The Regional Planning Committee meeting was called to order by Committee Chair Lori Holt Pfeiler (North County Inland) at 12:12 p.m. The attendance sheet for the meeting is attached.

1. **APPROVAL OF OCTOBER 1, 2004 MEETING MINUTES**

   **Action:** Upon a motion by Councilmember Jim Madaffer (City of San Diego) and a second by Mayor Maggie Houlihan (North County Coastal), the minutes of the October 1, 2004, meeting were unanimously approved.

2. **PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS**

   There were no public comments, communications, or member comments.

3. **REPORTS**

   **PROPOSED APPROACH FOR INTEGRATING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE REGIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN (RCP) AND THE UPDATE OF THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN (RTP)**

   Bob Leiter, Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning, provided a presentation with an overview of the RCP vision and policy framework, discussion of some of the key strategies in the RCP dealing with transportation and land use coordination, and next steps in implementing the plan. The RCP began with a vision for our region in the year 2030. Based on this vision, the RCP set forth a policy framework based on three themes: (1) better connecting land use and transportation plans both at the local and regional level, (2) using those coordinated plans to guide our other plans and investments, and (3) making it happen through incentives and collaboration. The RCP includes strategic initiatives in each of the following areas: land use/transportation, housing, economic development, healthy environment, public facilities, borders, and performance monitoring and analytical tools, and identifies priorities and time frames for completion of those initiatives. The core initiatives that connect land use and transportation include the Smart Growth Incentive Program, the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA), performance indicators and targets, a Smart Growth Concept Map, an Updated Regional Growth Forecast, and an updated Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The overall goal of these initiatives is to
further integrate our land use and transportation plans and policies, and provide incentives that promote the implementation of those plans and policies.

He then explained the goals and steps necessary for implementing each of these core initiatives.

The goals of the Smart Growth incentive Program are to support smart growth with regional transportation investments, provide regional funding for infrastructure and planning, provide local incentives, and acquire funding for activities from outside agencies. The steps to implement this program are developing pilot program guidelines, implementing the pilot program, evaluating the pilot program results, and developing and implementing the long-term program (beyond FY 05).

The goals for the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) are to set five-year targets for housing capacity at the regional level, and by jurisdiction and income category, and provide assistance to communities in meeting these targets. The steps to meet these goals are to prepare the draft Needs Assessment, conduct a public review, and adopt the final Needs Assessment. The SANDAG Board is scheduled to adopt the RHNA in January 2005.

The steps for implementing the performance indicators and targets are to prepare a baseline monitoring report, develop the performance targets, and adopt the Performance Indicators and Targets (by June 2005).

The goals for the Smart Growth Concept Map are to identify areas in the region that currently exhibit smart growth features or could be planned to promote smart growth principles, which aim to provide more compact land uses and good urban design, provide travel choices, provide employment opportunities near housing, provide more housing choices, increase infrastructure capacity in smart growth areas, and protect open space and habitat areas. Mr. Leiter said that from a geographic perspective the focus is in the western part of the region. The Concept Map will try to identify areas where smart growth makes sense and will connect well with the regional transportation system. From a transportation perspective the Concept Map would lay out a future network of transit facilities and show the potential locations of over 140 regional transit stations. The main focus of the Smart Growth Concept Map will be to connect transit station locations and adjacent land uses.

Mr. Leiter commented that one size does not fit all in Smart Growth place types. The RCP defines seven different smart growth “place types” ranging from the metropolitan center to rural communities. The steps to implement the Smart Growth Concept Map are to work with local planners to prepare a draft Concept Map, hold public workshops and meetings to gather input, refine the Concept Map as a result of that input, and adopt the Concept Map by September 2005.

Mayor Houlihan (North County Coastal) asked if local planners will be communicating with their various city councils. Mr. Leiter replied that SANDAG staff will be available to make presentations to city councils and to work with city staffs to keep the communication flowing. Mr. Gallegos noted that he meets with city managers on a monthly basis.
Mr. Leiter continued his report with the goals of the Updated Regional Growth Forecast, which are to incorporate the “Regional Housing Needs” targets, reflect new land use inputs from local general plan updates and the Smart Growth Concept Map, and update interregional modeling. The steps to implement the Updated Regional Growth Forecast are to perform a technical analysis, release the draft forecast, conduct a public input process, and adopt the final forecast by February 2007. This work will be conducted in connection with the RTP.

Mr. Leiter said that the goals for updating the RTP are to update the 2030 regional transportation network with the updated growth forecast and the smart growth land use concepts using the best available service concepts and technologies, and update the network phasing, policies, and project evaluation criteria.

