MEETING NOTICE
AND AGENDA

SHORELINE PRESERVATION COMMITTEE
The Shoreline Preservation Committee may take action on any item appearing on this agenda.

Thursday, February 5, 2004
11:30 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.

SANDAG, 7th Floor Conference Room
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101-4231

Staff Contact: Rob Rundle   Jennifer Cordeau
(619) 699-6949  (619) 699-7312
rru@sandag.org  jco@sandag.org

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

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

To request this document or related reports in an alternative format, please call (619) 699-1900, (619) 699-1904 (TTY), or fax (619) 699-1905.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM #</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Welcome and Introductions</td>
<td>INTRODUCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+2.</td>
<td>Minutes from December 4, 2003 meeting</td>
<td>APPROVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Regional Beach Sand Project Shoreline Monitoring Results - Year 2</td>
<td>INFORMATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SANDAG’s sand monitoring consultant, Coastal Frontiers, will report on the results of the second year of monitoring since the Regional Beach Sand Project was completed. The monitoring report is available on SANDAG’s Web site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Regional Beach Sand Project Biological Monitoring Results - Year 2</td>
<td>INFORMATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SANDAG’s biological resources monitoring consultant, AMEC Earth and Environmental, will report on the effects sand movement has had on nearshore resources since the RBSP was completed. The biological resources monitoring report is available on SANDAG’s Web site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+5.</td>
<td>Regional Comprehensive Plan – Beach Replenishment Funding</td>
<td>COMMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SANDAG released the draft Regional Comprehensive Plan for public comment on December 19, 2003. Comments on the draft document should be submitted to SANDAG prior to March 1, 2004. The relevant shoreline preservation sections, including funding recommendations, are attached. The committee should consider submitting comments on the funding recommendations to SANDAG’s Regional Planning Committee.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+6.</td>
<td>Southern California Coastal Ocean Observing System</td>
<td>INFORMATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scripps Institute of Oceanography staff will provide a brief overview of this program and how SANDAG’s/California Coastal Conservancy’s Nearshore Habitat Inventory will be integrated into the System.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+7.</td>
<td>Coastal Sediment Master Plan/Department of Boating and Waterways</td>
<td>INFORMATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The California Department of Boating and Waterways (DBW) has contracted with SANDAG to provide assistance in the development of the California Coastal Sediment Management Master Plan. Staff will provide an overview of the scope of services that will be provided to DBW.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEM #</td>
<td>ACTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Legislation Report INFORMATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Committee members and CalCoast representatives will discuss the status of state and federal legislation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Public Comments and Communications COMMENTS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Next Meeting Date INFORMATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It is suggested that the Committee's next meeting be scheduled for Thursday, April 1, 2004.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Adjourn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ next to an agenda item indicates an attachment
February 5, 2004

TO:   Shoreline Preservation Committee
FROM:   SANDAG Staff
SUBJECT:  December 4, 2003 Meeting Summary

Members in Attendance:
Councilmember Ann Kulchin, City of Carlsbad, Chair
Councilmember James Bond, City of Encinitas, Co-Chair
Councilmember Jerry Finnell, City of Del Mar
Mayor Doug Sheres, City of Solana Beach
Supervisor Pam Slater, 3rd District County of San Diego
Councilmember Jim Janney, City of Imperial Beach

Technical Advisory Members:
Bob Hoffman, NMFS
Kim Sterrett, CA Dept. of Boating & Waterways

Community Advisory Members:
August Felando, CA Lobster & Trap Fisherman’s Association
Dedi Ridenour, Sierra Club
Steve Aceti, CalCoast
Cami Mattson, San Diego North CVB

Others:
Ed Kleeman, City of Coronado
David Oakley, Seacoast Preservation Association, Encinitas
Danny L. Schrotberger, City of San Diego
Shannon Bryant, Army Corps of Engineers
Raynor Tsuneyoshi, CA Dept. of Boating & Waterways
Eric Munoz, City of Carlsbad
Jon Campbell, City of Carlsbad
Bud Carroll, City of Carlsbad
Steven Jantz, City of Carlsbad
Dick Bobertz, San Dieguito River Park JPA
David Altman, Noble Consultants, Inc.
Susie Ming, USACE
Sachiko Kohatsu, 3rd District County of San Diego
Kathy Weldon, City of Encinitas
Brian Leslie, City of Encinitas
Ray Duncan, City of Oceanside
Greg Wade, City of Imperial Beach
Mark Carpenter, KTDA
Jennifer Bethel, Hofman Planning
Jack Gorzeman, Coastal Planning & Engineering, Inc.
1. Welcome and Introductions

Councilmember Kulchin welcomed everyone and conducted the meeting.


