



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

MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

MEMBER AGENCIES

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

ADVISORY MEMBERS

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

Mexico

SHORELINE PRESERVATION WORKING GROUP

The Shoreline Preservation Working Group may take action on any item appearing on this agenda.

Thursday, February 7, 2008

11:30 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.

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

Staff Contact: Shelby Tucker
 (619) 699-1916
 stu@sandag.org

AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

- STATUS AND NEXT STEPS FOR POTENTIAL REGIONAL BEACH SAND REPLENISHMENT PROJECT
- PRESENTATION ON TIJUANA ESTUARY DEMONSTRATION PROJECT

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

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

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

SHORELINE PRESERVATION WORKING GROUP

Thursday, February 7, 2008

| ITEM # | RECOMMENDATION |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| 1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS | |
| 2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS | COMMENTS |
| Members of the public will have the opportunity to address the Shoreline Preservation Working Group (SPWG) during this time. | |
| +3. SUMMARY OF THE DECEMBER 6, 2007, MEETING | APPROVE |
| The December 6, 2007, meeting summary is attached for Working Group review and approval. | |
| 4. PRESENTATION ON TIJUANA ESTUARY DEMONSTRATION PROJECT | INFORMATION |
| Clif Davenport from the California Sediment Management Workgroup and Sam Johnson, Chief Geologist from the U.S. Geological Survey Coastal and Marine Section will provide a presentation on the Tijuana Estuary Demonstration Project in an effort to get input from the Working Group. The study is to monitor the effects of placing sediment with relatively high percentage of fines in the nearshore, with the assumption that if no adverse effects occur as a result then the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and others will have a technical basis for relaxing the 80/20 rule of thumb that limits the sediment that can be used for beach restoration (statewide objective). | |
| +5. STATUS AND NEXT STEPS FOR POTENTIAL REGIONAL BEACH SAND REPLENISHMENT PROJECT | DISCUSSION/POTENTIAL RECOMMENDATION |
| SANDAG staff will provide the Working Group with an update on the status of efforts to build a regional beach replenishment project similar to the 2001 Regional Beach Sand Project. | |
| 6. UPDATE ON REGIONAL SHORELINE MANAGEMENT EFFORTS | INFORMATION |
| SANDAG staff will provide the Working Group with an overview of regional shoreline efforts, including the Sand Compatibility and Opportunistic Use Program, Coastal Regional Sediment Management Plan, and potential regional infrastructure investments. | |

ITEM #**RECOMMENDATION**

7. ADJOURNMENT AND NEXT MEETING

INFORMATION

The next regularly scheduled Working Group meeting is Thursday, April 4, 2008, from 11:30 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. In addition, there may be a special meeting scheduled for March 6, 2008, to discuss follow-up to Item No. 5, if needed.

+ next to an item indicates an attachment

San Diego Association of Governments
SHORELINE PRESERVATION WORKING GROUP

February 7, 2008

AGENDA ITEM NO.: **3**

Action Requested: APPROVE

DECEMBER 6, 2007, MEETING SUMMARY

Members in Attendance:

Ann Kulchin, City of Carlsbad, Chair
Teresa Barth, City of Encinitas (Alt)
Carrie Downey, City of Coronado
Richard Earnest, City of Del Mar
Jim Janney, City of Imperial Beach
Joe Kellejian, City of Solana Beach
Esther Sanchez, City of Oceanside
Pam Slater-Price, County of San Diego
Mike Bixler, San Diego Unified Port District
Mitch Purdue, U.S. Navy

Advisory Members in Attendance:

Marco Gonzalez, Surfrider Foundation
Steve Aceti, California Coastal Coalition
August Felando, California Lobster and Trap Fishermen's Association
Bob Hoffman, National Marine Fisheries Service
Lee McEachern, California Coastal Commission
Julie Thomas, Scripps Institution of Oceanography
Kim Sterrett, California Department of Boating and Waterways
Heather Schlosser, US Army Corps of Engineers
Cliff Davenport, California Geological Survey