Mr. Leiter said that depending upon the outcome of the pending federal transportation reauthorization legislation, we will need to complete the next RTP update within either a three-year or four-year cycle. Under the four-year cycle we would incorporate the technical analysis and work products of the other core RCP initiatives in a comprehensive RTP update. However, the time constraints of the three-year cycle would limit what could reasonably be accomplished, and would rely on the currently adopted 2030 growth forecast and primarily incorporate technical updates to cost estimates, financial forecasts, etc.

Mr. Leiter reported that there would be a series of technical reports that would be developed for the following areas and incorporated into the RTP: the effects of smart growth plans on transportation needs and plans; independent review of the Regional Transit Vision; the effects of interregional commuting from Mexico, and Riverside and Imperial Counties; the effects of tribal reservation development; intermodal connections and freight needs, the effects of public safety and homeland security; a transportation systems management update; a transportation demand management update; the relationship between transportation and energy needs; and the relationship of the RTP with regional plans for air quality, natural habitats, and water quality. Mr. Leiter asked Committee members if there were other topics that have not been mentioned.

Mayor Houlihan asked if these reports would be geared to work with habitat plans. Janet Fairbanks, Senior Regional Planner, answered affirmatively.

Jim Bond, representing the San Diego County Water Authority, asked if alternative arterial street routes would be evaluated to avoid the congestion on Interstate 5 (I-5). He also wanted to know what kind of incentives or work will be done to improve other routes besides I-5. Mr. Leiter responded that staff will look at the overall network, which includes the arterials. Work similar to the North County Parkway Plan and other studies of arterial needs will be done and alternatives modeled. Mr. Gallegos said that how much will be done will depend upon available resources.

Mr. Bond stated that the Governor and the Legislature have allowed hybrids into the high-occupancy-vehicle (HOV) lanes. He said that sales of hybrid cars are high and wondered if that will congest the HOV lanes.
Pedro Orso-Delgado, Caltrans, said that the number of hybrid vehicles at this point is not a significant impact on the HOV lanes. He also said that we need to coordinate local development and arterial planning.

Supervisor Pam Slater (County of San Diego) stated that some of the arterial roads would have been expensive and not feasible to build. We need to look at the overall topography adjacent to housing developments to make a determination about what roads would be needed by the housing development. Mr. Gallegos pointed out that it is a Catch-22 situation because you can’t get the densities you need if you don’t have the infrastructure to support them.

Chair Pfeiler commented this is why the RCP and RTP need to be married.

Mr. Madaffer asked what happens to the incentive program in Proposition A if the measure doesn’t pass. Mr. Gallegos replied that it will be a struggle to come up with funding for that program if it doesn’t pass. The State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) does not have any new money in it. An alternate funding source would be the next federal transportation bill.

Councilmember Madaffer stated that the technical working group will need to be sensitive to that. Mr. Leiter agreed that the Technical Working Group will be looking to ensure funding sources and to size the pilot program to fit available funds.

Mayor Pfeiler said that less funding will result in the program criteria becoming more restrictive.

Kim Kawada, Principal Planner, said that $17 million in TEA funds have been identified to fund the incentive program called for in MOBILITY 2030; however, the funding sources of the other $8 million have not yet been identified.

Councilmember Madaffer cautioned the Committee that there may be opposition to the development of smart growth opportunity areas. He expressed his desire to make certain that we are tying in existing or planned preserves, open space, or habitat areas. He noted that if the federal law remains unchanged and we have to adopt the RTP in 2006, we may not be able to implement the core initiatives. Mr. Leiter said that if a federal reauthorization bill is not approved, we will not be able to provide a full-blown update of the growth forecast and we would not be able to fold the smart growth information into that forecast and the RTP. If that happens we would meet the federal requirements but we would continue to work on a more refined plan that would include those initiatives. We could then go back and amend the RTP a year later.

Mr. Bond said that the $25 million is not much of an incentive when you divide it up between 18 cities and the County.

David Druker, representing the North San Diego County Transit Development Board (NCTD), asked if the Concept Map will include the Del Mar fairgrounds, parks, and the new airport. Mr. Leiter said that was a good point and those areas could be included as special use centers.
Mr. Leiter said that the six initiatives are interrelated to make a connection between land use and transportation. Once the RTP update is complete, we will have a functional plan that implements the goals and policies of the RCP related to land use and transportation coordination. The next steps are to prepare work programs for each core initiative, establish the stakeholders working group, organize subregional staff teams at SANDAG to collaborate with local agencies, and implement the work program.

**Action:** The report was accepted by the Regional Planning Committee.

### 4. CREATION OF A NEW REGIONAL PLANNING STAKEHOLDERS WORKING GROUP

Ms. Fairbanks reported that this item relates to the creation of a new stakeholders working group. The original stakeholders working group completed its work on the RCP in June, and it was deemed a success. Staff would have this group work on RCP implementation and the RTP update. She explained that the Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group would work in an advisory capacity to the Regional Planning (RPC) and Transportation Committees (TC) on specific RCP implementation and RTP preparation activities. SANDAG staff would take draft reports and recommendations to the Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group, the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (RPTWC), and the City/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) for advice and input. Then, their recommendations would be presented to the RPC and the TC for recommendation to the SANDAG Board.

