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**REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE AGENDA**

Friday, March 7, 2014
12 noon to 2 p.m.
SANDAG Board Room
401 B Street, 7th Floor
San Diego

**AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS**

- **SAN DIEGO FORWARD: THE REGIONAL PLAN:** DRAFT PERFORMANCE MEASURES
- **SAN DIEGO FORWARD: THE REGIONAL PLAN:** EMERGING TECHNOLOGIES WHITE PAPER OUTLINE
- **TransNet ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION PROGRAM: LAND ACQUISITION GRANT PROGRAM INITIAL EVALUATION RESULTS**

**PLEASE TURN OFF CELL PHONES DURING THE MEETING**

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

**MISSION STATEMENT**

The Regional Planning Committee provides oversight for the preparation and implementation of the Regional Comprehensive Plan that is based on the local general plans and regional plans and addresses interregional issues with surrounding counties and Mexico. The components of the plan include: transportation, housing, environment (shoreline, air quality, water quality, habitat), economy, borders, regional infrastructure needs and financing, and land use and design.
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. Members of the public may address the Committee on any issue under the agenda item entitled Public Comments/Communications/Member Comments. Public speakers are limited to three minutes or less per person. The Regional Planning Committee may take action on any item appearing on the agenda.

Public comments regarding the agenda can be sent to SANDAG via comment@sandag.org. Please include the agenda item, your name, and your organization. Email comments should be received no later than 12 noon, two working days prior to the Regional Planning Committee meeting. Any handouts, presentations, or other materials from the public intended for distribution at the Regional Planning Committee meeting should be received by the Clerk of the Committee no later than 12 noon, two working days prior to the meeting.

In order to keep the public informed in an efficient manner and facilitate public participation, SANDAG also provides access to all agenda and meeting materials online at www.sandag.org/meetings. Additionally, interested persons can sign up for e-notifications via our e-distribution list at either the SANDAG website or by sending an email request to webmaster@sandag.org.

SANDAG operates its programs without regard to race, color, and national origin in compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act. SANDAG has developed procedures for investigating and tracking Title VI complaints and the procedures for filing a complaint are available to the public upon request. Questions concerning SANDAG nondiscrimination obligations or complaint procedures should be directed to SANDAG General Counsel, John Kirk, at (619) 699-1997 or john.kirk@sandag.org. Any person who believes himself or herself or any specific class of persons to be subjected to discrimination prohibited by Title VI also may file a written complaint with the Federal Transit Administration.

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

SANDAG agenda materials can be made available in alternative languages. To make a request, call (619) 699-1900 at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting.

Los materiales de la agenda de SANDAG están disponibles en otros idiomas. Para hacer una solicitud, llame al (619) 699-1900 al menos 72 horas antes de la reunión.

如有需要，我们可以把SANDAG议程材料翻译成其他语言。请在会议前至少 72 小时打电话 (619) 699-1900 提出请求。
ITEM # | RECOMMENDATION
--- | ---
+1. | APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

The Regional Planning Committee is asked to review and approve the minutes from its February 7, 2014, meeting.

2. | PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

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

CONSENT (3)

+3. | TransNet ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION PROGRAM: LAND MANAGEMENT GRANT PROGRAM QUARTERLY STATUS UPDATE (Katie Levy)

The Board of Directors has approved six cycles of the TransNet Environmental Mitigation Program Land Management Grant Program. This report provides information on the quarterly status of active projects.

REPORTS (4 through 9)

+4. | SAN DIEGO FORWARD: THE REGIONAL PLAN: DRAFT PERFORMANCE MEASURES (Rachel Kennedy)

Performance measures are used to compare the multimodal network scenarios, and will aid the Board of Directors in the selection of a preferred network of transportation projects for the Regional Plan. The Regional Planning Committee is asked to recommend that the Board of Directors accept/approve the draft performance measures for use in the development of San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan.

+5. | SAN DIEGO FORWARD: THE REGIONAL PLAN: EMERGING TECHNOLOGIES WHITE PAPER OUTLINE (James Dreisbach-Towle)

Staff is preparing a white paper on emerging technologies for use in the development of San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan. This item presents the white paper outline for feedback and discussion, and reports on discussion of emerging technologies at the SANDAG Board Retreat and working group meetings.
The California Public Utilities Commission offers two funding mechanisms for local government energy efficiency programs: Local Government Partnerships and Regional Energy Networks. Staff will provide an overview of these two funding mechanisms as possible options for local government energy programs in the coming year.

SANDAG received 17 project proposals for the FY 2014 Call for Projects for the TransNet Environmental Mitigation Program Land Acquisition Grant Program. This report provides the list of prioritized project proposals, including the top-ranked project proposals that will be appraised.

The Draft Bay Delta Conservation Plan and associated Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement were released for public review in December 2013. The plan is a 50-year habitat conservation plan with the twin goals of restoring the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta ecosystem and securing California water supplies for 25 million Californians, including San Diego. The public review and comment period ends on April 14, 2014. A presentation will be made for the Committee’s information.

The Metro Wastewater Joint Powers Authority would like to advance a water reuse plan that diversifies and increases locally controlled water supplies while reducing flows at the Point Loma Wastewater Treatment Plant. This will support permanent acceptance of Point Loma as a smaller advanced primary treatment plant. A presentation on this subject will be made for the Committee’s information.

The next Regional Planning Committee meeting is scheduled on Friday, April 4, 2014.

+ next to an agenda item indicates an attachment
REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION AND ACTIONS

FEBRUARY 7, 2014

The meeting of the Regional Planning Committee was called to order by Vice Chair Lesa Heebner (North County Coastal), at 12:02 p.m. See the attached attendance sheet for Regional Planning Committee (RPC) member attendance.

1. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES (APPROVE)

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Jerry Jones (East County), and a second by Councilmember Mike Woiwode, Coronado (South County), the RPC approved the minutes from its December 7, 2013, meeting. Yes – Vice Chair Heebner, Councilmember Woiwode, Councilmember Jones, Councilmember Lorie Zapf (City of San Diego), and Supervisor Dave Roberts (County of San Diego). No – None. Abstain – None. Absent – Mayor Sam Abed (North County Inland).

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/ COMMUNICATIONS/ MEMBER COMMENTS

There were no public comments.

CONSENT (3)

3. SAN DIEGO FORWARD: THE REGIONAL PLAN: RESULTS OF ALTERNATIVE LAND USE SCENARIOS (INFORMATION)

The results of the alternative land use scenarios to reduce greenhouse gas emissions were presented to the SANDAG Board of Directors in December. The Board report was attached for information.

Action: Upon a motion by Supervisor Roberts and a second by Councilmember Woiwode, the RPC approved Consent Item No. 3. Yes – Vice Chair Heebner, Councilmember Woiwode, Councilmember Jones, Councilmember Zapf, Supervisor Roberts, and Mayor Abed. No – None. Abstain – None. Absent – None.
CHAIR’S REPORT (4)

4. WORKING GROUPS THAT REPORT TO THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE
   (INFORMATION)

Seven working groups report to the RPC. The attached report outlined each of the working
group's roles, responsibilities, and membership.

Coleen Clementson, Principal Planner, presented this item. Chairs and Vice Chairs of the
working groups introduced themselves to the RPC and made brief presentations on the
membership composition and work efforts being undertaken by their working groups.

Action: This item was presented for information only.

REPORTS (5 through 8)

5. TransNet SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM AND ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION GRANT
   PROGRAM: STATUS UPDATE (APPROVE)

This report provided an overview of the progress made through
September 30, 2013, for projects awarded through the TransNet Smart Growth Incentive
Program and Active Transportation Grant Program. The RPC was asked to approve a no-cost,
time-only schedule extension for the City of San Diego Park Boulevard/City College/
San Diego High Pedestrian and Transit Access Improvements Smart Growth Incentive
Program project.

Suchi Mukherjee, Regional Planner, presented the item, and staff from Civic San Diego
provided information about the proposed schedule extension for the City of San Diego
Smart Growth Incentive Program project.

Action: Upon a motion by Mayor Sam Abed, and second by Councilmember Zapf, the RPC
approved a no-cost, time-only schedule extension for the City of San Diego
Park Boulevard/City College/San Diego High Pedestrian and Transit Access Improvements
Smart Growth Incentive Program project. Yes – Vice Chair Heebner, Councilmember Woiwode, Mayor Abed, Supervisor Roberts, Councilmember Zapf, and
Councilmember Jerry Jones. No – None. Abstain – None. Absent – None.

6. SAN DIEGO FORWARD: THE REGIONAL PLAN: DRAFT PERFORMANCE MEASURES
   (DISCUSSION)

Performance measures are used to compare multimodal network scenarios, and aid the
Board of Directors in the future selection of a preferred network of transportation projects
for the Regional Plan. RPC members were asked to discuss and provided feedback on the
initial draft performance measures.

Rachel Kennedy, Senior Planner, presented this item.

Action: This item was presented for discussion only.
7. TransNet ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION PROGRAM: ANNUAL STATUS REPORT (INFORMATION)

This report provided the annual status update on the implementation of the TransNet Environmental Mitigation Program.

Keith Greer, Senior Planner, presented the item.

Action: This item was presented for information only.

8. PORT OF SAN DIEGO PLANNING EFFORTS (INFORMATION)

Port of San Diego staff provided a presentation highlighting various port planning initiatives, including the Integrated Port Master Plan and the 50-year visioning effort.

Keith Walzak, Port of San Diego, presented the item.

Action: This item was presented for information only.

9. UPCOMING MEETINGS (INFORMATION)

The next RPC meeting is scheduled for Friday, March 7, 2014.

10. ADJOURNMENT

Vice Chair Heebner adjourned the meeting at 2:02 p.m.
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TransNet ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION PROGRAM:  
LAND MANAGEMENT GRANT PROGRAM QUARTERLY  
STATUS UPDATE

Introduction

The Board of Directors entered into a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with state and federal agencies on the implementation of the Environmental Mitigation Program (EMP). Originally signed on February 22, 2008, the MOA was most recently amended on April 26, 2013.

A provision of the MOA allocates $4 million annually for ten years to implement regional habitat management and monitoring efforts to help maintain the region’s biological integrity, thus avoiding the future listing of endangered species. Allocation of the $4 million is done on an annual basis by the Board of Directors pursuant to a Five-Year Funding Strategy (originally approved on December 15, 2006, and last updated by the Board of Directors on December 21, 2012).

The Five-Year Funding Strategy is designed to strategically allocate funding for land management and monitoring activities under the EMP, as approved annually by the Board of Directors. The Board of Directors allocates a portion of the $4 million annually for the TransNet EMP Land Management Grant Program. The purpose of this report is to provide information to the Committee on the quarterly status of active land management grant projects (Attachment 1).

Discussion

The TransNet Extension Ordinance and Expenditure Plan, approved by the voters in November 2004, includes the EMP, which provides funding to mitigate habitat impacts from regional and local transportation projects, and provides funding for regional land management and biological monitoring. A portion of this funding is distributed through a competitive Land Management Grant Program, which is administered consistent with the requirements identified in Board Policy No. 035: Competitive Grant Program Procedures (Attachment 2).

Since the program’s inception, 70 land management grants totaling $11.3 million in TransNet funding have been awarded to land management entities in the region through a competitive grant program. Eligible applicants include land managers from private, non-profit organizations; local jurisdictions; and other government agencies. Thirty-two grants were completed as of December 2013, when the FY 2014 1st Quarter status report was presented to the Committee. Subsequently, two more grant projects have been completed, San Dieguito River Park Joint Powers Authority, Invasive Species Removal and Habitat Restoration, and Groundwork San Diego Chollas Creek, Radio-Encanto Canyons Restoration Phase 2. Attachment 1 provides the FY 2014 2nd Quarter status report of the 36 active land management grants through December 31, 2013.
Projects under the EMP Land Management Grant Program are placed on the “watch list” if a grantee is not making timely progress toward their milestones (which are defined in Board Policy No. 035) and the grantee has not yet sought corrective action. Delays in tasks leading up to either the award of a contract or project completion may place grantees on the “watch list.” As of the date of this quarterly report, no projects are currently on the watch list.

**Grant Oversight**

SANDAG staff provides ongoing oversight of projects under the TransNet-funded EMP Land Management Grant Program through review of quarterly reports and invoices. Annual and quarterly status updates are provided to the TransNet Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee (ITOC) and the Regional Planning and Transportation Committees.

Staff reviews quarterly reports to ensure that grantees are making timely progress with respect to Board Policy No. 035 provisions (described below), and to ensure that the project submission of deliverables matches the scopes of work in their grant contract agreements.

**Next Steps**

The FY 2014 3rd Quarter status report (covering January 1 to March 30, 2014) is expected to be presented in June 2014 to the Regional Planning and Transportation Committees and the ITOC.

