



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

# MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

## ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION PROGRAM WORKING GROUP

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

Tuesday, May 14, 2013

1 to 3 p.m.

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

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

### AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

- SOUTH COUNTY COMMUNITY OUTREACH PROJECT
- PRESERVE MANAGEMENT STANDARDIZATION PLAN

*SANDAG offices are accessible by public transit.  
 Phone 1-800-COMMUTE or see [www.sdcommute.com](http://www.sdcommute.com) for route information.*

*In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), SANDAG will accommodate persons who require assistance in order to participate in SANDAG meetings. If such assistance is required, please contact SANDAG at (619) 699-1900 at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting.*

*To request this document or related reports in an alternative format, please call (619) 699-1900, (619) 699-1904 (TTY), or fax (619) 699-1905.*

#### MEMBER AGENCIES

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

#### ADVISORY MEMBERS

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

# ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION PROGRAM WORKING GROUP

Tuesday, May 14, 2013

ITEM #		RECOMMENDATION
1.	WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS (Chair Carrie Downey)	Estimated Start Time: 1:00 - 1:05
+2.	MEETING SUMMARY OF MARCH 12, 2013	APPROVE
	Review and approve the March 12, 2013, meeting summary.	Estimated Start Time: 1:05 - 1:10
3.	PUBLIC COMMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS	COMMENT
	Members of the public shall have the opportunity to address the Environmental Mitigation Program Working Group (EMPWG) on any issue within the jurisdiction of SANDAG that is not on this agenda. Anyone desiring to speak shall reserve time by completing a "Request to Speak" form and giving it to the EMPWG coordinator prior to speaking. Public speakers should notify the EMPWG coordinator if they have a handout for distribution to EMPWG members. Public speakers are limited to three minutes or less per person. EMPWG members also may provide information and announcements under this agenda item.	Estimated Start Time: 1:10 - 1:15
4.	<i>TransNet</i> Economic Benefit Next Steps and Request for Formation of Ad Hoc Committee for FY 2014 Funding (Keith Greer, SANDAG)	DISCUSSION/ RECOMMENDATION
	On April 26, 2013, the Board of Directors approved the execution of an amendment to a Memorandum of Agreement to incorporate the policy related to the implementation of the provision of <i>TransNet</i> referred to as Economic Benefit. Mr. Greer will discuss the next steps related to Economic Benefit and will be requesting the formation of an ad hoc committee of EMPWG members to develop recommendations for FY 2014 funding.	Estimated Start Time: 1:15 - 1:30
5.	SOUTH COUNTY COMMUNITY OUTREACH PILOT PROJECT (Cathy Chadwick, Earth Discovery Institute)	DISCUSSION
	In 2011, the Board of Directors approved a one-year grant pilot project to assess how effective education and volunteer coordination can be among multiple land managers. Ms. Cathy Chadwick will describe the outcome of the grant effort and discuss any lessons learned from the effort.	Estimated Start Time: 1:30 - 2:00
6.	PRESERVE MANAGEMENT STANDARDIZATION PLAN (Dr. Rebecca Lewison and Dr. Douglas Deutschman, San Diego State University)	DISCUSSION
	Drs. Lewison and Deutschman of San Diego State University's Institute for Environmental Management and Monitoring will provide a report on the standardization of land management plans for open space preserves, including past workshops, peer review activities, and a date for distribution of the final report and future recommendations.	Estimated Start Time: 2:00 - 2:40

**7. NEXT MEETING DATE AND ADJOURNMENT**

**INFORMATION**

The next meeting of the EMPWG is scheduled for Tuesday, July 9, 2013, from 1 to 3 p.m. Tentative Topics: FY 2014 Funding Recommendations and Proposed Request for Proposals for Economic Benefit Land Acquisitions.

