



Members

Lori Pfeiler, Chair
(Representing North County Inland)
Mayor, **Escondido**

Patty Davis, Vice Chair
(Representing South County)
Councilmember, **Chula Vista**

Jack Feller
(Representing North County Coastal)
Councilmember, **Oceanside**

Jill Greer
(Representing East County)
Councilmember, **Lemon Grove**

Jim Madaffer
Councilmember, **City of San Diego**

Ron Roberts
Board of Supervisors
County of **San Diego**

Alternates

Judy Ritter
(Representing North County Inland)
Councilmember, **Vista**

Patricia McCoy
(Representing South County)
Councilmember, **Imperial Beach**

Maggie Houlihan
(Representing North County Coastal)
Deputy Mayor, **Encinitas**

Jerry Jones
(Representing East County)
Councilmember, **Lemon Grove**

Vacant
City of San Diego

Bill Horn
Supervisor, **County of San Diego**

Gary L. Gallegos
Executive Director, **SANDAG**

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE NEW MEMBER ORIENTATION SESSION

Friday, March 7, 2003

11:30 a.m. to 12 noon

SANDAG

**401 B Street, 7th Floor Conference Room
San Diego, CA**

INVITATION TO NEW MEMBER ORIENTATION SESSION

New Members and Alternates of the Regional Planning Committee, as well as those wishing a refresher course, are invited to attend the "New Member Orientation Session," which will take place immediately before the regularly-scheduled March 7th Regional Planning Committee meeting.

Highlights include:

- **General Overview of RCP**
- **Committee Procedures**
- **Question and Answer Session**

If you plan to attend, please contact Carolina Gregor at (619) 595-5399 or cgr@sandag.org. Handouts will be provided at the meeting.

San Diego Association of Governments
401 B Street, Suite 800, San Diego, CA 92101-4231
(619) 595-5300 • Fax (619) 595-5305
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. Speakers are limited to three minutes. The Regional Planning Committee may take action on any item appearing on the agenda.

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

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), SANDAG will accommodate persons who require assistance in order to participate in SANDAG meetings. If such assistance is required, please contact SANDAG at (619) 595-5300 at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting. To request this document or related reports in an alternative format, please call (619) 595-5300, (619) 595-5393 (TTY), or fax (619) 595-5305.

*SANDAG offices are accessible by public transit.
Phone 1-800-COMMUTE or see www.sdcommute.com for route information.*





Members

Lori Pfeiler, Chair
(Representing North County Inland)
Mayor, **Escondido**

Patty Davis, Vice Chair
(Representing South County)
Councilmember, **Chula Vista**

Jack Feller
(Representing North County Coastal)
Councilmember, **Oceanside**

Jill Greer
(Representing East County)
Councilmember, **Lemon Grove**

Jim Madaffer
Councilmember, **City of San Diego**

Ron Roberts
Board of Supervisors
County of San Diego

Alternates

Judy Ritter
(Representing North County Inland)
Councilmember, **Vista**

Patricia McCoy
(Representing South County)
Councilmember, **Imperial Beach**

Maggie Houlihan
(Representing North County Coastal)
Deputy Mayor, **Encinitas**

Jerry Jones
(Representing East County)
Councilmember, **Lemon Grove**

Vacant
City of San Diego

Bill Horn
Supervisor, **County of San Diego**

Gary L. Gallegos
Executive Director, **SANDAG**

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE AGENDA

Friday, March 7, 2003

12 noon - 2 p.m.

SANDAG

**401 B Street, 7th Floor Conference Room *
San Diego, CA**

** Please note that the Regional Planning Committee meeting will start at 12 noon in the Seventh Floor Conference Room.*

AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

- **WELCOME NEW MEMBERS**
- **UPDATE ON STAKEHOLDERS WORKING GROUP AND RCP WORKSHOPS**
- **WATER SUPPLY COMPONENT OF RCP**
- **UPDATE ON HOUSING**
- **ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE/SOCIAL EQUITY STRATEGY**

MISSION STATEMENT

The Regional Planning Committee provides oversight for the preparation and implementation of the Regional Comprehensive Plan that is based on the local general plans and regional plans and addresses interregional issues with surrounding counties and Mexico. The components of the plan could include: transportation, housing, environment (shoreline, open space, air, water quality, habitat), economy, regional infrastructure needs and financing as well as land use and design components of the regional growth management strategy. Recommendations of the Committee are forwarded to the SANDAG Board of Directors for action.



Welcome to SANDAG! Members of the public may speak to the Regional Planning Committee on any item at the time the Committee is considering the item. Please complete a Speaker's Slip which is located in the rear of the room and then present the slip to Committee staff. Also, members of the public are invited to address the Committee on any issue under the agenda item entitled Public Comments/Communications. Speakers are limited to three minutes. The Regional Planning Committee may take action on any item appearing on the agenda.

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

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), SANDAG will accommodate persons who require assistance in order to participate in SANDAG meetings. If such assistance is required, please contact SANDAG at (619) 595-5300 at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting. To request this document or related reports in an alternative format, please call (619) 595-5300, (619) 595-5393 (TTY), or fax (619) 595-5305.

*SANDAG offices are accessible by public transit.
Phone 1-800-COMMUTE or see www.sdcommute.com for route information.*



REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

Friday, March 7, 2003

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

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

ITEM #		ACTION
+ 1.	WELCOME NEW COMMITTEE MEMBERS (Chair Lori Holt Pfeiler) (p. 5)	INFORMATION

Attached is an updated Committee roster, reflecting new subregional appointments and advisory members. The Chair will welcome the new members.

CONSENT ITEMS (ITEMS 2- 5)

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

+ 2.	ACTIONS FROM JOINT MEETING BETWEEN REGIONAL PLANNING AND BORDERS COMMITTEES ON JANUARY 17, 2003 (pp. 6-8)	INFORMATION
------	--	--------------------

+ 3.	PROGRESS REPORT ON REGIONAL ENERGY STRATEGY DEVELOPMENT FROM JANUARY 24, 2003 SANDAG BOARD MEETING AND EXCERPT OF MINUTES FROM BOARD MEETING (Steve Sachs) (pp. 9-14)	INFORMATION
------	--	--------------------

+ 4.	SUMMARY OF SANDAG POLICY BOARD MEETING ON INTEGRATED REGIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE STRATEGY (IRIS) ON FEBRUARY 14, 2003 (Marney Cox) (pp. 15-19)	INFORMATION
------	---	--------------------

+ 5.	PRELIMINARY DRAFT SHORELINE CHAPTER OF RCP (Steve Sachs) (pp. 20-23)	INFORMATION
------	---	--------------------

Attached for the Committee's information is a first draft Shoreline Chapter of the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP). Comments from SANDAG's Shoreline Preservation Committee and Regional Planning Technical Working Group have been incorporated. The Regional Planning Committee will discuss the chapter at its next meeting.

6. PUBLIC COMMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS

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

REPORTS

- 7. REPORT ON REGIONAL PLANNING STAKEHOLDERS WORKING GROUP AND PUBLIC OUTREACH EFFORTS (Carolina Gregor)**
- a. **Status Report on the Stakeholders Working Group** – At its December 2002 meeting, the Committee approved the membership of the Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group (SWG). The SWG has met twice. Councilmember Patty Davis, Vice-Chair of the Regional Planning Committee, serves as Chair of the SWG. **INFORMATION**
 - b. **Introduction of Vice-Chair of SWG** – The SWG has elected Carol Bonomo, Associate Vice President of External Affairs of Cal State San Marcos, as its Vice-Chair. Ms. Bonomo will represent the SWG on the Regional Planning Committee. **INTRODUCTION**
 - c. **Results of the RCP Workshops to Date** – Five out of the six RCP Workshops have been held. A brief report on the workshop outcomes, to date, will be made. **COMMENT**
- + 8. DRAFT OUTLINE OF WATER SUPPLY COMPONENT OF THE RCP (Bernie Rhinerson, Chairman of the San Diego County Water Authority (CWA), and Joanna Salazar, SANDAG Staff) (pp. 24-26)** **COMMENT / RECOMMENDATION**
- Attached is a draft outline of the water supply component of the RCP. The Committee is requested to provide policy direction on the outline. Based on the Committee's comments, SANDAG and the San Diego County Water Authority (CWA) will prepare a draft water supply chapter and present it to the Committee for formal action this Spring. The Regional Planning Technical Working Group's comments have been incorporated into the draft outline.
- + 9. UPDATE ON HOUSING ISSUES (Susan Baldwin) (pp. 27-33)** **DISCUSSION**
- A report will be made on the status of the regional share allocation process and the housing element self-certification program, and how these relate to the RCP. Attached are two reports on these topics that were presented to SANDAG's Executive Committee on February 14, 2003. Copies of the Draft Housing Element Self-Certification Report to the Legislature will be available at the meeting, and also can be accessed from the SANDAG Web site (www.sandag.org, click on Meetings, 3/14/03 Executive Committee).
- + 10. DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE AND SOCIAL EQUITY STRATEGY FOR RCP (Nan Valerio) (pp. 34-41)** **DISCUSSION**
- Attached is a proposed approach for addressing Environmental Justice and Social Equity issues within the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP). The Regional Planning Technical Working Group's comments also are attached.
- 11. ADJOURNMENT AND UPCOMING MEETINGS** **INFORMATION**
- The next Regional Planning Committee meeting is scheduled for **Friday, April 4, 2003, from 12 noon to 2 p.m.** in the Seventh Floor Conference Room.
- The regularly-scheduled Committee meetings are held on the first Friday of the month from 12 noon – 2 p.m.