Staff Subgroup

Ray Duncan, City of Oceanside
Steven Jantz, City of Carlsbad
Ed Kleeman, City of Coronado
Y. Sachiko Kohatsu, County of San Diego
Leslsea Myerhoff, City of Solana Beach
Danny Schrotberger, City of San Diego
Greg Wade, City of Imperial Beach
Kathy Weldon, City of Encinitas

Others:

Phil King, SFSU
Marriah Abellera, US Army Corps of Engineers
Barry Snyder, AMEC
Anne-Lise Lindquist, Moffatt & Nichol
Chris Webb, Moffatt & Nichol

Christian Appendini, DHI Water & Environment
Julio Zyserman, DHI Water & Environment
Julie Wang, EDAW
David Schug, URS Corp.
Susan Steele, Encinitas Seacoast Preservation Association
Bud Carroll, City of Carlsbad Beach Committee
Dick Erhardt, City of Carlsbad Beach Committee
Angela O'Hara, City of Carlsbad Beach Committee
Andrea Groves, SANDAG
Kevin Wood, SANDAG
Rob Rundle, SANDAG
Shelby Tucker, SANDAG

1. Welcome and Introductions

Ann Kulchin, City of Carlsbad, called the meeting to order at 11:35 a.m. and introductions were made.

2. Public Comment/Communications

Public comments and communications were invited but none were made.

3. Agenda Item #3, Summary of the July 12, 2007, Meeting

Ms. Kulchin noted an error in the July 12, 2007, meeting minutes. Dick Erhardt was listed as a member of Encinitas Seacoast Preservation Association when in fact he is a member of the City of Carlsbad Beach Committee.

Upon motion from Carrie Downey, City of Coronado, and seconded by Jim Janney, City of Imperial Beach, the Working Group recommended approval of the July 12, 2007, meeting minutes as corrected.

4. Agenda Item #4, San Diego Regional Beach Sand Replenishment Project Feasibility Study Cost-Benefit Analysis

Dr. Phil King, San Francisco State University (SFSU), presented his findings from the cost-benefit analysis prepared as a component of the Feasibility Study for the Regional Beach Sand Replenishment project submitted to the California Department of Boating and Waterways. Copies of the Cost-Benefit analysis and the presentation are available at www.sandag.org/shoreline

The study looked at the feasibility of a rebuild of the 2001 project, as well as alternatives as required by the State. His own work was supplemented by that of Moffat and Nichol, Everest Consultants, Coastal Frontiers Corp., and SANDAG staff.

In general, recreational benefits increase as beach width increases. Some storm damage prevention benefit was considered, especially impacts to public lands. The analysis was based on the number of visitors on the beach, which were counted near the sites of the 2001 project.

The costs and benefits vary from site to site. Fletcher Cove lost the sand that was placed in 2001 very quickly, so it has a lower cost-benefit ratio. Overall all the alternatives have a cost-benefit ratio of greater than one, so all are feasible. A rebuild of the 2001 project has a cost benefit ratio of 1.6 while a 3 million cubic-yard alternative would have a ratio of 1.2. An optimized alternative which place all of San Diego sand on Mission Beach and move the placement sites closer to the pier in Oceanside and Imperial Beach had a ratio of 2.0. The numbers are based on the monetary value of recreational benefits, not actual spending; it also doesn't consider environmental benefits.

Joe Kellejian, City of Solana Beach noted that if there is more sand on the beach, more people will come. In Solana Beach, the sand doesn't stay, but a retention structure, which the Army Corps is now studying, would be a great benefit.