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

Attachments: 1. Status of Active Land Management Grants FY 2014 2nd Quarter: Reporting Period October 1 to December 31, 2013  
2. Board Policy No. 035: Competitive Grant Program Procedures  

Key Staff Contact: Katie Levy, (619) 699-7312, katie.levy@sandag.org
### Status of Active Land Management Grants FY 2014 2nd Quarter

**Reporting period October 1 to December 31, 2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2008</th>
<th>Grantee</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description of Project Activities</th>
<th>Grant Amount</th>
<th>Contract Execution Date</th>
<th>Contract / Project Expiration Date</th>
<th>Watch List*</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
<td>Shinohara Vernal Pools</td>
<td>Continuation of existing vernal pool project. Needs continued weeding to keep weeds from invading created vernal pools. Thirty new pools to be created.</td>
<td>$308,238.00</td>
<td>07/02/09</td>
<td>12/31/14</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward their milestones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>City of Chula Vista</td>
<td>Cactus Wren Restoration</td>
<td>Coastal cactus wren habitat enhancement project - active management of suitable cactus wren habitat, restore degraded and/or fragmented cholla patches, and initiate activities to reduce edge effects.</td>
<td>$373,048.00</td>
<td>01/01/09</td>
<td>09/30/14</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward their milestones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
<td>SDNWR Cactus Wren Habitat Enhancement</td>
<td>Enhance coastal cactus wren habitat in high priority area in San Diego National Wildlife Refuge.</td>
<td>$180,070.00</td>
<td>07/02/09</td>
<td>12/31/14</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward their milestones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>County San Diego</td>
<td>Salt Creek Cactus Wren Habitat Restoration</td>
<td>Enhance, restore, expand, and monitor coastal cactus wren habitat in the Salt Creek area.</td>
<td>$125,000.00</td>
<td>01/01/09</td>
<td>05/30/15</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward their milestones.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2009</th>
<th>Grantee</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description of Project Activities</th>
<th>Grant Amount</th>
<th>Contract Execution Date</th>
<th>Contract / Project Expiration Date</th>
<th>Watch List*</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>City of Carlsbad</td>
<td>Calavera Preserve Planning Area</td>
<td>Provide access control, habitat restoration, and public outreach for the 735-acre Calavera Preserve Planning Area.</td>
<td>$286,667.00</td>
<td>09/30/09</td>
<td>12/31/14</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward their milestones.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2010</th>
<th>Grantee</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description of Project Activities</th>
<th>Grant Amount</th>
<th>Contract Execution Date</th>
<th>Contract / Project Expiration Date</th>
<th>Watch List*</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>San Diego River Conservancy</td>
<td>San Diego River Habitat</td>
<td>Invasive species control, re-treatment, restoration of native species, access control, increased park patrol and landowner outreach along the river in San Diego, Santee, and El Monte Valley.</td>
<td>$527,736.15</td>
<td>02/15/11</td>
<td>03/01/15</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward their milestones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>Lusardi Creek</td>
<td>Removal and treatment of non-native grasslands in order to restore ecological and hydrological functions of riparian areas of the Lusardi Creek Preserve that were burned in the 2007 wildfires.</td>
<td>$107,060.00</td>
<td>04/12/11</td>
<td>01/31/15</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward their milestones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>City of San Diego, Public Utilities Department</td>
<td>San Pasqual Valley Weed Management</td>
<td>Geographic Information System (GIS) database and an Integrated Weed Management Plan for San Pasqual Valley through data collection, mapping, and plan preparation.</td>
<td>$184,623.00</td>
<td>04/01/11</td>
<td>03/31/14</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project was not making timely progress toward their milestones. Grantee took corrective action and 6 month amendment was approved per Board Policy No. 035. Grantee has confirmed project completion by 3/31/14.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Watch List Projects are those grantees not making timely progress toward their milestones (which are defined in Board Policy No. 035) and not yet sought corrective action. Delays in tasks leading up to either the award of a contract or project completion may place grantees on the watch list.*
### Status of Active Land Management Grants FY 2014 2nd Quarter

Reporting period October 1 to December 31, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2010</th>
<th>Grantee</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description of Project Activities</th>
<th>Grant Amount</th>
<th>Contract Execution Date</th>
<th>Contract / Project Expiration Date</th>
<th>Watch List*</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>Lakeside Linkage</td>
<td>Plant coast prickly pear cactus on 5 acres adjacent to cactus wren populations, and control invasive plant species.</td>
<td>$200,824.00</td>
<td>04/12/11</td>
<td>01/31/17</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward their milestones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>City of Chula Vista</td>
<td>Chula Vista Tarplant</td>
<td>Restoration and enhancement for San Diego thornmint and Otay tarplant. Invasive control, dethatching, fencing, and monitoring.</td>
<td>$268,428.00</td>
<td>05/03/11</td>
<td>11/30/14</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward their milestones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Rocks Biological Consultants</td>
<td>Crest Canyon Invasive Removal</td>
<td>Invasive species mapping, and native species planting in Crest Canyon Open Space Park. Access control of unauthorized trail use through public outreach.</td>
<td>$74,480.00</td>
<td>03/28/11</td>
<td>11/30/14</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward their milestones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>San Elio Lagoon Conservancy</td>
<td>Carlsbad Hydrologic Unit</td>
<td>Throughout the Carlsbad Hydrologic Unit treat and monitor invasive plants, plant, and restore habitat. Map invasive plant infestations within the MHCP Core and Linkage Areas identified in Carlsbad Habitat Management Plan.</td>
<td>$194,455.00</td>
<td>04/06/12</td>
<td>07/31/14</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward their milestones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>San Diego Audubon Society</td>
<td>Mission Bay Park</td>
<td>Use habitat evaluation program to establish baseline habitat health to implement invasive species control and habitat restoration in Mission Bay Park.</td>
<td>$98,200.00</td>
<td>04/06/12</td>
<td>12/01/14</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward their milestones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Chaparral Lands Conservancy</td>
<td>Proctor Valley Vernal Pools</td>
<td>Restore and enhance quality of vernal pools and habitat at a 6-acre site in Proctor Valley.</td>
<td>$183,605.00</td>
<td>05/09/12</td>
<td>09/30/15</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward their milestones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Conservation Biology Institute</td>
<td>Brachypodium Removal</td>
<td>Develop and implement treatment strategies for the emerging invasive plant species Brachypodium. Restore impacted habitat on South Crest properties within the San Diego National Wildlife Refuge and Crestridge Ecological Reserve.</td>
<td>$233,975.00</td>
<td>04/05/12</td>
<td>06/30/14</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward their milestones. Grantee has confirmed project completion by 6/30/14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Zoological Society of San Diego</td>
<td>San Pasqual Valley</td>
<td>Develop and begin initial implementation of a subwatershed-level management plan to restore and manage native habitat to support Coastal Cactus Wren population in the San Pasqual Valley/Lake Hodges region of the San Dieguito Watershed.</td>
<td>$269,339.00</td>
<td>05/31/12</td>
<td>05/31/14</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward their milestones. Grantee has confirmed project completion by 5/31/14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>City of Chula Vista</td>
<td>Salt Creek Canyon</td>
<td>Restore and enhance degraded habitat for the Coastal Cactus Wren within the Salt Creek Canyon of the Otay Ranch Preserve. Conduct invasive species control, propagate cacti, and monitor Coastal Cactus Wren.</td>
<td>$182,282.00</td>
<td>04/30/12</td>
<td>08/31/15</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward their milestones.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Watch List Projects are those grantees not making timely progress toward their milestones (which are defined in Board Policy No. 035) and not yet sought corrective action. Delays in tasks leading up to either the award of a contract or project completion may place grantees on the watch list.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2011</th>
<th>Grantee</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description of Project Activities</th>
<th>Grant Amount</th>
<th>Contract Execution Date</th>
<th>Contract / Project Expiration Date</th>
<th>Watch List*</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>U.S. Geological Society</td>
<td>Western Pond Turtle</td>
<td>Conduct habitat suitability surveys for the Western Pond Turtle (WPT) on Marine Corps Base Camp Pendleton. Remove aquatic invasives and trap WPT.</td>
<td>$133,263.79</td>
<td>06/27/12</td>
<td>06/27/14</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward their milestones. Grantee has confirmed project completion by 6/27/14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Center for Natural Lands Management</td>
<td>Acanthomintha</td>
<td>Assess sites and collect plant materials, conduct local adaptation genetic study. Use the most appropriate molecular techniques to determine the genetic differences among occurrences.</td>
<td>$41,250.00</td>
<td>04/01/12</td>
<td>09/30/14</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward their milestones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
<td>SDNWR Golden Eagle</td>
<td>Enhance two existing rock ledges to be used as nest sites for Golden Eagles in the Jamul area. Monitor the area for eagle use.</td>
<td>$23,865.00</td>
<td>08/31/12</td>
<td>03/31/14</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward their milestones. Grantee has confirmed project completion by 3/31/14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Chaparral Lands Conservancy</td>
<td>Proctor Valley Vehicle Barriers</td>
<td>Install Off-Road-Vehicle barriers to close section of fencing between City of San Diego and CA Dept. of Fish and Game fencing in order to improve effectiveness of barriers in reducing illegal access.</td>
<td>$155,780.00</td>
<td>05/09/12</td>
<td>06/30/14</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward their milestones. Grantee has confirmed project completion by 6/30/14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2013</td>
<td>Mision Resource Conservation District</td>
<td>San Luis Rey and Santa Margarita Watersheds Arundo Re-treatment</td>
<td>Continue retreatments to continue moving towards the long-term goal of 100% eradication of invasive non-native Arundo in the Santa Margarita and San Luis Rey Watersheds.</td>
<td>$174,000.00</td>
<td>09/01/13</td>
<td>12/01/15</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward their milestones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Groundwork San Diego-Chollas Creek</td>
<td>Phase 3 Radio-Encanto Restoration, Maintenance, and Monitoring</td>
<td>Monitor recently created native habitat to implement Phase 3 Radio-Encanto Canyons Restoration/Maintenance/ Monitoring Program. Use matching funds to restore additional habitat in Radio Canyon.</td>
<td>$100,316.00</td>
<td>09/01/13</td>
<td>09/01/15</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward their milestones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Conservation Biology Institute</td>
<td>South County Grasslands Phase 2</td>
<td>Implement Phase 2 of South County Grasslands restoration and invasive control. Determine the most effective methods for site preparation, weed management, and seeding to prepare for and inform large-scale grassland restoration.</td>
<td>$272,307.00</td>
<td>09/01/13</td>
<td>12/01/14</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward their milestones.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Watch List Projects are those grantees not making timely progress toward their milestones (which are defined in Board Policy No. 035) and not yet sought corrective action. Delays in tasks leading up to either the award of a contract or project completion may place grantees on the watch list.
## Status of Active Land Management Grants FY 2014 2nd Quarter
### Reporting period October 1 to December 31, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Grantee</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description of Project Activities</th>
<th>Grant Amount</th>
<th>Contract Execution Date</th>
<th>Contract / Project Expiration Date</th>
<th>Watch List*</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
<td>SDNWR: (Shinohara) Vernal Pool Invasive Weed Treatment</td>
<td>Shinohara Parcel on SDNWR still has a substantial weed load. Hand weeding within restored pools and herbicide application adjacent to pools to treat weeds that inhibit full ecosystem function.</td>
<td>$ 95,400.00</td>
<td>09/01/13</td>
<td>01/01/15</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward their milestones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>Sycamore Canyon and Goodan Ranch Invasive Removal and Habitat Restoration</td>
<td>Treat and remove invasive non-native plant species in order to restore sensitive habitat within the Sycamore Canyon/Goodan Ranch Preserve.</td>
<td>$ 157,977.00</td>
<td>09/01/13</td>
<td>09/01/15</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward their milestones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Conservation Biology Institute</td>
<td>Dehesa nolina and Dudleya</td>
<td>Enhance, restore, and protect Dehesa nolina and variegated dudleya on portions of the South Crest property. Develop a science-based Conservation Vision and Management Strategy for Dehesa nolina in Management Unit 3.</td>
<td>$ 114,810.00</td>
<td>09/01/13</td>
<td>09/01/16</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward their milestones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Back Country Land Trust</td>
<td>San Diego thornmint and Quino Checkerspot Butterfly</td>
<td>Enhance native grassland habitat, populations of San Diego thornmint, and plantago erecta (host plant for Quino checkerspot butterfly) at Wright's Field.</td>
<td>$ 108,540.00</td>
<td>09/27/13</td>
<td>09/27/16</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward their milestones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>San Diego Audubon Society</td>
<td>California least tern</td>
<td>Observe and record predation events in order to provide recommendations for improving efficacy of predator management actions and in turn improve breeding productivity of CA least tern in Mission Bay Park.</td>
<td>$ 58,464.00</td>
<td>09/01/13</td>
<td>09/01/16</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward their milestones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Otay Water District</td>
<td>Cactus wren</td>
<td>Create cactus dominated Diegan coastal sage scrub habitat at the San Miguel Habitat Management Area that can support wintering cactus wren and a minimum of two pairs of nesting coastal cactus wrens.</td>
<td>$ 88,840.00</td>
<td>09/01/13</td>
<td>10/01/16</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward their milestones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Chaparral Lands Conservancy</td>
<td>Rare Plants</td>
<td>Prepare site plans for stabilization and expansion of Orcutt’s spineflower populations and site protection for spineflower, San Diego thornmint, and Short-leaved dudleya.</td>
<td>$ 137,610.50</td>
<td>09/01/13</td>
<td>09/01/15</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward their milestones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>San Elijo Lagoon Conservancy</td>
<td>North County Dunes Restoration (Coastal Species)</td>
<td>Survey and conduct restoration activities at potential dune habitat between northern Carlsbad and northern La Jolla in order to extend the range and increase the population of dune-dependent species CA least tern, Western snowy plover, and Nuttall’s lotus.</td>
<td>$ 180,144.00</td>
<td>09/01/13</td>
<td>09/01/15</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward their milestones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
<td>SD Bay NWR: California least tern and Western snowy plover Recovery at D Street Nesting Site</td>
<td>Support the recovery and protection of the CA least tern and western snowy plover through nest site preparation and predator management at the D St Fill.</td>
<td>$ 111,591.50</td>
<td>09/01/13</td>
<td>11/01/15</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward their milestones.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Watch List Projects are those grantees not making timely progress toward their milestones (which are defined in Board Policy No. 035) and not yet sought corrective action. Delays in tasks leading up to either the award of a contract or project completion may place grantees on the watch list.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grantee</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description of Project Activities</th>
<th>Grant Amount</th>
<th>Contract Execution Date</th>
<th>Contract / Project Expiration Date</th>
<th>Watch List*</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Earth Discovery Institute</td>
<td>South San Diego County Community Outreach and Habitat Stewardship</td>
<td>Expand conservation outreach and education in South County.</td>
<td>$ 164,650.00</td>
<td>08/01/13</td>
<td>10/01/14</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward their milestones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego River Park Foundation</td>
<td>San Diego River Park Watch</td>
<td>Institutionalize, enhance and further grow the San Diego River Park Watch program within Santee's River Park to be more effective.</td>
<td>$ 145,005.00</td>
<td>09/20/13</td>
<td>09/20/15</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward their milestones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Penasquitos Lagoon Foundation</td>
<td>Los Penasquitos Management</td>
<td>Protect Los Penasquitos Lagoon’s biological resources, public health and use through restoring tidal circulation, buffering sensitive habitats, and removal of urban debris.</td>
<td>$ 90,345.00</td>
<td>09/01/13</td>
<td>11/01/14</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward their milestones.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Watch List Projects are those grantees not making timely progress toward their milestones (which are defined in Board Policy No. 035) and not yet sought corrective action. Delays in tasks leading up to either the award of a contract or project completion may place grantees on the watch list.
COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM PROCEDURES

Applicability and Purpose of Policy

This Policy applies to the following grant programs administered through SANDAG, whether from TransNet or another source: Smart Growth Incentive Program, Environmental Mitigation Program, Bike and Pedestrian Program, Senior Mini Grant Program, Job Access Reverse Commute, New Freedom, and Section 5310 Elderly & Persons with Disabilities Transportation Program.

Nothing in this Policy is intended to supersede federal or state grant rules, regulations, statutes, or contract documents that conflict with the requirements in this Policy. There are never enough government grant funds to pay for all of the projects worthy of funding in the San Diego region. For this reason, SANDAG awards grant funds on a competitive basis that takes the grantees’ ability to perform their proposed project on a timely basis into account. SANDAG intends to hold grantees accountable to the project schedules they have proposed in order to ensure fairness in the competitive process and encourage grantees to get their projects implemented quickly so that the public can benefit from the project deliverables as soon as possible.

