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BOARD OF DIRECTORS
AGENDA

Friday, December 18, 2009
9 a.m. to 12 noon
SANDAG Board Room
401 B Street, 7th Floor
San Diego

AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

• SANDAG PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PLAN
• 2010 LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM
• FINAL REGIONAL ENERGY STRATEGY UPDATE

PLEASE TURN OFF CELL PHONES DURING THE MEETING

YOU CAN LISTEN TO THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING BY VISITING OUR WEB SITE AT WWW.SANDAG.ORG

MISSION STATEMENT
The 18 cities and county government are SANDAG serving as the forum for regional decision-making. SANDAG builds consensus, makes strategic plans, obtains and allocates resources, plans, engineers, and builds public transit, and provides information on a broad range of topics pertinent to the region’s quality of life.

San Diego Association of Governments • 401 B Street, Suite 800, San Diego, CA 92101-4231
(619) 699-1900 • Fax (619) 699-1905 • www.sandag.org
Welcome to SANDAG. Members of the public may speak to the Board of Directors on any item at the time the Board 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 the Clerk of the Board seated at the front table. Also, members of the public are invited to address the Board on any issue under the agenda item entitled Public Comments/Communications/Member Comments. Speakers are limited to three minutes. The Board of Directors 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 12 noon, two working days prior to the Board of Directors 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.
BOARD OF DIRECTORS AGENDA
Friday, December 18, 2009

ITEM #  RECOMMENDATION

+1.  APPROVAL OF NOVEMBER 20, 2009, MEETING MINUTES  APPROVE

2.  PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

Members of the public shall have the opportunity to address the Board on any issue within the jurisdiction of SANDAG that is not on this agenda. Anyone desiring to speak shall reserve time by completing a “Request to Speak” form and giving it to the Clerk of the Board prior to speaking. Public speakers should notify the Clerk of the Board if they have a handout for distribution to Board members. Speakers are limited to three minutes. Board members also may provide information and announcements under this agenda item.

+3.  ACTIONS FROM POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEES  APPROVE

This item summarizes the actions taken by the Borders Committee on November 20, the Executive and Regional Planning Committees on December 4, and the Transportation and Public Safety Committees on December 11, 2009.

CONSENT ITEMS (4 through 8)

+4.  REVISION TO THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO TransNet MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT AUDIT (Lisa Kondrat-Dauphin)*  APPROVE

The TransNet Extension Ordinance requires the setting of new Maintenance of Effort (MOE) levels. The City of San Diego requires an amendment to its previously approved base level to include a correction to the local discretionary funds used for transit pass subsidies. The Transportation Committee recommends that the Board of Directors approve the revised City of San Diego MOE base level.

+5.  FY 2010 BUDGET AND OVERALL WORK PROGRAM AMENDMENT: ACCEPTING ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR PROJECT SAFE NEIGHBORHOODS (Cynthia Burke)  APPROVE

In June 2009, the Board of Directors approved SANDAG assuming the role of fiscal agent for the Project Safe Neighborhoods (PSN) effort, executing a Memorandum of Understanding between SANDAG and the Southern District of California’s PSN Task Force, and accepting $669,866 in initial funding. The U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) has awarded $118,760 in additional funding, and it is anticipated that this may occur on a periodic basis. The Public Safety Committee recommends that the Board of Directors approve an amendment to the FY 2010 Budget and Overall Work Program to accept this additional funding and authorize the Executive Director to accept future funding that the U.S. DOJ provides for the PSN program during FY 2010.
+6. EXTENSION REQUEST FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009 TDA AUDITS (Lisa Kondrat-Dauphin) APPROVE

The Cities of Escondido, Oceanside, and San Diego, and SANDAG have requested an extension for their fiscal year 2009 Transportation Development Act (TDA) audits. The Transportation Committee recommends that the Board of Directors approve TDA audit extension requests for the Cities of Escondido, Oceanside, and San Diego, and SANDAG, until March 28, 2010, as permitted by the Public Utilities Code and the California Code of Regulations.

+7. REPORT SUMMARIZING DELEGATED ACTIONS TAKEN BY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR (Lauren Warrem) INFORMATION

In accordance with SANDAG Board Policy Nos. 003 (Investment Policy), 017 (Delegation of Authority), and 024 (Procurement and Contracting-Construction), this report summarizes certain delegated actions taken by the Executive Director since the last Board meeting.

+8. REPORTS ON MEETINGS AND EVENTS ATTENDED ON BEHALF OF SANDAG (Kim Kawada) INFORMATION

Board members will provide brief reports orally or in writing on external meetings and events attended on behalf of SANDAG since the last Board of Directors meeting.

CHAIR’S REPORT (9 through 10)

9. RECOGNITION OF SANDAG LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION PLANNING DIRECTOR BOB LEITER ON HIS RETIREMENT INFORMATION

10. ELECTION OF 2010 SANDAG BOARD OFFICERS (National City Mayor Ron Morrison, Nominating Committee Chair) APPROVE

The Nominating Committee recommends the attached slate of candidates for SANDAG Chair, First Vice Chair, and Second Vice Chair for calendar year 2010. Additional nominations for any officer may be made by Board members at the December meeting. The Board of Directors is asked to elect SANDAG Board Officers for the upcoming year.

REPORTS (11 through 19)

11. FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT FROM THE TransNet INDEPENDENT TAXPAYER OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE (Hamid Bahadori, ITOC Chair; Charles "Muggs" Stoll)* INFORMATION

Hamid Bahadori, Chair of the Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee (ITOC), will present the Committee’s annual report for FY 2009.
12. SANDAG PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PLAN (Second Vice Chair Jack Dale, Transportation Committee Chair; Anne Steinberger)  

The Transportation and Regional Planning Committees recommend that the Board of Directors approve the SANDAG Public Participation Plan, in substantially the same form as attached to the report.

13. 2010 LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM (First Vice Chair Jerome Stocks; Genevieve Morelos)  

Consistent with past programs, the proposed legislative program for calendar year 2010 includes policies and proposals for possible federal and state legislation and local activities. The Executive Committee recommends that the Board of Directors approve the 2010 Legislative Program.

14. 2010 STIP AND PROPOSITION 1B CMIA PROGRAM REVISIONS (Second Vice Chair Jack Dale, Transportation Committee Chair; José A. Nuncio)  

Due to lower than expected bids, there is approximately $69 million in Proposition 1B Corridor Mobility Improvement Account (CMIA) savings on the Interstate 15 (I-15) Express Lanes (South) project. Based on discussions with California Transportation Commission (CTC) and Caltrans staffs, the I-15 Direct Access Ramp at Mira Mesa Boulevard project, currently programmed with State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds, would be a good candidate for use of these CMIA savings. The Transportation Committee recommends that the Board of Directors: (1) approve the submittal of a modified I-15 Direct Access Ramp project to the CTC for programming using Proposition 1B CMIA savings; and (2) remove the project from the 2010 STIP submittal.

15. 2009-2013 COORDINATED PUBLIC TRANSIT AND HUMAN SERVICES TRANSPORTATION PLAN (Second Vice Chair Jack Dale, Transportation Committee Chair; Phil Trom)  

The 2009-2013 Coordinated Public Transit and Human Services Transportation Plan (Coordinated Plan) provides a blueprint for the development of transit and human services transportation in San Diego for the next five years. The Transportation Committee recommends that the Board of Directors approve Resolution No. 2010-06, approving the 2009-2013 Coordinated Plan.

16. LOS ANGELES-SAN DIEGO-SAN LUIS OBISPO (LOSSAN) RAIL CORRIDOR MEMBER AGENCY MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING FOR RAIL SERVICE INTEGRATION (Second Vice Chair Jack Dale, Transportation Committee Chair; Linda Culp)  

The LOSSAN Rail Corridor Agency seeks to increase ridership, revenue, capacity, reliability, and safety on the coastal rail line from San Diego to Los Angeles to San Luis Obispo. Since August 2008, SANDAG, NCTD, MTS, and the other LOSSAN member agencies have been working on ways to better integrate the corridor’s three passenger rail services. The Transportation Committee recommends that the Board of Directors authorize the SANDAG Executive Director to sign the interagency Memorandum of Understanding, in substantially the same form as shown in Attachment 1.
+17. FINAL REGIONAL ENERGY STRATEGY UPDATE (Imperial Beach Mayor Jim Janney, Regional Planning Committee Chair; Andrew Martin) APPROVE

The Regional Energy Strategy (RES) serves as the energy policy guide for SANDAG. At its October 9 meeting, the Board of Directors provided comments on a preliminary draft of the RES Update. The Final RES Update is the product of an extensive review and input process that, in addition to the Board, has included the Transportation, Regional Planning, and Borders Committees, the Regional Energy Working Group, local planning directors on the Regional Planning Technical Working Group, staff at the California Energy Commission, and members of the public. Staff will present an overview of the final document, including how Board member comments have been addressed. The Regional Planning Committee recommends that the Board of Directors approve the Final Regional Energy Strategy Update, in substantially the same form as shown in Attachment 2.

+18. COMPASS CARD STATUS UPDATE (James Dreisbach-Towle) INFORMATION

Staff will provide the Board of Directors with an update on recent Compass Card project activities.

19. FINANCIAL MARKET STATUS (Lauren Warrem and Marney Cox) INFORMATION

This monthly briefing is designed to keep the Board of Directors informed about the latest developments in the financial markets, the economy, and revenue forecasts, and the strategies we are exploring and implementing to minimize possible impacts to SANDAG.

20. UPCOMING MEETINGS INFORMATION

The next Board Policy meeting is scheduled for Friday, January 8, 2010, at 10 a.m. The next Board Business meeting of the SANDAG Board of Directors is scheduled for Friday, January 22, 2010, at 9 a.m.

21. ADJOURNMENT

+ next to an agenda item indicates an attachment
* next to an agenda item indicates a San Diego Regional Transportation Commission item
Chair Lori Holt Pfeiler (Escondido) called the meeting of the SANDAG Board of Directors to order at 9:08 a.m. The attendance sheet for the meeting is attached.

1. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES (APPROVE)

   Action: Upon a motion by Mayor Jim Wood (Oceanside), and a second by Mayor Mary Sessom (Lemon Grove), the SANDAG Board of Directors approved the minutes from the October 9 and October 23, 2009, meetings.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

   Chair Pfeiler welcomed Laurie Berman, the new Caltrans District 11 Director.

   Ms. Berman provided a report on a recent bid opening related to State Route 76.

   Chair Pfeiler announced that the American Planning Association has awarded Dr. Jane Clough-Riquelme the 2010 National Planning Achievement Award for Advancing Diversity and Social Change for her work with tribal governments in the San Diego region. Chair Pfeiler noted that the Southern California Tribal Chairmen’s Association and the Reservation Transportation Authority played an instrumental role in nominating Dr. Clough-Riquelme for this award.

   North County Transit District (NCTD) Chair Bob Campbell announced the recent award of a contract for outsourcing bus operations and maintenance responsibilities. He said that the NCTD Board’s action will bring the agency closer to having a balanced budget, but it is still $10 million short as a result of the state taking transit operating funds.

3. ACTIONS FROM POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEES (APPROVE)

   This item summarizes the actions taken by the Borders Committee on October 23, the Transportation and Regional Planning Committees on November 6, and the Executive and Public Safety Committees on November 13, 2009.

   Action: Upon a motion by Mayor Jim Desmond (San Marcos) and second by Mayor Crystal Crawford (Del Mar), the SANDAG Board of Directors approved the actions taken by the Policy Advisory Committees at the meetings noted above. Yes – 18 (weighted vote, 100%). No – 0 (weighted vote, 0%). Abstain – 0 (weighted vote, 0%). Absent – County of San Diego.
CONSENT ITEMS (4 through 8)

Mayor Desmond asked that Item No. 6 be pulled for questions.

4. REVISED ANNUAL MEETING CALENDAR (APPROVE)

The Board of Directors is asked to approve the revised meeting calendar for the Board and the Policy Advisory Committees for the upcoming year. A change to the date of the December Board Policy meeting is included.

5. QUARTERLY INVESTMENT REPORT FOR PERIOD ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2009 (INFORMATION)

The SANDAG Investment Policy requires that the Board be provided a quarterly report of investments held by SANDAG. This report includes all money under the direction or care of SANDAG as of September 30, 2009.

7. REPORT SUMMARIZING DELEGATED ACTIONS TAKEN BY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR (INFORMATION)

In accordance with SANDAG Board Policy Nos. 003 (Investment Policy), 017 (Delegation of Authority), and 024 (Procurement and Contracting-Construction), this report summarizes certain delegated actions taken by the Executive Director since the last Board meeting.

8. REPORTS ON MEETINGS AND EVENTS ATTENDED ON BEHALF OF SANDAG (INFORMATION)

Board members will provide brief reports orally or in writing on external meetings and events attended on behalf of SANDAG since the last Board of Directors meeting.

Action: Upon a motion by Mayor Desmond, and a second by Mayor Wood, the SANDAG Board approved Consent Items Nos. 4, 5, 7, and 8. Yes - 18. No - 0. Abstain - 0. Absent – County of San Diego.

6. QUARTERLY PROGRESS REPORT ON TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS – JULY TO SEPTEMBER 2009 (INFORMATION)

This quarterly report summarizes the current status of major highway, transit, arterial, traffic management, and transportation demand management (TDM) projects in SANDAG’s five-year Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) for the period July to September 2009.

Mayor Desmond questioned the statistics about vanpools that operate outside of the County of San Diego. Gary Gallegos, Executive Director, explained the vanpool program and said it is designed to ease traffic congestion by encouraging people to use vanpools. SANDAG partners with agencies in Orange and Riverside Counties on this program. He noted that not only do vanpools go from San Diego County to Orange and Riverside Counties, but vanpools also travel from Orange and Riverside Counties to San Diego County.

Action: This item was presented for information only.
9. REPORT FROM NOMINATING COMMITTEE ON SLATE OF BOARD OFFICERS FOR 2010 (INFORMATION)

In September, Chair Pfeiler appointed a six-person Nominating Committee for Board officers.

Nominating Committee Chair Ron Morrison (National City) reported that after consideration of the applications, the Committee recommends the following slate of nominees for SANDAG Board positions for 2010: Chair – Escondido Mayor Lori Holt Pfeiler; First Vice Chair – Encinitas Councilmember Jerome Stocks; and Second Vice Chair – Santee Councilmember Jack Dale. In accordance with SANDAG Bylaws, the election of officers is scheduled for the December 18 Board meeting. Additional nominations from the floor also may be made at the December meeting.

Action: This item was presented for information only.

REPORTS (10 through 16)

10. SECOND READING OF AN AMENDMENT TO ORDINANCE CO-04-01 (SAN DIEGO TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM ORDINANCE AND EXPENDITURE PLAN) TO REVISE ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION PROGRAM PRINCIPLE NO. 10 (APPROVE, SUBJECT TO 2/3RDS VOTE)

Chair Pfeiler stated that the current TransNet Extension Ordinance and Expenditure Plan requires the Board of Directors to act on additional regional funding measures to meet the long-term requirements for implementing habitat conservation plans in the San Diego region no later than six years after the passage of the TransNet Extension.

Acting as the San Diego Regional Transportation Commission, the Board of Directors is asked to conduct the second reading and approve the amendment to the TransNet Extension Ordinance (Commission Ordinance CO-10-02) to extend the deadline for acting on additional regional funding measures to meet the long-term requirements for implementing habitat conservation plans in the San Diego region by two additional years to 2012.

Julie Wiley, General Counsel, read the Ordinance amendment into the record.

Action: Upon a motion by Mayor Wood, and a second by Mayor Crawford, the SANDAG Board approved Commission Ordinance CO-10-02. Yes – 18 (weighted vote, 84%). No – 0 (weighted vote, 0%). Abstain – 0 (weighted vote, 0%). Absent – County of San Diego (weighted vote, 16%).

11. FINANCIAL MARKET UPDATE AND REVISION TO FY 2010 TransNet REVENUES AND TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT APPORTIONMENT (APPROVE)

Second Vice Chair and Transportation Committee Chair Dale reported that on a monthly basis, the Board of Directors has received updates that sales tax revenues continue to be negatively impacted by the ongoing economic conditions. Based on sales tax receipts to
date, the receipts are lower than projected, resulting in the need to reduce the FY 2010 TransNet revenue estimate and Transportation Development Act (TDA) apportionment. He noted that the Transportation Committee recommends approval of this action.

Marney Cox, Chief Economist, provided an overview of the current economic conditions and the rationale for the proposed reductions.

Lauren Warrem, Acting Finance Director, presented information on the impacts of the lower than projected sales tax revenues on the FY 2010 TransNet and TDA programs.

Action: Upon a motion by Second Vice Chair Dale and second by Mayor Sessom, the SANDAG Board of Directors approved the revised FY 2010 TransNet revenue estimate and Transportation Development Act apportionment. Yes – 18 (weighted vote, 100%). No – 0 (weighted vote, 0%). Abstain – 0 (weighted vote, 0%). Absent – County of San Diego.

12. 2010 STATE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (APPROVE)

Second Vice Chair and Transportation Committee Chair Dale introduced this item and indicated that the Transportation Committee recommended approval.

José Nuncio, Manager of Financial Programming and Project Control, reported that the California Transportation Commission (CTC) has released its fund estimate for the 2010 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). Due to the decreasing funds available statewide, the 2010 cycle will add a very limited amount of funding to the STIP program.

Action: Upon a motion by Second Vice Chair Dale and second by Mayor Cheryl Cox (Chula Vista), the SANDAG Board of Directors approved the programming and submission of the 2010 STIP to the CTC, in substantially the same form as described in the report. Yes – 17 (weighted vote, 100%). No – 0 (weighted vote, 0%). Abstain – 0 (weighted vote, 0%). Absent – County of San Diego and National City.

13. LOCAL GOVERNMENT PARTNERSHIP AWARD WITH SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC AND STATE ENERGY PROGRAM FUNDING (APPROVE)

Regional Planning Committee Chair Jim Janney (Imperial Beach) introduced this item, and indicated that the Regional Planning Committee recommended approval.

Andrew Martin, Associate Planner, reported that the partnership program funded by the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) will provide energy planning assistance to enable member agencies to develop “Energy Roadmaps” to reduce energy use and lower utility bills at existing buildings and in planned new construction. In addition, several member agencies have requested that SANDAG submit a regional application for $8 million in State Energy Program (SEP) funds to develop a whole-building retrofit program to improve the energy efficiency of residential buildings.

Chair Pfeiler noted there was one request to speak on this item.

Andrew McAllister, representing the California Center for Sustainable Energy, provided additional information about the SEP grant opportunity, and encouraged SANDAG support.
**Action:** Upon a motion by Mayor Janney and second by Councilmember Matt Hall (Carlsbad), the SANDAG Board of Directors approved: (1) an amendment to the FY 2010 Budget and Overall Work Program to accept the $1,760,870 CPUC funding award; and (2) Resolution No. 2010-05, authorizing SANDAG to submit the State Energy Program funding proposal on behalf of local governments and other collaborative partners. Yes – 17 (weighted vote, 100%). No – 0 (weighted vote, 0%). Abstain – 0 (weighted vote, 0%). Absent – Chula Vista and County of San Diego.

15. **ANNUAL UPDATE ON THE ACTIVITIES OF THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE RESEARCH DIVISION AND CLEARINGHOUSE (INFORMATION)**

Mayor Mark Lewis (El Cajon) stated that each year staff provides the Board with an update on the activities of the Criminal Justice Research Division and Clearinghouse.

Dr. Cindy Burke, Criminal Justice Research Division Director, reported that since the late 1980s SANDAG, through the Criminal Justice Clearinghouse, has tracked regional crime and arrest statistics as well as statistics related to drug use among the offender population. These data provide timely information for policymakers and practitioners interested in how crime and law enforcement’s response varies over time and across jurisdictions. An overview and update of the activities and accomplishments of the Criminal Justice Research Division and the Clearinghouse was provided.

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

14. **10:30 A.M. TIME CERTAIN: REGIONAL EFFORTS TO ADDRESS GRAFFITI (DISCUSSION/POSSIBLE ACTION)**

Mayor Lewis stated that in July 2009, staff surveyed local jurisdictions regarding use of formal graffiti tracking systems. A summary of these findings was presented to the Chiefs/Sheriff’s Management Committee and the Public Safety Committee (PSC) in September. As a result of these discussions, the PSC requested that the Board ask staff to report back on regional efforts to address graffiti, including preparing cost estimates and evaluating the feasibility of regional implementation.

Kurt Kroninger, Technical Services Department Director, provided a report on the analysis done to date on graffiti tracking systems used by local jurisdictions in the San Diego region.

Chair Pfeiler noted there were several requests to speak on this item.

Bonnie Dumanis, San Diego County District Attorney, suggested the Board take action on the next step to proceed on a regional basis to address graffiti.

Luis Monteagudo, representing the Office of San Diego County Supervisor Greg Cox, indicated the Supervisor’s strong support of this program.

Sergeant Mike Kearney, Escondido Police Department, provided information on the graffiti abatement program in Escondido.
Brian Trotier, Acting President/CEO, Southeast Economic Development Corporation, spoke in support of this program, noting the negative impact from graffiti on economic and redevelopment activity.

Mayor Sessom asked that we have a sense of how to quantify the value of proceeding with this program for each jurisdiction. She also suggested that any component of a future program should include an educational component.

Mayor Morrison suggested that nonjurisdictional groups, such as the transit agencies and special districts, also participate in this program.

Councilmember Dave Roberts (Solana Beach) recommended that consistent standards be established for graffiti, etching, and paint ball tagging.

**Action:** Upon a motion by Councilmember Marti Emerald (City of San Diego) and second by Mayor Art Madrid (La Mesa), the SANDAG Board of Directors directed staff to determine how Graffiti Tracker could be expanded across the region either by leveraging an existing competitively procured contract or via a sole source procurement, if justified. In addition, the Board requested staff to quantify the value of this graffiti tracking program for individual jurisdictions, and to include an educational component. Yes – 16 (weighted vote, 100%). No – 0 (weighted vote, 100%). Abstain – 0 (weighted vote, 0%). Absent – Chula Vista, County of San Diego, and Imperial Beach.

16. **COMPASS CARD STATUS UPDATE (INFORMATION)**

James Dreisbach-Towle, Principal Technology Program Analyst, provided an update on recent Compass Card project activities.

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

17. **UPCOMING MEETINGS**

The next Board of Directors Policy meeting is scheduled for Friday, December 4, 2009, at 10 a.m. The next Board of Directors Business meeting is scheduled for Friday, December 18, 2009, at 9 a.m. Please note that the December Board meetings will be held respectively on the first and third Fridays of the month due to the holiday schedule.

18. **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 11:24 a.m.
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### ATTENDANCE
SANDAG BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING
NOVEMBER 20, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JURISDICTION/ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ATTENDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Carlsbad</td>
<td>Matt Hall (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Chula Vista</td>
<td>Cheryl Cox (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Coronado</td>
<td>Al Ovrom (1st Alt.)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Del Mar</td>
<td>Crystal Crawford (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of El Cajon</td>
<td>Mark Lewis (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Encinitas</td>
<td>Teresa Barth (1st Alt.)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Escondido</td>
<td>Lori Holt Pfeiler, Chair (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Imperial Beach</td>
<td>Jim Janney (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of La Mesa</td>
<td>Art Madrid (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Lemon Grove</td>
<td>Mary Sessom (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of National City</td>
<td>Ron Morrison (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Oceanside</td>
<td>James Wood (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Poway</td>
<td>Don Higginson (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego - A</td>
<td>Jerry Sanders (Primary, Seat A)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego - B</td>
<td>Marti Emerald (1st Alt.)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Marcos</td>
<td>Jim Desmond (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santee</td>
<td>Jack Dale (2nd Vice Chair)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Solana Beach</td>
<td>Dave Roberts (1st Alt.)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Vista</td>
<td>Judy Ritter (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego - A</td>
<td>Dianne Jacob (Primary, Seat A)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego - B</td>
<td>Pam Slater-Price (Primary, Seat B)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Laurie Berman (1st. Alt.)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>Harry Mathis (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTD</td>
<td>Bob Campbell (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial County</td>
<td>Wally Leimgruber (Primary)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Dept. of Defense</td>
<td>CAPT Keith Hamilton (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD Unified Port District</td>
<td>Scott Peters (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD County Water Authority</td>
<td>Mark Muir (Primary)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baja California/Mexico</td>
<td>Lydia Antonio (Alternate)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern California Tribal Chairmen's Association</td>
<td>Robert H. Smith (Primary)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ACTIONS FROM POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEES

The following actions were taken by the Policy Advisory Committees since the last Board of Directors meeting.

BORDERS COMMITTEE (November 20, 2009)

The Borders Committee took the following actions or recommended the following approvals:

- Recommended that the proposed 2010 San Diego Regional Tribal Summit agenda be presented to both the SANDAG Executive Committee and the Southern California Tribal Chairmen’s Association Board for approval.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING (December 4, 2009)

The Executive Committee took the following actions or recommended the following approvals:

- Recommended that the Board of Directors approve the 2010 SANDAG Legislative Program, as amended.

- Approved the use of $225,000 in Contingency Reserve funds for additional modeling and consultant services for the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan, and approved a corresponding increase of $225,000 for this effort to the Long-Range Regional Plans and Forecast work element (#31005) in the FY 2010 Budget and Overall Work Program.

- Approved the agenda for the December 18, 2009, Board of Directors meeting, as amended.

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING (December 4, 2009)

The Regional Planning Committee took the following actions or recommended the following approvals:

- Recommended that the Board of Directors approve the Final Regional Energy Strategy Update.

- Recommended that the Board of Directors approve the agencywide SANDAG Public Participation Plan.

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MEETING (December 11, 2009)

The Transportation Committee is scheduled to take the following actions or recommend the following approvals:

- Approve Amendment No. 17 to the 2008 Regional Transportation Improvement Program.
• Recommend that the Board of Directors approve Transportation Development Act audit extension requests for the cities of Escondido, Oceanside, and San Diego, and SANDAG, until March 28, 2010, as permitted by the Public Utilities Code and the California Code of Regulations.

• Recommend that the Board of Directors approve the revised TransNet Maintenance of Effort base level for the City of San Diego to include a correction to the amount of local discretionary funds used for transit pass subsidies.

• In accordance with SANDAG Board Policy No. 018, make a finding of overriding considerations with regard to the proposed Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) service changes, which MTS plans to implement in February 2010.

• Conduct a public hearing on the 2009-2013 Coordinated Public Transit and Human Services Transportation Plan (Coordinated Plan), and after considering public comments, recommend that the Board of Directors approve the final Coordinated Plan.

• Recommend that the Board of Directors approve the agencywide SANDAG Public Participation Plan.

• Recommend that the Board of Directors authorize the SANDAG Executive Director to sign the Los Angeles-San Diego-San Luis Obispo (LOSSAN) Rail Corridor Member Agency Memorandum of Understanding for Rail Service Integration.

• Review and discuss proposed comments on the Del Mar Fairgrounds Master Plan Project Draft Environmental Impact Report.

• Recommend that the Board of Directors: (1) approve the submittal of a modified Interstate 15 Direct Access Ramp project to the California Transportation Commission for programming using Proposition 1B Corridor Mobility Improvement Account savings; and (2) remove the project from the 2010 State Transportation Improvement Program submittal.

PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE MEETING (December 11, 2009)

The Public Safety Committee is scheduled to take the following actions or recommend the following approvals:

• Recommend that the Board of Directors approve an amendment to the FY 2010 Budget and Overall Work Program to accept $118,760 in additional U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) funding for the Project Safe Neighborhoods (PSN) program, and authorize the Executive Director to accept future funding that the U.S. DOJ provides for the PSN program during this budget year.

Staff will update the Board of Directors if the actual actions taken by the Transportation and Public Safety Committees on December 11, 2009, differ from those described in this report.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director
REVISION TO THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO TransNet MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT AUDIT

Introduction

The TransNet Extension Ordinance requires the setting of new Maintenance of Effort (MOE) levels. This process was completed and approved by the Board of Directors on multiple dates during FY 2008.

A revision to the City of San Diego MOE audit is necessary at this time due to an error in the MOE level as reported in the previously approved audit.

Background

Section 8 of the TransNet Extension Ordinance (Attachment 1) prescribes the requirement to develop a new MOE level, based on the level of discretionary funds expended for street and road purposes on average over the fiscal years 2001, 2002, and 2003. The MOE level is subject to adjustment every three years based on the Construction Cost Index developed by Caltrans, not to exceed the growth rate in the local jurisdiction’s general fund revenues over the same time period.

On February 13, 2008, the Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee (ITOC) reviewed and commented on the set of procedures that were proposed to be used by SANDAG auditors, Caporicci & Larson (C&L), to perform the MOE audits. The audits were completed and approved by the Board of Directors during FY 2008. The result of the procedures was a new MOE base level that would be applied for the FY 2009 compliance audits, which is the first year the requirements under the TransNet Extension Ordinance apply.

While preparing for the FY 2009 annual TransNet compliance audits, it was determined that the local discretionary funds used for transit pass subsidies in fiscal years 2001, 2002, and 2003 were inadvertently understated in the approved City of San Diego MOE audit report. The auditors have subsequently conducted an analysis pursuant to Section 6 of the agreed-upon procedures, the results of which are included as Attachment 2.

The original MOE base calculation, as approved in March 2008, and current revision including an increase of $332,032 to the MOE base are as follows:

Recommendation

The Transportation Committee recommends that the Board of Directors approve the revised City of San Diego Maintenance of Effort base level (Attachment 2).
Adjusted MOE Base as of June 30, 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>As originally approved by the Board of Directors in March 2008</th>
<th>Proposed revision as corrected in October 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Streets and roads</td>
<td>$ 24,475,072</td>
<td>$ 24,475,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized transportation services</td>
<td>181,102</td>
<td>181,102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit bus subsidies</td>
<td>642,914</td>
<td>974,946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support of smart growth development</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat-related mitigation activities</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total adjusted MOE base</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 25,299,088</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 25,631,120</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The revised MOE base level for the City of San Diego was reviewed by the ITOC on November 4, 2009, and by the Transportation Committee on December 11, 2009, and it is recommended for Board approval.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Attachments: 1. Section 8 of the TransNet Extension Ordinance
2. City of San Diego TransNet Draft MOE Report (revised)

Key Staff Contact: Lisa Kondrat-Dauphin, (619) 699-1942, lko@sandag.org
EXEMPLARY FROM TransNet ORDINANCE

SECTION 8. MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT: It is the intent of the Legislature, as stated in the Act, and the Commission that revenues provided from this measure be used to augment, not supplant existing local revenues being used for the purposes set forth in Section 4 herein. Each local agency receiving revenues pursuant to Section 4(D) shall annually maintain as a minimum the same level of local discretionary funds expended for street and road purposes on average over the last three fiscal years completed prior to the operative date of this Ordinance (Fiscal Years 2000-01, 2001-02, 2002-03), as was reported in the State Controller's Annual Report of Financial Transactions for Streets and Roads and as verified by an independent auditor. The maintenance of effort level as determined through this process shall be subject to adjustment every three years based on the Construction Cost Index developed by Caltrans. Any increase in the maintenance of effort level based on this adjustment shall not exceed the growth rate in the local jurisdiction’s General Fund revenues over the same time period. The Commission shall not allocate any revenues pursuant to Section 4(D) to any eligible local agency in any fiscal year until that local agency has certified to the Commission that it will include in its budget for that fiscal year an amount of local discretionary funding for streets and roads purposes at least equal to the minimum maintenance of effort requirement. An annual independent audit shall be conducted to verify that the maintenance of effort requirement for each agency was met. Any local agency which does not meet its maintenance of effort requirement in any given year shall have its funding under Section 4(D)(1) reduced in the following year by the amount by which the agency did not meet its required maintenance of effort level. In the event that special circumstances prevent a local agency from meeting its maintenance of effort requirement, the local agency may request up to three additional fiscal years to fulfill its requirement. Such a request must be approved by the Commission. The Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee shall also review such requests and make recommendations to the Commission. Any local street and road revenues not allocated pursuant to the maintenance of effort requirement shall be redistributed to the remaining eligible agencies according to the formula described in Section 4(D)(1). The maintenance of effort requirement also shall apply to any local agency discretionary funds being used for the other purposes specified under Section 4. In addition, revenues provided from this Ordinance shall not be used to replace other private developer funding that has been or will be committed for any project.
City of San Diego

TransNet

Maintenance of Effort

Independent Accountants' Report on Agreed-Upon Procedures Performed on the TransNet Ordinance Maintenance of Effort Requirements

As of October 29, 2009
INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS’ REPORT ON
APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

To the Board of Directors
of the San Diego Association of Governments
San Diego, California

We have performed the procedures enumerated below which were agreed to by the San Diego Association of Governments, San Diego, California (SANDAG) solely to assist SANDAG with respect to an evaluation of the City of San Diego’s (City) Maintenance of Effort (MOE) base for compliance with the TransNet Extension Ordinance and Expenditure Plan - Commission Ordinance 04-01 (Ordinance) terms and conditions. It is understood that this report is only for the information of SANDAG for use in evaluating the City’s compliance with the provisions of the Ordinance that are referred to in the procedures described below. The engagement to apply agreed-upon procedures was performed in accordance with attestation standards established by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants. The sufficiency of the procedures for the purposes of SANDAG is solely the responsibility of SANDAG. Consequently, we make no representations regarding the sufficiency of the procedures described below either for the purpose for which this report has been requested or for any other purpose.

Scope of Procedures Performed and Findings

Our procedures and findings were as follows:

1. In accordance with the Ordinance, performed the following:

   a. Calculated the average local discretionary expenditures on streets and roads (as reported in the Street Report and for other purposes as specified in Section 4 (as represented by the City) for the 3 fiscal years ending June 30, 2001, 2002, and 2003.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local discretionary expenditures:</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>Revised MOE Base</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(per Street Report, as adjusted, if applicable)</td>
<td>$15,073,030</td>
<td>$24,076,536</td>
<td>$22,038,112</td>
<td>$20,395,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local discretionary expenditures:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized transportation services</td>
<td>150,918</td>
<td>150,918</td>
<td>150,918</td>
<td>150,918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit subsidies</td>
<td>759,280</td>
<td>846,823</td>
<td>831,261</td>
<td>812,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support of smart growth development</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat-related mitigation activities</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$15,983,228</td>
<td>$25,074,277</td>
<td>$23,020,291</td>
<td>$21,359,266</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b. Calculated the growth rate in the Construction Cost Index for the period July 1, 2003 through June 30, 2006 over the Construction Cost Index as of June 30, 2003.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Index as of June 30, 2006 divided by Index as of June 30, 2003} & 2006 & 2003 & \text{Growth Rate} \\
& 280.60 & 148.60 & 1.89 \text{ Times} \\
\end{array}
\]

c. Calculated the growth rate in the City’s General Fund revenues as of June 30, 2006 over the amount of General Fund revenues as of June 30, 2003.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{General fund revenues as of June 30, 2006 divided by General fund revenues as of June 30, 2003} & 2006 & 2003 & \text{Growth Rate} \\
& 833,162,000 & 693,724,000 & 1.20 \text{ Times} \\
\end{array}
\]

d. Compared the growth rate in the Construction Cost Index as calculated in 6(b) above with the growth rate in General Fund revenues calculated in 6(c) above and selected the lowest rate.

\[
\text{Lowest Growth Rate} \\
1.20 \text{ Times}
\]

e. Applied the growth rate selected in 6(d) above to the MOE base developed in 6(a) above and determined the adjusted MOE base as of June 30, 2006.

\[
\begin{array}{lcccc}
\text{Growth Rate} & \text{Revised MOE Base} & \text{Adjusted MOE Base as of June 30, 2006} \\
\text{Streets and roads} & 1.20 & \times & 20,395,893 & = & 24,475,072 \\
\text{Specialized transportation services} & 1.20 & \times & 150,918 & = & 181,102 \\
\text{Transit bus subsidies} & 1.20 & \times & 812,455 & = & 974,946 \\
\text{Support of smart growth development} & 1.20 & \times & - & = & - \\
\text{Habitat-related mitigation activities} & 1.20 & \times & - & = & - \\
\text{Total adjusted MOE base} & 1.20 & \times & 21,359,266 & = & 25,631,120 \\
\end{array}
\]

We were not engaged to, and did not, perform an audit of the City, the objective of which would be the expression of an opinion on the elements, accounts, or items specified above. Accordingly, we do not express such an opinion. Had we performed additional procedures, other matters might have come to our attention that would have been reported to you.

This report is intended solely for the use of SANDAG and this report should not be used by those who have not agreed to the procedures and taken responsibility for the sufficiency of the procedures for their purposes. However, this report is a matter of public record and its distribution is not limited.

San Diego, California
October 29, 2009
FY 2010 BUDGET AND OVERALL WORK PROGRAM AMENDMENT: ACCEPTING ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR PROJECT SAFE NEIGHBORHOODS

Introduction

Since 2003, a national effort has been coordinated through the local U.S. Attorney's Office to target gun- and gang-related violence. This effort, called Project Safe Neighborhoods (PSN), has involved a comprehensive strategy that includes coordinated regional response by law enforcement, the involvement of community partners, a media campaign, as well as the analysis of gun-crime statistics. In June 2009, the Board of Directors approved SANDAG assuming the role of fiscal agent for this effort, executing a Memorandum of Understanding between SANDAG and the Southern District of California's PSN Task Force, and accepting $669,866 in funding. Since that time, additional funding was awarded by the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) in the amount of $118,760, and it is anticipated that additional funding may be available again in FY 2010.

Discussion

As the PSN fiscal agent, SANDAG is responsible for participating on the PSN Task Force, entering into contracts with each entity (that is selected by the PSN Executive Committee) responsible for carrying out portions of the PSN Task Force strategy, preparing required federal reports, drawing down federal funds as needed, making payments to contractors, and working with federal monitors or auditors as needed. In exchange for completing these tasks, SANDAG is compensated for all costs incurred up to 10 percent of all grant funds that are managed. Attachment 1 shows the additional funds that would be available in FY 2010, increasing the total budget for this effort to $788,626.

Recommendation

The Public Safety Committee recommends that the Board of Directors approve an amendment to the FY 2010 Budget and Overall Work Program to accept this additional funding and authorize the Executive Director to accept future funding that the U.S. DOJ provides for the PSN program during FY 2010.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Attachment: 1. Program Work Element FY 2010 Budget – Project Safe Neighborhood Fiscal Agent

Key Staff Contact: Cynthia Burke, (619) 699-1910, cbu@sandag.org
**WORK ELEMENT: 23453.2  ** PROJECT SAFE NEIGHBORHOOD FISCAL AGENT  
**FY 2010 BUDGET: $669,866 $788,626**

**AREA OF EMPHASIS: MODELING & RESEARCH**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funds Source</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>FY 10</th>
<th>FY 11-14</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTA MPO Planning (5303)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA Transit Planning (5307)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHWA Metropolitan Planning</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHWA CMAQ</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Other</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$669,866</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$669,866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[788,626]</td>
<td>[788,626]</td>
<td>[788,626]</td>
<td>[788,626]</td>
<td>[788,626]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Other</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDA Planning/Administration</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet Program</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member Assessment</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Other</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$669,866</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$669,866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[788,626]</td>
<td>[788,626]</td>
<td>[788,626]</td>
<td>[788,626]</td>
<td>[788,626]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funds Application</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>FY 10</th>
<th>FY 11-14</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries, Benefits, Indirect</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$66,987</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$66,987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[78,863]</td>
<td>[78,863]</td>
<td>[78,863]</td>
<td>[78,863]</td>
<td>[78,863]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Direct Costs</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Employees</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Employees</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracted Services</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; Equipment</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass through/In-kind Services</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$602,879</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$602,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[709,763]</td>
<td>[709,763]</td>
<td>[709,763]</td>
<td>[709,763]</td>
<td>[709,763]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$669,866</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$669,866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[788,626]</td>
<td>[788,626]</td>
<td>[788,626]</td>
<td>[788,626]</td>
<td>[788,626]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Federal Other: U.S. Department of Justice
OBJECTIVE

Serve as the Fiscal Agent on behalf of the Project Safe Neighborhoods (PSN) Task Force for the Southern District of California (SDCA) at the request of the U.S. Attorney’s Office for the SDCA.

PREVIOUS ACCOMPLISHMENTS

SANDAG has been involved in PSN since its implementation in 2003, first as the media/outreach partner and subsequently as the research partner.

Project Manager: Cynthia Burke
Committee(s): Public Safety Committee
Working Groups: None

PRODUCTS, TASKS, AND SCHEDULES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK NO.</th>
<th>PERCENT EFFORT</th>
<th>TASK / PRODUCT DESCRIPTION(S) / SCHEDULE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1        | 15%            | Task Description: Participate on the PSN Task Force  
Product: N/A  
Completion Date: 06/30/10 |
| 2        | 20%            | Task Description: Enter into contracts with entities selected by the PSN Task Force and oversee any contracts entered into.  
Product: Contracts and relevant documentation  
Completion Date: 06/30/10 |
| 3        | 35%            | Task Description: Draw down federal funds as needed, account for all funds awarded, make payments to each contractor, and work with federal monitors as needed.  
Product: Accounting documentation  
Completion Date: 06/30/10 |
| 3        | 30%            | Task Description: Prepare required federal reports.  
Product: Reports submitted to the Department of Justice  
Completion Date: 06/30/10 |

FUTURE ACTIVITIES

Future activities are contingent on whether or not additional funds are allocated.
EXTENSION REQUEST FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009 TDA AUDITS

Introduction

In accordance with Public Utilities Code (PUC) Section 99245, each Transportation Development Act (TDA) claimant must submit an audit within 180 days after the end of the fiscal year. SANDAG may grant a 90-day extension, bringing the deadline to March 28, 2010.

The TDA audit fieldwork for most of the claimants is complete; however, there are a few claimants that may not be completed within the required timeframe. The TDA audit requirements are governed by the PUC and the California Code of Regulations, which do not permit any further extensions beyond the 270 days, and which specifically prohibit approval of the FY 2010 TDA claim until the TDA audits are completed.

Background

SANDAG, acting as the San Diego County Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA), is to receive the annual fiscal compliance audit report from each claimant within 180 days of the fiscal year end. The RTPA may grant a 90-day extension should it be requested by a claimant. While every effort is made to complete all audits within the 180 days, there are certain situations in which an extension request may be appropriate. The cities of Escondido and Oceanside are requesting an extension to allow sufficient time for the draft audit review process. The City of San Diego has requested an extension due to its ongoing effort to provide additional documentation for the FY 2009 TDA audit and to allow sufficient time for the draft audit review process. SANDAG is requesting an extension since it is the last TDA recipient to be audited and additional time is required to complete the audit process.

All four claimant agencies requesting an extension are expected to issue the audit reports no later than March 28, 2010. This would allow sufficient time for the submittal of the issued financial reports to the State Controller’s office.

Recommendation

The Transportation Committee recommends that the Board of Directors approve TDA audit extension requests for the Cities of Escondido, Oceanside, and San Diego, and SANDAG, until March 28, 2010, as permitted by the Public Utilities Code and the California Code of Regulations.
BOARD OF DIRECTORS
DECEMBER 18, 2009

REPORT SUMMARIZING DELEGATED ACTIONS TAKEN BY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

File Number 8000100

Introduction

Board Policy Nos. 003, 017, and 024 require the Executive Director to report certain actions to the Board of Directors on a monthly basis.

Discussion

Board Policy No. 003

Board Policy No. 003, “Investment Policy,” requires the submittal of a monthly report of investment transactions to the Board. There were no reportable investment transactions for October 2009.

Board Policy No. 017

Board Policy No. 017, “Delegation of Authority,” requires the Executive Director to report to the Board certain actions taken at the next regular meeting.

Section 4.1 of the policy authorizes the Executive Director to enter into agreements not currently incorporated in the budget and make other modifications to the budget in an amount up to $100,000 per transaction so long as the overall budget remains in balance. Attachment 1 contains the reportable actions since the report made at the last meeting.

Board Policy No. 024

Board Policy No. 024, “Procurement and Contracting-Construction,” requires the Executive Director to report to the Board the granting of (1) Relief from Maintenance and Responsibility, and (2) Acceptance of Work for construction contracts. There are no delegated actions to report.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Attachment: 1. Budget Transfers and Amendments

Key Staff Contact: Lauren Warrem, (619) 699-6931, lwa@sandag.org
### BUDGET TRANSFERS AND AMENDMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT NUMBER</th>
<th>PROJECT NAME</th>
<th>CURRENT BUDGET (in '000s)</th>
<th>NEW BUDGET (in '000s)</th>
<th>CHANGE (in '000s)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7500000</td>
<td>Service Bureau - Main Project FY 2010</td>
<td>$258.5</td>
<td>$260.3</td>
<td>$1.8</td>
<td>Returned funds back to the Main Service Bureau project (#7500000) to reflect a reduced scope of work for project #7508600.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7508600</td>
<td>Oceanside City Hall</td>
<td>$14.5</td>
<td>$12.6</td>
<td>($1.8)</td>
<td>Revised contract amount to reflect reduced scope of work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1140500</td>
<td>LRV Shop Modifications</td>
<td>$2,409.8</td>
<td>$2,408.2</td>
<td>($1.6)</td>
<td>Reduce project budget in accordance with final budget for Federal Formula 5307 grant CA-90-X693.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1142300</td>
<td>East Division Maintenance Facility</td>
<td>$7,375.3</td>
<td>$7,403.1</td>
<td>$27.9</td>
<td>Add $27,170 in matching funds received from NCTD for Federal Formula 5309 earmark and correct amount of the earmark by an increase of $680 from $108,000 to $108,680.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1130000</td>
<td>Capital Project Balancing Account</td>
<td>$395.4</td>
<td>$395.4</td>
<td>($0.0)</td>
<td>Transfer $23 to South Bay Maintenance Facility Miscellaneous Equipment project to cover project expenditures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1112400</td>
<td>South Bay Maintenance Facility Miscellaneous Equipment</td>
<td>$80.0</td>
<td>$80.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>Transfer $23 from Capital Project Balancing Account to cover project expenditures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7300200</td>
<td>Marketing Coordination (FY 2010)</td>
<td>$241.7</td>
<td>$268.3</td>
<td>$26.7</td>
<td>The remaining contractual commitment for presentation training was carried over from FY 2009.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7001800</td>
<td>Marketing Coordination (FY 2009)</td>
<td>$210.6</td>
<td>$184.0</td>
<td>($26.7)</td>
<td>The remaining contractual commitment for presentation training was carried over into FY 2010.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3310601</td>
<td>Compass Card Marketing (FY 2011)</td>
<td>$125.0</td>
<td>$68.7</td>
<td>($56.3)</td>
<td>Project funding approved by the Board in FY 2009 for FY 2011 was utilized to cover advertising and marketing expenses incurred late in FY 2009.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6000701</td>
<td>Compass Card Marketing (FY 2009)</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$56.3</td>
<td>$56.3</td>
<td>Project funding approved by the Board in FY 2009 for FY 2011 was utilized to cover advertising and marketing expenses incurred late in FY 2009.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2345400</td>
<td>CJ - Evaluation of Coming Home to Stay</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$63.7</td>
<td>$63.7</td>
<td>New grant funding for this Criminal Justice project evaluating a program aimed at improving the health of ex-offenders and local communities, as well as reducing recidivism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3100000</td>
<td>Regional Comprehensive Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy (FY 2010)</td>
<td>$1,091.4</td>
<td>$1,126.0</td>
<td>$34.7</td>
<td>Residual consultant work from FY 2009 was added to this annual program in order to complete the contractual commitment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3000200</td>
<td>Regional Comprehensive Plan - Planning and Implementation (FY 2009)</td>
<td>$1,128.9</td>
<td>$1,094.2</td>
<td>($34.7)</td>
<td>The remaining contractual commitment for this planning effort was carried over into the FY 2010 annual project, along with the remaining funds.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REPORTS ON MEETINGS AND EVENTS ATTENDED ON BEHALF OF SANDAG

Since the last Board of Directors meeting, Board members participated in the following meetings and events on behalf of SANDAG. Key topics of discussion also are summarized.

**November 30, 2009: California Association of Councils of Governments (CALCOG) Delegates Meeting**
San Diego, CA

- Chair Lori Holt Pfeiler and National City Mayor Ron Morrison attended this CALCOG meeting, which included panels on Senate Bill 375 implementation and transportation financing. Caltrans Director Randell Iwasaki and Gregg Albright, Deputy Secretary for Environmental Policy & Integration, California Business, Transportation, and Housing Agency, were the special program speakers. The delegates approved the CALCOG priority actions for 2010 and changes to the association’s bylaws.

**December 3, 2009: Joint Meeting of the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) Regional Council, the Southern California Leadership Council (SCLC), and the Global Land Use and Economic Council on the Implementation of Senate Bill 375**
Los Angeles, CA

- Chair Lori Holt Pfeiler attended this joint meeting, which included SCAG and other Southern California land use and transportation planning agencies and related interest groups. Among those in attendance were Assembly Speaker Karen Bass, Chair Mary Nichols of the California Air Resources Board (CARB), and leaders of the SCLC, including former Governors Pete Wilson and Gray Davis. The joint meeting focused on how best to implement Senate Bill 375 during these challenging economic times. The message to CARB was that Southern California would prefer an iterative process in which CARB provides the science and research, and regional and local agencies prioritize our infrastructure investments and policies to maximize efficient transportation systems that foster a great economy and a sustainable environment.

**December 9, 2009: Los Angeles-San Diego-San Luis Obispo (LOSSAN) Board of Directors Meeting**
Los Angeles, CA

- Solana Beach Councilmember Joe Kellejian, the SANDAG representative on LOSSAN, attended this meeting. He provided input from the interest of the San Diego region on the LOSSAN budget and funding alternatives for the corridorwide strategic assessment.
ELECTION OF 2010 SANDAG BOARD OFFICERS

Introduction
Consistent with SANDAG Bylaws, in September 2009, Chair Lori Holt Pfeiler appointed the following Nominating Committee for SANDAG Board Officers: National City Mayor Ron Morrison (Nominating Committee Chair), Council President Ben Hueso (City of San Diego), Supervisor Dianne Jacob (County of San Diego), El Cajon Mayor Mark Lewis (East County), Oceanside Mayor Jim Wood (North County Coastal), and San Marcos Mayor Jim Desmond (North County Inland).

Recommendation
The Nominating Committee recommends that the Board of Directors approve the following slate for 2010 SANDAG Board officers:

- Chair - Escondido Mayor Lori Holt Pfeiler
- First Vice Chair - Encinitas Councilmember Jerome Stocks
- Second Vice Chair - Santee Councilmember Jack Dale

The Nominating Committee met on October 23, 2009, to review and discuss the applications for SANDAG Board Officers. At the November 20, 2009, Board meeting, the Committee unanimously recommended a slate of Board officers for 2010. Per the SANDAG Bylaws, Board members may make additional nominations for any office during the December 18, 2009, Board meeting.

Discussion

Annual Nomination and Election Process
The SANDAG Bylaws set forth the annual nomination and election process for SANDAG Board Officers. The process calls for an application form for the Chair, First Vice Chair, and Second Vice Chair positions to be made available on the SANDAG Web site in or around July. To be considered for one of the Officer positions, prospective applicants must provide information about their current status and term of office, SANDAG experience, and other public agency experience. Applicants also must answer the following questions:

- Why do you want to serve as a SANDAG Board Officer?
- What is your vision for SANDAG next year and in five years?
- Describe how you believe that you are in touch with your constituents and give examples of why you have represented them well in the past.
- For First and Second Vice Chair positions only. Is your interest to serve only as a Vice Chair, or do you see yourself wanting to serve as Chair in the future?
The applications received included Mayor Pfeiler for Chair, Councilmember Stocks for First Vice Chair, and Councilmember Dale for Second Vice Chair; these members all hold the current Board Officer positions for 2009. In their discussion, Nominating Committee members recognized that the candidates were individuals who are dedicated to the positions, even with the extra time commitment involved, and they supported continuing with the current leadership for the upcoming year.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Key Staff Contact: Kim Kawada, (619) 699-6994, kka@sandag.org
FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT FROM THE TransNet
INDEPENDENT TAXPAYER OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

Introduction

One of the key requirements of the TransNet Extension Ordinance and Expenditure Plan was the establishment of an Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee (ITOC). The role of the ITOC is to ensure that the voter approved mandates of the Ordinance are carried out and to recommend improvements and enhancements to the financial integrity and performance of the TransNet program over time. The ITOC has been meeting since May 2005.

An annual report from the ITOC is a requirement of the Ordinance. The upcoming fiscal year for the ITOC will be a challenging one as the TransNet program moves into full implementation of the first Triennial Performance Audit and the first annual Fiscal Audit is completed. The report on the first annual Fiscal Audit will be presented to the Board of Directors in June 2010.

Once the audit process is complete, the ITOC annual report will focus on findings and recommendations resulting from the annual fiscal audit cycle. The ITOC members felt that it was appropriate to start the annual reporting process to the SANDAG Board of Directors and the public prior to implementation of the specific requirement for an annual report tied to the fiscal audit process.

This fourth annual report covers several activities that built on the Committee’s first three years of work through FY 2009 (Attachment 1). The report shows in detail the involvement of the ITOC in carrying out the voters’ mandate on the TransNet Extension, most notably this year the conduct and completion of the first Triennial Performance Audit.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Attachment: 1. ITOC 2009 Annual Report

Key Staff Contact: Charles “Muggs” Stoll, (619) 699-6945, mst@sandag.org
Future ITOC Activities

Although many of the projects and initiatives addressed by the ITOC in fiscal year 2008/2009 will continue, activities in the coming year will likely concentrate on the implementation of the first triennial performance audit and the completion of the first annual fiscal audit under the direct control of the ITOC.

Future Challenges

As the economic downturn accelerated through the 2008/2009 fiscal year, there has been a substantial reduction in sales tax revenues. This will certainly impact many of the programs within the TransNet Extension Ordinance. The latest update to the TransNet Plan of Finance (March 2009) for the major corridor projects predicts a present value deficit of approximately $1.3 billion over the 40-year program – a relatively small change from the year before. However, this year the effects of the sales tax revenue reductions will have to be assessed against the fact that construction bid prices for key TransNet projects continue to come in less than estimated. Regardless of the outcome of the analysis, the region will have to continue to seek out supplemental funding sources to ensure all projects included in the TransNet Extension Ordinance are constructed.

How can you get involved?

The ITOC is made up of citizens with selected expertise to provide effective oversight to protect the substantial investment the region has made in our transportation system. Citizens can receive real-time information on TransNet projects and programs through www.KeepSanDiegoMoving.com. Within this Web site visitors can access the TransNet Dashboard, which lists detailed project descriptions, updated schedules, and budgetary information for the region’s transportation corridors.

ITOC information also is available by visiting the SANDAG Web site at www.sandag.org/TransNet. Here you will find key documents related to the TransNet Extension Ordinance and a listing of past and upcoming agendas of all ITOC meetings. The ITOC meets regularly every second Wednesday of the month at 9:30 a.m. The meetings are generally held in the SANDAG downtown office at 401 B Street, Suite 800, San Diego, CA 92101, and all meeting agendas are posted to the Web site. Attendance by the public is welcome and encouraged.

Inquiries to the ITOC can be directed to itoc@sandag.org. Any persons interested in serving on the committee, as vacancies occur, are encouraged to use this same contact to request being placed on the vacancy notification list.

Current Status of TransNet Early Action Projects (in $1,000s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mid-City Transit Service</td>
<td>$660,000</td>
<td>$1,056,000</td>
<td>$1,246,292</td>
<td>$190,292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Town Center Transit Service: Superloop</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$48,000</td>
<td>$39,187</td>
<td>-$8,813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-15 Express Lanes and Transit Service</td>
<td>$769,000</td>
<td>$1,230,400</td>
<td>$896,187</td>
<td>-$333,213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 52 Extension: SR 125 to SR 67</td>
<td>$333,000</td>
<td>$532,800</td>
<td>$548,905</td>
<td>$16,105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 76 Extension: Melrose Drive to I-15</td>
<td>$164,000</td>
<td>$262,400</td>
<td>$469,772</td>
<td>$207,372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Line Trolley Ugrades</td>
<td>$268,000</td>
<td>$428,800</td>
<td>$354,863</td>
<td>-$73,937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange Line Trolley Ugrades</td>
<td>$69,000</td>
<td>$110,400</td>
<td>$99,331</td>
<td>-$11,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-City Transit Service</td>
<td>$89,000</td>
<td>$142,400</td>
<td>$144,526</td>
<td>-$2,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bay Bus Rapid Transit Service</td>
<td>$497,000</td>
<td>$791,200</td>
<td>$709,627</td>
<td>-$81,573</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES: All current budgets have been reviewed by ITOC and approved by the Board of Directors. Ordinance capital cost estimates escalated according to the Caltrans inflation cost index (4.5%). The SR 52 Extension Ordinance cost estimate comes from the Sept. 04 Quarterly Progress Report on Transportation Projects. The cost listed in the ordinance was the shortfall amount. Only projects that the full extent of improvements have been determined or are nearly determined are listed. The full extent of improvements for the I-15 Express Lanes and Transit Service and South Bay Bus Rapid Transit Service has not yet been determined.

Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee

2009 Annual Report

The Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee (ITOC) monitors the expenditure of TransNet funds, the voter approved half-cent sales tax for transportation improvements. The Committee also helps ensure that all voter mandates are carried out and develops recommendations for improvements to the financial integrity and performance of the TransNet program. The Committee was established as a condition of the 2004 TransNet extension.

Extension 2008-2048

In 2004, 67 percent of the region’s voters supported the extension of TransNet from 2008 to 2048 thereby generating an additional $14 billion to be distributed among highway, transit, and local road projects in approximately equal thirds. The San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) administers the TransNet half-cent sales tax. This extension is the focus of the ITOC’s responsibilities.

The 40-year extension will help fund major highway expansion projects along Interstates 5, 8, 15, and 805 as well as State Routes (SR) 52, 54, 56, 67, 75, 76, 78, 94, 125, and 905. In addition, it will support improvements to the public transportation system, including new Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) services and carpool/Managed Lanes along many of the major corridors. The TransNet extension also includes an extensive $850 million environmental mitigation program, and a $280 million smart growth incentive fund. Two percent of the available funds will be earmarked annually for bicycle paths and facilities, pedestrian improvements, and neighborhood safety projects. TransNet funds also help pay for senior, disabled, and youth discounted transit passes.

独立税务审查委员会

2009年度报告

独立税务审查委员会（ITOC）监控TransNet资金的支出，即通过投票批准的每季半税销售税用于交通改善。该委员会还致力于确保所有选民的命令得以执行，并提出改进建议以提高金融完整性和TransNet计划的性能。该委员会于2004年TransNet扩展时建立。

扩展2008-2048

2004年，67％的地区选民支持将TransNet的扩展从2008年延长至2048年，这样就产生了额外的140亿美元，这些资金将分配给高速公路、公共交通和当地道路项目，总共分配三分之二。圣地亚哥-奥尔萨戈维亚政府（SANDAG）负责管理TransNet每季半税销售税。这个扩展是ITOC的责任。

该40年扩展将有助于资助主要高速公路扩展项目，沿国家公路5号、8号、15号和805号，以及州公路（SR）52号、54号、56号、67号、75号、76号、78号、94号、125号和905号。此外，它还将支持公共交通系统的改善，包括新的BRT服务和共享/管理车道，以及许多主要走廊的许多车道。TransNet扩展还包括一个耗资8.5亿美元的环境影响 mitigation计划，以及一个耗资2.8亿美元的智能增长激励计划。2%的可用资金将被每年分配给自行车道、人行道和设施、行人改善和邻里安全项目。TransNet资金还用于为老年人、残疾人和儿童提供折扣的公共交通。

TransNet

扩展2008-2048

在2004年，67％的地区选民支持将TransNet的扩展从2008年延长至2048年，这样就产生了额外的140亿美元，这些资金将分配给高速公路、公共交通和当地道路项目，总共分配三分之二。圣地亚哥-奥尔萨戈维亚政府（SANDAG）负责管理TransNet每季半税销售税。这个扩展是ITOC的责任。

该40年扩展将有助于资助主要高速公路扩展项目，沿国家公路5号、8号、15号和805号，以及州公路（SR）52号、54号、56号、67号、75号、76号、78号、94号、125号和905号。此外，它还将支持公共交通系统的改善，包括新的BRT服务和共享/管理车道，以及许多主要走廊的许多车道。TransNet扩展还包括一个耗资8.5亿美元的环境影响 mitigation计划，以及一个耗资2.8亿美元的智能增长激励计划。2%的可用资金将被每年分配给自行车道、人行道和设施、行人改善和邻里安全项目。TransNet资金还用于为老年人、残疾人和儿童提供折扣的公共交通。
The Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee (ITOC) is responsible for conducting triennial performance audits of the TransNet program to review project delivery, cost control, schedule adherence, and related activities. The first triennial performance audit report was completed in May 2009 and is available on the SANDAG Web site at www.sandag.org/itoc.