Ms. Fairbanks explained that staff would follow the same format in terms of recruiting and appointing members as for the initial working group. There would be about 22-25 members recruited from all over the region representing various interests. Staff would prepare a membership application and solicit groups through the SANDAG Web site, our internal mailing lists, and in newspapers.

Mayor Houlihan asked that press releases on this solicitation be transmitted electronically to RPC members.

Ms. Fairbanks said that staff would develop criteria for a selection committee to rank the applications. The selection committee would be made up of two members from the RPC and two from the TC, SANDAG staff, and two members each from the RPTWG and the CTAC. In January 2005, the RPC and the TC would be asked to recommend to the SANDAG Board for approval.

Mayor Houlihan and Supervisor Slater volunteered to be on the selection committee.

Ms. Fairbanks stated that the creation of this new stakeholders working group would be acted on by the SANDAG Board at its November 19 meeting. A notice about the selection of Working Group members would be published the following day, with two weeks provided to accept applications. She suggested that the selection panel meet before the holidays. This will allow staff the time to put together the paperwork for appointing the working group members in January 2005 and would allow the Stakeholders Working Group to hold its first meeting in February 2005.
Mayor Houlihan asked how often this Working Group would meet. Ms. Fairbanks replied that it would likely meet once a month.

Mayor Houlihan noted that the reappointment process described in the staff report states that if a member misses three meetings, he/she would be replaced. She thought that should be reduced to missing two meetings in a row.

Mayor Pfeiler suggested that this section be amended to indicate that if a member misses two meetings in a row or three meetings over the course of one year, that he/she would be replaced.

Councilmember Madaffer said that information ought to be provided up front. Ms. Fairbanks agreed to make that change and to publish the meeting schedule so that members will know ahead of time when the meetings will be held.

Mr. Gallegos suggested that since Councilmember Madaffer sits on both the RPC and the TC, he would be a good candidate for the selection panel.

Ms. Fairbanks suggested that the selection panel meet on either December 15 or 16.

Councilmember Madaffer agreed to participate upon approval of the TC Chair.

Supervisor Slater indicated that December 16 would work best for her calendar.

Action: Upon a motion by Supervisor Slater and a second by Mayor Houlihan, the RPC unanimously recommended creation of a Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group outlined in this report, and approved Mayor Maggie Houlihan and Supervisor Pam Slater-Price as the two representatives from the RPC for the selection panel for the working group.

5. PILOT SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM

Stephan Vance, Senior Regional Planner, reported that MOBILITY 2030 calls for the development of an initial five-year, $25 million pilot smart growth incentive program. Under the pilot program, grant funds would be made available to local jurisdictions for projects that help integrate transportation and land use, such as transit-oriented developments and other smart growth projects that make areas more conducive to mixed land uses, walking, and biking. This pilot program would be a precursor to the anticipated longer-term, $280 million funding program proposed in the extension of TransNet. Lessons learned from the pilot program would be used to develop the longer-term incentive program.

The California Transportation Commission (CTC) has provided an estimate of Transportation Enhancement (TE) funds available to regional agencies of about $17 million for the period covering FY 2005 to FY 2009. Identifying a specific funding source for the remaining $8 million would occur after the adoption of a new federal transportation reauthorization act.
The TE program was implemented by the federal government to support enhancements to the transportation system that were not normally funded under traditional funding programs. There are a variety of uses for TE funds but, in the last funding cycle, SANDAG focused the use of these funds on four project types that supported the following key regional priorities: projects supporting transit-oriented development, regional corridor and feeder bikeways, scenic viewshed or wildlife corridor acquisitions, or corridor or gateway enhancements. For this cycle it is recommended that these funds be refocused exclusively for the Smart Growth Incentive Program.

Mr. Vance stated that this item has been presented to the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG) and CTAC to discuss various approaches to the program. It was the recommendation from those groups that SANDAG should do the program in one call for projects and only fund those projects that are “ready to go” and that showcase the benefits of smart growth.

Mr. Vance reviewed the schedule for implementing this program. Staff is suggesting that a joint ad hoc working group of CTAC and TWG members be formed to determine the administration process and project selection criteria. This would be performed over the next two months, with a report back in January containing the group’s recommendations for the proposed program. Staff will take this item to the Transportation Committee for concurrence and then to the SANDAG Board. A call for projects would be issued in February 2005. The selection process would be worked through the working groups, the RPC, the Transportation Committee in March, and project recommendations would be presented to the SANDAG Board in April 2005.

