



401 B Street, Suite 800  
 San Diego, CA 92101-4231  
 (619) 699-1900  
 Fax (619) 699-1905  
 www.sandag.org

# MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

## ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION PROGRAM WORKING GROUP

The Environmental Mitigation Program Working Group may take action on any item appearing on this agenda.

Tuesday, December 13, 2011

1:00 to 3:00 p.m.

SANDAG, 7th Floor Conference Room  
 401 B Street  
 San Diego, CA 92101-4231

Staff Contact: Keith Greer  
 (619) 699-7390  
 kgr@sandag.org

### AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

- MITIGATION ENDOWMENTS AT SAN DIEGO FOUNDATION
- PRESERVE MANAGEMENT PLAN STANDARDIZATION
- QUALITY OF LIFE PUBLIC INFORMATION SURVEY AND SANDAG BOARD ACTION

SANDAG offices are accessible by public transit.  
 Phone 511 or see [www.511sd.com](http://www.511sd.com) for route information.  
 Secure bicycle parking is available in the building garage off Fourth Avenue.

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.

#### MEMBER AGENCIES

Cities of  
 Carlsbad  
 Chula Vista  
 Coronado  
 Del Mar  
 El Cajon  
 Encinitas  
 Escondido  
 Imperial Beach  
 La Mesa  
 Lemon Grove  
 National City  
 Oceanside  
 Poway  
 San Diego  
 San Marcos  
 Santee  
 Solana Beach  
 Vista  
 and  
 County of San Diego

#### ADVISORY MEMBERS

Imperial County  
 California Department  
 of Transportation  
 Metropolitan  
 Transit System  
 North County  
 Transit District  
 United States  
 Department of Defense  
 San Diego  
 Unified Port District  
 San Diego County  
 Water Authority  
 Southern California  
 Tribal Chairmen's Association

Mexico

# ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION PROGRAM WORKING GROUP

Tuesday, December 13, 2011

ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION
1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS (Chair, SANDAG Board Member, Carrie Downey, City Of Coronado Council Member)	
+2. SUMMARY OF THE NOVEMBER 8, 2011, MEETING	APPROVE
Review and approve the meeting summary of the November 8, 2011, meeting.	Estimated Start Time: 1:00 – 1:05
3. PUBLIC COMMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS	COMMENT
Members of the public shall have the opportunity to address the Environmental Mitigation Program Working Group (EMPWG) on any issue within the jurisdiction of SANDAG 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 EMPWG coordinator prior to speaking. Public speakers should notify the EMPWG coordinator if they have a handout for distribution to EMPWG members. Public speakers are limited to three minutes or less per person. EMPWG members also may provide information and announcements under this agenda item.	Estimated Start Time: 1:05 – 1:10
4. MITIGATION ENDOWMENTS AT SAN DIEGO FOUNDATION (Karen Begin and Simona Valanciute, The San Diego Foundation)	INFORMATION
The San Diego Foundation is a community resource for receiving, managing, and distributing charitable funds to support organizations within the San Diego Region. The San Diego Foundation currently manages several funds set up for land acquisition and management activities. San Diego Foundation Staff will provide information on their investment strategies, financial performance, fees, and process for establishing funds that could be used for activities such as management endowments.	Estimated Start Time: 1:10 – 1:50
5. PRESERVE MANAGEMENT PLAN STANDARDIZATION (Rebecca Lewison, San Diego State University)	INFORMATION
Dr. Lewison of San Diego State University’s Institute for Environmental Management and Monitoring will provide a status report on the progress made on the standardization of land management plans for open space preserves, including past and pending workshops for land managers, and future activities.	Estimated Start Time: 1:50 – 2:30

**ITEM #**

**RECOMMENDATION**

- +6. QUALITY OF LIFE PUBLIC INFORMATION SURVEY AND SANDAG BOARD ACTION (Rob Rundle, SANDAG)

INFORMATION

Mr. Rundle will provide information on the results of the public information survey conducted on the Quality of Life efforts and the results of the SANDAG Board of Directors December 9, 2011, meeting on this topic.

Estimated Start Time:  
2:30 – 2:55

- 7. NEXT MEETING

Next meeting of the EMPWG is scheduled for January 10, 2011.

Estimated Start Time:  
2:55 – 3:00

Tentative topics: Final Dahlem Report Presentation and Timeline for Future Land Management Grants.

+ next to an item indicates an attachment

**San Diego Association of Governments**  
**ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION PROGRAM**  
**WORKING GROUP**

December 13, 2011

AGENDA ITEM NO.: **2**

**Action Requested: APPROVE**

SUMMARY OF THE NOVEMBER 8, 2011, MEETING

**Members in Attendance:**

Carrie Downey (Chair), City of Coronado  
Mike Grim (Vice Chair), City of Carlsbad, North County Coastal  
Bruce April, Caltrans  
Michael Beck, Endangered Habitats League  
Joan Cardellino, California Coastal Conservancy  
Leann Carmichael, County of San Diego  
Robert Fisher, U.S. Geological Survey  
Jeanne Krosch, City of San Diego  
Marisa Lundstedt, Chula Vista, South County  
Jim Lyon, City of Poway  
Kevin Mallory, City of Santee, East Suburban Communities  
David Mayer, CA Department of Fish and Game  
Barbara Redlitz, City of Escondido  
Deborah Townsend, Wildlife Conservation Board  
Jim Whalen, Alliance for Habitat Conservation  
Susan Wynn, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
Emily Young, The San Diego Foundation

**Others in Attendance:**

Erich Lathers, BRG  
Karen Begin, The San Diego Foundation  
Gabe Buhr, California Coastal Commission  
Cathy Chadwick, EDI  
Josh Garcia, City of San Diego  
Nancy Gardiner, Weston Solutions  
Scott Grimes  
Megan Hamilton, County of San Diego  
Vivi Mai, City of Carlsbad  
Erin Marnocha, IEMM, SDSU  
Niki McGinnis, City of San Diego  
Yvonne Moore, San Diego Management and Monitoring Program  
Tom Oberbauer, AECOM  
Ron Rempel, San Diego Management and Monitoring Program  
Christina Schaefer, ESA

Simona Valanciute, The San Diego Foundation

**SANDAG Staff in Attendance:**

Grace Chung  
Keith Greer  
Katie Levy  
Alex Samarin

**ITEM #1: WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

Vice Chair Mike Grim, City of Carlsbad, called the meeting to order at 1:05 p.m.

