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REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE
May 6, 2005

ITEM # | RECOMMENDATION

+1. APPROVAL OF APRIL 1, 2005, MEETING MINUTES | APPROVE

  a. Joint Meeting of the Transportation and Regional Planning Committees
  b. Regular Meeting of the Regional Planning Committee

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

Members of the public will have the opportunity to address the Regional Planning Committee on any issue within the jurisdiction of the Committee. Speakers are limited to three minutes each and shall reserve time by completing a “Request to Speak” form and giving it to the Clerk prior to speaking. Committee members also may provide information and announcements under this agenda item.

REPORTS

3. INTRODUCTION OF THE NEWLY-ELECTED VICE CHAIRS OF THE REGIONAL PLANNING STAKEHOLDERS WORKING GROUP (Chair Lori Holt Pfeiler) | INFORMATION

At its April 19 meeting, the Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group (SWG) elected two Vice Chairs. One of the roles of the Vice Chairs is to represent the SWG as advisory members on the Regional Planning and Transportation Committees. Bill Anderson will represent the SWG on the Regional Planning Committee, and Sandor Shapery will represent the SWG on the Transportation Committee. These new Vice Chairs will be introduced at the meeting.

+4. UPDATE ON TRANSNET ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION PROGRAM AND ESTABLISHMENT OF THE REGIONAL ENTITY TO ALLOCATE FUNDING FROM THE REGIONAL HABITAT CONSERVATION FUND (Janet Fairbanks) | RECOMMEND

The TransNet ordinance includes guiding principles for the Environmental Mitigation Program (EMP). One of these principles calls for establishing a regional entity responsible for program implementation. This item summarizes the three alternative proposals for the regional entity that are currently under consideration. Two of these proposals could affect the Regional Planning Committee’s existing structure. The Regional Planning Committee is asked to recommend one of the alternatives for SANDAG Board approval at its May 27, 2005, meeting.
5. SHOWCASING LOCAL SMART GROWTH PROJECTS: THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO’S “CITY OF VILLAGES” STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK ELEMENT AND PILOT VILLAGES PROGRAM (Gail Goldberg and Coleen Clementson, City of San Diego)

The Regional Planning Committee has received periodic presentations featuring local smart growth efforts throughout the region. City of San Diego representatives will make a presentation on their “City of Villages” general plan framework and on the Council-approved Pilot Villages that will demonstrate the City of Villages concepts. The Pilot Village projects will provide an opportunity for residents and businesses in each community to become the architects of their own villages, where livability can be enhanced and quality of life objectives can be realized on a local level.

6. ENERGY WORKING GROUP UPDATE (Councilmember Henry Abarbanel)

Energy Working Group Co-Chair Henry Abarbanel will update the Regional Planning Committee on the progress the EWG has made over the past several months. Specifically, Councilmember Abarbanel will discuss the Transmission Workshop that was held in March and the Summer Outlook Workshop that is scheduled for May 4, 2005. In addition, SANDAG will be hosting the California Energy Commission’s second Border Energy Workshop on May 18, 2005.

7. UPCOMING MEETINGS

The next Regional Planning Committee meeting will be held on Friday, June 3, 2005, from 12 noon to 2 p.m.

8. ADJOURNMENT

+ next to an agenda item indicates an attachment
The joint meeting of the Transportation and Regional Planning Committees was called to order by Transportation Committee Chair Joe Kellejian (North County Coastal) at 9:34 a.m. The attendance sheets for the meeting are attached.

Chairman Kellejian (Transportation Committee) reminded everyone that this meeting is being broadcast on the Web site. He requested that members of both Committees introduce themselves. Self-introductions were made.

PUBLIC COMMENTS (A)

A. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS (INFORMATION)

None.

CONSENT ITEM (B)

B. STATUS REPORT ON THE NEW REGIONAL PLANNING STAKEHOLDERS WORKING GROUP (INFORMATION)

Action: Upon a motion by Chair Holt Pfeiler (Regional Planning Committee) and a second by Deputy Mayor Davis (South County), the Committees voted to approve Consent Item B. The motion passed unanimously.

REPORTS (C-F)

C. WORK PROGRAM FOR THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN (RTP) UPDATE (ACCEPT)

Staff noted that this report provides an overview of the work program and schedule for updating the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). A technical RTP update is expected in 2006 to meet the requirements of the normal three-year update cycle. A more comprehensive RTP update is anticipated in 2007. This 2007 update, which will be based on an updated
2030 Regional Growth Forecast, will incorporate the results of the Independent Transit Planning Review and the strategic initiatives from the adopted Regional Comprehensive Plan. The last RTP update was completed in 2003, resulting in our current RTP, MOBILITY 2030. According to federal law, the next update is due March 2006; however, a pending bill could extend that due date to 2007. A comprehensive 2007 RTP will be prepared whether or not an update is required in 2006. The Regional Planning and Transportation Committees are asked to provide comments and accept the proposed work program and schedule.

Staff provided a brief description of the work program for the RTP and discussed in detail Attachments 1 through 5, which include the 2006 Schedule, the 2007 Schedule, Issue Papers, an Outline of the Work Program, and Milestones. Staff noted that the issue papers can be categorized into four major groups, based on the themes of MOBILITY 2030: System Development; Land Use/Transportation Connection; Demand Management; and Systems Management.

Chairman Kellejian noted that a revised version of Attachment 3, which includes several additional issue paper topics that could be explored during the development of this RTP, has been distributed to the Committees. He added that today is not the day to debate the specific issues one by one. The purpose of today’s presentation is to discuss the schedule and list of issues, and discuss the specific issues at a later date.

Councilmember Feller (North San Diego County Transit Development Board) asked, with regard to the Demand Management Issue Paper, if the intention is to put pipelines underground to reduce truck traffic. Staff responded that the initial intent is to explore the possibility of using transportation corridors to put electrical transmission lines underground to provide for joint use of the right-of-way.

Councilmember Feller asked whether the Independent Transportation Planning Review is going to last for only one year. Staff replied that the review is expected to be completed by the end of the year.

Chairman Kellejian noted the blue handout of an updated list of Issues Papers that was distributed by staff. Staff stated the issue of pipelines in the Regional Freight Strategy is a new issue that would be evaluated.

MOTION

Councilmember Peters (City of San Diego) made the motion to accept the staff recommendation. Councilmember Feller seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION ON THE MOTION

Mayor Madrid (East County) asked who is taking the lead on development of the Smart Growth Concept Map. Staff noted that SANDAG staff is working with local planning staffs from each jurisdiction for input.
Mayor Madrid asked where the funding will come from for Homeland Security issues. Staff stated that has not yet been determined.

