192.0</td>
<td>226.0</td>
<td>265.5</td>
<td>250.5</td>
<td>209.3</td>
<td>217.8</td>
<td>216.0</td>
<td>236.0</td>
<td>182.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Mar</td>
<td>185.5</td>
<td>227.0</td>
<td>166.0</td>
<td>133.3</td>
<td>167.3</td>
<td>157.3</td>
<td>120.7</td>
<td>102.3</td>
<td>158.0</td>
<td>106.0</td>
<td>232.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solana Beach</td>
<td>134.0</td>
<td>123.0</td>
<td>108.0</td>
<td>171.0</td>
<td>141.0</td>
<td>138.0</td>
<td>133.0</td>
<td>130.0</td>
<td>157.0</td>
<td>116.0</td>
<td>232.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encinitas</td>
<td>157.5</td>
<td>134.0</td>
<td>152.3</td>
<td>183.0</td>
<td>177.3</td>
<td>181.3</td>
<td>175.0</td>
<td>150.3</td>
<td>201.8</td>
<td>140.8</td>
<td>240.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiff</td>
<td>161.3</td>
<td>171.5</td>
<td>182.8</td>
<td>190.4</td>
<td>210.2</td>
<td>212.8</td>
<td>189.4</td>
<td>177.2</td>
<td>205.8</td>
<td>178.4</td>
<td>216.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside</td>
<td>283.0</td>
<td>278.3</td>
<td>287.3</td>
<td>287.0</td>
<td>254.7</td>
<td>302.7</td>
<td>265.0</td>
<td>277.7</td>
<td>300.7</td>
<td>248.0</td>
<td>232.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The SANDAG Regional Beach Sand Project nourished 12 of the region’s beaches in 2001.

Source: SANDAG Regional Beach Monitoring Program, Annual Report 2008

4 In 2001, the RBSP nourished twelve of the region’s beaches. Since the completion of the RBSP, little to no sand has been placed on area beaches.
Lagoon Health

Data are unavailable for this indicator.5

Impaired Waterbodies

There are no new data for this indicator. Between 2002 and 2006, impaired waterbodies in the region increased, as shown in Figure 16. Impaired waterbodies are those that do not meet Clean Water Act standards. This list is prepared every four years by the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board.

As noted in last year’s report, the region as a whole greatly has enhanced its monitoring efforts in recent years; as a result, a greater percentage of waterbodies were found to be impaired in 2006 than in 2002. Therefore, the extent to which the region’s impaired waterbodies has increased cannot conclusively be determined, as data from 2002 and 2006 are not comparable. Data collected in future years should indicate whether the dramatic increase in impaired waterbodies between 2002 and 2006 signifies a valid trend.

Figure 16
Impaired Waterbodies, 2002 and 2006

Source: San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board

Air Quality

In previous years, the Air Quality Index was used to report on the region’s air quality. The Air Quality Index indicated how clean or polluted the air was, relative to a 1-hour ozone standard established by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). However, the EPA has instituted stricter standards for ground-level ozone and particulate matter that went into effect in March 2008. Beginning with the 2008 Monitoring Report, SANDAG will report on progress toward meeting the new federal standards for ground-level ozone. The standard for ground-level ozone will serve as the air quality target for the purpose of this report.

This target is derived from requirements embodied in the federal and state Clean Air Acts. The federal and state Clean Air Acts regulate several common air pollutants. At the federal level, the San Diego air basin has been designated as a non-attainment area for the 8-hour ozone standard.

---

5 The City of Encinitas is charged with overseeing the collection of data regarding bacterial levels in the region’s lagoons. Their data methodology is being finalized. Once this data is available, SANDAG may utilize it to report on this indicator.
To achieve attainment, the region must demonstrate a 3-year average 4th-high design value\(^6\) below 0.080 parts per million for the 8-hour ozone average. As of 2007, this design value was at 0.089 parts per million. Figure 17 shows the region’s progress toward meeting both the prior and new federal 8-hour ozone standards.

**Figure 17**

Progress Toward Federal 8-Hour Ozone Standard Attainment, 2000 to 2007

For particulate matter, the San Diego region has been meeting one or both of the two attainment standards since 2005.

**Conclusion**

The region continues to make progress on habitat conservation, and further progress is anticipated as the North and East County MSCPs are adopted. As of 2007, the region has been experiencing mixed results with regard to water quality. The number of beach mile closure days has stabilized in recent years, but has not decreased overall. In addition, pollution in our region’s lakes, streams, rivers, bays, and lagoons has gotten worse. Mixed results also are observed with regard to shoreline preservation and air quality. In large part, beach widths have decreased since the region’s beach sand replenishment project in 2001; an increase in 2006 was followed by further decreases in 2007. With respect to air quality, the region is in attainment for the particulate matter standard, but remains in non-attainment for the 8-hour ozone standard. In FY 2009, SANDAG is evaluating strategies to fund improvements to water quality, habitat preservation, and beach nourishment.

---

6 Compliance with ozone standards is assessed by examining values over a period of three years. The 8-hour ozone design value is calculated as follows: Of all 8-hour ozone averages in a given year, the fourth highest average is determined for that year. The design value results from taking the average of the annual fourth highest averages over a 3-year period. For example, the 2007 design value would result from taking the average of the fourth highest averages in each year from 2005 through 2007.
Economic Prosperity

The Regional Economic Prosperity Strategy (REPS), originally developed in 1998, was updated this year. REPS identifies strategic goals and recommends actions that call for infrastructure investment and public policy support in order to strengthen the region’s economic foundation. REPS is based upon the premise that investments in human and physical infrastructure will lead to stronger businesses and a well-trained workforce, ultimately leading to improvements in the regional standard of living.

**Labor Force Educational Attainment**

Labor force educational attainment remains stable, as shown in Figure 18. Year-to-year fluctuations in the data may be the result of sample differences and may not reflect true year-to-year changes.

**Figure 18**
Labor Force Educational Attainment, 2000 to 2006

![Labor Force Educational Attainment Chart](image)

*Source: American Community Survey, U.S. Census Bureau*

**Employment Growth in High-Wage Economic Clusters**

There are no new data available for this indicator. In 2005, there was a slight increase in employment in high-wage economic clusters over 2002 and 2003, as shown in Figure 19.

**Figure 19**

![Employment in High-Wage Clusters Chart](image)

*Source: SANDAG Cluster Inventory*
Regional Unemployment Rate Compared to California and the United States

After three years of improvement, San Diego’s unemployment rate increased in 2007, and matched that of the United States for the first time in seven years, as shown in Figure 20.

Figure 20
Unemployment in San Diego, California, and the United States, 2000 to 2007

Real Per Capita Income Compared to California and the United States

In 2006, San Diego’s real per capita income increased. It remains above that of California and the United States, though it is not increasing as quickly in San Diego as it is in California and the United States, as shown in Figure 21.

Figure 21
Real Per Capita Income in San Diego, California, and the United States in Inflation-Adjusted 2007 Dollars, 2000 to 2007

Regional Poverty Rate Compared to California and the United States

The San Diego region’s poverty rate remains stable and below that of California and the United States, as shown in Figure 22. Year-to-year fluctuations in the data may be the result of sample differences and may not reflect true year-to-year changes.
Conclusion

Unemployment increased in 2007 in the San Diego region, paralleling California’s increase in unemployment. However, the region continues to experience a rising standard of living, as measured by real per capita income, though it is not keeping pace with California or the United States as a whole. Other indicators of economic prosperity in the region appear to be stable. San Diego’s REPS contains strategic goals and recommended actions to help improve the condition of the local economy. It calls for infrastructure investment and public policy support to strengthen the region’s economic foundation and make it more competitive. These policy efforts and infrastructure investments will ensure that the region reinforces its status as one of the most desirable places in the nation to work and live. Above all, the strategic goals and recommended actions are designed to expand and create high- and middle-income jobs, which will ensure a rising standard of living for the region’s residents. Future monitoring reports will measure the success of these strategies.
**Water Consumption**

As reported previously, water consumption continues to fluctuate, but increased in 2006, as shown in Figure 23.

**Figure 23**
Water Consumption, 2000 to 2006

![Graph showing water consumption from 2000 to 2006.]

Source: San Diego County Water Authority Annual Reports (fiscal year Water Supply by Source)

**Diversity of Water Supply**

The diversity of the region’s water supply has been increasing in recent years, but reliance on the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California as a source increased slightly in 2007. However, the share of water that is recycled has shown a slight increase, as shown in Figure 24.

**Figure 24**

![Graph showing water supply sources from 2003 to 2007.]

---

1 IID Transfer refers to water conveyed to the region from the Imperial Irrigation District. Canal Lining Transfer refers to water conserved as a result of the concrete lining of the All-American and Coachella canals in the Imperial Valley.