The report revealed that SANDAG and Caltrans have worked together to ensure that projects are completed on time and within budget. The ITOC reviewed and advised on many key TransNet-supported projects through this past fiscal year, including:

- Reviewed and recommended approval of the 2008 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) - subsequently reviewed three quarterly amendments to the new 2008 RTIP
- Received updates from corridor directors/project managers on the following TransNet EAP Projects:
  - SR 52
  - SR 76
  - Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project
  - Mid-City Rapid Bus
  - Mid-City Transit Stations
  - SPINTER
  - I-15 Express Lanes
- Reviewed and recommended approval for the use of the commercial paper program for the City of La Mesa
- Reviewed regular updates on the status of financial markets and the state budget situation and potential impacts to the TransNet program
- Received and recommended approval of the annual TransNet Plan of Finance update
- Welcomed new member Carolyn Lee and welcomed back John Meyer and Jim Ryan for a new term as members
- Involved in the planning for the use of new ARRA federal stimulus funding received by the region
- Reviewed the development of the TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program through its first call for projects
- Continued to oversee new developments in the Environmental Mitigation Program for both acquisition and management
- Reviewed and recommended approval of a TransNet amendment related to the Regional Transportation Congestion Improvement Program, making it more efficient for local agency reporting and compliance and linking it with the fiscal audit process
- The largest single effort for the year was the completion of the first triennial performance audit

The ITOC will continue to focus on the implementation of the performance audit recommendations over the next fiscal year and beyond.

**TransNet Extension Ordinance**

The TransNet Extension Ordinance requires that the ITOC conduct triennial performance audits of the program to review project delivery, cost control, schedule adherence, and related activities. The first triennial performance audit report was completed in May 2009 and is available on the SANDAG Web site at www.sandag.org/itoc.

The report revealed that SANDAG and Caltrans have launched a solid network with appropriate oversight, fiscal control, program management, and project delivery practices. In particular, the following was noted as part of the report:

- A robust governance structure is employed
- Solid management over TransNet exists
- Revenue and cost models are practical
- Project delivery methods are sound

However, the report also noted opportunities for improvement and made several recommendations regarding activities that could be enhanced at a program-wide as well as project-specific level as follows:

- Develop high-level project summary documents to capture project detail relating to key project budget, schedule, and scope changes;
- Standardize ITOC administrative documents, including meeting agendas and status reports used in the ITOC oversight and decision-making process;
- Revisit the intent and vision for the TransNet Dashboard to potentially include all TransNet projects as well as to refine existing data to ensure accuracy and clarity of data nuances;
- Define and clarify project and program performance goals and targets to measure program performance;
- Continue to regularly monitor and review the debt to revenue ratio and report status monthly to the ITOC;
- Establish a mechanism to link and track TransNet Ordinance planned projects and amounts with current plans and budgets for all TransNet projects;
- Enhance current project management and delivery practices by ensuring post-evaluation forms are consistently used and completed for all projects after each project phase, as well as memorializing transit practices and development of uniform filing systems; and
- Ensure consistent implementation and reliance on best practices to tighten project delivery tools including risk assessment tools.

Examples of some of the performance monitoring reporting developed as a result of the performance audit are shown in the adjacent charts. The ITOC will continue to focus on the implementation of the performance audit recommendations over the next fiscal year and beyond.

### TransNet Progress in FY 2008/2009

The SANDAG Board of Directors is responsible for selecting and prioritizing the timing of projects. The role of the ITOC is to assure that the projects carried out as a result of SANDAG Board actions meet all of the requirements of the TransNet Ordinance. Billions of dollars in TransNet funding have been allocated by the SANDAG Board of Directors to improve, expand, and better manage our well-traveled highways and expanding transit system. These funds are combined with state and federal dollars to maximize the effectiveness of transportation funding.

**TransNet Extension Ordinance**

The TransNet Extension Ordinance requires that the ITOC conduct triennial performance audits of the program to review project delivery, cost control, schedule adherence, and related activities. The first triennial performance audit report was completed in May 2009 and is available on the SANDAG Web site at www.sandag.org/itoc.

The report revealed that SANDAG and Caltrans have launched a solid network with appropriate oversight, fiscal control, program management, and project delivery practices. In particular, the following was noted as part of the report:

- A robust governance structure is employed
- Solid management over TransNet exists
- Revenue and cost models are practical
- Project delivery methods are sound

However, the report also noted opportunities for improvement and made several recommendations regarding activities that could be enhanced at a program-wide as well as project-specific level as follows:

- Develop high-level project summary documents to capture project detail relating to key project budget, schedule, and scope changes;
- Standardize ITOC administrative documents, including meeting agendas and status reports used in the ITOC oversight and decision-making process;
- Revisit the intent and vision for the TransNet Dashboard to potentially include all TransNet projects as well as to refine existing data to ensure accuracy and clarity of data nuances;
- Define and clarify project and program performance goals and targets to measure program performance;
- Continue to regularly monitor and review the debt to revenue ratio and report status monthly to the ITOC;
- Establish a mechanism to link and track TransNet Ordinance planned projects and amounts with current plans and budgets for all TransNet projects;
- Enhance current project management and delivery practices by ensuring post-evaluation forms are consistently used and completed for all projects after each project phase, as well as memorializing transit practices and development of uniform filing systems; and
- Ensure consistent implementation and reliance on best practices to tighten project delivery tools including risk assessment tools.

Examples of some of the performance monitoring reporting developed as a result of the performance audit are shown in the adjacent charts. The ITOC will continue to focus on the implementation of the performance audit recommendations over the next fiscal year and beyond.

### TransNet Activities for Fiscal Year 2008/2009

The ITOC reviewed and advised on many key TransNet-supported programs through this past fiscal year, including:

- Reviewed and recommended approval of the 2008 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) - subsequently reviewed three quarterly amendments to the new 2008 RTIP
- Received updates from corridor directors/project managers on the following TransNet EAP Projects:
  - SR 52
  - SR 76
  - Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project
  - Mid-City Rapid Bus
  - Mid-City Transit Stations
  - SPINTER
  - I-15 Express Lanes
- Reviewed and recommended approval for the use of the commercial paper program for the City of La Mesa
- Received regular updates on the status of financial markets and the state budget situation and potential impacts to the TransNet program
- Reviewed and recommended approval of the annual TransNet Plan of Finance update
- Welcomed new member Carolyn Lee and welcomed back John Meyer and Jim Ryan for a new term as members
- Involved in the planning for the use of new ARRA federal stimulus funding received by the region
- Reviewed the development of the TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program through its first call for projects
- Continued to oversee new developments in the Environmental Mitigation Program for both acquisition and management
- Reviewed and recommended approval of a TransNet amendment related to the Regional Transportation Congestion Improvement Program, making it more efficient for local agency reporting and compliance and linking it with the fiscal audit process
- The largest single effort for the year was the completion of the first triennial performance audit

**Capital vs. Development Expenditures**

Expenditures by Corridor (millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corridor</th>
<th>Capital</th>
<th>Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Coast</td>
<td>$56</td>
<td>$22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>$36</td>
<td>$10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>$93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 12</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>$22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 74</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>$22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TransNet Extension Data to Date**

July 2005 - June 2009

- Total $1.275 billion
- Mid-Coast: $381 million
- I-5: $53 million
- I-805: $98 million
- SR 12: $10 million
- SR 74: $10 million

**SR 76 (Melrose Drive to Mission Road)**

The final design and right-of-way work was completed to allow the construction contract to be awarded in December 2009 with a groundbreaking in January 2010.

The project received Federal American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) funds to cover the cost of both construction and support. This will launch the three year construction period initially highlighted in the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) in 2008, with work anticipated to be completed in 2012.

**Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project**

TransNet is committed to complete this project, which was originally intended to be completed in 2011. The project received funding from the ARRA to support the increased costs due to delays and further improvements, resulting in a revised completion date of 2013.

**Mid-City Transit Stations**

The Westside Transit Corridor project is in the final design phase, with construction expected to begin soon.

**Bus Rapid Transit Service**

Planning for BRT service to provide convenient and reliable transit choices for travelers on I-15 from Escondido to downtown San Diego, using the four new Express Lanes, has continued toward the system implementation in 2012. Planning also is underway on the South Bay BRT from Otay Ranch to downtown San Diego and Sorrento Mesa via I-15. The draft environmental document advanced during the past year and is set to be released in early 2010.

**I-15 Express Lanes**

The project received funding from the ARRA to support the increased costs due to delays and further improvements, resulting in a revised completion date of 2013.
SANDAG PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PLAN

Introduction

The draft SANDAG Public Participation Plan (PPP) was released by the SANDAG Board of Directors for a 45-day public review and comment period on October 9, 2009. The PPP guides SANDAG public outreach efforts for transit, highway, smart growth, environmental, planning, growth forecasts, the Regional Transportation Plan, Regional Transportation Improvement Program, Tribal Consultation, and other initiatives. The revised PPP is provided as Attachment 1.

Recommendation

The Transportation and Regional Planning Committees recommend that the Board of Directors approve the SANDAG Public Participation Plan in substantially the same form as shown in Attachment 1.

Discussion

The revised PPP reflects the SANDAG commitment to public participation and involvement to include all residents and stakeholders in the regional planning and decision-making process. The development of the PPP was a six-month collaborative process from June to December 2009 that included development, input, and feedback from the SANDAG Policy Advisory Committees, Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group, community and business groups, residents, and other stakeholders.

The PPP was developed in accordance with guidelines established by Federal Highway Administration for metropolitan transportation planning (23 CFR 450.316). It addresses Title VI, related nondiscrimination requirements, and reflects the principles of social equity and environmental justice. Included in the PPP are procedures, strategies, and outcomes associated with the ten requirements listed in 23 CFR 450.316. The PPP also fulfills various state and federal public involvement requirements.

Initial Outreach Survey

SANDAG launched initial public outreach in June 2009 with a survey in English and Spanish that asked residents, stakeholders, agencies, and other interested parties how they wished to receive information or provide input on regional projects. More than 1,100 participants responded to the initial survey. Key feedback included recommendations to provide information on the SANDAG Web site; provide information via e-mail newsletters; implement e-mail and online options for providing feedback; and consider conducting some public meetings, workshops, and/or open houses during the workday. Survey results are included in Appendix B of the revised PPP.
Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group Review

An initial task for the Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group (SWG) was to provide input on the draft PPP. The SWG is composed of diverse individuals from throughout the region who are interested in providing input on regional initiatives such as the Regional Transportation Plan and its Sustainable Communities Strategy, and the Regional Comprehensive Plan. In September, the SWG received an overview of the PPP. At the October and November meetings, the SWG members and public provided additional input that was incorporated into the draft plan. These comments are included in Appendix C of the revised PPP.

Public Notices and Outreach

In an effort to receive robust input on the draft PPP, notices were posted in the Asian Journal, La Prensa (in Spanish), North County Times (all editions), San Diego Daily Transcript, The San Diego Union-Tribune (all editions), San Diego Voice & Viewpoint, and Star News. Public service advertisements aired on 22 local radio stations during morning and evening drive-time radio from November 2 through 13, with a call to action for residents to tell SANDAG how they want to be involved in regional projects. The media list, radio stations for public service advertising, and media coverage received are outlined in Appendix B of the revised PPP.

SANDAG staff also contacted working groups, committees, organizations, and agencies to promote the public input period for the PPP and to solicit additional input. These groups also are listed in Appendix B. In addition, staff made presentations on the draft PPP to various agencies and organizations during the public review period.

Public Comments Received

Input was received from residents and agencies via phone, mail, fax, and e-mail. A record of comments received and responses is included in Appendix C of the revised PPP.

Plan Revisions

The PPP was revised based on public and staff input and review. Following are major changes that were made.

- Expanded the introduction to better explain the difference between and separate roles of the agencywide PPP and more detailed public participation or involvement plans that are developed for specific projects
- Added section on “Getting Involved in Regional Decision-Making” to provide a quick overview on how to communicate with SANDAG
- Provided additional information on how SANDAG considers and responds to public input before making project, policy, funding, planning, evaluation criteria, and other decisions
- Provided additional information on SANDAG Public Participation Web pages
- Included responses to comments in Appendix C
- Added Appendix E – Glossary of Terms
- Added Appendix F – SANDAG Committees and Working Groups
Next Steps

Following Board approval, the SANDAG Public Participation Plan will be forwarded to the Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration by December 31, 2009.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Attachment: 1. Public Participation Plan

Key Staff Contact: Anne Steinberger, (619) 699-1937, ast@sandag.org

Funds are budgeted in Work Element #7300100
SANDAG
PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PLAN
DRAFT
REVISED DECEMBER 18, 2009
The 18 cities and county government are SANDAG serving as the forum for regional decision-making. SANDAG builds consensus; plans, engineers, and builds public transit; makes strategic plans; obtains and allocates resources; and provides information on a broad range of topics pertinent to the region’s quality of life.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY OF CARLSBAD</th>
<th>CITY OF SANTÉE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Matt Hall, Councilmember</td>
<td>(A) Hon. Jack Dale, Councilmember</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) Hon. Bud Lewis, Mayor</td>
<td>(A) Hon. Hal Ryan, Councilmember</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) Hon. Ann Kulchin, Mayor Pro Tem</td>
<td>(A) Hon. John Minto, Councilmember</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY OF CHULA VISTA</th>
<th>CITY OF SOLANA BEACH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Cheryl Cox, Mayor</td>
<td>Hon. Lesa Hefner, Councilmember</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) Hon. Rudy Ramirez, Councilmember</td>
<td>(A) Hon. Dave Roberts, Councilmember</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) Hon. Steve Castaneda, Councilmember</td>
<td>(A) Hon. Mike Nichols, Mayor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY OF CORONADO</th>
<th>CITY OF VISTA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Carrie Downey, Councilmember</td>
<td>Hon. Judy Ritter, Councilmember</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) Hon. Al Orrom, Mayor Pro Tem</td>
<td>(A) Hon. Bob Campbell, Mayor Pro Tem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) Hon. Michael Woiwode, Councilmember</td>
<td>(A) Hon. Steve Gronke, Councilmember</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY OF DEL MAR</th>
<th>COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Crystal Crawford, Mayor</td>
<td>Hon. Dianne Jacob, Chairwoman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) Hon. Carl Hilliard, Councilmember</td>
<td>(A) Hon. Bill Horn, Chair Pro Tem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) Hon. Richard Earnest, Deputy Mayor</td>
<td>Pam Slater-Price, Vice Chairwoman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) Hon. Ron Roberts, Supervisor</td>
<td>(A) Hon. Greg Cox, Supervisor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY OF EL CAJON</th>
<th>CITY OF SANTEE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Mark Lewis, Mayor</td>
<td>(A) Hon. Hal Ryan, Councilmember</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) Hon. Jillian Hanson-Cox, Councilmember</td>
<td>(A) Hon. John Minto, Councilmember</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY OF ENCINITAS</th>
<th>CITY OF SAN MARCOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Jerome Stocks, Councilmember</td>
<td>Hon. Jim Desmond, Mayor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) Hon. Teresa Barth, Councilmember</td>
<td>(A) Hon. Hal Martin, Vice Mayor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) Hon. Dan Dalager, Deputy Mayor</td>
<td>(A) Hon. Rebecca Jones, Councilmember</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY OF ESCONDIDO</th>
<th>CITY OF SANTEE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Lori Holt Pfeifer, Mayor</td>
<td>(A) Hon. Hal Ryan, Councilmember</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) Hon. Sam Abed, Councilmember</td>
<td>(A) Hon. John Minto, Councilmember</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY OF IMPERIAL BEACH</th>
<th>CITY OF SANTEE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Jim Janney, Mayor</td>
<td>(A) Hon. Hal Ryan, Councilmember</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) Patricia McCoy, Mayor Pro Tem</td>
<td>(A) Hon. John Minto, Councilmember</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) Hon. Jim King, Councilmember</td>
<td>(A) Hon. Vandana, Councilmember</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY OF LA MESA</th>
<th>CITY OF VISTA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Art Madrid, Mayor</td>
<td>Hon. Judy Ritter, Councilmember</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) Hon. Mark Arapostathis, Councilmember</td>
<td>(A) Hon. Bob Campbell, Mayor Pro Tem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) Hon. David Allan, Councilmember</td>
<td>(A) Hon. Steve Gronke, Councilmember</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY OF LEMON GROVE</th>
<th>CITY OF VISTA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Mary Teresa Sessoms, Mayor</td>
<td>Hon. Judy Ritter, Councilmember</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) Hon. Jerry Jones, Mayor Pro Tem</td>
<td>(A) Hon. Bob Campbell, Mayor Pro Tem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) Hon. Jerry Selby, Councilmember</td>
<td>(A) Hon. Steve Gronke, Councilmember</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY OF NATIONAL CITY</th>
<th>CITY OF VISTA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Ron Morrison, Mayor</td>
<td>Hon. Judy Ritter, Councilmember</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) Hon. Frank Pena, Vice Mayor</td>
<td>(A) Hon. Bob Campbell, Mayor Pro Tem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) Hon. Rosalie Zarate, Councilmember</td>
<td>(A) Hon. Steve Gronke, Councilmember</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY OF OCEANSIDE</th>
<th>CITY OF VISTA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Jim Wood, Mayor</td>
<td>Hon. Judy Ritter, Councilmember</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) Hon. Jerry Kern, Councilmember</td>
<td>(A) Hon. Bob Campbell, Mayor Pro Tem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) Hon. Jack Feller, Councilmember</td>
<td>(A) Hon. Steve Gronke, Councilmember</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY OF POWAY</th>
<th>CITY OF VISTA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Don Higginson, Mayor</td>
<td>Hon. Judy Ritter, Councilmember</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) Hon. Jim Cunningham, Councilmember</td>
<td>(A) Hon. Bob Campbell, Mayor Pro Tem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) Hon. Carl Kruse, Councilmember</td>
<td>(A) Hon. Steve Gronke, Councilmember</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY OF SAN DIEGO</th>
<th>CITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA TRIBAL CHAIRMEN’S ASSOCIATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Jerry Sanders, Mayor</td>
<td>(A) Chairman Robert Smith (Pala), SCTCA Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) Hon. Anthony Young, Councilmember</td>
<td>(A) Chairman Allen Lawson (San Pasqual)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) Hon. Shem Lightner, Councilmember</td>
<td>MEXICO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Ben Hueso, Council President</td>
<td>(A) Hon. Remedios Gómez-Arnau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) Hon. Marti Emerald, Councilmember</td>
<td>Cónsul General of Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) Hon. Todd Gloria, Councilmember</td>
<td>Hon. Martha E. Rosas, Deputy Cónsul General of Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) Hon. Rebecca Jones, Councilmember</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

The SANDAG agencywide Public Participation Plan (PPP) provides an overview of the process for communicating with and obtaining input from the public concerning agency programs, projects, and program funding. The guidelines and principles outlined in the plan guide the agency’s public outreach and involvement efforts for regional transportation projects; transit service and fare changes; smart growth, environmental, and other planning efforts; growth forecasts; the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP); Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP); Regional Comprehensive Plan; Overall Work Program (OWP); tribal consultation; and other mandated or Board initiatives. A description of how the PPP was developed can be found in Appendix B.

The PPP reflects the SANDAG commitment to public participation and involvement to include all residents and stakeholders in the regional planning process. The PPP was developed in accordance with guidelines established by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) for metropolitan transportation planning (23 CFR 450.316) (see Appendix A), addresses Title VI of the Civil Rights Act, related nondiscrimination requirements, and reflects the principles of social equity and environmental justice. Included in the PPP are procedures, strategies, and outcomes associated with the ten requirements listed in 23 CFR 450.316.

The agencywide PPP provides the foundation for the development of specific public outreach plans prepared for transit construction projects, environmental documents, the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP), the transit fare ordinance, and other projects. The PPP is meant to inform the public and other stakeholders about the overall SANDAG public participation process and how they can receive information from SANDAG and how they can provide input into regional planning, policy, and decision-making efforts. It sets forth how SANDAG will commit to an open process that provides opportunities for input throughout the decision-making continuum. The PPP also fulfills various other state and federal public involvement requirements.
GETTING INVOLVED IN REGIONAL DECISION-MAKING

SANDAG is committed to a public participation program that includes opportunities for interaction with the public and Board of Directors, other elected officials, local planning and public works directors, business, community, and education leaders, and other key stakeholders. Public workshops, meetings, and other outreach efforts provide forums for input and feedback on SANDAG policy, program, project, and funding decisions.

Contact our Public Information Office
The Public Information Office is open 8 a.m. to 5 p.m., Monday through Friday. You can reach the Public Information Officer by phone at (619) 699-1950, by e-mail at pio@sandag.org, or by visiting the SANDAG Public Information Office, 401 B Street, Suite 800, San Diego, CA 92101.

Get on our Contact Lists
SANDAG maintains e-mail and U.S. Postal Service mailing lists so we can provide information to those who request it. Contact SANDAG at pio@sandag.org or (619) 699-1950 and let us know when you want to hear from us.

Visit www.SANDAG.org
The comprehensive SANDAG Web site is your resource for regional information, project updates, meeting schedules and agendas, and reports and other publications. SANDAG periodically posts surveys and promotes opportunities for online input.

View our Calendar
Visit www.sandag.org/calendar for a comprehensive monthly calendar of all Board of Directors and Policy Advisory Committee meetings, working group meetings, ad hoc meetings, public workshops, and more. These meetings are open to the public and agendas are typically posted seven days in advance of the meeting.

Sign up to Receive rEgion
To subscribe to rEgion, the SANDAG free monthly electronic newsletter, go to www.sandag.org and enter a valid e-mail address in the box at the bottom left corner of the page. Each month you will receive information to keep you updated on what’s happening in the San Diego region with regard to growth, transportation planning and construction, environmental management, housing, open space, energy, criminal justice, binational topics, and more. To read the latest edition of rEgion visit www.sandag.org/region.
OVERALL PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PROCESS

The SANDAG PPP establishes a process for obtaining input from and providing information to the public concerning agency policies, programs, projects, and program funding in order to ensure the public is informed and has the opportunity to provide SANDAG with input so plans can reflect the public’s vision. SANDAG will review and update this plan as needed. Various federal and state laws and regulations require that an agency such as SANDAG conduct public participation programs to ensure that the public is involved and that community concerns are addressed. For example, planning of public transit capital projects, development of short-range transit service policies and plans, and fare policy and structure changes to public transportation require public participation. The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) also have public information components that require an agency such as SANDAG to conduct public participation programs to ensure that the public is involved and that community concerns are addressed. A significant component of the SANDAG mission is a strong commitment to public participation and involvement to include all residents and stakeholders in the regional planning process. The public participation process, development of plans, and outreach activities are coordinated through the SANDAG Communications Division.

Part of the purpose of the PPP is to respond to requirements set forth in guidelines established by FHWA for Metropolitan Planning Organizations such as SANDAG. Title 23 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) section 450.316 states:

The Metropolitan Planning Organization shall develop and use a documented participation plan that defines a process for providing citizens, affected public agencies, representatives of public transportation employees, freight shippers, providers of freight transportation services, private providers of transportation, representatives of users of public transportation, representatives of users of pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities, representatives of the disabled, and other interested parties with reasonable opportunities to be involved in the metropolitan transportation planning process. (see Appendix A)

The PPP also is consistent with the requirements of Public Utilities Code Section 132360.1 established with the passage of Assembly Bill 361, which reads as follows:

The agency (SANDAG) shall engage in a public collaborative planning process; recommendations from that process shall be made available and considered for integration into the Regional Comprehensive Plan. A procedure to carry out this process including a method of addressing and responding to recommendations from the public shall be adopted.

Ensuring the meaningful involvement of low-income, minority, disabled, senior, and other traditionally underrepresented communities is a key component of the PPP. Activities covered in the PPP are consistent with federal and state environmental justice laws, regulations, and requirements, Title VI of the Civil Rights Act and related nondiscrimination requirements, and they reflect the principles of social equity and environmental justice. Social equity means ensuring that all people are treated fairly and are given equal opportunity to participate in the planning and decision-making process, with an emphasis on ensuring that traditionally disadvantaged groups are not left behind. Environmental justice means ensuring that plans, policies, and actions do not disproportionately affect low-income and minority communities.
The overall public participation process follows these guidelines and principles:

1. The PPP is designed to inform and involve the region’s residents in the decision-making process on issues such as growth, transportation, TransNet projects, environmental management, housing, open space, air quality, energy, fiscal management, economic development, and public safety.

2. The PPP seeks to involve all citizens, including, but not limited to, low-income households, Hispanic, African American, Asian, Native American, senior, and other communities, persons with disabilities, as well as community-based and civic organizations, youth, young adults, and college students, public agencies, business groups and associations, environmental organizations, educational institutions and other stakeholders in the decision-making process.

3. SANDAG seeks to involve audiences outlined in the 23 CFR Section 450.316: citizens, affected public agencies, representatives of public transportation employees, freight shippers, providers of freight transportation services, private providers of transportation, representatives of users of public transportation, representatives of users of pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities, representatives of the disabled, and other interested parties. These efforts also are designed to reach affordable housing advocates, transportation advocates, neighborhood and community groups, environmental advocates, home builder representatives, broad-based business organizations, landowners, commercial property interests, and homeowner associations. SANDAG endeavors to reach specific audiences through targeted notifications (e.g., the SANDAG Speakers Bureau, presentations, newsletters, press releases, public service announcements), and broadens this outreach through consultation with recognized community, business, social service, and other organizations, and through existing SANDAG committee structures (e.g., Social Services Transportation Advisory Council and Stakeholders Working Group).

4. SANDAG Board of Directors and Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) meetings provide the public input forum and decision point for significant regional issues. SANDAG Directors typically hold one or two board meetings each month: a Board Policy meeting the second Friday of each month and a Board Business meeting the fourth Friday of each month. PAC meetings also are held on Fridays. Meetings held at SANDAG offices are accessible by public transit. During these meetings, Directors solicit public input, adopt plans, allocate transportation funds, approve transit construction plans, approve transit fare changes, approve the Regional Growth Forecast, implement smart growth initiatives, consider energy and habitat plans, and establish policies and develop programs that are used by local governments, as well as other public and private organizations. The PACs are named as follows: Executive Committee, Regional Planning Committee, Transportation Committee, Borders Committee, Public Safety Committee.

5. For planning, project, funding, transit fare, and policy decisions, public input shall be documented, issues or concerns addressed, and resolution of issues and/or changes made reflected in final reports, plans, or other documents. The final reports or documents are subject to approval by a vote at a public SANDAG Board or Policy Advisory Committee meeting.

6. SANDAG proactively seeks and promotes public participation in SANDAG public workshops, meetings, and hearings, as well as participation and attendance at committees, working groups, and task forces. SANDAG follows local, state, and federal guidelines for posting public meeting and hearing notices. Depending upon the specific project, SANDAG endeavors to hold meetings at times that can attract as many participants as possible and at locations in communities throughout the region. SANDAG endeavors to hold these meetings in locations that are accessible by public transit. These meetings are held in buildings, rooms, or locations that are...
accessible to persons with disabilities. A list of SANDAG committees and working groups active in 2009 is provided in Appendix F. These meetings all provide opportunity for public comment.

7. SANDAG uses its Web site to provide the public with useful and timely information, including: meeting schedules and agendas; plans and environmental documents; reports and other publications; demographic profiles and data downloads; and interactive database and mapping applications. SANDAG maintains and updates a Public Involvement Web site with information for the public, reporters, and other stakeholders on the public participation program. The Web site is at www.sandag.org/ppp.

8. SANDAG seeks to provide information in a variety of media, including social media, visual simulations of projects, Web-based videos or photo displays, interactive displays at kiosks in targeted public locations, and other visualization techniques to secure feedback on transportation plans and projects.

9. SANDAG informs the public in a timely manner about regional issues, actions, and pending decisions through a number of efforts. As needed or required, SANDAG provides adequate notice by publicizing in newspapers of general circulation for publication of legal notices. Other publication and distribution efforts to residents, agencies, and city/county governments may include e-mail notification, notices on the SANDAG Web site, publication in rEqion (a SANDAG monthly electronic newsletter), and select distribution via mail.

10. SANDAG regularly informs local print and broadcast media about SANDAG decisions, events, research, and other issues. SANDAG regularly distributes press releases to community, minority, local and regional print, as well as Web-based publications. SANDAG also distributes information to local and Spanish radio and television stations. A compilation of news coverage on SANDAG programs and projects is posted on the SANDAG home page weekly.

11. As appropriate and depending on the specific project, SANDAG translates into Spanish and other languages, publications, announcements, and Web content. In addition, numerous staff members are bilingual Spanish-English speakers and participate in public outreach and conduct presentations in Spanish. Translators are hired as needed to provide services in Spanish and other languages as appropriate. SANDAG conducts periodic public opinion surveys as part of the outreach and citizen participation component of the SANDAG OWP. These surveys are designed to include the San Diego region’s residents in the regional planning process and to keep SANDAG officials aware of issues that are of concern to the people who live here.

12. SANDAG periodically reviews the effectiveness of the procedures and strategies contained in the agencywide PPP and any other planning, program, or project-specific public participation plans to ensure the goals of the outreach and involvement are met. Quantitative and qualitative assessment is considered to determine results of outreach effectiveness. SANDAG will revise the overall outreach process as needed based on these reviews.

13. SANDAG coordinates and consults with other federal, state, local, and nonprofit agencies in developing regional transportation plans and transportation improvement programs, including ensuring coordination of metropolitan planning activities with planning for nonemergency transportation services and social service transportation.

SANDAG Board Policy No. 025, which is SANDAG’s Public Participation Policy, is included as Appendix D to this PPP. The guidelines and principles in this PPP are intended to be consistent with the mandates in Board Policy No. 025. In the event of a conflict between the language in this PPP and Board Policy No. 025, however, the requirements in Board Policy No. 025 shall supersede the provisions in this PPP.
PROJECT DEVELOPMENT AND PROGRAM PLANNING

SANDAG will follow the guidelines outlined in the Overall Public Participation Process as well as the guidelines below when conducting public outreach and involvement for planning, environmental, and preliminary engineering activities.

Current SANDAG planning projects underway that are incorporated under this PPP are outlined below. If needed, individual public participation programs with specified strategies and activities to secure public input and involvement will be developed and included in the final plan or report related to the subject matters below.

- 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)
- Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP)
- Sustainable Communities Strategy
- Coordinated Public Transit - Human Services Transportation Plan (Coordinated Plan) for San Diego County
- Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) update
- Mid-Coast Corridor Transit project
- South Bay Bus Rapid Transit project
- SuperLoop Transit project
- TransNet Early Action Program implementation
- SANDAG Overall Work Program
- Other studies, projects, and initiatives (i.e., corridor studies, grant-funded programs)

Public Participation Process

1. SANDAG will follow current federal and state regulations regarding public involvement processes and procedures. SANDAG will develop participation programs in consultation with all interested parties and will describe and secure feedback on procedures, strategies, and desired outcomes.

2. SANDAG will develop public participation programs tailored to meet specific project needs, which address the unique challenges presented by each project. SANDAG will follow best practices in developing these plans such as incorporating the International Association for Public Participation (IAP2) Spectrum of Public Participation: Inform, Consult, Involve, Collaborate, Empower. This includes addressing needs and conducting outreach with stakeholders listed in the Overall Public Participation Process.

3. The tailored, strategic, and tactical public participation programs will set objectives, identify people and audiences to be reached, develop public involvement strategy, and define specific outreach techniques. This will be developed in consultation with interested stakeholders.

4. SANDAG will maintain and enhance opportunities to promote plans and projects and secure input on those plans and projects through the SANDAG Web site, e-mail newsletters and notification, and other Web-based activities.

5. SANDAG will promote plans and projects at Board of Directors meetings and meetings of the SANDAG Policy Advisory Committees: Executive, Transportation, Regional Planning, Borders, and Public Safety.
6. SANDAG will promote other opportunities for public participation and involvement at the Interagency Technical Working Group on Tribal Transportation Issues; Social Services Transportation Advisory Committee; Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group; Regional Planning Technical Working Group; Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee; Bicycle/Pedestrian Working Group; Regional Energy Working Group; Regional Housing Working Group; Committee on Binational Regional Opportunities, San Diego Region Conformity Working Group, and any other appropriate working groups.

7. SANDAG will ensure that opportunities for public participation and comment are provided at key milestones during the development of the draft RTP, RTIP, project criteria, network alternatives, funding alternatives, environmental documents, planning studies, and other project and policy efforts so that public comment and responses are provided and considered prior to any final SANDAG action or approval.

8. The PPP will be developed so that critical community concerns and technical issues are identified and potential options to address those concerns are provided. These issues include but are not limited to engineering, environmental, economic, social, and financial analyses that respond effectively to community needs and preferences and satisfy local, state, and federal environmental clearance requirements.

9. For planning, project, funding, transit fare, and policy decisions, public input shall be documented, issues or concerns addressed, and resolution of issues and/or changes made reflected in final reports, plans, or other documents. The final reports or documents are subject to approval by a vote at a public SANDAG Board or Policy Advisory Committee meeting.

10. To facilitate community participation, lists of individuals, agencies, and organizations will be developed for distribution of agency materials. SANDAG will promote opt-in opportunities for Web-based participation. These lists will include persons who have indicated an interest in transportation planning projects during previous public information efforts and/or focused on the specific project. Project information would be distributed to the persons on this list in conjunction with public meetings and workshops to solicit comments and recommendations.

11. Environmental documents will be prepared in accordance with CEQA and NEPA, as appropriate, and in coordination and consultation with various federal, state, and local agencies and with elected officials, community leaders, organizations, and other individuals from the neighborhoods and communities potentially affected by the proposed action. Coordination and public participation will be achieved through a variety of means, such as formal public hearings and meetings, circulation of draft documents, mailings, focus group meetings, workshops, and individual/group contacts.

12. When developing the RTP and the RTIP, SANDAG will consult with agencies and officials responsible for other planning activities within the metropolitan planning area – the San Diego region – that are affected by transportation. These planning activities include state and local planned growth, economic development, environmental protection, transit projects, border crossings, airport and seaport operations, or freight movements.

13. Formal scoping meetings, public hearings, and/or other meetings during the comment period and environmental document certification will be held in accordance with the requisite environmental document. As required, meetings will be announced in the Federal Register, local publications, and on the SANDAG Web site. Persons and organizations on the project mailing list also will be notified. SANDAG will endeavor to hold public meetings in locations...
accessible by public transit. These meetings will be held in buildings, rooms, or locations that are accessible to persons with disabilities.

14. SANDAG will prepare and distribute appropriate notices and communications to comply with CEQA and NEPA requirements.

15. A targeted public participation program will be developed to inform the community of factors related to a planning project. The information program may include briefings for the news media, informational meetings, presentations to include community and professional associations and educational institutions, community-based organizations, business groups and associations, environmental organizations, and other public forums.

16. Consistent with SANDAG Board policy, a project working or stakeholders working group may be organized to review and comment on a plan or project. This group may consist of various elected officials/staff, community and neighborhood organizations, business organizations, property owners, and other stakeholders and interested parties. This group would be formed to provide comment and guidance regarding planning, technical issues, review study alternatives and evaluation results, and provide community input regarding the plan or alternatives. This iterative process would allow for identified issues and concerns to receive follow-up responses. Meeting summaries of project working group activities will be produced. Meeting notices, agendas, and/or other information will be posted to the SANDAG Web site.

CAPITAL PROJECT DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION

SANDAG will follow the guidelines outlined in the Overall Public Participation Process and Project Development and Program Planning as well as the guidelines below. For all capital improvement projects with significant community impacts, SANDAG will provide opportunities for members of the public to provide input and express concerns. SANDAG also will implement a program designed to inform the public of progress, as well as safety and community impacts in the event of construction.

Public Participation Process

1. SANDAG will hold publicly noticed meetings at key stages of project development and implementation in the area(s) being impacted. The location of the meetings will depend upon the geographic location of the project. Meetings concerning projects exclusively within the NCTD service area will be held in North County locations. Meetings concerning projects exclusively within the MTS service area will be held in the MTS service area. If appropriate, additional meetings may be held at SANDAG offices. Meetings concerning all other projects will be held at SANDAG offices or other locations specified in SANDAG agendas. SANDAG, MTS, and NCTD offices are accessible by public transit. SANDAG will endeavor to hold off-site public meetings at locations accessible by public transit.

2. SANDAG will solicit input from representatives of interest groups of the local population, such as community groups, planning groups, business groups and associations, environmental organizations, neighborhood associations, and senior and disabled riders. These stakeholders will be consulted during the design and construction of capital projects. This includes addressing needs and conducting outreach with stakeholders listed in the Overall Public Participation Process.
3. SANDAG will work to advise the public regarding actual and perceived disruption during construction of capital projects by distributing educational and public information materials and by using other traditional community relations tools.

4. SANDAG will endeavor to meet citizen concerns as they arise and attempt to resolve those concerns.

5. For all projects requiring environmental review under CEQA and NEPA, such as major capital improvement projects, SANDAG will provide opportunities for members of the public to provide input and comply with all related legal requirements. (see Appendix D: SANDAG Board Policy No. 025)

**TRANSIT FARE CHANGES**

With the approval of Senate Bill 1703 (Peace 2002), the planning and programming functions of MTS and NCTD were consolidated under SANDAG. As part of these functions SANDAG assumed the responsibility for developing a Regional Fare Policy, including setting fares for transit services in the region through a Regional Comprehensive Fare Ordinance. A number of public participation activities are implemented to support the Regional Fare Policy, which is contained in Board Policy No. 029, Regional Fare Policy and Comprehensive Fare Ordinance.

**Public Participation Process**

1. SANDAG seeks to inform and involve public transit riders, stakeholders, and the general public about proposed changes in transit fares. This includes addressing needs and conducting outreach with stakeholders listed in the Overall Public Participation Process. Public information and involvement programs for service changes would fall under adopted policies of MTS and NCTD.

2. A public hearing(s) will be held by SANDAG for fare changes. The public hearings will be held at the SANDAG offices during a regularly scheduled meeting of the SANDAG Transportation Committee and/or Board of Directors and/or in the general geographic area of the affected public, as determined by the SANDAG Transportation Committee or Board of Directors. Public meetings will be held at a time and location that is accessible by users of public transit. When appropriate, meetings at which the public can provide comments will be held during evening hours and in different areas of San Diego County. Public hearings for fare changes affecting North County residents will be held by SANDAG in the North County area. Public meetings held at SANDAG during Board of Directors or Policy Advisory Committee meetings are Web cast live. The Web cast link is available at www.sandag.org.

3. A record of public input received at public hearings, meetings, workshops, or open houses will be provided to the Transportation Committee or Board of Directors prior to adoption of proposed amendments to the Regional Comprehensive Fare Ordinance for the purpose of adjusting fare prices.

4. Take One, Rider Alerts, or other public notices in both English and Spanish will be posted on all public transit vehicles within the affected area and will include a description of the proposed fare change, the date, time, intent and location of the public hearing, and the deadline for written, e-mail, and phone comments from the public. The notices also will be posted to the SANDAG and transit agency Web site(s).
5. Print notice of public hearings will be provided prior to the public hearing meeting date in newspapers of general circulation in the affected area(s), including appropriate minority and community publications. This notice also will be posted to the SANDAG Web site.

6. Additional public outreach will be performed through media notification, Web postings, and e-mail newsletters.

NATIVE AMERICAN CONSULTATION

Through the SANDAG Borders Committee, the Interagency Technical Working Group on Tribal Transportation Issues (Working Group), the Southern California Tribal Chairman’s Association, Reservation Transportation Authority, and other intertribal associations, SANDAG will conduct public participation and involvement activities to coordinate transportation and land use planning with tribal nations in San Diego County.

Public Participation Process

1. SANDAG will engage in consultation with tribal governments prior to making decisions, taking actions, or implementing programs that may impact their communities.

2. SANDAG will coordinate with the Working Group. The Working Group serves as a forum for regional tribal governments to discuss and coordinate transportation issues of mutual concern with various public planning agencies in the region, including SANDAG, Caltrans, the County of San Diego, and the transit operators.

3. The Working Group will monitor and provide input on the implementation of the strategies and planning activities. This includes providing input on PPPs.

4. The Working Group consists of representatives from each of the federally recognized tribal governments and California tribes in the San Diego region, as well as advisory members from the staff of SANDAG, Caltrans, the County of San Diego, Reservation Transportation Authority, Bureau of Indian Affairs, and the transit agencies.
SANDAG MANDATES AND DESIGNATIONS

The Board of Directors carries out a variety of responsibilities which are either mandated by federal or state law or regulation or delegated to SANDAG through local agreement.

Overall Authority

- **San Diego Regional Consolidated Agency**
  (State)

  With Senate Bill (SB) 1703 (Chapter 743, Statutes of 2002), SANDAG was designated as the San Diego Regional Consolidated Agency. SB 1703 went into effect on January 1, 2003, and is meant to strengthen how regional public policy decisions are made. The law mandates membership in the consolidated agency from the area’s 18 cities and county government. It consolidated transit planning, programming, project development, and construction into SANDAG, leaving responsibilities for day-to-day operations with the existing transit operators. Assembly Bill 361 (Chapter 508, Statutes of 2003) added to SANDAG responsibilities by mandating preparation of a RCP.

- **Regional Transportation Planning and Fund Allocation Agency**
  (State)

  Adopt RTP (long-range plan) and RTIP (five-year programming of state and federal transportation funds). Allocate Transportation Development Act (TDA) funds (¼ cent sales tax for transit support).

- **Metropolitan Planning Organization**
  (Federal)

  Allocate federal transportation revenues and meet comprehensive planning requirements of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) in order to be eligible for funds.

- **San Diego County Regional Transportation Commission**
  (State and Voter Approval)

  Administer ½ cent transaction and use tax, TransNet, with revenues to be used for transportation purposes.
- **Co-lead Agency for Air Quality Planning**  
  (Federal and State)
  Carry out air quality planning mandates in cooperation with the San Diego County Air Pollution Control District (APCD). Determine conformity of transportation plans and programs (RTP and RTIP) with air quality plan.

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

- **Housing**  
  (State)
  Determine each jurisdiction’s share of the regional housing need and establish performance criteria for self-certification of housing elements.

- **Areawide Clearinghouse**  
  (Federal and State)
  Review projects with regional impacts under California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

- **Manage and Administer the North County Multiple Habitat Conservation Program**  
  (Local)
  Undertaken on behalf of North County cities.

- **Otay Mesa East Toll Facility Act**  
  (State)
  Authorizes SANDAG to establish highway toll projects to facilitate the movement of goods and people along the State Route 11 corridor in the County of San Diego or at the Otay Mesa East Port of Entry.

- **Airport Multimodal Accessibility Plan**  
  (State)
  Designated as the agency responsible for preparing and adopting an Airport Multimodal Accessibility Plan for the San Diego region.
• **Quality of Life**  
  *(State)*  
  SANDAG is authorized by statute to place a ballot measure before the voters and use revenues from the tax to provide for implementation of the RCP, water quality improvement, beach sand replenishment projects, and various other projects and purposes.

• **Other**  
  *(Local)*  
  Regional Criminal Justice Clearancehouse, Automated Regional Justice Information System (ARJIS), Regional Census Data Center, Regional Information System development and maintenance, local planning activities pursuant to agreements with Navy, Caltrans, State Office of Planning and Research, San Diego Metropolitan Transit System (MTS), North County Transit District (NCTD), APCD, San Diego County Water Authority, the San Diego County Regional Airport Authority, cities and the County, and others; SourcePoint/Service Bureau.

**Operational**

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

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

• **Regional Transportation Demand Management Program Administration**  
  *(Local)*  
  Provide and administer regional program (iCommute) consisting of carpool, vanpool, and transit programs, bike locker program, employer outreach, and other projects.

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

• **State Route 125 Toll Collection**  
  *(State)*  
  Authorized to continue the collection of tolls on State Route 125 after a period of up to 35 years of operation by the private sector.

• **Regional Beach Sand Replenishment Program**  
  *(Local)*  
  Administer the regional program in coordination with federal, state, and local agencies.
Title 23: Highways; Part 450—Planning Assistance And Standards
450.316 Interested parties, participation, and consultation

(a) The Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) shall develop and use a documented participation plan that defines a process for providing citizens, affected public agencies, representatives of public transportation employees, freight shippers, providers of freight transportation services, private providers of transportation, representatives of users of public transportation, representatives of users of pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities, representatives of the disabled, and other interested parties with reasonable opportunities to be involved in the metropolitan transportation planning process.

(1) The participation plan shall be developed by the MPO in consultation with all interested parties and shall, at a minimum, describe explicit procedures, strategies, and desired outcomes for:

(i) Providing adequate public notice of public participation activities and time for public review and comment at key decision points, including but not limited to a reasonable opportunity to comment on the proposed metropolitan transportation plan and the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP);

(ii) Providing timely notice and reasonable access to information about transportation issues and processes;

(iii) Employing visualization techniques to describe metropolitan transportation plans and TIPs;

(iv) Making public information (technical information and meeting notices) available in electronically accessible formats and means, such as the World Wide Web;

(v) Holding any public meetings at convenient and accessible locations and times;

(vi) Demonstrating explicit consideration and response to public input received during the development of the metropolitan transportation plan and the TIP;

(vii) Seeking out and considering the needs of those traditionally underserved by existing transportation systems, such as low-income and minority households, who may face challenges accessing employment and other services;

(viii) Providing an additional opportunity for public comment, if the final metropolitan transportation plan or TIP differs significantly from the version that was made available for public comment by the MPO and raises new material issues which interested parties could not reasonably have foreseen from the public involvement efforts;
(ix) Coordinating with the statewide transportation planning public involvement and consultation processes under subpart B of this part; and

(x) Periodically reviewing the effectiveness of the procedures and strategies contained in the participation plan to ensure a full and open participation process.

(2) When significant written and oral comments are received on the draft metropolitan transportation plan and TIP (including the financial plans) as a result of the participation process in this section or the interagency consultation process required under the EPA transportation conformity regulations (40 CFR part 93), a summary, analysis, and report on the disposition of comments shall be made as part of the final metropolitan transportation plan and TIP.

(3) A minimum public comment period of 45 calendar days shall be provided before the initial or revised participation plan is adopted by the MPO. Copies of the approved participation plan shall be provided to the FHWA and the FTA for informational purposes and shall be posted on the World Wide Web, to the maximum extent practicable.

(b) In developing metropolitan transportation plans and TIPs, the MPO should consult with agencies and officials responsible for other planning activities within the MPA that are affected by transportation (including State and local planned growth, economic development, environmental protection, airport operations, or freight movements) or coordinate its planning process (to the maximum extent practicable) with such planning activities. In addition, metropolitan transportation plans and TIPs shall be developed with due consideration of other related planning activities within the metropolitan area, and the process shall provide for the design and delivery of transportation services within the area that are provided by:

(1) Recipients of assistance under title 49 U.S.C. Chapter 53;

(2) Governmental agencies and non-profit organizations (including representatives of the agencies and organizations) that receive Federal assistance from a source other than the U.S. Department of Transportation to provide non-emergency transportation services; and

(3) Recipients of assistance under 23 U.S.C. 204.

(c) When the MPA includes Indian Tribal lands, the MPO shall appropriately involve the Indian Tribal government(s) in the development of the metropolitan transportation plan and the TIP.

(d) When the MPA includes Federal public lands, the MPO shall appropriately involve the Federal land management agencies in the development of the metropolitan transportation plan and the TIP.

(e) MPOs shall, to the extent practicable, develop a documented process(es) that outlines roles, responsibilities, and key decision points for consulting with other governments and agencies, as defined in paragraphs (b), (c), and (d) of this section, which may be included in the agreement(s) developed under §450.314.
Appendix B

HOW THE PLAN WAS DEVELOPED

The PPP guides SANDAG public outreach efforts for transit, highway, smart growth, environmental, planning, growth forecasts, binational planning and coordination, the Regional Transportation Plan, Regional Transportation Improvement Program, Tribal Consultation, and other initiatives. It was developed in accordance with guidelines established by FHWA for metropolitan transportation planning (23 CFR 450.316), and addresses Title VI, related nondiscrimination requirements, and reflects the principles of social equity and environmental justice. Included in the PPP are procedures, strategies, and outcomes associated with the ten requirements listed in 23 CFR 450.316. The plan also fulfills various state and federal public involvement requirements. The PPP reflects the SANDAG commitment to public participation and involvement to include all residents and stakeholders in the regional planning process.

Initial Outreach Survey

To start the update process for the PPP, in June 2009 SANDAG launched initial outreach with a survey in English and Spanish that asked residents, stakeholders, agencies, and other interested parties on how they wished to receive information or provide input on regional projects. The survey was distributed at SANDAG Board and Committee meetings, promoted in rEgion (the SANDAG monthly electronic newsletter) in June, July, August, September, and October, circulated to SANDAG e-mail lists, promoted on the SANDAG Web site as a public notice, home page “featured project,” and news item, and circulated at diverse community events. SANDAG distributed a press release and public notices to promote the survey. More than 1100 participants responded to the initial survey. Key feedback included recommendations to provide information on the SANDAG Web site; provide information via e-mail newsletters; implement e-mail and online options for providing feedback; and consider conducting some public meetings, workshops, and/or open houses during the workday. A breakdown of the outreach survey questions and answers is available at the end of this Appendix.

 Outreach Timeline

The updated draft SANDAG Public Participation Plan (PPP) was released by the SANDAG Board of Directors for a 45-day public review and comment period on October 9, 2009. The deadline for comments via mail, e-mail, fax, or phone was November 30, 2009, at 4 p.m. Presentations also were made to the following working groups and committees:

Tribal Transportation Working Group – 9/8/2009
Board of Directors – 10/9/2009
Presentations were made to the SANDAG Transportation, Regional Planning, Borders, and Public Safety Committees and to the SANDAG Stakeholders Working Group (SWG) in September, October, and November to secure additional input. The SWG is composed of diverse individuals from throughout the region who are interested in providing input into regional initiatives such as the Regional Transportation Plan, the Sustainable Communities Strategy, and the Regional Comprehensive Plan.

SANDAG staff also requested input on the PPP from the Tribal Transportation Working Group at its September 8, 2009 meeting hosted by the Viejas Band of the Kumeyaay Nation. Tribal representatives provided comments to staff regarding their interest in utilizing the Working Group and the Southern California Tribal Chairmen’s Association as the principal mechanisms for consultation. In addition, tribal representatives added that this does not replace SANDAG’s direct communication with each tribal nation; it is, however, the best policy mechanism for collaborative planning efforts. These comments were incorporated into the PPP.

Public Notices and Outreach

In an effort to receive robust input on the draft PPP, notices were posted in the Asian Journal, La Prensa (in Spanish), North County Times (all editions), San Diego Daily Transcript, The San Diego Union-Tribune (all editions), San Diego Voice & Viewpoint, and Star News. Public service advertisements aired on 22 local radio stations during morning and evening drive-time radio from November 2 through 13, with a call to action for residents to tell SANDAG how they want to be involved in regional projects. The media list and radio stations for public service advertising are listed below.

- **Newspaper Advertising (October 16 – 22)**
  - Asian Journal
  - La Prensa (in Spanish)
  - North County Times (all editions)
  - The San Diego Reader
  - San Diego Daily Transcript
  - San Diego Union-Tribune (all editions)
  - San Diego Voice & Viewpoint
  - Star News

- **Radio Advertising (November 2 – 13)**
  - KBZT - 94.9 FM Alternative
  - KCBQ - 1170 AM Talk
  - KCEO - 1000 AM Business News
- KFMB - 760 AM  Adult Contemporary
- KFMB - 100.7 FM  Adult Contemporary
- KFSD - 1450 AM  Big Band
- KIFM - 98.1 FM  Lite Jazz
- KPRI - 102.1 FM  Adult Album Alternate
- KPRZ - 1210 AM  Christian
- KSCF - 103.7 FM  Adult Contemporary
- KSON - 97.3 FM  Country
- KSOQ - 92.1 FM  Country
- KYXY - 96.5 FM  Adult Contemporary
- XGLX - 91.7 FM  Spanish
- XHIT - 95.3 FM  Spanish
- XHRM - 92.5 FM  Top 40
- XHTZ - 90.3 FM  Urban
- XLTN - 104.5 FM  Spanish
- XMOR - 98.9 FM  Hip Hop
- XOCL - 99.3 FM  Spanish
- XSPN - 800 AM  Sports Talk
- XTRA - 91.1 FM  Alternative Rock

- Press Release Distribution List
  Asia Media
  Associated Press
  Peninsula Beacon News
  BIA Builder Magazine
  Cal Regions
  Chinese News
  City Beat
  Clairemont Community News
  CNS City
  Coast News
  CW 6
  Daily Journal
  Del Mar Times
  Diario San Diego
  Downtown News
  East County Californian
  Mercury News
  Navy Dispatch
  NBC 7/39
  North County Times
  Oceanside Magazine
  Poway Corridor News
  Presidio Sentinel
  Prime News
  Ramona Sentinel
  Rancho Bernardo News Journal
  Riverside Press Enterprise
  San Diego AP
  San Diego Business Journal
  San Diego California Examiner
  San Diego Channel
  San Diego Community Newspaper Group
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El Latino</td>
<td>San Diego Daily Transcript</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox 5 News</td>
<td>San Diego Metropolitan Magazine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanos Unidos</td>
<td>San Diego Monitor News</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KBNT - Univision</td>
<td>San Diego News</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KFMB</td>
<td>San Diego Reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KFTV</td>
<td>San Diego Union-Tribune</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KGO Radio</td>
<td>San Diego Voice and Viewpoint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPBS</td>
<td>San Diego Uptown News</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KUSI</td>
<td>Star News</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Jolla Village News</td>
<td>Voice of San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Opinion</td>
<td>XEWT Televisa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Prensa</td>
<td>XHAS Telemundo 33 News</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Opinion</td>
<td>XHTY Uniradio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Times</td>
<td>ZETA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Media coverage included a news article that appeared in The San Diego Union-Tribune on October 26, 2009, and a story on KPBS radio on October 26, 2009.

Announcements also were distributed to the following groups to secure input and promote further distribution to other interested parties. Working groups, committees, and interested stakeholders include:

City Managers
Planning Directors
City of San Diego and County of San Diego Community Planning Groups
Bicycle-Pedestrian Working Group
Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee
Committee on Binational Regional Opportunities
iCommute (formerly RideLink) Employer Database
Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee
Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project Working Group
Regional Energy Working Group
Regional Housing Task Force
Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group
Regional Planning Technical Working Group
San Diego Region Conformity Working Group
Tribal Working Group
SANDAG also promoted the public comment period and solicited additional input through the SANDAG Web site, e-mail distribution, and through the rEgion newsletter. Through these outreach efforts, more than 5,000 interested stakeholders were reached.
Initial Outreach Survey Results

QUESTION 1: How would you prefer to receive information from SANDAG on regional issues? Please only check up to three.

- Public meetings: 29.9% (266)
- Informal community meetings: 24.1% (266)
- Email newsletters: 78.7% (868)
- Surveys: 17.2% (130)
- Not interested in receiving information: 5.0% (59)
QUESTION 2: How would you prefer to provide input to SANDAG on regional issues? Please only check up to three.

- Public meetings: 20.7% (234)
- Informal community meetings: 19.4% (219)
- Online survey: 51.7% (584)
- Mail survey: 11.9% (134)
- Focus group: 16.1% (182)
- Email comment: 55.1% (622)
- Letter: 9.3% (105)
- Online discussion board: 12.5% (146)
- Phone comment line: 7.3% (82)
- Not interested in providing input: 2.9% (33)
QUESTION 3: Approximately how many times within the last year did you provide SANDAG input on regional issues? (This could be at a meeting, via e-mail, mail, or phone message.)

- 0: 62.8% (708)
- 1 to 2: 24.9% (281)
- 3 to 4: 8.1% (91)
- 5 or more: 4.2% (47)
QUESTION 4: SANDAG holds meetings or events to introduce regionally significant topics to the public or to ask for input on specific issues. How important are the following factors in your decision to attend a meeting or event?

- An interesting meeting topic, but does not affect you directly
- A meeting topic that affects you directly
- Co-sponsored by a familiar local group or entity
- Parking provided
- Must be accessible by transit
- Providing an incentive, such as a transit pass or other item

Colors used:
- Orange: Very Important
- Blue: Somewhat Important
- Purple: Not Very Important
- Red: Definitely Not Important
- Green: N/A
QUESTION 5: What is the farthest you would be willing to travel for a meeting?

- 1 to 5 miles: 22.6% (237)
- 6 to 10 miles: 38.1% (379)
- 11 to 20 miles: 24.7% (259)
- Over 20 miles: 16.7% (175)
QUESTION 6: When do you prefer to attend a meeting?

- Monday through Friday between 8 a.m. and 11 a.m. or between 1 p.m. and 5 p.m.: 30.9% (325)
- Monday through Friday between 11 a.m. and 1 p.m.: 12.1% (127)
- Monday through Friday after 5 p.m.: 35.1% (365)
- Saturday or Sunday between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m.: 16.1% (169)
- Other times/days of the week: 5.8% (61)
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QUESTION 7: What is the best way to notify you about a meeting? Please rank the following items from 1 to 7, with 1 being the BEST way to notify you.
QUESTION 8: How would you prefer to have detailed or complicated material presented to you? Please only check one.

- Information online for review in advance: 53.0% (540)
- Live presentation: 18.2% (185)
- Brochure, flyer, or printed material: 19.5% (199)
- Map, chart, or other visual: 9.3% (95)
QUESTION 9: How are you involved with SANDAG? Please check all that apply.

- Receive e-mail notification of agendas, Region newsletter, or other e... 67.8% (451)
- Attend Board meetings 19.8% (72)
- Attend Policy Advisory Committee meetings 7.5% (50)
- Listen to Board or Policy Advisory Committee meetings via Web cast 8.9% (59)
- Attend SANDAG working group or ad hoc meetings 15.9% (106)
- Attend SANDAG-sponsored public meetings on transportation, transit, h... 30.2% (201)
- Provide public comment or input on plans, environmental documents, or... 26.0% (173)
QUESTION 10: How well does SANDAG communicate opportunities for public input in the planning process?

- Very well: 16.5% (171)
- Somewhat well: 33.5% (348)
- Not very well: 18.1% (186)
- Not well at all: 33% (37)
- No opinion: 22.5% (234)
QUESTION 11: How would you identify yourself? (Check all that apply)

- Business person: 34.7% (334)
- Concerned individual: 49.0% (472)
- Elected official: 0.9% (9)
- Environmental group member or staff: 2.9% (28)
- Community group member or staff: 17.2% (166)
- Government agency staff: 15.0% (144)
QUESTION 12: What part of San Diego County do you live in?

