REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE AGENDA

Friday, November 1, 2002
11 a.m. - 1 p.m.
SANDAG
401 B Street, Conference Room A
San Diego, CA

AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

• SCHEDULE FOR SUBREGIONAL ROUNDTABLES
• GOALS & OPTIONS FOR REGIONAL ENERGY STRATEGY
• INTRODUCTION TO BORDERS ISSUES
• 2030 CITIES / COUNTY FORECAST

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.
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. E-mail 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, November 1, 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 - 3)
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 OCTOBER 4, 2002 MEETING (pp. 5-7) INFORMATION

+2. SUMMARY OF THE TRIBAL GOVERNMENTS/ SANDAG BOARD SUMMIT (Chair Lori Pfeiler) (pp. 8-10) INFORMATION

On October 11, 2002, the region’s Tribal Governments and the SANDAG Board held a Summit to promote mutual respect, cooperation, and coordination. Opportunities for SANDAG and the Tribal Governments to work together on RCP issues are anticipated. Attached is the Summit summary.

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. PROPOSED SCHEDULE FOR SUBREGIONAL ROUNDTABLES (Janet Fairbanks, Staff) (pp. 11-12) APPROVE

Attached are proposed meeting dates for the first series of Subregional Roundtables. The Regional Planning Working Group has helped narrow down the range of dates for each subregional workshop. The Committee is requested to approve the proposed dates, or to suggest alternative dates if there are conflicts with the proposed dates. Additionally, Committee members are requested to play a key role in obtaining elected official representation in their subregions.

+5. BASIC GOALS, ISSUES, AND OPTIONS FOR THE REGIONAL ENERGY STRATEGY (John Moot, Chairman of the Regional Energy Policy Advisory Council (REPAC), and Irene Stillings, Executive Director of the San Diego Regional Energy Office) (pp. 13-16) DISCUSSION

The San Diego Regional Energy Office (SDREO) has been contracted by SANDAG to provide a Draft Regional Energy Strategy for consideration by the Regional Planning Committee and the SANDAG Board. The Strategy is intended to become the Energy Element of the RCP. The enclosed report contains the outline of the basic goals, issues, and options that REPAC and the Energy Office are working with at this point in time.
+6. **INTRODUCTION TO BORDER ISSUES AND PROPOSAL FOR JOINT MEETING WITH BORDERS COMMITTEE (Chair Lori Pfeiler and Hon. Crystal Crawford, Chair of SANDAG’s Borders Committee) (pp. 17-19)**

SANDAG’s two newest Policy Committees are the Regional Planning Committee and the Borders Committee. The Borders Committee will develop the Borders component of the RCP. Councilmember Crawford will provide a brief overview of the Committee’s work, including important border issues that could be addressed in the RCP. A joint meeting is proposed for Friday, January 17, 2003 from 11 a.m. to 1 p.m. at SANDAG.

+7. **2030 CITIES/COUNTY FORECAST (Chair Pfeiler and Paul Kavanaugh, Staff) (pp. 20-22)**

The 2030 Cities/County Forecast is being used as the basis for the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), and will be used for other local and regional planning purposes, including the RCP (which includes the Integrated Regional Infrastructure Plan (IRIP) and the regional share allocation for local housing elements). A presentation on the forecast will be made.

8. **ADJOURNMENT AND UPCOMING MEETINGS**

The next Regional Planning Committee meeting is scheduled for **Friday, December 6, 2002, starting no earlier than 12 noon**, following SANDAG’s Policy Board meeting, which will serve as a public hearing on the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Committee members may wish to attend the RTP Public Hearing before attending the Regional Planning Committee meeting, which will run approximately from **12 noon - 2 p.m.** at SANDAG.

+ 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 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 Gene Pound (Caltrans) and Susanah Aguilera (Department of Defense). Bob Leiter, representing the Regional Planning Working Group, also was in attendance.

**CONSENT ITEMS**

1. **ACTIONS FROM AUGUST 2, 2002 MEETING**

2. **ENERGY COMPONENT OF THE RCP**

   Action: The Regional Planning Committee voted to approve the Consent Agenda.

3. **PUBLIC COMMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS**

   There were no public speakers.

**REPORTS**

4. **SUMMARY OF THE SANDAG BOARD POLICY MEETING ON THE REGIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN (RCP)**

   Chair Pfeiler discussed the results of the Board Policy meeting held on September 13, 2002, stating that the Board provided valuable direction to the Committee to continue its work on the RCP and to keep the Board informed on a quarterly basis.

   Councilmember Holz expressed concern over discussion at the Board meeting about scaling back on environmental issues. The MSCP and MHCP need to be funded. The region needs a commitment to balance growth and the environment as a fundamental part of the RCP.

