REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE AGENDA

Friday, October 4, 2002
10 a.m. - 12 noon*

SANDAG
401 B Street, Conference Room A
San Diego, CA

AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

• STAKEHOLDERS WORKING GROUP
• SUBREGIONAL ROUNDTABLES
• INTEGRATED REGIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE PLAN (IRIP)
  A FINANCING STRATEGY FOR THE RCP

* Please note meeting time. This meeting will start at 10 a.m. and go to 12 noon.

MISSION STATEMENT

The Regional Planning Committee provides oversight for the preparation and implementation of the Regional Comprehensive Plan that is based on the local general plans and regional plans and addresses interregional issues with surrounding counties and Mexico. The components of the plan could include: transportation, housing, environment (shoreline, open space, air, water quality, habitat), economy, regional infrastructure needs and financing as well as land use and design components of the regional growth management strategy. Recommendations of the Committee are forwarded to the SANDAG Board of Directors for action.

San Diego Association of Governments
401 B Street, Suite 800, San Diego, CA 92101-4231
(619) 595-5300 Fax (619) 595-5305
www.sandag.org
Welcome to SANDAG! Members of the public may speak to the Regional Planning Committee on any item at the time the Committee is considering the item. Please complete a Speaker’s Slip which is located in the rear of the room and then present the slip to Committee staff. Also, members of the public are invited to address the Committee on any issue under the agenda item entitled Public Comments/Communications. Speakers are limited to three minutes. The Regional Planning Committee may take action on any item appearing on the agenda.

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

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), SANDAG will accommodate persons who require assistance in order to participate in SANDAG meetings. If such assistance is required, please contact SANDAG at (619) 595-5300 in advance of the meeting. To request this document or related reports in an alternative format, please call (619) 595-5300 or fax (619) 595-5305.

SANDAG offices are accessible by public transit.
Phone 1-800-COMMUTE or see www.sdcommute.com for route information.
REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE
Friday, October 4, 2002

The Regional Planning Committee may take action on any item appearing on this agenda.
Staff Contact: Carolina Gregor, (619) 595-5399; cgr@sandag.org

ITEM # ACTION

CONSENT ITEMS (Items 1 and 2)
The Regional Planning Committee will take action on all items on the consent agenda without further discussion and with one vote unless an item is pulled by a Committee member or by a member of the public for comment.

+ 1. ACTIONS FROM AUGUST 2, 2002 MEETING – (pp. 5-7) INFORMATION
+ 2. ENERGY COMPONENT OF THE RCP (Steve Sachs, Staff) (pp. 8-9) INFORMATION

This past July, the SANDAG Board of Directors held a Policy meeting on energy. The purpose of this item is to inform the Committee on the outcomes of the Policy meeting and prepare the Committee for input on regional energy priorities at the next meeting.

3. PUBLIC COMMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS
Members of the public will have the opportunity to address the Regional Planning Committee on any issue within the jurisdiction of the Committee. Speakers are limited to three minutes each.

REPORTS

+ 4. SUMMARY OF THE SANDAG BOARD POLICY MEETING ON THE REGIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN (RCP) (Chair Pfeiler and Carolina Gregor, Staff) (pp. 10-14) INFORMATION

On September 13, 2002, the SANDAG Board held a Policy meeting on the Regional Comprehensive Plan. The Chair will report on the results. Those that were present at the meeting also are invited to comment.

+ 5. PROPOSAL TO CREATE A STAKEHOLDERS WORKING GROUP FOR THE RCP (Chair Pfeiler and Janet Fairbanks, Staff) (pp. 15-17) APPROVE

As part of the public involvement and outreach strategy for the RCP, the creation of a Stakeholders Working Group to more directly involve regional stakeholders interested in contributing to the preparation of the RCP is being recommended. If the Committee approves this item, the Working Group’s membership would be appointed at the Committee’s December meeting.
ITEM #

+ 6. PROPOSED FORMAT FOR SUBREGIONAL ROUNDTABLES (Chair Pfeiler and Janet Fairbanks, Staff) (pp. 18-19)  

The structure and format of the upcoming subregional roundtables on the RCP is being proposed. The Regional Planning Working Group’s comments are included in the proposal. It is anticipated that Committee members will play a key role in their subregions.

+ 7. PROPOSED APPROACH FOR THE INTEGRATED REGIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE PLAN (IRIP) AND A FINANCING STRATEGY FOR THE RCP (Hon. Scott Peters, City of San Diego, and Marney Cox, Staff) (pp. 20-24)

The Committee should discuss and provide initial policy direction on the attached report outlining the scope of work and policy issues that could be addressed in the infrastructure and financing component of the RCP. Direction from the SANDAG Board of Directors from the recent Policy Board meeting, and comments from the Regional Planning Working Group, have been incorporated into the report.

8. ADJOURNMENT AND UPCOMING MEETINGS  

The next Regional Planning Committee meeting is scheduled for Friday, November 1, 2002, from 9 - 11 a.m. at SANDAG. The Committee is requested to assess whether its regularly-scheduled meetings should remain on the first Friday of the month from 9 - 11 a.m. or whether they should be moved to the afternoon, from 1 - 3 p.m. (or 1:30 - 3:30 p.m.).

