REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE AGENDA

Friday, December 6, 2002
12 noon - 2 p.m.*

SAN Dag
401 B Street, Conference Room A
San Diego, CA

AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

• MEMBERSHIP FOR STAKEHOLDERS WORKING GROUP
• REGIONAL VISION AND CORE VALUES
• URBAN FORM COMPONENT OF RCP
• INTEGRATION OF REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN
• INFRASTRUCTURE UPDATE

* The Regional Planning Committee meeting will start no earlier than 12 noon due to the SAN Dag Board Public Hearing on the Regional Transportation Plan, which could last past 12 noon.

MISSION STATEMENT

The Regional Planning Committee provides oversight for the preparation and implementation of the Regional Comprehensive Plan that is based on the local general plans and regional plans and addresses interregional issues with surrounding counties and Mexico. The components of the plan could include: transportation, housing, environment (shoreline, open space, air, water quality, habitat), economy, regional infrastructure needs and financing as well as land use and design components of the regional growth management strategy. Recommendations of the Committee are forwarded to the SAN Dag Board of Directors for action.
Welcome to SANDAG! Members of the public may speak to the Regional Planning Committee on any item at the time the Committee is considering the item. Please complete a Speaker’s Slip which is located in the rear of the room and then present the slip to Committee staff. Also, members of the public are invited to address the Committee on any issue under the agenda item entitled Public Comments/Communications. Speakers are limited to three minutes. The Regional Planning Committee may take action on any item appearing on the agenda.

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

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

SANDAG offices are accessible by public transit. Phone 1-800-COMMUTE or see www.sdcommute.com for route information.
# REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE
Friday, December 6, 2002

The Regional Planning Committee may take action on any item appearing on this agenda.

Staff Contact: Carolina Gregor, (619) 595-5399; cgr@sandag.org

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM #</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

## CONSENT ITEMS (ITEMS 1 - 3)

The Regional Planning Committee will take action on the consent agenda without further discussion and with one vote unless an item is pulled by a Committee member or by a member of the public for comment.

+1. **ACTIONS FROM NOVEMBER 1, 2002 MEETING** (pp. 5-8)  
INFORMATION

+2. **REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING SCHEDULE FOR 2003**  (Chair Holt Pfeiler) (p. 9)  
APPROVE

Attached for approval is a proposed meeting schedule for 2003.

+3. **WORK PROGRAM FOR THE REGIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN**  (Carolina Gregor, Staff) (pp. 10-12)  
APPROVE

Attached is a work program for the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) outlining the timeframe for the preparation of the components and their relationship to the public outreach efforts. A draft RCP is expected by December 2003, with a final RCP by June 2004. The Regional Planning Technical Working Group’s comments have been incorporated into the work program. The work plan will guide the preparation of the RCP, and will be presented to the Stakeholders Working Group at its first meeting next January.

4. **PUBLIC COMMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS**

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

## REPORTS

+5. **STATUS OF PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT EFFORTS**  (Chair Lori Holt Pfeiler, Vice-Chair Patty Davis, and Janet Fairbanks, Staff) (pp. 13-19)  
INFORMATION

a. **Introduction of Public Involvement Consultant and Overview of Program**  
The Chair will introduce the new public involvement consultant, who will then provide a brief overview of the public involvement program for the RCP.

b. **Selection and Appointment of Stakeholder Working Group Members** - At its October meeting, the Committee voted to create a Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group. The Committee is requested to appoint the membership of the Stakeholders Working Group. A recommended slate from Chair Holt Pfeiler and Vice-Chair Davis will be provided at the meeting. The Working Group will start meeting in January 2003.

c. **Final Schedule for Subregional Roundtables** - Attached is the final schedule for the upcoming Subregional Roundtables on the RCP. Committee members are asked to mark their calendars and encourage fellow councilmembers, supervisors, and other interested parties to attend.
+6. REGIONAL VISION AND CORE VALUES FOR RCP (Chair Holt Pfeiler and Carolina Gregor) (pp. 20-22)  
**DISCUSS/ APPROVE**  
Earlier this year, the Committee developed a preliminary vision statement and core values based on smart growth that could be used as the basis for the RCP, with the understanding that the vision would be tested and refined through the public involvement program. In anticipation of the Subregional Roundtables and the joint meeting with the Borders Committee, the Regional Planning Committee is requested to discuss the attached vision statements and core values, and approve them for use at the Roundtables. Comments by the Regional Planning Technical Working Group have been incorporated.

+7. INTRODUCTION OF OUTLINE OF URBAN FORM COMPONENT OF THE RCP (Rob Rundle, Staff) (pp. 23-26)  
**COMMENT**  
Attached is a draft outline for the urban form component of the RCP. The Committee is requested to provide policy direction on the outline. Based on the Committee’s comments, a draft urban form chapter will be developed and brought to the Committee for formal action in April 2003. The Regional Planning Technical Working Group’s comments have been incorporated into the draft outline.

+8. INTEGRATION OF THE 2030 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN (Kim Kawada, Staff) (pp. 27-29)  
**DISCUSSION / RECOMMENDATION**  
At its October 2002 meeting, SANDAG accepted “Mobility 2030” for distribution for review and comment. Copies are available from the SANDAG Web site at www.sandag.org. Attached are the recommendations included in Chapter 5, which focus on land use and the environment. The Committee is requested to discuss the integration between the RTP and the RCP.

+9. PROGRESS ON INFRASTRUCTURE ITEMS (Marney Cox, Staff) (pp. 30-44)  
**INFORMATION**  
At its October 4, 2002 meeting, the Committee approved a procedure to complete the Integrated Regional Infrastructure Plan (IRIP). Attached is a report summarizing progress on the first three infrastructure components of the Plan. At the meeting, staff will present preliminary findings from step one of the approved procedures.

10. ADJOURNMENT AND UPCOMING MEETINGS  
**APPROVE**  
The next Regional Planning Committee meeting is scheduled for Friday, January 17, 2003, from 11 a.m. - 1 p.m. as the Joint Meeting with SANDAG’s Borders Committee. Additionally, the Committee is requested to stay an additional half hour from 1 - 1:30 p.m. to discuss important items related to the Regional Housing Needs Statement.

Due to the Subregional Workshops, there will be no Committee meeting in February. The next regularly scheduled meeting after the joint meeting with the Borders Committee will be on March 7, 2003, from 11 a.m. - 1 p.m.

+ next to an agenda item indicates an attachment
The regularly-scheduled meeting of the Regional Planning Committee was called to order by Vice-Chair Patty Davis (South County). Committee members in attendance were Dennis Holz (North County Coastal), Scott Peters (City of San Diego), and Ron Roberts (County of San Diego), along with alternates Judy Ritter (North County Inland), Ron Morrison (South County), and Jill Greer (East County). Ex-officio members in attendance were Gene Pound (Caltrans), Susanah Aguilera (DOD), Julianne Nygaard (NCTD), Jim Turner (SDCWA), and Bill Chopyk (SDUPD). Bob Leiter, representing the Regional Planning Working Group, also was in attendance.

CONSENT ITEMS

1. ACTIONS FROM OCTOBER 4, 2002 MEETING (INFORMATION)

2. SUMMARY OF THE TRIBAL GOVERNMENTS / SANDAG BOARD SUMMIT (INFORMATION)
   Action: The Regional Planning Committee approved the consent agenda.

3. PUBLIC COMMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS

Vice-Chair Patty Davis introduced and welcomed Jim Turner, the Committee’s new advisory member from the San Diego County Water Authority (CWA).

4. PROPOSED SCHEDULE FOR SUBREGIONAL ROUNDTABLES (APPROVE)

Action: Committee members approved the following dates and locations for the first series of Subregional Roundtables on the RCP, pending confirmation by the City of San Diego and South County. The meeting date for the County of San Diego is still under discussion.

- East County: January 15, 2003, La Mesa
- North County Coastal: January 16, 2003, Encinitas
- North County Inland: January 23, 2003, Escondido
- City of San Diego: February 3, 2003, Council Chambers, pending Mayor approval
- South County: February 26, 2003, Chula Vista, pending Imperial Beach
- County of San Diego: Date and location under discussion

5. BASIC GOALS, ISSUES, AND OPTIONS FOR THE REGIONAL ENERGY STRATEGY (DISCUSSION)

John Moot, Chairman of the Regional Energy Policy Advisory Council (REPAC), and Irene Stillings, Executive Director of the San Diego Regional Energy Office (SDREO), made a presentation on the
region’s long-term energy challenges. The SDREO is preparing the Regional Energy Strategy (RES), which is scheduled for review and consideration by the Regional Planning Committee and the SANDAG Board early next year, as a component of the RCP. Key concerns to be addressed in the RES include the rising demand for electricity and natural gas, limited local generation, limited electric transmission, underutilized local resources, and international energy opportunities. The speakers discussed potential policy areas (such as energy independence vs. inter-dependence and energy impacts on the environment), electric supply options, demand-side options, regulatory and legislative options, and goals and processes. They also discussed the key findings of the Regional Energy Infrastructure Study (REIS) (which will serve as the technical basis for the more policy-oriented RES); the forecast of energy demand doubling by 2030; the need for at least two new generating plants in addition to local energy efficiency, small-scale generation, and renewables; the need for additional transmission assets; the implications of significant new plant development in adjacent states and Mexico; the need for re-powering of existing gas plants; and significant potential for wind resources in the region.

Recommendations from the REIS included: a Joint Powers Energy Development Authority to provide a regional joint effort; ensure a diverse portfolio; create hedges against market and political risks; plan for the worse; and monitor and adjust to markets and regional supply situations. Public involvement forums were encouraged in order to increase public awareness and understand what the public wants.