Procedures

1. Project Milestone and Completion Deadlines

1.1. When signing a grant agreement for a competitive program funded and/or administered by SANDAG, grant recipients must agree to the project delivery objectives and schedules in the agreement. In addition, a grantee’s proposal must contain a schedule that falls within the following deadlines. Failure to meet the deadlines below may result in revocation of all grant funds not already expended. The final invoice for capital, planning, or operations grants must be submitted prior to the applicable deadline.

1.1.1. Funding for Capital Projects. If the grant will fund a capital project, the project must be completed according to the schedule provided in the grant agreement, but at the latest, any necessary construction contract must be awarded within two years following execution of the grant agreement, and construction must be completed within eighteen months following award of the construction contract. Completion of construction for purposes of this policy shall be when the prime construction contractor is relieved from its maintenance responsibilities. If no construction contract award is necessary, the construction project must be complete within eighteen months following execution of the grant agreement.

1.1.2. Funding for Planning Grants. If the grant will fund planning, the project must be completed according to the schedule provided in the grant agreement, but at the latest, any necessary consultant contract must be awarded within one year following execution of the grant agreement, and the planning project must be complete within two years following award of the consultant contract. Completion of planning for purposes of this policy shall be when grantee approves the final planning project deliverable. If no consultant contract award is necessary, the
planning project must be complete within two years of execution of the grant agreement.

1.1.3 Funding for Operations Grants. If the grant will fund operations, the project must be completed according to the schedule provided in the grant agreement, but at the latest, any necessary services contract for operations must be awarded within one year following execution of the grant agreement, and the operations must commence within six months following award of the operations contract. If no services contract for operations is necessary, the operations project must commence within one year of execution of the grant agreement.

1.1.4 Funding for Equipment or Vehicles Grants. If the grant will fund equipment or vehicles, the project must be completed according to the schedule provided in the grant agreement, but at the latest, any necessary purchase contracts for equipment or vehicles must be awarded within one year following execution of the grant agreement, and use of the equipment or vehicles for the benefit of the public must commence within six months following award of the purchase contract.

2. Project Milestone and Completion Deadline Extensions

2.1. Schedules within grant agreements may include project scopes and schedules that will identify interim milestones in addition to those described in Section 1 of this Policy. Grant recipients may receive extensions on their project schedules of up to six months for good cause. Extensions of up to six months aggregate that would not cause the project to miss a completion deadline in Section 1 may be approved by the SANDAG Executive Director. Extensions beyond six months aggregate or that would cause the project to miss a completion deadline in Section 1 must be approved by the Policy Advisory Committee that has been delegated the necessary authority by the Board. For an extension to be granted under this Section 2, the following conditions must be met:

2.1.1. For extension requests of up to six months, the grantee must request the extension in writing to the SANDAG Program Manager at least two weeks prior to the earliest project schedule milestone deadline for which an extension is being requested. The Executive Director or designee will determine whether the extension should be granted. The Executive Director’s action will be reported out to the Board in following month’s report of delegated actions.

2.1.2. A grantee seeking an extension must document previous efforts undertaken to maintain the project schedule, explain the reasons for the delay, explain why the delay is unavoidable, and demonstrate an ability to succeed in the extended time frame the grantee proposes.

2.1.3. If the Executive Director denies an extension request under this Section 2, the grantee may appeal within ten business days of receiving the Executive Director’s response to the responsible Policy Advisory Committee by sending the appeal to the SANDAG Program Manager.

2.1.4. Extension requests that are rejected by the Policy Advisory Committee will result in termination of the grant agreement and obligation by the grantee to return to SANDAG any unexpended funds within 30 days. Unexpended funds are funds for project costs not incurred prior to rejection of the extension request by the Policy Advisory Committee.
3. Project Delays and Extensions in Excess of Six Months

3.1 Requests for extensions in excess of six months, or that will cause a project to miss a completion deadline in Section 1 (including those projects that were already granted extensions by the Executive Director and are again falling behind schedule), will be considered by the Policy Advisory Committee upon request to the SANDAG Program Manager.

3.2 A grantee seeking an extension must document previous efforts undertaken to maintain the project schedule, explain the reasons for the delay, explain why the delay is unavoidable, and demonstrate an ability to succeed in the extended time frame the grantee proposes. The grantee must provide the necessary information to SANDAG staff to place in a report to the Policy Advisory Committee. If sufficient time is available, and the grant utilized TransNet funds, the request will first be taken to the Independent Taxpayer Advisory Committee (ITOC) for a recommendation. The grantee should make a representative available at the meeting to present the information to, and/or answer questions from, the ITOC and Policy Advisory Committee.

3.3 The Policy Advisory Committee will only grant an extension under this Section 3 for extenuating circumstances that the grantee could not have reasonably foreseen.

4. Resolution and Execution of the Grant Agreement

4.1 Two weeks prior to the review by the Policy Advisory Committee of the proposed grants, prospective grantees must submit a resolution from their authorized governing body that includes the provisions in this Subsection 4.1. Failure to provide a resolution that meets the requirements in this Subsection 4.1 will result in rejection of the application and the application will be dropped from consideration with funding going to the next project as scored by the evaluation committee. In order to assist grantees in meeting this resolution deadline, when SANDAG issues the call for projects it will allow at least 90 days for grant application submission.

4.1.1 Grantee governing body commits to providing the amount of matching funds set forth in the grant application.

4.1.2 Grantee governing body authorizes staff to accept the grant funding and execute a grant agreement if an award is made by SANDAG.

4.2 Grantee’s authorized representative must execute the grant agreement within 45 days from the date SANDAG presents the grant agreement to the prospective grantee for execution. Failure to meet the requirements in this Subsection 4.2 may result in revocation of the grant award.

5. Increased Availability of Funding Under this Policy

5.1 Grant funds made available as a result of the procedures in this Policy may be awarded to the next project on the recommended project priority list from the most recent project selection process, or may be added to the funds available for the next project funding cycle, at the responsible Policy Advisory Committee’s discretion. Any project that loses funding due to failure to meet the deadlines specified in this Policy may be resubmitted to compete for funding in a future call for grant applications.

Adopted: January 2010
**Projected housing and job growth – 1999**  
(Series 9 Regional Growth Forecast)  

**Projected housing and job growth – 2013**  
(Series 13 Regional Growth Forecast)
Policy Advisory Committee Feedback

At its February 7, 2014, meeting, the Regional Planning Committee discussed and provided feedback on the draft performance measures. Comments from some members focused on understanding the role of the performance measures in the future selection of the draft Regional Plan preferred network, support for including a list of key questions and narrowing down the number of measures from the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan and its Sustainable Communities Strategy (2050 RTP/SCS), and clarifications on how the data for the proposed draft performance measures would be generated.

The Transportation Committee discussed and provided input on the draft performance measures at its February 21, 2014, meeting. Some member comments stressed the importance of creating a balanced list of performance measures that utilize available tools but keep the bigger regional picture in mind. Other comments were focused on specific performance measures, including concerns that travel times for Communities of Concerns be captured, discussion as to whether the smog forming pollutants and greenhouse gas measures should be reported per capita or for the region as a whole, and concern from some members as to whether transportation-related physical activity measures should be included. Comments also were made about the value of including metrics measuring travel times to military bases and neighboring counties, in addition to the proposed metrics for tribal lands and Mexico. Support for development of a dashboard was voiced by some members.

Based on comments from Committee members, the draft performance measures and key questions have been revised. Question 6 has been refined to read: Are connections to neighboring counties, Mexico, tribal lands, and military bases/installations improved? Two additional performance measures have been added to support this question: total travel times to/from neighboring counties (Imperial, Orange, and Riverside) and total travel times to/from military bases/installations. Based on input received, staff will proceed with development of a refined dashboard.

Performance Measures Development

Using the performance measures from the 2050 RTP/SCS as a starting point, staff initiated the review and refinement of the draft performance measures for the San Diego Forward in September 2013. With the assistance from a consultant team with strong technical expertise, staff reviewed best practices as input in the development of the draft performance measures. In an effort to highlight how the plan is expected to perform in a more clear and easy to understand way, a list of key questions, which support the San Diego Forward policy objectives established by the SANDAG Board, was developed. Additionally, revisions to the existing measures and methodologies were made to take advantage of the recently enhanced modeling tools, the Activity Based Model, and the economic and land use microsimulation model – the Production, Exchange and Consumption Allocation System. Attachment 1 highlights the San Diego Forward goals and policy objectives, and the revised draft performance measures, which would be used to gauge the plan’s performance and respond to key questions.

Staff received input on the draft performance measures from regional stakeholders at meetings of the Active Transportation Working Group, Cities and County Technical Advisory Committee, Community Based Organization partners, Freight Stakeholder Working Group, Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee, Public Health Stakeholders Working Group, Regional Planning
Technical Working Group, Social Services Transportation Advisory Council, and the Tribal Transportation Working Group. Staff also sought input from partner agencies including Caltrans, the Metropolitan Transit System, and the North County Transit District.

A peer review panel also was convened to review and assess the measures, and to provide feedback and input which is proposed to be incorporated into the draft performance measures. The panelists, which included experts from academia, Metropolitan Planning Organizations, and the private sector, met on November 12, 2013, and provided recommendations for revision and enhancement to the draft measures.

**Performance Measures Proposed Refinements**

The draft performance measures are nested within the San Diego Forward’s goals: Innovative Mobility and Planning, Healthy Environment and Communities, and Vibrant Economy and also tie into the plan’s policy objectives. The proposed draft performance measures include twenty two metrics which will assist in evaluating the performance of the multimodal transportation network scenarios. The performance measures will benefit from the investments that SANDAG has made to enhance its regional models over the past five years.

Key measures have been added to provide more information with respect to new or enhanced policy objectives such as public health and social equity. The total time engaged in transportation-related physical activity and percentage of population engaging in more than 20 minutes of daily transportation related physical activity metrics capture the benefits which result from people walking and biking to access transit and destinations such as work and school. A new social equity measure: the percent of income consumed by transportation costs for each of the Communities of Concern (COC),¹ has also been proposed.

Other new and refined measures include:

- Truck and commercial vehicle travel times to and around regional gateways and distribution hubs
- Average travel times to and from tribal lands
- Average travel times to and from Mexico
- Average travel times to and from neighboring counties (Imperial, Orange, and Riverside)
- Average travel times to and from military bases and installations
- Percent of population and employment within 0.5 miles of high frequency transit stops
- Percent of population and employment within 0.25 miles of a bike facility
- Average travel distance to work
- Percent of population within 30 minutes of jobs and higher education

Social Equity considerations have been incorporated into the performance measures to provide an indication of benefits and burdens to COC. A separate comprehensive Social Equity analysis will be conducted as part of San Diego Forward, in compliance with Title VI and Environmental Justice guidelines. This analysis may include additional measures specific to that analysis and will be presented in conjunction with the network performance measure analysis.

¹ Working with the *San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan* community based organization network, staff proposes to define “Communities of Concern” as low-income (200 percent of Federal Poverty Rate), minority, or seniors (75 and over).
**Public Outreach**

Public input on the performance measures was solicited as part of the San Diego Forward workshop series held in June 2013 throughout the San Diego region and at Caltrans. In addition to the workshop series, a public workshop focused on performance measures was held on November 4, 2013, at Balboa Park, with more than 40 participants.

Over 360 comments have been collected from local jurisdictions, partner agencies, stakeholders, and the general public and were compiled into a comprehensive matrix, which was included in the Committee’s February agenda package. Comments to date have been focused on access to jobs and services, safety, cost effectiveness, public health, greenhouse gas reductions, social equity, mode share, and travel times in the evaluation of scenarios.

**Peer Review**

The peer review panel that provided input on the draft project evaluation criteria earlier this year was reconvened to review and assess the draft performance measures. A meeting was held at SANDAG on November 12, 2013, concluding with a session open to the general public. Prior to the meeting, the panelists were provided with the 2050 RTP/SCS performance measures, the proposed revisions/modifications to the San Diego Forward draft performance measures, and a public outreach comment matrix.

The panel complimented SANDAG’s ability to produce a concise number of performance measures that provide a comprehensive amount of quantifiable analysis to compare multimodal transportation network scenarios. The panel also had a favorable reaction to connection of the performance measures with the plan’s goals and liked the idea of creating a list of key questions which could be used to convey the data results in an easy to understand format. Based on the panel’s review as well as comments received from the public, the following performance measures were eliminated from consideration: *systemwide vehicle miles traveled per capita, transit miles per capita, return on investment/Net Present Value of transportation investments*. The *average travel time to work (drive alone, carpool, transit, bike and walk)* was modified to specify peak-period travel and was expanded to look at data for the total population as well as COC and non-COCs and the *total time engaged in transportation-related physical activity* measure was modified to be calculated on a per capita basis. The *percent of population engaging in more than 20 minutes of daily transportation related physical activity* was added based on comments from the peer review and public.
Next Steps

On March 14, 2014, the SANDAG Board will be asked to discuss and possibly accept/approve the draft performance measures for use in San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan.

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


Key Staff Contact: Rachel Kennedy, (619) 699-1929, rachel.kennedy@sandag.org
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Policy Objectives</th>
<th>Key Questions</th>
<th>Draft Performance Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Innovative Mobility and Planning</td>
<td>Mobility Choices</td>
<td>1. Are travel times reduced?</td>
<td>1A. Average peak-period travel time to work (drive alone, carpool, transit, bike, and walk) (Communities of Concern and Non-Communities of Concern)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1B. Daily vehicle delay per capita (minutes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Are more people walking, biking, using transit and sharing rides?</td>
<td>2A. Increase in walk, bike, transit, and carpool mode share</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Is the transportation system safer?</td>
<td>3A. Annual projected number of vehicle (driver/passenger) injury/fatal collisions per vehicle miles traveled (VMT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3B. Annual projected number of bicycle/pedestrian injury/fatal collisions per bicyclist/pedestrian miles traveled (BPMT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vibrant Economy</td>
<td>Regional Economic Prosperity, Partnerships and Collaboration</td>
<td>4. Do the transportation investments help to improve the regional economy?</td>
<td>4A. Benefit/Cost Ratio of transportation investments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4B. Average truck/commercial vehicle travel times to and around regional gateways and distribution hubs (minutes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Are the relative costs of transportation changing similarly for all communities?</td>
<td>5A. Percent of income consumed by transportation costs (Communities of Concern and Non-Communities of Concern)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Are connections to neighboring counties, Mexico, tribal lands, and military bases/installations improved?</td>
<td>6A. Average travel times to/from tribal lands (minutes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6B. Average travel times to/from Mexico (minutes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6C. Average travel times to/from neighboring counties (Imperial, Orange, Riverside) (minutes)</td>
<td>6D. Average travel times to/from military bases/installations (minutes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Environment and Communities</td>
<td>Complete Communities, Habitat and Open Space Preservation, Environmental Stewardship</td>
<td>7. Does the transportation network support smart growth?</td>
<td>7A. Percentage of population/employment within 0.5 miles of high frequency (&lt;=15 min peak and midday) transit stops (Communities of Concern and Non-Communities of Concern)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7B. Percentage of population/employment within 0.5 miles of a transit stop (Communities of Concern and Non-Communities of Concern)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7C. Percentage of population/employment within 0.25 miles a bike facility (class I and II, cycletrack, and bicycle boulevard) (Communities of Concern and Non-Communities of Concern)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7D. Average travel distance to work (drive alone, carpool, transit, bike, and walk) (miles)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7E. Total time engaged in transportation-related physical activity per capita (minutes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7F. Percent of population engaging in more than 20 minutes of daily transportation related physical activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8. Is access to jobs and key destinations improving for all communities?</td>
<td>8A. Percent of population within 30 minutes of jobs and higher education (Communities of Concern and Non-Communities of Concern)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8B. Percent of population within 15 minutes of goods and services (retail, medical, parks and beaches) (Communities of Concern and Non-Communities of Concern)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9. Is the region’s air quality improving?</td>
<td>9A. On-road smog-forming pollutants (pounds/day) per capita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10A. On-road CO2 emissions (pounds/day) per capita and regionwide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10. Are GHG emissions reduced?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Work on the Performance Measures is being funded in part through a grant awarded by the Strategic Growth Council. The statements and conclusions resulting from these efforts are not necessarily those of the Strategic Growth Council or the Department of Conservation, or its employees. The Strategic Growth Council and the Department make no warranties, express or implied, and assume no liability for the statements or the information contained in the work products.
SAN DIEGO FORWARD: THE REGIONAL PLAN:  
EMERGING TECHNOLOGIES WHITE PAPER OUTLINE

Introduction

A white paper is being prepared on emerging technologies for use in the development of San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan. Staff will present the white paper outline for feedback and discussion, and will report input from the working groups to date. In addition, emerging technology concepts were presented to the SANDAG Board of Directors at their annual Retreat in January. Ideas discussed at the Retreat will be presented.

