MEETING NOTICE
AND AGENDA

REGIONAL PLANNING
TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP

The Regional Planning Technical Working Group may take action on any item appearing on this agenda.

Thursday, July 14, 2005
1:15 – 3:15 p.m.

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

Staff Contact: Susan Baldwin
(619) 699-1943
sba@sandag.org

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

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

To request this document or related reports in an alternative format, please call (619) 699-1900, (619) 699-1904 (TTY), or fax (619) 699-1905.
1. Welcome and Introductions (Vice Chair Niall Fritz, City of Poway)

2. Public Comments and Communications

Members of the public will have the opportunity to address the Technical Working Group on any issue within the jurisdiction of the Working Group. Speakers are limited to three minutes each.

CONSEN T ITEMS (Items 3 – 5)


The TWG should review and approve the June 16, 2005 meeting summary.

+4. 2030 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Update – Policy Board Report (Mike Hix)

The 2030 RTP Update will be discussed by the SANDAG Board of Directors at its policy meeting on Friday, July 8, 2005. The report for that meeting is attached.

+5. Legislative Update (Susan Baldwin)

Information on smart growth and housing-related legislation at the state and federal level included in the July 8, 2005 Executive Committee report is attached.

REPORTS (Items 6 – 9)

+6. Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program (Stephan Vance)

SANDAG has received 34 applications for the Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program. Staff will provide a report on the evaluation process and program schedule.

+7. Regional Planning Technical Working Group Charter (Susan Baldwin)

The TWG should continue its discussion of and approve its charter.

+8. Revised Smart Growth Concept Maps and Related Issues/Schedule for Public Workshops (Carolina Gregor)

Last month, the TWG reviewed and discussed the preliminary regional-scale Smart Growth Concept Map and its related subregional maps. This item focuses on three items: (a) comments received to date on the maps and discussion of remaining issues; (b) land use scenarios to be used in the 2007 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) update and the generic overlay assumptions for the potential smart growth areas; and (c) refinements to the upcoming workshops. The TWG should discuss and comment on these items.
9. RHNA Ad Hoc Working Group Update (Susan Baldwin)  

Staff and members of the Ad Hoc Working Group will update the TWG regarding the work of this group.

10. Adjournment and Next Meeting  

The next Technical Working Group meeting will be held on Thursday, September 8, 2005 from 1:15 to 3:15 p.m.
SUMMARY OF JUNE 16, 2005 TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP MEETING

Agenda Item #1: Welcome and Introductions

Gail Goldberg, City of San Diego, chaired the meeting. Self-introductions were conducted.

Agenda Item #2: Public Comments and Communications

Susan Baldwin of SANDAG announced that a joint meeting of the Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) and the TWG will be held on June 20, 2005 from 1:30 – 3:00 p.m. The CTAC and TWG members will be provided with an overview of the Independent Transit Planning Review (ITPR) and asked to provide comments on the list of issues to be addressed.

Ms. Baldwin also reported that SANDAG has been asked to comment on the final report of the Statewide Infill Study conducted by UC Berkeley and sponsored by the California Business, Transportation, and Housing Agency. The study quantifies the potential to expand the state’s housing supply through infill development. The results will soon be available to both local jurisdictions and the public via the Internet.

CONSENT ITEM (3)

Agenda Item #3: Summary of the May 12, 2005 Regional Planning Technical Working Group Meeting

A motion and second were made to approve the May 12, 2005 meeting summary; the motion passed unanimously.

REPORTS (4-7)

Agenda Item #4: Showcasing Local Smart Growth Projects: Smart Growth Plans in Escondido

As part of an ongoing series of presentations featuring local smart growth efforts throughout the region, Charlie Grimm, City of Escondido and Linda Culp, SANDAG staff, provided the TWG with a presentation on smart growth and transit planning efforts in downtown Escondido and along Escondido Boulevard.
Mr. Grimm stated that downtown Escondido’s smart growth vision features the following efforts: adding housing units and increasing density where public facilities and services already exist; retaining the existing character; balancing uses; creating an area in which people will want to live and work; establishing pedestrian and multi-passenger links with the center for the arts and the transit center; and providing additional office use to encourage live-work opportunities.

Mr. Grimm also highlighted the main issues in downtown Escondido’s smart growth efforts: creating an appropriate parking strategy; identifying the ideal height of buildings; and implementing good urban design.

Ms. Culp reported that Route 350 in Escondido serves one of the city’s potential smart growth areas in addition to other activity centers. The route has been identified for improvements to current services, evaluation of Rapid Bus service in the mid-term, and extension of SPRINTER LRT service in the long-term.

A number of possible transit priority measures will be evaluated with the goal of improving transit trip times and reliability along the route while not adversely impacting local traffic. The measures include signal prioritization, which allows the bus to extend the green signal if necessary, and queue jumper lanes at key intersections to put the bus ahead of automobile congestion.

Once the appropriate priority measures are identified, their impacts will be evaluated. The public and involved agencies will then be shown the conceptual designs for the appropriate priority measures and asked to provide feedback. Lastly, potential station changes will be evaluated in terms of both existing service and future rapid bus service. The emphasis will be on integrating the plans for Route 350 with local land use/smart growth plans. The evaluation and study of Route 350 will be complete by November 2005.

Questions and comments included:

In response to questions from Dennis Turner, City of Carlsbad, Mr. Grimm affirmed that an urban methodology is being used to calculate average daily trip (ADT) generation in the downtown area. Mr. Grimm added that efforts to implement fee-parking and reduce retail-parking downtown have met resistance.

Patrick Richardson, City of Vista, commented that Vista has confronted similar parking issues in its downtown smart growth efforts. Their consultant developed a strategy of phasing in new urban parking standards as the character of the downtown becomes increasingly urban.

Mark Stephens, City of Chula Vista, asked if dedicated right-of-way will be evaluated as a potential transit priority measure for Route 350; Ms. Culp replied that the only transit priority measures to be evaluated are signal prioritization and queue jumper lanes.

Agenda Item #5: Draft Smart Growth Concept Map and Initial Ideas for Public Outreach Workshops

Carolina Gregor, SANDAG staff, made a presentation on the Draft Smart Growth Concept Map illustrating the location of existing, planned, and potential smart growth areas in the region. The
Concept Map will assist two other SANDAG initiatives: (1) the update of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and (2) determining project eligibility in the long-term Smart Growth Incentive Program. The TWG was presented with a regional-scale map as well as four subregional-scale maps and asked to provide input. The TWG was also asked to comment on the public workshops for the Concept Map, which will be held in September 2005.

**Questions and comments included:**

Rosemary Rowan, County of San Diego, felt it was inappropriate for potential smart growth areas meeting land use intensity targets to be categorized as such when regional transit service is lacking because local jurisdictions do not control the provision of regional transit service. Transit service should serve as an incentive for jurisdictions to plan for smart growth land uses.

Bob Leiter, SANDAG staff, replied that the potential smart growth areas illustrated on the Concept Map will be used to develop the Enhanced Smart Growth land use alternative for the RTP update, which will reflect the addition of regional transit service to potential smart growth areas currently lacking transit service. The potential areas will be used to determine additional regional transit routes.