+ next to an agenda item indicates an attachment
The regularly scheduled meeting of the Regional Planning Committee was called to order by Chair Lori Pfeiler (North County Inland). Committee members in attendance were Patty Davis (South County), Dennis Holz (North County Coastal), Scott Peters (City of San Diego), and Ron Roberts (County of San Diego), along with alternates Judy Ritter (North County Inland), and Ron Morrison (South County). Ex-officio members in attendance were Pedro Orso-Delgado (Caltrans), Julianne Nygaard (NCTD), and Bill Chopyk (San Diego Unified Port District). Bob Leiter, representing the Regional Planning Working Group, also was in attendance.

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Chair Pfeiler welcomed Committee members and guests. Self-introductions were made.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS

There were no public comments or communications.

3. ACTIONS FROM JULY 12, 2002 MEETING

There were no changes to the July 12, 2002 meeting actions.

4. STATUS REPORT TO THE SANDAG BOARD OF DIRECTORS ON THE REGIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN (RCP)

Chair Pfeiler informed the Committee that, due to extensive discussions on preceding SANDAG Board items, a presentation on the status of the RCP was not made. However, the Board is scheduled to discuss the RCP in depth at its next Policy meeting on September 13, 2002.

5. COMPONENTS, ORGANIZATION, AND PRODUCTS OF THE RCP

Committee members were asked to provide feedback on a draft diagram which graphically depicted the components, organization, and products of the RCP. Comments included:

- In light of the TransNet extension efforts, the work on the RCP should focus on the Infrastructure Needs and Financing Strategy, particularly in an attempt to identify dedicated funding sources for non-transportation related infrastructure as a way to build the necessary coalitions to extend TransNet.
- The Plan can help identify regional values and regional funding, and allocate the resources as incentives to achieve the values.
• Local responsibilities, such as housing, may become regional issues, but providing housing will still fall on the local jurisdictions. We need to be careful about creating our own unfunded mandates.

6. **HOUSING COMPONENT OF THE RCP**

Councilmember Patty Davis, City of Chula Vista and Co-Chair of the Regional Housing Task Force, gave an overview of the importance of adequate housing in the region. The Committee watched a 5-minute Smart Growth Housing video produced by SANDAG and the Task Force, which profiles market rate and affordable projects in the region.

The Committee discussed the draft outline of the housing chapter of the RCP, which could serve as a template for the other chapters. Comments included:

- The outline seems ambitious.
- Actions such as "change general plans and zoning ordinances" implies that there is something wrong with the existing general plans and ordinances, or that SANDAG will remove those barriers. Better wording would be to "evaluate" general plans and ordinances.
- There needs to be a focus on maintaining our existing housing stock, through such action as preventing the demolition of SROs and proper code enforcement.
- The fundamental problem is one of supply - we have an enormous shortage of housing.
- Despite proper zoning and general plans, it still takes too long to bring housing units to market. How do we change a system that, even in the short term, prevents the market from filling the housing needs of the area, even when existing local plans allow development? We need to evaluate and implement short term actions to remove barriers to housing production and increase the supply.
- How do we avoid duplicating the planning efforts of the County and other jurisdictions currently updating their general plans?
- We need to examine the performance of the local redevelopment agencies in creating affordable housing (20% allocation from tax-increment financing).
- Another major challenge, in addition to the regulatory barriers to development, is the financing of the needed public facilities and infrastructure that new homes require.
- The Plan should create a "tool box," which should include inclusionary housing and other aggressive tools that jurisdictions can use to address their housing needs, but that will not become mandatory.
- The immediate focus should be on how to provide infrastructure dollars to those communities willing to support growth.
- The County of San Diego has established the "New Urban Vision Award" to reward communities with $25,000 grants for good design and planning.

7. **CALIFORNIA PLANNING ROUNDTABLE**

SANDAG recently held a peer review session with the California Planning Roundtable to brainstorm ideas on the RCP. The major points made by the Roundtable were:

- The most effective way of providing affordable housing is by addressing the infrastructure funding problem.
• Public education is key for the successful adoption of the RCP; 60% or more of the overall RCP budget should be designated for public outreach and involvement.
• San Diego is well-positioned to attempt fiscal reform on a regional level; regions can no longer wait for state level action.
• Rather than establishing Urban Limit Lines, the region should use its habitat protection plans as de facto urban growth boundaries.
• The RCP should reflect the differences in the urban, suburban, and rural characteristics of the region.

8. SEPTEMBER POLICY DEVELOPMENT BOARD MEETING ON THE RCP

The subject of SANDAG’s September Policy Development Board meeting will be the RCP. Committee members directed staff to focus the Board’s discussion on:

• Local control versus regional priorities, and the use of "carrots" versus "sticks."
• The appropriate level of public participation versus budgeted resources, and the most effective ways of implementing public involvement strategies.
• Equity issues related to the transportation system and other regional infrastructure networks.

9. ADJOURNMENT AND NEXT MEETING

The next meeting will be on Friday, September 6, 2002, from 9-11 a.m., at SANDAG in Conference Room A. Committee members were encouraged to attend the September 13th Policy Development Board meeting on the RCP, which will take place in the Board Room from 10:15 a.m. - 12:00 noon.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director
ENERGY COMPONENT OF THE RCP

Introduction

Energy supply and use are issues that have major implications for the region’s economy, environment and general quality of life. As such, energy has been identified as one of the topics that should be addressed in the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP).