Marco Gonzales, Surfrider Foundation noted that prior to the 2001 project, the surf resource at Cardiff State Beach was totally gone, but that natural beach breaks have returned, along with lots of surfers. Other beaches didn't have the same increase in surf benefits, but he wondered if the surfer benefits or the numbers of surfers in the water was included in the study. Dr. King indicated that the study did not include benefits to surfers or count the number of surfers in the water, and he was still trying to get a handle on quantifying surf benefits.

August Felando, California Lobster and Trap Fishermen's Association, wondered with all the cited benefits in the study, were the environmental costs considered? Dr. King indicated that the environmental costs and benefits were not within the scope of the work. The costs considered were simply the costs of project construction. Full environmental analysis will be performed to determine any impacts to off-shore habitat.

Mike Bixler, San Diego Unified Port District, suggested that the sand should be placed far south in Imperial Beach, so that it moves north throughout the whole littoral cell. The facilities in Imperial Beach are best utilized by having sand throughout, not concentrated at the pier. It was noted that all the different projects had positives, and there may be other alternatives. It is up to the Cities to decide what final project moves forward.

Steve Aceti, California Coastal Coalition, wondered whether we should look more deeply and develop a way to quantify the habitat benefits. Bob Hoffman, National Marine Fisheries Service indicated that any study would require both a comprehensive analysis of all costs and benefits and it may actually find other benefits or harmful aspects from the Project. Dr. King said that it was hard to put a dollar value on the environment, and that the State didn't require it. Ms. Downey noted that there would be coastal impacts requiring mitigation from some of the transportation projects being put forward by SANDAG. By putting a dollar value on the habitat benefits, it may save mitigation costs.

5. Agenda Item #5, Potential Regional Infrastructure Investments

Shelby Tucker, SANDAG, updated the Working Group on the discussions of three infrastructure areas identified in the Regional Comprehensive Plan as unfunded, including habitat management, water quality, and beach sand replenishment. Throughout the summer the Board was briefed on each one of these types of infrastructure, and in October the Board was presented a range of cost estimates for all three infrastructure types.

For Beach Sand Replenishment, it was presented with two options. Option A; included replenishment every 5 years from 2010 to 2030, with 3 percent per year escalation of costs, totaling \$165 million. Option B; included retention structures with occasional replenishment which would cost approximately \$200 million, including \$100 million for structures that will last beyond the time frame. Several different local funding sources were identified including TOT, regional sales tax, and rental cars fees. Ms Tucker asked for input from the working group on funding sources and replenishment options that should be presented at the Board Retreat in January.

Mr. Kellejian, City of Solana Beach, thought the Board saw it as a regional issue but also thought finding the funding wouldn't be easy. The choices we have now are probably what will be considered. Ms Downey clarified that the Board as of yet didn't delve too deeply into the funding issues. The Board may recommend a different funding mechanism for beach sand than for EMP or water quality. We might want to give the board something more permanent, like building structures. The sand issue is very small dollar wise compared to EMP.

Ms Tucker, SANDAG, clarified that option B included retention structures with replenishment every 10 years.

Pam Slater-Price, San Diego County, asked Mr. Gonzales if there were negative surf impacts from replenishment. He said that since the beaches were severely eroded the sand was simply making up for deficits, but if you put too much on the beach, it could have negative impacts.

Esther Sanchez, City of Oceanside, wondered if mitigation funds from the Poseidon Desalination Plant in Carlsbad could be used for Beach Restoration. Mr. Gonzales indicated it would simply continue what was being done by the Encina Powerplant, mostly the dredging of Agua Hedionda Lagoon.

Pam Slater-Price, County of San Diego, mentioned that non-coastal residents often see sand replenishment as a waste of public funds, since they don't understand the importance of putting sand in the littoral cell, even if it doesn't stay right on the beach where it was placed. In 15 years on the Board of Supervisors, this is the closest she's seen to regional cooperation and consensus, we need to make the final drive and present this as a permanent solution that is badly needed.