Estimated Start Time:  
2:40 - 2:50

+ next to an agenda item indicates an attachment

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

May 14, 2013

AGENDA ITEM NO.: **2**

**Action Requested: APPROVE**

SUMMARY OF MARCH 12, 2013, MEETING

**Members in Attendance:**

Carrie Downey (Chair)  
Mike Grim (Vice Chair)  
Anne Harvey, San Diego Conservation Network  
Bill Tippets, The Nature Conservancy  
Bobbie Stephenson, County of San Diego  
David Mayer, California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW)  
David Means, The Wildlife Conservation Board  
Emily Young, The San Diego Foundation  
Glen Laube, Chula Vista, South County  
James Whalen, Alliance for Habitat Conservation  
Jeanne Krosch, City of San Diego  
Michael Beck, Endangered Habitats League  
Michelle Mattson, Army Corps of Engineers  
Richard Whipple, City of Poway  
Robert Fisher, USGS  
Susan Wynn, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)

**Others in Attendance:**

Anne Fege, Community Forest Advisory Board  
Antoinette Gutierrez, Merkel and Associates Inc.  
Betsey Miller, City of San Diego  
Carla Scheidlinger, AMEC  
Chris Meador, Wildlife Research Institute  
Christina Schaefer, ESA  
Diane Nygaard, Preserve Calvarera  
Gabriel Buhr, California Coastal Commission  
Hallie Thompson, City of Carlsbad  
Jeanne Krosch, City of San Diego  
John Holder, WILDCOAST  
Kim Roeland, City of San Diego  
LeAnn Carmichael, County of San Diego  
Leonard Wittwer, The Escondido Creek Conservancy  
Lisa Coburn-Boyd, Otay Water District  
Marco Mares, County of San Diego

Mary Ann Hawke, ICF  
Megan Hamilton, San Diego Department of Parks and Recreation  
Patrick Zabrocki, ECORP Consulting  
Rebecca Schwartz, San Diego Audubon  
Ron Rempel, San Diego Management and Monitoring Program  
Teri Fenner, AECOM  
Tim Dillingham, California Department of Fish and Wildlife  
Yvonne Moore, SDMMMP  
Richard Van Sant, US Army Corps of Engineers

**SANDAG Staff in Attendance:**

Allison King, SANDAG  
Carolina Gregor, SANDAG  
Dan Gallagher, SANDAG  
Katie Levy, SANDAG  
Keith Greer, SANDAG  
Phil Trom, SANDAG  
Rob Rundle, SANDAG  
Sarah McCutcheon, SANDAG

**ITEM #1: WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

Chair Carrie Downey, City of Coronado Councilmember, called the meeting to order at 1:01 p.m.

**ITEM #2: SUMMARY OF JANUARY 8, 2013, MEETING**

Michael Beck, Endangered Habitats League, motioned to approve the summary from January 8, 2013, and Mike Grim, City of Carlsbad, seconded the motion. The motion carried without opposition.

**Item #3: Public Comments/Communications/Member Comments**

Keith Greer, SANDAG, provided the Working Group with a trifold leaflet of the annual Environmental Mitigation Program status report. This report is brought to the SANDAG Board of Directors every year. The updated report shows the progress SANDAG has made since starting to acquire property in 2008 and outlines stewardship, management, and related scientific research as well as the award from the California Chapter of the American Planning Association last year.

Mr. Greer also briefed the Working Group on the status of the Economic Benefit Policy Points. The Working Group approved the Economic Benefit Policy Points at the November 2012 meeting, and Mr. Greer presented them at the Joint Regional Planning and Transportation Committees (RPC/TC) meeting on March 1, 2013, for discussion. This was the first round at the committee meetings. The Economic Benefit Policy Points will next go to the *TransNet* Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee (ITOC) for discussion. Input from both the committees and ITOC will be presented at the RPC and the TC at their April meetings for a recommendation leading up to a Board action. Mr. Greer informed the Working Group that after the Board takes action, SANDAG will amend and sign the Memorandum of Agreement as proposed by staff. SANDAG staff will then prepare a Call for Projects for consideration by the Board.

Mr. Greer announced that two scientific peer-reviewed papers have recently come out of the work that the Working Group has done. The first paper was Thorne's Hairstreak butterfly work done by Amy Lucas, a graduate student, and her professor, Dr. Matt Forrester. The work was submitted to the *Journal of Insect Conservation*. The second paper detailed work that San Diego State conducted on regional land management needs. That paper was accepted into journal *Environmental Management*.