The meeting summary was approved by the Committee.

3. Local Funding For Fiscal Year 2005 Shoreline Monitoring Program

The Committee approved to continue the local funding for the shoreline monitoring program in FY2005.

4. Nearshore Habitat Inventory Web Site

Holly Henderson, Merkel & Associates, presented the project. The project has been a cooperative effort between the Coastal Conservancy and SANDAG, with input provided by the Department of Fish and Game, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, the Army Corps of Engineers, and the Coastal Commission. Representatives from each of these organizations were members of steering committees that guided the program from goals, to content, to completion of the project.

The project was initiated because there was a need for a regional program that could pull together existing nearshore data and could also generate a regional map of all coastal resources to be used by resource managers. The main goal of the project was to provide a comprehensive inventory of nearshore and marine habitats, and to put the information into a user-friendly database that would be accessible to everyone. In the San Diego region, there has not been a comprehensive map available on nearshore resources. Before this program the existing data consisted primarily of many different small-scale data sets that were out of date, not digitally available, or not available publicly. The program can be used as a regional planning tool for environmental risk assessments, and impact analysis for large-scale actions, but does not replace the need for site-specific surveys.
The work on the program was completed in two phases. The first phase involved the collection of existing data and the creation of a habitat classification system. A GIS database and web site were created to make GIS mapping tools available to the public, to provide a spatial bibliography, and to supply other educational and scientific tools. The second phase involved supplemental field data collection.

The program study area includes the nearshore area from Dana Point to the International border, and the area extends from the beach seaward to one nautical mile offshore. The study area does not include lagoons, bays, or estuaries, but can be incorporated at a later date when data becomes available. The web site address to access the inventory is http://sccoos.ucsd.edu/nearshore. Scripps Institution of Oceanography is hosting the web site and is participating in the program which relates to its Coastal Ocean Observing System program.

5. CA Department of Boating and Waterways Budget and Master Plan Effort

Kim Sterrett, CA Dept. of Boating and Waterways, stated that some of the responsibilities of the department are to provide boating access grants to regional, local, and some federal entities in California. The department is also involved with public and private marina loans, which grant money to marinas for vessel pump-out stations to deal with water quality issues. Other responsibilities include providing research grants through Scripps Institution of Oceanography, yacht and ship licensing, and boating safety programs. About 80 percent of the annual budget is for infrastructure, which goes back to local and regional governments for improvements on lakes, rivers, bays, and marinas for boating facilities.

Rayor Tsuneyoshi, CA Dept. of Boating and Waterways, discussed the potential for merger with Parks and Recreation, and funding of the department. Parks and Recreation, Fish and Game, and Boating and Waterways may be combined into one department headed by one person. The Department of Boating and Waterways has dedicated funding sources received from trust funds, money repaid from loans, and a portion of the registration from boats. For about 10 years, the finance department has given approximately $11.5 million a year of their budget to Parks and Recreation, to use at facilities where boating is a recreational activity. In the last 2 years, an additional $15.5 million was taken from the budget, forcing the department to use money from their reserve fund, which has been almost depleted. By 2006 the funds will be gone and the department will not have money to build facilities, to use for loans or grants, and may have to cut programs. Boating activity generates around $68 billion in direct and indirect revenues, and $1.5 billion flows into the state in taxes. If the department does not receive funding, it will deteriorate assets that many of the cities and the county depend on for the recreational dollars that are generated. There were about $180 million worth of projects unfunded this year because of the budget.

6. Progress on Encinitas Opportunistic Sand Project

Councilmember Bond reported that the Parks and Recreation Department has approved and is supporting the project, and has allowed the sand to be transported across the parking lot out to the beach. He thanked the Coastal Commission for their continuous pursuit of moving the material to the beach. KSL, the builders of the beach hotel, have requested that they be the lead agency in getting the sand moved from their development down onto the beach, which needs to be worked out. Reports received on Encinitas beaches show that the sand from the Regional Beach Sand Project is still there and the ecosystem has hugely improved. Lobster and
fish catch in the area has gone up over the last 2 years since the placement of the sand on the beach.

