REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

Friday, March 4, 2011
12 noon to 2 p.m.
SANDAG Board Room
401 B Street, 7th Floor
San Diego

AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

- NEW MEMBER ORIENTATION: OVERVIEW OF THE REGIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES STRATEGY, AND THE REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT

- MILITARY PLANNING IN THE SAN DIEGO REGION: LAND USE COMPATIBILITY AND THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE MISSION

PLEASE TURN OFF CELL PHONES DURING THE MEETING

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

MISSION STATEMENT

The Regional Planning Committee provides oversight for the preparation and implementation of the Regional Comprehensive Plan that is based on the local general plans and regional plans and addresses interregional issues with surrounding counties and Mexico. The components of the plan include: transportation, housing, environment (shoreline, air quality, water quality, habitat), economy, borders, regional infrastructure needs and financing, and land use and design.

San Diego Association of Governments  401 B Street, Suite 800, San Diego, CA 92101-4231
(619) 699-1900  Fax (619) 699-1905  www.sandag.org
Welcome to SANDAG. Members of the public may speak to the Regional Planning Committee on any item at the time the Committee is considering the item. Please complete a Speaker’s Slip, which is located in the rear of the room, and then present the slip to Committee staff. Also, members of the public are invited to address the Committee on any issue under the agenda item entitled Public Comments/Communications/Member Comments. Public speakers are limited to three minutes or less per person. The Regional Planning Committee may take action on any item appearing on the agenda.

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

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

SANDAG offices are accessible by public transit. Phone 511 or see 511sd.com for route information.
REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE
Friday, March 4, 2011

ITEM # 

+1. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

1a. January 7, 2011, Regional Planning Committee Meeting Minutes
1b. January 21, 2011, Joint Meeting Minutes of the Regional Planning Committee and Transportation Committee
1c. February 11, 2011, Joint Meeting Minutes of the Regional Planning Committee and the San Diego County Water Authority Water Planning Committee

+2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

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

+3. REGIONAL ENERGY WORKING GROUP CHARTER AMENDMENT AND MEMBERSHIP ADDITION (Andrew Martin)

The RPC is asked to review and approve amendments to the Regional Energy Working Group Charter and approve the addition of an organization to its membership, the San Diego County Regional Airport Authority.


The primary responsibility of the RPC is to provide oversight for the preparation and implementation of the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP), adopted in 2004. SANDAG is preparing to update the RCP in the near future. A presentation on the RCP and other related SANDAG initiatives will be provided. Next month, the Regional Planning Committee will be requested to make a recommendation to the SANDAG Board on the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) Plan.

APPROVE

INFORMATION
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM #</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>MILITARY PLANNING IN THE SAN DIEGO REGION: LAND USE COMPATIBILITY AND THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE MISSION (Commander Michael P. Oestereicher or Commander Jason M. Picard; Steve Chung, Regional Community Plan and Liaison Officer)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Navy will provide an informational presentation on military planning efforts in the San Diego region and provide an overview of land use compatibility initiatives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6.</th>
<th>UPCOMING MEETINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The next meeting of the Regional Planning Committee is scheduled for Friday, April 1, 2011, at 12 noon.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7.</th>
<th>ADJOURNMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

+ next to an agenda item indicates an attachment
The meeting of the Regional Planning Committee was called to order by Chair Jim Janney (South County) at 12:03 p.m. See the attached attendance sheet for Regional Planning Committee member attendance.

Chair Janney opened the meeting by recognizing new Committee members, Mayor Sam Abed and Councilmember John Aguilera representing North County Inland. He also thanked Chris Orlando for attending on behalf of the North County Transit District (NCTD).

1. **APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES (APPROVE)**

   **Action:** Upon a motion by Vice Chair Jerry Jones (East County) and a second by Councilmember Sherri Lightner (City of San Diego), the Regional Planning Committee unanimously approved the minutes from the December 3, 2010, meeting. Mayor Abed abstained.

2. **PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS**

   Chair Janney announced that a joint meeting of the Transportation Committee and Regional Planning Committee would be held January 21, 2011, at 10:30 a.m. at SANDAG on revenue assumptions and project phasing related to the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan, and asked RPC members to mark their calendars.

3. **CHAIR’S REPORT (#3)**

   **Action:** This item was presented for information only.
REPORTS (#4 through #7)

4. OVERVIEW OF SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL AND THE 2050 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN – DRAFT WHITE PAPER (DISCUSSION)

Bridget Enderle, Associate Planner, presented the preliminary draft white paper “Overview of Safe Routes to School and the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)” and provided information related to the process of developing the regional Safe Routes to School strategy.

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

5. REGIONAL BEACH SAND PROJECT (RBSP) II ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT / ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT PUBLIC REVIEW PERIOD (INFORMATION)

Rob Rundle, Principal Planner, updated Committee members on the Regional Beach Sand Project’s progress, milestones, and anticipated future schedule.

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

6. SAN DIEGO REGION AGGREGATE SUPPLY STUDY (INFORMATION)

Bill Figge, Deputy District 11 Director of Planning (Caltrans), introduced this item by providing information on the role that Caltrans played. He stated that the study increases the understanding of the issues and implications of the aggregate supply shortfall in the region and establishes a methodology that can be employed in other areas. He introduced Richard Chavez (SANDAG Principal Engineer) and Cheryl Mason (SANDAG Senior Research Analyst) to present the study’s major findings.

Crystal Howard of EnviroMINE, relayed her appreciation for the study, which brings aggregate-related issues to the forefront, and recognized this as an opportunity to work together in order to address the challenges related to meeting the region’s need for aggregate.

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

7. HIGHLIGHTING SMART GROWTH: THE VILLAGE AT MARKET CREEK (INFORMATION)

Bill Anderson (Regional Planning Technical Working Group) introduced this item by reporting on various aspects related to the Village at Market Creek development, which was once a Brownfield site, now converted into an anchor for a future larger mixed-use district. He introduced Jennifer Vanica (President/CEO of the Jacobs Center for Neighborhood Innovation) and Chip Buttnner (President/CEO of Diamond Management, Inc.) to present details on the challenges and opportunities encountered during the process of creating a development which is a model for neighborhood transformation and recipient of the Catalyst Project designation.
Lorraine M. Leighton, a member of the public, said she was impressed with the revitalization effort.

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

8. **UPCOMING MEETINGS**

The next meeting of the Regional Planning Committee will be held jointly with the Transportation Committee on Friday, January 21, 2011, from 10:30 a.m. to 12 noon at SANDAG.

In addition, the February meeting of the Regional Planning Committee will be held jointly with the San Diego County Water Authority Water Planning Committee on Friday, February 11, 2011, from 12:30 to 2:30 p.m. at the offices of the Water Authority in Kearny Mesa, at 4677 Overland Avenue, San Diego, CA.

9. **ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Janney adjourned the meeting at 1:42 p.m.

Attachment: Attendance Sheet
## CONFIRMED ATTENDANCE
### SANDAG REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING
**JANUARY 7, 2011 - 12 p.m. to 2 p.m.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBREGIONAL AREA</th>
<th>JURISDICTION</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>MEMBER / ALTERNATE</th>
<th>ATTENDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North County Inland</td>
<td>City of Escondido</td>
<td>Sam Abed</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Vista</td>
<td>John Aguilera</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South County</td>
<td>City of Imperial Beach</td>
<td>Jim Janney, Chair</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Coronado</td>
<td>Al Ovrom</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North County Coastal</td>
<td>City of Solana Beach</td>
<td>Lesa Heebner</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Encinitas</td>
<td>Teresa Barth</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East County</td>
<td>City of Lemon Grove</td>
<td>Jerry Jones, Vice Chair</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Lemon Grove</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Jerry Sanders</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Sherri Lightner</td>
<td>1st Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Pam Slater-Price</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Bill Horn</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Members</td>
<td>Caltrans, District 11</td>
<td>Laurie Berman</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bill Figge</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>San Diego County Water Authority</td>
<td>Howard Williams</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Elsa Saxod</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>Department of Defense</td>
<td>Steve Chung</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>San Diego Unified Port District</td>
<td>Lou Smith</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Steve Padilla</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>Al Ovrom</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>NCTD</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG)</td>
<td>Bill Anderson</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bill Chopyk</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>Southern California Tribal Chairmen’s Association</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Allen Lawson (San Pasqual)</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Denis Turner (SCTCA)</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Agency/Board</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Mitigation Program Advisory Member</td>
<td>Wildlife Conservation Board</td>
<td>Dave Means</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Mitigation Program Advisory Member</td>
<td>California Department of Fish and Game</td>
<td>Steve Juarez</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>David Mayer</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Mitigation Program Advisory Member</td>
<td>US Army Corps of Engineers</td>
<td>Therese O’Rourke</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Michelle Matson</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Mitigation Program Advisory Member</td>
<td>US Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Susan Wynn</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The joint meeting of the Transportation Committee and the Regional Planning Committee was called to order by Chair Jack Dale (East County) and Chair Jim Janney (South County) at 10:31 a.m.

A. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

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

REPORT (B)

B. 2050 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN: REVIEW OF ANTICIPATED REVENUES AND THEIR ALLOWABLE USES AND DRAFT PHASING OF THE PREFERRED REVENUE CONSTRAINED TRANSPORTATION NETWORK SCENARIO (DISCUSSION)

Elisa Arias, Principal Regional Planner, reported on the amount and timing of the anticipated revenues over the next 40 years, when they will become available to the region, and the allowable uses for the various local, state, and federal revenues.

Heather Adamson, Senior Regional Planner, informed on the draft phasing of transit and highway projects, as well as overall revenue phasing for local streets, active transportation projects and programs, Transportation Demand Management (TDM), and Transportation System Management (TSM) programs.

Gayle Reid, representing Emerald Hills, expressed concern that District 4 was being overlooked and relayed their interest in being included in the planning efforts related to the extension of the I-805 corridor and west on Highway 94.

Elyse Lowe, Executive Director of Move San Diego, commented that transit frequency and trip times play a strong role and asked that staff consider 10-minute frequencies. She also requested an increased investment by SANDAG in smart growth opportunity area incentive funding.

Brian Pollard, representing the Valencia Park Town Council, expressed concern that they were not included in the planning process regarding the I-805 corridor and asked that more outreach be available to the community.
Ed Batchelder, Advance Planning Manager for the City of Chula Vista, supported the build-out scenario that is under the revenue constrained alternatives and commented about the phasing proposals. Regarding the SR 125, he asked that a priority ranking be reflected for the SR 125 in the RTP so that it is clear as to its need and timing; and, that the RTP consider reflecting a four- to six-lane phasing improvement at some point, based on demands that are in the travel model. Regarding BRT service in the I-805 corridor, he asked that the BRT service extend to Kearny Mesa and Sorrento Mesa in the first phase to provide access to job centers. And, regarding the bus rapid services proposed in Project 46, which connect the southern portion of Otay Ranch with regional LRT and BRT service, he asked that the project be moved to the 2021-2030 phasing increment.

Frank Rivera, Principal Civil Engineer for the City of Chula Vista, requested that improvements coincide with recommendations that were made in the I-5 Multimodal Corridor Study in regards to the I-5 corridor. He also suggested that two managed lanes only be provided between SR 54 and I-15 as part of Project 1, with the southerly limits of Project 1 being moved north from SR 905 to either SR 75 or Palomar Street.

Chip Buttner, representing the Jacobs Center, requested that they be informed of future planning in order to help them create a better access system in the area.

Charles Davis, Director of Development for the Jacobs Center and resident of the southeast community, asked that a BRT in-line station be placed at the 47th Street trolley station in order to serve his community.

Colleen Windsor, Communications Director (SANDAG), informed on the public meetings and outreach efforts related to the I-805 and SR 94 projects.

Action: This item was provided for discussion only.

C. UPCOMING MEETINGS (INFORMATION)

The next meeting of the Regional Planning Committee is scheduled for Friday, February 11, 2011, at 12:30 p.m. at the San Diego County Water Authority offices in Kearny Mesa, located at 4677 Overland Avenue, San Diego, CA.

The next meeting of the Transportation Committee is scheduled for Friday, February 18, 2011, at 9:00 a.m. at SANDAG.

D. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Dale adjourned the joint meeting of the Transportation and Regional Planning Committees at 11:43 a.m.

Attachment: Attendance Sheet
# CONFIRMED ATTENDANCE

## SANDAG TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE JOINT MEETING
**JANUARY 21, 2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GEOGRAPHICAL AREA/ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>JURISDICTION</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>MEMBER/ALTERNATE</th>
<th>ATTENDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North County Coastal</td>
<td>City of Carlsbad</td>
<td>Matt Hall (Vice Chair)</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Del Mar</td>
<td>Carl Hilliard</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North County Inland</td>
<td>City of San Marcos</td>
<td>Jim Desmond</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Vista</td>
<td>Judy Ritter</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East County</td>
<td>City of Santee</td>
<td>Jack Dale (Chair)</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of La Mesa</td>
<td>Art Madrid</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South County</td>
<td>City of Coronado</td>
<td>Carrie Downey</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Imperial Beach</td>
<td>Jim King</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td></td>
<td>Todd Gloria</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Anthony Young</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lori Zapf</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ron Roberts</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bill Horn</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pam Slater-Price</td>
<td>2nd Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Transit System</td>
<td></td>
<td>Harry Mathis</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Al Ovrom</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North County Transit District</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bill Horn</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chris Orlando</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VACANT</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego County Regional Airport Authority</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tom Smisek</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego County Regional Airport Authority</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jim Panknin</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADVISORY/LIAISON Caltrans</td>
<td></td>
<td>Laurie Berman</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bill Figge</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCTCA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Albert Phoenix</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dave Toler</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Francine Kupsch</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jerome Stocks</td>
<td>Vice Chair BOD</td>
<td>Ex-Officio</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3
## CONFIRMED ATTENDANCE
### SANDAG REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE JOINT MEETING
### JANUARY 21, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBREGIONAL AREA</th>
<th>JURISDICTION</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>MEMBER / ALTERNATE</th>
<th>ATTENDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Escondido</td>
<td>Sam Abed</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North County Inland</td>
<td>City of Vista</td>
<td>John Aguilera</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Imperial Beach</td>
<td>Jim Janney, Chair</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South County</td>
<td>City of Coronado</td>
<td>Al Ovrom</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Solana Beach</td>
<td>Lesa Heebner</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North County Coastal</td>
<td>City of Imperial Beach</td>
<td>Jim Janney, Chair</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Coronado</td>
<td>Al Ovrom</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Solana Beach</td>
<td>Lesa Heebner</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Encinitas</td>
<td>Teresa Barth</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East County</td>
<td>City of Lemon Grove</td>
<td>Jerry Jones, Vice Chair</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Lemon Grove</td>
<td>George Gastil</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Vista</td>
<td>John Aguilera</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Imperial Beach</td>
<td>Jim Janney, Chair</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Coronado</td>
<td>Al Ovrom</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Solana Beach</td>
<td>Lesa Heebner</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Encinitas</td>
<td>Teresa Barth</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Lemon Grove</td>
<td>Jerry Jones, Vice Chair</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Lemon Grove</td>
<td>George Gastil</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Jerry Sanders</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Sherri Lightner</td>
<td>1st Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Bill Horn</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Pam Slater-Price</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Members</td>
<td>Caltrans, District 11</td>
<td>Laurie Berman</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bill Figge</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>San Diego County Water Authority</td>
<td>Howard Williams</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Elsa Saxod</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>Department of Defense</td>
<td>Steve Chung</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>San Diego Unified Port District</td>
<td>Lou Smith</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>Al Ovrom</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mary England</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>NCTD</td>
<td>Mark Filanc</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ed Gallo</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG)</td>
<td>Bill Anderson</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bill Chopyk</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>Southern California Tribal Chairmen’s Association</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Allen Lawson (San Pasqual)</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Denis Turner (SCTCA)</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Mitigation Program Advisory Member</td>
<td>Wildlife Conservation Board</td>
<td>Deborah Townsend</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Mitigation Program Advisory Member</td>
<td>California Department of Fish and Game</td>
<td>Catherine Caldwell</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Mitigation Program Advisory Member</td>
<td>California Department of Fish and Game</td>
<td>Steve Juarez</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Mitigation Program Advisory Member</td>
<td>California Department of Fish and Game</td>
<td>David Mayer</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Mitigation Program Advisory Member</td>
<td>US Army Corps of Engineers</td>
<td>Therese O’Rourke</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Mitigation Program Advisory Member</td>
<td>US Army Corps of Engineers</td>
<td>Michelle Matson</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Mitigation Program Advisory Member</td>
<td>US Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Mitigation Program Advisory Member</td>
<td>US Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
<td>Susan Wynn</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
JOINT MEETING BETWEEN THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY WATER AUTHORITY WATER PLANNING COMMITTEE AND THE SANDAG REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 11, 2011

The joint meeting between the San Diego County Water Authority Water Planning Committee and the SANDAG Regional Planning Committee was called to order by Water Planning Committee Chair Mitch Dion at 1:05 p.m. at the San Diego County Water Authority, 4677 Overland Avenue, San Diego, California.