5. **PROPOSAL TO CREATE A STAKEHOLDERS WORKING GROUP FOR THE RCP**

   The Committee discussed a proposal to create a Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group of approximately 12 - 15 members from throughout the region to assist in the preparation of the RCP. Committee members asked about the relationship between the Stakeholders Working Group (SWG) and the Regional Planning Committee, and requested that the SWG forward a range of viewpoints to the Committee for consideration. The SWG will be chaired by Councilmember Patty Davis, Vice-Chair of the Regional Planning Committee, who will provide a direct link between the policymakers.
and the stakeholders. Additionally, the SWG will select a Vice-chair, who will serve as an advisory member on the Regional Planning Committee. (Bob Leiter, Planning Director of Chula Vista, represents the Regional Planning Working Group, and currently is an advisory member.)

Action: The Regional Planning Committee voted to approve the formation of the Stakeholders Working Group. The Committee will appoint members at its December 2002 meeting.

6. **PROPOSED FORMAT FOR THE SUBREGIONAL ROUNDTABLES**

SANDAG is organizing a series of subregional roundtables on the RCP to provide early opportunities for involvement and feedback on the RCP by local elected officials, stakeholders, and the public. The first round will be held in January and February 2003 and will focus on the vision, regional priorities, infrastructure issues, housing, and border issues. Committee members will play a critical role in encouraging fellow elected officials and constituents to attend and in introducing the RCP at each of the Roundtables. Committee members requested that a presentation be prepared for the Roundtables, outlining how we got to where we are and the major components of the RCP. They also suggested a cable link with interactive video technology to remote locations.

Action: The Regional Planning Committee voted to approve the format for the Subregional Roundtables.

7. **PROPOSED APPROACH FOR THE INTEGRATED REGIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE PLAN (IRIP) AND A FINANCING STRATEGY FOR THE RCP**

Councilmember Peters introduced this item by describing his work on the California Commission on Tax Policy in the New Economy. The Commission is evaluating and making recommendations on reforming California’s tax system, including changes to the State’s income, sales, and property tax structures. He explained some of the fiscal issues facing the state and local jurisdictions inherent in the existing system, including the fiscalization of land use, but expressed optimism about reform in coming years. Additionally, Councilmember Peters suggested that the Committee invite John Russo, the new President of the California League of Cities, to provide an overview of the work being coordinated by the League of Cities and CSAC.

The Committee received a presentation on the proposed approach for the Integrated Regional Infrastructure Plan (IRIP) and a financing strategy for the RCP. Four components form the basis of the IRIP, and would be included in the RCP: (1) an infrastructure evaluation process; (2) an infrastructure needs assessment; (3) a set of financing and public policy options, building primarily on an incentive-based process that works toward achieving the RCP’s regional smart growth vision; and (4) performance monitoring at two levels - implementation by infrastructure providers of infrastructure networks that support smart growth policies, and actual impacts of the new infrastructure networks, as they affect quality of life. The final document would be updated on a periodic basis, and would be expanded if necessary. The IRIP would promote sustainability by providing incentives for changes to land use policies that reduce urban sprawl, match the RCP vision including the vision for the region’s urban form, connect regional and interregional infrastructure systems, and mitigate impacts associated with interregional commutes.

The Committee expressed support for the IRIP approach. Comments and questions included:

- Could funding provided by some jurisdictions be used in other jurisdictions? For example, could jurisdictions provide funding in a regional pot for affordable housing projects located in other jurisdictions?
The IRIP and financing strategy should provide a hierarchy of financing strategies, based on specific criteria, with agreement and commitment by all jurisdictions to move forward.

The Strategy could put forth a funding matrix – critical infrastructure projects that serve smart growth could be funded first; infrastructure projects outside the smart growth areas would need to find other funding.

Regional infrastructure could include parking lots for Coaster or light rail systems.

Our definition of smart growth should not result in providing smart growth infrastructure related incentives to areas like Temecula/Southern Riverside.

The region needs to look inward and evaluate where we are providing housing, but we also need to recognize that what happens outside our boundaries directly impacts our infrastructure needs. It was suggested that the Interregional Planning effort occurring between SANDAG and the Western Riverside Council of Governments (WRCOG) be discussed at a future meeting.

The Committee reviewed the work schedule. It was emphasized that local jurisdictions and infrastructure providers are key to the success of the IRIP, and participation by Committee members and their fellow elected officials will be critical, especially in drafting Memorandums of Understanding on the smart growth approach.

The Committee also was asked whether the IRIP should focus solely on capital expenditures, or whether it should look at both capital expenditures and operations and maintenance. The Committee indicated that it should not only include both capital expenditures and operations and maintenance, but that it should also identify the tradeoffs between different infrastructure systems (e.g., rail versus buses, and related operating costs). Additionally, if looking at operations, it will be extremely important to distinguish between regional and local levels of infrastructure.