7. Legislative Report

Steve Aceti, CalCoast, reported that there was not much to report on state legislature. There is a leftover bill from last year that they are working on with the Department of Boating and Waterways trying to get money reprogrammed from a fund that had a 50/50 split state local match to an 85/15 match. For Federal legislature, the President signed the Energy and Water Appropriations bill, and among the things in the bill are the federal, state, and local matches to the beach projects.

8. Public Comments and Communications

Councilmember Kulchin announced that Dan Muslin is retiring from the Navy and Patrick McCay will be taking his place on the Committee.

Kim Sterrett noted that they are embarking on a cooperative project with the Federal Minerals Management Service and the CA Geological Survey in looking at sand and gravel in Federal waters. San Diego County, Orange County, Los Angeles, and Santa Barbara will be the areas of concentration.

9. Next Meeting Date

It is suggested that the next Committee meeting be scheduled for Thursday, February 5, 2004.

10. Adjourn
February 5, 2004

TO: Shoreline Preservation Committee
FROM: SANDAG Staff
SUBJECT: Regional Comprehensive Plan and Funding

Dear Committee Members:

Attached is the Shoreline Preservation section of the Healthy Environment chapter of the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) for your review. Also attached are the relevant sections of Chapter 7, the Integrated Regional Infrastructure Strategy (IRIS), which addresses funding issues. To view Chapter 7 in its entirety, please see the RCP available on SANDAG’s website at: www.sandag.org. Please be prepared to make comments on the Shoreline Preservation section of the Healthy Environment section and the funding proposal as presented in the IRIS section of the draft RCP at the February 5 meeting. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at (619) 699-6949.

RR/crd

Attachment
1. Educate the community about the impacts of our daily activities on the water quality of the ocean and other bodies of water.

2. Establish design guidelines that reduce the impact of urban runoff.

3. Evaluate the quality of surface water bodies in lower income and minority communities and develop and implement programs to ensure they are not disproportionately affected.

Funding

1. Secure a reliable funding source to ensure development and implementation of comprehensive regional storm water plans and programs.

2. Secure funding to comply with state and federal mandated regulations and enhance the storm water infrastructure throughout the region.

SHORELINE PRESERVATION

EXISTING SETTING

The San Diego region’s shoreline, including the beaches, bluffs, bays, and estuaries, is a significant environmental and economic resource locally and globally. It is an integral part of the area’s ecosystem, interconnected with the near-shore ocean environment, wetland habitats, and water quality.

Beaches are a priceless recreational resource and a key part of the region’s positive image and overall quality of life. Beaches also protect important public infrastructure such as parks, roads, and rail lines. However, the San Diego shoreline is an erosional coast, which means that it constantly wears away. This is a shoreline response to the forces of the ocean and the atmosphere. This process is further accelerated by urban development that traps or restricts natural sediment from flowing downstream through the watersheds to the ocean. Episodic and site-specific coastal retreat, such as bluff collapse, is inevitable, although some coastal areas remain stable for many years. Most of the San Diego shoreline consists of narrow beaches backed up by steep sea cliffs. The beaches and cliffs have for thousands of years been eroded by ocean waves and rising sea levels. The San Diego region’s beaches will continue to suffer serious erosion, thereby reducing, and eventually almost eliminating, their physical and economic benefits.

Some projects have successfully slowed erosion and widened beaches, while others have been harmful. Natural sand supply to the beaches has been significantly altered as a result of coastal development, including the building of dams, seawalls, and the removal of sand and gravel through extraction operations. Where beaches were once fed by continuously through the region’s
watersheds, our beaches’ natural supply of sand has been significantly diminished by flood control structures, dams, water quality control devices, and other such mechanisms. Seawalls have further reduced natural sand supply at the beach, necessitating active management of our coastline to maintain and/or reestablish historic beach widths to prior levels. Ongoing management of sand supply will be required to maintain beaches of historic widths in this region.