Chairman Kellejian thanked the Regional Planning Committee Stakeholders Working Group (SWG), as well as the SANDAG staff, for putting this item together.

**Action:** Upon a motion by Councilmember Peters and a second by Councilmember Feller, the Committees voted to accept the RTP work program, schedule, and issues papers. The vote passed unanimously.

**D. PROGRESS REPORT ON PILOT SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM (COMMENT)**

Staff brought the Committees up to date on the status of the Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program (SGIP). Staff reviewed the guidelines associated with the SGIP, including the use-it-or-lose-it policy, and indicated that two key issues revolving around the draft project evaluation criteria remain. At the Joint Transportation/Regional Planning Committee meeting in January 2005, a general list of criteria was provided. That list did not include weighting or scoring. This version includes scoring mechanisms. The criteria are divided into project screening criteria and project evaluation criteria. Also at the meeting in January, the Committees requested that staff add a criterion for projects that are associated with affordable housing; such a criterion has been included. Other significant changes are the action the Board took in February regarding the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) numbers and low-income household bonus points, which are different from the affordable housing points. The local jurisdictions that qualify for those points are included in the staff report.

Staff noted that the evaluation criteria were presented to the Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC), which recommended approval. When the criteria were presented to the Regional Planning Committee Technical Working Group (TWG), some members requested that the Ad Hoc Working Group re-assess the weighting associated with the Intensity of Development criterion, recommending that the weighting factor be increased to 3 or 4. Another concern raised by the TWG was the possibility that the low-income household bonus points may lead to selection of projects that won’t meet the “ready-to-go” restrictions on the use of funding. Next steps will be to go back to the TWG for its recommendation, refer that recommendation back to the Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group (SWG) for their comments, and return to these two Committees for input. After that, calls for projects will be issued, and staff will work with the evaluation group, return to each Committee separately, and forward a recommendation to the SANDAG Board for consideration.

Chairman Kellejian announced that he was approached by two members of the Committees regarding restrictions on the use of funding and noted that these funds are not allowed for developing parking structures. Maybe the smart growth incentive funds in the future will make provisions for that.

Regional Planning Committee (RPC) Chair Holt Pfeiler (North County Inland) mentioned that the RPC has discussed this issue and has debated whether to limit the project amount to $2 million or whether not to have any monetary cap.
Councilmember Monroe (South County) commented that staff did a great job in leading the work of the committees and working groups for the results presented today. He reminded the Committees that this is a pilot project that only involves $17 million. Therefore, the Committees need to get this going, move forward with the ready-to-go projects, and award funding to those projects that are ready. Some areas will qualify and some won’t because of the smart growth evaluation criteria. He commented that it would be nice to have several projects from several jurisdictions.

Councilmember Peters (City of San Diego) agreed with the $2 million limit, which would allow at least nine projects to be completed. He expressed concern about the project readiness criterion and mentioned that he has had conversations with Caltrans regarding this issue. He added that receiving federal funds requires National Environmental Protection Agency (NEPA) work, which Caltrans is reluctant to do. If there is going to be a problem with the project having a NEPA document, it needs to be known now. Staff commented that even though it would be helpful, if a ready-to-go project does not have a NEPA document, it won’t be disqualified. However, all approved projects will eventually need to have NEPA clearance in order to be funded.

Chairman Kellejian stated that he would like to gain consensus from the Committees regarding the $2 million cap.

Regional Planning Committee Vice Chair Davis (South County) commented that the Intensity for Development criterion needs to be increased to a weighting factor of at least 3 or 4. She would prefer that the projects be limited to $2 million, but the Committees should have the flexibility to approve a project that is more.

Councilmember McCoy (South County) asked how much funding is allocated to the projects, and how much would be allocated to overhead. Staff responded that the entire $17 million is allocated to the pilot projects—there should be no overhead.

Councilmember Rindone (South County) commented that a $2 million cap on projects may not be a good idea. He suggested that the $2 million amount be used as a general guideline or range, and added that the quality of the project also should be considered.

Chairman Kellejian asked Councilmember Rindone what the limit should be. Councilmember Rindone indicated that the limit should be increased to up to $4 million per project, and the projects should be based on merit. If the project range was $2 million to $4 million, there could be at least 4 to 5 projects.

Mayor Madrid stated that some jurisdictions have programs where they have the resources available and can afford to build larger projects because they have more staff. The smaller cities would not be able to compete on that level. He agreed with the $2 million cap and added that if the larger cities have projects that are viable, they can match them with their own funding. All jurisdictions should be given the chance to compete for the funding.

Pedro Orso-Delgado (Caltrans) asked what is meant by transportation characteristics. Staff responded that the RCP Smart Growth Matrix in the staff report describes those definitions which relate to characteristics, such as freeway connections, corridor or regional transit
service characteristics, park-and-ride facilities, regional arterials, shuttle services, local transit connections, and other related characteristics.

Councilmember Ritter (North County Inland) indicated that projects should be considered on a case-by-case basis and the quality, not just the quantity, of the project also should be evaluated. She noted that she would be okay with the proposed $2 million to $4 million range.

Councilmember Feller agreed that the cap should be no more than $2 million.

Chairwoman Slater-Price (County of San Diego) stated that to start a pilot program and increase the amount of the award would be going in the wrong direction. The purpose of this project is to encourage everyone to come forward with projects. Jurisdictions should be looking for matching funds from developers and private sources.

Councilmember Stocks (North County Coastal) supported the $2 million cap and noted that matching funds is only 15 percent of the total project evaluation. Selecting smaller projects would give the region more “bang for the buck.” He mentioned that the Committees could always revisit this issue if the funding cap becomes a problem.

Councilmember Rindone indicated that the issue is not just about the projects, but about flexibility for staff. The salient point is not about the cap amount but about flexibility. If staff is expected to make good judgment, then they shouldn’t have to have one arm tied behind their backs.

Councilmember Feller mentioned that if a project is valuable to a community, then the community should pay for it.

Mayor Pro Tem Jones (East County) requested clarification on what the funding can be used for.

Chairman Kellejian noted that the project activities eligible for funding include bicycle and pedestrian paths and bridges; on-street bike lanes; pedestrian plazas; pedestrian street crossings; streetscape enhancements such as median landscaping, street trees, lighting, street furniture, traffic calming design features such as pedestrian bulb-outs or traffic circles; transit stop amenities; way-finding signage; and gateway features. Other project types such as parking also may be eligible provided the Transportation Enhancement (TE) funds can be swapped for another funding source.

Mayor Pro Tem Jones stated that it appears that the money that is going to be spent on this pilot program will be a small percentage of a larger project. However, this funding could make a difference on whether or not a small project would be built. He commented that there could be some type of compromise on projects that are $2 million or less.