Committee members made the following comments:

- The region needs to reduce its dependence from the grid and focus on smaller-scale, renewable resources, such as photovoltaics, and on more progressive tax policies that encourage more environmentally-sensitive outcomes.
- Building power plants in San Diego doesn’t guarantee that the power that we generate will remain in our region. For planning purposes, we need statewide agreement on where the new facilities will be located. Additionally, we should be hesitant to institute real-time pricing.
- Electricity cannot be stored; as a result, the problems occur at times of peak demand. Real-time pricing is one tool for addressing peak loads.
- About 90% of the power generated in our region is exported due to the way our current contracts are structured. Most of those contracts will expire in the next six or seven years.
- The region should create a JPA as a mechanism for developing a better energy strategy.
- We need to reduce energy demand and lessen the legislative roadblocks to using alternative energy sources, such as solar, photovoltaic, and wind.
- The RCP should include a regional strategy for transmission rights of way.
- Outreach should include all stakeholders, including Baja California, and Riverside and Imperial Counties.
- We need to have a reliable source of energy as part of the region’s economic strategy.

The REPAC and the SDREO will provide a draft Regional Energy Strategy to SANDAG by February 2003 and a final strategy by April 2003. The goal is to develop a consensus and implement the strategy. Ms. Stillings offered to make presentations to any interested communities or agencies.
6. INTRODUCTION TO BORDER ISSUES AND PROPOSAL FOR JOINT MEETING WITH BORDERS COMMITTEE (INFORMATION / DISCUSSION)

Vice-Chair Davis introduced Councilmember Crystal Crawford, Chair of SANDAG’s Borders Committee, and recognized Councilmembers Ritter and Greer as serving on both the Regional Planning and the Borders Committees.

Councilmember Crawford provided a brief overview of the work of the Borders Committee over the past six months, including ports of entry, border wait times, national security, transportation infrastructure, water supply, air quality, energy production and transmission, economic development, tourism, and tribal issues.

Councilmember Crawford proposed a joint meeting between the Borders Committee and Regional Planning Committee on January 17 from 11:00 a.m. - 1:00 p.m. to discuss issues related to the Borders component of the Regional Comprehensive Plan. Staff clarified that the Regional Planning Committee would skip its regularly-scheduled meeting on January 3, 2003, and instead, hold the joint meeting on January 17, 2003, when the Borders Committee usually meets.

**Action:** The Committee approved the Joint Meeting between the Regional Planning and the Borders Committees on January 17, 2003.

7. 2030 CITIES/COUNTY FORECAST (INFORMATION)

A presentation was made on the 2030 Cities/County Forecast. The long-range forecasts are SANDAG’s assessment of the amount of population, housing, and jobs to expect in our region over time. They are produced collaboratively with the local jurisdictions and are based on the most recently-available data and policies. They are not an endorsement of growth. The population, housing, and job figures projected in the 2030 forecast are lower than those projected in the previous forecast for the following reasons:

- The 2000 census figures, which serve as the base year for the 2030 forecast, came in lower than expected. The region had 100,000 fewer people in 2000 than originally projected, partially because the Department of Finance underestimated out-migration during the recession of the early 1990s.
- There was a remarkable drop in fertility rates, especially Hispanic population; those trends then become incorporated into the projections.
- Interregional commuting from Riverside has increased four-fold since 1990.

However, despite the lower projection, the important point is that the growth will continue, and we need to plan for the additional population in order to maintain our quality of life. The 2030 Forecast incorporates smart growth assumptions based on current general plan updates and assumptions provided by professional planning staffs of local jurisdictions.
Committee members made the following points:

- **SANDAG** is building interregional commuting into the forecast, which will become a self-fulfilling prophecy. Our plans are forcing us to export people out of our region. This is not smart growth.
- If local jurisdictions in our region would provide more housing in their local plans, the levels of interregional commuting could be decreased. The RCP is a mechanism to affect policies that influence the forecast and potentially could reverse the trends. The region needs smarter growth.
- The I-15 interregional survey showed that the people that made the choice to move to Riverside did so intentionally because of a desire for larger lots and more affordable housing, and they won’t change their minds.
- The survey was directed at people who already made the life-style change; so a bias is built in. We need to separate the short-term interpretation of the survey from the long-term implication.
- If we build cities and communities that are balanced with a mix of affordable housing and jobs for residents, people won’t have to commute out of the region to the extent identified in the forecasts.
- We need to increase densities, to provide additional housing choices and to get people off the roads.
- It is only when we deal with housing that we get myopic. There needs to be a basic change in the dynamics of housing provision.
- People tend to understand smart growth at the regional level. But when it is applied in their own backyards, they question the ability to provide infrastructure. There is still a lot of work to be done in our communities about how smart growth could work, and how it ties to regional incentives.
- One concern is that jobs may follow people moving out of the region in pursuit of affordable housing.
- Good planning suggests more housing. We need to provide housing for the jobs that we’re creating, to take a different approach than we have in the past. We need to create incentives for affordable housing to enhance alternatives to relocating people and businesses.
- A comment by the public was made in favor of promoting lower fertility rates more strongly. Committee members responded that that issue has been addressed effectively in the schools through teen pregnancy prevention programs.

8. **ADJOURNMENT AND UPCOMING MEETINGS (APPROVE)**

**Action:** The Committee approved the next meeting date for December 6, 2002 from 12:00 noon – 2 p.m., following the SANDAG Policy Board Meeting on the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Secretary
REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING SCHEDULE FOR 2003

The regularly-scheduled meetings of the Regional Planning Committee are generally held on the first Friday of the month from 11 a.m. - 1 p.m. at SANDAG. The following is the proposed meeting schedule for calendar year 2003, with exceptions to the regular meeting schedule noted with an asterisk* and in bold. Starting in January, the Regional Planning Committee meetings will be held in the SANDAG Board Room.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 17, 2003*</td>
<td>11 a.m. - 1 p.m. 1 - 1:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Joint Meeting with SANDAG's Borders Committee, followed by special 1/2 hour meeting to discuss regional housing needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2003*</td>
<td></td>
<td>No Meeting due to Subregional Workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 7, 2003</td>
<td>11 a.m. - 1 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 4, 2003</td>
<td>11 a.m. - 1 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2, 2003</td>
<td>11 a.m. - 1 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 6, 2003</td>
<td>11 a.m. - 1 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 11, 2003*</td>
<td>12 noon - 2 p.m. following the Board Policy Meeting</td>
<td>Date/time change due to the Independence Day Holiday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 1, 2003</td>
<td>11 a.m. - 1 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 5, 2003</td>
<td>11 a.m. - 1 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 3, 2003</td>
<td>11 a.m. - 1 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 7, 2003*</td>
<td>12 noon - 2 p.m., following the Board Policy Meeting</td>
<td>Time change to follow Board Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 5, 2003*</td>
<td>12 noon - 2 p.m., following the Board Policy Meeting</td>
<td>Time change to follow Board Meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the regularly-scheduled meetings, Committee members will be asked to take an active role in the public workshops on the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) occurring in their subregions in the January/February and June/July timeframes.

**Requested Action:** The Committee is requested to approve the Meeting Schedule for 2003.
WORK PROGRAM FOR THE REGIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

The Board of Directors and the Regional Planning Committee have called for the timely preparation of the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP). Under the attached Work Program, the SANDAG Board would be asked to accept the Draft RCP for review and comment in December 2003, and would be asked to adopt a final RCP by June 2004. All work associated with the preparation of the RCP is geared toward meeting this timeframe.

The Work Program outlines four specific work areas:

1. The Final Products (Draft Outline of RCP, Draft RCP, and Final RCP);
2. The RCP Components;
3. The Public Involvement and Outreach Efforts; and
4. SANDAG Board Actions.

The Work Program shows the estimated months in which the Board, the Regional Planning Committee, and the Regional Planning Committee’s associated working groups have considered or will consider specific items. The Work Program also shows the timeframes for Workshops and Board Retreats.

Three series of subregional public workshops are anticipated. The first round of workshops will begin early next year through the Subregional Roundtables in an effort to seek input from policymakers and stakeholders on the region’s vision and core values, and on the framework and structure of the RCP. Those roundtables currently are being organized. The second round of workshops will be held in June and July 2003 to seek input on specific components of the RCP. The third round will occur after the Draft RCP has been released for review and comment, in early 2004.

The Work Program shows that much work has already begun. However, a majority of the work on the components will occur between January and May 2003 in an effort to prepare for the second round of workshops. The Work Program also shows that the SANDAG Board will be extensively involved in the preparation of the RCP, with updates or actions on a quarterly basis at a minimum.

The Work Program encourages public involvement throughout the planning process. In addition to the scheduled workshops (described above) and the Stakeholders Working Group meetings that will begin in January 2003, the Work Program contains a number of actions designed to enrich public involvement (e.g., focus groups with peer facilitation, interactive technologies to be used at the workshops, environmental justice analysis and outreach, and others). *

Attachment

* Additionally, all SANDAG meetings are open to the public, and the public is invited and encouraged to participate.
## RCP Work Program