Carrie Downey, City of Coronado, noted that although the group didn't need to make a recommendation, it should convey that there is a consensus behind this replenishment. Mr. Kellejain said we should look at the long term, 40 and 50 Years in order to build permanency and leave a legacy.

Mr. Gonzalez reiterated that the Surfrider Foundation is interested in retaining sand with submerged reefs, but would put its resources against groins or other on beach hard structures. Mr. Kellejain made a motion to look at option B with an extended time frame, with understanding that there may be new retention technologies and environmental issues that will need to be taken into consideration. Ms Downey seconded the motion, which carried without opposition.

Mr. Felando said that the trap fisherman did not have a problem with sand replenishment if it is retained on the beach. Sand not retained can damage surf grass, and right now we can't replicate surf grass so we need to reduce the impacts to it. Mr. Aceti asked Heather Schlosser, of the Army Corps of Engineers, what the status of the Ventura Reef Project was. Ms. Schlosser said that the federal

funding has been extended so they should have the money needed to finish permitting and then hopefully will begin construction the next year.

Mr. Bixler, San Diego Unified Port District, asked the staff to translate the numbers into a 50 year vision for the Board to what it means as sales tax or other assessment on a annual basis, such as 5 cents a month or 5 dollars a year. Mr. Hoffman, cautioned the group that you can't really call retention structures permanent, like roads they will need maintenance, although less replenishment will be needed with structures.

6. Agenda Item #6, Status and Next Steps for Potential Regional Beach Sand Replenishment Project

Ms. Tucker provided an update on the potential regional beach sand replenishment project. In September the board approved the allocation of \$500,000 for preliminary studies, including off-shore sand investigation and preliminary engineering. All cities now have MOU's in place except Del Mar and San Diego, which hope to have them in place in January.

A final feasibility study was sent to the California Department of Boating and Waterways for their consideration of project funding. If the funding is approved, the region will need to provide a match and decide on an allocation for that match. Attachments to this agenda item showed a number of different options, but were not meant to be a definitive list. SANDAG staff would like to get a recommendation from this group at the February meeting so it can move forward to the Regional Planning Committee and Board of Directors. It was noted that scenario 1 would not be supported by the cities of San Diego or Del Mar.

Mr. Janney noted that we had talked about beach sand as a regional issue, but we are putting forward a proposal with only the coastal cities paying. Richard Earnest, City of Del Mar noted that we all pay for roads in the region but also was afraid that we are heading in direction of only coastal cities paying for beaches which isn't fair. Ms. Tucker noted that this allocation would be for this project only, and we don't have the time to look at other regional allocations. In the future, we might be using different allocations, including regional funding.

Teresa Barth, City of Encinitas, asked what the chance of getting state funding was. Kim Sterrett, Department of Boating and Waterways (DBW), noted that the feasibility study was under review, but we won't know if the state will provide funding until the governor's budget comes out. Ms. Kulchin asked if the group could help sway the governor's budget; Mr Sterrett indicated it couldn't.

Ms Sanchez noted that the City of San Diego would also be against a number of the other options that left it paying a substantial share of the costs, and some would stretch her city thin as well. Oceanside voted to fund the study, but has huge challenges to funding a whole project. People think the federal government should pay and we need to be realistic about the options. Mr. Kellejian noted that despite being a small city, Solana Beach would be willing to fund their share of any scenario since they have money from sea wall mitigation and dedicate a portion of their TOT revenue to beach sand replenishment. Other cities will have to make the hard choices. Ms. Downey noted that the cities and county are currently paying for habitat management and monitoring, but will be looking towards the region for future funding. We should do the same for beach replenishment.