SANDAG’s work program has included regional energy planning since the mid 1970’s. The Board adopted a Regional Energy Plan in 1994. That Plan currently is being updated, and will result in a Draft Regional Energy Strategy for Board consideration in early 2003. The Strategy is intended to serve as the basis for the energy component of the RCP. The Board held a Policy Board meeting on energy in July 2002. The results of the Policy meeting provide initial input for the Committee to consider.

The purposes of this report are to: (1) describe the progress on the energy element, (2) inform the Committee on the outcome of the SANDAG Policy Board meeting, and (3) prepare the Regional Planning Committee for input on regional energy priorities that should be addressed by the Committee at its next meeting.

Progress to Date

SANDAG has contracted with the San Diego Regional Energy Office (SDREO) to develop the Regional Energy Strategy. The SDREO has created a “Regional Energy Policy Advisory Council,” which includes SANDAG representation, to assist in the Strategy’s development and secure the input of key interest groups.

The two main pieces of information that will provide the basis of the Regional Energy Strategy are the Regional Energy Infrastructure Study (REIS) and a report on Energy Issues in the California-Baja California Binational Region. The REIS is being prepared by the SDREO and its consultant, SAIC. The Binational Energy Issues Report is being prepared by the San Diego State University Foundation under contract to SANDAG.

The two reports are being coordinated so that they can be integrated in the Strategy, which will be primarily a policy document, in contrast with the more informational nature of the REIS and Binational Energy Report. It is anticipated that the REIS and the Binational Report will be appendices to the Regional Energy Strategy. An important note is that the REIS effort is currently focusing on non-transportation energy issues. Transportation energy issues will be addressed in the 2030 Regional Transportation Plan.
Results of the SANDAG Board Policy Meeting

In the context of the preparation of the RCP, the Committee will be requested to provide direction on key energy issues as they relate to other areas that will be included in the RCP. Some of the more important issues discussed by the Board of Directors at its Policy meeting on energy were:

- How to meet the projected need for up to seven or eight new power plants to meet the region’s growing demand over the next 30 years.

- How to maximize the utilization of energy efficiency and renewable energy technologies, to reduce costs in the long run, and improve the environment.

- What can be done to coordinate U.S./Mexico interests in light of the dramatically growing energy demands in northern Baja California, and the energy industry’s significant interest in building electricity generator and natural gas projects there.

- The importance of improving organization and coordination within the San Diego region to effectively plan, influence, and even participate in implementation of projects to meet future energy needs.

Other topics that the Committee may wish to consider at its next meeting include:

- Energy infrastructure in relation to existing and planned land uses/smart growth.

- Urban form and design in relation to energy demand and consumption.

- Opportunities for “green” energy.

- Others?

The Board will take action on the Regional Energy Strategy early next year. Major policies and components of the Regional Energy Strategy will be brought back to the Regional Planning Committee for assessment and/or inclusion in the RCP.
The meeting of the SANDAG Board of Directors was called to order at 10:23 a.m. by Chair Morrison. Attendance was as follows:

**Voting Members**
- City of Carlsbad ................................................................. Bud Lewis, Mayor
- City of Chula Vista ................................................................. Patty Davis, Councilmember
- City of Coronado ................................................................. Absent
- City of Del Mar ................................................................. Crystal Crawford, Councilmember
- City of El Cajon ................................................................. Richard Ramos, Councilmember
- City of Encinitas ................................................................. Dennis Holz, Councilmember
- City of Escondido ................................................................. Lori Pfeiler, Mayor
- City of Imperial Beach ........................................................... Patricia McCoy, Councilmember
- City of La Mesa ................................................................. Art Madrid, Mayor
- City of Lemon Grove ............................................................ Mary Teresa Sessom, Mayor
- City of National City ............................................................ Ron Morrison, Councilmember
- City of Oceanside ................................................................. Jack Feller, Deputy Mayor
- City of Poway ................................................................. Mickey Cafagna, Mayor
- City of San Diego ................................................................. Absent
- City of San Marcos .............................................................. Hal Martin, Councilmember
- City of Santee ................................................................. Absent
- City of Solana Beach ........................................................... Joe Kellejian, Councilmember
- City of Vista ................................................................. Judy Ritter, Mayor Pro Tem
- County of San Diego ............................................................ Ron Roberts, Supervisor

**Advisory Liaison Members**
- Department of Transportation ........................................ Pedro Orso-Delgado, District Director
- U.S. Department of Defense ........................................ Absent
- Mexico ................................................................. Absent
- San Diego Unified Port District ........................................ Jess Van Deventer, Commissioner
- San Diego County Water Authority*  
  *The SDCWA Representative (Mayor Claude “Bud” Lewis, Director) was representing the City of Carlsbad)
- Metropolitan Transit Development Board ................................ Leon Williams, Chairman
- North San Diego County Transit Development Board ............ Absent
REGIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

Chair Morrison stated that the topic of the Policy Meeting is the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP), and announced that Mayor Lori Pfeiler will be leading the discussion. Mayor Pfeiler serves as the Chair of the Regional Planning Committee, which is spearheading the preparation of the RCP.

Mayor Pfeiler noted that this is a great opportunity to discuss the RCP with the Board, especially as related to the Board’s values and vision. She emphasized that now that SB 1703 does not require the preparation of the RCP, it becomes even more incumbent upon SANDAG to create the Plan, be proud of it, and implement it.

