REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

Friday, December 3, 2010
12 noon to 2 p.m.
SANDAG Board Room
401 B Street, 7th Floor
San Diego

AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

• TransNet EMP FIVE-YEAR FUNDING STRATEGY UPDATE, FY 2011 FUNDING ALLOCATION, AND FY 2011 LAND MANAGEMENT GRANT CRITERIA
• CPPW GRANT PROGRAM EVALUATION CRITERIA AND PROCESS
• SAN DIEGO REGION: PLANNING FOR HEALTHY COMMUNITIES
• REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT (RHNA) DETERMINATION
• HIGHLIGHTING SMART GROWTH: LA MESA GENERAL PLAN UPDATE

PLEASE TURN OFF CELL PHONES DURING THE MEETING

YOU CAN LISTEN TO THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING BY VISITING OUR WEB SITE AT WWW.SANDAG.ORG

MISSION STATEMENT

The Regional Planning Committee provides oversight for the preparation and implementation of the Regional Comprehensive Plan that is based on the local general plans and regional plans and addresses interregional issues with surrounding counties and Mexico. The components of the plan include: transportation, housing, environment (shoreline, air quality, water quality, habitat), economy, borders, regional infrastructure needs and financing, and land use and design.
Welcome to SANDAG. Members of the public may speak to the Regional Planning Committee on any item at the time the Committee is considering the item. Please complete a Speaker's Slip, which is located in the rear of the room, and then present the slip to Committee staff. Also, members of the public are invited to address the Committee on any issue under the agenda item entitled Public Comments/Communications/Member Comments. Public speakers are limited to three minutes or less per person. The Regional Planning Committee may take action on any item appearing on the agenda.

This agenda and related staff reports can be accessed at www.sandag.org under meetings on the SANDAG Web site. Public comments regarding the agenda can be forwarded to SANDAG via the e-mail comment form also available on the Web site. E-mail comments should be received no later than noon, two working days prior to the Regional Planning Committee meeting. Any handouts, presentations, or other materials from the public intended for distribution at the Regional Planning Committee meeting should be received by the Clerk of the Board no later than 12 noon, two working days prior to the meeting.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), SANDAG will accommodate persons who require assistance in order to participate in SANDAG meetings. If such assistance is required, please contact SANDAG at (619) 699-1900 at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting. To request this document or related reports in an alternative format, please call (619) 699-1900, (619) 699-1904 (TTY), or fax (619) 699-1905.

SANDAG offices are accessible by public transit. Phone 511 or see 511sd.com for route information.
REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE  
Friday, December 3, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM #</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1a.</td>
<td>APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1b.</td>
<td>APPROVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1a. September 10, 2010, Meeting Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1b. October 15, 2010, Meeting Minutes from Joint Regional Planning and Transportation Committees Meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 2.     | PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS |
|        | Members of the public shall have the opportunity to address the Regional Planning Committee (RPC) on any issue within the jurisdiction of the Committee that is not on this agenda. Anyone desiring to speak shall reserve time by completing a “Request to Speak” form and giving it to the Clerk prior to speaking. Public speakers should notify the Clerk if they have a handout for distribution to Committee members. Public speakers are limited to three minutes or less per person. Committee members also may provide information and announcements under this agenda item. |

| 3.     | CHAIR’S REPORT (#3) |
|        | ANNNOUNCEMENT: UPCOMING JOINT MEETING WITH SAN DIEGO COUNTY WATER AUTHORITY PLANNING COMMITTEE (Chair Jim Janney) |
|        | A joint meeting between SANDAG’s RPC and the San Diego County Water Authority’s (CWA) Water Supply Planning Committee is being planned. The joint meeting will be held on Friday, February 11, 2011, from 12 noon to 2:30 p.m. at the CWA office. Additional information will be provided as the meeting date approaches. RPC members are asked to mark their calendars for this joint meeting. |

<p>| 4.     | REPORTS (#4 through #8) |
| +4.    | TransNet ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION PROGRAM FIVE-YEAR FUNDING STRATEGY UPDATE, FY 2011 FUNDING ALLOCATION, AND FY 2011 LAND MANAGEMENT GRANT CRITERIA (Keith Greer) |
|        | The RPC is asked to recommend that the SANDAG Board of Directors: (1) approve the updated Five-Year Conceptual Funding Strategic Plan, the proposed management and monitoring activities and budget for FY 2011 totaling $4 million, and, subject to Board Policy No. 017, authorize staff to solicit proposals and enter into contracts or amend existing contracts accordingly; and (2) adopt the modifications to the eligibility and evaluation criteria for land management grants for FY 2011 as described in the report. RPC recommendations will be presented to the Board of Directors on January 28, 2011, for review and approval. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM #</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+5.</td>
<td>COMMUNITIES PUTTING PREVENTION TO WORK: GRANT PROGRAMS EVALUATION CRITERIA AND PROCESS (Vikrant Sood)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SANDAG will administer four pass-through grant programs as part of the Communities Putting Prevention to Work (CPPW) project to promote health principles in planning, active transportation and safe routes to school. Staff will present the proposed grant program objectives, eligibility, evaluation criteria and process, which were developed with input from the Regional Planning Technical Working Group, Public Health Stakeholders Group, Safe Routes to School Coordination Team, Bicycle-Pedestrian Working Group, and San Diego Regional Traffic Engineers Council. The Regional Planning Committee is asked to recommend that the Board of Directors approve the proposed grant program objectives, eligibility, evaluation criteria, and process as shown in Attachment 2.

+6. SAN DIEGO REGION: PLANNING FOR HEALTHY COMMUNITIES (Stephan Vance)

The Regional Comprehensive Plan and 2030 Regional Transportation Plan recommend that SANDAG should collaborate with the public health community to determine how public health considerations could be taken into account in the planning, funding, and project development process. Toward that end, a white paper has been developed to describe the relevant issues and potential approaches.

+7. REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT (RHNA) DETERMINATION (Susan Baldwin)

Housing element law requires the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) to consult with SANDAG regarding the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) Determination prior to each housing element cycle. The consultation process began in June, and HCD provided SANDAG with the RHNA Determination for the RHNA planning period, which extends from January 1, 2010, through December 31, 2020 (11 years), for the fifth housing element cycles. The fifth housing element covers the time period of January 1, 2013, to December 31, 2020. The report describes the consultation process and provides HCD’s RHNA Determination.

8. HIGHLIGHTING SMART GROWTH: LA MESA GENERAL PLAN UPDATE (Bill Chopyk, Community Development Director, City of La Mesa)

The RPC periodically receives reports about local smart growth efforts. The City of La Mesa is embarking upon an update of its General Plan. City staff will provide an overview of the process, the kinds of issues under consideration, and “lessons learned” at these early stages of the update.

9. UPCOMING MEETINGS

The next meeting of the RPC is scheduled for January 7, 2011, at 12 noon.

10. ADJOURNMENT

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

1. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES (APPROVE)
   
   **Action:** Upon a motion by Councilmember Lesa Heebner (North County Coastal) and a second by Mayor Don Higginson (North County Inland), the RPC unanimously approved the minutes from the July 2, 2010, meeting. Vice Chair Jerry Jones abstained as he did not attend the meeting.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS
   
   **Action:** There were no public comments/communications/member comments.

REPORTS (3 through 6)

3. 2050 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN: DRAFT UNCONSTRAINED TRANSPORTATION NETWORK AND CONCEPTUAL OVERVIEW OF REVENUE CONSTRAINED SCENARIOS (DISCUSSION)
   
   Heather Werdick, Senior Planner, made a presentation on the Draft Unconstrained Transportation Network; initial revenue constrained scenarios; revenue projections, flexible funding, board policy, and the Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS); and presented an overview of the upcoming process to develop various revenue constrained scenarios.
   
   **Action:** This item was presented for discussion only.

4. REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT (RHNA) UPDATE (INFORMATION)
   
   Susan Baldwin, Senior Planner, reported on input received from the Board, the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG), and the Regional Housing Working Group (RHWG) regarding principles and factors to be used in the RHNA methodology for the fifth housing element cycle (January 1, 2013, to December 31, 2020), RHNA objectives from state housing element law, and past RHNA methodologies.
Bill Anderson, representing the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG), and Councilmember Jerry Selby (East County), presented highlights from discussions which took place at the Joint Meeting of the Regional Housing Working Group and the Regional Planning TWG held on September 9, 2010.

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

5. **TransNet SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM (SGIP) PROGRESS REPORT AND TDA/TransNet BICYCLE-PEDESTRIAN AND NEIGHBORHOOD SAFETY GRANT PROGRAM (INFORMATION)**

Christine Eary, Associate Planner, provided an overview of SANDAG’s first round of SGIP projects under TransNet, issued in May 2009. The staff report provides an overview of the implementation phase of the program and the progress made to date by the grant recipients. Staff anticipates that the next call for projects will be conducted after completion of the 2050 RTP.

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

6. **TransNet ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION PROGRAM (EMP): STATUS REPORT (INFORMATION)**

Keith Greer, Senior Planner, presented an update on the implementation of the TransNet EMP. It included the current status of land acquisition for mitigation funding for regional land management and monitoring, and future efforts to launch an interactive Web site for tracking and public information.

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

7. **UPCOMING MEETINGS**

The next meeting of the RPC is scheduled for Friday, October 1, 2010, at 12 noon; however, it is possible that this meeting date may change.

8. **ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Janney adjourned the meeting at 1:27 p.m.

Attachment: Attendance Sheet
## CONFIRMED ATTENDANCE
### SANDAG REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING
#### SEPTEMBER 10, 2010
12 p.m. to 2 p.m.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBREGIONAL AREA</th>
<th>JURISDICTION</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>MEMBER / ALTERNATE</th>
<th>ATTENDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North County Inland</td>
<td>City of Vista</td>
<td>Steve Gronke</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Poway</td>
<td>Don Higginson</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South County</td>
<td>City of Imperial Beach</td>
<td>Jim Janney, Chair</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Coronado</td>
<td>Al Ovrom</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North County Coastal</td>
<td>City of Solana Beach</td>
<td>Lesa Heebner</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East County</td>
<td>City of Encinitas</td>
<td>Teresa Barth</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Lemon Grove</td>
<td>Jerry Jones, Vice Chair</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Lemon Grove</td>
<td>Jerry Selby</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Jerry Sanders</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Sherri Lightner</td>
<td>1st Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Pam Slater-Price</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Members</td>
<td>Caltrans, District 11</td>
<td>Laurie Berman</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Bill Figge</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>San Diego County Water Authority</td>
<td>Elsa Saxod</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Howard Williams</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>Department of Defense</td>
<td>Steve Chung</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>San Diego Unified Port District</td>
<td>Lou Smith</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Steve Padilla</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>Al Ovrom</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>NCTD</td>
<td>Carl Hilliard</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Sam Abed</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>Regional Planning TWG</td>
<td>Bill Anderson</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Bill Chopyk</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>Southern California Tribal Chairmen’s Association</td>
<td>Johnny Hernandez (Iipay Nation of Santa Ysabel)</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Allen Lawson (San Pasqual)</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Denis Turner (SCTCA)</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Mitigation Program Advisory Member</td>
<td>Wildlife Conservation Board</td>
<td>Deborah Townsend</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Catherine Caldwell</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Mitigation Program Advisory Member</td>
<td>California Department of Fish and Game</td>
<td>Steve Juarez</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>David Mayer</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Mitigation Program Advisory Member</td>
<td>US Army Corps of Engineers</td>
<td>Therese O’Rourke</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Michelle Matson</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Mitigation Program Advisory Member</td>
<td>US Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Susan Wynn</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The joint meeting of the Transportation Committee (TC) and the Regional Planning Committee (RPC) was called to order by Chair Jack Dale (East County) and Chair Jim Janney (South County) at 8:32 a.m. See the attached attendance sheet for RPC member attendance.

A. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

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

REPORTS (B through D)

B. 2050 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN: DRAFT REVENUE CONSTRAINED TRANSPORTATION NETWORK SCENARIOS (DISCUSSION)

Based on revenue projections, various Revenue Constrained Transportation Network Scenarios have been developed using the prioritized project list and other factors. One of the goals of the Revenue Constrained Transportation Network Scenarios is to build and operate as much of the Unconstrained Transportation Network as possible, given revenue availability and flexibility, project priorities, and performance measures outcomes.

Heather Werdick, Senior Planner, presented the Revenue Constrained Transportation Network scenarios, as well as the preliminary performance of each scenario based on feedback from SANDAG Working Groups, Policy Advisory Committees and Board of Directors over the past month. Dave Schumacher, Principal Planner, provided a detailed overview of the transit components, as part of the transit network within the scenarios.

Kathy Keehan, Executive Director of San Diego County Bicycle Coalition, requested staff dedicate 3 percent of the funds toward developing a scenario which would increase the investment in bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure improvements, transportation demand management, and non-motorized transportation.

Action: This item was presented for discussion only.
C. 2050 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN: DRAFT POLICY OPTIONS TO SUPPORT THE TRANSIT NETWORK (DISCUSSION)

In conjunction with the preparation of the various Revenue Constrained Transportation Network Scenarios, SANDAG is preparing a menu of policy options that could be considered for inclusion in the RTP to support the transit network that ultimately becomes part of the overall transportation network. The Regional Planning Technical Working Group, Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee, and Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group have participated in an interactive exercise to help prioritize the options for consideration by the Regional Planning and Transportation Committees. In addition, a public workshop is planned later this month. The options also will be considered for possible inclusion in the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS).

Carolina Gregor (Senior Planner) and Dave Schumacher (Principal Planner) introduced the policy options to support the transit network, which could be included in components of the RTP, the SCS, and possibly the update to the Regional Comprehensive Plan, focusing specifically on parking, land use, and funding.

Action: This item was provided for discussion only.

D. 2050 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN: SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES STRATEGY (INFORMATION)

The Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) will be an integral part of the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan, demonstrating how the regional development pattern, transportation network, policies, and programs can work together to achieve greenhouse gas emission targets for cars and light trucks. The SCS will be based upon four building blocks that have underpinned transportation planning in the San Diego region for many years: (1) a land use pattern that accommodates the region’s future employment and housing needs, and protects sensitive habitat and other resources; (2) a transportation network of public transit, highways, local streets, bikeways, and walkways; (3) transportation demand management strategies; and (4) transportation system management programs. Coleen Clementson, Principal Planner, presented a summary of the SANDAG Board discussion on this report.

Action: This item was provided for information only.

E. UPCOMING MEETINGS

The next meeting of the RPC is scheduled for Friday, December 3, 2010, at 12 noon.

F. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Jim Janney (South County) and Chair Jack Dale (East County) adjourned the joint meeting of the Transportation Committee and the Regional Planning Committee at 10:54 a.m.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBREGIONAL AREA</th>
<th>JURISDICTION</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>MEMBER / ALTERNATE</th>
<th>ATTENDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North County Inland</td>
<td>City of Vista</td>
<td>Steve Gronke</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Poway</td>
<td>Don Higginson</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South County</td>
<td>City of Imperial Beach</td>
<td>Jim Janney, Chair</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Coronado</td>
<td>Al Ovrom</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North County Coastal</td>
<td>City of Solana Beach</td>
<td>Lesa Heebner</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Encinitas</td>
<td>Teresa Barth</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East County</td>
<td>City of Lemon Grove</td>
<td>Jerry Jones, Vice Chair</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Lemon Grove</td>
<td>Jerry Selby</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Jerry Sanders</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Sherri Lightner</td>
<td>1st Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Pam Slater-Price</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Bill Horn</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Members</td>
<td>Caltrans, District 11</td>
<td>Laurie Berman</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bill Figge</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>San Diego County Water Authority</td>
<td>Elsa Saxod</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Howard Williams</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>Department of Defense</td>
<td>Steve Chung</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>San Diego Unified Port District</td>
<td>Lou Smith</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Steve Padilla</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>Al Ovrom</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>NCTD</td>
<td>Carl Hilliard</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sam Abed</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>Regional Planning TWG</td>
<td>Bill Anderson</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bill Chopyk</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>Southern California Tribal</td>
<td>Johnny Hernandez (Iipay Nation of Santa Ysabel)</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chairmen's Association</td>
<td>Allen Lawson (San Pasqual)</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Denis Turner (SCTCA)</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Mitigation Program Advisory Member</td>
<td>Wildlife Conservation Board</td>
<td>Deborah Townsend</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Mitigation Program Advisory Member</td>
<td>California Department of Fish and Game</td>
<td>Catherine Caldwell</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Mitigation Program Advisory Member</td>
<td>California Department of Fish and Game</td>
<td>Steve Juarez</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Mitigation Program Advisory Member</td>
<td>California Department of Fish and Game</td>
<td>David Mayer</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Mitigation Program Advisory Member</td>
<td>US Army Corps of Engineers</td>
<td>Therese O'Rourke</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Mitigation Program Advisory Member</td>
<td>US Army Corps of Engineers</td>
<td>Michelle Matson</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Mitigation Program Advisory Member</td>
<td>US Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Mitigation Program Advisory Member</td>
<td>US Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
<td>Susan Wynn</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TransNet ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION PROGRAM
FIVE-YEAR FUNDING STRATEGY UPDATE, FY 2011 FUNDING ALLOCATION,
AND FY 2011 LAND MANAGEMENT GRANT CRITERIA

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

The purpose of this report is to discuss minor updates to the approved five-year EMP funding strategy, the allocation of FY 2011 funding for regional management and monitoring activities, and modifications to land management grant criteria for FY 2011.

Discussion
Five-Year Funding Strategy and FY 2011 Allocations

On February 22, 2008, the SANDAG Board of Directors entered into a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with state and federal agencies on the implementation of the EMP. A provision of the MOA allocates $4 million annually for 10 years to implement regional habitat management and monitoring efforts to help maintain the region’s biological integrity, thus avoiding the future listing of endangered species. Allocation of the $4 million is done on an annual basis by the SANDAG Board of Directors pursuant to a Five-Year Funding Strategy (original approved on December 15, 2006, and subsequently updated by the Board of Directors on September 25, 2009). This five-year funding strategy is designed to chart a course for the funding of land management and monitoring activities under the EMP with allocations to implement this strategy approved annually.
On July 13, 2010, and September 9, 2010, the EMP Working Group (an advisory group to the Regional Planning Committee on TransNet EMP implementation) reviewed the Five-Year Funding Strategy and developed recommendations for funding allocations for Fiscal Year 2011 and revisions to the Five-Year Funding Strategy (Attachments 1 and 2). Beyond some minor edits to the task names, the only new activities being recommended to the Five-Year Funding Strategy are: “Invasive Animal Species Removal” and an “Emergency Land Management Fund.” The former task reflects a need to target non-native invasive animal species in open space areas that are impacting native habitat and species (e.g., bullfrogs, exotic turtles, parasitic birds). The latter task is a result of identification by regional land managers of the need for a source of contingency funds to address land management emergencies that occur between funding cycles (e.g., fire, floods, sudden outbreak of aggressive weed species or disease).