1. INTRODUCTIONS AND WELCOMING REMARKS

Chair Dion provided welcoming remarks and a brief overview of the Water Planning Committee, whose members present included Vice Chair Price, Vice Chair Saunders and Directors Boyle, Hogan, Jungreis, Linden, Walson, Pocklington, and Watton. Also present were Water Authority Board Members Bond, Bowersox, Dailey, Douglas, Hilliker, Knutson, Lewinger, Lewis, McIntosh, Morrison, Muir, Saxod, Smith, Tu, Williams, Wilson, and Wornham.

Water Authority staff present was General Manager Stapleton, General Counsel Hentschke, Deputy General Manager Kerl, Director of Water Resources Weinberg, Principal Water Resources Specialist Frieauf, and Senior Water Resources Specialists Bombardier and Gage.

SANDAG Regional Planning Committee Chair Janney followed with additional opening remarks and introductions of Regional Planning Committee members. See the attached attendance sheet for Regional Planning Committee member attendance. SANDAG staff present was Executive Director Gallegos, Chief Deputy Director Wasmund, Legal Counsel Coleman, Senior Regional Planner Gregor, Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning Stoll, and Senior Research Analyst Jarosz.
2. **SETTING THE STAGE: CURRENT CONDITIONS AND COMMON CHALLENGES (INFORMATION)**

Ms. Stapleton and Mr. Gallegos each provided commentary on the relationship and collaboration between the Water Authority and SANDAG, and the challenges each agency faces in fulfilling its mission.

3. **A LOOK TO THE FUTURE: REGIONAL GROWTH PROJECTIONS AND RELATED IMPLICATIONS ON WATER DEMAND (INFORMATION)**

Ms. Jarosz provided a comprehensive report on the SANDAG 2050 Growth Forecast and was followed by Mr. Bombardier, who reported on the impact of growth on the Water Authority’s 2035 Water Demand Forecast.

4. **INNOVATION AT PLAY: NEW TECHNOLOGIES AND PROGRAMS IN THE RESPECTIVE FIELDS (INFORMATION)**

Mr. Weinberg provided an in-depth report on water supply reliability, beginning with a brief view of recent history leading to strategies used in supply diversification. The Water Authority’s 2010 Urban Water Management Plan and its $3.8 billion investment in the agency’s Capital Improvement Program were also featured.

Mr. Stoll concluded the formal presentations with remarks about the services and innovative tools SANDAG provides its member agencies in managing and planning for growth.

Staff responded to comments and questions concerning the Bay-Delta, water quality and salinity levels, planning maps, the effect of major development on water supply, and indirect potable reuse and reclaimed water.

5. **PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS**

There were no comments from the public.

6. **WRAP UP: OPPORTUNITIES FOR COLLABORATION**

Chair Dion and Chair Janney thanked all for their attendance and attention. Director Saunders added closing comments on future opportunities for continued collaboration. The meeting was adjourned at 2:38 p.m.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBREGIONAL AREA</th>
<th>JURISDICTION</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>MEMBER/ALTERNATE</th>
<th>ATTENDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North County Inland</td>
<td>City of Escondido</td>
<td>Sam Abed</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Vista</td>
<td>John Aguilera</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South County</td>
<td>City of Imperial Beach</td>
<td>Jim Janney, Chair</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of National City</td>
<td>Alejandra Sotelo-Solis</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North County Coastal</td>
<td>City of Del Mar</td>
<td>Carl Hilliard</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Solana Beach</td>
<td>Lesa Heebner</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East County</td>
<td>City of Lemon Grove</td>
<td>Jerry Jones, Vice Chair</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Lemon Grove</td>
<td>George Gastil</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jerry Sanders</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sherri Lightner</td>
<td>1st Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bill Horn</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pam Slater-Price</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Members</td>
<td>Caltrans, District 11</td>
<td>Laurie Berman</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bill Figge</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>San Diego County Water Authority</td>
<td>Howard Williams</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Elsa Saxod</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>Department of Defense</td>
<td>Steve Chung</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>San Diego Unified Port District</td>
<td>Lou Smith</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VACANT</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>Al Ovrom</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mary England</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>NCTD</td>
<td>Mark Filanc</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ed Gallo</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG)</td>
<td>Bill Anderson</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bill Chopyk</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>Southern California Tribal Chairmen’s Association</td>
<td>LaVonne Peck (La Jolla)</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Allen Lawson (San Pasqual)</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBREGIONAL AREA</td>
<td>JURISDICTION</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>MEMBER/ALTERNATE</td>
<td>ATTENDING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Mitigation Program Advisory Member</td>
<td>Wildlife Conservation Board</td>
<td>Dave Means</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VACANT</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Mitigation Program Advisory Member</td>
<td>California Department of Fish and Game</td>
<td>Steve Juarez</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>David Mayer</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Mitigation Program Advisory Member</td>
<td>US Army Corps of Engineers</td>
<td>Therese Bradford</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Michelle Matson</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Mitigation Program Advisory Member</td>
<td>US Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
<td>VACANT</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Susan Wynn</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SAN DIEGO ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

March 4, 2011

AGENDA ITEM NO.: 3

Action Requested: APPROVE

REGIONAL ENERGY WORKING GROUP CHARTER AMENDMENT
AND MEMBERSHIP ADDITION

File Number 3200300

Introduction

SANDAG staff proposes clean-up amendments to the Regional Energy Working Group (EWG) Charter and the addition of the San Diego County Regional Airport Authority (SDCRAA) to its membership. The proposed clean-up amendments reflect the most recent version of the Regional Energy Strategy (RES) approved by the Board of Directors in December 2009 and clarify the purpose, line of reporting, and membership of the EWG (Attachment 1). The proposed addition of the SDCRAA is because of their expertise and active involvement in energy-saving initiatives identified in the RES, including measures to promote the use of alternative transportation fuels and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. A revised EWG membership list is provided as Attachment 2.

Recommendation

The Regional Planning Committee is asked to review and approve clean-up amendments to the Regional Energy Working Group Charter (Attachment 1) and approve the addition of an organization to its membership, the San Diego County Regional Airport Authority.

Discussion

The Regional EWG provides input to the Regional Planning Committee and the Board of Directors on issues related to the coordination and implementation of the RES. The EWG also serves as a forum to discuss regional energy issues in order to build consensus among diverse stakeholders. The RPC appoints the EWG Chair, which is currently Councilmember Carrie Downey, City of Coronado.

The RES establishes goals for the San Diego region to use energy more efficiently, increase the use of energy from renewable sources, and enhance energy infrastructure to meet the energy needs of our growing population. It focuses on the multiple opportunities and authorities that SANDAG and its member agencies could take advantage of to address energy issues in the region.

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

Attachments: 1. Regional EWG Charter
              2. Regional EWG Membership List

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

Regional Energy Working Group

PURPOSE

The Regional Energy Working Group (EWG) provides input to the Regional Planning Committee (RPC) and the SANDAG Board of Directors on issues related to the coordination and implementation of the Regional Energy Strategy (RES), adopted by the SANDAG Board of Directors in July 2003, including measures to reduce energy consumption and greenhouse gas emissions related to electricity, natural gas, and transportation fuels. The EWG serves as a forum to discuss regional energy issues in order to build consensus among diverse stakeholders.

BACKGROUND

The EWG was formed based on the recommendations of the Energy Task Force, which had been established to advise the Board of Directors on the best way to implement the RES. The Energy Task Force recommended SANDAG as the most appropriate agency to implement the RES and recommended that an Energy Working Group, comprised of a diverse group of stakeholders, be formed to provide input and comments to the RPC and Board of Directors on energy issues.

LINE OF REPORTING

The EWG reports to the RPC, which in turn reports to the SANDAG Board of Directors. In addition, the SANDAG Board recognized that the EWG may request that a policy advisory committee make comments on proceedings at the California Public Utilities Commission and California Energy Commission. Due to the time limitations on many of these proceedings, the Board approved an alternate reporting structure which enables the EWG to obtain an approval from the Executive Committee to take action on issues with deadline constraints. The RPC approves changes to the EWG Charter.

RESPONSIBILITIES

The EWG provides input and comments to the RPC related to the development and implementation of the RES and regional energy planning, Regional Energy Planning Program, as prioritized by the Board of Directors in the Overall Work Program (OWP). The EWG may be asked to provide input on a variety of energy issues to the RPC and the Board of Directors. The EWG will ensure that regional energy planning activities align with the objectives of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP), and the Regional Economic Prosperity Strategy (REPS). The EWG will bring stakeholders together to develop ideas on state and federal energy matters and bring them forward through the RPC and the Board. The EWG also will work with various stakeholders at the local level to discuss the best ways to provide energy-saving programs and services as they relate to the implementation of the Regional Energy Strategy, and then provide feedback to the RPC.