Michael Daney, Metropolitan Transit System (MTS), cautioned against making transit investment decisions based solely on land use intensities; various additional factors also influence the sustainability of transit. Ed Batchelder, City of Chula Vista, replied that transit service is unlikely to be sustainable when first provided; transit investments have to be made on the reasoning that travel behavior will change and people will use transit when given the opportunity.

Several TWG members commented that SANDAG should not ask the public for input on the smart growth areas illustrated on the Concept Map because these areas have already been vetted by the public through the local planning process. Ms. Rowan stressed the importance of avoiding confusion on the land uses in the County’s General Plan 2020 with those illustrated on the Concept Map during the workshops. Ms. Goldberg advised SANDAG to only solicit public input on the Concept Map if prepared to make changes; public input should not be asked for if it will not lead to change.

John Bridges, P&D Consultants, asked how potential smart growth areas—some of which have not been vetted by the public—should be approached during the public workshops. Ms. Goldberg replied that the community needs to be assured that such areas will be subject to additional analysis—including community input—before they are considered as existing or planned smart growth areas.

Several TWG members felt that the roles of SANDAG and the local jurisdictions in developing the Concept Map should be clarified during the public workshops. The public should understand that local jurisdictions identified the areas with smart growth land uses while SANDAG is offering financial incentives to these areas, using local smart growth areas to refine regional transportation plans, and prioritizing regional transit investments using smart growth principles.

Bob Leiter informed the TWG that regional transit service may be eliminated in certain corridors if local jurisdictions do not identify smart growth areas along those corridors.
Mr. Leiter also commented that local jurisdictions identified fewer special use center place types than anticipated by SANDAG staff. Local jurisdictions are encouraged to identify locations such as colleges and universities as special use centers, as long as they exhibit smart growth land uses and design.

Ms. Rowan commented that areas illustrated on the Concept Map must meet the criteria put forth in the smart growth matrix of the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP); areas generating a high number of trips—like colleges and universities—should also meet the RCP criteria to be eligible for illustration on the map.

Mr. Batchelder suggested replacing the employment intensity target for special use centers with a population intensity target and asked SANDAG staff to provide local jurisdictions with information on the employment intensities generated by various employment uses.

**Agenda Item #6: Regional Planning Technical Working Group Draft Charter**

Due to a lack of time, discussion of the draft charter was postponed until the next TWG meeting.

**Agenda Item #7: Report from RHNA Ad Hoc Working Group**

Susan Baldwin, SANDAG staff, reported that the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) Ad Hoc Working Group held the first of about four to five meetings to discuss two issues associated with the RHNA process: (1) interpretation and implementation of the memorandum adopted with the final RHNA numbers, and (2) improvement of the RHNA process for the next housing element update cycle.

**Agenda Item #8: Adjournment and Next Meeting**

The next regular TWG Meeting will be held on Thursday July 14, 2005 from 1:15 to 3:15 p.m.
2030 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN UPDATE

Introduction

In April 2005, the SANDAG Board of Directors approved the work program for the 2030 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) update. Scheduled for approval by March 2007, this comprehensive RTP update will be based on an updated 2030 Regional Growth Forecast and will incorporate the results of the Independent Transit Planning Review and the strategic initiatives from the adopted Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP). The RTP work program also includes a number of issue papers that will highlight major topics under development for the plan.

This is the first RTP to follow the approval of the RCP, the long-term planning framework for the San Diego region. The RCP better integrates our local land use and transportation decisions and contains an incentive-based approach to encourage and channel growth into existing and future urban areas and smart growth communities. The RTP contains specific public policies, strategies, projects, and programs aimed at meeting the diverse mobility needs of our growing region through the year 2030. The Plan’s vision for transportation supports the region’s comprehensive strategy to promote smarter, more sustainable growth.

The existing RTP is also known as MOBILITY 2030. When work on MOBILITY 2030 was initiated in 2001, the Board of Directors established a new vision and goals to guide the development of the RTP. Along with developing a vision and goals, the Board of Directors provided direction for major Transportation System and Land Use Distribution Policies. As staff begins its development of the 2030 RTP Update, and in light of the adopted RCP and voter approval of the TransNet sales tax extension, the Board is again requested to provide policy direction for the plan.

The Board should provide policy direction in four general areas: (1) goals; (2) transportation system issues; (3) land use distribution issues; and (4) revenue scenarios. As in the past, interactive technology will be used at the meeting to pose survey questions and help the Board discuss and debate these major policy issues.

**DISCUSSION TOPICS AND GENERAL POLICY QUESTIONS**

1. GOALS

Seven policy goals were adopted by the Board of Directors to guide the development of the present RTP, MOBILITY 2030. They are:

   - **Mobility** – Improve the mobility of people and freight
Accessibility – Improve accessibility to major employment and other regional activity centers

Reliability – Improve the reliability and safety of the transportation system

Efficiency – Maximize the efficiency of the existing and future transportation system

Livability – Promote livable communities

Environmental Sustainability – Minimize impacts on the environment

Equity – Ensure an equitable distribution of the benefits among various demographic and user groups

While all goals were considered interrelated and important, Mobility was considered the prior RTP’s highest goal.

a. Should the 2030 RTP Update strive to accomplish these same goals?

b. Are there any additional goals?

2. TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM ISSUES

Additional Capacity in Major Transportation Corridors

As San Diego and the surrounding regions grow, the demand for east/west and north/south regional travel grows with it. Most of these trips occur in existing major transportation corridors: on freeways, highways, and regional arterials, or on regional rail or bus services. Transportation facilities and services in some of these corridors have been improved to meet demand, and additional improvements are either underway or planned. However, given right-of-way or environmental constraints, even planned facilities in some cases may not accommodate the growing volumes.

Looking at the origins and destinations of travelers in the year 2030 indicates that they too would like to use these same existing/planned corridors. New corridors outside the desired travel paths do not draw well. In addition, locating and constructing an entirely new corridor that would not have significant impacts to sensitive habitat areas or existing and planned development will be very difficult. This became evident in the initial analysis completed for the North/South Transportation Facility Study. Therefore, the focus for additional capacity anywhere may come back to what we can do in our existing corridors.

The types of physical improvements in existing corridors can vary widely. In MOBILITY 2030, the emphasis for capital improvements was constructing the high occupancy vehicle (HOV)/Managed Lane network, providing the flexibility to control access and serve carpools, bus rapid transit, toll customers, and potential new technology users. The I-15 Managed Lane system is already under construction, with other Managed Lanes to follow on other major corridors. Another option for additional capacity is new general purpose lanes, open to all highway users. The Managed Lane network supports quicker commutes and faster travel speeds for users and even single occupant vehicles (SOVs), provides more travel choices, and moves people, not just vehicles, more efficiently.
Except for specific lanes on State Route 54 and I-15, in the past all freeway lanes in San Diego County were constructed as general purpose lanes.