As an introductory exercise, Board members took a quick “Warm-Up Survey.” Mayor Pfeiler reviewed the answers, and then made a brief background presentation, emphasizing that there are four main areas that the Regional Planning Committee would like to hear the Board’s views on:

A. The Core Values that should be included in the Regional Vision.
B. The Regional Priorities that the RCP should address to ensure our core values.
C. Whether an incentive-based approach, using smart growth criteria, should be applied to regional infrastructure expenditures, and
D. The best ways to ensure public involvement and meaningfully involve our local elected officials in the preparation of the RCP.

Mayor Pfeiler introduced Chuck Anders of Strategic Consulting to lead the “Interactive Technology Survey,” and requested that all members participate in the discussion.

INTERACTIVE SURVEY / DISCUSSION

Chuck Anders, from Strategies Initiatives, emphasized that the interactive survey is not a test, but rather a tool to assist the Board in exploring general viewpoints about the RCP. He pointed out that the focus of the meeting is to hear the Board’s discussion on the topics, and provide the Regional Planning Committee with feedback.

A. CORE VALUES / VISION

Board members were asked whether various core values serve as a good starting point for a regional vision statement to test with stakeholders and the public. The core values were loosely based on the smart growth principles that were included in the “Resolution of Support for Smart Growth” that local jurisdictions adopted during the REGION2020 program. Generally, Board members expressed strong support for most of the core values. However, there was discussion on the core value pertaining to healthy open space and habitat conservation systems. Comments included that we need a more moderate environmental perspective to balance our environmental and infrastructure needs, that people are concerned about the lack of funding for open space and how much it will truly cost, that the use of the word “systems” is important in connecting habitat corridors, and that we need to keep the word “healthy” in that core value.
Other general comments included to add the following concepts to the vision: the need for a stronger relationship between San Diego, our surrounding counties, and the international border; clean air and clean water as part of the healthy environment core value; educational opportunities; good neighbors to Native American tribes and vice-versa, and good neighbors to adjoining jurisdictions.

B. REGIONAL PRIORITIES

The next question focused on whether the RCP should focus on the following six regional priorities: Urban Form, Transportation, Housing, Healthy Ecosystems, Economic Prosperity, and Borders. Generally, responses indicated that there was strong support for including all of the topics as regional priorities. Of the six, Urban Form received the most discussion.

**Urban Form:** Concerns on “urban form” included that the definition of smart growth varies depending on who you talk to and what community you are in, and therefore, there needs to be a clear, agreed-upon definition of smart growth; that not a lot of incentive is given to those cities that are already built out; and that work will have to be done in the area of retrofitting existing built-out communities. (Note: As part of SANDAG’s work on REGION2020, the Board adopted a smart growth definition and principles. The resolution of support for smart growth adopted by each jurisdiction in the region was based on that definition.)

**Housing:** There should be some method to compensate or reward those jurisdictions that are providing their fair share (or more) of affordable housing. Also, we need to evaluate how current affordable housing funds are being spent.

**Healthy Ecosystems:** We all have traffic concerns, but traffic problems become larger issues when we are overwhelmed by environmental conflicts and our surrounding jurisdictions. Also, North County cities have been working on an MHCP program for the past 10 years, but even so, environmental groups are calling for a moratorium on building housing in North County.

**Transportation:** The transportation priority should include the goal to eliminate traffic congestion, not just reduce it. Also, is the region going to pursue an additional North/South connector in North County?

**Economic Prosperity:** The economic prosperity priority should establish a financing mechanism, as part of the financing strategy, to ensure that our region’s infrastructure is funded.

**Others:** There was discussion about whether health and education should be regional priorities in the RCP. Board members agreed that health and education are important, but were not sure that they belong in this discussion. They recognized, however, that planning has implications for our health, and that we want a healthy public. There might be the opportunity to look at how the other regional priorities impact health and education. Also, there might be opportunities to focus on education about the transportation system and about how our transportation choices impact our health. They also recognized the need for coordination with transportation services to universities.
C. REGIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE

Board members were asked to provide feedback on whether various infrastructure systems should be analyzed as part of the Integrated Regional Infrastructure Plan (IRIP) and be included in the RCP. Of the eleven infrastructure systems proposed for inclusion, only two did not receive significant support: K-12 Educational Facilities, and Courthouse & Jail System. Additionally, the Board also wanted to further discuss the Storm Water Collection and Treatment System.

K-12 Educational Facilities: Due to the sheer number of local school board elected officials, it would be extremely difficult to focus on the K-12 facilities. On the other hand, the RCP should be comprehensive, and should include schools and universities, especially community colleges, as they are major assets to communities, and major traffic generators. Another issue is that new development is paying for new schools in newly-developing areas, but redevelopment does not pay for new schools or school improvements in urban areas. Is there a way to get the information from the school districts on where new schools will be located, especially to relate back to our transportation plans?

Courthouse and Jail System: The Board should not emphasize courts and jails; instead, it should focus on institutions that serve positive roles in people’s lives. Also, why include jails and not hospitals?

Storm Water Collection and Treatment System: There are counterproductive measures taking place in the backcountry where issues associated with polluted beaches originate. The Board should not only look at the symptoms of our water quality issues, but the causes.

Smart Growth Question: The next question asked whether smart growth criteria should be used to establish regional infrastructure spending priorities. Over half of the Board supported this concept. There needs to be a give and take between the jurisdictions, or an override for the good of the region in certain cases. If we continue with the status quo, we are just perpetuating our problems. Currently, the region is growing by about 38,000 people per year, but is adding only 11,000 housing units per year, exacerbating our housing crisis, overcrowding, and other infrastructure issues. Jurisdictions willing to take additional growth should receive infrastructure improvements.