**ITEM #2: JULY 12, 2011, MEETING SUMMARY**

Michael Beck, Endangered Habitats League, motioned to approve the meeting summary from July 12, 2011, and, Leann Carmichael, County of San Diego, seconded the motion. The motion carried without opposition.

**ITEM #3: PUBLIC COMMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS**

There were no public comments. Keith Greer, SANDAG, provided a status report of where the Environmental Mitigation Program Working Group's (EMPWG) recommendations for the Five-Year Funding Strategy and Fiscal Year (FY) 2012 Annual Funding are within the SANDAG process. The Transportation Committee and Regional Planning Committee have recommended approval and the Independent Tax Oversight Committee (ITOC) will review next before going before the Board for approval on Friday, November 11, 2011.

Additionally, ITOC conducts performance reviews every three years of SANDAG's grant programs. EMPWG members may be contacted as part of the audit on the Land Management grant program.

SANDAG's communication department put together a brochure to highlight EMPWG projects over the past year to present to ITOC and the Board as part of the annual report. Copies were provided to the EMPWG members and available online at:

[http://www.keepsandiegomoving.com/Libraries/EMP-doc/EMP\\_Brochure\\_FINAL.sflb.ashx](http://www.keepsandiegomoving.com/Libraries/EMP-doc/EMP_Brochure_FINAL.sflb.ashx).

**ITEM #4: CONSERVED LANDS DATABASE NEXT STEPS**

Grace Chung, SANDAG, and Yvonne Moore, San Diego Management and Monitoring Program (SDMMP), provided a status update on the Conserved Lands Database (CLD) and the proposed next steps to work with land owners and managers to fill in missing attributes.

Within San Diego County there are 1,262,994 acres of land, of which 32 percent is conserved land, 61 percent is non-conserved land, 3 percent is Indian Reservation land, and 4 percent is Military land. Furthermore, of the 32 percent of conserved land within the county, a combined 86 percent of the lands are owned by the state and federal governments, with the remaining 14 percent of lands owned by special districts, non-profits, private land owners, cities, and the county.

The CLD was updated into two categories: Land Information and Land Management Information. Data for Land Information such as property name, owner name, conserved date, conserved type, funding source, APN, and public access has been collected. The focus of the Land Information is to make sure it is current. The Land Management Information has several gaps. The next focus will be coordinating with land managers for the Land Management Information where there are several missing attributes including management agency, management responsibility, management plan, management plan date, management plan funding, and management contact.

SANDAG and SDMMMP staff will be contacting land managers and owners to update the database and fill in any missing gaps. SANDAG has created a Web site for the CLD to provide another tool for input, review, and comment, please contact Ms. Chung at [cchu@sandag.org](mailto:cchu@sandag.org) for the username and password.

Mr. Beck commented the total conserved land in the county is closer to 60 percent, rather than 32 percent, and if this included special districts such as lands owned by the water districts. Ms. Chung stated the water districts are included within the CLD, but 32 percent conserved lands did not include lands on Camp Pendleton. Mr. Beck added the local governments should confirm annually their updated data was uploaded to the CLD.

Marisa Lunstedt, City of Chula Vista, asked if there was a way to enter data one time as they currently use Habitrack to enter their data. Ms. Chung responded information from Habitrack was incorporated into the CLD. Mr. Greer added the purpose of updating the CLD is to establish a baseline of what information is missing and work with land managers in assembling a complete database of conserved lands.

Ms. Moore commented coordination with land managers will occur from December 2011 to March 2012 and the CLD will be available after March 2012 to be used as another tool by land managers. Mr. Greer stated Ms. Chung and Ms. Moore will be contacting land managers to set up meetings.

Mr. Beck asked how to indicate management plans which have anticipated approval dates. Susan Wynn, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), noted there are plans that are completed for local jurisdictions, but have not been approved. Mr. Greer stated management plans should be noted whether or not completed or currently in-progress. Ms. Moore commented land managers should answer this question in reference to whichever plan is currently used for management activities.

Robert Fisher, U.S. Geological Survey (USGS), asked if there is a contact list available to be used by land managers in order to ensure everyone receives any updated information for the CLD. Mr. Greer stated there is a contact list that will be revised with the most updated contact information available. After baseline information is gathered and updated in the CLD, the CLD will be continually updated through monthly or quarterly requests for information from the land managers on the contact list. This could include new acquisitions, completion of management plans, changes in land manager, and changes to contact information. Ms. Moore added Ms. Chung has been collecting data for the contact list.

Mr. Beck asked about Resource Protection Ordinance land dedications pre-MSCP lands that are managed by Home Owner Associations (HOAs). Ms. Chung confirmed that several HOA, private, etc., land information was included in the CLD. Mr. Greer encouraged land managers to browse the CLD to review the depth of information that has already been included. Ms. Chung noted a function of the GIS CLD is the ability to zoom in and see which portions of parcels are conserved.

#### **ITEM #5: AD HOC COMMITTEE'S REVIEW OF PAST CYCLES AND RECOMMENDATION ON FISCAL YEAR 2012 LAND MANAGEMENT GRANTS**

Mr. Greer introduced Yvonne Moore, SDMMMP, to review the feedback received on the land management grant program.