When freeway expansion is limited, parallel arterials can provide additional capacity options. Both the freeways and the regional arterials can work together to improve the overall flow in a major corridor. The prior RTP identified a Regionally Significant Arterial Network that provides critical links to the highway network and serves as alternative routes themselves. Regional arterials serve many purposes, and their design standards can encourage or discourage their use for longer subregional trips. Interconnecting signals, limiting access, accommodating bus rapid transit, and completing the planned regional arterial network are all important aspects for a regional arterial to contribute to corridor capacity.

**Flexibility in Long-Range Planning**

Improvements in the RTP are normally based on proven and implemented technology. However, the RTP has a long life span. Between now and the year 2030, technology advancements will occur, some sooner, some later. The region may wish to be in a position to take advantage of these opportunities, adding capacity to the improvements we've already made. An example of this type of opportunity could be lanes designed to accommodate automated vehicles. Decisions about today's projects could consider leaving the door open for developing technology that's around the corner.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. Should the region focus its resources on ways to provide additional capacity to existing transportation facilities or services versus exploring the development of new corridors?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b. Should corridor improvements continue to focus on Managed Lanes versus general purpose lanes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Should completion and improvements to the Regional Arterial System be given more emphasis in constrained corridors?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Should our long-range vision provide maximum flexibility for new technology in our transportation system?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. Land Use Distribution Policies

The adopted RCP contains policy objectives and actions aimed at improving transportation and land use coordination, and establishing a new approach to planning in the San Diego region. Emphasis is given to:

1. Improving connections between land use and transportation plans using smart growth principles;
2. Using land use and transportation plans to guide decisions related to environmental and public facility investments; and
3. Focusing on collaboration and incentives to achieve regional goals and objectives.

To advance these concepts, SANDAG, in collaboration with local jurisdictions, is identifying smart growth areas and hoping to encourage development in those areas by placing a higher priority on
transportation and other infrastructure investments in those areas. A preliminary draft Smart Growth Concept Map is under development to illustrate the location of existing, planned, and potential smart growth areas. This map will be used to develop land use scenarios and refine transit network alternatives for the 2030 RTP update, and determine eligibility to participate in the longer-term smart growth incentive program funded by TransNet.

The RCP identifies seven smart growth place types, ranging from the most intense area in the region—the Metropolitan Center—to the least intense areas, Rural Villages. Each of the place types has recommended land use characteristics, intensity targets, transportation system characteristics, and public transit service levels. In order to ensure a wider range of transportation choices within the region, the RCP promotes a strong link between land uses, urban design principles, and transportation networks, particularly transit services. Recently, the Peer Review Panel of the Independent Transit Planning Review (ITPR) emphasized the importance of land uses and pedestrian connections to the success of transit. The Smart Growth Concept Map and the recommendations of the ITPR will be used in the development of the alternative land use scenarios and transit networks developed for the RTP update.

Two or more land use scenarios should be developed for evaluation for the 2030 RTP update. The scenarios currently under consideration are:

- **Current Plans and Policies Scenario** - This baseline scenario includes the adopted general plans from each of the 18 cities, and the County of San Diego's land use inputs based on its General Plan 2020 update effort. The scenario will include the "existing/planned" smart growth areas identified by local jurisdictions on the Smart Growth Concept Map. Note that the adopted general plans do not accommodate all of the growth to the year 2030 projected for San Diego County, resulting in interregional commuting.

- **Enhanced Smart Growth Scenario** - This scenario builds upon the Current Plans and Policies scenario described above, and will include assumptions for increased housing and employment intensities in the "potential" smart growth areas identified by local jurisdictions on the Concept Map. Under this scenario, less interregional commuting is expected compared to the Current Plans and Policies scenario.

It's expected that the regional transit network laid out earlier in MOBILITY 2030 and the final Smart Growth Concept Map may reveal a disconnect in some areas. The planned transit network may not serve some potential smart growth areas, and it may show transit lines in areas that have relatively few identified smart growth opportunities. In a separate study related to the RTP, the ITPR will be analyzing the overall transit plan and, as a result, may recommend some changes to the regional transit system.

| a. How should the RTP evaluate a revised regional transit network that better serves the identified potential smart growth opportunity areas? |
| b. Are there other land use scenarios that should be evaluated in relation to the RTP? |

**4. REVENUE SCENARIOS**

In the last RTP, three revenue forecast scenarios were developed. A mid-range revenue forecast was added to the normal high and low scenarios to incorporate the revenues and projects that would
result from the passage of a TransNet sales tax extension. The previous scenarios are described below.

- **Revenue Constrained Scenario** - Required by state and federal planning regulations, this revenue forecast was based only on current sources and levels of federal, state, and local transportation revenue projected to 2030. The total amount was $30 billion in MOBILITY 2030.

- **Reasonably Expected Revenue Scenario** - This revenue scenario built upon the Revenue Constrained forecast and also included additional sources of transportation revenue that were reasonably expected to become available through 2030. The TransNet half-cent local sales tax extension, higher levels of state and federal discretionary funds, as well as increases in state and federal gas taxes based on historical trends were among these additional funding sources. Totaling $42 billion, this revenue scenario was used to define the adopted transportation network for MOBILITY 2030.

- **Unconstrained Revenue Scenario** - This scenario identified a desired list of projects that required funding beyond the levels assumed for the Reasonably Expected Revenue Scenario. For MOBILITY 2030, this scenario totaled $67 billion.

For the 2030 RTP update, the passage of the TransNet extension will result in the addition of the projected sales tax revenues from 2008 through 2030 in the Revenue Constrained Scenario. In addition, the TransNet extension requires local jurisdictions levy a $2,000 fee on new housing units that will go towards improvements on the regional arterial system. These additional revenues will result in a new Revenue Constrained Scenario that will be close in dollars to the previous Reasonably Expected Revenue Scenario.

However, a large revenue gap would still separate the funding needed for the Unconstrained Revenue Scenario. Several other types of funding sources such as toll financing of new facilities, or additional sales tax or gas tax measures, could partially fund the additional transportation facilities and services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a.</th>
<th>Should a mid-range revenue forecast be generated for the 2030 RTP update? If so, what additional sources of transportation revenue should be included in the Reasonably Expected Revenue Scenario?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>What potential sources of funding should be included in the Unconstrained Revenue Scenario? Should an increase in the TransNet local sales tax be considered?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>To what extent should user fees, such as tolls, be pursued in order to finance and expedite major capital improvements?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Key Staff Contact: Michael Hix (619) 699-1977; mhi@sandag.org

 Funds are budgeted in Work Element #8000400
The following excerpts from the Legislative Status Report presented to the Executive Committee on July 8, 2005, and an excerpt from the Governor’s FY05-06 Budget, May Revision, are attached to the TWG for information.

LEGISLATIVE STATUS REPORT

Housing Funding

This year the Committee on Appropriations combined Transportation and Treasury with Housing and Urban Development. As discussed above, the House adopted its version of the FY 2006 spending bill for these programs which included $37.5 billion to address critical housing needs.