- North County Coastal (Cities of Del Mar, Solana Beach, Encinitas, Carlsbad): 5.4% (97)
- North County Inland (Cities of Vista, San Marcos, Escondido, Poway): 7.9% (62)
- South County (Cities of Chula Vista, National City, Imperial Beach, Coronado): 7.2% (74)
- East County (Cities of El Cajon, Santee, La Mesa, Lemon Grove): 14.3% (148)
- City of San Diego: 51.9% (537)
- Unincorporated Area: 4.1% (42)
- Do not live in San Diego County: 5.2% (54)
QUESTION 13: What topics would you like to be notified about in the future? Please check all that apply.

- Land Use & Regional Growth
- Transportation
- Environment
- Bioregional
- Public Safety / Criminal Justice
- Demographics (Census, Estimates & Forecasts)
- Compass Card
- FastTrak
- RideLink
- SANDAG Service Bureau
- Regional Transportation Plan
- Regional Comprehensive Plan
- Public Participation Plan
- Not interested in being notified about SANDAG projects

Percentage and number of responses:

- Transportation: 72.7% (738)
- Land Use & Regional Growth: 51.7% (626)
- Environment: 46.2% (470)
- Bioregional: 11.4% (116)
- Public Safety / Criminal Justice: 28.3% (288)
- Demographics (Census, Estimates & Forecasts): 28.4% (289)
- Compass Card: 16.2% (165)
- FastTrak: 17.2% (175)
- RideLink: 14.7% (148)
- SANDAG Service Bureau: 8.9% (91)
- Regional Transportation Plan: 46.6% (474)
- Regional Comprehensive Plan: 26.8% (273)
- Public Participation Plan: 22.9% (233)

- Not interested in being notified about SANDAG projects: 5.6% (57)
QUESTION 14: What is the best way to notify you about the project(s) you selected in question 13? Please check one.

- Email: 75.7% (728)
- Postcard or letter: 12.0% (119)
- Newspaper Ad: 4.9% (47)
- SANDAG Web site: 2.7% (26)
- eRegion - the SANDAG electronic newsletter: 2.7% (26)
- Community or media sponsored site: 0.9% (8)
- Announcement from Community Group: 1.1% (11)
## Appendix C -- 2009 SANDAG Public Participation Plan (PPP)
**Comments and Responses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>Name/Agency</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10/20/09</td>
<td>Guy Preuss</td>
<td>Stakeholders Working Group Meeting</td>
<td>Media outreach needs improvement to reach wider audience; do not rely solely on Internet for dissemination of information since it doesn’t reach the audience we think it does.</td>
<td>SANDAG uses a variety of communications methods to reach different audiences. Please see “Guidelines and Principles” beginning on page 5.</td>
<td>Outreach: Notification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10/20/09</td>
<td>Guy Preuss</td>
<td>Stakeholders Working Group Meeting</td>
<td>Overuse of acronyms in PPP; general public doesn’t know what they mean; provide more explanations</td>
<td>Glossary of Terms to be included in final Public Participation Plan.</td>
<td>Level of Detail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10/26/09</td>
<td>Bill Chatham</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>It’s pretty late if you are going to close comments by November 1 to be advertising in the paper today. One of the problems with getting information to you is not knowing that you are soliciting it.</td>
<td>Deadline for comments was November 30, 2009.</td>
<td>Outreach: Notification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10/26/09</td>
<td>Annette Halderman</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>General comment against the Merriam development by Deer Springs Road</td>
<td>Comments forwarded to County of San Diego.</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10/26/09</td>
<td>Jim</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>General comment against the development of a new park at Harbor Drive and Pacific Highway</td>
<td>Comments forwarded to City of San Diego.</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10/26/09</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>General comment against the Merriam development by Deer Springs Road</td>
<td>Comments forwarded to County of San Diego.</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>10/26/09</td>
<td>Howard Post</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Extend MTS bus hours until 2 a.m.</td>
<td>Comments forwarded to the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS).</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>10/26/09</td>
<td>Howard Post</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>General comment against the I-15 Express Lanes Project</td>
<td>Comments forwarded to SANDAG Project Manager.</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10/26/09</td>
<td>Theresa Quiroz</td>
<td>E-mail/Letter</td>
<td>It is my belief that the Draft Plan does not come close to fulfilling the requirements of the federal law which requires this plan to be developed and used by all MPO’s (23 CFR Section 450.316).</td>
<td>The SANDAG Public Participation Plan was crafted in compliance with the requirements of 23 CFR Section 450.316, which is part of the Public Participation Plan. See Appendix A.</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10/26/09</td>
<td>Theresa Quiroz</td>
<td>E-mail/Letter</td>
<td>The first step this plan should take is to set goals and objectives for public involvement.</td>
<td>The SANDAG Public Participation Plan sets overall guidelines for all of SANDAG’s public outreach efforts. More specific goals and objectives are developed at the project level. See revised page 1 and page 6, Item #12.</td>
<td>Level of Detail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>Name/Agency</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>10/26/2009</td>
<td>E-mail/Letter</td>
<td>Theresa Quiroz</td>
<td>But on review of the guiding principles, there is not a single mention of the disabled community or how efforts can be made to ensure their meaningful involvement.</td>
<td>The SANDAG Public Participation Plan’s General Guidelines and Principles are the foundation of all outreach processes and include audiences to which SANDAG targets outreach efforts. Persons with disabilities are specifically cited here, and in several other places in the plan. Please see page 5, Item #2.</td>
<td>Level of Detail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>10/26/2009</td>
<td>E-mail/Letter</td>
<td>Theresa Quiroz</td>
<td>The SWG meetings are currently being held at Caltrans where a member of the public is required to sign in to gain admittance to the meeting. (cites Brown and Bagley Act requirements).</td>
<td>Caltrans requires guests to sign-in at the front entrance to its building for security reasons. Guests may sign-in using only their initials, first name, or the Caltrans guest pass number if they do not want to give their full name. SANDAG does not receive any information from the Caltrans sign-in sheet. The Caltrans office was chosen as the location for Stakeholders Working Group (SWG) meetings because of its proximity to public transit and its free public parking.</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>10/26/2009</td>
<td>E-mail/Letter</td>
<td>Theresa Quiroz</td>
<td>Goal 1: Amend the mission statement of SANDAG to reflect its strong commitment to public participation and involvement.</td>
<td>SANDAG is not revising its mission statement at this time.</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>10/26/2009</td>
<td>E-mail/Letter</td>
<td>Theresa Quiroz</td>
<td>Goal 2: To change SANDAG’s position from ‘we are required to take public input’ to ‘we value your input.’ This can be done by creating programs within SANDAG to encourage staff to always have a ‘we value your input’ approach.</td>
<td>The Guidelines and Principles section of the SANDAG Public Participation Plan addresses SANDAG’s commitment to public involvement. Please see page 5.</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>10/26/2009</td>
<td>E-mail/Letter</td>
<td>Theresa Quiroz</td>
<td>Goal 3: Have a Public Participation Plan that reflects SANDAG’s strong commitment to democracy.</td>
<td>The SANDAG Public Participation Plan promotes all opportunities for public involvement.</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>10/26/2009</td>
<td>E-mail/Letter</td>
<td>Theresa Quiroz</td>
<td>The guidelines must be fleshed out with explicit strategies that will allow the public to participate.</td>
<td>The SANDAG Public Participation Plan provides the foundation for development of specific public outreach plans. Please see revised page 1.</td>
<td>Level of Detail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>10/26/2009</td>
<td>E-mail/Letter</td>
<td>Theresa Quiroz</td>
<td>SANDAG could have a page on their website, a Public Participation Page.</td>
<td>SANDAG maintains and is enhancing a public involvement page that highlights public participation opportunities.</td>
<td>Level of Detail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>10/26/2009</td>
<td>E-mail/Letter</td>
<td>Theresa Quiroz</td>
<td>However, staff will still have to deal with the lack of internet access in our low-income and minority communities. This can be helped by creating the explicit strategy that SANDAG will create a Fact Sheet which mirrors to a great extent the Public Participation web page.</td>
<td>Web-based outreach is just one communications method employed by SANDAG. Communications strategies are tailored to meet the needs of specific audiences.</td>
<td>Level of Detail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>Name/Agency</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>10/26/2009</td>
<td>E-mail/Letter</td>
<td>Theresa Quiroz</td>
<td>The federal law also requires that the PPP offer explicit desired outcomes to the process. The draft does not speak to that issue in any substantive way.</td>
<td>The SANDAG Public Participation Plan sets overall guidelines for all of SANDAG’s public outreach efforts. More specific goals and objectives are developed at the project level. See revised page 1 and page 6, item #12.</td>
<td>Level of Detail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>10/26/2009</td>
<td>E-mail/Letter</td>
<td>Theresa Quiroz</td>
<td>There is so much more specific detail that could - and must – be added to this draft.</td>
<td>The SANDAG Public Participation Plan provides the foundation for development of specific public outreach plans. See revised page 1.</td>
<td>Level of Detail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>10/26/2009</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Peter H. St. Clair</td>
<td>Public comments on environmental documents, plans or ordinances are rarely addressed in any comprehensive manner. Quality of input is low. Response to public comment is barely adequate and certainly does not encourage ongoing participation.</td>
<td>The SANDAG Public Participation Plan provides the foundation for development of specific public outreach plans. See revised page 1.</td>
<td>Level of Detail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>10/26/2009</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Peter H. St. Clair</td>
<td>The public has no idea if there are regional and subregional goals for various aspects of life in our region or whether there are data measurements against these goals, or a process in place to make adjustments if we are off track. Provide better representation of regional and subregional goals and whether or not there are data measurements against these goals, or processes in place to make adjustments if we are off track.</td>
<td>Evaluation criteria are developed as part of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Public input is solicited during the development of all elements of the RTP.</td>
<td>Level of Detail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>10/26/2009</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Peter H. St. Clair</td>
<td>Analysis of environmental documents is haphazard and there are inadequate standards against which to measure quality and progress.</td>
<td>SANDAG follows state and federal environmental guidelines for projects. Please see pages 4, 8, and 9.</td>
<td>Level of Detail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>10/27/2009</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Nadine Scott</td>
<td>Not enough meetings in Coastal North County or Oceanside, the largest city in North County</td>
<td>Subregional workshops are held in North County for various planning projects.</td>
<td>Outreach: Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>11/2/2009</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Nadine Scott</td>
<td>Comment regarding involvement of local individuals and groups, per page 15, paragraph 2: are we developing or soliciting lists for interested persons/groups</td>
<td>Yes. See sandag.org/PPP.</td>
<td>Outreach: Notification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>11/2/2009</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Nadine Scott</td>
<td>Not enough meetings in Coastal North County, particularly Oceanside</td>
<td>Subregional workshops are held in North County for various planning projects.</td>
<td>Outreach: Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>11/2/2009</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Linda Vista</td>
<td>Under the section titled: Capital Project Design and Construction #4, it is crucial that participants who have been recruited to provide community input are provided with updates continuously.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
<td>Outreach: Notification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>11/2/2009</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Linda Vista</td>
<td>The tactics that would be most effective to promote public participation are through the model of collaborating with community organizations that have an entry into community groups that may otherwise not be as open to participate directly with a government</td>
<td>Please see revised page 5, item #2 and page 9, item #15.</td>
<td>Outreach: Collaboration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C-3
organization. Community based organizations, for instance, have established trust and connection with the members of their communities. Therefore, they serve as effective intermediaries and can more easily identify which are the most significant obstacles that prevent community groups from participating. For example, Bayside Community Center has identified that if we provide food and childcare services then our community members are able to participate. Another tactic is to provide capacity building for participants as many of them are not necessarily aware of the initiatives centered around transportation. It is also important that these capacity building opportunities train members to become actively involved in the process of decision making.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>Name/Agency</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>11/2/2009</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Linda Vista Collaborative</td>
<td>Identify how many different cultural groups are represented and outreach to the groups that are missing. Identify what other methods of communication are working to get people to participate and replicate these efforts. Identify how effective is working with community based organizations as intermediaries to reach out to groups who have not been involved in the past. Identify the diverse methods of communication and technology being used by the participants. Identify what groups are not being represented and how they can be incorporated into the process of participation. It is crucial to incorporate advocacy work as a component of the PPP as many of the community based organizations currently receiving grants through SANDAG may have more opportunity to help community leaders to contribute and participate in the decision making process.</td>
<td>Please see revised page 5, item #2 and page 9, item #15.</td>
<td>Outreach: Diversification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>11/17/2009</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Brian Gregory/UCSD</td>
<td>Overall, it is a comprehensive document that provides a good framework to engage the public in SANDAG's planning and capital improvement processes. As you know, one of the most important aspects of a successful public participation plan is to engage the public early in the process, where comments can be received and appropriately addressed. On occasions when the public is solicited for input, it is too late in the process to affect change. In the PPP there is a reference to “key milestones” or “key stages of project development and implementation” and while we recognize the challenge in finding language that fits every project, perhaps it could be clearly noted that the public outreach effort will commence early in the process.</td>
<td>Please see revised page 8, item #7.</td>
<td>Outreach: Notification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>Name/Agency</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>11/17/2009</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Brian Gregory/UCSD</td>
<td>Another comment is in regards to representatives on working groups or advisory committees. The selection of those participants is a critical part of public participation and it is important to select members that are able and willing to share information with their constituency. The representatives should engage their community/institution/organization in a dialogue and communicate these perspectives with SANDAG staff.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
<td>Outreach: Diversification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>11/17/2009</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Brian Gregory/UCSD</td>
<td>Lastly, the description of public outreach for Project Development and Program Planning (pages 12–14) seems to be broader and more inclusive than what is listed for Capital Project Design and Construction (pages 14-15). Is that the intent? Is it assumed that the public was already engaged during the planning process? Perhaps that could be clarified.</td>
<td>The outreach efforts that are part of Capital Project Design and Construction build upon the efforts conducted as part of Project development and Program Planning. Please see revised page 9.</td>
<td>Level of Detail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>11/19/2009</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Donna McGinty</td>
<td>Enough silly decisions are made in Oceanside to make me realize you will be doing the Public an injustice by limiting their opportunity to speak on anything. YOU represent the Public and we certainly have the Democratic right to protect our rights to participate in person, by letter by email or by phone. Oceanside City Council majority would take our rights to speak or participate in discussion and decision making if they could. It would expedite their time at the Council Meetings. They were elected or appointed TO LISTEN TO OUR VIEWS. Please enter my comments in the public SANDAG record on this issue.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>11/19/2009</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jurbinder@aol.com">jurbinder@aol.com</a></td>
<td>I believe that the public interest is best served when and if The Public Participation Plan should include input on transportation policy, priorities, and project selection. Coordinated signal lights in cities, more freeway lanes, more selective use of small Visa busses, construction before the need has been determined by supposed authorities (wider bridges, over and underpasses, fewer promises and more action and more public input at least annually, names of those who are responsible for expenditure of all public funds to detailed small projects as well as major projects. It is time for SANDAG to be more accountable to all involved parties.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>Name/Agency</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 35  | 11/19/2009 | E-mail        | Jeanne Sisson     | SANDAG has sand-bagged taxpayers of San Diego County into voting billions for transportation upgrades with the understanding most of the funds would go to highway, road and street improvements. SANDAG seems to have little intention of honoring these promises (OK, if they weren’t ‘promises’, it was ‘understood’ the public wanted surface roads given priority and most of the funds).  
Now comes a ‘Public Participation Plan’ that limits discussion on any SANDAG programs other than the few SANDAG chooses for public comment.  
BULL FEATHERS! True Public Participation includes the public be involved in every aspect of transportation policy, project selection and project priorities.  
The San Diego Association of Governments has been run like a private fiefdom long enough. Give us complete, unrestricted Public Participation now. | The SANDAG Public Participation Plan is an umbrella document with guidelines for public participation on general categories of SANDAG projects and programs. All SANDAG projects and programs have opportunities for public involvement. See revised page 1, page 5, item #6, and page 8, items #7, 8, and 9. | General                  |
<p>| 36  | 11/20/2009 | E-mail        | Mike Preston      | I believe it would be a mistake and un-American to limit public participation and discussion to only targeted plans and projects and not allow public testimony on how and what projects are selected. I don’t think SANDAG should fear an open and frank discussion of the entire traffic congestion relief plan. I thought that an important part of the 2004 bond was periodic public input and adjustments based on that input. Please reconsider this ill-advised limit on public comment. | The SANDAG Public Participation Plan is an umbrella document with guidelines for public participation on general categories of SANDAG projects and programs. All SANDAG projects and programs have opportunities for public involvement. See revised page 1, page 5, item #6, and page 8, items #7, 8, and 9. | General                  |
| 37  | 11/20/2009 | E-mail        | George Crissman   | The Public Participation Plan does not state or contemplate public participation in the project selection process or the setting of transportation priorities. The processes of project selection and prioritizing represent “key decision points” and must be open to public comment to satisfy 23 CFR 450.316. Please amend the Public Participation Plan to specifically include full public access to and participation in the project selection and prioritizing process. Full public access to the decision process must include the requirement of active and diligent efforts on the part of SANDAG and partners to fully inform the public of all available transportation modes and methods. | Public participation is part of the early stages of transportation planning. Strategic and tactical outreach plans are developed for individual projects and programs, but general outreach guidelines that call for early involvement are covered in the SANDAG Public Participation Plan. See revised page 1, page 5, item #6, and page 8, items #7, 8, and 9. | Level of Detail    |
| 38  | 11/20/2009 | E-mail        | George Crissman   | The Plan should provide for a variety of techniques for the public to submit commentary (public, facsimile, internet email, unbiased professional surveys, etc.) to assist with the selection process. | The Public Participation Plan includes many methods aimed at securing a high level of public involvement in the planning process. The plan serves as the foundation for the development of more specific public outreach plans tailored to individual projects, programs and planning efforts. Please see | Level of Detail    |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>Name/Agency</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>11/20/2009</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>George Crissman</td>
<td>The plan should require SANDAG and partners must make an active and diligent effort to obtain the greatest amount of public comment on the planning and prioritization process.</td>
<td>See response for question #38.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>11/20/2009</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>George Crissman</td>
<td>The expressed desires of the public at large must be given preferential consideration in the decision-making process.</td>
<td>See revised page 1, page 5, item #5, and page 8, items #7, 8, and 9.</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>11/20/2009</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Peter H. St. Clair</td>
<td>The plan is long winded. Repetitive. That is not good. It does call for periodic Board review of its efficacy. That is good. How are you going to measure that? I found nothing that discusses goals, measurement, evaluation and feedback. Some numbers might be nice. How many of this? What percentage of that?</td>
<td>The SANDAG Public Participation Plan sets overall guidelines for all of SANDAG's public outreach efforts. More specific goals and objectives are developed at the project level. See revised page 1 and page 5, item #12.</td>
<td>Level of Detail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>11/20/2009</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Peter H. St. Clair</td>
<td>I wrote earlier. There are still two components of public input that I think need attention: Quality of CEQA/NEPA reports. It is one thing to get them. It is another to insure the quality of data collection and analysis. I do not see anything in the plan that attempts to capture public comment on study inadequacies and determine whether some form of Quality Assurance program is needed. A QA program would use statistical tools to attempt to increase report quality. Simple evidence of quality: decline in the number of report iterations before certification--assuming, of course, agencies just don't abrogate their responsibility to read critically. Further evidence: reports are received and read by qualified people. In many cases we have biologists writing about project/construction alternatives and the reports are read by planners. Nobody in the loop has any real training or experience! Reports frequently fail to consider alternatives, such as the use of passive, natural systems to obtain higher levels of flood control or water quality vs. engineered solutions relying on steel, concrete and energy; or the affect of conservation on demand, and therefore, the need for capital intensive projects.</td>
<td>SANDAG always subjects its environmental comments to quality assurance and quality control. SANDAG is only responsible for certifying or adopting CEQA documents; NEPA documents are the responsibility of the federal lead agency. The projects SANDAG works on are those that are part of its Regional Transportation Plan or Overall Work Program.</td>
<td>Level of Detail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>Name/Agency</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>11/20/2009</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Peter H. St. Clair</td>
<td>Feedback level 1. While public comments are often published, it is frequently very difficult to determine whether anything in a final report or approval has changed as a result. Draft documents are often revised and released with no strike out/replacement annotation.</td>
<td>SANDAG reflects changes, including those resulting from public comment, by outlining comments received and revisions made as well as using strike out/replacement annotation in reports.</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>11/20/2009</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Peter H. St. Clair</td>
<td>Feedback level 2. It would be beneficial to aggregate public comment. Into what categories or specific concerns do they fall, if any? What is done to address repetitive (but not redundant) criticism?</td>
<td>SANDAG aggregates public comments into categories and makes revisions based on input.</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>11/21/2009</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>James L. Johnson</td>
<td>As a property owner and tax payer in San Diego County, I wish to express my desires regarding the Public Participation Plan. The Public Participation Plan should include input on transportation policy, priorities and project selection processes. At no phase should Public Participation be excluded or limited from any of your processes or proceeding whenever they involve the use of Tax Payer Monies be they in the form of bonds, federal, state, or local grants. Federal Law requires public participation and I personally will support any legal actions if my ability to present input is restricted in any form.</td>
<td>Comment noted. See revised page 1, page 5, item #5, and page 8, items #7, 8, and 9.</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>11/23/2009</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Connery Cepesda/Caltrans</td>
<td>Consider simply listing the mandates, and including the description narratives as an appendix. The bulk of the PPP should be on the public participation process.</td>
<td>The mandates section has been moved to the end of the plan.</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>11/23/2009</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Connery Cepesda/Caltrans</td>
<td>Page 2: RCP not previously defined - revise to &quot;Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP).&quot;</td>
<td>RCP is now defined on first reference.</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>11/23/2009</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Connery Cepesda/Caltrans</td>
<td>Page 2: May be worth mentioning that the (TransNet) program was approved by voters in 1987 and re-approved in November 2004, extending the program to 2048.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>Name/Agency</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>11/23/2009</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Connery Cepesda/Caltrans</td>
<td>Page 5: As currently written, the principles and guidelines range from &quot;Inform&quot; to &quot;Involve&quot; in the IAP2 Public Participation Spectrum - principles with &quot;Collaborate&quot; to &quot;Empower&quot; levels of public impact are strongly recommended. A current example of collaboration with citizens is the RTP Stakeholder Working Group (SWG). For the overall principles (pgs. 11-12), collaboration is only hinted at on #4.</td>
<td>Reference to best practices and IAP2 Spectrum of Public Participation added to page 6.</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>11/23/2009</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Connery Cepesda/Caltrans</td>
<td>Page 6: At the October SWG meeting, Nico Calavita commented on the lack of youth participation (high school age and younger) in planning activities and Margarita Holguin commented on the need to outreach to non-English speaking communities; consider adding a mention of &quot;youth&quot; and &quot;non-English speaking&quot;.</td>
<td>SANDAG conducts outreach efforts tailored to non-English speaking audiences. Please see page 6, item #1. The plan has been revised to include youth as an audience. Please see page 5, item #2.</td>
<td>Outreach: Diversification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>11/23/2009</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Connery Cepesda/Caltrans</td>
<td>Page 11: Since the word is in quotation marks, consider defining consultation in this context.</td>
<td>The quotation marks have been removed.</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>11/23/2009</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Connery Cepesda/Caltrans</td>
<td>Appendix A: Do the PPP guidelines address this explicitly - how many days/weeks in advance will the public be notified of meetings, workshops and other opportunities to participate?</td>
<td>Please see Appendix D, SANDAG Public Participation Policy (Board Policy No. 025).</td>
<td>Outreach: Notification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>11/23/2009</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Connery Cepesda/Caltrans</td>
<td>Appendix A: The bulk of the guidelines provide opportunities for members of the public to provide input and express concerns, but little mention of the level of consideration SANDAG will give to the collected comments - consider elaborating on the &quot;explicit consideration and response&quot; in the principles.</td>
<td>See revised page 1, page 5, item #5, and page 8, items #7, 8, and 9.</td>
<td>Level of Detail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>11/25/2009</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Christina Burke/El Cajon Community Development Corporation</td>
<td>Before receiving feedback, have a preface to the survey, etc. that states what transportation currently exists, so that feedback may come from an educated answer.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
<td>Outreach: Notification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>11/25/2009</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Christina Burke/El Cajon Community Development Corporation</td>
<td>Is it possible to use a system like reverse 911 to let people know there is something important to comment on that affects their region and future (especially for non-internet users).</td>
<td>SANDAG endeavors to use multiple efforts to reach the public such as direct mail, newspaper advertising, outreach to affected communities, and collaborating with local agencies and organizations to promote regional initiatives.</td>
<td>Outreach: Notification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>11/25/2009</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Christina Burke/El Cajon Community Development Corporation</td>
<td>For internet users, I recommend having an E-Alert. This is where one can sign up with San Diego via e-mail to be alerted when something important is going on. The title of the subject line will always say E-Alert: plus a topic to notify San Diegans what is going on without them having to check the SANDAG website consistently. (The El Cajon Police Department uses this to tell people about crime</td>
<td>Comment noted. SANDAG does send e-mail announcements to those who have signed up to receive meeting notices and other information. An enhanced sign-up option to be posted at <a href="http://www.sandag.org/ppp">www.sandag.org/ppp</a> in early 2010.</td>
<td>Outreach: Notification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>11/25/2009</td>
<td>E-mail Christina Burke/El Cajon Community Development Corporation</td>
<td>Be creative in how you gather information: Give a space for people to blog about transportation. People are often more interested in blogging with one another about their opinions than filling out a survey. Visit: elcajonneighbors.org to take a look.</td>
<td>SANDAG will use social media as appropriate. See page 6, item #8.</td>
<td>Level of detail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>11/30/2009</td>
<td>E-mail Nancy Taylor</td>
<td>After reviewing the SANDAG Public Participation Plan online, I must say that as a resident of San Diego I truly appreciate the effort SANDAG makes to apprise community members of issues and future plans involving SANDAG that affect our county. The outreach effort that SANDAG makes has always struck me as far-reaching and comprehensive, and the Public Participation Plan continues that effort. I periodically check the SANDAG Web site to keep current with transportation developments, and so frequently there are opportunities for citizen input and involvement. In the past I served on the Complete Count Committee and have attended public workshops offered by SANDAG. I appreciate these opportunities to get involved with my city and county. Thank you!</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>11/30/2009</td>
<td>E-mail Michael Morris Jr. Transportation Planner, FHWA CA Division</td>
<td>I have reviewed SANDAG’s Public Participation Plan (PPP) and overall it looks and reads well and it appears to meet almost all of the applicable MPO PPP requirements per 23 CFR Section 450.316.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>11/30/2009</td>
<td>E-mail Michael Morris Jr. Transportation Planner, FHWA CA Division</td>
<td>Add additional language to demonstrate explicit consideration and response to public input received during the development of the metropolitan transportation plan and the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).</td>
<td>See revised page 1, page 5, item #5, and page 8, items #7, 8, and 9.</td>
<td>Level of Detail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>11/30/2009</td>
<td>E-mail Michael Morris Jr. Transportation Planner, FHWA CA Division</td>
<td>I may have overlooked it within the document, yet, on Page 7, what does RCP mean?</td>
<td>RCP is now defined on first reference.</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>11/30/2009</td>
<td>E-mail Elyse Lowe, Executive Director, Move San Diego</td>
<td>Our greatest concern is the lack of policies related to transparency of public review process. SANDAG does not make their transportation models - developed with public funds - available to either the public or qualified experts so as to insure either transparency or independent review for accuracy or improvement. Under the Freedom of Information Act, SANDAG uses language described in the exceptions to preclude allowing models to be reviewed by qualifying them as “software.” In the spirit of supporting a well educated public in the participation process, please allow the public to be SANDAG participates in the FHWA Transportation Model Improvement Program <a href="http://tmip.fhwa.dot.gov/resources/dearinghouse/docs/tmip/peer_review/sandag/">http://tmip.fhwa.dot.gov/resources/dearinghouse/docs/tmip/peer_review/sandag/</a>. The SANDAG modeling framework and assumptions were reviewed by FHWA and expert modelers from around the country. The review panel included experts from the University of Texas, Atlanta, Seattle, and Sacramento. Other information on the SANDAG modeling framework is at <a href="http://www.sandag.org/demographics">www.sandag.org/demographics</a> in the 2030</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>Name/Agency</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>11/30/2009</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Elyse Lowe, Executive Director,</td>
<td>CIP Progress Reports. SANDAG will implement a program designed to inform the public of progress, including posting Project-to-date timelines status and budget billings on a quarterly basis.</td>
<td>SANDAG provides quarterly update reports on transportation progress to the SANDAG Board. These reports are distributed as part of the Board Agenda, posted on the SANDAG Web site, summarized in Board Actions, and posted in the Region newsletter. There is a “Transportation Progress Report” page on the SANDAG Web site at <a href="http://www.sandag.org/progress">www.sandag.org/progress</a>. The quarterly reports include information on approved budget, funded budget, cost to complete, schedule, and status for Capital Improvement Program (CIP) projects. Also, the TransNet Dashboard is posted at <a href="http://www.KeepSanDiegoMoving.com">www.KeepSanDiegoMoving.com</a> and provides a database of information on project budget, tracking expenditures against budget schedule, status, and other updates on the TransNet Early Action Program. The TransNet Dashboard is updated monthly. TransNet Dashboard information added to Progress Web page.</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>11/30/2009</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Elyse Lowe, Executive Director,</td>
<td>Lack of Performance Measures in the PPP. Move San Diego found no policy stating how often procedures and strategies would be reviewed nor against what measures. The PPP contains no specific desired outcomes against which the agency can be measured. For instance, there are no goals for what percentage of individuals or groups to get on the record, nor goals for how many comments should be received. There are no goals related to timeliness of the process or projects. Therefore there are currently no measures against which to review the effectiveness of the PPP.</td>
<td>See revised page 1, page 5, item #5, and page 8, items #7, 8, and 9.</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>11/30/2009</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Elyse Lowe, Executive Director,</td>
<td>Improved Website Search Results. While SANDAG provides excellent access to many documents, we find the SANDAG website search engine to be extremely poor. We urge SANDAG to improve the search engine and displayed results on the web site.</td>
<td>SANDAG conducted search engine enhancements and improvements in August 2009. SANDAG will accept additional keywords for inclusion in the search engine program.</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>11/30/2009</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Cary Lowe</td>
<td>My primary recommendation regarding the Public Participation Plan is that greater emphasis should be placed on making informational materials more accessible to the public.</td>
<td>Comment noted. Additionally, Glossary of Terms to be included in final Public Participation Plan.</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>Name/Agency</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>11/30/2009</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Cary Lowe</td>
<td>I also recommend maximizing the extent to which public comments and questions can be submitted on-line. Especially for elderly and disabled people, people who are uncomfortable with preparing formal comments, and people who are simply too busy to attend meetings or even write letters, e-mail communication is an excellent alternative.</td>
<td>SANDAG does intend to maximize opportunities for on-line communications.</td>
<td>Level of Detail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>11/30/2009</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Cary Lowe</td>
<td>Finally, I recommend improving participation opportunities by holding as many informational meetings in diverse community locations.</td>
<td>SANDAG tailors outreach efforts to individual audiences. These efforts include determination of appropriate meeting locations.</td>
<td>Level of Detail</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of Comments from the October 20, 2009, Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group Meeting Agenda Item #6: Draft SANDAG Public Participation Plan (Anne Steinberger)

Anne Steinberger, SANDAG provided an update of the Public Participation Plan, outreach, and the review period for feedback on the plan.

Cary Lowe: I think it’s a nice comprehensive list, but I would like to see more emphasis on the channels where that participation can occur. For most people I think it’s burdensome to come to public meetings for hours, wait through presentations, and then wait to be speaker number 95 out of 270. There should be more emphasis on either mail or other simpler means of providing input. People can always write letters and presumably they will be read, but probably electronic communications is the means that most people would find most convenient, and I’m sure that you will accept that kind of input, but I encourage a section here somewhere that says “we can take input through any of the following channels,” and particularly emphasize those that are simplest for most people to use.

Ken Mitchell: Having conducted a lot of public participation plans for the navy, what does SANDAG consider a good return from the public? When you finish, when do you feel that you did a really job on the input that you got back?

Ms. Steinberger: Unfortunately we haven’t quite touched everyone yet, and so the few thousands that we hear from, for us, is a good number. But we are able to do in the way of expanding our outreach is this is the third stakeholders working group since the year 2000. This is our third time at awarding community-based organizations grants to do the additional outreach. So while some of the general advertising, we could technically say everyone, should have heard about this, we know that’s not possible. I think that since the year 2000, by adding the stakeholders working group, and adding the community-based outreach component, as well as opportunities for people to participate via the web, and communicate with us about how they want to be involved, that we have expanded into the thousands, and we would consider it successful if we got into the ten thousands, but I think we really have expanded our core base, and we’ve also found that our numbers of “awareness of SANDAG” have increased from in the teens to in the 70s and 80s with some of our public participation surveys. So we have various measures that we use and that is why it is important to measure this and report it back to the public, to our board, and the stakeholders so they know the results.

Gary Knight: Not to be so specific, but you’ve mentioned televisions, and I know myself watching the Padres game there’s a way to vote on who’s the best player through the television and there are mediums out there now to expand your reach to the hundreds of thousands. It gives you instantaneous [feedback] and they report, also there’s some electronic signal gets noted and I get little thing in the mail saying would you like to go to Valley View and get your free whatever…not only do you get input but you can write back to presidents and the senate…so you now you can sit through an hour-long presentation and vote on your best aspect of this.
Nico Calavita: How can we create a process so that younger people can participate? What I am really suggesting is that SANDAG could try to have school districts participate in this process. To have means by which some students could learn from it and be leaders.

Dennis Wahl: I’ve also been involved in a lot of public participation and the one thing that I thought...I used to count how many meetings we’d do and how many people we’d talk to...but over time I learned I thought there was more success if we incorporated some of the ideas and concepts in projects. So I’m not sure exactly how you could measure this, but you could write up a section that talked about how you incorporated what you heard because over time I realized you really expand the idea pool...so something like that I think might help measure how effective the outreach program is.

Andrea Skorepa: I think that one of the ways that we can reach you people is if we expand not just to web pages but Facebook and YouTube and all the things that they use... I think it’s important to understand and recognize that to reach different populations you have to be culturally relevant to those populations. We deal with a high percentage of Latinos but they’re very different than the Latinos that you find in Barrio [Logan] and have to be treated in a different way. Maybe if the stakeholders group and public participation providers could share those things that way things that we have found to work with our Mexican-American population in San Ysidro might work up there. We have a very involved community and we would happy to share that with you.

Lois Knowlton (Of Friends of Adult Day Health Care Centers): I’m representing those older than 65 in health care facilities, and very few have cars so most of their transportation is public transit or family members. My experience with this population is there are not very many of them that are using the web and getting information that way. So I think the one-on-one, the group meetings that they’re a part of is more effective. I went to the Mira Mesa Street Fair and there was a display for Direct Access and they have people lined up - ethnic minorities and older people concerned about this and to get participation and interest you almost have to be in those kind of venues to get the word out and have hard copies of things that they’re going to take home to read and publicize meetings for transit for 2050. I think a lot of people are going to say “that doesn’t affect me, I’m not going to be around that long,” but it does affect because those plans are the direction it’s going in...I think we should piggyback on other meetings and get on their agenda and be able to bring in that participation in that way. It may be a typical meeting, but it might be a senior yoga experience and try to get that message out.
November 18, 2009, Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group
Meeting Agenda Item #6: Update and Input on Draft SANDAG Public Participation Plan (PPP) (Anne Steinberger, SANDAG)

The draft SANDAG agency-wide PPP was released on October 9, 2009, for a 45-day public review and comment period. This plan establishes a process for communicating with and obtaining input from the public concerning agency programs, projects, and program funding. Anne Steinberger (SANDAG) provided an update on outreach efforts and solicited additional input from the SWG on the plan.

Ms. Steinberger reminded the SWG that the review period is coming to a close, and to please provide input during this time.

Elyse Lowe (City of San Diego) asked for clarification on the deadline for the public review period. Ms. Steinberger clarified that the deadline is November 30, one week from Monday. Ms. Lowe inquired about the method that SANDAG will use for the part of the PPP that mentions “periodically reviewing the effectiveness of the policies and procedures to ensure an open participation process.” Ms. Steinberger responded that as individual programs are implemented; for example, the Mid-Coast Public Involvement Plan, staff will assess if it is getting the level of input that is desired through the scoping period and environmental review. Ms. Lowe asked for clarification on “getting the input that you want.” Ms. Steinberger replied that, for instance, having a meeting where no one shows up is not getting the desired amount of participation. Staff will review level of input and response rate to that input. Staff has received suggestions to utilize the internet and put more information on the website, especially in terms of making the information accessible. Another work assignment for the SWG is to help with the outreach for the RTP and the SCS, and staff will get input by the SWG on affective outreach measures to reach a broad cross-section of the community and how those measures can be achieved.

Ms. Lowe commented on the desire for Move San Diego to participate in the fullest and utilize its technical capacity, and stated that she would like to have SANDAG’s transportation model available for technical review. All technical information on data and modeling should be available to the public or upon request to ensure a fully transparent process. SANDAG should publish all changes to its model parameters. She noted that she has heard that SANDAG has one of the best models in the state, but she has not seen an independent review to support that statement. Ms. Lowe will also submit this comment in writing. Ms. Lowe then explained that Move San Diego is a non-profit organization that advocates for sustainable transportation and land use.

David Krogh (South County) commended staff for the tremendous outreach that has already been accomplished. He suggested reaching out to members of travel-oriented organizations such as AAA and insurance companies to create a mass information distribution channel with no cost to SANDAG.

Amy Gunderson (Casa Familiar) commented that the community-based outreach model will be successful and that it would be great to have it exist in a continuous manner that does not revolve around one project, and that the members of the SWG (and community-based organizations represented in the SWG) continue to act as a liaison to the community. The community groups know best practices when it comes to interacting with their respective communities. Ms. Gunderson mentioned that Casa Familiar has already begun outreach in the [San Ysidro] community, and that it has been a successful venture to distribute information and to
know their concerns about public transit. It has been an education opportunity to talk about the things that SANDAG is already doing.

Stephen Russell (City of San Diego) (could not understand recording)

Eddie Price (City of San Diego) explained that the value of SANDAG is missing from the community, even when people see the logo. It’s a challenge to create the value along transit corridors and deep urban areas so they become part of the process too. Outreach through media will not be effective until the value has been created. Even if outreach is conducted to different cultures, the message needs to be brought home.

Andrea Skorepa (City of San Diego) suggested Dario San Diego for newspaper advertising as it is available in all markets and more legitimate locations. Ms. Skorepa supported Mr. Price’s sentiments, and added that outreach needs to be done in a way that people can realize the direct benefit of their participation. The information needs to address their concerns in a concrete manner. Ms. Skorepa noted that the PPP as it is looks like every other public participation plan she has seen. Ms. Steinberger agreed with Ms. Skorepa and added that it will be helpful to discuss some of these specifics as they move forward with the RTP. For example, when the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) was first launched in 2004, the advertisements in the paper said “How does our region grow?” It didn’t mention the RCP directly. The SWG will help develop messages that resonate with the public when talking about 2050. Ms. Skorepa commented that jobs need to be mentioned in the sustainable piece – which areas will be producing workers. It needs to be upfront.

Jerome Stocks (Chair) suggested the San Diego Reader. Ms. Steinberger will check to make sure it is on the media list.

Margarette Morgan (North County Inland) inquired about development concerns with the SCS. Chair Stocks said this will be addressed at further discussions.

Mr. Price suggested that communities need to hear more about what transportation already exists in their area and where it goes, in order to address what is needed. It will help with younger people especially to discuss transportation to employment centers and career options. Transportation corridors need to be defined.

Robert Leonard (North County Inland) wanted clarification on the role of the public. If a response is needed, it should be clear as to what is being asked, at a level they can understand.

Elaine Cooluris (Able-Disabled Advocacy) commented that the last SWG that worked on the 2030 RTP and the Smart Growth Concept Map took employment into account, which could be a resource and starting point.

Sandor Shapery (City of San Diego) added that he has been on a number of boards that have set up PPPs by law where the staff has no interest, but that SANDAG has an effective constant feedback system loop which is impressive. The SWG is part of that feedback loop. The feedback adjusts the system which adjusts outreach in this loop. He is satisfied with the outcome of this system.

Grover Diemert (Linda Vista Collaborative) said when he involved with the 2030 RTP he noticed that the immigrant population in Linda Vista, a major user of public transportation, needed to have specifics in order to generate responses. Questions where they can respond “yes, no, or maybe” work best.
From: Post, Howard [mailto:chip.post@sdcdca.org]
Sent: Monday, October 26, 2009 7:46 AM
To: PIO
Subject: Input from the public, offering comments, per sign-on san diego article

I have two suggestions/comments:

1) Please figure out a way to extend bus hours till 2:00 am that run from downtown or any other late-night business districts to residential areas. It is crazy that most busses from downtown stop running around 6:00 in the evening when everyone is just heading out to go drinking and dining. It is no wonder we have such an incredibly high number of drunk driving accidents in our county. If the bus routes can run till 2:00, like they do in all other major cities in the world, we would cut down on the number of DUI’s and save on court and prosecution expenses as well as hospital and insurance expenses and at least a dozen other expenses that impact all of our community. I realize that MTS funds have been cut, so in an ideal world the county should help supplement the cost of extended bus hours. Their savings in other areas should more than make up for the funding MTS would need.

2) It would have been nice if a trolley or coaster line was built up the middle of Hwy 15 into the north suburbs rather than an express lane that is hardly used. Probably too late for this suggestion, and very poor planning by caltrans and whoever else was involved in the whole HOV lanes project. Perhaps this should just be taken as an example and a better suggestion is rather than try to think up solutions ourselves every time and take a chance of them not being the best solution for our dollars we should look at what other cities around the world have done and do some proper analysis. It’s not like we’re inventing the wheel. Every challenge we have has been faced by other cities already and we should be looking at how well it’s worked for them and what their residents think of how those decisions worked or didn’t work rather than trying to reinvent the wheel ourselves. Solutions that work already exist, so there is no excuse for mistakes. I hope this doesn’t sound too critical, but lack of proper analysis is the key problem to almost all project failures.

"Regional planners want input from the public
The San Diego region’s planning agency is seeking the public's input on public input.

The San Diego Association of Governments wants residents to weigh in on a plan the agency is crafting to improve public participation in long-range initiatives.

The plan will guide SANDAG's outreach efforts on transportation, the environment, land use and other plans. Elected officials from across the county oversee the agency's work.

To request a copy of the draft plan or offer comments, send an e-mail to pio@sandag.org or call (619) 699-0640."
From: Theresa [mailto:quiroz@cox.net]
Sent: Monday, October 26, 2009 8:53 AM
To: Steinberger, Anne; PIO
Subject: Comment Draft PPP

Ms. Steinberger,

I am mailing my comments on the draft Public Participation Plan to you as I have attachments to it. However, in order to be sure that my comments are received, I am attaching my comments below as a back-up.

If you do not receive the hard copy of my comments within the week, please let me know so that I can re-send it.

Theresa Quiroz

COPY
Re: Draft Public Participation Plan

Dear Ms. Steinberger,

This is my official comment to the Draft Public Participation Plan.

I will begin by stating that I find most SANDAG staff to be helpful, professional and friendly. I am not discussing here the current attitude of staff in general toward public involvement, just the attitude of the draft plan, the SANDAG policies that seem to lead to that attitude and the chilling effect that has on public participation.

It is my belief that the Draft Plan does not come close to fulfilling the requirements of the federal law which requires this plan to be developed and used by all MPO's (23 CFR Section 450.316). It is also my belief that the Draft Plan does not fulfill the stated goal of ensuring that the public has the opportunity to provide input so that their vision can be reflected in plans and projects.

The first step this plan should take is to set goals and objectives for public involvement. According to the FHWA, "public involvement is more than simply following legislation and regulations". Yet, the goals and objectives set forth in this draft are almost entirely that SANDAG comply with regulations. The opening statement in the staff report is that they are creating this plan because the FHWA requires them to do so by December 31, 2009. The draft and the staff report put forward an attitude of distaste that they have to waste their time on this - but they realize they must follow the law.

As an example, please note that the draft states that it is "a key component of the PPP" to ensure meaningful involvement of the disabled community. Of course it says that, the law requires it. But on review of the guiding principles, there is not a single mention of the disabled community or how efforts can be made to ensure their meaningful involvement. There is nothing to help staff determine the best way to involve this complicated group. How can it be a "key component", if it is ignored? Such actions which pretend to be following the law and then snub the very people they are required to help shows the attitude of distaste for true public involvement.

Then, the draft states that "a significant proponent of SANDAG's mission is a strong commitment to public participation". As I review SANDAG's mission statement, I can find nothing that speaks to a commitment to public participation. It is hard for the
public to accept that SANDAG is really interested in public input when the draft is so misleading, presumably to fulfill some regulation. Perhaps that is the root of the problem with this draft. There is little respect for public involvement; it suggests it is simply a burden staff has placed upon them by law.

An example of this lack of a strong commitment to public input is currently taking place with SANDAG’s RTP 2050 Stakeholder Working Group. The SWG is covered by the Brown Act, as SANDAG is local in nature and the group was formed through the action of the legislative body. The Brown Act states very clearly that a member of the public may not be required to sign in as a condition of attendance. The Bagley Act, which covers meetings of State Commissions, includes that same prohibition but then includes an exception for security measures that require identification in order to gain admittance to a government building. The Brown Act does not have that exception. The SWG meetings are currently being held at Caltrans where a member of the public is required to sign in to gain admittance to the meeting. Requiring people to sign in has a chilling effect on public participation, and these meetings could have been held anywhere. Yet, SANDAG chose to hold them at Caltrans.

Some suggested goals are -

Goal # 1 – Amend the mission statement of SANDAG to reflect its strong commitment to public participation and involvement.

Goal # 2 – To change SANDAG’s position from ‘we are required to take public input’ to ‘we value your input’. This can be done by creating programs within SANDAG to encourage staff to always have a ‘we value your input’ approach. One of the steps created by another agency’s PPP is to have a “Public Participation Desk” at their office where the public can come in at any time to discuss issues that are currently being reviewed.

Goal # 3 – Have a Public Participation Plan that reflects SANDAG’s strong commitment to democracy.

The first requirement of the federal law is that all stakeholders have a reasonable opportunity to participate. A member of the public can only participate if they know an issue is being considered. This draft only provides general guidelines of what can be done to encourage participation. As such, it forces a member of the public to review every board, commission and working group agenda, read every newspaper, every day, look at SANDAG’s website constantly and sign up for every e-mail list SANDAG keeps. Only then can a person know that they will learn of an opportunity to participate in an issue that affects them. That is not reasonable. The guidelines must be fleshed out with explicit strategies that will allow the public to participate.

For example, SANDAG could have a page on their website, a Public Participation Page, similar to that provided by the Brevard MPO (see attached). It would have a translation bar that allows the information to automatically be translated into different languages. It would have a list of issues, plans and projects currently under review. The list would include a description of the issue, who would be affected and how, and who to contact for more information. With that in place, the member of the public will have just one central place to go to know that they will be informed if an issue comes up that could affect them. That gives much of the public a reasonable opportunity to participate.

However, staff will still have to deal with the lack of internet access in our low-income and minority (LIM) communities. This can be helped by creating the explicit strategy that SANDAG will create a Fact Sheet which mirrors to a great extent the
Public Participation web page. The Fact Sheet should be updated each week, and there must be a requirement that it be available at every meeting, every workshop – anywhere that staff go – and that it be included at the bottom of every external e-mail. Then there is a simple, up-to-date, consistent, written document that is always being made available to anyone who cannot get to the web page. In addition, let's remember that the Board is made up of elected officials of the different municipalities. They should also be responsible for ensuring that these Fact Sheets are posted in every municipal building, recreation center, library and so forth.

These first explicit strategies are essential. They make the public aware of what is going on in a very simple, consistent, reliable way. They give the impression that SANDAG is willing to make the effort to get input because they care, not because they are required by law. They are both inexpensive actions and yet have immense potential for encouraging input. And there seem to be no drawbacks.

The federal law also requires that the PPP offer explicit desired outcomes to the process. The draft does not speak to that issue in any substantive way. The award-winning Brevard MPO created a Public Involvement Evaluation Criteria Handbook. Instead of just requiring that information be put out, it sets performance goals.

For example, for their web site, the evaluation criteria is determined to be the number of hits, and the performance goal is a minimum of 90 hits per month with a 5% increase per quarter. (See attached sheet). Without such criteria in place, any ineffective portions of the plan will not be highlighted. This evaluation will allow SANDAG staff to determine whether their efforts have been successful or if they need to make another attempt at encouraging input.

There is so much more specific detail that could – and must – be added to this draft. My comment letter could be fifteen pages long. There is, as I mentioned in my input to the Transportation Committee, a great deal of information on the FHWA website to help MPO's with the creation of their plans. It offers specific techniques that can be used to flesh out the guidelines that have been chosen. And yet none of that has been included in this draft. It should not be left to the public to do the work of staff and write a comprehensive public participation plan.

This draft is very clear in its message – SANDAG has to do this because the law requires it.

My overarching comment on this draft is that it is unacceptable in its current form. It gives the perception that public participation is most strongly discouraged. It should be sent back to staff to begin the process of creating a Public Participation Plan again.

Sincerely,

Theresa Quiroz
Please send the plan to me, or a summary of findings and conclusions.

Please pass on my comments to those in charge:

I've participated for years in many SANDAG projects as well as County and city projects, state and federal projects in our region.

I would say there are two huge disconnects for the public:

1. Public comments on environmental documents, plans or ordinances are rarely addressed in any comprehensive manner.

For example, over many years, over a broad range of projects, it is evident that some environmental documents are prepared with vastly more care than others. Data gathering, analysis and presentation of real-world alternatives are far better in a few documents than in the majority.

2. The public has no idea if there are regional and subregional goals for various aspects of life in our region or whether there are data measurements against these goals, or a processes in place to make adjustments if we are off track.

We seem to grope in the dark, treating each project on a de-novo basis without real reference to the goals imbedded in regional and general plans.

In short, zoning triumphs over general plans and project by project analysis and approval over any kind of comprehensive plan.

By the way, a true comprehensive plan would satisfy both environmentalists and developers.

We would know the rules and have a sense of the shape we wish for things, their cost, their benefits.

3. We are asking biologists, primarily, to evaluate project alternatives in CEQA documents. They are largely untrained to do so, especially in the case of infrastructure (water, flood, fire, transportation, etc.)

We are then handing these documents off to planning and development services officials and staff who may have little or no training in biology or the other sciences needed to evaluate the data and the proposed alternatives, and limited access to qualified experts.

We do not know whether data gathering, conclusions and alternatives are, in fact, reasonable or accurately stated.

This is absurd.
In most cases the process outline for CEQA fulfillment, planning, public evaluation and decision making is very good.

But words alone a successful outcome do not make.

There has to be intellectual firepower and technical know-how behind the documentation and review process.

That is lacking.

So, two problems:

1. Quality of input is low. Response to public comment is barely adequate and certainly does not encourage ongoing participation.

2. Analysis is haphazard and there are inadequate standards against which to measure quality and progress.

Alternatives are not given adequate consideration--especially when the alternatives differ from old-fashioned civil engineering practice.

Thus, we use and pollute too much water, pollute too much air, convert too many acres of open space to development or weeds, spend too much money on steel, concrete and energy-using infrastructure and generally fail to measure baselines, impacts and outcomes.

Peter H. St. Clair
2326 Whitman Street
San Diego CA 92103
619-260-1307 home phone
The public is generally discouraged when they come out against something and SANDAG still votes for it.

Plus you don't have nearly enough meetings in Coastal North County or Oceanside, the largest city is North County.

Good luck on this public outreach-outreach endeavor. I would like an electronic link to the draft plan, please, so that I may comment further.

Nadine L Scott
550 Hoover St.
Oceanside, CA 92054
760-757-6685

Think with Kindness

The test of courage comes when we are in the minority.
The test of tolerance comes when we are in the majority.

Ralph W. Sockman
From: Brian Gregory [mailto:bgregory@ucsd.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, November 17, 2009 3:42 PM
To: Steinberger, Anne
Cc: bwerdick@ucsd.edu; mphegley@ucsd.edu
Subject: RE: SANDAG invites public review of draft Public Participation Plan

Anne,

Thank you for the opportunity to review and provide comment on SANDAG’s Draft Public Participation Plan (PPP). Overall, it is a comprehensive document that provides a good framework to engage the public in SANDAG’s planning and capital improvement processes. As you know, one of the most important aspects of a successful public participation plan is to engage the public early in the process, where comments can be received and appropriately addressed. On occasions when the public is solicited for input, it is too late in the process to affect change. In the PPP there is a reference to “key milestones” or “key stages of project development and implementation” and while we recognize the challenge in finding language that fits every project, perhaps it could be clearly noted that the public outreach effort will commence early in the process.

Another comment is in regards to representatives on working groups or advisory committees. The selection of those participants is a critical part of public participation and it is important to select members that are able and willing to share information with their constituency. The representatives should engage their community/institution/organization in a dialogue and communicate these perspectives with SANDAG staff.

Lastly, the description of public outreach for Project Development and Program Planning (pages 12–14) seems to be broader and more inclusive than what is listed for Capital Project Design and Construction (pages 14-15). Is that the intent? Is it assumed that the public was already engaged during the planning process? Perhaps that could be clarified.

Thank you again for the opportunity to review the document and we look forward to working closely with SANDAG on the preparation of future plans and projects. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,
Brian

Brian D. Gregory
Assistant Vice Chancellor - Strategic Campus Resource Initiatives
University of California, San Diego
bgregory@ucsd.edu; 858.336.3623
From: d-mcginty [d-mcginty@cox.net]
Sent: Thursday, November 19, 2009 7:36 AM
To: PIO
Subject: Public Comment Opportunity

Enough silly decisions are made in Oceanside to make me realize you will be doing the Public and injustice by limiting their opportunity to speak on anything. YOU represent the Public and we certainly have the Democratic right to protect our rights to participate in person, by letter by email or by phone.
Oceanside City Council majority would take our rights to speak or participate in discussion and decision making if they could. It would expedite their time at the Council Meetings. They were elected or appointed TO LISTEN TO OUR VIEWS.
Please enter my comments in the public Sandag record on this issue.
Thank you, Donna McGinty
2405 Mesa Drive, Oceanside, CA 92054
I believe that the public interest is best served when and if The Public Participation Plan should include input on transportation policy, priorities, and project selection. Coordinated signal lights in cities, more freeway lanes, more selective use of small Visa busses, construction before the need has been determined by supposed authorities (wider bridges, over and underpasses, fewer promises and more action and more public input at least annually, names of those who are responsible for expenditure of all public funds to detailed small projects as well as major projects. It is time for Sandag to be more accountable to all involved parties.
From: Jeanne Sisson [meanmj@cox.net]
Sent: Thursday, November 19, 2009 3:53 PM
To: PIO
Cc: psisson@nctimes.com; editor@nctimes.com; editor@sduiontrib.com
Subject: SANDAG's Public Participation Plan

SANDAG has sand-bagged taxpayers of San Diego County into voting billions for transportation upgrades with the understanding most of the funds would go to highway, road and street improvements. SANDAG seems to have little intention of honoring these promises (OK, if they weren't 'promises', it was 'understood' the public wanted surface roads given priority and most of the funds).

Now comes a 'Public Participation Plan' that limits discussion on any SANDAG programs other than the few SANDAG chooses for public comment. BULL FEATHERS! True Public Participation includes the public be involved in every aspect of transportation policy, project selection and project priorities. The San Diego Association of Governments has been run like a private fiefdom long enough. Give us complete, unrestricted Public Participation now.

Thank you,

Jeanne Sisson
5151 Wisteria Drive
Oceanside CA 92056
760.414.9040
From: Mike Preston [prest@cox.net]
Sent: Friday, November 20, 2009 8:55 AM
To: PIO
Cc: jdesmo@sbcglobal.net
Subject: Public Participation Plan

SANDAG;
I believe it would be a mistake and un-American to limit public participation and discussion to only targeted plans and projects and not allow public testimony on how and what projects are selected. I don't think SANDAG should fear an open and frank discussion of the entire traffic congestion relief plan. I thought that an important part of the 2004 bond was periodic public input and adjustments based on that input. Please reconsider this ill-advised limit on public comment.

Thank you,

Mike Preston

San Marcos City Councilman
Hello, SANDAG Public Information Office!

SANDAG is currently accepting public comment on the draft Public Participation Plan until November 30th, as stated on your website http://www.sandag.org/PPP.

These remarks are submitted in compliance with that effort. Please ensure they receive the proper attention and consideration.

Thank you.

George Crissman
strads@cox.net

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Public Participation Plan Comments

1. The proposed Public Participation Plan says: "The PPP responds to requirements set forth in guidelines established by FHWA for metropolitan transportation planning (23 CFR 450.316)...".


2. The guidelines in 23 CFR 450.316 (a)(1)(i) require "Providing adequate public notice of public participation activities and time for public review and comment at key decision points...".


3. The Public Participation Plan does not state or contemplate public participation in the project selection process or the setting of transportation priorities. The processes of project selection and prioritizing represent "key decision points" and must be open to public comment to satisfy 23 CFR 450.316.

4. Please amend the Public Participation Plan to specifically include full public access to and participation in the project selection and prioritizing process. Full public access to the decision process must include the requirement of active and diligent efforts on the part of SANDAG and partners to fully inform the public of all available transportation modes and methods.

5. The Plan should provide for a variety of techniques for the public to submit commentary (phone, facsimile, Internet email, unbiased professional surveys, etc.) to assist with the selection process.

6. The plan should require SANDAG and partners must make an active and diligent effort to obtain the greatest amount of public comment on the planning and prioritization process.

7. The expressed desires of the public at large must be given preferential consideration in the decision-making process.

George Crissman
strads@cox.net

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------

11/20/2009
From: Phstc@aol.com
Sent: Friday, November 20, 2009 1:33 PM
To: PIO
Subject: Comments on Public Participation Plan

The plan is long winded. Repetitive. That is not good.

It does call for periodic Board review of its efficacy. That is good.

How are you going to measure that? I found nothing that discusses goals, measurement, evaluation and feedback. Some numbers might be nice. How many of this? What percentage of that?

I wrote earlier. There are still two components of public input that I think need attention:

1. Quality of CEQA/NEPA reports. It is one thing to get them. It is another to insure the quality of data collection and analysis. I do not see anything in the plan that attempts to capture public comment on study inadequacies and determine whether some form of Quality Assurance program is needed.

A QA program would use statistical tools to attempt to increase report quality.

Simple evidence of quality: decline in the number of report iterations before certification—assuming, of course, agencies just don’t abrogate their responsibility to read critically.

Further evidence: reports are received and read by qualified people. In many cases we have biologists writing about project/construction alternatives and the reports are read by planners. Nobody in the loop has any real training or experience!

Reports frequently fail to consider alternatives, such as the use of passive, natural systems to obtain higher levels of flood control or water quality vs. engineered solutions relying on steel, concrete and energy; or the affect of conservation on demand, and therefore, the need for capital intensive projects.

It seems that many projects are driven by funding sources. The Feds or the State appropriates $ for steel/concrete/energy intensive projects but nothing for conservation efforts. So, your projects all look the same—just as they have since the 1950’s.

2. Feedback level 1. While public comments are often published, it is frequently very difficult to determine whether anything in a final report or approval has changed as a result. Draft documents are often revised and released with no strike out/replacement annotation.

3. Feedback level 2. It would be beneficial to aggregate public comment. Into what categories or specific concerns do they fall, if any? What is done to address repetitive (but not redundant) criticism?