The Emergency Land Management Funding task was discussed extensively by the EMP Working Group who recognized the need for such a fund, but with strict parameters on its approval and use. The EMP Working Group is recommending a process of allocation as shown in Attachment 3. If approved, this process would give strict control over the type of projects that would qualify for the funding and authorize the Executive Director’s approval, in accordance with the delegation granted in Board Policy No. 017, based upon the written support from a cross-section of technical experts not affiliated with the request. It is expected that if approved, this task this would be reviewed to determine its success prior to any additional requests for future funding allotments.

The proposed funding levels for Fiscal Year 2011 are consistent with the adopted TransNet EMP MOA, and the TransNet Extension Ordinance.

**TransNet EMP FY 2011 Land Management Grant Criteria**

The proposed Five-Year Funding Strategy and proposed Fiscal Year 2011 funding allotments, contains a competitive grant program to assist land managers in the region to maintain the existing habitat and native species. This in turn will help to reduce the need to list species as endangered and avoid delay to regional infrastructure projects. Four previous cycles of the competitive grant program have occurred; each time improving in the quality and focus of the submitted grants (see June 4, 2010 RPC Agenda, Item 5 for more details).

The EMP Working Group has reviewed the past four cycles of the land management grant program to try to seek improvements and better streamline the process. The EMP Working Group concluded that the competitive land management grant process has proven to be a successful in the distribution of needed funding to the land managers in the region, and that the funding is being distributed across the region.

For Fiscal Year 2011, the EMP Working Group is recommending revisions to eligibility and ranking criteria to align the competitive grant program funding to better reflect the most at risk habitats and species, while still maintaining some funding for general habitat related management. For the proposed Fiscal Year 2011 funding of $1.95 million, the recommended eligible projects and the proposed funding allotment are as follows:

1. Invasive Control and Habitat Restoration ($950,000),
2. Species-Specific Management ($650,000), and
3. Habitat Maintenance, Access Control/Management and Volunteer Coordination ($350,000).

These eligible activities are similar to previous cycles, but with more specificity in key habitats, species and division of available funding. Details on these eligible activities are described in Attachment 4. The EMP Working Group has recommended that the eligible projects be evaluated against a revised evaluation and prioritization criteria specific to the three types of eligible projects as shown in Attachment 4. No other changes in process or content are proposed for the land management grants in Fiscal Year 11.

Next Steps

With the Regional Planning Committee’s approval, these recommendations on the Five-Year Funding Strategy, the Fiscal Year 2011 allotments and the revised land management grant criteria will be presented to the Transportation Committee for recommendation and the SANDAG Board of Directors for approval in January 2011.

CHARLES “MUGGS” STOLL
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachments: 1. Summary of Recommended FY 11 Funding Allocations
2. Updated Conceptual Five-Year Funding Strategy
3. Recommended Criteria for FY 11 Emergency Land Management Funding
4. FY 11 Land Management Grants – Eligible Projects, and Evaluation and Prioritization Criteria

Key Staff Contact: Keith Greer, (619) 699-7390, kgr@sandag.org
## Summary of Recommended FY 2011 Funding Allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Funding Allocated Prior Years FY 06-10</th>
<th>Proposed Funding FY 2011</th>
<th>Recommended Approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Coordination</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Developer/Administrator</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>RFP once existing contract expires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS Specialist</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>Continue to fund SANDAG staff and USFWS staff working on these activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Database Support</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>Fund through procurement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Regional Coordination</strong></td>
<td>$1,590,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Management</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conserved Lands Database</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>Continue to fund SANDAG staff working on these activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Management Implementation</td>
<td>$5,280,000</td>
<td>$1,950,000</td>
<td>Competitive grant process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Land Management Fund¹</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>Contract to qualifying land manager²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invasive Animal Species Removal¹</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
<td>Fund through procurement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Updated Vegetation Mapping</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>Fund through existing contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Regional Management</strong></td>
<td>$8,935,000</td>
<td>$2,575,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Monitoring</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Fire Monitoring</td>
<td>$1,725,000</td>
<td>$325,000</td>
<td>Fund through existing MOA with USGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetation Monitoring</td>
<td>$295,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>Fund through existing contract with SDSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rare Butterfly Monitoring</td>
<td>$230,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>Fund through procurement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife Corridor Monitoring</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>Fund through procurement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Wildlife Monitoring</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>Fund through procurement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Regional Monitoring</strong></td>
<td>$4,475,000</td>
<td>$925,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL FUNDING STRATEGY</strong></td>
<td>$15,000,000</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Some activities will require implementation over multiple years.

---

¹ Proposed new task added to the Five-Year Funding Strategy.
² See Attachment 3 for details on use of the fund.
Five-Year Funding Strategy for Management and Monitoring
SANDAG Board of Directors approved December 15, 2006
Last updated by SANDAG Board September 25, 2009
Proposed Transportation Committee Update December 17, 2010
Proposed Board of Directors Update January 2011

Background

This attachment provides specific details on the activities and funding allocations related to management and monitoring under the TransNet Environmental Mitigation. This includes a conceptual five-year funding strategy (page 9) to serve as a future blueprint for management and monitoring activities and funding allocations.

Regional Coordination

Currently, there is an effort to close the gap in the regional coordination of management and monitoring. SANDAG, through its Regional Conservation Fund, has assisted with the coordination of the habitat preserve activities at a regional level. Coordination is required to comprehensively identify gaps in resources, knowledge, leveraging funds, and developing cost-effective programming. Initial starts by the South County Land Manager Group and by the newly formed North County Lands Managers Group are starting to close these gaps. The following activities will help to assist these efforts.

Program Developer/ Program Administrator

The Program Developer helped to create the San Diego Management and Monitoring Program (SDMMP). After this contract ends in July 2011, it is envisioned that this position will take on more of the overarching administrator functions to coordinate among federal, state, local agencies and non-profits, to assist in leveraging funding, and to guide regional monitoring efforts. Until a regional funding source is identified, the Program Administrator will be an independent contractor of SANDAG.

Role and functions of the Program Administrator:

- Review other regional habitat preservation programs, institutional structures, and operations as models for a San Diego regional coordinating entity.
- Define the roles and functions of staff of the regional coordinating entity, with a reporting structure.
- Draft mission statement, charter, and other governing documents.
- Draft a scope of work and contract for the next three to five years based on the TransNet needs assessment.
- Draft a scope-of-work and structure for science advisors.
• Identify complementary roles and in-kind contributions of agencies and partner groups, including the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, California Department of Fish and Game, U.S. Geological Survey (USGS), San Diego Natural History Museum, Conservation Resource Network, etc.

• Re-evaluate Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) implementation committees (e.g., Interagency Coordinating Committee, Habitat Management Technical Committee.)

• Prepare and oversee the work plan for the Management and Monitoring Coordinator

• Identify and collaborate with other state and federal programs (e.g. FWS Landscape Conservation Collaborative, Partners In Flight, etc.) to help them implement actions/programs complementary to the monitoring and management goals in San Diego County.

• Prepare annual budget recommendations to implement the monitoring, management and connectivity strategic plans and annually oversee their updates.

Management and Monitoring Coordinator

The Management and Monitoring Coordinator is the lead for bringing the regional management and monitoring efforts into close coordination, ensuring that monitoring data is used to inform management of preserves, monitoring efforts are focused at providing the data needed by preserve managers, and that management actions implemented by preserve managers will, in aggregate, help achieve species and habitat goals.

Specific Roles and Responsibilities include:

• Utilize existing (or establish additional) land management groups to help identify regional management issues (management/focal species, invasive species, habitats and threats/stressors etc.), identify priorities for management actions based on priorities, risk levels and other considerations.

• Identify land managers for each preserve area by watershed, utilize their experience to identify cost-effective methods to address specific threats/stressors and identify appropriate technical assistance to help land managers.

• Work with an advisor group and land managers to develop a multi-year budget, to address high priority actions identified in the strategic plan (including invasive species) and establish a time frame for periodic review of management actions and evaluate their success at meeting specific objectives.

• Develop a regional Geographic Information System (GIS) database of management action locations including habitat restoration efforts, location of invasive species, and edge effects (increased urban runoff which modifies habitats, illegal trails, trash dumping etc.) common to multiple preserves. Track efforts including costs and evaluate their success.

• Work with an advisor group, land managers, public agencies, and stakeholders within the watershed to allocate available funding for implementation of priority actions identified in the strategic plan. Review budgets annually.
• Oversee and manage contracts for funded projects

• Coordinate the collection and analysis of monitoring data throughout San Diego County with an emphasis on permitted jurisdictions within the NCCP.

• Coordinate with the wildlife agencies on monitoring priorities.

• Coordinate and make recommendations for future grant proposals.

• Work with the wildlife agencies and science advisors to develop training workshops for field data collection efforts.

• Prepare and oversee the work plan for the program science support biologist

This position would be an independent contractor and report to the Program Developer/Administrator with oversight from SANDAG.

**Biologist/Scientist**

The Biologist/Scientist will provide the science support for the Management and Monitoring Coordinator and the Program Developer/Administrator. This position will be the lead for on-the-ground activities and evaluations of activities.

Specific Roles and Responsibilities include:

• Providing biological input for updating the 5-year horizon monitoring and adaptive management program documents.

• Organizing workshops to obtain input from scientists on priority monitoring and adaptive management needs.

• Literature review and synthesis.

• Synthesizing and analyzing monitoring data.

• Reviewing biologically based management practices.

• Designing monitoring strategies/protocols (including cost analyses) for monitoring Risk Group 2 species (and any other species identified as a priority monitoring species).

• Developing a prioritized research needs list.

• Preparing grant proposal to help implement elements of the adaptive management and monitoring programs and identified research needs.

• Assisting with the design and coordination of the connectivity monitoring efforts.

• Developing a matrix of similarities/differences in preserve management issues including habitats and species.
• Identifying mechanisms to engage preserve managers’ participation in preserve management coordination efforts/meetings; preparing synthesized and analyzed data sets utilizing the multi-taxa database and using the products to inform the stakeholders on the benefits and use of the database to help inform management and monitoring efforts.

This position would be an independent contractor (or part of a university lead effort) and report to the Monitoring and Management Coordinator with oversight from SANDAG.

GIS and Database Support

The GIS Specialist would take data collected by the region and incorporate it into a geographic information system for analysis. The GIS Specialist would also initiate a regional database for management and monitoring data that could serve as a regional hub for information collection, analysis and sharing.

Additional contract positions and support may be required in future years depending on the progress and needs of the regional coordination entity. Annual funding requests would be required to be approved by the SANDAG Board in the future prior to pursuing any new contract positions.

Administrative and Science Support

Implementing a county-wide effort to coordinate the coordination and logistical functions of land managers and biological monitoring will require administrative support (office space, computers administration, etc.) and specific scientific support to address key issues that arise. It is envisioned that the science support would be a short-term, specific issue assist that could come from local universities or species specific experts.

Regional Management

Lands preserved as part of the regional habitat conservation plans need to be actively managed to retain and, in many cases, enhance their quality as habitat for the covered species. The EMPWG identified a preliminary list of regional management issues. These included invasive plants, invasive animals, off-road vehicle impacts, use of grazing as a management tool, fire management, and restoration of native habitats, erosion, and control of runoff.

Conserved Lands Database

This completed project developed a GIS data layer of all the existing lands conserved in San Diego County. The data layer was reviewed by regional stakeholders and land managers. Future activities include adding more information on the management and monitoring activities associated with each parcel and keeping the database current.

Regional Land Management Grants

Since 2006, SANDAG has solicited land management grant applications from land managers around the region to provide funding to address regional habitat management issues such as: invasive species, post wildfire recovery, habitat restoration and access control and litter removal. This program is designed to provide critical funding to address management efforts that, if left unaddressed, could lead to regional impediments to protecting habitats and endangered species. For Fiscal Year 2011, the focus of the call for projects will be on weed removal and habitat restoration; projects to help specific imperiled species, and general land stewardship.
Emergency Land Management Actions (proposed new task added FY 2011)

Emergencies can arise in the course of the management of land that need to be addressed promptly or severe ramifications could occur. This proposed new funding allotment would allow a small contingency of funds to be reserved to address emergencies where no other funding source exists. The funds would only be used if findings could be made to the satisfaction of the SANDAG Executive Director, or his/her designee, with the support of an oversight committee comprised of members including the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, California Department of Fish and Game, TransNet EMP Program Manager, and an at-large member of the EMP Working Group representing land managers.

Invasive Weed Control and Removal

This project has been initiated and would create a strategic plan(s) for invasive weed removal. Timing and allocations of the funds would be established in the strategic plan(s). This multi-year effort would identify the key species and priority areas, and methods to address invasive species in the region. The goal is to identify where funding would most efficiently be spent to address invasive species.

Invasive Animal Species Removal (new task added FY 2011)

Similar to invasive weeds, several non-native, exotic animal species have been impacting the regional preserve system. Species like bullfrogs and red-eared slider turtles are displacing native amphibian species. Cowbirds, a non-native bird that parasitizes the nest of other birds, have been shown to decrease the populations of endangered bird species in San Diego. This task would allow funds to be made available to address the removal of these species and enhance the population of native fauna.

Updated Vegetation Mapping

The existing regional vegetation database is, in some areas, over ten years old. In addition, the vegetation classifications have error rates of 35 percent to 45 percent (San Diego State University 1995) and 34 percent (USFWS 2002). This update is approximately halfway completed. A new classification system for mapping vegetation in San Diego is being finalized. The new system is more applicable to track changes in vegetation over time and, thus, will aid land managers in tracking their management efforts. This classification system would be used to revise the current vegetation mapping starting in winter of 2011.

Open Space Enforcement

Illegal off-highway vehicle use, dumping of litter, hunting, and other illegal uses impact the open space areas set aside for habitat conservation and legal public recreation. A one-year pilot project is underway which is allowing SANDAG to work with the Sheriff Department Off-road Enforcement Team and the California Department of Fish and Game Enforcement Branch to determine the success of the increased presence of enforcement as an effective means to deter illegal uses in open space. The results of this one-year effort will determine a course of action for future enforcement recommendations.
Standardized Management Plans

Standardization of Natural Resource Management Plans is critical to assure coordination among the region’s land managers. This standardized plan or template would identify and prioritize the specific species populations and vegetation communities to be managed in a given area and identify activities, specific to individual regions, core areas, or linkages of the jurisdiction, that address specific covered species requirements and the individual preserve objectives. The management plan template will include recommendations and protocols for how to collect this type of data and how the preserve managers could adapt their management as new information is provided from monitoring or changes in methodologies. The goal would be to develop a unified resource management plan that is grounded in an adaptive management framework.

Regional Monitoring

Lands preserved as part of the regional conservation plans need to be actively monitored to evaluate their success at effectively conserving the covered species and maintaining the processes that allow for their persistence. Contractors are in various stages of updating the biological monitoring plans for the MSCP, which can serve as a model for all other San Diego conservation plans. The contractors working on the monitoring plans have consistently commented on the need for regional coordination and an institutional structure. The following list of actions is needed to address biological monitoring in the region.

Post-Fire Monitoring

Approximately 300,000 acres were burned in the Cedar and Otay Fires in San Diego County in the fall of 2003. This included approximately half of the natural lands of the County of San Diego MSCP planning area. The USGS, in coordination with the USFWS, CDFG, and County of San Diego, have completed a five-year study on the impacts of these massive fires, and resultant changes in vegetation communities, vegetation structure, and prey availability over the period beginning in 2005. The USGS also has pre-fire data (some dating back to 1995) from within the footprint of both the Cedar and Otay Fires providing for an excellent pre- and post-burn analysis.

What has been learned from these studies has helped refine future post-fire monitoring efforts. Specifically the five-year funding strategy envisions continued monitoring of focal small vertebrate communities that have not recovered since the fires, a 4th year of monitoring for riparian birds located in the 2007 burn areas and control sites, and synthesized data collected across all species’ taxa on the fire responses to develop adaptive management actions that will be implemented to manage for diversity following similar future fire events.

Vegetation Monitoring

Monitoring the conditions of the vegetation provides a surrogate for the conditions of the habitat of endangered species. Monitoring has been started through San Diego State to look at the most efficient and cost-effective approaches towards monitoring the vegetative conditions of the open space lands. This is especially critical since the 2003 and 2004 wildfires. The following activities are envisioned for the five-year strategic plan:
• Continued vegetation monitoring in the spring of 2011 to determine the inter-annual variation in vegetation communities. The addition of a structural monitoring element to look at physical aspects such as shrub height, gap size, and bare ground to address correlates with the vegetation conditions;

• A comparative analysis of the vegetation conditions to other vegetation monitoring data to determine the repeatability, compatibility and increase the same size of the current efforts;

• A direct comparison of various vegetation monitoring efforts and techniques (field vs. remote sensing) to determine the cost-effectiveness of these approaches to establish a best management practice.

**Rare Plant Monitoring Protocols**

This activity would provide standardization for the required monitoring of rare and endangered plants in the NCCP preserves. The analysis of 11 years of rare plant monitoring data has been completed by the U.S. Geological Survey under contract to SANDAG. The next steps for this activity include:

• Development of an expert oversight committee to assist in the development of the rare plant protocol development.

• Prepare standardized final protocols for monitoring rare plants.

• Train others to utilize the protocols.

**California Gnatcatcher Monitoring**

As the flagship species of the NCCP, monitoring of the California Gnatcatcher is required for the regional preserves. The USFWS has developed a new protocol for conducting California Gnatcatcher monitoring. The protocol was peer reviewed, and monitoring was completed in 2002 (Orange County and parts of San Diego County), 2004 (MSCP areas only) using this new protocol, and 2007 and 2009 throughout the San Diego region. Information provided by these efforts has led to the conclusion that monitoring for this species could be reduced to one every three years redirecting efforts to other taxa.

**Burrowing Owl Monitoring**

Western Burrowing owls have been reported to be on the decline across the majority of their range for over a decade. The decline is recognized by ornithologists working in California, where it is a Species of Special Concern, and in San Diego, the decline could be described as precipitous. The San Diego Bird Atlas reports that only eight of the 28 locals prior to 1997 still have owls. Burrowing owls also are a covered species under the San Diego MSCP, as well as other Habitat Conservation Programs. Systematic surveys in Southern San Diego County were completed in 2010 and the results are being analyzed. A coordination committee led by the San Diego Management and Monitoring Program, which includes the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, California Department of Fish and Game, San Diego State University, U.S. Geological Survey and the San Diego Zoological Society, will be discussing options for future burrowing owl efforts.
Rare Butterfly Monitoring

San Diego County contains several rare butterflies that are declining for unknown reasons. These butterflies are part of the regional open space system and additional monitoring is needed to determine the distribution, abundance and threats to their populations and habitat. Currently survey work is being conducted for the Thorne’s hairstreak and Hermes copper butterflies. Both of these species were dramatically impacted by the 2003 and 2007 wildfires.