MEMBERSHIP

The EWG will have a maximum of 20 voting members. Membership is voluntary and will include a diverse group of regional stakeholders. Members are selected by the bodies they represent and serve at the discretion of the RPC. Members are allowed to have alternates which, like members, are selected by the bodies they represent.
Elected officials serving on the EWG are appointed by the six subregions they represent: North County Coastal, North County Inland, East County, South Bay, the City of San Diego, and the County of San Diego. In the event that an elected official cannot serve, a subregion may appoint a non-elected government employee to serve as either a primary or alternate member.

MEETING TIME AND LOCATION
The EWG generally meets from 11:30 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. on the fourth Thursday of the month. Meetings are normally held in the 7th Floor Conference Room at SANDAG offices.

SELECTION OF THE CHAIR
The EWG chair is selected by the RPC and should be rotated on a periodic basis unless otherwise determined by the Chair of the Board of Directors. The vice-chair is elected by the members of the EWG.

DURATION OF EXISTENCE
EWG status is that of a standing working group. An evaluation of the group’s work will be conducted annually as part of the SANDAG Executive Committee’s annual committee/working group review process.
### Current Regional Energy Working Group Membership as of February 14, 2011 And Proposed Additional Member: San Diego County Regional Airport Authority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REPRESENTATION</th>
<th>JURISDICTION / ORGANIZATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South County Subregion</td>
<td>City of Coronado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Chula Vista</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North County Coastal Subregion</td>
<td>City of Del Mar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Solana Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North County Inland Subregion</td>
<td>City of Escondido</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Vacant</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East County Subregion</td>
<td>City of Santee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Vacant</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego Subregion</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego Subregion</td>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transit Operators</td>
<td>Metropolitan Transit System (MTS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North County Transit District (NCTD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Public Agencies</td>
<td><strong>San Diego County Regional Airport Authority</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unified Port of San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities</td>
<td>San Diego State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of California, San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Utility</td>
<td>San Diego Gas &amp; Electric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Non-Profit</td>
<td>California Center for Sustainable Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Fuels</td>
<td>San Diego Clean Fuels Coalition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional Sustainability Partnership, Clean Transportation Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Academics and Research</td>
<td>Energy Policy Initiatives Center, University of San Diego School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment/Social Justice</td>
<td>Environmental Health Coalition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>North County Economic Development Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South County Economic Development Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NEW MEMBER ORIENTATION: OVERVIEW OF THE REGIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES STRATEGY, AND REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT

Two reports that were presented to the SANDAG Board of Directors, one on July 9, 2010, and the other on January 28, 2011, regarding the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) for the next housing element cycle are attached. The July 9, 2010, report provides an overview of the RHNA process, and the January 28, 2011, report informed the Board of the RHNA-Determination made following the consultation between SANDAG and California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) staff. These reports also were presented to the RPC in September and December 2010.

The Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG) and Regional Housing Working Group (RHWG) have held eight joint meetings starting in June 2010 (June, July, September, October, December, January, and February (2 times)) to prepare a draft RHNA Plan to allocate the RHNA-Determination to the 19 jurisdictions in the region in four income categories (very low, low, moderate, and above moderate).

Staff will provide a presentation that will cover key points in the attached reports, including the objectives, process, and schedule for the RHNA.

The two attached reports are presented to the RPC for background purposes in anticipation of making a recommendation to the SANDAG Board on the draft RHNA-Plan at its April meeting.
SANDAG is beginning the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) for the next (fifth) housing element cycle. This responsibility is assigned to SANDAG by state housing element law, and SANDAG undertakes this process prior to each housing element cycle as described in the statutory excerpts in Attachment 1.

Recent legislation, Senate Bill 375 (SB 375) (Steinberg, 2008) and SB 575 (Steinberg, 2009), affect the RHNA and fifth housing element cycle in several ways. The main differences for this cycle include the timing of the RHNA process, required coordination/consistency with the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and its Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) per SB 375, and the length of the housing element cycle. The fifth cycle for the San Diego region will cover an eight-year time period from January 1, 2013, to December 31, 2020. Past housing elements covered a five-year cycle.

Attachment 2 of this report is a timeline for the RHNA process as it relates to the development of the 2050 RTP and its SCS. Staff will give a presentation regarding the history of housing element law, related statewide housing issues, the relationship of the RHNA to the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP), and challenges and opportunities presented by the RHNA process.

Discussion

State Housing Element Law and Regional Comprehensive Plan Objectives

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

1. Increasing the housing supply and the mix of housing types, tenure, and affordability in all cities and counties within the region in an equitable manner, which shall result in all jurisdictions receiving an allocation of units for low- and very low-income households.

2. Promoting infill development and socioeconomic equity, the protection of environmental and agricultural resources, and the encouragement of efficient development patterns.

3. Promoting an improved intraregional relationship between jobs and housing.

4. Allocating a lower proportion of housing need to an income category when a jurisdiction already has a disproportionately high share of households in that income category, as compared to the countywide distribution of households in that category from the most recent decennial United States census.
Consistency Between RHNA and SCS

SB 375 requires that the RHNA be consistent with the development pattern of the SCS, that the SCS show that it accommodates the RHNA, and that the SCS land use pattern, and therefore the RHNA, assist the region in meeting the greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction targets that will be set by the California Air Resources Board (CARB). The CARB established draft GHG targets on June 24, 2010, and plans to issue final GHG targets by September 30, 2010. SANDAG will need to develop the RHNA and the SCS in such a way that they assist the region in meeting these GHG targets.

Role of SANDAG Working Groups in RHNA Process

In its charter, the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG) – composed of the planning directors of the 18 cities and County of San Diego – is given the responsibility of reporting to the Regional Planning Committee on the RHNA. The Regional Housing Working Group (RHWG) advises the Regional Planning Committee on regional housing-related issues. Because of their common responsibilities, the TWG and RHWG will meet jointly to discuss and formulate recommendations to the Regional Planning Committee on the RHNA process, allocation methodology, and allocations. The first joint meeting of the two working groups occurred on June 8, 2010.

At that meeting, comments from working group members were focused on factors to be used in developing the RHNA. Interest was expressed in considering the following factors as the RHNA is developed:

- Subregional allocations
- Rural vs. urban areas
- Jobs/housing fit (as discussed in the Regional Targets Advisory Committee (RTAC) report)
- Transportation and housing costs
- Reducing GHG emissions
- Social equity and environmental justice
- Employment capacity
- Constraints to development such as airport influence areas, habitat, etc.
- Fair housing

The two working groups will meet again on Thursday, July 8, to further discuss the factors to be used in the development of the RHNA methodology.

Regional Planning Committee

The Regional Planning Committee discussed the RHNA schedule and RHNA objectives contained in state housing element law on April 2, 2010. Comments from members of the Committee included:

- Expression of interest in providing for socio-economically balanced communities that include housing for households in all four income categories (very low-, low-, moderate-, and above moderate-income);

- Expression of interest in considering state legislation that would allow counting (to a greater degree than currently allowed) affordable units that have been acquired, rehabilitated, and rent restricted (often referred to as “acq/rehab” units) in the identification of adequate sites section of the housing element and that would reflect the SANDAG RCP;
• A question regarding whether granny flats/second units can be used in the identification of adequate sites (state law allows such units to be counted); and

• A question regarding what affect the Palmer v. City of Los Angeles (2009 California Court of Appeals) decision will have on inclusionary housing. Based on this court decision, local jurisdiction inclusionary housing requirements may not be able to be applied to rental units unless the units are subsidized through a direct financial contribution or receive a density bonus incentive, because of preemption by a state law known as the Costa-Hawkins Rental Housing Act. This case is causing jurisdictions to consider changes to their inclusionary housing ordinances and could result in the construction of fewer affordable units.

Consultation with California Department of Housing and Community Development

Prior to the determination by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) of the region’s housing needs by income category for the next housing element cycle, SANDAG and HCD staff are required to consult with each other to exchange information about the assumptions and methodology (population projections, vacancy rates, household formation rates, etc.) used in the determination. HCD staff met with SANDAG staff on June 21, 2010, to continue the consultation that started during the formulation of the 2050 Regional Growth Forecast. Linda Wheaton from HCD and Mary Heim from the California Department of Finance both participated in the expert review meetings that took place during the development of the SANDAG 2050 forecast. SANDAG expects to receive its regional housing determination from HCD by the end of July.