### Project Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORK ELEMENTS</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>Jun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Final Products</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Outline of RCP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft RCP</td>
<td>C, B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final RCP</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RCP Components</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision and Core Values</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Form (Spatial Distribution and Urban Design)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRIP (Infrastructure Evaluation and Needs Assessment; Implementation Options)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecosystems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat Conservation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoreline Preservation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borders (International and Interregional Borders)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Prosperity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration of Regional Economic Prosperity Strategy (REPS) into RCP (including Standard of Living, Workforce Development, International Trade, Hazardous Waste)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Energy Strategy (Pilot Component)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Supply</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing (Supply, Affordability, Jobs/Hsg Balance, Reg. Share) (Pilot Component)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTP -- (Mobility, Land Use Connections, Systems Development, Systems Management, Demand Management)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration of RTP into RCP</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>BR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reprogramming, Public Policies, and Financing Strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions and Responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Monitoring</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Justice Analysis (Preliminarily as part of RTP; later as part of RCP)</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Documentation</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Involvement &amp; Outreach</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare Public Involvement Strategy</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Involvement Consultant Work</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders Working Group</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*C = Regional Planning Committee and Related Working Groups; B = SANDAG Board of Directors; BR = Board Retreat; W = Workshops*
## PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT & OUTREACH (con’t)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORK ELEMENTS</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>Jun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Planning Technical Working Group</td>
<td>C * C * * * * * * * C * * * * * * * * * *</td>
<td>1st Round</td>
<td>2nd Round</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subregional Workshops</td>
<td>C C C</td>
<td>3rd Round</td>
<td>C C B W W C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Justice</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Groups (Peer Facilitated)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>3rd Round</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press and Media</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web Pages</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail Newsletter Issues</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentations</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academics / Universities</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BOARD ACTIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B (1)</td>
<td>B (2)</td>
<td>B (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B (4)</td>
<td>B (5)</td>
<td>B (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B (7)</td>
<td>B (8)</td>
<td>B (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B (10)</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) = RCP Status Report
(2) = RCP: Regional Priorities
(3) = Environmental Justice
(4) = Regional Planning Committee Meetings and Public Workshops
(5) = Board Update:
(6) = Board Update:
(7) = Summary of Workshops, Draft RCP Outline
(8) = Accept Draft RCP for Distribution, Env. Documentation
(9) = Board Discussion:
(10) = Approve Final RCP and Act Upon Env. Documentation

* Representation and Participation at Regional Planning Committee Meetings and Public Workshops

RCP WORK PROGRAM
PROJECT SCHEDULE

C = REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE AND RELATED WORKING GROUPS; B = SANDAG BOARD OF DIRECTORS; BR = BOARD RETREAT; W = WORKSHOPS
SELECTION AND APPOINTMENT OF STAKEHOLDERS WORKING GROUP MEMBERS

At its October meeting, the Committee approved the creation of a “Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group (SWG)” to more directly involve regional stakeholders interested in contributing to the preparation of the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP).

The Committee currently is advised by the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (RPTWG), the region’s planning and community development directors. Bob Leiter, Chair of the Technical Working Group, represents that group at the Regional Planning Committee meetings. The Stakeholders Working Group will act in concert with the Technical Working Group, as illustrated below, and also will have an advisory member on the Regional Planning Committee.

SANDAG received applications from over 70 individuals interested in serving on the Stakeholders Working Group. Attached are a summary of the characteristics of the SWG that the Committee approved in October (Attachment 1), and a list of the applicants (Attachment 2).

Recommendation

The Regional Planning Committee is requested to consider approval of a recommended membership slate of the Stakeholders Working Group. The Committee should either approve the recommended slate (which will be distributed at the meeting) or provide additional parameters for establishing a revised slate of candidates. The selection process is described in additional detail on the next page.
Selection Process

A three-step process has been established to select the Stakeholders Working Group membership. Membership applications were due to SANDAG in mid-November. SANDAG received over 70 applications.

First Step

At its October meeting, the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (planning directors) established an Evaluation Subgroup, consisting of subregional representation. The Evaluation Subgroup met in late November to review the applications, and formulate a recommendation to Chair Holt Pfeiler and Vice-Chair Davis, based on the criteria approved by the Regional Planning Committee included in Attachment 1. The Evaluation Subgroup recommended approximately 30 candidates for consideration.

Second Step

The second step was for Chair Holt Pfeiler and Vice-Chair Davis to review the recommendations made by the Evaluation Subgroup, and add or remove any candidates based upon the general features that the Committee approved (Attachment 1). The list was narrowed down to approximately 25 candidates. The recommended slate will be distributed at the Committee meeting.

Third Step

The third step will be for the Regional Planning Committee to review the recommended slate, and vote to either (a) approve the slate in its entirety; or (b) reduce or increase the size of the Stakeholders Working Group. In either scenario, the Committee will observe its voting procedures – a Committee quorum will be necessary, and only one representative from each subregion will vote on the membership.

Should the Committee decide to reduce or increase the Working Group’s size beyond the slate, the Committee would be asked to suggest additional parameters to narrow or expand the field. The Committee could also delegate authority to the Chair and Vice-Chair to make the final membership determination, or the Committee could request to vote on the item at its January 2003 meeting, which would delay the SWG’s proposed meeting schedule.

Administration

The Stakeholders Working Group will be chaired by Councilmember Patty Davis, and is scheduled to start meeting in January 2003. The SWG will select its own Vice-Chair, who will then serve as an advisory member to the Regional Planning Committee, in the same way that Bob Leiter represents the Technical Working Group.

Applicants that are not ultimately selected as official Stakeholder Working Group members will be added to SANDAG’s mail and email lists and will be invited to participate in the RCP process through the program’s other public involvement efforts, such as workshops and forums. SANDAG also encourages public involvement in all of its meetings.
General Features of the Stakeholders Working Group and Membership Selection Process  
(As approved by the Regional Planning Committee in October 2002)

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

**Membership Selection Process:**

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

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

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

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

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

**Potential Groups to be Invited to Apply:**

- Environment
- Business/Economy
- Housing
- Equity
- Transportation
- Advocacy
- Borders
- Building
- Redevelopment/Infill
- Agriculture
- Professional Organizations
- Other

*Note:* Based upon the number of qualified candidates, the range of groups that the Committee invited to apply, and the need for geographic balance, the number of people on the recommended slate increased from the original 12 – 15 proposed at the October meeting to the larger slate recommended by the Chair and Vice-Chair.
List of Applications Received for Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group

1. Albers, F.W. (Gus) / Individual
2. Anderson, Janet / Sierra Club
4. Barnes, Justin / UCR Connect
5. Barnum, Brad / Associated General Contractors (AGC)
6. Bell, Jim / Ecological Life Systems Institute Inc. (ELSI)
7. Bergman, Terri / San Diego Workforce Partnership
8. Blackson, Howard / Congress for the New Urbanism
9. Bonomo, Carol / Cal State San Marcos
10. Bowlby, Eric / Sierra Club
11. Bruhn, Lois / San Diego Community College District (SDCCD)
12. Carpenter, Claire / El Cajon Community Development Corp.
13. Carter-Robert, Susan / All Congregations Together
14. Chase, Carolyn / San Diego Coalition for Transportation Choices
16. Constant, Hugh / San Diego World Trade Center
17. Davis, Rose / Indian Voices (Community Newspaper)
18. DeLorenzo, Nicholas / San Diego Council of Design Professionals
19. Dowds, Curtis / Balancing Interests In Economics
20. Elias, Alexandra / Centre City Development Corp. (CCDC)
21. Emery, Bob / City of Poway
22. Fawson, Kenneth / San Diego Community College District
23. Forbis, Paula / Environmental Health Coalition (EHC)
24. Gatzke, David / Alliance for Habitat Conservation
25. Gonzalez, Eduardo German Aguirre / Municipality of Tecate, Baja California, Mexico
26. Gonzalez, Marco / Surfrider Foundation, San Diego BayKeeper
27. Gonzalez-Luna, Jaime / Maquiladora Assoc.
28. Guseman, Dennis / Cal State University, San Marcos
29. Hill, Gary / Carlsbad Chamber of Commerce
30. Hoffman, Robert / Society for Modern Applications to Regional Transportation (SMART)
31. Hollander, Marla / Leadership for Active Living
32. Hom, Dan / Asian Business Assoc
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization/Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Hopkins, David</td>
<td>SCAT (SANDAG Subcommittee for Accessible Transit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>House, Afsaneh (Sunnie)</td>
<td>CELSOC Transportation Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Kirby, Pamela</td>
<td>San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Jenkins, Michael</td>
<td>City of San Diego, Community &amp; Eco. Development Dept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>LiMandri, Marco</td>
<td>New City America, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Lindquist, Wayne</td>
<td>San Diego World Trade Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Lomac, John</td>
<td>San Diego Assoc. of Realtors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Lungerhausen, Charles</td>
<td>MTDB Accessible Services Advisory Committee (ASAC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Mattson, Greg</td>
<td>Otay Mesa Chamber of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Mufetridge, Duncan</td>
<td>SOFAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Monroy, Marjorie</td>
<td>League of Women Voters - North Coast SD County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Mullaney, Thomas</td>
<td>Friends of San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Nygaard, Julianne</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Pallares, Sergio</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Pennock, Ron</td>
<td>East County Construction Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Peterson, Marjorie</td>
<td>California Assoc. of Community Mgrs. (CACM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Peugh, Jim</td>
<td>San Diego Audubon Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Pezzoli, Keith</td>
<td>UCSD Urban Studies and Planning Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Piper, Larry</td>
<td>SDSU Facilities Planning and Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Potter, David</td>
<td>Community Planners Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Salisbury, Ramona</td>
<td>League of Women Voters of San Diego County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Schmidt, James</td>
<td>Retired Banker and Attorney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Scott, Tom</td>
<td>San Diego Housing Federation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Simon, Warren</td>
<td>Hillcrest Assoc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Spehn, Deanna</td>
<td>San Diego County Taxpayers Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Spoor, Daniela</td>
<td>AIA, San Diego Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Stephenson, Bobbie</td>
<td>California Native Plant Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Stepler, Michael</td>
<td>San Diego Economic Development Corp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Stepp, David</td>
<td>San Diego County Farm Bureau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Stockwell, Harriet</td>
<td>East County Economic Development Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Tanguay, Margo</td>
<td>Business Woman, Transportation - Taxi Cab Lease Driver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Tucker, Wallace</td>
<td>Fallbrook Land Conservancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Turnham, Keith</td>
<td>San Diego Human Relations Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Uriell, Patrick</td>
<td>Ramona Community Planning Group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
68. Van Dierendonck, Dutch / Ramona Community Planning Group
69. Varnadore, Jim / City Heights Area Planning Committee
70. Winterer, Jacqueline / Friends of San Dieguito River Valley
71. Youkman, David / National Wildlife Federation

Late Applications

72. Michael Beck, Endangered Habitats League
73. Tom Driscoll, San Diego Port Tenants Assoc.
74. Brooke Peterson, SD Regional Energy Office
75. Dana Smith, El Sol de San Diego
FINAL SCHEDULE FOR SUBREGIONAL ROUNDTABLES

At its last meeting, the Regional Planning Committee discussed the Subregional Roundtables that will be part of the public involvement and outreach program for the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) early next year. The purpose of the Subregional Roundtables is to encourage discussion and feedback on the RCP, particularly on the region’s vision and core values, which will serve as the foundation of the RCP.