Wildlife Corridor Monitoring

It is well understood in the scientific literature that fragmentation and isolation of open space areas will lead to the extinctions of native species. Maintaining the connectivity between open space and enhancing existing connections is critical. Currently the San Diego Management and Monitoring Program is working with specific experts to design a strategy for wildlife corridor monitoring that includes specific objectives and a scope of work.

Other Wildlife Monitoring

San Diego State has conducted a peer review of the monitoring plan for the region and has indicated a prioritization for various faunal monitoring. The key species (priority 1) have been addressed above. There are several priority 2 species that should also be addressed. The specific species and scope of the study would still need to be established prior to initiating the monitoring over the coming years.
## TransNet Environmental Mitigation Program
### Conceptual Five-Year Funding Strategy
#### Proposed FY 11 Update

### A. Proposed Prior FYs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>FY06-10</th>
<th>FY 07</th>
<th>FY 08</th>
<th>FY 09</th>
<th>FY 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Developer/Administrator</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Coordinator</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring Coordinator</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management &amp; Monitoring Coordinator</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biologist</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative &amp; Science Support</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS Support</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Database Support</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$130,000</td>
<td>$130,000</td>
<td>$130,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal Regional Coordination**

$1,590,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>FY06-10</th>
<th>FY 07</th>
<th>FY 08</th>
<th>FY 09</th>
<th>FY 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conserved Lands Database Development</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Management Implementation</td>
<td>$7,365,000</td>
<td>$1,950,000</td>
<td>$1,640,000</td>
<td>$2,040,000</td>
<td>$2,290,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Land Management Fund</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invasive Plant Species Mapping</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invasive Animal Species Removal</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Updated Vegetation Mapping</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement</td>
<td>$370,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preserve level management plan standardization</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal Regional Management**

$8,935,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>FY06-10</th>
<th>FY 07</th>
<th>FY 08</th>
<th>FY 09</th>
<th>FY 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post Fire Monitoring/ Recovery Planning</td>
<td>$1,725,000</td>
<td>$325,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetation Monitoring</td>
<td>$295,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$165,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rare and Endemic Plant Monitoring</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$295,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Gnatcatcher Monitoring &amp; Recovery</td>
<td>$740,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$445,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Coastal Cactus Wren Monitoring &amp; Recovery</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burrowing Owl Monitoring</td>
<td>$295,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rare Butterfly Monitoring</td>
<td>$230,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife Corridor and Linkages Monitoring</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Species Monitoring (e.g. priority 2 species)</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal Regional Monitoring**

$4,475,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>FY06-10</th>
<th>FY 07</th>
<th>FY 08</th>
<th>FY 09</th>
<th>FY 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL FUNDING STRATEGY</td>
<td>$15,000,000</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Some activities will require implementation over multiple years.

**1 Funds encumbered in FY10 are available in FY 2011**
Recommended Criteria for Emergency Land Management Funding
Propose Fiscal Year 2011

If approved, this funding would allow for an emergency response to address land management issues that arise between land management grant cycles. This program would be structured to fund “first year” emergency actions where no other funding sources are readily available within the time period needed to address the emergency. It is assumed that follow up adaptive management and monitoring actions could be funded through the annual allocation of management and monitoring funds via the TransNet EMP annual budget approval process or other local, state, or federal funding sources. This program would apply to the covered species, habitats, linkages and corridors identified in the San Diego county Natural Communities Conservation Planning program.

The initial funding allocation ($150,000), if unused, would roll over to subsequent years until an account of $500,000 was established. The fund would be replenished as needed during the annual TransNet EMP annual budget cycle.

Authorization to utilize these funds would occur pursuant to SANDAG Board Policy No. 017 (Delegation of Authority) using the following criteria as guidance:

- A sudden and clear threat to a major population(s) of a covered species or sensitive habitat has been documented and a clear method to address the issue has been proposed; or

- A catastrophic event that severely impacts population(s) of covered species or wildlife movement (examples include, fires, flooding, landslides, hazardous waste spills);

- Immediate action necessary to rehabilitate or eliminate illegal human activities that severely threaten the integrity of a preserve, by impacts to large populations of covered species, sensitive habitats or wildlife linkages (examples include, restoration of illegal grading, elimination of the sudden expansion of feral invasive animals, controlling access of the sudden increase in off-highway vehicles),

- A documented rapid or early invasion of habitat by aggressive invasive species with the potential to severely alter ecosystem dynamics (e.g., fire frequency, flooding, salinity). Examples include the identification of an aggressive invasive species new to the County, or an invasive species known to occur in the County but previously undocumented in a regional preserve.
Eligible Projects

It is being recommended to the SANDAG Board of Directors that $1.95 million of Fiscal Year 2011 funding be allotted to a competitive land management grant program to address invasive species control and restoration of degraded habitat areas, management to preclude damage caused by human use, and species-specific management. Review of the monitoring data collected since 1997 indicates some species and habitats are at significant risk due to a variety of stressors and that action is needed to reverse downward trends in habitat or species conditions. It is envisioned that the $1.95 million would be part of a multi-year strategic approach that includes one or more of the following eligible activities:

1. **Invasive Control and Habitat Restoration** ($950,000) – Projects that reduce existing or emerging invasive species that threaten endangered and/or other sensitive species AND that engage in active habitat restoration on degraded habitat lands to promote recovery of native vegetation communities and/or threatened, endangered, and other sensitive species habitat. Projects that focus on the following vegetation communities will be given the highest priority for funding:
   - Grasslands
   - Maritime succulent scrub/Coastal bluff scrub
   - Coastal sage Scrub
   - Riparian and Inland aquatic systems, including vernal pools.

2. **Species-Specific Management** ($650,000) – Projects that focus on managing species at risk of extirpation to species covered under the regional habitat conservation plans, generally by identifying and reducing threats, and that include monitoring to demonstrate success at increasing or stabilizing populations. Pursuant to a regional assessment of monitoring efforts conducted in 2010, the following species have been determined to be the highest at risk species in the region where land management activities could benefit existing populations. Projects that focus on the following species will be given the highest priority for funding:
   - Western pond turtle
   - Coastal cactus wren
   - Golden Eagle
   - Nuttall’s lotus
   - San Diego ambrosia
   - San Diego thornmint
   - Short-leaved dudleya
   - Sticky dudleya
   - Orcutt’s spineflower

3. **Habitat Maintenance, Access Control/Management and Volunteer Coordination** ($350,000) – Regular day-to-day habitat maintenance, management of public use combined with monitoring of effects on species and habitats, and the coordination of volunteer programs
to implement management actions. This includes signage (both interpretive and cautionary), education, erosion control, culvert maintenance, fencing, patrolling public use, costs related to volunteer coordination, law enforcement, and efforts to remove garbage in existing preserve systems to allow habitat areas to recover. Eligible projects also include data collection/monitoring to:

- Determine the effects of public use on species and vegetation communities
- Track types, quantity, and seasonality of public use
- Assess areas for compatible public use prior to allowing access.

Projects that are not ready to start within 12 months of submission of the application to SANDAG will not be eligible for this funding cycle. Projects approved by the SANDAG Board of Directors for funding, that do not start within one year of the awarded grant agreement’s execution will be at risk of losing their funding. Projects will only be funded for a maximum of 3 years initially.

**Project Evaluation and Ranking**

The following evaluation and ranking criteria will be used by an evaluation committee made up of EMP Working Group Members and outside technical experts NOT applying for land management grants.

**Eligible Activity: 1. Invasive Control and Habitat Restoration Projects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Point Range</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Maximum Score Possible</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of management of vegetation communities and/or exotic species may result in extirpation of covered species</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project addresses species or vegetation community at highest risk of loss</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical linkage parcels or in regional wildlife corridor</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long term success of management activities is likely with clear measurable positive results which will reduce future land management costs. Success criteria have been identified and will be monitored and reported. (High Cost-Effectiveness)</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urgent action is needed to address a problem that would severely degrade a sensitive vegetation community</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project part of a larger strategic effort which covers a large area with multiple partners and multiple benefits? High Economy-of-Scale</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sufficient matching funds available to complete the project | 0-5 | 3 | 15
---|---|---|---
Project promotes public awareness of sustainable land management through public outreach and participation | 0-5 | 2 | 10
---|---|---|---
Total | | | 160

Eligible Activity: 2. *Species-Specific Management*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Point Range</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Maximum Score Possible</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of management of vegetation communities and/or exotic species may result in extirpation of covered species</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project addresses species or vegetation community at highest risk of loss.</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical linkage parcels or in regional wildlife corridor</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long term success of management activities is likely with clear measurable positive results which will reduce future land management costs. Success criteria have been identified and will be monitored and reported. (High Cost-Effectiveness)</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urgent action is needed to address a problem that would severely degrade a sensitive vegetation community</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project part of a larger strategic effort which covers a large area with multiple partners and multiple benefits? High Economy-of-Scale</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient matching funds available to complete the project</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project promotes public awareness of sustainable land management through public outreach and participation</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Eligible Activity: 3. Habitat Maintenance, Access Control/Management and Volunteer Coordination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Point Range</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Maximum Score Possible</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of management of vegetation communities and/or exotic species may result in extirpation of covered species</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project addresses species or vegetation community at highest risk of loss.</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical linkage parcels or in regional wildlife corridor</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long term success of management activities is likely with clear measurable positive results which will reduce future land management costs. Success criteria have been identified and will be monitored and reported. (High Cost-Effectiveness)</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urgent action is needed to address a problem that would severely degrade a sensitive vegetation community</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project part of a larger strategic effort which covers a large area with multiple partners and multiple benefits? High Economy-of-Scale</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient matching funds available to complete the project</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project promotes public awareness of sustainable land management through public outreach and participation</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>145</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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AGENDA ITEM NO.: 5

Action Requested: RECOMMEND

COMMUNITIES PUTTING PREVENTION TO WORK:
GRANT PROGRAMS EVALUATION CRITERIA AND PROCESS

File Number 3300500

Introduction

In March 2010, the County of San Diego Health and Human Services Agency (HHSA) received $16.1 million from the federal Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) for the Communities Putting Prevention to Work (CPPW) program. The overarching goal of the CPPW program is to expand the use of evidence-based strategies and programs to address obesity rates, physical inactivity, and poor nutrition in the San Diego region.

In June 2010, SANDAG staff provided the Regional Planning Committee (RPC) with an overview of the CPPW program and SANDAG’s role in implementing six initiatives that relate to transportation and land use planning and policy in the San Diego region (Attachment 1). Two of the initiatives will provide pass-through grant programs to local agencies, tribal governments, community programs, and school districts. These initiatives include:

- Healthy Communities Campaign (HCC); and
- Safe Routes to School (SR2S) Implementation.

HCC includes the following two pass-through grant programs:

- Healthy Community Planning Grants will provide a total of $700,000 to incorporate public health into local planning efforts. SANDAG will award a minimum of six (6) grants, with at least one in each County of San Diego Board of Supervisor district. Grant awards are expected to range from $50,000 to $75,000 each.

- Active Community Transportation Grants will provide a total of $150,000 to promote pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly neighborhoods. SANDAG will award a minimum of three (3) grants for this program. Grant awards are expected to range from $30,000 to $50,000 each.

Recommendation

The Regional Planning Committee is asked to recommend that the Board of Directors approve the proposed grant program objectives, eligibility, evaluation criteria, and process as shown in Attachment 2.
SR2S Implementation includes the following two pass-through grant programs:

- Safe Routes to School Capacity Building and Planning Grants will provide five (5) grants of approximately $50,000, for a total of $250,000, to support comprehensive SR2S planning.

- Safe Routes to School Education, Encouragement, and Enforcement Grants will provide five (5) grants of approximately $10,000, for a total of $50,000, to fund programs that encourage and educate students, parents, school officials, and other community stakeholders on walking and bicycling to school safely.

### Pass-Through Grants Program Timeline

Under the terms of the CPPW grant, all projects must be completed by March 2012. The following grant program timeline was developed in order to meet that requirement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Call for Projects Released</td>
<td>December 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant Workshop</td>
<td>January 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Due Date</td>
<td>Mid-February 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Awards</td>
<td>Mid-March 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Start Date</td>
<td>Mid-April 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Completion Date</td>
<td>February 1, 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Discussion

On October 19 and 21, 2010, SANDAG staff held two workshops to seek initial input on preliminary draft grant program objectives, eligibility, evaluation criteria, and process (Attachment 2). Members of the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG), Public Health Stakeholder Group (PHSG), and Safe Routes to School Coordination Team were invited to these workshops.

SANDAG staff has also presented the draft evaluation criteria and process at the following meetings for review and feedback: the Joint TWG and Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) meeting on October 28; the San Diego Regional Traffic Engineers Council (SANTEC) meeting on November 18; and the Bicycle-Pedestrian Working Group meeting on November 17, 2010.

### Board Policy No. 033

Policy No. 033 broadly applies to discretionary funding that SANDAG allocates to cities within and/or the County of San Diego. This policy defines discretionary funding as, “funds allocated by SANDAG only to local jurisdictions (the cities or County) through a competitive process.” It also states that funds not subject to this provision would include, among others, “Funds which can be allocated to entities other than local jurisdictions.” Eligible recipients of the CPPW pass-through grants include tribal governments, school districts, and community groups, not just the local jurisdictions within the County of San Diego. For these reasons, the CPPW pass-through grants are not subject to Policy No. 033.
Next Steps

SANDAG staff will incorporate the RPC’s comments into a final draft call for projects, for the four pass-through grant programs, which will be presented to the SANDAG Board of Directors on December 17, 2010, with a recommendation for approval.

CHARLES "MUGGS" STOLL
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachments: 1. Communities Putting Prevention to Work Fact Sheet
              2. Draft Evaluation Criteria and Process for Communities Putting Prevention to Work Pass-Through Grant Programs

Key Staff Contact: Vikrant Sood, (619) 699-6940, vso@sandag.org
Communities Putting Prevention to Work
Fact Sheet

OVERVIEW

What is it? A $372 million nationwide grant program for the purpose of combating obesity and tobacco use.

How are funds coming to the San Diego region? The County Health and Human Services Agency (HHSA) applied for a grant under the obesity control component of the program. The CDC awarded $16.1 million to the County, the largest grant in the country for obesity control.

How is SANDAG involved? The County of San Diego HHSA has partnered with SANDAG as a subcontractor under the grant to help implement the components of the project related to regional planning issues, active transportation, and safe routes to school. This work will be supported by $3 million in grant funds.

How will local agencies be involved? There will be several opportunities for local agencies that want to be involved in the project. The Communities Putting Prevention to Work (CPPW) grant will fund pass-through grants to local agencies, and an ad hoc working group with local agency staff participation will be formed to help SANDAG implement its component of the grant program.

PROGRAM SCHEDULE

The grant program is a component of the federal ARRA effort to provide economic stimulus funds. As such, the program must be completed within two years under the following proposed schedule.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grant award notification</td>
<td>March 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executed contract between County and SANDAG</td>
<td>August 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANDAG work commences</td>
<td>August 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass through grants awarded</td>
<td>Fall/Winter 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant-funded interventions completed</td>
<td>February 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant program completed</td>
<td>March 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GRANT-FUNDED INTERVENTIONS

Health Impact Assessment and Forecasting

Utilizing consultant assistance and SANDAG’s regional modeling staff, this work will:

- develop a GIS-based regional health impact assessment tool to identify key areas where public health disparities can best be addressed with planning an infrastructure investments;
- add a health outcomes component to SANDAG’s CommunityViz sketch planning tool; and
- provide support for the update of SANDAG’s activity-based regional transportation model to better account for and forecast nonmotorized trips.
Regional Comprehensive Planning Policies

With the help of a planning and public health specialist, this work will:

- identify the public health impacts of transportation and land use decisions, provide options for integrating public health consideration into regional planning;
- develop recommendations for public health goals and objectives for the Regional Comprehensive Plan and Regional Transportation Plan; and
- develop metrics necessary to monitor progress.

Health Communities Campaign

This component of the grant will develop, implement, and support two pass-through grant programs:

- $700,000 for grants to local agencies to add public health components to local planning efforts; and
- $150,000 for Active Community Transportation Studies to develop comprehensive approaches for creating bicycle- and pedestrian-friendly neighborhoods.

Countywide Safe Routes to School (SRTS) Strategic Plan and Implementation Resources

SANDAG will develop a countywide SRTS strategic plan, and provide pass-through grants:

- $250,000 capacity building and planning grants; and
- $50,000 for education, encouragement, and enforcement campaigns.

Active Commuter Transportation Campaign

Through iCommute, this project will support efforts in FY 2011 to expand bike-to-work promotions over the entire month of May, including employer outreach and bike commute training. It also will support development of a walking school bus program and bike buddies program that will complement the SRTS initiative.

Regional Bicycle Plan Implementation

This effort will begin implementation of the Regional Bicycle Plan, scheduled to be adopted in May 2010. It will develop and produce regional bikeway corridor and wayfinding signs, and, in cooperation with local agencies, begin installation of the signs. It also will produce promotional materials about the regional bikeway network.
Healthy Communities Campaign

1. Healthy Community Planning Grants
The Healthy Community Planning Grants will provide a total of $700,000 to incorporate public health into local planning efforts. SANDAG will award a minimum of six (6) grants, with at least one in each County of San Diego Board of Supervisor District. Grant awards are expected to range from $50,000 to $75,000 each.

A. Program Objectives
The Healthy Community Planning Grants will promote public health principles at the local and regional level by funding projects that:

- Integrate and institutionalize public health considerations in the local and regional policies, programs, projects, and decision-making;
- Address health disparities and inequities in lower income and minority communities;
- Promote physical activity by increasing opportunities for walking, bicycling, parks and recreation, and the use of public transit;
- Promote access to healthy, fresh, affordable, and nutritious foods in neighborhoods and schools;
- Establish collaborative working relationships between health and planning agencies; and
- Build consensus in the community around public health needs and priorities through an inclusive process that engages a wide range of stakeholders.

B. Eligibility
Only cities, the County of San Diego, and Tribal Governments are eligible to apply. Nonprofit and community-based organizations may partner with public agencies, but cannot apply directly to the grant program. Grant applicants are encouraged to partner with other public agencies, such as HHSA and local school districts, as well as community-based organizations, where appropriate.