+ next to an agenda item indicates an attachment

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

MEMBERSHIP

Members

Chair: Lori Holt Pfeiler
Mayor,
City of Escondido
(North County Inland)

Vice Chair: Patty Davis
Councilmember,
City of Chula Vista
(South County)

Jack Feller
Councilmember,
City of Oceanside
(North County Coastal)

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

Jim Madaffer
Councilmember,
City of San Diego

Ron Roberts
Supervisor,
County of San Diego

Alternates:

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

Patricia McCoy
Councilmember,
City of Imperial Beach
(South County)

Maggie Houlihan
Deputy Mayor,
City of Encinitas
(North County Coastal)

Jerry Jones
Councilmember,
City of Lemon Grove
(East County)

Vacant
City of San Diego

Bill Horn
Supervisor,
County of San Diego

Advisory/ Alternate(s):

**Pedro Orso-Delgado /
Gene Pound**
Caltrans

Susanah Aguilera
Department of Defense

**Leon Williams /
Bob Emery**
Metropolitan Transit
Development Board

**David Druker / Tom Golich /
Pia Harris Ebert**
North County Transit District

Mike Madigan
San Diego County Water
Authority

**Jess Van Deventer /
Bill Chopyk**
San Diego Unified Port District

Bob Leiter
Regional Planning Technical
Working Group

Carol Bonomo
Regional Planning Stakeholders
Working Group

The Regional Planning Committee normally meets on the first Friday of the month from 12 noon - 2 p.m. at SANDAG.

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



**BOARD OF DIRECTORS
JANUARY 24, 2003**

**AGENDA ITEM NO. 03-01- 3-C
ACTION REQUESTED - APPROVE**

**JOINT REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE AND BORDER COMMITTEE MEETING
DISCUSSION AND ACTIONS
Meeting of January 17, 2003**

The joint meeting between the Borders and the Regional Planning Committees was called to order by Borders Committee Chair Crystal Crawford (North County Coastal) and Regional Planning Committee Vice- Chair Patty Davis (South County).

Borders Committee members and alternates in attendance were Patricia McCoy (South County), Hal Martin (North County Inland), Jill Greer (East County), Ralph Inzunza (City of San Diego), Judy Ritter (North County Inland), and Phil Monroe (South County). Ex-Officio members in attendance were Consul General Rodolfo Figueroa (Republic of Mexico), Victor Carrillo (Imperial County), Thomas Buckley (Riverside County), Pedro Orso Delgado (Caltrans), and Elsa Saxod (COBRO).

Regional Planning Committee members and alternates in attendance were Ron Roberts (County of San Diego), Ron Morrison (South County), Judy Ritter (North County Inland), and Jill Greer (East County). Ex-officio members in attendance were Pedro Orso Delgado (Caltrans), and Gail Goldberg (Regional Planning Technical Working Group).

CONSENT ITEMS

1. **ACTIONS FROM THE DECEMBER 6, 2002 REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING AND THE DECEMBER 20, 2002 BORDERS COMMITTEE MEETING (INFORMATION)**
2. **REGIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN SUBREGIONAL WORKSHOPS (INFORMATION)**

Action: The consent agenda was moved forward based on group consensus.

3. **PUBLIC COMMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS**

There were no public comments or communications.

4. **OVERVIEW OF REGIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND REGIONAL VISION (INFORMATION/ DISCUSSION)**

Vice-Chair Davis made a brief presentation on the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP), the regional vision, public involvement and outreach activities, and the decision-making process. Chair Crawford applauded the Regional Planning Committee for making significant progress over a short time period.

5. OVERVIEW OF BORDERS ISSUES AND CORE VALUES (INFORMATION/ DISCUSSION)

Chair Crawford provided an overview of issues related to our international border with Baja California, and our interregional borders with the counties of Riverside, Imperial, and Orange. She also reviewed the border-related core values that the Borders Committee has developed over its past several meetings and invited Committee members to make comments.

The following comments were made:

- For the first time since the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks, we are beginning to see some positive changes at the international border. The recent meeting between Mexican Commissioner of Migration Magdalena Corral and U.S. Attorney John Ashcroft resulted in positive outcomes, such as the opening of the new SENTRI enrollment office, and the extension of the SENTRI passes from one year to two years. Other issues, however, still need to be addressed, such as changing the criteria to grant humanitarian waivers for people who do not carry visas or passports. But generally, relations are improving, and there is significant goodwill after the stagnation resulting from 9/11.
- The relationship between Riverside County, Imperial County, and Baja California is like a marriage. We need a lot of communication, a lot of give and take, and a spirit of cooperation. We still need to continue working on the water transfer issue, on air quality issues posed by power plants, and on housing and commuting issues.
- Riverside County is growing tremendously, with over 145,000 residential permits in the pipeline in the southwestern part of the county. Riverside is working on the Riverside County Integrated Plan (RCIP), but more work needs to be done on interregional coordination. One positive step is that Caltrans is hosting quarterly meetings with the various transportation agencies from the San Diego and Riverside regions.
- The dream for the Borders Committee is to not only hear about important border-related issues, but to act upon them. We should be sending position papers to the Board on issues such as the border crossing wait times, extending the time frame for SENTRI passes, trade and commerce issues, and related infrastructure issues.

Chair Crawford mentioned that one of the goals of the meeting was to heighten the awareness of the important border issues facing us, and to hear from the Regional Planning Committee about issues that they believe should be addressed in the Borders Component of the RCP.

6. BORDERS CHAPTER OF THE RCP (INFORMATION / DISCUSSION)

Committee members discussed the structure and content of the Borders Chapter. Members noted that border issues will sprinkle across all of the chapters. One suggestion was to focus the Borders chapter on international border issues, which are unique to our region, and address other border issues, such as water, energy, the jobs/housing imbalance, and related congestion issues, in the other chapters, such as the Transportation, Housing, and Ecosystems chapters. This approach would allow us to focus on solutions to the issues. In general, the Committee members agreed with this approach, but wanted to make sure that the key issues for the other border areas would not get lost. We face significant issues on all of our borders, and we should address the key pieces in the Borders Chapter and the other chapters.

Committee members also discussed the regional vision and core values. Members liked the regional vision proposed in the presentation, (*"Make the San Diego region a better place to live, work, and play, with a healthy natural environment and an outstanding quality of life for everyone."*), and the concise nature of the core values. Committee members also agreed that the goals of fairness, equity, and respect for our counterparts that were described in the Borders presentation should be integrated into, and reflected in, the general core values.

Members discussed the role of the RCP, suggesting that it should change the culture of our region. For example, we know that vast development is occurring in Temecula. Should we facilitate that development with a wider I-15? We know that our federal government continues to push for additional fencing at the international border. Is that what we really want in our region? What are we going to do to "move the rudder?"

The RCP should serve as a planning tool to get us where we want to be; not as a projection of where we are headed. The San Diego region has failed to meet its housing responsibilities. We cannot solve our transportation issues if we continue to move our housing units further away. The RCP has to come to grips with that, and we have to show communities that there are housing opportunities, even in existing communities. It is about design, not density, but it is a difficult subject to address because of people's perceptions. In the RCP, we have to provide the housing for the jobs that we are creating, not build the infrastructure to facilitate moving housing units out of the County.

Staff described the upcoming workshops on the RCP, and encouraged Committee members to attend, and to invite their colleagues and constituents to attend, as well. The workshops will help get many people from throughout the region involved in preparing the RCP.

A public comment was made that the Borders component should include performance objectives (such as how long the SENTRI passes should last, or wait times to cross the border), and that groundwater issues should be addressed. It was cited that Imperial County has an excellent groundwater program.

7. ADJOURNMENT AND UPCOMING MEETINGS (INFORMATION)

The next Borders Committee meeting is scheduled for February 21, 2003 from 12:30 to 2:30 p.m. in Temecula. The next Regional Planning Committee will be held on March 7, 2003 from 12 noon to 2 p.m. Members from both Committees were encouraged to attend the upcoming RCP Workshops.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

**BOARD OF DIRECTORS
JANUARY 24, 2003**

**AGENDA ITEM NO. 03-01- 14
ACTION REQUESTED – INFORMATION**

**PROGRESS REPORT ON REGIONAL
ENERGY STRATEGY DEVELOPMENT**

Introduction

The San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) has contracted with the San Diego Regional Energy Office (SDREO) to develop the Regional Energy Strategy (RES). The Strategy is intended to become the Energy Element of the Regional Comprehensive Plan. The SDREO has created a "Regional Energy Policy Advisory Council" (REPAC), which includes SANDAG representation, to assist in the Strategy's development and secure the input of key interest groups.

The REPAC and SDREO have been working on the development of the Regional Energy Strategy over the past year. The Regional Comprehensive Plan schedule calls for a recommended RES to be available for SANDAG review in late April. *The key RES proposal now being discussed by the REPAC is to create an energy development authority in order to develop a regional approach to energy planning, decision making, investments, and financing.* The State's (and San Diego region's) recent energy supply and price problems point out the serious risks and uncertainties in the current energy market and the need for a broad based regional effort to better plan and implement an energy strategy. The objectives for the authority would be to be able to take actions that could help reduce risks, manage costs, and stabilize market uncertainties. Such actions would focus on diversifying energy supplies to be more flexible, cost-efficient, environmentally sound, self-sustaining,

secure and reliable. Examples of such actions include:

- Provide integrated energy resource planning for the region on an ongoing basis, working closely with public entities, state and federal regulations, SDG&E, and other energy market participants;
- Coordinate regional involvement in legislative and regulatory proceedings with significant implications for the region's energy situation;
- Evaluate, recommend and invest in (if needed) major regional energy infrastructure projects; and
- Raise money to fund energy efficiency, small-scale distributed power production and renewable resources.