Recently a variety of federal bills were introduced that if enacted would provide funding for affordable housing. These bills listed below are consistent with Goal 10 of SANDAG’s Legislative Program, which calls for support of legislation that provides additional funding for affordable housing.

- H.R. 1461, the Federal Housing Finance Reform Act of 2005 (introduced on 4/15/05 by Representative Baker), would create a new regulator for Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac, and the Federal Home Loan Banks, and calls for the establishment of an Affordable Housing Fund using 5 percent of Fannie Mae’s and Freddie Mac’s after-tax profits in order to produce, preserve, and rehabilitate rental housing that is affordable to extremely low and very low income families and to assist first time homebuyers. The bill is expected to go to the House floor for a vote after the July 4 recess and is expected to generate $1 billion over a five- to six-year period.

- H.R. 2681, the Affordable Housing Tax Credit Enhancement Act of 2005 (introduced 5/26/05 by Representative Jefferson), would increase the current low income housing tax credit from $1.75 per capita to $3.70 per capita and change the name of the Low Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) to the Affordable Housing Tax Credit. The LIHTC has provided a significant amount of investment in affordable low income housing in the San Diego region and throughout the state. Increasing the per capita income limit would provide more financial resources to build and rehabilitate housing for lower income households.
H.R. 2636, the Housing Preservation Matching Grant Act of 2005 (introduced by 05/25/05 by Representative Nadler), would authorize matching grants to states, up to a two to one federal to state ratio, for preservation of affordable housing. Grants can be used for acquisition, preservation incentives, operating costs, and capital expenditures to preserve Federal Housing Administration (FHA) insured properties, project-based Section 8 properties, or projects purchased by residents.

Related to Housing and Land Use

AB 691  
**Author:** Hancock (D)  
**Title:** Transit Village Plans  
**Introduced:** 02/17/05; Last amended 05/31/05  
**Fiscal:** No  
**Status:** Passed Assembly Local Government 03/30/05; Assembly Floor 04/14/05; Senate Local Government 06/15/05  
**Location:** Senate Third Reading  
**Hearing Date:** 06/28/05  

**Summary:**  
Authorizes a county or city to declare that a previously adopted specific plan or redevelopment plan that conforms to specified requirements constitutes a transit village plan, after publishing a notice stating the intent to make the declaration, describing the general location of the proposed plan, stating the time, date, and place of the public meeting.  
**COMMITTEE POSITION:** SUPPORT  
**LEGISLATIVE GOAL:** 11

AB 712  
**Author:** Canciamilla (D)  
**Title:** Land Use: Density  
**Introduced:** 02/17/05; [Last amended 06/08/05](#)  
**Fiscal:** No  
**Status:** Passed Assembly Local Government 04/13/05; Assembly Housing and Community Development 05/04/05; Assembly Floor 05/09/05; [Senate Transportation and Housing 06/21/05](#)  
**Location:** Senate Second Reading  
**Hearing Date:** 06/28/05  

**Summary:**  
This bill would require each city, county, or city and county to ensure that its housing element inventory or its housing element program to make those sites available can accommodate its share of the regional housing need throughout the planning period. Defines a lower residential density (amendment adds sites zoned for residential use) below which the city or county would be required to make specified written findings. **This bill would also make the applicable provisions**
for the award of attorney’s fees and costs of lawsuits permanent. Support is registered by the California Association of Realtors (Co-sponsor), California Rural Legal Assistance (Co-sponsor), Western Center on Law and Poverty (Co-sponsor), and the California Chamber of Commerce. Opposition is registered by the California State Association of Counties (CSAC) and the County of San Diego, Association of Bay Area Governments, and the City of Lakewood.

COMMITTEE POSITION: MONITOR
LEGISLATIVE GOAL: 5

AB 1020
Author: Hancock (D)
Title: Planning: Smart Growth Models
Introduced: 02/18/05
Fiscal: Yes
Status: Hearing canceled at the request of author
Location: Assembly Transportation
Hearing Date: 04/25/05-Two-year bill

Summary:
Requires certain federally designated metropolitan planning organizations and certain state-designated regional transportation planning agencies to develop and implement improved regional travel models incorporating smart growth concepts and to undertake other related planning activities. This will become a two-year bill to provide author time to gather input from transportation planning agencies.

COMMITTEE POSITION: MONITOR, ISSUES/CONCERNS HAVE BEEN CONVEYED TO AUTHOR
LEGISLATIVE GOAL: 11

AB 1233
Author: Jones (D)
Title: Housing Element: regional housing need
Introduced: 02/22/05; Last amended 06/14/05
Fiscal: No
Status: Passed Assembly Local Government 04/14/05; Assembly Housing and Community Development 05/04/05; Assembly Floor 06/01/05; Senate Transportation and Housing 06/01/05
Location: Order placed on Second File Reading
Hearing Date: 06/28/05

Summary:
The most recent amendment to this bill includes specific requirements for housing elements due on or after January 1, 2006, in regards to making the assessment and inventory for meeting the locality’s share of the regional housing need for the new planning period. Specifically, if a city or county failed to complete a zoning or rezoning commitment from a prior plan, that commitment would be required to be completed within the first year of the new planning period. The amendment also states that if a city or county’s housing element was neither self-certified nor determined to be in
SB 223  
Author: Torlakson (D)  
Title: Infill Housing  
Introduced: 02/15/05; Last amended 05/31/05  
Fiscal: Yes  
Status: Senate Transportation and Housing 04/05/05; Senate Appropriation 05/26/05; Senate Floor 06/02/05; Assembly Local Government 06/23/05  
Location: Assembly Housing and Community Development  
Hearing Date: 06/29/05  

Summary:  
This bill would establish the Job-Center Housing Planning Program to be administered by the Department of Housing and Community Development for the purpose of providing loans, to the extent funds are made available for this purpose, to cities, counties, and cities and counties to adopt specific plans that provide for additional infill housing opportunities. The bill would require, as a condition of loan eligibility, that a specific plan meet specified criteria, including that it cover an area that is predominantly urbanized and served by public transportation and that it allow for the development of at least 200 new housing units in a nonmetropolitan area or 500 new housing units in a metropolitan area. The bill would limit the amount of a loan from the fund to $1,000,000 for a term of not more than 10 years at 3 percent simple interest.  
COMMITTEE POSITION: SUPPORT  
LEGISLATIVE GOAL: 5  

SB 253  
Author: Torlakson (D)  
Title: Housing Elements: fees and enforcement  
Introduced: 02/15/05; Last Amended 05/24/05  
Fiscal: Yes  
Status: Passed Senate Transportation and Housing 4/05/05; Senate Floor 04/25/05; Assembly Local Government 06/22/05  
Location: Assembly Housing and Community Development  
Hearing Date: 06/29/05
SB 253  
(continued)  
Summary: This bill makes a number of technical, non-controversial changes to statutes that relate to housing. It authorizes a council of governments to charge a fee for determining shares of the existing and projected regional housing needs for cities, counties, and subregions at all income levels and for subsequent revisions of specified housing elements. Support is registered by the California Rural Legal Assistance Foundation.