Ms. Slater-Price said that the other cities in SANDAG are inching towards agreement on beach sand, and it is really important that we stay on message on this, we need to move ahead. We shouldn't give any indication that we are maybe going to say 'no' anywhere along the line. Highway 52 and the *SPRINTER* don't serve that many people, are hugely expensive, and are being done. People on the coast are paying for this and don't use it. People inland use the beach and don't spend one dime. If we get dissension in this group we might as well quit. The representatives on the SANDAG Board need to be willing to ask for regional support on this just like we give support for the inland if we want to get it done. The number one reason why people come to the region is because of the beach; we need to pay up and get other people to pay up. The City of San Diego is raising its TOT for tourism marketing; we should get funds to make sure the tourists have beaches to come to.

7. Agenda Item #7, San Compatibility and Opportunistic Use Program (SCOUP)

Chris Webb from Moffatt & Nichol Engineers gave a status update on the SCOUP initiative which streamlines the permitting process to get opportunistic sand on area beaches. The cities of Imperial Beach, Encinitas, Solana beach and Coronado are participating. He said it had taken a little bit longer than expected, but the environmental document was finished and will be out for administrative review immediately with the public review period starting in January. Julie Wang from EDAW prepared the document, which is a mitigated negative declaration.

8. Agenda Item #8, Coastal Regional Sediment Management Plan

Shelby Tucker, SANDAG reminded the working group that SANDAG had received funding from the DBW for a sediment management plan, and that after staff had contracted with Moffat and Nichol, work begun on this document. The plan will look at the best way to manage sediment from both an economic and environmental standpoint. The plan will look at all possible sediment sources folded into one giant plan so that future projects will have consistency with it. It will look at a number of alternatives and put costs to those and identify possible funding. There will be a public meeting on Jan 23 to bring all stakeholders together so they can identify what they would like to see in the plan. A draft plan will be in place toward the end of April with a final plan out in June.

9. Agenda Item #9, Legislative Update

Mr. Aceti informed the Working Group that the State gave Moffat & Nichol some money to perform a feasibility study on the purchase of a dredge which will be delivered in January. There was a meeting in Sacramento, and it was indicated a dredge could fit into the Governor's west coast initiative with Oregon and Washington. Mr. Aceti said he had talked to Senator Ducheny who was willing to sponsor a bill to use Prop. 84 funds for a dredge.

Mr. Bixler asked what the actual economic savings would be with the purchase of a dredge. Mr. Aceti said it might make more sense to contract and keep a dredge on the west coast, if we can make sure that there is enough work. Mitch Perdue, US Navy said the cost of operations and maintenance on a large dredge are astronomical and that the high costs make it better to mobilize out of the Caribbean or Europe. A dredge is not one size fits all, and there may not be enough projects on the West Coast.

Mr. Aceti told the working group that last year there was the possibility of moving the Coastal Sediment program from the Department of Boating and Waterways to the Coastal Conservancy. It was decided that it should move as a policy bill in the next session instead of as a budget trailer bill

due to political considerations. It will have to undergo policy hearings and may be considered in the 2008 Session.

10. Adjournment and Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for February 6, 2008, 11:30 am-1 pm

The meeting was adjourned by Ms. Kulchin at 12:48.

San Diego Association of Governments
SHORELINE PRESERVATION WORKING GROUP

February 7, 2008

AGENDA ITEM NO.: **5**

Action Requested: DISCUSSION/POTENTIAL RECOMMENDATION

STATUS AND NEXT STEPS FOR POTENTIAL REGIONAL
BEACH SAND REPLENISHMENT PROJECT

File Number 3002800

Introduction

Since the December 6, 2007, Shoreline Preservation Working Group (Working Group) meeting, efforts to build a regional beach replenishment project have continued and progress has been made in three areas. First, funding for the preliminary planning activities should be secured and the Request for Proposals should be released in late February 2008. Second, SANDAG staff is working with the California Department of Boating and Waterways to secure funding for a regional beach sand project. And, third, SANDAG staff has been working with the coastal cities on methods for allocating a state funding match.

Recommendation

SANDAG staff is requesting that the Working Group recommend to the Regional Planning Committee one of the funding allocation methods outlined in the report.