Diane Nygaard representing Preserve Calvarera and a co-chair of the Sierra Club, provided public comment on the status of the Multiple Habitat Conservation Plan (MHCP) in North County. She explained that it has been ten years since the adoption of the MHCP, and, yet, there is still neither a county plan adopted in the North County area, nor a second city in the MHCP area. Additionally, there is no funding available for many of the preserved lands to keep them up to the standards that were assumed in the MHCP and there is still active damage occurring within land identified in the MHCP as preserved. Another issue that she voiced was that North County was not included in the major wildlife corridor study that was conducted. For the MHCP to function properly, there needs to be a funding source and increased funding for the enforcement of the land to bring the management of the lands up to standards. Ms. Nygaard emphasized that everyone attending the Working Group is part of the process and as they look forward to the next phase of implementation, she wants to make sure that these issues do not fall through the cracks.

**ITEM #4: SAN DIEGO FORWARD: THE REGIONAL PLAN: FINAL WORK PROGRAM AND SCHEDULE (Phil Trom, SANDAG)**

Phil Trom, SANDAG Project Manager for *San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan*, the long-range regional planning document at SANDAG, gave a broad overview of the plan. The two previous long-range planning documents were the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP), adopted in 2004, and the RTP with the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS), approved in October 2011. In May 2012, the Board of Directors decided to merge the update of the RTP with the RCP update, which was almost ten years old. The RTP was historically a document that outlined transportation projects in the region and the RCP was a broad policy-based document that handled more than transportation.

The most recent RTP drew upon the policies from the RCP. The SCS component came from Senate Bill 375 (Steinberg, 2008) which required SANDAG to look at greenhouse gas emissions in the region. SANDAG had already started towards combining those plans, and this was an opportunity to do that combining at a much broader scale. *San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan* will be a clearly defined document with policy and planning projections out to 2050. The plan will be an opportunity to better communicate with the public and stakeholders about an array of issues that are occurring in the San Diego region. This plan will be more relevant and understandable to the planners, stakeholders, and community members that want one integrated long-range planning document. SANDAG staff hopes that this will lead to a more successful public engagement process. A draft work program went to the Board in September 2012, and after that, it went to various Working Groups at SANDAG and the three Policy Advisory Committees. The final work plan and schedule was received by the Board at the end of February 2013.

Mr. Trom informed that at the time that the 2050 RTP/SCS was approved, the Board committed to several planning elements. Those were developing into a Regional Transit-Oriented Development Strategy, a Regional Complete Streets Strategy, an Active Transportation and Implementation Strategy, an enhancement to our Travel Demand Model, and a look at specific alternative land use scenarios. The plan also will look to refine and develop policy areas. There are nine specific policy

areas that have come from the twelve that were included in the RCP. Those nine areas are public health, land use/regional growth/urban forum/and housing, healthy environment, infrastructure and public facilities, social equity and environmental justice, economic strategies, borders, military, and transportation.

This plan is similar to the other RTP in that SANDAG will evaluate projects in the plan, develop a network of projects, see what is affordable with the cost of revenue equation, look at the environmental impacts and alternatives of those scenarios, and adopt air quality conformity. Air quality is really what drives the traditional four-year timeframe of the RTP. SANDAG needs a completed document by the summer of 2015 to ensure that the region still receives transportation funding (about \$219 billion). The RCP does not have that similar requirement, but combining it with the RTP then requires a 2015 completion year.

There is a completed work plan and schedule, and calendar year 2013 will focus on the vision goals and policy objectives that the Board of Directors is deliberating on. Those efforts will be combined with a broad regionally significant survey effort. Telephone surveys will be used to assess the public's desires for the future direction of the San Diego Region.

The nine previously listed policy areas will be turned into nine research white papers over the next year. Those nine policy areas will be weaved into the chapter development and will inform the transportation scenario development and ultimately will be key appendices to *San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan*. The land use policy area was added in response to critiques in the past that SANDAG did not look enough at alternate land uses. SANDAG acknowledged that as part of a commitment that the Board made when they approved the last RTP. SANDAG expects the whole plan to be completed by 2015.

For more information or to leave questions or comments, log on to [sandag.org/sandiegoforward](http://sandag.org/sandiegoforward).