Transportation Committee Vice Chairman Madaffer (City of San Diego) stated that this pilot program is a good foundation and the criteria are appropriate for the moment.
MOTION

Vice Chairman Madaffer made the motion to have a $2 million cap on the projects submitted for this pilot program. Mayor Madrid seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION ON THE MOTION

Chairman Kellejian mentioned that this action would be advisory only.

Chairwoman Slater-Price noted that if a jurisdiction is using the $2 million for the projects listed, it would only serve to supplement other project funding.

Supervisor Horn (County of San Diego) commented that he didn’t see any credit for farm workers and housing in his area. He expressed concern that if this pilot program becomes the basis for eligible projects in the future, low-income housing and any other criteria will outweigh and eliminate projects that the unincorporated area could come up with.

Chair Holt Pfeiler indicated that the proposed criteria are a test for a future program. She added that there are a different set of standards for the unincorporated areas than the more urban areas.

Supervisor Horn stated that the $2 million is minimal considering that a NEPA document alone would cost, at a minimum, $250,000.

Chair Holt Pfeiler commented that the "Smart Growth and Land Use Characteristics" category currently comprises 33 percent of the total points, and that within that, the Intensity of Development criterion accounts for 7 percent of the total points. If the weighting of the Intensity of Development criterion was increased to a 3 or a 4, she estimated that those points would account for approximately 10 percent or 12 percent of the total points, which would not be excessive. She expressed support for increasing the weighting factor for the Intensity of Development criterion to a 4. Staff mentioned that if there are good projects in the region, the rural areas will be eligible to compete for the funding.

Deputy Mayor Emery (Metropolitan Transit System [MTS]) stated that if the Committees take the vote on this issue today, there will be no need to discuss it at future individual Transportation and/or Regional Planning Committee meetings because the Board will have the final say.

Chairman Kellejian reminded the Committees that the vote would be advisory and not binding, and questioned if all members, including the advisory members, will be able to vote. He requested clarification from the General Counsel. SANDAG General Counsel replied that all Committee members, including advisory members, are eligible to vote because the vote is not binding.
Action: Upon a motion by Vice Chairman Madaffer and a second by Mayor Madrid, the Committees voted for a $2 million cap on the projects submitted for this pilot program. The advisory motion passed.

Chair Holt Pfeiler requested to have an advisory vote on weight of 4 for Intensity of Development criterion.

Chairman Kellejian requested confirmation that the smaller cities that are built out will get credit for their efforts. Staff responded that the program will recognize smart growth development that has already occurred.

Councilmember Stocks requested clarification if the issue is the weight number or the percentage. Chairman Kellejian confirmed that the issue being considered is the weight number.

Action: Upon a motion by Chair Holt Pfeiler and a second by Vice Chairman Madaffer, the Committees voted to increase the weight number for the Intensity of Development criterion to 4. The advisory motion passed.

E. SHOWCASING LOCAL SMART GROWTH PROJECTS: SMART GROWTH IN SOLANA BEACH (INFORMATION)

Chairman Kellejian noted that at the last joint meeting, the Committees were briefed on smart growth projects in La Mesa. This month, the Committees will be briefed on a smart growth project in Solana Beach.

Barry Johnson, City Manager for the City of Solana Beach, noted that this presentation is called the “Super Smart Growth Project.” He introduced Greg Shannon from the Sheadona Company, who made the presentation to the Committees.

Greg Shannon, representative for Sheadona, a partnership of Shea Properties and Sedona Pacific Corporation, the developers for the NCTD/Solana Beach Mixed-Use Project, provided the Committees with an overview of the project. Mr. Shannon mentioned that public/private partnerships are always difficult to implement. He noted that transit-oriented developments need to make transit convenient and exciting. Parking availability is critical and there are two factors working in tandem to make this project successful—freeway congestion and convenient parking. And, if parking can be covered, that provides an extra convenience. Mr. Shannon commented that the City of Solana Beach and NCTD have been working on this project since 1991. NCTD put out the Requests for Proposals for developers to create a project that would satisfy several goals, including parking and the SANDAG Regional Growth Management Strategy’s Land Use Development Element principles. The project also needed to include smart growth as well as consider the concerns of the residential community.

Mr. Shannon stated that the majority of the project is a 500-space parking structure, which will be underground and will include covered bicycle parking. NCTD will build the parking structure and will issue a bond to finance the project. The developer will enter into a ground lease with NCTD for the rights to build on top of the parking structure. The lease
would pay for approximately one-half of the cost of the parking garage. Through the NCTD garage, parking structures will be carved out of the existing retaining wall and will allow quick walking access to the Coaster. Cedros Plaza, a mixed-used building to include live/work lofts over retail space, will be considered the entry way to Solana Beach. It also will reduce traffic congestion. The North Coast Repertory Theatre also will be rebuilt in downtown Solana Beach and will be a 27,000-square-foot facility. The total project cost is $48 million.

The City of Solana Beach is currently going through the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) process. The schedule is to start groundbreaking on the parking garage in April 2006, with garage completion in June 2007, and Cedros Plaza being completed in February 2009. In summary, this project will provide the following benefits to the City of Solana Beach: transit parking, affordable housing, traffic reduction, beach sand replenishment, public art (North Coast Repertory Theatre), transit-oriented development, reduced traffic generation, and pedestrian orientation and beach access.

Chairman Kellejian noted that NCTD provided the property and created a good relationship with the City of Solana Beach to promote the project.

Karen King, Executive Director of NCTD, stated that this joint effort is subsidy-dependent, but provides a long-term revenue stream and is an important project for NCTD. She complimented Mr. Shannon for coming onboard with this project when there wasn’t a lot of community support. She mentioned that future projects need to move more quickly and added that NCTD is currently undertaking the design phase for the parking structure, which should be completed soon.

Chairman Kellejian indicated that with assistance from the developers and Congressman Cunningham, the project is lacking only approximately $4.5 million in funding.

Councilmember Feller commented that this project is great news and is encouraging for future projects throughout the region.

Councilmember Monroe questioned where the major revenue stream will come from. Mr. Shannon replied that the majority of the revenue will come from the ground lease revenues, which is 10 percent of the gross revenues of the rents received.

Councilmember Monroe asked if the parking will be free. Mr. Shannon indicated that parking will be free for the Coaster riders.

Chairman Kellejian stated that if parking is not free, people may begin to park in the residential areas in lieu of paying the parking fees.

Chairwoman Slater-Price asked if the housing units will be available for sale. Mr. Shannon stated that all apartments will be for rent and many will be designated as low-income and affordable housing.
Supervisor Horn mentioned that he worked on the NCTD committee for this project, and it is a good project for the region. He added that they should consider including a major department store in the development plans.