Source: San Diego County Water Authority Annual Reports (fiscal year Water Supply by Source)
**Recycled Water Use**

As predicted in last year’s report, the amount of recycled water used continues to increase as the region continues to invest in infrastructure and consumer awareness, as shown in Figure 25. Recycled water use has fluctuated since 2000, but increased 29 percent in 2007, following an 18 percent increase in 2006. These increases may be due to a few new larger water recycling facilities that have begun serving new customers in the region. In addition, agencies have been providing recycled water retrofit assistance to existing customers in order to expedite hook-ups to their recycled water systems. It is anticipated that the amount of recycled water used will continue to increase as the region continues to invest in infrastructure and consumer awareness.

**Per Capita Electricity Consumption and Peak Demand**

Per capita electricity consumption continues to increase and move further away from the target established in the 2003 Regional Energy Strategy (RES), as shown in Figure 26. Figure 27 illustrates that peak demand is increasing as well.
In 2006, the region reached the target established in the 2003 RES for share of energy produced in the region versus imported, but this share declined slightly in 2007, as shown in Figure 28.

Figure 28
Share of Energy Produced In-County as Compared to Total County Requirement, 2000 to 2007

Share of Energy Produced from Renewable Resources

Five percent of the region’s electricity comes from renewable resources. In 2003, the RES called for 15 percent from renewable resources by 2010. Subsequently, state law was enacted requiring 20 percent renewable energy resources by 2010. An Executive Order calls for 33 percent renewable resources by 2020. Thus far, the region’s primary electric utility, San Diego Gas & Electric (SDG&E), has slowly increased the percentage of renewable resources in its overall portfolio. Additional renewable resources will be needed to meet the 20 percent by 2010 requirement, as shown in Figure 29.

7 The RES will be updated in FY 2009, and the regional targets will be reevaluated at that time.
As shown in Figure 30, natural gas supplies more than half of the fuel to generate electricity for the San Diego region. Natural gas is the most environmentally benign fossil fuel and the only fossil fuel that the state permits to power electricity. The renewable resources percentage must increase significantly to meet state minimum requirements. Purchased power refers to power that is sold to SDG&E but the energy source is unknown. This unknown percentage should shrink over time as California Department of Water Resources contracts entered into during the energy crisis are phased out.

**Percent of Solid Waste that is Recycled**

The percent of solid waste that is recycled in the region increased in 2006, moving closer to the state-mandated target, as shown in Figure 31. The target calls for a 50 percent solid waste diversion rate; in 2006, 48 percent of solid waste was diverted from landfills.  

---

8 These values are based on the California Public Utility Commission’s Renewable Portfolio Standard Rules, and thus, do not include customer-owned Photovoltaic.

9 The percent of solid waste that was recycled in 2006 is based on a preliminary estimate; it is anticipated that when this estimate is revised, it will be higher than originally was estimated and will show that the region actually has achieved or exceeded the state-mandated target.
Landfill Space Available

For the regional landfill system as a whole, there appears to be an adequate supply of physical landfill capacity in terms of land area and air space until approximately 2016, but there is a significant limiting factor because present permitted daily tonnages at the landfills will not accommodate projected tonnages in the near future. Permitted daily tonnages for each landfill are determined by environmental concerns such as traffic, noise, water quality, and odors. Based on these limitations, estimates from the San Diego County Integrated Waste Management Plan Countywide Siting Element indicate that the region actually will reach capacity in terms of permitted daily tonnage prior to 2016, unless other changes are made, such as reducing the amount of trash generated in the region, and extending the hours of operation for trash collecting and hauling. This estimate is based on existing permitted regional capacity, excluding the San Onofre and Las Pulgas landfills located in Camp Pendleton.

The estimate also was based on assumptions such as reaching a regionwide solid waste diversion rate of 50 percent by 2005, and slight increases in total disposal and exported solid waste. According to the California Integrated Waste Management Board preliminary estimates, the region reached a 48 percent solid waste diversion rate in 2006, and progress continues to be made.

The County and City of San Diego are working actively on a number of options to expand physical landfill capacity. There are current efforts underway at both Sycamore Canyon and Miramar landfills to expand the landfill area. A new landfill at Gregory Canyon also is proposed but has not received final permits.

Every year there has been some solid waste exported from San Diego County. Export tonnage has fluctuated from year to year. In 1995, the region exported 14 percent of its waste compared to 4 percent in 2001.

According to the 2005 Countywide Siting Element, if the Sycamore Canyon landfill expansion and proposed Gregory Canyon landfill are approved with proposed increases in daily permitted disposal tonnages, the region may need to export 7.2 percent of its waste in 2017 to meet the region’s disposal need of 6.1 million tons. If neither landfill proposal is approved without using other strategies, the region may export significantly more of its waste in 2017.

Conclusion

Regional water consumption continues to fluctuate, as consumption increased slightly in 2007 following declining consumption in 2006. It is particularly important to note that there continues to be a significant increase in the amount of recycled water used. Our per capita usage and the share of energy produced within the region are moving away from the targets set in the RES, and after six years of increasing our share of energy produced from renewable resources, this share declined in 2007.
Regarding solid waste management, the region almost has reached its state-mandated recycling target, but must continue moving in this direction in order to avoid running out of landfill space. Unless proposed permit changes are implemented, the region will reach permitted landfill capacity prior to 2016.
The region’s distinct characteristics present a variety of opportunities and challenges for planning and coordinating along our interregional and binational borders. Access to jobs and housing continues to be an important issue. As people move farther away from their places of employment, increased pressure is placed upon our interregional transportation systems.

**Interregional Traffic Volumes into San Diego from Surrounding Counties and Baja California**

After years of steady increases, the number of interregional trips into San Diego from Baja California, Orange County, Riverside County, and Imperial County appears to be stabilizing. The number of trips into San Diego from Riverside County continued to increase in 2006, but to a lesser extent than in previous years. In addition, the annual number of pedestrian trips into San Diego from Baja California continues to decline, as shown in Figures 32 and 33.

**Figure 32**
San Diego Region Average Weekday Traffic Volumes to and from Orange, Imperial, and Riverside Counties and Tijuana, Baja California, 2000 to 2006

**Figure 33**
Pedestrian Border Crossings from Tijuana into San Diego, 1997 to 2007
Border Wait Times

There are no new data for this indicator in 2007, as the data source used in previous years has been eliminated. SANDAG is pursuing a new source of border wait times data and hopes to be able to continue reporting on this indicator in future years. As of 2006, border wait times were increasing, as shown in Figure 34.

Figure 34
Average Border Wait Times – Northbound into San Diego from Tijuana, 2004 to 2006

![Bar chart showing average border wait times for different categories of travelers]


Participation in SENTRI Lanes, Pedestrian Commuter Program, Free and Secure Trade Program

There are a total of 115,000 Secure Electronic Network for Travelers Rapid Inspection (SENTRI) participants as of 2008, which represents 18,000 more participants than were reported in 2007, as shown in Figure 35. There are no new data for the Pedestrian Commuter Program and the Free and Secure Trade Program.

Figure 35
SENTRI Participants, 2006 to 2008

![Line chart showing increase in SENTRI participants]

Source: SANDAG Border Crossing Data

Conclusion

The volume of commutes into San Diego from surrounding counties and Baja California appears to have stabilized. Finally, there are 18,000 new participants in the SENTRI program.
Summary and Conclusions

The results of the 2008 Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) Annual Performance Monitoring Report highlight those areas in which the region appears to be moving in the right direction and those in which improvement is needed:

**Moving in the Right Direction**

- The share of new housing units built in Smart Growth Opportunity Areas increased.
- Annual hours of traffic delay per traveler have decreased.
- Transit ridership continued to increase.
- The regional crime rate continued to decrease.
- The percent of solid waste that was recycled was close to achieving the state-mandated target.\(^{10}\)
- Recycled water use continued to increase substantially.

**Areas for Improvement**

- Housing production in the very low, low, and moderate income categories did not keep pace with above-moderate housing production: 42 percent of the above moderate-income housing goal identified in the RHNA has been met, while less than 10 percent of the very low-, low-, and moderate-income housing goal has been met. Overall, only 21 percent of the RHNA housing production goal has been met during the first half of the housing element cycle.
- Regionwide, the share of commutes made by transit, walking, bicycling, and carpool/vanpool have not increased substantially.
- Following beach width increases at all beaches in 2006, beach widths declined in 2007; for multiple beaches, widths are even smaller in 2007 than they were in 2005.
- Unemployment increased for the first time in three years.
- Per capita energy usage in the region continued to increase, moving further away from the target established in the Regional Energy Strategy.
- Plans estimate that the region will reach physical landfill capacity in 2016, but unless proposed permit changes are implemented, permitted capacity could be reached prior to 2016.