The San Diego region’s nearshore environment, which supports a large and diverse array of species and habitats, is directly linked to the beaches that are so important to the region. Activities that occur on land adjacent to the ocean, such as sand replenishment, can affect nearshore marine habitats such as kelp forests and seagrass bed, as well as species that depend on these habitats for food and shelter, including lobsters, mussels, and rockfish.

EXISTING PLANS AND PROGRAMS

In 1993, the SANDAG Board of Directors adopted the Shoreline Preservation Strategy, a long-term vision for restoring the region’s beaches to their historic widths. The strategy is the region’s response to concerns about erosion voiced by thousands of citizens in both coastal and inland San Diego County.

The Shoreline Preservation Strategy proposes an extensive beach building and maintenance program for the critical shoreline erosion areas in the region. The strategy contains a comprehensive set of recommendations on the beach building program, and on financing and implementation.

To support ongoing and future beach nourishment efforts, SANDAG enacted a shoreline monitoring program in 1996. This program consists of semi-annual beach profile surveys, semi-annual oblique aerial photographs, and monthly beach width measurements. The beach profile surveys are conducted during the transitions between winter and summer wave seasons. This monitoring helps provide an indication of what is happening to the coastline, both seasonally and over time. The comprehensive approach to monitoring the shoreline provides data that can demonstrate the long-term effectiveness of beach replenishment as a means of protecting the long-term health of the shoreline.

The Shoreline Preservation Strategy set the stage for the successful implementation of the Regional Beach Sand Project in 2001, which deposited over two million cubic yards of clean, beach-quality sand in key areas along our coastline. Our shoreline will require continuing active management and annual funding levels of around $7.5 million over the next decade or more to restore and maintain the severe sand deficit along the region’s coastline.
Shortly after completion of the Regional Beach Sand Project, SANDAG and the California Coastal Conservancy initiated the development of the San Diego Nearshore Habitat Inventory. This comprehensive marine database is intended to provide a central clearinghouse of nearshore habitat information for the San Diego region. The database is intended to guide future decisions on projects that may affect the nearshore ocean environment.

KEY ISSUES

Erosion

The region’s shoreline is continuing to erode. Although erosion is a natural condition, the process has been accelerated by activities that have severely limited the amount of sediment reaching the beaches. For this reason, the region needs to address the erosion problem in the short- and long-term.

- **Short-term Sediment Management.** Beach nourishment is one approach to addressing the erosion problem in the short-term. Although one demonstration project was completed in 2001, a strategy to continue with more beach nourishment needs to be implemented.

- **Long-term Management.** In the long-term, development regulations, including water supply management, runoff control, and coastal plain development should consider the impacts those decisions have on coastal erosion as well as other natural systems.

Near-shore Habitat Management

In order to successfully implement more beach nourishment projects in the future, the region needs to better understand the natural resources that are located in the near-shore, which includes kelp beds, surf grass, and reefs. The integrity of the near-shore resources cannot be compromised when placing sand on the region’s beaches.

SHORELINE PRESERVATION POLICY OBJECTIVES AND ACTIONS

Policy Objective

1. Preserve and enhance the region’s beaches and nearshore areas as environmental and recreational resources.

Actions

Planning, Design, and Coordination

1. Continue to implement the Regional Shoreline Preservation Strategy.

2. Prepare and implement habitat conservation plans for nearshore areas.

Program and Project Development and Implementation

1. Improve existing programs and develop new programs to restore and maintain beach sand.
2. Explore new programs to help restore natural systems, thereby reducing sand depletion.

Funding

1. Secure regional funding to continue sand replenishment activities consistent with the Regional Shoreline Preservation Strategy.

---

AIR QUALITY

EXISTING SETTING

There are 15 air basins in the State of California. An air basin is a land area with generally similar meteorological and geographic conditions throughout. Areas within an air basin are considered to share the same air masses and therefore are expected to have similar air qualities. To the extent possible, air basin boundaries are defined along political boundary lines and include both stationary and mobile sources and receptors of pollution. The San Diego Air Basin encompasses the entire county of San Diego.

In general, air quality in the San Diego region has improved dramatically over the past two decades, but continued efforts are needed to sustain this positive trend and ensure clean air. The region has seen remarkable reductions in common air pollutants such as carbon monoxide (CO) ozone, oxides of nitrogen (NOx), and reactive organic gasses (ROG), as well as reductions in more harmful, toxic air contaminants. The air quality improvement is the result of an ambitious undertaking at the federal, state, and local levels to implement the federal and state Clean Air Acts.