Councilmember Peters stated that he would like to see this type of project happen throughout the region and congratulated the City of Solana Beach for its efforts, especially by bringing on Greg Shannon as the developer.

Councilmember Monroe encouraged Mr. Shannon to coordinate with SANDAG’s Shoreline Preservation Committee to put the sand on the beach from this project.

Action: The Committee received this item for information.

F. BUS RAPID TRANSIT OVERVIEW (INFORMATION)

Chairman Kellejian noted that Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) is a transit service type that will soon be implemented in San Diego through our various BRT projects.

Staff reported that BRT is a new concept in the San Diego region and is an integral part to transportation planning. For that reason, SANDAG contracted with Bill Lieberman to do research on other areas that currently have BRT systems in place in order to learn both the good and bad aspects of existing BRT systems and to assess the applicability of the different types and various components of BRT in the San Diego region.

Bill Lieberman, Transit Planning and Design, and consultant to SANDAG, explained that BRT is a package of improvements for bus transit, which includes frequent service, infrequent stops, priority in traffic, upscale buses and stops, coordination with land use planning, and branded service (vehicles and stops/stations) as a premium way to travel. He added that reasons to develop BRT would be to attract more riders by offering a higher level of bus service, similar in many respects to rail transit, and to improve service in corridors not suited to rail transit. There were seven BRT systems that were studied: East Bay Area (California), Los Angeles (California), Boston (Massachusetts), Rouen (France), Houston (Texas), Sydney (Australia), Brisbane (Australia), and Adelaide (Australia). He noted that he selected locations based on areas that he has visited in the past and those that he felt had similarities to the San Diego region. The systems fall into three categories: (1) on-street in mixed traffic; (2) on-street in reserved lanes; and (3) off-street. He described in detail the differences of the systems in each category. He noted that BRT should be adapted to the travel patterns of San Diegans; radial busways are less appropriate here because we already have radial rail lines; and busway segments may be useful in certain parts of the region to bypass congested roadways. BRT utilizing streets or freeways seems most promising here.

There were ten lessons that he learned about BRT:

1. BRT has many forms, the common trait is priority over general traffic;
2. Application of BRT strategies from other nations must be tempered by our own limitations in governmental authority;
3. BRT needs to have an upscale image to attract the more demanding market segments;

4. Use the different forms of BRT where they are best suited – a fluid system is more cost-effective than one confined by rigid standards;

5. Reserved bus lanes in city streets are a cost-effective, high-profile strategy requiring lots of cooperation from local jurisdictions;

6. Freeways can be efficiently utilized for BRT, but the stations should not be isolated;

7. In most instances, BRT is not a substitute for light rail, but rather one of several elements in a multimodal system;

8. The more that BRT emulates light rail, the smaller the difference in development costs;

9. The fewer the physical facilities involved, the more important are the other attributes of BRT; and

10. Simple route structures are better understood by the occasional traveler.

Chairman Kellejian noted that the Transportation Committee will need to begin to look at some of these different systems because they will be making decisions soon on various projects. He thanked Mr. Lieberman for his report.

Councilmember Rindone mentioned that long delays usually discourage riders. He asked whether there were any express services utilized at any of the systems that he studied. Mr. Lieberman responded that in Australia, there were some systems that made every stop and some that provided express service.

Councilmember Rindone asked whether there has been any analysis done with the frequency of service between BRT and light rail transit (LRT). Mr. Lieberman stated that, generally, the more frequency, the better. He mentioned that a bus-based service generally needs to have higher frequency to provide the same capacity as a rail system. Higher frequency leads to higher operating costs, and we have found that it is hard to obtain clear operating costs for some of the BRT systems.

Councilmember Rindone stated that the concept that not one size fits all must be maintained in San Diego County. The Transportation Committee must keep that awareness to tailor services to communities. He added that the whole purpose of the BRT system is to reduce congestion on the highways. The public wants frequency and uncomplicated schedules.

Councilmember Peters pointed out that the Transportation Committee should recognize that there is going to be a role for BRT in the San Diego region. He mentioned that there are approximately five major development projects in his jurisdiction that will need BRT to support them. He noted that he is willing to have developers contribute to the cost and requested that staff assist and educate him on the potential systems coming to the region. He requested that BRT be given the same attention as LRT. Staff responded that BRT and
LRT work together and noted that both systems should be thought out for coordinated implementation.

Chairman Kellejian noted that during the TransNet campaign, the voters were surveyed regarding different types of transit systems. The consensus was that they liked the concept of BRT, but they also preferred rail.

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

Chairman Kellejian pointed out that there was a mistake on the agenda regarding the next meeting date and time for the Transportation Committee. The next meeting of the Transportation Committee will be held at 9:00 a.m. on Friday, April 15, 2005, at the SANDAG offices.

G. **ADJOURNMENT**

Transportation Committee Chairman Kellejian adjourned the joint meeting at 11:53 a.m.
<table>
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<tr>
<th>GEOGRAPHICAL AREA</th>
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<tbody>
<tr>
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<td>Lori Holt Pfeiler, Chair</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
<td>City of Vista</td>
<td>Judy Ritter</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>City of Chula Vista</td>
<td>Patty Davis, Vice Chair</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Patricia McCoy</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>City of Carlsbad</td>
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<td>Member</td>
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</tr>
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<td>✓</td>
</tr>
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<td>City of Lemon Grove</td>
<td>Jerry Jones</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of La Mesa</td>
<td>Barry Jantz</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Scott Peters</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Jim Madaffer</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Bill Horn</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Pam Slater-Price</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>Caltrans, District 11</td>
<td>Pedro Orso-Delgado</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bill Figge</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>San Diego County Water Authority</td>
<td>Howard Williams</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>Department of Defense</td>
<td>Susannah Aguilera</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>San Diego Unified Port District</td>
<td>William Hall</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>Metropolitan Transit System</td>
<td>Leon Williams (Chairman)</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bob Emery</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>North San Diego County Transit Development Board</td>
<td>Dave Druker</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>Regional Planning Technical Working Group</td>
<td>Gail Goldberg</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONFIRMED ATTENDANCE FOR TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MEMBERS SANDAG JOINT TRANSPORTATION AND REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING APRIL 1, 2005 9:30 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GEOGRAPHICAL AREA</th>
<th>JURISDICTION</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>MEMBER/ ALTERNATE</th>
<th>ATTENDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North County Coastal</td>
<td>City of Solana Beach</td>
<td>Joe Kellejian (Chair)</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Encinitas</td>
<td>Jerome Stocks</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jim Madaffer (Vice Chair)</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scott Peters</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dick Murphy</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North County Inland</td>
<td>City of Poway</td>
<td>Mickey Cafagna</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Vista</td>
<td>Judy Ritter</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South County</td>
<td>City of Chula Vista</td>
<td>Jerry Rindone</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Coronado</td>
<td>Phil Monroe</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East County</td>
<td>City of Santee</td>
<td>Jack Dale</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of La Mesa</td>
<td>Art Madrid</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ron Roberts</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pam Slater-Price</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dianne Jacob</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Transit System</td>
<td>City of Poway</td>
<td>Bob Emery</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>Leon Williams (Chairman)</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North San Diego County Transit Development Board</td>
<td>City of Oceanside</td>
<td>Jack Feller</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Vista</td>
<td>Judy Ritter</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Escondido</td>
<td>Ed Gallo</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego County Regional Airport Authority</td>
<td>City of Lemon Grove</td>
<td>Mary Sessom</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Governor's Appointee</td>
<td>Xema Jacobsen</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADVISORY MEMBER/ Caltrans</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pedro Orso-Delgado</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bill Figge</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
San Diego Association of Governments