Discussion

Emerging Technology is an exciting and ever-changing field. The white paper is in a formative stage and will discuss transportation technologies which the region has influence over, including roadway, transit, payment systems, and traveler information. The white paper will explore how the region can use these technologies to increase the efficiencies and effectiveness of transportation modes while increasing safety and decreasing energy use and greenhouse gases. The white paper also will explore other technologies that influence how we will live, work, and play in the future. Although SANDAG and the region are not tasked with implementing non transportation-related areas of emerging technologies, these technologies will shape our lives in the future. Therefore, from a planning approach, it is important to take a broader look at how overall technology trends impact our travel demand, travel behaviors, and transportation systems. The outline of the Emerging Technologies white paper is included as Attachment 1.

The white paper outline has been presented to working groups including Cities-County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC), the Regional Energy Working Group (EWG), San Diego Regional Traffic Engineers Council (SANTEC), the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG), and the Community Based Organizations participating in the development of San Diego Forward. Staff has been collecting excellent feedback from the working groups and will use their comments as well as additional feedback to continue to refine and complete the paper. In addition, an Emerging Technology round table was held at this year’s Board of Directors retreat and discussion will be incorporated into the paper.
Lastly, staff is seeking input for both the white paper as well as the region’s overall use of technology. To that end, staff has been working with both internal and external resources to identify emerging technologies, the potential impact of those technologies, and finally, policy considerations to maximize the positive application of both transportation systems as well as general technology trends. Attachments 2 and 3 comprise a graphical representation of those types of technologies as well as a table detailing each of the technology's applications.

JIM LINTHICUM
Director of Mobility Management and Project Implementation

Attachments: 1. Emerging Technologies White Paper Outline
   2. Existing, Emerging, and Advanced Transportation Technologies - Diagram
   3. Existing, Emerging, and Advanced Transportation Technologies - Table

Key Staff Contact: James Dreisbach-Towle, (619) 699-1914, james.towle@sandag.org
EMERGING TECHNOLOGIES WHITE PAPER OUTLINE

I. Introduction

The field of Emerging Technologies is exciting and ever-changing. This paper will explore emerging technologies, specifically as they affect and influence transportation infrastructure. Additionally, this paper will discuss technological trends and how those trends – albeit not transportation specific, affect our everyday lives. Technology influences where we work and live, how we communicate with each other, and the personal choices we make.

Personal technology has changed the landscape in the last five to ten years and has started to significantly deliver the ability to access the ‘virtual’ office, classroom, and doctor’s office to name just a few. Today’s world of universal communication and instant access to information paints a picture of what our future holds.

These advances have the potential to reduce travel demand by reducing the need to make as many trips to work, school, or to medical appointments. Technology can help reduce single-occupancy trips; however, there is also the potential that technologies such as the Autonomous Vehicle could increase trips by increasing access to so-called self-driving cars.

This paper will explore vehicle technology, infrastructure or roadway technology, as well as personal technology all from a planning perspective to inform the public and policy makers on investments, policies, and timing so that as a region we all can make informed choices that will shape our future.

II. Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS)

For nearly the last two decades, SANDAG has been investing in technology that supports and enhances our transportation network and systems. The following section will outline those more traditional technology investments, setting the stage later in the paper to discuss newer, emerging, and just over-the-horizon technologies that will impact our transportation needs and demands.

Intelligent Transportation Systems or ITS is the application of technology to transportation systems including vehicles, roadways, intersections, transit, and traveler information with the goal of maximizing efficiency of those services while increasing vehicle throughput, reducing congestion, and providing quality information to the commuting public — information that influences transportation decisions and choices across all modes of travel.

The SANDAG ITS Program is divided into three areas of emphasis.

- Planning – Both long range, and at the project level, including Performance Monitoring and Management
• Implementation – Stand-alone projects and projects integrated into a larger capital improvement

• Operations – Integrating new ITS systems into ongoing operations and maintenance

A. ITS Planning / Transportation System Performance Monitoring and Management

A fundamental emerging technological need that remains constant during Regional Transportation Planning cycles is determining if the region is maximizing the benefits of transportation project improvements. To assess and realize the progress and transportation performance benefits of existing and planned project investments, requires the application of a comprehensive and sound statistical evidence gathering and analytical process to determine facts, trends, quality of services, and optimal system efficiency. Under Transportation System Management, this is achieved through Transportation System Performance Monitoring and Management.

ITS Planning places emphasis on two key areas improving data collection, analysis, and management for (1) transportation performance monitoring and (2) transportation system performance management. These program areas are key to Mobility, Reliability, and System Preservation RTP Goals.

Transportation Performance Monitoring

Getting the most out of our transportation investments requires monitoring the system’s performance, to (1) provide current and ongoing information on how well the transportation system is performing; (2) identify opportunities for near-term improvements; and (3) assess the impacts of future improvements. Priority activities for improving performance monitoring are focused on continued development for enhancing this region’s ability to automate the data collection, data analysis, and data management systems for all modal networks regardless of data collection technology. Transportation System Performance Monitoring is guided by the following principles:

• Improved Traveler Information – Focus on the region’s ability to provide better information on speeds, travel times, or congestion-related information to the motoring public.

• Improved Performance Monitoring and Reporting – Focus on enhancing support for on-going or new efforts that support and align with local, regional, and federal performance monitoring and reporting programs and initiatives.

  o Transportation performance monitoring needs to be automated and uniformed across networks. This will reduce costs and provide more frequent data collection and allow for data collection, analysis, and reporting to be consistent year to year.

  o Transportation performance monitoring needs to reflect the multimodal nature of our transportation system by focusing on all modes of travel.
Data availability, accuracy, and management should be carried out to supplement and support on-going performance management and operations efforts including the development of decision support systems and real-time proactive corridor management approach.

B. Implementation and Project Delivery

Project Delivery follows System Engineering Principles and accepted project management process as detailed by the Project Management Institute.

C. ITS Operations

The SANDAG ITS team has deployed several modal programs, systems, and regional communications networks that transition from implementation into normal or pilot operations. These systems require ongoing support for operations, administration, and maintenance to ensure that the systems perform as expected and deliver mobility services to the public.

Due to the fluid nature of demand for real time traveler information, there is a requirement to maintain high-availability, robust systems. To accomplish this, the ITS operations team develops support plans, best practices, documentation and administration strategies. Once proper administration tools and practices are applied, the completed project can be supported by a traditional Information Technology department and thus transferred to the appropriate support team within the regional network of partners.

III. Transportation-Related Emerging Technologies (Roadway and Infrastructure)

- Next Generation Traveler Information
- Parking Guidance
- Shared-use Vehicles
- Connected Vehicles, Autonomous Vehicles, Automated Vehicles
- Smart Roads / Intersections
- Integrated Corridor Management
- Roadway Electrification

IV. Trends in Vehicle and Personal Technology

- Virtual Office
- Smart Phones
- Tablets
- Personal / Wearable Technology
- Communication Advancements
V. Policies and Investments

- Transportation Demand Management (TDM) and Transportation System Management (TSM)
- Active Transportation
- Parking and Pricing Strategies

VI. Conclusions and Recommendations
Existing, Emerging, and Advanced Transportation Technologies
### A. Roadway Capacity Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transportation Technology</th>
<th>Application to GHG Reduction</th>
<th>When?</th>
<th>Primary Responsible Party</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Vehicle Automation/ Semi-Automation</td>
<td>Less Stop-N-Go/Reduced Idling</td>
<td>Near*, Mid, and Long-Term</td>
<td>Public/Private</td>
<td>Vehicles are partially or fully automated or able to navigate without human input improving roadway performance and safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Real-Time Traveler Information Via Personal Devices</td>
<td>Fewer SOV Trips&lt;br&gt;More Bike/Walk Trips&lt;br&gt;More Transit/Carpool/Vanpool</td>
<td>Near-Term*</td>
<td>Public/Private</td>
<td>Provides real-time traveler and parking information, available on-the-fly, to influence mode choice, route choice and time of travel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Green GPS Fleet Tracking Systems</td>
<td>Fewer SOV Trips&lt;br&gt;Less Stop-N-Go/Reduced Idling</td>
<td>Near-Term</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Reduces GHG emissions and operating costs by using real-time tracking to monitor fuel consumption, route efficiency, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Corridor Level Signal Timing</td>
<td>Less Stop-N-Go/Reduced Idling</td>
<td>Near-Term*</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Improvements to real-time data collection and arterial management, operations, and coordination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Dynamic Lanes on Arterials to Support HOV Access</td>
<td>Fewer SOV Trips&lt;br&gt;Less Stop-N-Go/Reduced Idling&lt;br&gt;More Bike/Walk Trips&lt;br&gt;More Transit/Carpool/Vanpool</td>
<td>Near-Term*</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Infrastructure and lane control that enables arterial lanes to be switched on-the-fly from general purpose, to HOV use, for certain time periods or based on demand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Smart Intersections</td>
<td>Less Stop-N-Go/Reduced Idling&lt;br&gt;More Bike/Walk Trips</td>
<td>Near-Term*</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Improvements to intersection infrastructure to allow real-time and proactive signal timing operations and support Multi-Agency Arterial Management. Improved mobility and efficiency.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## B. Vehicle and Personal Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transportation Technology</th>
<th>Application to GHG Reduction</th>
<th>When?</th>
<th>Primary Responsible Party</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Car Sharing</strong></td>
<td>Fewer SOV Trips</td>
<td>Near-Term</td>
<td>Public/Private</td>
<td>Transportation service that provides communities with a neighborhood based fleet of shared vehicles available to members for a fee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More Bike/Walk Trips</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More Transit/Carpool/Vanpool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased Fuel Efficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Variable Speed Limits on Freeway Network</strong></td>
<td>Less Stop-N-Go/Reduced Idling</td>
<td>Near-Term*</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Speed limits vary in real-time to respond to congestion levels and roadway conditions to maintain smooth and consistent traffic flow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Personal Technology</strong></td>
<td>Fewer SOV Trips</td>
<td>Mid, Long- Term</td>
<td>Public/Private</td>
<td>Transit ticketing via personal devices; trip-tracking and reward reclamation via personal devices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More Bike/Walk Trips</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More Transit/Carpool/Vanpool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Universal Transportation Account (UTA)</strong></td>
<td>Fewer SOV Trips</td>
<td>Near-Term*</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Fully integrated account for accessing all transportation services (transit, bikeshare, carshare, bikelockers, FasTrak, vanpool etc).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More Bike/Walk Trips</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More Transit/Carpool/Vanpool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. On-the-Fly Trip Planning and Ride Matching</strong></td>
<td>Fewer SOV Trips</td>
<td>Near-Term</td>
<td>Public/Private</td>
<td>Multi-modal trip planning and ridematching in real-time via personal devices enabling travelers to find a ride, where and when they need it, using the mode and time that fits best.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More Bike/Walk Trips</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More Transit/Carpool/Vanpool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. Enhanced Virtual Office/Telework</strong></td>
<td>Fewer SOV Trips</td>
<td>Near-Term</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Expansion of virtual collaboration technologies that facilitate telework.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### C. Infrastructure Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transportation Technology</th>
<th>Application to GHG Reduction</th>
<th>When?</th>
<th>Primary Responsible Party</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Automated Truck Corridors</td>
<td>Less Stop-N-Go/Reduced Idling</td>
<td>Near-Term</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Increased fuel efficiency. Hybrid, fuel-cell, battery, corridor-level, etc. for energy efficiency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Solar Highways &amp; Parking Lots</td>
<td>Increased Fuel Efficiency</td>
<td>Long-Term</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Road surfaces and parking lots that generate electricity by solar power.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Eco-Driving</td>
<td>Less Stop-N-Go/Reduced Idling</td>
<td>Mid-Term</td>
<td>Public/Private</td>
<td>Technologies that control and maintain vehicle speed for optimal fuel efficiency and reduced carbon emission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Mobility Hub – Shared Vehicles</td>
<td>Fewer SOV Trips</td>
<td>Mid-Term</td>
<td>Public/Private</td>
<td>Interconnected “mobility hubs,” integrate regional transit services with communities. Mobility hubs provide a source of shared vehicles and services including cars, neighborhood electric vehicles, personal electric vehicles, and bicycles, along with supporting amenities and technologies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Electric Vehicle En-Route Charging</td>
<td>Increased Fuel Efficiency</td>
<td>Near-Term</td>
<td>Public/Private</td>
<td>Transition to fully electric bus/vehicle fleets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Electric Vehicle Charging Stations</td>
<td>Increased Fuel Efficiency</td>
<td>Near-Term</td>
<td>Public/Private</td>
<td>Expansion of efficient vehicle charging stations to support an increase in electric cars and light duty trucks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Rail Technologies</td>
<td>Less Stop-N-Go/Reduced Idling</td>
<td>Near-Term</td>
<td>Public/Private</td>
<td>Electric catenary (or other electric) rail systems, dual-mode locomotives, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Bike Sharing or Other Shared Services</td>
<td>Fewer SOV Trips</td>
<td>Near-Term</td>
<td>Public/Private</td>
<td>Expand shared transportation services such public bike and car sharing and peer-to-peer carsharing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**" Included in the Intelligent Transportation System for the San Diego Region (SANDAG)**  
Near-Term = 2013-2020; Mid-Term = 2020-2030; Long-Term = 2030-2050
Introduction

The California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) approved two mechanisms for funding local government and public agency energy efficiency programs: Local Government Partnerships (LGPs) and Regional Energy Networks (RENs). SANDAG, the City and County of San Diego, the City of Chula Vista, and the San Diego Unified Port District (Port) currently have LGPs with San Diego Gas & Electric (SDG&E). SANDAG’s LGP, the Energy Roadmap Program, provides services to the jurisdictions without direct partnerships. The Regional Energy Working Group (EWG) has used several meetings to discuss how a REN could supplement existing LGP program offerings for the San Diego region. Staff will provide an overview of these two funding mechanisms as possible options for local government energy efficiency programs in the coming year.