Existing projects are eligible for the grant program as long as the application proposes an expanded scope or additional deliverables. For example, a city that is currently updating its general plan may be eligible to apply for developing a stand-alone health element if it is not already included in the scope of work. Also, a city that is developing a health element for its general plan update may be eligible to apply for developing an implementation plan.
C. Type of Projects
SANDAG encourages grant applicants to be creative and innovative in defining the projects for this grant program. While the proposed projects should strive to meet most if not all the objectives, the type of projects, the approach, and key deliverables and outcomes are best defined by the needs of the community and agencies.

Grant applicants may consider one of two approaches in defining potential projects: a comprehensive approach that addresses multiple health outcomes and built environment determinants; and a targeted approach that drills deeper in specific areas. Projects that adopt a comprehensive approach may include but are not limited to:

- Public health elements for general plans, redevelopment plans, community plans, or specific plans; and
- Zoning codes, street design guidelines or subdivision ordinances that integrate public health principles.

Projects that adopt a targeted approach may include but are not limited to:

- Health impact assessments for transportation and infrastructure projects, redevelopment projects, or corridor studies;
- Urban agriculture or food systems assessments and/or implementation plans;
- “Edible schoolyards”, outdoor learning environments, community gardens and farmer’s markets assessment and implementation strategies; and
- Park master plans or design guidelines that improve access to recreation activities.

Grant applicants are strongly encouraged to attend the application workshop and to contact SANDAG staff for assistance in defining potential projects.

D. Evaluation Criteria
NOTE: Applications will be evaluated on a 5-point scale for each criterion as follows: 5 = maximum possible benefit, 4 = very high benefit, 3 = good benefit, 2 = adequate benefit, 1 = marginal benefit, and 0 = no benefit.

The evaluation panel will use the following criteria to score and rate the applications. Grant applications will receive higher scores if they can provide evidence that the project will:

1. Address Program Objectives (20 Points Maximum, Relative Weight = 4)
   The proposed project should strive to address multiple, if not all, program objectives. Points will be awarded proportional to the number of objectives addressed.

2. Implement an Innovative Approach (20 Points Maximum, Relative Weight = 4)
   Proposed projects that result in a paradigm shift or a new approach to current issues and opportunities are highly encouraged. Applications that propose an innovative and creative approach to incorporating public health considerations in the design of the built environment AND present a model that may be relevant and applicable to other communities and jurisdictions in the region will receive up to five (5) points. Applications that propose EITHER an
innovative and creative approach OR a model that may be relevant to the region will receive up to three (3) points.

3. Serve High-Need Communities (20 Points Maximum, Relative Weight = 4)
The grant program has limited resources and will prioritize support for high-need areas and communities while also distributing funds across the region equitably. Grant applications must define ‘high-need’ communities within the project area that will benefit from the proposed project and provide supporting data on the high-need community, where available. Communities may be defined as high-need based on demographics (such as age, income, education attainment, ethnicity, and disability), physical conditions (such as physical blight, environmental pollution, traffic accidents/collisions, concentration of liquor stores, concentration of fast food restaurants, and lack of grocery stores), social conditions (such as poverty, crime, and violence), and/or health outcomes (such as obesity and asthma rates).

Proposed projects that will address health disparities in areas or communities that are defined as high-need based on existing demographic, physical, social AND health conditions will receive up to five (5) points. Proposed projects that meet three of the four conditions will receive up to four (4) points, those that meet two of the four conditions will receive up to three (3) points, and those that meet one condition will receive up to two (2) points.

4. Lead to Implementation and Systems Change (20 Points Maximum, Relative Weight = 4)
Proposed projects that lead to systems change are highly encouraged. Systems change should address the grant applicant’s decision-making and/or resource-allocation process, and must be related to improving health outcomes. Applicants may propose systems change as part of the proposed project OR commit to addressing systems change as a follow up implementing action. Applications that propose or commit to a systems change that impacts the entire jurisdiction/community planning area will receive up to five (5) points. Applications that propose or commit to a systems change just for the project area will receive up to three (3) points. Examples of systems change include but are not limited to:

- Requiring consideration of public health benefits and impacts in project/plan review and/or approval process;
- Developing ordinances, guidelines, and codes that promote health policies;
- Creating a commission or advisory group that can advise the city council or governing boards on health benefits and impacts of proposed policies, projects, programs, services, or strategies; and
- Formulating guidelines and processes for ongoing monitoring and evaluation of project performance based on public health outcomes in the community or project area, among others.

5. Build on Local Commitment to Public Health (10 Points Maximum, Relative Weight = 2)
Proposed projects that build on ongoing or existing efforts to improve public health outcomes in the community may be best positioned to succeed. Often for these projects, partner agencies and community groups are already engaged in the process and there is political support for change.
Grant applicants that can cite recent projects, policies, programs, or interventions (however small or large in scale) that address public health in planning AND have dedicated resources to implement the recommendations from those efforts AND can demonstrate recent success will receive up to five (5) points. An applicant who has met two of the three conditions will receive up to three (3) points, and an applicant who has met one of the three conditions will receive one (1) point. Policy efforts that are underway, but have not yet been adopted by a city council or governing board, will count towards this evaluation criterion.

6. Support a Collaborative and Inclusive Process (10 Points Maximum, Relative Weight = 2)
Involving key stakeholders, community-based organizations, and community members in developing plan recommendations will help build consensus and ownership, and result in successful implementation of the project. Engaging underrepresented groups in the process will build trust and credibility for proposed recommendations and strategies. For this grant program, a grant applicant’s support for a collaborative and inclusive process may be demonstrated by:

- Committing to develop a comprehensive stakeholder and community outreach and engagement plan/program (as part of the scope of work for the proposed project), especially for underrepresented groups in the community;
- Identifying specific stakeholder and community groups and organizations that will be involved in developing plan recommendations; and
- Providing support letters in the application packet from community groups and organizations for the proposed project.

Applications that can demonstrate evidence for all three actions listed above will receive up to five (5) points. Those that can demonstrate evidence for at least two actions will receive up to three (3) points and for one action will receive one (1) point.

**Bonus Points**
Leverage Funds and Resources (10 Bonus Points Maximum; Relative Weight = 2)
Grant applicants are highly encouraged to leverage multiple sources of funding for the proposed project. Up to 10 percent match or in-kind contribution will receive one (1) point, 11 percent – 20 percent will receive two (2) points, 21 percent – 30 percent will receive three (3) points, 31 percent – 40 percent will receive four (4) points, and 41 percent or more will receive five (5) points. Applications that do not include any matching funds or in-kind contributions will not receive any bonus points.

**E. Selection Process**
The grant applications will be selected on a competitive basis. Each application will be scored and ranked by a selection panel using the evaluation criteria. The panel will consist of the following members:

- Two members of SANDAG staff;
- One member from the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG);
- One member from the Public Health Stakeholders Group (PHSG);
- One member of HHSA staff;
- Two health and the built environment experts; and
- One member from the San Diego Council of Design Professionals.
The panel will include individuals with knowledge of health and the built environment principles. Panel members must not represent local jurisdictions that have submitted applications for funding under the grant program. Panel members who are not SANDAG or HHSA staff must not have had prior involvement in any of the submitted applications, nor must they receive compensation for work on any of the funded projects in the future.

2. **Active Community Transportation Grants**

Active Community Transportation Grants will provide a total of $150,000 to promote pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly neighborhoods. SANDAG will award a minimum of three (3) grants for this program. Grants are expected to range from $30,000 to $50,000 each.

A. **Program Objectives**

The Active Community Transportation Grants will promote pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly neighborhoods by funding projects that:

- Integrate and institutionalize public health considerations in the local and regional policies, programs, projects, and decision-making;
- Address health disparities and inequities in lower income and minority communities;
- Promote physical activity by increasing opportunities for walking, bicycling, parks and recreation, and the use of public transit;
- Promote access to neighborhoods destinations such as schools, parks, and retail;
- Establish collaborative working relationships between health and planning agencies; and
- Build consensus in the community around public health needs and priorities through an inclusive process that engages a wide range of stakeholders.

B. **Eligibility**

Only cities, the County of San Diego and Tribal Governments are eligible to apply. Any department or division within the city or County government may apply. Nonprofit and community-based organizations may partner with public agencies, but cannot apply directly to the grant program. Grant applicants are encouraged to partner with other public agencies, such as HHSA and local school districts, as well as community-based organizations to develop the applications, where appropriate. Existing projects are eligible for the grant program as long as the application proposes an expanded scope or additional deliverables.

C. **Type of Projects**

This grant program will support active transportation plans for neighborhoods that address pedestrian, bicycle, persons with disabilities, and public transit access and amenities, traffic calming, and Safe Routes to School (SR2S). Grant applicants are strongly encouraged to attend the application workshop and to contact SANDAG staff for assistance in defining potential projects.

D. **Evaluation Criteria**

NOTE: Applications will be evaluated on a 5-point scale for each criterion as follows: 5 = maximum possible benefit, 4 = very high benefit, 3 = good benefit, 2 = adequate benefit, 1 = marginal benefit, and 0 = no benefit.
The evaluation panel will use the following criteria to score and rate the applications. Grant applications will receive higher scores if they can provide evidence that the project will:

1. **Address Program Objectives (20 Points Maximum, Relative Weight = 4)**
   The proposed project should strive to address multiple, if not all, program objectives. Points will be awarded proportional to the number of objectives addressed.

2. **Implement a Comprehensive Approach (20 Points Maximum, Relative Weight = 4)**
   Proposed projects that prioritize walking and bicycling as the primary mode of travel (over motorized vehicles) along corridors and neighborhoods are highly encouraged. Projects should address multiple aspects of active transportation in the project area including traffic calming, safe routes to local destinations (such as schools, parks, community gardens, and grocery stores), streetscape improvements, and safety, among others. Projects that propose a comprehensive approach that leads to shared thoroughfares and prioritized corridors for pedestrians and bicyclists will receive up to five (5) points. Projects that address safe crosswalks and signage, bulb-outs and sidewalk improvements, and traffic calming measures will receive up to three (3) points. Projects that address safe crosswalks and signage will receive one (1) point.

3. **Serve High-Need Communities (20 Points Maximum, Relative Weight = 4)**
   The grant program has limited resources and will prioritize support for high-need areas and communities while also distributing funds across the region equitably. Grant applications must define ‘high-need’ communities within the project area that will benefit from the proposed project and provide supporting data on the high-need community, where available. Communities may be defined as high-need based on demographics (such as age, income, education attainment, ethnicity, and disability), physical conditions (such as physical blight, environmental pollution, traffic accidents/collisions, concentration of liquor stores, concentration of fast-food restaurants, and lack of grocery stores), social conditions (such as poverty, crime, and violence), and/or health outcomes (such as obesity and asthma rates).
   Proposed projects that will address health disparities in areas or communities that are defined as high-need based on existing demographic, physical, social AND health conditions will receive up to five (5) points. Proposed projects that meet three of the four conditions will receive up to four (4) points, those that meet two of the four conditions with receive up to three (3) points and those that meet one condition will receive up to two (2) points.

4. **Lead to Implementation and Systems Change (20 Points Maximum, Relative Weight = 4)**
   Proposed projects that lead to systems change are highly encouraged. Systems change should address the grant applicant’s decision-making and/or resource-allocation process, and must be related to improving health outcomes. Applicants may propose systems change as part of the proposed project OR commit to addressing system change as a follow up implementing action. Applications that propose or commit to a systems change that impacts the entire jurisdiction/community planning area will receive up to five (5) points. Applications that propose or commit to a systems change just for the project area should receive up to three (3) points. Examples of systems change include but are not limited to:
o Requiring consideration of public health benefits and impacts in project/plan review and/or approval process;
o Developing ordinances, guidelines, and codes that promote health policies;
o Creating a commission or advisory group that can advise the city council or governing boards on health benefits and impacts of proposed policies, projects, programs, services, or strategies; and
o Formulating guidelines and processes for ongoing monitoring and evaluation of project performance based on public health outcomes in the community or project area, among others.

5. Build on Local Commitment to Active Transportation (10 Points Maximum, Relative Weight = 2)
The proposed project should be supported by existing commitments to active transportation in the jurisdiction. This commitment may be demonstrated through citywide policies or ordinances, existing bicycle and pedestrian plans, SR2S efforts, and programs, projects, or other activities that encourage active transportation. Points will be awarded proportional to the number and type of plans, programs, projects, or activities cited that have a relationship to the project and/or area.

6. Support a Collaborative and Inclusive Process (10 Points Maximum, Relative Weight = 2)
Involving key stakeholders, community-based organizations, and community members in developing plan recommendations will help build consensus and ownership, and result in successful implementation of the project. Engaging underrepresented groups in the process will build trust and credibility for proposed recommendations and strategies. For this grant program, a grant applicant’s support for a collaborative and inclusive process may be demonstrated by:

o Committing to develop a comprehensive stakeholder and community outreach and engagement plan/program (as part of the scope of work for the proposed project), especially for underrepresented groups in the community;
o Identifying specific stakeholder and community groups and organizations that will be involved in developing plan recommendations; and
o Providing support letters in the application packet from community groups and organizations for the proposed project.

Applications that can demonstrate evidence for all three actions listed above will receive up to five (5) points. Those that can demonstrate evidence for at least two actions will receive up to three (3) points and for one action will receive one (1) point.

Bonus Points
Leverage Funds and Resources (10 Bonus Points Maximum; Relative Weight = 2)
Grant applicants are highly encouraged to leverage multiple sources of funding for the proposed project. Up to 10 percent match or in-kind contribution will receive one (1) point, 11 percent – 20 percent will receive two (2) points, 21 percent – 30 percent will receive three (3) points, 31 percent – 40 percent will receive four (4) points, and 41 percent or more will receive five (5) points. Applications that do not include any matching funds or in-kind contributions will not receive any bonus points.
E. Selection Process
The grant applications will be selected on a competitive basis. Each application will be scored and ranked by a selection panel using the evaluation criteria. The panel will consist of the following members:

- Four members of SANDAG staff;
- One member from the Bicycle-Pedestrian Working Group (BPWG);
- One member from the TWG;
- One professional with Safe Routes to School expertise from a national or statewide organization; and
- One member of HHSA staff.

The panel will include individuals with knowledge of health and the built environment principles. Panel members must not represent local jurisdictions that have submitted applications for funding under the grant program. Panel members who are not SANDAG or HHSA staff must not have had prior involvement in any of the submitted applications, nor must they receive compensation for work on any of the funded projects in the future.

Safe Routes to School Implementation

3. Safe Routes to School Capacity Building and Planning Grants
Safe Routes to School Capacity Building and Planning Grants will provide a total of $150,000 to promote comprehensive Safe Routes to School planning. Under this program, SANDAG will award five (5) grants of $50,000.

A. Program Objectives
The Safe Routes to School Capacity Building and Planning Grants will promote comprehensive local Safe Routes to School efforts by funding plans that aim to:

- Increase rates of children walking and biking to school
- Improve safety conditions for child pedestrians and bicyclists
- Realize the health, community, traffic management, and environmental benefits associated with Safe Routes to School efforts
- Consider all of the 5 E's (education, encouragement, enforcement, engineering, and evaluation)
- Establish collaborative partnerships with implementing agencies, organizations, and groups
- Contain a systematic evaluation plan that includes collecting data, analyzing findings, and identifying potential program improvements
- Bolster community and public agency support for Safe Routes to School
- Initiate institutional change to support Safe Routes to School

B. Eligibility
Only cities, the County of San Diego, Tribal Governments, and nonprofit organizations are eligible to apply. Any department or division within the city or County government may apply. Lead agencies and organizations are encouraged to partner with other public agencies, non-profit organizations, community organizations, and individual schools.
C. Type of Projects
Potential Safe Routes to School Capacity Building and Planning projects may include but are not limited to citywide, neighborhood, or community-level safe routes to school plans that include the following elements:

- Existing conditions analysis and needs assessment (including walk/bike audits);
- Community and stakeholder input;
- Suggested route and/or deficiency maps;
- Infrastructure improvement plans and concepts;
- Education, encouragement, and enforcement program strategies;
- Summary of funding sources; and
- Evaluation and monitoring plan.

Grant applicants are strongly encouraged to review local, state, and national resources, such as the National Center for Safe Routes to School website (http://www.saferoutesinfo.org/), and contact SANDAG staff for assistance in defining potential projects. Grant applicants are strongly encouraged to attend the application workshop and to contact SANDAG staff for assistance in defining potential projects.

D. Evaluation Criteria
NOTE: Applications will be evaluated on a 5-point scale for each criterion as follows: 5 = maximum possible benefit, 4 = very high benefit, 3 = good benefit, 2 = adequate benefit, 1 = marginal benefit, and 0 = no benefit.

The evaluation panel will use the following criteria to score and rate the applications.

1. Commitment to Active Transportation (20 Points Maximum; Relative Weight = 4)
The proposed project should be supported by existing commitment to active transportation. This commitment may be demonstrated through existing bicycle and pedestrian plans, programs, projects, or other activities that advance active transportation. Projects in cities with citywide bicycle master plans, pedestrian master plans, or other active transportation plans that have been successful in their implementation of those plans will receive maximum points.

2. Capacity to Implement (20 Points Maximum; Relative Weight = 4)
The project should have an established leadership team or commit to establishing a team to oversee the implementation of the project and build capacity. Ideally, partnering public agencies, school districts, parent organizations, or community organizations and elected officials have expressed support for the project and committed to a role in implementing the project.

Proposed projects may receive up to five (5) points for the criteria. Five (5) points may be awarded to applicants who have, in writing, a commitment from at least one partnering agency, organization, or school and, at minimum, at least one letter of support from an external agency, organization, or group. Four (4) points will be awarded to applicants who have, in writing, a commitment from at least one partnering agency, organization, or school. Three (3) points will be awarded to applicants with an identified leadership team and at least one written letter of support from another organization, agency, school, or group. Two
(2) points will be awarded to applicants if they identify a potential leadership team and resources are committed to initiating the project.

3. **Evidence of Need (20 Points Maximum; Relative Weight = 4)**
The project should serve a project area with demonstrated need based on current conditions. Descriptions and supportive data should indicate that there are safety issues and/or other barriers to children walking and biking to school. Ideally, the proposed project also would serve a community with poor health indicators. Points will be awarded relative to the number and severity of environmental and social barriers to walking and biking in the project area.

4. **Methodology (20 Points Maximum; Relative Weight = 4)**
The scope of work should clearly facilitate opportunities to improve safety, increase child walking and biking rates, raise awareness, reduce traffic congestion, and derive health, environmental, quality of life, and other benefits associated with Safe Routes to School efforts by comprehensively addressing each of the 5 E’s (education, encouragement, enforcement, engineering, and evaluation). A total of five (5) points will be awarded proportionate to adequately addressing each of the 5 E’s.