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

May 6, 2005

AGENDA ITEM NO.: 1b

Action Requested: APPROVE

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION AND ACTIONS
Meeting of April 1, 2005

The Regional Planning Committee meeting was called to order at 11:54 a.m. by Committee Chair Lori Holt Pfeiler (North County Inland). The attendance sheet for the meeting is attached.

1. APPROVAL OF FEBRUARY 4, 2005, MEETING MINUTES

Action: Mayor Pro Tem Jones (East County) moved and Deputy Mayor Davis (South County) seconded the motion to approve the minutes of the February 4, 2005, meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBERS COMMENTS

None.

CONSENT AGENDA

3. ENERGY WORKING GROUP MEMBERSHIP (APPROVE)

The Energy Working Group has been meeting since March 2004 and is represented by elected officials and a cross-section of other interests. The Energy Working Group recommends that the membership be expanded to include additional representation from the Industrial Environmental Association and the University of California, San Diego.

Action: Deputy Mayor Davis moved and Mayor Pro Tem Jones seconded the motion to approve the Energy Working Group’s recommendation to add the Industrial Environmental Association and the University of California, San Diego to the Energy Working Group. The motion passed unanimously.

4. UPCOMING MEETINGS

The next meeting of the Regional Planning Committee is scheduled for 12 noon to 2 p.m. on Friday, May 6, 2005.

5. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Holt Pfeiler adjourned the meeting at 11:55 p.m.
## CONFIRMED ATTENDANCE
### SANDAG REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING
#### APRIL 1, 2005
9:30 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GEOGRAPHICAL AREA</th>
<th>JURISDICTION</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>MEMBER/ ALTERNATE</th>
<th>ATTENDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Escondido</td>
<td>Lori Holt-Pfeiler, Chair</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Vista</td>
<td>Judy Ritter</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Chula Vista</td>
<td>Patty Davis, Vice Chair</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Imperial Beach</td>
<td>Patricia McCoy</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Carlsbad</td>
<td>Matt Hall</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Carlsbad</td>
<td>Bud Lewis</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Lemon Grove</td>
<td>Jerry Jones</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of La Mesa</td>
<td>Barry Jantz</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>Scott Peters</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>Jim Madaffer</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>Bill Horn</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>Pam Slater-Price</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans, District 11</td>
<td>Pedro Orso-Delgado</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans, District 11</td>
<td>Bill Figge</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego County Water Authority</td>
<td>Howard Williams</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Defense</td>
<td>Susannah Aguilera</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego Unified Port District</td>
<td>William Hall</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTDB</td>
<td>Leon Williams (Chairman)</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTDB</td>
<td>Bob Emery</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTD</td>
<td>Dave Druker</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTD</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Planning Technical Working Group</td>
<td>Gail Goldberg</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UPDATE ON TRANSNET ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION PROGRAM AND
ESTABLISHMENT OF THE REGIONAL ENTITY TO ALLOCATE FUNDING FROM THE
REGIONAL HABITAT CONSERVATION FUND

Introduction

Proposition A, approved by the voters of San Diego County in November 2004, extended the TransNet half-cent sales tax for an additional 40 years. The TransNet Ordinance and Expenditure Plan include an Environmental Mitigation Program (EMP), described in Section 2(D) of the Ordinance, and in Attachment 3 of the Ordinance titled “TransNet Extension Environmental Mitigation Program Principles.” Implementing guidelines were approved by the SANDAG Board on September 24, 2004 (TransNet Extension Environmental Mitigation Program Implementation Guidelines Agenda Item No. 04-09-15) (Attachment 1).

The EMP is intended to provide a total of $850 million for environmental mitigation of projects identified in the Regional Transportation Plan (MOBILITY 2030). Specifically, $450 million is allocated to mitigate impacts of the regional transportation projects identified in MOBILITY 2030, and $200 million is allocated to mitigate impacts of local transportation projects. The EMP also identifies $200 million for a Regional Habitat Conservation Fund to be used for habitat acquisition, management and monitoring activities that are not necessarily associated with the mitigation of transportation projects.

The EMP principles state that “SANDAG shall work with the wildlife agencies and permit holders under the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) and Multiple Habitat Conservation Program (MHCP) to establish a regional entity that will be responsible for the allocation of funding included in the “Regional Habitat Conservation Fund” in accordance with the goals and policies of said plans.” The wildlife agencies are the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and the California Department of Fish and Game (DFG). In addition, this entity will provide recommendations regarding the structure and content of future funding measures as described in Section 10 of the principles.

SANDAG staff and the wildlife agencies have developed three alternative structures for a regional entity that would have the responsibilities outlined above. The alternatives were presented on April 6, 2005, at an EMP “kick-off” meeting attended by federal, state, and local government agencies, environmental groups and non-profits, members from the business community, and university representatives. SANDAG solicited input on the alternative structures for the regional entity through April 20, 2005, and did not receive any comments.
Recommendation

The Regional Planning Committee is asked to recommend to the SANDAG Board of Directors approval of Alternative C, which would assign responsibilities for allocating the Regional Habitat Conservation Fund to the SANDAG Board of Directors, with the advice of the Regional Planning Committee, and to appoint three new advisory members to the Regional Planning Committee: the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the California Department of Fish and Game, and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

Discussion

Responsibilities of Regional Entity

The regional entity responsible for implementation of the TransNet Environmental Mitigation Program would adhere to the following overall objectives:

a. Ensure the most efficient expenditure of both funds, with all permit holders and stakeholders working under the same structure.

b. Identify and fund mitigation obligations (including both acquisition and restoration) early in the project development process to ensure this process does not impede the overall schedule for completing transportation projects.

c. Meet mitigation objectives of transportation projects within the context of the MSCP and the MHCP through the development of “mitigation banks” or other similar mechanisms.

d. Contribute funding for coordination and implementation of a regional biological monitoring program, with assurances that data collected meets standard protocols, are stored centrally, and are accessible to everyone.

e. Ensure that adequate funding is available for land management, and that adaptive management occurs based on biological monitoring information.