Emission control efforts have resulted in cleaner vehicles, power plants, factories, and consumer products, as well as transportation plans that integrate transit and other alternatives to solo vehicle travel. Still, more reductions in air contaminant emissions are needed to meet and maintain federal and state clean air standards for ozone and fine particulate and to reduce health risks from exposure to toxic air contaminants.

Exposure to polluted air can cause health problems, especially in children and adults who are active outdoors, and in people with respiratory diseases, such as asthma. According to the Air Resources Control Board, air pollution in California contributes annually to as many as:

- 17,000 premature deaths,
- 55,000 hospital admissions,
- 1.3 million asthma attacks, and,
- 3.3 million lost work days.

Air quality standards are set by the state and federal governments to provide an adequate margin of safety in protecting public health.
INTEGRATED REGIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE STRATEGY (IRIS)
Ensuring the Foundation of our Vision for the Future

INTRODUCTION

The first hint of trouble came during the late 1970s and early 1980s; policy makers, engineers, and economists across the nation expressed their deep concern about the nation’s inadequate infrastructure investments. This concern quickly spread to the states. In California, landmark reports like Rusty Hinges on the Golden Gate released during 1983 identified the many reasons for inadequate infrastructure investment, although the report suggested things were not as bad in California as they were elsewhere in the nation.

Since the release of that publication, Sacramento policy analysts have produced a virtual flood of reports identifying the state’s infrastructure inadequacies and a range of proposals to remedy the problems. During the late 1990s, the Business Roundtable and the state’s Legislative Analyst Office produced a series of publications on reforming infrastructure policy, stimulating renewed interest in planning issues in the state. More recently, the state’s Commission on Building for the 21st Century assessed the state’s infrastructure issues and formulated policy options for improving infrastructure quality. About the same time, the Public Policy Institute of California commissioned three studies on infrastructure policy and institutional planning.

While all the hand wringing has gone on at the national and state level, regions have suffered. More recently, they have begun to act.

In the San Diego region, for example, more local funding sources have been developed to fund needed improvements to our infrastructure, such as transportation systems and schools. More recently, the water agencies in the southern California region signed a joint agreement to reduce California’s over-dependence upon the Colorado River. For those closely watching these events, none were easy, but each represents progress in solving our regional infrastructure issues.

Will this trend stick? Will regions become more responsible for planning and paying for their own infrastructure solutions? The lack of available resources at the national and state level may make this our best option. This is not to say we don’t need state or federal funds that help finance infrastructure planning, programming, and maintenance. But it does seem that regions are being asked to increasingly leverage or match state and federal funds with local money or programs that help fill the infrastructure gaps.
A key source of uncertainty lies with the fact that, except in the City of San Diego, waste collection and disposal in the region are performed by private companies. Although the county is responsible for preparing the Integrated Waste Management Plan, it lacks the means to undertake the necessary investment and other actions to implement the plan's recommendations.

The "gap" with respect to solid waste infrastructure has less to do with funding and more with an appropriate authority to implement the long-term plan, although, a revenue source is needed to exercise such authority. The most suitable revenue source is a fee or charge for solid waste collection, which is already levied by most jurisdictions. It is recommended that jurisdictions that do not currently charge fees for solid waste collection do so and that a portion of the fee revenues be used to implement the goals of the Integrated Waste Management Plan. As recommended in the City of San Diego’s Facilities Financing Study (July 2002), implementing a user fee for residential refuse collection could generate over $32 million every year.

Education - K-12 and Community Colleges. New K-12 schools and community college facilities are funded from a combination of state and local funds. In order to generate local matching funds and, in some cases, to supplement state funding, local bond issues will be needed. Proposition 39, passed in 2000, reduced the voting requirement for bonds to finance construction of K-12 schools and community colleges from two-thirds to 55 percent. School districts, as well as other infrastructure and service providers, will likely be impacted by the general plan changes called for under the RCP. Channeling growth into existing urban communities will likely increase school enrollment, where land is scarce and expensive. School districts should consider different kinds of sites, more vertical and shared resources, to cope with a more urban setting.