SDMMMP was tasked with gathering feedback on the Land Management grant program in order to improve processes for the FY 2012 cycle. Of the 47 contacts provided by SANDAG, which included past grantees, grant reviewers, and stakeholders, 20 responded to the survey between August and September 2011. The comments provided were summarized by Ms. Moore and submitted to the Ad Hoc Committee (AHC) for review.

Overall, respondents described the land management grant process as "smooth", "great", "open", and "thorough". However, suggestions were made for the following:

- changes should be made in the SANDAG contracting process including the timeline, invoicing, indirect cost analysis, reporting 10 percent retention, the "use it or lose it" requirement within Board Policy No. 035, and matching funds
- a concept paper is desired to reduce effort "Dead on Arrival" (DOA) projects
- public awareness of TransNet should be required to include signage, press release, and public presentations
- partially funded projects should be acknowledged in later grant cycles

Respondents had additional comments on the application, eligible activities, and selection criteria. They noted that the application budget tables should include separate line items for indirect costs, multiple years of funding, and start date should be flexible as it is dependent on contracting completion. Additionally, the applicants were confused which eligible activities category to apply for as their projects spanned multiple categories. Suggestions were to provide more information on focal species in the Call for Projects (CFP) as well as allowing for more flexibility in funding across categories. Finally, respondents suggested the addition of cores and not just corridors as selection criteria, and more information on the CFP on how matching funds are weighed by evaluators.

Chair Downey asked how the results of this information could be used by the EMPWG in planning the next grant cycle and the effect any recommendations would have on the timeline. Mr. Greer explained that the AHC reviewed these comments and will discuss their recommendations on how to incorporate respondents' feedback. There are certain comments which staff cannot control such as Board Policy No. 035 ("Use-It-or-Lose-It"). However, the feedback received was provided to the ITOC auditors, so there is potential for auditors to make recommendations which could lead to change.

Megan Hamilton, County of San Diego, inquired if this report included all comments received. Ms. Moore stated that all comments were not included as they would have revealed the respondent's identity. All respondents were informed that their comments would remain confidential.

Joan Cardellino, California Coastal Conservancy, asked how much is given out each year for the land management grant program. Mr. Greer noted that the amount of funding varies each year and \$1.95 million was available for the FY 2011 cycle.

Vice-Chair Grim chaired the AHC, which included the following EMPWG members: Bruce April, Caltrans, Jim Lyon, City of Poway, David Mayer, California Department of Fish and Game, Susan Wynn, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and Emily Young, The San Diego Foundation. Ms. Moore and Ron Rempel from SDMMP were also in attendance at the AHC meeting.

Vice-Chair Grim reviewed the discussions and recommendations the AHC is proposing for FY 2012 Land Management Grant cycle which was included in the agenda packet. In general, the AHC found that more information is needed for and from grant application. The criteria and information provided within the grant application did not elicit detailed applications that are needed for evaluation.

Rather than having point-based criteria, the AHC recommended that signage be revised to be a requirement for submitted project applications. Additionally, applicants will need to indicate more detailed information on other outreach volunteer and community events they will conduct for the project. The AHC also recommends that applicants be required to break out tasks by year matching funds within the budget and schedule attachments. More information will also be required on start dates and schedule of the proposed projects. Applicants will also be required to agree that they will provide deliverables such as final reports and data in a format compatible with the regional lands management database.

The AHC also recommended that the \$2 million for FY 2012 be approximately distributed for each of the three categories, instead of listing set dollar amounts. This will allow for more flexibility in evaluating applications. The invasive control and habitat category was refined to have focus on habitat restoration. Additional clarification for habitats were based on feedback received and include the addition of native grasslands, vernal pools, and associated uplands around bays and lagoons to the highest priority habitats list. For species specific management, the AHC took into consideration feedback for further guidance. Habitat maintenance and access control category did not change except for the added requirement for signage.

AHC members agreed that the evaluation criteria needed to be specialized for each of the three categories. Language and weighting of points associated with each of the evaluation criteria was tailored to be more appropriate for each of the three categories. While the AHC discussed whether a minimum matching funds requirement should be added, they decided against it.

Chair Downey suggested the matching funds information on the application should be clear that matching funds is weighted by evaluators, but is not a requirement to apply for grant funding. Ms. Wynn explained the evaluation process for matching funds and the purpose for requesting this information from applicants is to see if they have procured additional sources for matching funds.

Mr. Greer noted the AHC discussed the need to revise the application criteria language to ask "if sufficient matching funds are available to implement the project."

Debbie Townsend, Wildlife Conservation Board, asked if applicants need to demonstrate that matching funds are available within their applications or invoices. Vice-Chair Grim stated any matching funds disclosed must be secured at the time of application submission.

Mr. Fisher requested clarification on the recommended list of priority species for the FY 2012 Land Management Grant cycle. He noted the snowy plover and least tern could be covered with other EMP management activities that are consistent with the USFWS recovery plans. Mr. Greer explained that one of the discussions for the EMPWG was to decide if additional modifications such as prioritization of species should be made. Additionally, the list of species has grown from 10 species for FY 2011, to 18 species for FY 2012. Ms. Wynn clarified the goal of the AHC was to identify the priority species for the following year. Mr. Greer explained further that while work on cactus wren is currently funded by the grant program, the EMPWG needs to decide whether they want to have more funding available next year for this species. Vice-Chair Grim stated the development of the strategic plan will present an opportunity to have a larger discussion on prioritization of species.

Chair Downey explained the EMPWG should come to a decision whether the list of priority species should be revised or left as is. Additionally, the list should be focused in order to receive applications on species which the EMPWG wants to cover. Vice-Chair Grim noted the species on the list will be given the highest priority, but applications for grant projects on other species will be accepted.