COMMITTEE POSITION: MONITOR
LEGISLATIVE GOAL: 5

SB 326  
Author: Dunn (D)
Title: Land Use: Housing Elements
Introduced: 02/16/05; Last amended 06/06/05
Fiscal: No
Status: Passed Senate Transportation and Housing on 04/19/05; Senate Environmental Quality 05/03/05; Senate Floor 05/16/05; Assembly Housing and Community Development 06/15/05
Location: Assembly Local Government
Hearing Date: 06/29/05

Summary: Provides that under certain criteria, housing developments would not be subject to conditional use permitting requirements. According to the sponsors, the intent of the bill is to prohibit local governments from requiring a conditional use permit for duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes where such housing is allowed by the zoning. Support is registered by many organizations. The bill would revise conditions, as specified and apply them to an attached housing development. The attached housing development consists of not more than 100 residential units with a minimum density of not less than 12 units per acre or a minimum of not less than eight units per acre. Support is registered by many housing organizations. There are a few cities, outside of San Diego, with registered opposition.

COMMITTEE POSITION: MONITOR
LEGISLATIVE GOAL: 5

SB 521  
Author: Torlakson (D)
Title: Local Planning: Transit Village Plans
Introduced: 02/18/05; Last amended on 05/27/05
Fiscal: Yes
Status: Passed Senate Local Government 04/12/05; Senate Appropriations 05/26/05; Senate Floor 06/01/05
Location: Assembly Housing and Community Development
Hearing Date: Not Scheduled

Summary:
Specifies requirements of a transit village plan. Specifically the bill would require a transit village plan to include a transit station and a parcel, at least one-half of which is within not more than 1/4 mile of the exterior boundary of the parcel on which the transit station is located; expands the definition of "blight" to include the economic condition of a lack of high density development within a transit village development, imposes conditions on a redevelopment agency. Support is registered by California Transit Association, American Planning Association, California Chapter, and the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District. Opposition is registered by the Department of Finance, the County of Los Angeles, and the County of Santa Clara.

COMMITTEE POSITION: SUPPORT
LEGISLATIVE GOAL: 11

SB 968
Author: Torlakson (D)
Title: Land use planning: general plans
Introduced: 02/22/05; Last Amended 05/05/05
Fiscal: Yes
Status: Passed Senate Transportation and Housing 04/19/05; Senate Floor 05/16/05;
Location: Assembly Local Government
Hearing Date: 06/15/05 Hearing canceled by author

Summary
This bill as amended proposes that the circulation element of the general plan be renamed as the transportation element. Support is registered by the League of California Cities, the California Building Industry Association, and Homeownership Advancement Foundation.

COMMITTEE POSITION: MONITOR
LEGISLATIVE GOAL: 11

Related to Environment

AB 153
Author: Senators Chesbro, Kehoe, Kuehl, Perata, Simitan, Torlakson (D); Assembly Co-authors: Berg, Bermudez, Evans, Karnette, Koretz, Leno, Nation, Nava, and Ruskin (D)
Title: California Clean Water, Clean—Air, Safe Neighborhood Parks, and Coastal Protection Act of 2006.
Introduced: 03/29/05; Last amended 06/27/05
Fiscal: No
Status: Passed Senate Natural Resources and Water 03/29/05; Senate Appropriations 05/26/05; Senate Floor 06/02/05
Location: Assembly Natural Resources
Hearing Date: Not Scheduled
This bill proposes to enact the California Clean Water, Clean Air, Safe Neighborhood Parks, and Coastal Protection Act of 2006, which if adopted, would authorize the issuance of bonds in the amount of $3.595 billion. If enacted, Act would be presented to the voters at the 2006 statewide primary election. The last amendment specifies how the funds would be allocated.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:  MONITOR
LEGISLATIVE GOAL:  14

Business, Transportation, and Housing
May Revision 2005-06 GOVERNOR’S BUDGET

Regional Blueprint Plans — To facilitate better community design, the May Revision also proposes to increase federal authority by $5 million to provide grants to metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs) to produce regional “blueprint” planning documents. MPOs, in cooperation with the Councils of Government, may voluntarily apply for grants to develop plans that will guide future development and land use decisions to promote economic development, while protecting the environment, promoting healthy cities, and reducing unnecessary travel demand. Additionally, the Administration is working with local government and other stakeholders to develop legislation to authorize a revolving loan program to fund local General Plan revisions to accommodate more housing, consistent with the improved transportation planning.

Source: Governor’s Budget, May Revision 2005-2006, p. 65.

Key Staff Contact: Susan Baldwin, (619) 699-1943, sba@sandag.org
PILOT SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM UPDATE

Introduction

The Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program (SGIP) funds transportation infrastructure improvements that support smart growth development. Project types could include improvements to pedestrian, bicycle and transit facilities, traffic calming, streetscape enhancements, and other innovative smart growth-supporting infrastructure. These projects should encourage pedestrian, bicycle, and transit trips; support a community’s larger infill development or revitalization effort; and provide for a wider range of transportation choices, improved internal mobility, and stronger sense of place. Awardees may be granted up to $2 million in funding per project. Under the Pilot SGIP, a total of $17 million will be awarded.

Discussion

At the beginning of June, SANDAG issued a call for applications for the Pilot SGIP, with a deadline of June 24, 2005. SANDAG received 34 proposals from ten cities, the County of San Diego, and the North County Transit District. Applicants requested a total of $46,597,682 in funding, far exceeding the $17 million in available funding. Fifteen applicants requested the maximum funding amount ($2 million), and six applicants requested less than $500,000. A list of the proposed projects is attached. SANDAG staff has reviewed each proposal for eligibility and completeness. All proposals submitted were deemed eligible and passed on to the evaluation pane, though some application components may have to be excluded as ineligible.

The Pilot SGIP evaluation panel, consisting of volunteers from the Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group and two members of the San Diego Council of Design Professionals, met on June 29, 2005. At that meeting, SANDAG staff distributed the proposals to panel members and provided them with instructions on how to score the proposals according to each evaluation criterion. The evaluation panel will be reviewing the project applications over the next several weeks.