Beach Sand Replenishment. There is currently no revenue source to implement the beach sand replenishment program, although the start of a strategic plan and capital budget do exist. SANDAG’s Shoreline Preservation Committee initiated the plan and several funding options. Under one option, the Shoreline Preservation Committee has proposed dedicating a portion of revenues from the transient occupancy tax to fund the program. The transient occupancy tax would provide a reliable source and is consistent with the goal of improving visitor-serving facilities.

Habitat Conservation. The regional habitat conservation plans (MSCP and MHCP; see Appendix section on Parks and Open Space available at www.sandag.org) have estimated the local jurisdictions’ cost to assemble and manage a regional preserve system in perpetuity at $1.3 billion (discounted present value), but the local jurisdictions have not established a funding source to cover this cost.
### TABLE 7.1—SOURCES OF EXISTING OR NEW REVENUES FOR INFRASTRUCTURE

| INFRASTRUCTURE         | REVENUE FOR OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE                                                                 | REVENUE FOR CAPITAL INVESTMENT                                                                 |
|------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------******************************************|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| TRANSPORTATION         | - Continuation of existing general revenues (streets and highways)                                    | + TransNet extension (1/2-cent sales tax; highways and transit)                                 |
|                        | - Continuation of existing fare/user charges (transit)                                                 | + Gas tax increase (highways and transit)                                                       |
|                        | - Continuation of income from operations (air and maritime ports)                                     | - Continuation of bond financing based on income from operations and federal and state funds (air and maritime ports) |
|                        | + User charges (land ports of entry)                                                                  | + Bond financing based on user charges (land ports of entry)                                    |
| WATER                  | - Continuation of existing rate/user charges                                                           | - Continuation of pay-as-you-go or bond financing based on rate revenues and fees                |
| WASTEWATER             | - Continuation of existing rate/user charges                                                           | - Continuation of pay-as-you-go or bond financing based on rate revenues and fees                |
| STORM WATER MANAGEMENT | - Continuation of existing general revenues                                                            | + Regional storm water impact fee, special assessment, or special tax                           |
| SOLID WASTE            | + User charge                                                                                            | + User charge and bond financing based on user charges                                           |
| ENERGY                 | - Continuation of existing rate/user charges                                                           | - Continuation of pay-as-you-go or bond financing based on rate revenues                         |
| EDUCATION              | - Continuation of existing general revenues and state funding (K-12)                                   | + Local bond financing (K-12, community colleges)                                                |
|                        | - Continuation of existing tuition/user charges, donations, and state funding (CSU, UC)                | - Continuation of state funding (K-12, community colleges)                                      |
|                        | - Continuation of local funding (donations) and state funding (CSU, UC)                               | - Continuation of local funding (donations) and state funding (CSU, UC)                         |
| PARK AND OPEN SPACE    | - Continuation of existing general revenues                                                            | - Continuation of existing pay-as-you-go based on impact fees (local parks)                     |
|                        | + Special assessment or special tax (beach sand replenishment, habitat)                               | + RTP / TransNet mitigation bank (habitat)                                                      |
|                        |                                                                                                     | + Special assessment or special tax or TOT (beach sand replenishment, habitat)                  |

**Note:** This table summarizes types of revenues that are currently used to fund operations and maintenance or capital investment (-) or that are proposed as new funding sources to meet the infrastructure needs of the RCP (+); see text for discussion of new funding sources and appendix sections for discussion of existing revenue sources.
Parks and Open Space

1. Local jurisdictions, acting through SANDAG, should consider the feasibility of leveraging a portion of transportation funding (RTP and TransNet) required for the biological mitigation of transportation projects to maximize benefits for the region's habitat conservation programs. To this end, the local jurisdictions should:

   - Establish a regional habitat mitigation bank consisting of priority habitat acquisition lands identified by the region's habitat conservation programs (MSCP and MHCP) and use its credits to mitigate the biological impacts of transportation projects.
   - Consolidate the mitigation budgets of separate transportation projects to fund the establishment and management of the regional mitigation bank.
   - Allocate a portion of the consolidated mitigation budget for the long-term management and monitoring of other preserve lands which currently do not have funding for those purposes.
   - Establish an entity, such as a conservancy, which will conduct the management and monitoring and obtain additional funds for habitat acquisition, management, and monitoring.
   - Work with other regional infrastructure providers, such as for water, wastewater, or energy, to consolidate mitigation banking needs, thus improving the efficiency and effectiveness of mitigation actions to further the goals of the regional conservation plans.