Incentive Based Approach Question: The last infrastructure question asked whether an incentive-based approach designed to promote smart growth decisions should be applied to infrastructure. The Board also supported this concept. Comments included that while all jurisdictions support smart growth principles, jurisdictions that are near build-out still have to provide for a small amount of growth, but it is almost impossible to use or embrace all of the smart growth principles, and as a result, those jurisdictions would not qualify for infrastructure improvements on that basis. Other comments included that incentives should benefit the region, not just the individual jurisdictions.

D. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT AND SUBREGIONAL ROUNDTABLES

The next set of questions focused on public involvement and the subregional roundtables. The Board unanimously supported a strong public involvement and participation program, but
cautioned that the involvement program should extend beyond the traditional stakeholders and interest groups. The majority of the Board expressed support for quarterly or bi-monthly updates to the Board on the results of the public involvement program.

With regard to the first round of Subregional Roundtables, the majority of the Board felt that the roundtables should be organized by our defined subregions based upon SANDAG’s existing policy committee meeting structure. Board members also suggested, however, that elected officials from the City of San Diego and County of San Diego be invited to attend the other subregional roundtables, and that elected officials from adjoining jurisdictions be invited to attend the City and the County roundtables. Additionally, Board members expressed strong support for attendance from elected officials and planning staff at the first round of roundtables, with a more divided opinion on attendance by planning commissioners, stakeholder group representatives, and citizens. The topics, in order of importance, should include the regional vision, regional priorities, and infrastructure. Other suggested topics include the process for public involvement (i.e., description of the series of workshops and other activities).

E. EVALUATION

Board members generally found the Policy meeting very effective in clarifying and providing direction on issues related to the RCP. They noted that they enjoyed the interactive technology because there were immediate results, and it also allowed the Board to cover many topics in a short amount of time. A suggestion was made to be more specific or expand on the questions next time.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Robert Hoffman, a resident of San Diego, commented that the Board needs, more than anything else, workshops with experts on this subject. He offered to make a PowerPoint presentation to the Board to help solve the region’s transportation problems.

Walt Brewer, a San Diego resident, stated that the mission for a new regional agency should be the process of how it evaluates and solves regional problems. Additionally, the agency should evaluate existing smart growth developments to see if they are working.

Mayor Pfeiler thanked the Board for their participation and for their direction to the Regional Planning Committee.

ADJOURNMENT – 12:17 p.m.
PROPOSAL TO CREATE A STAKEHOLDERS WORKING GROUP
FOR THE REGIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

Introduction

As part of the public involvement and outreach program for the RCP, the Committee is requested to consider the creation of a “Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group” to more directly involve regional stakeholders interested in contributing to the preparation of the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP).

The Committee currently is advised by the Regional Planning Working Group (RPWG), the region’s planning and community development directors. Bob Leiter, Chair of the RPWG, represents the RPWG at the Regional Planning Committee meetings. If approved, the Stakeholders Working Group would act in concert with the Regional Planning Working Group, as illustrated below, and would also have an advisory member on the Regional Planning Committee. The subsequent table describes the features and membership selection process associated with the creation of the Group.

Recommendation

It is the staff recommendation that the Regional Planning Committee establish a Stakeholders Working Group to provide interested stakeholders with a direct mechanism for early and continuous involvement in the preparation of the RCP.
# Features of the Stakeholders Working Group and Membership Selection Process

| Roles: | Provide input to the Regional Planning Committee on the RCP, including but not limited to, the structure, chapters, and elements of the RCP  
| | Communicate RCP issues back to the group(s) that the stakeholders represent |
| Chair: | Vice-Chair of the Regional Planning Committee |
| Membership: | 12 – 15 members, with a regional balance between geography and interests |

## Membership Selection Process:

1. **Recruitment**: SANDAG would solicit membership applications and credentials from the groups listed below, from additional groups identified by the Regional Planning Committee, and from the general public through advertisements in community newspapers, postings at local jurisdictions, and Internet postings.

2. **Applications**: Interested parties would be asked to provide information on their qualifications for the Stakeholders Working Group.

3. **Selection Criteria**: Criteria could include balancing the group by qualifications, geography and interests; maximizing the number of “hats” worn by members and regional perspective.

4. **Selection and Confirmation**: At its December 2002 meeting, the Regional Planning Committee would select 12 – 15 members based on the selection criteria and the applications received.

5. **Assembly of Working Group**: Once the Regional Planning Committee concludes the selection process, SANDAG staff would assemble the Stakeholders Working Group and begin meetings.

## Potential Groups to be Invited to Apply:

### Environment
- Endangered Habitats League
- Sierra Club
- Land Conservancy Representative

### Business/Economy
- Economic Development Corporations
- Chambers of Commerce
- Other Business Associations

### Housing
- San Diego Housing Federation
- Faith Based Community Development Corporation

### Equity
- Center on Policy Initiatives
- Environmental Health Coalition
- San Diego Organizing Project
- San Diego Access Center
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Transportation</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Diego Coalition for Transportation Choices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego County Bicycle Coalition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk San Diego</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Advocacy**

- San Diego Quality of Life Coalition
- League of Women Voters of San Diego County
- Taxpayer’s Association
- Council of Design Professionals
- Citizens Coordinate for Century 3 (C-3)

**Borders**

- Northern Baja California
- Imperial County
- Riverside County
- Orange County

**Building**

- Alliance for Habitat Conservation
- Building Industry Association

**Redevelopment/Infill**

- Redevelopment Agencies
- Urban Land Institute (ULI)

**Agriculture**

- San Diego County Farm Bureau

**Professional Organizations**

- Association of Environmental Professionals (AEP)
- American Planning Association (APA)
- American Society of Landscape Architects (ASLA)

**Other**

- Educational Community Representative
- Tribal Government Representative / Indian Human Resource Center
- ?