Another issue that HCD and SANDAG staff discussed at the June 21 meeting was the requirement in SB 575 that SANDAG inform HCD of the adoption date for the 2050 RTP. Per SB 375, local jurisdiction housing elements are due within 18 months of adoption of the RTP. SANDAG staff is planning to inform HCD that the 2050 RTP is scheduled to be adopted on July 22, 2011 (at the regular Board of Directors meeting scheduled in July 2011). Based on that adoption date, local housing elements would be due no later than January 21, 2013. (If the RTP is adopted later than July 22, 2011, the due date for local housing elements also would be later.)

Next Steps

SANDAG staff will be keeping the Board of Directors informed and seeking its direction regularly during the RHNA process regarding the development of the RHNA methodology, the regional housing need determination from HCD, and the draft allocation numbers.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Attachments: 1. Excerpts from Housing Element Law (65584 and 65584.04) – Regional Housing Needs Assessment Objectives, Methodology, and Factors
2. Key Dates for Regional Housing Needs Assessment Fifth Housing Element Update

Key Staff Contact: Susan Baldwin, (619) 699-1943, sba@sandag.org
Excerpts from Housing Element Law  
(Government Codes Sections 65584 and 65584.04)  
Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA)  
Objectives, Methodology, and Factors

65584.  (a) (1) For the fourth and subsequent revisions of the housing element pursuant to Section 65588, the department shall determine the existing and projected need for housing for each region pursuant to this article. For purposes of subdivision (a) of Section 65583, the share of a city or county of the regional housing need shall include that share of the housing need of persons at all income levels within the area significantly affected by the general plan of the city or county.

(2) While it is the intent of the Legislature that cities, counties, and cities and counties should undertake all necessary actions to encourage, promote, and facilitate the development of housing to accommodate the entire regional housing need, it is recognized, however, that future housing production may not equal the regional housing need established for planning purposes.

(b) The department, in consultation with each council of governments, shall determine each region’s existing and projected housing need pursuant to Section 65584.01 at least two years prior to the scheduled revision required pursuant to Section 65588. The appropriate council of governments, or for cities and counties without a council of governments, the department, shall adopt a final regional housing need plan that allocates a share of the regional housing need to each city, county, or city and county at least one year prior to the scheduled revision for the region required by Section 65588. The allocation plan prepared by a council of governments shall be prepared pursuant to Sections 65584.04 and 65584.05 with the advice of the department.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the due dates for the determinations of the department or for the councils of governments, respectively, regarding the regional housing need may be extended by the department by not more than 60 days if the extension will enable access to more recent critical population or housing data from a pending or recent release of the United States Census Bureau or the Department of Finance. If the due date for the determination of the department or the council of governments is extended for this reason, the department shall extend the corresponding housing element revision deadline pursuant to Section 65588 by not more than 60 days.
The regional housing needs allocation plan shall be consistent with all of the following objectives:

1. Increasing the housing supply and the mix of housing types, tenure, and affordability in all cities and counties within the region in an equitable manner, which shall result in each jurisdiction receiving an allocation of units for low and very low income households.

2. Promoting infill development and socioeconomic equity, the protection of environmental and agricultural resources, and the encouragement of efficient development patterns.

3. Promoting an improved intraregional relationship between jobs and housing.

4. Allocating a lower proportion of housing need to an income category when a jurisdiction already has a disproportionately high share of households in that income category, as compared to the countywide distribution of households in that category from the most recent decennial United States census.

For purposes of this section, “household income levels” are as determined by the department as of the most recent decennial census pursuant to the following code sections:


2. Lower incomes, as defined by Section 50079.5 of the Health and Safety Code.

3. Moderate incomes, as defined by Section 50093 of the Health and Safety Code.

4. Above moderate incomes are those exceeding the moderate income level of Section 50093 of the Health and Safety Code.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, determinations made by the department, a council of governments, or a city or county pursuant to this section or Section 65584.01, 65584.02, 65584.03, 65584.04, 65584.05, 65584.06, or 65584.07 are exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (Division 13 (commencing with Section 21000) of the Public Resources Code).
methodology shall be consistent with the objectives listed in subdivision (d) of Section 65584.

(b) (1) No more than six months prior to the development of a proposed methodology for distributing the existing and projected housing need, each council of governments shall survey each of its member jurisdictions to request, at a minimum, information regarding the factors listed in subdivision (d) that will allow the development of a methodology based upon the factors established in subdivision (d).

(2) The council of governments shall seek to obtain the information in a manner and format that is comparable throughout the region and utilize readily available data to the extent possible.

(3) The information provided by a local government pursuant to this section shall be used, to the extent possible, by the council of governments, or delegate subregion as applicable, as source information for the methodology developed pursuant to this section. The survey shall state that none of the information received may be used as a basis for reducing the total housing need established for the region pursuant to Section 65584.01.

(4) If the council of governments fails to conduct a survey pursuant to this subdivision, a city, county, or city and county may submit information related to the items listed in subdivision (d) prior to the public comment period provided for in subdivision (c).

(c) Public participation and access shall be required in the development of the methodology and in the process of drafting and adoption of the allocation of the regional housing needs. Participation by organizations other than local jurisdictions and councils of governments shall be solicited in a diligent effort to achieve public participation of all economic segments of the community. The proposed methodology, along with any relevant underlying data and assumptions, and an explanation of how information about local government conditions gathered pursuant to subdivision (b) has been used to develop the proposed methodology, and how each of the factors listed in subdivision (d) is incorporated into the methodology, shall be distributed to all cities, counties, any subregions, and members of the public who have made a written request for the proposed methodology. The council of governments, or delegate subregion, as applicable, shall conduct at least one public hearing to receive oral and written comments on the proposed methodology.

(d) To the extent that sufficient data is available from local governments pursuant to subdivision (b) or other sources, each council of governments, or delegate subregion as applicable, shall include the following factors to develop the methodology that allocates regional housing needs:

(1) Each member jurisdiction’s existing and projected jobs and housing relationship.
(2) The opportunities and constraints to development of additional housing in each member jurisdiction, including all of the following:

(A) Lack of capacity for sewer or water service due to federal or state laws, regulations or regulatory actions, or supply and distribution decisions made by a sewer or water service provider other than the local jurisdiction that preclude the jurisdiction from providing necessary infrastructure for additional development during the planning period.

(B) The availability of land suitable for urban development or for conversion to residential use, the availability of underutilized land, and opportunities for infill development and increased residential densities. The council of governments may not limit its consideration of suitable housing sites or land suitable for urban development to existing zoning ordinances and land use restrictions of a locality, but shall consider the potential for increased residential development under alternative zoning ordinances and land use restrictions. The determination of available land suitable for urban development may exclude lands where the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) or the Department of Water Resources has determined that the flood management infrastructure designed to protect that land is not adequate to avoid the risk of flooding.

(C) Lands preserved or protected from urban development under existing federal or state programs, or both, designed to protect open space, farmland, environmental habitats, and natural resources on a long-term basis.

(D) County policies to preserve prime agricultural land, as defined pursuant to Section 56064, within an unincorporated area.

(3) The distribution of household growth assumed for purposes of a comparable period of regional transportation plans and opportunities to maximize the use of public transportation and existing transportation infrastructure.

(4) The market demand for housing.

(5) Agreements between a county and cities in a county to direct growth toward incorporated areas of the county.

(6) The loss of units contained in assisted housing developments, as defined in paragraph (9) of subdivision (a) of Section 65583, that changed to non-low-income use through mortgage prepayment, subsidy contract expirations, or termination of use restrictions.

(7) High-housing cost burdens.

(8) The housing needs of farmworkers.

(9) The housing needs generated by the presence of a private university or a campus of the California State University or the University of California within any member jurisdiction.
(10) Any other factors adopted by the council of governments.

(e) The council of governments, or delegate subregion, as applicable, shall explain in writing how each of the factors described in subdivision (d) was incorporated into the methodology and how the methodology is consistent with subdivision (d) of Section 65584. The methodology may include numerical weighting.

(f) Any ordinance, policy, voter-approved measure, or standard of a city or county that directly or indirectly limits the number of residential building permits issued by a city or county shall not be a justification for a determination or a reduction in the share of a city or county of the regional housing need.

(g) In addition to the factors identified pursuant to subdivision (d), the council of governments, or delegate subregion, as applicable, shall identify any existing local, regional, or state incentives, such as a priority for funding or other incentives available to those local governments that are willing to accept a higher share than proposed in the draft allocation to those local governments by the council of governments or delegate subregion pursuant to Section 65584.05.