Several of the Working Group members had questions for Mr. Trom:

- Mr. Beck asked how the white papers will ultimately be integrated into policy decisions, budget, and determinations.
- Mr. Trom answered that there are three stages of information. Some of the white papers are topics SANDAG has dealt with recently in the RTP, some topics are part of the RCP; and therefore, have not been dealt with in a while, and there are those topics that SANDAG has never dealt with. There are various stages where those existing policies lie at SANDAG. For example, for energy-related topics there are the Regional Energy Strategy and Climate Action Strategy documents. There are several documents that are disparate and this will be a chance to bring all of those documents together for one voice on the policy area. Public health is a new policy area for a SANDAG plan and will be an opportunity to see how it can be integrated into policies. SANDAG is hoping to see the plan evolve into the three "E" approach: economy, environment, and social equity. This is an opportunity to look at emerging areas and evaluate the models SANDAG calibrates to those areas. Board and Policy Advisory Committee members said that they would like SANDAG to group together these policy areas as much as possible as they develop, so there can be cohesive discussions.

SANDAG is at the front end of the plan and trying to understand what the key questions are. Those questions and the feedback should help to form the development of the chapters.

- James Whalen asked what effect the litigation for the RTP will have on this plan.
- Mr. Trom emphasized that this is an entirely new plan that is not tied to the last RTP and; therefore, the litigation should not impact the current planning effort. These plans need to be updated anyway, so this is an opportunity provide a more integrated approach. This is a unique plan that is not part of the RTP litigation.
- Dr. Emily Young, The San Diego Foundation, asked if SANDAG is adapting the new urban footprint scenario into to this new plan. She also asked how it relates to the policy white papers.
- Mr. Trom informed that SANDAG is using the CalThorp product, since one of SANDAG's prior commitments was alternative land use/transportation scenarios. The current model that SANDAG uses takes several days to run, but since SANDAG is looking at individual models, the CalThorp model allows models to run without wholesale running the model. With that element, SANDAG will be using that model for the eight to twelve scenarios and finding the best one. By the time SANDAG runs a model, they have already learned from that exercise of running an urban footprint.
- Chair Downey added that the EMPWG has a lot of expertise. She encouraged that as the white papers move forward, members review them and verify that the answers to the questions that are of importance to them go into the final plan.

**ITEM #5: SAN DIEGO FORWARD: THE REGIONAL PLAN: KEY POLICY ISSUES AFFECTING THE REGIONAL HABITAT CONSERVATION (Keith Greer, SANDAG)**

Mr. Greer presented on the key issues affecting regional habitat conservation as they relate to *San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan*. This was the fourth time aspects related to the Regional Plan have come before the Working Group. The Working Group previously heard the Public Participation Plan for the whole project, and then Carolina Gregor of SANDAG, presented the Public Involvement Plan for the Regional Plan, and at the last meeting, David Hicks elaborated on the final Public Involvement Plan. Sustained public engagement is a commitment that SANDAG made to all of the working groups and the public. As part of that commitment, SANDAG kicked off the whole program with a workshop in October 2012 at Caltrans. SANDAG wishes to continue that evolution of getting information and feedback to and from larger groups. For example, SANDAG staff has discussed the possibility of a joint workshop for healthy environments, which includes habitat conservation, climate change, water quality, public health, etc. There will be additional workshops and opportunities at the EMPWG to look at the draft white papers.

Mr. Greer voiced that he would like feedback on concepts that EMP members would like in the white papers. Those listed previously are key issues that SANDAG staff and stakeholders have put together, but wanted to know if those were the right key issues to address in the white papers. He added that nothing is finalized and SANDAG is still hoping to solicit input.

Page 19 of the agenda listed the three major issues that SANDAG staff believes should be addressed in the region. One is Regional Habitat Conservation Plans (the cost-effective methods for managing those lands and options for funding), another is planning and funding for wildfires and biodiversity and preservation along the urban interface (how to better plan for those, what are the tools so we can proactively respond), and the last was how to plan for future impacts from climate change (sea level rise, extreme heat events, increase in wildfires, changes in the amount of rainfall).