Ms. Cardellino asked if the grant program is limited to capital outlay projects, what other funding is available to cover these species for ongoing management. Ms. Wynn disclosed Section 6 funding for listed species such as the least tern and snowy plover are available for monitoring, management, and predator control for certain sites; however, there are some sites that do not receive funding. In response to Mr. Fisher's question, Ms. Wynn explained the snowy plover and least tern were left on the list because the AHC was not able to reach consensus.

Mr. Beck requested further clarification on why the AHC chose to leave the snowy plover and least tern on the species list. Mr. Rempel stated that an argument made for leaving these species on the list was that research implies coordinated management of the species leads to better results. Moreover, there are some sites of concern where the USFWS Section 6 does not cover these species. Ms. Wynn elucidated one of the sites of issue is FAA Island for least tern. Mr. Beck commented the EMPWG should look at information on how species such as the snowy plover performed over the past five years instead of a funding source perspective.

Mr. Mayer stated other species were removed such as the southwestern pond turtle as other funds are available. Mr. Rempel added the USGS is currently conducting exotic removal work for the southwestern pond turtle with funds from a previous grant cycle. Additionally, one of the applications received for FY 2011 was for genetic work on the southwestern pond turtle, and research such as this is not an eligible category under the land management grant program.

Mr. Beck indicated the golden eagle data should lead to an interpretation of land use implications and policy leadership discrepancies. Also, the Hermes copper species should be added to the priority species list as the status of Hermes viability is equal to other species currently on the list. Ms. Wynn responded funding for Hermes has been provided through EMP monitoring grants.

Mr. Greer explained the Hermes data is still being processed and needs to be understood prior to moving forward with management actions. Furthermore, the EMPWG should make decisions for the species list by considering whether species is currently under direct threats and needing immediate management, or should be addressed with long-term management. ITOC auditors have inquired what the goals and objectives for the EMP land management grant program are. For priority of species, the goal then is to address the direct threats or critical needs of species over the next year.

Mr. Beck stated genetic work needs to be conducted for Hermes to see if the population is lower than records currently indicate. Mr. Greer noted genetic work is being conducted through other funding sources and the land management grant program must be consistent for eligible activities for species on the list.

Mr. Greer asked whether there were any suggestions whether any plants on the priority species list should be removed or added. Tom Oberbauer, AECOM, confirmed that the current plant list is appropriate. Mr. Mayer stated that another plant for consideration is Del Mar Manzanita as it is difficult to restore. Mr. Oberbauer agreed and advocated to replace Robert's Dehesa beargrass with Del Mar Manzanita. Mr. Rempel inquired what the associated management action for Del Mar Manzanita would be until you straighten out the issue with the genetics. Mr. Greer indicated that there is money to evaluate the genetic difference in Del Mar Manzanita and monitoring the general baseline distribution. It could be added once the threats and distribution are known.

Chair Downey made a motion to use the proposed AHC list (including leave snowy plover and least tern on the species list), adding the red-legged frog, changing language to "manage existing populations, and where appropriate, increase number and size". Vice-Chair Grim seconded the motion and carried without opposition.

There was further discussion on additional language revisions to clarify grant applications, applicants using resources provided such as SDMMP assistance, and how the timeline for the FY 2012 grant cycle process will need to be changed.

Mr. Greer proposed that staff will review and present the recommended timeline and options to update the FY 2012 Land Management Grant cycle. In response to Mr. April's suggestion to reduce the SANDAG process of committees required to review grants, Mr. Greer clarified that this issue is out of SANDAG staff's control.

#### **ITEM #6: MITIGATION ENDOWMENTS AT SAN DIEGO FOUNDATION**

Mr. Greer introduced Karen Begin and Simona Valanciute from The San Diego Foundation. The issue of endowments has been expressed in the past; therefore Ms. Begin and Ms. Valanciute were invited to educate the EMPWG on investment and funding strategies.

Chair Downey noted that there was limited time left for this item and wanted to provide the full amount necessary for the presentation. Ms. Valanciute confirmed that the presentation was longer than the time allotted, but they are able to return to the next EMPWG meeting and provide the full presentation.

#### **ITEM #7: MANAGEMENT STRATEGIC PLAN STATUS**

Mr. Rempel gave a brief status report on the Management Strategic Plan (MSP). The MSP is designed to identify the goals, objectives, and actions for regional management. In addition, the MSP will prioritize actions to help guide regional funding under the Regional Conservation Fund of the EMP. This would include a cost-benefit analysis. Long-term goal is better management outcomes with the limited management funding that is available.

Scale of how we management species and habitat will be a key for the MSP. Also what species are at greatest risk need to be documented and what are the threats to those species and overall preserve. Two working groups have been formed. A group looking at the overall landscape has been formed to help with regional distribution, threats, and priorities have met once and will continue to meet to guide the MSP. A second group consisting of land managers will start to meet in the early spring (2012) to identify which species and area have greatest management opportunities, and which specific management techniques are best used to address those opportunities. The overall goal is to develop a draft by next summer (2012). At the same time San Diego State University is under contract to work on management plans at the preserve-level which will help standardize effective processes, methods. and directions for individual preserve.

#### **ITEM #8: NEXT MEETING DATE AND ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. Greer proposed a special session of the EMPWG on December 13, 2011, from 1:00 to 3:00 p.m., to hear the San Diego Foundation's presentation on Mitigation Endowments.

Additionally, the EMPWG will still hold the regularly scheduled meeting on January 10, 2012, from to 1:00 to 3:00 p.m. to review the findings on the land management grant program by ITOC auditors.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 p.m. by Chair Downey.