8. **ADJOURNMENT AND UPCOMING MEETINGS**

Action: Committee members discussed whether future meetings should be held at a different time, and decided to try 11 a.m. – 1 p.m. as the new schedule to maximize attendance.

The next meeting will be on Friday, November 1, 2002, from 11 a.m. – 1 p.m., at SANDAG in Conference Room A.
The meeting of the Joint Tribal Governments/SANDAG Policy Development Board was called to order at 10:20 a.m. by SANDAG Chair Ron Morrison. Attendance was as follows:

**Tribal Representatives:**
- Campo: Michael Connelly, EPA/Land Use
- Cuyapaipe: Willie Micklin, Tribal Manager
- Jamul: Bill Mesa, Councilmember
- La Jolla: Leroy Mendez, Roads Manager
- Mesa Grande: Louis Guassac, Economic Development
- Rincon: John Currier, Chair
- Rincon: Bo Mazetti, Councilmember
- Sycuan: Roger Simpson, Community Development Director
- Viejas: Steven TeSam, Chair
- Viejas: Allen Barrett, Councilmember

**SANDAG Board Voting Members**
- City of Carlsbad: Ramona Finnila, Councilmember
- City of Chula Vista: Absent
- City of Coronado: Phil Monroe, Councilmember
- City of Del Mar: Absent
- 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: Dick Murphy, Mayor
- City of San Marcos: Hal Martin, Councilmember
- City of Santee: Hal Ryan, Councilmember
- City of Solana Beach: Joe Kellejian, Councilmember
- City of Vista: Judy Ritter, Mayor Pro Tem
- County of San Diego: Judy Ritter, Mayor Pro Tem

**Advisory Liaison Members**
- California Department of Transportation: Pedro Orso-Delgado, District Director
- Metropolitan Transit Development Board: Leon Williams, Chairman
- North San Diego County Transit Development Board: Julianne Nygaard, Chair
Introduction and Overview

SANDAG Chairman Morrison recognized that each of the tribal governments is a sovereign nation, and that it will be important to address issues on a government to government basis.

After the representatives of Tribal Governments and the SANDAG Board of Directors made self-introductions, SANDAG Chair Morrison provided a brief overview of the agenda packet and outlined a suggested agenda for this meeting.

SANDAG’s Board of Directors, sitting as the Policy Board, had invited the leaders of the region’s tribal governments to meet and learn about SANDAG’s responsibilities and how they may relate to the Reservations, and for the Board to learn more about each of the tribal governments. This summit could be the first of recurring summits between SANDAG and the tribal government representatives, which will promote mutual respect, cooperation, and coordination.

SANDAG’s Roles and Responsibilities

The roles and responsibilities of SANDAG were presented through a video about SANDAG and a summary of the 2030 Mobility Plan (the proposed Regional Transportation Plan - RTP) by Board Member Joe Kellejian (Vice Chair of SANDAG’s Transportation Committee).

Tribal Governments’ Comments

The tribal governments then provided comments from their individual tribal perspectives. Each representative gave a brief overview of their respective tribe’s population, land size, form of government, and issues of concern. Tribal representatives reiterated that their comments are from their tribe's perspective, and that they could not speak for the other tribes. Following are a list of key comments made by the tribal government representatives:

- It was good that SANDAG took the “bold step” to invite all of them to participate.
- San Diego County has more Indian Reservations than any other county in the United States, and the Native American tribes should receive as much consideration as Mexico.
- They are elected officials, representing different jurisdictions, with different forms of government. Each is a unique, sovereign nation with some similarities and some differences.
- SANDAG should consider establishing a liaison staff member to work with each of the tribal governments.
- While some corrections need to be made before the final document is completed, the County of San Diego’s recent Update on Impacts of Tribal Economic Development Projects in San Diego County report contains good background information on each of the tribes.
- There is a lack of understanding about how tribes relate economically, and what constraints they are under for development on their land. Tribes may need to develop to allow them to provide needed services to their residents. The local off-reservation population consists of people who have moved there in order to have a rural lifestyle, but the tribe often has conflicts with them.
• Land use planning is one of the most difficult issues, since their plans for improvements may be inconsistent with outside government planning because they have a different system.

• Many cities feel they’re not getting their fair share of revenue returned. However, tribal members that work off-reservation pay taxes; yet none of the money is shared with tribal governments.

• The tribes provide services to members and non-Indian residents, yet no state funding is returned to them.

• Communities that destroyed habitat look to the reservations to offset their developments, but don’t share the revenues.

• The tribes have mutual aid agreements with local jurisdictions; they work with regional water and sewer agencies and have demonstrated a willingness to work together.

• Tribes have a right to re-claim “surplus” federal land, but requests for the federal land (e.g., NTC) have not been honored.