Mr. Greer opened the Working Group up to discussion:

- Susan Wynn, USFWS, asked what was meant by completion of the habitat conservation plans.
- Mr. Greer explained that it is open-ended, and SANDAG would like input to understand the impediments.
- Mr. Grim explained that even if a regional habitat conservation plan is not adopted, that it does not mean that there are not covered species in that jurisdiction and that there are not lands that need conservation and management. He added that more exploration is needed for alternatives, and explained that a local jurisdiction cannot be forced to adopt a plan if they do not want to.
- David Mayer, California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), commented that there are many reasons why different jurisdictions have struggled, and it may be easier to put those reasons in writing and submit them to Mr. Greer.
- Dr. Emily Young described the impacts of energy and water infrastructure. She questioned how extending San Diego's service delivery boundaries will affect land use and habitat conservation issues. She also emphasized the need to balance our renewable energy structure with habitat.
- Chair Downey added that San Diego is missing how renewable energy affects habitats and species. The region should look to see what can be done for that.
- Mr. Beck agreed with previous comments and added that he would prefer that the first item focus on quality of life as our existing commitment for regional funding. He agreed with Ms. Nygaard that areas within the regional habitat preserves need more attention on regional security (i.e., enforcement). Mr. Beck suggested the broad issue of climate change be broken up into large issue areas. One issue unique to San Diego is the impact to the lagoons and estuaries and they should receive more attention. While the region is behind the curve for planning, Mr. Beck believes that there are maps that will allow real planning to occur. He introduced the possibility of discussing a binational conservation strategy. He believes a good role for SANDAG is participation at a habitat level with federal and state policy and funding discussions. He thinks that there should be more focus on control of invasive plant and animal species when they have such a systemic impact on habitat properties and the funding priorities for land managers. Lastly, Mr. Beck commented that it would be nice to know if East County will actually have a plan.
- Chair Downey asked what alternatives exist if the East County Plan never actualizes. How do jurisdictions deal with the habitat if they cannot get funding?

- Mr. Whalen commented that there is nine years of work behind the Quality of Life Initiative and while it was obvious that the voters were not going to vote in favor of funding that initiative at the present time, he thinks that work should be used for the time being until the region is ready to approve it. Mr. Whalen added that it seems that jurisdictions are dealing with renewable energy plans in an almost ad hoc way with cumulative impacts associated with renewable energies and wildlife habitat. He suggested SANDAG organize all of those impacts and act as a moderator. He agreed that the rest of the habitat conservation plans should be finished, but it all comes down to money.
- Bill Tippetts, The Nature Conservancy, shared that several groups outside of SANDAG have been examining whether there is any value of increasing the green aspect of urban cities in relationship to climate change and mitigation adaptation. Those groups also have been looking at whether or not the green aspect of urban cities can be linked to regional open space. San Diego is unique in its expensive commitments to habitat conservation right outside the city, but the cities have basically been redlined and written off. Now, the City of San Diego has made investments by dedicating 6,000 acres of open space and funding the Urban Forest Plan and if SANDAG could look at that and integrate some of the emerging ideas, it cuts across many different policy papers.
- Michelle Mattson, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, added that there are new water quality standards for hydro-modification and treatment. There are some new guidelines to capture all of the runoff, which Ms. Mattson explained that does not make sense for every watershed or sub-basin, but in some cases it does.
- A member of the public commented that two things should be considered. What needs to change, in terms of goals and objectives, based upon anticipated climate change, and how is recreational use better accommodated? There is a large recreational use demand and much of it is focused on the natural land. How do jurisdictions integrate that in a way that allows that habitat to produce the products land managers want in terms of species and habitats and also provide further recreational use?
- Mr. Beck commented that the region is still struggling with the idea of reclaimed water so that seems like a good white paper topic.
- A member of the public agreed with Mr. Tippetts' comments on urban greening and the benefits of increasing our gardens, open space, or trees. Land managers have high values for habitat and individual species, but from the public's standpoint, managers need to weave in the idea of "*what does this mean to me.*" Urban greening is important to bringing nature and the nature experience into people's daily lives. The voting public's perspective needs to be considered.
- Chair Downey added that at the time that the Quality of Life initiative survey was conducted, there was a lot of interest in water issues. Citizens recognize that Southern California is often in a drought and the region should look at options. She suggested that if the jurisdictions can tie that in with habitat, it might resonate with the public.