The region would expect to experience improvements in the areas listed above as the initiatives recommended in the RCP are developed and implemented. SANDAG is involved in a number of efforts that ideally will result in improvements to the region’s quality of life and reflect progress in future monitoring reports such as:

- TransNet Early Action Program projects;
- Transit improvements, such as Bus Rapid Transit on Interstate 15;

\(^{10}\) The percent of solid waste that was recycled in 2006 is based on a preliminary estimate; it is anticipated that when this estimate is revised, it will be higher than originally estimated and show that the region actually has achieved or exceeded the state-mandated target.
• Funding for smart growth through the TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program and the Transportation Act/TransNet Bicycle and Pedestrian Funding Program;

• Strategies recommended in the Regional Economic Prosperity Strategy update earlier this year; and

• An updated Regional Energy Strategy and Climate Change Action Plan.
TransNet SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM AND AMENDMENTS TO BOARD POLICY NO. 001

Introduction

On August 1, 2008, the Regional Planning Committee (RPC) recommended approval of the attached draft eligibility and project selection criteria for capital and planning grants for use in the first two-year funding of the TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program (TSGIP). As part of that action, the RPC asked that staff review and discuss options to the criterion related to matching funds with the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG). The TWG reviewed and discussed options at its meeting of September 11, 2008, and recommended that the matching fund criterion not be changed at this time. This report provides an overview of the discussion with the TWG.

Additionally, in preparation for the first call for projects, staff has worked with an ad hoc working group to draft program guidelines detailing the TSGIP application and administrative process. As part of this process, it has been recommended that the RPC perform two important functions in the TSGIP: recommend a list of projects for funding to the SANDAG Board and administer the TSGIP “use it or lose it” procedure. An amendment to Board Policy No. 001 (SANDAG Board and Policy Advisory Committee Responsibilities) is necessary to grant the RPC the authority to perform these functions. More details regarding the proposed amendment is provided in the discussion section below.

Discussion

Matching Funds Criterion

At the August RPC meeting, SANDAG staff was asked to review and discuss options to the criterion related to matching funds with the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG). After a thorough discussion of an alternative approach, the TWG recommended that no change be made to the criteria at this point in time. The main reason for this position was that existing SANDAG
competitive grant programs use criteria like the proposed local match requirement and cities of all sizes have been awarded funding under these programs. In addition, the eligible sources of matching funds are broad enough that the size of an agency’s budget would not be a significant constraint on the ability to include matching funds in their proposal.

In making its recommendation, the TWG emphasized that the TSGIP project selection criteria will be subject to review and change prior to future calls for projects. If the matching fund criterion is determined to introduce a bias into the program, it could be revised prior to the next call for projects.

Revisions to Board Policy No. 001

SANDAG Board Policy No. 001 is the agency’s operations policy that specifies Board and Policy Advisory Committee responsibilities. Under the current policy, the RPC does not have the authority to recommend funding allocations to the Board, nor does it have the authority to establish or approve policies and monitor “use it or lose it” project funding requirements. Consequently, an amendment to this policy will be required before the RPC can assume these responsibilities for the TSGIP. The proposed revisions are attached for RPC consideration (Attachment 2).

“Use It or Lose It” Provision

In order to ensure timely completion of the funded projects, it is recommended that the RPC be responsible for implementing a “use it or lose it” procedure (Attachment 3). The “use it or lose it” procedure calls for capital projects to be under construction within two years of the grant award and completed within another 18 months. Planning projects must be underway within one year and completed within two years. The procedure specifies the circumstances under which a project may be granted an extension and the process for requesting an extension. If the RPC agrees with this recommendation, the “use it or lose it” procedure will be incorporated into the TransNet SGIP program guidelines.

Revisions to Board Policy No. 033

The TSGIP is one of the discretionary funding programs subject to Board Policy No. 033 (Implementation Guidelines for SANDAG Regional Housing Needs Assessment Memorandum). As part of the annual review of this policy, some revisions are proposed which may adjust both the TSGIP eligibility requirements and how the points are calculated for the Policy No. 033 criterion. The proposed revisions are being presented to the RPC for discussion (Item 8 of this agenda).

Next Steps

Staff will present the TSGIP eligibility criteria to the Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee for review on October 8. With resolution of the proposed revisions to Board Policy No. 033 by the RPC and SANDAG Board, it is anticipated that a call for projects could be issued at the end of November.
Applications would be due in January 2009 and the project evaluation process would take place in January and February 2009. SANDAG working groups would review the projects in March and a recommended list of projects would be presented to the RPC and Board of Directors in April 2009.

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachments: 1. TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program Project Eligibility and Selection Criteria
2. Revisions to Board Policy No. 001
3. “Use It or Lose It” Procedure

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

1. For Metropolitan Center/Urban Center/Town Center:
   - 3 Exceeds minimum requirements by 100% or more
   - 2 Exceeds minimum requirements by 50-99%
   - 1 Exceeds minimum requirements by 25-49%
   - 3 Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 100% or more
   - 2 Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 50-99%
   - 1 Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 25-49%
   - OR
   - For Community Center/Open Village/Fixed-Use Transit Corridor:
     - 3 Exceeds minimum requirements by 100%
     - 2 Exceeds minimum requirements by 50-99%
     - 1 Exceeds minimum requirements by 25-49%

Where specific plan, master ER, or other mechanism allows for administrative approval of development projects, add 4 points.

B. Existing and Entitled Land Development Around the Proposed Capital Project

1. Existing Development Density within ½ mile radius of proposed capital project site (maximum 6 points)*

   - For Metropolitan Center, Urban Centers & Town Centers:
     - 3 Exceeds minimum requirements by 100% or more
     - 2 Exceeds minimum requirements by 50-99%
     - 1 Exceeds minimum requirements by 25-49%
     - OR
     - For Community Center, Rural Villages, or Fixed-Use Transit Corridor:
       - 3 Exceeds minimum requirements by 100%
       - 2 Exceeds minimum requirements by 50-99%
       - 1 Exceeds minimum requirements by 25-49%
     - 3 Mix of Uses (maximum 3 points)*
       - Single family residential, retail, office, civic, parks, visitor within ½ mile of project site
       - 3 Residential & 6+ other uses
       - 2 Residential & 4-5 other uses
       - 1 Residential & 2-3 other uses
       - If a new use will be added to the project area, add 2 points.

C. New Affordable Housing Development (maximum 3 points)*

   - % of income restricted affordable housing provided in proposed new development
     - Within ½ mile radius of project site
     - 3 100% of units affordable
     - 1 10-99% of units affordable

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

1. Relation to Transit (maximum 12 points)*

   - Scale of actual walking distance to existing or programmed station or transit hub
     - 2 Projects abuts or is on site to a Regional or Corridor service station or a Transit Center
     - 10 Project is within ½ mile of a Regional or Corridor station or a Transit Center
     - 8 Project is within ½ mile of a transit stop (15 min all day) local bus service and at least two additional bus services (transit hub)
     - 6 Project is within ½ mile of a transit stop (15 min all day) local bus service
     - (Within ½ mile radius of project site)
     - 2 Bicycle facilities* (up to 2 points based on quality and utility)*
     - 4 Walkability measured by intersection density (up to 4 points)*
     - 4 TOD strategies existing or proposed (2 points)

E. Community Design Features (within 1/4 mile radius of project site)

1. Urban Design Characteristics and Community Context (maximum 6 points)

   - Project review panel scoring based on existing community structure and design characteristics in project area, and planned or proposed design characteristics in the area based on documented guidelines such as design guidelines for area or jurisdiction, form-based codes, or renderings of proposed development. Consideration also given to the appropriate mix of land uses in the project area
   - 3 Sustainability
     - 2 Where existing or entitled buildings in the project area include sustainable building principles, add 2 points
   - 3 Universal Design
     - Where existing entitled buildings in the project area include universal design features, add 2 points

B. QUALITY OF PROPOSED CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT

A. Support for Public Transit (maximum 5 points)

   - How well does the project support regional public transit service in the project area?
   - 5 5 25 6%

B. Providing Transportation Choices (maximum 5 points)

   - How well does the project support transportation choices that would reduce vehicle miles traveled, such as walking and bicycling?
   - 5 5 25 6%

C. Community Enhancement (maximum 5 points)

   - How well does the proposed project contribute to the enhancement of the public realm in the project area to engender support for smart growth, attract private investment, and to activate public places?
   - 5 2 10 3%

D. Addressing Project Area Issues (maximum 5 points)

   - How well does the project address identified special needs of the community such as improving access and public safety?
   - 5 2 10 3%

III. PROPOSED CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT READINESS (maximum 5 points)

A. Major Milestones Completed (maximum 3 points)

   - Environmental Clearance
     - 3 5 15 5%
   - Right-of-Way Acquisition
   - Final Design
   - B. Evidence of Local Commitment (maximum 2 points)

   - Demonstrated Community Support*
     - 2 5 10 3%

Subtotal 185 62%

IV. COST EFFECTIVENESS (ratio of grant request to project score (maximum 20 points))

   - Project grant request divided by project evaluation points (Example: $2,000,000 divided by 185 = $10,811)

   - All grants graded on a curve from best to least matching funds.