• Money drives the world, and they are invited here today because of gaming.

• Many of the tribes stressed the importance of improving the roads to the reservation’s casino facilities, to make it safer for patrons.

• SANDAG should consider taking an action similar to the Board of Supervisors regarding legislation on the Indian Gaming Special Distribution Fund.

Summary

Representatives from the tribal governments and SANDAG felt that the Summit was a good FIRST step. The participants had an opportunity to: hear from each other, put issues on the table, and suggest next steps. Some of those next steps may be:

1. Providing SANDAG Board Members with background information on the tribes from the Update on Impacts of Tribal Economic Development Projects in San Diego County report.
2. Appointing a SANDAG staff person as a full time liaison to the tribal government;
3. Examining the opportunities for closer coordination between tribal governments and SANDAG, especially on transportation matters;
4. Taking an action similar to the County Board of Supervisors regarding the Indian Gaming Special Distribution Fund; and
5. Hosting another summit, sooner rather than later (certainly more than once per year).

SANDAG Vice Chair Cafagna thanked everyone for attending, appreciated the information provided, and didn’t hear anything that couldn’t be addressed.

SANDAG Chairman Morrison stated that this was our first meeting, to determine what the issues are, and now future meetings may address specific issues.

Chairman Morrison adjourned the meeting at 12:25 pm
PROPOSED SCHEDULE FOR SUBREGIONAL ROUNDTABLES

At its last meeting, the Regional Planning Committee discussed the Subregional Roundtables that will be part of the public involvement and outreach program for the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP), and directed staff to establish dates as soon as possible in order to allow enough time for scheduling purposes. The purpose of the Subregional Roundtables is to encourage discussion and feedback on the RCP. Three rounds of workshops are anticipated over the next year and a half.

The first round, which will be held in January and February 2003, 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, and to involve them early in the planning process to enhance local ownership of the RCP. The second round, tentatively proposed for May and June 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 Policy meeting on the RCP, the Board agreed that the Subregional Roundtables should be organized to reflect SANDAG’s established subregions. Several alternative dates are proposed for each subregion, with the staff recommendation indicated by an asterisk and highlighted in bold. Committee members are requested to approve the proposed dates and times, or to identify the best alternative dates and times if there are conflicts with the recommended dates. Additionally, the RPWG has identified potential locations, as listed below, that the Committee may wish to comment on.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subregion and Proposed Times</th>
<th>Proposed Dates for Consideration (One date will be scheduled for each Subregion - Recommendation is highlighted and asterisked)</th>
<th>Proposed Locations (As identified by the RPWG)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| North County Inland 6 - 8:30 p.m. | • Thursday, January 16, 2003  
• **Thursday, January 23***  
• Thursday, February 20 | Escondido City Hall |
| South County 6 - 8:30 p.m. | • Wednesday, January 15, 2003  
• **Wednesday, January 22***  
• Wednesday, February 5  
• Wednesday, February 19 | Southwestern Community College |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subregion and Proposed Times</th>
<th>Proposed Dates for Consideration (One date will be scheduled for each Subregion - Recommendation is highlighted and asterisked)</th>
<th>Proposed Locations (As identified by the RPWG)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North County Coastal 6 - 8:30 p.m.</td>
<td>▪ <strong>Thursday, January 16, 2003</strong>* ▪ Thursday, January 23 ▪ Thursday, February 6 ▪ Thursday, February 20</td>
<td>Encinitas City Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East County 6 - 8:30 p.m.</td>
<td>▪ <strong>Wednesday, January 15, 2003</strong>* ▪ Wednesday, January 22 ▪ Wednesday, February 5 ▪ Wednesday, February 19</td>
<td>La Mesa Community Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego City Council Meeting- 2 p.m.</td>
<td>▪ Monday, January 13, 2003 ▪ Monday, January 20 ▪ <strong>Monday, February 3</strong>* ▪ Monday, February 17</td>
<td>City of San Diego City Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>Under Discussion with the County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the last meeting, Regional Planning Committee members agreed that members and alternates should serve as hosts for 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 regions. Once the dates are confirmed, SANDAG will prepare a formal notice and work with Committee members to encourage attendance.
BASIC GOALS, ISSUES, AND OPTIONS FOR THE REGIONAL ENERGY STRATEGY

Introduction

SANDAG has contracted with the San Diego Regional Energy Office (SDREO) to develop the Regional Energy Strategy. The Strategy is intended to become the Energy Element of the Regional Comprehensive Plan. The SDREO has created a “Regional Energy Policy Advisory Council” (REPAC), 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 has been prepared by the SDREO and its consultant, SAIC. The Binational Energy Report is being prepared by the San Diego State University Foundation under contract to SANDAG, with input by SANDAG’s Borders Committee.