Discussion

SANDAG’s Energy Roadmap Program, as well as the other LGP programs, is one way the region is implementing the Regional Energy Strategy, Climate Action Strategy, and the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy. The city and county LGPs with SDG&E were established in 2006. The SANDAG and Port programs began in 2010. Since then the LGPs have provided municipal and community energy-saving programs that would otherwise not have been funded. The existing LGP programs are to be extended through 2015. SDG&E is responsible for approving LGP programs and includes them as part of their energy efficiency portfolio, which is approved by the CPUC.

In addition to the LGP method, local governments now can apply directly to the CPUC for energy efficiency funding for regional programs called RENs. This option is intended to provide local governments more control over the development and implementation of energy efficiency programs that are central to meeting their Climate Action Plans and/or sustainability goals. RENs also serve as an instrument for continuing and expanding those local government energy and water efficiency programs that were funded through federal stimulus grants stemming from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act.

The CPUC has approved two RENs, one in the Bay Area (BayREN) and one spanning much of Los Angeles and Orange Counties (SoCalREn). RENs complement LGPs and are comprised of multiple governments and public agencies within a region. They are managed by local governments rather than the local utility and offer another means for the region to receive energy efficiency funding. Budgets for 2013-2014 LGPs and RENs are described in the following table.
The EWG has expressed interest in the program and funding possibilities of a REN, and was concerned about the amount of energy efficiency funds coming to the San Diego region. LGP program administrators in this region have begun exploring how a local REN would enhance existing energy efficiency programs and expand services throughout the county.

**Next Steps**

New energy programs would likely begin in 2016 but program development would start now and continue through the coming year. As the San Diego region’s LGPs continue to meet about regional energy programs, REN opportunities will be considered alongside other local government energy efficiency programs.

The table below provides a potential timeline for REN application development. In addition, staff would return to the Regional Planning Committee with more information and to seek direction on:

- Using the REN framework to bring more energy efficiency programs and services to the San Diego region
- SANDAG’s potential role in a REN organizational structure
- Submittal of a REN application to the CPUC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible Timeline</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Near-term:</strong></td>
<td>Communicate with existing RENs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Learn more about each structure, administration and staff needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Resource and non-resource efficiency programs, planning and issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mid 2014:</strong></td>
<td>Determine probable REN organizational structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Explore methods to enable multiple governments to jointly pursue a REN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Method could be Resolutions, Memorandums of Understanding, or other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mid-late 2014:</strong></td>
<td>REN application development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Identify regional energy and water efficiency programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Prepare implementation plan to launch REN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2014 or 2015:</strong></td>
<td>Submittal to CPUC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2015:</strong></td>
<td>CPUC decision on REN application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2016:</strong></td>
<td>REN energy and water efficiency programs available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Key Staff Contact: Anna Lowe, (619) 595-5603, anna.lowe@sandag.org
Introduction

The TransNet Extension Ordinance and Expenditure Plan, approved by the voters in November 2004, includes the Environmental Mitigation Program (EMP), which provides funding to mitigate habitat impacts from regional and local transportation projects, and provides funding for regional land management and biological monitoring. The EMP is a unique component of the TransNet Extension Ordinance in that it goes beyond traditional mitigation for transportation projects by including a funding allocation for habitat acquisition, management, and monitoring activities to help implement the regional habitat conservation plans. This funding allocation is tied to mitigation requirements and the environmental clearance approval process for projects outlined in the Regional Transportation Plan.

Each year the Board of Directors allocates $4 million toward implementation of regional land management and biological monitoring pursuant to a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with state and federal agencies on the implementation of the EMP. On April 26, 2013, the Board of Directors amended the MOA to define policy related to the release of cost savings referred to as “economic benefit” under the TransNet Ordinance. Additionally, the Board of Directors authorized SANDAG staff to develop a competitive grant program for land acquisition as a way to distribute $20 million of economic benefit funds.

The purpose of this report is to provide information to the Committee on the initial evaluation results from the $20 million call for projects for the TransNet EMP FY 2014 Land Acquisition Grant Program.

Discussion

On February 22, 2008, the Board of Directors entered into an MOA with state and federal resource agencies on the implementation of the EMP. A provision of the MOA allocates $4 million annually for ten years to implement regional habitat management and monitoring efforts to help maintain the region’s biological integrity, with the intention of avoiding future listing of endangered species. Allocation of the $4 million is done on an annual basis by the Board of Directors pursuant to a five-year program funding strategy (last updated by the Board of Directors on December 21, 2012).
On April 26, 2013, the Board of Directors approved the execution of an amended MOA to include a set of 11 policy points that clarified the definition, use, and process for release of funding related to the “economic benefit” provision of the TransNet Extension Ordinance. Under the amended MOA, regional and local transportation projects that have received all of the required local, state, and federal permits for construction are eligible to release economic benefit funding pursuant to a prorata share formula included in the MOA. This milestone in the construction process of transportation infrastructure was identified to correspond with the last environmental clearance milestone that sets the final required mitigation obligations. After this time, no additional mitigation obligations can be added. To date, 11 projects totaling approximately $20 million in economic benefit funds have received all of the required permits.

**Competitive Selection Process**

As a means to distribute the $20 million of economic benefit funds, the Board of Directors directed SANDAG staff to develop a call for projects for land acquisition. Pursuant to the amended MOA, an evaluation committee composed of representatives from Caltrans, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, California Department of Fish and Wildlife, U.S. Geological Survey, and SANDAG would evaluate all project proposals resulting from a competitive grant program for land acquisitions and provide its recommendation to the Board of Directors.

On September 27, 2013, the Board of Directors approved the eligibility and evaluation criteria for, and release of the FY 2014 call for projects for the TransNet EMP Land Acquisition Grant Program. A total of $20 million was available for land acquisition which promotes the success of the Natural Communities Conservation Planning Program, through conservation of habitat areas critical to promote endangered species and wildlife movement.

**Initial Evaluation Ranking Results**

The FY 2014 call for projects was issued on October 4, 2013 (Attachment 1), and closed on January 8, 2014. SANDAG received 17 project proposals which requested approximately $61 million in grant funds and proposed approximately $30 million in matching funds. The project proposals were distributed to each evaluation committee member to evaluate and score independently. SANDAG staff also conducted a visit to each of the proposed grant properties to verify consistency with the applications and identify any issues not addressed by the grantee.

On February 12, 2014, the evaluation committee met to review their individual rankings, which were compiled prior to the meeting by SANDAG staff based upon overall cumulative ranks. The proposals were then collectively discussed regarding merit, shortcomings and conditions, and/or reductions in project funding based upon available funding for this call for projects.

The SANDAG Technical Services Department also performed an independent review, checking for consistency with the evaluation committee score sheets, and correct formulas and calculations used for scores. No errors were found during this independent review.

The initial list of prioritized project proposals is reflected in the Summary of Initial Evaluation Ranking Results (Attachment 2). The projects highlighted in green in Attachment 2 are the six top-ranked projects. Project Reference Numbers 1-5 fall within the $20 million available. However, Project Reference Number 6, Escondido Creek Conservancy, Cielo Del Norte/White Phase B falls
outside of available funding by approximately $900,000. This applicant will be asked to provide additional match for this shortfall and is being recommended to only receive partial funding.

Project Reference Numbers 7-9 highlighted in orange are the subsequent 3 top-ranked projects that fall further outside of the $20 million available. SANDAG staff is recommending that the nine top-ranked project proposals with a combined value of approximately $25 million will be appraised by SANDAG to determine the fair-market value of each proposed property. The remaining project proposals not highlighted will not be appraised by SANDAG.

Applicants are aware that SANDAG will only pay the appraised fair-market-value of their proposed project properties and that a total of $20 million is available for this call for projects. With the possibility that property owners may not accept the resulting appraised values, more projects are being appraised than will be funded from the $20 million available for this call for projects. This will allow SANDAG to move forward with requesting Board of Directors award of funding without having to reinitiate the appraisal process.

A listing of all individual proposal scores using the approved evaluation criteria is posted on the TransNet Environmental Mitigation Program: Grant Programs website (http://www.sandag.org/uploads/projectid/projectid_447_17223.pdf)

**Next Steps**

Once the appraisals of the TransNet EMP FY 2014 Land Acquisition Grant Program top-ranked project proposals are complete, staff will inform the Regional Planning, Transportation, and Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committees, and the EMP Working Group of the appraisal results. If the appraised value is accepted by the property owner, staff will request a funding recommendation from the Regional Planning and Transportation Committees for Board of Directors approval. If approved by the Board of Directors, the selected grantees will be sent Notices of Award and escrow will be opened for the approved project proposals.

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

Attachments: 1. FY 2014 Funding for Environmental Mitigation Program Land Acquisition Grant Program: Call for Projects Memo, Overview and Instructions, and Eligibility and Evaluation Criteria
2. TransNet Environmental Mitigation Program - FY 2014 Land Acquisition Grant Program: Summary of Initial Evaluation Ranking Results

Key Staff Contact: Katie Levy, (619) 699-7312, katie.levy@sandag.org
October 4, 2013

Dear Interested Property Owners and Land Managers:

SUBJECT: Fiscal Year 2014 Funding for Environmental Mitigation Program
Land Acquisition Grant Program Project Proposals

On September 27, 2013, the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) Board of Directors approved a competitive grant process to solicit proposals to assist with land acquisitions to promote regional habitat conservation plans. The SANDAG Board of Directors allocated $20 million of TransNet Environmental Mitigation Program (EMP) funds for land acquisition, which promotes the success of the Natural Communities Conservation Planning Program, through conservation of habitat areas critical to promote endangered species and wildlife movement.

Attached to this letter are the program overview, instructions, and schedule (Attachment 1); eligibility and evaluation criteria (Attachment 2); an application form (Attachment 3); and sample escrow instructions, conservation easement, and management agreement, are provided for your information (Attachment 4).

If your project proposal is successfully awarded funding by the SANDAG Board of Directors, your organization will be required to enter into a conservation easement, deed restriction, or similar restrictive covenant, in favor of SANDAG, and sign a land management agreement.

Note that all organizations that require a Board action to accept funds will be required to provide a resolution or similar written authorization two weeks prior to the recommendation by the Regional Planning Committee of the list of prioritized project proposals. SANDAG will provide applicants with advance notice of the Regional Planning Committee meeting, tentatively scheduled for September 5, 2014.

The Grant Application Form and all required supporting material (as described within Attachments 1 through 3) are due to SANDAG no later than 4 p.m. local time, on January 8, 2014.

In addition to the Grant Application Form, the project proposal submission must include a letter of interest, purchase agreement, or similar commitment from the property owner as a willing seller. The applicant also must provide a preliminary title; map of listed or sensitive species and location in relation to regional open space plans; and letter from the local jurisdiction of consistency/non-objection of habitat conservation/open space designation of the property. See Attachments 1, 2, and 3 for more information on submittal requirement details.
A pre-proposal meeting will be held on **Tuesday, November 5, 2013, from 1 to 3 p.m.** in the SANDAG Board Room to address any questions from applicants.

The Conserved Land Database application is available at: gis1.sandag.org/conservedlandviewer, and can be used as a resource in project proposal preparation.

Please mail the required **one signed hard copy** and **one signed electronic copy as a PDF file** on disc or flash drive by **4 p.m. on January 8, 2014**, at the office of:

Katie Levy, Grant Administrator  
San Diego Association of Governments  
401 B Street, Suite 800  
San Diego, CA 92101

*Postmarks will NOT be accepted in lieu of this agreement.*

For more information, please contact Katie Levy at (619) 699-7312 or katie.levy@sandag.org.

Sincerely,

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

MST/KLE/bga

Attachments:  
1. EMP Fiscal Year (FY) 2014 Land Acquisition Grant Program – Overview and Instructions  
2. EMP FY 2014 Land Acquisition Grant Program – Eligibility and Evaluation Criteria  
3. EMP FY 2014 Land Acquisition Grant Program – Grant Application Form  
4. EMP FY 2014 Land Acquisition Grant Program – Sample Escrow Instructions, Conservation Easement, and Management Agreement
Program Description

The TransNet Extension Ordinance and Expenditure Plan, as approved by the voters on November 2, 2004, includes an Environmental Mitigation Program (EMP). The EMP is a funding allocation category for the costs to mitigate habitat impacts for regional transportation projects. The EMP is a unique component of the TransNet Extension Ordinance in that it goes beyond traditional mitigation for transportation projects by including a funding allocation for habitat acquisition, management, and monitoring activities as needed to help implement regional habitat conservation plans.

On September 27, 2013, the SANDAG Board of Directors approved the release of the FY 2014 Call for Projects for land acquisitions of up to $20 million to promote regional habitat conservation plans. The SANDAG Board may choose to acquire one or more properties that will not exceed $20 million. Project applicants are encouraged to provide matching funds. Funding is contingent on SANDAG Board adoption of the FY 2015 budget and subsequent approval of the prioritized list of land acquisition project proposals.

Eligible Project Proposals

The FY 2014 Call for Projects for the TransNet EMP Land Acquisition Grant Program provides up to $20 million to assist with land acquisition that promotes the success of the Natural Communities Conservation Planning Program (NCCPP) through conservation of habitat areas critical to promoting endangered species and wildlife movement.

All applicants are required to fill out a Grant Application Form (Attachment 3), which will help SANDAG staff determine if a project proposal is eligible for land acquisition grant funding and how it ranks among other eligible project proposals. The Eligibility and Evaluation Criteria for the project proposals are provided as Attachment 2. Project proposals must first be determined to be eligible for funding before being evaluated and ranked.

Process for Allocating Funds

SANDAG will accept project proposals from applicants in San Diego County that will benefit regional habitat conservation planning under the NCCPP. The applicant must own the land or submit documentation that the owner is a willing seller. The owner of the property does not need to be the applicant or co-applicant on the project proposal. Applicants will need to estimate the total cost of the project proposal and provide information on how the costs were determined.

The land must be acquired or conserved as open space for natural resources. The application must include a discussion of who will own the property, who will manage the property, and who will be responsible for the financial management of any funds associated with the acquisition and/or management.