(h) Following the conclusion of the 60-day public comment period described in subdivision (c) on the proposed allocation methodology, and after making any revisions deemed appropriate by the council of governments, or delegate subregion, as applicable, as a result of comments received during the public comment period, each council of governments, or delegate subregion, as applicable, shall adopt a final regional, or subregional, housing need allocation methodology and provide notice of the adoption of the methodology to the jurisdictions within the region, or delegate subregion as applicable, and to the department.

(i) (1) It is the intent of the Legislature that housing planning be coordinated and integrated with the regional transportation plan. To achieve this goal, the allocation plan shall allocate housing units within the region consistent with the development pattern included in the sustainable communities strategy.

(2) The final allocation plan shall ensure that the total regional housing need, by income category, as determined under Section 65584, is maintained, and that each jurisdiction in the region receive an allocation of units for low- and very low income households.

(3) The resolution approving the final housing need allocation plan shall demonstrate that the plan is consistent with the sustainable communities strategy in the regional transportation plan.

SANDAG shall explain how factors were used in RHNA

Building permit limits shall not be justification for RHNA allocations

SANDAG shall identify incentives for acceptance of higher RHNA share

60-day public comment period

Coordination with RTP, consistency with SCS development pattern

Each jurisdiction shall receive an allocation of units for lower-income households
Key Dates for Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA)
Fifth Housing Element Update
July 9, 2010
(Revised August 27, 2010)

February 2010  SANDAG Board accepts 2050 Regional Growth Forecast for planning purposes for use in preparing the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS), and RHNA.
(The California Department of Finance (DOF) and Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) staff participated in SANDAG’s forecast advisory group.)

January 1, 2010  Eleven-year RHNA projection period for fifth housing element cycle starts (January 1, 2010 – December 31, 2020)

May 1, 2010  DOF issues 2010 E-5 estimates used in RHNA consultation process; SANDAG and HCD continue consultation started during development of 2050 Regional Growth Forecast

June – Dec. 2010  Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG) and Regional Housing Working Group (RHWG) develop draft RHNA methodology and prepare draft jurisdiction/income RHNA allocations

June 10, 2010  Joint TWG/RHWG meeting to kick off RHNA methodology discussion: RHNA background, schedule, and principles

July 9, 2010  SANDAG Board of Directors holds policy meeting to discuss RHNA

July 23, 2010  SANDAG provides HCD and Caltrans date of expected adoption of 2050 RTP in writing as required by SB 575

September 2010  Following HCD/SANDAG RHNA consultation, HCD provides SANDAG with regional housing need determination for RHNA projection period: January 1, 2010 – December 31, 2020 (11 years) (The SANDAG 2050 Regional Growth Forecast projects an additional 127,000 housing units during the 11-year RHNA projection period.)

February 2011  Draft of RTP/SCS/RHNA accepted for distribution/public review

July 22, 2011  Final RTP/SCS/RHNA adopted

January 21, 2013  Due date for January 1, 2013 – December 31, 2020 (8 year) housing elements due within 18 months after RTP is adopted)*

*Housing elements are due every four years for:
1. Jurisdictions that did not adopt their fourth housing element revisions by January 1, 2009, and did not adopt the fourth revision by March 31, 2010, and complete any rezoning contained in the housing element program by June 30, 2010; and
2. Jurisdictions that do not adopt their housing element within 120 days from next housing element due date.
REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT DETERMINATION

Introduction

The Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) process for the fifth housing element cycle (January 1, 2013 – December 31, 2020) is being conducted in conjunction with the development of the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and its Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) in accordance with Senate Bill 375 (Steinberg, 2008) (SB 375). SB 375 calls for the coordination and integration of housing planning with the regional transportation plan.

The RHNA process has three main components:

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

SANDAG has received its RHNA-Determination from HCD following a consultation process between the two agencies, which began in June 2010 (Attachment 1). State housing element law requires HCD to consult with SANDAG in determining the region’s overall housing need. The HCD RHNA-Determination is required to be completed at least two years before the scheduled revision of the next housing element. Housing elements for the San Diego region are required to be completed within 18 months following the adoption of the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

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

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

A report on the RHNA Determination was presented to the Regional Planning Committee for information on December 3, 2010; no comments were made at the meeting.

Discussion

HCD-SANDAG Consultation Process

The consultation process for the RHNA-Determination between SANDAG and HCD occurred between June and November 2010. The consultation process included meetings and conference calls during which information was exchanged about assumptions and the methodology (population projections, vacancy rates, household formation rates, etc.) to be used in the determination.

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

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

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

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

Data from the 2050 Regional Growth Forecast demonstrates the San Diego region’s ability to accommodate the overall RHNA-Determination of 161,980 housing units, and the lower income RHNA of 64,150 units (36,450 very low income units plus 27,700 low income units). The 2050 Regional Growth Forecast projects the construction of 169,528 housing units between January 1, 2010, and January 1, 2025 (only four years beyond the RHNA Projection Period). The forecast also contains a capacity of more than 200,000 housing units in the category of 30 dwelling units per acre or greater (based primarily on existing general/community plans and policies), which demonstrates that the region has more than enough sites planned to meet its RHNA-Determination lower income housing need of 64,150 units.
**Next Steps**

The TWG and RHWG are continuing to meet jointly to develop the RHNA-Plan and methodology for allocating the RHNA-Determination by jurisdiction and into the four income categories. Joint meetings of the two working groups are being held monthly. The TWG and RHWG will make a recommendation to the Regional Planning Committee on the RHNA-Plan in the spring, after which the Board of Directors will hold a public hearing to consider accepting the Draft RHNA-Plan and Draft 2050 RTP and its SCS for distribution and public comment. Public workshops also will be held on the Draft RHNA-Plan and Draft 2050 RTP and its SCS following Board action.

GARY L. GALLEGOS  
Executive Director

Attachment: 1. Letter dated 11/23/10 from California Department of Housing and Community Development - Regional Housing Need Determination

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

Funds are budgeted in Work Element #3100000
November 23, 2010

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

Dear Mr. Gallegos:

RE: Regional Housing Need Determination

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Cathy E. Creswell
Deputy Director

Enclosures
### HCD REGIONAL HOUSING NEED DETERMINATION

**SANDAG GOVERNMENTS: JANUARY 2010 through DECEMBER 2020**

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

**Notes:**

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

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

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

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

Methodology

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

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

4. Projected Households (HHs):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Groups (DOF)</th>
<th>HH Population</th>
<th>HH Formation or Headship Rate (DOF)</th>
<th>Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 15 years</td>
<td>710,371</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1,258,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 24 years</td>
<td>427,306</td>
<td>14.5589%</td>
<td>62,211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 34 years</td>
<td>495,193</td>
<td>41.9984%</td>
<td>207,973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - 44 years</td>
<td>422,529</td>
<td>50.1651%</td>
<td>211,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 - 54 years</td>
<td>425,138</td>
<td>53.5210%</td>
<td>227,538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 - 64 years</td>
<td>435,523</td>
<td>54.8790%</td>
<td>237,913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 plus years</td>
<td>523,523</td>
<td>59.4782%</td>
<td>311,383</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Projected Households (HHs): 1,258,980

5. less: Existing Households at Beginning of Projection Period (January 1, 2010) -1,103,320

7. Vacancy Allowance:

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

8. Replacement Allowance: 0.70%

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

Explanation and Data Sources

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

8. Replacement Allowance: Rate (.7%) reflects housing losses localities annually reported to DOF each January for years 2000-2010.
Item 3
Regional Energy Working Group Charter Amendment and Membership Addition

Recommendation:
The Regional Planning Committee is asked to review and approve clean-up amendments to the Regional Energy Working Group Charter (Attachment 1) and approve the addition of an organization to its membership, the San Diego County Regional Airport Authority.
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Regional Comprehensive Plan

Adopted by SANDAG in 2004

- Urban Form
- Transportation
- Housing
- Healthy Environment
- Economic Prosperity
- Public Facilities
- Borders
From the Ground Up

Public Involvement
- Regional Planning Committee
- Working Group Meetings
- Public Workshops/Presentations
- SANDAG Board Meetings
- Community Based Outreach
- Web-based feedback

Our Vision for a Better Future

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

- Connect transportation and land use plans
- Guide infrastructure investments
- Provide incentives and collaboration

Smart Growth Concept Map

Smart Growth Areas
- Metropolitan Center
- Urban Center
- Town Center
- Community Center
- Rural Village
- Mixed Use Transit Corridor
- Special Use Center
Imperial Beach