V. MATCHING FUNDS

   - 20 7% 7%

VI. POLICY 33 POINTS (affordable housing production)

   - 75 25% 25%

TOTAL PROJECT SCORE 300 100%

1 Transit station or hub qualify 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 SPREITE, Trolley, and arterial-based Rapid Bus.
5 All day is defined as 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m.
6 Bike facilities will be defined as bike lanes, bicycle boulevards, or a designated bike path.
7 TOD strategies can include transit pas programs for employees or residents in the area, va/pot/desp/pool 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

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

G. 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.

H. 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.

I. 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)

   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)

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: 15)

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: 25)

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: 25)

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? 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: 20)

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. Cost Effectiveness (weight factor 2, maximum points 10)

Points awarded proportionately base on the ration of points earned on items A through F divided by the amount of the grant request.

H. Matching Funds (up to 20 points)

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

I. Percentage of Lower Income Housing Units per RHNA (up to 50 points)

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.
OPERATIONS POLICY
Board and Policy Advisory Committees Responsibilities

Shown below are responsibilities for the Board of Directors and each of the five Policy Advisory Committees (Executive, Transportation, Regional Planning, Borders, Public Safety) of the new Agency. Selected responsibilities are delegated by the Board to the Policy Committees to allow the Agency to effectively address key public policy and funding responsibilities. All items delegated to the Policy Advisory Committees are subject to Board action upon request of any member.

All functions not specifically delegated by the Board to a Policy Advisory Committee may be delegated to a Policy Advisory Committee on a one-time basis upon request by the Executive Director and approval by the Chair. Such actions shall be reported to the Board at its next regular meeting.

Board Responsibilities

1. Approve Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) and plan components and other regional plans (e.g. Regional Energy Plan, MHCP, etc.)
2. Approve Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) and corridor studies
3. Fulfill responsibilities of SB 1703 as consolidated agency
4. Fulfill the responsibilities of the San Diego Regional Transportation Commission (RTC)
5. Approve programming of funds (TDA, CMAQ, STIP, etc.)
6. Approve project environmental reports
7. Approve Overall Work Program and Program Budget
8. Approve amendments to the Budget and Work Program and authorize contracts with consultants for amounts equal to or greater than the amounts to be determined for administrative and policy committee authorization.
9. Approve the annual legislative agenda
10. Provide policy direction through Policy Development Board meetings
11. Appoint Committees and Board officers
12. Delegate responsibilities to Policy Advisory Committees and approve Committee actions. All items delegated to the five Policy Advisory Committees are subject to direct Board action upon request of any members.
13. Delegate responsibilities to Board Chair consistent with Board criteria. Conference sponsorships and proclamations are hereby delegated subject to current or subsequently approved criteria.

Executive Committee Membership and Responsibilities

The Executive Committee shall consist of six voting members with board members representing East County, North County Coastal, North County Inland, South County, and the representative, or the
representative’s alternate in their absence, from the City of San Diego and the County. The Chairperson of the consolidated agency shall be one of the six voting members. The First and Second Vice Chairpersons of the consolidated agency shall serve as voting members if one or both of the Vice Chairpersons represent an area of the region that is different from the area of the region represented by the Chairperson or the other Vice Chairperson.

1. Set agenda for Board
2. Review and recommend annual work program and program budget
3. Approve amendments to the Budget and Overall Work Program and authorize contracts up to amount approved by the Board
4. Review and act on state and federal legislation
5. Comment on project EIR/EIS
6. Act upon and evaluate dispute resolution
7. Advise on personnel actions
8. Act on behalf of Board when timing requires
9. Make policy recommendations to the Board
10. Perform other duties as assigned by the Board
11. Approve financial/contracting transactions, including selection of vendors, acceptance of funding, stipulations of any nature, and any resulting budget amendment up to $500,000, subject to increase by Board action.
12. Annually review a list of all the SANDAG lower-level committees and working groups to determine the need to maintain the committee or working group and approve any revisions in functions or membership.
13. Review all proposed amendments to the Bylaws or Board Policies and make recommendations to the Board regarding those amendments.
14. Conduct expedited reviews and approvals of Energy Working Group actions on an as-needed basis.

Transportation Committee Membership and Responsibilities

The Transportation Committee shall consist of nine voting members with board members or alternates representing East County, North County Coastal, North County Inland, South County and the mayor or a council member from the City of San Diego, a supervisor from the County of San Diego, a member of the Board of the MTS appointed by the Board of the MTS, a member of the Board of the NCTD appointed by the Board of the NCTD, and a member of the San Diego County Regional Airport Authority appointed by the airport authority.

1. Provide oversight for consolidated transit responsibilities
2. Provide policy oversight for transportation plans and corridor and systems studies
3. Establish/approve transportation prioritization criteria
4. Establish/approve policies and monitor “Use it or lose it” project funding, except for the TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program
5. Approve TDA and STA claim amendments and RTIP and STIP amendments
6. Recommend funding allocations to the Board, except for the TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program
7. Approve transit operator budgets for funding
8. Approve Short Range Transit Plan
9. Consistent with the transition plans, approve regional fare policy¹

¹ To ensure seamless transit service for the transit users of the region the consolidated agency, in consultation with the transit agencies, will be responsible for the development of a Regional Fare Policy. The Regional Fare Policy will incorporate
10. Conduct public hearings as delegated by Board
11. Approve contracts for transit up to amount approved by the Board
12. Advise Board on other transportation policy-level issues
13. Recommend legislative program for transportation and transit
14. Approve financial/contracting transactions, including selection of vendors, acceptance of funding, stipulations of any nature, and any resulting budget amendment up to $500,000 for transportation items, subject to increase by Board action
15. To convene closed sessions and make final decisions with regard to real property transactions related to transportation projects, however, this delegation does not include the authority to make a Resolution of Necessity or to commence litigation.
16. Approve the Congestion Management Program (CMP) and any updates to the CMP
17. Conduct hearings regarding fare setting and approve comprehensive fare ordinance amendments
18. Accept for distribution, hold public hearings regarding, and adopt/certify environmental documents where items can be approved through actions of the policy committee
19. Approve loans of TransNet funds when such loans are incorporated into an RTIP amendment requiring an exchange of TransNet funds for funds from another source
20. Provide oversight and approvals for Coordinated Transportation Services Agency (CTSA) matters and appoint Transportation Committee representative to the CTSA board

Regional Planning Committee Membership and Responsibilities

The Regional Planning Committee shall consist of six voting members with board members or alternates representing East County, North County Coastal, North County Inland, South County, and the mayor or a council member from the City of San Diego, and a supervisor from the County of San Diego.

1. Provide oversight for preparation and implementation of the RCP and its components
2. Recommend regional infrastructure financing strategies to the Board
3. Represent the Board for outreach and public information on the RCP and its components
4. Advise Board on regional planning policy issues
5. Establish/approve policies and monitor “Use it or lose it” project funding for the TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program
6. Recommend funding allocations to the Board for the TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program

Borders Committee Membership and Responsibilities

The Borders Committee shall consist of seven voting members with board members or alternates representing East County, North County Coastal, North County Inland, South County and the mayor or a council member from the City of San Diego, a supervisor from the County of San Diego, and a mayor, council member, or supervisor from the County of Imperial.

1. Provide oversight for planning activities that impact the borders
2. Provide oversight for the preparation of binational and interregional planning programs

---

a uniform fare structure, a transfer policy, and agreement for revenue sharing of regional tickets, tokens, and passes, while also allowing the consolidated agency to adopt specialized fare procedures for travel within each operator’s service area. Additionally, the consolidated agency will adopt a Comprehensive Fare Ordinance setting forth all fares for all operators, including their special fares.
3. Recommend border infrastructure financing strategies to the Board
4. Establish closer SANDAG working relations with surrounding counties and Mexico
5. Advise Board on binational and interregional policy-level issues
6. Review and comment on regionally significant projects in adjoining counties.

**Public Safety Committee Membership and Responsibilities**

The membership, authority and responsibilities for this committee are set forth in Board Policy No. 026.

**Distribution of Meeting Materials**

1. All agendas for meetings of the Board of Directors, Policy Advisory Committees, and all other SANDAG legislative bodies covered by the Brown Act (Government Code § 54950 et seq.) shall be posted on the SANDAG Web site and copies of such agendas will be available for viewing by the public in the SANDAG business office reception area.

2. All closed session items shall be provided to appropriate Board and/or Policy Advisory Committee members prior to the closed session. Closed session meeting materials will be sent in sealed envelopes and clearly labeled as confidential. If a representative will not be able to attend a meeting he/she should ensure the closed session materials are given to the appropriate alternate to review prior to the meeting. All closed session meeting materials must be returned to the Office of General Counsel at the end of the closed session.