The following is the final schedule for the upcoming roundtables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subregion</th>
<th>Date and Time</th>
<th>Tentative Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East County</td>
<td>Wednesday, January 15, 2003 6 - 8:30 p.m.</td>
<td>La Mesa Community Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North County Coastal</td>
<td>Thursday, January 16, 2003 6 - 8:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Encinitas City Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North County Inland</td>
<td>Thursday, January 23, 2003 6 - 8:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Escondido City Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego City Council Meeting-</td>
<td>Monday, February 3, 2003 2 p.m., upon confirmation with the City</td>
<td>City of San Diego City Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South County</td>
<td>Wednesday, February 26, 2003 6 - 8:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Southwestern Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>Under Discussion with the County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regional Planning Committee members and alternates are asked to serve as hosts for the roundtable in their respective subregion, and take a proactive role in promoting the event to other elected officials and interested parties in their subregion and in neighboring regions.
REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

December 6, 2002

AGENDA ITEM NO.: 6

Action Requested: APPROVE

REGIONAL VISION AND CORE VALUES FOR RCP

Earlier this year, the Regional Planning Committee developed a preliminary vision statement and core values based on smart growth that could be used as the basis for the RCP, with the understanding that the vision would be tested and refined through the public involvement program. The SANDAG Board held a Policy Development Board meeting on the RCP in September and provided additional input on the vision and core values. The Regional Planning Technical Working Group also provided comments at its last meeting. Additionally, SANDAG’s Borders Committee is reviewing the vision and core values from the borders perspective, and will provide its comments to the Regional Planning Committee at the joint meeting on Friday, January 17, 2003. The most recently-revised version of the vision statement is listed below.

Draft Vision Statement for RCP

“In 2030, 2040, 2050 and beyond, the San Diego region will be an exciting and equitable place to live with a healthy environment, a vibrant and sustainable economy, an excellent transportation system, and strong interregional and international connections.”

However, concise visions have generally worked better. The following are examples of visions that worked and didn’t work.

Visions that Worked

- Put a man on the moon by the end of this decade. (John F. Kennedy)
- Put a computer on every desk in America. (Bill Gates)
- Be number one or two in every market we compete in. (Jack Welch)

Visions that Didn’t Work

- To be an aeronautical leader and apply ingenuity and innovation in our work as we value our taxpayers and employees.
- Be a leader in the field of software development in the American market by making software that is easy to use. We also will provide a good return on investment for our shareholders.
- Be an industry leader providing quality products to our customers, using the talents of our employees and providing an above average return to our shareholders.

In anticipation of the Subregional Roundtables and the joint meeting with the Borders Committee, the Committee is requested to discuss the draft RCP vision statement listed above and the potential alternatives listed below, provide input on the core values, and approve the vision statement(s) and core values for use at the Roundtables. The Regional Planning Technical Working Group
recommended that both short and long alternatives be presented to the Committee due to the complex and interrelated nature of the issues that will be addressed in the RCP.

**Existing Draft Vision Statement for RCP**

In 2030, 2040, 2050 and beyond, the San Diego region will be an exciting and equitable place to live with a healthy environment, a vibrant and sustainable economy, an excellent transportation system, and strong interregional and international connections.

**Alternative Vision Statements**

**Short Alternatives**
- A future of opportunities and choices.
- A sustainable and prosperous region.
- A region with vibrant urban communities and healthy natural environments.
- More choices and opportunities for working, living, playing, and traveling within the region.
- A vibrant and sustainable region, serving as the best international gateway in the world.
- Making the region a better place to live, work, and play.
- Better choices for achieving permanent paradise.
- A region that offers more choices in housing and transportation, and is free from pollution.
- Local communities working together toward regional goals.

**Long Alternatives**
- In 2030 and beyond, the San Diego region will be an equitable place to live, providing economic opportunities, a healthy environment, and an excellent transportation system.
- The San Diego region will preserve and enhance its vibrant communities and diverse environment while providing new opportunities in housing and transportation to enrich the quality of life of its residents.

**Draft Core Values**

1. Our region will understand and respect the delineations between our urban and rural lands.
2. Our communities will be healthy places. They will have more mixed uses and better urban design. They will be walkable, have a distinct sense of place, and strive for greater equity.
3. The people that live in the San Diego region will have the ability to choose from a wider spectrum of housing types, closer to jobs, and have more affordable housing choices.
4. The region will have a coordinated transportation system that will supply a variety of options for getting about, better link our jobs and homes, provide more transit, walking, and biking opportunities, and efficiently transport cargo and goods.
5. Our ecosystems will be healthy. Our water and air will be clean. Our open space and habitat conservation systems will be preserved and maintained.
6. We will have a great variety of jobs, with the educational opportunities and the workforce to meet the demand for these jobs. Our wages will sustain our families' standard of living.
7. Our infrastructure systems will be in place and will function appropriately, so that our quality of life will be measurably better.
8. Our local governments will be good neighbors to each other, to our Native American Tribal governments, to our surrounding counties and Mexico, and to our military.

*Note: The vision and core values will be a primary subject of discussion at the upcoming Subregional Roundtables. Committee members are encouraged to provide comments and recommendations on these items so that staff can integrate those comments into the vision statement(s) and core values before the Roundtables.
INTRODUCTION OF OUTLINE OF URBAN FORM COMPONENT OF THE RCP

The following is a draft outline of the Urban Form component of the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP). The Regional Planning Technical Working Group’s comments have been incorporated into the draft outline. The Committee is requested to review and comment on the outline.

The region’s local decisionmakers in each of the 19 local jurisdictions have adopted resolutions of support for smart growth. The Urban Form component of the RCP can provide a framework for encouraging local agencies to implement smart growth in their communities with recommendations at all levels (from plan level to individual projects). The RCP should focus on region-wide implementation in terms of smart growth planning and localized implementation in terms of smart growth development.

The Urban Form component of the RCP could be developed in two tiers:

1. **Spatial Distribution**: Macro-scale growth impacts on the region’s physical character and vision for how land use patterns and the transportation network can evolve simultaneously to complement each other and make the best use out of what we have (this tier of the Urban Form component could include an analysis of alternative land use development patterns (Smart Growth Light vs. Smart Growth Heavy scenarios); and

2. **Urban Design**: Impacts of development on people (how to provide better pedestrian access, improve safety, and improve aesthetic quality of the built environment).

**Issue Statement**

The San Diego region’s urban form is defined by distinct physical features and boundaries, and distinct neighborhoods and community character. Local jurisdictions and regional agencies should strive to maintain and enhance the unique elements of individual communities, while recognizing the context of the growing region. In addition, the region should create neighborhoods that reflect the character of their residents and provide an atmosphere that promotes economic and physical well being.

- **Land Consumption** - Existing development patterns are rapidly reducing the amount of vacant land in the San Diego region (this section should identify and analyze the associated consequences). Plans and development projects should strengthen and encourage growth in existing communities, close to existing residential areas, job centers, public facilities, and transportation networks. An evaluation of different growth scenarios could be included in this section and would be closely tied to the infrastructure needs assessment and financing section.

- **Balancing Land Use Patterns** - Separation of land uses encourages unnecessary automobile trips (and air quality impacts). This also is related to the first bullet and would include a
discussion of where and how to incorporate walkability, Transit Oriented Developments (TOD), and mixed use.

- **Regional Character**

  1. **Natural Environment** - Rapid development and low-density development are changing the natural landscape of the San Diego region and eliminating the natural features that define the region’s unique character.
  2. **Built Environment** - Visual monotony and limited architectural variety are homogenizing the aesthetic quality of some areas in the region. This section of the RCP could include a discussion of why unique features in the region are important and why they should be protected. Similarly, this section can discuss how SANDAG can encourage local agencies to showcase and/or enhance their unique features.

- **Accessibility and Safety** - Design of some communities and single-use development within communities discourages pedestrian activity and/or makes walking unsafe. This discussion would incorporate the Pedestrian Design Guidelines (and perhaps a link between implementation and eligibility for future TransNet funding).

- **Visual Quality** - Visual quality along the region’s transportation corridors is often blighted and construction of adjacent development is not built to consider the visual impact on drivers. This could recommend a region-wide strategy for creating a design plan for freeway, LRT right-of-way aesthetic treatment. Similarly, visual quality around transit nodes should recognize the impacts that development can have on the pedestrian.

**Interrelated Issues**
- Transportation/mobility
- Healthy ecosystems
- Energy consumption
- Water supply
- Borders
- Economic Prosperity
- Fiscal issues
- Social equity/environmental justice
- Public health
- Air quality

**Policies/Principles/Goals**
- Reduce sprawl into the region’s rural lands.
- Balancing land use patterns and our transportation systems.
- Maintain and enhance the unique character of communities and neighborhoods in the San Diego region.
- Create neighborhoods, job centers, and commercial areas that encourage pedestrian activity and offer a variety of uses that reduce the need for vehicular trips.
- Consider the visual experience of existing communities and the adjacent roadways when developing or redeveloping.

**Actions and Implementation Responsibilities**
- Implement Smart Growth Land Use Policies - this section of the RCP will rely on the smart growth definition, principles, and designations for the San Diego region accepted by the Board of Directors in 2000 (see attachment). Further refinement of these definitions and
implementation strategies, especially related to Smart Growth criteria for allocating funding will have to be developed.