Peter H. St. Clair
2326 Whitman Street
San Diego CA 92103
619-260-1307 home phone

11/20/2009
From: Jim Johnson [james.l.johnson@cox.net]
Sent: Saturday, November 21, 2009 6:14 PM
To: PIO
Cc: Marina
Subject: Public Participation Plan

As a property owner and tax payer in San Diego County, I wish to express my desires regarding the Public Participation Plan. The Public Participation Plan should include input on transportation policy, priorities and project selection processes. At no phase should Public Participation be excluded or limited from any of your processes or proceeding whenever they involve the use of Tax Payer Monies be they in the form of bonds, federal, state, or local grants. Federal Law requires public participation and I personally will support any legal actions if my ability to present input is restricted in any form.

Sincerely,

James L. Johnson
276 N. El Camino Real Spc 62
Oceanside, CA 92058

4438 San Joaquin Street
Oceanside, CA 92057

11/23/2009
Anne,

I've attached the Draft PPP with my initial comments directly on the pdf, to view the comments list in Adobe Reader/Acrobat, go to View, then Show Comments List. Please let me know if you have any questions or thoughts.

A comment on pg. 10 refers to the IAP2 (International Association for Public Participation) Public Participation Spectrum, which I've pasted below.

---

IAP2 has developed a Public Participation Spectrum to demonstrate the possible types of engagement with stakeholders and communities. The spectrum also shows the increasing level of public impact as you progress from "Inform" through to "Empower".
### INCREASING LEVEL OF PUBLIC IMPACT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INFORM</th>
<th>CONSULT</th>
<th>INVOLVE</th>
<th>COLLABORATE</th>
<th>EMPOWER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Participation Goal:</strong> To provide the public with balanced and objective information to assist them in understanding the problems, alternatives and/or solutions.</td>
<td><strong>Public Participation Goal:</strong> To obtain public feedback on analysis, alternatives and/or decisions.</td>
<td><strong>Public Participation Goal:</strong> To work directly with the public throughout the process to ensure that public concerns and aspirations are consistently understood and considered.</td>
<td><strong>Public Participation Goal:</strong> To partner with the public in each aspect of the decision, including the development of alternatives and the identification of the preferred solution.</td>
<td><strong>Public Participation Goal:</strong> To place final decision-making in the hands of the public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Promise to the Public:</strong> We will keep you informed.</td>
<td><strong>Promise to the Public:</strong> We will keep you informed, listen to and acknowledge concerns and provide feedback on how public input influenced the decision.</td>
<td><strong>Promise to the Public:</strong> We will work with you to ensure that your concerns and aspirations are directly reflected in the alternatives developed and provide feedback on how public input influenced the decision.</td>
<td><strong>Promise to the Public:</strong> We will look to you for direct advice and innovation in formulating solutions and incorporate your advice and recommendations into the decisions to the maximum extent possible.</td>
<td><strong>Promise to the Public:</strong> We will implement what you decide.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Example Tools:**
- fact sheets
- web sites
- open houses
- public comment
- focus groups
- surveys
- workshops
- public meetings
- deliberate polling
- citizen advisory committees
- consensus-building
- participatory decision-making
- citizen juries
- ballots
- delegated decision-making

© Copyright IAP2. All rights reserved.

For more information regarding the IAP2 Public Participation Spectrum, refer to [www.iap2.org](http://www.iap2.org).

---

Very sincerely,

Connery Cepeda

*Associate Transportation Planner*

California Department of Transportation – Caltrans

District 11, Planning Division

4050 Taylor Street, MS-240

San Diego, CA 92110-2737

Ph: 619-688-6968 Fx: 619-688-4299

connery.cepeda@dot.ca.gov
SANDAG MANDATES AND DESIGNATIONS

The Board of Directors carries out a variety of responsibilities which are either mandated by federal or state law or regulation or delegated to SANDAG through local agreement.

Overall Authority

- San Diego Regional Consolidated Agency
  
  With Senate Bill 58 (SB) 1783 (Chapter 742, Statutes of 2002), SANDAG was designated as the San Diego Regional Consolidated Agency. SB 1783 went into effect on January 1, 2003, and is meant to strengthen how regional public policy decisions are made. The law mandates membership in the consolidated agency from the area's 18 cities and county government. It consolidated transit planning, programming, project development, and construction into SANDAG, leasing responsibilities for day-to-day operations with the existing transit operators. Assembly Bill 381 (Chapter 508, Statutes of 2003) added to SANDAG responsibilities by mandating preparation of a RCF.

- Regional Transportation Planning and Fund Allocation Agency
  
  (State)
  Adopt RTP (long-range plan) and RTIP (five-year programming of state and federal transportation funds). Allocate Transportation Development Act (TDA) funds (½ cent sales tax for transit support).

- Metropolitan Planning Organization
  
  (Federal)
  Allocate federal transportation revenues and meet comprehensive planning requirements of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) in order to be eligible for funds.

- San Diego County Regional Transportation Commission
  
  (State and Voter Approval)
  Administer ¾ cent sales tax, TransNet, with revenues to be used for transportation purposes.

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

The SANDAG PPP establishes a process for obtaining input from and providing information to the public concerning agency programs, projects, and program funding in order to ensure the public is informed and has the opportunity to provide input to plans that can reflect the public's vision. SANDAG will review and update this plan as needed. Various federal and state laws and regulations require that an agency, such as SANDAG, conduct public participation programs to ensure that the public is involved and that community concerns are addressed. For example, planning of public transit capital projects, development of short-range transit service policies and plans, and fare policy and structure changes to public transportation require public participation. The CEQA and the NEPA also have public information components that require an agency such as SANDAG to conduct public participation programs to ensure that the public is involved and that community concerns are addressed. A significant component of the SANDAG mission is a strong commitment to public participation and involvement to include all residents and stakeholders in the regional planning process.

The PPP responds to requirements set forth in guidelines established by FHWA for metropolitan transportation planning (23 CFR 450.318), which follows:

The Metropolitan Planning Organization shall develop and use a documented participation plan that defines a process for providing citizens, affected agencies, representatives of public transportation employees, freight shippers, providers of freight transportation services, private providers of transportation, representatives of users of public transportation, representatives of users of pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities, representatives of the disabled, and other interested parties with reasonable opportunities to be involved in the metropolitan transportation planning process. (See Appendix A)

The PPP also is consistent with the requirements of Public Utilities Code Section 152360.1 established with the passage of Assembly Bill 351, which reads as follows:

The agency shall engage in a public collaborative planning process; recommendations from that process shall be made available and considered for incorporation into the plan. A procedure to carry out this process including a method of addressing and responding to recommendations from the public shall be adopted.

Ensuring the meaningful involvement of low-income, minority, disabled, senior, and other traditionally underrepresented communities is a key component of the PPP. Activities covered in the PPP are consistent with federal and state environmental justice laws, regulations, and requirements, Title VI of the Civil Rights Act and related nondiscrimination requirements, and they reflect the principles of social equity and environmental justice. Social equity means ensuring that all people are treated fairly and are given equal opportunity to participate in the planning and decision-making process, with an emphasis on ensuring that traditionally disadvantaged groups are not left behind. Environmental justice means ensuring that plans, policies, and actions do not disproportionately affect low-income and minority communities.
The overall public participation process follows these guidelines and principles:

1. The PPP is designed to inform and involve the region’s residents in the decision-making process on issues such as growth, transportation, environmental management, housing, open space, air quality, energy, San Onofre, economic development, and public safety.

2. The PPP seeks to involve all citizens, including, but not limited to, low-income households, Hispánic, African American, Asian, Native American, senior, and other communities; persons with disabilities; as well as community and civic organizations, public agencies, business groups and associations, environmental organizations, and other stakeholders.

3. SANDAG Board of Directors meetings provide the public forum and decision point for significant regional issues. SANDAG Directors typically hold one or two board meetings each month: a Board Policy meeting the second Friday of each month and a Board Business meeting the fourth Friday of each month. Meetings held at SANDAG offices are accessible by public transit. During these meetings, Directors adopt plans, allocate transportation funds, approve transit construction plans, approve transit fare and regional transit service changes, and establish policies and develop programs that are used by local governments, as well as other public and private organizations.

4. SANDAG proactively seeks and promotes public participation in SANDAG public workshops, meetings, and hearings, as well as participation and attendance at committees, working groups, and task forces. SANDAG follows local, state, and federal guidelines for posting public meetings and hearing notices. Depending upon the specific project, SANDAG endeavors to hold meetings at times that can attract as many participants as possible and at locations in communities throughout the region. SANDAG endeavors to hold these meetings in locations that are accessible by public transit. These meetings are held in buildings, rooms, or locations that are accessible to persons with disabilities.

5. SANDAG uses its Web site to provide the public with useful and timely information, including: meeting schedules and agendas; plans and environmental documents; reports and other publications; demographic profiles and data downloads; and interactive database and mapping applications.

6. SANDAG seeks to provide information in a variety of media, including social media, video simulations of projects. Web-based videos or photo display, interactive displays at kiosks in targeted public locations, and other visualization techniques to secure feedback on transportation plans and projects.

7. SANDAG informs the public in a timely manner about regional issues, actions, and pending decisions through a number of efforts. As needed or required, SANDAG provides adequate notice and publishes in newspapers of general circulation, for publication of legal notices. Other publication and distribution efforts to residents, agencies, and city/town governments may include e-mail notification, notices on the SANDAG Web site, publication in a Region (a SANDAG monthly electronic newsletter), and select distribution via mail.

8. SANDAG regularly informs local print and broadcast media about SANDAG decisions, events, research, and other issues. SANDAG regularly distributes press releases to community, minority, local and regional print, as well as Web-based publications. SANDAG also distributes information to local and Spanish radio and television stations.
9. As appropriate and depending on the specific project, SANDAG translates into Spanish and other languages, publications, announcements, and Web content. In addition, numerous staff members are bilingual Spanish-English speakers and participate in public outreach and conduct presentations in Spanish. Translators are hired as needed to provide services in Spanish and other languages as appropriate. SANDAG conducts periodic public opinion surveys as part of the outreach and citizen participation component of the SANDAG OWP. These surveys are designed to include the San Diego region's residents in the regional planning process and to keep SANDAG officials aware of issues that are of concern to the people who live here.

10. SANDAG periodically reviews the effectiveness of the procedures and strategies contained in the agencywide OWP for any other planning, program, or project-specific public participation plan to ensure the goals of the outreach and involvement are met. SANDAG will revise the outreach process as needed based on this review.

11. SANDAG coordinates and consults with other federal, state, local, and nonprofit agencies in developing regional transportation plans and transportation improvement programs, including ensuring coordination of metropolitan planning activities with planning for nonemergency transportation services and social service transportation.

SANDAG Board Policy No. 025, which is SANDAG's Public Participation Policy, is included as Exhibit D to this PPP. The guidelines and principles in this PPP are intended to be consistent with the mandates in Board Policy No. 025. In the event of a conflict between the language in this PPP and Board Policy No. 025, the requirements in Board Policy No. 025 shall supersede the provisions in this PPP.

PROJECT DEVELOPMENT AND PROGRAM PLANNING

SANDAG will follow these guidelines when conducting public outreach and involvement for planning, environmental, and preliminary engineering activities.

Current SANDAG planning projects underway that are incorporated under this PPP are outlined below. If needed, individual public participation programs with specified strategies and activities to secure public input and involvement will be developed and included in the final plan or report.

- 2050 RTP
- RTP
- Sustainable Communities Strategy
- Public Transit and Social Services Transportation Plan (Coordinated Plan) for San Diego County
- RCP update
- Mid-Coast Corridor Transit project
- South Bay Bus Rapid Transit project
- SuperLoop Transit project
- TransNet Early Action Program Implementation
- OWP
- Other studies, projects, and initiatives (i.e., corridor studies, grant-funded programs)
4. A record of public input received at public hearings, meetings, workshops, or open houses will be provided to the Transportation Committee or Board of Directors at the time of the first reading when amendments are proposed to the Regional Comprehensive Fare Ordinance for the purpose of adjusting fare prices.

5. Take One, Rider Alerts, or other public notices in both English and Spanish will be posted on all public transit vehicles within the affected area and will include a description of the proposed change, the date, time, intent and location of the public hearing, and the deadline for written, email, and phone comments from the public. The notices will be posted to the SANDAG and transit agency websites.

6. Public notices of public hearings will be provided prior to the public hearing meeting date in newspapers of general circulation in the affected area(s), including appropriate minority and community publications. This notice also will be posted to the SANDAG website.

7. Additional public outreach will be performed through media publica, Web postings, and e-mail newsletters.

NATIVE AMERICAN CONSULTATION

Through the SANDAG Border Committee, the Interagency Technical Working Group on Tribal Transportation Issues (Working Group), the Southern California Tribal Chairmen's Association, Reservation Transportation Authority, and other intertribal associations, SANDAG will conduct public participation and involvement activities to coordinate transportation and land use planning with tribal nations in San Diego County.

1. SANDAG will engage in "consultation" with tribal governments prior to making decisions, taking actions, or implementing programs that may impact their communities.

2. SANDAG will coordinate with the Working Group. The Working Group serves as a forum for regional tribal governments to discuss and coordinate transportation issues of mutual concern with various public planning agencies in the region, including SANDAG, Caltrans, the County of San Diego, and the transit operators.

3. The Working Group will monitor and provide input on the implementation of the strategies and planning activities. This includes providing input on FFPs.

4. The Working Group consists of representatives from each of the federally recognized tribal governments and California tribes in the San Diego region, as well as advisory members from the staff of SANDAG, Caltrans, the County of San Diego, Reservation Transportation Authority, Bureau of Indian Affairs, and the transit agencies.
Appendix A

Excerpt from Federal Register/Vol. 72 No. 30

Title 23: Highways; Part 450—Planning Assistance and Standards
450.316 Interested parties, participation, and consultation

(a) The Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) shall develop and use a documented participation plan that defines a process for providing citizens, affected public agencies, representatives of public transportation employees, freight shippers, providers of freight transportation services, private providers of transportation, representatives of users of public transportation, representatives of users of pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities, representatives of the disabled, and other interested parties with reasonable opportunity to be involved in the metropolitan transportation planning process.

(1) The participation plan shall be developed by the MPO in consultation with all interested parties and shall, at a minimum, describe explicit procedures, strategies, and desired outcomes for:

(i) Providing adequate public notice of public participation activities and time for public review and comment on key decision points, including but not limited to a reasonable opportunity to comment on the proposed metropolitan transportation plan and the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP);

(ii) Providing timely notice and reasonable access to information about transportation issues and processes;

(iii) Employing visualization techniques to describe metropolitan transportation plans and TIPs;

(iv) Making public information (technical information and meeting notices) available in electronically accessible formats and means, such as the World Wide Web;

(v) Holding any public meetings at convenient and accessible locations and times;

(vi) Demonstrating explicit consideration and response to public input received during the development of the metropolitan transportation plan and the TIP;

(vii) Seeking out and considering the needs of those traditionally underserved by existing transportation systems, such as low-income and minority households, who may face challenges accessing employment and other services;

(viii) Providing an additional opportunity for public comment, if the final metropolitan transportation plan or TIP differs significantly from the version that was made available for public comment by the MPO and raises new material issues which interested parties could not reasonably have foreseen from the public involvement efforts.
I recommend the following:

1) Before receiving feedback, have a preface to the survey, etc that states what transportation currently exists, so that feedback may come from an educated answer.

2) Is it possible to use a system like reverse 911 to let people know there is something important to comment on that affects their region and future. (especially for non-internet users.

3) For internet users, I recommend having an E-Alert. This is where one can sign up with San Diego via email to be alerted when something important is going on. The title of the subject line will always say E-Alert: plus a topic to notify San Diegans what is going on without them having to check the SANDAG website consistently. (The El Cajon Police Department uses this to tell people about crime trends in their area. Visit: elcajonneighbors.org to take a look)

4) Be creative in how you gather information: Give a space for people to blog about transportation. People are often more interested in blogging with one another about their opinions than filling out a survey.

Thank you and have a happy holiday,

Christina

Christina Burke
Community Development Coordinator

El Cajon Community Development Corporation
A non-profit 501(c)(3) community based organization

131 East Main Street, Suite 201
El Cajon, CA 92020
Tel: (619) 401-9858
Fax: (619) 401-8870
www.downtownelcajon.com

IMPORTANT: The information contained in this email and/or its attachments is confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately by reply and immediately delete this message and all its attachments. Any review, use, reproduction, disclosure or dissemination of this message or any attachment by an unintended recipient is strictly prohibited.
From: Nancy Taylor [nct92037@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, November 30, 2009 11:13 AM
To: PIO
Subject: Public Participation Plan

After reviewing the SANDAG Public Participation Plan online, I must say that as a resident of San Diego I truly appreciate the effort SANDAG makes to apprise community members of issues and future plans involving SANDAG that affect our county. The outreach effort that SANDAG makes has always struck me as far-reaching and comprehensive, and the Public Participation Plan continues that effort. I periodically check the SANDAG Web site to keep current with transportation developments, and so frequently there are opportunities for citizen input and involvement. In the past I served on the Complete Count Committee and have attended public workshops offered by SANDAG. I appreciate these opportunities to get involved with my city and county. Thank you!

Nancy Taylor
8636-B Via Mallorca
La Jolla, CA 92037
858-922-1399
From: Michael.Morris@dot.gov [mailto:Michael.Morris@dot.gov]
Sent: Monday, November 30, 2009 12:26 PM
To: Steinberger, Anne
Cc: Wade.Hobbs@dot.gov
Subject: RE: Follow up re: Draft SANDAG PPP

Hi Anne,

I have reviewed SANDAG’s Public Participation Plan (PPP) and overall it looks and reads well and it appears to meet almost all of the applicable MPO PPP requirements per 23 CFR § 450.316. Comments I have, following my review of the document, are as follows:

1. Add additional language to demonstrate explicit consideration and response to public input received during the development of the metropolitan transportation plan and the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

As mentioned, it appears SANDAG’s draft PPP meets almost all of the applicable MPO PPP requirements per 23 CFR § 450.316. I am not exactly satisfied that the regulation requirement (23 CFR 450.316 (1) (vi)) – to demonstrate explicit consideration and response to public input received during the development of the metropolitan transportation plan and the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) – is addressed. I believe item No. 7 on p. 13, “SANDAG will ensure that opportunities for public participation and comment are provided at key milestones (e.g., release of draft RTP, RTIP, planning studies, etc.) so that public comment and responses are provided prior to any final SANDAG action or approval”, essentially tends to this requirement without stating how SANDAG will consider and respond to such public input. The process of allowing for public comments is outlined without a description of SANDAG’s action as a result of any public contributions.

2. I may have overlooked it within the document, yet, on p. 7, what does RCP mean?

If you would have questions or need further clarification per my comments, please feel free to contact me. Thanks.

Regards,

Michael Morris Jr.

Michael Morris Jr.
Transportation Planner
FHWA CA Division
650 Capitol Mall, Suite 4-100
Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 498-5887
November 30, 2009

SANDAG
Public Information Office
401 B St. Ste. 800
San Diego, CA 92101

Dear SANDAG:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed Public Participation Plan.

Move San Diego’s mission is to organize and serve a broad collaboration of people and organizations to prioritize, fund, and implement sustainable, healthy, convenient transportation and related land use solutions that get people and goods wherever they are going, on time, throughout the San Diego region.

First and foremost, we appreciate the excellent and timely access to public documents from the SANDAG staff. However, we have a few questions and concerns outlined here about the PPP. They include:

1. Transparency of detailed technical information
2. CIP progress reports
3. Lack of performance measures in the PPP
4. Improved website search results

1. Transparency of detailed technical information

Our greatest concern is the lack of policies related to transparency of public review process. SANDAG does not make their transportation models - developed with public funds - available to either the public or qualified experts so as to insure either transparency or independent review for accuracy or improvement. Under the Freedom of Information Act, SANDAG uses language described in the exceptions to preclude allowing models to be reviewed by qualifying them as “software.”

In the spirit of supporting a well educated public in the participation process, please allow the public to be as technically informed as possible when discussing billions of dollars of regional transportation investments. To do so, Move San Diego suggests the addition of the following new policy:

SANDAG is committed to running a transparent public process. To that end, all requests for meeting notes, technical information, data,
modeling and the models themselves and the parameters being used and how they are changed over time, shall be made available to the public upon request, for a reasonable fee. SANDAG will publish all changes to model parameters within 30 days of the changes being made.

Without access to the models and information about when and how parameters are being added or changed, there can be no reasonable independent review of whether or not the models conform to reality, or traffic forecasts as well as other issues being modeled regionally on all major public and private projects. The basis of all scientific modeling is allowing for other experts to review their modeling assumptions on a regular basis. Move San Diego would appreciate being granted the ability to participate in the process at the technical level that we desire, and feels we are not able to do so without access to the SANDAG developed Regional Travel Model.

2. CIP Progress Reports
On Page 9, it states: "For all capital improvement projects with significant community impacts, SANDAG will provide opportunities for members of the public to provide input and express concerns. SANDAG also will implement a program designed to inform the public of progress,"

Move San Diego suggests the addition of the following specific information:

SANDAG will implement a program designed to inform the public of progress, including posting Project-to-date timelines status and budget billings on a quarterly basis.

3. Lack of Performance Measures in the PPP

We call your attention to:
"Appendix A, Excerpt from Federal Register/Vol. 72 No. 30
Title 23: Highways; Part 450-Planning Assistance And Standards
450.316 interested parties, participation, and consultation
(1) The participation plan shall be developed by the MPO in consultation with all interested parties and shall, at a minimum, describe explicit procedures, strategies, and desired outcomes for: (items i through x) including:....
Page 17
Demonstrating explicit consideration and response to public input received during the development of the metropolitan transportation plan and the TIP; and Periodically reviewing the effectiveness of the procedures and strategies contained in the participation plan to ensure a full and open participation process."

Move San Diego found no policy stating how often procedures and strategies would be reviewed nor against what measures. The PPP contains no specific desired outcomes against which the agency can be measured.

For instance, there are no goals for what percentage of individuals or groups to get on the record, nor goals for how many comments should be received. There are no goals
related to timeliness of the process or projects. Therefore there are currently no measures against which to review the effectiveness of the PPP.

4. Improved Website Search Results
While SANDAG provides excellent access to many documents, we find the SANDAG website search engine to be extremely poor. We urge SANDAG to improve the search engine and displayed results on the website. We repeatedly have experienced it to not return correct results even for specific searches for the names of documents known to be online. The titles of the results are difficult to scroll through as not enough information is displayed, thus requiring us to open each one to determine its contents. It’s very time consuming and could be improved.

Again, thanks for the opportunity to comment. We believe the difficult work SANDAG does to engage the public is very important and would like to support you in your effort to outreach to the region’s residents about transportation, land use planning, climate and other related quality of life issues that our agendas align on.

If you have any questions, please don’t hesitate to contact me at elowe@movesandiego.org or (619) 702-4266.

Sincerely,

ELYSE W. LOWE

Elyse Lowe
Executive Director
From: CARY LOWE [mailto:CARYLOWE@COX.NET]
Sent: Monday, November 30, 2009 6:22 PM
To: PIO
Subject: Public Participation Plan

My primary recommendation regarding the Public Participation Plan is that greater emphasis should be placed on making informational materials more "friendly" and accessible to the general public. This means describing programs and policies in plain language, and avoiding "plannerese" or professional jargon. Most of the public, including people interested enough to follow SANDAG issues, are not trained in urban planning and related areas. If the goal is to maximize their ability to give meaningful input, it is necessary that they have meaningful information in a form that can be plainly understood.

I also recommend maximizing the extent to which public comments and questions can be submitted on-line. Especially for elderly and disabled people, people who are uncomfortable with preparing formal comments, and people who are simply too busy to attend meetings or even write letters, e-mail communication is an excellent alternative.

Finally, I recommend improving participation opportunities by holding as many informational meetings in diverse community locations.

Cary D. Lowe, Ph.D., AICP
Attorney at Law
3517 Garrison Street
San Diego, CA 92106
Tel: (619) 255-3078
Fax: (619) 501-4194
E-mail: carylowe@cox.net

CARY D. LOWE E-MAIL NOTICE -- This transmission may be: (1) subject to the attorney-client privilege, (2) an attorney work product, or (3) strictly confidential. If you are not the intended recipient of this message, you may not disclose, print, copy or disseminate this information. If you have received this in error, please notify the sender and delete the message.
Appendix D

SANDAG Public Participation Policy No. 025

The policy is posted at: http://www.sandag.org/organization/about/pubs/policy_025.pdf. You also can request a copy by calling (619) 699-1950 or e-mailing pio@sandag.org.
Appendix E
Glossary of Terms, Abbreviations, and Acronyms

Transportation, like many other fields, has numerous uses of “jargon.” These language short-cuts ease communication among professionals in the field, but can be confusing to everyone else. Here is an abridged list of commonly used transportation terms, abbreviations, and acronyms:

**ADA**
Americans with Disabilities Act:
Federal civil rights legislation for disabled persons that was passed in 1990; requires public transportation systems to be more fully accessible, including the provision of paratransit service.

**APCD**
Air Pollution Control District:
The APCD is a government agency that regulates sources of air pollution within San Diego County. The County Board of Supervisors sits as the Air Pollution Control Board. The mission of the APCD is to protect the public from the harmful effects of air pollution, achieve and maintain air quality standards, foster community involvement, and develop and implement cost-effective programs meeting state and federal mandates, considering environmental and economic impacts.

**Caltrans**
California Department of Transportation:
The state agency responsible for the design, construction, operation, and maintenance of the state highway system. The State system includes interstate freeways and state highways. Caltrans and SANDAG cooperate in highway planning and in preparing the funding priorities of the state highway system. Final funding priorities for the region are adopted by SANDAG in the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP). Caltrans is administered through 12 geographic districts. For Southern California, District 11 (D11) administers San Diego and Imperial Counties, D7 administers Los Angeles County, D8 administers Riverside County, and D12 administers Orange County.

**CARB**
California Air Resources Board:
The state agency responsible for adopting state air quality standards, establishing emission standards for new cars sold in the state, and overseeing activities of regional and local air pollution control agencies.

**CEQA**
California Environmental Quality Act.
COG............................ Council of Governments:
A voluntary organization of local governments that strives for comprehensive, regional planning. SANDAG is the COG in the San Diego region.

DOT............................ Department of Transportation:
At the federal level, the cabinet agency, headed by the Secretary of Transportation, that is responsible for highways, transit, aviation, and ports. The DOT includes Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Federal Transit Administration (FTA), Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), and others. The state DOT is Caltrans.

EAP............................. Early Action Program:
A subset of TransNet projects which the SANDAG Board has selected to begin work on before 2008 by accessing future dollars now.

EIR............................. Environmental Impact Report:
A detailed statement prepared under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) describing and analyzing the significant environmental effects of a project and discussing ways to mitigate or avoid the effects. The term EIR may mean either a draft or a final EIR depending on the context.

EMP............................. Environmental Mitigation Program:
Provides funding for the mitigation of local and regional transportation projects and additional funding for activities that help implement the region’s habitat preservation plans.

Environmental Justice ................ The fair treatment of people of all races, cultures, and incomes with respect to the development, adoption, implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws and policies.

EPA............................. See U.S. EPA.

FHWA.......................... Federal Highway Administration:
Federal agency responsible for the administration of federal highway funds and issuing policy and procedures for implementation of federal legislative directives. FHWA is a component of the federal DOT.

Fiscal Year................... The 12-month period established for budgeting purposes. In California, the commonly accepted fiscal year for governmental purposes starts July 1 and continues to the following June 30.

FTA............................. Federal Transit Administration:
Federal agency responsible for the administration of federal transit funds. Formerly known as the Urban Mass Transportation Administration (UMTA), FTA is a component of the federal DOT.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MPO</td>
<td>Metropolitan Planning Organization: A federally-designated agency that is responsible for regional transportation planning in each metropolitan area. SANDAG is the MPO for the San Diego region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>San Diego Metropolitan Transit System: The agency created by the California legislature to operate transit facilities in the southwestern portion of the region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEPA</td>
<td>National Environmental Policy Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTD</td>
<td>North San Diego County Transit Development Board: The agency created by the California legislature to operate transit facilities in the northwestern portion of the region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCP</td>
<td>Regional Comprehensive Plan: A plan that serves as a foundation for integrating land uses, transportation systems, infrastructure needs, and public investment strategies within a regional smart growth framework. The RCP is the regional vision to prepare for change and meet our future needs. The RCP was adopted by SANDAG in July 2004.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTIP</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP): A three to seven-year listing of major highway and transit projects including project costs, funding sources, and development schedules. Compiled from priority lists submitted by local jurisdictions and transportation agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Plan: A minimum 20-year plan that is required by state and federal law to guide the development of the region’s transportation system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTPA</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Planning Agency: A state-designated agency responsible for preparing the RTP and the RTIP and administering state transportation funds. SANDAG is the San Diego region’s RTPA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANDAG</td>
<td>San Diego Association of Governments: The regional Council of Governments for the San Diego region. SANDAG is responsible for long-range transportation planning and programming under both federal and state law.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP</td>
<td>State Transportation Improvement Program: A multi-year program of major transportation projects to be funded by the state. The CTC adopts the STIP every two years based on projects proposed in RTIPs and from Caltrans.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TDA**

Transportation Development Act:

TDA funds are generated from a tax of one-quarter of one percent on all retail sales in each county and are used for transit, specialized transit for disabled persons, and bicycle and pedestrian purposes.

**TCRP**

Transportation Congestion Relief Program

**TEA-21**

Transportation Efficiency Act for the 21st Century:

Federal legislation enacted in 1998, authorizing the preparation and funding of a surface transportation program. Like the previous ISTEA legislation, TEA-21 emphasizes diversity and balance of modes as well as the preservation of existing systems before construction of new facilities.

**TransNet**

A half-cent local sales tax approved by San Diego region voters in 1987. Administered by SANDAG, this 20-year program to improve the region’s transportation system is expected to generate $2.7 billion (in 1995 dollars). The funds are to be divided equally among three major transportation categories: highways, public transit, and local streets.

**EXTENSION**

The TransNet sales tax approved in 1987 expires in 2008. In November 2004, over 67 percent of voters countywide approved an extension of the TransNet program to 2048. This 40-year extension will generate more than $14 billion for transportation improvements, and includes an innovative $850 environmental mitigation program.

**U.S. DOT**

United States Department of Transportation:

The federal cabinet-level agency with responsibility for highways, mass transit, aviation and ports; headed by the secretary of transportation. The DOT includes the Federal Highway Administration and the Federal Transit Administration, among other agencies.

**U.S. EPA**

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency:

The federal agency charged with setting policy and guidelines, and carrying out legal mandates for the protection of national interests in environmental resources.
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2010 LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Introduction

Each year, the Executive Committee recommends a legislative program in priority order to the Board of Directors for the upcoming calendar year. Consistent with past programs, the 2010 Legislative Program (Attachment 1) includes policies and proposals for federal and state legislation as well as local activities.

Recommendation

The Executive Committee recommends that the Board of Directors approve the 2010 Legislative Program.

Discussion

The SANDAG Legislative Program serves as a road map for Board members and staff to follow as legislation is introduced and activities occur during the federal and state legislative sessions. The program is organized into three distinct sections that relate to the level of effort needed to support corresponding legislative activities: (1) Sponsor, (2) Support/Oppose, and (3) Monitor. Within each section, individual goals are assigned a priority level, ranging from highest priority to lower priority. The program also lists the Board position, position year, which Policy Advisory Committee is involved, and whether the goal includes federal, state, and/or local efforts.

Proposed 2010 Legislative Program

The Sponsor section includes eight items where SANDAG will be actively involved with sponsoring specific legislation, requests for funding, and/or policy changes. New goals under the Sponsor section for 2010 include expanding access to resources and technical tools to prepare a Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) in compliance with Senate Bill 375 (Goal No. 3A); pursuing statutory authority for a subregional funding mechanism dedicated to public transit (Goal No. 5A); and participating in discussions with stakeholders, and developing priorities for federal climate change legislation (Goal No. 6A).

The Support/Oppose section includes 18 goals that relate to the SANDAG diverse work program. The goals focus on the areas of transportation planning, funding, and project delivery; implementation the Regional Comprehensive Plan, including housing, climate change, energy, environmental, fiscal reform; and public safety and criminal justice areas. Staff routinely monitors proposed bills in these subject areas and provides regular reports to the Executive Committee during the year. In turn, the Executive Committee determines whether SANDAG should take a specific position on the various bills.

Finally, the Monitor section includes four lower priority goals related to monitoring proposals to limit eminent domain, public facility infrastructure funding proposals, and legislation regarding personnel and administrative matters.
The 2009 Legislative Program, which was approved by the Board of Directors in December 2008, included 29 separate goals. Goals that were completed in 2009 or that are no longer relevant have been deleted, modifications have been made to some existing goals, and new goals for 2010 are proposed. A summary of all major changes is included as Attachment 2.

2009 Legislative Highlights

SANDAG had a successful legislative year in 2009. The Executive Committee took formal positions on six measures, and five of these bills made it to the Governor’s desk. The Governor’s actions on the legislative measures were consistent with the Executive Committee’s recommended actions on the bills. Highlights include:

• On October 11, 2009, the Governor signed into law Senate Bill 575 (Chapter 354, Statutes of 2009), by Senator Darrell Steinberg. The measure eliminated an “interim” housing element cycle for all 19 local jurisdictions in the San Diego region, under which housing elements would be due in 2010 based on the requirements of Senate Bill 375 (Steinberg, 2008). Senate Bill 575 aligns the schedule for the next Regional Housing Needs Assessment with the preparation of the 2050 RTP. The deadline for completion of the next housing elements by the local jurisdictions would be December 31, 2012.

• On October 12, 2009, the Governor signed into law Assembly Bill 672 (Chapter 463, Statutes of 2009) by Assembly Speaker Karen Bass. The measure allows an agency responsible for administering a Proposition 1B (Prop. 1B) program to issue a letter of no prejudice to a local agency, providing an assurance that the administrative agency will reimburse the local agency for expenditures it makes on a Prop. 1B project that has been programmed, but for which funds have not yet been allocated.

• On October 12, 2009, the Governor signed into law Assembly Bill 729 (Chapter 466, Statutes of 2009) by Assembly Member Evans. Existing law authorizes transit operators to enter into design-build contracts until January 1, 2011. This measure extends these provisions until January 1, 2015.

Next Steps

Staff will continue to provide periodic status reports on legislative activities to the Executive Committee and/or Board of Directors during the next year. If new legislation or activities related to the agency’s mission are introduced that are not part of our established legislative goals, a report will be brought back to the Executive Committee for direction.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Attachments: 1. Draft 2010 Legislative Program
              2. Summary of Proposed Changes to the 2009 Legislative Program

Key Staff Contact: Genevieve Morelos, (619) 699-1994, gmo@sandag.org
DRAFT 2010 LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

OVERARCHING GOAL: Pursue policy and legislative changes that enable SANDAG to better implement its adopted plans and programs

(A) SPONSOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF GOAL</th>
<th>PRIORITY</th>
<th>BOARD POSITION</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>JURISDICTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td>Pursue SANDAG priorities for the next federal surface transportation reauthorization, including appropriate funding levels, goods movements/border funding programs, transit investment and reforms, process improvements, climate change, non-motorized transportation, and tribal transportation planning. (2007)</td>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>Sponsor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Federal/State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A</td>
<td>Pursue funding from the statewide infrastructure bond measures; participate in development of guidelines and other activities to maximize the availability and flexibility of funding for the San Diego region to support the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) implementation. (2006)</td>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>Sponsor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A</td>
<td>Expand access to resources and technical tools that will enable SANDAG to prepare an RTP in compliance with SB 375. (2009)</td>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>Sponsor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Federal/State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4A</td>
<td>Pursue FY 2011 federal appropriation requests and potential economic stimulus funding. (2005)</td>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>Sponsor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Federal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5A</td>
<td>Pursue statutory authority for a subregional funding mechanism dedicated to public transit. (2009)</td>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>Sponsor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State/Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6A</td>
<td>Participate in discussions with stakeholders, and develop SANDAG priorities for federal climate change legislation. (2009)</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>Sponsor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Federal/State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7A</td>
<td>Pursue policy and/or legislative changes to enable comprehensive state environmental process to fulfill federal environmental requirements. (2008)</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Sponsor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Federal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8A</td>
<td>Pursue policy and/or legislative changes to enable the use of freeway shoulders as transit lanes on major corridors in the San Diego region. (2006)</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Sponsor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend - T: Transportation; R: Regional Planning; P: Public Safety; B: Borders
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF GOAL</th>
<th>PRIORITY</th>
<th>BOARD POSITION</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>JURISDICTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>Legislation that provides incentives to jurisdictions that provide opportunities for more housing including affordable and transit-oriented developments, supports regional fair-share allocation of housing funds, and provides additional affordable housing funding with greater local/regional control. (2002)</td>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Federal/State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B</td>
<td>Support policies and/or legislation implementing climate change plans and programs that are consistent with the RCP and RTP. (2007)</td>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Federal/State/Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B</td>
<td>Efforts consistent with financial strategies adopted in the RTP such as, but not limited to, increase revenues for transportation and other related purposes through measures that would increase gas tax or equivalent revenue sources, bond measures, developer fees, and public/private partnerships, and maximize flexibility of federal and state funds. (2002, 2005)</td>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>TBD (based on activity)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Federal/State/Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5B</td>
<td>Legislation assisting in the implementation of the RCP, including dedicated ongoing funding source for regional blueprint planning and funding incentives for smart growth (mixed-use projects, transit-oriented development, walkable communities, etc.). (2002)</td>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Federal/State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B</td>
<td>Efforts to expand available methods of transportation project delivery including design-build, design sequencing, construction manager/general contractor, and other alternative methods that expedite project delivery. (2005)</td>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7B</td>
<td>Efforts to pursue resources to improve regional public safety voice and data communications and interoperability, including connectivity with state and federal systems. (2005)</td>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Federal/State/Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8B</td>
<td>Efforts to pursue Homeland Security funding at both the state and federal levels to improve public safety, enhance border security and improve security in the San Diego region through Automated Regional Justice Information System (ARJIS) operations and enhancements, regional transportation system improvements, and activities related to regional emergency preparedness, prevention, and response to catastrophic events. (2003, 2005)</td>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Federal/State/Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9B</td>
<td>Fiscal reform initiatives that enable regions to develop their own fiscal strategies and oppose unfunded mandates on local governments. Pursue initiatives that balance the fiscal influence that sales tax revenues have upon local land use decisions. (2002)</td>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Federal/State/Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10B</td>
<td>Lower the current two-thirds voter requirement for special purpose taxes, such as transportation and quality of life improvements, to a simple majority vote. (2002)</td>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11B</td>
<td>Efforts assisting in the implementation of key environmental issues, including habitat conservation, planning, beach restoration and replenishment, and water quality-related issues. (2002)</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State/Local</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF GOAL</th>
<th>PRIORITY</th>
<th>BOARD POSITION</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>JURISDICTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12B</td>
<td>Mechanisms providing for the implementation of the RTP, including value pricing, managed lanes, high occupancy toll (HOT) lanes, the alleviation of current constraints on transponder technology, transit priority treatments, and other efforts that promote efficient use of highways and local roads. (2003)</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Federal/State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13B</td>
<td>Support energy-related legislation that is consistent with the Regional Energy Strategy. (2002)</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Federal/State/Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14B</td>
<td>Support legislation and/or policies that promote governmental efficiencies and cost savings. (2009)</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>Federal/State/Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15B</td>
<td>Transit boards’ legislative programs where consistent with SANDAG policy. (2002)</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Federal/State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16B</td>
<td>Support funding opportunities for prevention and intervention programs that address substance abuse and youth and gang violence, and for public safety initiatives including 211 services. (2005, 2009)</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Federal/State/Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17B</td>
<td>Participate in efforts related to legislative and administrative reform of the state housing element law and ensure adequate state funding for the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) process. (2002)</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(C) MONITOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF GOAL</th>
<th>PRIORITY</th>
<th>BOARD POSITION</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>JURISDICTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1C</td>
<td>Proposals that limit the use of eminent domain for public infrastructure projects. (2005)</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Monitor/Respond</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>Federal/State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2C</td>
<td>Legislation affecting solid waste, water supply, and storm water, and support of funding opportunities to assist in these areas. (2003)</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Monitor/Respond</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>State/Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3C</td>
<td>Legislation relating to personnel matters, i.e., workers’ compensation, Public Employee Retirement Systems (PERS) benefits, and other labor-related issues. (2003)</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Monitor/Respond</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Federal/State/Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4C</td>
<td>Legislation requiring local agencies to implement new administrative compliance measures. (2005)</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Monitor/Respond</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Federal/State</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Summary of Proposed Changes to the 2009 Legislative Program

The 2009 Legislative Program, approved by the Board of Directors in December 2008, includes 29 separate legislative goals. Staff modified the 2009 program as a starting point to initiate Executive Committee discussion regarding the 2010 program. Goals that have been completed or that are no longer relevant have been deleted, modifications have been made to some existing goals, and new goals for 2010 are proposed.

Proposed Deletions

Three legislative goals are proposed to be deleted because the legislative work was completed during 2009 or legislative action is no longer required.

- **Goal No. 3A** – Pursue technical clean-up legislation to SB 375 to align the timing of the implementation of the RTP and RHNA requirements

  On October 11, 2009, the Governor signed into law Senate Bill 575 (Chapter 354, Statutes of 2009). The measure eliminated an “interim” housing element cycle for all 19 local jurisdictions in the San Diego region, under which housing elements would be due in 2010 based on the requirements of Senate Bill 375 (Steinberg, 2008). Senate Bill 575 aligns the schedule for the next Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) with the preparation of the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The deadline for completion of the next housing elements by the local jurisdictions would be December 31, 2012.

- **Goal No. 5A** – Work with Governor’s administration and other stakeholders to implement SB 1486

  SANDAG and Caltrans continue our collaborative work on the State Route 11 (SR 11) and Otay Mesa East Port of Entry (POE) project. Last year when Governor Schwarzenegger signed Senate Bill 1486 (Ducheny, 2008), his signing message identified certain issues, including ensuring adequate toll rates and funding of state maintenance and enforcement costs for the SR 11/Otay Mesa East POE project. Staff recommends deleting the current legislative goal, as the issues raised by the Governor will be addressed during the process to develop the project’s financial strategy and as part of ongoing project implementation efforts, without the need for further legislative action.

- **Goal No. 17B** – Full Funding of the Census Bureau’s American Community Survey Program to ensure timely release of critical demographic and economic information for our region

  In previous years, this item has been included in our legislative program to advocate for full funding for this Census Bureau program. Currently, the American Community Survey Program is fully funded, and therefore this item could be removed for this upcoming year. Staff will continue to track this issue in future years.

Proposed Modifications

Modifications are proposed for five legislative goals from the 2009 program.
• Goal No. 1A – Pursue SANDAG priorities for the next surface federal transportation reauthorization including appropriate funding levels, goods movement/border funding programs, transit investment and reforms, process improvements, climate change, non-motorized transportation, and tribal transportation planning.

Last year’s goal focused on developing SANDAG priorities for the next federal surface transportation authorization. In March, the Board of Directors endorsed the statewide California Consensus Principles and adopted SANDAG-specific principles for the next authorization. The focus during 2010 would be on working with our Congressional delegation and other stakeholders in the coming months as the next federal authorization is developed. Congress has passed a short-term extension of SAFETEA-LU (Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users), continuing funding of current programs at FY 2009 levels.

• Goal No. 4A – Pursue FY 2011 federal appropriation requests and potential economic stimulus funding

This goal is proposed to be updated to reflect the FY 2011 federal appropriations process.

• Goal No. 2B – Support policies and/or legislation implementing climate change plans and programs that are consistent with the RCP and the RTP

The 2009 goal focused primarily on the state climate change efforts related to Assembly Bill 32 (Nunez, 2006), which requires California to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. This goal is proposed to be broadened to incorporate support for various climate change initiatives that are consistent with SANDAG plans. Several federal climate change proposals have been introduced this year in the 111th Congress.

• Goal No. 13B - Support energy-related legislation that is consistent with the Regional Energy Strategy

In 2009, supporting climate change and energy-related legislation was incorporated into Goal No. 13B. With the proposed change to Goal No. 2B above, staff proposes amending Goal No. 13B to focus it solely on energy-related legislation.

• Goal No. 16B - Support funding opportunities for prevention and intervention programs that address substance abuse and youth and gang violence, and for public safety initiatives including 211 services.

The PSC recommended including support for funding opportunities for 211 services, which has played a vital role in providing public safety information on the H1N1 vaccination in the San Diego region.
Proposed New Goals

Four new legislative goals are proposed for the 2010 program.

- **Goal No. 3A – Expand access to resources and technical tools that will enable SANDAG to prepare an RTP in compliance with Senate Bill 375**

  SANDAG will be the first major Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) in the state to implement the new requirements of Senate Bill 375 with our next RTP update. This proposed legislative goal highlights the importance of adequate funding resources and technical tools to accomplish this expanded effort to develop our 2050 RTP.

- **Goal No. 5A – Pursue statutory authority for a subregional funding mechanism dedicated to public transit**

  A new goal is proposed in order to address public transit needs in the San Diego region. The state’s recent diversions of State Transit Assistance funds and declining sales tax revenues in our current economy have impacted transit services and fare levels. While SANDAG currently has statutory authority for a sales tax measure at the regional level, this proposed new goal would enable us to seek authority for a possible subregional funding mechanism to support public transportation.

- **Goal No. 6A – Participate in discussions with stakeholders and develop SANDAG priorities for federal climate change legislation**

  With the recent focus on climate change policy at the national level, this proposed new goal would enable SANDAG to develop priorities for pending federal climate change legislation. Potential issues include funding for transportation and land use initiatives that address climate change (enabling greenhouse gas reductions), and ensuring federal and state climate change and transportation planning requirements are consistent and do not conflict.

- **Goal No. 14B – Support legislation and/or policies that promote governmental efficiencies and cost savings**

  A new legislative goal is proposed in order to pursue governmental efficiencies and savings, particularly in our current fiscal and economic climate. A potential effort could be to eliminate the requirement for biennial reports on the agency consolidation. As identified in the 2008 report, the agency consolidation efforts that began six years ago concluded with the transition of the last few SPRINTER staff to SANDAG in 2008.
2010 STIP AND PROPOSITION 1B
CMIA PROGRAM REVISIONS

File Number 1500000

Introduction

Due to lower than expected bids, there is approximately $69 million in Proposition 1B (Prop. 1B) Corridor Mobility Improvement Account (CMIA) savings on the Interstate 15 (I-15) Express Lanes (South) project. The California Transportation Commission (CTC) has just released and is scheduled to adopt at its December meeting a statewide policy to deal with savings such as those identified on the I-15 corridor, and it includes a proposal to reprogram savings on other eligible projects. This report discusses a recommendation to submit the I-15 Direct Access Ramp (DAR) at Mira Mesa Boulevard project for these savings. The 2010 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) proposal, recently approved by the Board of Directors in November, would need to be modified to reflect the CMIA proposal.

Discussion

The uncertainty in the ability of the CTC to allocate significant funds during the early years of the STIP (FY 2010/11 to 2012/13), coupled with the recent release by the CTC of a policy to deal with savings on the Prop. 1B CMIA program, is pointing to the need to change funding sources on the I-15 DAR project. This change in funding source would increase the certainty that funding will be available for the project when it is ready to go to construction in FY 2011/12. The replaced STIP funds would be reprogrammed on another project anticipated to need funding in FY 2013/14 or beyond.

Prop. 1B CMIA Savings Policy and Reprogramming Proposal

The draft policy guidance released by the CTC states that the Commission will consider proposals to program projects nominated during the original CMIA process in 2007, but that were not recommended for funding by the Commission at that time. Further, the guidance states that the Commission also will consider projects that enhance the benefits of projects already programmed in the CMIA. Proposed projects would still need to meet CMIA eligibility guidelines, including the ability to deliver these projects for construction prior to December 2012. The I-15 DAR project meets these criteria well, having scored high in the initial CMIA project evaluation and providing additional access to I-15 corridor via direct access ramps to the Express Lanes. Staff therefore recommends submitting the $50 million I-15 DAR project to be programmed with the CMIA savings. Staff would further recommend consolidating the TransNet-funded transit station at Mira Mesa into this project as part of the overall project, for a total of $56.5 million, thus deferring the use of approximately $6.5 million in TransNet funds. In addition, the CTC policy allows 10 percent of the...
savings amount to remain in the corridor as a contingency for future claims or unanticipated costs. The amount of this 10 percent set-aside is approximately $6.9 million. Lastly, staff would recommend pursuing a subsequent proposal to program the remaining $5.6 million in I-15 corridor bond savings on another CMIA-eligible project. In the next few months, staff will evaluate potential options and bring these to the Transportation Committee and the Board of Directors for approval. Table 1 summarizes these various proposals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Amount ($millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-15 CMIA Savings available</td>
<td>69.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-15 Direct Access Ramp</td>
<td>(56.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve for Potential Claims and Unanticipated Costs</td>
<td>(6.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remainder Available for other CMIA-eligible Projects</td>
<td>(5.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be noted that, with the exception of the 10 percent set-aside for potential claims, all reprogramming proposals are subject to approval by the CTC.

2010 STIP Program Revision

The Board approved the 2010 STIP recommendation at its November 20, 2009, meeting. The 2010 STIP recommendation includes funding for the I-15 DAR project. At the time, staff indicated that there was a risk to having the CTC program the I-15 DAR project in the year in which it was being proposed (FY 2011/12) because the CTC on a statewide basis needed to move approximately 40 percent of the STIP from the first three years of the program (FY 2010/11 to 2012/13) to the latter two years of the program (FY 2013/14 and 2014/15) due to a statewide capacity shortfall in the early years. Subsequent discussions with CTC staff point to the continued high risk of proposing the I-15 DAR project in FY 2011/12. In short, there may not be sufficient STIP capacity in that year, and the CTC may be forced to program the project in FY 2013/14 at the earliest.

In response to this high degree of uncertainty in funds availability in the early years of the 2010 STIP, staff proposes at this time to unprogram the $50 million from the I-15 DAR project and replace the funding with the CMIA funds, as described above. A subsequent STIP programming recommendation for the $50 million would be brought to the January 2010 Board meeting. This programming recommendation would seek to better align the schedule for the proposed project(s) with the potential funding availability in the STIP.

**Next Steps**

Upon approval by the Board, staff will submit the proposal to reprogram the CMIA savings to the CTC at the earliest possible opportunity. A revised 2010 STIP recommendation will be brought to the Transportation Committee and the Board in January to reprogram the $50 million. And, a subsequent recommendation on the remaining CMIA savings will be developed and presented to the Transportation Committee and the Board of Directors in the next few months.

GARY L. GALLEGOS  
Executive Director  

Key Staff Contact: José A. Nuncio, 619-699-1908; jnu@sandag.org
2009-2013 COORDINATED PUBLIC TRANSIT AND HUMAN SERVICES TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Recommendation

The Transportation Committee recommends that the Board of Directors approve Resolution No. 2010-06 (Attachment 1), approving the 2009-2013 Coordinated Plan.

Introduction

SANDAG was designated by the State of California as the agency responsible for preparation of the federally mandated Coordinated Public Transit and Human Services Transportation Plan (Coordinated Plan) for San Diego County. The Coordinated Plan prepared by SANDAG also incorporates the Regional Short Range Transit Plan required by SANDAG Board of Directors Policy No. 018 (Transit Service Planning), as well as service monitoring data required by the State of California Transportation Development Act.

The Coordinated Plan provides a five-year blueprint for the implementation of the public transit and human service transportation concepts described in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). SANDAG prepared the 2009-2013 Coordinated Plan to include new information on the evaluation of transit service performance, service implementation, and transit funding. Additionally, the Coordinated Plan was updated to include changes to the Program Management Plan, which monitors several grant programs funded through the plan. The Coordinated Plan was prepared in collaboration with staff members from Metropolitan Transit System (MTS), North County Transit District (NCTD), Caltrans District 11, the SANDAG Social Services Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC), and the Coordinated Transportation Services Agency for San Diego County (CTSA).

On December 11, 2009, the Transportation Committee held a public hearing and recommended that the Board of Directors approve the Final Coordinated Plan. This report highlights key items covered by the Coordinated Plan, including the incorporation of comments received.

Discussion

The 2009-2013 Coordinated Plan is an update to the 2008-2012 plan. The plan involves the identification of mobility needs from a passenger perspective and includes strategies to meet those needs. This Coordinated Plan incorporates Service Implementation Plans from MTS and NCTD that outline anticipated service changes for the beginning of the plan period.

Updated Content

A major focus of the 2009-2013 Coordinated Plan was to update the regional performance evaluation program, which now includes information from human and social service transportation
programs funded through the plan. The evaluation program was developed to retain a regional perspective on the transportation system as a whole, and it also was conducted to assist the transportation agencies with their evaluation of current or future service expansions or contractions. Trend data, rather than year-over-year performance, is emphasized to ensure that additional planning and funding resources are allocated appropriately.

The overall public transportation system is generally performing well despite the funding challenges that will impact the ability of the agencies to maintain existing services based on reduced tax revenues. Ridership growth continued to outpace growth in population, employment, and vehicle registrations over the past several years, and both MTS and NCTD continue to provide service that is productive and accessible. Recent news about further reductions in state funding for transit operations and declining sales tax revenues will likely mean MTS and NCTD will have to make significant service cuts over the next year in order to balance their FY 2010 and FY 2011 budgets. The scope of these service cuts unfortunately could erase much of the positive trends in ridership and cost-effective service restructuring that the two operators have implemented over the last several years.

The update also includes a revised Program Management Plan, which provides the mechanism to fund various strategies contained in the Coordinated Plan and ensures that the maximum possible benefit is enjoyed by the community through a fair and equitable distribution process. Finally, the 2009-2013 update includes a Regional Service Implementation Plan (RSIP), which evaluates recent operational changes in the region’s transit system and ensures that proposals for new service meet regional objectives. The RSIP is based on the Service Implementation Plans (SIPs) developed by MTS and NCTD. The SIPs list the operational changes each transit operator implemented or plans to implement in order to achieve balanced budgets. Unfortunately, due to the continued negative trends with regard to funding for public transit, a number of service cutbacks have already been implemented and further cutbacks are likely for the foreseeable future.

Public Comments

On November 6, 2009, the Transportation Committee released the Draft Coordinated Plan for public comment through December 5, 2009, and held a public hearing at its meeting on December 11, 2009. SANDAG received one comment from MTS early in the comment period regarding the validation of the on-time performance data included on page 4-18 and detailed in the Technical Appendix on page L-11. SANDAG and MTS staffs worked together during the public comment period to validate the on-time performance data that is now included in the final plan. Other comments were minor and did not necessitate revisions to the plan. Attachment 2 summarizes the comments received and includes staff responses to the comments. Attachment 3 includes the Final Coordinated Plan.

Implementation and Funding Distribution

The approval of the Coordinated Plan will enable the continued distribution of federal funding under the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) New Freedom (transportation for people with disabilities), Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) (reverse commute transportation and work-related transportation for individuals with limited means), and Section 5310 (seniors and persons with disabilities) programs. The Plan also is used to guide the distribution of local funding for projects targeted at improving specialized transportation for seniors (Senior Mini-Grant program) that was created through the TransNet Extension.
Next Steps

Copies of the approved Coordinated Plan and resolution will be forwarded to Caltrans to enable it to hold the competitive process for FTA New Freedom and JARC grants in the rural areas of the San Diego region. A copy of the Final Coordinated Plan also will be forwarded to the FTA. Printed copies of the Technical Appendix will be available at the Board of Directors meeting. The Technical Appendix also is available on the SANDAG Web site at www.sandag.org/coordinatedplan.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Attachments:  1. Resolution No. 2010-06
               2. Final 2009-2013 Coordinated Plan Comments and Responses

Key Staff Contact: Phil Trom, (619) 699-7330, ptr@sandag.org
RESOLUTION
NO. 2010-06

APPROVING THE 2009-2013 COORDINATED PUBLIC TRANSIT –
HUMAN SERVICES TRANSPORTATION PLAN
IN CONFORMANCE WITH THE SAFE, ACCOUNTABLE, FLEXIBLE,
AND EFFICIENT TRANSPORTATION EQUITY ACT: A LEGACY FOR USERS

WHEREAS, the federal Safe, Accountable, Flexible, and Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) requires that each region prepare a Locally Developed Coordinated Public Transit – Human Services Transportation Plan (Coordinated Plan); and

WHEREAS, SAFETEA-LU introduced a requirement that funding for three federal programs be derived from a locally developed Coordinated Plan and that these programs are the Federal Transit Administration Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) (Section 5316), New Freedom (NF) (Section 5317), and Elderly Persons with Disabilities (Section 5310); and

WHEREAS, the Governor of California has determined that SANDAG will be the designated recipient of funds for these three programs;

NOW THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Directors approves the 2009–2013 Coordinated Plan.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 18th of December 2009.