Major functions of the policy advisory committee (PAC) advising the SANDAG Board of Directors would include:

a. Make recommendations regarding suitable locations for mitigating transportation projects through establishment of mitigation banks or other similar mechanisms, and make recommendations to the Board of Directors on funding land acquisition, restoration, management, and monitoring as needed to mitigate transportation projects. These recommendations would be based on proposals developed by the working group.

b. Pursue additional funding sources to leverage the existing funds to acquire and restore additional land needed to help complete the MSCP and MHCP preserve systems.

c. Provide policy guidance regarding the administration of the “Regional Habitat Conservation Fund,” including Identification of priority habitat acquisition areas, and recommendations
regarding the allocation of funds for regional land acquisitions, management and monitoring activities, based on proposals from the working group.

d. Make recommendations to the Board of Directors regarding additional regional funding measures to meet the long-term requirements for implementing habitat conservation plans in the San Diego region.

Based on the objectives and functions outlined above, staff worked with the wildlife agencies and interested stakeholders to develop alternative proposals for a regional entity. Under all three scenarios, the regional entity would be the SANDAG Board of Directors with the advice of a PAC working in concert with SANDAG’s existing Transportation Committee to ensure that the EMP is implemented in accordance with the TransNet ordinance.

The Transportation Committee, through the transportation project planning and environmental review process, recommends to the SANDAG Board general project mitigation needs for transportation projects. Once mitigation requirements and schedules are approved for a particular project, the PAC for the EMP would recommend suitable sites for acquisition to meet the mitigation requirements. Final decisions would be made by the SANDAG Board, with permit compliance oversight by the permitting agencies.

Alternative A – Environmental Resources Committee

Under this alternative, SANDAG would create a new PAC, the “Environmental Resources Committee” of the SANDAG Board of Directors.

The Committee would include as voting members the County of San Diego, the City of San Diego, and other MSCP and MHCP jurisdictional representation of the four subregions (North County Inland, South County, North County Coastal, and East County). The USFWS, CDFG, Caltrans, and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers would be advisory members.

Alternative B – Expand the duties of the Regional Planning Committee

SANDAG’s existing Regional Planning Committee (RPC) provides oversight on the implementation of the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP). The components of the plan include: transportation, housing, environment, economy, regional infrastructure needs and financing, as well as land use
and design components of the regional growth management strategy. This alternative would expand their duties to include policy guidance on the EMP. This alternative would provide the Regional Planning Committee with the opportunity to provide guidance on one of the key implementation strategies of the RCP, which would complement its existing role in providing policy guidance on the Smart Growth Incentive Program and other land use implementation strategies in the RCP.

The RPC members include elected officials representing the City of San Diego, the County of San Diego, and the four subregions (North County Inland, South County, North County Coastal, and East County). The RPC also includes advisory members from Caltrans, the Department of Defense, the Metropolitan Transit System, the North County Transit Development Board, the San Diego County Water Authority, the San Diego Unified Port District, the Regional Planning Technical Working Group, and the Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group.

Alternative C - Add Advisory Members to the Regional Planning Committee

Alternative C is a “hybrid” of Alternatives A and B. This alternative recognizes time and budget constraints of forming a new committee and, at the same time, recognizes the need for additional advisory members for agenda items related to the Environmental Mitigation Program. Under this alternative, the responsibilities of the Regional Planning Committee would be expanded to include EMP items. Current advisory members of the Regional Planning Committee would continue their role on Regional Comprehensive Plan related issues, and the SANDAG Board of Directors would appoint the USFWS, CDFG, Caltrans, and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to act as advisory members for EMP-related items. Caltrans would advise on both RCP and EMP items. The RPC would organize items on its agenda related to the EMP so that the appropriate advisory members can be present for those items without being required to attend the entire meeting.

As with Alternative B, this alternative would provide the Regional Planning Committee with the opportunity to provide guidance on one of the key implementation strategies of the RCP. At the same time, this alternative is the most cost-effective, since SANDAG would not have the additional expense of staffing a new committee. This alternative also recognizes the time constraints of the wildlife agencies by grouping all EMP agenda items together.
Environmental Mitigation Program Working Group

Once the Board of Directors selects an alternative, the PAC would appoint an EMP Working Group. Members could include staff from: the USFWS, the DFG, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Caltrans, Coastal Commission, Regional Water Quality Control Board, and local jurisdictions that have completed or are in the process of completing habitat conservation plans. It is also recommended that the group include a member representing a consortium of habitat preserve land managers who are active within the county (as called for in the implementation guidelines), as well as from other stakeholder groups.

At the April 6 EMP “kick-off” meeting, some of the attendees expressed interest in working on EMP-related issues. The attendees included individuals from land conservancies, land management and non-profit organizations, environmental groups, universities, and the business community. As the work program for the EMP Working Group unfolds, the attendees will be asked to participate in meetings and forums designed for specific tasks and/or specific issues.

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Key Staff Contact: Janet Fairbanks (619) 699-6970; jfa@sandag.org
TransNet Extension
ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION GUIDELINES

Recommendation

It is recommended that the Board of Directors concur with the implementation guidelines, as outlined in this report, to be used as the basis for the agreements with state and federal wildlife agencies that will be required to implement the Environmental Mitigation Program (EMP) consistent with the passage of Proposition A.

Introduction

The TransNet Extension Ordinance and Expenditure Plan, as adopted by the Board on May 28, 2004, includes an attachment containing a set of principles (Attachment 1) that further defines the major elements of the EMP and a process for how the EMP will be implemented if Proposition A is approved by the voters on November 2, 2004. These principles refer to the establishment of a regional entity to be responsible for the allocation of funds available under the EMP and the development of implementing agreements needed to provide coverage for the projects in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) under the adopted habitat conservation plans.

Following the adoption of the Ordinance, a series of meetings related to the EMP has taken place including representatives of environmental organizations, officials from the state and federal wildlife agencies (California Fish & Game and U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service), SANDAG Board members and staff. These discussions have been focused on developing guidelines for the implementation of the EMP which will serve as the initial steps in the process for preparing the required implementing agreements and establishing the regional entity. The purpose of this item is to provide a statement of intent from the Board regarding the implementation of the EMP, as summarized in the implementation guidelines outlined in the Discussion section.