- Tie future SANDAG funding to local agencies’ implementation of smart growth strategies (similar to the Walkable Communities Demonstration Grants, Transit Oriented Design Planning Grants, and Smart Growth Incentive Fund-MOBILITY 2030 that have been, or will be distributed to local jurisdictions by SANDAG). Criteria for the $25 Million Smart Growth Incentive Funds identified in MOBILITY 2030 should be developed in this section of the Urban Form chapter.

- Identify high pedestrian-involved accident locations and prepare needs assessment.
- Identify infrastructure.
- Identify funding for Smart Growth development including improved pedestrian access.
- Identify comprehensive approach for urban design adjacent to the region’s major transportation corridors (similar to that prepared for SR 78).

**Social Equity/Environmental Justice**

- Equal access to transportation
- Need for design standards for higher density development
- Infrastructure access
The attachments to the Agenda Item may be obtained by contacting SANDAG’s Public Information Office at (619) 595-5347.
INTEGRATION OF THE 2030 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN

At its October meeting, SANDAG accepted the draft Regional Transportation Plan, entitled “MOBILITY 2030: The Transportation Plan for the San Diego Region,” for review and comment. The document is posted on the SANDAG Web site at www.sandag.org, and copies were mailed to a wide variety of groups and individuals throughout the region. The SANDAG Board is scheduled to take action on the MOBILITY 2030 at its March meeting.

Attached are the recommendations from the Land Use and Environment Chapter of MOBILITY 2030. The issue of integration of the RTP and RCP has come up at several SANDAG meetings, and the topic will be discussed at the SANDAG Board Retreat in January. The Committee is requested to identify any issues, questions, and potential approaches that should be discussed at the Board Retreat. The results of the discussion at the Retreat will be brought back to the Committee for further deliberations.

Close coordination with SANDAG’s Transportation Committee will be necessary as this item evolves.
**ACTIONS**

The following actions support the Plan’s Land Use and Environment Chapter recommendations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Actions</th>
<th>Responsible Parties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LAND USE &amp; ENVIRONMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Smart Growth and the Regional Comprehensive Plan –** The following proposed actions support the RTP goals of Accessibility, Livability, Sustainability, and Equity.

1. Support the preparation and implementation of the Regional Comprehensive Plan, and update local general and community plans and zoning codes to encourage smart growth development and to strengthen the implementation of the Regional Comprehensive Plan. **Local jurisdictions**

2. Support legislation that provides low-cost loans and/or tax incentives to developers of smart growth projects; that helps provide housing for all; and that addresses fiscal reform issues, consistent with smart growth principles and regional strategies. **SANDAG and local jurisdictions**

3. Develop design guidelines that encourage aesthetically pleasing high-density housing. **Local jurisdictions**

4. Establish a five-year, $25 million pilot program to provide incentives for integrating transportation and smart growth development. **SANDAG**

**Integrating Transit –** The following proposed actions support the RTP goals of Mobility, Accessibility, Livability, Sustainability, and Equity.

5. Integrate local land use plans and policies with smart growth and the Regional Transit Vision (RTV) principles and goals. **Local jurisdictions**

6. Prepare RTV design guidelines to permit transit facilities to be successfully integrated into community and neighborhood centers, and identify areas where future transit stations can be located to best integrate with activity centers to maximize transit ridership. **SANDAG and local jurisdictions**

7. Revisit the RTV annually and compile a progress report on efforts to implement the vision. **SANDAG**

**Air Quality and Conformity –** The following proposed actions support the RTP goal of Sustainability.

8. Implement the Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) with the assistance of SANDAG where appropriate, and ensure that transportation plans contribute to the implementation of the RAQS and conform to the current State Implementation Plan (SIP). **APCD and SANDAG**
### Proposed Actions

#### Air Quality and Conformity
- **9.** Review and update the Transportation Control Measures (TCM) Plan for Air Quality for consistency with changing goals and policies. Any revisions to the TCM Plan would be submitted to the APCD for inclusion in mandated updates of the RAQS and the SIP.
  - Responsible Parties: SANDAG and APCD
- **10.** Encourage local jurisdictions to implement smart growth strategies, including the APCD’s Air Quality/Land Use Guidelines.
  - Responsible Parties: SANDAG

#### Environmental Justice
- **11.** Seek comments from minority and low income communities in planning and programming efforts to ensure that plans and programs do not adversely affect the communities.
  - Responsible Parties: SANDAG
- **12.** Work with the region’s transit operators to ensure that transit services are available to minority, disabled, elderly, and low income persons so that they have access to services, employment, and schools.
  - Responsible Parties: SANDAG
SUMMARY OF PROGRESS ON THE INTEGRATED REGIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE PLAN (IRIP)

Introduction

The Integrated Regional Infrastructure Plan (IRIP) is an element of the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP). The RCP is based on the premise that we must plan our future differently than we have our past. Although we are 19 separate jurisdictions, the RCP recognizes that we are one region that requires a seamless plan.

One of the primary goals of the RCP is to prepare for future growth. The objective is to be smart about growth, planning and preparing in advance of its occurrence. For example, local jurisdictions, acting together as SANDAG, have agreed to channel much of the region’s future growth into existing urban (incorporated) communities, especially specific “smart growth areas”, and away from rural (unincorporated) areas.

To accomplish this goal, the RCP is considering an incentive based approach recognizing that the region’s quality of life is largely impacted by the level of service provided by its infrastructure. The IRIP will assess whether the region’s existing infrastructure and planned capital improvement expenditures are adequate to meet the region’s needs and support, or can be reprogrammed to support, channeling growth into urban communities and smart growth areas. This is why the IRIP is a key component of the RCP.

Summary of IRIP Approach

Staff presented the scope of work for the IRIP at the October 4th, Regional Planning Committee meeting. The IRIP will be completed in a four step process, as illustrated in the attached diagram.

- First, staff will gather data to verify the following: who is responsible for the infrastructure; how is it financed; what are the current and planned levels of service; and, what types of capital and operating budgets are available.
- The second step is to determine if there are any infrastructure deficiencies using current level of service standards and estimates of future service demands.
- The third step will be to develop a set of options that address each infrastructure deficiency and identify the incentives necessary to support an urban form based on smart growth areas.
- The final step will be to develop an integrated regional infrastructure strategy from the set of options.
Integrated Regional Infrastructure Plan
Public Policy and Financing Strategy

**INFRASTRUCTURE EVALUATION PROCESS**
- Inventory
- Capacity-LOS
- Responsibilities
- Operations & Maintenance
- Funding

**UPDATE/EXPAND**

**IRIP**
- Strategy
- RCP
- Caltrans product

**PERFORMANCE MONITORING**
- Implementation/Impact

**KEY STAKEHOLDERS**
Infrastructure Providers and Local Jurisdictions

**INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS ASSESSMENT**
- Regional Gaps
- Subregional Gaps

**FINANCING & PUBLIC POLICY OPTIONS**
- Incentive based
  - Reprogramming funds
  - Public policy changes
  - New funding sources
- Target Smart Growth Areas
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The purpose of this report is to share Staff’s progress to date on the first three infrastructure items studied: energy, solid waste, and wastewater. The infrastructure overviews included represent progress to date on the first of four steps and are intended to highlight preliminary findings and their relationship to the IRIP. Because staff is continuing to gather information, the reports do not contain all of the data necessary to complete a full needs assessment and deficiency analysis. Staff will return to the Committee at a later date with this information included as part of the complete evaluation of the current infrastructure system.

Report 1: Energy Supply and Delivery System

Energy Generation (Current Supply)

Energy generation in the San Diego region can be categorized into four distinct areas based on fuel type: nuclear, oil, natural gas (NG) and alternative (renewable). As shown in Table 2, there are 36 existing power plants in the San Diego region producing 2,359 Megawatts of electricity. The plants include: one nuclear plant\(^1\), 23 oil/natural gas plants, and several alternative facilities. Existing alternative energy generation plants in the region consist of eight hydro facilities, one reciprocating plant and several other forms of alternative energy such as photovoltaic, wind, and geothermal. The provider of transmission lines in the San Diego region is San Diego Gas and Electric (SDG&E), a subsidiary of SEMPRU utilities. SDG&E, a regulated monopoly, operates a majority of the electricity transmission lines in the San Diego region and provides service to 3 million consumers through 1.3 million electric meters and 775,000 natural gas meters in San Diego and southern Orange counties.\(^2\)

Capacity Requirements (Current Demand)

In 2002, the total San Diego regional capacity requirements for energy (i.e. total demand for energy) are 4,302 MW. Existing power plants do not produce a sufficient amount of power to meet the region’s needs and the imbalance is met with imported energy.

Pricing

The San Diego regional energy market is among the highest priced in the nation.\(^3\) The relatively higher costs are due to many factors including: infrastructure performance, regulation, market power, geography (terrain, density), and others. Insufficient transmission mechanisms and limited import capacity create high prices in the region’s electricity market. In the future, limited fuel supply may contribute to higher costs.

Regulation

There are numerous regulatory agencies overseeing the energy market in the region. SDG&E’s transmission is regulated by the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC), California Energy Commission (CEC), California Energy Oversight Board (EOB), and two federal agencies.\(^4\) The CPUC

---

\(^1\) San Diego Gas and Electric only has the right to 20 percent of the San Onofre Nuclear Power Plant’s capacity. It is not included in the region’s total generating capacity figure.

\(^2\) Source: SDG&E: SDG&E is part of Sempra Energy Utilities, the umbrella for Sempra Energy’s regulated business units. SDG&E is responsible for operating most of the utilities throughout the region. However, there are many plants that are owned by non-SDG&E agencies and companies.

\(^3\) Source: Regional Energy Infrastructure Study 3rd highest residential cost market, 6th highest commercial cost market. Page ES-1.