The REPAC is discussing several organizational options for initiating an energy development authority. The purpose of this report is to review these options and obtain Board of Directors' feedback prior to the development of recommendations by the REPAC.

Discussion

Background

The two main pieces of information that will provide the basis of the Regional Energy Strategy are the Regional Energy Infrastructure Study (REIS) and a report on Energy Issues in the California-Baja California Binational Region. The REIS has been prepared by the SDREO and its consultant, SAIC. The Binational Energy Report has been prepared by the San Diego State University Foundation under contract to SANDAG, with input by SANDAG's Borders Committee.

The two reports are being coordinated so that they can be integrated in the Regional Energy Strategy, which will be primarily a policy document. An important note is that the RES effort is focusing on non-transportation energy issues. Transportation energy issues are scheduled to be addressed in the next phase of SDREO's energy work.

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

As an early action item, the Borders Committee has recommended, and SANDAG has authorized, the formation of a Binational Energy Forum, as proposed in the Binational Energy Strategy Report. This action was taken at the October Board meeting. The objective of the forum will be to foster communication and coordination about the growing binational energy market in the northern Baja California-San Diego-Imperial County area.

Options for a Regional Energy Development Authority

The REPAC has evaluated potential energy development authority roles and responsibilities at its last four regular monthly meetings and held a special workshop in December to review organizational options for the authority. A summary of three of the four options follows. The fourth option -- creation of a Municipal Utility for the region -- was deemed too risky, and unnecessary to achieve the objectives identified for a regional energy development authority.

OPTION A: NO CHANGE IN STATUS QUO

Currently, SANDAG has a limited contract with SDREO to update the Regional Energy Strategy by spring 2003. In addition, SDREO has energy programs to provide energy technical assistance to public agencies and promote energy efficiency, self-generation

and renewables. A number of public agencies have staff and resources devoted to working on energy issues.

Coordination and sharing of information is informal. Concerted efforts by the public sector to provide close coordination during the energy crisis proved beneficial.

Pros

- No additional risk to public agencies.

Cons

- Inefficient use of public resources -- cost-sharing of similar activities could provide significant cost savings.
- Potential lost opportunities due to lack of timely engagement in rapidly changing energy landscape.
- Difficult to leverage coordinated public action to fund and implement energy development opportunities.

OPTION B: EXISTING AGENCY EXPANDED TO ASSUME NEW ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

An existing agency, such as SANDAG, could assume expanded role and responsibilities of an energy development authority. This option is most suitable for non-investment activities such as advocacy, resource planning and project evaluation. For specific initiatives, SANDAG member agencies could "opt-out," much like was done with the Regional Power Purchasing Pool. SDREO could provide staff and technical resources to manage the process or SANDAG could provide them internally.

Pros

- May significantly reduce the start-up time and costs and present a more efficient use of public resources in pursuing energy initiatives.
- Could position the region to take advantage of opportunities that emerge in the rapidly changing energy market and coordinate energy-related economic development opportunities.

- Would provide a regional perspective to solving existing and future energy challenges and provide for sharing of benefits for all jurisdictions in the region.

Cons

- Current complexities of existing organizations may limit the ability to achieve consensus on issues and to move forward in a timely manner.
- An existing agency may have other overriding priorities that distract from pursuing energy options with the commitment that is required.

OPTION C: NEW JOINT POWERS AGREEMENT TO CREATE REGIONAL ENERGY DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

A new Joint Powers Agreement (JPA) could be executed either within the context of an existing agency (e.g., SANDAG) or independently with the explicit objective of carrying out the functions of a regional energy development authority. The new JPA would negotiate appropriate financing and/or ownership commensurate with the need, e.g., individual member agencies could serve own facilities or aggregate and serve residents and businesses under AB 117. For energy asset development, options could exist for financing only or financing and ownership.

A new JPA would have many of the benefits listed under the pros for Option B, above. Additional pros and cons would include:

Additional Pros

- A new organization would have clear focus on energy issues and organization could be structured to mitigate barriers to achieving consensus on regional issues in existing organizations.
- Revenues generated from interest in financing or ownership of energy assets could be used to pursue other initiatives (e.g., energy efficiency and renewables development).

Cons

- A new agency may increase start-up time and costs.
- A new agency, if made up of only a few cities and/or agencies, could limit sharing of benefits across all jurisdictions within region.
- Financing and project ownership could impact bonding rating and costs and would involve some degree of financial risk.

Conclusion

The REPAC, assisted by the SDREO, is in the process of evaluating more details related to the possible institution of Options B and C, such as potential membership in the JPA, decision-making structure, costs and ways to pay for basic operation of the JPA. While these issues are essential to any final consideration of if and how an energy development authority should be created, SANDAG Board input on the general concept and options presented in this report would be very helpful to the REPAC as it works to put together its Regional Energy Strategy recommendation to SANDAG.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Key Staff Contact: Steve Sachs,
(619) 595-5346; ssa@sandag.org

No Budget Impact

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

March 7, 2003

AGENDA ITEM NO.: **3-B**

Action Requested: INFORMATION

EXCERPT OF MINUTES FROM JANUARY 24, 2003 BOARD MEETING

PROGRESS REPORT ON REGIONAL ENERGY STRATEGY DEVELOPMENT

Chair Morrison announced that the San Diego Regional Energy Office (SDREO) and the Regional Energy Policy Advisory Council (REPAC) have been working hard over the past couple months in developing a draft of a Regional Energy Strategy for review. He pointed out that the four SANDAG appointees to the REPAC included Mayor Morris Vance (Vista), Mayor Jerome Stocks (Encinitas), Councilmember Mary Salas (Chula Vista), and Councilmember Jerry Jones (Lemon Grove). In addition, County Supervisor Dianne Jacob and San Diego City Councilmember Michael Zucchet have both been appointed to the REPAC.

John Moot, Chair of the REPAC, noted that the REPAC appeared before the Board in July 2002 to review what the region's vision is for its energy future; what were the most critical energy problems facing the region; and what energy projects and programs are needed. The REPAC also had an opportunity to lay out a forward looking forecast of the region's energy needs, which looks out 30 years.

Irene Stillings, Executive Director of the SDREO, presented the Board with a PowerPoint presentation which laid out the key strategy and elements that the REPAC has been looking at, which included the potential organizational structures that could help meet the region's energy needs. She highlighted the critical energy issues that the REPAC has identified and discussed next steps and plans for outreach. Ms. Stillings noted that the SDREO is continuing to solicit discussion and input from key stakeholders, which includes business, government, environmental and health agencies, and a draft Energy Plan will be presented to the REPAC for discussion at its March 6, 2003 meeting. More outreach to stakeholders will take place and a revised draft of the Plan will be presented to the REPAC on April 3, 2003 and a completed Regional Energy Strategy and Implementation Plan will be presented to the SANDAG Board at its April 2003 meeting.

Mayor Pro Tem Finnilla (Carlsbad) asked if the draft will include an estimate of the fiscal impacts on options B and C presented in the Board report? *Ms. Stillings responded yes.*

Councilmember Kellejian (Solana Beach) needed clarification on the process of forming a JPA, the development of an annual budget and the process for the allocation of the budget between the cities. *Mr. Moot stated that first the draft of the strategy would be*

presented to the Board and if the Board accepted the REPAC's recommendation, the details would then be prepared.

Councilmember Kellejian inquired if the financial information can be made available prior to Board making a decision. *Mr. Moot replied that hopefully, rough numbers will be included as part of the draft Regional Energy Strategy.*

Councilmember Kellejian requested that those numbers be provided to the Board prior to April 2003 meeting and pointed out that it is hard to approve something without knowing the cost. He added that the Solana Beach City Council would need, at a minimum, a ballpark figure in order to consider the request.

Councilmember Guerin (Encinitas) pointed out that SDG&E, a publicly held corporation, has been charged by the CPUC to develop a 30-year plan and to evaluate the needs of the area agencies. She expressed concern that SDG&E should be at the table regarding this issue and questioned if there has been any coordination with SDG&E on this issue. *Ms. Stillings noted that regarding coordination, the SDREO is working very closely with SDG&E to assist them and provide input in their 20-year plan. Mr. Moot added that the REPAC has identified advisory members, of which SDG&E is one. He added that the SDG&E representative is an active, productive member of the group, having attended all of the REPAC meetings and is called upon regularly for input.*

Mayor Madrid (La Mesa) asked if the REPAC has been able to project the demand that new homes and new infrastructure needs will add. *Mr. Moot stated that the Infrastructure Study speaks to that issue.*

Mayor Madrid asked if the energy provider can be supplanted for five years down the road if the Board chooses to adopt this proposal. He asked if there is any way that each jurisdiction can take a stand alone position without incurring huge costs that could jeopardize their general fund budgets. *Mr. Moot stated that the most controversial discussion amongst the group is how does the current energy utility fit into this structure. The REPAC has never taken a vote and moves forward simply on consensus. But this is an issue that is very controversial.*

Mayor Murphy (City of San Diego) suggested creating a San Diego Regional Energy Authority, with geographical representation similar to the San Diego Regional Airport Authority. He added that SANDAG should not take this function on, its plate is too full. *Ms. Stillings stated that Mayor Murphy's proposal will be presented to the REPAC, will be discussed and may very well be a part of what is presented to the SANDAG Board in April.*

Public Comment

Mitch Mitchell, representing the San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce, indicated that this is a very complex regional issue. The most important issue for this region and the business community is that we create a road map, a plan, that we know where we're going to be 5-10 years from now. That's what needs to be done to settle concerns. Forming a JPA is a scary situation for the business

community. Mayor Murphy's proposal is one that the Chamber is willing to look at. However, the \$1 surcharge needs to be investigated.