Discussion

Based on the results of these discussions related to the EMP, and building upon the numerous EMP requirements contained in the adopted Ordinance and its attachments, a summary of the implementation guidelines representing areas of agreement on specified issues is provided below. These implementation guidelines provide a statement of intent regarding how the EMP will be implemented if Proposition A is approved by the voters in November. These guidelines assume the early implementation of the EMP program. The acceleration of the EMP program is important in order to provide for the required mitigation of key projects in advance so that transportation project implementation can be accelerated as well. These early actions would require restructuring the financial plans for the current program or borrowing against future funding from the new program beginning in FY 2009. This advance funding would be one of many issues to be resolved in a detailed financial planning analysis to be undertaken following passage of Proposition A. The
implementation guidelines are as follows (all dollars shown are in 2002 dollars consistent with the TransNet Extension Ordinance and Expenditure Plan):

1. Funding for “management and monitoring implementation” activities would be allocated based on the targets set forth in the following schedule: $1 million in FY 05-06; $2 million in FY 06-07; $4 million in FY 07-08; and $5 million in each year thereafter. Funding for this category may be reduced due to restrictions on borrowing of such funds for management purposes.

2. Funding for “habitat restoration activities” would be allocated based on the targets set forth in the following schedule: $5 million per year beginning in FY 14-15 and continuing through FY 22-23. These are estimated costs. Actual expenditures for restoration activities would be based on requirements for mitigation of upland and wetland habitat impacts of transportation projects, and may exceed the targets set forth above.

3. A line of credit, or similar flexible financing mechanism, would be established in order to allow acquisition of habitat land to meet mitigation requirements for transportation projects, while at the same time meeting acquisition priorities established in the adopted regional habitat management programs. This will include early acquisition of properties that are at risk of conversion to agricultural or urban uses, or other critical habitat lands that would satisfy the mitigation requirements for transportation projects covered by this program. Acquisitions outside approved sub-area plans of the adopted regional habitat management programs also must meet wildlife agency approved state Natural Community Conservation Program (NCCP) criteria.

The total financing costs for early land acquisitions under this line of credit, including any subsequent debt financing that may be used to retire the line of credit, would not exceed $230 million, which would be paid from the “Regional Habitat Conservation Fund” (up to $200 million) and a portion of total financing costs allocated in the Expenditure Plan (up to $30 million).

Total costs for the EMP are not to exceed $880 million, of which $650 is allocated for direct mitigation of transportation projects, up to $200 million for allowable activities under the Regional Habitat Conservation Fund, and up to $30 million for additional financing costs.

In addition, to the degree needed, up to $82 million in “intra-program fund transfers” (interest-free fund transfers from transportation project categories) would be allowed beginning in FY 08-09. Such intra-program transfers would be distributed over the early years of the program in such a way that transportation projects are not delayed. Such transferred funds would be returned for use on transportation projects by end of the program.

4. Funding for advanced land acquisitions under this program would be made available beginning July 1, 2006, with approximately $290 million of habitat land to be purchased over no more than a fifteen year period.

5. The regional entity described in Principle 5 would be advised by a technical working group that includes staff members representing the entities described above, as well as representation from a consortium of habitat preserve land managers who are active within the county.
These guidelines provide the initial steps toward development of the agreements with the wildlife agencies required to implement the EMP and to ensure that the intent of the EMP is carried out. In addition to being used in the development of these required agreements, the guidelines also will be used in other actions related to the implementation of the EMP as they are presented to the SANDAG Board of Directors in the future should Proposition A be successful this November.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Attachment

Key Staff Contact: Craig Scott, (619) 699-1926; csc@sandag.org

No Budget Impact
1. The TransNet Extension Expenditure Plan shall include a funding allocation category entitled “Transportation Project Environmental Mitigation Program.”

2. The Environmental Mitigation Program (EMP) shall include an allocation for the estimated direct costs for mitigation of upland and wetland habitat impacts for regional transportation projects included in the proposed TransNet Expenditure Plan, as well as for regional projects that are included in the adopted 2030 Regional Transportation Plan Mobility Network. The “mitigation costs,” including land acquisition, restoration, management, and monitoring, for these regional projects are estimated at approximately $450 million. Funds for direct mitigation, management and monitoring of these projects shall be placed into a “Transportation Project Mitigation Fund,” where they can be used as partial funding for regional acquisition, habitat management and monitoring activities related to implementation of the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP), the Multiple Habitat Conservation Program (MHCP), and future amendments thereto.

3. The EMP shall also include an allocation for the estimated direct costs for mitigation of upland and wetland habitat impacts for local transportation projects, in a total amount not to exceed $200 million. Funds for direct mitigation of these projects shall also be placed in the “Transportation Project Mitigation Fund” outlined in Section 2 above.

4. The EMP shall also include a funding allocation for the estimated economic benefits of incorporating specified regional and local transportation projects into applicable habitat conservation plans, thereby allowing mitigation requirements for covered species to be fixed, and allowing mitigation requirements to be met through purchase of land in advance of need in larger blocks at a lower cost. The benefits of this approach are estimated at approximately $200 million ($150 million for regional projects and $50 million for local projects). This amount will be allocated to a “Regional Habitat Conservation Fund,” which will be made available for regional habitat acquisition, management and monitoring activities necessary to implement the MSCP and MHCP described in Section 2 above. Therefore, the total funding allocation for the Environmental Mitigation Program shall be set at $850 million.

5. SANDAG shall work with the Wildlife Agencies (California Department of Fish and Game and the US Fish and Wildlife Service) and permit holders under the MSCP and MHCP to establish a regional entity that will be responsible for the allocation of funding included in the “Regional Habitat Conservation Fund” in accordance with the goals and policies of said plans. In addition, this entity will provide recommendations regarding the structure and content of future funding measures as described in Section 10 below.

6. Land acquisitions, and management and monitoring activities, that result from the implementation of this program shall receive credit toward the “regional funding obligations,” if any, under the applicable habitat conservation plans, with the exception that land acquisitions in the MSCP planning area (as designated and permitted as of April 9, 2004) shall not count toward the regional funding obligation for land acquisition (currently estimated at 10,267 acres) established for that program.
7. In order to provide the economic benefits of the proposed EMP, the participating local jurisdictions shall apply for, and the Wildlife Agencies shall process, requests for any necessary amendments to the previously adopted MSCP and related agreements and permits, to include Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) transportation projects as “covered projects” under this plan pursuant to the standards in effect at that time for the remaining life of those plans. For projects in the planning areas of the MHCP and proposed MSCP North County Suburban for unincorporated North County, the participating local jurisdictions shall include RTP projects in their proposed plans and implementing agreements, and the Wildlife Agencies will process those plans and agreements so as to provide coverage for RTP projects for the life of those plans.