Next Steps

The evaluation panel is expected to complete their independent review of the project proposals and meet to develop a recommendation by the end of July. The panel’s recommendation is currently scheduled for approval by the Regional Planning and Transportation Committees at a joint meeting on September 2, 2005. Following approval by the Committees, the selected projects will then be submitted to Caltrans so they can be amended into the State Transportation Improvement Program.
## Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program Proposed Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsoring Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>SGIP Funds Requested</th>
<th>Matching Funds</th>
<th>Total Project Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 City of Chula Vista</td>
<td>City of Chula Vista</td>
<td>H Street Transit Corridor Project</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$2,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 City of Chula Vista</td>
<td>City of Chula Vista</td>
<td>Palomar Gateway Community Transit Area Project</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$375,000</td>
<td>$2,375,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 City of Coronado</td>
<td>City of Coronado</td>
<td>SR 75/2823 Toll Removal Mitigation Measure Project</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>$2,100,000</td>
<td>$2,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 City of Encinitas</td>
<td>City of Encinitas</td>
<td>Streetscape II Project</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$2,805,000</td>
<td>$3,105,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 City of Escondido</td>
<td>City of Escondido</td>
<td>Maple Street Pedestrian Plaza Project</td>
<td>$945,000</td>
<td>$165,000</td>
<td>$1,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 City of Escondido</td>
<td>City of Escondido</td>
<td>Grand Avenue/ El Mercado Project</td>
<td>$1,320,000</td>
<td>$280,000</td>
<td>$1,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 City of Imperial Beach</td>
<td>Imperial Beach Redevelopment Agency</td>
<td>Old Palm Avenue Streetscape Improvement Project</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 City of La Mesa</td>
<td>City of La Mesa</td>
<td>Grossmont Trolley Station Pedestrian Enhancements</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$2,700,000</td>
<td>$4,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 City of La Mesa</td>
<td>City of La Mesa</td>
<td>Allison Avenue- University Avenue Pedestrian Enhancements</td>
<td>$1,994,000</td>
<td>$1,162,000</td>
<td>$3,156,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 City of National City</td>
<td>City of National City</td>
<td>National City Boulevard Sidewalk and Streetlighting Improvement Project</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$1,280,000</td>
<td>$3,280,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 City of National City</td>
<td>City of National City</td>
<td>Fountain Plaza-Promenade</td>
<td>$258,000</td>
<td>$258,000</td>
<td>$516,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 City of National City</td>
<td>City of National City</td>
<td>National City Boulevard Median and Landscape Improvement Project</td>
<td>$720,000</td>
<td>$720,000</td>
<td>$1,440,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 City of San Diego</td>
<td>Centre City Development Corporation</td>
<td>Park Boulevard at Harbor Drive Pedestrian Bridge</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$11,000,000</td>
<td>$13,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 City of San Diego</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>The Paseo</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$290,000,000</td>
<td>$292,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 City of San Diego</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>University Avenue Mobility Project- Phase I</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$550,000</td>
<td>$2,550,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 City of San Diego</td>
<td>Planning, and Engineering &amp; Capital Projects Departments</td>
<td>Bird Rock Area Traffic Management Plan</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$2,385,000</td>
<td>$4,385,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 City of San Diego</td>
<td>Engineering &amp; Capital Projects</td>
<td>Mid-City Urban Trail &amp; SR-15 Bikeway</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$966,000</td>
<td>$2,966,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 City of San Diego</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>Balboa Avenue Corridor Improvements Project - Phase I</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>$6,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 City of San Diego</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>Commercial Street. Streetscape Project</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$1,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 City of San Diego</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>Coastal Rail Trail Project</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$712,900</td>
<td>$1,712,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsoring Jurisdiction</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>SGIP Funds Requested</td>
<td>Matching Funds</td>
<td>Total Project Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 City of San Diego</td>
<td>City of San Diego/ Engineering and Capital Projects</td>
<td>Alvarado Canyon Road Realignment Project</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$4,300,000</td>
<td>$6,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 City of San Diego</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>San Diego River Bike Path Linkages</td>
<td>$371,000</td>
<td>$1,031,000</td>
<td>$1,402,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 City of San Diego</td>
<td>City of San Diego Redevelopment Agency</td>
<td>San Ysidro Pilot Village Corridor Project</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$268,851</td>
<td>$2,268,851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 City of San Diego</td>
<td>Community and Economic Development Department</td>
<td>Washington/Goldfinch Intersection Pedestrian Improvement Project</td>
<td>$684,000</td>
<td>$244,000</td>
<td>$928,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 City of San Diego</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>Rose Creek Bicycle Path and Pedestrian Bridge</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$1,100,000</td>
<td>$3,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 City of San Diego</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>Reo Drive Revitalization Project- Phase II Improvements</td>
<td>$447,282</td>
<td>$492,281</td>
<td>$939,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 City of San Diego</td>
<td>City of San Diego, Community and Economic Development Department</td>
<td>25th Street Renaissance Project</td>
<td>$1,425,000</td>
<td>$164,000</td>
<td>$1,589,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 City of San Marcos</td>
<td>City of San Marcos</td>
<td>Oceanside-to-Escondido Rail Trail Project - Phase II</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>$4,100,000</td>
<td>$5,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 City of Santee</td>
<td>City of Santee</td>
<td>Santee Trolley Square Raised Pedestrian Crossing</td>
<td>$343,400</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$343,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 City of Santee</td>
<td>City of Santee</td>
<td>City of Santee Bike path/Walkway</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,233,800</td>
<td>$2,233,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 County of San Diego</td>
<td>Department of Public Works</td>
<td>Stage Coach Lane Sidewalks at Fallbrook High School</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>$1,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 County of San Diego</td>
<td>Department of Public Works</td>
<td>Sweetwater Springs Boulevard Sidewalks</td>
<td>$390,000</td>
<td>$545,000</td>
<td>$935,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 NCTD</td>
<td>NCTD</td>
<td>Solana Beach Mixed Use Development</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$1,400,000</td>
<td>$3,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 NCTD</td>
<td>NCTD</td>
<td>San Luis Rey Transit Center at North River Village</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
<td>$6,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** | **$46,597,682** | **$342,637,832** | **$389,225,514**

Key Staff Contact: Stephan Vance, (619) 699-1924, sva@sandag.org
Regional Planning Technical Working Group Charter

PURPOSE
The purpose of the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG) is to review and make recommendations on key activities associated with the implementation of the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP), including the update of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), Regional Growth Forecast, and other SANDAG land use and environmental planning activities.

LINE OF REPORTING
The TWG acts in an advisory capacity to both the Regional Planning and Transportation Committees primarily on RCP-related activities. The Regional Planning and Transportation Committees in turn report to the SANDAG Board. The SANDAG Board makes final decisions on the RCP and the RTP.

RESPONSIBILITIES
The TWG makes recommendations on key RCP implementation activities and updates to the RCP. These activities include the development of a Smart Growth Concept Map, a Smart Growth Incentive Program, land use and transportation performance indicators and targets, the Regional Housing Needs Assessment, and the RTP update. The TWG also assists with associated public outreach activities and helps inform and encourage active public participation by citizens and groups throughout the region. In general, the TWG's focus is on land use and environmental planning activities of regional significance.

MEMBERSHIP
The membership of the TWG includes the planning/community development directors of the 19 local jurisdictions in the region (or their alternates). Representatives of Caltrans, the Local Agency Formation Commission, San Diego Unified Port District, San Diego County Water Authority, San Diego County Air Pollution Control District, San Diego County Regional Airport Authority, U.S. Department of Defense, North County Transit District (NCTD), and Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) are advisory members.

MEETING TIME AND LOCATION
The TWG meets on a monthly basis at SANDAG. Meetings are held on the second Thursday of the month from 1:15 to 3:15 p.m.

SELECTION OF THE CHAIR
The Chair and Vice Chair of the TWG are chosen by the members of the group on a periodic basis.