Ken Smokaska, Chapter Vice Chair and Air Quality Committee Chair of the Sierra Club San Diego, agreed that energy efficiency and renewable resources are an important element of the Regional Energy Plan and are supported by the Sierra Club. Also, he introduced to the Board a, "San Diego Go Solar," campaign that the Sierra Club has recently adopted. He suggested that the Board give authorization to staff to initiate a feasibility study with a budget not to exceed \$50,000.

Mayor Lewis (El Cajon) expressed concerned regarding the costs of the proposed energy JPA.

Mayor Pro Tem Monroe (Coronado) pointed out that former Port Commissioner Frank Urtasun is available to answer any questions the Board may have regarding this issue: He expressed concerned that SDG&E is not a voting member of REPAC. SDG&E, by law, is required to develop a 20-year plan for the region. SANDAG should be in sync with that in order to move forward.

Councilmember McCoy (Imperial Beach) mentioned that she is looking at the Border Power Plant Working Group. She is under the impression that there will be several LNG plants on the other side of the border. This is an issue that has to be faced so people understand the safety factors.

Councilmember Jones (Lemon Grove) indicated that the JPA idea developed as a funding mechanism in order to finance renewables and generation. Energy can be thought of in two ways: (1) generation and (2) transmission. SDG&E is primarily the source of transmission. He added that he can't think of any other way for the Board, as a region, to take its destiny into its own hands other than forming a JPA. There needs to be a conceptual agreement in order to move forward on this issue.

Chair Morrison reiterated that this is an information item only.



**BOARD OF DIRECTORS
FEBRUARY 28, 2003**

**AGENDA ITEM NO. 03-02- 3
ACTION REQUESTED - APPROVE**

SUMMARY OF THE POLICY DEVELOPMENT BOARD MEETING

Meeting of February 14, 2003

The meeting of the SANDAG Policy Development Board was called to order at 10:37 a.m. by Chair Ron Morrison. Attendance was as follows:

SANDAG Board Voting Members

- City of CarlsbadRamona Finnila, Mayor Pro Tem
- City of Chula Vista Steve Padilla, Mayor
- City of Coronado Phil Monroe, Mayor Pro Tem
- City of Del Mar Crystal Crawford, Councilmember
- City of El CajonMark Lewis, Mayor
- City of Encinitas Christy Guerin, Councilmember
- City of Escondido Lori Holt Pfeiler, Mayor
- City of Imperial Beach Patricia McCoy, Councilmember
- City of La Mesa Art Madrid, Mayor
- City of Lemon Grove Jill Greer, Councilmember
- City of National City Ron Morrison, Councilmember
- City of Oceanside Jack Feller, Deputy Mayor
- City of Poway Mickey Cafagna, Mayor
- City of San Diego Dick Murphy, Mayor
- City of San Marcos Corky Smith, Mayor
- City of Santee Hal Ryan, Vice Mayor
- City of Solana Beach Joe Kellejian, Councilmember
- City of Vista Morris Vance, Mayor
- County of San Diego Greg Cox, Supervisor

Advisory Members

- California Department of Transportation Pedro Orso-Delgado, District Director
- Metropolitan Transit Development Board Leon Williams, Chairman
- North San Diego County Transit Development Board Hon. Judy Ritter, Chair
- U.S. Department of Defense Absent
- San Diego Unified Port District Jess Van Deventer, Commissioner
- San Diego County Water Authority Absent
- Mexico Absent

INTEGRATED REGIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE STRATEGY (IRIS)

Chairman Morrison pointed out that today's Policy Development Board meeting discussion will focus on the Integrated Regional Infrastructure Strategy (IRIS), a subcomponent of the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP), and will begin with public comment.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Clive Richard, a San Diego resident, congratulated the Board on becoming the new consolidated planning agency and supported keeping the SANDAG name.

Donna Tisdale, President of Backcountry Against Dumps, commented on the last sentence of the Policy Development Board agenda, which states, "there are efforts underway to augment the region's landfill capacity by opening a new site in East county in the community of Campo." She noted that the site is located on the Campo Indian Reservation, and is a project that she has been fighting since 1989. She does not believe that the Campo landfill has completed all of the necessary requirements to become operational.

Chair Morrison commented that the staff report indicates that these are on-going issues and does not take a position for or against any of the projects mentioned.

OVERVIEW OF THE INTEGRATED REGIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE STRATEGY (IRIS)

Mayor Lori Holt Pfeiler, Chair of SANDAG's Regional Planning Committee, stated that the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) is progressing and discussion of the Integrated Regional Infrastructure Strategy (IRIS) is a key part of the process. In recognizing that the SANDAG Board is composed of 18 individual cities, there is a need for an integrated framework for the region. The IRIS and RCP are ongoing processes and as the region moves forward, enhancements and expansions to the work programs will be considered.

Staff provided the Board with a presentation of the four-step IRIS process summarized in the board report. First, staff will create an inventory of the existing infrastructure provision in the region. This information will be organized into documents similar to SANDAG's Regional Transportation Plan (long-range planning document) and Regional Transportation Improvement Plan (short-term programming document) so comparisons can be made across infrastructure areas. The second step is to determine if there are any infrastructure deficiencies using level of service standards and estimates of future service demands. The third step will be to develop a set of solution options that address each infrastructure deficiency from the perspective of supporting the urban form called for in the RCP. The options will be incentive based and come from three main areas, reprogramming existing funds, public policy changes and, if necessary, raising new revenue. The final step will be to develop an integrated regional infrastructure strategy from the set of public policy and financing options, and a procedure to monitor the region's progress and performance in meeting the quality of life goals and objectives identified in the RCP.

Staff noted that progress to date has been primarily in the first of the four steps. As the work progresses, one of the principles of the RCP is to plan for growth differently in the future than we have in the past. To do things differently, the RCP is proposing an incentive based process to channel growth into the incorporated cities and protect the rural unincorporated areas from sprawling development. In order to maintain or improve the region's quality of life, we will have to make sure that the infrastructure expenditures necessary to accommodate that growth are available in advance of its occurrence.

Regional Integration

The Board asked about the relationship between the RCP and other agencies representing the ten infrastructure areas included in the IRIS. The Board asked how do we get those organizations to coordinate their investments regionally and support the vision proposed in the RCP? Furthermore, how involved should the board be in facilitating this interaction?

Staff responded that it is up to the board to decide if they want to move in the direction of creating an integrated framework for the region's infrastructure plans and that staff will assist the Board however the Board sees fit. Staff suggests a two step process to facilitate collaboration with regional infrastructure providers on the IRIS and RCP: 1) make sure that all staffs of pertinent agencies are on the same page. This will entail a staff-to-staff discussion to work out major issues and ensure data consistency across agencies; and 2) Peer-to-Peer discussion by the SANDAG Board members and Board members from the infrastructure providers to discuss how to proceed. The Peer discussion will focus on how we can integrate regional capital improvement plans with the smart growth vision outlined in the RCP.

In addition to these efforts, staff will work to include the infrastructure providers in the outreach efforts planned for the RCP, including Workshops and Committee meetings where appropriate.

The Board supported this approach, emphasizing the need for regional integration, and requested to be kept abreast of IRIS progress. The Board agreed with Mayor Holt Pfeiler and restated that the RCP should not be looked at as a static plan, it should be looked at as an ongoing and continuing effort. The Board also emphasized the need to make sure that the infrastructure Boards/Agencies in the region understand and are familiar with the RCP, preferably supporting the Plan's vision and core values. The Board stated that all jurisdictions' general plans are at the table and SANDAG should be proactive with those agencies that have an influence on what the region is proposing as far as infrastructure development and regional planning are concerned.

Staff clarified that SANDAG does not want to take over the planning functions from the individual infrastructure agencies. The objective is to organize the information so that it is more useful, to see what the long-term strategies and incremental expenditures are. Staff's role is to collect the data and put it in an informative format that can be used to help make decisions.

Staff suggested that we need to identify long-term goals for each issue and work toward them incrementally with the short term plans. Of the four infrastructure studied so far, only one has integrated their short-term expenditure plans into their long-term strategies. The Board agreed that short and long term plans should be integrated. Staff noted that each infrastructure area will be treated the same way and all viable information from long-term strategies will be considered as the IRIS moves forward.

Infrastructure Areas

The Board suggested including healthcare as an additional infrastructure area to be included in the plan. Staff agrees that a more inclusive look at the region's infrastructure is useful for planning purposes, noting that what was presented to the Board were the 10 infrastructure areas that staff felt could be adequately addressed and incorporated into the first round of the RCP. Once the Board has adopted the first RCP and believes the process to be successful, additional infrastructure areas could be added to the list. To assist the Board, staff will develop and maintain a list of potential infrastructure areas that could be included in later versions of the RCP.

The Board also made a number of comments regarding the specifics of the infrastructure areas being studied. For example, the Board would like to emphasize the importance of recycling with respect to solid waste, to incorporate discussions on desalinization, trash to energy plants and other forms of renewable resources. The Board directed staff to describe the interaction of all the infrastructure areas and to mention trade offs where appropriate. In addition, a discussion of previous efforts that have been tried and failed should also be included. Staff will incorporate these discussions into the final report.