Adopted January 2003
Amended November 2004
Amended January 2006
Amended December 2006
SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM

USE-IT-OR-LOSE-IT PROCEDURE

1. PROJECT MILESTONE AND COMPLETION DEADLINES

1.1 This policy applies to all Smart Growth Incentive Program grant funds, whether from TransNet or another source. By signing a grant agreement for the Smart Growth Incentive Program, grant recipients agree to the following project delivery objectives.

1.1.1 Capital Grants: The project must be completed according to the schedule provided in the grant agreement, but at the latest, a construction contract must be awarded within two years following execution of the grant agreement, and construction must be completed within eighteen months following award of the construction contract.

1.1.2 Planning Grants: The project must be completed according to the schedule provided in the grant agreement, but at the latest, a consultant contract must be awarded within one year following execution of the grant agreement, and the planning project must be complete within two years following award of the consultant contract.

Failure to meet the above deadlines may result in revocation of all grant funds not already expended.

1.2 Grant funds made available as a result of this process may be awarded to the next project recommended on the project priority list from the most recent project selection process, or they may be added to the funds available for the next project funding cycle, at SANDAG’s discretion. Any project that loses funding due to failure to meet the deadlines specified in this policy may be resubmitted to compete for funding in a future call for projects.

2. PROJECT DELAYS AND EXTENSIONS OF UP TO ONE YEAR

2.1 Grant recipients may receive extensions on their project schedules of up to one year for good cause. Extensions of up to twelve months aggregate that would not cause the project to miss a deadline in Sections 1.1.1 or 1.1.2 may be approved by the SANDAG Program Manager for the Smart Growth Incentive Program. Extensions beyond twelve months aggregate or that would cause the project to miss a deadline in Sections 1.1.1 or 1.1.2 must be approved by the Regional Planning Committee. For an extension to be granted under this Section 2, the following conditions must be met:

2.1.1 For extension requests of up to six months, the grant recipient must request the extension in writing to the SANDAG Program Manager at least two weeks prior to the earliest project schedule milestone deadline for which an extension is being requested.
2.1.2 For extension requests that will cause one or more project milestones to be delayed more than six months, but less than twelve months aggregate, the grant recipient must request an extension in writing to the SANDAG Program Manager at least six weeks prior to the earliest project schedule milestone deadline for which an extension is being requested.

2.1.3 The project sponsor seeking the extension must document previous efforts undertaken to maintain the project schedule, the reasons for the delay and why they were unavoidable, and demonstrate an ability to succeed in the extended time frame.

2.2 If the Program Manager denies an extension request under this Section 2, the project sponsor may appeal within ten business days of receiving the Program Manager’s response to the Regional Planning Committee.

2.3 Extension requests that are rejected by the Regional Planning Committee will result in termination of the grant agreement and obligation by the project sponsor to return to SANDAG any unexpended funds. Unexpended funds are funds for project costs not incurred prior to rejection of the extension request by the Regional Planning Committee.

3. PROJECT EXTENSIONS BEYOND ONE YEAR

3.1 Requests for extensions beyond one year or that will cause a project to miss a deadline in Sections 1.1.1 or 1.1.2 (including those projects that were already granted extensions by the SANDAG Program Manager and are again falling behind schedule) will be considered by the Regional Planning Committee. The Regional Planning Committee will only grant an extension under this Section 3 for extenuating conditions beyond the control of the project sponsor, defined as follows:

3.1.1 Capital Grants:

3.1.1.1 Environmental: An extension may be granted when during the environmental review process, the project sponsor discovers heretofore unknown sites (e.g., archeological, endangered species) that require additional investigation and mitigation efforts. The project sponsor must demonstrate that the discovery is new and unforeseen.

3.1.1.2 Right of Way: Extensions for delays necessary to complete right of way acquisition may be granted only when right of way needs are identified that could not have been foreseen at the time the grant agreement was signed.

3.1.1.3 Permitting: Delays associated with obtaining permits from external agencies may justify an extension when the project sponsor can demonstrate that every effort has been made to obtain the necessary permits and that the delay is wholly due to the permitting agency.

3.1.1.4 Construction Schedule: Extensions may be granted when unavoidable construction delays create a conflict with restrictions on construction during certain times of the year (for instance, to avoid nesting season for endangered species).
3.1.4 Litigation: Extensions may be granted when a lawsuit has been filed concerning the project being funded.

3.1.5 Other: Extensions may be granted due to changes in federal/state policies or laws that can be shown to directly affect the project schedule.

3.2 Planning Grants:

3.2.1 Changed Circumstances: An extension may be granted for a planning project when circumstances not within the control of the grant recipient, such as an action by an outside agency, require a change in the scope of work for the project.

3.3 Extension requests that are rejected by the Regional Planning Committee will result in termination of the grant agreement and obligation by the project sponsor to return to SANDAG any unexpended funds. Unexpended funds are funds for project costs not incurred prior to rejection of the extension request.
ANNUAL REVIEW OF BOARD POLICY NO. 033: IMPLEMENTATION GUIDELINES FOR SANDAG REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT MEMORANDUM

Introduction


This Policy sets forth guidelines for incentives related to the RHNA for the 2005-2010 housing element cycle for the San Diego region. As part of the approval of the final RHNA, on February 25, 2005, the Board agreed to provide certain financial incentives to jurisdictions based on housing element compliance and lower-income housing production.

The Policy requires that an annual review be performed. In the annual review prepared in June 2007, staff recommended and the Executive Committee and Board of Directors concurred that no changes be made to the Policy because full application had only occurred with one funding program—the 2008 TDA/TransNet Bicycle and Pedestrian Program. It was agreed that the Policy be reviewed again following the FY 2009 TDA/TransNet funding cycle and in anticipation of the TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program (for which the call for projects is scheduled in November 2008). Although a call for projects was not issued for FY 2009 for bicycle/pedestrian funding, staff and the Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) Leadership agreed to review several issues that have been raised in association with the Policy at this time.

As part of this annual review process, several amendments are being considered to the Policy. The Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG) and Regional Housing Working Group (RHWG) discussed these potential amendments and will make recommendations regarding the Policy to the Regional Planning Committee (RPC) at its November 7 meeting. The purpose of this report is to discuss the amendments being considered. The RPC will be asked to make its recommendation on the amendments at its November 7 meeting to the Executive Committee and Board of Directors.

Discussion

Implementation of Board Policy No. 033

The first full implementation of the Policy took place during the FY 2008 TDA/TransNet Bicycle and Pedestrian funding cycle. Based on the Policy, eligibility for these funds required that a jurisdiction had:
1. adopted a housing element found in compliance with state law by HCD,
2. submitted information to SANDAG regarding the number of housing units produced in all four income categories, and
3. provided (if applicable) information to SANDAG regarding progress toward complying with any rezoning programs contained in its housing element.

Up to 25 percent of the total points awarded were based on lower-income housing production as a percentage of each jurisdiction’s lower-income RHNA goals. For the FY 2008 TDA/TransNet program, six jurisdictions had approved housing elements and were eligible to apply for funds: Chula Vista, El Cajon, Escondido, La Mesa, San Diego, and San Marcos.

**Proposed Revisions to Board Policy No. 033**

The proposed revisions to the Policy address both technical issues and policy issues. The technical issues were largely resolved by the TWG at its September 11 meeting, while the policy issues require further discussion. The report reflects initial discussions with the TWG, and input from the September 25 RHWG will be reported at today’s meeting. A copy of the Policy is attached for reference.

**Key Principles**

The Policy was originally developed two years ago to implement the memorandum approved by the SANDAG Board in conjunction with the adoption of the RHNA for the 2005–2010 housing element cycle. The key principles expressed in the memorandum that should be considered when discussing the potential amendments to the Policy include:

1. Jurisdictions “that are willing and able to accommodate additional housing,... should be compensated through incentives that would help improve existing as well as future infrastructure.”

   This principle focuses on the share of the region’s new housing each jurisdiction is providing.

2. “Incentive points (a minimum of 25 points out of 100 possible) will be given to projects in jurisdictions in which lower-income housing units are being produced in accordance with the housing unit figures contained in Alternative 3.” (Alternative 3 was one of several alternative income distributions considered during the RHNA process; the Board adopted Modified Alternative 1).

   This principle focuses on how well each jurisdiction met its Alternative 3 lower-income housing targets.

3. Each “jurisdiction will be required to demonstrate that they are in compliance with provisions of their adopted housing element, which set forth their commitment to providing adequate multifamily-zoned land or other actions necessary to accommodate their share of lower-income housing under the adopted RHNA.”
Policy Issues

The following three policy-related issues have been raised as part of the annual Policy review process.

Award of Incentive Points

To implement the first two key principles listed above, the current Policy awards points to projects applying for funds based on the cumulative number of new lower-income housing units produced in a jurisdiction as a percentage of the annualized RHNA Alternative 3 targets (see Attachment 5 for a hypothetical example of how the incentive points would be awarded).