5. **Community Involvement (20 Points Maximum; Relative Weight = 4)**
The proposed scope of work should include significant community outreach and involvement strategies. The scope of work should include elements that will ensure that community involvement efforts are inclusive and contain content that is culturally-appropriate to various groups. Applicants may demonstrate an effective approach by:

   - Identifying key stakeholder groups and community organizations that will be contacted and encouraged to participate in the project;
   - Defining methods for engaging parents, school officials, teachers, parent organizations, and community members; and
   - Listing methods for ensuring that activities and materials are culturally-appropriate and are useful to non-English speakers, for example.

**Bonus Points**

**Leverage Funds and Resources (10 Bonus Points Maximum; Relative Weight = 2)**
Grant applicants are encouraged to leverage multiple sources of funding for the proposed project. Up to 10 percent match or in-kind contribution will receive one (1) point, 11 percent – 20 percent will receive two (2) points, 21 percent – 30 percent will receive three (3) points, 31 percent – 40 percent will receive four (4) points, and 41 percent or more will receive five (5) points. Applications that do not include any matching funds or in-kind contributions will not receive any bonus points.

**E. Selection Process**
Each application will be scored and ranked by a selection panel using the evaluation criteria. The panel will consist of the following members:

- Two members of SANDAG staff;
- One member from the TWG;
- One member from the PHSG;
- One member of HHSA staff; and
• One professional with Safe Routes to School expertise from a national or statewide organization.

The panel will include individuals with knowledge of Safe Routes to School principles. Panel members must not represent grant applicants that have submitted applications. Panel members who are not SANDAG or HHSA staff must not have had prior involvement in any of the submitted applications, nor must they receive compensation for work on any of the funded projects in the future.

4. Safe Routes to School Education, Encouragement, and Enforcement Grants
Safe Routes to School Education, Encouragement, and Enforcement Grants will provide a total of $50,000 to promote Safe Routes to School programmatic efforts. Under this program, SANDAG will award five (5) grants of $10,000.

A. Program Objectives
The Safe Routes to School Education, Encouragement, and Enforcement Grants will promote comprehensive local Safe Routes to School efforts by funding programs that contribute to the following goals:

• Increase rates of children walking and biking to school
• Improve safety conditions for child pedestrians and bicyclists
• Realize the health, community, traffic management, and environmental benefits associated with Safe Routes to School efforts
• Consider all of the 5 E’s (education, encouragement, enforcement, engineering, and evaluation)
• Establish collaborative partnerships with implementing agencies, organizations, and groups
• Contain a systematic evaluation plan that includes collecting data, analyzing findings, and identifying potential program improvements
• Bolster community and public agency support for Safe Routes to School
• Initiate institutional change to support Safe Routes to School

B. Eligibility
Only cities, the County of San Diego, Tribal Governments, non-profit organizations, and school districts are eligible to apply. Any department or division within the city or County government may apply. Lead agencies and organizations are encouraged to partner with other public agencies, non-profit organizations, community organizations, and individual schools.

C. Type of Projects
Potential Education, Encouragement, and Enforcement Programs may include but are not limited to:

• Bicycle and pedestrian safety courses, curriculums, and lesson plans
• Events such as bicycle and pedestrian rodeos and school assemblies
• Walk and Bike to School Day/Week/Month programs
• Suggested walking and biking to school route maps
• Incentive programs such as pollution punch cards, mileage clubs, golden sneaker awards, and Walk Across America
• Teen-oriented programs
Grant applicants are strongly encouraged to review local, state, and national resources, such as the National Center for Safe Routes to School website (http://www.saferoutesinfo.org/), and contact SANDAG staff for assistance in defining potential projects. Grant applicants are strongly encouraged to attend the application workshop and to contact SANDAG staff for assistance in defining potential projects.

D. Evaluation Criteria

NOTE: Applications will be evaluated on a 5-point scale for each criterion as follows: 5 = maximum possible benefit, 4 = very high benefit, 3 = good benefit, 2 = adequate benefit, 1 = marginal benefit, and 0 = no benefit.

The evaluation panel will use the following criteria to score and rate the applications.

1. Commitment to Active Transportation (20 Points Maximum; Relative Weight = 4)
   The proposed project should be supported by existing commitment to active transportation. This commitment may be demonstrated through existing programs, projects, school wellness policies, bicycle and pedestrian plans, or other activities that advance active transportation. Points will be awarded proportional to the number and type of programs, projects, or activities cited that have a relationship to the project and/or area.

2. Capacity to Implement (20 Points Maximum; Relative Weight = 4)
   The project should have an established leadership team or commit to establishing a team to oversee the implementation of the project and build capacity. Ideally, partnering public agencies, school districts, parent organizations, or community organizations and elected officials have expressed support for the project and committed to a role in implementing the project.

   Proposed projects will receive up to five (5) points for the criteria. Five (5) points will be awarded to applicants who have, in writing, a commitment from at least one partnering agency, organization, or school and, at minimum, at least one letter of support from an external agency, organization, or group. Four (4) points will be awarded to applicants who have, in writing, a commitment from at least one partnering agency, organization, or school. Three (3) points will be awarded to applicants with an identified leadership team and at least one written letter of support from another organization, agency, school, or group. Two (2) points will be awarded to applicants if they identify a potential leadership team and resources are committed to initiating the project.

3. Evidence of Need (20 Points Maximum; Relative Weight = 4)
   The project should serve a project area with demonstrated need based on current conditions. Descriptions and supportive data should indicate that there are safety issues and/or other barriers to children walking and biking to school. Ideally, the proposed project also would serve a community with poor health indicators. Points will be awarded relative to the number and severity of environmental and social barriers to walking and biking in the project area.
4. **Methodology (20 Points Maximum; Relative Weight = 4)**
   The scope of work should clearly facilitate meeting the objectives of the program(s) and consider how the proposed program(s) contribute to an overall comprehensive 5 E's approach. Up to four (4) points will be awarded based on the method for addressing project objectives. One point may be awarded for clearly demonstrating that the project supports comprehensive existing or future Safe Routes to School efforts.

5. **Community Involvement (20 Points Maximum; Relative Weight = 4)**
   The proposed scope of work should include significant community outreach and involvement strategies. The scope of work should include elements that will ensure that community involvement efforts are inclusive and contain content that is culturally-appropriate to various groups. Applicants may demonstrate an effective approach by:
   
   - Identifying key stakeholder groups and community organizations that will be contacted and encouraged to participate in the project;
   - Defining methods for engaging parents, school officials, teachers, parent organizations, and community members; and
   - Listing methods for ensuring that activities and materials are culturally-appropriate and are useful to non-English speakers, for example.

**Bonus Points**

**Leverage Funds and Resources (10 Bonus Points Maximum; Relative Weight = 2)**
Grant applicants are encouraged to leverage multiple sources of funding for the proposed project. Up to 10 percent match or in-kind contribution will receive one (1) point, 11 percent – 20 percent will receive two (2) points, 21 percent – 30 percent will receive three (3) points, 31 percent – 40 percent will receive four (4) points, and 41 percent or more will receive five (5) points. Applications that do not include any matching funds or in-kind contributions will not receive any bonus points.

**E. Selection Process**
Each application will be scored and ranked by a selection panel using the evaluation criteria. The panel will consist of the following members:

- Two members of SANDAG staff;
- One member from the TWG;
- One member from the PHSG;
- One member of HHSA staff; and
- One professional with Safe Routes to School expertise from a national or statewide organization.

The panel will include individuals with knowledge of Safe Routes to School principles. Panel members must not represent grant applicants that have submitted applications. Panel members who are not SANDAG or HHSA staff must not have had prior involvement in any of the submitted applications, nor must they receive compensation for work on any of the funded projects in the future.
Introduction

In recent years, urban planners and public health practitioners have become increasingly aware that the design of the built environment can have a significant impact on the health and wellness of the public. For example, one may expect more physical activity and healthier diets among persons who live in communities with convenient, safe walking paths and accessible sources of fresh fruits and vegetables. On the other hand, poorer health indicators may be expected among residents of communities with high crime rates, few parks or walking paths, numerous alcohol and tobacco outlets, and little access to fresh food.

Today, many people live some distance away from where they work, go to school, or shop. In addition, neighborhood streets are often designed for the automobile. This encourages driving and discourages walking and bicycling. The resulting decrease in daily physical activity has been attributed as a critical factor in the rising epidemic of obesity across the United States, especially among children. Childhood obesity in the country has more than tripled in the last 30 years.\(^1\) In the San Diego region, over one-quarter of all children are obese.\(^2\) As with the adults, poor nutrition and a lack of physical activity are cited as the primary causes.

This item presents for information the initial work by SANDAG staff to document this relationship between the built environment and public health, and to suggest possible policy responses.

Discussion

The white paper attached to this report begins the process of developing a regional policy framework that will outline strategies to address public health in local and regional land use and transportation planning efforts. This public health policy framework will become the basis for developing specific recommendations that will be incorporated in the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The framework will also be a starting point for developing more comprehensive policies and implementing actions for a future update of the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP).

---

\(^1\) U.S. Center for Disease Control and Prevention (2009)

The process for developing the regional policy framework will include the following key steps:

- Develop a white paper by December 2010 that identifies the connection between public health and planning at the local and regional level.
- Develop key recommendations for inclusion in the 2050 RTP by December 2010.
- Develop a policy framework for including public health in a future update of the RCP update by August 2011.

Funding to develop the public health policy framework comes from the County of San Diego Health and Human Services Agency’s (HHSA) “Communities Putting Prevention to Work” (CPPW) program. The CPPW program is funded by the federal Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA). The overarching goal of the program is to expand the use of evidence-based strategies and programs to address obesity rates, physical inactivity, and poor nutrition in the San Diego region. HHSA has partnered with SANDAG to implement six CPPW initiatives that focus on integrating public health issues into regional planning and encouraging active transportation, including Safe Routes To School. Please see the Fact Sheet included as Attachment 1 in Agenda Item 5 for a description of the six initiatives.

**Next Steps**

The white paper will be distributed for comment or feedback to the Public Health Stakeholders Group established to support the CPPW program, and to other interested parties. Those comments will be used to inform a discussion of the public health issues associated with transportation that are proposed to be included in the 2050 RTP. Over the longer term, the paper will be used as background to develop a broader discussion of public health and regional planning in the update to the Regional Comprehensive Plan.

CHARLES “MUGGS” STOLL
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachment: 1. San Diego Region: Planning for Healthy Communities

Key Staff Contact: Stephan Vance, (619) 699-1924, sva@sandag.org
SAN DIEGO REGION: PLANNING FOR HEALTHY COMMUNITIES

A. HISTORY OF PUBLIC HEALTH AND URBAN PLANNING

Modern urban planning grew out of concerns for public health in early 20th century cities where people lived right next to farm animals, butcher shops and industry. Planners and health advocates established zoning regulations to protect the health and safety of city residents from contagious diseases such as tuberculosis and cholera, which spread through sewage, contaminated water and air. This was achieved in part by separating uses and activities that were considered incompatible. And so the tanneries and factories were moved away from homes. But most other uses such as shops, restaurants and schools remained integrated in the neighborhoods. People could still live relatively close to where they worked or went to school1. It was an effective response to the communicable disease epidemic of the early 20th century.

After World War II, many factors including a growing population, rising standard of living, increasing popularity of the private automobile as the primary mode of transportation, and federal policies that encouraged homeownership led to the rise of the suburbs. The construction of the national highway system further fueled a more dispersed land development pattern with employment and other uses leaving the inner cities as well. Single-family suburban homes on large lots with a white picket fence became the ‘American Dream’ for many middle-class families.

While the highways provided convenient access to the suburbs, many of them cut through the inner cities, separating and isolating many traditional neighborhoods. Lack of infrastructure investment and a declining population base convinced many families that suburban neighborhoods were safer and healthier, with cleaner air, lack of crime and blight, wide streets and new homes.

As a predominant model for urban development, the walkable, compact, mixed-use neighborhoods, built on a grid street pattern with public facilities such as a school or a park at its core were starting to be replaced by the automobile-oriented suburbs connected to consolidated retail and employment centers or public facilities by parkways or arterial streets with fast-moving traffic2. Today, many people in the United States live in such neighborhoods3. This paper addresses the public health consequences of today’s predominant development pattern.

B. WHY PUBLIC HEALTH MATTERS

“Transportation impacts more than just how Americans get from place to place. It influences physical activity, accessibility to goods and services, air pollution, greenhouse gases, stress levels, family budgets, and our amount of leisure time, as well as a host of other lifestyle and health variables...While transportation may not immediately be thought of as a key determinant of health, transportation policies and accompanying land use patterns have far-reaching implications for our risk of disease and injury”4 – Robert Wood Johnson Foundation’s Center to Prevent Childhood Obesity Working Group

According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the percentage of the population in California that is obese increased from less than ten percent in 1985 to nearly 25 percent in 2008. The San Diego County Health and Human Services Agency reports that in 2007, 33 percent of county residents were overweight and nearly 22 percent were obese5. The cost to society as a result of this
trend is significant. The California Center for Public Health Advocacy estimated that in 2006 the total annual cost to California from overweight, obese and physically inactive population was $41.2 billion. The estimated cost for the San Diego region was $3 billion.6

Between 1977 and 1995, people who walked to their destination declined by more than 42 percent while those driving increased by about 90 percent.7 From 1969 to 2001, the number of children who walked or bicycled to school decreased by 68 percent. Concerns about traffic and safety were cited as the key reasons why parents preferred to drive their children to school.8 Ironically, between 20 to 30 percent of the morning commute-time traffic is generated by parents driving their children to school.9

Land use patterns in most communities today make driving a necessity. It also discourages walking and bicycling. A decrease in walking and bicycling results in a decrease in daily physically activity, which is attributed as a critical factor in the rising epidemic of obesity across the US, especially among children. Childhood obesity in the country has more than tripled in the last 30 years10. In the San Diego region, over one-quarter of all children are obese.11 As with the adults, poor nutrition and a lack of physical activity are cited as the primary causes.

In 2008, there were over 37,000 traffic-related fatalities in the United States. Despite improvements in vehicle safety such as seat belts and air bags, roadway design changes, and reductions in drunk driving, the per capita traffic fatality rate has changed very little since 1960, in part because of the continuing increase in total vehicle miles travelled (VMT). In fact, there is a strong relationship between VMT and per capita traffic fatalities.12

In the San Diego region, approximately 300 people die in crashes on the roadway every year, though 2008 saw a decrease to 263 fatalities. Of these, 61 were pedestrians.13 Bicyclists and pedestrians combined represent nearly one-quarter of all fatalities while they account for only 3 percent of trips in the region. This disparity has added significance since safety is a primary concern for people when they choose a mode of travel, especially for children traveling to school14,15

In direct contrast to the relationship between VMT and safety, bicycle and pedestrian safety increases when the number of bicycle and pedestrian trips increase.16 It is possible that this “safety in numbers” effect results from a complementary relationship between improved infrastructure and increased walking and bicycling.

Internal combustion engines in vehicles emit a number of air-born pollutants, which are regulated by state and federal air quality standards to protect public health and safety. The San Diego region has met these standards for carbon monoxide, nitrogen dioxide, sulfur dioxide, and lead, but has not met the state and federal standards for ozone or the state standards for particulate matter.17 While the region’s air quality has improved, the health impacts of transportation-related pollutants remain a concern. According to the California Air Resources Board (CARB), attaining the California standards for particulate matter and ozone would prevent about 8,800 premature deaths annually. That constitutes 3.7 percent of all deaths in California. These premature deaths shorten lives by an average of 14 years. In comparison, motor vehicle crashes caused 3,200 deaths statewide while homicides were responsible for only 2,000 deaths.18
Health impacts often affect vulnerable populations disproportionately. Vulnerable populations in the San Diego region include seniors, children, low-income and minority populations, and people with disabilities.

While the communicable diseases of the early 20th century have been contained, chronic diseases such as heart disease, diabetes, cancer, and asthma have emerged as the leading causes of death – seven out of every ten deaths in the United States are now caused by chronic diseases. The focus of both urban planners and public health practitioners has therefore shifted towards addressing the risk factors for chronic diseases in addition to incidence of traffic injuries (involving pedestrians and bicyclists) and health disparities (difference in health outcomes between people of different ethnicities, education attainment and/or income levels).

C. HOW THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT AFFECTS HEALTH

People who live in compact, mixed-use communities have more opportunities for walking and are less likely to be obese and hypertensive than people who live in communities that do not prioritize active transportation. In other words, land use and transportation planning decisions have an impact on public health. In light of growing evidence to support these facts, urban planners and public health practitioners have begun collaborating to develop strategies that improve community health and wellness through the design of the built environment. Some of these strategies are described below.

Active Transportation and Public Transit

Streets that are designed for the safety of multiple users—including pedestrians of all ages, bicyclists, people with disabilities, buses and cars—reduce the risk of pedestrian and bicycle injuries. Walking or biking to school, work, daily errands and public transit helps people meet the Surgeon General’s recommendation of at least 30 minutes of physical activity per day. Physical activity includes moderate-intensity exercise, which varies between individuals depending on fitness level, such as walking and jogging.

Using public transit and active transportation options such as walking and biking reduces vehicle miles traveled, vehicle emissions, respiratory disease, hypertension from exposure to high decibels of noise as well as exposure to environmental contamination due to fuel and oil spills. Proximity to transit is also associated with improved access to social, medical, employment and recreational activities.

Access to Parks and Recreation

Residents with convenient access to parks are more likely to utilize them for recreation and physical activity. Quality recreational facilities and programs can also increase physical activity. The health benefits of physical activity include a reduced risk of premature mortality, coronary heart disease, hypertension, stroke, some cancers and diabetes mellitus. Regular participation in physical activity can also reduce depression and anxiety, improve mood and enhance ability to perform daily tasks throughout the life span. Contact and exposure to open spaces can also reduce stress, improve mental health and facilitate recovery from illness.
Neighborhood Completeness

Neighborhood completeness refers to the ability of residents to walk easily to all of the goods and services needed in daily life. A complete neighborhood encourages walking and bicycling because goods are nearby, and helps contribute to neighborhood safety by ensuring that many pedestrians are on the street throughout the day, helping to keep eyes on the street. Complete neighborhoods also reduce residents’ reliance on cars, with fewer automobile trips required. This in turn leads to reduced air and noise pollution as well as risk of collisions and injuries.

The availability of primary medical care has a role in preserving good health and preventing morbidity and hospitalizations from chronic and communicable diseases, including asthma and diabetes. Ensuring that medical services are accessible and located throughout the neighborhood affects each resident’s ability to meet their medical needs and the needs of their families in a timely fashion. The availability of medical services throughout the community can also reduce vehicle trips with benefits to air quality, community noise and injuries.