Fiscal Reform

The Board asked if the issue of State/Local fiscal reform will also include lobbying efforts with Sacramento.

Staff responded yes, it will. SANDAG's State/Local fiscal reform approach is a five-prong strategy that not only provides incentives for housing development but also takes a look at fiscal stabilization, exchanging relatively unstable funds, such as Vehicle License Fees with more stable fees such as property taxes and constitutionally protecting revenue streams. There has been discussion to moving towards a regional solution to fiscal reform as opposed to a state solution.

The Board suggested discussing State/Local fiscal reform with the region's City Managers, using the SANDAG proposal as a starting point for discussion.

The Board also brought up the issue of a Regional Impact Fee. Perhaps the residents in the region should be polled to see if they're willing to pay for infrastructure. If not, maybe a sliding scale could be developed for residents to pay on an as used basis.

The Board concluded that the RCP is needed because the region is going to grow. However, the region can affect the form of that growth through good planning and regional collaboration. There are choices to be made and the better the choices that the region makes, the more likely we will be to maintain and improve our existing quality of life. The question remains, as this effort is coordinated, how can the Board help with that coordination?

Staff will continue to work towards the direction provided by the Board, identifying opportunities for the Board to coordinate with regional infrastructure providers and stakeholders and incorporating them into the process.

Public Comment

Robert Hoffman, a resident of San Diego, commented that the region's real transportation problem is that mass transit has no marketable features.

Clive Richard, a San Diego resident, stated that basic transportation service should be a social service, to be paid for by the public.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Chairman Morrison noted that the next SANDAG Board meeting will be held at 9:00 a.m. on Friday, February 28, 2003 and added that there will be no Policy Development Board meeting to be held in March 2003. In addition, he encouraged all members and colleagues to attend the upcoming subregional RCP workshops.

The Board asked if there is a time frame when SDG&E's 20-year plan is to be completed.

Frank Urtasun stated that SDG&E is required to submit its 20-year Resource Plan by April 1, 2003.

Leon Williams pointed out that the MTDB Board voted to request that the SANDAG Board leave the question of changing the name of SANDAG open for discussion.

Mayor Madrid commented that those same MTD Board members mentioned at the SANDAG retreat that they wanted to keep the SANDAG name.

ADJOURNMENT – 12:08 p.m.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Secretary

San Diego Association of Governments
REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

March 7, 2003

AGENDA ITEM NO.: **5**

Action Requested: INFORMATION

PRELIMINARY DRAFT SHORELINE CHAPTER OF RCP

I. ISSUE STATEMENT

The San Diego region's Shoreline, in particular its beaches:

- Are an environmental resource of local, regional, statewide, and national significance; and an integral part of the area's ecosystem, interconnected with nearshore ocean, wetland habitats, and water quality.
- Are an important part of the local, regional, and state economies and a considerable source of revenue to local governments, the state and the nation;
- Are a priceless recreational resource and a key part of the region's positive image and overall quality of life;
- Protect important public infrastructure such as parks, roads, and rail lines;
- Have experienced, and will continue to suffer serious beach erosion, thereby reducing, and eventually almost eliminating all of the aforesaid benefits;
- Were the beneficiary of over 2 million cubic yards of clean, beach quality sand in 2001 as a result of SANDAG's successfully implemented Regional Beach Sand Project (RBSP), the first regional scale beach restoration project on the West coast of the U.S.; and
- Will require a continuing active management program featuring additional projects like the RBSP, and annual funding levels of around \$7.5 million over the next decade or more to restore and maintain the severe sand deficit along the region's coastline.

II. INTERRELATED ISSUES

- The region's beaches are integrally connected to the other important environments of our watersheds, including rivers and creeks, lagoons and wetlands. Sand flows with water through watercourses and wetlands to the coast, creating our beaches. The quality of our riparian, wetland and beach habitats is therefore closely linked. Development of the region's coastal plain, mesas and foothills over the past century has drastically cut the supply of sand reaching the beaches, and resulted in the deterioration of the quality of these environments and the water flowing through them. Preserving and improving these environments must be approached comprehensively.

- Water quality in the region's waterways, wetlands, and urban drainage systems affects, and is affected by, our beaches. Polluted water from these sources reaches beaches and results in public health hazards, particularly at times of high rainfall and runoff. As sand moves along the coast, it can restrict tidal flow in wetlands and adversely affect water quality to them. Integrated management of these water quality issues is essential.
- Similarly, beach and rock shoreline provide unique and high value habitats, and share close connections with valuable nearshore ocean and wetland habitats. Shoreline management actions must also consider and be integrated with effects to preserve and improve these related ecosystems.
- Beaches are by far the region's most important outdoor recreational resource. A number of studies show that beaches attract many more visits annually than all other outdoor recreational opportunities combined. (This comparison includes local, regional, state, and national parks and commercial theme parks.) Planning, funding, and operating our recreational infrastructure should be coordinated and set priorities for beaches, parks, and open space.
- Beaches are an important factor in the region's economy. They are a key supporting aspect to virtually all of the region's tourism. In addition, beach visitors have a direct economic impact worth hundreds of millions of dollars per year in spending in the region. Up to one-half of this comes from visitors from other parts of the state and nation and foreign visitors. This infusion of income from outside makes beach tourism a very valuable basic industry for our area. The region's strategy for economic prosperity is in no small part dependent on our beaches, and their preservation and improvement should be part of it.
- As the number one recreational destination in the region, and in the context of a national and global economy whose trends show steady increases in recreational demand, beaches should be viewed as one of the region's transportation access priorities. We not only need to make sure our beaches are wide enough and adjacent waters clean enough to accommodate this high demand, we need to focus more attention on providing reasonable ways to travel to the beach. In some cases, regional transportation initiatives will play a part along with local street, transit, and parking strategies.
- As the most important free recreational resource in the region, beaches play a part in efforts to make public infrastructure equally accessible to all groups. American notions of justice and fairness dictate that public investment decisions strongly consider impacts on all groups and equitable access to the benefits of tax supported amenities. The region needs to know much more about the relationship between where different groups live in relationship to the beaches, what their recreational interests are and how those factors can be addressed in future public investment strategies concerning beach preservation and access, versus other public investment.

III. POLICIES, GOALS, AND OBJECTIVES

The region's policies, goals, and objectives for our beaches are contained in the Shoreline Preservation Strategy for the San Diego Region adopted by SANDAG in 1993. The Strategy remains valid and up-to-date today. Following is some of the most important guidance from the Strategy:

GOAL: TO PRESERVE AND ENHANCE THE REGION'S BEACHES.

Objectives

- Manage the region's shoreline to provide environmental quality, recreation, and property protection.
- Develop and carry out a cost-effective combination of shoreline management tactics that will have a positive impact on the region's economy.
- Develop a program to pay for the shoreline management strategy which equitably allocates costs throughout the region, and among local, state, and federal sources.
- Obtain commitments to implement and finance the Shoreline Management Strategy.

Policies

- The Strategy should provide a cooperative, coordinated, and long-range preservation program for the region's shoreline.
- The Strategy should consider the full range of shoreline management tactics, with emphasis on beachfilling to preserve and enhance the environmental quality, recreational capacity, and property protection benefits of the region's shoreline.
- Structural and mechanical management tactics to stabilize beaches, reduce sand losses and redistribute sand along the shoreline should be evaluated as complements to the regional beachfilling program and implemented where they have a positive impact on cost-effectiveness and are locally and environmentally acceptable. Tactics which mimic natural processes should be preferred when they are equal in cost-effectiveness to other approaches.
- Policies and actions to promote the availability of offshore, coastal and upland sources of sand for beachfilling and natural beach replenishment should be developed.
- The Strategy should evaluate local, state, and federal policies and regulations and recommend changes to support the other policies and objectives, and proactively involve key agencies (such as the State Lands Commission) in the policy-making process.
- The Strategy should be based on the best available scientific data and analysis, and on sound engineering principles.

IV. INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS

Restoration of the region's beaches involves placing a total of up to between 20 and 30 million cubic yards of clean beach quality sand on our beaches, to be implemented in 2 million cubic yard sand replenishment projects carried out every other summer at an annual cost of about \$7.5 million. The total amount of sand and the specifics of each project would be determined based on environmental constraints and coastal processes.

After completion of restoration, additional 2 million cubic yard beach replenishment projects could be required to maintain the restored beaches at a rate of one every 4 or 5 years.

State and national studies indicate that such a program will increase the region's economy by several hundred million dollars per year, and provide a direct return in local tax revenues well in excess of the public investment.

V. ACTIONS, IMPLEMENTATION RESPONSIBILITIES AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Funding: SANDAG's Shoreline Preservation Committee had developed a series of reasonable funding strategies for the beach restoration program described above (including environmental management and monitoring), based on local and regional funding sources. These sources could be supplemented by state and federal beach replenishment funding programs. The region needs to decide on and implement one or more of the funding options.

Beach Restoration Project Planning, Designing, and Construction

The region has proved it can successfully implement a regional-scale beach replenishment project through SANDAG's 2.1 million cubic yard Regional Beach Sand Project, completed in 2001. Once funding is secured, SANDAG should implement the next project.