The two reports are being coordinated so that they can be integrated in the Regional Energy 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 next phase of SDREO’s energy work.

Over the past several months, the key facts and issues in the REIS and Binational Report have been reviewed by the Borders Committee, the Regional Planning Committee (consent items), and the SANDAG Board at a Policy Board meeting last July.

The SDREO has prepared an initial Discussion Paper for the development of the Regional Energy Strategy, which is under review by the REPAC. The purpose of this discussion at the Regional Planning Committee is to provide feedback to the SDREO and REPAC as they continue their work on the Strategy. The Regional Comprehensive Plan schedule currently calls for a final recommended Strategy from the REPAC to be available to the Regional Planning Committee by the middle of February 2003.
Discussion

SANDAG Review and Actions to Date

The Borders Committee has recommended that SANDAG authorize it to expedite the formation of a Binational Energy Forum, as proposed in the Binational Energy Strategy Report. The SANDAG Board of Directors is scheduled to consider this recommendation at its October 25, 2002 business meeting.

The key energy issues discussed at the Board of Directors Policy meeting last July were:

- How to meet the projected need for three or more 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 generation 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.

Initial Regional Energy Strategy Discussion Points

The initial Discussion Paper on the Regional Energy Strategy contains the following key points. The final Strategy will refine the Strategy and outline options to answer the questions posed below.

Goal

To provide a coordinated, proactive approach to meeting the energy needs and supporting the future prosperity of the San Diego region through measures that ensure an adequate and secure energy supply at a reasonable cost and environmental quality.

Guiding Principles

- Meet the region’s energy needs with a diverse portfolio of resources.
- Develop indigenous resources to the greatest extent possible in order to improve self-reliance.
- Improve cost-effective energy efficiency and reduce peak demand as an alternative supply option.
- Factor efficient energy supply, distribution and use into land use planning and development decisions.
- Involve all regional stakeholders in energy discussions and decisions.
- Empower customer choice and energy decisions by increasing public awareness and education.
- Recognize the close economic and energy relationship between the San Diego region and northern Baja California.
Five Broad Energy Strategies and Implementation Issues

1. Develop a balanced portfolio of diversified supply resources that are cost efficient, environmentally sound, self-sustaining, secure and reliable.

- Dynamic pricing: time-of-use, time-of-day, etc.
- Re-powering generating plants
- Energy efficiency
- Distributed generation
- Renewables
- Conservation
- New transmission
- New power plants
- New construction efficiency standards
- Energy efficient mortgages
- Efficient site design
- Other?

Discussion Questions
a. What barriers exist to implementing this strategy?
b. Where are the financial resources to implement this strategy? Who will build these resources?
c. Will the regions’ consumers accept dynamic pricing, additional cost of new building standards, more controls, etc.?
d. What are the barriers to the regions’ utilities implementation of their portion of the Strategy?
e. What entity sets standards and ensures compliance?
f. Can the land planning process set aside land sites for future energy production and distribution? Who will do the planning to assure that all options are assessed and integrated?

2. Develop binational coordination and collaboration between the San Diego region and the Northern Baja California region.

- Ensure adequate environmental protection as new energy infrastructure is developed in Mexico.
- Ensure that energy development in northern Baja California has a positive impact on the San Diego region.
- Provide new energy resources to the region, south and north of the border.

Discussion Questions
a. Can we (are we willing to) establish a binational energy forum as a precursor to a more permanent entity?
b. What would be the goal of this forum? Would this forum have any authority?
c. Can binational collaboration result in shared regional energy infrastructure development?
d. Can binational collaboration have a positive effect on air quality & water issues?
e. What entity or groups take responsibility to implement this strategy?

3. Become active at the state and federal level to shape the discussion and decisions regarding market design, legislation and regulation.

- FERC Standard Market Design proceeding
- National Energy Plan
- California legislation
• Public good programs
• Dynamic pricing
• Other?

**Discussion Questions**

a. Who will speak for the region?
b. How will the interests of the various stakeholders be brought together?
c. Can the many stakeholders in the region come to agreement on what needs to be done?
d. What would be the role of REPAC? SDREO? SANDAG?
e. Where are the resources to address this issue?
f. Who selects the issues/forums on which to focus?

4. **Building regional consensus on the solutions to current energy issues.**

• Community forums
• Moderated discussion
• Key stakeholder retreats
• Media involvement

**Discussion Questions**

a. Who has responsibility for this process?
b. How do we create public interest?
c. Again, where are the financial and staffing resources to conduct public education on issues and options?