Place Type: Community Center

Palm Avenue – Imperial Beach, CA
Escondido

Place Type: Town Center

Valley Parkway at the Escondido Transit Center – Escondido, CA
Valley Parkway at the Escondido Transit Center – Escondido, CA

Existing

Conceptual

Smart Growth Photo Library
Smart Growth Design Guidelines

Design Guidelines: Creating Great Places in the San Diego Region

- Site and building design
- Multimodal streets
- Transit stations
- Civic buildings
- Parks
- Civic Space
- Sustainability
- Smart Growth Scorecard
Trip Generation and Parking Strategies

Smart Growth Incentive Program

Capital Improvements:
- Sidewalks, plazas
- Streetscape enhancements
- Improvements to transit stations
- Other community initiatives

Planning Grants:
- General plan updates
- Specific plans
- Zoning regulations
TDA/TransNet Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Neighborhood Safety Program

- Active transportation projects:
  - Capital Projects
  - Bicycle/Ped Master Plans
  - Bicycle Parking

- Regional Bicycle Plan

Environmental Mitigation
Healthy Neighborhoods

Performance Indicators

Report Card

Urban Form & Transportation

Housing

Healthy Environment

Economic Prosperity

Public Facilities

Borders
Summary

- 2004 – Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP)
- 2006 – Smart Growth Concept Map
- 2007 – Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)
- 2008 – Smart Growth Tool Box
- 2010 – Regional Growth Forecast
- Currently – 2050 RTP/SCS and RHNA
- Future – Update of RCP and Smart Growth Concept Map; SGIP Call for Projects

Goal: Build smart growth in smart growth opportunity areas
Our Region.  
Our Future.

2050 Regional Transportation Plan

2050 RTP Process and Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
<th>Spring 2010</th>
<th>Summer 2010</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th>Spring 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goals and Objectives</td>
<td>Network Development All Modes</td>
<td>Plan Performance Measures</td>
<td>Project Evaluation Criteria</td>
<td>Ranked Projects by Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2050 Regional Growth Forecast</td>
<td>Unconstrained Network</td>
<td>Revenue Constrained/SCS Network Scenarios</td>
<td>Revenue Constrained/SCS Preferred Network Scenario</td>
<td>Draft 2050 RTP and EIR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2050 RTP Goals

- Reliability
- Mobility
- System Preservation & Safety
- Prosperous Economy
- Social Equity
- Healthy Environment

2050 RTP Regional Growth Forecast

- Population
- Jobs
- Housing


Millions: 1.90, 2.0, 3.0, 4.0, 5.0

2050: Population 4.38 Million, Jobs 1.90 Million, Housing 1.53 Million
Preferred Revenue Constrained Scenario: Other Key Components

Sustainable Communities Strategy
Next Steps

- Spring 2011 – Board of Directors anticipated to accept Draft 2050 RTP and EIR for public review
- Public workshops June 2011
Regional Housing Needs Assessment

Who’s Involved?

- Board of Directors
- Regional Planning Committee
- Regional Planning Technical Working Group
- Regional Housing Working Group
SB 375 and Housing Element Law

- Planning for housing and transportation synchronized - RTP and RHNA
- Housing elements due 18 months after RTP adopted
- Eight-year housing element cycle
- Consistency with Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS)

Past Housing Element Cycles

San Diego Region

- 1986 – 1991 (First Cycle)
- 1991 – 1996 (Second Cycle)
- 1999 – 2004 (Third Cycle)
- 2005 – 2010 (Fourth Cycle)
- 2013 – 2020 (Fifth Cycle) (SB 375 and 575)
RHNA Objectives from Housing Element Law (added in 2004)

- Increasing supply and mix of housing types, tenure, and affordability
- Promoting infill development and socio-economic equity, protection of environmental and agricultural resources, and encouragement of efficient development patterns
- Promoting jobs/housing balance
- Alleviating over-concentration households, i.e. promoting balanced communities

RCP Housing Chapter

- **Goal:** Provide a variety of affordable and quality housing choices for people of all income levels...
- **Policy Objective:** Increase the supply of and variety of housing choices, especially higher density multifamily housing...
RCP Housing Chapter

Recommended Actions:
- Identify and rezone appropriate sites for entry-level houses, multifamily and mixed use housing, close to public transportation, employment, and other services
- Identify and develop appropriate underutilized sites for housing, such as older strip commercial centers

Housing Element
Regional Roles and Responsibilities

- Consultation with HCD to determine the region’s housing needs
- Allocation of regional share by jurisdiction
- Allocation of jurisdiction share by income category
Allocation by Income Category

- Very low – 23 percent
- Low – 17 percent
- Moderate – 19 percent
- Above moderate – 41 percent

2010 Household Income Limits

- **Very Low Income**
  0-50 percent AMI - $39,250
- **Low Income**
  50-80 percent AMI - $62,800
- **Moderate Income**
  80-120 percent AMI - $90,600
- **Above Moderate**
  120 percent and above area median income

AMI = Area Median Income
Housing Element
Local Roles and Responsibilities

- Update housing element every eight years
- Identify adequate sites to accommodate overall share of the region’s housing needs
- Identify adequate sites at 30 du/ac for lower income housing

Potential Sites for Lower & Moderate Income Housing
RHNA - Determination
2010 – 2020 RHNA Planning Period

- 161,980 housing units (11 years)
- 64,150 lower income housing units

Employment and Residential Lands Inventory

- 80 percent of new residential development will be multifamily homes
- 80 percent of new residential development will be located in redevelopment/infill areas
 RHNA Allocation Factors

- Jobs and housing relationship
- Opportunities and constraints to developing housing
  - Lack of sewer/water service capacity
  - Vacant/redevelopment/infill land availability
  - Land protected from development
  - County policies to preserve agricultural land
- Distribution of household growth in RTP and maximizing transportation infrastructure

 RHNA Allocation Factors

- Market demand for housing
- Agreements between county and cities to direct growth toward incorporated areas
- Units “at risk” of converting to market rate units
- High housing cost burdens
- Housing needs of farm workers
- Housing needs generated by CSU or UC campuses
- Other factors adopted by SANDAG
RHNA Schedule

- **September 2010** – State determines regional housing needs
- **June 2010 – March 2011** – Develop methodology for distributing regional housing need to local jurisdictions
- **April 2011** – Draft RHNA for distribution
- **October 2011** – SANDAG Board adoption of final RHNA
- **April 2013** – Housing Elements due within 18 months of RTP adoption
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Above Moderate</th>
<th>Total for All Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Housing Units Produced</td>
<td>3,972</td>
<td>4,021</td>
<td>3,512</td>
<td>64,616</td>
<td>76,121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHNA Goal</td>
<td>24,143</td>
<td>18,348</td>
<td>20,280</td>
<td>44,530</td>
<td>107,301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Goal Produced</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>145%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units Left To Permit</td>
<td>20,171</td>
<td>14,327</td>
<td>16,768</td>
<td>-20,086</td>
<td>31,180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regional Housing Needs Assessment

Who’s Involved?

- Board of Directors
- Regional Planning Committee
- Regional Planning Technical Working Group
- Regional Housing Working Group
**SB 375 and Housing Element Law**

- Planning for housing and transportation synchronized - RTP and RHNA
- Housing elements due 18 months after RTP adopted
- Eight-year housing element cycle
- Consistency with Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS)

**Past Housing Element Cycles**

**San Diego Region**

- 1986 – 1991 (First Cycle)
- 1991 – 1996 (Second Cycle)
- 1999 – 2004 (Third Cycle)
- 2005 – 2010 (Fourth Cycle)
- 2013 – 2020 (Fifth Cycle) (SB 375 and 575)
**RHNA Objectives from Housing Element Law (added in 2004)**

- Increasing supply and mix of housing types, tenure, and affordability
- Promoting infill development and socio-economic equity, protection of environmental and agricultural resources, and encouragement of efficient development patterns
- Promoting jobs/housing balance
- Alleviating over-concentration households, i.e. promoting balanced communities

---

**RCP Housing Chapter**

- **Goal:** Provide a variety of affordable and quality housing choices for people of all income levels...
- **Policy Objective:**
  Increase the supply of and variety of housing choices, especially higher density multifamily housing...
RCP Housing Chapter

- Recommended Actions:
  - Identify and rezone appropriate sites for entry-level houses, multifamily and mixed use housing, close to public transportation, employment, and other services
  - Identify and develop appropriate underutilized sites for housing, such as older strip commercial centers

Housing Element
Regional Roles and Responsibilities

- Consultation with HCD to determine the region’s housing needs
- Allocation of regional share by jurisdiction
- Allocation of jurisdiction share by income category
**Allocation by Income Category**