Performance Monitoring

SANDAG is currently implementing a comprehensive program of performance monitoring of the Regional Beach Sand Project which will continue through June 2005. Sand movement and environmental impacts to nearshore ocean habitats and lagoons are measured and evaluated. There is a mitigation fund available to address any problems encountered. In addition, SANDAG is working with the California Coastal Conservancy, Scripps Institution of Oceanography, state and federal regulatory and management agencies and interested groups in the region to inventory, evaluate, and better manage nearshore ocean and shoreline flora and fauna, habitats and water quality. These programs should be continued in support of future replenishment projects.

San Diego Association of Governments
REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

March 7, 2003

AGENDA ITEM NO.: **8**

Action Requested: COMMENT/RECOMMENDATION

DRAFT OUTLINE OF WATER SUPPLY COMPONENT OF THE RCP

1. Issue Statement

A secure and reliable water supply is essential for maintaining economic prosperity and quality of life in the San Diego region. Diversification of San Diego County's water supply is essential to meeting future water demands. San Diego County is a semi-arid region, highly reliant on imported water supplies. In order to meet the future water demands associated with the forecasted growth, supplies must be managed efficiently and a diverse mix of resources developed. The efficient use of water, through implementation of cost-effective conservation programs and water recycling projects, is fundamental to the region's future water plans. The development of local supplies, such as groundwater and seawater desalination, will assist in diversifying the region's resources. In addition, the conservation and transfer of agricultural water to the region will also provide a reliable supply for San Diego County. Implementation of a diverse mix of supply projects and programs necessary to meet future growth will require coordination and communication between land use and water agencies. Working together will ensure continued water supply reliability for the current and future population within our region.

2. Description of Interrelated Issues

- Forecasting mechanisms: the CWA/ SANDAG relationship
- 1992 Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between CWA/ SANDAG and current water legislation
- Forecast growth, water supply and demand
- Smart Growth and water use: Urban Sprawl effects on water resources
- Infrastructure needs
- Housing and land use policies incorporating water efficiency
- Water quality and watershed protection
- Borders issues

3. Policies, Principles and Goals

OVERALL GOAL: TO ENSURE A SAFE, SUFFICIENT, AND RELIABLE SUPPLY OF WATER TO MEET THE EXISTING AND FUTURE WATER NEEDS OF THE SAN DIEGO REGION.

Policies to meet this goal:

- A. Conduct water supply planning based on forecasted growth included in the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP), and identify and implement actions necessary to develop the supplies required to meet future growth.
- B. Pursue a Capital Improvement Program to increase reliability of the regional aqueduct system, provide adequate emergency storage and carryover storage needs, add treatment capacity to satisfy the region's treated water needs, and develop a regional seawater desalination facility.
- C. Enhance the reliability of the region's water supplies through development of water recycling, seawater desalination, groundwater, water transfers and other appropriate diversification strategies to maximize available water resources.
- D. Fully implement Best Management Practices (BMPs) to obtain a maximum conservation savings.

4. Actions and Implementation Responsibilities

- A. Conduct water supply planning based on forecasted growth included in the RCP; identify and implement actions necessary to develop the supplies required to meet future growth.
 - i. SANDAG and local jurisdictions should assure consistency between the land use policies and general plans of local jurisdictions and regional growth forecasts.
 - ii. CWA and member agencies should review and update their Urban Water Management Plans to be regionally consistent.
 - iii. CWA and member agencies should adopt drought allocation plans to cope with potential future shortages within the region.
 - iv. CWA, SANDAG and SANDAG member agencies should promote smart growth
 - v. SANDAG and CWA should pursue a legislative program consistent with water supply policies, principles and goals.
- B. Pursue a Capital Improvement Program to increase reliability of the regional aqueduct system, provide adequate emergency storage and carryover storage needs, add treatment capacity to satisfy the region's treated water needs, and develop a regional seawater desalination facility.
 - i. CWA should complete implementation of the emergency storage project.
 - ii. CWA should complete Regional Water Facilities Master Plan, which identifies what regional water facilities will be needed to serve the San Diego region through 2030.
 - iii. CWA and its member agencies should develop 50-100 million gallons per day (mgd) of treatment capacity within the region to maintain regional water delivery reliability.
 - iv. CWA should construct a minimum 50 mgd seawater desalination plant in Carlsbad by year 2010, including pump stations and pipelines to convey the water to CWA's second aqueduct.
- C. Promote recycling, seawater desalination, groundwater development, water transfers and other appropriate diversification strategies to maximize available water resources.
 - i. The CWA, its member agencies, and other local agencies should continue to pursue funding through existing and future federal, state, and regional programs for development of local projects.
 - ii. The CWA, its member agencies, and other local agencies should work with regulatory agencies to pursue regulatory changes that are more conducive to water recycling.
 - iii. The CWA should continue to pursue implementation of the transfer agreement with the Imperial Irrigation District and pursue other potential transfers.

- D. Fully implement BMPs to obtain a maximum conservation savings.
- i. CWA, member agencies, and local land use jurisdictions should promote to the general public the importance of using water efficiently in the San Diego region.
 - ii. CWA, member agencies, and local land use jurisdictions should continue to implement water conservation techniques with an increased focus on reducing outdoor water use.
 - iii. Local jurisdictions should incorporate water efficiency into land use policies.

5. Performance Measures

- Per Capita water use
- Production and use of reclaimed and recycled water
- Seawater desalination
- Groundwater recharge

6. Infrastructure Needs

- To be developed

7. Environmental Justice and Social Equity

- To be developed

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

March 7, 2003

AGENDA ITEM NO.: **9**

Action Requested: DISCUSSION

UPDATE ON HOUSING ISSUES

The purpose of this item is to update the Regional Planning Committee on SANDAG's work on housing issues.

Housing Element Due Date Extension

On February 14, SANDAG's Executive Committee approved pursuing legislation to extend the housing element due date by six months to December 31, 2004. This extension will allow SANDAG to tie the regional housing needs determination and allocation process to the development of the Regional Comprehensive Plan. Senator Denise Ducheny is the author of the bill, SB 491.

Housing Element Self-Certification Pilot Program: Report to the Legislature and Legislative Proposals

At the same meeting, the Executive Committee approved pursuing legislation to extend the sunset date for the pilot housing element self-certification program, and to grant full eligibility for all state funds and programs to jurisdictions that self-certify their housing elements. Senator Ducheny also is the author of this bill, SB 492, which was written as a vehicle to continue discussions regarding the pilot program. The Executive Committee also approved the report to the Legislature regarding the use and results of the self-certification pilot program to date.

March 14 Executive Committee Meeting

On March 14, the Executive Committee will discuss SB 492 (the self-certification bill) and potential changes that would strengthen the self-certification program. These potential changes include: tying self-certification to approval of the Regional Comprehensive Plan and better monitoring of progress toward meeting self-certification goals. Senator Ducheny will attend the Executive Committee meeting.

Regional Housing Needs Working Group

Members of the Regional Planning Technical Working Group and Regional Housing Task Force are working on the various tasks that SANDAG is responsible for undertaking in preparation for the 2004-09 housing element cycle. These responsibilities include determining the region's share of the state's housing needs, and allocating the regional housing need by jurisdiction and income category. This work was started in the Fall and will continue over the next several months.

Housing Chapter of the Regional Comprehensive Plan

The Regional Planning Committee reviewed an outline of the housing chapter of the Regional Comprehensive Plan on August 2, 2002. Staff will present a draft of this chapter to the Regional Planning Committee along with the housing element-related work described above at its June 6 meeting. This chapter and the housing element-related work also will be reviewed by the Regional Planning Technical Working Group, Regional Housing Task Force, and Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

February 14, 2003

AGENDA REPORT NO.: **3-A**

Action Requested: APPROVE

HOUSING ELEMENT DUE DATE EXTENSION

Introduction

State law requires that all cities and counties update the housing elements of their general plans every five years. Preparations for the next housing element update, which currently covers the time period from July 1, 2004 – June 30, 2009, started recently. SANDAG has been working with its working groups on two key housing element-related tasks: determination of the region's share of the state's housing needs and allocation of this need by jurisdiction and by income category (the regional share allocation). Currently, state law mandates that these tasks be completed by June 30, 2003, to assist jurisdictions in meeting the June 30, 2004 housing element due date.

The Regional Housing Task Force (RHTF) and the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (RPTWG) have recommended that SANDAG pursue legislation to extend the housing element due date so that the regional housing needs process can be integrated into the preparation of the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP). A draft RCP will be completed by December 2003, with the final RCP scheduled for June 2004. Because legislation is required to extend the housing element due date, an extension is not guaranteed. Given this uncertainty, SANDAG could proceed with the regional housing needs process in one of two ways:

1. Pursue legislation extending the housing element due date by six months, and proceed based on the assumption that extension of the due date will be granted, and complete the allocation process by December 31, 2003.
2. Do not pursue legislation to extend the housing element due date, and complete the allocation process by the original deadline of June 30, 2003.

SANDAG staff recommends the first alternative. While there are pros and cons to each alternative, the benefits of coordinating SANDAG's housing element-related tasks with the development of the RCP outweigh the benefits of meeting the original deadline. The Regional Housing Task Force and the Regional Planning Technical Working Group concur with this recommendation.

Therefore, it is my

RECOMMENDATION

that the Executive Committee direct staff to pursue legislation to extend the housing element due date from June 30, 2004 to December 31, 2004, and proceed with the regional housing needs determination and allocation based on the passage of the proposed legislation.

Discussion

The primary goal of pursuing legislation to extend the housing element due date is to obtain consensus on regional housing needs issues by tying the regional housing needs determination and allocation process to the preparation of the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP).

Through the RCP, policy makers will be developing principles on important regional housing needs issues such as the desired balance between jobs and housing, interregional commuting, and connections between transportation and land use decisions. The regional housing needs determination and allocation should be carried out based upon these principles.