**BOARD OF DIRECTORS  
DECEMBER 9, 2011**

**AGENDA ITEM NO. 11-12-7  
ACTION REQUESTED - APPROVE**

---

**QUALITY OF LIFE FUNDING STRATEGY: PUBLIC  
INFORMATION SURVEY RESULTS AND NEXT STEPS**

File Number 3200000

**Introduction**

The Quality of Life Stakeholder Working Group (SWG) has been meeting regularly since January 2010. SANDAG asked this diverse group of regional stakeholders to consider and provide input to the SANDAG Quality of Life Steering Committee and Board of Directors on several matters, including:

- The regional significance and appropriateness of the four potential funding elements identified for the Quality of Life Funding Strategy (i.e., habitat conservation, shoreline preservation, water quality enhancement, and transit operations and maintenance);
- Development of criteria that would be useful in evaluating and prioritizing the funding needs of the four elements;
- Assessment of the programs considered for regional funding, and the amount of funding needed;
- Identification and evaluation of the range of feasible funding alternatives; and
- The appropriateness, timing, and viability of initiating a SANDAG quality of life funding measure.

**Recommendation**

The Quality of Life Steering Committee recommends that the Board of Directors direct staff to return with a proposed amendment to the TransNet Extension Ordinance to extend the deadline for acting on an additional funding measure to no later than 2016 as well as related revisions to the Quality of Life Stakeholder Working Group charter as may be needed.

On November 18, 2011, the Quality of Life Steering Committee reviewed the results from a survey of the public about its views of quality of life issues and funding measures, and has recommended that the deadline for acting on an additional funding measure be extended to no later than 2016.

**Discussion**

Meeting monthly, the SWG was able to deliver its initial feedback on its efforts at the beginning of 2011 to the Steering Committee, which is composed of SANDAG Board members from each of the six subregions. Feedback was summarized in a report produced by the SWG. A summary of this input also was provided to the Board of Directors at its annual summit in February 2011. A brief summary of that feedback follows:

- The four elements identified by SANDAG for consideration in a Quality of Life Funding Strategy all meet the criteria for being underfunded, lacking a dedicated funding stream, and potentially benefiting from a regional funding approach. That feedback should not, however, be taken as an indication that other elements of regional quality of life might not also meet those criteria now or in the future.
- Proposed evaluation criteria were developed by the SWG and applied to the programs identified as making up the funding needs for each quality of life element. The general theme of these criteria was to determine whether a proposed program could demonstrate that it would provide community benefits that were quantifiable through a sustainable approach that is currently unfunded and/or underfunded.
- Generally, proposed programs all met the threshold, as defined by the criteria, for being appropriate to fund through a regional funding mechanism. However, while the relative order of magnitude of funding needed for each element was acknowledged, definitive funding projections were not defined. Also, while it was generally agreed that transit operations were underfunded, the SWG did not reach consensus on what should be funded and if funding the proposed 2050 Regional Transportation Plan and its Sustainable Communities Strategy network and operations plan would be the best use of additional funding for transit.
- Several funding alternatives were identified as feasible from a legal sense, but when the SWG examined the practicality of implementation (e.g., the need to coordinate and pass certain measures at the municipal or even smaller scale) as well as the lower amounts of funding that most of these alternatives would produce in relation to the magnitude of need, a regional sales tax measure emerged as the most feasible funding alternative.

Prior to providing any additional feedback regarding a potential SANDAG funding measure, the SWG sought additional direction from the Steering Committee and information from a survey of the public about its views of quality of life issues and funding measures. After receiving that direction and results of the survey (Attachment 1), the SWG provided the input for Steering Committee and SANDAG Board consideration. The full survey results can be found on the SANDAG Web site at [www.sandag.org/QofLsurvey](http://www.sandag.org/QofLsurvey).

It was determined from the survey that from a timing standpoint, there does not appear to be any possible scenario under current or foreseeable conditions in which a quality of life funding measure would pass the required two-thirds majority of San Diego County voters. It also was determined that among the four quality of life elements, water quality tended to garner the most public support. Based on that practical information, the SWG and Steering Committee feedback is that the Board of Directors should amend the TransNet Extension Ordinance to again extend the deadline for acting on "additional regional funding measures to meet long-term requirements for implementing habitat conservation plans in the San Diego region."

What the survey did make apparent is that there is a tremendous education process that would be needed ahead of such a measure, as the purported benefits of the quality of life programs that would be funded did not immediately resonate with most survey respondents. Assuming a potential sales tax measure was deferred for several years, raising awareness of current and projected funding gaps would still be useful to inform officials in the region.

Finally, the meetings and discussions over the past 18 months conducted by the SWG and Steering Committee form a considerable body of analysis, feedback, and programmatic definition. While the programs and their costs discussed may be a “snapshot” in time, a summary of them will still be useful as a starting place for any future measure or regional dialogue on the subject. It also may be appropriate to refine some of the information that has been put together through the SWG process so that there is a viable list of potential projects and/or programs to choose from in developing a comprehensive initiative, should an opportunity arise. For example, while there are substantial planning documents to draw from for habitat conservation, shoreline preservation, and transit operations, water quality enhancement could benefit from a more directed effort to establish an effective regional plan of projects and programs.

The SWG members agreed that monthly meetings were no longer needed and provided potential options on how to proceed. One option would be to meet regularly but less often, perhaps on a quarterly schedule. Another option would be to meet on a “milestone” basis, for example, when and as often as there is meaningful work for the SWG to perform. Depending on the future “mission” of the SWG as defined by SANDAG, there also was consideration of whether the current membership should be reconsidered.

### **Next Steps**

Pending Board action, staff will draft the amendments to the TransNet Extension Ordinance and schedule the first and second readings during 2012. Staff also will make revisions to the SWG charter and membership pursuant to Board direction.