\(^4\) Source: California Independent System Operator. The two federal agencies are the Department of Energy and Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.
regulates privately owned telecommunications, electric, natural gas, water, and transportation companies. The CPUC is responsible for assuring California utility customers have safe, reliable utility service at reasonable rates, protecting utility customers from fraud, and promoting the health of California’s economy. The CPUC has regulatory control over transmission but cannot ensure residential rates or reliable supply. The California Energy Commission is the state’s primary energy policy and planning agency, charged with ensuring a reliable and affordable energy supply. The Commission has five major responsibilities: 1) forecasting future energy needs and keeping historical energy data; 2) siting and licensing power plants; 3) promoting energy efficiency through appliance and building standards; 4) developing energy technologies and supporting renewable energy; and, 5) planning for and directing the state’s response to energy emergencies. The Energy Oversight Board was formed by the California Legislature to perform three functions: 1) To oversee the Independent System Operator and the Power Exchange; 2) determine the composition and terms of service and to appoint the members of the governing boards of the Independent System Operator and the Power Exchange; and, 3) serve as an appeal board for majority decisions of the Independent System Operator’s governing board.

**Outlook**

According to the REIS, the region is at a crucial stage with respect to energy generation, facing uncertainty in supply and growing demand. There are different strategies for accomplishing increased generation capacity and market certainty. The two most discussed are dependence and independence. The dependence strategy calls for importing energy from outside the region to accommodate demand within the region. The Independence strategy suggests building all necessary energy infrastructure within the region to achieve self-sufficiency. Although the region currently shows a net surplus in terms of energy supply versus demand, there is a 1,943 MW deficit before accounting for power imported from outside the region. By 2030, locally generated energy capacity (before accounting for imported power) will comprise less than 30 percent of total capacity demanded. To prepare for the challenges ahead, a Regional Energy Strategy is being prepared for SANDAG that will utilize the findings and recommendations from the Regional Energy Infrastructure Study and the Binational Energy Strategy.

**Highlights from the REIS report include:**

- To supplement the region’s power generation, there are plans for nine additional projects capable of generating up to 3,659.5 MW. In northern Mexico, there are 15 capital improvement projects in the planning stages totaling 3,362 MW. Though current natural gas supplies are predicted to be sufficient for the next 10-20 years, NG supplies are projected to decline in the nation, peaking in 2015-2020. According to the San Diego Regional Energy Infrastructure Study (REIS), the region needs additional transmission capabilities, increased energy efficiency measures, and a minimum of 1 to 2 new generating plants and 1 to 2 repowered plants able to generate 500MW of power to meet the estimated doubling of demand for electricity by 2030.

---

5 Including railroad, rail transit, and passenger transportation.
6 Source: REIS page 6-12, Table 6-6.
7 Source: REIS page 3.2.
8 Source: REIS pages ES 3-4.
• Increased alternative energy source production would help to diversify the region’s energy portfolio. Alternative energy currently provides one percent of energy generated in the San Diego region. ⁹ According to California SB 1078, SDG&E is required to increase its alternative energy usage by one percent a year. This would total 20% of all electricity by 2017. In conjunction with SB 1078, the San Diego Regional Energy Infrastructure Study (REIS) also endorses investment in alternative energy sources. To help the region meet these goals, there are many different federal, state and local incentive programs for the creation of additional alternative energy sources. ¹⁰

Report 2: Solid Waste Collection and Disposal

System Capacity (Supply)

The solid waste management system in the San Diego region is serviced by seven operating landfills, seven transfer stations, nine household hazardous waste facilities, and numerous composting facilities and bin sites. Two of these landfills, Las Pulgas and San Onofre, are owned, operated, and used solely by the federal government (U.S. Marines) and are not available to the general public. The Miramar landfill also is owned by the Federal government (U.S. Marines). However, it is operated and used primarily by the City of San Diego. The remaining four landfills, Borrego Springs, Ramona, Otay/Otay Annex, and Sycamore, are privately owned and operated by Allied Waste Industries, Inc. Most of the cities in the San Diego region use the five regional landfills, although one city, Oceanside, exports the majority of their waste out of the region.

Waste Generation (Demand)

In 2001, residents of San Diego generated about 3.7 million tons of waste; 3.5 million tons were landfilled in the region and the remaining was exported out of the region. Since 1997, the region has increased the amount of locally generated waste disposed of within the region, rising from 88 percent to 95 percent in 2001 (see Table 3).

System Operations and Pricing

Trash is collected by private haulers, such as Waste Management Inc., EDCO, Escondido Disposal, Pacific Waste, or by local jurisdictions, such as the City of San Diego, and taken to a landfill. If trash is not taken directly to a landfill for disposal, it is generally taken to a transfer station. It is then loaded into large tractor-trailers for more efficient hauling to local or out-of-county landfills. Landfill operators charge haulers and the general public “tipping fees” in order to dispose of waste in their landfills. Tipping fees in the San Diego region currently range from $22/ton to $41/ton, which is within the range of other regions in California. All jurisdictions (except the City of San Diego) charge their single-family residences monthly trash-collection fees to cover tipping fees. These fees may include transportation cost, curbside recycling costs, and green waste costs. The City of San Diego is restricted from charging its single-family households for residential trash collection services due to the People’s Ordinance, passed in 1919 by the City’s voters. As a result, the City pays

---

⁹ Source: REIS page 6-9: 25.1 MW/2,359 MW=0.01064 ~1%
¹⁰ Funding sources include: Property Tax Exemptions, Fed/State/Local Rebate Programs, Utility rebate programs, Industry Recruitment, Fed/State/Local Grants Programs, Loan Programs, Lease Purchase, Corporate/Personal Tax Credit or Deduction, Green Pricing Program, Public Education/Assistance, Production Incentives, Corporate Depreciation, and others.
for its single-family residential trash collection services from its General Fund. However, the City of San Diego does charge for commercial trash collection services.

**Regulations**

Solid waste landfills in the San Diego region are regulated by the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) and, in all areas of the County except for the City of San Diego, the County Department of Environmental Health (DEH). Solid waste management practices and programs are summarized in the County of San Diego Waste Management Plan (CIWMP), prepared in response to AB 939\[^{11}\]. The Countywide Siting Element, which is part of the CIWMP, requires a minimum of 15 years of permitted disposal capacity to serve the region. Currently, the County is updating the CIWMP and the plan is to be completed by 2004. SANDAG is the region’s solid waste task force. The Task Force consists of representatives from local jurisdictions and required solid waste agencies.

**Outlook**

---

\[^{11}\] Assembly Bill 939 (AB939) is the California Solid Waste Management Act signed into law in 1989. AB 939 requires local governments within the State to divert from landfills 25% of the waste generated within their jurisdictions by 1995, and 50% by 2000. AB939 also established the California Integrated Waste Management Board to oversee local compliance with the law, and specifies monetary fines of up to $10,000 per day for non-compliance.
It is estimated that the San Diego region may have up to 11 out of 19 jurisdictions failing to meet the requirements of the waste diversion law (AB 939), which requires each city and county in California to develop and implement plans to reduce the amount of waste they send to landfills by 50 percent no later than the year 2000. To achieve their high diversion rates, jurisdictions have tailored new waste handling processes that incorporate options such as curbside recycling, material recovery facilities and composting operations. All of these approaches are supported by comprehensive waste prevention and public education efforts. In addition, franchise fees and AB 939 fees (from private haulers) help jurisdictions attain the 50 percent or higher diversion rate by providing funding for reuse and recycling efforts. To encourage compliance, if jurisdictions do not meet the AB 939 requirement they face the possibility of heavy fines.

Although the diversion law has helped extend the estimated life expectancy of landfills, they are expected to exceed their capacity limits in the near future. Proposals for a new landfill at Gregory Canyon, as well as continued adherence to AB 939 could alleviate some, but not all of these capacity issues. However, the Gregory proposal may require 20 or more years before it will become an operational facility. Depending on the method of calculation used, it is estimated that there currently exists between 11 to 17 years of permitted capacity remaining in the San Diego region’s landfills (Table 4). There currently exist two sources of information for this calculation: the adopted 1996 San Diego Integrated Waste Management Plan\textsuperscript{12}, and the California Integrated Waste Management Board. Because the San Diego Integrated Waste Management Plan (SDIWMP) information is older and possibly outdated\textsuperscript{13}, staff has chosen to use the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) (provided by the landfill operators) to estimate current levels of capacity. As shown in Table 4, the estimate differs significantly from the approved 1995 figures. Staff will work with the County, State and local waste management board to resolve these discrepancies and refine the numbers.

**Report 3: Sewage Discharge and Treatment System (Wastewater)**

**System Capacity (Supply)**

The Sewage Discharge and Treatment system (Wastewater system) in the San Diego region consists of approximately 7000 miles of sewer main lines, 24 wastewater treatment/reclamation facilities, and numerous pump stations. Furthermore, there are approximately 5 wastewater treatment plants within the Camp Pendleton boundaries which are not available to the general public. Most cities in the San Diego region have a wastewater division that operates and maintains a sanitary sewer collection system. Some cities treat their own wastewater, while others transport their wastewater to treatment plants in other cities. Along with cities taking care of their wastewater, there are also sanitation districts, municipal water districts and community services districts that provide wastewater services to various areas in the San Diego region. In 2000, the wastewater treatment facilities in the San Diego region had a combined (primary, secondary, tertiary) treatment plant capacity of 474 MGD (see Table 5).

\textsuperscript{12} The San Diego County Integrated Waste Management Plan was adopted in 1996. However, the capacity data are from a 1995 survey. The estimated capacity figure excludes Las Pulgas and San Onofre landfills because the public is not allowed access to their facilities.

\textsuperscript{13} Numerous changes have occurred since the adoption of the plan, including the sale of all county landfill facilities to Allied Waste Management.
Wastewater Generation (Demand)

Staff is in the process of gathering data on wastewater generation (the demand for sewage treatment).