Environmental Quality

Epidemiological studies have found consistent associations between living in proximity to a busy roadway and respiratory disease symptoms, including asthma and poor lung function. Diesel particulate matter from truck and train engine exhaust has acute short-term impacts and disproportionate effects on the elderly, children, and people with illnesses or others who are sensitive to air pollutants. Health risks increase with closer proximity to roadways with high-volume traffic.

Traffic is also a significant source of environmental noise. Chronic noise exposure can result in sleep disturbance, cognitive impairment in children and adults, adult hypertension and stress hormone activation. With the exception of low emissions and natural gas-powered vehicles, traffic contributes directly to air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions. These emissions and other air pollutants, including ozone and particulate matter, are risk factors for cardiovascular mortality and respiratory disease and illness. Speeding vehicles can also endanger pedestrians and bicyclists, posing additional safety concerns in neighborhoods. In addition, tree canopy coverage in the neighborhood can provide multiple benefits. Trees capture air pollution, reduce carbon dioxide and increase oxygen levels. Trees close to traffic have been found to absorb nine times more pollutants than distant trees. In addition to the numerous environmental benefits, trees in urban areas also provide social benefits. Street trees have shown to have a calming effect on traffic, causing motorists to slow down. Urban trees can facilitate stress reduction and better mental health.

Global climate change and changing weather patterns also have a range of direct and indirect impacts on public health. Extreme temperature fluctuations can lead to deaths from heat strokes and higher temperatures can lead to higher counts of pollen and other aeroallergens that affect an estimated 300 million people with allergies around the world.

Access to Healthy Food

The presence of a grocery store or food market in a neighborhood correlates with higher fruit and vegetable consumption, reduces the prevalence of overweight and obesity and reduces the incidence of hunger and malnutrition.
Farmers’ markets can provide another source of fresh, locally produced fruits, vegetables and other food products. This in turn may help residents meet the recommended daily servings of healthy foods such as fruits and vegetables. Healthy food is generally low in fat and saturated fat, contains limited amounts of cholesterol and sodium, and provides natural vitamins. Markets may be particularly important in areas poorly served by full-service grocery stores.\textsuperscript{39}

Community gardens can also provide a source of fresh fruits and vegetables for users, increase physical activity and provide opportunities for social interaction and cohesion. Locally produced food helps attain other benefits, such as sustaining the local economy and reducing long-distance shipping, thereby decreasing vehicle emissions, which are associated with chronic diseases and global climate change.

Neighborhood studies demonstrate that where there are high numbers of fast food restaurants compared to grocery stores, there are also higher rates of diabetes, cardiovascular disease and cancer.\textsuperscript{40} Increasing the number of full-service grocery stores relative to fast food restaurants in neighborhoods can help to combat these health conditions.

**Public Safety**

Environmental design affects social interactions, which in turn may affect violence. Violence has a negative effect on the physical and mental health of victims and their families, friends and neighbors. It also negatively impacts the social and economic well-being of the neighborhood, influencing business investment, job and housing security, educational attainment, resident participation in community development and community integration.\textsuperscript{41} When neighborhoods are well designed, the resulting social cohesion contributes to lower crime and violence and therefore better health outcomes.\textsuperscript{42}

Environmental design factors associated with levels of perceived and actual neighborhood safety include sidewalk cleanliness and width, street design for pedestrian safety and speed control, street lighting, number of liquor stores, degree of community isolation, and access to services and housing for low-income persons. Other factors include presence of drugs or gangs, police presence, availability of weapons, employment and access to community activities for families and youth.\textsuperscript{43}

**Table 1: How the Built Environment Affects Public Health**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Built Environment Strategies</th>
<th>Policy Considerations</th>
<th>Community Health Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to Active Transportation and Public Transit</td>
<td>Complete streets; pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly neighborhoods; regional and local bicycle routes; safe routes to school and other destinations; traffic calming on neighborhood streets; and safe and convenient public transit within walking distance of homes/work.</td>
<td>Increased physical activity; lower risk of injury; reduced air and noise pollution; lower greenhouse gas emissions; improved neighborhood safety; and greater social cohesion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>Parks, recreation and trails within walking distance of homes/work; and joint use facilities (with school districts and other public agencies).</td>
<td>Increased physical activity; improved mental health; improved neighborhood safety; and greater social cohesion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Neighborhood Completeness
- Neighborhood-serving retail and public amenities within walking distance of homes; and retrofit of underutilized retail centers or corridors into mixed-use development.
- Increased physical activity; lower risk of injury; reduced air and noise pollution; lower greenhouse gas emissions; improved neighborhood safety; and greater social cohesion.

### Environmental Quality
- Restriction on the location of sensitive uses (such as parks and childcare centers) close to major sources of pollution (such as highways); remediation of contaminated sites; habitat and open space (including canyons in urban areas) preservation; and urban forests/greenery.
- Reduced risk of respiratory diseases; reduced exposure to toxic substances; and improved mental health.

### Access to Healthy Food
- Grocery stores and food markets in all neighborhoods; community gardens, farmer’s markets, and edible schoolyards; healthy school lunches; restrictions on concentration of fast food restaurants; and food stamp enrollment.
- Improved nutrition; increased physical activity; and reduced incidence of hunger.

### Public Safety
- Crime prevention through environmental design; street lighting; restrictions on concentration of liquor stores; traffic enforcement; and code enforcement.
- Improved neighborhood safety; greater social cohesion; improved mental health; and lower risk of injury.

### D. WHAT OTHER REGIONS ARE DOING

#### Wasatch Front Regional Council, Utah

In 2006, the Wasatch Front Regional Council (WFRC) commissioned a study on Public Health and Transportation: Planning for Active Modes along Utah’s Wasatch Front. The study recommends incorporating physically active transportation modes into the existing regional transportation system. The study covered subjects ranging from funding options to policy guidelines and design elements.

By adopting active transportation policies as part of the Regional Transportation System (RTS), the WFRC is encouraging local governments and other organizations to accommodate more pedestrian and bicycle options in transportation planning projects. Key policy recommendations in the RTS that address health include:

- Provide adequate, safe, and appropriately located infrastructure for all modes of transportation;
- Provide active links (sidewalks and bike paths) to existing and new transit stations and stops;
- Provide bicycle parking and storage in transit oriented locations; and
- Plan and implement active-friendly land use and transportation choices.

---

44. Relevant reference number or citation.
King County, Washington

In 2009, King County launched the HealthScape project to “promote improved public health and air quality through wise land use and transportation choices”\(^{45}\). HealthScape builds upon the findings of the Land Use, Transportation, Air Quality and Health (LUTAQH) study, which found strong connections between the design of a neighborhood and health and air quality in that neighborhood. The study found that an increase of just five percent in a neighborhood’s walkability resulted in:

- 6.5% fewer miles driven each day per person;
- 5.5% less major air pollutants (nitrogen oxides and volatile organic compounds) emitted;
- 32% more time spent per person being physically active; and
- Lower average Body Mass Index (BMI) by 0.23 points.

HealthScape is using research findings from the LUTAQH study to create two tools that will help jurisdictions in King County predict the health and environmental benefits of new development and transportation investments. These include:

1. Transportation Programming Tool – This tool will allow planners to predict the likely benefits of proposed non-motorized transportation projects such as bike lanes and walking trails. A benefits calculator created from the LUTAQH research results will allow them to weigh the likely increases in route connectivity and transit access, as well as the decreases in conflicts with vehicles associated with each proposal. The tool will also take into account factors such as population density in the surrounding community. The result will be a score for each project’s predicted transportation, safety, economic, air quality, and health benefits.

2. Development Impact Assessment Tool - This tool will focus on proposed land-use changes, using the study results to modify a standard modeling tool (the PLACES model) to assess the likely impacts and benefits of development plans. It will allow planners to compare baseline scenarios against various alternatives to determine the alternatives’ relative effects on transportation (i.e., transit use and walking), public health (i.e., obesity levels), and air quality (including greenhouse gas emissions).

City and County of San Francisco, California

Health Impact Assessment (HIA) is an approach to examining the effects that land use and development decisions could have on health in a particular geographic area. The methodology has been applied in England, Australia, Canada and several other countries, while in the U.S., some of the most comprehensive work has taken place in San Francisco.

For 18 months beginning in November, 2004, the San Francisco Department of Public Health worked on the Eastern Neighborhoods Community Health Impact Assessment (ENCHIA) with stakeholders in a part of the city slated for intensive redevelopment. Out of this process came the “Healthy Development Monitoring Tool” (HDMT). The HDMT provides the health rationales for considering each element of community conditions, and moves through the established standards,
key indicators, development targets, and strategic suggestions for policy and design. The seven elements include environmental stewardship, sustainable transportation, public safety, public infrastructure, access to goods and services, adequate and healthy housing, healthy economy, and citizen participation.

The process has proven useful to community-based organizations and has informed the debate over redevelopment policies in neighborhoods and strategies to address gentrification and displacement. Several groups who participated in ENCHIA, including the South of Market Community Action Network and the Mission Economic Development Association, are continuing to use the HIA framework as a basis for leadership development and assessment of project proposals. This is an educational and voluntary process, rather than a mandated review process such as Environmental Impact Assessment, though there are some topics which overlap the two processes.

The San Francisco experience is being mirrored by a growing set of other HIA processes, many of them driven by community coalitions. In Richmond and West Oakland, local groups are using the HIA approach not only for analysis but also as an educational tool and a way to organize and increase the participation of residents of lower income communities. In this context, the HIA has become part of a broader effort to inform the decision-making process about the costs and benefits of development.

**Washington State Department of Transportation**

In 1995, Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) began to educate people in the state about the health benefits of active environmental design. Through community workshops on urban design that discussed walkable and bikeable communities, trails, downtown revitalization, and bicycling, WSDOT built community support for bicycling, walking, safe school routes, and safe, accessible transit. In addition, training programs within WSDOT, such as design and planning workshops, have strengthened staff understanding of the health benefits of active environmental design.

To further strengthen this understanding, WSDOT involved other agencies in the planning of a number of their projects. These agencies included the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), State Department of Health's Nutrition and Physical Activity Advisory Team (which developed the state's Health Plan), and the state land use agency (which reviews comprehensive land use plans).

WSDOT also developed partnerships with the following groups:

- Washington Traffic Safety Commission;
- Washington State Department of Health;
- Washington Coalition for Promoting Physical Activity;
- Leadership for Active Living Initiative with the National Governor's Association; and
- Active Community Environments (ACE).
ACE is a grassroots initiative between Washington State MPOs and Regional Transportation Planning Organizations (RTPOs) that receives multi-year funding through a partnership with the Department of Health. Under this program, MPOs and RTPOs prioritize transportation projects for funding.

WSDOT is also involved in policy development. Some of the policies that take into account health benefits on which WSDOT has worked or adopted include:

- Livable Communities policy;
- Context Sensitive Solutions, which has a community-based project development process that directs staff to support a context-driven approach; and
- Memorandum of Understanding with land use and health agencies.

Additionally, a WSDOT task force is developing an active living policy for the transportation plan update47.

**Marin County Safe Routes to School Program**

The Transportation Authority of Marin administers Safe Routes to School (SR2S) programs aimed at promoting walking, bicycling, taking transit or carpooling to school; planning safer walking and bicycling routes to schools; funding the construction of safe pathways to school; and providing crossing guards at major intersections.

The program integrates health, fitness, traffic relief, environmental awareness and safety under one program. It is an opportunity for parents to work closely with their children's school, the community and the local government to create a healthy lifestyle for children and a safer and cleaner environment for everyone. The program is offered to all schools in Marin County, California.

The program has four components:

- **Encouragement** - Events, contests and promotional materials are incentives that encourage children and parents to try walking and biking.
- **Education** - Classroom lessons teach children the skills necessary to navigate through busy streets and persuade them to be active participants in the program.
- **Engineering** - Examine the physical barriers that prohibit children from safely navigating the routes to schools.
- **Enforcement** - Partner with law enforcement to increase the police presence around schools. Driver's education is even more effective in changing the behavior of harried parents and commuters who are not paying attention to the children on the roads.

Marin County's robust Safe Routes to School program is credited with decreasing single-student automobile school trips by 15 percent.48
E. EXISTING FEDERAL, STATE, REGIONAL AND LOCAL EFFORTS

A number of existing policies, programs and statutes at the federal, state, regional and local level support planning and implementation for healthy communities in the San Diego region. These are described below.

State Legislation

Assembly Bill 32 and Senate Bill 375

In 2006, California passed Assembly Bill 32 (AB 32), also known as the Global Warming Solutions Act. The Bill charged CARB with implementing a comprehensive statewide program to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

Signed in September 2008, Senate Bill 375 (SB 375) requires regional governing bodies in each of the state’s major metropolitan areas to adopt a “sustainable community strategy” as part of their regional transportation plan that will meet the region’s target for reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. The Bill provides incentives for implementing the sustainable community strategies by allocating federal transportation funds to projects that reduce GHG emissions.

State goals to reduce GHG emissions and vehicle miles traveled, established by AB 32, and SB 375 respectively, could have the most far-reaching impacts on travel choices and environmental health.

Complete Streets Act and Deputy Directive 64 R-1

In 2008, the legislature passed the Complete Streets Act, which will require all future updates to the circulation elements of local jurisdiction general plans to plan for and accommodate the needs of all users of the public right-of-way.

In addition, Caltrans has updated and strengthened its internal policy on non-motorized travel, Deputy Directive 64 R-1(e), to ensure that the planning, development and operation of the state highway system supports active transportation.

State Bill 1420, Menu Labeling

In September 2008, California became the first state in the nation to pass legislation requiring chain restaurants to provide nutritional information on menus and menu boards. Effective July 1, 2008, SB 1420 requires restaurants with 20 or more locations to make nutritional information available to customers in a phased-in approach.

Regional Plans and Programs

Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP)

Adopted in July 2004 by SANDAG, the RCP provides a blueprint for managing the region's growth while preserving natural resources and limiting urban sprawl in the San Diego region. A key component of the RCP is the smart growth strategy that promotes compact, mixed-use development in communities that provide a variety of transportation choices. SANDAG supports
smart growth development through a variety of planning and transportation funding programs. SANDAG plans to update the RCP after the 2050 RTP is adopted.

Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)

Adopted in November 2007 by SANDAG, the 2030 RTP is a blueprint for improving mobility in the San Diego region. This long-range plan includes policies, strategies and investments to maintain, manage, and improve the region’s transportation system. SANDAG is currently developing the 2050 RTP, which will integrate land uses, transportation systems, infrastructure needs, and public investment strategies within a regional smart growth framework.

SANDAG is the first major Metropolitan Planning Organization in the State that will prepare a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS). The SCS is a new element of the RTP required by SB 375, and will demonstrate how the development patterns and the transportation network, policies, and programs can work together to achieve the GHG emission reduction targets for cars and light trucks established by CARB, if there is a feasible way to do so. The 2050 RTP will also include a Climate Action Strategy, Regional Energy Strategy, Urban Area Transit Strategy, Regional Bicycle Plan, and high-speed rail planning.

SANDAG is working to craft a new vision for public transit as part of its 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). This vision of creating a world-class transit system is taking shape now, as SANDAG develops the Urban Area Transit Strategy, an innovative transit network within the San Diego region. The goals of the transit strategy are twofold: first, maximize transit ridership in the greater urbanized area of the region; and second, test the role of the transit network to reduce vehicle miles traveled and greenhouse gas emissions. The second goal will also help SANDAG comply with Senate Bill 375.

TransNet Ordinance

TransNet is the half-cent sales tax for local transportation projects that was first approved by voters in 1988, and then extended in 2004 for another 40 years beginning in 2008. Administered by SANDAG, the program has been instrumental in expanding the region’s transportation system, reducing traffic congestion, and bringing critical transportation programs to life. During the 60-year life of the program, more than $17 billion will be generated and distributed among highway, transit, and local road projects.

The TransNet extension ordinance approved in 2004 dedicated two percent of revenues to the Smart Growth Incentive Program, and two percent of revenues to the Bicycle, Pedestrian, Neighborhood Safety and Traffic Calming Program. These grant programs allow for the planning and construction of street improvements along local corridors and intersections, such as sidewalks, crosswalks, streetscape enhancements, and other pedestrian upgrades, traffic calming, and safety measures. The Smart Growth Incentive Program emphasizes support of compact, mixed-use development, and providing more housing and transportation choices.

Board Policy No. 031, Rule 21, in the TransNet Ordinance and Expenditure Plan Rules refers to accommodation of bicyclists and pedestrians. The policy requires that local jurisdictions receiving TransNet funding must accommodate bicyclists and pedestrians in their Local Streets and Roads projects.
iCommute Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Program
The goal of the iCommute program is to manage and reduce traffic congestion during peak-times, as well as reduce greenhouse gas emissions and other environmental pollutants that result from commuters driving to work each day alone. iCommute plays a vital role in promoting active transportation through employer incentive programs, bicycle programs such as Bike to Work Day, and marketing and outreach efforts.

San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan
The Regional Bike Plan, adopted in May 2010, establishes a network of regional bikeway corridors for intercommunity bicycle travel and proposes a comprehensive set of programs to support bicycling in order to make the bicycle a practical means of transportation in the San Diego region.

Safe Routes to School Programs
At the federal level, Section 1404 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) authorized the SRS Program in August 2005. This federal funding program emphasizes community collaboration in the development of projects, and projects that incorporate elements of the 5 E’s – education, encouragement, engineering, enforcement, and evaluation.

California was the first state in the country to legislate a Safe Routes to School program with the enactment of Assembly Bill 1475 in 1999. Eight years later, in 2007, Assembly Bill 57 (AB 57) extended the program indefinitely with funding provided from the State Highway Account.

Section 2333.5 of the Streets and Highways Code calls for the Department of Transportation, in consultation with the California Highway Patrol (CHP), to make grants available to local governmental agencies under the program based upon the results of a statewide competition. To date, there have been nine program cycles released under the SR2S program.

At the local level, a number of jurisdictions have initiated comprehensive Safe Routes to School programs in order to encourage more walking and bicycling to school. For example, the City of Chula Vista is collaborating with education, public health and community partners on the Healthy Eating Active Communities (HEAC) campaign with the goal of improving access to healthy food and physical activity in schools and neighborhoods.

For more information on SANDAG’s regional Safe Routes to School strategy, please also see the Safe Routes to School White Paper.