5. **Create an energy development authority in order to develop a regional approach to energy planning, decision making, resource allocations, etc.**

• Deal with risks inherent in current dependency on natural gas
• Raise money to fund new energy sources, acquire assets to mitigate market risk
• Become focal point for development of energy policy and strategy
• Provide regional integrated resource planning
• Evaluate, recommend and co-invest in regional infrastructure projects
• Contribute energy perspective to land use planning
• Invest in large-scale energy efficiency, distributed generation and clean energy resources
• Coordinate regional approach to the evaluation of potential new energy assets
• Monitor regulatory, legislative proceedings and coordinate regional involvement and response
• Influence current FERC Standard Market Design proceedings
• Group energy efficiency projects for economies of scale and cost savings
• Other?

**Discussion Questions**

a. Does the community have the will to create this organization?
b. How is it structured?
c. Can the fractionalization of key stakeholder groups be overcome?
d. What needs to be done that is not getting done or is done inadequately now?
e. Can we coordinate and implement using existing entities and authorities?
BORDERS RELATED ITEMS:

BORDERS COMMITTEE SIX-MONTH REVIEW

Introduction

The Borders Policy Committee is working to provide policy guidance to the SANDAG Board of Directors on issues of importance and relevance to cross-border planning with the surrounding counties and Republic of Mexico. In so doing, the Committee has reviewed many issue areas, sent recommendations to other SANDAG policy committees and the SANDAG Board of Directors, and taken action on relevant legislation. The Committee also has proposed specific issue areas for which it will focus its attention in the near future and beyond. Membership on the Borders Committee is attached.

Discussion

The Borders Committee first met on February 15, 2002 and since then has completed eight monthly meetings including two joint meetings with representatives from Riverside County under the auspices of the I-15 Interregional Partnership. The Borders Committee has successfully drawn a great deal of support and participation from representatives of our neighboring counties and the Republic of Mexico, and continues to make cross-jurisdictional outreach an integral part of its mission and work. Specific actions that have been taken include the following:

- Supported HR4837 (Davis) – Strengthening a Fast Entry at the Border (Safe Border) Act of 2002;
- Supported the Interregional Partnership recommendations and forwarded the recommendations to the SANDAG Transportation Committee for inclusion in the Regional Transportation Plan;
- Supported, and forwarded to the Board of Directors, the recommendations for member and Chair appointments for the COBRO Committee;
- Supported, and forwarded to the Board of Directors, the recommendations from the COBRO Annual Summer Conference (Agenda Item 14-B).

The Borders Committee also has had many noteworthy accomplishments in the short time since its inception. Such accomplishments include:

- Providing the first public forum regarding the potential Imperial water transfer where officials from both regions jointly discussed the project;
- Consistently bringing together representatives from adjoining regions to discuss cross-jurisdictional issues in a positive and productive manner;
- Educating SANDAG member agencies and the public regarding pertinent cross-jurisdictional issues;
- Identifying issues of significance for regional cooperation and developing a plan of action for addressing such issues in the future.
Areas where the Committee plans to focus its attention are as follows:

- Completion of a Borders Visioning process to define borders infrastructure priorities and potential financing strategies. This work will aid preparation of the Borders chapter in the Regional Comprehensive Plan, and will include joint meetings with the Regional Planning Committee;

- Development of the long-term strategies from the I-15 Inter-regional Partnership work with Riverside County;

- Identifying economic development opportunities with Imperial County;

- Facilitating the creation of the Binational Energy Forum and promoting collaborative binational energy planning;

- Continued collaboration as part of the Transportation Alliance to develop strategies to address Port of Entry issues.

CRYSTAL CRAWFORD
Chair, Borders Committee

Attachment

Key Staff Contact: Hector Vanegas,
(619) 595-5372; hva@sandag.org

Funds are budgeted in Work Element #1.05
MEMBERSHIP

The Borders Committee provides oversight for planning activities that impact the borders of the San Diego region (Orange, Riverside and Imperial counties and the Republic of Mexico). The preparation and implementation of the SANDAG Binational Planning and Interregional Planning Programs are included under its purview. It advises the SANDAG Board of Directors on major interregional planning policy-level matters. Recommendations of the Committee are forwarded to the Board of Directors for action.

The Borders Committee generally meets on the third Friday of the month.

Staff contact: Hector Vanegas
(619) 595-5372; hva@sandag.org

MEMBERS

Chair: Crystal Crawford
Councilmember, City of Del Mar
(representing North County Coastal)

Vice Chair: Patricia McCoy
Councilmember, City of Imperial Beach
(representing South County)

Hal Martin
Councilmember, City of San Marcos
(representing North County Inland)

Jill Greer
Councilmember, City of Lemon Grove
(representing East County)

Ralph Inzunza
Councilmember, City of San Diego

Greg Cox
Supervisor, County of San Diego

Alternates:

Carol McCauley
Councilmember, City of Oceanside
(representing North County Coastal)

Phil Monroe
Councilmember, City of Coronado
(representing South County)

Judy Ritter
Councilmember, City of Vista
(representing North County Inland)