System Operations

Because of the diversity of treatment procedures, the following three examples demonstrate the variability between jurisdictions. First, the City of San Diego has the Metropolitan Wastewater Department (MWWD). MWWD serves the Greater San Diego population across 16 local cities and districts that generate approximately 190 million gallons of wastewater per day. MWWD operates 85 pump stations and 4 treatment plants. Second, the County of San Diego has the Department of Public Works (DPW) Wastewater Management Section, which serves the unincorporated areas of Alpine, Julian, Lakeside, Spring Valley, Pine Valley, Campo, East Otay Mesa and the Winter Gardens area. All of these areas (except Julian, Pine Valley and Campo) transmit their wastewater to the City of San Diego metro system for treatment and disposal. Julian, Pine Valley and Campo utilize “on-site” treatment and disposal systems. DPW operates and maintains 6 wastewater treatment facilities. These facilities serve as collection and treatment for final processing systems and do not transmit flow to the City of San Diego. A final example is the Buena Sanitation District, which is located east of the City of Carlsbad, between the City of Vista and the Vallecitos Water District. The southern portion of the City of Vista is within the sanitation district’s boundaries. The remaining area of Vista is serviced by the City of Vista. Covering an area of approximately 5,800 acres, the Buena Sanitation District owns 90 miles of sewer mains (collection and trunk lines), a force main, and several pump stations. The Buena Sanitation District transmits its wastewater to the Encina Water Pollution Control Facility in the City of Carlsbad. The diverse range of treatment possibilities illustrates the complexity of the system and the potential overlap of responsibility.

Pricing

Most residential sewer bills include a sewer base fee, which is a non-variable amount collected to offset the fixed costs of running the wastewater division, and a sewer service charge, which is an individualized sewer rate based upon the average water consumption rate of each household during the winter months. Business sewer service charges are based on the flow and strength of wastewater produced. Other charges include sewer connection/capacity charges, which are collected for the maintenance and operation of present sewer facilities, and monthly service charges. Sewer service charges may be collected through the tax roll, the property’s water bill, or by a manual bill for payment.

Regulations

Treatment facilities must meet the requirements and standards of the Clean Water Act, and are monitored by the Environmental Protection Agency and the Regional Water Quality Control Board. The City of San Diego received a waiver from the Secondary Treatment requirements of the Clean Water Act in November 1995. The waiver removes the need for a significant upgrade to the City’s secondary level sewage treatment. Through a combination of factors, including industrial source control, Advanced Primary Treatment of wastewater, a deep ocean outfall and comprehensive monitoring, the EPA and the Regional Water Quality Control Board agreed that the Point Loma
Wastewater Treatment Plant fully protects the ocean. In April, the state Coastal Commission voted 6-1 to oppose San Diego’s application to continue with primary treatment. City officials appealed the commission’s ruling to the U.S. secretary of commerce, who has the power to arbitrate and possibly overturn the ruling. In September of this year, the state Coastal Commission approved San Diego’s bid to renew a five-year federal waiver. The commission voted 8-1 in favor of the waiver, which will allow SD to continue with its advance primary treatment method.

Outlook

Most of the proposed sewage treatment facility upgrades are to increase secondary and tertiary treatment capacities and not primary treatment capacities. The capacities of the facilities, as well as pipe diameters, will need to expand, in order to accommodate the increased flow volume and to arrest sewer overflows.
### TABLE 1. ENERGY SUMMARY SUPPLY AND DEMAND (MEGAWATTS)
San Diego Region, 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total SD County Capacity Requirements in Megawatts (Demand)</td>
<td>4,302 MW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total In-County Generation (Supply) (Note A)</td>
<td>2,359 MW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deficit Before Transmission</td>
<td>(-1,943 MW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Import Capability (Note 1)</td>
<td>2,500 MW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus Energy Available (Note 2)</td>
<td>557 MW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Total energy use produced locally</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES**

Note A: Excludes San Onofre

Note 1: Simultaneous import capability is the maximum amount of power that can be imported at the same time. This may vary from actual transmission capacity due to export and other load balancing requirements.

Note 2: Net balance is the net surplus or deficit of resources to meet peak load and reserves before demand response programs and distributed generation have been considered.

**SOURCE:** San Diego Regional Energy Office, Regional Energy Infrastructure Study, table 6-4 page 6-9
## TABLE 2. ENERGY EXISTING GENERATION CAPACITY BY TYPE SAN DIEGO REGION, 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENERGY PLANT NAME</th>
<th>FUEL TYPE</th>
<th>TECHNOLOGY</th>
<th>CAPACITY (MW)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RED MOUNTAIN HYDRO</td>
<td>HYDRO</td>
<td>HYDRAULIC TURBINE - PIPELINE</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALVARADO HYDRO FACILITY</td>
<td>HYDRO</td>
<td>HYDROELECTRIC</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEAR VALLEY HYDRO</td>
<td>HYDRO</td>
<td>HYDRAULIC TURBINE - CONVENTIONAL</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BADGER FILTRATION HYDRO</td>
<td>HYDRO</td>
<td>HYDROELECTRIC</td>
<td>1.485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIRAMAR HYDRO FACILITY</td>
<td>HYDRO</td>
<td>HYDROELECTRIC</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLIVENHAIN MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT HYDRO</td>
<td>HYDRO</td>
<td>HYDROELECTRIC</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RINCON HYDRO</td>
<td>HYDRO</td>
<td>HYDRAULIC TURBINE - CONVENTIONAL</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN FRANCISCO PEAK HYDRO</td>
<td>HYDRO</td>
<td>HYDROELECTRIC</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT. LOMA SEWAGE TREATMENT</td>
<td>LANDFILL GAS</td>
<td>RECIPROCATING ENGINE</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTAY I POWER STATION</td>
<td>LANDFILL GAS</td>
<td>RECIPROCATING ENGINE</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTAY LANDFILL GAS</td>
<td>LANDFILL GAS</td>
<td>RECIPROCATING ENGINE</td>
<td>1.875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN MARCOS LANDFILL FACILITY - LA</td>
<td>LANDFILL GAS</td>
<td>GAS TURBINES</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYCAMORE LANDFILL FACILITY - LAND</td>
<td>LANDFILL GAS</td>
<td>RECIPROCATING ENGINE</td>
<td>1.325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN ONOFRE NUCLEAR</td>
<td>OIL/GAS</td>
<td>STEAM TURBINES &amp; GAS TURBINE</td>
<td>2254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENCINA GROWTH ENERGY FACILITY</td>
<td>OIL/GAS</td>
<td>STEAM TURBINE, NATURAL GAS</td>
<td>1000.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH BAY</td>
<td>OIL/GAS</td>
<td>STEAM TURBINE</td>
<td>732.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEARNY</td>
<td>OIL/GAS</td>
<td>COMBUSTION TURBINE</td>
<td>164.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH ISLAND</td>
<td>OIL/GAS</td>
<td>COMBUSTION TURBINE WITH WASTE HEAT</td>
<td>52.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOAL LINE</td>
<td>OIL/GAS</td>
<td>COMBINED CYCLE</td>
<td>49.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIRAMAR</td>
<td>OIL/GAS</td>
<td>COMBUSTION TURBINE</td>
<td>47.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAVAL STATION / NAVALTRAINING CENTER</td>
<td>OIL/GAS</td>
<td>COMBINED CYCLE</td>
<td>46.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH ISLAND ENERGY FACILITY</td>
<td>OIL/GAS</td>
<td>COMBINED CYCLE</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAVAL STATION</td>
<td>OIL/GAS</td>
<td>COMBUSTION TURBINE WITH WASTE HEAT</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUTRA SWEET KELCO</td>
<td>OIL/GAS</td>
<td>GAS TURBINE</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTRC/CRD ENERGY FACILITY</td>
<td>OIL/GAS</td>
<td>COMBINED CYCLE</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTC CENTRAL</td>
<td>OIL/GAS</td>
<td>COMBUSTION TURBINE WITH WASTE HEAT</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIVISION</td>
<td>OIL/GAS</td>
<td>COMBUSTION TURBINE</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL CAJON</td>
<td>OIL/GAS</td>
<td>COMBUSTION TURBINE</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOLAR TURBINES, INC.</td>
<td>OIL/GAS</td>
<td>GAS TURBINE</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHULA VISTA COGENERATION</td>
<td>OIL/GAS</td>
<td>COMBINED CYCLE</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACIFIC BELL</td>
<td>OIL/GAS</td>
<td>3.2335 KW TURBINES</td>
<td>6.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH ISLAND STEAM TURBINE</td>
<td>OIL/GAS</td>
<td>STEAM TURBINE</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSC WESTERN CENTER COGENERATION</td>
<td>OIL/GAS</td>
<td>TURBINE</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KYOCERA INTERNATIONAL</td>
<td>OIL/GAS</td>
<td>RECIPROCATING ENGINE</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.J. DONOVAN CORRECTIONAL FACILITY</td>
<td>OIL/GAS</td>
<td>GAS TURBINE</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNION-TRIBUNE PUBLISHING CO.</td>
<td>OIL/GAS</td>
<td>GAS TURBINE</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDSU MAIN</td>
<td>OIL/GAS</td>
<td>GAS TURBINE</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAVY REG. DATA AUTOMATION CENTER</td>
<td>OIL/GAS</td>
<td>RECIPROCATING ENGINE</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTRC/CRD STEAM TURBINE</td>
<td>OIL/GAS</td>
<td>STEAM TURBINE</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEA WORLD, INC.</td>
<td>OIL/GAS</td>
<td>RECIPROCATING ENGINE</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDICAL CENTER HOSPITAL</td>
<td>OIL/GAS</td>
<td>GAS TURBINE</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUALCOMM</td>
<td>OIL/GAS</td>
<td>GAS TURBINE</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROSVON HOSPITAL</td>
<td>OIL/GAS</td>
<td>GAS TURBINE</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN DIEGO POWER &amp; COOLING COMPANY</td>
<td>OIL/GAS</td>
<td>RECIPROCATING ENGINE</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENCINA WATER POLLUTION CONTROL</td>
<td>OIL/GAS</td>
<td>RECIPROCATING ENGINE</td>
<td>1.425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PALOMAR MEDICAL CENTER</td>
<td>OIL/GAS</td>
<td>RECIPROCATING ENGINE</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALK INSTITUTE</td>
<td>OIL/GAS</td>
<td>RECIPROCATING ENGINE</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTHWEST MARINE</td>
<td>OIL/GAS</td>
<td>RECIPROCATING ENGINE</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRW</td>
<td>OIL/GAS</td>
<td>RECIPROCATING ENGINE</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL</td>
<td>OIL/GAS</td>
<td>RECIPROCATING ENGINE</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF SAN DIEGO</td>
<td>OIL/GAS</td>
<td>RECIPROCATING ENGINE</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA HOSPITAL</td>
<td>OIL/GAS</td>
<td>GAS TURBINE</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOTEL DEL CORONADO</td>
<td>OIL/GAS</td>
<td>GAS TURBINE</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARRIOTT HOTEL &amp; MARINA I - NORTH</td>
<td>OIL/GAS</td>
<td>RECIPROCATING ENGINE</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARRIOTT HOTEL &amp; MARINA II - SOUTH</td>
<td>OIL/GAS</td>
<td>RECIPROCATING ENGINE</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MERCY HOSPITAL II</td>
<td>OIL/GAS</td>
<td>RECIPROCATING ENGINE</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUNTER INDUSTRIES</td>
<td>OIL/GAS</td>
<td>RECIPROCATING ENGINE</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LE MERIDIEN HOTEL</td>
<td>OIL/GAS</td>
<td>RECIPROCATING ENGINE</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POMERADO HOSPITAL</td>
<td>OIL/GAS</td>
<td>RECIPROCATING ENGINE</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLIANT FOOD SERVICE, INC.</td>
<td>OIL/GAS</td>
<td>RECIPROCATING ENGINE</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>939 COAST MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>OIL/GAS</td>
<td>RECIPROCATING ENGINE</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROSVON HOSPITAL</td>
<td>OIL/GAS</td>
<td>RECIPROCATING ENGINE</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE WAVE</td>
<td>OIL/GAS</td>
<td>RECIPROCATING ENGINE</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL CONQUISTADOR</td>
<td>OIL/GAS</td>
<td>RECIPROCATING ENGINE</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2336.195</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Existing Energy Generation Capacity in the Region**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Capacity (MW)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Energy Generation Capacity in the Region (including only 20% of San Onofre)</td>
<td>4,612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Energy Generation Capacity in the Region (Excluding San Onofre)</td>
<td>2,809</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES**