Childhood Obesity Initiative
In 2006, the San Diego County Childhood Obesity Initiative was formed as a public-private partnership to reduce and prevent childhood obesity in the region by creating healthy environments for all children.
Public Health Elements for General Plans

A number of local jurisdictions in the San Diego region are currently in the process of developing public health components for their general plans. These include the cities of National City, La Mesa, and Encinitas.

Communities Putting Prevention to Work Program

In March 2010, the County of San Diego Health and Human Services Agency (HHSA) received $16.1 million from the federal Center for Disease Control and Prevention through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) for the Communities Putting Prevention to Work (CPPW) program. The overarching goal of the program is to expand the use of evidence-based strategies and programs to address obesity rates, physical activity, and poor nutrition ion the San Diego region.

HHSA has partnered with SANDAG to implement six CPPW initiatives that focus on integrating public health issues into regional planning and encouraging active transportation, including SRTS. Please see the attached Fact Sheet for a description of the six initiatives.

F. PLANNING FOR HEALTHY COMMUNITIES IN THE SAN DIEGO REGION

“A network-level approach to transportation planning and design recognizes that a transportation system’s primary purpose is to connect people, places, and activities with each other and with the social and economic activities of the larger community and region, and that there are multiple strategies available to do so.”54 – Congress for New Urbanism, Sustainable Network Principles

Local jurisdictions, community groups, individuals as well as regional agencies such as SANDAG and HHSA are already collaborating on a range of projects that address public health in local and regional land use and transportation policies and projects. Examples of such collaborations include the Smart Growth Incentive Program, funded through the TransNet regional transportation sales tax program, and the Communities Putting Prevention to Work (CPPW), a project led by HHSA and funded through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA).

But addressing the chronic disease epidemic will require a sustained and collaborative effort from public agencies, community groups and individuals. SANDAG can collaborate with partners at the regional and local level to implement a range of actions that address chronic diseases, injury prevention and health disparities. These actions may include:

1. Developing an integrated and inclusive public health policy framework at the regional level

A comprehensive and integrated public health policy framework, developed with input and buy-in from local jurisdictions and stakeholders, can help set priorities for the San Diego region. The framework can also inform local and regional policies, programs and projects. A regional framework may address the following potential strategies:

- Urban Form – promote compact and walkable neighborhoods. SANDAG’s regional policy documents such as the RCP promote a regional smart growth strategy. The smart growth strategy can be expanded to include public health principles that address access to active
transportation, parks and recreation, healthy food, and daily goods and services at the neighborhood level.

- Transportation – prioritize pedestrian, bicycle and public transit modes; promote complete streets (update street design guidelines and level of service requirements) and green streets; and expand safe routes to school.

- Housing – increase the supply of quality, affordable housing; promote economically and ethnically integrated neighborhoods; and encourage proximity of multi-family housing to transit and daily goods and services.

- Environment – protect air, water and soil quality; promote urban greening; preserve natural areas; promote green buildings; and encourage conservation.

- Economic Development – support job growth, living wages, and workforce training.

- Public Facilities – promote access to public facilities and amenities such as parks and recreation, schools, medical and emergency services, transit stations, and safe pedestrian and bicycle routes.

- Public Safety – promote safety in public areas such as streets, schools, parks and transit stations through community design (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design), improved lighting, and enforcement; address gang violence; and mitigate blight, graffiti, and illegal dumping.

- Healthy Food – promote access to fresh, locally-grown fruits and vegetables; reduce the incidence of hunger; restrict concentration of fast-food restaurants and liquor stores; restrict availability of unhealthy food at schools and public facilities; and increase the number of community gardens, edible schoolyards, farmer’s markets, and food markets, especially in low-income neighborhoods.

2. Supporting local efforts for healthy communities through incentives, technical assistance and guidance

- Expand planning and implementation grant programs to local jurisdictions. SANDAG has a number of existing grant programs including the Smart Growth Incentive Program and the Bicycle, Pedestrian, Neighborhood Safety and Traffic Calming Program. These programs can be expanded to provide more resources at the local level. SANDAG can also partner with other agencies such as HHSA and Caltrans to leverage existing resources.

- Provide assistance with data collection, analysis and reporting.

- Develop healthy communities toolkits and guidelines.
3. Developing partnerships and supporting collaboration
   - Establish a working relationship with partner agencies such as the HHSA and school districts to share data and collaborate on projects. Partner with community-based organizations.
   - Identify strategies to leverage existing resources.
   - Develop a coordinated public information and education campaign, and a communications strategy to raise public awareness.

4. Developing tools and processes to incorporate health considerations in decision-making
   - Develop a geographic information systems (GIS) based health impact assessment and forecasting tool to support planning and decision-making at the local and regional level.
   - Develop a public module for SANDAG’s CommunityViz sketch planning tool.
   - Establish health-based project selection and evaluation criteria to determine priorities for regional investments.

5. Establishing performance measures
   - Identify performance measures to monitor and evaluate effectiveness and progress of policies, programs and projects.
     - Develop performance measures for active transportation.
     - Develop performance measures to measure benefit and impacts to high-need communities (as defined by demographics, physical or social characteristics, and health outcomes).

6. Focusing on implementation
   - Identify resources to implement projects and programs.
   - Identify opportunities to institutionalize change.

G. CONCLUSION

In a walkable neighborhood, most daily goods and services including parks, schools, transit stops, grocery stores or food markets, medical services, and other local-serving retail, are located within a walking or bicycling distance from homes. These activities are connected with safe and accessible paths and routes that provide multiple opportunities for community members to walk to their destinations. Walkable neighborhoods also experience a relatively smaller number and shorter length of car trips on local streets, leading to lower emissions and reduced risk of injury. As people walk to local destinations, they provide more “eyes on the street,” improving safety through “natural surveillance.”
Reduced traffic volumes on local streets in these neighborhoods provide opportunities to redistribute or balance the street rights-of-way and parking areas to accommodate pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure and amenities, and even add public plazas and open space. By providing greater access to a range of uses and activities, increasing opportunities for daily physical activity, reducing emissions, lowering the risk of injury, and enhancing social cohesion and interaction with neighbors, walkable neighborhoods promote better physical and mental health, cleaner environment, and a better quality of life.

The connection between air quality and public health has been understood for some time. Only recently, however, have we come to understand that the way we construct our transportation system and the way that system relates to our land use plans and community design also plays a role in the overall health of our communities.

The implications for SANDAG’s regional planning activities in general, and transportation plans in particular, could be significant. SANDAG has a history of supporting bicycling and walking, but consideration of public health has not been incorporated into transportation decisions. While SANDAG has supported active transportation through smart growth incentives and bicycle and pedestrian programs, no basis for evaluating the effectiveness of these efforts on active transportation has been developed.

SANDAG should collaborate with public health professionals in the region to determine how public health considerations could be taken into account in the planning, funding, and project development process. In addition, SANDAG should partner with local jurisdictions to develop and implement a methodology for monitoring and reporting on the amount of bicycling and walking that takes place in the region so it can better evaluate the effects of its plans and programs.

By providing successful leadership in this area, SANDAG could not only inform and support planning and decision-making at the local and regional level, but can also influence policy at the state and national level.
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REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT (RHNA) DETERMINATION

Introduction

The Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) process for the fifth housing element cycle (January 1, 2013 – December 31, 2020) is being conducted in conjunction with the development of the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) in accordance with Senate Bill (SB) 375 (Steinberg). SB 375 calls for the coordination and integration of housing planning with the regional transportation plan.

The RHNA process has three main components:

- RHNA-Determination - HCD’s regionwide housing need determination;
- RHNA-Plan - SANDAG’s plan to distribute the RHNA-Determination to the local jurisdictions by four income categories, which includes the RHNA methodology; and
- RHNA - Each jurisdiction’s housing need allocation in four income categories for use in updating local housing elements.

SANDAG has received its RHNA-Determination from the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) following a consultation process between the two agencies, which began in June 2010 (Attachment 1). State housing element law requires HCD to consult with SANDAG in determining the region’s overall housing need. HCD’s RHNA-Determination is required to be completed at least two years before the scheduled revision of the next housing element. Housing elements for the San Diego region are required to be completed within 18 months following the adoption of the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Based on the current RTP schedule, local jurisdiction housing elements for the fifth housing element cycle shall be completed (including a finding of compliance by HCD) by January 21, 2013 (18 months following the July 22, 2011, planned adoption of the RTP).

HCD’s RHNA-Determination for the 11-Year RHNA Projection Period of January 1, 2010, through December 31, 2020, is 161,980 housing units. The regional distribution of the RHNA-Determination by income category is shown in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Categories</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>36,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>27,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>30,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above-Moderate</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
<td>67,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>161,980</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SANDAG is holding joint meetings of the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG) and Regional Housing Working Group (RHWG) to develop a draft of the RHNA-Plan. The RHNA-Plan will include the RHNA methodology, how the methodology meets the RHNA objectives, how the factors in housing element law were used in the RHNA methodology, and the RHNA for each jurisdiction.

**Discussion**

**HCD-SANDAG Consultation Process**

The consultation process for the RHNA-Determination between SANDAG and HCD occurred between June and November 2010. The consultation process included meetings and conference calls during which information was exchanged about assumptions and the methodology (population projections, vacancy rates, household formation rates, etc.) to be used in the determination. Attachment 2 (excerpted from housing element law) includes a list of the information SANDAG provided HCD during the consultation process.

**Difference between HCD RHNA-Determination and SANDAG 2050 Regional Growth Forecast**

As reported to the Regional Planning Committee, SANDAG Board of Directors, and at joint meetings of the Regional Planning TWG and RHWG, the 2050 Regional Growth Forecast (RGF) projects that about 127,000 housing units will be built during the 11-year RHNA projection period. The RHNA-Determination projects the need for 161,980 housing units, almost 35,000 more units than the 2050 RGF for the same time period.

The two projections have different purposes and were developed using different assumptions. The 2050 RGF reflects the number of housing units that are likely to be built in the region during the 11-year period based on economic, fiscal, and other policy factors. The RHNA-Determination is a projection of housing need based solely on demographic considerations such as population growth, vacancy rates and household formation rates, and is not influenced by economic factors. The 2050 RGF is oriented toward actual housing production, whereas the RHNA-Determination is focused on planning for adequate housing capacity.

**Adequacy of Housing Capacity for RHNA based on 2050 Regional Growth Forecast**

Data from the 2050 RGF demonstrate the San Diego region’s ability to accommodate the overall RHNA-Determination of 161,980 housing units, and the lower income RHNA of 64,143 units\(^1\) (36,445 very low income units plus 27,698 low income units). First, the 2050 RGF projects the construction of 169,528 housing units between January 1, 2010, and January 1, 2025 (only four years beyond the RHNA Projection Period).

Second, the forecast also contains a capacity of over 200,000 housing units in the category of 30 dwelling units per acre or greater (based primarily on existing general/community plans and policies), which demonstrates that the region has more than enough sites planned to meet its RHNA-Determination lower income housing need of 64,143 units. Housing element law requires jurisdictions to identify adequate sites to accommodate their share of the region’s lower income housing needs and allows the use of sites with densities of at least 30 dwelling units per acre (at least 20 dwelling units per acre for Coronado, Del Mar, and Solana Beach) in their analysis.
SB 375 (Steinberg) and RHNA

SB 375 calls for a land use pattern that will help meet regional GHG targets by improving transportation and land use coordination and jobs housing balance, creating more transit-oriented, compact and walkable communities, providing more housing capacity for all income levels, and protecting resource areas (such as sensitive habitat areas and mineral resources) and farmland.

SB 375 requires that the RHNA be consistent with the development pattern of the SCS, that the SCS show that it accommodates the RHNA, and that the SCS land use pattern, and therefore the RHNA, assist the region in meeting the greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction targets set by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) in September 2010. SANDAG is developing the RHNA, SCS, and RTP in a way that assists the region in meeting its GHG targets, and the 2050 Regional Growth Forecast serves as a foundation in their development.

State housing element law (Government Code Section 65584 (d)) states that the RHNA shall be consistent with the four following objectives. These objectives are consistent with the SANDAG RCP and Smart Growth Concept Map and include:

1. Increasing the housing supply and the mix of housing types, tenure, and affordability in all cities and counties within the region in an equitable manner, which shall result in all jurisdictions receiving an allocation of units for low- and very low-income households.
2. Promoting infill development and socioeconomic equity, the protection of environmental and agricultural resources, and the encouragement of efficient development patterns.
3. Promoting an improved intraregional relationship between jobs and housing.
4. Allocating a lower proportion of housing need to an income category when a jurisdiction already has a disproportionately high share of households in that income category.

The 2050 RGF (approved for planning purposes by the SANDAG Board in February 2010) provides the foundation for the 2050 RTP/SCS land use pattern and the RHNA for the fifth housing element cycle. The Forecast identifies existing land uses, planned land uses (on vacant land and in redevelopment and infill areas), habitat conservation areas, agricultural lands, and development constraints, such as steep slopes, floodplains, and wetlands on a parcel level basis, which also are factors that housing element law requires to be considered in the development of the RHNA methodology.

Next Steps

The information in this report will be presented to the Board of Directors on December 17, 2010. The Regional Planning TWG and RHWG are continuing to meet jointly to develop the RHNA-Plan and methodology for allocating the RHNA-Determination by jurisdiction and by the four income categories. Joint meetings of the two working groups are being held monthly through January, with the goal of making a recommendation on the draft RHNA-Plan to the RPC at its February 2011 meeting.
A public hearing on the draft RHNA-Plan is anticipated to be held by the Board of Directors in spring 2011, in addition to public workshops on the draft RHNA-Plan and draft RTP/SCS.

CHARLES “MUGGS” STOLL
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachments: 1. Letter from California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), HCD Final RHNA-Determination – 1/1/10-12/31/20 (11-Year Projection Period)
2. Excerpt from Housing Element Law – RHNA-Determination

Key Staff Contact: Susan Baldwin, (619) 699-1943, sba@sandag.org
November 23, 2010

Mr. Gary L. Gallegos
Executive Director
San Diego Association of Governments
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 95101-4231

Dear Mr. Gallegos:

RE: Regional Housing Need Determination

This letter provides the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) its Regional Housing Need Determination. Pursuant to State housing element law (Government Code Section 65584, et seq.), the Department of Housing and Community Development (Department) is required to provide the determination of SANDAG's existing and projected housing need.

As you know, recent legislation amended State laws impacting regional housing and transportation planning. SB 375 (Chapter 728, Statutes of 2008) strengthened coordination of housing and transportation planning and requires Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) to prepare a sustainable communities strategy to achieve greenhouse gas emission reductions. Among other things, SB 575 (Chapter 354, Statutes of 2009) included amendments establishing the due date for San Diego local governments to update the fifth revision of their housing elements. In assessing SANDAG's regional housing need, the Department considered the importance of these legislative amendments in connection with the critical role housing plays in creating sustainable communities and providing jobs.

In determining SANDAG's regional housing need, the Department and SANDAG staff completed an extensive consultation process. On June 21, 2010, the Department met with the following SANDAG staff: Mr. Muggs Stoll, Ms. Coleen Clementson, Ms. Susan Baldwin, and Ms. Beth Jarosz. The Department, along with Ms. Baldwin and Ms. Jarosz, also consulted with Ms. Mary Heim, State Department of Finance (DOF) Deputy Director of the Demographic Research Unit. Consultations between June and November included data generation and review by SANDAG, DOF, and the Department.

Attachment 1 displays the minimum regional housing need allocation (RHNA) of 161,980 total units among four income categories for SANDAG to distribute among its local governments. Attachment 2 explains the methodology applied pursuant to Government Code Section 65584.01. As you know, SANDAG is responsible for adopting a methodology and RHNA Plan for the projection period beginning January 2010 and
ending December 2020. Within 30 days from adopting the Plan, SANDAG must submit
the Plan to the Department for approval. Local governments are required to update
their Housing Element for the planning period beginning January 2013 and ending
December 2020 to accommodate the share of RHNA for each income category.

Pursuant to Government Code Section 65584, the methodology to prepare SANDAG's
RHNA plan must be consistent with the following objectives:

(1) increasing the housing supply and mix of housing types, tenure, and affordability;
(2) promoting infill development and socioeconomic equity, protecting environmental and
agricultural resources, and encouraging efficient development patterns;
(3) promoting an improved intraregional relationship between jobs and housing;
(4) balancing the distribution of households by income category.

The Department commends SANDAG for its leadership and efforts in fulfilling its
important role in advancing the State's housing, transportation, and environmental
goals. SANDAG is also recognized for successfully undertaking the challenging task of
being the first MPO in the State to begin implementing SB 375 including efforts to
develop its RHNA and sustainable communities strategy. The Department especially
thanks Ms. Baldwin and Ms. Jarosz for their significant efforts and assistance. The
Department looks forward to its continued partnership with SANDAG and its member
jurisdictions and assisting SANDAG in its planning efforts to accommodate the region's
share of housing need.

If the Department can provide any additional assistance, or if you, or your staff, have any
questions, please contact Glen Campora, Assistant Deputy Director, at (916) 445-4728.

Sincerely,

Cathy E. Creswell
Deputy Director

Enclosures
ATTACHMENT 1

HCD REGIONAL HOUSING NEED DETERMINATION

SANDAG GOVERNMENTS: JANUARY 2010 through DECEMBER 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Category</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Housing Unit Need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very-Low</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>36,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>27,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>30,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above-Moderate</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
<td>67,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>161,980</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

Housing Need Determination:
Refer to Attachment 2 for a description and explanation of methodology.

The Department and SANDAG staff acknowledge important differences between the "projection" methodology specified in statute to determine housing need versus the "forecasting" methodology SANDAG used for its 2050 Growth Forecast. The planning objective of the RHNA is to accommodate housing "capacity" for projected household growth. However, among the objectives of SANDAG's Growth Forecast is to estimate housing "production" based on policy considerations (including potential constraints) and assumptions regarding variables such as housing prices, resource limitations and market trends, etc. Differences in estimates of the number of housing units can occur from applying different methodologies.