Additionally, each chapter of the RCP will include information on standards, performance monitoring, and assessment. The regional housing needs determination and allocation represents an opportunity to set housing goals and standards within the RCP, and to link incentives to these goals and standards.

State law, however, currently mandates that SANDAG complete the regional housing needs allocation process by June 30, 2003. This gives jurisdictions one year to incorporate the regional share numbers into their housing elements, which are currently due June 30, 2004. If the housing element due date extension legislation does not pass, SANDAG will be six months late in meeting the June 30, 2003 deadline, and jurisdictions will only have six months to incorporate the regional share numbers into their housing elements. Attachment 1 shows the schedule of actual and recommended housing element-related dates and deadlines as well as the schedule for the RCP.

If housing element due date legislation is not pursued, SANDAG will work with its working groups to meet the June 30, 2003 regional share determination and allocation deadline. This alternative would keep SANDAG in compliance with state law, and would give jurisdictions a full year to incorporate the regional housing needs allocation numbers into their housing elements.

If, however, we do not fully develop our housing policies and principles through the RCP, it will be difficult to determine and allocate the region's housing needs in a manner that equitable and supported by the local jurisdictions. This alternative could lead to jurisdictions appealing their regional share allocations. While an appeals process is established by state law, the housing needs allocation has never been appealed in the San Diego region.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Attachment

Key Staff Contact: Rebecca Davis, (619) 595-5344; rda@sandag.org

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

February 14, 2003

AGENDA REPORT NO.: **3-B**

Action Requested: APPROVE

HOUSING ELEMENT SELF-CERTIFICATION PILOT PROGRAM:
REPORT TO THE LEGISLATURE AND LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

Introduction

In 1995, legislation was passed and signed by the Governor to establish a pilot program that would allow jurisdictions in the San Diego region to self-certify the housing elements of their general plans if they met certain criteria. This report addresses two issues related to this legislation.

Report to the State Legislature

The self-certification law requires that SANDAG report to the Legislature on the use and results of the self-certification process following the completion of the revision of all housing elements in the region. The law states that "the report shall contain data for the last planning period regarding the total number of additional affordable housing units provided by income category, the total number of additional newly constructed housing units, and any other information deemed useful by SANDAG in the evaluation of the program." Attached is a draft of the report to the Legislature. The report describes the self-certification program, provides data regarding the number of affordable housing opportunities added during the 1991-99 housing element cycle, lists the jurisdictions that self-certified their housing elements, discusses some of the impediments to implementation of the program, and evaluates the effectiveness and merit of the program.

Legislative Proposals

Two changes are proposed to state law regarding the housing element self-certification program: a) extension of the sunset date to allow jurisdictions to self-certify their 2009-14 housing elements (an option that does not exist under the current law), and b) grant full eligibility for all state funds and programs to jurisdictions that self-certify their housing elements. This legislation is consistent with SANDAG's 2003 Legislative Program and would allow a more thorough and complete evaluation of the self-certification program. It also would eliminate discrimination against self-certifying jurisdictions for state funding, which has acted as a disincentive to use the program.

Based on the recommendation of the Regional Housing Task Force, it is my

RECOMMENDATION

that the Executive Committee approve the report to the Legislature on the use and results of the self-certification pilot program and direct SANDAG to pursue legislation to extend the sunset date for the pilot housing element self-certification program, and to grant full eligibility for all state funds and programs to jurisdictions that self-certify their housing elements.

Discussion

Report to the State Legislature

Following the recent housing element cycle, SANDAG is required to report to the state legislature on the use and results of the self-certification process by local governments in the San Diego region. The Regional Housing Task Force has reviewed the attached report and recommends its approval.

The report makes the following findings and conclusions about the housing element self-certification pilot program:

- Eleven of the 19 jurisdictions in the region self-certified their housing elements.
- Jurisdictions that self-certified their housing elements met a higher percentage of their affordable housing needs during the 1991-99 housing element cycle than jurisdictions that did not self-certify.
- The self-certification pilot program provides an incentive for actual production of affordable housing: exemption of local governments from state housing element review.
- The Department of Housing and Community Development's (HCD) position that self-certified housing elements are not equivalent to housing elements that are found in compliance with state law damaged the viability of the pilot program.
- Six of the eleven jurisdictions that self-certified their housing elements submitted their self-certified elements to HCD for a finding of compliance to preserve their eligibility for state funds. In some cases these reviews took several months to complete, resulted in only minor changes to the housing elements, and required additional environmental review and public hearings.
- The process of establishing the self-certification program focused attention on the need for, and the ability of, jurisdictions to provide affordable housing. Continuation of the program will draw additional attention to the need to provide affordable housing for low income households and families.
- The self-certification program provides a cost savings for both state and local government, which is important in light of our current budget crisis.

Legislative Proposal to Extend the Sunset Date

Section 65585.1 (e) of the Government Code states that, "This section [housing element self-certification] shall become inoperative on June 30, 2009, and as of January 1, 2010, is repealed, unless a later enacted statute, which is enacted before January 1, 2010, deletes or extends that date." Based on this section of the law, local jurisdictions in the San Diego region only have one more opportunity to self-certify their housing elements – in June 2004, when they complete their 2004-09 housing element. Their ability to self-certify will be based on whether they achieved their affordable housing goals during the 1999-2004 housing element cycle.

SANDAG and the Regional Housing Task Force believe that the pilot program should be allowed to operate for another housing element cycle in order to more fully evaluate its effectiveness and success. This recommendation is made in light of state policies and legislation that requires jurisdictions to submit their self-certified housing elements to HCD for a determination of compliance in order to be

eligible for certain state funds and programs. This policy damaged the viability of the self-certification program by denying access to state funding and programs to jurisdictions that self-certified their housing elements unless they also submitted them to HCD.

If the sunset date is extended to allow jurisdictions the ability to self-certify their 2009-14 housing elements, SANDAG will need to develop a new set of affordable housing goals during the next six to nine months. These goals would have to be met during the 2004-09 housing element cycle if a jurisdiction wishes to self-certify its 2009-14 housing element.

Legislative Proposal to Grant Full Eligibility for State Funds and Programs

Legislation was proposed at the end of the legislative session last year that would have granted full eligibility for all state funds and programs to jurisdictions that self-certified their housing elements. This legislation was amended at the end of the session to apply only to Proposition 46 funds, the statewide housing bond that passed in November. A bill that would provide self-certified jurisdictions with full eligibility for all state funds and programs is proposed. If approved, this bill will allow the self-certification program to be implemented without the threat of restricted access to state funds and programs, and improve our ability to gauge its success and potential for permanency.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Attachment

Key Staff Contact: Michael McLaughlin, (619)595-5343; mmc@sandag.org

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

March 7, 2003

AGENDA ITEM NO.: **10**

Action Requested: DISCUSSION

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE STRATEGY AND SOCIAL EQUITY FOR RCP

Introduction

Federal and State laws and regulations require that Environmental Justice and Social Equity considerations be included in all regional planning programs. Thus, SANDAG will include an environmental justice / social equity program in the Regional Comprehensive Plan to assure that benefits and any potential adverse impacts of policies within the Plan be addressed.

Involvement of Environmental Justice / Social Equity Populations

SANDAG is reaching out to traditionally under-represented groups to discuss the Regional Comprehensive Plan and Environmental Justice and Social Equity issues. SANDAG is in the process of issuing mini-grants to community based organizations to conduct special community meetings or events that will generate discussion from members of minority and low-income groups. These events will begin within two months. The input received will be integrated into the RCP, and will compliment the RCP's current public involvement program and the Environmental Justice and Social Equity Analysis described below.

Environmental Justice and Social Equity Analysis

A draft strategy for how to conduct an Environmental Justice and Social Equity Analysis for the Regional Comprehensive Plan is attached. The approach proposes a focus on the effects of regional policies included in the RCP, and five steps for analysis, as follows.

1. Identify the Environmental Justice / Social Equity populations in the region (define minority and low income populations);
2. Identify performance measures at the program level;
3. Create 2030 projections for the selected performance measures and map the results;
4. Conduct a comparison analysis of the Environmental Justice / Social Equity impacts on all populations; and
5. Integrate the results of Environmental Justice / Social Equity analysis into the Regional Comprehensive Plan.

Discussion by the Regional Planning Technical Working Group

This draft document has been discussed by your Regional Planning Technical Working Group. The Technical Working Group will continue to discuss it at future meetings.

At its most recent discussion, the Technical Working Group made the following comments.

1. **Environmental Justice / Social Equity Policy.** A definition of Environmental Justice and Social Equity should be added in order to define the exact parameters of the analysis. The Technical Working Group will discuss the proposed definition at its next meeting. Staff proposes that the definition read as stated in SB 115 (Statutes of 1999):

Environmental Justice and Social Equity is defined as the fair treatment of people of all races, cultures, and incomes with respect to the development, adoption, implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations, and policies.

2. **Environmental Justice / Social Equity Populations.** The Technical Working Group accepted the proposal in the report that low-income populations in the analysis are 60% of the median income.

There was considerable discussion of the use of the term minority as defined in federal and state legislation and regulations. Staff will recommend the continued use of the standard definitions, to be consistent with other Plans and the federal and state requirements.

3. **Performance Measures for Analysis.** The Technical Working Group requested staff to revise the performance measures to more closely reflect the component elements of the Regional Comprehensive Plan and relate to the populations affected by Environmental Justice and Social Equity concerns. Staff will revise the performance measures and present them to the next Technical Working Group meeting.