2. Local jurisdictions should consider the availability of local, active parks and the possibility of obtaining additional park resources, such as through joint-use of school playgrounds and athletic facilities, in identifying and prioritizing smart growth opportunity areas.

3. Local jurisdictions should take advantage of the strategic plan which they prepared, acting through SANDAG's Shoreline Preservation Committee, to finance shoreline sand replenishment by dedicating a portion of the transient occupancy tax collected throughout the region.
February 5, 2004

TO: Shoreline Preservation Committee
FROM: SANDAG Staff
SUBJECT: Southern California Coastal Ocean Observing System

The Southern California Coastal Ocean Observing System (SCCOOS) is a consortium of ten Southern California universities and laboratories that extends from Northern Baja CA in Mexico to Morro Bay at the southern edge of central California. SCCOOS aims to streamline, coordinate, and further develop individual institutional efforts by creating an integrated, multidisciplinary coastal observatory in the Bight of Southern California. By leveraging existing infrastructure, partnerships, and other resources, SCCOOS plans to develop a fully operational coastal observation system designed to address issues related to coastal water quality, marine life resources, and coastal hazards. This system, based on new sensor and information technologies and providing seamless links between observations, data management, and modeling, would provide scientists, water quality managers, natural resource managers, and policy makers with a solid scientific basis for evaluating the effectiveness of present management strategies, the design of new approaches, and serving as a risk management and early warning tool.

RR/crd
February 5, 2004

TO: Shoreline Preservation Committee

FROM: SANDAG Staff

SUBJECT: SANDAG’s Contract Work in support of the California Coastal Sediment Management Master Plan

Introduction

The California Department of Boating and Waterways has contracted with SANDAG to provide assistance in the Development of the California Coastal Sediment Management Master Plan (Master Plan). The Master Plan is an innovative collaboration between the State Resources Agency and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. It will result in an integrated strategy for nourishing the state’s beaches and dealing with the problems of sedimentation in wetland and harbors. It will focus on problems and solutions on a regional basis, and provide a framework for directing state and federal resources to help regional and local entities implement projects and programs.

The development of the Master Plan was initiated earlier this year using state and federal funds. It is anticipated that the Master Plan process will span three to five years and involve several million dollars. A Coastal Sediment Management Working Group is guiding the work. The Working Group involves a number of state and federal agencies with coastal management responsibilities. Local and regional interests are incorporated in the Working Group through the membership of CalCoast, and through a public outreach process.

The Master Plan will, for the first time, provide the opportunity for local / regional / state / federal collaboration to generate support, funding, programs and projects to preserve and enhance the state’s shorelines. SANDAG’s involvement will ensure that the San Diego region’s coastal plans (e.g. Shoreline Preservation Strategy) and interests (e.g. regional beach nourishment, wetlands enhancement) are an integral part of the Master Plan.

Discussion

SANDAG has agreed to undertake two tasks in support of the Master Plan. Steve Sachs has been hired as a temporary employee by SANDAG to do the work.

Public Outreach

The first task is to plan and conduct a series of Public Workshops around the state to introduce the Master Plan’s objectives and elicit participation in its development. The cost is $30,000. There will be approximately seven Workshops occurring between now and the end of June. The first Workshop will be presented immediately after today’s (February 5th) Shoreline Preservation Committee meeting. The Workshop Agenda and an Overview of the Master Plan are included in the Committee agenda mailout. Additional materials will be distributed at the Workshop.

Regional Opportunistic Sand Template

SANDAG will provide contracting and administrative / management services for hiring a consultant to carry out this work. The objective is to develop a permitting and project planning and implementation template that can be used to implement opportunistic beach nourishment
throughout the state. An important goal of the work will be to develop statewide agreement and support among local, regional, state and federal entities for opportunistic nourishment projects and programs. Permitting issues such as sand compatibility criteria will be addressed. The total cost (consultant contract and contract administration and management) is $105,000. This work is anticipated to be completed by the end of calendar 2004.