DURATION OF EXISTENCE
The TWG is a standing working group.
Committee Structure

SANDAG Board of Directors

Makes regional public policy

- Executive Committee
  - Sets agenda; oversight for budget and work program; reviews grant applications; makes recommendations on legislative proposals and agency policies

- Transportation Committee
  - Policy recommendations on planning and programming; strong focus and commitment to meet public transit needs

- Regional Planning Committee
  - Policy recommendations on Regional Comprehensive Plan development and implementation

- Borders Committee
  - Policy recommendations on interregional programs and projects

- Public Safety Committee
  - Policy recommendations to enhance public safety and thwart crime
Board of Directors

Regional Planning Committee

- Shoreline Preservation Working Group
- Regional Housing Working Group
- Regional Energy Working Group
  - Regional Planning Technical Working Group
    - Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group
    - Regionwide Forecast Technical Working Group
Introduction

Last month, the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG) reviewed and discussed the preliminary regional-scale Smart Growth Concept Map and its related subregional maps. The Regional Planning Committee (RPC) and the Stakeholders Working Group (SWG) also reviewed the preliminary maps. Staff is revising the maps based on comments from the three groups.

This item focuses on three items: (a) comments received to date on the maps and discussion of remaining issues; (b) land use scenarios to be used in the 2007 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) update and the associated Generic Overlay Assumptions for the potential smart growth areas; and (c) refinements to the upcoming workshops. The TWG is requested to discuss and comment on these items. Each section of the report contains Discussion Questions to help facilitate discussion.

Potential Schedule Changes

The Smart Growth Concept Map is tied to development of the comprehensive update of the RTP (currently scheduled for adoption in early 2007). Because of a delay in the reauthorization of the federal transportation bill, SANDAG will need to adopt a technical update to the RTP by March 2006. Work on the 2006 technical RTP update will likely delay the development of the 2007 comprehensive RTP update, which would, in turn, extend the Smart Growth Concept Map schedule. If the due date for the 2007 RTP update is extended, several deadlines associated with the Concept Map also would be extended, providing additional time for the public workshops as well as for the development of the final map.

Discussion

A. Comments Received on the Draft Smart Growth Concept Map and Remaining Issues

At their June and July meetings, the TWG, SWG, and RPC discussed the preliminary regional-scale Smart Growth Concept Map and its related subregional maps. The draft maps reflected the smart growth place types, boundaries, and descriptions provided by each jurisdiction to SANDAG, with the exception of the City of San Diego, which has identified over 140 possible smart growth areas as part of its City of Villages general plan effort. Staffs from the City of San Diego and SANDAG
continue to work together to refine the proposed areas within San Diego. In addition, since the last TWG meeting, several jurisdictions including the Cities of Chula Vista, San Marcos, and El Cajon, have identified additional smart growth areas or refinements to their mapped areas or written descriptions. These refinements and additions will be reflected on the next round of maps.

Comments by the TWG, SWG, and RPC

Generally, comments by the TWG, SWG, and RPC have been supportive of the draft Smart Growth Concept Map. The RPC reaffirmed that the Concept Map is an important first step toward implementing a key goal of Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP)—better integrating land use and transportation. The following provides a summary of comments on both the Concept Map and the upcoming workshops.

Comments on the Map

Regarding the map itself, all three groups expressed concern about the lack of major employment areas depicted on the map. In particular, if the map will be used to place a higher priority on directing transportation facility improvements toward smart growth areas, particularly transit services, would the omission of major employment areas negatively impact the development of effective transit network alternatives that would connect smart growth areas to those employment centers?

The discussion by the three groups pointed toward the need to clarify the definition of the Special Use Center place type, perhaps more clearly stating the importance of transit-oriented design for future employment areas, such as industrial parks, colleges, and/or malls, and the potential of transit connections or transportation demand management (TDM) programs to those areas.

In addition, RPC members questioned the differences between community centers and town centers, and asked that these two place types be revisited to clarify their differences. In addition, some RPC members recommended that certain community centers (e.g., in Lemon Grove) be re-evaluated and reclassified as town centers instead.

Finally, the SWG indicated that the Transit Corridor place type is difficult to understand and questioned why most of the Transit Corridors are east/west and so few are north/south. The SWG also suggested that the definitions that accompanied the preliminary draft maps should be illustrated in a hierarchical format to assist people in understanding the map. The SWG also indicated that it should be made clear how often the map will be updated, particularly as related to eligibility qualifications for smart growth incentive funds.

Discussion Questions

Based on comments from the three groups, staff requests the TWG to discuss and if necessary, make clarifications to the definitions of the following smart growth place types:

- Special Use Center
- Town and Community Centers
- Transit Corridors
B. Land Use Scenarios and Generic Overlay Assumptions for Potential Smart Growth Areas

The Smart Growth Concept Map will be used for two key purposes—in the update of the comprehensive 2007 RTP update and to determine eligibility to participate in the longer-term smart growth incentive program funded by TransNet. As related to the 2007 RTP update, the map will be used to generate alternative land use and transportation scenarios that will be considered as part of the RTP environmental assessment.

Currently, staff anticipates two land use scenarios.

1. Existing Plans and Policies Land Use Scenario: This scenario would reflect local inputs into the regional growth forecast, including local inputs on the Existing/Planned smart growth areas.

2. Enhanced Smart Growth Land Use Scenario: This scenario would build upon the Existing Plans and Policies Land Use Scenario described above, and in addition, would incorporate certain land assumptions for the Potential smart growth areas.

As part of the Enhanced Smart Growth Land Use Scenario, certain land use assumptions, or “generic overlays,” are proposed for each Potential smart growth area place type. The generic overlays will serve as “placeholders” for transportation modeling purposes until the potential areas “matriculate” into planned smart growth areas. A Potential area would become a Planned smart growth area when the local general plan or specific plan is updated. The land use assumptions from the general or specific plan would then be incorporated into the next update of the Regional Growth Forecast.

As discussed at previous TWG meetings, Attachment 1 includes recommended residential and employment intensity assumptions for the generic overlays. The assumptions are based upon a combination of the midpoint of the intensity ranges specified in the RCP Smart Growth Matrix and a sampling of projected land use intensities within certain smart growth areas. Additionally, the generic overlays assume a particular mix of residential, employment, and commercial land uses, depending upon place type. Attachment 2 illustrates the potential physical design of the generic overlays, with the highest intensity housing and mixed uses located closest to transit stations.

Jurisdictions that have identified potential smart growth areas may choose to provide specific assumptions for those areas, rather than use the generic assumptions included in Attachment 1. If so, they should notify SANDAG staff as soon as possible.

Discussion Questions

- Do members of the TWG agree with the generic overlay assumptions provided in Attachment 1 and illustrated in Attachment 2 to be applied to potential smart growth areas?
- What kind of changes, if any, should be made to the generic assumptions?
C. Upcoming Workshops

The TWG, SWG, and RPC made a number of comments regarding the upcoming Smart Growth Concept Map workshops at their meetings in June and July. The TWG suggested that the workshops concentrate on generating awareness about the coordination between local land use plans and regional transportation plans and about SANDAG’s commitment to reward local smart growth efforts. The TWG also suggested that the workshops focus on the transportation network alternatives that can best connect the smart growth place types instead of an evaluation of identified smart growth areas.