**Additional Outreach**

Additional outreach activities included in the Public Involvement and Outreach Program include:

- Subregional Roundtables
- Issue Identification Workshops, Focus Groups, and Polling
- Ongoing Meetings of the Regional Planning Committee and the Regional Planning Working Group
- Newsletters, E-mail database, and Web Site Development
- Earned Media
- Environmental Justice and Social Equity Outreach
PROPOSED FORMAT FOR SUBREGIONAL ROUNDTABLES

Introduction

As part of the public involvement and outreach program for the RCP, the Committee is requested to consider the proposed format for the upcoming Subregional Roundtables. Three rounds of roundtables are anticipated over the next year and a half.

The first round, which will be held early next year as described below, will provide a forum to initiate a discussion on the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) with the region's local elected officials, infrastructure providers, stakeholders, the public, and representatives from bordering areas. The second round, tentatively proposed for June and July 2003, will provide a public forum to refine the concepts in the RCP and provide input on the key pieces of the plan. The third round of workshops, anticipated for the end of 2003, will focus on local and regional actions that could be undertaken to implement the plan.

At SANDAG's September 13, 2002 Policy Board meeting on the RCP, the Board agreed that the Subregional Roundtables should be organized to reflect SANDAG's established subregions, and that elected officials from throughout the region should be invited to the City of San Diego and the County of San Diego roundtables, and that City and County elected officials should be invited to the other subregional roundtables. Upon additional consideration, staff recommends that elected officials from surrounding counties and the international border be invited to the appropriate roundtables, coordinated through the Borders Committee.

The table below outlines recommendations for the first round of roundtables.

Proposed Format for the First Round of Subregional Roundtables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ Introduce local elected officials, infrastructure providers, stakeholders, the public, and representatives from bordering areas to the RCP, and involve them early in the planning process to enhance local ownership of the RCP.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Identify issues and perspectives that the Regional Planning Committee should address as the RCP is prepared.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeframe:</th>
<th>January and February 2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subregions: (Host)</th>
<th>Local Host</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ North County Inland (Escondido)</td>
<td>It is proposed that Regional Planning Committee members and alternates host the roundtable in their respective subregion, and take a proactive role in promoting the event to other elected officials and interested parties in their subregion and in neighboring areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As part of previous outreach efforts on other topics, SANDAG has conducted workshops in the past, and learned that facilities hosting the meetings should have the capacity for approximately 75-100 attendees and be accessible by transit. Staff will work with Committee members to identify adequate locations and preferred dates and times for the roundtables.

### Proposed Topics for Discussion:

At the SANDAG policy meeting, the Board expressed support for discussing the Vision / Core Values, Regional Priorities, and Regional Infrastructure at the Roundtables. Staff recommends that, in addition to these items, the Roundtables be used to obtain input for the Regional Planning Committee on the following items:

- Funding Alternatives for Regional Infrastructure;
- Housing Supply, Affordability, and Distribution; and Mixed Uses;
- Borders Issues; and
- Others, as identified by the Committee

### Format: (2 hours)

The following format is suggested for discussion:

- **Overview of RCP** - Local Elected Official from Regional Planning Committee provides a brief overview of the RCP and the objectives of the meeting. (15 min.)

- **Interactive Technology Survey** - Attendees participate in an interactive survey and facilitated discussion on key RCP issues. (35 min.)

- **Break-out session** - Attendees break out into smaller groups of 7-10 people (depending on attendance) to further explore areas of agreement and disagreement identified by the interactive survey. Representatives from each group briefly report back to the larger forum. (1 hour)

- **Closing Remarks** - Concluding remarks and schedule of RCP events by Regional Planning Committee elected official(s).

- **Public Comment** - Additional opportunities for comments by the public.

The Committee is requested to take action on the proposed format for the first round of subregional roundtables in order for necessary arrangements to be made for scheduling purposes.
PROPOSED APPROACH FOR THE INTEGRATED REGIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE PLAN (IRIP) AND A FINANCING STRATEGY FOR THE REGIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN (RCP)

Introduction

The region’s quality of life is largely impacted by the level of service provided by its infrastructure. This is why a key component of the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) is an assessment of infrastructure needs and a financing strategy. This information will help assess whether the region’s infrastructure and planned capital improvement expenditures are adequate to meet the region’s needs and support, or can be reprogrammed to support, the development of smart growth areas. At this time, the work will focus on infrastructure that serves the region. Non-regional infrastructure may be added to the inventory and the RCP at a later time, if necessary. Attached are: (1) a set of criteria defining regional infrastructure; and (2) a project schedule, including potential roles and responsibilities for the Regional Planning Committee.

Direction from SANDAG Board

On September 13, 2002, SANDAG held a Policy Board meeting on the RCP. The Board provided general policy direction on the regional vision, regional priorities, and regional infrastructure questions to be addressed in the RCP.