Dick Ramos
Councilmember, City of El Cajon
(representing East County)

Jim Madaffer
Councilmember, City of San Diego

Dianne Jacob
Supervisor, County of San Diego

Advisory/Liaison:

Larry Grogan
Mayor, City of El Centro, County of Imperial

Thomas Buckley
Councilmember, City of Lake Elsinore, County of Riverside

Rodulfo Figueroa
Consul General of Mexico, Republic of Mexico

Pedro Orso-Delgado
District 11 Director, California Department of Transportation

To be determined
San Diego County Water Authority

To be determined
County of Orange
PRELIMINARY 2030 CITIES/COUNTY FORECAST

Background
Since 1972, SANDAG has produced long-range forecasts of population, housing, and employment that are used as a basic resource by elected officials, planners, academics, and the general public. Among other applications, the Preliminary 2030 Cities/County Forecast is the basis for the 2030 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP). Both the RTP and the RCP are intended to be regularly updated using the most current forecast data available.

These forecasts represent the best assessment of the changes we can anticipate for the region and its communities based on the best available information and well-proven and verified computer models. They are meant to help policy and decision-makers prepare for the future and are not an expression for or against growth. SANDAG’s forecasts are developed through a collaborative effort with experts in demography, housing, the economy and other disciplines, and the close cooperation of the local planning directors and their staffs.

The forecast process includes two iterative phases. First, a forecast for the entire region is produced, based largely on economic trends and the associated demographic characteristics. As discussed below, the regional forecast also is affected by the amount of interregional commuting that occurs. The second phase allocates the regional forecast to jurisdictions and smaller geographic areas based on the region’s general and community plans, and the amount and location of identified smart growth focus areas. The forecast allocation is influenced by land use and transportation policy decisions. Actions taken by one jurisdiction can affect not only that jurisdiction’s forecast but potentially others as well.

The Preliminary 2030 Cities/County Forecast differs from the 2020 forecast produced in 1999 and from all previous forecasts. First, the 2000 Census revealed the region’s population to be about 100,000 persons lower than the California Department of Finance had estimated. Second, new data indicate that Hispanic fertility rates dropped dramatically during the 1990s. These facts resulted in a regional population forecast for 2030 of about the same magnitude that was previously predicted for 2020: about 3.9 million people.

Another important issue incorporated into the 2030 Forecast is the inclusion of assumptions regarding the increasing amounts of interregional commuting. To account for and estimate the future levels of this type of commuting, SANDAG utilizes a model in conjunction with the allocation phase of the forecast process. To support the region’s anticipated job growth, an additional 47,300 housing units will be needed by 2030 for workers living outside the region’s boundary.

For the year 2020, the new 2030 Forecast projects a total of 250,000 fewer people in the region than did the old 2020 Forecast. Of that 250,000, 100,000 (40 percent) is the result of the lower Census, another 100,000 is due to the lower fertility rates, and 50,000 (20 percent) is attributable to interregional commuting.

Finally, the 2030 Cities/County Forecast differs from previous forecasts in how it deals with smart growth. The 2020 Forecast, used for the 2020 RTP, added mixed use and higher density development around some 150 transit focus areas (TFAs) that were originally identified in the 1996 edition of the 2020 RTP. The 2030 Forecast replaces the TFAs with smart growth focus areas that were identified during consultations with the local jurisdictions.
As part of our normal forecasting process and in conjunction with the development of the Regional Comprehensive Plan, we will prepare a Final 2030 Cities/County Forecast scheduled for release in the fall of 2003. This revision will incorporate comments we receive about the forecast as well as any new or updated information that becomes available.

**Summary**

Two factors, the lower than expected population figures from the 2000 Census, and the sharply lower fertility rates, account for 80 percent of why the region will grow at a slower pace than the previous forecast had predicted. However, it is important to emphasize that the one million more people are still coming, and the region still needs to plan accordingly.

Compared to those factors, the rise of interregional commuting has a relatively minor impact in terms of numbers, but is very significant with respect to future policy decisions. The 19 local jurisdictions, through their local land use authority, have the power to provide more and better housing opportunities for the region’s residents.

As we plan for the future, the forecasts provide a tool that can aid in the formulation of local and regional policies, as well as help to assess the results of implementing those policies. Quality of life can be improved and tedious long distance commutes avoided simply by making smarter planning choices. This is integral to both the vision and the challenge of the Regional Comprehensive Plan.

Finally, it is important to note that although the region’s rate of growth has slowed considerably compared to that of the late 1980s, since the end of the recession we have been growing about twice as fast as the nation. That gap will gradually narrow until sometime in the 2020s, when our growth rate is expected to fall below the national figure.

The following tables present base year and forecasted population, housing, and employment data for the 19 local jurisdictions.