Applicants must complete a Grant Application Form (Attachment 3) that does not exceed 10 pages (not including attachments).
All project proposals will be reviewed for eligibility, evaluated, ranked, and prioritized using the criteria in Attachment 2. The top-ranked project proposals that cumulatively total up to $20 million will be appraised by SANDAG through its on-call appraisers. The appraisal will follow the Uniformed Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice by a member of the Appraisal Institute. SANDAG will use this appraisal to determine the value of the property for its highest and best use. SANDAG will only fund the appraised value of the property as part of the grant.

A list of recommended project proposals and their appraised value will be submitted for consideration to the Environmental Mitigation Program Working Group (EMPWG) and Regional Planning and Transportation Committees for a recommendation to the SANDAG Board of Directors. The SANDAG Board of Directors would authorize any funding for approved project proposals in FY 2015.

If approved by the SANDAG Board of Directors, successful applicants will be required to enter into escrow for the acquisition of property, provide a conservation easement or similar restrictive covenant, in favor of SANDAG, and sign a land management agreement that spells out the terms of management of the property.

Who Will Score the Project Proposals?

An evaluation committee will be made up of representatives from SANDAG, Caltrans, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, California Department of Fish and Wildlife, and U.S. Geological Survey; and would rank all project proposals.

Submittal Requirements and Application Deadline

One (1) signed hardcopy and one (1) signed electronic copy as a PDF file on disc or flash drive of the project proposal shall be submitted. Project proposals submitted by facsimile or email are not acceptable and will not be considered.

The applicant is responsible for submitting its entire project proposal package with all required submittal documents and any modifications or revisions, so as to reach the SANDAG office as designated in the Call for Projects by the time specified below. Any proposal, modification, or revision received by SANDAG after the exact time specified for receipt of proposals is “late” and will not be considered unless it is received before award is made and the Chief Deputy Executive Director determines that accepting the late proposal would not unduly delay the procurement process; and:

(1) The proposal was received, with all required submittal documents, by SANDAG before proposals were distributed for evaluation or within 24 hours after the exact time specified for receipt, whichever is earlier; or

(2) There is acceptable evidence to establish that the proposal was received, with all required submittal documents, at the SANDAG location designated for receipt of proposals and was under SANDAG control prior to the time set for receipt of proposals; or

(3) There is acceptable evidence to establish that the proposer submitted its proposal, with all required submittal documents, to a third-party carrier for guaranteed delivery to SANDAG by the specified “Closing Time/Date” written below; however, due to an unforeseen event beyond the proposer’s reasonable control, such as poor weather, an act of God, or a delivery mistake by a third-party carrier, the proposal package arrived after the “Closing Time/Date”; or

(4) It is the only proposal received.
The project proposal must be addressed to and received no later than 4 p.m., local time, on January 8, 2014, at the office of:

Katie Levy, Grant Administrator
San Diego Association of Governments
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, California 92101

*Postmarks will NOT be accepted in lieu of this requirement.*

Proposed Schedule

October 4, 2013 – FY 2014 Call for Projects for the TransNet EMP Land Acquisition Grant Program is provided to interested stakeholders included in the SANDAG EMP stakeholder database. This Call for Projects also will be posted on the SANDAG website and in select local newspapers.

November 5, 2013 – A public workshop will be provided to address any questions on the Call for Projects or the process. Staff from SANDAG will be present to address questions and provide information on the eligibility, approval, contracting, and specific requirements of this grant program.

January 8, 2014 – Project proposal application submissions are due to SANDAG, no later than 4 p.m. local time.

January - February 2014 – SANDAG staff will determine the eligibility of all submitted project proposals. Eligible projects will be distributed to the evaluation committee for review and evaluation. SANDAG staff and evaluation committee members may conduct site visits to any submitted and top-ranking project proposals to confirm the information provided by the applicant.

March 2014 – The list of prioritized project proposals, including those top-ranked project proposals to be appraised, will be presented for information to the Independent Tax Payer Oversight Committee (ITOC), Regional Planning, and Transportation Committees.

March 2014 - May 2014 – Project proposals receiving the top-ranks totaling up to $20 million will be appraised by SANDAG through its on-call appraisers.

June or July 2014 – The prioritized list of project proposals, including the appraised value of the top-ranked project proposals, will be presented to the EMPWG for its recommendation to the Regional Planning Committee.

July or September 2014 – The prioritized list of project proposals, including the appraised value of the top-ranked project proposals, will be presented to the ITOC, Regional Planning, and Transportation Committees for information.

September or October 2014 – The Regional Planning and Transportation Committees will be asked to recommend that the Board of Directors consider awarding funds for the top-ranked, appraised project proposals.

September or October 2014 – The prioritized list of project proposals including the appraised value of the top-ranked project proposals, will be presented to the SANDAG Board of Directors for consideration.

October or November 2014 – Approved project proposals will enter into escrow.
San Diego Association of Governments
TransNet Environmental Mitigation Program
FY 2014 Land Acquisition Grant Program –
ELIGIBILITY AND EVALUATION CRITERIA

PROJECT PROPOSAL INFORMATION (For Use By SANDAG staff)
Project Proposal Title: ___________________________________________________________________
Jurisdiction: __________________________________________________
Acreage of land acquisition (break down acreage by parcel if more than one parcel is proposed for
acquisition):  _________________________________________________________________
Estimated total cost of land acquisition: __________________________
Estimated total cost of land management: ____________________________
Proposed Long-term Management Entity: ______________________________________
Percent of cost to be borne by partners (list by entity and % of cost): _____________
Applicant Name: _______________________________________
Submittal date: ____________________________________________

PART 1: ELIGIBILITY

SANDAG will utilize the following findings for potential acquisition opportunities to determine their eligibility. A project proposal must meet ALL five of the findings to be considered eligible:

1. Promotes Natural Communities Conservation Planning Program: The proposed acquisition will contribute to the success of the San Diego regional Natural Communities Conservation Planning Program by acquiring and restoring unique habitat areas, key populations of endangered species, lands adjacent to existing conserved habitat lands, and/or promoting wildlife linkages.

2. Jurisdictional Land Use Plans: Use of the site as habitat conservation/open space is consistent with the long-range land use and transportation policies of one or more local jurisdictions. If the use of the site as habitat conservation/open space is not consistent, the jurisdiction(s) does not object to the site being purchased for habitat conservation/open space.

3. Willing Seller: Owner of the property is a willing seller with clear title to the property and any hazardous material identified in a Phase I environmental site assessment has been evaluated and addressed to the satisfaction of SANDAG.

4. Appraisal: The property must be appraised by a qualified licensed appraiser in accordance with established acquisition and appraisal standards, and reviewed independently by an appraisal specialist working for SANDAG. The first written offer will reflect the fair market value of the property.

5. Owner/Manager: Perpetual ownership of the land has been identified as well as a qualified land manager. The identified owner is a public agency or nonprofit organization willing to provide a conservation easement or deed restriction to SANDAG or mutually agreed-upon third party. SANDAG and the land manager have agreed upon the annual cost to manage the land and the method for funding the annual management costs.
PART 2: EVALUATION CRITERIA

If a potential acquisition opportunity is deemed eligible, then the following Evaluation Criteria will be used to evaluate and prioritize the project proposal:

A) SPECIES BENEFITS:

The purpose of this section is to evaluate how beneficial the land acquisition will be for listed and unlisted species.

Listed Species

1. Acquisitions that benefit more listed, proposed, or candidate species will score higher.

   **Score:** Number of state and federally listed, proposed, or candidate species (a species that is both state and federally listed only counts as 1) that will benefit from the land acquisition. (10 points maximum)

   0 species (0 pts.) - Skip to Question 3

   1 species (1 pt.)

   2-5 species (4 pts.)

   6-10 species (8 pts.)

   11+ species (10 pts.)

2. Acquisitions that provide greater benefit to listed species will score higher. The benefits to the listed species will be considered **major** if, through the acquisition, the majority of the species’ range-wide habitat or an essential piece (e.g., core or linkage) of habitat is protected, a major/critical/significant population necessary for recovery is protected, or major threats to the species are eliminated. The benefits to the listed species will be considered **minor** if, through the acquisition, only a small percentage of the species’ range-wide habitat is protected, etc.

   **Score:** Magnitude of benefits for listed species that will result from the land acquisition. (10 points maximum)

   **Score:** Magnitude of species benefits for listed species. (10 points maximum)

   Mostly minor benefits will result for the listed species (1 pt.)

   A combination of major and minor benefits will result for listed species (6 pts.)

   Mostly major benefits will result for the listed species (10 pts.)
Unlisted Species

3. Acquisitions that benefit more unlisted sensitive (e.g., on the County of San Diego’s Sensitive Plant List; California Department of Fish and Wildlife list of species of special concern) species will score higher. Unlisted species do not include species listed by the state or federal governments as listed as threatened or endangered or that are proposed or candidates for listing.

Score: Number of unlisted, proposed, and candidate species that will benefit from the land acquisition. (10 points maximum)

0 species (0 pts.) - Skip to Question 5
1-5 species (3 pts.)
6-10 species (6 pts.)
11+ species (10 pts.)

4. Acquisitions that provide greater benefit to unlisted species will score higher. The benefits to the species will be considered major if, through the acquisition, the majority of the species’ range-wide habitat is protected, an essential piece of the habitat is protected, a major population necessary for conservation is protected, or major threats to the species are eliminated. The benefits to the species will be considered minor if, through the acquisition, only a small percentage of the species’ range-wide habitat is protected, etc.

Score: Magnitude of species benefits for unlisted species. (10 points maximum)

Mostly minor benefits will result for the unlisted species (1 pt.)
A combination of major and minor benefits will result for unlisted species (6 pts.)
Mostly major benefits will result for the unlisted species (10 pts.)

B) ECOSYSTEM BENEFITS

The purpose of this section is to evaluate how beneficial the land acquisition will be for the identified ecosystem function and services.

5. Lands that require little or no management or significant restoration to provide benefits for the identified species will score higher in this evaluation factor. This habitat can include occupied or suitable, unoccupied habitat. The level of management and/or restoration expected to be necessary is based on an evaluation of the biotic and abiotic components and ecological processes and known or anticipated threats. Biotic factors include the structure and composition of plant and animal communities. Abiotic factors include soil, hydrology, natural topography, and salinity gradients. Ecological processes include succession, trophic energy flows, and disturbance regimes.

Score: When considered in the context of the surrounding landscape, what is the anticipated need for management and/or restoration to maintain the ecological processes necessary to maintain a fully functioning ecosystem? (15 points maximum)
Continued management and/or restoration to maintain ecosystem functions

___Significant (0 pts.)
___Moderate (10 pts.)
___Little to none (15 pts.)

6. Land acquisitions that fill in critical components for land protection will score higher (e.g., lands that link two preserves together to reduce habitat fragmentation).

Score: Do the lands proposed for acquisition fill a critical void in the matrix of protected lands, such as a connection between protected areas or protection of a core population area? (15 points maximum)

To some degree for at least one identified listed species (5 pts.)

To a great degree for one identified listed species and some degree for one or more identified listed or unlisted species (10 pts.)

To a great degree for more than two identified listed species (15 pts.)

C) THREATS

This section includes consideration of how the acquisition removes or minimizes threats/stressors on the species identified above.

7. Acquisitions that address an imminent threat will score higher. Examples of threats/stressors include fragmentation; edge effects; loss of habitat from proposed development, conversion to agriculture, or lack of or inappropriate management. (15 points maximum)

Score: What is the lands likelihood that the land targeted for acquisition will be converted from natural habitat in the near term (2 years)?

___Not likely (0 pts.)
___Possible (e.g., land owner has been pursuing development permits, infrastructure is in, prime agricultural land adjacent to the site) (10 pts.)
___Highly likely (e.g., property has an approved development plan, identified species habitat is degrading due to lack of or current management practices) (15 pts.)

8. Land acquisition projects with a focus on climate change adaptation should be addressed here to identify the conservation benefits to be derived through acquisition of the property in support of the identified species (15 points maximum).

Score: Do the lands proposed for acquisition increase the likelihood that species and their habitats will be able to respond/adapt to climate changes (e.g., temperature and precipitation) or remove potential impediments to those responses?

___Not likely (0 pts.)
___Possible (8 pts.)
Highly likely (15 pts.)

D) SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS (15 points maximum).