With a few minor adjustments, the SANDAG Board supported the preliminary list of regional infrastructure to be analyzed and included in the first RCP document. The Board suggested that Courthouses and Jails be removed from the inventory and Community Colleges and Universities be added. An updated list of the infrastructure and definition criteria is included in Attachment 1.

The Board generally agreed that smart growth should play a leading role in setting major regional infrastructure priorities. The Board also indicated that a flexible set of criteria should acknowledge existing smart growth development and should allow for differences in implementing smart growth development by jurisdictions in the region. A flexible set of smart growth evaluation criteria should be developed by the Committee and incorporated into a quality of life framework that represents the three broad areas of environment, economy, and equity.

Policy Related Actions and Issues for Discussion

- What criteria should be used in conjunction with an incentive based approach for allocating regional infrastructure resources?
- What steps are needed to galvanize the support of the regional infrastructure providers behind smart growth and the RCP?
- Should the regional infrastructure plan focus on capital expenditures only, or should it also include operations?
Finally, the Board agreed that the RCP should apply an incentive-based approach for allocating regional infrastructure resources based on the set of flexible smart growth criteria to be developed for inclusion in the RCP. The incentives would reward smart growth planning and implementation. This approach is similar to the incentive-based process that SANDAG currently uses for allocating transportation funds; and may require Memorandums of Understanding (MOU’s) between infrastructure providers and local jurisdictions.

**Product**

Thus, the product to be prepared over the coming year for inclusion in the RCP will include an inventory, needs assessment, and financing options and strategies coordinating smart growth implementation and regional capital improvements, including some infrastructure areas listed in the Quality of Life Funding report presented to the Regional Planning Committee in July 2002. The product will address the question:

“Of the capital expenditures within this service area, are there opportunities for reprogramming or reallocation that would encourage and enable smart growth planning decisions?”

An important product of the IRIP is an inventory illustrating where capital improvement dollars are programmed and to determine whether the planned expenditures are supporting designated smart growth communities throughout the region. The analysis will begin by determining whether any unmet needs can be addressed by reprogramming existing revenue sources towards smart growth communities. If this is insufficient, additional sources of revenue, including new revenue opportunities, will then be explored, including but not limited to sales taxes, transient occupancy taxes, real estate transfer taxes, user fees, development impact fees, assessments and state subvention funds, and regional fiscal reform. Thus, for select areas designated for smart growth, multiple financing options and strategies varying by infrastructure type, may be necessary to address any unmet infrastructure needs.

**Summary of Approach**

The RCP is based on the premise that we must plan our future differently than we have our past. The RCP recognizes that, although we are 19 separate jurisdictions, we are one region that requires a seamless plan. One of the Plan’s primary goals is to prepare for future growth. The objective is to be smart about growth, planning and preparing in advance of its occurrence. Local jurisdictions, acting together as SANDAG, have identified smart growth areas, and are supporting an incentive-based approach designed to encourage and channel growth into these smart growth areas and communities. For example, SANDAG, as the regional transportation planning agency has acted to direct the expenditure of transportation funds to primarily urban areas and communities as an incentive to encourage smart growth planning decisions. One of the tasks of the IRIP is to determine whether the same incentive based strategy is applicable for other forms of infrastructure.

The IRIP will begin at the regional level, focusing on infrastructure services with a regional perspective. Next, the analysis will move toward the sub-regional level, focusing more specifically on smart growth related infrastructure. The main distinction between these two levels (regional and sub-regional) is the relative importance of location with respect to smart growth planning. Regional
infrastructure includes those facilities that are important for the region’s quality of life but do not require proximity to smart growth centers. Examples include beach sand replenishment projects, the region’s solid waste sites and water supply, and the regional airport. Sub-regional infrastructure has a more direct and functional link to smart growth, i.e. location is critical. Examples include intra-regional surface transportation links, power and water delivery systems, sewage discharge, and K-12 schools.

The regional water supply can be used to illustrate the progression from regional to sub-regional. At the regional level, this report will address the overall supply of water, focusing on total capacity. With regard to sub-regional and smart growth planning, the distribution network and location of water-related infrastructure becomes increasingly important.

In preparing the IRIP, SANDAG will involve and work closely with regional and sub-regional infrastructure providers in each infrastructure category. Examples include the San Diego County Water Authority (CWA) and local water districts, the San Diego Regional Energy Office, and others.

Performance Monitoring Framework

In order to evaluate the success of the Regional Comprehensive Plan, it is vital to monitor the Plan's performance. Maintaining and improving the region’s quality of life is an overall goal of the RCP and the Plan’s performance monitoring system must address this.

An agreed upon set of regional goals and objectives, consistent with the regional vision, regional priorities, and smart growth evaluation criteria, will be developed as the basis for monitoring the Plan. Maintaining and improving the regional quality of life is an overall goal, and performance indicators can provide a framework for monitoring our progress. Infrastructure is directly linked to quality of life because infrastructure investments are responsible for providing amenities and for ensuring the efficient and productive use of our developed areas.