_______________________________           ________________________________
CHAIRPERSON                   SECRETARY

_____________________________
ATTEST:

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

ADVISORY MEMBERS: California Department of Transportation, Metropolitan Transit System, North County Transit District, Imperial County, U.S. Department of Defense, San Diego Unified Port District, San Diego County Water Authority, Southern California Tribal Chairmen’s Association, and Mexico.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Name/Agency</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Chapter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10/22/2009</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>DeAnna Tillotson</td>
<td>My son is a student at Palomar College. He has a Friday night class that ends at 9:20pm. The last Sprinter stop at the college is at 9:10pm. If the Sprinter stops went until 9:30pm we would definitely use it!! It seems that you would want to plan the First and Last stops around all 3 college schedules!! It may be too late for this semester, but what about checking with the colleges for next semester? I would think such a move would up your ridership considerably! Thank you for your time and interest.</td>
<td>SPRINT service spans dependent on agreement with freight operators. Comment noted and forwarded to NCTD.</td>
<td>Chapter 4 Appendix B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10/25/2009</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>LaVonna Connelly/ Ramona Resident and FACT Board Member</td>
<td>A year ago, Ramona suffered severe transit cuts, leaving the majority of the members of our vulnerable populations (seniors, disabled, economically challenged individuals and families) &quot;stuck&quot; in Ramona. While we understand that we are in a budget crisis, and we also understand that the former service model in Ramona was not cost-effective, we also understand that there is great unmet transportation need in Ramona and being unincorporated, could languish without a concentrated effort among upright individuals and organizations. The fixed route bus service to Escondido was under-utilized, but the FAST and LIFT buses in Ramona were heavily used. I believe there are alternative models out there that we could consider, such as deviated fixed route with smaller buses, and even limited day FAST bus-type options, and I feel strongly that we need such service deployed here in Ramona. Ramona, the unincorporated, is a child of the County, and has minimal political representation. In addition, there is no real non-profit hub to speak of, with many services brokered from non-profits &quot;down the hill&quot;. With limited local leadership and limited business activity, and limited non-profit championship, Ramona tends to be passed over for funding. Without our own local government we just are not as &quot;plug-in able&quot; for funds. WELL, Ramona has a new development. A small group of local citizens is working to bring transportation access to Ramona. The Ramona Transportation Action Committee meets regularly and is winding up a community survey to define the local unmet transportation need. We are working with FACT to implement a Senior Transportation Pilot Project in Ramona. While this is a fantastic movement forward, the small amount of operational funds for this service will not begin to meet the vast unmet need among the community members. We desperately need SANDAG and its stakeholders to understand that Ramona is isolated. We have limited employment opportunities, and many who moved up there did so because the real estate was less expensive. So the working class, who has an expensive repair to their vehicle and cannot afford to fix it, cannot find a job in Ramona and cannot take public transit effectively, due to the extremely limited schedule of the &quot;lifeline&quot; service now in place. We had TWO fire disasters in Ramona, the only community to be that hard hit by both the Cedar and Witch Creek fires. Our community has been financially disrupted due to the losses associated with those disasters. Our school enrollments have been declining year after year, and many businesses on main street are boarded up. We have newly forming gangs in Ramona, and this week our local paper said that someone tried to rob Chevron at rifle point! This may sound all unrelated, but what I’m trying to say is this... You have a small but strong</td>
<td>Comment noted. Ramona included as a “Very High Priority” area with limited transit service beginning with the 2008-2012 plan and extending through the 2009-2013 plan update.</td>
<td>No Specific Chapter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
effort in Ramona to work on the access issue. Ramona needs your help. Please fan the smoke of the RTAC group, don’t do what is easy... let Ramona, the unincorporated, rural-out-of-the-hub town die on the vine. There are resources and energy in Ramona, encourage the town’s own innovation, and put SOME service in place, so people can at least access medical care and buy groceries. There are literally disabled, elderly and poor community members who cannot even get from their house to basic services they require to survive. Ramona covers 130 mile area, which is a challenge. I’m not saying let’s try to serve every last person in its boundaries... I’m saying we should do what we can with what we have. We have local energy, we have local spirit, work with us, guide us, partner with us. We don’t need perfect, we just can’t settle for nothing at all. Thank you for your time and consideration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Name/Agency</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Chapter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10/29/2009</td>
<td>Email and Phone</td>
<td>Sharon Cooney/MTS</td>
<td>The first sentence on OTP states that MTS does not meet the 80 percent OTP guideline. However, our OTP is above 80 percent for the years this plan covered.</td>
<td>SANDAG worked with MTS to update the on-time performance statistics which are included in Chapter 4 and Appendix L</td>
<td>Chapter 4 Appendix L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12/01/2009</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>James Knott III/Resident</td>
<td>After taking about 3 hours to read the entire report and appendix, I found it quite informative and comprehensive. But it was incomplete with the recent actions of NCTD outsourcing of their entire operations to a private company which is totally frightening and abhorrent to the very concept of Public transit services. Every time our government has outsourced a public service it initially has a decreased cost but then the service suffers and costs inflate and rarely if ever do these actions ever succeed. Many seniors I know dislike this action that has been taken, we already have diminished services as well as the disabled community in North County - we have virtually no weekend or evening services like if there is an urgent medical situation we can’t get to the doctor or store to get the help we need it ain’t there folks, our military service has been reduced again and again those guys and gals are stuck and they’re taken advantaged of by the vermin of our society by the negligence of the cuts, the buses no longer serve the people they only serve the trains and this is the mindset of NCTD board and administration. Why? The board spent over a billion dollars on both the coaster and sprinter and they’re trying to prove they can both work and they’re not but in doing such the board and the NCTD administration is destroying the entire transit system. Because it has ceased to serve the Bus service needs of the people but only serves the needs of the transit system itself. This disconnect has abandoned tens of thousands of folks and businesses. Many people who use to take the bus like myself no longer take it due to the cuts that have been made by the NCTD board, I can’t get where I need to go when I need to get there as the routes only serve their train lines anymore for the times they want it to. SANDAG should dissolve the NCTD board and absorb this entire system and consolidate it with MTS to reduce the cost of the administration and duplicative efforts by both entities and SANDAG itself. This would reduce the cost by about 20% for all transit costs.</td>
<td>Comment Noted</td>
<td>No Specific Chapter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Name/Agency</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Chapter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>12/03/2009</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Connery Cepeda/ Caltrans District 11</td>
<td>county wide if it involved an integrated system as well. Many people I've talked with in the rural county area feel abandoned as well. I say it's time to stop operating this broken system and redesigning it from the bottom up as a unified system from county border to county border under a single agency. Operate the current ones for one year while the new agency is designed and allowed for full public input with a start date set for 365 days from the day you begin. Both agencies are experiencing great problems due to their entrophy of their own bureaucracy and duplicative make work and they're applying band aids to the problems and not addressing the real problem - meeting the transportation needs of the citizens but rather preserving their own jobs - especially up on high. All your statistics and map show this radical approach of a single transit system is needed, nay demanded. It's time for SANDAG to truly implement the countywide system, now. Just quit doing the studies and switch your mindset and address these needs and end the endless bickering, politics and game playing, please.</td>
<td>Chapter 10 was updated subsequent to this comment to move the transit budget narrative earlier in the chapter. SANDAG will wait to incorporate the final PPP into Chapter 2 of the Coordinated Plan update (2010-2014) next year.</td>
<td>Chapters 2 and 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>12/04/2009</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Minjie Mei/ Santee</td>
<td>Appendix P: ISSUES AND STRATEGIES Issue #2: Gaps in transportation services serving individuals with limited means. Santee should be on the list for this issue as well. There are large parts of Santee where no service exists.</td>
<td>Appendices O and P were updated to include the City of Santee.</td>
<td>Appendices O and P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Printed copies of the 2009 - 2013 Coordinated Plan (Attachment 3) and Technical Appendix may be obtained from the SANDAG Web site at www.sandag.org/coordinatedplan or by contacting the SANDAG Public Information Office at (619) 699-1950.
LOS ANGELES-SAN DIEGO-SAN LUIS OBISPO (LOSSAN) RAIL CORRIDOR MEMBER AGENCY MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING FOR RAIL SERVICE INTEGRATION

File Number 3400600

Introduction

The LOSSAN Rail Corridor Agency seeks to increase ridership, revenue, capacity, reliability, and safety on the coastal rail line from San Diego to Los Angeles to San Luis Obispo. Known as Amtrak’s Pacific Surfliner corridor, it is the second busiest intercity passenger rail corridor nationwide and Amtrak’s fastest growing. The North County Transit District (NCTD) COASTER and Southern California Regional Rail Authority’s Metrolink commuter trains and Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) Railway freight trains also share the 351-mile corridor.

Since August 2008, SANDAG, NCTD, Metropolitan Transit System (MTS), and the other LOSSAN member agencies have been working on ways to better integrate the corridor’s three passenger rail services. Surveys were completed both of riders onboard Amtrak, COASTER, and Metrolink trains and nonriders to learn more about their travel patterns and opinions on why they use or don’t use the corridor’s passenger rail services. An analysis of the corridor’s strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats, combined with the public opinion research and input from the LOSSAN member agencies, assisted the LOSSAN Board of Directors to develop a shared corridor vision that outlines a corridorwide approach to planning and implementing service improvements for current and underserved markets.

At its September 9, 2009, meeting, the LOSSAN Board of Directors approved this corridor vision and instructed the member agency chief executive officers to develop an interagency memorandum of understanding (MOU) that outlines the roles and responsibilities for implementation, including short- and long-term actions (Attachment 1). The LOSSAN Board of Directors approved this MOU in substantially the same form as shown in Attachment 1 at its October 28, 2009, meeting.

Discussion

LOSSAN Rail Corridor Agency

The LOSSAN Rail Corridor Agency is a joint powers authority that works to increase ridership, revenue, capacity, reliability, and safety on the coastal rail corridor. LOSSAN is governed by a Board of Directors whose voting members are Caltrans, Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LACMTA), NCTD, Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA), SANDAG, MTS,
San Luis Obispo Council of Governments (SLOCOG), Santa Barbara County Association of Governments (SBCAG), and Ventura County Transportation Commission (VCTC). The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) is an ex-officio member. The agency’s Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) includes these member agencies and Amtrak, BNSF Railway, Union Pacific, Southern California Regional Rail Authority, and the California Public Utilities Commission as advisory members (Attachment 2).

The LOSSAN Joint Powers Board of Directors meets quarterly and the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) generally meets every other month. SANDAG serves as staff to the LOSSAN Board and TAC through a cooperative funding agreement with the member agencies.

Shared Corridor Vision

Through the corridorwide strategic assessment, the LOSSAN Board of Directors on September 9, 2009, approved a shared corridor vision of:

- Short-term roles and responsibilities
- Corridor-long responsibility and authority
- Corridor-long planning and investment ($6 – $8 billion by 2025)
- Interactive electronic fare collection
- Recognition of the diverse nature of the corridor
- Better traveler information distribution
- Focus on local partnerships

The MOU outlines a number of key short-term and long-term steps to implement this vision ranging from development of a consolidated timetable and traveler information Web site to integrated operations and fare policy.

Next Steps

The LOSAN Board of Directors also requested that a project manager be hired to oversee this implementation over the next 18 months. SANDAG has agreed to handle the procurement for this limited term position with funding from each LOSSAN member agency. A Business Plan, including detailed operations modeling and ridership forecasts, will be completed in order to test the key service changes proposed as part of the corridorwide vision. Funding for this position, Business Plan, and other short-term actions as outlined in Attachment 1 will be provided by each LOSSAN member agency.

At its December 9, 2009, meeting, the LOSSAN Board of Directors approved a funding distribution formula based on the proportion of intercity and commuter passenger rail ridership by county. For San Diego, 28 percent of Amtrak, COASTER, or Metrolink riders use a station in San Diego County. Total expenses are estimated at $1,084,000 over an 18-month period, and once a number of in-kind and funding commitments are applied, the amount needed from LOSSAN member agencies is $686,500. San Diego’s member agency share is $192,800 (28 percent), of which $21,200 would be needed in FY 2010 and $171,600 would be needed in FY 2011. There are sufficient funds in the
SANDAG FY 2010 Budget and Overall Work Program to cover San Diego’s member agency share for FY 2010. We will work on the FY 2011 funding strategy with our partner agencies in conjunction with the FY 2011 budget process.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Attachments: 1. Memorandum of Understanding
2. LOSSAN Membership

Key Staff Contact: Linda Culp, (619) 699-6957, lcu@sandag.org

Funds are budgeted in Work Element #3400600
MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
BY AND BETWEEN
SAN DIEGO METROPOLITAN TRANSIT SYSTEM
SAN DIEGO ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER CORPORATION
NORTH COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
ORANGE COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA REGIONAL RAIL AUTHORITY
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
LOS ANGELES COUNTY METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
VENTURA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
SANTA BARBARA COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
CALIFORNIA HIGH-SPEED RAIL AUTHORITY

This Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) dated ____________, between SAN DIEGO METROPOLITAN TRANSIT SYSTEM (MTS), SAN DIEGO ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS (SANDAG), NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER CORPORATION (NRPC), NORTH COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT (NCTD), ORANGE COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY (OCTA), SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA REGIONAL RAIL AUTHORITY (SCERRA), SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS (SCAG), LOS ANGELES COUNTY METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY (MTA), VENTURA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION (VCTC), SANTA BARBARA COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS (SBCAG), SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS (SLOCOG), CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (Caltrans), and CALIFORNIA HIGH-SPEED RAIL AUTHORITY (CHSRA), (referred to herein individually as a Party and collectively as the “Parties” sets forth principles, responsibilities, activities and work, and funding needs required to support the development and implementation of a Business Plan for the Los Angeles-San Diego-San Luis Obispo (LOSSAN) corridor to support improved freight, commuter, intercity, and high speed rail operations in the corridor.

Whereas the LOSSAN rail corridor runs through a six-county coastal region in southern and central California from the City of San Diego, to the City of Los Angeles, and terminates in the City of San Luis Obispo; and

Whereas the LOSSAN rail corridor is the second busiest intercity rail (Amtrak Pacific Surfliner service) corridor in the United States of America; and
Whereas, the LOSSAN corridor is a federally recognized high speed rail corridor eligible for federal funding (Section 3043(c)(105) of SAFETEA-LU for New Starts funds); and

Whereas Metrolink and NCTD’s COASTER commuter rail services and Amtrak’s Pacific Surfliner service carried more than 8.5 million riders in FY 09 along the LOSSAN corridor; and

Whereas Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) Railway and Union Pacific (UP) own portions of and provide freight rail transportation on the LOSSAN rail corridor that support the movement of goods from the Ports of San Diego, Los Angeles, and Long Beach; and

Whereas MTS, NCTD, OCTA, MTA, and VCTC own portions of the LOSSAN corridor railroad right of way; and

Whereas, MTA, SCAG, OCTA, NCTD, MTS (formerly MTDB), SANDAG, and Caltrans in 1989 formed the LOSSAN Joint Powers Authority (JPA) to implement Study Group recommendations directed by Senate Bill 1095 (Craven) in 1987; and

Whereas, the LOSSAN JPA in 2002 added VCTC, SBCAG, SLOCOG, and SANDAG as voting members and appointed a full complement of directors from member agencies; and

Whereas, the LOSSAN JPA is advised by a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) consisting of representatives from its member, ex officio, and advisory member agencies; and

Whereas, the LOSSAN JPA in 2007 completed the “LOSSAN North Strategic Business Plan” and the “LOSSAN Corridorwide Strategic Business Plan;” and

Whereas, Proposition 1B (2006), the Highway Safety, Traffic Reduction, Air Quality, and Port Security Bond Act of 2006, dedicates $400 million in state general obligation bonds to the state’s intercity rail program, including projects along the LOSSAN corridor; and

Whereas, Proposition 1A (2008), the Safe, Reliable High-Speed Passenger Train Bond Act for the 21st Century, dedicates $9 billion to the state’s High-Speed Train (HST) system, including HST improvements along the segments of the LOSSAN corridor and $950 million to urban feeder rail services including the Pacific Surfliner, Metrolink, COASTER, and other feeder services along the corridor; and

Whereas, President Obama in 2009 signed the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, providing for $8 billion for high-speed and intercity passenger rail improvements nationwide; and

Whereas, the LOSSAN JPA has expended much time, effort, and public funding on studies and capital projects to support improved and expanded rail operations in the corridor; and

Whereas, the LOSSAN JPA recognizes the urgent need to advance efforts to support improved customer information, service(s) coordination, and operations to the following action at its meeting of September 9, 2009, directing the member agency chief executive officers (CEOs) to:
(1) Draft a memorandum of understanding (MOU) that:

(a) Clearly articulates our shared vision of

- Short-term roles and responsibilities
- Corridor-long responsibility and authority
- Corridor-long planning and investment ($6-8 billion by 2025)
- Interactive electronic fare collection system
- Recognition of the diverse nature of the corridor (e.g., North and South of Los Angeles Union Station; discretionary intercity and commuter passengers)
- Better traveler information distribution including a consolidated timetable and corridor website
- Focus on local partnerships

(b) Identifies the Business Plan tasks/scope of work required to support implementation of that shared vision,

(c) Identifies the budget, resource requirements, respective responsibilities, and schedule associated with completing the necessary studies, and

(d) Outlines the next steps after completion of Business Plan analysis.

(2) Move forward with identification of the lead agency acting for LOSSAN to hire a project manager/principal (title to be determined and hereafter referred to as PM) to work independent of any one Party and report directly to the LOSSAN Board of Directors, with input from the TAC and oversight by a steering committee of member agency CEOs or their designees, and lead the development of a Business Plan that will provide the operating plan, ridership forecasts, capital and operating requirements and the public benefits associated with implementing a coordinated and expanded rail operations plan for the LOSSAN rail corridor and develop a draft job description for this position.

(3) Work collaboratively to (a) build a Business Plan that accounts for the plans associated with intercity rail passenger service, local commuter rail services and freight rail services. The transportation plan will demonstrate the desire and ability to collaborate with member agencies for the success of the LOSSAN corridor and (b) to strive for early success that demonstrates that we can work collaboratively to implement initiatives (e.g., joint timetable).

(4) Develop an initial work plan of tasks that can be completed in FY 2010 (October 2009 – June 2010)

Whereas, the Parties’ CEOs have worked collaboratively to implement the actions of the LOSSAN JPA at its meeting of September 9, 2009;
NOW THEREFORE, the Parties hereby set forth their mutual understandings and actions required to support the implementation of the LOSSAN JPA action regarding Agenda Item #6 at its meeting of September 9, 2009;

Section 1 Vision for Corridor

The Parties agree to the following actions in order to implement a corridor vision:

- Collectively provide the infrastructure to allow more peak period trains, faster through-express trains and additional service improvements that meet current and future conventional and high-speed intercity, commuter, and freight demands both north and south of Los Angeles Union Station
- Integrate regional fare policy and develop common fare media that are based in part on early implementation lessons in the corridor as appropriate (electronic revenue collection)
- Integrate and/or coordinate operations and develop efficient operating schedules and dispatching for corridor services
- Implement a strategy for seamless rail travel in the corridor
- Collaborate to identify and establish new services for underserved markets
- Integrate and improve traveler information
- Coordinate with Long-Distance Passenger Rail and Motorcoach Services

Section 2 Short-Term Actions

The Parties agree to the following short term actions:

- Development of a scope of work for a Business Plan that identifies the required work to support the implementation of the shared vision for the corridor (August 2009; CEOs/TAC to lead).

- Development of a job description for the LOSSAN Corridor Program / PM (October 2009; CEOs/TAC to lead).

- Identify the budget, resource requirements and schedule associated with completing the Business Plan that includes ridership and revenue forecasting, operational modeling, operating and capital costs, and an analysis of the benefits of the proposed changes (including infrastructure, rolling stock, stations, fare collection technology, and management) (February 2010; PM to lead).

- Development of a scope of work for the Program/PM to focus on between October 2009 and April 2011 including completion of the Business Plan by September 2010 (October 2009; CEOs/TAC to lead and the Project Manager is to detail this work plan within 30 days of hire).

In an effort to make immediate changes that have a direct, positive experience on the traveling public, the Parties agree to direct the PM to focus on the following early action items:
• Implementation of service modifications of both COASTER and Metrolink service with a goal of serving under served markets (January 2011)

• Implementation of a program similar to the Rail 2 Rail Program to include COASTER, Metrolink, and Amtrak under one unified program (June 2010)

• Implementation of a limited stop express service between San Diego, Orange County and Los Angeles with continuing service to Ventura, Santa Barbara, and San Luis Obispo (January 2011)

• Development of a joint timetable (January 2010)

• Implementation of remaining tasks from the LOSSAN Corridor Quick Improvements Study, July 2008 (August 2010)

• Revise Amtrak schedule to better serve the Ventura-Santa Barbara peak period market (January 2011)

• Review these actions with the Business Plan for consistency (Ongoing)

Section 3 - Long-Term Actions

Based upon the Business Plan, the Parties agree to:

• decide upon the appropriate institutional and organizational structure for the future success of the LOSSAN corridor

• implement “Coast Daylight” services to close the gap in state-supported intercity rail services connecting downtown Los Angeles and downtown San Francisco along the coast route

Section 4 - Priority of Projects/Funding

The Parties agree to develop a prioritized program of projects with the goals of realizing the shared vision of the corridor without regard to operational and jurisdictional boundaries.

Section 5 - Board/Stakeholder Feedback

Each Party will be responsible for gathering comments and feedback from their respective Boards of Directors as a key input into this process.

The Parties also agree to solicit input from the Federal Railroad Administration in the development of the Business Plan and to consult the Railroad Corridor Transportation Plans Guidance Manual, FRA, July 8, 2005.
Nonbinding Memorandum of Understanding

The Parties acknowledge and agree that this Memorandum of Understanding is a nonbinding understanding of agreed upon vision, goals, and plans for the LOSSAN corridor and not a contract. Any definitive agreement reached in connection with the matters described herein shall be subject to the approval of the Parties’ duly authorized representatives, which approval may be withheld or conditioned in their sole discretion. No joint venture, partnership or other undertaking shall be deemed to exist as a result of this Memorandum of Understanding.

[insert signature blocks]
LOSSAN
(LOS ANGELES–SAN DIEGO–SAN LUIS OBISPO RAIL CORRIDOR AGENCY)

MEMBERSHIP

This board is composed of current and former elected officials representing rail owners, operators, and planning agencies along Amtrak’s Pacific Surfliner corridor between San Diego and San Luis Obispo. LOSSAN is staffed by SANDAG. The objective of the agency is to coordinate planning and programs that increase ridership, revenue, reliability, and safety on the coastal rail line from San Luis Obispo to Los Angeles to San Diego.

The Los Angeles - San Diego – San Luis Obispo Rail Corridor Agency meets every quarter.

Staff contact: Linda Culp, (619) 699-6957; lcu@sandag.org

MEMBERS

Chair: Arthur Brown
Orange County Transportation Authority

Vice Chair: Jacki Bacharach
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Diane DuBois
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Mary Ann Reiss
San Luis Obispo Council of Governments

Julianne Nygaard
North County Transit District

Richard Dixon
Orange County Transportation Authority

Jerry Rindone
San Diego Metropolitan Transit System

Keith Millhouse
Ventura County Transportation Commission

Salud Carbajal
Santa Barbara County Association of Governments

Bill Bronte
Caltrans, Division of Rail

Joe Kellejian
San Diego Association of Governments

ALTERNATES

Harry Mathis
San Diego Metropolitan Transit System

Brian Humphrey
Ventura County Transportation Commission

Marty Blum
Santa Barbara County Association of Governments

Adam Hill/ Fred Strong
San Luis Obispo Council of Governments

Jerome Stocks / Chris Orlando
North County Transit District

Karen Heit/Beatrice Proo
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

EX-OFFICIO MEMBER

Paul Glaab
Southern California Association of Governments

ADDITIONAL TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Amtrak
BNSF Railway
California Public Utilities Commission
Southern California Regional Rail Authority
Union Pacific
FINAL REGIONAL ENERGY STRATEGY UPDATE

Introduction

The Regional Energy Strategy (RES) serves as the energy policy guide for the San Diego region. SANDAG decided to undertake an update of the adopted 2003 RES in response to increasing scientific and policy focus on global climate change and in light of the significant policy changes and implementation programs affecting the electricity, natural gas, and transportation sectors. The Regional Energy Working Group (EWG) has overseen development of the draft at its monthly meetings. In addition, status reports have been provided to the Regional Planning and Transportation Committees and the Board of Directors, most recently at its October 9, 2009, Board Policy meeting.

Recommendation

The Regional Planning Committee recommends that the Board of Directors approve the Final Regional Energy Strategy Update in substantially the same form as Attachment 2.

Discussion

The Board of Directors first provided input into the RES Update at its May 22, 2009, meeting. A preliminary draft of the RES Update was accepted by the Regional Planning Committee for public distribution and comment at its July 31, 2009, meeting. Since that time, the RES Update has been revised in response to input and direction provided by the EWG, local planning directors on the Regional Planning Technical Working Group, Regional Planning and Transportation Committees, Board of Directors, and members of the public. The Final Regional Energy Strategy Update is provided as Attachment 2.

At the October 9, 2009, Board Policy meeting, Board member comments focused on addressing energy infrastructure like transmission lines and aging, coastal power plants, and their potential environmental impacts. Description of the relationship among SANDAG plans addressing energy issues, support for utility buy-back of customer-generated energy, and the importance of reclaimed water as a low-energy supply option are additional themes of the comments. Attachment 1 lists the Board comments and describes how they are addressed in the Final Regional Energy Strategy Update.

Overview of the Final Regional Energy Strategy Update

The RES Update serves as the SANDAG energy policy guide through 2030 to support decision-making as the region strives to meet the energy needs of a growing population and economy while enhancing our quality of life. It will be a component of the SANDAG Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP), which provides a long-term strategic planning framework for the region to address issues affecting our quality of life, including energy. The energy policy guidance fits within the larger regional vision and strategic planning framework of the adopted RCP, including the Regional Transportation Plan.
Recognizing that state agencies have significant authority over electricity and natural gas end-uses (e.g., space and water heating), the RES focuses on opportunities and authorities that SANDAG and its member agencies could take advantage of to address energy issues through their authorities in areas such as land use planning, transportation planning and funding, and the building entitlement process. Although the RES Update does not make recommendations for specific energy projects (e.g., power plants or transmission projects), it does assess regional need for energy resources and infrastructure. The RES also does not replace the long-term electricity plan that San Diego Gas & Electric develops for the California Public Utilities Commission, but it can inform their decision-making.

After an introduction section, description of the prior 2003 RES, and discussion of related SANDAG planning efforts, the RES Update features the following main components:

- Analysis of existing conditions and projections related to energy use in the San Diego region;
- Discussion of key state policies addressing global climate change and meeting new energy needs driving preparation of the update;
- Guiding principles to provide a vision for the region and guide the development of goals and recommended actions for the RES Update and future decision-making; and
- Goals and recommended actions for 11 major energy topics.

For each topic, the document provides an overarching goal, a summary of relevant facts and issues, and a set of recommended actions that contribute to the goal. The recommended actions represent options for SANDAG, local governments, other regional entities, or potential combinations thereof, to contribute to regional energy goals. Achieving many, if not most, of the goals will require actions that go above and beyond existing requirements or that would require funding amounts or types not provided through existing programs. Achieving the energy goals will require regional and local governments to take active and innovative approaches, not the least of which is securing needed funding.

During the update, six recommended actions emerged as priority actions, or core strategies, essential to meeting the region’s goals. These are implementation actions that can be pursued upon completion of the RES Update; indeed, efforts related to most of these actions are already underway. SANDAG and local governments can play an integral role in implementing each of the priority actions and, in many cases, coordination and collaboration among many jurisdictions and stakeholders will be needed to ensure successful implementation.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Attachments: 1. Comments on the Draft Regional Energy Strategy Update from the SANDAG Board of Directors Policy Meeting, October 9, 2009
2. Final Regional Energy Strategy Update

Key Staff Contact: Andrew Martin, (619) 699-7319, ama@sandag.org

Funds are budgeted in Work Element #3200400
# Comments on the Draft Regional Energy Strategy Update

**SANDAG Board of Directors Policy Meeting**  
**October 9, 2009**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board of Directors Comment/Discussion</th>
<th>Where Addressed in the Regional Energy Strategy (RES) Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The RES Update should be consistent with the direction of state policy and regulation.</td>
<td>The main policy drivers for the RES Update are state policy direction for meeting new energy needs and addressing global climate change (e.g., The California Global Warming Solutions Act [Assembly Bill 32] and The Preferred Loading Order). Chapter II of the revised RES Update addresses these key policy drivers. The RES Update follows the preferred loading order by prioritizing energy efficiency and demand response first, followed by renewable energy and clean distributed generation, and finally clean fossil fuel generation and transmission infrastructure. Although SANDAG and local governments are not subject to binding requirements under Assembly Bill 32, the RES Update is consistent with its direction and intent by identifying policies that would reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and contribute to state goals for GHG emission reduction. Also included is discussion of SANDAG efforts to address climate change requirements pursuant to Senate Bill 375. The RES Update also reflects state policy direction for procuring electricity from renewable resources, increasing the use of alternative fuels and vehicles, and promoting the development of clean energy or &quot;green&quot; jobs and industries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Describe the relationship among SANDAG plans addressing energy and energy-related issues.</td>
<td>The Introduction to the RES Update has been revised to include an expanded discussion of the relationship between the multiple SANDAG plans where energy and climate change are addressed, including the Regional Comprehensive Plan, Regional Transportation Plan, Regional Climate Action Plan, and Regional Alternative Fuels, Vehicles, and Infrastructure Report.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3. Address key energy infrastructure like aging and coastal power plants and transmission lines. Some Board members expressed desire to remove existing coastal power plants. There is concern about the existing and potential environmental and other adverse impacts of coastal power plants and transmission infrastructure. The state-level Renewable Energy Transmission Initiative ( RETI) process addressing potential conflicts | Aging and Coastal Power Plants: Section 7. Natural Gas Power Plants, has been revised to include discussion of state policy to address aging, inefficient power plants and those using once through cooling. The revised section includes discussion of such plants in the San Diego region, their environmental impacts, and the state’s strategy to replace, refit, or repower these facilities. The revised Section 7 includes the following recommended action to address this issue:  
NG-1. Support the repowering, replacement, or removal of older, inefficient coastal power plants in the region with the most efficient natural gas technology or renewable sources in other areas, or transmission upgrades, as needed —consistent with state policy direction to address aging power plants and those with once through cooling. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board of Directors Comment/Discussion</th>
<th>Where Addressed in the Regional Energy Strategy (RES) Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| between renewable energy projects and sensitive environmental areas was cited as an example that SANDAG and the region can look to for guidance on the issue of renewable energy projects and their potential environmental impacts. | Renewable Energy and Transmission Lines: Section 2. Renewable Energy has been revised to include expanded discussion of state policy to address potential conflicts between renewable energy projects and environmental resources. Also added to the section an additional description of the conflicts that renewable energy projects can have with environmental resources like conservation areas and pristine landscapes. Section 2 includes the following recommended actions to address this issue:  
RE-4. Support cost-effective transmission access and related infrastructure that will help the region meet or exceed requirements for procuring electricity from renewable resources while protecting environmental and other resources.  
RE-5. Monitor the Renewable Energy Transmission Initiative (RETI) and related state efforts and consider their recommendations in future regional planning. |
| 4 Revise recommended action to "support cost-effective transmission access and infrastructure..." to reflect consideration of environmental issues. | Section 2. Renewable Energy, now includes the following revised recommended action in response to this comment:  
RE-4. Support cost-effective transmission access and related infrastructure that will help the region meet or exceed requirements for procuring electricity from renewable resources while protecting environmental and other resources. |
| 5 Support the distribution of information on the latest energy-related technologies and products to stakeholders, including local government staff, retailers, and property owners. | Section 1. Energy Efficiency, identifies the following new recommended action in response to this comment:  
EE-12. Provide information and resources to help residents, businesses, developers, builders and others improve energy efficiency and conservation in new and existing buildings. |
| 6 Support policies that promote the buyback by utilities of customer-generated renewable energy, such as the Feed-in Tariff mechanism. | Section 2 - Renewable Energy, identifies the following recommended action:  
DG-5. Continue to monitor and support a feed-in-tariff or other policies that will facilitate increased, cost-effective installation of small-scale renewable energy systems like solar photovoltaics.  
This section has been updated to include description of recently adopted Senate Bill 32, which amends the existing California feed-in tariff. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board of Directors Comment/Discussion</th>
<th>Where Addressed in the Regional Energy Strategy (RES) Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 Support expanded use of reclaimed water as a low-embedded energy water supply option. Discuss impediments to expanded use in the region. Policy solutions mentioned included: assessment districts to finance purple pipe installations, and groundwater replenishment similar to Orange County. Also reference reclamation effort in the San Elijo JPA (Encinitas and Solana Beach member cities) that produces about 1.2 million gallons per day, much of which is unutilized and dumped into the ocean.</td>
<td>Section 4. Energy and Water, includes a discussion of water reclamation, which has been revised to include discussion of assessment districts to finance purple pipe installation, the groundwater replenishment system in Orange County, and the reclamation effort in the San Elijo JPA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Revise recommended action to &quot;identify existing or develop new financing mechanisms that end users can utilize to reduce water-related energy consumption...&quot; to make it clear that this includes purple pipe.</td>
<td>Section 4. Energy and Water, includes the following revised recommended action: EW-4. Identify existing or develop new financing mechanisms that end users can utilize to reduce water-related energy consumption (e.g., purple pipe to support use of reclaimed water), such as those available for energy measures (e.g., on-bill financing [property tax or utility] and low interest loans).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Clarify use of the term &quot;clean energy&quot; jobs instead of &quot;green&quot; jobs.</td>
<td>Section 11. Clean Energy Economy, now includes a note that the term “clean energy” job has essentially the same meaning as “green” job. Staff chose to use the term clean energy job because of its focus on energy-related employment, whereas the term green job can convey a variety of environmental attributes, not just energy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Acknowledge and explain the RES recommendation of actions to reduce use of natural gas for end uses like heating and to increase use in transportation applications.</td>
<td>Section 7. Natural Gas Power Plants, has been revised to include an explanation of why the RES Update includes recommended actions to reduce use of natural gas for end uses like heating and to increase use in transportation applications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Strategies are needed to promote transportation alternatives to driving.</td>
<td>Section 9. Land Use and Transportation Planning, includes discussion of strategies to promote alternatives to driving, and explains how these strategies can help the region save energy, reduce GHG emissions, and comply with the requirements of Senate Bill 375.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Directors Comment/Discussion</td>
<td>Where Addressed in the Regional Energy Strategy (RES) Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Expand the scope of the recommended action calling for SANDAG to incorporate alternative fuel vehicles and increased efficiency into its vehicle fleet and that of its contractors to encourage the region’s trash haulers to use alternative fuel vehicles. Also, create a separate recommended action for “contractors and funding recipients” to clearly explain their use of alternative fuels should be encouraged through mechanisms such as use of points in evaluation for criteria in Requests for Proposals, Grant applications, etc. | Section 8. Transportation Fuels, has been revised to include the following revised recommended action:

TF-1. Create an action plan that incorporates alternative fuel vehicles and increased efficiency into the SANDAG and local government-owned vehicle fleets, and the vehicle and equipment fleets of contractors and funding recipients, such as the vehicle fleet for the SANDAG vanpool program or for local government trash haulers.

Staff felt that both points of the comment are important, but are adequately addressed in this one recommended action. Thus a separate recommended action was not created. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board of Directors Comment/Discussion</th>
<th>Where Addressed in the Regional Energy Strategy (RES) Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Consider adding new recommended action to revise definition of smart growth in other planning documents, such as Regional Comprehensive Plan and Regional Transportation Plan, to include all energy saving strategies. Also, redefine the phrase “smart growth.” | Section 9. Land Use and Transportation Planning has been revised to indicate that the SANDAG Smart Growth Design Guidelines include discussion of important energy considerations, such as distributed photovoltaics, green buildings, and energy-saving and GHG reduction benefits of smart growth and alternative travel options like walking, bicycling, and public transportation. This section also includes the adopted SANDAG definition of smart growth. Staff believes that redefining the term “smart growth” would be outside the purview of the RES Update and the Regional Energy Working Group. The following recommended action from the RES Update calls on SANDAG to promote energy saving strategies in future updates of its Regional Transportation Plan and Regional Comprehensive Plan. Staff feels that the updates of these documents would be more appropriate times to consider revising or redefining the adopted definition of smart growth. LUTP-2. Support policy measures that promote the general characteristics of a low-energy demand built environment (described above), energy efficient transportation choices, and alternative fuels and vehicles in future updates of the Regional Transportation Plan, and Regional Comprehensive Plan, such as:  
  a. Investments in pedestrian, bicycle, and public transit travel,  
  b. Measures to reduce transportation demand like telecommuting, congestion and road pricing as well as parking pricing and reform,  
  c. Compact, walkable, mixed use and human scale smart growth community design,  
  d. Measures to optimize the efficiency of vehicle travel conditions, and  
  e. Infrastructure to support alternative fuel vehicle charging and fueling. |
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I. INTRODUCTION

Energy is fundamental to the regional economy and the quality of life of San Diego residents. Energy lights, heats, and cools our homes and offices, runs our businesses and industrial machines, moves people and goods, delivers and heats our water, and impacts nearly every facet of daily life. Abundant amounts of electricity, natural gas, and transportation fuels like gasoline and diesel are required to support the region’s existing three million residents, one million housing units, and one and a half million jobs. According to the SANDAG regional growth forecast, regional population is expected to increase by almost one million people (32 percent), four hundred thousand housing units (26 percent), and add nearly half a million jobs (32 percent) by 2030, which will increase demand for energy.

The Regional Energy Strategy Update (RES Update) builds on and revises the RES adopted in 2003 (2003 RES) to serve as an energy policy guide to support decision-making by SANDAG and its member agencies as the region strives to meet the energy needs of a growing population, housing stock, and number of workers while maintaining and enhancing regional quality of life and economic stability.

Benefits of developing a regional energy plan include:

- Identifying region-specific energy issues, such as increasing the diversity of energy supply in the region or reducing energy intensity of water and wastewater processes;
- Identifying commonly held principles or unique aspects about the region that may differ from those of state policymakers and utility planners;
- Prioritizing regional energy issues, guiding future actions and decisions in the region;
- Establishing a mechanism to implement regional goals;
- Representing shared regional interests at appropriate proceedings, such as a utility's long-term procurement plan or state regulatory and legislative activities;
- Helping local governments represent their interests in the energy arena and increase energy-efficiency; and
- Realizing potential co-benefits of energy policies, such as improved air quality, public health, job creation, and financial savings.

The Adopted Regional Energy Strategy

The San Diego region has a history of developing an energy strategy going back to 1979, with updates occurring through the 1980s and 1990s. The most recent update was adopted by the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) Board of Directors in 2003. At the same time, the SANDAG Board established the Regional Energy Working Group to advise SANDAG on issues related to the coordination and implementation of the 2003 RES.

The 2003 RES focused primarily on electricity and natural gas issues and developed a vision for how energy would be produced and consumed in the region. The 2003 RES proposed a series of goals and implementation steps to achieve the goals addressing issues such as: regional consensus, peak
demand, renewable energy, distributed generation, transmission, per capita electricity and natural
gas consumption, and natural gas supply.

The 2003 RES helped the region develop programs for energy efficiency and renewables, set legislative priorities, make recommendations to state regulatory and policy proceedings and the local utility San Diego Gas and Electric (SDG&E), obtain funding, and implement the SANDAG Sustainable Region Program, which helps local governments improve energy efficiency of their operations and throughout their communities.

The 2003 RES is a component of the SANDAG Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP), which provides a long-term strategic planning framework for the region to address the many issues affecting regional quality of life, including energy.

**The SANDAG Regional Comprehensive Plan**

The RCP, adopted in 2004, integrates the array of local and regional plans in land use, transportation, and supporting infrastructure like energy that influence the region’s quality of life. The RCP creates a regional vision and provides a broad context in which local and regional decisions can be made that foster a healthy environment, a vibrant economy, and a high quality of life for all residents.

---

**Regional Comprehensive Plan Vision**

“To preserve and enhance the San Diego region’s unique features – its vibrant and culturally diverse communities, its beaches, deserts, mountains, lagoons, bluffs, and canyons, and its international setting – and promote sustainability, economic prosperity, and an outstanding quality of life for everyone.”

---

The SANDAG Board adopted the goals and policy direction of the RCP as the strategic planning framework for the region, in conjunction with other plans and strategies. To implement these goals, the RCP calls for the application of principles of “smart growth” and “sustainability.” Smart growth means developing the region in a way that creates livable communities by connecting land use and transportation and improving the quality of travel by focusing on better urban design and walkability. The principles of sustainability are based on achieving goals and objectives in three broad areas: a prosperous economy, a healthy environment, and social equity. These “three Es” together provide the foundation for achieving sustainable and livable communities in the San Diego region.

The RES Update approach to energy issues has been developed to fit within the larger regional vision and strategic planning framework of the adopted RCP.
Relationship with other SANDAG Planning Efforts

Regional Transportation Plan

The Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), most recently updated in 2007, serves as the primary transportation element of the RCP, and helps position the region to achieve smarter, more sustainable growth that meets the transportation needs of the growing population and changing region. The RCP calls upon SANDAG to update the RTP and related programming documents in a way that both maximizes opportunities for local governments to implement smart growth and ensures that the design and implementation of regional transportation facilities support local smart growth. The adopted RTP calls for more than $42 billion for transportation investments through 2030. The types of transportation investments identified in the RTP and their relationship with local smart growth will greatly influence the transportation choices people make to reach jobs and services, including driving alone, walking, bicycling, taking public transit, and carpooling. Transportation energy consumption and related greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions are in large part determined by the sum of individual travel choices, as well as other important factors like vehicle fuel efficiency.

Senate Bill 375

Federal and state laws require that SANDAG prepare a long-range transportation plan and make an air quality conformity determination every four years, and the next RTP update (2050 RTP) is scheduled for adoption in 2011. In the next update, SANDAG will be the first major metropolitan planning organization (MPO) in the state to prepare an RTP that will include the provisions of Senate Bill (SB) 375 (Statutes of 2008). In effect, SB 375 requires the next RTP update to achieve GHG emissions reduction targets from passenger cars and light-duty trucks for 2020 and 2035. The legislation requires a new element of the RTP called a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) that shows how regional GHG reduction targets, to be established by the California Air Resources Board (CARB), would be achieved through development patterns, transportation infrastructure investments, and/or transportation measures or policies that are determined to be feasible. The SCS also must address housing needs and protection of sensitive resource areas. If the SCS does not meet regional GHG reduction targets, an Alternative Planning Strategy (APS) must be developed to demonstrate how the targets could be achieved.

The adopted SANDAG Smart Growth Concept Map, which identifies existing, planned, and potential smart growth areas linked to existing and planned public transit, along with habitat conservation areas and major employment areas, will serve as a basis for the SCS. The sections of the RES Update dealing with Transportation Fuels and Land Use and Transportation Planning provide policy guidance related to saving energy and reducing GHG emissions from the transportation sector generally, and passenger cars and light-duty trucks, specifically. The SANDAG Regional Climate Action Plan (RCAP), currently under preparation, will provide more in-depth analysis of land use and transportation policy measures that could reduce GHG emissions and help achieve the SB 375 targets. SB 375 is also discussed in Chapter II – Key Policy Drivers, and Section 9, Land Use and Transportation Planning.

SB 375 implementation will ultimately be addressed in the next update of the SANDAG RTP, which is currently under preparation and scheduled for adoption in 2011, and the next update of the SANDAG RCP, which is slated for preparation after the adoption of the RTP.
Regional Climate Action Plan

Although there is overlap between the energy policy guidance provided in the RES Update and types of policy measures that would reduce GHG emissions, energy and climate change are not synonymous issues. As a result, SANDAG is preparing an RCAP to accompany the RES Update that will provide regional policy guidance related to climate change. Where applicable, the RCAP will reference the energy policy guidance of the RES Update.

The primary purpose of the RCAP is to provide more in-depth analysis of land use and transportation policy measures that could reduce GHG emissions and help achieve SB 375 targets. With a focus on identifying measures to achieve SB 375 targets for passenger cars and light-duty trucks, the RCAP will examine potential GHG emissions reductions from land use and transportation policy measures. In addition, the RCAP will identify climate change policy measures that SANDAG and its member agencies could implement and support to reduce GHG emissions from other major sectors and activities and adapt to the projected impacts of climate change. The RCAP is expected to be available in early 2010.

Regional Alternative Fuels, Vehicles, and Infrastructure Report

As part of a partnership with the California Energy Commission (CEC), SANDAG developed a regional assessment of alternative transportation fuels, vehicles, and infrastructure. The report identifies and recommends regional and local government actions to increase the use of alternative fuels and vehicles in the fleets of local governments and their franchisees. While primarily focused on opportunities for local government fleets, the report also provides analysis, tools, and recommendations to facilitate a regional rollout of alternative fuels, vehicles, and infrastructure to the general public.

The report concludes with four sets of recommendations to help local government fleets and the region as a whole increase the use of alternative fuels and vehicles and develop the supportive infrastructure. The SANDAG Board accepted the final report for distribution at its September 25, 2009, meeting.

The Regional Energy Strategy Update

New California Energy Policy Authority

Deregulation of the electricity market and its implications was a major focus of the 2003 RES, among other issues. Since adoption of the 2003 RES, the state has established new regulations for utilities like SDG&E and required preparation of long-range electricity plans. California has also implemented comprehensive energy policies affecting residents, the economy, and the environment, including landmark legislation to address global climate change and adoption of a preferred loading order dictating the state’s priorities for meeting new energy needs and addressing climate change. As a result, the state, through agencies like the California Public Utility Commission (CPUC) and California Energy Commission and utilities like SDG&E has significant authority over electricity and natural gas end uses (e.g., space and water heating) in the San Diego region. In addition, SANDAG and local governments have significant energy-related authorities through their role in areas like land use planning, transportation planning and funding, and building permitting.
SANDAG decided to undertake an update of the 2003 RES in response to the increasing scientific and policy focus on global climate change and in light of the significant policy changes and implementation programs affecting the electricity, natural gas, and transportation sectors. These issues will significantly affect energy-related issues in the San Diego region.

Focus of the RES Update

In light of significant state control over certain energy policy areas like electricity and natural gas, the RES Update focuses on the multiple opportunities and authorities that SANDAG and its member agencies could take advantage of to address energy issues and achieve both local and regional goals related to energy and climate change. This includes opportunities for SANDAG to address energy climate change considerations through RCP implementation and the next RTP update, as well as options for local governments through mechanisms like the General Plan. The RES Update looks out to 2030, the horizon year for current adopted regional growth projections.

Although the RES Update does not make recommendations for specific energy projects (e.g., power plants or transmission projects), it does assess regional need for energy resources and infrastructure. Furthermore, the RES Update does not replace the long-term electricity plan (i.e., procurement plan) that SDG&E is required to develop for the CPUC, but it can inform decisions made by SDG&E and the CPUC.

Structure of the RES Update

The RES Update provides analysis of existing conditions and projections in the region related to energy, as well as guiding principles, goals, and recommended actions.

II. Key Policy Drivers

This section provides more detailed discussion of the main two drivers of the RES Update: (1) global climate change and its policy implications, and (2) the state’s preferred loading order for meeting new energy needs.

III. Existing Conditions and Future Projections

This section provides existing conditions and future projections to 2030 related to consumption of electricity, natural gas, and transportation fuel, as well as the resulting GHG emissions.

IV. Guiding Principles

Guiding principles for the RES Update were developed with the participation of the Regional Energy Working Group, Regional Planning Technical Working Group, SANDAG Board and policy advisory committees, and members of the public. These principles helped to identify a vision for the region that guides regional decision-making on energy-related items in response to key policy drivers and future projections. They also informed the development of goals and recommended actions for the RES Update.
V. Major Energy Topic Areas

The RES Update is structured around 11 major energy topics identified during its development:

**Major Topic Areas of the Regional Energy Strategy Update**

1. Energy Efficiency and Conservation  
2. Renewable Energy  
3. Distributed Generation  
4. Energy and Water  
5. Peak Demand  
6. The Smart Grid  
7. Natural Gas Power Plants  
8. Transportation Fuels  
9. Land Use and Transportation Planning  
10. Border Energy  
11. Clean Energy Economy

For each topic, the document identifies an overarching goal, a summary of relevant facts and issues, and a set of recommended actions that contribute to the goal. The recommended actions represent options for SANDAG, local governments, other regional entities, or potentially combinations thereof, to contribute to regional energy goals. Achieving many, if not most, of the goals will require actions that go above and beyond existing requirements or would require funding amounts or types not provided through existing programs. Achieving the goals will also require regional and local governments to take active and innovative approaches, not the least of which is securing needed funding.

Priority Recommended Actions

During the update, stakeholders, elected officials and members of the public identified actions that, if implemented, would go a long way toward helping the region meet its energy goals. While all of the recommended actions identified in the RES Update are considered important, the following six have emerged as priority actions, or core strategies, that are essential to meeting the region’s goals. These are implementation actions that can be pursued near immediately upon completion of the RES Update; indeed, efforts related to most of these actions are already underway. SANDAG and local governments can play an integral role in implementing each of the following priority actions, and in many cases, coordination and collaboration amongst many jurisdictions and stakeholders will be needed to ensure successful implementation.

1. Pursue a comprehensive building retrofit program to improve efficiency and install renewable energy systems;
2. Create financing programs to pay for projects and improvements that save energy;
3. Utilize the SANDAG-SDG&E Local Government Partnership funding award to help local government identify opportunities and implement energy savings at government facilities and throughout their communities;
4. Support land use and transportation planning strategies that reduce energy use and GHG emissions;
5. Support planning of electric charging and alternative fueling infrastructure; and
6. Support use of existing unused reclaimed water to decrease the amount of energy needed to meet the water needs of the San Diego region.
Broad Strategies to Implement Multiple Goals

During preparation of the RES Update, broad strategies were identified with overarching connections to several energy topic areas. By implementing these broad strategies, SANDAG and local governments will contribute to achievement of most, if not all of the goals identified in the RES Update.

1. Identify, secure, or develop funding mechanisms to pay for energy-related projects and programs;
2. Educate and engage the general public or other stakeholders;
3. Support enabling legislation or policy changes from state or federal government;
4. Take early actions that set examples for residents and businesses; and
5. Develop standardized approaches and programs that can be implemented by all member agencies.
II. KEY POLICY DRIVERS

California Preferred Loading Order

The CPUC and CEC adopted a preferred loading order to meet goals for satisfying the state’s growing demand for electricity and significantly reducing the level of GHG emissions responsible for global climate change. The loading order calls for achieving these goals by placing top priority on first increasing energy efficiency and demand response, then with new generation from renewable and distributed generation resources, and finally with clean fossil-fueled generation and infrastructure improvements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The California Preferred Loading Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Increase energy efficiency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Increase demand response - temporary reduction or shift in energy use during peak hours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Meet generation needs with renewable and distributed generation resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Meet new generation needs with clean fossil-fueled generation and infrastructure improvements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The components of the preferred loading order are addressed throughout the RES Update: Section 1 - Energy Efficiency and Conservation; Section 2 - Renewable Energy, including transmission issues; Section 3 - Distributed Generation; Section 5 - Peak Demand (i.e., demand response); and Section 7 - Natural Gas Power Plants.

Global Climate Change

Overview

Global climate change has emerged as the defining challenge of the 21st century, with the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) reporting that GHG emissions from human activities have begun to destabilize the Earth’s climate. The IPCC is the leading international scientific body for the assessment of climate change, established by the United Nations Environment Program (UNEP) and the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) to provide the world with a clear scientific view on the current state of climate change and its potential environmental and socio-economic consequences. The changing climate threatens the public health, economy, and environment of the San Diego region, California, and the entire world. Projected adverse climate change impacts to the San Diego region include hotter temperatures, sea level rise, water shortages, more frequent and intense wildfires, increased risks to public health, loss of native plant and animal species, increased demand for electricity, and subsequent economic losses. Significant actions are needed to both reduce the region’s contribution to climate change and adapt to the impacts of climate change.

A more detailed and up-to-date discussion of global climate change and its impacts will be provided in the SANDAG RCAP, which is anticipated for completion in early 2010. For discussion of the
projected impacts of climate change on the San Diego region, please see San Diego’s Changing Climate: A Regional Wake-Up Call - A Summary of the Focus 2050 Study by the San Diego Foundation.

Key State Climate Change Policy and Legislation

California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (Assembly Bill 32)

California has responded to the challenge of climate change in many ways, including passage of the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (Assembly Bill (AB) 32, Chapter 488, Statutes of 2006). This legislation establishes the 1990 emissions level as the statewide limit for 2020; an approximately 15 percent reduction from the baseline 2006 level. AB 32 calls for regulatory market mechanisms to achieve the GHG emissions reduction target. Many of the state’s energy policies and programs are now significantly shaped, at least in part, by the requirements and spirit of AB 32.

Climate Change Scoping Plan

The CARB Climate Change Scoping Plan report outlines the main strategies for meeting the AB 32 GHG reduction target, which include a range of actions including direct regulations, alternative compliance mechanisms, monetary and non-monetary incentives, voluntary actions, market-based mechanisms like a cap-and-trade system, and a cost of implementation fee to fund the program. CARB and other state agencies must adopt these reduction measures by the start of 2011, and already a number of “early action” measures required by Scoping Plan have been adopted, such as the Low Carbon Fuel Standard (LCFS). In addition, the Scoping Plan emphasizes the need to better connect land use and transportation planning to help the state achieve its GHG emissions reduction target for 2020.

Senate Bill 375

As described in the introduction, Senate Bill (SB) 375 (Statutes of 2008) requires MPOs like SANDAG to create a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) that integrates the transportation network with development patterns in a way that achieves GHG emissions reduction targets from passenger cars and light-duty trucks while meeting housing needs and other regional planning objectives. The SCS must demonstrate how changes to land use patterns, transportation infrastructure investments, funding allocations, policies, or any other measures will achieve the targets to be established through the SB 375 process in the next update of the RTP.

Governor’s Executive Order S-3-05

Governor’s Executive Order S-3-05 establishes a long-term climate goal for the state of reducing emissions an additional 80 percent below the 1990 level by 2050 (an approximately 95 percent reduction from the baseline 2006 level). Although not required by statute, the 2050 target is based on the scientifically-supported level of emissions reduction required for climate stabilization and used as the long-term driver for state policy development.
Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Targets

While achieving the near-term goal of reducing statewide GHG emissions to the 1990 level by 2020 is ambitious but likely achievable with available policy measures and technology options, the long-term goal of reducing statewide GHG emissions to 80 percent below the 1990 level by 2050 will require fundamental changes in policy, technology, and behavior.

Although the state does not set economy-wide reduction targets for specific geographic regions of the state, projections showing the theoretical emissions reductions necessary to reach the 2020 and 2050 targets illustrate the magnitude of change the region needs to make over the next four decades (Figure II-1). It should be noted that deep cuts in GHG emissions required for climate stabilization must also occur during a period of projected growth in population and economic output.

Figure II-1: Theoretical Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Targets for the San Diego Region

![Figure II-1](source: Energy Policy Initiatives Center, University of San Diego, 2008.)

The Effect of Climate Change on Energy Consumption

Environmental changes caused by climate change also will impact energy production. In the San Diego region and statewide, climate change is projected to increase the risk of drought or water shortages during summer months. In addition, winter runoff may increase and increase the risk of flooding. As a result, hydroelectric power generation may be adversely affected. Lower runoff flows would decrease hydropower generation while higher flows often must be spilled past dams without generating any electricity. Lost hydropower generation would have to be replaced with electricity generated from renewable sources, or else GHG emissions from electricity generation would increase.

In addition, increased average temperatures and longer and more extreme heat events associated with climate change are expected to increase peak demand for electricity. In many cases, relatively inefficient and high cost “peaker plants” are utilized to meet peak demand. As a result, demand

1 Except for SB 375, which will lead to the establishment of regional GHG emission reduction targets for passenger cars and light-duty trucks.
response strategies will become an even more important part of the region’s energy strategy as a result of climate change.

More discussion of the connection between how we use energy, the deep GHG reductions required to address climate change, and the regional impacts of climate change will be provided in the forthcoming Regional Climate Action Plan.

**The RES Approach to Climate Change**

Achieving the near-term 2020 target for GHG emissions reduction will likely focus on increasing energy efficiency and the use of renewable energy and clean distributed energy systems. By contrast, reaching the 2050 target for GHG emission reductions will require more fundamental changes in how we use energy through technology and behavior change. The recommended actions of the RES Update start the region on a long-term path to do its part for climate stabilization. Consistent with the state’s policy framework, the RES Update focuses primarily on strategies for reducing GHG emissions from electricity generation and natural gas end use by increasing energy efficiency and reducing the carbon intensity of electricity supplies.

The three primary strategies for reducing GHG emissions from fuel use in the on-road transportation sector are to: (1) improve vehicle fuel efficiency, (2) reduce the carbon content of transportation fuels, and (3) better integrate land use patterns and transportation infrastructure through improved planning. The RES Update focuses on reducing GHG emissions from transportation fuel consumption by transitioning the region away from petroleum-based fuels and reducing automobile dependence through a variety of policy measures, including improved integration of land use and transportation planning, smart growth development patterns, promoting walking, bicycling, and public transit as viable travel options, managing transportation demand, pricing vehicle trips and parking, and improving transportation system efficiency.
III. EXISTING CONDITIONS AND FUTURE PROJECTIONS

This section presents existing conditions and future projections for transportation fuel, electricity, and natural gas use, as well as resulting GHG emissions.

Electricity

Current Statewide and Regional Electricity Supply

Figures III-1 and III-2 illustrate the types of resources that make up the total electricity production (measured in GWh) for California. Statewide, natural gas is the predominant fuel type, followed by coal, nuclear, and large hydroelectric. Renewable sources, which are used to generate about 10 percent of total system power, are largely geothermal, followed by wind, biomass, small hydroelectric, and solar.

Figure III-1: 2008 Statewide Total Electricity System Power Mix (GWh)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Type</th>
<th>% of Total System Power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural Gas</td>
<td>45.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coal</td>
<td>18.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear</td>
<td>14.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Hydro</td>
<td>11.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewables</td>
<td>10.61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: California Energy Commission

Figure III-2: 2008 Statewide Renewables Mix (GWh)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Renewable Resource Type</th>
<th>% of Total Renewable Mix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geothermal</td>
<td>42.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind</td>
<td>22.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biomass</td>
<td>19.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Hydro</td>
<td>13.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solar</td>
<td>2.29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: California Energy Commission
Figure III-3 shows projected 2009 electricity production for the SDG&E service area, which includes all of San Diego County and a small portion of southern Orange County. Much like statewide figures, the SDG&E power mix is dominated by natural gas. Renewable resources are close to the state total at about nine percent, with wind as the largest component of the renewable portfolio.

![Figure III-3: Projected 2009 SDG&E Power Mix (GWh)](chart)

**Resource Type**
- Natural Gas: 56%
- Nuclear: 20%
- Coal: 11%
- Wind: 5%
- Large Hydro: 4%
- Biomass: 3%
- Small Hydro: <1%
- Solar: <1%
- Geo-thermal: <1%

**Eligible Renewable Resources (9% of Total Power Mix)**

Source: SDG&E

**Regional Electricity Consumption Forecast**

Under a business-as-usual scenario (i.e., no change in existing policy, programs, or behavior), the region’s total electricity consumption from 2007\(^2\) (18,648 GWh) is expected to increase by about 10 percent in 2020 (to 20,555 GWh) and 21 percent in 2030 (to 22,647 GWh). This increase in total consumption assumes that existing levels of funding for energy efficiency programs administered by the utility continue.

The RES Update uses the CEC June 2009 electricity consumption forecast to determine energy efficiency targets. SDG&E also relies on the CEC forecast for resource planning. Figure III-1 depicts regional electricity consumption if current business-as-usual trends continue.

\(^2\) 2007 data was the most recent available at the time the RES update was initiated.
The June 2009 forecast for regional electricity consumption is about 10 percent lower than the previous forecast, attributed primarily to the economic recession. Despite this projected decrease, aggressive actions are needed to reduce electricity use are needed to meet long-term greenhouse gas emissions reduction targets.

Residential and commercial sectors use the most electricity in the San Diego region, as depicted in Figure III-2. Consumption in these sectors could continue to grow due to regional population and job growth.
Though current trends indicate that total regional electricity consumption will continue to grow, per capita consumption is projected to remain flat through 2030. Consumers are using more electronic products and appliances today, but energy-saving measures like conservation and energy efficiency standards have been effective in maintaining per capita consumption. The main reason for overall growth in electricity consumption is population growth, anticipated to be on the order of nearly one million additional people between now and 2030 according to the SANDAG regional growth forecast. The region will need sufficient energy supply resources to accommodate this future growth.

**Natural Gas**

As shown in Figure III-3, the San Diego region currently consumes approximately 581 million therms (MMTh) of natural gas per year (not including gas used for electricity generation, which is accounted for in the previous section above). As the figure also shows, the majority of natural gas end-uses are in the residential and commercial sectors. At present, California imports 87 percent of its natural gas needs from out state, and at the same time in-state production is decreasing. Over the last decade, natural gas prices have been volatile; therefore, it is difficult to reliably predict future prices.

Under a business-as-usual scenario, regional natural gas consumption is expected to grow to 660 MMTh in 2020 and 730 MMTh in 2030 as shown below. With increase in demand expected to coincide with continued price volatility, natural gas must be utilized in the most energy efficient manner and replaced with renewable or other options where feasible.
Transportation

On-Road Transportation

The on-road transportation sector is a large consumer of energy, and is almost entirely dependent on petroleum-based fuels (gasoline and diesel). As shown in Figure III-4, passenger cars and light-duty trucks are by far the largest consumers of transportation fuel, accounting for about 1.6 billion gallons of gasoline and diesel per year, or 85 percent of total consumption by on-road vehicles.

Figure III-4: Projected On-road Fuel Consumption 2007-2030

Light-duty trucks represent only about 35 percent of total miles traveled, but due to their relatively low efficiency, account for about half of fuel consumption.

Heavy-duty trucks and buses account for most of the remaining consumption by on-road vehicles, about 170 million gallons or about 11 percent of total on-road fuel consumption. While heavy-duty trucks mostly use diesel fuel, the region’s transit agencies operate a substantial number of CNG buses, including CNG-electric hybrids. Passenger cars and light-duty trucks are the largest contributors, generating about 89 percent of emissions from on-road vehicles, while heavy-duty vehicles account for the remainder. Without changes in policy or behavior, on-road consumption of petroleum-based fuels is expected to increase sizably by 2020, with the trend continuing to 2030.