- Very low – 23 percent
- Low – 17 percent
- Moderate – 19 percent
- Above moderate – 41 percent

---

**2010 Household Income Limits Family of Four**

- **Very Low Income**
  0-50 percent AMI - $39,250
- **Low Income**
  50-80 percent AMI - $62,800
- **Moderate Income**
  80-120 percent AMI - $90,600
- **Above Moderate**
  120 percent and above area median income

AMI = Area Median Income
Housing Element
Local Roles and Responsibilities

- Update housing element every eight years
- Identify adequate sites to accommodate overall share of the region’s housing needs
- Identify adequate sites at 30 du/ac for lower income housing

Potential Sites for Lower & Moderate Income Housing
**RHNA - Determination**

2010 – 2020 RHNA Planning Period

- 161,980 housing units (11 years)
- 64,150 lower income housing units

---

**Employment and Residential Lands Inventory**

- 80 percent of new residential development will be multifamily homes
- 80 percent of new residential development will be located in redevelopment/infill areas
RHNA Allocation Factors

- Jobs and housing relationship
- Opportunities and constraints to developing housing
  - Lack of sewer/water service capacity
  - Vacant/redevelopment/infill land availability
  - Land protected from development
  - County policies to preserve agricultural land
- Distribution of household growth in RTP and maximizing transportation infrastructure

RHNA Allocation Factors

- Market demand for housing
- Agreements between county and cities to direct growth toward incorporated areas
- Units “at risk” of converting to market rate units
- High housing cost burdens
- Housing needs of farm workers
- Housing needs generated by CSU or UC campuses
- Other factors adopted by SANDAG
RHNA Schedule

- **September 2010** –
  State determines regional housing needs
- **June 2010 – March 2011** –
  Develop methodology for distributing regional housing need to local jurisdictions
- **April 2011** –
  Draft RHNA for distribution
- **October 2011** –
  SANDAG Board adoption of final RHNA
- **April 2013** –
  Housing Elements due within 18 months of RTP adoption
# New Housing Units by Income Category

1/1/03 – 12/31/09

## 2009 RCP Performance Monitoring Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Above Moderate</th>
<th>Total for All Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Housing Units Produced</td>
<td>3,972</td>
<td>4,021</td>
<td>3,512</td>
<td>64,616</td>
<td>76,121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHNA Goal</td>
<td>24,143</td>
<td>18,348</td>
<td>20,280</td>
<td>44,530</td>
<td>107,301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Goal Produced</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>145%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units Left To Permit</td>
<td>20,171</td>
<td>14,327</td>
<td>16,768</td>
<td>-20,086</td>
<td>31,180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NRSW N4/NAVFAC SW Overview
for
San Diego Association of Governments
Regional Planning Committee

4 March 2011
Supporting the Navy & Marine Corps Team
$3.3B EXECUTION FOR NAVFAC SW IN FY 2010:

• Awarded more than 8,400 contract actions worth $2.8B
  - Awarded over $1.6B in September

• Awarded 26 contract actions for over $500M in Recovery Act projects
  - Includes Camp Pendleton Naval Hospital

• Delivered over $367M of Environmental Support
  - 60% of environmental work accomplished by NAVFAC Worldwide

• Delivered $495M in Navy Working Capital Fund direct labor services
  - 344,000 Facility Sustainment Actions
  - 1205 Ship moves
  - 99,683 Crane lifts
### FY-11 Military Construction

**San Diego County**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Project Location</th>
<th># of Projects</th>
<th>Prog Amt ($000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BEQ</td>
<td>MCB CAMP PENDLETON CA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$79,884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NAVBASE SAN DIEGO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$75,342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavement</td>
<td>MCB CAMP PENDLETON CA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$66,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NAVBASE SAN DIEGO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$108,414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training &amp; Operations</td>
<td>MCB CAMP PENDLETON CA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$114,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NAVBASE SAN DIEGO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$57,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NAVBASE CORONADO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$67,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NAVBASE POINT LOMA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$108,414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>MARCORPRCUCITDEP SAN DIEGO CA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$9,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MCB CAMP PENDLETON CA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$140,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NAVBASE POINT LOMA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
<td><strong>$874,246</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AWAITING FY 11 APPROPRIATIONS**
Future Platforms

- CVN 78
- F35 – JSF
- LCS
- DDG 1000
- E2D
- LHD 8
- UAS/UXS
- LHA 6
- LPD 17
Navy Energy Goals

“Department of the Navy will by 2020 produce at least half of our shore-based energy requirements on our installations from alternative sources.”

-- Secretary of the Navy Ray Mabus

The "Green Hornet" -- F/A-18F Super Hornet

03/07/2011
Renewable Energy

- **Solar**
  - 7.5 MW PV installed
  - 20+ MW PV in development

- **Wind**
  - San Clemente & San Nicholas Islands, Barstow

- **Geothermal**
  - 272 MW at NAWS China Lake

- **Bio-fuels**
  - Fleet & Tactical Vehicles
MILCON Impact on San Diego County

- Total economic impact (direct + ripple effects) for 2010 is $2.3B & 2011 is $2.6B
  - Ripple effects add $75 for every $100 of direct military construction outlays
- A major offset to recession and a critical boost toward economic recovery
- The military is a leader in establishing higher standards for the environment, energy efficiency, and sustainability.

Source: Fermanian Business & Economic Institute, San Diego
10

MILCON Impact
On San Diego Jobs

Source: Fermanian Business & Economic Institute, San Diego

- Will create almost 16,000 jobs in San Diego County in 2010 and 2011
- The total value of salaries/earnings resulting from MILCON spending is nearly $1 Billion in 2010 and 2011
- Creates high paying jobs with earnings ~$62,000 per employee in 2010 -- 5% above average

Source: Fermanian Business & Economic Institute, San Diego

Chart 10
Economic Ripple Effects Contribute to Earnings Total
Millions of dollars

- Will create almost 16,000 jobs in San Diego County in 2010 and 2011
- The total value of salaries/earnings resulting from MILCON spending is nearly $1 Billion in 2010 and 2011
- Creates high paying jobs with earnings ~$62,000 per employee in 2010 -- 5% above average

Source: Fermanian Business & Economic Institute, San Diego

Chart 12
Military Construction Spending Creates More Jobs as It Flows Through the Economy
Thousands of jobs

Source: Fermanian Business & Economic Institute, San Diego

Chart 13
Military Construction Drives Employment Across the Economy
Top 15 sectors, 2010e

1. Maintenance & repair of nonresidential structures
2. Construction of other new nonresidential structures
3. Construction of new single and multi-family structures
4. Architectural, engineering, and related services
5. Food services and drinking places
6. Construction of new commercial and health care structures
7. Real estate establishments
8. Wholesale trade businesses
9. Physicians, dentists, and other health practitioners
10. Employment services
11. Retail Stores - Food and beverage
12. Retail Stores - General merchandise
13. Retail Stores - Motor vehicle and parts
14. Retail Stores - Direct and electronic sales
15. Private household operations
Strategic Drivers & Way Ahead

- **ENERGY - Independence and Security**
  - On-site generation and consumption
  - Reduced dependence on purchased power

- **GROWTH - BRAC Net Gain/ Pacific Mission Focus**
  - New ships: LHD, CVN, MCMs, LCS, DDG, LHA, LPDs
  - New/ realigned helicopter squadrons 8 NB Coronado
  - New aircraft: F35 Joint Strike Fighter, E2D, UAS
  - Naval Special Warfare/ Naval Expeditionary Cmd
  - USMC Grow the Force (FY07-11, 50+ proj, $4B)

- **INFRASTRUCTURE - Pressing Demands**
  - Maximize existing shore capabilities
  - Vision 2035 in work - optimizing lay down
  - Upgrade piers - power capability for new platforms
  - Bachelor Quarters Homeport Ashore/ Q4 Elimination
  - USMC BQ Recapitalization (FY08-11, 42 proj, $1.4B)
Program Objectives:
• Systematic identification, quantification, mitigation and prevention of incompatible developments that could potentially impact operational sustainability

Method:
• Coordinated efforts between multiple commands
• Proactive assessment of potential impacts
• Active engagement with local, state, other federal agencies and community leaders to prevent incompatible development
• Promote compatible development of lands in the vicinity of installations and OP areas (i.e. Ranges & MTRs)

Challenges:
• Incompatible Urban Development
• Incompatible Renewable Development

Continue Pursuing Innovative Tools/Methods:
• Mission Compatibility Analysis Tool (MCAT) Beta testing ongoing
Live Interactive MCAT Demo
Questions?