Income Categories:
Each category is defined by California Health and Safety Code (Section 50093, et seq.). Percent is derived based on Census reported household income brackets and county median income. Housing unit need is derived from multiplying income category percent against total.
ATTACHMENT 2

HCD REGIONAL HOUSING NEED DETERMINATION: SANDAG January 2010-December 2020

Methodology

Projected Population, Households, and New Housing Unit Need: December 31, 2020

2. Less: Group Quarter Population (SANDAG's Estimate): -130,973
3. Household (HH) Population: 3,437,583

4. Projected Households (HHs): HH Population HH Formation or Headship Rate (DOF) Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Groups (DOF)</th>
<th>HH Population</th>
<th>HH Formation or Headship Rate (DOF)</th>
<th>Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 15 years</td>
<td>710,371</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1,258,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 24 years</td>
<td>427,306</td>
<td>14.5589%</td>
<td>62,211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 34 years</td>
<td>495,193</td>
<td>41.9984%</td>
<td>207,973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - 44 years</td>
<td>422,529</td>
<td>50.1651%</td>
<td>211,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 - 54 years</td>
<td>425,138</td>
<td>53.5210%</td>
<td>227,538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 - 64 years</td>
<td>433,523</td>
<td>54.8790%</td>
<td>237,913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 plus years</td>
<td>523,523</td>
<td>59.4782%</td>
<td>311,383</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Projected Households (HHs): 1,258,980
5. Less: Existing Households at Beginning of Projection Period (January 1, 2010): -1,103,320

7. Vacancy Allowance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure Percentage</th>
<th>Owners</th>
<th>Renters</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55.4%</td>
<td>44.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td>155,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Unit Need</td>
<td>86,304</td>
<td>69,356</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacancy Rate</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacancy Allowance</td>
<td>1,726</td>
<td>3,468</td>
<td>5,194</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Replacement Allowance: 0.70%

REGIONAL HOUSING NEED DETERMINATION (New Housing Unit Need): 161,980

Explanation and Data Sources

1. Population: Population reflects SANDAG's January 1, 2021 projection from its 2050 Growth Forecast. Per Government Code 65584.01(b), HCD accepted SANDAG's projection upon determining it was within 3 percent of the population projected by State Department of Finance (DOF) for the same period.

2. Group Quarter Population: Figure is SANDAG's estimate of persons residing in group home/institution/military/dormitory quarters. As this population doesn't constitute a "household" population generating demand for a housing unit, the group quarter population is subtracted from total population to derive household population or the number of persons generating a housing need for a owner or renter unit.

3. Household (HH) Population: The population projected to reside in housing units after subtracting the group quarter population from total projected population.

4. Projected Households (HHs): Projected HHs are derived by applying (to HH population) estimated HH formation rates determined by DOF among displayed age groups. HH formation or headship rates reflect the propensity of different population groups (by age, ethnicity, etc.) to form new households.

5. Existing Households: This figure reflects DOF's estimate of "occupied" units at start of period of January 2010 (per DOF E-6 report released May 2010 by the Demographic Research Unit). Existing HHs (units) are subtracted from projected HHs at end of period (December 31, 2020) to derive household growth.

6. Household (HH) Growth: This figure reflects projected HH growth and need for new units.

7. Vacancy Allowance: An adjustment (unit increase) is made to facilitate availability among owner and renter units. Owner/Renter % is based on Census data. A smaller rate is applied to owner units due to less frequent movement. Information from different authoritative sources support an acceptable range of 1-4% for owner units and 4-8% for renter units depending on market conditions. The 2% owner rate was reduced from the 3% rate used in 2005. No change was made to the 5% renter rate.

8. Replacement Allowance: Rate (.7%) reflects housing losses localities annually reported to DOF each January for years 2000-2010.
Excerpt from Housing Element Law – Regional Housing Needs Assessment - Determination

65584.01. (a) For the fourth and subsequent revision of the housing element pursuant to Section 65588, the department, in consultation with each council of governments, where applicable, shall determine the existing and projected need for housing for each region in the following manner:

(b) The department’s determination shall be based upon population projections produced by the Department of Finance and regional population forecasts used in preparing regional transportation plans, in consultation with each council of governments. If the total regional population forecast for the planning period, developed by the council of governments and used for the preparation of the regional transportation plan, is within a range of 3 percent of the total regional population forecast for the planning period over the same time period by the Department of Finance, then the population forecast developed by the council of governments shall be the basis from which the department determines the existing and projected need for housing in the region. If the difference between the total population growth projected by the council of governments and the total population growth projected for the region by the Department of Finance is greater than 3 percent, then the department and the council of governments shall meet to discuss variances in methodology used for population projections and seek agreement on a population projection for the region to be used as a basis for determining the existing and projected housing need for the region. If no agreement is reached, then the population projection for the region shall be the population projection for the region prepared by the Department of Finance as may be modified by the department as a result of discussions with the council of governments.

(c) (1) At least 26 months prior to the scheduled revision pursuant to Section 65588 and prior to developing the existing and projected housing need for a region, the department shall meet and consult with the council of governments regarding the assumptions and methodology to be used by the department to determine the region’s housing needs. The council of governments shall provide data assumptions from the council’s projections, including, if available, the following data for the region:

(A) Anticipated household growth associated with projected population increases.

(B) Household size data and trends in household size.

(C) The rate of household formation, or headship rates, based on age, gender, ethnicity, or other established demographic measures.

(D) The vacancy rates in existing housing stock, and the vacancy rates for healthy housing market functioning and regional mobility, as well as housing replacement needs.

(E) Other characteristics of the composition of the projected population.
(F) The relationship between jobs and housing, including any imbalance between jobs and housing.

(2) The department may accept or reject the information provided by the council of governments or modify its own assumptions or methodology based on this information. After consultation with the council of governments, the department shall make determinations in writing on the assumptions for each of the factors listed in subparagraphs (A) to (F), inclusive, of paragraph (1) and the methodology it shall use and shall provide these determinations to the council of governments.

(d) (1) After consultation with the council of governments, the department shall make a determination of the region’s existing and projected housing need based upon the assumptions and methodology determined pursuant to subdivision (c). The region’s existing and projected housing need shall reflect the achievement of a feasible balance between jobs and housing within the region using the regional employment projections in the applicable regional transportation plan. Within 30 days following notice of the determination from the department, the council of governments may file an objection to the department’s determination of the region’s existing and projected housing need with the department.

(2) The objection shall be based on and substantiate either of the following:

(A) The department failed to base its determination on the population projection for the region established pursuant to subdivision (b), and shall identify the population projection which the council of governments believes should instead be used for the determination and explain the basis for its rationale.

(B) The regional housing need determined by the department is not a reasonable application of the methodology and assumptions determined pursuant to subdivision (c). The objection shall include a proposed alternative determination of its regional housing need based upon the determinations made in subdivision (c), including analysis of why the proposed alternative would be a more reasonable application of the methodology and assumptions determined pursuant to subdivision (c).

(3) If a council of governments files an objection pursuant to this subdivision and includes with the objection a proposed alternative determination of its regional housing need, it shall also include documentation of its basis for the alternative determination. Within 45 days of receiving an objection filed pursuant to this section, the department shall consider the objection and make a final written determination of the region's existing and projected housing need that includes an explanation of the information upon which the determination was made.
Environmental Mitigation Program

Five-Year Strategy, FY 11 Funding and Grant Criteria

December 3, 2010

Calavera Preserve, Carlsbad

Environmental Mitigation Program Costs

(In Millions, 2002 Dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Program</td>
<td>$850 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Habitat Conservation Fund</td>
<td>$200 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Transportation Project Mitigation</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Highway &amp; Transit Project Mitigation</td>
<td>$450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Project Mitigation Fund</td>
<td>$650 M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Environmental Mitigation Program Costs

Habitat Conservation Fund

Regional Monitoring and Land Management

Habitat Conservation Fund

Implementation Process

- MOA (February 22, 2008)
- $4 million annually for 10 years
- Five-Year Funding Strategy
- Annual Funding Approved by SANDAG Board
- Land Management Grants

Five-Year Strategy & FY 2011 Allocation

- Chart a course for the EMP funding
- FY 2011 allocation total $4 million
- Proposed update to five-year strategy
- Two New Tasks Added

Golden Spotted Oak Borer
Yellow Star Thistle
2007 Poomacha Fire

Large scale acquisition, management, and monitoring
Reduce cost
Accelerate delivery
Implement habitat plans
↓ Listing of species
Land Management Grants FY 2011

- Proposed fifth grant cycle
- FY 2011 proposed $1.95 million

Eligible Activities:

- Invasive control and habitat restoration: $950,000
- Species-specific management: $650,000
- Habitat maintenance, access control, and volunteer coordination: $350,000

What's Next?

1) Transportation Committee: January 7, 2011
2) ITOC: January 12, 2011
3) SANDAG Board of Directors: January 28, 2011
4) Land Management Grants RFP: February 2011

Recommendation

The Regional Planning Committee is requested to recommend to the SANDAG Board of Directors to:

1) approve the updated Five-Year Conceptual Funding Strategic Plan, the proposed management and monitoring activities and budget for FY 2011 totaling $4 million, and, subject to Board Policy No. 017, authorize staff to solicit proposals and enter into contracts or amend existing contracts accordingly; and

2) adopt the modifications to the eligibility and evaluation criteria for land management grants for FY 2011 as described in Attachment 4 of the report.
### SANDAG Initiatives

- Health impact and forecasting assessment
- Regional comprehensive land use and transportation policies
- Healthy communities campaign
  - Countywide Safe Routes to School implementation
- Active commuters transportation promotion
- Regional bikeway signage and promotion

### Healthy Communities Campaign
- Healthy community planning grants ($700,000 total)
- Active community transportation grants ($150,000 total)

### Program Objectives: Healthy Community Planning Grants
- Integrate and institutionalize public health considerations in planning
- Address health disparities and inequities
- Promote physical activity
- Promote access to healthy and nutritious foods
- Establish collaborative working relationships
- Build consensus in the community

### Eligibility: Healthy Community Planning Grants
- Cities and the County of San Diego
- Tribal Governments
- Existing projects are eligible to apply

### Type of Projects: Healthy Community Planning Grants
- Public health elements
- Zoning codes, street design guidelines, or subdivision ordinances
- Health impact assessments
- Urban agriculture or food systems assessments
- Park master plans or design guidelines
- Other . . .
### Evaluation Criteria: Healthy Community Planning Grants

- Address Program Objectives (20 Pts.)
- Implement an Innovative Approach (20 Pts.)
- Serve High-Need Communities (20 Pts.)
- Lead to Implementation and Systems Change (20 Pts.)
- Build on Local Commitment to Public Health (10 Pts.)
- Support a Collaborative and Inclusive Process (10 Pts.)

**Bonus Points**
- Leverage Funds and Resources (10 Pts.)

### Selection Panel: Healthy Community Planning Grants

- Two members of SANDAG Staff
- One member from the TWG
- One member from the PHSG
- One member of HHSA Staff
- Two health and the built environment experts
- One member from the San Diego Council of Design Professionals

### Program Objectives: Active Community Transportation Grants

- Integrate and institutionalize public health considerations in planning
- Address health disparities and inequities
- Promote physical activity
- Promote access to healthy and nutritious foods
- Establish collaborative working relationships
- Build consensus in the community

### Eligibility: Active Community Transportation Grants

- Cities and the County of San Diego
- Tribal Governments
- Existing projects are eligible to apply

### Type of Projects: Active Community Transportation Grants

- Comprehensive, neighborhood- or corridor-level active transportation plans

### Evaluation Criteria: Active Community Transportation Grants

- Address Program Objectives (20 Pts.)
- Implement a Comprehensive Approach (20 Pts.)
- Serve High-Need Communities (20 Pts.)
- Lead to Implementation and Systems Change (20 Pts.)
- Build on Commitment to Active Transportation (10 Pts.)
- Support a Collaborative and Inclusive Process (10 Pts.)

**Bonus Points**
- Leverage Funds and Resources (10 Pts.)
Selection Panel:
Active Community Transportation Grants

- Four members of SANDAG Staff
- One member from the BPWG
- One member from the TWG
- One professional with SRTS expertise
- One HHSA Staff

Safe Routes to School Implementation

- Capacity building and planning grants ($250,000 total)
- Education, encouragement, and enforcement grants ($50,000 total)

Program Objectives

- Increase walking and biking to schools
- Improve safety conditions
- Realize the benefits of SRTS efforts
- Consider all of the 5 E's
- Establish collaborative partnerships
- Evaluate effectiveness
- Strengthen support for SRTS
- Initiate institutional change

Eligibility

- Cities and the County of San Diego
- Tribal Governments
- School Districts
- Non-Profit Organizations
- Existing projects are eligible to apply

Type of Projects

- Capacity Building and Planning Grants
  - Neighborhood, community, or citywide SRTS plans
- Education, Encouragement, and Enforcement Grants
  - Safety courses, curriculums, and lesson plans
  - Incentive programs
  - Teen-oriented programs

Evaluation Criteria

- Commitment to Active Transportation (20 Pts.)
- Capacity to Implement (20 Pts.)
- Evidence of Need (20 Pts.)
- Methodology (20 Pts.)
- Community Involvement (20 Pts.)

Bonus Points

- Leverage Funds and Resources (10 Pts.)
### Selection Panel
- Two members of SANDAG Staff
- One member from the TWG
- One member from the PHSG
- One member of HHSA staff
- One professional with SRTS expertise

### Review Process
- Review workshops, October 19 and 21
- Bicycle and Pedestrian Working Group, October 27
- Joint Regional Planning Technical Working Group and Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee meeting, October 28
- San Diego Regional Traffic Engineers Council, November 18
- Public Health Stakeholder Group, November 18

### Proposed Grant Program Timeline
- Release call for projects by end-December, 2010
- Receive grant applications by mid-February, 2011
- Review applications and award grants by mid-April, 2011
- Contract with on-call list of consultants by end-March, 2011
- Project completion by February 1, 2012

### Recommendation
- The Regional Planning Committee is asked to recommend that the Board of Directors approve the proposed grant program objectives, eligibility, evaluation criteria, and process as shown in Attachment 2.
Planning for Healthy Communities
December 3, 2010

Obesity Trends* Among U.S. Adults, BRFSS, 1990

Obesity Trends* Among U.S. Adults, BRFSS, 1994

Obesity Trends* Among U.S. Adults, BRFSS, 1997

Obesity Trends* Among U.S. Adults, BRFSS, 2000

Obesity Trends* Among U.S. Adults, BRFSS, 2004

(*BMI ≥ 30, or ~30 lbs. overweight for 5'4" person)
Leading Causes of Death in the US

7 out of 10 deaths each year are from chronic diseases
CDC’s National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion (NCCDPHP), USA

Built Environment Matters

Disconnected (auto-oriented) vs. Connected (walkable)

Source: Urban Design 4 Health

Next Steps

Public Health Policy Framework Development
- Circulate white paper for comment and feedback by December 31
- Develop key recommendations for inclusion in the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan
- Develop a policy framework for including public health in a future update of the Regional Comprehensive Plan
What is a General Plan

- Every city in California must have a General Plan, a blueprint for growth and development.
- La Mesa’s General Plan reflects community values and directs policy decisions and planning for the future.
- The General Plan informs residents, developers and decision makers of the City’s policies that guide future development of the City.
96% built-out
Access to two Trolley lines, five Trolley stations, and five local bus routes
City segmented by I-8, SR 125, and SR 94
SANDAG 2050 Growth Forecast for La Mesa:
- 2008 pop. 56,445
- 2050 pop. 77,780 (38%)
Transit Oriented Developments

1. **Navy Housing**
   - 244 units, low & moderate income
   - ¼ mile to trolley station, ½ mile to shopping

2. **La Mesa Village Plaza**
   - 95 condos, office and commercial space
   - Adjacent to Trolley station

3. **Villages of La Mesa**
   - 384 units on 20 acres
   - ¼ mile to Trolley

4. **Paseo Condominiums**
   - 18 condominiums + retail
   - ¼ mile to shopping/Trolley

5. **Alterra & Pravada**
   - 527 residential units + retail
   - 80 affordable units
   - Adjacent to Trolley station
New TOD Opportunities

- **Downtown La Mesa Village**
  - Park Station mixed-use project, 80 du/acre
- **Grossmont Shopping Center**
  - 65-acre site planned for mixed-use retail and residential development
- **70th Street Trolley Station**
  - Former trailer park, now RV park ready for a mixed-use Specific Plan

Mixed-Use Overlay Zone:
Encouraging Smart Growth
Aragon – Mixed-Use TOD

Located on the El Cajon Blvd. transit corridor

40 du/acre

Why update?

• Initial goals for the General Plan:
  – Incorporate new issues of sustainability, climate change, water conservation, and wellness
  – Strengthen policies that preserve single-family neighborhoods while promoting in-fill development along transit corridors
  – Consistency with SANDAG Smart Growth Principles and SCS
New Components

• Health and Wellness Element
  – Funded with $50,000 Kaiser grant
  – Incorporates “Ready... Set… Live Well” Initiative for La Mesa/Spring Valley

• Sidewalk Master Plan and SANDAG funded Bicycle Facilities Plan

• Sustainability throughout the Elements

New Components

• Urban Agriculture
  – Community Garden
  – Weekly Farmer’s Market
### State Legislation and Regional Plans

- **AB 32**
  - Reducing GHG emissions and utilizing SANDAG Climate Action Strategy and SCS
- **SB 375**
  - Links land use and transportation planning
- **AB 1358**
  - Complete Streets
- **SANDAG 2050 RTP**
- **SANDAG Smart Growth Concept Map**
- **SANDAG Regional Comprehensive Plan**

### Public Participation

- [www.cityoflamesa.com](http://www.cityoflamesa.com) Web page
- E-updates (Notify Me)
- Community Workshops
- Online and Written Surveys
- Public Meetings and Hearings
Community Workshops

- April 15, 2010
  Public Workshop #1
- Sept. 23, 2010
  Public Workshop #2
- Oct. 9, 2010
  “Sustain La Mesa” Environmental Festival

Preliminary Survey Results

Question: What do you think are the most important issues for La Mesa in the next 20 years?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental sustainability</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood preservation</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public safety</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic development</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public services/facilities</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective government</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown village</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density/growth</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks/recreation/open space</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban design</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity/diversity</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers market/community agriculture</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdictional collaboration</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on 177 of 232 survey respondents who provided comments
Stakeholder Meetings

- City Council, Boards, and Commissions
- Governmental Agencies
- Business Associations
- Community Groups
- Faith-based Organizations
- Environmental Groups

Public Participation Schedule for the General Plan Update

2010
- Town Hall Meeting 1/7/10
- Public Workshop #1 4/16/10
- Council Update
- Webpage, Live 3/15/10

2011
- Council Update
- Town Hall Meeting
- Public Workshop #2
- Public Workshops, TBD

2012
- Quarterly Council Updates and Public Hearings
- EIR Process
- RHNA Allocation From SANDAG
**Challenge: Putting the Pieces Together**

- **Small budget**
  - However, slow economy allows more staff time to work on the General Plan
  - Public Services and Facilities Element, Land Use and Sidewalk Master Plan completed in house

- **Technical assistance**
  - SANDAG bicycle facilities grant will ensure that Circulation Element contains Bicycle Master Plan and complete streets
  - Consultants completing Noise and Housing Element analysis

**EIR Challenge**

- Funding yet to be identified
- EIR will cost more than the entire General Plan update
- Cannot adopt the new General Plan without an EIR
Questions?