Other Transportation: Aviation, Rail, Watercraft, and Off-Road Equipment

Although small relative to fuel use by passenger cars and heavy-duty vehicles, energy consumed by the civil aviation, rail transportation, water-borne equipment, and off-road sectors is significant. Fuel consumption in these sectors accounts for about 10 percent of GHG emissions in the San Diego region and is primarily petroleum-based.
In 2007, the civil aviation sector, which comprises commercial flights and ground operations at San Diego International Airport (SDIA), consumed about 210 million gallons of jet fuel, 28,000 gallons of aviation gasoline, and 53 million cubic feet of natural gas. International flights and aviation at other airports and military facilities are not included in this analysis because data could not be obtained. Fuel use in this sector combined to account for about five percent of total GHG emissions in the region. The off-road vehicle and equipment category is the next largest consumer of fuel in this sector (primarily gasoline and diesel), accounting for about 4 percent of total GHG emissions. The largest fuel users in this category are construction and mining, industrial, pleasure craft, and agricultural.

The rail transportation category consumes diesel fuel for freight and goods movement, the Coaster commuter rail line, and the Sprinter light-rail line. The light-rail San Diego Trolley is powered by electricity. The diesel consumption accounts for about one percent of the region’s carbon footprint, while electricity to power the Trolley accounts for a very small amount of GHG emissions from the region’s electricity consumption.

There are many types of water-borne navigation in the San Diego region, but the largest sources of fuel consumption are ocean going vessels (OGVs) and harbor operating within San Diego Harbor. It should be noted that like rail, OGVs are among the most efficient mode of goods movement. The majority of fuel use from OGVs is due to automobile shipments, refrigerated vessels, and passenger cruise ships. The majority of harbor craft fuel use is due to commercial and charter fishing boats. Water-borne navigation accounts for less than one percent of total GHG emissions.

New California Air Resources Board (CARB) fuel regulations effective July 2009 and January 2012 will require the use of clean marine distillate fuels in OGVs that visit California seaports and operate within 24 nautical miles of the coast. In addition new CARB shore power regulations effective in 2014 will reduce emissions from cruise ships and refrigerated container ships while at berth.

**Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

**Existing Greenhouse Gas Emissions in the San Diego Region**

Energy use in the San Diego region is the largest source of greenhouse gas emissions. Table III-4 shows emissions in the four principal categories established by the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). As it shows, 91 percent of all GHG emissions in the region are related to the production and consumption of energy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change Category</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Greenhouse Gas Emissions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial (non-fuel)</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, Forestry, Land Use</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Energy Policy Initiatives Center, University of San Diego, 2008.
Existing Greenhouse Gas Emissions by End-Use Category

Although many activities consume energy, most of the region’s energy consumption and related GHG emissions are caused by three end-use categories of energy consumption: the movement of people and goods in the on-road transportation sector, electricity generation that provides power to homes and businesses, and natural gas for end uses like space heating and cooking (Figure III-5).

**Figure III-5: Summary of Existing Greenhouse Gas Emissions by End-Use Category**

On-Road Transportation

The largest emissions category is on-road transportation, which accounts for nearly half of emissions (46 percent). Moreover, energy consumed by passenger cars and light-duty vehicles (pick-up trucks, sport utility vehicles), primarily gasoline for personal automobile transportation, accounts for about 89 percent of on-road transportation emissions, and about 41 percent of total emissions in the region.

The high level of GHG emissions from on-road transportation is due to the region’s near total dependence on petroleum-based gasoline and diesel fuel, average vehicle efficiency, and levels of driving. On-road transportation also comprises a significant proportion of GHG emissions statewide. In response, the state has enacted several transportation-related laws and regulations calling for petroleum reduction, development of low-carbon and alternative fuels, increased vehicle fuel efficiency, and improved land use and transportation planning.

Electricity and Natural Gas End-Use Sectors

Electricity and natural gas end-uses account for about one-third (33 percent) of GHG emissions in the region. Total consumption levels and fuel sources contribute to the level of GHG emissions from electricity generation. About two-thirds (67 percent) of the fuel used to generate the electricity consumed in the region is natural gas and out-of-state coal. Older and relatively inefficient natural gas power plants, buildings, and end-use equipment are also factors that contribute to the level of emissions from electricity and natural gas.
Existing Greenhouse Gas Emissions by Economic Sector

GHG emissions can also be analyzed by economic sector. As shown in Figure III-6, the residential sector (i.e., passengers cars, light-duty trucks, electricity and natural gas consumption) accounts for more than half (56 percent) of all regional emissions. This indicates that energy used by residents for personal transport and home use contribute significantly to regional GHG emissions.

**Figure III-6: Greenhouse Gas Emissions by Economic Sector**

![Emissions by Economic Sector Pie Chart]

Source: Energy Policy Initiatives Center, University of San Diego, 2008.

Future Projections for Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Under a business-as-usual scenario in which current energy use trends and policies do not change, GHG emissions in the region will be approximately 43 MMT CO$_2$E in 2020, approximately 26 percent greater than the 2006 level and 48 percent higher than the 1990 level. Emissions would be even greater in 2030 under a business-as-usual scenario. The projected increases in GHG emissions for on-road transportation, natural gas, and electricity are shown in Figures III-7 to III-9 below. Because the following figures are business-as-usual projections depicting the consequences of not taking action, the effect of new federal, state, and local policies is not shown.
Figure III-7: Projected Greenhouse Gas Emissions from On-road Transportation, 1990-2030

Source: Energy Policy Initiatives Center, University of San Diego, 2008.

Figure III-8: Projected Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Natural Gas End-Uses, 1990-2030

Source: Energy Policy Initiatives Center, University of San Diego, 2008.

Figure III-9: Projected Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Electricity Generation, 1990-2030

Source: Energy Policy Initiatives Center, University of San Diego, 2008.
IV. GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR THE RES UPDATE

Sustainably Meet Future Energy Needs
The region’s energy needs are met while maintaining environmental quality by employing resources efficiently, diversifying our fuel mix, and utilizing supplies that minimize cost.

Reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Energy Use
All levels of government are engaged in immediate and sustained cost-effective actions to reduce and mitigate GHG emissions and to prepare for the serious impacts of climate change to public health, the environment and the economy.

Promote Education and Consensus-Building
An open, transparent and inclusive planning process including community and business stakeholders and education programs combine to increase public awareness and responsible energy decision-making in the region.

Foster the Clean Energy Sector
Economic development initiatives and workforce training programs position the region to supply a growing demand for energy efficient and renewable energy products and services.

Ensure Social Equity and Environmental Justice
Energy planning and programs promote the principles of opportunity, inclusion, and equal access for disadvantaged populations and ensure fair treatment and meaningful involvement for all people regardless of race, ethnicity, gender, income, national origin, or geography.

Implement the State’s Preferred Loading Order
Following the state’s preferred loading order, new resources come first from energy efficiency, demand response, renewable energy, and distributed generation, all before new transmission and natural gas generation are sought.

Implement the Smart Grid
The deployment of smart devices, controls, and communications modernize our electricity grid to improve reliability, power quality, and detect problems before service is affected.

Pursue Energy Reductions in Existing Residential and Commercial Buildings
Net energy usage and costs from the region’s existing building stock are significantly reduced through targeted energy policies, programs and financing options.

Reduce Energy Demand and Renewable Energy System Cost
Policies and programs promote the integration of energy efficiency at a structure prior to the installation of a renewable energy system in order to reduce the size and cost of the renewable energy system.

Promote State Policy for Zero Net Energy Residential and Commercial Buildings
Consistent with the policy direction of state agencies like the CPUC, aggressive strategies, including regulations and incentives, are employed to achieve zero net energy usage in new residential and commercial buildings and communities, and reduce energy usage in existing residential and commercial buildings and communities, through energy efficiency, clean distributed generation, and community planning efforts.
Reduce the Energy Intensity of the Built Environment
The energy intensity of community design, including buildings and travel options, is an integral consideration in land use and transportation planning.

Ready the Region for Wide-Scale Deployment of Alternative Fuel Vehicles
The region has convenient access to alternative transportation fuels that reduce our dependence on foreign oil supply, reduce local economic impacts from oil price volatility and reduce GHG emissions.
V. MAJOR ENERGY TOPIC AREAS

1. Energy Efficiency and Conservation

**Goal:** Reduce per capita electricity consumption in the residential and commercial sectors by 20 percent by 2030 in order to keep total electricity consumption flat between now and 2030.

**Introduction**

Reducing energy use is the first priority in the state’s preferred loading order for meeting new energy needs because it can help meet future energy needs and reduce GHG emissions without significant investment in infrastructure and with little or no environmental impact. From a customer perspective, reducing energy use has direct and measurable benefits including cost savings. Energy use can be reduced by two related strategies: conservation and energy efficiency. Energy conservation refers to behavior changes that decrease energy use, such as turning off lights and changing thermostat settings. Energy efficiency includes programs that require buildings and appliances to be constructed in a manner that uses less energy, provide incentives for purchasing energy efficient equipment, and provide information and education to encourage people to save energy. Energy efficiency refers to structural changes, such as replacing appliances with more efficient models, replacing incandescent lamps with compact fluorescent (CFL) or light-emitting diode (LED) lamps, or tuning up building systems to improve their energy performance. Efficiency and conservation are necessary and complimentary.

California has promoted energy efficiency through policies and programs that require buildings and appliances to be constructed in a manner that uses less energy, provide incentives for purchasing energy efficient equipment, and provide information to encourage people to save energy. Since the 1970s, these programs have helped keep per capita electricity consumption flat.

Energy efficiency measures for both electricity and natural gas can significantly reduce GHG emissions. Given the region’s relatively low level of industrial activity, the primary focus is on improving energy efficiency, in both the existing building stock and new construction. In particular, the existing building stock presents a significant opportunity to achieve major improvements in energy efficiency. Because buildings typically have a lifespan of several decades, it is important to build in as much efficiency as possible.

**California Energy Efficiency Policy**

Key state energy efficiency policies include:

- California’s Energy Efficiency Standards for Residential and Nonresidential Buildings were established in 1978 and are regularly updated as relevant cost-effective improvements become available. The next update will take effect on January 1, 2010. Local government building departments are responsible for enforcing these mandatory energy efficiency standards for buildings at the time of construction.
- The California “Green Building Action Plan” was developed in conjunction with the signing of Executive Order S-20-04, the “Green Building Initiative,” in which the governor calls for state
buildings to be 20 percent more energy efficient by 2015 and encourages similar private sector efforts.

- **Assembly Bill 2021** (Levine, Chapter 734, Statutes of 2006), which requires an estimate of all potentially achievable cost-effective electricity and natural gas efficiency savings and establishment of annual statewide targets for energy efficiency savings and demand reduction over 10 years. AB 2021 is a key legislative mechanism for utilities to expand their energy efficiency programs.

- The **Climate Change Scoping Plan**, which outlines GHG reduction measures in the electricity and natural gas sectors through building and appliance standards, implementing additional conservation and efficiency programs, increasing combined heat and power (CHP), solar water heating systems, and the like.

- The **California Public Utility Commission (CPUC) Long-Term Energy Efficiency Strategic Plan**, which provides a roadmap to achieve maximum energy savings across all sectors in the state including local government, and identified four “Big Bold Energy Efficiency Strategies”:

  1. All new residential construction in California will be zero net energy by 2020;  
  2. All new commercial construction in California will be zero net energy by 2030;  
  3. Heating, ventilation, and air conditioning will be transformed to ensure that its energy performance is optimal for California’s climate; and  
  4. All eligible low-income customers will be given the opportunity to participate in the low income energy efficiency program by 2020.

The Strategic Plan also specifically calls upon local governments to do the following:

- At least 5 percent of California’s local governments (representing at least 5 percent of CA total population) each year adopt “reach” (enhanced energy efficiency) codes.
- By 2020, the majority of local governments have adopted incentives or mandates to achieve above-code levels of energy efficiency in their communities, or have led statewide adoption of these higher codes.
- The current rate of non-compliance with codes and standards is halved by 2012, halved again by 2016, and full compliance is achieved by 2020.
- By 2015, 50 percent of local governments have adopted energy efficiency/sustainability/climate change action plans for their communities and 100 percent by 2020, with implementation and tracking of achievements.
- The Plan also identifies the following areas where local government authority can reduce energy use in new and existing buildings:
  1. Ensuring compliance and enforcement of the Title 24 energy code for residential and commercial buildings.

---

3 A zero net energy building combines building energy efficiency design features and clean onsite or near-site distributed generation of sufficient quantity on an annual basis to offset any residual purchases of electricity or natural gas from utility suppliers.

4 The CPUC is working with investor-owned utilities like SDG&E to develop a menu of strategies that local governments could implement through local government partnerships to contribute to the Strategic Plan goals.
2. Adopting building codes beyond Title 24’s energy requirements (and potentially other “green” requirements).

3. Supporting highly efficient projects that voluntarily exceed minimum energy codes through favorable fee structures, fast-tracked permitting and other innovative and locally appropriate approaches.

4. Enacting ordinances with point-of-sale or other approaches that spur efficiency actions in existing, privately-owned buildings.

5. Applying efficiency-related “carrots” and “sticks” using local zoning and development authority.

California Energy Efficiency Programs

In September 2009 the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) issued a decision to approve energy efficiency programs for 2010 - 2012, establishing a three-year budget of $3.1 billion for Southern California Edison, Pacific Gas and Electric Company, San Diego Gas and Electric Company, and Southern California Gas Company. This is the largest commitment ever made by a state to energy efficiency. Statewide, these programs could create estimated energy savings of almost 7,000 gigawatt hours, 1,500 megawatts, and 150 million metric therms of natural gas, the equivalent of three 500-megawatt power plants and could avoid 3 million tons of GHG emissions. The funding from this decision can create between 15,000 and 18,000 skilled green jobs statewide.

The decision includes the new California statewide program for residential energy efficiency - CalSPREE - the largest and most comprehensive residential retrofit program in the country, aiming to reduce energy consumption by 20 percent for up to 130,000 California homes by 2012. The decision also funds $175 million for innovative programs to deliver zero net energy homes and commercial buildings, including design assistance, incentives for “above code” construction, and research and demonstration of new technologies and materials.

The decision also provides over $260 million in funding for 64 cities, counties, and regional agencies for local efforts targeting public sector building retrofits and leading edge energy efficiency opportunities. Over $100 million will go to education and training programs at all levels of our educational system to ensure a steady pipeline of skilled blue and white collar energy efficiency professionals.

At the national level, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA) is funding the Energy Efficiency and Conservation Block Grant Program, which is providing millions of dollars for local governments in the region to implement projects and programs that reduce total energy use and fossil fuel emissions and improve energy efficiency in multiple sectors. ARRA also is providing $226 million to the Energy Commission for the State Energy Program (SEP). The SEP provides grants to states to help address energy priorities and program funding to finance renewable energy and energy efficiency improvements in buildings. The SEP is an important component of the overall strategy for making buildings and industrial facilities more energy efficient.
SANDAG, the California Center for Sustainable Energy, several local governments, and other partners are currently collaborating on a SEP proposal to develop a whole building residential retrofit program focused on improving the energy efficiency of existing single family and multifamily residential buildings in the region. If successful, this proposal could bring up to $8 million to the region, and lay the foundation for a long-term existing building retrofit program.

Electricity Consumption Overview

Within buildings, lighting usually comprises the largest portion of electricity usage, roughly 20-25 percent of the total. Air conditioning is likely to be the largest single energy user for buildings in hotter climate zones in the region. Central, wall-unit, and so-called “split” air-conditioning systems available today are significantly more energy efficient relative to older systems.

In addition, “plug loads” collectively account for around 25 percent of overall household energy use in California – more than the refrigerator in most homes. Plug loads are smaller electrical devices or appliances that draw power through an electric outlet, such as computers and their peripherals; televisions and entertainment systems; and a wide variety of electronics and rechargeable devices. Further, many electronics and electronic components of appliances use electricity even when the device is not being used. Consumers are often unaware that they are paying higher electricity bills to cover this “phantom” usage (also called “standby” power). Some estimates show standby power to be as much as 10 percent of a home’s electricity consumption. While state and federal governments work with the manufacturing industry to establish and strengthen energy standards for appliances and electronics to reduce demand from plug loads, consumer education about plug loads and efficient appliances in the marketplace can also reduce electricity consumption.

Approach to Meeting the Energy Efficiency Goal

Keeping total electricity consumption in the residential and commercial sectors flat through 2030 will require increased energy conservation and efficiency efforts, above and beyond existing state policy and utility-administered programs described above. As shown in Figure EE-1, additional measures are needed to keep total residential and electricity consumption flat through 2030.
The future electricity projections presented here do not take into account potential growth in electricity consumption due to plug-in electric vehicles. As discussed further in Section 8. Transportation Fuels, plug-in electric vehicles can help the region meet its goals for reducing GHG emissions, improving air quality, and reducing dependence on imported petroleum fuels. While initial market penetration of plug-in electric vehicles likely can be accommodated by the existing electricity grid, conversion of a substantial portion of the vehicle fleet to plug-in vehicles has the potential to increase total electricity consumption, and interfere with the goal of keeping consumption flat, as well as increase peak demand.

Table EE-1 depicts the potential electricity savings from select energy efficiency measures that could be implemented by local governments (except for increased utility program funding and new appliance standards).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>2030 Reductions (2007 baseline)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased utility energy efficiency program funding</td>
<td>675 GWh 3.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive residential building retrofit program</td>
<td>1482 GWh 6.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive commercial building retrofit program</td>
<td>572 GWh 2.6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New construction building standards (post-2009 updates)</td>
<td>260 GWh 1.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appliance standards (post-2009 updates)</td>
<td>447 GWh 2.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total electricity reduction from above measures</td>
<td>3438 GWh 15.6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in total electricity consumption due to energy efficiency</td>
<td>22 GWh 0.1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in per capita electricity consumption due to energy efficiency</td>
<td>n/a 22.2 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: California Center for Sustainable Energy, 2009.
Notes: 1) Energy efficiency measures are above and beyond currently funded energy efficiency programs. 2) Table does not include transportation fuels.
Local governments have the opportunity to use their authority and influence to help achieve the needed additional energy efficiency savings to achieve the goal for 2030. Table EE-1 shows that the retrofits of existing residential and commercial buildings, particularly residential buildings, offer the greatest potential for additional energy efficiency savings. However, there are challenges to increasing the efficiency of existing buildings. The upfront costs of an energy audit and energy improvements can be expensive. In addition, there is little incentive for renters in the residential sector or lessees in the commercial sector to pay for energy-saving improvements because they do not own the property. At the same time, there is little incentive for an owner to pay for energy improvements because they do not pay the energy bill. This concept is known as the “split incentive.”

Also, although numerous energy efficiency programs exist for residential and commercial buildings, they generally focus on individual building components. Longer-term and larger energy savings can be achieved through more comprehensive or holistic programs that take an integrated approach to evaluating an entire building and creating prioritized packages of measures. Measures can include lighting, insulation, windows, space and water heating, space cooling, ductwork, weatherization, electronics, appliances, swimming pools, and spas. In general, efficiency upgrades are not required retroactively for existing buildings. As a result, policies and programs, and especially funding mechanisms, are needed to achieve energy efficiency savings in the region’s existing building stock.

**Pursuing Energy Efficiency in Existing Buildings**

To determine how much energy an existing building uses, including the devices plugged into its electrical outlets, an energy audit serves as an essential first step. The audit can identify both energy usage and opportunities where energy can be saved. The “Home Energy Rating System” program, better known as HERS program, is a nationally recognized system to conduct whole-house energy assessments. HERS raters perform a comprehensive audit for existing homes. Building performance contractors are certified to perform audits for residential and nonresidential buildings as well.5

An energy audit can discover inefficiencies and provide solutions for increased efficiency. In addition, the audit is an opportune time to assess potential for installing a distributed generation system, such as rooftop solar photovoltaics (PV) or a fuel cell, along with or after any energy efficiency improvements have been made. This topic is addressed further in Chapter V, Section 3, Distributed Generation.

**Potential Funding Mechanisms for Energy Efficiency**

Building owners often need financial assistance to implement energy-saving projects due to upfront purchase and installation costs. Energy efficiency financing mechanisms exist but some are new, not well known, not widely used, or only available to certain customers. Mechanisms include utility on-bill financing, property-assessed financing, low interest loans for energy efficiency improvements, rebates, incentives, and federal and state tax credits. A local workforce of trained contractors also is needed to perform building retrofits and other assessments.

---

5 However, there is a significant lack of trained HERS raters in the San Diego region, a void that could be addressed through new training programs. These programs could build from previous programs, like the “Healthy Homes” program funded by the City of San Diego and U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, which utilized an integrated approach to remediation issues in existing building stock.
Upfront costs can be offset by participating in an on-bill financing (OBF) program, which allows utility customers to pay for energy-efficient improvements through their monthly energy bills. The utility offers an upfront loan used to pay for the cost of the qualifying measure. The energy savings realized from the improvement are used to pay back the loan through monthly utility bills, and once the loan is paid off, monthly bills are permanently lower. SDG&E offers an OBF program for business and government customers participating in demand response programs.

AB 811 assessment districts can provide needed financing for energy efficiency improvements. Assembly Bill (AB) 811 allows local government entities to offer sustainable energy project loans to eligible property owners. With the creation of assessment financing districts, interested property owners can finance energy efficiency projects, solar photovoltaic installations, and possibly other improvements fixed to real property through an assessment on their property tax bills. This mechanism allows property owners to avoid high upfront installation costs and eliminate concern they might sell the property before seeing full return on that high upfront investment. The result is that property owners within AB 811-type financing districts can finance their improvements with reduced financial risk. The AB 811 mechanism does not require investment of general fund dollars and loan repayment becomes a senior lien on the property, ahead of the mortgage itself.

Local governments such as the City of San Diego are actively developing municipal financing programs. Additionally, the California Statewide Community Development Authority (CSCDA, also known as “California Communities”) is developing an AB 811 program, which member jurisdictions (virtually all local governments in the state) could join. California Communities is a statewide joint powers authority (JPA) that can utilize its existing authority to aggregate demand from local governments to relieve them of the burden of establishing financing districts and accessing the bond market for funding.

SANDAG, California Center for Sustainable Energy, several local governments, and other partners are currently collaborating on a State Energy Program (SEP) proposal to develop a whole building residential retrofit program focused on improving the energy efficiency of existing single family and multifamily residential buildings. If successful, this proposal could bring up to $8 million to the region, and lay the foundation for a long-term existing building retrofit program.

Another example of a financing mechanism is the energy efficient mortgage (EEM). An EEM allows new or current homeowners to finance purchase of a home (or refinance a current mortgage) and include the value of energy saving, cost efficient improvements. EEMs can be used to purchase a new energy efficient home or to finance new improvements to existing homes (also known as an Energy Improvement Mortgage, or EIM). Because cost-effective energy improvements can result in lower utility bills, making more funding available for a mortgage payment, energy efficiency improvements can be directly included in the EEM without the need to qualify for additional financing. By giving borrowers the opportunity to finance improvements as part of a single mortgage, an EEM can also stretch the debt-to-income qualifying ratio and enable homebuyers to qualify for a larger loan amount (and a more energy efficient home).

EEMs are sponsored by federally insured mortgage programs and the conventional secondary mortgage market (Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac). Several types of EEM programs are available. Eligibility for individual EEM programs varies, but in general there is no age limit or income level required. Typically, all programs require that a home energy rating be conducted to provide the
lender with an estimate of the “Energy Savings Value”, which includes monthly energy savings and the value of existing/planned energy efficiency measures.

SANDAG Sustainable Regional Program and Energy Roadmap Initiative

As part of CPUC funding for local efforts targeting public sector building retrofits, SANDAG has been awarded about $1.7 million in funding for a Local Government Partnership with SDG&E. The Partnership funding will enable SANDAG and SDG&E to make energy planning assistance available to local governments through the Energy Roadmap initiative, which is an expansion of the existing SANDAG Sustainable Region Program (SRP). The SRP began as a pilot program with the City of Carlsbad from 2005-2006. The pilot program identified almost $200,000 in available energy savings through cost-effective energy efficiency measures and the City was able to save 489,571 kWh in energy consumption through local energy efficiency programs. The SRP was later expanded to the cities of Solana Beach, Poway, and Imperial Beach.

Since the cities of Chula Vista and San Diego and the County, have individual partnerships with SDG&E, the SANDAG-led initiative is primarily targeted at local governments without full-time energy staff and that have minimally participated or not participated in available energy-saving programs. The energy planning assistance is expected to help local governments save money, use less energy, and reduce GHG emissions. The Partnership will fund the Energy Roadmap initiative from January 2010 through December 2012.

The Energy Roadmap initiative will focus on the identification of energy-saving measures for local government operations, as well as policy measures that local governments could implement to realize energy savings for residents, businesses, and throughout their communities. Components of the program will include energy assessments and audits of existing government buildings and facilities, plan review of proposed construction projects, analysis of opportunities to integrate energy-saving policies into the General Plan and other local plans, policies, and regulations, assistance with project development for energy efficiency installations, training of local government staff, public education and engagement tools, identification of rebate and financing programs, and other useful resources for energy management planning. There also will be a focus on clean energy economic development, potential pilot demonstrations of emerging technologies, and opportunities for clean, on-site energy generation.

Strategies to improve building energy efficiency include Zero Net Energy (ZNE) buildings, voluntary and mandatory measures to achieve energy efficiency beyond minimum requirements for new construction, voluntary and mandatory energy-saving retrofits for existing buildings, and improved compliance and enforcement of energy efficiency standards. Increased installation of high efficiency technologies like solar hot water heaters and cogeneration systems are additional strategies to offset natural gas use and meet energy needs more efficiently. And finally, funding and financing strategies are essential to successfully increasing energy efficiency and reducing GHG emissions from the region’s building stock.

Recommended Actions to Promote Energy Efficiency and Conservation

SANDAG, local governments, or other regional entities can undertake the following actions to support energy efficiency and conservation. In some cases, active collaboration among multiple jurisdictions will be needed to implement the recommended actions. The following recommended
actions also would contribute to other energy goals, and the energy efficiency goal would be enhanced by recommended action identified in other topic areas, as described below.

**SANDAG**

EE-1. Provide energy efficiency planning assistance to local governments through the SANDAG Sustainable Region Program.

**Local Governments**

EE-2. Establish building energy rating and disclosure policies that inform building owners of their energy usage.

EE-3. Develop a policy to include energy star appliances in new construction.

EE-4. Exceed Title 24 energy requirements for new construction through regulations or incentives that work toward an overall goal of zero net energy new homes by 2020 and zero net energy new commercial buildings by 2030.

EE-5. Increase enforcement of building energy requirements to reduce the rate of noncompliance.

EE-6. Promote policies that lead to energy efficiency retrofits in existing buildings.

EE-7. Support increased use of solar water heating in residential, pool, and commercial uses to offset natural gas demand (e.g., pre-plumb policies).

**SANDAG, Local Governments, or other Regional Entities**

EE-8. Develop model language for a range of policies that seek to reduce energy use in existing buildings and new construction.

EE-9. Develop a whole-building retrofit program to improve energy efficiency in existing residential, commercial, municipal, and other buildings.

EE-10. Establish financing programs (using public or private sources) that residents and businesses can access to conduct energy assessments and make energy efficiency retrofits to existing buildings, as well as other energy-related improvements such as distributed photovoltaic installations.

EE-11. Conduct an assessment of the regional building stock to determine the potential magnitude of energy savings, their contribution to the energy efficiency and conservation goal, and geographical concentrations of retrofit opportunities.

EE-12. Provide information and resources to help residents, businesses, developers, builders and others improve energy efficiency and conservation in new and existing buildings.
2. **Renewable Energy**

**Goal:** Support the development of renewable energy resources to meet or exceed a 33 percent renewable portfolio standard (RPS) by 2020 and a 45 percent RPS by 2030.

**Introduction**

After energy efficiency and demand response, the state’s preferred loading order calls for meeting electricity needs and reducing GHG emissions with renewable resources, including onsite power systems such as photovoltaic solar panels and utility-scale electricity projects that convert solar and wind resources into electricity.

This section discusses the need to increase utility scale renewable energy projects and the potential challenges that arise, such as impacts to sensitive environmental resources and landscapes. Renewable onsite power systems, and clean, nonrenewable onsite power systems are addressed in Section 3 – Distributed Generation.

In general, renewable energy resources include:

- Wind (produced in windy locations usually at wind farms to generate electricity),
- Solar (systems powered by the sun to provide heat or generate electricity including photovoltaics, concentrated solar power, and solar thermal),
- Geothermal (systems using thermal energy from beneath the earth’s surface to provide heat and generate electricity),
- Biogas (captured from landfills and sewage at wastewater treatment plants),
- Biomass (technologies that burn primarily paper, wood, tree trimming and other similar “green” waste as fuel),
- Hydro power (flowing water that drives a turbine to generate electricity), and
- Offshore wave power (built along shorelines, systems extract energy in breaking waves).

The advantages of utility scale renewable energy can include lower greenhouse gas emissions, energy price stability, and ability to bring large amounts of power online quickly. Many renewables resources such as wind and geothermal are cost-competitive with fossil fuel energy sources and can be carried on existing transmission infrastructure. Renewables can also displace the need for fossil fuel-powered generation.

A mixture of utility scale renewable resources can support a stable and reliable electricity grid. Resources like biomass, geothermal, and small-scale hydroelectric generation can provide baseload power. Some renewables such as solar thermal technologies have the potential to store energy for an extended period and provide power generation into evening hours (i.e., after the sun goes down). Some renewable technologies like solar thermal may also be able to operate in a hybrid mode as typical natural gas or biomass-fired power plant with characteristics similar to a baseload power plant. Other renewable resources are intermittent such as wind or solar. The integration of large amounts of intermittent generation into the electricity system will require grid improvements to accommodate variation in power availability and improve grid reliability such as improved
communications technology, automated demand response, and other modern technologies that would be possible with a smart grid (see Section 6 for further discussion).

Key state policies related to renewable energy production include:

- Senate Bill 1078 (Sher, Chapter 516, Statutes of 2002), which establishes California’s Renewables Portfolio Standard (RPS) requiring retail sellers of electricity to procure 20 percent of retail sales from renewable energy by 2017.
- Energy Action Plans I (2003) and II (2005), which recommended accelerating the RPS deadline to 20 percent by 2010, and recommended a further goal of 33 percent renewables by 2020, respectively.
- Senate Bill 107 (Simitian, Chapter 464, Statutes of 2006), which accelerated the 20 percent target to 2010 and authorizes a system of tradable renewable energy credits (RECs).
- Executive Order S-06-06 (2006), which established a biomass target for 20 percent within the RPS goals for 2010 and 2020.
- Executive Order S-14-08 (2008), which established accelerated RPS targets (33 percent by 2020) as recommended in Energy Action Plan II. The order also called for the formation of the Renewable Energy Action Team, comprised of the Energy Commission, Department of Fish and Game, Bureau of Land Management, and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Through the team, the Energy Commission and the Department of Fish and Game are to prepare a plan for renewable development in sensitive desert habitat.
- Executive Order S-21-09 (2009), which directs the ARB to work with the CPUC, the California Independent System Operator (ISO), and the Energy Commission to adopt regulations increasing California’s RPS to 33 percent by 2020. ARB must adopt these regulations by July 31, 2010.

Key state policies related to renewable energy and transmission infrastructure include:

- Senate Bill 1565 ( Bowen, Chapter 692, Statutes of 2004) addresses the need for an official state role in transmission planning with the passage of this bill. SB 1565 directed the Energy Commission to develop a Strategic Transmission Investment Plan (Strategic Plan), which identifies and recommends actions to stimulate transmission investments to ensure reliability, relieve congestion, and meet future growth in load and generation, including renewable resources, energy efficiency, and other demand reduction measures.
- Senate Bill 1059 (Escutia and Morrow, Chapter 638, Statutes of 2006), which continued to develop an integrated, statewide approach to electric transmission planning and permitting to address the state’s critical energy and environmental policy goals. This bill provided a bridge between the transmission planning process and the permitting process by designating transmission corridor zones on state and private lands available for future high-voltage electricity transmission projects, consistent with the state’s electricity needs identified in the IEPRs and Strategic Transmission Investment Plans.

Many state strategies and programs have been implemented to increase renewable energy generation consistent with these policies, including Energy Commission’s Renewable Energy Program, the RPS Program jointly administered by the Energy Commission and CPUC, the
Renewable Energy Transmission Initiative, the Desert Renewable Energy Conservation Plan, feed-in tariffs for renewable generators, the Bioenergy Action Plan, and multiple RD&D activities.

Renewable Energy Credits

A system of tradable RECs could facilitate goals for increasing the amount of renewable energy. The REC is a certificate representing the environmental benefit of a given unit of renewable energy production. RECs could reward generators of renewable resources by allowing them to earn revenue from the environmental benefit of their renewable energy systems, and could provide purchasers of RECs like utilities with increased flexibility to meet legal mandates such as the RPS. The CPUC may authorize the use of RECs for RPS compliance, but has not done so as of this writing.

Renewable Energy in the San Diego Region

The renewable energy targets developed for the 2003 Regional Energy Strategy were considered aggressive at the time. Since then, state laws and policies have called for more aggressive targets. As discussed above, Executive Order S-21-09 requires multiple state agencies to collaborate and adopt regulations to increase the state RPS to 33 percent by 2020. The RES Update reflects these changes to be consistent with state policy direction by setting an increased target of 45 percent, which represents a little more than one percent supply increase each year between 2020 and 2030 (roughly consistent with the annual one percent increase required by state policy through 2020). The state does not currently set policy for the RPS beyond 2020.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table RE-1. Renewable Energy Targets for San Diego County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TARGETS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RES Targets from 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RES Update Targets (% of sales)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Renewable Energy and Electricity Prices

The CPUC, Energy Commission, and other agencies are conducting financial analyses to learn the cost and benefit impacts of meeting the 33 percent renewable energy target by 2020. Initial CPUC analysis shows that electricity costs will increase in 2020, regardless of renewable resource requirements. As shown in Table RE-2, the preliminary analysis indicates that the cost of producing statewide electricity with a 20 percent RPS in 2020 is comparable to the cost of generating the same amount of electricity with all natural gas. Achieving a 33 percent RPS by 2020, is estimated to cost approximately 7 percent more than using all natural gas generation sources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table RE-2: Electricity Costs in 2020 under Renewable Portfolio Standard and Natural Gas Scenarios</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2008</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Total Statewide Electricity Expenditures | $36.8 billion | $49.2 billion | $50.6 billion | $54.2 billion
---|---|---|---|---
Average Statewide Electricity Cost | $0.132 per kWh | $0.154 per kWh | $0.158 per kWh | $0.169 per kWh

Source: CPUC/E3, June 2009

The all-natural gas scenario may grow more costly with passage of federal climate change laws. A greater demand for natural gas may occur in places reliant on coal. The added competition could raise prices (for example, San Diego natural gas prices are impacted by price spikes in the eastern United States) and reduce available supply. If this scenario occurs, increasing renewable energy supply may help insulate the region from higher-priced finite natural gas resources. Historical average electricity prices by customer class are shown in Table RE-3. However, natural gas prices have been volatile in recent history, and price forecasts have been highly inaccurate. See Section 7. Natural Gas Power Plants, for more discussion of natural gas prices. Renewable energy is expected to provide more price stability than more volatile natural gas.

### Table RE-3: Historical Average Electricity Prices by Customer Class (in cents per kilowatt-hour)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Residential SDG&amp;E</th>
<th>Residential CA</th>
<th>Commercial SDG&amp;E</th>
<th>Commercial CA</th>
<th>Industrial SDG&amp;E</th>
<th>Industrial CA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Energy Almanac, CEC, 2009

### Potential Impacts of Renewable Energy

Renewable energy can provide environmental benefits to the region by improving air and water quality and reducing GHG emissions. Adding large amounts of renewables can also present challenges. Conflicts could arise between the broader goal of reducing GHG emissions and the specific environmental impacts of additional renewable infrastructure such as power lines to access renewable resources or renewable energy projects that could impact sensitive habitats or communities. While residents are generally supportive of renewable energy and its environmental benefits, many citizens are concerned about renewable energy projects and transmission lines because of their potential for environmental and aesthetic impacts. For example, proposed solar projects located in the California desert may impact sensitive species habitat or may require large amounts of water, while transmission lines could adversely affect sensitive environmental resources or pristine landscapes. Some desert solar technologies such as photovoltaic and dish-Stirling use little water (for cleaning only) while cooling towers could be used for solar thermal power plants to significantly reduce water use. The impacts of solar projects to the landscape can also vary significantly from major grading activity to little-to-no disturbance to the landscape. Wind projects use only a small percentage of the project site for turbines and service roads, leaving most of the site available for compatible uses.
State Initiatives are already underway to facilitate the early identification and resolution or to avoid land use and environmental constraints to promote timely development of renewable generation resources and associated transmission lines.

Even with the 45% renewables goal for 2030, dispatchable power (most likely natural gas power plants) will provide much of the power supply to the grid. This dispatchable power along with utility scale renewables to the extent they are equipped with energy storage or hybrid operating characteristics will provide stability and reliability to balance power supplied from renewables that are variable in nature, such as wind and solar. Additionally, there may be need for energy storage and other technologies to provide the kinds of services that electricity and transmission systems need to operate reliably. Although new natural gas plants are more efficient and cleaner burning than older gas plants, some of the efficiency and emission benefits may be lost if such plants are frequently ramped up and down to firm up variable renewables. Many factors will influence the mixture of renewables, fossil fuels and other sources providing power to the grid including weather conditions, load characteristics, geographic dispersion of renewables, implementation of smart grid technologies, the extent to which plug-in electric vehicles can feed power to the grid, and others.

Renewable Energy Transmission Initiative (RETI)

To help address potentially significant land use and environmental concerns, the state created the Renewable Energy Transmission Initiative (RETI), a statewide initiative to help identify the transmission projects needed to accommodate state renewable energy goals, support future energy policy, and facilitate transmission corridor designation and transmission and generation siting and permitting. The RETI process, which is open and collaborative so all interested parties can participate, is supervised by a coordinating committee comprised of the Energy Commission, CPUC, California ISO, and publicly owned utilities. In addition to identifying transmission corridors for renewable resources, RETI assesses all competitive renewable energy zones (CREZ) in California, and sometimes zones in neighboring states, that can provide significant electricity to California by 2020. In addition, the federal Department of the Interior and the State of California entered into an agreement to encourage the development of environmentally-appropriate renewable energy on federal lands in the state. Major provisions of the agreement include developing a strategy to identify areas suitable and acceptable for renewable energy development, including renewable energy zones, based on criteria such as renewable energy development potential and wildlife and conservation criteria.

RETI has identified and prioritized preferred renewable resource development areas and associated transmission line links to deliver renewable power to load centers. The RETI Phase 2A Report prioritizes transmission projects to interconnect renewables that are identified as in the state’s best interests. It also forms the basis for a draft method for identifying which of the RETI line segments should be considered for corridor designation in the Energy Commission’s corridor designation process.

In addition, to help address potential impacts of new renewable power plants and related transmission lines, the Energy Commission and California Department of Fish and Game are implementing Governor Schwarzenegger’s Executive Order S-14-08, which establishes a process to conserve natural resources while expediting the permitting of renewable energy power plants and transmission lines. The primary objectives are to identify and establish areas for potential renewable
energy development and conservation areas in the Colorado and Mojave deserts to help reduce the time and uncertainty associated with licensing new renewable projects on state and federal lands.

The criteria used in this process or the RETI process to balance the objectives of renewable energy development and environmental conservation could be used to guide regional decision-making in situations where these objectives may coincide in the San Diego region.

**Barriers to Renewable Energy Development**

In order to reach the renewable energy targets, certain permitting barriers must be addressed. Renewable generation facilities must receive a site permit in order to construct a project. The California Energy Commission is responsible for approving permits for thermal power plants 50 megawatts and greater. All other projects must receive a county or city permit. Projects on federal land also must receive permits from the appropriate federal agencies, usually the Bureau of Land Management or the United States Forest Service. Most renewable facilities in California require permits from federal and state agencies since renewable resources often are located on lands within federal and state jurisdiction. In recent years, permitting entities have been inundated with applications for new renewable energy facilities, causing project delays. Governor’s Executive Order S-14-08, discussed previously, seeks to remove permitting barriers to renewable energy projects. The Energy Commission and Department of Fish and Game also adopted a one-stop permitting process to streamline the process, which has generally reduced application times by half.

Many renewable electrical generation facilities need to be located near the site where geothermal, wind, and solar resources are available, and therefore need new transmission lines to connect to existing transmission infrastructure. New transmission lines often require lengthy permitting processes and, as discussed above, can have the potential to result in significant adverse impacts to conservation areas and landscapes. These factors may impede the development of renewable resources. Potential adverse impacts will need to be weighed against positive impacts such as lower GHG emissions, price stability, and improved air quality.

Connecting to the electricity grid to supply clean power to resource load centers like the San Diego region is generally cost prohibitive for a single renewable energy project. Since multiple renewable projects are often located within a renewable resource area, California ISO is developing a framework for multiple projects within a transmission constrained renewable resource area to share the costs of connecting to the grid.

The magnitude and scale of infrastructure necessary for California to meet the 33 percent target for 2020 has never before been planned, permitted, procured, developed, and integrated in such a short time horizon. The CPUC identified several measures that must be implemented in the near term if achieving a 33 percent RPS by 2020 is to be a top priority, including:

- Planning now for adequate transmission and generation capacity to meet long-term needs for increased generation from renewable energy sources;
- Procuring electricity from resources that are not dependent on new transmission such as distributed solar photovoltaics; and
- Concentrating renewable development in pre-permitted land that could be set aside for a renewable energy park.
Recommended Actions to Support Renewable Energy

SANDAG, local governments, or other regional entities can undertake the following actions to support the development of renewable energy. In some cases, active collaboration among multiple jurisdictions will be needed to implement the recommended actions. The following recommended actions will contribute to other energy goals, and likewise be enhanced by recommended actions identified in other topic areas, as described below.

SANDAG, Local Governments, or other Regional Entities

RE-1. Identify potential locations in the region that could accommodate utility-scale renewable energy infrastructure.
RE-2. Explore options to pre-permit zones of appropriate land for renewable energy development.
RE-3. Identify existing barriers to siting large-scale renewable energy installations (e.g., renewable energy parks) in the San Diego region.
RE-4. Support cost-effective transmission access and related infrastructure that will help the region meet or exceed requirements for procuring electricity from renewable resources while protecting environmental and other resources.
RE-5. Monitor the Renewable Energy Transmission Initiative (RETI) and related state efforts and consider its recommendations in future regional planning.
3. Distributed Generation

Goal: Increase the total amount of clean distributed generation (renewable and non-renewable) to reduce peak demand and diversify electricity resources in the San Diego region.

Introduction

After energy efficiency and demand response, increased use of renewables and distributed generation systems is the preferred strategy for meeting the state’s GHG reduction goals while satisfying demand for energy. Distributed energy systems are complementary to traditional electric power systems, and include small-scale power generation technologies such as photovoltaics, small wind turbines, and cogeneration systems located close to where energy is being used. The advantages of distributed energy systems include increased grid reliability, energy price stability, and reduced GHG emissions. The following state policies encourage the use of distributed generation systems:

- Assembly Bill 1969 (Yee, Chapter 731, Statutes of 2006) authorized feed-in tariffs for small renewable generators of less than 1 MW at public water and wastewater treatment facilities. In July 2007, the CPUC (D. 07-07-027) implemented AB 1969 and expanded the feed-in tariffs to 1.5 MW and included non-water customers in the PG&E and SCE territories (SDG&E territory was included by later legislation). The power sold to the utilities under feed-in tariffs can be applied towards the state’s RPS targets.

- Assembly Bill 2466 (Laird) Government Renewable Energy Producers, which authorizes a city, county (whether general law or chartered), special district, school district, political subdivision, or other local public agency, if authorized by law to generate electricity to receive a bill of credit to a designated benefiting account for electricity exported to the electric grid by an eligible renewable generating facility. Additionally, the bill requires the CA Public Utilities Commission to adopt a rate tariff for the benefiting account.

- Assembly Bill 811 (Levine) Public Financing Districts For Energy Improvements, which authorizes a legislative body of any city to determine that it would be in the public interest to designate an area within which authorized city officials and free and willing property owners may enter into contractual assessments to finance the installation of distributed generation renewable energy sources or energy efficiency improvements that are permanently fixed to real property, as specified. The bill would require the resolution of intention to include the kinds of distributed generation renewable energy sources or energy efficiency improvements that may be financed as well as a statement specifying that it is in the public interest to finance those distributed generation renewable energy sources or energy efficiency improvements.

- Assembly Bill 920 (Huffman) Credit For Net Surplus Electricity From Solar And Wind Distributed Generation, which among other things would: require the ratemaking authority of an electric utility to adopt, by January 1, 2011, a net surplus electricity compensation valuation to compensate a net surplus customer-generator, for the value of net surplus electricity generated by an eligible customer-generator and delivered to the grid that is in excess of the amount of electricity that is delivered from the grid to the eligible customer-generator; require the electric utility to offer a standard contract or tariff to eligible customer-generators that includes compensation for the value of net surplus electricity; require the electric utility, upon an affirmative election by the eligible customer-generator to receive service pursuant to this contract or tariff, to either: (1) provide net surplus electricity compensation for any net surplus
electricity generated in the 12-month period, or (2) allow the eligible customer-generator to apply the net surplus electricity as a credit for kilowatt-hours subsequently supplied by the electric utility to the surplus customer-generator; provide that upon adoption of the net surplus electricity compensation rate and the eligible customer-generator electing to receive net surplus electricity compensation, any renewable energy credit, for net surplus electricity belongs to the electric utility purchasing the electricity and that net surplus electricity counts toward the electric utility’s renewables portfolio standard purchasing requirements.

- Senate Bill 412 (Kehoe) Self-Generation Incentive Program: Inclusion Of Non-Solar Technologies, which would require the CPUC to require the collection of funding for the self-generation incentive program for non-solar distributed generation resources through December 31, 2011; require that combined heat and power units meet certain efficiency and emissions requirements, including the greenhouse gases emission performance standard, to receive incentives; require the PUC to ensure that distributed generation resources are made available in the program for all ratepayers; prohibit recovery of the costs of the program from ratepayers that participate in the California Alternative Rates for Energy (CARE) program; delete the authorization for the PUC, in administering the program, to include other ultra-clean and low-emission distributed generation technologies; and, delete the current requirement that the CA Energy Commission, by November 1, 2008, and in consultation with the PUC and CA Air Resources Board, to evaluate the costs and benefits of providing ratepayer subsidies for renewable and fossil fuel ultra-clean and low-emission distributed generation.

- Senate Bill 380 (Kehoe, Chapter 544, Statutes of 2008) codified CPUC’s expanded feed-in tariff to include all RPS-eligible generators 1.5 MW and below. The program cap was also expanded from 250 MW to 500 MW. SB 380 expanded the program to include all investor-owned utilities including SDG&E.

- Assembly Bill 1613 (Blakeslee, Chapter 713, Statutes of 2007), also known as the Waste Heat and Carbon Emissions Reduction Act, was designed to encourage the development of new combined heat and power (CHP) systems in California with a generating capacity of up to 20 MW, resulting in more efficient use of natural gas and reduced GHG emissions. The bill requires the CPUC and the Energy Commission to establish policies and procedures for the purchase of electricity from eligible CHP systems.

- The California ARB Climate Change Scoping Plan set a target of 4,000 MW of CHP that would displace 30,000 gigawatt hours of electric energy from other power generation resources with the overall goal of reducing GHG emissions by 6.7 million metric tons of CO2 equivalent.

- Senate Bill 1 (Murray, Chapter 132, Statutes of 2006) enacted the Governor’s “Million Solar Roofs” program with the overall goal of installing 3,000 MW of solar PV systems.

To implement SB 1, the state officially launched Go Solar California in 2007 to bring customer awareness to the CPUC California Solar Initiative (CSI) and the Energy Commission New Solar Homes Partnership (NSHP), and solar incentive programs offered by publicly-owned utilities beginning in 2008. The CSI offers rebates to existing homes and non-residential energy customers installing solar systems in IOU service territories. As of June 2009, 226 MW of new solar systems were installed as a result of the program. When fully implemented in 2016, the CSI program is expected to provide incentives for about 165 MW of photovoltaics in the San Diego region.
The NSHP offers incentives for home builders to construct solar homes. The goals of the program are to achieve 400 MW of installed solar capacity by the end of 2016, create a self-sustaining solar market without the need for government incentives, and foster sufficient market penetration in the new residential market so that 50 percent or more of new housing built by 2016 and thereafter will include solar systems. However, with the recent extreme downturn in new home construction, program activity has been slow and is likely to remain so until if and when the economy recovers. The NSHP does not allocate available funding on a regional basis, so it is not possible to project the amount of photovoltaics that will be installed in the region as a result of the program.

Another customer-side strategy is the Self-Generation Incentive Program, which is administered by the CPUC and implemented through the IOUs and provides rebates for customers who install wind turbines and fuel cells. SB 412 (Statutes of 2009) revises this program to provide incentives for certain non-renewable distributed generation systems. The program originally included microturbines, small gas turbines, wind turbines, solar photovoltaics, fuel cells, and internal combustion engines, but as of January 1, 2008, only fuel cells and wind energy technologies are eligible. As of December 2008, the IOUs have paid more than $600 million in rebates for more than 1,200 projects totaling more than 337 MW of generating capacity. The Energy Commission administers a similar program also limited to wind turbines and fuel cells, the Emerging Renewables Program.

**Feed-in Tariff**

The feed-in tariff is intended to help contribute to the state RPS and encourage customers to install renewable energy systems to help meet the state RPS goals. Some smaller renewable energy systems are able to be counted toward the RPS due to the state feed-in-tariff. Feed-in tariffs are fixed, long-term prices for energy. The law initially supported deployment of renewable resources on publicly owned water and wastewater treatment facilities.

The California feed-in tariff was amended by Senate Bill 32 (Statutes of 2009), and must be implemented through regulations to be developed by the CPUC. SB 32 allows eligible customer-generators in the residential, commercial, and industrial sectors to enter into 10-, 15-, or 20-year standard contracts with their utilities to sell electricity produced by small renewable energy systems, up to 3 megawatts (MW), at time-differentiated market-based prices determined by the CPUC’s market price referent (MPR), which is an administratively determined rate based on the cost of natural gas generated electricity. Eligible technologies include solar thermal and photovoltaic, landfill gas, wind, small hydroelectric, among others.

Time-of-use adjustments will be applied by each utility and will reflect the increased value of the electricity to the utility during peak periods and its lesser value during off-peak periods. Power produced during peak demand times earns the highest rate. Power purchased under the feed-in tariff counts toward the utility’s RPS obligations, and renewable energy credits (RECs) (discussed below) transfer to the utility under a feed-in tariff contract. The tariff is available until installed generation equals 750 MW, a portion for which each utility is responsible. Any customer-generator who sells power to the utility under this tariff may not participate in other state incentive programs.
Net Metering

Net metering is another strategy to help increase customer-side distributed generation technologies, particularly PV. Customers who install an on-site renewable energy system can apply for net metering, a special billing arrangement with the utility for electric customers who generate their own electricity. Net metering allows for the flow of electricity both to and from the customer - typically through a single, bi-directional meter. When a customer’s generation exceeds the customer’s use, electricity flows back to the grid and offsets electricity consumed at a different time. In effect, the customer uses excess generation to offset electricity that the customer otherwise would have to purchase at the utility's full retail rate. Unlike the feed-in tariff, net metering does not involve long-term agreements or prevent the customer from taking advantage of incentives prohibited under the feed-in tariff. The customer’s electric meter tracks electricity generated by the renewable system versus electricity consumed, with the customer paying only for the net amount taken from the grid over a 12-month period.

California's net-metering law requires investor-owned utilities like SDG&E to offer net metering to all customers for solar, wind, biogas-electric, and fuel cell systems up to 1 MW. Net excess generation (NEG) is carried forward to a customer's next bill. Previous law granted NEG remaining at the end of each 12-month period accrue to the customer's utility. Assembly Bill 920 (Statutes of 2009) now gives customers the option of rolling over remaining NEG from month-to-month indefinitely or receiving financial compensation from the utility for their remaining NEG. Customers not electing either option will have their NEG granted to the utility at the end of the 12 month period without any compensation. The renewable energy credits (RECs) associated with the electricity produced and used on-site remain with the customer-generator. If, however, the customer chooses to receive financial compensation for the NEG remaining after a 12-month period, the utility will be granted the RECs associated with just the surplus they purchase. The utility can take credit for the surplus purchased under the RPS.

Interconnection Policies

Interconnection policies can be a barrier to increased use of distributed generation (further defined below). California applies a standard practice for interconnecting distributed generation systems to the electric grid (Rule 21). Non-standardized interconnection rules create uncertainty and risk for customers interested in using distributed generation technologies and can make this option cost prohibitive. Rule 21 specifies standard interconnection, operating, and metering requirements for specified distributed generation generators.

Distributed Generation in the San Diego Region

For purposes of the RES Update, clean distributed generation is small-scale power generation technologies located close to the load being served, capable of lowering costs, improving reliability, reducing emissions and expanding energy options. Combining energy efficiency measures with distributed generation is the best way to reduce a customer's energy demand, thereby properly sizing the distributed system and generally saving the customer the costs of a larger system.
Table DG-1 presents quantified goals for distributed generation technology penetration through 2030 building on several California mandates and recommendations. These market projections were developed for SANDAG by the California Center for Sustainable Energy.

### Table DG-1. Distributed Generation Targets for 2030

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technology</th>
<th>2008 Level</th>
<th>2030 Base Targets</th>
<th>2030 Stretch Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biogas/Biomass</td>
<td>26 MW</td>
<td>27 MW</td>
<td>31 MW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solar photovoltaics</td>
<td>49 MW</td>
<td>844 MW</td>
<td>970 MW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined heat and power</td>
<td>341 MW</td>
<td>398 MW</td>
<td>458 MW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (hydro &amp; steam)</td>
<td>11 MW</td>
<td>11 MW</td>
<td>11 MW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Distributed Generation in the Region</td>
<td>427 MW</td>
<td>1,278 MW</td>
<td>1,590 MW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proportion of Regional Peak Demand</th>
<th>RES 2030 targets from 2003</th>
<th>RES Update targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12% (2010)</td>
<td>9% (actual)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: California Center for Sustainable Energy, 2009

**Solar Photovoltaic Systems**

Using the Energy Commission Distributed Generation Roadmap, CCSE projects that the amount of solar photovoltaics could increase from 49 MW in 2008 to a base target of 844 MW in 2030. With additional measures, the region could achieve a stretch target of 970 MW. In the San Diego region, solar PV systems have the greatest growth potential among DG technologies. Several regional resources are available that help enable residents to install solar. The City of San Diego partnered with the California Center for Sustainable Energy (CCSE) to develop an interactive solar mapping tool. The Solar Map identifies solar systems installed in the region and can help a resident determine their own rooftop’s viability for solar panels.

Moreover, CCSE manages the California Solar Initiative incentive program for the region and hosts an annual Solar Energy Week including a Solar Homes Tour and Commercial Solar Sites Tour. In the 2009 Environment California report, California’s Solar Cities, the City of San Diego was ranked the number one solar city in California, with the most solar roofs and the highest solar capacity kilowatts installed.

**Combined Heat and Power Systems**

Using the Energy Commission Distributed Generation Roadmap, CCSE projects that the amount of combined heat and power (CHP) (also known as cogeneration) could increase from 341 MW in 2008 to a base target of 398 MW in 2030. With additional measures, the region could achieve a stretch target of 458 MW. CHP efficiently converts natural gas to energy by recycling otherwise wasted heat and reusing it for additional electricity or heating and cooling. These systems also can operate on renewable fuels such as biogas. Technologies typically used on a CHP configuration include microturbines, internal combustion engines and fuel cells.
CHP can provide a variety of benefits to end users. Customers that need greater reliability than what the electric grid can supply can use CHP systems. Biotech firms, data centers, telecommunications, and industrial processes are some of the business types that cannot afford power interruptions. CHP can provide premium power onsite, offering end users a higher level of reliability than the electric grid. CHP is often used in industrial processes that take advantage of the electricity and heat. The relatively small amount of industry and manufacturing in the region limits the potential applications for CHP systems.

**Distributed Generation System Costs**

Although the lifecycle costs of distributed generation systems make them a good choice for many end users, the upfront capital costs can be a barrier to their increased penetration. California offers many financial incentives (e.g. the California Solar Initiative, New Solar Homes Program, and Self Generation Incentive Program) to help defray the costs for new and existing buildings. Some local governments and large businesses use third party energy providers that can cover the upfront cost of a system through a long-term contract with the jurisdiction.

Since there are a variety of distributed generation systems, customers are able to choose the technology that best serves their needs. Distributed generation also benefits the utility by reducing peak demand on the electric grid and benefits businesses by reducing costs associated with peak demand charges. In power constrained areas where outages are common, distributed generation can serve to provide reliable power.

Advanced energy storage (AES) is a distributed energy system that is expected to perform an integral role in future increased use of renewable energy and in improving grid reliability. AES is a technology that converts electricity into another form of energy, stores it, and then converts it back into electricity at another time. By storing energy that can be used or dispatched at a time when it is more useful to the overall electric grid, AES can help make electricity from intermittent resources such as solar and wind more usable to the electricity system. Similarly, AES also can reduce peak demand and save money by storing electricity for use when grid-based electricity is most expensive (e.g., during periods of peak demand).

**Recommended Actions to Support Distributed Generation**

SANDAG, local governments, or other regional entities can undertake the following actions to encourage an increase in clean distributed generation. In some cases, active collaboration among multiple jurisdictions will be needed to implement the recommended actions. The following recommended actions will contribute to other energy goals, and likewise be enhanced by recommended actions identified in other topic areas, as described below.

**Local Governments**

DG-1. Revise, or support revision of, local zoning policies, homeowner association codes, and other codes to remove hindrances and promote installation of PV or other distributed renewable energy systems (e.g., require or provide incentives for new construction to pre-wire for PV installation).

DG-2. Explore opportunities and applications for local governments to demonstrate and deploy advanced energy storage with distributed generation technologies.
SANDAG, Local Governments, or other Regional Entities

DG-3. Combine energy assessments and energy efficiency improvements with installation of distributed energy generation systems to reduce system costs and maximize energy savings.

DG-4. Establish financing programs (using public or private sources) that residents and businesses can access to install distributed energy systems such as PV and combined heat and power systems as well as conduct energy assessments and make energy efficiency retrofits to existing buildings.

DG-5. Continue to monitor and support a feed-in-tariff or other policies that will facilitate increased, cost-effective installation of small-scale renewable energy systems like solar photovoltaics.

DG-6. Identify local barriers to DG installations and provide supportable and applicable solutions across jurisdictions to reduce confusion for builders, contractors, and officials, about technologies, costs and benefits.

DG-7. Conduct analysis of potential applications for CHP systems in the region (e.g., industrial, hotel, etc.).

DG-8. Promote the use of high efficiency distributed generation technologies like combined heat and power.

DG-9. Encourage local home builders to participate in the New Solar Homes Partnership to install solar photovoltaics on new homes in the region.
4. Energy and Water

Goal: Reduce water-related energy use.

Introduction

In the San Diego region, water and energy resources – and therefore climate change – are closely connected. The amount and ways water is used in the region require large amounts of energy. Water utilities use large amounts of energy to pump, treat, deliver, and recycle water, while residents and businesses use energy to heat, cool, and use the water. Energy is also used to dispose of wastewater and power the large pumps that move water throughout the state. Power plants use a significant volume of water, primarily for cooling, which can impact local water supplies. Water also provides hydroelectricity generation for the region, while pumped storage facilities provide commercially viable electricity storage on a large scale.