GARY L. GALLEGOS  
Executive Director

Attachment: 1. SANDAG 2011 Quality of Life Survey Topline Results

Key Staff Contact: Rob Rundle, (619) 699-6949, rru@sandag.org

**SANDAG 2011 Quality of Life Survey Topline Results**

n=1207 active voters, 200 interviews conducted in each SANDAG region

May 31-June 5, 2011

Margin of Sampling Error +/- 2.8%

Weighted on Area, Age, Phone Type and Party

Hello is \_\_\_\_ there? Hi this is \_\_\_\_ with Competitive Edge Research, a national polling firm and we're calling the good folks of San Diego County to ask your opinion on local issues. We are not selling anything. Most people find it interesting and all your answers will be kept strictly confidential. Please let me begin by asking . . .

Q1. Do you think things in San Diego County are moving in the right direction or have they gotten off on the wrong track?

	%
Right Direction, strongly	6.6
Right Direction, somewhat	23.9
Wrong Track, somewhat	19.3
Wrong Track, strongly	23.9
Mixed ( <i>Not read</i> )	6.4
Unsure ( <i>Not read</i> )	19.6
Refused ( <i>Not read</i> )	0.5
<b>Net Direction</b>	<b>-12.7</b>

Q2. How would you rate the overall quality of life in San Diego County? Would you say it is . . . (*Options were rotated*)

	%
Excellent	15.6
Very good	30.5
Good	35.1
Only fair	13.7
Poor	3.8
Unsure ( <i>Not read</i> )	1.3

Q3. Over the next three years, do you think the quality of life in San Diego County will . . . (*Options were rotated*)

	%
Improve a lot	6.0
Improve a little	28.3
Remain about the same	35.7
Worsen a little	18.4
Worsen a lot	6.1
Unsure ( <i>Not read</i> )	5.5

I am going to read you some issues. Please tell me how much effort you think local governments in San Diego County should put into addressing each of them. (Q4-Q12 were randomized.)

	Large Amount %	Some %	Not Much %	None at All %	Unsure %	Ref %
Q4. Protecting the natural environment	41.2	41.8	11.2	4.4	1.3	0.1
Q5. Increasing the availability of public transportation, such as buses, trolleys and trains	39.7	37.1	12.7	9.0	1.5	0.0
Q6. Conserving more wildlife habitat	31.3	45.5	14.3	7.9	0.9	0.1
Q7. Improving the water quality of rivers and lakes	40.2	44.5	9.4	3.6	2.0	0.3
Q8. Keeping beaches and ocean water clean	51.0	39.5	6.0	1.8	1.7	0.1
Q9. Reducing traffic congestion	42.4	43.4	9.7	3.3	1.1	0.1
Q10. Replenishing beach sand	16.7	47.9	17.8	12.8	4.7	0.1
Q11. Improving the local economy and jobs	74.2	17.6	4.1	3.0	0.9	0.1
Q12. Controlling finances and balancing its budgets	83.7	13.2	1.6	0.8	0.7	0.0

Please tell me whether you agree or disagree with the following statements. (Q13-Q14 were rotated)

Q13. I would not vote for a tax increase no matter what the money would be used for.

	%
Agree, strongly	36.8
Agree, somewhat	7.6
Disagree, somewhat	29.5
Disagree, strongly	24.2
Unsure (Not read)	1.9

Q14. I trust local government agencies to spend the funds they get wisely.

	%
Agree, strongly	10.1
Agree, somewhat	15.9
Disagree, somewhat	26.4
Disagree, strongly	44.6
Unsure (Not read)	3.0
Refused (Not read)	0.0

Q15. Would you rate the current employment situation in San Diego County as . . . (Options were rotated.)

	%
Excellent	1.5
Good	11.3
Only fair	46.9
Poor	38.0
Unsure (Not read)	2.1
Refused (Not read)	0.2

Q16. I am now going to ask you about a San Diego County quality of life measure which may appear on the ballot in an upcoming election. It would read: To protect the public health and improve quality of life in San Diego County by protecting and preserving open space and natural habitat and by cleaning up polluted stormwater runoff, keeping toxic chemicals, bacteria, and trash out of San Diego rivers, lakes, beaches and the ocean, shall San Diego County enact a quarter-cent/increasing and improving public transportation services to relieve traffic congestion and improve air quality, shall San Diego County enact a half-cent sales tax with guaranteed independent annual audits and a citizens oversight committee which would expire after 20/40 years? If the election were held today would you vote “yes” to approve this measure or “no” to reject it?

	Water 20 years (n=288) %	Water 40 years (n=288) %	Transportation 20 years (n=290) %	Transportation 40 years (n=341) %
Yes, definitely	26.1	21.6	19.5	27.1
Yes, probably	24.1	29.0	30.1	17.0
No, probably	12.9	16.6	12.4	15.3
No, definitely	34.2	27.2	34.4	36.6
Unsure ( <i>Not read</i> )	2.7	5.7	3.5	4.0

And I'll read you the provisions contained in this measure. Please tell me whether each is a good reason to vote for the measure or a good reason to vote against the measure. (Q17-Q23 were randomized.)

	For, very good %	For, some good %	Against, some good %	Against, very good %	Uns %	Ref %
Q17. The measure funds the protection and preservation of natural areas and wildlife habitat.	39.1	32.3	11.5	12.4	4.0	0.6
Q18. The measure also funds putting sand on local beaches and keeping it there.	22.1	31.3	20.4	17.6	8.0	0.7
Q19. The measure requires annual independently conducted audits.	44.3	26.9	10.4	11.6	6.2	0.7
Q20. The measure requires oversight by a citizens committee.	34.5	33.7	10.6	11.9	8.7	0.6
Q21w. The measure funds the clean-up of polluted stormwater runoff. (n=578)	44.4	35.1	8.5	8.2	3.7	0.0
Q21t. The measure funds more and better public transportation services to relieve traffic congestion and improve air quality. (n=629)	45.7	26.5	11.4	12.6	3.2	0.5
Q22w. The measure funds efforts to keep toxic chemicals, bacteria, and trash out of San Diego rivers, lakes, the ocean, and beaches. (n=578)	56.6	28.8	5.5	6.8	2.1	0.2
Q22t. The measure also funds better public transportation services for seniors and disabled persons. (n=629)	48.0	29.0	7.7	9.9	4.3	1.1

	For, very good %	For, some good %	Against, some good %	Against, very good %	Uns %	Ref %
Q23w. The measure increases the County's sales tax by one-quarter cent. (n=578)	18.2	23.1	15.1	38.5	5.1	0.0
Q23t. The measure increases the County's sales tax by one-half cent. (n=629)	18.5	19.0	16.1	41.9	4.3	0.2

Now I would like to read you some arguments you might hear both for and against the measure. I'll start with arguments from supporters/opponents. Please tell me how convincing each is to you. (Supporter and opponent batteries were randomized.)