The Regional Planning Committee's discussion is requested.

Environmental Justice and Social Equity Analysis for the San Diego Regional Comprehensive Plan

A five-step analysis proposal

Environmental Justice Policy

It is SANDAG policy to encourage the involvement of all citizens in its planning process, regardless of ethnicity, area of residence, income, or other social factors. This participation traditionally has been carried out through the Public Involvement Program and the participation of the citizens in SANDAG's advisory committees, and is now being extended through the addition of Environmental Justice to the planning process of the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP).

Furthermore, addressing Environmental Justice is required by both Federal Executive Order and State law in all programs that receive funding from federal or state agencies. Presidential Executive Order 12898 (1994) promotes nondiscrimination in federal programs substantially affecting human health and the environment; and it provides minority and low-income communities access to public information on, and an opportunity for public participation in, matters relating to human health or the environment. In California, AB 1553 (Keeley), requires the California Office of Planning and Research to include environmental justice considerations in its next set of general plan guidelines, which are anticipated to be available by July 2003.

STEP ONE:

Identify Environmental Justice / Social Equity Populations in the San Diego Region

Define Minority and Low-Income Populations

The first step in the Environmental Justice (EJ) analysis is to define and identify selected populations. According to Federal and California State laws, Environmental Justice is about including typically underrepresented populations in the planning process, which are comprised of minority and low-income populations.

For the Environmental Justice analysis portion of the 2030 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), SANDAG staff created a map using Traffic Analysis Zones (TAZ) showing areas with high concentrations of minority populations, low-income populations, and both, for the year 2030. TAZs are useful units of analysis because they are smaller than Census tracts, and can be cross-referenced to census tracts. The mentioned maps can be found in the Technical Appendices of Mobility 2030, Appendix 5.

Minority Populations

According to federal guidelines, minority groups include the following populations: Black or African American, Asian, American Indian or Alaskan Native, and Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander. In addition, persons of Hispanic ethnicity also are considered a minority group.

SANDAG compiles data and prepares projections for the following groups: Hispanic, White, Black, Asian, and Other. Therefore, Hispanic, Black, Asian, and Other were

classified as minority groups for the 2030 RTP analysis. In 2030, 59 percent of the region's population is projected to be minority and 41 percent non-minority.

For the 2030 RTP analysis, TAZs were classified as minority or non-minority. A minority TAZ was defined as having at least 65 percent minority population based on 2030 projections. This methodology captured 61 percent of the region's projected minority population in 2030.

Low-Income Populations

For the 2030 RTP, low-income was defined as household income at 50 percent of the median income for the region. Median income is projected at \$70,500 in 2030 (in today's dollars). A low-income TAZ was defined as one where at least one-third of the households were projected to have an income of less than \$35,000 per year in 2030, based upon the definition above. This methodology resulted in approximately 25 percent of the households classified as low-income.

Recommendations:

(1) Minority Populations: Staff recommendation is to build upon the work performed for the 2030 RTP, and use the same definition of minority populations that was used in the 2030 RTP.

(2) Low-Income Populations: It is also recommended that the low-income TAZs be re-defined for greater consistency with other SANDAG planning processes. For instance, in SANDAG's Indicators for Sustainable Competitiveness, the upper threshold for "below middle income" was 90 percent of median income, while the Department of Housing and Urban Development defines low-income at 80 percent of median income, while very low-income is 50 percent of median income. The staff recommendation for defining low-income populations for the RCP analysis is **60 percent of the median income**. The definition of a low-income TAZ, then, would be one where at least one-third of the households are projected to make \$42,300 a year or less in 2030, thereby capturing a greater number of low-income households and reflecting a more accurate portrayal of income distribution.

STEP TWO:

Identify Performance Measures at the Program Level

Select Performance Measures for Analysis

Imperative to any analysis is the definition of what is to be measured. In this analysis, the performance measures will be based on policies included in the RCP, rather than proposed individual projects. For instance, providing more housing in the region's urbanized areas and restricting housing in the region's rural areas is an example of a general policy that could be included in the RCP, while building a new solid waste landfill in a particular location is an example of a project. The focus of this Environmental Justice analysis is on how proposed policies in the RCP (versus particular infrastructure projects) will affect minority and low-income populations.

With regards to transportation, performance measures used in the Mobility 2030 Environmental Justice analysis focused on the major goals of Mobility and Accessibility and included:

- 1) Average travel time per trip;
- 2) Percent of work and college trips accessible in 30 minutes; and
- 3) Percent of non-work related trips accessible in 15 minutes.

These performance measures were calculated and compared for minority and non-minority populations, and for low-income and non low-income populations for 2030 projections.

Recommendation: Staff recommends selecting performance measures that are broad in nature and generally cover the sustainability policies of economy, environment, and equity in the San Diego region, and can be measured in 2030 under the Preliminary 2030 Growth Forecast. Building upon SANDAG's "Indicators of Sustainable Competitiveness," and Mobility 2030, examples of performance measures for consideration could include:

- 1) Transportation: (a) average travel time per trip, (b) percent of work/college trips accessible in 30 minutes, (c) percent of non-work related trips accessible in 15 minutes, and/or (d) accessibility to transit.
- 2) Environment: (a) air quality hotspots (b) beach closures and/or (c) proximity to open space and other recreational areas such as parks and beaches.
- 3) Housing / Urban Form: (a) proximity of existing new housing development to major employment areas, (b) housing availability, and/or (c) housing affordability as measured by the housing opportunity index.

The selected performance measures will be evaluated by the Regional Planning Technical Working Group for technical input. Once the performance measures have been accepted, staff recommends that the performance measures be discussed with the selected populations through the EJ community outreach program to see how they resonate. Modifications to the performance measures should be made on a case-by-case basis.

STEP THREE: 2030 Projections

Create 2030 Projections for Selected Performance Measures

Pending comments and input from the associated working groups and the selected EJ populations, the final four or five program-level performance measures should be selected, and from these, comparative analysis may begin. Building on the Environmental Justice analysis performed in the RTP, 2030 projections should be created for each performance measure, using the Preliminary 2030 Growth Forecast.

Map Results of the Performance Measures

Geographic Information Systems (GIS) can be used to analyze demographic, socioeconomic, and transportation data. For instance, some performance measures, such

as those associated with infrastructure items, or new housing growth, can be plotted on a map.

Recommendation: It is the recommendation of staff to make projections for a final selection of four or five performance measures, chosen with the input of the working groups, outreach groups and staff. It is also recommended that maps of the 2030 projections be used, whenever possible, to aid in the understanding and presentation of the analysis.

STEP FOUR:

Comparison Analysis

The next step in the analysis process is to combine the data from the performance measures with the selected EJ groups. In the RTP, the analysis resulted in a finding of no disproportionate effects when considering minority versus non-minority populations in 2030. However, there was a slight difference in average regional travel times in 2030 when considering low-income versus non-low-income populations. This information can be represented in tabular form, in description, or graphically. Once projections are created for the performance measures, they can be analyzed for effects on the selected EJ populations.

Comparison Analysis of EJ versus Non-EJ Populations

Unbalanced adverse effects due to regional policies set forth in the RCP should also be identified by analyzing the projected data between minority versus non-minority, and low-income versus non-low-income populations. This is the procedure that was undertaken in the EJ analysis of the 2030 RTP and is the staff recommendation for the RCP.

Examples of questions that could be posed to determine the significance of impacts could include the following:

1. What is the ratio of open space acreage to population in San Diego County in 2030?
2. What is the ratio of open space acreage to population in minority areas / low-income areas?
3. What is the ratio of open space acreage to population in non-minority areas / non-low-income areas?
4. Is this better or worse than non-minority areas/ non-low-income areas?
5. If so, by how much?
6. Is this significant?

For the 2030 RTP, the analysis showed differences of less than one minute in average regional travel times when considering low-income versus non-low-income populations. However, travel times were found to be greater for low-income populations by less than a minute, which may or may not be considered significantly worse than non-low-income.

STEP FIVE:

Integrate Results of Environmental Justice / Social Equity Analysis into the RCP

The final step in analysis of Environmental Justice and Social Equity in the Regional Comprehensive Plan is to integrate the outcomes of the analysis into the document, and recommend a set of proactive actions to address Environmental Justice and Social Equity Issues.

Recommendations:

(1) Staff recommends that a complete chapter be dedicated to Environmental Justice, describing the EJ analysis and public outreach process, and proposing policy recommendations that could be applied at the regional and local planning levels. This step will be coordinated with local agencies to reinforce the ability of their general plans to respond to new State guidelines for general plans (AB 1553).

(2) Staff also recommends that each chapter of the RCP include proactive suggestions for addressing potential Environmental Justice / Social Equity issues, if applicable, within that chapter.

<i>Proposed Schedule for Environmental Justice Analysis for the RCP</i>	
January 23, 2003 and February 27, 2003	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ RPTWG meeting – Discuss and Refine Proposed Environmental Justice Strategy
March 2003	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Step One – Identify and Map Selected EJ Populations▪ Step Two – Define Performance Measures at Program Level
March 7, 2003	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Present EJ / Social Equity Strategy to Regional Planning Committee
March 27, 2003	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ RPTWG meeting – Review and Recommend Performance Measures
April and May 2003	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ EJ populations to provide input on performance measures through EJ public outreach program. Staff to incorporate comments and revise measures as necessary.▪ Step Three – 2030 Projections for Selected Performance Measures
July/August 2003	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Step Four – Comparison Analysis
September 2003	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Step Five – Integration