**TABLE 1 — TOTAL POPULATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>2000 to 2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NUMBER</td>
<td>PERCENTAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlsbad</td>
<td>78,247</td>
<td>124,922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>173,556</td>
<td>282,664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronado</td>
<td>24,100</td>
<td>25,536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Mar</td>
<td>4,389</td>
<td>5,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Cajon</td>
<td>94,869</td>
<td>109,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encinitas</td>
<td>58,014</td>
<td>78,762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>133,559</td>
<td>166,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Beach</td>
<td>26,992</td>
<td>31,866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Mesa</td>
<td>54,749</td>
<td>60,932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemon Grove</td>
<td>24,918</td>
<td>30,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National City</td>
<td>54,260</td>
<td>67,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside</td>
<td>161,029</td>
<td>214,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poway</td>
<td>48,044</td>
<td>55,932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>1,223,400</td>
<td>1,613,355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>54,977</td>
<td>106,772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santee</td>
<td>52,975</td>
<td>69,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solana Beach</td>
<td>12,979</td>
<td>14,411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista</td>
<td>89,857</td>
<td>113,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated</td>
<td>442,919</td>
<td>718,862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGION</td>
<td>2,813,833</td>
<td>3,889,604</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SANDAG, Preliminary Cities/County Forecast, October 2002
### TABLE 2 — TOTAL HOUSING UNITS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carlsbad</td>
<td>33,798</td>
<td>50,990</td>
<td>17,192</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>59,495</td>
<td>90,666</td>
<td>31,171</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronado</td>
<td>9,494</td>
<td>9,819</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Mar</td>
<td>2,557</td>
<td>2,615</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Cajon</td>
<td>35,190</td>
<td>38,188</td>
<td>2,998</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encinitas</td>
<td>23,843</td>
<td>30,786</td>
<td>6,943</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>45,050</td>
<td>53,282</td>
<td>8,232</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Beach</td>
<td>9,739</td>
<td>10,832</td>
<td>1,093</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Mesa</td>
<td>24,943</td>
<td>25,988</td>
<td>1,045</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemon Grove</td>
<td>8,722</td>
<td>10,025</td>
<td>1,303</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National City</td>
<td>15,422</td>
<td>18,569</td>
<td>3,147</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside</td>
<td>59,581</td>
<td>74,867</td>
<td>15,286</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poway</td>
<td>15,714</td>
<td>17,425</td>
<td>1,711</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>469,689</td>
<td>602,529</td>
<td>132,840</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>18,862</td>
<td>36,237</td>
<td>17,375</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santee</td>
<td>18,833</td>
<td>23,272</td>
<td>4,439</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solana Beach</td>
<td>6,456</td>
<td>6,634</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista</td>
<td>29,814</td>
<td>35,903</td>
<td>6,089</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated</td>
<td>152,947</td>
<td>241,017</td>
<td>88,070</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REGION</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,040,149</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,379,644</strong></td>
<td><strong>339,495</strong></td>
<td><strong>33%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SANDAG, Preliminary Cities/County Forecast, October 2002

### TABLE 3 — TOTAL EMPLOYMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carlsbad</td>
<td>50,780</td>
<td>81,126</td>
<td>30,346</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>53,750</td>
<td>98,989</td>
<td>45,239</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronado</td>
<td>29,913</td>
<td>30,349</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Mar</td>
<td>3,830</td>
<td>4,215</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Cajon</td>
<td>41,333</td>
<td>48,224</td>
<td>6,891</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encinitas</td>
<td>24,240</td>
<td>28,220</td>
<td>3,980</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>49,678</td>
<td>64,974</td>
<td>15,296</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Beach</td>
<td>3,886</td>
<td>4,560</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Mesa</td>
<td>25,385</td>
<td>27,936</td>
<td>2,551</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemon Grove</td>
<td>8,575</td>
<td>9,793</td>
<td>1,218</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National City</td>
<td>24,763</td>
<td>29,404</td>
<td>4,641</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside</td>
<td>39,610</td>
<td>74,817</td>
<td>35,207</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poway</td>
<td>21,776</td>
<td>34,605</td>
<td>12,829</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>777,679</td>
<td>984,872</td>
<td>207,193</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>30,453</td>
<td>53,278</td>
<td>22,825</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santee</td>
<td>16,088</td>
<td>27,924</td>
<td>11,836</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solana Beach</td>
<td>8,870</td>
<td>9,812</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista</td>
<td>33,820</td>
<td>51,462</td>
<td>17,642</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated</td>
<td>140,244</td>
<td>218,835</td>
<td>78,591</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REGION</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,384,673</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,883,395</strong></td>
<td><strong>498,722</strong></td>
<td><strong>36%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SANDAG, Preliminary Cities/County Forecast, October 2002