This section documents special considerations that are not addressed in the above point scoring sections. Special considerations may include but are not limited to: percentage of matching funds; cost per acre for acquisition and/or management; significantly facilitates broader management goals beyond the targeted parcel boundaries; ancillary benefits (e.g., supports water quality, flood control, or wildfire management needs); completes or significantly benefits a local or regional acquisition strategy/opportunity; etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Proposal Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Point Range</th>
<th>Maximum Score Possible</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A) SPECIES BENEFITS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Listed Species</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Number of Listed Species</td>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Magnitude of Benefit</td>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Unlisted Species</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Number of Unlisted Species</td>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Magnitude of Benefit</td>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) ECOSYSTEM BENEFITS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Landscape Context</td>
<td>0-15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Missing Linkage or Gap in Protection</td>
<td>5-15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C) THREATS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Land Under Imminent Threat</td>
<td>0-15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Necessary for Climate Change Adaptation</td>
<td>0-15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D) SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS</td>
<td>0-15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>115</strong></td>
<td><strong>115</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total points score _______ (Maximum available = 115)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PR Ref #</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Requested Grant Amount</th>
<th>Proposed Match Amount</th>
<th>Project Acreage</th>
<th>Cost Per Acre</th>
<th>Sum of Evaluation Committee Ranks</th>
<th>Overall Rank</th>
<th>Cumulative Funding Request Amount</th>
<th>Discussion/Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Skyline 779</td>
<td>Endangered Habitats Conservancy</td>
<td>$4,913,000.00</td>
<td>$1,500,000.00</td>
<td>779.00</td>
<td>$6,306.80</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$4,913,000.00</td>
<td>Important North/South linkage from Hollenbeck to Sycuan Peak as identified in USFWS MSCP Status Report. Significant contribution to conservation of Hermes Copper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>San Diego Mountain Ranch</td>
<td>Trust for Public Land</td>
<td>$940,081.00</td>
<td>$1,694,700.00</td>
<td>982.00</td>
<td>$957.31</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$5,853,081.00</td>
<td>Protects critical habitat area for Quino checkerspot butterfly. Has potential for occurrence and/or reintroduction of presumed extirpated red-legged frogs. Has high ratio of proposed match to grant request. Site needs to be managed for threats from cattle and illegal access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lakeside Downs</td>
<td>Endangered Habitats Conservancy</td>
<td>$5,359,000.00</td>
<td>$3,000,000.00</td>
<td>409.23</td>
<td>$13,095.33</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$11,212,081.00</td>
<td>Core population of gnatcatcher. Species refugia for gnatcatchers. Part of Lakeside linkage that connects Crestridge and San Diego River to Santee and Miramar and Goodan Ranch to the north. Historical/potential for current Hermes Copper. Contains structure on-site for management. Critical property for conservation buffer for Miramar MCAS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Luce Creek</td>
<td>California Department of Fish and Wildlife</td>
<td>$1,647,200.00</td>
<td>$492,000.00</td>
<td>391.00</td>
<td>$4,212.79</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$12,859,281.00</td>
<td>Critical area for Quino checkerspot butterfly and gnatcatcher, and historically for Hermes Copper. Update Hollenbeck Wildlife Management Plan to address threats (illegal access, etc.) and enhance populations of Quino checkerspot butterfly, Hermes Copper, gnatcatchers, etc. on the Luce Creek property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Clover Flat</td>
<td>Trust for Public Land</td>
<td>$1,722,700.00</td>
<td>$1,792,500.00</td>
<td>763.22</td>
<td>$2,257.15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$14,581,981.00</td>
<td>Protects critical habitat area for Quino checkerspot butterfly. Has potential for occurrence and/or reintroduction of presumed extirpated red-legged frogs. Has high ratio of proposed match to grant request. Site needs to be managed for threats from cattle and illegal access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Cielo Del Norte/White Phase B</td>
<td>Escondido Creek Conservancy</td>
<td>$6,332,634.00</td>
<td>$8,025,000.00</td>
<td>241.95</td>
<td>$26,173.32</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$20,914,615.00</td>
<td>Completes a priority acquisition area that has had significant outside investment ($35.5 million). Supports significant population of Hermes Copper and gnatcatcher. Core block of habitat and minimizes threats to adjacent lands.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TransNet Environmental Mitigation Program
**Fiscal Year 2014 Land Acquisition Grant Program**
**Summary of Initial Evaluation Ranking Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRJ Ref #</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Requested Grant Amount</th>
<th>Proposed Match Amount</th>
<th>Project Acreage</th>
<th>Cost Per Acre</th>
<th>Sum of Evaluation Committee Ranks</th>
<th>Overall Rank</th>
<th>Cumulative Funding Request Amount</th>
<th>Discussion/Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Lucky 5 Ranch Phase II</td>
<td>Anza-Borrego Foundation</td>
<td>$2,191,000.00</td>
<td>$1,000,000 + $60,000/year</td>
<td>1170.00</td>
<td>$1,872.65</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$23,105,615.00</td>
<td>Provides a missing gap between conserved Anza Borrego State Park property and Cuyumaca State Park. Low cost-per-acre. No updated site-specific biological information. Unable to confirm species on site. Low threat of development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Proctor Valley Paxton/Fazio Trust</td>
<td>U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service - SDNWR</td>
<td>$1,444,500.00</td>
<td>$18,425.00</td>
<td>39.75</td>
<td>$36,339.62</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$24,550,115.00</td>
<td>Important for Quino checkerspot butterfly and connectivity in south county. Buffers high-quality adjacent conserved habitats. High cost-per-acre. Disturbed habitat. Low native species cover.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Beaver Hollow</td>
<td>The Nature Conservancy</td>
<td>$750,000.00</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>120.00</td>
<td>$6,250.00</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$25,300,115.00</td>
<td>Connectivity between refuge and conserved open space. Degraded property with illegal clearing and goats. No listed species identified. No biological information to confirm species on site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Fenton Ranch Estates</td>
<td>San Dieguito RVC &amp; River Park JPA</td>
<td>$1,315,253.00</td>
<td>$745,331.00</td>
<td>32.88</td>
<td>$40,001.61</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$26,615,368.00</td>
<td>Under threat from approved development. Property highly disturbed, no endangered species. High restoration cost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Paradise Mountain Ranch</td>
<td>California Land Conservancy</td>
<td>$3,750,000.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>250.90</td>
<td>$14,946.19</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$30,365,368.00</td>
<td>Provides buffer to core habitat areas. Moderate potential for only 1 listed species and highly disturbed. No matching funds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>San Luis Rey River-Loretta St</td>
<td>Trust for Public Land</td>
<td>$1,114,740.00</td>
<td>$1,465,620.00</td>
<td>35.32</td>
<td>$31,561.16</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$31,480,108.00</td>
<td>Buffer property. Has some gnatcatchers. High cost-per-acre. Not a core habitat area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Saint Jerome's</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>$3,299,134.00</td>
<td>$725,000.00</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>$186,391.75</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$34,779,242.00</td>
<td>Great potential for restoration. Highly disturbed, high restoration cost. High cost-per-acre. Low match.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>MacHutchin</td>
<td>Buena Vista Audubon Society</td>
<td>$2,176,386.00</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>$611,344.38</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$36,955,628.00</td>
<td>Provides buffer for the lagoon. Highly disturbed. No known endangered species. High cost-per-acre. Low match.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Cheatham</td>
<td>Buena Vista Audubon Society</td>
<td>$1,175,000.00</td>
<td>$2,713,584.00</td>
<td>31.00</td>
<td>$37,903.23</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$38,130,628.00</td>
<td>Provides some connectivity. Highly disturbed. Limited native species. No endangered species. High cost-per-acre. High restoration cost, required to improve functionality.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TransNet ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION PROGRAM
### FISCAL YEAR 2014 LAND ACQUISITION GRANT PROGRAM
### SUMMARY OF INITIAL EVALUATION RANKING RESULTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRJ Ref #</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Requested Grant Amount</th>
<th>Proposed Match Amount</th>
<th>Project Acreage</th>
<th>Cost Per Acre</th>
<th>Sum of Evaluation Committee Ranks</th>
<th>Overall Rank</th>
<th>Cumulative Funding Request Amount</th>
<th>Discussion/Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Roberts Ranch</td>
<td>Pala Band of Mission Indians</td>
<td>$20,000,000.00</td>
<td>$7,111,500 + $57,500/year</td>
<td>1331.96</td>
<td>$15,015.47</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$58,130,628.00</td>
<td>Great ecosystem benefits. Large property. Very low threat of development. Listed species identified was not supported (surveys have not yet been conducted). Total acquisition cost very high.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Moosa Creek</td>
<td>San Diego Habitat Conservancy</td>
<td>$3,098,304.00</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td>41.00</td>
<td>$75,568.39</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$61,228,932.00</td>
<td>Supports vireo and potential flycatcher. Property will be conserved as part of proposed wetland mitigation bank. No threat. High cost. Low match.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**  
$61,228,932.00  $30,403,660.00
Draft Network Performance Measures
Regional Planning Committee, March 7, 2014

Performance Measures

- Applied to networks of projects
- Mode neutral
- No points or weighting
- Scorecard to assess performance of networks
Process and Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spring 2013</th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
<th>Winter 2014</th>
<th>Spring 2014</th>
<th>Fall 2014</th>
<th>Spring 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vision Goals Objectives</td>
<td>Network Development All Modes</td>
<td>Project Evaluation Criteria All Modes</td>
<td>Ranked Projects by Category</td>
<td>Revenue Projections</td>
<td>Ongoing Public Involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2050 Regional Growth Forecast</td>
<td>Alternative Land Use Scenarios</td>
<td>Unconstrained Network</td>
<td>Revenue Constrained SCS Network Scenarios</td>
<td>Revenue Constrained Preferred Network Scenario</td>
<td>Draft San Diego Forward Regional Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Performance Measures All Modes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Network Performance Measures

- Used in past regional transportation plans
  - Evaluate multimodal transportation networks
  - Assist the Board in selecting the transportation network for the draft RTP

- Coordinating with USDOT on MAP-21 performance measures
Regional Plan Vision and Goals

To provide innovative mobility choices and planning to support a sustainable and healthy region, a vibrant economy, and an outstanding quality of life for all.

Scenario Development Based on Revenue Constraints

Unconstrained Multimodal Network

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Bike/Pedestrian</th>
<th>1. --</th>
<th>2. --</th>
<th>3. --</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>1. --</td>
<td>2. --</td>
<td>3. --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highway</td>
<td>1. --</td>
<td>2. --</td>
<td>3. --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HOV Connectors</td>
<td>1. --</td>
<td>2. --</td>
<td>3. --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freeway Connectors</td>
<td>1. --</td>
<td>2. --</td>
<td>3. --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rail Grade Separation</td>
<td>1. --</td>
<td>2. --</td>
<td>3. --</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Network #1

Network #2

2050 No-Build Network
Network Selection Based on Performance Measures

- Network #1
- Network #2
- 2050 No-Build Network
- Performance Measures
- Board Selects Draft Regional Plan Network

Draft Network Performance Measure Development Process

- Working group and partner agency input
- Public outreach
- Peer panel review
- Input and recommendations from Policy Advisory Committees
Draft Performance Measures

- Support Regional Plan goals and policy objectives
- Fewer performance measures
- Key questions
- Simplified format

Addressing Comments from Regional Planning Committee and Transportation Committee

Proposed Revisions:

6. Are connections to neighboring counties, Mexico, tribal lands, and military bases/installations improved?
   - Average travel times to and from neighboring counties (Imperial, Orange, and Riverside)
   - Average travel times to and from military bases and installations

10. Are GHG emissions reduced?
    - On road CO2 emissions (pounds/day) per capita and regionwide
Performance Measure Scorecard

- Plan goals and policy objectives
- Key questions
- Graphics
- Key statistics
Schedule and Next Steps

• March 2014: Draft performance measures presented to Board of Directors for discussion and approval

• Spring/summer 2014: Apply performance measures to the draft Regional Plan revenue constrained transportation networks

Recommendation

The Regional Planning Committee is asked to recommend that the Board of Directors approve the draft performance measures for use in San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan.
Emerging Technology Challenge

Henry Ford:
“If I had asked people what they wanted, they would have said faster horses.”
Vehicle Technology

- Autonomous Vehicles
- Connected Vehicles
- Driver-Assist Technology

Autonomous Vehicle

- 2020
  - Fully Automated
  - Highly Automated
  - Partially Automated

- 2016
  - Partially Automated

- Vision of the future: autonomous vehicles on highways and roads.
Infrastructure Technology

• Infrastructure to Vehicle Communications
• Smart Intersections
• Cooperative Systems

Electrified Infrastructure
Thank you.

James Dreisbach-Towle
Email: james.towle@sandag.org
REGIONAL ENERGY EFFICIENCY PROGRAMS

Regional Planning Committee
March 7, 2014

Current Energy Efficiency Activities

• Local Government Partnerships (LGPs)
  • Partnership with San Diego Gas & Electric
  • SANDAG, City and County of San Diego, City of Chula Vista, and Port of San Diego
• SANDAG LGP: Energy Roadmap Program
• Regional Collective Energy Programs
  • Energy Upgrade California
  • Climate Collaborative
  • Green Business Challenge
### LGPs
Local Government Partnerships
- Program coordination and administration through SDG&E
- Core program focus
  - Government facilities
  - CA Long Term Energy Efficiency Strategic Plan
  - SDG&E incentive and rebate programs
- Regional collaborations

### RENs
Regional Energy Networks
- Program development and administration through regional collective
- Continue and expand LG energy and water efficiency programs started with ARRA
  - Home retrofit programs
  - Climate planning
- Programs complement, not duplicate, LGP and utility programs

---

### Energy Efficiency Program Budgets Across Regions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding source</th>
<th>San Diego region</th>
<th>Bay Area</th>
<th>Southern CA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Government Partnerships (LGP)</td>
<td>$13,022,575* SDG&amp;E</td>
<td>$139,500,000** PG&amp;E</td>
<td>$44,916,984 SCE/SCG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Energy Networks (REN)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$26,567,750 BayREN</td>
<td>$44,800,328 SoCalREN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL BUDGET</td>
<td>$13,022,575</td>
<td>$166,067,750</td>
<td>$88,717,312</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* SANDAG LGP: $1,262,660
** Regional collective programs (contributions from each SDG&E LGP): $710,500

**Includes non-REN public agencies
## Potential Next Steps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Near-term</th>
<th>Communicate with existing RENs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mid 2014</td>
<td>Determine probable REN organizational structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-late 2014</td>
<td>REN application development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 or 2015</td>
<td>Submittal to CPUC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>CPUC decision on REN application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>REN energy and water efficiency programs available in San Diego region</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION PROGRAM

LAND ACQUISITION GRANT PROGRAM INITIAL EVALUATION RESULTS
Regional Planning Committee
March 7, 2014

TransNet Environmental Mitigation Program

Large scale acquisition, management, and monitoring

Reduce cost, accelerate delivery, implement habitat plans, and reduce listing of species
Land Acquisition Grant Program

- *TransNet* EMP MOA
  - Economic benefit
- Competitive grant
- Eligibility
- Evaluation criteria
- Call for projects
- Initial evaluation ranking results

Map of Mitigation Acquisitions
Map of Prioritized Land Acquisition Grant Project Proposals

Field Visits

Project Photos
Next Steps

- Appraisals: June 2014
- Appraisal results: July 2014
- Funding recommendation: September 2014
- Request for Board approval: October 2014
- Start escrow: November 2014
Presentation Overview

1. Water 101: The Bay Delta and California’s water supply
2. Bay Delta Conservation Plan process & Report
3. April 15 comment deadline
4. Discussion:
   • Questions and comments on process and findings
   • What more would you like to know?
   • What other organizations should be briefed?
Water 101: What is the Bay Delta?

- Formed by the confluence of California’s two largest watersheds:
  - Sacramento River
  - San Joaquin River
- Home to more than 750 plant and animal species – over 40 threatened or endangered
- Backbone of California’s Water Supply system

Total Annual Runoff = 71 MAF

Precipitation (blue contours) vs. Population (yellow icons)
Water 101: Areas Served by Delta Water Supplies

Regions relying on water flowing through the Delta:
- Bay Area = 33%
- Central Valley = 23-90%
- Southern CA = 30%
- Some regions 100% dependent

Water 101: Importance of the Bay Delta

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WATER SUPPLY RELIABILITY</th>
<th>ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION</th>
<th>CLIMATE RISK ADAPTATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 MILLION PEOPLE from the Bay Area to San Diego rely on water from the Delta</td>
<td>MORE THAN 3 MILLION ACRES OF FARMLAND rely on water from the Delta</td>
<td>DELTA FISH AND WILDLIFE depend upon a healthy Delta ecosystem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEE FAILURES</td>
<td>RISING SEA LEVELS</td>
<td>EARTHQUAKES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NATURAL RISKS AND CLIMATE CHANGE threaten the reliability of the existing system.
The BDCP is Important for the San Diego Region

San Diego County imports ~80% of its water supply

- 25% to 20% Delta
- 25% to 17% Local Supplies and Conservation
- 50% to 63% Colorado River

What is the Bay Delta Conservation Plan?

*The Bay Delta Conservation Plan*
- 2006 Federal/State collaboration: Government, scientific & environmental
- 2009 Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Reform Act (SB X1) requires:
  - Management of the Delta in support of co-equal goals
    - eco-system health
    - water supply and water quality
- 15 alternatives explored
- Outcomes:
  - Comprehensive Delta conservation strategy:
    - Framework for biological assessment to support long-term authorizations under Federal and State law
    - Federal: Habitat Conservation Plan (Endangered Species Act)
    - State: Natural Community Conservation Plan (Natural Community Conservation Planning)
What is the Bay Delta Conservation Plan?