**NOTE 1:** Capacity represents Gross Megawatts.

**NOTE 2:** Generation capacity includes San Onofre nuclear power plant (Songs). The SDREO does not include San Onofre as part of the San Diego region energy generation because of the transmission line configuration, which exempts it from “Import.” As a result, the summary figure from the previous table differs.

**NOTE 3:** SDG&E owns 20 percent of the rights to the San Onofre power plant. This figure includes 20 percent of the power generated at the plant and removes Southern California Edison’s 80 percent over which the San Diego region has no control.

**SOURCE:** San Diego Regional Energy Office website www.sdenergy.com, existing power plants database *sheet 1* from CA Energy Commission
### TABLE 3. SOLID WASTE SUMMARY TONS OF LOCALLY GENERATED WASTE 
SAN DIEGO REGION, 1997 VS. 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL (TONS)</th>
<th>PERCENT OF TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Waste Disposed of in San Diego region (2001)</td>
<td>3,543,318</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Waste Disposed of in San Diego region (1997)</td>
<td>2,472,639</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Waste Exported Out of the region (2001)</td>
<td>196,466</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Waste Exported Out of the region (1997)</td>
<td>350,647</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL WASTE GENERATED (2001)</strong></td>
<td>3,739,784</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL WASTE GENERATED (1997)</strong></td>
<td>2,823,286</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4. Solid Waste Landfill Capacity Estimates San Diego Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landfill</th>
<th>Estimated Remaining Permitted Capacity (cubic yards)¹</th>
<th>Estimated Years of Permitted Remaining Capacity</th>
<th>Estimated Remaining Permitted Capacity (cubic yards)²</th>
<th>Estimated Years of Permitted Remaining Capacity³</th>
<th>Estimated Closure Date Provided by Landfill Operators⁴</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Borrego Springs</td>
<td>455,075</td>
<td>113 years</td>
<td>426,000</td>
<td>16 to 69 years</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otay/Otay Annexb</td>
<td>19,248,488</td>
<td>36.7 years</td>
<td>41,816,617</td>
<td>16 to 27 years</td>
<td>2027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramona</td>
<td>1,266,695</td>
<td>24.3 years</td>
<td>690,000</td>
<td>5 to 7 years</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sycamore Sanitary</td>
<td>28,796,645</td>
<td>61.8 years</td>
<td>23,769,035</td>
<td>14 to 16 years</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Miramar Sanitary</td>
<td>34,296,000</td>
<td>20 years</td>
<td>23,194,883</td>
<td>6 to 11 years</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Pulgasc</td>
<td>888,576</td>
<td>23 years</td>
<td>9,150,000</td>
<td>70 to 207 years</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Onofre</td>
<td>132,787</td>
<td>18.5 years</td>
<td>1,407,000</td>
<td>58 to 235 years</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL (ALL LANDFILLS)</strong></td>
<td><strong>85,084,266</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>100,453,535</strong></td>
<td><strong>12 to 19 years</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Pulgas &amp; San Onofre</td>
<td>1,021,363</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REMAINING CAPACITY (without Las Pulgas &amp; San Onofre)</strong></td>
<td><strong>84,062,903</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>89,896,535</strong></td>
<td><strong>11 to 17 years</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources:**
1. County of San Diego Integrated Waste Management Plan, Chapter 4 (capacity as of June 30, 1995)
3. Calculations for estimated years of permitted remaining capacity in 2000 done by SANDAG staff.

**Notes:**
- ¹ Estimated Years of Permitted Remaining Capacity calculated by dividing remaining permitted capacity by maximum and average daily disposal. The result was then divided by 310 operating days.
- Maximum daily disposal data obtained from each landfill’s solid waste facility profile, CIWMB.
- Average Disposal is calculated by dividing the average inflow rate by 310 operating days.
- Used Ton to Cubic Yard Conversion Rate (from County of San Diego Waste Management Plan, 1996): 1 ton = 1.56 cubic yards (for Miramar, Las Pulgas, San Onofre), 1 ton = 1.67 cubic yards (for Sycamore, Otay, Ramona, Borrego Springs).
- There is more than one way to calculate estimated years of remaining capacity and SANDAG staff will work with the Integrated Waste Management Board to further refine this figure and to understand discrepancies between estimated closure dates.
- Information on Otay's remaining permitted capacity was obtained from the San Diego County, Department of Environmental Health, 2002.
- Las Pulgas and San Onofre landfills accept military waste only.
### TABLE 5. WASTEWATER SUMMARY WASTEWATER PLAN CAPACITY SAN DIEO REGION, 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TREATMENT LEVEL</th>
<th>PRIMARY</th>
<th>SECONDARY</th>
<th>TERTIARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL REGIONAL CAPACITY (Million Gallons per Day)$^1$</td>
<td>348.5 MGD</td>
<td>108.5 MGD</td>
<td>16.85 MGD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES**

NOTE 1: Total Regional Capacity does not include Camp Pendleton facilities.

SOURCE: San Diego County Water Authority
### TABLE 6. WASTEWATER PLANT CAPACITY SAN DIEGO REGION, 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TREATMENT PLANT NAME</th>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>PLANT CAPACITY (MGD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encina WPCF/Carlsbad WRP</td>
<td>City of Carlsbad (CMWD)</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hale Avenue RRF/WRP</td>
<td>City of Escondido</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Salina WWTP</td>
<td>City of Oceanside</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Rey WWTP</td>
<td>City of Oceanside</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North City WRP</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Point Loma WWTP</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>240.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Pasqual WRP</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bay WRP</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bay WWTP</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadowridge WRP</td>
<td>City of Vista</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairbanks Ranch WPCF</td>
<td>Fairbanks Ranch Com. Services District</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fallbrook Plant #1</td>
<td>Fallbrook Public Utilities District</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gafner WRF</td>
<td>Leucadia County Water District</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Fe Valley WRF</td>
<td>Whispering Palms Community Services District</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4S Ranch WWTP</td>
<td>Olivenhain MWD</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph W. Chapman WRF</td>
<td>Otay Water Dist.</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Padre Dam WRF</td>
<td>Padre Dam Municipal Water District</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Maria WPCF</td>
<td>Ramona Municipal Water District</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Vicente WWTP</td>
<td>Ramona Municipal Water District</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rancho Santa Fe WPCF</td>
<td>Rancho Santa Fe Com. Services District</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Elijo WPCF/WRP</td>
<td>San Elijo Joint Powers Authority</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meadowlark WRF</td>
<td>Vallecitos Water District</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Moosa Canyon WRF</td>
<td>Valley Center Municipal Water District</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skyline Ranch Country WTP</td>
<td>Valley Center Municipal Water District</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp Pendleton WWTPs (5 total)</td>
<td>United States Marine Corps.</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL REGIONAL CAPACITY (MGD)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>348.5</td>
<td>108.5</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NOTES

**NOTE 1:** There are approximately 5 wastewater treatment plants at Camp Pendleton. These facilities are not available for local jurisdictions to use.

**NOTE 2:** Total Regional Capacity does not include Camp Pendleton facilities.

### ABBREVIATIONS:

- MGD: Million Gallons per Day
- WRF: Water Reclamation Facility
- WRP: Water Reclamation Plant
- WWTP: Wastewater Treatment Plant
- WPCF: Water Pollution Control Facility
- RRF: Resource Recovery Facility

- P - Primary Treatment
- S - Secondary Treatment
- T - Tertiary Treatment