- A member of the public commented that aside from water bills, water generally does not have a direct effect on our lives. There needs to be a way to connect water to other effects. There needs to be emphasis on how water allows the park to be green or the tree to grow in the canyon. Simply talking about water conservation does not give the public anything in your daily life, so jurisdictions need to connect that to other experiences and benefits.
- Christina Schaefer, ESA, informed the Working Group that the county is conducting hydro-modification studies right now, and could provide a baseline model for the white paper.
- Dr. Robert Fisher commented on the urban interface piece. He explained that the Sunrise Power Link now has a \$2 million grant program for houses at the urban interface (6,000 homes last year and another 6,000 this year). Homeowners are offered \$2,000 grants for habitat modification. Unfortunately, there are not any guidelines provided, nor a link to what residents might do that would be beneficial for the habitat. There is also no explanation given to the homeowner as to why they should modify their home versus just taking the money and having someone remove all of the vegetation within 100 feet. He believes that a link back to the grants program would be important since it will continue for the next 50 years.
- Dr. Emily Young shared that it is best to find a way to reconcile access, recreational use, and active transportation infrastructure with habitat preservation in a way that meets both needs.

Any comments on white paper topics should be sent to Keith Greer (keith.greer@sandag.org).

**ITEM #6: SAN DIEGO MULTIPLE SPECIES CONSERVATION PLAN STATUS REPORT: 1997-2011 (Susan Wynn, USFWS)**

Susan Wynn, USFWS, presented the status report of the Multiple Species Conservation Plan (MSCP) for 1997-2011. The report is a snapshot of the summary of what has happened to date with the MSCP. The document includes the status of the preserve, the covered species, and the available range of monitoring data. The document summarizes the thought process and all of the reports that have been funded through Fish and Wildlife and *TransNet*. The report provides recommendations on where data management and funding should go. The report includes a recommendation that reflects the work by the EMPWG and San Diego Management and Monitoring Program (SDMMP) for managing and monitoring.

Ms. Wynn informed the group that over 109,000 acres of the preserve have been conserved to date out of 171,000 acres. An additional 25,000 acres that are outside of the preserve have been conserved through various acquisitions. The MSCP was broken into core areas for evaluation and to provide more detail. Some of those cores have a majority of their lands conserved and others have yet to achieve conservation goals. On average, 45 percent of the core areas have been conserved. A map provides data for the linkages and shows that while some are great, others linkages are still highly constrained.

All land conservation goals have been achieved for 13 plant species. Most goals were achieved for 12 plants, some conservation goals have been achieved for 17 plant species, and minimal conservation goals have been achieved for a few plant species. The information can be misleading since there are narrow endemic species that occur in the coastal strand in jurisdictions where the state parks do not have plans, which means that those lands may never be a part of the MSCP. Those species are predominantly the coastal species and are flagged in the report to explain why their numbers appear low. Ms. Wynn explained the less positive situation for the animal species in the preserve. She shared a few examples of species in the report to explain the structure. There are appendices for the plants and the animals. In the report, species were evaluated based on habitat points and populations.

- Mr. Whalen asked to what extent are the 25,000 acres figured in to conservation levels. Is the percentage conserved based on the aggregate of all of the land that has been conserved?
- Ms. Wynn replied that those 25,000 acres were preserved outside of the Multiple Habitat Planning Area (MHPA). Therefore, were not included in the information and were accounted for separately. She shared that the preserve is great in some areas, but in other very critical areas, it is not in the condition that it should be. Both types of areas and their linkages are spotlighted in the report with maps. The map shows where the gaps are and what core areas and linkages need improvement.
- Ms. Schaefer commented that San Diego is now 18 years into the MSCP process and asked whether the work and funding by the EMP program towards conserved lands shows in the data.
- Ms. Wynn replied that the EMP efforts are reflected in the increase in focus on management and monitoring. Federal, state, and local grants in the first ten years focused on acquisition of the land. Now the focus is on management and effectiveness rather than just acquisition.

The report is available on the SDMMP website to download ([www.sdmmp.com/Home.aspx](http://www.sdmmp.com/Home.aspx)).

**ITEM# 7: FY 2013 LAND MANAGEMENT GRANTS: EVALUATION COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS (EMPWG Vice Chair, Mike Grim, City of Carlsbad; and Katie Levy, SANDAG)**

Glen Laube, Dr. Fisher, Mr. Tippetts, and Mr. Beck had conflicts of interest for this item and recused themselves.