Planning staff from the cities of San Diego and Chula Vista have suggested that incentive points be awarded based not only on the number of new lower-income housing units produced as a percentage of the RHNA Alternative 3 by jurisdiction, but also based on the total number of lower-income units produced. This approach would address the first key principle listed above, while the current formula addresses the second key principle more directly. Several ways of calculating the points that take both ideas into consideration and different ways of weighting them will be further discussed by the TWG and RHWG, with a recommendation brought back to the RPC in November.

Another issue related to the award of incentive points that was raised by the TWG was whether units that were acquired, rehabilitated, and rent-restricted for lower-income households should be counted in the calculation of points. Currently, these units are not counted because the RHNA goals are intended to address the provision of additional housing stock for future population growth and units that are acquired and rehabilitated do not add to the region’s housing stock. The draft Smart Growth Incentive Program criteria do recognize these units in the evaluation of projects in a separate evaluation criterion. This issue also will be discussed by the TWG and RHWG, with a recommendation brought back to the RPC in November. If the decision is made to count these units, SANDAG would need to collect this data from the local jurisdictions.

Housing Element Compliance

Currently, in order to be eligible for funding, the Policy requires that a jurisdiction have a housing element that has been found in compliance with state law by HCD or self-certified. A number of jurisdictions have submitted their housing elements to HCD for review but have not received a finding of compliance. Several suggested that this requirement be modified to recognize the progress many jurisdictions have made. The following three-tiered approach is being discussed:

1. Jurisdictions with a housing element found in compliance by HCD or self-certified would receive 100 percent of the incentive points awarded based on the number of building permits issued for new lower-income residential units.

2. Jurisdictions that have adopted a draft element and made findings that the element is in compliance with state law, and have submitted the element to the state for review but have not received a letter of compliance, would be eligible for funding but would only receive 50 percent of the incentive points based on the number of building permits issued for new lower-income residential units.
3. Jurisdictions with a draft housing element under review by HCD would be eligible for funding but no incentive points would be awarded based on the number of building permits issued for new lower-income residential units.

Requirement for “Making Progress” Toward Implementation of Rezoning Programs

As a means for implementing the third key principle listed above, the Policy refers to the requirement in housing element law that a jurisdiction unable to identify adequate sites to meet its lower-income RHNA goals is required to include a rezoning program in its housing element to identify additional multifamily sites, and that it must be able to demonstrate progress toward implementing the rezoning program in compliance with the program schedule. The Policy states that, “‘Making progress’ toward implementing the rezoning program is defined as having demonstrated a good faith effort in undertaking the rezoning program described in the housing element.” Two options have been presented to the TWG regarding this issue: (1) a jurisdiction should provide SANDAG with the information submitted to HCD in its Annual Housing Element Progress Report to comply with the Policy; or (2) eliminate this requirement from the Policy due to the difficulty in evaluating compliance. The TWG suggested eliminating the requirement due to the difficulty in evaluating compliance.

Technical Issues

As noted above, the following technical issues have been discussed and largely resolved by the TWG.

Change Reporting from Certificates of Occupancy or Final Inspections to Building Permits and Request Submission of HCD Annual Housing Element Progress Reports

It is proposed that jurisdictions report the number of new residential units produced based on the number of building permits issued, not certificates of occupancy or final inspections as was originally required by the Policy. This change would make the reporting consistent with housing element law and would require that each jurisdiction submit a copy of its Annual Housing Element Progress Report to SANDAG at the same time it is submitted to HCD (April 1 of each year for the preceding calendar year).

Update of SANDAG Funding Sources Affected by Board Policy No. 033 (Attachments 2 and 3)

Attachments 2 and 3 of the Policy are being updated to reflect current information about the funding sources it affects. In addition, an inconsistency between two sections of the Policy with respect to the Senior Transportation Mini-Grant Program will be corrected. Attachment 2 of the Policy indicates that this program is subject to the Policy, while wording in Section 2.2.4 states that “Funds which can be allocated to entities other than local jurisdictions (e.g., TransNet Environmental Mitigation Program Regional Habitat Conservation Fund) shall not be subject to the Policy. Since the Policy was originally adopted, guidelines for allocation of the Senior Mini-Grant Program have been adopted. These guidelines allow agencies other than local jurisdictions, including nonprofit agencies, to receive this funding. Therefore, based on Section 2.2.4, the Policy would not apply to this funding program, thus the Senior Transportation Mini-Grant Program should be removed from the list of programs subject to the Policy.
Time Period for Evaluation of Lower-Income Housing Production

A proposal to provide flexibility in the time period for evaluating lower-income housing production was suggested by the City of Lemon Grove. The City proposed allowing the use of more recent building permit data than that included in the most recent Annual Housing Element Progress Reports. Unless requested otherwise, SANDAG would use the most recent Annual Housing Element Progress Report for the preceding calendar year to award points for calls for projects. Based on this proposal, a jurisdiction also could submit the latest building permit data up to the date of a call for projects for use in determining points. Jurisdictions choosing this option would be evaluated based on the percentage of new lower-income residential units permitted from the beginning of the housing element cycle through the date of the call for projects (a longer time period than covered by the annual report). This proposal will be discussed further by the TWG and RHWG, with a recommendation brought back to the RPC in November.

Next Steps

The purpose of Board Policy No. 033 is to incentivize housing element compliance and reward jurisdictions for the production of affordable lower-income housing units. The next program that this Policy will affect is the TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program (SGIP).

On November 7, 2008, the RPC will be asked to make a recommendation regarding changes to the Policy to the Executive Committee, which will meet on November 14, 2008. The Board will be asked to take action on the annual review of the Policy at its November 21 meeting.

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachment: SANDAG Board Policy No. 033

Key Staff Contact: Susan Baldwin, (619) 699-1943, sba@sandag.org
IMPLEMENTATION GUIDELINES FOR SANDAG REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT MEMORANDUM

Purpose

The purpose of this policy is to provide guidelines on the implementation of the memorandum adopted by the SANDAG Board of Directors on February 25, 2005, in association with the adoption of the 2005-2010 Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) (Attachment 1, referred to herein as the “Memorandum”). The Memorandum laid out specific provisions regarding SANDAG’s allocation of discretionary funding to local agency projects in relation to local jurisdiction housing element compliance and lower income housing production.

These implementation guidelines restate the provisions of the Memorandum and define how they will be implemented. The numbered italicized wording in this Policy is taken verbatim from the Memorandum; the implementation guidelines are contained in the text that follows. This policy shall be reviewed and evaluated annually to determine whether changes to the guidelines are needed. Issues to be considered during the annual review include, but are not limited to: lessons learned during the prior year, the relationship between the RHNA memorandum and SANDAG’s smart growth goals, and new funding sources proposed to be subject to the memorandum.

Pilot Smart Growth Implementation Program

1. Jurisdictions whose 1999 lower income households as a percentage of total households is estimated to be greater than the regional average shall receive 15 bonus points (out of 100 possible) for projects requesting funding through the Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program. (This would include National City, El Cajon, Imperial Beach, Lemon Grove, La Mesa, Escondido, Vista, Chula Vista, San Diego, and San Marcos.)

1.1 This provision of the Memorandum has been implemented. The Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program criteria, which were approved by the SANDAG Board on April 22, 2005, included the required bonus points for the cities noted above (22 points out of 147 points – 15 percent of the total points awarded).

Future Discretionary Funding Criteria

2. In addition to the current Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program, for all future discretionary funding allocated to local agency projects by SANDAG (following the adoption by jurisdictions of housing elements for 2005-2010), the following criteria shall apply:

a. In order to qualify for such funding, a jurisdiction will be required to demonstrate that it is in compliance with provisions of its adopted housing element which set forth their commitment to providing adequate multi-family zoned land or other actions necessary to accommodate their share of lower income housing under the adopted RHNA.
b. Incentive points (a minimum of 25 points out of 100 possible) will be given to projects in jurisdictions in which lower income housing units are being produced in accordance with the housing unit figures contained in Alternative 3.

c. In order to verify compliance with these provisions, each jurisdiction shall annually submit a report to SANDAG indicating its progress in complying with requirements of its housing element, as well as actual production of housing units within its jurisdiction by income category, during the preceding year.

2.1 To implement Items 2.a. - 2.c. of the Memorandum, "discretionary funding allocated to local agency projects by SANDAG" shall be defined as: funds allocated by SANDAG to local jurisdictions (the cities or County) through a competitive process. These funds are listed in Attachment 2 and include the TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program, Transportation Development Act (TDA) Non-motorized Program, and TransNet Bicycle Program, among others.

2.2 The following types of funding shall not be subject to the provisions of the Memorandum:

2.2.1 Formula funds allocated by population or number of miles, because they are not allocated on a competitive basis.

2.2.2 Discretionary funds allocated to Caltrans, the two transit agencies, and SANDAG because they are not local agencies.