Discussion

Preliminary Planning Activities

SANDAG staff is working with the coastal cities to secure funding for the preliminary planning activities that include an investigation of offshore sand sources and preliminary engineering/design. SANDAG staff is currently working on the scope of work and initiation of the procurement process. The Request for Proposals is expected to be released in late February and work is scheduled to begin in late Spring 2008.

State Funding

In August, SANDAG submitted a Feasibility Study to the California Department of Boating and Waterways (DBW) for their consideration of funding for a regional beach sand project similar to the 2001 Regional Beach Sand Project (RBSP). SANDAG staff is working with DBW to determine if funding will be available in FY 2009. SANDAG staff will continue to work on obtaining any available funding from sources such as Proposition 84, which was approved by the voters in November 2006.

State Funding Match Allocation

If funding from DBW is approved, it would likely be available in early FY 2009. In anticipation of potential project funding, the region needs to determine how the required 15 percent match would be divided among the participating coastal jurisdictions.

In September, the SANDAG Board of Directors (Board) approved the allocation of funds for preliminary planning activities, which was an allocation based on miles of coastline. As part of discussions leading up to the Board meeting, several jurisdictions indicated that the allocation based on miles of coastline may not be an appropriate way to allocate the match to the remaining project costs.

The staff subgroup (subgroup), which consists of staff from each of the coastal jurisdictions and SANDAG, met in September 2007 and January 2008 to discuss appropriate allocations. In January, the subgroup came to consensus on a general method. This method takes into consideration three factors: amount of sand pumped onto each beach, miles of shoreline restored, and city population. The City of San Diego was unable to attend the January meeting.

The subgroup determined that each jurisdiction should pay for the amount of sand they received as part of the project. The importance of this concept is reflected in the fact that both amount of sand and miles restored are included in the allocations. The subgroup also thought that a jurisdiction's population plays an important role and should be considered.

Once the subgroup agreed that these are the most important factors, they then discussed how each of the factors should be weighted with the goal of trying to ensure that the cost allocation would not negatively impact a jurisdiction to the point where they would be unable to participate in the project. The two options recommended by the subgroup include a 50/10/40 split for Option A and a 33/33/33 split for Option B for amount of sand/miles restored/population.

There have also been discussions at some of the coastal cities regarding additional allocation methods. These include a 60/10/30 split for Option C and a 45/10/45 split for Option D for amount of sand/miles restored/population. SANDAG staff has reviewed all allocations and supports a method that focuses primarily on jurisdictions paying for the amount of sand they receive, preferring Option C, the 60/10/30 split.

The allocation methods are outlined below. They show dollars for the State's required 15 percent based on a phased approach to project implementation (year one match) and total project match (three year total). Please note that the dollar figures provided below are for consideration by the Working Group for planning purposes only, actual project costs may be different. The goal is to provide the Working Group with an idea of approximate allocation costs based on current information.

Option A:

| Jurisdictions | 50% Sand | 10 % Miles Restored | 40% Population | Year One Total | 3-Year Total |
|----------------|------------------|---------------------|------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Oceanside | \$115,374 | \$18,517 | \$47,665 | \$181,556 | \$544,222 |
| Carlsbad | \$105,731 | \$20,446 | \$26,588 | \$152,764 | \$457,917 |
| Encinitas | \$124,960 | \$25,405 | \$16,072 | \$166,437 | \$498,902 |
| Solana Beach | \$38,458 | \$12,513 | \$3,628 | \$54,599 | \$163,662 |
| Del Mar | \$49,421 | \$12,904 | \$1,240 | \$63,565 | \$190,538 |
| San Diego | \$107,108 | \$14,580 | \$356,523 | \$478,211 | \$1,433,456 |
| Imperial Beach | \$32,948 | \$10,435 | \$7,485 | \$50,868 | \$152,479 |
| Total | \$574,000 | \$114,800 | \$459,200 | \$1,148,000 | \$3,441,176 |