Katie Levy, SANDAG, presented the FY 2013 Land Management Grants Evaluation Committee recommendations. She gave the Working Group background on the grant proposal process.

- September 28, 2012: SANDAG Board of Directors approved a call for projects for land management grants totaling \$2 million.
- November 1, 2012: The call for proposals was issued.
- December 6, 2012: A pre-proposal workshop was held to discuss the grant requirements and processes as well as to answer any questions.

- January 8, 2013: The EMPWG appointed an ad hoc committee to evaluate and review the applications.
- January 25, 2013: The ad hoc committee had a teleconference to discuss the categories of eligibility and to discuss criteria adopted by the Board (Attachment 9 on page 28).
- January 29, 2013: 34 proposals were received at the close of the call for projects. Two members of the ad hoc committee, Mr. Tippetts and Megan Cooper, recused themselves due to a conflict of interest. At that point, Mr. Greer stepped in as one of the members of the ad hoc committee.
- February 27, 2013: The ad hoc committee met to discuss their individual recommendations, which were completed prior to the meeting for SANDAG staff to compile (Attachment 2 on page 32). The committee discussed the proposals regarding merit, shortcomings, conditions, and reductions in funding based upon availability.

The proposed funding received was distributed proportionately to the funding available for each category and eligible activities. Thirteen proposals were received for the Habitat Restoration and Invasive Control category and five were recommended for funding for a total of \$800,000 in funding. Thirteen proposals were received for the Species Specific Management category and seven were recommended for a total of \$800,000. Eight proposals were received for the Habitat Maintenance, Access Management, and Volunteer Coordination category and three were recommended for a total of \$400,000.

Staff will present the recommendations at the April 5 RPC and TC meetings for the committee's information and discussion. All outstanding exhibits and resolutions must be received by SANDAG by April 15. Staff will return again on May 3 to RPC/TC for recommendation to the Board of Directors. The Board will then be asked to approve the ad hoc committee's recommended projects at the May 24, 2013, meeting. Any applicants who are not recommended for funding can email Ms. Levy (katie.levy@sandag.org) to schedule a time for a conference call or a brief meeting at SANDAG.

Mr. Grim informed the group that the whole process has worked very well for the last few years. Last year was the first year the Working Group had separate categories for habitat maintenance, specific species, and habitat restoration. He encouraged applicants to continue the good work, and he suggested they speak with Ms. Levy on how they ranked and apply next time there is a Call-for-Projects. He explained that while there is a need for many of the proposed projects, unfortunately, SANDAG is unable to fund them all. Mr. Grim presented a summary of the grants that were recommended and how they will be funding.

- Chair Downey asked how the grantees would decide to spend the recommended funding if not fully funded.
- Ms. Wynn replied that the grantees could, for example, choose one site to receive funding for all three years, or they could have all of their sites receive funding for only one year.

- Dr. Young asked how the committee could be sure that a project could have the same success with only receiving partial funding.
- Mr. Grim replied that all applicants were available via phone during the evaluation meeting and could explain to the ad hoc evaluation members whether or not these changes would still allow the goals to be achieved.
- Mr. Greer explained that last year CBI applied and requested multiple years of funding. At that time, the committee could only fund one year and CBI grantees were told to apply again the following year. CBI applied again, and again only one year could be funded with the recommendation to also apply again next cycle.
- Mr. Grim explained that funding was only granted to projects provided they get to the point of being self-sustaining.
- Mr. Whalen added that the ability to communicate back and forth with the applicants was helpful, and he encouraged any of the applicants who did not receive a recommendation this year to apply again.
- Mr. Grim presented brief summaries for the projects that are being recommended for funding.

Ms. Wynn motioned to recommend the list of grant projects to the RPC, and Mr. Whalen seconded the motion. The motion carried without opposition.

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

The next meeting of the EMPWG is scheduled for Tuesday, May 14, 2013, from 1 to 3 p.m. Tentative topics include the Preserve Management Standardization Plan and the South County Community Outreach Project.

Chair Downey adjourned the meeting at 2:30 p.m.