*The Bay Delta Conservation Plan*

- 2006 Federal/State collaboration:
  - Government Agencies
  - Scientific expertise
  - Environmental agencies
- 2009 Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Reform Act (SB X1):
  - Management of the Delta in support of co-equal goals
    - eco-system health
    - water supply and water quality
- 15 alternatives explored

Key Delta Risks

- Fishery Declines
- Delta smelt
- Seismic Risk
- Bay Area Faults
- Subsidence
- Sea Level Rise
Endangered or Sensitive Delta Wildlife and Plants

11 Fish Species
- Delta smelt
- Longfin smelt
- Winter-run Chinook salmon
- Spring-run Chinook salmon
- Fall-run and late fall-run Chinook salmon
- Central Valley steelhead
- Green sturgeon
- White sturgeon
- Sacramento splittail
- River lamprey
- Pacific lamprey

21 Plant Species
- Yellow-breasted chat
- Least Bell’s vireo
- Western burrowing owl
- Western yellow-billed cuckoo
- California least tern
- Great sandhill crane
- California black rail
- California clapper rail
- Swainson’s hawk
- White-tailed kite
- Giant garter snake
- Western pond turtle
- California red-legged frog
- Western spadefoot toad
- California tiger salamander
- Lange’s metalmark butterfly
- Valley elderberry longhorn beetle
- Vernal pool tadpole shrimp
- Conservancy fairy shrimp
- Longhorn fairy shrimp
- Vernal pool fairy shrimp
- Midvalley fairy shrimp
- California linderella
- Alkali milk-vetch
- San Joaquin spearscale
- Boggs Lake hedge-hyssop
- Heckard’s peppergrass
- Legenera
- Heartscale
- Brittlebush
- Slough thistle
- Suisun thistle
- Soft bird’s-beak
- Delta button-celery
- Dwarf downingia
- Contra Costa wallflower
- Carquinez goldenbush
- Delta tule pea
- Suisun Marsh aster
- Mason’s liaeopsis
- Delta mudwort
- Antioch Dunes evening-primrose
- Side-flowering skullcap
- Caper-fruited tropidocarpum

31 Other Animal Species
- San Joaquin kit fox
- Riparian woodrat
- Salt marsh harvest mouse
- Riparian brush rabbit
- Townsend’s big-eared bat
- Suisun shrew
- Tricolored blackbird
- Suisun song sparrow
- Least Bell’s vireo
- Western burrowing owl
- Western yellow-billed cuckoo
- California least tern
- Great sandhill crane
- California black rail
- California clapper rail
- Swainson’s hawk
- White-tailed kite
- Giant garter snake
- Western pond turtle
- California red-legged frog
- Western spadefoot toad
- California tiger salamander
- Lange’s metalmark butterfly
- Valley elderberry longhorn beetle
- Vernal pool tadpole shrimp
- Conservancy fairy shrimp
- Longhorn fairy shrimp
- Vernal pool fairy shrimp
- Midvalley fairy shrimp
- California linderella
- Alkali milk-vetch
- San Joaquin spearscale
- Boggs Lake hedge-hyssop
- Heckard’s peppergrass
- Legenera
- Heartscale
- Brittlebush
- Slough thistle
- Suisun thistle
- Soft bird’s-beak
- Delta button-celery
- Dwarf downingia
- Contra Costa wallflower
- Carquinez goldenbush
- Delta tule pea
- Suisun Marsh aster
- Mason’s liaeopsis
- Delta mudwort
- Antioch Dunes evening-primrose
- Side-flowering skullcap
- Caper-fruited tropidocarpum

The BDCP is Guided by the Best Available Science

- ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM
  to implement and monitor BDCP biological goals and objectives

- WATER OPERATIONS
  by the Department of Water Resources and the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation

- OVERSIGHT
  by state and federal fish and wildlife agencies
BDCP Actions

- 22 separate Measures (Actions)
  - Water Supply Conveyance
    - Dual conveyance, North Delta diversion facilities
  - Habitat Restoration
    - Approximately 145,000 acres
  - Other actions to reduce/eliminate stressors

A Long-Term Strategy...

...To secure California’s water supplies, enhance the environment, and restore the health of the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta.

The BDCP Co-Equal Goals

- **WATER SUPPLY RELIABILITY**
  - 3 Intakes
  - 2 Gravity Flow Tunnels
  - 30 Miles in Length
  - 9,000 CFS* Capacity

- **ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION**
  - 150,000 Acres of Restored and Protected Habitat
  - 56 Protected Species
  - Improved Flow Conditions to Benefit Fish in the Delta
• Three pumping plants
• Two gravity flow tunnels (35 miles each)
• 9,000 cfs
• State-of-the-art fish screens
• Forebay temporarily stores water pumped from river

Habitat Restoration Under BDCP

Accelerated habitat restoration in the Delta
• Approximately 145,000 acres of restored and protected habitat
• **30,000 acres** of aquatic habitat in next 15 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Floodplain in the south Delta</th>
<th>Tidal Habitat</th>
<th>Channel Margin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10,000 Acres</td>
<td>65,000 Acres</td>
<td>20 Levee Miles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Riparian</th>
<th>Grassland</th>
<th>Other Habitats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5,000 Acres</td>
<td>10,000 Acres</td>
<td>5,000 Acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Managed Wetlands</th>
<th>Cultivated Lands</th>
<th>Enhanced Floodplain Habitat in the Yolo Bypass</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6,500 Acres</td>
<td>Approx. 45,000 Acres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The BDCP Would Benefit the Delta Ecosystem

DELTA RESTORATION

BDCP would contribute to the conservation of 57 species of fish, plants, and wildlife in the Delta.

- **46** species of plants & wildlife conserved through protection and enhancements in the quantity and quality of habitat in the Delta.
- **52%** increase in protected land in the Delta.
- **11** fish species benefit from an increase in the amount and quality of habitat, food sources, and ecological function of Delta flows. Species include Chinook salmon and delta smelt.
- **10** stressor reduction measures would reduce adverse effects, such as invasive species, predation, and contaminants, to improve the ecological function of the Delta.

BDCP Costs and Funding

The BDCP would be implemented over a 50-year period.

- **$16 billion** for tunnel construction paid for by public water agencies.
- **$4.4 billion** for habitat restoration paid for with state/federal funding and by public water agencies.
- **$1.7 billion** for program oversight paid for by public water agencies and state/federal funding.
- **$2.6 billion** to address other stressors paid for by public water agencies and state/federal funding.

TOTAL $24.7 billion
### Funding Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water Contractors</td>
<td>$16,808</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Funding</td>
<td>$3,927</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Funding</td>
<td>$3,742</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Income</td>
<td>$224</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**More Information:**
- Chapter 8, Implementation Costs and Funding Sources, represents the types of sources that may be available to support the funding of the implementation actions identified in the Plan.
- Over 50 years in undiscounted 2012 dollars

### Cost Allocation: Water Contractors

- **Water Contractors** $16,808 billion
  - State Water project supplies 27 member agencies
  - State water contractors are negotiating cost allocation
  - The Metropolitan Water District (MWD) is the purchasing agent for the San Diego County Water Authority and 25 other agencies
  - Subsequent agreements will allocate MWD’s share of this project cost among its 26 member agencies
  - This allocation would be adopted by the MWD Board of Directors
**Economic Impact**

Net benefit over 50 years: $84 billion  
Annual job preservation/creation: 20,000

**Stimulus:**  
Construction jobs & impact: $11 billion  
- Construction: 122,000 jobs  
- Habitat restoration: 56,000 jobs  
Water reliability: $73 billion

**Costs:**  
Higher water rates: $25 billion

---

**San Diego Water Sources**

Increasing San Diego County's Water Supply Reliability through Supply Diversification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1991</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26 TAF (13%)</td>
<td>80 TAF (13%)</td>
<td>80 TAF (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>582 TAF (50%)</td>
<td>214 TAF (45%)</td>
<td>231 TAF (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total = 578 TAF</td>
<td>Total = 612 TAF</td>
<td>Total = 779 TAF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Metropolitan Water District
- Imperial Irrigation District Transfer
- All American & Coachella Canal Livings
- Conservation (existing and additional)
- Recycled Water
- Seawater Desalination
- Groundwater
- Local Surface Water

TAF = Thousand Acre-Feet
## Comparing Water Sources & Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water Source</th>
<th>Cost per acre foot</th>
<th>Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bay Delta</td>
<td>2014 MWD Tier 1: $890 - $1,100</td>
<td>Delta environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BDCP: $5 per month per customer</td>
<td>Delta infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Final allocation: TBD</td>
<td>Price/Energy Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desalination</td>
<td>Carlsbad: $2,014 - $2,257</td>
<td>Environmental impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Huntington Beach: $1,768 - $1,812</td>
<td>Price/Energy Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Camp Pendleton: $1,900 - $2,340</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repurified</td>
<td>Elsinore Valley: $1,312</td>
<td>Price/Energy costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Central Basin: $1,672</td>
<td>Consumer Acceptance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>San Diego Projection: $2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EIR/EIS Process

The environmental review process is being conducted by **four state and federal agencies**; the California Department of Water Resources is the state lead agency under CEQA, while the Bureau of Reclamation, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), and the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) serve as the joint federal co-leads under NEPA.
What’s Next?

- **December 2013**: Public Draft EIR/EIS
  – Public Comment Period: December 13, 2013 to April 14, 2014
Discussion

• Questions and comments on process and findings
• What more would you like to know to permit SANDAG participation in comment process?
• What other organizations should be notified regarding opportunity to comment?
Regional Water Reuse Plan
and Secondary Equivalency for a
Smaller Point Loma Wastewater Treatment Plant

March 2014

Metro Wastewater Joint Powers Authority

• Twelve Member Agencies
• 35% of Flow & Cost of SD Metro WW System

County of San Diego                   City of La Mesa
City of Chula Vista                  City of National City
City of Coronado                     City of Poway
City of Del Mar                      Lemon Grove Sanitation District
City of El Cajon                     Otay Water District
City of Imperial Beach               Padre Dam Municipal Water District
San Diego Metropolitan Wastewater System

- PLWTP: 240 MGD
- North City Water Reclamation Plant (NCWRP): 30 MGD
- South Bay Water Reclamation Plant (SBWRP): 15 MGD
- Metro Biosolids Center (MBC)
- Point Loma Ocean Outfall (PLOO)
- South Bay Ocean Outfall (SBOO)
- Metro Wastewater Pump Stations/Pipelines

Problem #1:
- Permit expires 2015
- Science says no environmental harm
- Therefore Modified Permit granted
- Modified permit allows Advanced Primary

$3.5 Billion

Problem #2:
- San Diego at end of water supply pipeline
- Imported water at risk as competition for the resource rises
- Imported water expensive and prices continue to rise
- New, local, diversified water supply is the best solution

SOLUTION

*Use Problem #1 To Fix Problem #2*

- Secondary Equivalency: Offloading 100 mgd flow = 240 mgd treated to secondary level
- Potable Reuse: Offloads Point Loma AND increases local, diversified water supply
Next Steps

• Create Long Range (≈20 year) Regional Water Reuse Program focused on potable water reuse that:
  – Provides new, local, sustainable water supply (≈83 mgd)
  – Offloads PLWTP to ≈143 MGD

• Obtain Legislation to permit SMALLER Secondary Equivalent PLWTP (≈143 MGD) that:
  – Avoids billions of dollars in capital, financing, energy and operating costs
  – Continues to protect the ocean environment

Thank you

Questions
Background

- Point Loma Wastewater Treatment Plant
  - Operated by City of San Diego
  - Serves 12 member JPA (35% of flow)
- 240 mgd Permitted Capacity
- Advanced Primary Level Treatment
- Allowed by EPA Waiver of Secondary Treatment Requirement
- Peak demand to date: 180 mgd
March 5, 2014

SANDAG
Transportation Committee Members
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101

Honorable Members of the Transportation Committee,

We are writing this letter to urge you to support the proposed Network Performance Measures for the SANDAG Regional Plan, and ask that you heed the recommendation of the Expert Review Panel to integrate the land use and transportation scenarios. In particular, we ask you to support the measures proposed by staff that are tied to the goal of creating Healthy Environment(s) and Communities;

- Total time engaged in transportation-related physical activity per capita
- Percent of population engaged in more than 20 minutes of daily transportation-related physical activity.

These measures are in place in California, and are used by MTC to gauge achievements in health. Perhaps the biggest misconception regarding these two measures is that they were created to regulate health, when in reality their purpose is to evaluate how well the transportation network supports smart growth and walkable transit oriented communities. Active transportation time is an important indicator of low-carbon travel modes. While measuring the amount of physical activity undeniably provides public health experts with valuable data, it is not the main purpose of these metrics, just one of the many positive externalities they indirectly facilitate.

SANDAG’s Regional Plan looks to implement your cities’ adopted land uses which call for increased density, mix of land uses and a focus on transit oriented development. This facilitates the regional Sustainable Community Strategy, which by design, enables transportation choices beyond driving solo. By collecting data regarding the prevalence of people engaging in transportation related physical activity SANDAG can provide the link between the application of smart growth principles and their functionality for creating a more vibrant region. If smart growth improvements are failing to increase walking and bicycling, then we need to know that so adjustments can be made.

It is not enough to plan for smart growth; cities must be able to demonstrate that those plans spur actual improvements and desired outcomes. Measuring behavior change provides the region with a framework for goal setting around economy, environment and equity.

We’re merging in 2014! Stay tuned for our new name!
Using The Measurements
We also urge you to ensure that the recommendation made by the expert review panel about integrating alternative land use scenarios with the different transportation networks comes to fruition as a part of this process.

"Integrate parallel land use-transportation scenario development with current Regional Plan scenario development. Land use scenarios should be defined in conjunction with, and explicitly linked to, specific transportation network scenarios."

By only modeling the Series 13 Regional Growth Forecast with very similar transportation networks, the regional model is suffocated from delivering projections with varied results. Failure to model the land use scenarios with different transportation networks will limit the variance between transportation networks by less than one percent, seriously restraining the potential viability of transit/bike/pedestrian projects and inhibiting the board’s ability to pick out the best network.

The Land Use Scenario modeling exercise conducted by SANDAG should be an iterative process, with the proposed land use scenarios informing the transportation scenario network development. The performance metrics for the network scenarios will play an important role in defining the multiple benefits that scenarios can provide.

Thank you very much for your public service. Please call me with any questions at 619-544-9255 x 310.

Sincerely,

Elyse Lowe

Elyse Lowe
Executive Director, Move San Diego

James Sallis, PhD
Professor of Family and Preventive Medicine, UCSD
Director, Active Living Research