2.2.3 Funds allocated directly by Caltrans to local jurisdictions because SANDAG is not involved in their allocation.

2.2.4 Funds which can be allocated to entities other than local jurisdictions (e.g., TransNet Environmental Mitigation Program Regional Habitat Conservation Fund).

Attachment 3 provides a more detailed list of funding sources/programs that shall not be subject to the Memorandum.

2.3 As new funding sources become available, the Board of Directors shall decide whether they should be subject to the Memorandum and this Policy shall be amended.

2.4 To be eligible to apply for future discretionary funding allocated by SANDAG to local agency projects, local jurisdictions shall do the following:

2.4.1 During the first year of the housing element cycle (July 1, 2005 - June 30, 2006), a jurisdiction shall have submitted a draft of its housing element to HCD or have self-certified its housing element in compliance with state law by the due date for the grant application. This screening criterion shall apply for any discretionary funding programs subject to the Memorandum whose application due date is between July 1, 2005, and December 31, 2006.
2.4.2 Starting January 1, 2007, jurisdictions shall be required to have adopted housing elements (which have been found in compliance with state law by HCD or self-certified). Also, those jurisdictions that were not able to identify adequate sites to meet their RHNA goals and were required to include a program in their housing elements to identify additional sites by rezoning must be able to demonstrate that they are making progress toward implementing the rezoning program in conformance with the schedule contained in their housing elements. "Making progress" toward implementing the rezoning program is defined as having demonstrated a good faith effort in undertaking the rezoning program described in the housing element.

2.4.3 Starting in 2006, jurisdictions shall be required to submit an annual report with the information described in Section 2.4.3.1 below in order to be eligible for funding programs for the following calendar or fiscal year, whichever is applicable. The report must be have been submitted to SANDAG prior to the application due date for the funding source. The first annual reports are due on October 1, 2006, and cover the first year of the 2005-2010 housing element cycle (July 1, 2005 – June 30, 2006). Starting in 2007, the reports will be due on April 1 per Senate Bill 253 (Torlakson), which changed the reporting time frame to the calendar year and the reporting due date to April 1 of each following year.

2.4.3.1 The annual report shall provide information regarding the actual production of housing units by all four income categories (very low, low, moderate, and above moderate). If the report is submitted for the first time in years two, three, four, or five of the housing element cycle, it shall include the total number of units produced by income category during each year of the housing element cycle. The report also shall indicate (if relevant) progress toward complying with any rezoning programs contained in the housing element that are required to meet the adequate site identification requirements of state law (as noted in paragraph 2.4.2 above).

2.5 Memorandum Item 2.b. ties the allocation of funding to the production of lower income housing through the award of incentive points based on the number of lower income housing units produced in accordance with RHNA Alternative 3 (Attachment 4).

2.5.1 Production of lower income housing units will be evaluated and points awarded for each application for discretionary funds based on the percentage of lower income (total very low and low combined) units that were produced in the jurisdiction. The number of lower income units will be calculated for each year on a cumulative basis, and compared to annualized RHNA Alternative 3 numbers. An example of the methodology to calculate the incentive points is shown in Attachment 5. Units shall be counted based on certificates of occupancy or final inspection. Lower income units that were acquired and rehabilitated may only count toward the RHNA Alternative 3 goals when this type of unit was used to meet the site identification requirements for the RHNA numbers as permitted in state law.

Attachments: 1. February 25, 2005, RHNA Memorandum to SANDAG Board of Directors  
2. Discretionary Funding Programs Subject to Board RHNA Memorandum  
3. Funding Programs Not Subject to Board RHNA Memorandum
4. Final Regional Housing Needs Assessment Modified Alternative 1 (Adopted RHNA) and Alternative 3
5. Hypothetical Example of Allocation of Incentive Points

Adopted April 2006
San Diego
ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS

MEMO

February 25, 2005

TO: SANDAG Board of Directors
FROM: Mayor Lori Pfeiler, Mayor Steve Padilla, and Councilmember Jim Madaffer
SUBJECT: Agenda Item No. 12 – Final Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA)

Our regional housing needs are significant – both now and in the future. Addressing these needs is often a complex process when dealing with the varied interests of the cities in our region. We are committed to doing everything we can to address our regional housing needs. Recognizing the differences between the cities, we are proposing an incentive-based compromise to the RHNA Modified Alternative 1. Simply put, for those cities that are willing and able to accommodate additional housing, those cities should be compensated through incentives that would help improve existing as well as future infrastructure.

We recommend the Board approve Modified Alternative 1, with the following provisions:

1. Jurisdictions whose 1999 lower income households as a percentage of total households is estimated to be greater than the regional average (Attachment 2, Column 1) shall receive 15 bonus points (out of 100 possible) for projects requesting funding through the Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program. (This would include National City, El Cajon, Imperial Beach, Lemon Grove, La Mesa, Escondido, Vista, Chula Vista, San Diego, and San Marcos.)

2. In addition to the current Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program, for all future discretionary funding allocated to local agency projects by SANDAG (following the adoption by jurisdictions of housing elements for 2005-2010), the following criteria shall apply:
   a. In order to qualify for such funding, a jurisdiction will be required to demonstrate that they are in compliance with provisions of their adopted housing element which set forth their commitment to providing adequate multi-family zoned land or other actions necessary to accommodate their share of lower income housing under the adopted RHNA.
   b. Incentive points (a minimum of 25 points out of 100 possible) will be given to projects in jurisdictions in which lower income housing units are being produced in accordance with the housing unit figures contained in Alternative 3 (Attachment 2, Column 13).
   c. In order to verify compliance with these provisions, each jurisdiction shall annually submit a report to SANDAG indicating their progress in complying with requirements of their housing element, as well as actual production of housing units within their jurisdiction by income category, during the preceding year.
## DISCRETIONARY FUNDING PROGRAMS
SUBJECT TO BOARD RHNA MEMORANDUM
(LOCAL JURISDICTION PROJECTS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Program</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
<th>Timeframe Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Transportation Enhancements (TE) Program – Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program</td>
<td>$19.1 M</td>
<td>FY 2006 to FY 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$6.4 M</td>
<td>FY 2010 to FY 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 3 – Non-motorized Program</td>
<td>$2.4 M (FY 2006 allocation)</td>
<td>Annual apportionments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$2.5 M</td>
<td>(FY 2007 allocation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local</strong></td>
<td>$3 M</td>
<td>$1 M annually from 2006 to 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• TransNet Bicycle Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Future</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal</strong></td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To be determined (TBD)</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State</strong></td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local</strong></td>
<td>$280 M*</td>
<td>2009 to 2048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• TransNet Bicycle, Pedestrian and Neighborhood Safety Program</td>
<td>$285 M*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program</td>
<td>$73 M*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• TransNet Senior Transportation Mini-grant Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Rail Grade Separation Program</strong></td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Funding source TBD)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$100 M in Revenue Constrained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$200 M in MOBILITY 2030 Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* In 2002 dollars

---

1 In prior funding cycles, the SANDAG Board of Directors has allocated funding to local jurisdictions through a competitive process for Regional Arterial System, Traffic Signal Optimization, Highway Noise Barrier, Regional Bikeway, and Transportation Enhancements programs. To the extent that such competitive funding programs are made available in the future, they would be subject to the Board RHNA memorandum.
### FUNDING PROGRAMS NOT SUBJECT TO BOARD RHNA MEMORANDUM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Funding Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal</strong> ^2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) ^2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Congestion Mitigation &amp; Air Quality (CMAQ) ^2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Transportation Enhancement (TE) Program ^2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Urbanized Area Formula Program (Section 5307)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- FTA Fixed Guideway Modernization Program (Section 5309 Rail Mod)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- FTA Section 5310 Elderly &amp; Disabled Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State</strong> ^2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) – Regional Improvement Program (RIP) ^2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- STIP – Interregional Improvement Program (IIP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- TDA Article 4 – General Public Transit Services (Fixed Transit Route Services)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- TDA Article 4.5 – Community Transit Service (Accessible Service for the Disabled)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- TDA Article 8 – Special Provisions (Express Bus and Ferry Services)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- TDA Planning and Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- State Transit Assistance (STA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- TransNet Highway Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- TransNet Transit Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- TransNet Local Streets &amp; Roads Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Future Funding Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal</strong> – same as current programs above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State</strong> – same as current programs above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. TransNet Congestion Relief Program – Major Transportation Corridor Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Highway &amp; transit capital projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Operating support for bus rapid transit (BRT) &amp; rail transit capital improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. TransNet Congestion Relief Program – Transit System Services Improvements &amp; Related Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. TransNet Congestion Relief Program – Local System Improvements &amp; Related Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Local Street &amp; Road Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Environmental Mitigation Program (EMP) ^2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. TransNet Administration and Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee (ITOC)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

^1 There are a variety of federal and state discretionary funding programs allocated directly by Caltrans that provide funding to local jurisdictions (e.g., Highway Bridge Repair & Replacement [HBRR], Safe Routes to School, etc.). Because SANDAG does not have decision-making authority over these funding programs, they would not be subject to the Board RHNA memorandum.