Historically, the energy implications of water decisions were not typically considered. Water sources were chosen without consideration of the energy costs; conversely, energy savings were not associated with water conservation and efficiency measures. However, understanding of the nexus between water and energy is beginning to grow. The region can build from this understanding to take actions that save energy and water resources: reducing the energy intensity of water supply and uses will reduce the region’s contribution to climate change while using less water will help the region adapt to the reduction in water supply anticipated from climate change. Integrating energy considerations into water planning also can save money and strengthen the economy. California water and wastewater agencies spend more than $500 million annually on energy costs.

California’s water systems are highly embedded with energy relative to national averages. The state has major conveyance systems that move water to end users over hundreds of miles and thousands of feet in elevation. The State Water Project (SWP) consumes energy by pumping water 2,000 feet over the Tehachapi Mountains -- the highest lift of any water system in the world. The San Diego region is at the farthest -- and therefore most energy intensive -- end of the SWP and Colorado River Aqueduct. The amount of energy used to deliver water from the SWP to residential customers in Southern California is almost one-third the total average household electric use in the region. The San Diego region currently imports more than 80 percent of its water from these distant sources that are embedded with large amounts of energy; about 18 percent is supplied from local water sources.

Table EW-1: Embedded Energy in the Water Cycle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water Cycle Segments</th>
<th>Range of Embedded Energy (kilowatt hours/million gallons)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply and Conveyance</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater Collection and Treatment</td>
<td>1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater Discharge</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycled Water Treatment and Distribution</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: California Energy Commission, California’s Water-Energy Relationship, final staff report, 2005.
As of 2005, water-related energy use annually consumes 19 percent of the state’s electricity consumption, 30 percent of non-power plant natural gas consumption, and 88 million gallons of diesel fuel. Statewide water-related electricity consumption alone costs at least $2 billion per year. As water demand grows, so does energy demand. Water demand and associated energy costs will continue to grow if current trends continue. Since population growth drives demand for both resources, water and energy demands are growing at roughly the same rate. Water-related electricity use is expected to grow at a faster rate in the future because of increasing and more energy-intensive water treatment requirements such as those under the Safe Drinking Water Act and Clean Water Act, conversion of diesel agricultural pumps to electric, increasing long-distance water transfers, and changes in crop patterns that require more energy intensive irrigation methods.

Peak demand for water, and energy required to treat and transport that water, coincides with peak demand for electricity. If not coordinated and managed, water-related electricity demand could affect the reliability of the electric grid during peak load periods. Conversely, reliable and adequate electricity supplies are essential for water and wastewater agencies to meet the needs of their customers. If electricity infrastructure fails, water system reliability quickly worsens.

Energy and Water in the San Diego Region

The San Diego County Water Authority (CWA) currently supplies about 600,000 acre-feet\(^6\) of water per year (af/year) to water agencies in the region. Supply sources include 470,000 af/year from the Metropolitan Water District (MWD), 83,000 af/year from the SWP, 30,000 af/year from local groundwater supplies, and 18,000 af/year from recycled wastewater. The average energy intensity of the water-energy cycle in the San Diego region is 6,900 kilowatt-hours per acre-foot (kWh/af). Based on these figures, total water-related energy consumption to satisfy current regional water demand is estimated at 4,140,000 megawatt-hours (mWh) per year. The energy intensities for the five stages of the water life cycle in San Diego region are estimated as follows:

1. **Sources and conveyance:** 2,040 kWh/af,
2. **Water treatment:** 60 kWh/af,
3. **Distribution:** 330 kWh/af,
4. **End uses:** 3,900 kWh/af, and
5. **Wastewater treatment:** 570 kWh/af.

Energy and Water End Uses

Despite the energy-intensive process of conveying water over long distances and high elevations to the region, water end use applications are the most energy-intensive stages of the water life cycle, accounting for over half (57 percent) of water-related energy use. The same is true for the state as a whole.

Energy efficiency water programs have traditionally focused on either saving energy in water and wastewater treatment facilities or saving energy in end-use applications including water heating, clothes washing and drying or process heating. Water use efficiency programs have similarly focused on saving water in end-use applications. For the most part these efficiency improvement

\(^6\) An acre-foot is equal to about 325,850 gallons of water, or enough to cover an acre of land to a depth of one foot.
efforts have occurred separately, although there are some examples of water and energy utility coordination. What appears to be missing is recognition that saving water saves energy throughout the entire water use cycle.

Understanding the embedded energy of water requires distinguishing between cold and hot water. Conserving a unit of cold water avoids using the energy that would have been needed to supply, treat, deliver, consume, treat, and then dispose of it as wastewater. In San Diego, saving cold water, both indoors and outdoors, saves energy (primarily electricity). Saving outdoor water saves the energy needed to extract, convey, treat, and distribute water to customers. Saving indoor water saves the additional energy (mostly electricity), used to collect, treat, and dispose of the wastewater. Saving hot water results in additional energy savings needed to heat the water (usually natural gas).

From an energy perspective, saving cold outdoor water is good, saving cold indoor water is better, and saving hot indoor water will save the most energy. Moreover, saving end-use energy can save water and the energy associated with the applicable portion of the water use cycle. For example, saving electricity of any kind also will save water at power plants that use cooling water.

As shown in Table EW-2, the residential sector in the San Diego region is estimated to be responsible for 58 percent of water end uses in 2010. The commercial, industrial and institutional sectors are estimated to account for an additional 32 percent, while agriculture will account for about 10 percent. The five largest end use consumers of water are cold outdoor water for residential landscape irrigation (23 percent), cold indoor water for residential toilets and leaks (14 percent), cold outdoor water for commercial/industrial landscape irrigation (12 percent), hot indoor water for residential showers, faucets and bathtubs (12 percent), and hot and cold indoor water for clothes washers (8 percent). The water end uses with highest embedded energy include water-cooled chillers (67,700 kWh/af), dishwashers (27,200 kWh/af), residential clothes washers and commercial laundries (11,650 kWh/af), showers, faucets, and bathtubs (6,700 kWh/af).

Targeting conservation and efficiency measures toward the largest end use consumers of water and water end uses with the highest embedded energy can reduce the overall energy intensity of water end uses. Renewable or clean distributed energy systems, such as solar hot water heating, also can be used to save energy from the use of hot indoor water.

| Table EW-2: Estimated Embedded Energy of Water End Uses in the San Diego Region |
|-----------------------------------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| **Water Use Category** | **Estimated Percent of Total Use in 2010** | **Estimated Energy Intensity (kWh/af)** |
| Residential | 58% | 0 |
| Toilets and leaks | 14% | 0 |
| Dishwashers | 1% | 27,200 |
| Clothes washers | 8% | 11,650 |
| Showers, faucets, and bathtubs | 12% | 6,700 |
| Landscape irrigation | 23% | 0 |
| Commercial, industrial, and institutional | 32% | |
| Kitchen dishwashers | 50% | 27,200 |
| Pre-rinse nozzles | 20% | 6,700 |
| Other kitchen use | 1.2% | Not Estimated |
Laundries 0.6% 11,650
On-site wastewater treatment 5.8% 800
Water-cooled chillers 2.4% 67,700
Single pass cooling 2.4% 0
Landscape irrigation 12.1% 0
Other heated water 0.3% 6,700
Other unheated water 6.5% Not Estimated
Agricultural 10% Not Estimated
Totals and weighted average 100% 3,900


Energy Considerations for Meeting Future Water Demand

With the population of the San Diego region expected to increase by approximately one million residents by 2030, demand for water will increase. CWA estimates that at least an additional 100,000 af/year will be needed in 2020, and demand for water will continue to grow to 2030 and beyond. CWA must save 80,000 af by 2010, 94,000 af by 2020 and 108,000 af by 2030 to meet the region’s water needs, or it must develop or contract additional water supplies. There are various strategies to meet future water demand, including conservation, recycling, and desalination. Imported supplies from the SWP and Colorado River will likely be constrained by various factors including enforcement of the Colorado River Compact, environmental restrictions on water from the SWP, and the impacts of climate change such as reduced snowpack levels in the Sierra Nevada. The energy intensity of each potential strategy varies, as shown in Table EW-3.

Table EW-3: Energy Intensity for Satisfying Additional Water Demand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source and Conveyance (kWh/af)</th>
<th>Water Treatment (kWh/af)</th>
<th>Distribution (kWh/af)</th>
<th>End Use (kWh/af)3</th>
<th>Wastewater Treatment (kWh/af)4</th>
<th>Total (kWh/af)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Status quo</strong></td>
<td>2,040</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>3,900</td>
<td>570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Status quo plus scenario5</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation</td>
<td>1,780</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>3,400</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling</td>
<td>1,830</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>3,900</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water bag transfer</td>
<td>1,950</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>3,900</td>
<td>570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Irrigation District transfer</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>3,900</td>
<td>570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional State Water Project</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>3,900</td>
<td>570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seawater desalination</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>3,900</td>
<td>570</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: California Energy Commission.

Notes: (1) Conserved water does not need to be distributed, reducing the embedded energy of distribution from 330 to 290 kWh/af delivered. (2) Conservation assumes no energy is conserved when water is conserved, but no energy is expended to conserve water either. (3) Wastewater is not generated by conservation or by recycling if recycled water is used for landscape irrigation, reducing energy intensity from 570 to 500 kWh/af delivered. (4) The scenarios are presented for purposes of comparing energy consumption only. They do not necessarily represent feasible or likely scenarios for satisfying future water demand in the San Diego region.
Water Efficiency and Conservation

The Energy Commission identifies water conservation and efficiency as the best, most energy efficient way to serve future demand using the largest available supply—existing water resources. Investment in conservation and efficiency may forestall or avoid larger public investments for drinking water, clean water infrastructure, or power generation facilities, and it will help stretch available public water funds. For example, total energy savings of meeting the next 100,000 af through conservation instead of additional SWP water could be approximately 767 million kWh, enough to provide electricity for 118,000 households for one year. Waste Not, Want Not, a study published by the Pacific Institute in November 2003, estimated that cost effective urban water conservation measures could save 22 percent of water end uses in the residential, commercial, and industrial sectors, and without technological chance.

Reclamation

Water recycling (reclamation) is the next best efficient source of additional water supply. Recycled water is the fastest growing source of new supplies in the state. After treatment to stringent health and quality standards, recycled water can displace offset use of fresh water for power plant cooling, industrial processes, landscape irrigation, and groundwater replenishment.

The San Diego region has made substantial investment in water reclamation. The City of San Diego has constructed two reclamation facilities – North City Water Reclamation Plant (NCWRP) and South Bay Water Reclamation Plant (SBWRP). NCWRP has capacity to produce up to 24 million gallons per day (MGD) of recycled water (about 26,880 acre feet per year), but existing beneficial reuse, consisting mostly of irrigation and some industrial purposes, total only about 6 MGD (about 6,700 acre feet per year) (City of San Diego, Water Reuse Study [2006]). Although the region has substantial capacity to produce recycled water with adequate quality, actual demand for recycled water has not matched that capacity. None of the recycled water is currently used as potable water.

The cities of Encinitas and Solana Beach, acting as the San Elijo Joint Powers Authority (SEJPA), operate the San Elijo Water Reclamation Facility (SEWRF), a wastewater treatment and water reclamation plant that treats approximately 5.25 million gallons of raw sewage per day. Approximately 1,200 to 1,300 acre-feet is produced and bought annually, equal to over 400 million gallons per year and serving approximately 32,000 people. Two recycled water reservoirs, one underground, and one above, each with a capacity of 750,000 gallons, provide operational storage for the water reclamation program.

In neighboring Orange County, the City of Huntington Beach and the Orange County Water District (OCWD) developed a Groundwater Replenishment (GWR) System, the world’s largest advanced water purification project of its kind. The GWR provides about 70 million gallons per day of near-distilled quality water to central and northern Orange County in an effort to offset the effects of future water shortages. The project takes highly-treated sewer water and put it through a three-step purification process that includes microfiltration, reverse osmosis, and ultraviolet light with hydrogen peroxide. As of 2008, the water produced cost $550 per acre-foot, only slightly more expensive than supplies imported from northern California. In the future, GWR water is forecasted to be more cost-effective due to decrease in the availability of imported water and resulting in an increase in cost. The reclamation process uses less electricity than currently used to import the same amount of water through the state aqueduct system.
Currently, a substantial portion of the processed reclaimed water is never utilized. Instead, it is pumped back into the general wastewater lines where it is run through treatment processes again at the Point Loma water treatment facility, and disposed of in the Pacific Ocean. This is an inefficient use of water and the energy used for processing and pumping. Distributing processed reclaimed water to end users via the purple pipe system (i.e., separate system of pipes for transporting reclaimed water) would require investments in water infrastructure such as storage and additional purple pipe system installation. Assessment districts could be established as a means of financing purple pipe system installation.

Another option for the region would be to treat processed reclaimed water to potable standards and distribute via the existing potable water distribution system. Reuse of the processed reclaimed water would save energy to the extent it displaces the embedded energy of water supply that would have otherwise been used to meet water demand.

The City of San Diego is currently undertaking a pilot Indirect Potable Reuse study to examine opportunities to expand its overall water reuse capacity by up to 16 million gallons of highly treated wastewater every day (about 17,900 acre feet per year).

**Desalination**

Desalination is another option to meet future water demand. The process removes salt from brackish water (a mixture of salt water and fresh water) or seawater to create potable fresh water. Brackish water desalination is considerably less energy intensive than seawater desalination. The Energy Commission reports that desalinated brackish water and seawater can relieve drought conditions, replace and restore groundwater, and provide a source of water for river and stream ecosystem restoration.

The future demand for additional sources of water and constraints on imported supply require the identification of conservation and efficiency options in all stages of the water-energy cycle, as well as potential sources of local supply. It is important to note that many consideration, are relevant to the selection of water sources to meet future demand in the region. Energy is just one of the considerations. Reliability, impacts to environmental resources, cost, and regional control may be other important considerations relevant to the selection of future water sources to meet regional demand.

**Water for Electricity Generation**

Several opportunities exist to increase energy supplies from water and wastewater utilities, including hydroelectric power in hydroelectric power plants and pumped storage facilities, water storage for peak shifting, in-conduit hydroelectric generation, biogas cogeneration at wastewater treatment plants, and development of local renewable resources on water and wastewater utilities' extensive watersheds and rights-of-way.

Opportunities for construction of new hydroelectric plants are very limited. Pumped storage projects involve the transfer of water between two reservoirs or tanks at varying elevations to generate electricity. Water can be pumped from the lower to the higher reservoir during off-peak electricity periods, and then released to the lower reservoir during peak electricity periods to spin a turbine or power an electricity generating unit. This is considered a method of storing renewable
electricity, particularly intermittent sources such as wind and solar power. In-conduit generation utilizes the flow of water through pipelines, canals, and the like to generate electricity. Additional in-conduit projects could help offset the embedded energy of the water system or be sold back to the grid. In-conduit projects could also help contribute to the region’s goals for renewable power generation.

Wastewater treatment plants use anaerobic digestion to clean wastewater, a process that releases biogas (60 to 90 percent methane). Biogas can be captured and used for electricity. The Point Loma Wastewater Treatment Plant in the City of San Diego produces enough biogas to run a 4.5 megawatt (MW) generator, which saves millions of dollars in energy costs and produces power for the electricity grid.

There are opportunities at pumping stations to take advantage of downgrade water flow to provide hydroelectric electricity to pumping stations. In addition to hydroelectric power, onsite solar arrays or cogeneration systems at pumping stations can provide energy for water pumping while reducing impacts on the electricity grid. Wind and solar photovoltaic facilities are excellent power sources from a water perspective as they do not use water during operation. Distributed energy systems are essentially air-cooled machines that require little to no water for operations. Many water agencies can install have potential for installation of solar panels on rooftops and structures and on other unused or underutilized land within their control. Water agencies can take advantage of renewable energy opportunities to offset their own electricity load and potentially even send power to the grid and contributing to regional goals for the generation of renewable power (e.g., Renewable Portfolio Standard goals).

**Recommended Actions for Energy and Water**

SANDAG, local governments, or other regional entities can undertake the following actions to encourage reduced water-related energy use. In some cases, active collaboration among multiple jurisdictions will be needed to implement the recommended actions. The following recommended actions will contribute to other energy goals, and likewise be enhanced by recommended actions identified in other topic areas, as described below.

**Local Governments**

EW-1. Increase energy conservation and efficiency of water end-uses in the residential and commercial sectors, with priority on the largest end uses of water (e.g., landscape irrigation, toilets, and showers) and the water end-uses with the most embedded energy (e.g., dishwashers, residential clothes washers and commercial laundries, and showers).

**SANDAG, Local Governments, or other Regional Entities**

EW-2. Identify existing or develop new financing mechanisms that end users can utilize to reduce water-related energy consumption (e.g., purple pipe to support use of reclaimed water), such as those available for energy measures (e.g., on-bill financing [property tax or utility] and low interest loans).

EW-3. Integrate measures that save water and energy into any regional retrofit program(s) to incorporate energy efficiency and distributed generation into the existing building stock.
EW-4. Promote energy efficiency, demand response and self generation efforts to local
governments that own or operate water pumping stations and water or wastewater
treatment facilities.

EW-5. Support or identify uses for existing unused reclaimed water to decrease the amount of
energy needed to meet the water needs of the San Diego region.

EW-6. Identify and support programs for residential re-use of gray water to decrease the amount
of energy needed to meet water needs.

EW-7. Support landscape design educational programs to help residential customers install low
water use landscaping, thereby reducing water-related energy use.
5. **Peak Demand**

**Goal:** Implement cost-effective steps and incentives to utilize demand response and energy efficiency measures to reduce peak demand.

**Introduction**

After energy efficiency, demand response is the next highest priority in the state’s preferred loading order for meeting new energy needs and reducing GHG emissions. Like energy efficiency, demand response is given a high priority in the loading order because addressing peak demand can help meet energy needs and lower GHG emissions with measures consumer benefits like cost savings and little or no environmental impact. Lower peak demand can improve air quality for the region, particularly in areas near peak electricity-producing power plants.

Peak demand is the maximum level of electric load, measured in megawatts (MW) for a specified time period. In contrast, average demand measures the total annual demand over all 8,760 hours in a year. The ratio of average demand and peak demand is called the load factor. This measures how effectively the total capacity of the electrical system is used on average. The higher the load factor, the more effectively the system is being used. A load factor of 100 percent, which is nearly unattainable, would mean the average and peak demand were equal and that system capacity was fully used 100 percent of the time. The RES Update uses the Energy Commission’s June 2009 peak demand forecast. SDG&E relies on the Energy Commission forecast for its resource planning. Recent trends for peak demand, average demand, and the resulting load factor for the SDG&E service territory are presented in Figure PD-1.

![Figure PD-1. Demand Trends in SDG&E Service Territory, 1990 - 2008](image)

Source: Energy Policy Initiatives Center, University of San Diego, 2009.
The current regional load factor is approximately 53 percent, lower than the average over the 1990-2008 period (59 percent) and significantly lower than the highest load factor of about 70 percent at the beginning of the decade. The increased load factor in the early 2000s was primarily the result of decreased demand during the California Energy Crisis. While average demand has modestly increased over this period, peak demand has increased more significantly.

Weather and behavior are major determinants of peak demand. On an annual basis, the region generally experiences high peak demand periods driven by air conditioning use on the hottest days of the year and during continuous heat waves.

Peak demand is a significant concern for energy planners about 80 to 100 hours each year. During that time, when electricity demand increases significantly, base-load electricity supply has been surpassed and electricity prices are at their highest. Increased demand must be offset by increasing supply or reducing demand. Supplemental power plants called “peaking units” or “peaker plants” can be used to increase supply for these short durations. These resources are generally more expensive to operate, less efficient, and have higher emission rates than base-load power. Reducing peak demand and thus the need for peaking resources can minimize their impacts.

**Measures to Address Peak Demand**

**Demand Response**

In general, demand response means shifting end user electric use from high demand periods to lower demand periods, when electricity is cheaper and more abundant. Doing so can reduce the overall demand (MW) on the electric system but does not necessarily reduce overall energy use (MW-hours), so demand response may not lower greenhouse gas and other emissions associated with electricity use. Demand response can be achieved by rate designs that provide customers lower electricity prices during most hours in exchange for higher prices during the times of peak demand when supply reserves are small. Traditional energy efficiency programs that result in peak demand reductions are another tool to manage demand. Demand response program also can reduce peak demand by providing customers with incentives for reducing their electric load in response to a call for load reduction by the utility, particularly during critical times like high temperature days. Incentives can include a credit on a utility bill, a dynamic rate, or exemption during a time of rolling blackouts.

Demand response includes new rate designs and incentive programs for on-peak load reductions. New rate designs would provide customers lower electricity prices during most hours in exchange for higher prices during the times of peak demand when supply reserves are small and electricity typically costs more (this is referred to as dynamic pricing).

Demand response programs are available at the retail level primarily through utility programs administered through the CPUC. The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission identifies Demand Response as a high priority and issued Order 719 on October 17, 2008, which directs regional transmission organizations, such as the California Independent System Operator (CAISO), to implement demand response programs. CAISO established a Proxy Demand Resource program to facilitate demand response in wholesale markets, to be implemented by the summer of 2010.
SDG&E manages several types of demand response programs in which local governments and SANDAG can participate or educate employees, businesses and residents. Residential programs include “Summer Saver,” which allows SDG&E to install a device on a central air conditioning unit and to cycle the unit on and off during specific summer days. Ratepayers receive an annual bill credit ranging from an average of $46 to $184. Business programs include cash rebate assistance to replace existing equipment with newer high-efficiency models, and capacity bidding, which offers monthly incentives to businesses that commit to reducing power by a pledged amount for the month. SDG&E also offers a variety of third party programs administered by other contractors under competitive bid contracts awarded by SDG&E.

Distributed Generation

In addition to demand response programs, distributed generation systems can reduce peak demand. Rooftop solar photovoltaics, fuel cells, and combined heat and power systems can produce electricity during peak times and reduce demand on the electricity grid. The amount of peak reduction varies by technology type and operating characteristics. For example, summer peak period in the region occur between 3-5p.m. Solar photovoltaics do not produce at full capacity during that time and may only contribute half of its capacity during the peak. Other technologies such as CHP that generate electricity more hours of the year can contribute more during peak periods. For more on distributed generation, please see Section 3, Distributed Generation.

Advanced Metering Infrastructure

Smart meters and advanced metering infrastructure, can help to reduce regional peak demand by providing customers with detailed information about their energy consumption and charging dynamic rates for electricity. Pilot smart metering projects in the San Diego region and across the state have shown that consumers provided with information about their energy use and the actual cost of electricity based on the time of use, modified their consumption and reduced peak demand.

In addition, smart meters can communicate to smart end-use devices and appliances. This will enable energy consumers to cycle air-conditioning units off and on, set clothes dryers and dishwashers to run at off-peak hours, and manage other energy intensive equipment based on the time of use, the cost and availability of electricity. The electric utility or the customer will be able to remotely enable demand response programs and measures that could reduce some of the need for new electric generation resources.

Electric Vehicles and Peak Demand Management

The electricity and transportation sectors may converge in the coming decades. Several major automakers are introducing electric vehicles and plug-in hybrid electric vehicles in to U.S. auto markets. Use of electricity as a transportation fuel has significant potential to reduce regional GHG emissions but could require major changes to the existing electrical infrastructure. For example, large numbers of drivers returning home from work on a hot summer day and plug in their cars to charge would increase the existing peak demand. In addition, high concentrations of electric vehicle owners in the same neighborhoods could potentially strain local circuits.
To avoid adverse impacts from plug-in electric vehicles, strategies must be developed to accommodate electric vehicles while ensuring that the grid is not stressed. One potential strategy would be to encourage electric vehicle charging overnight during off-peak hours through pricing incentives. This strategy could be enhanced through smart charging capabilities that would allow the utility to determine the best times for vehicle charging and even out the increase in electric demand caused by electric vehicles.

Electric vehicles could also play a role in helping to control peak demand. In the future, utilities may be able to provide vehicle-to-grid capability in which a plug-in electric car owner can sell electricity from their car battery back to the grid, providing benefits to the electric grid as well as financial benefits to the car owner. Section 5. Demand Response, and Section 6. Smart Grid offer more discussion of the approaches and measures to address the potentially adverse impacts of plug-in electric vehicles.

For discussion of plug-in electric vehicles, please see Section 9, Transportation Fuels.

**Recommended Actions to Support Peak Demand Reduction**

SANDAG, local governments, or other regional entities can undertake the following actions to support reduced peak demand for electricity. In some cases, active collaboration among multiple jurisdictions will be needed to implement the recommended actions. The following recommended actions also would contribute to other energy goals, and the peak demand goal would be enhanced by the recommended actions identified in other topic areas, as described below.

**Local Governments**

PD-1. Participate in peak demand reduction programs and undertake peak demand reduction measures at local government facilities.

PD-2. Exceed Title 24 energy requirements for new construction through policy or incentives that work toward an overall goal of zero net energy new homes by 2020 and zero net energy new commercial buildings by 2030.

PD-3. Develop policies to reduce energy use in existing buildings.

**SANDAG, Local Governments, or other Regional Entities**

PD-4. Support fair and reasonable rate designs and incentives that encourage customers reduced electricity consumption during peak demand periods.

PD-5. Support the establishment of building retrofit programs or other mechanisms that can reduce energy consumption during periods of peak demand, such as heating, ventilation and air conditioning (HVAC) systems.

PD-6. Provide information and resources to help residents, businesses, developers, builders, nonprofits, agencies, jurisdictions, schools, colleges and universities, and other institutions understand individual and community costs associated with peak electricity demand.

PD-7. Monitor regional peak demand and measure the impacts of efforts to reduce peak demand.
6. **Smart Grid**

**Goal:** Modernize the electricity grid with smart meters, smart end-use devices, and interactive communication technologies.

**Introduction**

The smart grid concept is generally characterized by increased use digital communication and control technologies across the entire electric transmission and distribution system. An intelligent electric grid could help the region achieve many of the goals included in the RES Update, including increasing renewable energy, integrating electric vehicles, increasing energy efficiency and demand response, and increasing use of distributed generation. Smart grid technologies and strategies also can support other important goals, such as increased power reliability and cost savings for both the utility and end user. The smart-grid can accurately report power outages to the utility and customers, which may reduce their frequency and duration.

Smart meters and advanced metering infrastructure can automate utility billing, optimize electricity resources connected to the grid, and provide energy consumers with greater information on their electricity use. Smart meters are designed to give consumers access to their previous day’s electricity consumption and electricity cost information via the internet. Pilot smart metering projects in the San Diego region and across the state have shown that consumers provided with information about their energy use and the actual cost of electricity based on the time of use modified their consumption and reduced peak demand.

Smart grid implementation can occur at a region-wide and smaller or micro-grid level. For instance, the University of California, San Diego was awarded a U.S. Department of Energy grant to create a campus micro-grid combining fuel cells and advanced energy-storage technologies. The project will demonstrate smart grid benefits at a campus scale.

In 2006, the Energy Policy Initiatives Center (EPIC) of the University of San Diego released the **San Diego Smart Grid Study**, which included extensive analysis of the technologies, utility and societal costs and benefits as depicted in Tables SG-1 and SG-2, as well as scenarios for implementing a smart grid in the San Diego region.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table SG-1. Summary of San Diego Smart Grid Study Cost-Benefit Analysis Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Annual Benefits</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>System Benefits (20 years)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Societal (Consumer-side) Benefits (20 years)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Capital Cost</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual Operating and Maintenance Cost</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: EPIC, 2006

---

7 In the study, societal benefits are those benefits that accrue to non-utility stakeholders (i.e. the region at large) and represent such things as fewer outages resulting in avoidance of lost revenue to local businesses, job growth, and an increase in high-tech businesses that require and value high power reliability (e.g., biotech, pharmaceutical and research and development) and the resultant economic development attributes. System benefits are those benefits that can be achieved through the operations of the grid system.
### Table SG-2. Smart Grid Benefits for the San Diego Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit Type</th>
<th>Societal Benefits</th>
<th>System Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in congestion cost</td>
<td>$13.1 million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced blackout probability</td>
<td>$1.5 million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in forced outages/interruptions</td>
<td>$38.6 million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in restoration time and reduced operations and management</td>
<td>$11.3 million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>due to predictive analytics and self-healing attribute of the grid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in peak demand</td>
<td>$25.6 million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other benefits due to self-diagnosing and self-healing attribute of the grid</td>
<td>$0.2 million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased integration of distributed generation resources and higher capacity</td>
<td>$14.7 million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>utilization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased security and tolerance to attacks/natural disasters</td>
<td>$1.2 million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power quality, reliability, and system availability and capacity improvement</td>
<td>$1.3 million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>due to improved power flow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional job creation and increased Gross Domestic Product (GDP)</td>
<td>$28.3 million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased capital investment efficiency due to tighter design limits and</td>
<td>$0.2 million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>optimized use of grid assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax benefits from asset depreciation, tax credits, and other</td>
<td>$3.1 million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental benefits gained by increased asset utilization</td>
<td>$2.4 million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotals</strong></td>
<td><strong>$69.7 million</strong></td>
<td><strong>$71.8 million</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$141.5 million</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: EPIC, 2006

As the results show, the benefits of modernizing the electric grid through smart grid technologies far outweigh the costs. By supporting implementation of the smart grid, SANDAG and local governments can help residents and businesses save money on energy, increase job creation and regional GDP, protect environmental resources like air quality and habitat, and reduce peak demand. Smarter communications also will improve reliability and reduce outages, as well as enable electric vehicles, renewable energy, and distributed generation technologies to be accurately integrated into the electricity grid.

**Recommended Actions to Support the Smart Grid**

SANDAG, local governments, or other regional entities can undertake the following actions to support the smart grid. In some cases, active collaboration among multiple jurisdictions will be needed to implement the recommended actions. The following recommended actions will contribute to other energy goals, and likewise be enhanced by the recommended actions identified in other topic areas, as described below.
SANDAG, Local Governments, or Other Regional Entities

SG-1. Support efforts to modernize communications across the electricity grid through implementation of smart grid technologies and strategies in the San Diego region.
SG-2. Support mechanisms that encourage installation of smart appliances that interface with smart meters and provide real time electricity pricing information to electricity consumers.
SG-3. Support rate structures that reflect the real time price of electricity.
SG-4. Support the rollout of advanced metering infrastructure that enables electric vehicles, distributed generation systems, and electricity consumption to be accurately monitored by end-users and the utility.
SG-5. Support educational information on the regional deployment of the smart grid and smart meters.
SG-6. Support regional entities such as universities and the utility in acquiring state and federal funds to implement components of the smart grid in the San Diego region.
7. **Natural Gas Power Plants**

**Goal:** Increase overall efficiency of electricity production and support replacement of inefficient power plants consistent with the state’s preferred loading order.

**Introduction**

Despite long-term efforts to promote preferred resources like energy efficiency, demand response, distributed generation, and renewable energy, natural gas power plants remain an important source of electricity for the region. State-of-the-art utility-scale natural gas plants will be needed to reduce the GHG intensity of the region’s energy supply, at least in the short-term. Natural gas power is needed to promote grid reliability as intermittent renewable resources like wind and solar power are integrated into the electricity mix. Intermittent renewables offset need for fossil fuel power generation, but existing technology does not allow wind and solar to be quickly dispatched to meet peak power needs; natural gas peaker plants are therefore needed for this crucial function.

While the region mostly uses natural gas to generate electricity, natural gas also is used for end uses like space heating and water heating for homes and buildings, industrial processes, distributed energy systems, and increasingly in the transportation sector. This section focuses on use of natural gas for power plant electricity generation. Other natural gas applications are addressed in the following sections of the RES Update: 1 - Energy Efficiency and Conservation, 2 - Renewable Energy, 3 - Distributed Generation, 5 - Peak Demand, and 8 - Transportation Fuels.

**RES Approach to Natural Gas Use for Transportation, End-Uses, and Electricity Generation**

While it may seem contradictory, the RES Update calls for increased use of natural gas for certain transportation applications, decreased use of natural gas for end-uses like water heating, and more efficient use of natural gas in electricity generation. This reasoning is primarily based on the availability of alternative technologies in these unique sectors. For example, increased use of natural gas in transportation applications like heavy-duty trucks and transit buses can displace petroleum consumption, reduce air pollution, and lower GHG emissions compared to the conventional diesel alternative. For at least the near-term, natural gas is one of the best options in the heavy-duty transportation sector. By contrast, for end-uses like water heating, gas can be replaced with proven solar water heating technology, so the RES Update calls for decreased use of natural gas in these types of applications. And while renewable resources like solar and wind offer superior environmental benefits for electricity generation, existing technologies do not have the capability of providing the same supply benefits as natural gas-fired power plants. As a result, the RES Update identifies more efficient natural gas plants as a needed component of the region’s electricity resource mix.

**California Policies Related to Natural Gas Power Plants**

The following key policies affect natural gas power plants:

- State Water Resources Control Board’s (SWRCB) Once Through Cooling Resolution (2006) seeks to reduce marine impacts from once through cooling systems used by 21 coastal power plants in California, including natural gas and nuclear plants. This began a coordinated process between
several government agencies to phase out the use of once through cooling (described in further detail in the following section).

- Senate Bill 1368 (Perata, Chapter 598, Statutes of 2006) limited long-term investments in baseload generation by the state’s utilities to power plants that meet a GHG emissions performance standard (EPS) jointly established by the Energy Commission and the CPUC. The regulations require a baseload standard for generation of 1,100 lbs CO₂ per megawatt-hour, roughly equivalent to the emissions of a combined cycle natural gas power plant.

- 2005 and 2007 Energy Commission IEPR Policy on Aging Power Plants recommended that the CPUC require IOUs to procure enough capacity from long-term contracts to allow for the orderly retirement or re-powering of aging plants by 2012. In the 2007 IEPR, the Energy Commission recommended that California’s utilities adopt all cost-effective energy efficiency measures for natural gas, including replacement of aging power plants with new efficient power plants. In addition, the 2007 IEPR recommended the Energy Commission, the CPUC, the California ISO, and other interested agencies work together to complete studies on the impacts of retiring, re-powering, and replacing aging power plants, particularly in Southern California.

- The ARB Climate Change Scoping Plan calls for industrial facilities, such as power plants, to implement cost-effective GHG emissions reduction strategies. Specifically, the Climate Change Scoping Plan requires a reduction in GHG emissions from fugitive emissions from oil and gas extraction and gas transmission. The policies directing the state to meet climate change goals, such as the Renewable Portfolio Standard, intend to reduce the state’s dependence on fossil fuels—such as natural gas—and replace these with cleaner fuel resources.

- The State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) draft policy for addressing OTC calls for replacing existing once through cooling facilities with some combination of re-powered technologies onsite, new generation located in other areas, and/or upgrades to the transmission system.

**Natural Gas Power Plants in the San Diego Region**

The major existing natural gas-fueled power plants in the region include the aging and less efficient Encina plant in the City of Carlsbad and South Bay plant in the City of Chula Vista, as well as the newer Palomar plant in Escondido and the newer plant at Otay Mesa. There are also a number of smaller plants, including cogeneration facilities, which generate electricity at high overall efficiency rates when use of ancillary heat is taken into account.

Power plants are the region’s largest users of natural gas, and some of the older plants are inefficient relative to the latest technology, combined cycle gas turbine plants. Natural gas is a low polluting fossil fuel, and is the primary fuel used for in-state power generation due to its clean burning characteristics and stringent state emissions requirements. Natural gas provides approximately 56 percent of power plant electricity generation in the region. The region will need to rely on natural gas plants for part of its fuel supply for the foreseeable future to provide dispatchable power when the electricity system requires it.

All natural gas is produced outside of the San Diego region, and some even outside the nation. It is imported into the region through pipelines to end users. SDG&E is the region’s distributor of natural gas. A reliable infrastructure system is needed to support the receipt and delivery of adequate supply to the region and keep prices low.
Natural Gas Power Plants and Once Through Cooling

The Encina and South Bay power plants use once through cooling, a process by which water is drawn directly from a source water body, used to absorb heat, and then discharged back into the source water body at elevated temperatures. Because the water is not re-circulated, this process can require millions of gallons of water per day. Marine impacts from once-through cooling power plants are another major environmental concern of natural gas power plants. These plants pump large amounts of ocean, bay, or estuary water each day, impinging on fish, invertebrates, and crustaceans, destroying thousands of fish eggs and larvae, and harming marine organisms with heat discharged water.

As part of an interagency working group, the Energy Commission, CPUC, and California ISO have been working with the SWRCB to outline a proposal to maintain electric grid reliability while reducing once through cooling coastal power plants, including those in the San Diego region. The SWRCB has issued a compliance schedule for retiring, refitting, or repowering OTC plants to comply with federal water policy.

New generating capacity will be needed to replace OTC power plants. The SWRCB draft policy calls for replacing existing OTC facilities with some combination of re-powered technologies onsite, new generation located in other areas, and/or upgrades to the transmission system. In addition, demand response programs (discussed in Section 5) can offset the need for some natural gas peaker plants. Replacement power sources will have to meet local air quality requirements. In some cases emission offsets will have to obtained before replacement power can be built, which can be challenging. For example, in order to cite the Otay Mesa power plant, Calpine agreed to replace over 100 Waste Management diesel-powered trash haulers with liquefied natural gas (LNG) vehicles and construct an LNG fueling station in the City of El Cajon. The emission reduction credits earned through the cleaner-burning LNG vehicles and fueling station allowed construction of the needed power plant.

Natural Gas Prices

At present, California imports about 87 percent of its natural gas needs from out of state, and at the same time in-state production is decreasing. Natural gas markets have been proven to be very volatile over the last decade, thus most price forecasts are unreliable. Federal changes in energy policy will likely impact natural gas markets, creating some uncertainty for California and the San Diego region regarding access to stable, reasonably priced supply. For example, the establishment of federal carbon caps or laws to reduce GHG emissions will likely cause many states that rely heavily on coal for electricity generation to switch to natural gas power plants. What effect federal policy changes will have on supply that currently comes to California is not known. Natural gas prices and volatility also are affected by factors such as supply and demand imbalances, infrastructure (storage and pipeline) issues, the weather, regional and global economic conditions, speculative trading, market manipulation, and unreliable data and drilling technologies and rig deployment.
Recent technological advancements in exploration, drilling, and hydraulic fracturing have transformed shale formations from marginal natural gas producers to substantial and expanding contributors to the nation’s natural gas portfolio. Recoverable shale reserve estimates range as high as 842 trillion cubic feet, a 37-year supply for the U.S. at today’s consumption rates. However, while natural gas production from shale formations has significantly increased domestic production, there is ongoing investigation of potential environmental concerns related to shale gas development, including the potential for increased GHG emissions and groundwater contamination from the activities required to extract the gas.

Past efforts to forecast natural gas prices have been highly inaccurate compared to actual prices, even when price volatility was largely dominated by traditional, physical market factors. Recent natural gas price volatility is at least partially explained by evolving, less traditional, financial market factors that are complicating efforts to accurately forecast future natural gas prices. Additionally, as the United States continues moving to a carbon-constrained economy, GHG policies will further complicate these efforts, likely rendering future natural gas price forecasts even less accurate and more uncertain. The uncertainty associated with predicting major input variables and the resulting natural gas price forecasts brings into question the value in producing date specific, single-point natural gas price forecasts.

**Recommended Actions for Supporting Replacement of Inefficient Natural Gas Power Plants**

SANDAG, local governments, or other regional entities can undertake the following actions to support replacement of inefficient natural gas power plants using OTC technology, consistent with state policy. In some cases, active collaboration among multiple jurisdictions will be needed to implement the recommended actions. The following recommended actions will contribute to other energy goals, and likewise be enhanced by recommended actions identified in other topic areas, as described below.
SANDAG, Local Governments, or other Regional Entities

NG-1. Support the re-powering, replacement, or removal of older, inefficient coastal power plants in the region with the most efficient natural gas technology or renewable sources in other areas, or transmission upgrades, as needed -- consistent with state policy direction to address aging power plants and those with once through cooling.


NG-3. Monitor and evaluate regional natural gas storage and pipeline capacity to accommodate future demand.

NG-4. Support policies that reduce regional exposure to natural gas market volatility.
8. Transportation Fuels

Goal: Substantially increase the deployment of alternative transportation fuels and vehicles.

Introduction

The region can improve air quality, promote public health, protect against petroleum price volatility and supply uncertainty, reduce GHG emissions, and benefit the economy by substantially improving the transition to alternative fuel vehicles in the region. Passenger vehicles, heavy-duty trucks and buses, aircraft, watercraft, off-road vehicles, and rail transportation can each improve the efficiency of fuel consumption or operate fully or in part on fuels other than gasoline or diesel.

Alternatives to petroleum-based fuels include:

- Biofuels (ethanol and biomass-based diesels), electricity, hydrogen, natural gas, and liquefied petroleum gas (LPG or propane);
- Electricity, which can displace the most petroleum and reduce GHG emissions (electric drives are able to utilize renewable energy as a fuel source, and existing electricity infrastructure in the region would facilitate the deployment of this alternative fuel faster than others);
- Hydrogen and renewable biofuels, which also offer significant GHG emission and petroleum reduction benefits, but significant economic and technological barriers must be overcome before these fuels can be deployed on a large scale; and
- Natural gas and propane, which can also achieve economic and environmental benefits for the region, but of a more modest nature.

Please consult the SANDAG Regional Alternative Fuels, Vehicles, and Infrastructure Report for a detailed assessment and comparison of petroleum-based and alternative fuels, vehicle technologies, and infrastructure.

Alternative fuels and vehicle technologies, although generally offering more benefits than petroleum, are not without potential drawbacks. For example, natural gas is a finite fossil fuel, as is propane, with many other important applications including electricity generation, residential and commercial end uses like space and water heating, as well as the raw material in fertilizers critical to food production. Electric vehicles, deployed on a large scale, would have a potentially significant impact on the electricity grid. In addition, there is a limited amount of land to produce feedstocks for biofuels, and hydrogen fuel must be created from another energy source like natural gas or electricity. Moreover, production of alternative fuel vehicles is an energy-intensive process that requires the extraction of raw materials, industrial assembly, and typically long-distance distribution to customers. A careful, holistic approach to the use of alternative transportation fuels will help the region minimize the unintended consequences of a transition to alternative fuels and vehicle technologies.

State and federal energy policy provides significant opportunities for the region to increase the deployment of alternative fuel vehicles and infrastructure, including funding and tax credits. Moreover, a variety of alternative fuel vehicles in multiple vehicle classes are available now or will be in the near future, including factory-made and commercially available vehicles from major automobile manufacturers and after-market vehicle conversions and retrofits. Much government
funding, research, and private sector investment is focused on the development of plug-in hybrids, electric vehicles, and biofuels. Hydrogen, natural gas, and propane are also the focus of public and private sector research and dollars.

Government funding sources include the Alternative and Renewable Fuel, Vehicle Technology, Clean Air, and Carbon Reduction Act (Assembly Bill 118, 2007). As part of the AB 118 Investment Plan, the Energy Commission performed a gap analysis to help determine where best to apply state funding for alternative fuels. They found that overall funding from federal, state and private sources totaled about $35 billion per year and that biofuels was the most funded fuel category. Of the $35 billion, research and development (R&D) expenditures totaled about $11 billion per year with most funding focused on biofuels, followed by fuel cells and batteries.

Overall, federal funding for alternative fuels has focused on three primary areas: next generation biofuels processes and pilot plant construction; energy storage; and plug-in hybrid electric vehicles. The federal stimulus bill allocates $3 billion for transportation programs and an additional $2 billion to transportation-related tax incentives. The Energy Commission has stated it will work with the DOE to leverage AB 118 funds and support projects in the clean energy sector that provide long-term economic benefits and promote sustainability.

SANDAG has developed relationships with a variety of regional stakeholders regarding alternative fuels, including the San Diego Regional Clean Fuels Coalition and the Clean Transportation Program at SDG&E. SANDAG will also partner in the recently-announced ARRA funded project between eTec and Nissan North America (eTec Nissan project) to deploy up to 1,000 all-electric vehicles and establish up to 2,250 private and publicly accessible charging points in the San Diego region as part of the largest transportation electrification project in U.S. history.

It should be noted that the future of alternative fuels in general, as well as individual technologies, is uncertain. While this strategy attempts to identify broad future trends in alternative transportation fuels, the many variables that affect these trends can be unpredictable, including but not limited to national and global economic conditions, the price and availability of crude oil and natural gas, national and global energy policy, technological developments, and levels of state and federal funding and support. This alternative fuels strategy should be revisited and revised as needed in the case that any of these or other important variables change significantly.

Increasing efficiency and reducing the growth in vehicle travel demand are also essential components of a comprehensive approach to achieving goals for air quality, climate change, public health, and energy security. Measures to reduce vehicle travel demand are discussed in Section 9. Land Use and Transportation Planning.

Passenger Cars and Light-Duty Trucks

California has developed a 2050 vision for alternative fuels and vehicles based on fair-share GHG emission reductions from passenger vehicles. Although transportation accounts for a larger proportion of regional than statewide emissions and a fair-share approach is not established by statute, the vision illustrates the magnitude of change the region must undergo over the next four decades. By 2030, the horizon year of the RES, substantial progress toward this vision must be achieved. Major attributes of the state’s 2050 vision include:
Average vehicle fuel economy of 60 miles per gallon (mpg); 80 mpg equivalent for electric vehicles, significantly higher than current average of about 22 mpg;

Fuel mix consisting of 40 percent electricity and hydrogen, 30 percent biofuels, and 30 percent petroleum-based fuels, substantially different than existing supply of nearly 100 percent petroleum;

Carbon intensity reductions of 90 percent below today's gasoline vehicles for electricity and hydrogen, 80 percent for biofuel vehicles, and at least 10 percent for other fuel and vehicle types;

Per-capita vehicle miles traveled (VMT) of about 8,200, approximately 20 percent lower than projected statewide for 2050 without change in policy or behavior (about 14 percent lower than the regional 2030 projection); and

Transportation measures complemented by changes to land use policies in order to realize full GHG reductions.

The Regional Alternative Fuels, Vehicles, and Infrastructure Report provides a detailed analysis of alternative fuels and vehicles, including recommendations for passenger cars and light-duty trucks. At least for the near-term, plug-in hybrids and electric vehicles are the priority alternative fuel and vehicle recommendations for the region. Electricity can achieve significant GHG and petroleum reductions, and electric charging points are relatively inexpensive. Electric vehicles will likely first become available to the region in 2010, with additional automaker vehicle rollouts over the next two to five years. While hydrogen and biofuels (when produced from renewable sources) show potential to significantly reduce petroleum consumption and GHG emissions, there are technological and economic barriers to making these alternative fuel sources commercially viable. The cost and availability of infrastructure and fuel production (as well as vehicles for hydrogen) currently makes hydrogen and renewable biofuels uncompetitive with other alternative fuels. If these technologies become commercially viable on a large scale, they could offer benefits of a similar level to plug-in hybrids and electric vehicles. Natural gas and propane can help the region achieve modest near-term benefits, although not of equal magnitude to plug-in hybrids and electric vehicles. Long-term, natural gas and propane will comprise a minor portion of the passenger vehicle fleet. Government coordination of public access to electric charging and alternative fueling infrastructure is required to support private sector rollout and purchase of vehicle and fuels in the San Diego region.

**Heavy-Duty Trucks and Buses**

Although heavy-duty trucks and buses represent a small portion of transportation fuel consumption relative to passenger vehicles, there are opportunities to reduce petroleum energy consumption from the movement of people and goods by transitioning heavy-duty trucks and buses to alternative fuels. Other heavy-duty vehicles such as trash haulers and street sweepers can operate on alternative fuels and efficient vehicle technologies. The emerging fuels and vehicle technologies included in this analysis are renewable diesel, hydraulic hybrids, battery-electric hybrids, full-electric vehicles, hydrogen fuel cells, propane, CNG, and LNG.

The state's 2050 vision for heavy-duty vehicles foresees CNG, LNG, propane, biodiesel and hybrid technologies with the greatest potential for displacing petroleum-based fuels and improving
efficiency. Biodiesel blends up to B20\(^{8}\) can be used in most existing vehicles and equipment, when consistent with manufacturer warranty. Changes in diesel engines may allow the use of blends greater than B20, while efforts to produce biodiesel from renewable feedstocks like algae and waste may be commercially viable within the timeframe of the RES. Natural gas is recommended for heavy-duty trucks and buses. CNG is best suited for short- and medium-haul applications, while LNG is better suited for longer distances. Both propane and natural gas can be applied to more medium-duty vehicles like vans and cargo trucks. Hybrid electric and hydraulic hybrids are viable options for a variety of medium and heavy-duty applications like refuse trucks, drayage trucks, and utility trucks as well as transit and school buses. Where opportunities arise to incorporate electricity and hydrogen fuels into the heavy-duty vehicle sector, the region should take advantage of them. However, electricity and hydrogen will play an important, but likely smaller role in the heavy-duty truck and bus sector.

Additional information on statewide goods movement goals and policies is available in the California Goods Movement Action Plan. SANDAG also participated in the development of the Multi County Goods Movement Action Plan along with five other Southern California counties.

It should be noted that, after air transport, heavy-duty trucks are the least efficient form of goods movement. Rail and ocean-based goods movement are more energy efficient modes than heavy-duty trucks.

Regional Planning for Alternative Fuels and Vehicles

Siting alternative fueling stations, electric charging points, vehicle maintenance facilities, and other infrastructure in coordination with vehicle availability and purchases is of critical importance to a successful transition to alternative fuel vehicles in the on-road transportation sector. Such coordination is needed to provide customers like fleet managers and the general public with a level of certainty that infrastructure will be available to support their investment in an alternative fuel passenger vehicle. Planning for truck stop electrification (TSE) and anti-idling (AI) measures can help save energy from heavy-duty trucks in the goods movement sector. Outfitting the region with electric charging points and alternative fuel infrastructure can also help attract private investment associated with alternative transportation to the region.

SANDAG is a logical entity for coordinating the planning of alternative fuel infrastructure and identifying suitable locations for infrastructure. As a regional planning agency, SANDAG can ensure that alternative transportation considerations are integrated with development of the regional transportation network and recommend specific alternative fuel and vehicle technologies for different transportation sectors that are tailored to the unique characteristics of the region. In addition, SANDAG can facilitate vehicle and infrastructure deployment through actions such as development of a unified regional vision, identification of funding opportunities and coordination of funding applications, and development of standardized guidelines for infrastructure siting, permitting, and education. Please see the SANDAG Regional Alternative Fuels, Vehicles, and Infrastructure Report for a detailed assessment of alternative fuels, vehicles, infrastructure status and additional requirements, and recommended actions for the San Diego region.

\(^{8}\) Biodiesel can be legally blended with petroleum diesel in any percentage. The percentages are designated as B20 for a blend containing 20% biodiesel and 80% petroleum diesel. B20 is the most common biodiesel blend in the United States.
**Recommended Actions to Support Increased Use of Alternative Transportation Fuels**

SANDAG, local governments, or other regional entities can undertake the following actions to support increased use and deployment of alternative transportation fuels and technologies. In some cases, active collaboration among multiple jurisdictions will be needed to implement the recommended actions. The following recommended actions will contribute to other energy goals; likewise, the alternative transportation fuel goal can be enhanced by recommended actions identified in other topic areas, as described below.

**SANDAG, Local Governments, or other Regional Entities**

TF-1. Create an action plan that incorporates alternative fuel vehicles into SANDAG and local government-owned vehicle fleets, and the vehicle and equipment fleets of contractors and funding recipients, such as the vehicle fleet for the SANDAG vanpool program or for local government trash haulers.

TF-2. Use the Regional Alternative Fuels, Vehicles, and Infrastructure Report and the RES Update as tools to support the integration of alternative transportation options into local government fleets, planned regional transportation projects, and future updates of the Regional Transportation Plan and the Regional Comprehensive Plan.

TF-3. Develop a regional approach to infrastructure planning for alternative fuels by facilitating continued development of a public-private strategic alliance.

TF-4. Support electricity and natural gas tariffs that encourage their use as transportation fuels.

TF-5. Develop streamlined permitting requirements and standardized design guidelines and siting criteria for all types of electric charging stations (e.g., single- and multi-family residential, commercial, public access, etc.).

TF-6. Accelerate the transition to plug-in hybrid electric and battery electric vehicles by developing a regional plan for the installation of a public access electric car charging network, as recommended in the Regional Alternative Fuels, Vehicles, and Infrastructure Report.

TF-7. Analyze the potential impacts of widespread plug-in hybrid and electric vehicle deployment on the electricity grid.
9. Land Use and Transportation Planning

**Goal:** Reduce the energy demand of the built environment through changes in land use and transportation planning.

**Introduction**

**Energy and the Built Environment**

Regional energy consumption is strongly related to urban form, the physical features and composition of the built environment. The built environment is comprised of the building stock, land use pattern, transportation network, open space system, and distribution of other public facilities such as parks and schools. In turn, the energy demand of the built environment is strongly dependent upon the design and orientation of buildings, distribution and density of development, types of transportation infrastructure and policies, and the design of public facilities. Although there is considerable variation throughout the region, the existing built environment generally features segregation between land uses and transportation systems and policies and urban design that favor the automobile over biking, walking, and public transit. In addition, many existing buildings are relatively energy inefficient compared to requirements for new construction, particularly those buildings constructed prior to the 1980s. To a large degree, these factors influence the amount of energy residents of the San Diego region consume in everyday activities by influencing travel modes and distances and the type and amount of energy they use. In fact, personal vehicle use (e.g., passenger cars; sport utility vehicles; pick-up trucks), residential electricity use and natural gas consumption together account for about 56 percent of total GHG emissions in the region, while the commercial and industrial sectors account for about 21 percent and 11 percent of total GHG emissions, respectively.

**Figure LUTP-1: The Urban Heat Island Effect**

Exposed urban surfaces like roofs and pavement absorb heat and cause surface and air temperature in the built environment to become warmer than less developed or undeveloped areas through a process known as the urban heat island effect (Figure 1). Several negative impacts are associated with urban heat islands, including increased energy demand for cooling during summer months, particularly during periods of peak electricity demand.

Source: United Environmental Protection Agency.

---

9 As of 2008, international travel into or out of Baja California, Mexico accounts for about three percent of total regional vehicle miles traveled. This figure is expected to increase to four percent by 2030.
Government Influence Over the Built Environment

Local governments and SANDAG can influence the built environment, including the amount of energy consumed, through their ability to regulate, provide incentives, collaboratively plan, and make infrastructure investments that affect land use patterns, the transportation system, and other public infrastructure investments. Local governments’ ability to influence building energy use, efficiency, distributed energy systems is discussed in Section 1 - Energy Efficiency and Conservation.

In addition, local governments can contribute to regional energy goals for increased distributed generation and large scale renewable power by considering the spatial requirements of energy infrastructure in local land use plans, ranging from on-site and distributed generation systems to larger- and utility-scale renewables, power plants, substations and transmission lines requiring larger areas of land. The RES Update provides policy guidance for local governments in their consideration of these issues. The approach of SANDAG and local governments to these issues will influence regional energy consumption, GHG emissions, types of available energy sources, and overall quality of life.

Land Use and Transportation Planning in the San Diego Region

A major objective of local land use and regional transportation planning is to identify the land and infrastructure needed to accommodate projected population, housing, and job growth while maintaining and enhancing quality of life. In the past, population, economic and job growth have resulted in increased total electricity, gasoline, and diesel consumption, and increased vehicle miles traveled (VMT). In fact, since 1980, national VMT has increased about three times faster than population growth, in large part due to auto-oriented development patterns, increasing vehicle trip distances, and declines in walking and public transit use (Figure LUTP-2). Relatively stable and low fuel prices also likely contributed to the past VMT growth rate.

Figure LUTP-2: Growth in Vehicle Miles Traveled, Vehicles, and Population in the US
The relationship among population and economic growth, energy consumption and travel behavior will continue to follow past trends unless the region develops a new strategy for population growth and the built environment that addresses total VMT and the amount and types of energy used for transportation and to power buildings and industries. Moreover, as shown in Figure LUTP-3, efforts to reduce GHG emissions from on-road transportation through more fuel efficient vehicles and lower carbon fuels will fail if VMT continues to follow past trends and increase. Projections for all of California show that the state cannot reduce its GHG emissions to 80 percent of 1990 levels by 2050 unless VMT is reduced by at least 17 percent\(^\text{10}\). The trend of VMT growth must be slowed, stopped, and eventually reversed in order to successfully lower GHG emissions from the on-road transportation sector.

**Figure LUTP-3: Projected US Mileage, Vehicles Miles Traveled, and CO2 Emissions**

Existing Smart Growth and Transportation Planning Efforts

SANDAG and the local jurisdictions, through a collaborative process, have developed a strategy to accommodate projected growth based on an adopted smart growth policy. Under smart growth principles adopted by the SANDAG Board of Directors, smart growth opportunity areas are identified as places that could accommodate higher residential and employment densities within pedestrian-friendly activity centers connected to other activity centers by public transit. By promoting walking, bicycling, and public transit as viable alternatives to driving, and creating shorter vehicle trips, smart growth leads to lower total VMT. The Smart Growth Concept Map (Figure LUTP-4) illustrates the nearly 200 locations of existing, planned, and potential smart growth opportunity areas in seven smart growth place type categories, reflecting the notion that smart growth is not a “one-size-fits-all” concept. The Map also shows the relationship between smart growth areas and existing, planned, and potential public transit service. SANDAG uses the Map to provide funding for transportation and transportation-related infrastructure improvements and planning efforts that support smart growth development through the TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program.

---

Figure LUTP-4: SANDAG Smart Growth Concept Map
The SANDAG Regional Comprehensive Plan – the blueprint for the region’s growth – describes the importance of better integrating smart growth development with transportation planning. SANDAG also updates the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) every four years to allocate funding to implement the long-range vision for the regional transportation network to 2030. The adopted 2007 RTP is founded on four main components: (1) better integration of smart growth land use with the transportation system, (2) systems development including improvements to the highway, road, and public transportation systems, (3) systems management to make more efficient use of existing facilities and investments, and (4) demand management to encourage alternatives to driving alone and minimize demand during peak travel periods. These two plans are the broad framework for SANDAG land use and transportation planning efforts and are the foundation for developing other related plans.

Business-As-Usual Fuel Consumption and GHG Emissions Projections

The Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the 2007 RTP projects that implementation of the set of transportation projects, funding allocations, policies, and adopted local land use plans identified in the RTP would increase annual gasoline and diesel fuel consumption by about 500 million gallons (31 percent) and 46 million gallons (23 percent), respectively, and GHG emissions by 30 percent by 2030, relative to baseline (2006) conditions. Population is expected to increase by about 32 percent by 2030, relative to 2006. In addition, total daily on-road gasoline and diesel fuel consumption per capita are projected to increase by about 4 percent, and daily VMT per capita is expected to increase by about 3 percent. This indicates that VMT and transportation-related energy use are projected to increase slightly faster than population growth under adopted regional transportation and local land use plans.

State Legislation related to Land Use and Transportation Planning: Senate Bill 375

The state’s Climate Change Scoping Plan and Senate Bill (SB) 375 (Statutes of 2008) emphasize the need to better connect land use plans with regional transportation networks to help achieve the state’s GHG emissions reduction target for 2020. SB 375 requires MPOs like SANDAG to create a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) that integrates the transportation network with development patterns in a way that achieves GHG emissions reduction targets from passenger cars and light-duty trucks while meeting housing needs and other regional planning objectives.