Mr. Vance noted that this process is a little different this time around because these projects have to go through a Caltrans review process and receive approval by the CTC. He noted that the state has very strict “use it or lose it” funding provisions. The CTC would act on the project recommendations by July 2005 for approval and project development in the next fiscal year.

Mr. Druker asked how the list of projects in Attachment 2 relates to this pilot program. Mr. Vance said the list includes the projects funded in the past with TE funds.

Mr. Gallegos clarified that the list was intended to show the kinds of projects that were previously funded with TE funding. The recommendation now is to focus the funding on smart growth projects.

Chair Pfeiler stated that this is an affirmation that we are changing the focus for the expenditure of these funds.

Mr. Bond clarified that this is not new money, but a new focus on spending TE monies.

Supervisor Slater-Price pointed out that TE requires a local match of about 12 percent.

**Action:** Upon a motion by Councilmember Madaffer and a second by Mayor Houlihan, the Committee unanimously approved the proposed approach for the Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program.
6. HOUSING UPDATE

Susan Baldwin, Senior Regional Planner, reported that on September 24, 2004, the SANDAG Board accepted the Draft RHNA numbers for the 2005-2010 housing element cycle for a 90-day public review period. SANDAG is seeking comments on the draft RHNA numbers by December 31, 2004. She said that staff is available to make presentations on this matter to city councils and the County Board of Supervisors. Staff also has scheduled a meeting with the City/County Management Association on December 2, 2004, and will be talking to them about the RHNA process, the draft numbers, and other issues. The area Planning Directors are invited to that meeting. A Policy Board meeting will be held on January 14, 2005, to talk about housing issues related to the RHNA. The issues that were previously raised included real ways that the region can provide affordable housing and how best to meet the housing element law, tools for providing affordable housing (federal and state subsidies, etc.), inclusionary housing, second units, and what areas are most appropriate to provide additional multifamily-zoned land.

Mayor Houlihan suggested that we obtain information from areas that have tried inclusionary housing or accessory units and find out the methods used, how it works, what the loopholes are, and whether these approaches pay off.

Mr. Druker agreed with the regional and subregional type of planning and the possibility of partnering with adjacent cities or areas to meet the RHNA numbers.

Mayor Houlihan suggested that staff gather information on the experience in Hermosa Beach on the additional zoning that occurred in that area.

Bob Emery, representing MTS, indicated that Poway has already had a meeting with staff to discuss these items. One of the major issues is the flexibility to put affordable housing where it might feasibly be built. It’s not a matter of not wanting affordable housing; rather, it is a matter of having the land and the zoning for it. He added that a large percentage of the City of Poway is designated for preservation through the Multiple Species Conservation Plan (MSCP). He expressed support for arrangements with other jurisdictions to meet the RHNA numbers.

Mr. Gallegos challenged the RPC members and the planning directors to come up with a way to work together to resolve this issue. He said it is especially challenging when the RHNA number we get from the state exceeds the housing capacities of the local general plans. He was in favor of subregional planning, but said that we have to work with the planning directors on this concept. Meeting the RHNA will continue to get tougher in the future.

Mayor Houlihan stated that even if we increase the zoning, we have to be sure that we can build what needs to be built.

Supervisor Slater stated that there are three things that work against subregional planning: (1) the mandate that we had to have affordable housing in each community; (2) developers were given incentives to build units that would then sunset their affordability status in
20-30 years; and (3) jurisdictions were not given credit for older units that might become more affordable.

Mr. Gallegos stated that we have some flexibility, though he expected some input from housing advocates about the social equity issue. The state Secretary of Business, Transportation, and Housing is really focused on this and wants to tie investments in transportation with housing. The state will be asking the question, “Are we investing our transportation dollars in the right place?”

**Action:** The Committee received this item for information.

7. **PROPOSAL FOR SHOWCASING LOCAL SMART GROWTH EFFORTS**

Ms. Kawada reported that next month the City of Chula Vista will provide information about Otay Ranch as an example of green field smart growth development. In January 2005, the City of La Mesa is scheduled to make a presentation on its redevelopment plans as an example of smart growth in older, built-out communities.

The Committee expressed interest in receiving future presentations on smart growth efforts. Ms. Kawada asked Committee members to notify her of ideas for future presentations.

**Action:** The Committee received this item for information.

8. **UPCOMING MEETINGS**

The next meeting of the Regional Planning Committee is scheduled for 12 noon to 2 p.m. on Friday, December 3, 2004.

9. **ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Pfeiler adjourned the meeting at 1:28 p.m.

**BOB LEITER**
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Key Staff Contact: Carolina Gregor, (619) 699-1989, cgr@sandag.org
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