^2 With the exception of the EMP funds, these funds (STIP-RIP, RSTP, CMAQ, TE) are being used to match the TransNet Early Action Program (EAP) and other high priority regional projects. If, however, some portion of these funds were allocated by the SANDAG Board of Directors to local jurisdictions through a competitive process, they would be subject to the Board RHNA memorandum and this policy.
## Final Regional Housing Needs Assessment
### Modified Alternative 1 (Adopted RHNA) and Alternative 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Modified Alternative 1**</th>
<th>Alternative 3***</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlsbad</td>
<td>1,922</td>
<td>1,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>3,875</td>
<td>2,945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronado</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Mar</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Cajon</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encinitas</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Beach</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Mesa</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemon Grove</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National City</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside</td>
<td>1,445</td>
<td>1,098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poway</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego - Original</td>
<td>10,292</td>
<td>7,822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated Area</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total San Diego Region</td>
<td>14,764</td>
<td>13,661</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Draft RHNA Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlsbad</td>
<td>1,922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>3,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronado</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Mar</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Cajon</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encinitas</td>
<td>392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Beach</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Mesa</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemon Grove</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National City</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside</td>
<td>1,445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poway</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego - Original</td>
<td>10,292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated Area</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total San Diego Region</td>
<td>14,764</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unit: 1000

**Modified Alternative 1 was approved by the SANDAG Board on February 25, 2005.**

**Alternative 3 is referenced in the memorandum approved by the SANDAG Board in conjunction with the approval of the Final RHNA. Totals may be affected by rounding.**

---

**Note:** Some jurisdiction allocations by income category were adjusted slightly to ensure that regional income category percentages provided by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) -- 22.5 percent very low income, 17.1 percent low income, 18.9 percent moderate income, and 41.5 percent above moderate income -- were met.

*Adjusted to reflect transfer of lower income units from Unincorporated Area to City of San Diego.

**Modified Alternative 1 was approved by the SANDAG Board on February 25, 2005.**

***Alternative 3 was approved by the SANDAG Board in conjunction with the approval of the Final RHNA."
### Example

**Hypothetical Allocation of Incentive Points**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Alt. 3 – Low/Very Low Income Units*</th>
<th>Annual Number Year 1</th>
<th>Number Produced Year 1**</th>
<th>Percentage of Alt. 3 Year 1**</th>
<th>Incentive Points**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carlsbad</td>
<td>4,322</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>6,322</td>
<td>1,264</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Beach</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>17,739</td>
<td>3,548</td>
<td>1,419</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated County</td>
<td>4,758</td>
<td>952</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Alt. 3 – Low/Very Low Income Units</th>
<th>Cum. Annual Number Year 2</th>
<th>Cum. Number Produced Year 2**</th>
<th>Percentage of Alt. 3 Cum. Year 2**</th>
<th>Incentive Points Year 2**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carlsbad</td>
<td>4,322</td>
<td>1,728</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>6,322</td>
<td>2,528</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Beach</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>275%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>17,739</td>
<td>7,096</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated County</td>
<td>4,758</td>
<td>1,904</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 7.5 year number in RHNA Alternative 3 may be modified based on 5-year number included in local housing elements.

** These percentages and numbers are hypothetical for the purpose of explaining the methodology.
Why Performance Monitoring?

• Assembly Bill 361 (Kehoe)- Mandated RCP preparation and ongoing monitoring

• Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) Chapter 8 Performance Monitoring- Measuring our Progress
Report Indicators

- Urban Form and Transportation
- Housing
- Healthy Environment
- Economic Prosperity
- Public Facilities
- Borders
Moving in the Right Direction

- Housing in Smart Growth Areas
- Annual Hours of Traffic Delay
- Transit Ridership
- Crime
- Solid Waste Recycling
- Recycled Water Use
Areas for Improvement

- Progress Toward RHNA Goal
- Alternative Commute Mode Share
- Beach Widths
- Unemployment
- Per Capita Energy Usage
- Landfill Capacity
Recommendation

The Regional Planning Committee is asked to authorize release of the draft 2008 Annual RCP Performance Monitoring Report for a 30-day public review and comment period.
Regional Comprehensive Plan:
2008 Annual Performance Monitoring Report
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CITY OF IMPERIAL BEACH

City of Imperial Beach, California

www.cityofiib.com

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR

October 2, 2008

Chair Jerry Jones and Members of the Regional Planning Committee
San Diego Association of Governments
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101

SUBJECT: ANNUAL REVIEW OF BOARD POLICY NO. 33 – AGENDA ITEM NO. 8

Dear Mr. Chair and Members of the Regional Planning Committee:

On behalf of the City of Imperial Beach, I would like to make clear our position regarding proposed amendments to Policy 33 relating to grant funding eligibility criteria for local jurisdictions. With respect to the Award of Incentive Points in competing for grant funding, we believe strongly that credit should be given not only to newly constructed lower-income units produced within a jurisdiction but also to units that, with the assistance of the local jurisdiction, are acquired, substantially rehabilitated and rent-restricted. In a small, urban City that is largely built out and characterized by relatively small parcels, the acquisition and substantial rehabilitation of existing, oftentimes sub-standard multi-family housing is the best and most readily available opportunity to provide vitally needed affordable housing in both the near- and long-term. During the current Housing Element cycle, the City of Imperial Beach, through its Redevelopment Agency, has financially assisted and permitted 30 units of this type of affordable housing. And this in a City that already ranks as the third lowest income city in the County. Under the current Policy, however, the City of Imperial Beach receives no credit and no incentive points for these units. We believe strongly, therefore, that at least some credit should be given for the acquisition, substantial rehabilitation and rent-restriction of these units. Furthermore, because we continue to provide for additional affordable housing opportunities despite the fact that we are currently home to a high percentage of lower income households, we would also request that the Committee consider amending Policy 33 to again award points to jurisdictions whose lower income households as a percentage of total households is greater than the regional average, as was done during the Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program funding cycle.

With respect to Housing Element Compliance, it is the position of the City of Imperial Beach that Policy 33 should be amended to make those jurisdictions that have submitted their draft Housing Element to the State Department of Housing and Community Development for review eligible for grant funding. We would further recommend that such jurisdictions be eligible to receive up to fifty (50) percent of the
incentive points based on the number of building permits issued for both new and substantially rehabilitated and rent-restricted lower income units.

As the Vice Chair of this Committee, I have enjoyed participating in the discussion of these issues and regret that I could not be at today’s meeting to express our position on this item in person. I nevertheless appreciate the Committee’s consideration of the points I’ve raised on behalf of the City of Imperial Beach.

Sincerely,

Jim Jinney
Mayor, City of Imperial Beach
Implementation Guidelines for SANDAG RHNA Memorandum
Background
Guiding principles
Application of Policy to Bicycle/Pedestrian funding
Six issue areas – 3 policy and 3 technical
Review Process to Date

- TWG – September 11, 2008
- RHWG – September 25, 2008
- Special TWG meeting (RHWG invited) – September 30, 2008
- RPC - October 3, 2008
Background

- Board adopted 2005-2010 RHNA on February 25, 2005
- Memorandum was proposed to gain consensus on RHNA income allocation
- Financial incentives for projects applying for SANDAG discretionary funds based on housing element status and affordable housing production
- Ad hoc working group formed to develop Board Policy No. 033 to implement the memorandum
- Board adoption April 2006 following RPC and Executive Committee review
Guiding Principles

- Reward jurisdictions that provide more affordable housing
- Award points to projects in jurisdictions where lower income units are produced in accordance with Alt. 3
- Housing element compliance / provision of adequate multifamily-zoned land
Application of Policy – FY2008 Bike/Ped Funds

- Adopted housing element found in compliance by HCD
- Submit information regarding number of new homes produced in all four income categories
- Make progress toward implementing rezoning programs
Policy Issues

- Award of incentive points
- Housing element compliance
- “Making progress” toward implementing rezoning programs
Technical Issues

- Report building permits for new residential units / submit HCD annual report
- Update SANDAG funding sources affected by Policy 33
- Time period for evaluation of lower income housing production
Next Steps

- RPC information item – Oct. 3, 2008
- TWG recommendation to Regional Planning Committee – Oct. 9, 2008
- RPC recommendation – Nov. 7, 2008
- Executive Committee recommendation – Nov. 14, 2008
- Board of Directors action – Nov. 21, 2008
Annual Review of
Board Policy No. 033:
Implementation Guidelines for
SANDAG RHNA Memorandum

Regional Planning Committee
October 3, 2008
Smart Growth Incentive Program

Final Program Recommendations
TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program

Recommendations

- Approve project selection criteria for capital and planning grants.

- Authorize a call for projects.

- Revise Board Policy No. 001 to authorize the RPC to recommend projects and administer “Use it or lose it” provision.