Quality of life can be described and measured as an integrated balance between quality of the environment, the economy and social equity. Without a balance between these three broad areas, referred to as the “three E's,” it is unlikely that the region will maintain or improve its quality of life. The relationship between traffic congestion, the environment and economic performance is one example of the inter-relationship between the three areas. Worsening traffic congestion hinders the economic performance of regions by slowing goods movement. It also results in poorer air quality and longer commute times. Similarly, current high and rising home prices have created an affordable housing crisis in the region. For example, some employed here are turning to nearby southern Riverside for housing accommodations, increasing the level of traffic congestion on I-15; the commute trip for about 20 percent of the cars on I-15 below Lake Hodges originate in southern Riverside. The lack of convenient, affordable housing is threatening to derail our economy and standard of living. Thus, because these three broad areas are inextricably linked and interact synergistically to make our region livable, the three E's will be used as a framework for measuring the impacts to our quality of life.
Integrated Regional Infrastructure Plan (IRIP)

DEFINITION OF REGIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE

One purpose for creating a set of criteria to define regional infrastructure is to organize the work into a set of tasks that can be accomplished during the coming year. For the purposes of this report, regional infrastructure is defined as a shared physical network or system that provides a public service or resource and is the foundation to enhancing opportunity, potential for prosperity, and regional quality of life. The list below does not include infrastructure that is provided to serve, or is the responsibility of one jurisdiction, or a group of jurisdictions, excluding people that live outside the jurisdiction(s) (e.g. libraries, public safety, and emergency services). These additional, non-regional infrastructure items may be added to the inventory and the RCP at a later date. Furthermore, after the SANDAG Board Policy meeting discussions, courthouses and jails have been removed from the list and community colleges and universities have been added.

INFRASTRUCTURE CRITERIA

In order for an infrastructure to be included in the report, it is required to fit the definition above as well as meet all of the strict criteria below.

- Must be a public facility or regulated monopoly
- Must be a publicly shared system, network, or resource used by or benefiting a majority of the region on a regular and consistent basis
- Must provide for equal opportunity for all residents and businesses to benefit
- Must be run, regulated, or overseen by state or local elected officials or their appointed representatives
- Must insure that the level of service available and the price of the service to be about the same for all users
- Must play an integral part in maintaining the quality of every day life for the average resident
- Must include Ports of Entry with Mexico due to the unique location of the San Diego region

INFRASTRUCTURES TO BE ANALYZED

The list below shows the eleven types of infrastructure that meet the criteria listed above.

- Transportation
- Water Supply and Delivery System
- Energy Supply and Delivery System
- Storm Water Collection and Treatment System
- Sewage Discharge System and Treatment Facilities (Wastewater)
- Regional Open Space and Habitat Preservation
- Regional Parks and Recreation Facilities (including beach sand replenishment)
- K-12 Education and Community Colleges and Universities
- Solid Waste Collection and Disposal
- Ports of Entry with Mexico
### INTEGRATED REGIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE PLAN (IRIP): PROJECT OUTLINE, SCHEDULE, AND COMMITTEE ROLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK</th>
<th>WORK ELEMENTS</th>
<th>COMMITTEE ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES</th>
<th>PROJECT SCHEDULE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Infrastructure Definition and Components</td>
<td>Approve regional infrastructure list and framework for IRIP</td>
<td>2002 Sep/Oct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop criteria and define regional infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Structure IRIP within RCP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Differentiate between regional and subregional infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Assess the way infrastructure is currently provided and funded</td>
<td>Evaluate current framework for providing infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>including assessment of current capital improvement plans and LOS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Assess the current and future demand for each infrastructure type</td>
<td>Evaluate the performance of regional infrastructure providers using LOS Standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identify service areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop LOS Standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estimate Current and future infra. demand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Perform needs assessment, identify areas with unmet demand for infrastructure</td>
<td>Approve preliminary draft IRIP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Including assessment of current capital improvement plans and LOS</td>
<td>Initiate Committee outreach to infrastructure providers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluate needs assessment and unmet demand</td>
<td>Evaluate needs assessment and unmet demand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compare region’s infrastructure plans to smart growth goals and objectives</td>
<td>Determine if region’s infrastructure plans support smart growth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identify capital improvement expenditures and LOS by service area</td>
<td>Recommend ways for infrastructure capital improvement plans to support smart growth, including ways to reprogram funds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identify Smart Growth areas and categorize region into urban/suburban/rural and “smart growth”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identify unmet demand (supply = demand?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assess region’s ability to reprogram funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Develop financing options for areas with unmet infrastructure demand</td>
<td>Evaluate financing options</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Create set of financing options to satisfy unmet needs consistent with smart growth goals and objectives</td>
<td>Evaluate relationship between IRIP and Smart Growth goals and objectives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Determine if MOA’s are an appropriate way to support smart growth</td>
<td>Develop recommendations/MOA with Infrastructure providers to support smart growth, including reprogramming existing funds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Draft MOA with infrastructure providers to support smart growth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Develop Financing Strategy</td>
<td>Approve Financing Strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop a set of priorities for capital improvements and identify sources of revenue to pay for them</td>
<td>Approve smart growth priorities and objectives/ evaluation criteria for infrastructure funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use smart growth characteristics to establish priorities and objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work with regional infrastructure providers to establish guidelines and priorities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>First Draft of IRIP and Financing Strategy</td>
<td>Approve First Draft of IRIP with Financing Strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deliverable to CALTRANS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Final IRIP and Financing Strategy for the RCP</td>
<td>Approve Final IRIP and Financing Strategy for RCP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Create Performance Monitoring Framework and indicators</td>
<td>Approve performance monitoring framework and indicators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*09/06/2002*