Supporter arguments were randomized.

Q24. Supporters say that this measure will improve the quality of life for San Diegans. It will fund necessary improvements to ensure that open space and natural habitat is preserved and that the quality of our water is ensured/ improvements to public transportation are made. Is this argument to vote for the measure. . .

	Water (n=578) %	Transport (n=629) %
Very convincing	32.8	24.8
Somewhat convincing	38.6	44.8
Not at all convincing	27.7	29.3
Unsure (Not read)	0.9	1.1

Q25. Supporters say that, by protecting San Diego's natural beauty, this measure will help tourism remain a strong and healthy local industry. Each year visitors spend \$7 billion and have a \$16 billion impact on the County. This measure ensures that they keep coming back to our region while paying their fair share. Is this argument to vote for the measure . . .

	%
Very convincing	35.8
Somewhat convincing	37.5
Not at all convincing	26.5
Unsure (Not read)	0.2

Q26. Supporters say that this measure is really a small price to pay to improve our quality of life. The cost amounts to four dollars/eight dollars a month for the average local household. Is this argument to vote for the measure . . .

	Four (n=578) %	Eight (n=629) %
Very convincing	24.4	19.6
Somewhat convincing	31.9	34.2
Not at all convincing	42.8	45.9
Unsure (Not read)	0.9	0.3

Q27. Supporters say that studies have shown that open space and natural habitat are disappearing from San Diego County at a rapid rate. This measure will address that issue and preserve open space for generations to come. Is this argument to vote for the measure . . .

	%
Very convincing	30.9
Somewhat convincing	36.0
Not at all convincing	32.5
Unsure ( <i>Not read</i> )	0.6

Q28. Supporters say that this measure makes good financial sense and it's money that the politicians in Sacramento cannot take away. All the money raised by this measure will only be used on local projects and will help boost employment in San Diego County. Is this argument to vote for the measure . . .

	%
Very convincing	32.2
Somewhat convincing	36.5
Not at all convincing	30.8
Unsure ( <i>Not read</i> )	0.5

Q29. Supporters say improving our quality of life is proven to be a good way to improve property values. This measure will keep San Diego County an attractive place to live. Is this argument to vote for the measure . . .

	%
Very convincing	26.5
Somewhat convincing	40.1
Not at all convincing	32.9
Unsure ( <i>Not read</i> )	0.5

Q30. Supporters say that the measure will protect our economy and promote better paying jobs. By improving our quality of life, clean industries like biotech and telecommunications will locate and grow here in our region. Is this argument to vote for the measure . . .

	%
Very convincing	24.5
Somewhat convincing	36.4
Not at all convincing	37.7
Unsure ( <i>Not read</i> )	1.4

Q31. Supporters say this measure will restrict urban sprawl. Through the preservation of natural habitat, the measure will manage housing development and how we grow as a region. Is this argument to vote for the measure . . .

	%
Very convincing	22.2
Somewhat convincing	39.0
Not at all convincing	37.7
Unsure ( <i>Not read</i> )	1.1

Q32w. Supporters say that we should pass this measure to leave a good legacy to our children and grandchildren. We need to clean up and restore our lakes, rivers and beaches so that future generations can safely enjoy them. Is this argument to vote for the measure . . . (Of track w respondents, n=576)

	%
Very convincing	36.3
Somewhat convincing	36.4
Not at all convincing	26.9
Unsure (Not read)	0.4

Q32t. Supporters say that we should pass this measure to leave a good legacy to our children and grandchildren. We need to clean up our air quality for the health of future generations. Is this argument to vote for the measure . . .

	%
Very convincing	30.8
Somewhat convincing	34.7
Not at all convincing	34.5

Now I'll read you some arguments you might hear from supporters/opponents. Please tell me how convincing each is to you.

*Opponent arguments were randomized.*

Q33. Opponents say that working to improve quality of life is fine, but this is the wrong time to be asking residents for more funds. A sales tax increase places too much of a burden on working families. Is this argument to vote against the measure . . .

	%
Very convincing	44.7
Somewhat convincing	30.8
Not at all convincing	24.1
Unsure (Not read)	0.5

Q34. Opponents say that the tax is too big and goes on too long. It will cost County taxpayers billions of dollars over 20/40 years and put a damper on our local economy. Is this argument to vote against the measure . . .

	Twenty (n=576) %	Forty (n=631) %
Very convincing	36.3	36.2
Somewhat convincing	33.0	34.0
Not at all convincing	30.0	29.0
Unsure (Not read)	0.7	0.8

Q35. Opponents say there is no real accountability for how the funds from this tax are spent. There may be audits and an oversight committee, but the real decisions of how to spend the money will be made by unaccountable bureaucrats. Is this argument to vote against the measure . . .

	%
Very convincing	40.5
Somewhat convincing	34.3
Not at all convincing	23.9
Unsure ( <i>Not read</i> )	1.3

Q36. Opponents say that the tax is a waste of money. You can't protect something like quality of life through a tax like this and there are more deserving issues. Is this argument to vote against the measure . . .