SANDAG is required to develop a SCS demonstrating how changes to land use patterns, transportation infrastructure investments, funding allocations, and policies, or any other measures will achieve the targets to be established through the SB 375 process in the next update of the RTP. Since the state and federal government regulate vehicle fuel economy and fuel carbon content, SANDAG is responsible for lowering GHG emissions through measures that reduce the amount of vehicle miles traveled and maximize the efficiency of vehicle travel. Potential land use and transportation-related policy measures available to help the region are discussed below, will be explored in greater detail in the forthcoming SANDAG Regional Climate Action Plan, and ultimately addressed in the next update of the SANDAG Regional Transportation Plan currently under preparation and scheduled for adoption in 2011, and the next update of the SANDAG Regional Comprehensive Plan, which is slated for preparation after the adoption of the RTP.
Addressing Energy and Climate Change through Land Use and Transportation Planning

Land Use and Transportation Strategies

In the past, energy-related criteria like gasoline and diesel consumption and GHG emissions were not explicit factors in land use and transportation planning in the region, in many other metropolitan regions of California, or in the U.S. However, past investments and decisions that shaped the region’s land use patterns and transportation systems are major determinants of current and future energy consumption. Once in place, land use patterns and transportation infrastructure will likely remain part of the built environment and influence travel behavior and energy consumption for several decades, perhaps longer. As a result, it is imperative that future planning take into account the energy and climate change implications of transportation infrastructure and land use investments for the duration of their useful lives. This is important because transportation and land use choices made today will affect the region several years and decades into the future.

Past decisions and investments in areas like smart growth planning, public transportation, and demand management contribute to energy savings and climate change objectives. The connection between past and current these and other land use and transportation strategies and energy and climate change goals should be made explicit. Likewise, land use and transportation strategies that do not save energy or contribute to climate change objectives also must be recognized and understood. Generally speaking, segregated, low-density land use patterns and automobile-oriented transportation investments and urban design do not contribute to energy savings or GHG reduction.

There are many land use and transportation-related policy measure options available to help the region save energy and achieve the level of GHG reductions required by state policy and demanded by climate science. These options address vehicle travel, and primarily seek to save energy and lower GHG emissions by decreasing the total amount of driving or vehicle miles traveled (VMT). Policy measure options to lower VMT include:

- Enhancing or expanding investments in public transportation, walking, and bicycling infrastructure;
- Increasing development of compact, mixed use projects and communities in which walking, bicycling, and public transit are convenient transportation options and vehicle trips are shorter; and
- Reducing transportation demand through policies like telecommuting, alternative work schedules, congestion, road, and parking pricing, and parking reform.

Land use and transportation-related policy options that address energy and GHG emissions but not necessarily VMT include:

- Measures to optimize the efficiency of vehicle travel by reducing congestion and limiting excessive vehicle speeds, and
- Installing publicly accessible infrastructure to support alternative fuel vehicle charging and fueling.
Further analysis of these broad land use and transportation policy measures is needed prior to their potential implementation to understand a variety of issues including their potential for fuel savings, contribution to near- and long-term cuts in GHG emissions, possible barriers to regional or local implementation, and their potential for regional economic, financial, environmental and social costs and benefits. Preliminary analysis of the policy measures will be included in the Regional Climate Action Plan, while additional analysis will be conducted for the next update of the Regional Transportation Plan, which is anticipated for adoption in 2011.

**Non-Transportation Strategies**

Land use plans and tools could more broadly address energy demand, supply, and infrastructure issues by broadening the smart growth planning efforts to include a comprehensive package of energy saving strategies. Some of the non-transportation related strategies that could fall under a broader definition of smart growth and produce significant energy savings within the region include:

- Increasing onsite production of renewable energy;
- Using distributed electricity generation;
- Orienting residences in relation to the sun;
- Increasing shading and incorporating roofs and pavements that reflect heat;
- Producing food locally;
- Improving energy efficiency in new construction and through existing building retrofits; and
- Smart community strategies (including the use of information technology to change how a community uses its physical space, which may also reduce the energy demand of the built environment by reducing the amount of vehicle travel).

A review of the region’s existing land use and transportation planning strategies against the following general characteristics of low-energy demand built environments, at a minimum, would ensure that energy considerations are more fully integrated into the region’s land use and transportation planning efforts. The SANDAG Smart Growth Design Guidelines include some discussion of important energy considerations such as renewable energy technologies like distributed photovoltaics, building orientation to promote solar access and natural ventilation, green building, and using tree planting and other techniques to minimize the urban heat island effect. The guidelines also discuss the energy saving and GHG reduction benefits of smart growth land use and alternative transportation choices like walking, bicycling, and public transportation.

**General Characteristics of a Low-Energy Demand Built Environment**

2. Compact land use patterns with convenient access to public transit, a mixture of land uses and a person’s daily needs, and jobs-housing balance.
3. Transportation infrastructure and policies that reduce the amount of vehicle miles traveled and support high levels of use for energy efficient transportation choices like walking, bicycling, and public transit as well as alternative fuel vehicles.
4. Public realm designed to reduce urban heat island effect (e.g., increased tree and vegetative cover; cool pavements) and convey a scale and character that supports convenient access and energy efficient transportation choices.

5. Smart community strategies that deploy information technology to change how a community uses its physical space to save energy (e.g., telecommuting to avoid vehicle trips).

6. Consideration of spatial requirements of small- and large-scale energy infrastructure.

Since the existing built environment is the result of several decades of land use development and transportation investments, reducing energy demand within the region will likely be incremental in the near-term. However, by 2030, land use and transportation planning decisions made to accommodate future growth will likely have a large impact on the amount of energy consumed, the distribution of land uses, efficient access to destinations, the design of the public realm, and how people travel. The evolution of the built environment will not only affect achievement of energy and climate change goals, but the region’s ability to maintain and enhance residents’ quality of life through co-benefits like improved public health and air quality. The region can lower the energy demand of the built environment through continued smart growth development, increased energy efficiency and distributed generation, improved urban design, and transportation planning and investments that reduce energy consumption.

**Recommended Actions for Land Use and Transportation Planning**

SANDAG, local governments, or other regional entities can undertake the following actions to facilitate reduced energy use in the built environment. In some cases, active collaboration among multiple jurisdictions will be needed to implement the recommended actions. The following recommended actions will contribute to other energy goals, and likewise be enhanced by recommended actions identified in other topic areas, as described below.

**SANDAG**

LUTP-1. Continue to encourage and assist local governments in implementing smart growth development (e.g., incorporating Potential Smart Growth Opportunity Areas into adopted land use plans, identifying new areas, and developing Planned Opportunity Areas) in part as a means to lower total vehicle miles traveled, save energy, and lower GHG emissions.

**SANDAG, Local Governments, or other Regional Entities**

LUTP-2. Support policy measures that promote the general characteristics of a low-energy demand built environment (described above), energy efficient transportation choices, and alternative fuels and vehicles in future updates of the Regional Transportation Plan, and Regional Comprehensive Plan, such as:

a. Investments in pedestrian, bicycle, and public transit travel,
b. Measures to reduce transportation demand like telecommuting, congestion and road pricing as well as parking pricing and reform,
c. Compact, walkable, mixed-use and human-scale smart growth community design,
d. Measures to optimize the efficiency of vehicle travel conditions, and
e. Infrastructure to support alternative fuel vehicle charging and fueling.
LUTP-3. Coordinate public investments related to transportation, energy, water supply, parks and open space and others in a manner that supports energy savings and climate change goals.

LUTP-4. Explore opportunities to support one or more demonstration projects in the region that exemplify adopted smart growth principles along with comprehensive energy saving strategies such as distributed photovoltaic installation and energy efficient improvements in building retrofits or new construction.

LUTP-5. Include comprehensive estimates of energy consumption and GHG emissions for land use and transportation planning scenarios at the regional, local, and project levels.
10. **Energy and Borders**

**Goal:** Integrate energy considerations into existing and future collaborative border initiatives.

**Introduction**

Energy supply, usage, and conservation in the San Diego region are impacted by actions of its neighbors and vice versa. San Diego County borders include Orange, Riverside and Imperial Counties, Mexico, and 17 tribal governments (the most in any county of the United States). Collaborative efforts are underway among SANDAG, its member agencies and its neighbors on various issues including transportation congestion management and goods movement. SANDAG and its member agencies can take steps to further integrate energy considerations into its border planning activities as the region strives to diversify its fuel sources, expand renewable energy resources, and address environmental and climate-related pollutants from transportation. The region cannot be successful in any of these areas without the involvement of its neighbors. Through its Borders Committee, SANDAG addresses policy issues related to cross-border planning from three perspectives—tribal, interregional, and binational.

**Tribal Governments**

The tribal governments in San Diego County and SANDAG are working together to develop and implement innovative government-to-government strategies to address transportation and other regional planning issues. Existing tribal coordination includes goals, policy objectives and actions focused on improving communication and collaboration with tribal governments in areas of regional importance such as economic development, transportation, housing and water supply. Energy can be integrated into these discussions in terms of transportation fuels, mobility choices, efficient building design and retrofits, renewable energy development, and water-energy issues.

In 2009, under a SANDAG-administered Caltrans Environmental Justice grant, the Reservation Transportation Authority (RTA) representing Southern California tribal governments completed a tribal transportation demand management (TDM) project to (1) facilitate staff training in TDM management practices; (2) develop a business plan for a tribal transportation management association (TTMA); (3) develop a marketing strategy; (4) develop marketing materials, including a web site; (5) assess and survey the transportation and commuting needs of tribal enterprise staff in six locations; and (6) develop a collaborative TDM strategy with SANDAG with the potential establishment of a tribal TMA. A report was produced highlighting the work effort and partnership between SANDAG, RTA, and participating tribal government administrations. Because transportation staff capacity is often limited within most tribes, SANDAG can act as a regional partner bringing together the interests of diverse tribes and enabling the sharing of resources and information to address common transportation goals.

---

Interregional Coordination

During the 1990s, the San Diego region’s average annual population growth rate paralleled the national average. However, growth rates in neighboring Orange, Riverside, and Imperial Counties during the same period were substantially higher. Through interregional coordination, neighboring councils of government and transportation planning agencies have begun to develop collaborative strategies in economic development, transportation, and housing. These collaborations will improve the quality of life for residents in each county by reducing the impacts of interregional commuting, creating more jobs in housing-rich areas and more housing in jobs-rich areas. SANDAG and its member agencies can foster the integration of energy considerations into existing interregional efforts, such as the voluntary partnership between Western Riverside and San Diego region centered on the two-county commute corridor along the Interstate 15. The I-15 Interregional Partnership (I-15 IRP) has completed three phases of work with notable products including identification of transit priority treatments and transit infrastructure development to support possible future Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) and commuter express on the I-15 and I-215 corridors, and creation of a pilot Smart Growth Opportunity Area Map for selected cities in Western Riverside modeled after the SANDAG Smart Growth Concept Map.

Binational Coordination

Given San Diego’s unique position as an international gateway, binational coordination already exists to address economic development, homeland security and other pressing cross-border issues. In 2008, SANDAG hosted its annual binational event in which participants met to discuss smart growth issues, including climate change. The 2009 event focused solely on climate change initiatives on both sides of the border, and explored opportunities to share information and work together to address climate change. Continued coordination between California and Baja California can help identify common issues, interdependencies and policies and actions to address energy planning and infrastructure on both sides of the border.

Recommended Actions for Energy and Borders

SANDAG, local governments, or other regional entities can undertake the following actions to further integrate energy considerations into binational planning efforts. In some cases, active collaboration among multiple jurisdictions will be needed to implement the recommended actions. The following recommended actions will contribute to other energy goals; likewise, the energy and borders goal can be enhanced by recommended actions identified in other topic areas, as described below.

SANDAG

EB-1. Encourage regional coordination on energy and climate change issues in the border region that come within the purview of SANDAG including the Borders Committee, Committee on Binational Regional Opportunities, and the Regional Energy Working Group.

EB-2. Support measures related to cross-border goods movement that reduces petroleum use and GHG emissions from heavy duty vehicles.
SANDAG, Local Governments, or other Regional Entities

EB-3. Support the integration of energy-saving measures for buildings, transportation and overall project design for the (re)development of the land Ports of Entry between San Diego and Baja California.

EB-4. Encourage conservation, energy efficiency, and peak demand reduction in San Diego and Baja California that relieve stress on the shared regional electricity system.

EB-5. Support coordination with binational stakeholders to explore opportunities for developing renewable energy that benefits the binational region.
11. Clean Energy Economy

**Goal:** Collaborate with workforce entities, employers, and labor unions to identify and expand local job placement mechanisms in the Clean Energy Sector.

**Introduction**

According to the California Economic Strategy Panel, green products and practices, including those in the Clean Energy Sector, can be found in the same industries as conventional products and practices. As such, an economic analysis of the type and amount of clean energy jobs (sometimes referred to as green jobs) and investment based primarily on tracking business and employment growth by industry is difficult to quantify. Table CEE-1 shows the types of industries and jobs that comprise the Clean Energy Sector:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies for Green Economic Investment</th>
<th>Representative Jobs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Retrofitting</td>
<td>Electricians, Heating/Air Conditioning Installers, Carpenters, Construction Equipment Operators, Roofers, Insulation Workers, Carpenter Helpers, Industrial Truck Drivers, Construction Managers, Building Inspectors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Transit/Freight Rail</td>
<td>Civil Engineers, Rail Track Layers, Electricians, Welders, Metal Fabricators, Engine Assemblers, Bus Drivers, Dispatchers, Locomotive Engineers, Railroad Conductors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smart Grid</td>
<td>Computer Software Engineers, Electrical Engineers, Electrical Equipment Assemblers, Electrical Equipment Technicians, Machinists, Team Assemblers, Construction Laborers, Operating Engineers, Electrical Power Line Installers and Repairers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind Power</td>
<td>Environmental Engineers, Iron and Steel Workers, Millwrights, Sheet Metal Workers, machinists, Electrical Equipment Assemblers, Construction Equipment Operators, Industrial Truck Drivers, Industrial Production Managers, First-Line Production Supervisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Biofuels</td>
<td>Chemical Engineers, Chemists, Chemical Equipment Operators, Chemical Technicians, Mixing and Blending Machine Operators, Agricultural Workers, Industrial Truck Drivers, Farm Product Purchasers, Agricultural and Forestry Supervisors, Agricultural Inspectors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Political Economy Research Institute, University of Massachusetts-Amherst, 2008
Clean Energy Sector jobs are defined as blue or white collar positions that:

- Preserve, restore, or improve the environment;
- Help save energy, advance new energy efficient technologies, or foster a more sustainable regional and national energy system;
- Have been updated to adopt sustainability as a core segment of the job description; and
- Provide career pathway opportunities leading to sufficient income to support a household and potential for advancement.

Opportunities and advantages to the region from expanding the Clean Energy Sector:

- Creating new jobs or retraining the unemployed and under-employed in a time of economic downturn;
- Providing opportunities for career advancement in the sustainability fields;
- Reducing our dependence on foreign oil, and strengthening national security;
- Promoting the use of domestic renewable energy resources;
- Reducing high utility costs of energy-inefficient public buildings and public housing; and
- Mitigating climate change by cutting GHG emissions.

Through 2019, significant investment will be injected into the Clean Energy Sector through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) of 2009. Nationally, ARRA will provide $787 billion of stimulus funding, with most made available in 2009-2011. As of June 2009, energy-related allocations to California are listed in Table CEE-2 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Energy Program</td>
<td>California Energy Commission</td>
<td>$ 226 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weatherization Program Assistance Program</td>
<td>CA Dept. of Community Services &amp; Development</td>
<td>$ 185 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>U.S. Department of Energy</td>
<td>$ 184 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Management</td>
<td>U.S. Department of Energy</td>
<td>$ 62 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biomass</td>
<td>U.S. Department of Energy</td>
<td>$ 111 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Growing Investment in the Clean Energy Sector

Even without ARRA funds, the Clean Energy Sector is expected to grow. Clean Edge, which tracks the growth of clean-tech markets, reports that global revenues for solar photovoltaics, wind power, and biofuels expanded from $75.8 billion in 2007 to $115.9 billion in 2008, an increase of about 53 percent. Clean Edge’s 2009 energy trends study identified a 30 percent growth of clean energy venture capital investments as a percentage of total venture capital investments in U.S.-based companies from 2007 (9.1 percent) to 2008 (11.8 percent). In 2000, clean energy venture capital comprised only 0.6 percent of the total.
Job Creation by Clean Energy Sector

The influx of federal stimulus funding creates the potential for significant growth in the Clean Energy Sector. Various levels of job creation are identified in economic studies from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy (ACEEE), American Solar Energy Society (ASES), US Council of Mayors, University of California Berkeley, among others. In 2008, a comprehensive analysis of national energy efficiency and energy supply investments by ACEEE found that since 1970, energy efficiency and energy productivity gains have met 75 percent of new energy service demands in the U.S., while new energy supplies contributed 25 percent. A summary of revenues and job creation in the U.S. renewable energy and energy efficiency industries is provided in Table CEE-3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Revenues</th>
<th>Direct Jobs Total</th>
<th>Jobs Created (direct and indirect)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Renewable Energy</td>
<td>$39.2 billion</td>
<td>196,000</td>
<td>452,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Efficiency</td>
<td>$932.6 billion</td>
<td>3,498,000</td>
<td>8,046,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$971.8 billion</td>
<td>3,694,000</td>
<td>8,498,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Bezdek, Management Information Services, Inc. for ASES, 2007

Existing Building Retrofits and Green New Construction

Generally, green construction, retrofit, and conventional construction projects are bid and worked on by similar contractors. In construction, some of the differences between green and conventional renovations are the composition of materials used in the process, where and how the materials are produced and how waste is addressed.Continual training and continuing education programs can provide the knowledge needed about green construction for contractors, architects, inspectors, permitters, and marketers that communicate with customers.

Renewable Energy and Smart Grid Workers

Similar to construction, many workers in renewable energy also fall under the traditional job classifications of the construction trades. Increasing demand for energy efficiency and renewable energy systems can be expected to generate new employment opportunities for electricians, HVAC technicians, carpenters, inspectors and permitters, plumbers, roofers, laborers, and insulation workers, among others. Comprehensive home and commercial building programs also would increase demand for green building materials, and would stimulate associated manufacturing industries. Training and retraining of existing workers is integral to expanding the region’s clean energy sector. Table CEE-4 shows show the job creation potential of investments in clean energy industries.
Table CEE-4. Clean Energy Investment and Resulting Job Creation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Investment</th>
<th>Job Creation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1 million in renewable energy systems</td>
<td>5 full time employment component manufacturing jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1 million in energy efficiency programs</td>
<td>3-4 building material manufacturing jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 energy efficient appliance manufacturing jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 direct manufacturing job</td>
<td>2.9 indirect jobs (finance, transportation, supply chains, installers, and other related businesses) (EPI 2003)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Apollo Alliance Green Manufacturing Action Plan, 2009, Economic Policy Institute

Clean Transportation

Continuing and rapid changes in transportation technology to improve vehicle or system operation efficiency, to switch from petroleum based to alternative fuels, to reduce environmental emissions, and to effectively integrate transportation systems have also resulted in major changes in skill requirements. Some of these skills are enhancements of existing ones; however there is a substantial difference between working on a diesel powered vehicle and one powered by natural gas. Hybrid vehicles require advanced electrical training and biodiesel requires a working knowledge of chemistry. Training and retraining of existing workers is critical to reducing petroleum use and limiting adverse environmental emissions.

Regional Clean Energy Job Development Opportunities

Leverage state and federal resources such as California’s Green Collar Jobs Council (formed by passage of Assembly Bill (AB) 3018) and Clean Energy Workforce Training Partnership, which was formed to best utilize ARRA funding to stimulate quality job growth.

The Green Jobs Guidebook prepared by the Environmental Defense Fund provides detailed job descriptions for renewable energy and energy efficiency related jobs in California for employment year 2008-2009. Links to apprenticeship programs and job placement programs are included.

Job training and assistance are also available through the California Clean Energy Workforce Training Program, a partnership between the CEC and a number of state agencies, educational institutions, local workforce investment boards, community organizations, and employers to deliver 21st century training programs for workers with all levels of experience. The goal of the CEWTP is to promote the use of industry sector strategies as the framework for addressing the need for skilled workers in the industries related to energy efficiency, water efficiency, renewable energy (distributed generation and utility-scale), and alternative and renewable transportation technologies.

Recommended Actions for Clean Energy Economy

SANDAG, local governments, or other regional entities can undertake the following actions to expand the clean energy economy. In some cases, active collaboration among multiple jurisdictions will be needed to implement the recommended actions. The following recommended actions will
contribute to other energy goals, and likewise be enhanced by recommended actions identified in other topic areas, as described below.

**SANDAG, Local Governments, or other Regional Entities**

CE-1. Promote the integration of Clean Energy workforce training initiatives into existing workforce systems.

CE-2. Support existing and future pathways to provide technical training for clean energy jobs to help integrate students and newly trained workers into the local workforce.

CE-3. Support the development and implementation of clean energy workforce training programs amongst the region’s private and governmental organizations and labor unions.


CE-5. Support training and education to building officials and associated building trades on energy codes.

CE-6. Collaborate with regional economists to identify metrics for measuring the clean energy economy, such as levels of investment, number of businesses, total jobs, etc.
VI. CONCLUSION

The goals and recommended actions of the RES Update will help the region meet its energy needs while beginning and making substantial progress on a path to a clean, low carbon energy future. Moreover, the RES Update identifies actions that can improve air quality, reduce traffic congestion, save money, create jobs, increase the use of alternative fuels, expand transportation alternatives, ensure an adequate energy supply to meet growth projections, and improve the region’s quality of life.

As discussed in Chapter 1 – Introduction, the following six priority recommended actions, or core strategies, have been identified as essential to meeting the region’s energy goals. These are implementation actions that can be pursued near immediately upon completion of the RES Update; indeed, efforts related to most of these actions are already underway. SANDAG and local governments can play an integral role in implementing each of the following priority actions, and in many cases, coordination and collaboration amongst many jurisdictions and stakeholders will be needed to ensure successful implementation.

1. Pursue a comprehensive building retrofit program to improve efficiency and install renewable energy systems;
2. Create financing programs to pay for projects and improvements that save energy;
3. Utilize the SANDAG-SDG&E Local Government Partnership funding award to help local government identify opportunities and implement energy savings at government facilities and throughout their communities;
4. Support land use and transportation planning strategies that reduce energy use and GHG emissions;
5. Support planning of electric charging and alternative fueling infrastructure; and
6. Support use of existing unused reclaimed water to decrease the amount of energy needed to meet the water needs of the San Diego region.
COMPASS CARD STATUS UPDATE

File Number 1145700

Introduction

The Compass Card was launched in May 2009 for COASTER and Premium Express Bus pass holders. Since September, SANDAG began selling new Regional Pass Compass Cards at 20 outlet locations. The current plan calls for approximately 60 outlet locations within the San Diego area where monthly Regional Passes are available on a Compass Card or as paper fare media, in addition to the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) Transit Store and North County Transit District (NCTD) Customer Service Center locations. Compass Cards also will be available for purchase and reloads of monthly passes at ticket vending machines, via phone and mail, and through the internet.

Since last month’s report, SANDAG, MTS, and NCTD have increased the total distribution of Compass Cards to approximately 27,000 monthly pass holders. SANDAG, working with MTS, is looking at monthly incremental increases until all third-party sellers are offering Compass Cards.

Discussion

In September, SANDAG and MTS began selling the monthly Regional Pass on Compass Cards at five third-party outlets. Since then the number of third-party outlets has been expanded to 20 locations, and staff is in the process of launching sales at an additional five to seven locations this month. The current plan has the remaining outlet locations switching from paper to Compass Cards during the months of January and February. The general approach has the Compass Card rolling out incrementally, allowing users to acclimate to the new system and allowing SANDAG and the transit operators to adequately manage the transition.

The outlet locations are being augmented where needed to ensure customers have reasonable access for obtaining Compass Cards and passes. Staff will continue to monitor the distribution network and work with the transit operators to address needs for modifications to the outlet network.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Key Staff Contact: James Dreisbach-Towle, (619) 699-1914, jdr@sandag.org
Public Policy Institute of California
Poll Results, 2009

- 77% of Californians say the state should focus transportation planning dollars on expanding public transit.

- Just 18% say the state should focus on building freeways and highways.


---

Public Policy Institute of California
Poll Results, 2009

- In 2009, Californians were asked, “do you think things in California are generally going in the right direction or the wrong direction?”

- 89% of Californians answered: wrong direction

December 10, 2009

Via Email and Hand Delivery

Members of the Transportation Committee
San Diego Association of Governments
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101

Re: Proposed MTS Service Reductions
December 11, 2009 meeting agenda item #6

Dear Committee Members:

This firm represents Save Our Forest and Ranchlands ("SOFAR"), an organization dedicated to utilizing proper land use and transportation planning to protect wilderness, watershed, and agricultural resources, as well as ensuring that cities remain liveable in San Diego County. The purpose of this letter is to oppose MTS's proposed service reductions scheduled for February 2010 and to object to SANDAG's proposed finding of overriding considerations with respect to these cuts.

SOFAR is deeply troubled by these proposed service reductions, which will cripple San Diego's already spotty public transit network. Study after study has demonstrated that the public wants and needs a reliable, efficient transit system. Public transit is critical to charting San Diego's future. Without it, the region's social, environmental and economic problems—coupled with its overreliance on low density development—will persist.
The proposed MTS service reductions are justified by a so-called “fiscal emergency.” As detailed below, however, MTS and SANDAG have failed to consider alternatives that would solve existing budget shortfalls. Without adequate justification, SANDAG cannot make a finding of “overriding considerations” pursuant to Board Policy No. 018.

MTS Proposes Drastic Service Reductions—With No Environmental Review

MTS proposes to virtually eliminate Sunday bus service and reduce weekday service. As explained in the December 1, 2009 memo from Councilmember Todd Gloria, attached as Exhibit A, MTS’s service reductions will impact roughly 145,000 MTS customers. Many of these San Diego residents who use the bus system to commute to church, medical appointments, and shopping trips will be left with no other means of transportation. Others will use their cars, emitting air pollutants and greenhouse gases into our environment.

MTS intends to avoid analyzing the significant air quality, traffic, global warming and other impacts caused by the proposed reduction in bus service by relying on CEQA’s statutory exemption for transit agency responses to revenue shortfalls. See Pub. Res. Code § 21080.33; CEQA Guidelines § 15285. This exemption, however, only applies in instances where a “fiscal emergency” exists, i.e., where “the transit agency is projected to have negative working capital within one year from the date that the agency finds that a fiscal emergency exists.” Guidelines § 15285(c). “Working capital” is defined as the sum of all unrestricted cash, unrestricted short-term investments, and unrestricted short-term accounts receivable, minus unrestricted accounts payable.” Id.

No Fiscal Emergency Exists

MTS has provided no analysis to support its conclusion that a fiscal emergency exists. Its sole evidentiary support consists of a one-page memo dated November 25, 2009, attached as Exhibit B, which summarily concludes that MTS’s working capital will drop from $6.2 million in November 2009 to negative $0.5 million in December 2009. No explanation or backup calculations are provided to support this conclusion.

Even more troubling, MTS and SANDAG have failed to consider other funding sources that are available to solve this so-called “fiscal emergency.” For example, in June MTS chose not to request that SANDAG amend the TransNet ordinance to provide $22 million for transit operations but held open the possibility to reconsider this amendment during mid-year budget discussions. See Exhibit A. This funding alone would solve the MTS’s $13 million deficit projection and should be requested
Immediately. In addition, in September 2009, SANDAG finalized its Transit Impediments Study. MTS should actively pursue the Study’s recommendations for potential existing, new and future funding options. Nor has MTS explained why it could not solve the budget shortfall with its $30 million contingency “rainy day” fund. Finally, as recommended by Councilmember Todd Gloria (see Exhibit A), MTS could achieve additional revenue by restoring commercial advertising on MTS buses.

As a result, no fiscal emergency exists and MTS’s reliance on CEQA’s statutory exemption (Pub. Res. Code § 21080.33) is misplaced.

There is No Evidence to Support SANDAG’s Finding of Overriding Considerations

SANDAG Board Policy No. 018 requires that MTS service changes be consistent with the Regional Short Range Transit Plan (“RSRTP”) and, if they are not, SANDAG must make a finding of overriding considerations. SANDAG proposes to waive this consistency requirement by blindly accepting MTS’s declaration of fiscal emergency. SANDAG’s approach is misguided for two reasons.

First, MTS has not concluded its finding of fiscal emergency. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15285, MTS must engage in a two step process before it may make a finding of fiscal emergency. It must hold an initial public hearing to solicit comments on its proposed finding. Guidelines § 15285(b). After this public hearing, MTS is required to respond within 30 days at a regular public meeting to suggestions made by the public. The initial public hearing was held yesterday, on December 10, 2009, at which time members of the public and groups such as SOFAR submitted extensive comments in opposition to the service reductions. SOFAR’s comments to MTS are attached as Exhibit C. As explained in the CEQA Guidelines, “the transit agency may make the finding of fiscal emergency only after it has responded to public suggestions.” Id. (emphasis added). MTS has scheduled this second public hearing for January 7, 2009. Therefore, SANDAG’s proposed finding of overriding considerations is entirely premature.

Second, SANDAG has failed to consider potential solutions to MTS’s budget shortfalls such as those outlined above. As explained in SOFAR’s letter and in Councilman Todd Gloria’s memo, MTS could solve its budget problems by requesting $22 million in TransNet funding from SANDAG. It is inexcusable that MTS has not requested this funding and is instead making MTS customers and our environment suffer as a result of these proposed service reductions.
Conclusion

For the reasons set forth above, the Transportation Committee should refuse to make a finding of overriding considerations. The Committee should work with MTS to achieve funding solutions that do not adversely impact our transit system and our region's well being.

Very truly yours,

SHUTE, MIHALY & WEINBERGER LLP

Catherine C. Engberg

cc:  Duncan McFetridge

Attachments

P:/SOFAR/GEN/SANDAG letter 12-10-09.doc
The Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) FY 2010 and 2011 forecast presented at the November 12, 2009 Board of Directors meeting presented a sobering assessment of our agency's fiscal health over the next 18 months. While I appreciate and support the staff's refusal to consider fare increases to bridge the growing budget deficit, I am deeply concerned by the suggested reductions in transit service, particularly on Sundays.

In response to the concerns I raised at the November 12 meeting, you and others called on board members to make suggestions on alternative methods for addressing the budget challenge our organization is currently facing. I would like to offer a couple of options that should be considered in advance of a final decision on the service reductions presented at the board meeting.

- **Consideration of underutilized transit service on weekdays and Saturdays.** While it is true that ridership declines on the weekend, it is also true that 145,000 customers do choose to use our system on Sundays. Before any Sunday service is eliminated, I would like to ensure weekday and Saturday routes that may have lower ridership than the proposed Sunday routes are considered for reductions. Additionally, I would request that "discretionary trips" not include rides to medical appointments and religious functions.

- **Restoration of commercial advertising on MTS buses.** This suggestion was raised by a member of the public at the November 12 meeting. I understand that this action alone would not cover the budget gap but could allow the board to avoid cutting transit service on which our customers rely.

- **Revisit SANDAG offer of the use of one-time funds.** In June, MTS chose not to request SANDAG amend the TransNet ordinance to provide approximately

EXHIBIT A
$20 million for transit operations but held open the possibility to reconsider this angle during mid-year budget discussions.

- Implementation of transit funding options offered in SANDAG’s Transit Impediments Study. In September 2009, SANDAG finalized its Transit Impediments Study. This document includes three sections dedicated to potential existing, new and future funding options for transit. Acknowledging that MTS’s five year budget outlook is not encouraging, it would be wise for the board to aggressively champion one or more of the funding mechanisms contemplated in the study.

The global economic crisis and its corresponding effects on national, state and local governments understandably require public agencies like MTS to make tough choices in order to balance their budgets. I stand ready to do my part to resolve our budget deficit but I would hope that the ramifications of our choices will not be borne solely by our customers – most of whom are the least able to sacrifice in an economy like this one. I would hope that the board, with your leadership, can entertain a broader conversation to resolve our financial challenge than just service cuts and fare increases. Indeed, if we wish to entice choice riders to select our service and meet the demands regional growth models and state environmental mandates, we must grow our operations, not shrink them.
Memorandum

DATE: November 25, 2009
TO: Paul Jablonski, Chief Executive Officer
FROM: Cliff Telfer, Chief Financial Officer
SUBJECT: MTS Fiscal Emergency

As of today, November 25, 2009, MTS is qualified to issue a “fiscal emergency” based upon the California Public Resources Code (CPRC) Section 21080.32(d):

(2) For purposes of this subdivision, "fiscal emergency," when applied to a publicly owned transit agency, means that the agency is projected to have negative working capital within one year from the date that the agency makes the finding that there is a fiscal emergency pursuant to this section. Working capital shall be determined by adding together all unrestricted cash, unrestricted short-term investments, and unrestricted short-term accounts receivable and then subtracting unrestricted accounts payable. Employee retirement funds, including Internal Revenue Code Section 457 deferred compensation plans and Section 401(k) plans, health insurance reserves, bond payment reserves, workers' compensation reserves, and insurance reserves, shall not be factored into the formula for working capital.

As outlined in the above definition, the below table indicates MTS' current and forecasted working capital position over the next two months. MTS's working capital is projected to become negative in December 2009.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>San Diego Metropolitan Transit System</th>
<th>Working Capital Analysis</th>
<th>In Millions $</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>December</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$6.2</td>
<td>($0.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes all unrestricted cash, investments and accounts receivable less unrestricted accounts payables.

Concluding, the table above indicates MTS is projected to have negative working capital by December 2009 and based upon the CPRC Section 21080.32(d), MTS qualifies to issue a “fiscal emergency.”

DEC10-09.25 AttD.FISCAL EMERG.SVC ADJ.SCOONEY.DOC

EXHIBIT B
December 9, 2009

MTS Public Hearing Comments
1255 Imperial Avenue, Suite 1000
San Diego, CA 92101

RE: Proposed MTS Service Reductions

Dear MTS Board of Directors:

Please accept this letter on behalf of Save Our Forest and Ranchlands ("SOFAR"), an organization dedicated to utilizing proper land use and transportation planning to protect wilderness, watershed, and agricultural resources, as well as ensuring that cities grow in a sustainable manner in San Diego County.

The purpose of this letter is to submit the following comments on the Metropolitan Transit System ("MTS") Service Reductions proposed to take place starting February 28, 2010: (a) SOFAR challenges the validity of MTS’s claim that they are in a fiscal emergency (b) SOFAR is opposed to the proposed service reductions, because such reductions will only harm the long-term vitality of San Diego's public transit system, (c) MTS needs to consider alternative means of funding to reduce their budget deficiency without cutting service, (d) MTS is obligated to complete further research into public desire for transit projects before making service reductions, and (e) failing to provide public transit as an adequate means of transportation will continue to exacerbate social, economic, and environmental problems throughout San Diego.

EXHIBIT C
Fiscal Emergency

MTS seeks to avoid analyzing the significant air quality, traffic, global warming and other impacts caused by the proposed reduction in bus service by relying on CEQA’s statutory exemption for transit agency responses to revenue shortfalls. See Pub. Res. Code § 21080.33; CEQA Guidelines § 15285. This exemption, however, only applies in instances where a “fiscal emergency” exists, i.e., where “the transit agency is projected to have negative working capital within one year from the date that the agency finds that a fiscal emergency exists.” Guidelines § 15285(c). “Working capital” is defined as the sum of all unrestricted cash, unrestricted short-term investments, and unrestricted short-term accounts receivable, minus unrestricted accounts payable.” Id.

MTS has provided no analysis to support its conclusion that a fiscal emergency exists. Its sole evidentiary support consists of a one-page memo dated November 25, 2009 (Attachment D to staff report), which summarily concludes that MTS’s working capital will drop from $6.2M in November 2009 to negative $0.5M in December 2009. No explanation or backup calculations are provided to support this conclusion.

Furthermore, MTS fails to mention that other funding sources are available to solve this so-called “fiscal emergency.” For example, in June MTS chose not to request that SANDAG amend the TransNet ordinance to provide $22M for transit operations but held open the possibility to reconsider this amendment during mid-year budget discussions. This funding alone would solve MTS’s $13M deficit projection and should be requested immediately. In addition, as detailed below, in September 2009, SANDAG finalized its Transit Impediments Study. MTS should actively pursue the Study’s recommendations for potential existing, new, and future funding options. Finally, as recommended by Councilmember Todd Gloria, MTS could achieve additional revenue by restoring commercial advertising on MTS buses.

Before taking the draconian step of virtually eliminating Sunday service – a decision that would impact roughly 145,000 churchgoers, shoppers, and workers – MTS must evaluate these additional funding options. If it does, MTS will conclude that no fiscal emergency exists.

Service Reductions and the Public Transit System

Cutbacks and fare changes are not new in the recent history of MTS, but rather how MTS has chosen to handle budgeting issues. The recent history of MTS includes the following service reductions and fare price increases:

- 2007: On September 27, 2007 the MTS Board of Directors adopted various service changes and reductions to help reconcile a predicted $11 million dollar deficit for the following fiscal year.
- 2008: In August and September of 2008 MTS implemented route and schedule modifications in order to reconcile an operating deficit of more than $6 million.
- 2009: On March 26, 2009, the MTS Board of Directors approved a proposal to cut service by $4.7 million and raise monthly pass fares for MTS customers. The service
reductions and fare increases were deemed necessary to accommodate the loss of STA funds from the State of California.

The recent history of MTS also includes positive events, such as on July 30 of 2009 when MTS was selected as the Outstanding Transit System of the year by the American Public Transportation Association ("APTA"). In accepting this award, the Chief Executive Officer of MTS, Paul Jablonski stated, "Our goal is always to maintain the highest level of service even when our funding is getting slashed. I think our performance numbers show that we have become a very efficient and well-run agency."\(^2\)

One has to wonder how a transit agency could claim to be efficient when it responds to short-term budgeting issues by reducing service and increasing fares. The long-term history of public transit in San Diego suggests that while there may be short-term lapses in ridership, the use of public transit has grown dramatically over the past thirty years. According to SANDAG, transit ridership has grown in San Diego County by more than 150% over the past 30 years, when population during this time frame only grew by 75%. In addition, public opinion polls suggest that reducing service and increasing fares only reduces ridership further, and that such cutbacks taken by MTS make the system less efficient. A 2008 transit public opinion study conducted by SANDAG states,

"The most commonly mentioned obstacle preventing increased ridership among those who were interested was that the transit mode did not travel to the places they needed to go (20%), followed by the locations of transit stops being inconvenient (15%), and a general reference to transit being inconvenient (14%). Other frequently mentioned reasons for not increasing their use of transit included that transit takes too much time (11%), there are few transit options near their home (10%), transit schedules were inconvenient (9%), that they prefer to use a different mode (8%), and that transit is too expensive (5%)."\(^2\)

In summary, 79% of San Diegans mentioned an error in the system itself, including inconvenience and not enough service as being the obstacle that prevented ridership. In contrast, only 8% of people mentioned that their obstacle to transit was that they preferred to use a different mode of transportation.

Although MTS is currently facing budgeting issues due to the loss of STA and other funding sources, the aforementioned information suggests that by continually reducing service; MTS is only further hindering the efficiency and use of its public transit system in San Diego. Therefore, it is the responsibility of MTS to find other means of funding and/or other ways to reduce its budget deficit that do not require service reductions.

**Potential Funding Sources**

Due to the current economic climate, transit authorities throughout the United States have had to make difficult decisions regarding how to reduce budget deficits.\(^3\) While this is a challenging issue, it is not imperative that transit authorities such as MTS reduce budgets by cutting transportation services. The 2009 report by SANDAG entitled *Transit Impediments Study* explored various methods of increasing

\(^1\) http://www.sdmts.com/APTAaward.asp
transit revenues.\textsuperscript{4} This report mentions three main arenas that should be explored to increase funding for transit projects, including: reallocation of existing funding, new funding sources, and future federal and state funding opportunities.

The first potential source of funding would consist of restructuring current transportation funding sources, such as TransNet. The Transit Impediment Study states that, "Excluding administrative expenses, oversight, and funds for the bicycle/pedestrian/neighborhood safety program (approximately 3%), the TransNet Extension Ordinance includes a set-aside dollar amount comprising 8.1 percent of revenues collected to operate new transit services developed by the TransNet Major Corridors program." The report goes on to explain that shifting TransNet dollars, including increasing the percentage of funding to transit projects, would be possible with two-thirds approval from the SANDAG Board of Directors. TransNet is funded by taxpayer money, and therefore should reflect the needs and desires of the taxpayers. Therefore, as detailed below, SOFAR demands that MTS examines and analyzes the current demand of taxpayers, and ensures that TransNet funds are being allocated in a way that reflects taxpayer interests.

\textbf{Public Desire for Transit}

A public opinion poll conducted by the Public Policy Institute of California ("PPIC") in July of 2009 found the following survey results with regards to transit:

- 77\% of Californians say the state should focus transportation planning dollars on expanding public transit.
- 18\% of Californians say the state should focus on building freeways and highways.
- 78\% of Californians favor encouraging local governments to change land use and transportation planning so that people wouldn't have to drive as much.\textsuperscript{5}

The aforementioned survey was conducted throughout the state of California, and therefore may not directly correlate with the opinions held by San Diegans. As public officials, the Board of Directors for MTS ("Board") are obligated to act in a manner that fulfills the desire of San Diegans. Therefore, it is the responsibility of MTS to conduct surveys and polls to determine where San Diego taxpayers want their TransNet money to go. If the Board finds a conclusion that even remotely mirrors the results found by the PPIC, they must urge the SANDAG Board of Directors to re-allocate TransNet funds such that taxpayer money funds transit projects at a much higher level than 8\%, and dramatically reduces highway funding.

\textbf{Social, Economic, and Environmental Problems Caused by Reduced Public Transit System Capacity}

The aforementioned points argue for the necessity of funding public transit projects throughout San Diego in lieu of continuing to spend money on highway projects. While it has been suggested above that public opinion would agree with this idea, research and lessons from other cities demonstrate that if San Diego does not improve its development patterns and transit infrastructure, community livability will be jeopardized. The livability and/or sustainability of a community are often addressed within three

\textsuperscript{4} \url{http://www.sandag.org/uploads/publicationld/publicationid_1452_10128.pdf}
\textsuperscript{5} \url{http://www.ppic.org/main/publication.asp?l=834}
categories of issues: social, economic, and environmental issues. San Diego is currently experiencing social, economic, and environmental crises at a regional level, indicating that San Diego is not going to succeed if it continues on its current course. Such regional crises include: housing, traffic, economy, and the environment. These crises, as will be described further below, have one general cause: low-density development within a system that is dependent on the automobile for the primary means of transportation. Similarly, these crises can be resolved by one solution: high-density development structured around transit-based infrastructure.

Housing:

There are two main components to housing issues within San Diego, there is a lack of affordable housing, and the housing market is unstable. Affordable housing has been an issue in San Diego for many years, and according to SANDAG’s 2008 publication titled Affordable Homes in Our Neighborhoods, “the housing market— the system for people finding places to live — is not working in the San Diego region...” In this report SANDAG recognizes that despite the current economic recession, affordable housing continues to be an issue by saying, “Even with recent downturns in home prices, the cost to purchase or rent a home is well beyond what most residents earn — or what they can expect to earn in the foreseeable future.” In their 2003 report Solving the Region’s Housing Crisis, SANDAG states that, “New homes are being built, but the majority of them are single-family homes, and luxury apartments and condominiums. The result is that many residents are commuting long distances to find affordable homes, causing urban sprawl and contributing to increased traffic on our roadways.” The last SANDAG statement identifies the key problem to San Diego’s housing problem: sprawl. Continued sprawl development of large single-family homes in the region is continuing to provide homes that San Diegans cannot afford, and utilizing resources that the region cannot afford to waste. If SANDAG would heed its own advice and stray away from sprawl development, investing in transit infrastructure to support higher density development, San Diego would have the housing units that are needed at a price that citizens can afford.

Low-density, sprawl development that exists in San Diego is not only unaffordable, but also unstable. In 2007 San Diego scored twenty third on a list of 100 cities with the top foreclosure rates in the United States, with a rate of 1 foreclosure for every 75 homes. In comparison, Portland Oregon, which is considered to be the most sustainable city in the nation, scored eighty fourth on the list with a foreclosure rate of 1 foreclosure for every 353 homes. The difference between San Diego and Portland’s foreclosure rates could be greatly attributed to San Diego’s lack of public transit and smart growth development when compared to Portland. Studies demonstrate that smart growth development, defined as high density development with transit infrastructure, results in reduced vulnerability to economic downturns and weak housing markets, thus resulting in more stable communities. The root of this stability is founded in the fact that the price of personal automobile transportation is prohibitively expensive for many people. Therefore, by utilizing public transportation, people can save thousands of dollars a year in transportation costs. Reducing daily transportation costs allows for

---

greater savings during economic downturns, as well as provides for reduced monthly expenses, and therefore increased economic stability.

Traffic:

Many San Diego residents experience some form of traffic congestion on a daily basis, and such congestion is easily visible during peak hours when many of the freeways are at full capacity. This sentiment was firmly expressed in a 2004 survey conducted by the City of San Diego, in which 89% of respondents said that they felt it was either very important or somewhat important to reduce traffic congestion. The severity of traffic congestion can be estimated by total delay, which measures the total difference between actual travel time and the amount of time it would take to travel at free-flow speeds. In other words, this measure can estimate the amount of time people spend in their cars due to traffic congestion. The Texas Transportation Institute estimated that in 2007 the total delay time for San Diego was approximately 85 million hours. Such time spent behind the wheel in traffic reduces quality of life, and threatens the ability of San Diego to succeed as a community in the future.

Therefore, the main issue in San Diego is not whether or not there is a traffic issue, but how will this issue be resolved. One obvious way would be to provide alternative means of transportation and reduce vehicle miles travelled (VMT), thereby reducing the amount of driving done each day. This is exactly what SANDAG suggested in their 2030 Regional Transportation Plan by saying, “Traffic congestion in urban areas like the San Diego region generally will worsen over time unless we take actions to directly address travel demand and have options to get people out of their single occupant vehicles, especially during peak travel periods.” It seems obvious that reducing transit funding and cutting service to transit will only increase congestion and VMT, yet this continues to be San Diego’s strategy with regards to transportation planning. The only way to alter this pattern and reduce traffic congestion is to make transit competitive with the automobile so that people choose transit over driving.

Economy:

There is no doubt that San Diego is currently in an economic crisis. There are many indicators that point toward this fact, but some important indicators are:

- March 26, 2009: MTS declares a “fiscal emergency,” meaning that it will have negative working capital by March 26, 2010.
- November, 2009: The City of San Diego announces various budget cuts to public services, including libraries and police services to address a $179 million deficit.
- December, 2009: The County of San Diego unemployment rate reached approximately 10.5%, which directly impacts local tax revenues.

The current state of San Diego’s economy demonstrates that we cannot currently afford to waste any money on unnecessary resources. In addition, if governmental agencies have money to spend at this time, it seems prudent that such money be spent on projects that benefit the public rather than
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12 [http://mobility.tamu.edu/ums/congestion_data/tables/san_diego.pdf](http://mobility.tamu.edu/ums/congestion_data/tables/san_diego.pdf)
benefitting special-interests. Historically, growth in San Diego County has been in an outward direction, consisting of sprawl development on previously undeveloped lands. This kind of growth is not only expensive to the homeowners of such development projects, but also costs taxpayers a considerable amount of money to add public services in areas that do not have any infrastructure. For example, studies demonstrate that sprawl development (on undeveloped land) compared to infill development (in developed areas) will increase local road lane-miles by an average of 10%, which in San Diego would require tax-payer money to fund. According to the County of San Diego, additional public service costs (roads, sewer, water, schools, parks, etc.) associated with residential development require an estimated $1.42 in expenses to the public for every dollar such projects generate in tax revenues, and that such costs are 74% greater for low-density semi-rural development.

While sprawl development costs taxpayers money, transit can actually generate money for communities. Research demonstrates that over time, every $10 million invested in transit saves more than $15 million in transportation costs to highway and transit users due to reduced operating, fuel, and congestion costs. In addition, long-term transit investments have been shown to generate $31 million in business output and personal income for every $18 million invested. A specific example of this is the 4.7-mile loop of the Portland Streetcar, which generated an estimated $1.4 billion in just five years.

Given the current economic crisis that San Diego faces, it seems necessary that government officials direct funds into projects that will continue to enhance the economy, such as transit rather than allocating tax dollars to fund highways that service sprawl development projects.

Environment:

San Diego currently faces two major environmental crises: water availability and air quality. These issues threaten the ability for San Diego to function as a community in the future, because they directly threaten the health and well-being of all San Diego citizens.

Water availability has become an increasingly pressing issue in San Diego, and throughout most of Southern California. This fact is echoed in the response that many local municipalities have taken to increase water conservation. For example, the City of San Diego, the leading retail water agency in the county, implemented mandatory conservation measures on June 1, 2009 when they declared a Level 2 drought alert. Following this declaration, the majority of water agencies within San Diego County began to implement various water conservation measures. Water conservation has two major components: availability and consumption, meaning that municipalities can choose to increase availability, and/or reduce consumption in order to increase future water security. Water conservation measures, such as those taken by local municipalities, generally aim at reducing water consumption by limiting and restricting highly consumptive activities. In contrast, proposed projects such as the Carlsbad Desalination Project attempt to increase water supply in the region. This proposed desalination project proposes to produce 50 million gallons of drinking water per day, at an estimated cost of approximately
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19 http://www.sdcounpty.ca.gov/gofu/goupdate/docs/draftgppch2vision.pdf
$2 billion just for construction of the facility. While increasing water supply is one way to increase water availability in the region, as exemplified in the Carlsbad Desalination Project, it can come at an extremely high price to taxpayers and the environment.

As mentioned previously, water conservation measures generally aim at reducing consumption by activities that use large amounts of water. In the San Diego region, municipalities generally target irrigation activities to reduce water consumption. Although such conservation measures can be effective, they do not address the whole issue. Development patterns have a drastic impact on water conservation in terms of water consumption and water supply. Studies demonstrate that per capita water consumption is generally greater in low-density development compared to high density development, because low-density development is correlated with larger lot sizes and therefore necessitates more outdoor water use. In addition, increasing the impermeability of a surface by paving or compacting soils for development alters the hydrologic cycle and prevents water infiltration into the ground, thereby decreasing future water supplies. Infill development, which consists of building within already developed areas, does not generate additional impermeable surfaces, and generally includes limited landscaped environments (limited outdoor water use). Therefore, increasing infill development decreases water demand by providing a lower demand for outdoor water use and increases water supply by reducing the amount of impermeable surfaces that would otherwise threaten future water supply. Proper infill development is not possible without a transit infrastructure, thus changing development patterns and providing transit infrastructure are necessary to ensure a more secure water supply at a reduced cost to taxpayers.

At a time where Californian governments are being pressed to address global climate change due to the inception of Senate Bill ("SB") 375 and Assembly Bill ("AB") 32, San Diego has the additional pressure of needing to comply with basic air quality standards of the Clean Air Act. Currently, San Diego is in nonattainment for California’s particulate matter ("PM") standard, and for the state and federal standards for ozone ("O₃"), the major component of smog. Due to this lack of compliance, San Diego received an "F" grade from the American Lung Association in the 2009 report titled State of the Air.

Both O₃ and PM pollution in San Diego would be greatly improved by significantly reducing VMT throughout the region. According to the United States Environmental Protection Agency ("US EPA"), the source for at least half of the pollutants contributing to O₃ pollution in urban areas includes: cars, buses, trucks, and off-highway mobile sources such as construction vehicles and boats. Furthermore, the San Diego Air Pollution Control District ("APCDO") states that, "Locally, motor vehicles and mobile equipment powered by internal combustion engines produce about three-quarters of the smog-forming emissions, about one-half of the greenhouse gases, and they contribute significantly to diesel particulate matter, a known carcinogen, in the air we breathe." In the 2030 Regional Transportation Plan produced in 2007, SANDAG estimated that in 2009 yearly average VMT for the entire region would be approximately 89 million, and that this number would grow to approximately 115 million by 2030. Given that mobile sources of air pollution are the leading causes of both O₃ and PM pollution, it does not seem that San
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22 http://www.westernresourceadvocates.org/media/pdf/SWChapter4.pdf
23 http://www.epa.gov/ednrmfel/publications/reports/epa600r00016/epa600r00016.pdf
26 http://www.sandec.org/info/reports/ANNUAL.pdf
Diego will ever meet air pollution requirements by continuing to base land use planning around automobile driving. The only way to reduce these emissions and directly reduce health-related air quality issues within the region is to increase transit infrastructure and reduce VMT.

Future:

The regional crises described above all point to the fact if San Diego is going to have a viable future, land use and transportation planning must change in a fundamental way. Currently, transportation and land use are disjointed planning efforts where areas are developed, then roads are built to provide access. Due to the regional crises caused by this sort of ad hoc planning, San Diego must take a proactive planning approach that recognizes the inherent connection between land use, transportation, and sustainability. Several initiatives and publications throughout San Diego demonstrate that the region has begun, albeit on a preliminary level, to begin such changes. A publication produced by the APCD and entitled Tools for Reducing Vehicle Trips through Land Use Design states,

"Low density sprawl can’t continue forever. In fact, the San Diego Association of Governments projects the region will run out of urban residential land by 2010. Consequently, growth will be more compact in the future. To keep vehicle emissions and congestion in check, we need to provide ways to travel without a car. The Tools recommend 37 land use and transportation strategies for cities and neighborhoods to encourage walking, biking, and transit use."

In addition, SANDAG is currently working on an Urban Core Transit Strategy that has the overarching goal of creating a “world class transit system for the San Diego Region.” In order to achieve such a goal, SANDAG is looking at various cities with well-developed transit systems and finding out how such transit systems were achieved. One of the lessons learned from this process is, “transit success depends on regional plans and visions that guide the integration of land use and transportation.”

These examples demonstrate that now is the time to be investing in transit infrastructure and planning for development and growth that would be supported by such infrastructure. They also demonstrate that cutting transit service will only lead San Diego down a wrong path that will ultimately lead to failure and exacerbate region-wide crises.

28 [http://www.sdapcd.org/planning/LandUse.pdf](http://www.sdapcd.org/planning/LandUse.pdf)
29 Parsons Brinckerhoff for SANDAG. 2009. Lessons Learned from Peer Regions.
Conclusion:

In sum, if MTS moves forward with their proposed service cuts without further examining their supposed fiscal emergency and ensuring that SANDAG TransNet funding reflects public opinions, they will have sidestepped their duties as public servants and will have threatened the viability of San Diego to exist as a livable community.

Sincerely,

Save Our Forest and Ranchlands

Duncan McFetridge

Duncan McFetridge
**Item 4**
Revision to the City of San Diego Transnet Maintenance of Effort Audit

**Recommendation:**
The Transportation Committee recommends that the Board of Directors approve the revised City of San Diego Maintenance of Effort base level (Attachment 2).

**Item 5**
FY 2010 Budget and Overall Work Program Amendment Accepting Additional Funds for Project Safe Neighborhoods

**Recommendation:**
The Public Safety Committee recommends that the Board of Directors approve an amendment to the FY 2010 Budget and Overall Work Program to accept this additional funding and authorize the Executive Director to accept future funding that the U.S. DOJ provides for the PSN program during FY 2010.
Recommendation:
The Transportation Committee recommends that the Board of Directors approve TDA audit extension requests for the Cities of Escondido, Oceanside, and San Diego, and SANDAG, until March 28, 2010, as permitted by the Public Utilities Code and the California Code of Regulations.
Item 10
Election of 2010 SANDAG Board Officers

Recommendation:
The Nominating Committee recommends that the Board of Directors approve the following slate for 2010 SANDAG Board officers:

- Chair – Escondido Mayor Lori Holt Pfeiler
- First Vice Chair – Encinitas Councilmember Jerome Stocks
- Second Vice Chair – Santee Councilmember Jack Dale

Item 10
Election of 2010 SANDAG Board Officers

Recommendation:
The Nominating Committee recommends that the Board of Directors approve for 2010 SANDAG Board Chair:

- Escondido Mayor Lori Holt Pfeiler
Item 10  
Election of 2010 SANDAG Board Officers 

Recommendation: 
The Nominating Committee recommends that the Board of Directors approve for 2010 SANDAG Board First Vice Chair:  
• Encinitas Councilmember Jerome Stocks 

Item 10  
Election of 2010 SANDAG Board Officers 

Recommendation: 
The Nominating Committee recommends that the Board of Directors approve the following for 2010 SANDAG Board Second Vice Chair:  
• Santee Councilmember Jack Dale
**Item 12**
SANDAG Public Participation Plan

**Recommendation:**
The Transportation and Regional Planning Committees recommend that the Board of Directors approve the SANDAG Public Participation Plan in substantially the same form as shown in Attachment 1.

**Item 13**
2010 Legislative Program

**Recommendation:**
The Executive Committee recommends that the Board of Directors approve the 2010 Legislative Program.
Item 14
2010 STIP and Prop. 1B CMIA Program Revisions

Recommendation:
The Transportation Committee recommends that the Board of Directors: (1) approve the submittal of a modified I-15 Direct Access Ramp project to the CTC for programming using Proposition 1B CMIA savings; and (2) remove the project from the 2010 STIP submittal.

Item 15
2009-2013 Coordinated Public Transit and Human Services Transportation Plan

Recommendation:
The Transportation Committee recommends that the Board of Directors approve Resolution No. 2010-06 approving the 2009-2013 Coordinated Plan.
Los Angeles – San Diego – San Luis Obispo (LOSSAN) Rail Corridor

Member Agency Memorandum Of Understanding For Rail Service Integration

December 18, 2009
LOSSAN Joint Powers Authority

- Established in 1989
- 10 Member Agencies including SANDAG, MTS, and NCTD
- Additional Technical Members
- Board of Directors and Technical Advisory Committee
- SANDAG Provides Staff Support Through Member Assessments

Major MOU Provisions

- Corridor Vision
- Short-Term Actions (Early Action)
- Long-Term Actions
- Priority Projects/Funding
- Board/Stakeholder Feedback
- Nonbinding MOU
Next Steps

- Project Manager
- Business Plan
- Early Action Items
- Member Agency Funding and Budget Impact

Recommendation

The Transportation Committee recommends that the Board of Directors authorize the SANDAG Executive Director to sign the interagency Memorandum of Understanding in substantially the same form as shown in Attachment 1.
What does the Regional Energy Strategy Update do?

• Provides energy policy guidance for SANDAG
• Responds to new realities
  – Climate change science and policy
  – State policy for meeting new energy needs
• Recognizes significant authority of state agencies and utilities
• Focuses on opportunities and authorities of SANDAG and local governments
• Does not address specific projects or replace the SDG&E long-term energy plan
How Does it Relate to Other SANDAG Plans?

- Local and Regional Transportation Plans
- Open Space
- Energy
- Wastewater
- Water
- Storm Water
- Education
- Solid Waste
- Local and Regional Land Use Plans

How is the RES Update Organized?

- Introduction
- Existing Conditions and Projections
- Key State Policy Drivers
- Guiding Principles
- Major Energy Topic Areas
- Priority Actions
The Update Process

- Board provided direction in May 2009
- Staff prepared preliminary draft and solicited extensive input
- Energy Working Group (EWG) oversight
- Improved and clarified technical information
- Achieved consensus on major policy direction
- Board of Directors provided comments at its October Policy meeting
- EWG and RPC recommend Board approval

Board of Directors Comments

- Location and impacts of aging and coastal power plants and transmission projects
- Relationship among SANDAG energy plans and other planning efforts
- Utility buyback of customer-generated energy
- Reclaimed water as low-energy supply option
- Clarification on different goals for natural gas
- Consistency with state policy direction
Recommendation

The Regional Planning Committee recommends that the Board of Directors approve the *Final Regional Energy Strategy Update* in substantially the same form as Attachment 2.
SANDAG Variable Rate Bonds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interest rate</th>
<th>SANDAG Swap Payment</th>
<th>30 Year Fixed Rate Bond Index</th>
<th>SANDAG Total Cost, Net of LIBOR Receipt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>