Option B:

| Jurisdictions | 33% Sand | 33 % Miles Restored | 33% Population | Year One Total | 3-Year Total |
|----------------|------------------|---------------------|------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Oceanside | \$76,916 | \$61,724 | \$39,721 | \$178,361 | \$534,644 |
| Carlsbad | \$70,487 | \$68,153 | \$22,156 | \$160,797 | \$481,994 |
| Encinitas | \$83,307 | \$84,684 | \$13,393 | \$181,384 | \$543,706 |
| Solana Beach | \$25,639 | \$41,711 | \$3,023 | \$70,372 | \$210,944 |
| Del Mar | \$32,948 | \$43,012 | \$1,033 | \$76,993 | \$230,788 |
| San Diego | \$71,406 | \$48,599 | \$297,102 | \$417,107 | \$1,250,294 |
| Imperial Beach | \$21,965 | \$34,784 | \$6,237 | \$62,987 | \$188,806 |
| Total | \$382,667 | \$382,667 | \$382,667 | \$1,148,000 | \$3,441,176 |

Option C:

| Jurisdictions | 60% Sand | 10 % Miles Restored | 30% Population | Year One Total | 3-Year Total |
|----------------|------------------|---------------------|------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Oceanside | \$138,449 | \$18,517 | \$35,749 | \$192,715 | \$577,670 |
| Carlsbad | \$126,877 | \$20,446 | \$19,941 | \$167,264 | \$501,379 |
| Encinitas | \$149,952 | \$25,405 | \$12,054 | \$187,411 | \$561,772 |
| Solana Beach | \$46,150 | \$12,513 | \$2,721 | \$61,384 | \$184,000 |
| Del Mar | \$59,306 | \$12,904 | \$930 | \$73,139 | \$219,237 |
| San Diego | \$128,530 | \$14,580 | \$267,392 | \$410,502 | \$1,230,496 |
| Imperial Beach | \$39,537 | \$10,435 | \$5,614 | \$55,586 | \$166,622 |
| Total | \$688,800 | \$114,800 | \$344,400 | \$1,148,000 | \$3,441,176 |

Option D:

| Jurisdictions | 45% Sand | 10% Miles Restored | 45% Population | Year One Total | 3-Year Total |
|----------------|------------------|--------------------|------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Oceanside | \$103,837 | \$18,517 | \$53,623 | \$175,977 | \$527,498 |
| Carlsbad | \$95,158 | \$20,446 | \$29,911 | \$145,515 | \$436,186 |
| Encinitas | \$112,464 | \$25,405 | \$18,081 | \$155,950 | \$467,467 |
| Solana Beach | \$34,612 | \$12,513 | \$4,081 | \$51,207 | \$153,494 |
| Del Mar | \$44,479 | \$12,904 | \$1,395 | \$58,778 | \$176,188 |
| San Diego | \$96,398 | \$14,580 | \$401,088 | \$512,065 | \$1,534,937 |
| Imperial Beach | \$29,653 | \$10,435 | \$8,421 | \$48,509 | \$145,407 |
| Total | \$516,600 | \$114,800 | \$516,600 | \$1,148,000 | \$3,441,176 |

Next Steps

SANDAG staff is scheduled to present the outcome and potential recommendations from this discussion to the Regional Planning Committee and Board of Directors in March. If no decision is made at the February Working Group meeting regarding the allocation methodology, SANDAG staff recommends a special meeting be held on March 6, 2008, from 11:30 a.m. to 1:00 p.m., for further discussion of the issue.

Additionally, over the next several months SANDAG staff will be working on a revised project schedule and project funding plan to provide to DBW. If the State budget is approved with funding for the SANDAG project, SANDAG Board approval will be required to accept the funds from DBW and enter into a contract in early FY 2009.

Key Staff Contact: Shelby Tucker, (619) 699-1916, stu@sandag.org