8. The expenditure of funds included in this allocation category shall be phased over time in order to allow goals of regional habitat acquisition, management and monitoring to be met, while also meeting the requirements for individual transportation projects. The timeframe by which the phasing will be done will allow for the early acquisition of land within the first 10 years of the permits and/or amended permits with corresponding funds available for management and monitoring. In addition, mitigation land for projects in the planning area covered in the proposed MSCP for unincorporated North County shall be purchased within the multiple habitat planning area designated for that plan, while mitigation for projects in the adopted MSCP and MHCP planning areas shall be purchased within the multiple habitat planning areas designated for those plans, unless otherwise approved by SANDAG, the Wildlife Agencies, and affected permit holders. As transportation projects are completed, if it is determined that the actual direct costs for mitigation of upland and wetland habitat impacts are less than those that were estimated in Section 2 above, those cost savings shall be transferred to the “Regional Habitat Conservation Fund” described in Section 4 above.

9. In addition to the direct economic benefits associated with inclusion of these projects in the MSCP and MHCP, SANDAG and the Wildlife Agencies both recognize the value of expedited processing of environmental documents for individual transportation projects by all involved Federal, State, and regional agencies. Therefore, SANDAG and the Wildlife Agencies shall actively support efforts to accomplish complete review of environmental documents within reduced timeframes. To the extent that the processing time required for such documents is reduced, the value of expedited processing shall be allocated equally between transportation-related expenditures and the “Regional Habitat Conservation Fund”. SANDAG and the Wildlife Agencies will develop guidelines for implementing this principle within one year of the passage of the TransNet extension.

10. SANDAG agrees to act on additional regional funding measures (a ballot measure and/or other secure funding commitments) to meet the long-term requirements for implementing habitat conservation plans in the San Diego region, within the timeframe necessary to allow a ballot measure to be considered by the voters no later than four years after passage of the TransNet Extension. In the event that such future funding measures generate funding to fully meet regional habitat acquisition and management requirements, SANDAG is authorized to reallocate excess funds included in the “Regional Habitat Conservation Fund” to local transportation projects.
11. In the event that SANDAG and its member agencies are not able to obtain coverage for transportation projects the MSCP and MHCP in accordance with the principles set forth above, the funding allocations set forth in this program shall be made available to meet habitat mitigation requirements of transportation projects, either through an alternative program that is acceptable to SANDAG, its member agencies, and the Wildlife Agencies, or through environmental review and permitting of individual projects under existing regulatory procedures.
April 29, 2005

TO: Regional Planning Committee

FROM: SANDAG Staff

SUBJECT: AGENDA ITEM #6 – ENERGY WORKING GROUP UPDATE: UPCOMING ENERGY WORKSHOPS

The Energy Working Group (EWG) has identified a series of workshops that will be conducted throughout 2005 to inform EWG members, stakeholders, and the public about the issues that are addressed in San Diego Gas & Electric’s (SDG&E’s) Long-Term Resource Plan. The Long-Term Resource Plan identifies the electrical energy needs for the region over the next 10 years. The EWG’s participation in the preparation of this plan with SDG&E is its top priority.

Attached are notices for two upcoming workshops. The first workshop will feature California’s Deputy Secretary of Energy, Joe Desmond, who will provide an energy outlook for summer 2005. The second workshop will focus on border energy issues and will be hosted by the California Energy Commission.

Anyone interested is welcome to attend.

RR/sgr

Attachments
San Diego Regional Energy Summit
May 4, 2005, 8:30 a.m. to Noon
Qualcomm Auditorium, 6455 Lusk Blvd., San Diego

Commercial and industrial energy use in California is predicted to increase over 10% by 2010. To ensure that San Diego has the energy it needs to meet its growth in the near future, we need to manage our energy resources wisely TODAY.

We invite you to join us at the San Diego Regional Energy Summit on May 4th, where leading experts will highlight how together we can build the foundation for a prosperous economy. California’s Deputy Secretary of Energy, Joe Desmond, will address this summer’s energy outlook and the actions Governor Schwarzenegger’s administration is taking to ensure a stable energy supply for California. Mr. Desmond will also discuss how the public and private sector can join the Administration in working together to keep the lights on and our energy costs low. Government and business leaders will discuss successful energy-saving steps they are taking to improve their bottom line and boost productivity. The San Diego Regional Energy Office, SDG&E, and Flex Your Power staff will have tools and resources on-hand that can help you manage your energy use efficiently.

We are calling on San Diego’s business and government leaders to attend, so that together we can agree to take action to both protect our economy today and expand our economic potential tomorrow. By pledging to “Flex Your Power,” you will be doing your part to ensure a sustainable energy future.

Be sure to join us on May 4th from 8:30 a.m. to Noon at the Qualcomm Auditorium, 6455 Lusk Blvd, San Diego. This event is FREE. For an agenda and to register, visit http://www.fypower.org/feature/regional/. RSVP deadline is April 27th. For more information, contact Allison Quaid, Flex Your Power, at (619) 990-7239.

This event is co-sponsored by Governor Schwarzenegger’s office, San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG), San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce, San Diego Regional Energy Office, San Diego Gas & Electric, City of San Diego, Industrial Environmental Association, Qualcomm, and Flex Your Power.
CALIFORNIA-MEXICO BORDER ENERGY WORKSHOP

On May 18, 2005, the California Energy Commission will conduct a public workshop in San Diego, California, on energy and related issues in the California-Mexico border region. A workshop was held on December 14, 2004, to help define the key energy issues of the region. Based on this feedback, the Energy Commission staff developed the following four white papers:

- Demographics and Trends in the California-Mexico Border Region
- Border Energy Supply and Demand Assessment
- Energy-Related Environmental Issues and Opportunities Along the California-Mexico Border
- Energy-Related Economic Opportunities and Challenges

The primary purpose of this workshop is to discuss the topics in these papers, which will be released to the public on May 2, 2005. By November 2005, the Energy Commission will make recommendations in a California-Mexico Border Energy section of the 2005 Energy Report to the Governor and California Legislature. The Energy Report recommendations may lead to new legislation, Governor’s Executive Orders and other policies and programs.

The Energy Commission invites all interested parties to participate in the 2005 Energy Report process and attend the workshop, which will be held from 9:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. at the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) Board Room, 7th Floor, 401 B Street in San Diego. For additional information, please contact Tim Olson at (916) 654-4528 or Jennifer Williams at (916) 654-4710.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electric Transmission</td>
<td>3-15-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2005: Energy Outlook and Tools for Action</td>
<td>5-4-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 Long Term Resource Plan Kick Off Meeting</td>
<td>July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewable Energy Resources</td>
<td>September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative Briefing</td>
<td>October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change</td>
<td>December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Metering and Broadband over Power Lines</td>
<td>January/February 2006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>