	%
Very convincing	27.5
Somewhat convincing	35.7
Not at all convincing	36.1
Unsure ( <i>Not read</i> )	0.6

Q37. Opponents say that this tax will just fund more government and make the bureaucracy bigger. We have extended and increased local sales taxes twice already. Enough is enough. Is this argument to vote against the measure . . .

	%
Very convincing	43.7
Somewhat convincing	30.7
Not at all convincing	25.3
Unsure ( <i>Not read</i> )	0.3

Some people change their minds after hearing more information so let me ask you again about a San Diego County quality of life measure.

Q38. It would read: To protect the public health and improve quality of life in San Diego County by protecting and preserving open space and natural habitat and by cleaning up polluted stormwater runoff, keeping toxic chemicals, bacteria, and trash out of San Diego rivers, lakes, beaches and the ocean, shall San Diego County enact a quarter-cent/(t) increasing and improving public transportation services to relieve traffic congestion and improve air quality, shall San Diego County enact a half-cent sales tax with guaranteed independent annual audits and a citizens oversight committee which would expire after 20/40 years? If the election were held today would you vote "yes" to approve this measure or "no" to reject it?

	Water 20 years (n=288) %	Water 40 years (n=288) %	Transportation 20 years (n=290) %	Transportation 40 years (n=341) %
Yes, definitely	27.2	21.9	23.5	23.9
Yes, probably	23.1	22.6	24.9	20.2
No, probably	11.2	15.9	10.7	14.1
No, definitely	34.0	31.8	36.3	38.9
Unsure ( <i>Not read</i> )	4.4	7.8	4.6	2.9

Q39. There has been a suggestion to add another component to this quality of life measure. This measure would read: To protect the public health and improve quality of life in San Diego County by protecting and preserving open space and natural habitat and by cleaning up polluted stormwater runoff, keeping toxic chemicals, bacteria, and trash out of San Diego rivers, lakes, beaches and the ocean, shall San Diego County enact a quarter-cent increasing and improving public transportation services to relieve traffic congestion and improve air quality, shall San Diego County enact a half-cent sales tax with guaranteed independent annual audits and a citizens oversight committee which would expire after 40 years? If the election were held today would you vote “yes” to approve this measure or “no” to reject it?

	%
Yes, definitely	15.4
Yes, probably	17.5
No, probably	17.5
No, definitely	43.4
Unsure ( <i>Not read</i> )	6.2

Thanks. Now I have just a few background questions to make sure we have a representative sample...

Q40. About how many times, if ever, have you visited the beaches in San Diego County in the last three years?

	%
None	6.1
1-5 times	15.1
6-10 times	14.7
11-20 times	15.0
21-50 times	20.9
51-200 times	14.8
More than 200 times	9.6
Unsure	3.1
Refused	0.7

Q41. About how many times, if ever, have you hiked on trails, hunted or fished in San Diego County in the last three years?

	%
None	28.8
1-5 times	21.9
6-10 times	11.3
11-20 times	12.0
21-50 times	12.5
More than 50 times	11.7
Unsure	1.2
Refused	0.7

Q42. About how many minutes is your usual daily commute to work or school, or do you not commute?

	%
None	2.7
1-10 minutes	12.2
11-20 minutes	17.7
21-30 minutes	13.2
31-60 minutes	10.5
More than 60 minutes	3.9
Do not commute	38.2
Unsure	0.8
Refused	0.8

Q43. On average how many days per month, if any, do you take the bus, the train or the trolley?

	%
None	78.4
1-2 days	8.7
3-5 days	3.7
6-20 days	4.1
More than 20 days	2.3
Unsure	1.8
Refused	1.0

Q44. When it comes to social issues and politics do you consider yourself to be . . .

	%
Very liberal	10.6
Somewhat liberal	30.2
Somewhat conservative	30.0
Very conservative	19.3
Somewhere in between ( <i>Not read</i> )	6.7
Unsure ( <i>Not read</i> )	1.4
Refused ( <i>Not read</i> )	1.8

Q45. How many children, if any, under the age of 18 live in your home?

	%
None	64.8
One	15.1
Two	12.0
Three	4.4
More than three	1.4
Refused ( <i>Not read</i> )	2.4

Q46. Please stop me when I reach your general age category. Is it . . .	%
18 to 24	7.1
25 to 34	13.8
35 to 44	16.3
45 to 54	20.4
55 to 64	20.4
65 to 74	11.2
75 and over	10.7
Refused ( <i>Not read</i> )	0.1

Q44. And were you born in . . .	%
California	42.7
Somewhere else in the United States	45.2
In another country	12.1

Q45. And please stop me when I reach the category closest to your household's total annual income...	%
Less than \$20,000	8.2
\$20 to 40,000	12.7
\$40 to 60,000	16.1
\$60 to 80,000	13.6
\$80 to 100,000	11.0
\$100,000 to \$150,000	17.2
More than \$150,000	10.1
Refused ( <i>Not read</i> )	11.1

Thanks for your time and your opinion counts, goodbye.

Q46. GENDER (BY OBSERVATION)	%
Male	46.7
Female	53.3

Q50. PARTY (FROM SAMPLE)	%
Republican	36.9
Democrat	36.6
Other	26.4

Q51. TURNOUT HISTORY (FROM SAMPLE)	%
Unreliable/New	14.5
Reliable	47.8
Very Reliable	37.7

Q52. GEO BREAKS (FROM SAMPLE)

	%
East County	17.1
Central	18.2
North City	27.8
North County East	2.5
North County West	23.7
South County	10.7

Q53. DATE OF REGISTRATION (FROM SAMPLE)

	%
2006 to Present	44.7
2004 to 2005	10.7
2000 to 2003	16.2
1990 to 1999	18.0
Before 1990	10.4

Q54. PERMANENT VBM (FROM SAMPLE)

	%
Yes	53.4
No	46.6