The SWG felt that five or six subregional workshops would not constitute sufficient public outreach and recommended additional time for public review. The group also suggested that staff clearly identify the desired participants and that the workshops be held in transit-accessible areas. In addition, they agreed with the TWG that the workshops should focus on transportation alternatives that could connect the smart growth areas and suggested that the concepts need to be explained in terms that are easily understood.

Comments by the TWG and SWG were relayed to the Regional Planning Committee. To address the SWG’s comment about extending the public review period, staff recommended supplementing the workshops with a “Speaker’s Bureau,” similar to that established during the development of the RCP. The speaker’s bureau would be available to make presentations to local chambers of commerce, economic development corporations, environmental groups, housing groups, local city councils and the Board of Supervisors, and other interested organizations. The presentations would complement the outreach efforts generated by the workshops. The RPC expressed support for this idea and requested that staff schedule presentations to local city councils as part of the public review process. They also expressed support for the transportation focus of the workshops and the open house format. In addition, RPC members expressed interest in participating in the Speaker’s Bureau and attending the workshops, particularly to listen to participants and help answer questions regarding smart growth areas in their jurisdictions.

If the 2007 RTP update schedule is not delayed, the public review period on the draft Smart Growth Concept Map will extend from early September through mid-October. To facilitate input, SANDAG will hold subregional workshops on the draft Concept Map in mid-September. As discussed at the last meeting, workshops are proposed for the following subregions: North County Coastal, North County Inland, City of San Diego, South Bay, and East County. Public outreach with the County of San Diego still needs to be determined. Additional details about the proposed dates, locations, and format of the workshops will be distributed at the meeting.

Based on input from the TWG and the SWG at their last meetings, the objectives of the workshops have been refined, and are twofold as follows: (1) to generate greater awareness of the links between smart growth land uses and transportation choices, including transit, walking, and biking; and (2) to obtain public input on the transportation networks and transit services that connect the smart growth areas that have been identified by the local jurisdictions. The input received at the workshops will assist in developing and refining the transit networks to be included in the 2007 RTP update.
Ideally, the workshops will be held during the third and fourth weeks of September, pending the 2007 RTP update schedule. The workshops are proposed to be held on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, or Thursday evenings for two hours each, in an "Open House" style. The workshops could begin with a 30-minute introductory session, followed by a brief facilitated discussion, and then smaller-scale break-out sessions staffed by SANDAG, local planning staffs, and local elected officials for the remaining hour.

The consultant currently is assisting staff with the preparation of a draft agenda for the workshops and with tools and techniques to facilitate interactive discussions. Staff will distribute a draft agenda for discussion at the meeting.

Discussion Questions

- Do TWG members feel comfortable with the revised workshop objectives?
- Can TWG members commit to attend the workshop in their subregion?
- How can TWG members generate awareness of the workshops and help increase attendance in their subregions, including the participation of local elected officials?
- What is the best timing for presentations on the Concept Map to local City Councils and the Board of Supervisors?

Attachments: 1. Generic Overlay Land Use Assumptions for Potential Smart Growth Areas (7-14-05)
   2. Generic Overlay Land Use Assumptions for Potential Smart Growth Areas

Key Staff Contact: Carolina Gregor, (619) 699-1989, cgr@sandag.org
### Generic Overlay Land Use Assumptions for Potential Smart Growth Areas - July 14, 2005

#### RCP Smart Growth Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place Type</th>
<th>Residential Density (1)</th>
<th>Employment Intensity (2)</th>
<th>Mixed Use Intensity (3)</th>
<th>Frequency of Transit Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban Center</td>
<td>40-75</td>
<td>50+</td>
<td>25+</td>
<td>High to very high (less than 15 minute peak) on all corridor/regional services. High frequency throughout the day on all lines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Center</td>
<td>20-45</td>
<td>30-50</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Very high service (less than 15 minute) throughout the day on all corridor/ regional service or connecting shuttle. High frequency throughout the day on most lines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Center</td>
<td>20-45</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>High frequency service (15 minute in peak hours) on corridor/regional services. Moderate to high frequency throughout the day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Corridor</td>
<td>25-75</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>High frequency service (15 minute in peak hours) on corridor/regional and/or local services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Use Center</td>
<td>50+ (optional)</td>
<td>45+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>High to very high frequency (15 minute or better in peak) on corridor/regional services. Moderate to high frequency throughout the day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Community</td>
<td>10.9-24+</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Served by one or more local services with moderate frequencies throughout the day. Possible peak period corridor/ regional service with transit stations located within village core.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### RCP Matrix Densities vs. Example Area Densities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place Type</th>
<th>Example Areas</th>
<th>Frequency of Transit Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban Center</td>
<td>Rio Vista</td>
<td>Little Italy, Morena Linda Vista, UTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Center</td>
<td>Downtown El Cajon, Downtown Escondido, Downtown La Mesa, Downtown Oceanside, Hillcrest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Center</td>
<td>Otay Ranch Villages, Downtown Lemon Grove, Downtown Coronado, Mercado (Barrio Logan), Palm Ave (Imperial Beach)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Corridor</td>
<td>Adams Avenue, Normal Heights, El Cajon Boulevard, University Avenue, Washington Avenue, The Paseo at SDSU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Use Center</td>
<td>The Paseo at SDSU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Community</td>
<td>Fallbrook, Ramona, Lakeside</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Notes:

1. **Residential Density:** Total dwelling units divided by built or planned residential acreage net of public right-of-way within 1/4 mile of transit station. (No requirement to be within 1/4 mile of transit for Rural Community.)
2. **Employment Intensity:** Total employees divided by built or planned office, commercial, retail acreage net of public right-of-way within 1/4 mile of transit station. (No requirement to be within 1/4 mile of transit station for Rural Community.)
3. **Mixed Use Density:** Total dwelling units divided by built or planned residential acreage net of public right-of-way and any other non-residential uses (e.g., commercial, retail, etc.) within 1/4 mile of transit station.

* Figure is the mid point of the density/intensity range found in the Smart Growth Matrix of the Regional Comprehensive Plan. The figures have been rounded down to the closest multiple of 5 where appropriate.

** Figure is identical to the minimum threshold found in the Smart Growth Matrix of the Regional Comprehensive Plan.

An 'n/a' indicates that a density/intensity target was not identified in the RCP Smart Growth Matrix.

---

DRAFT
**Urban Center**

- Single Family: 0% 0 acres
- Multifamily: 20% 25 acres
- Office: 15% 19 acres
- Retail: 15% 19 acres
- Roads: 40% 50 acres
- Other: 10% 13 acres
- Total: 100% 126 acres

**Town Center**

- Single Family: 5% 6 acres
- Multifamily: 15% 19 acres
- Office: 15% 19 acres
- Retail: 25% 32 acres
- Roads: 30% 37 acres
- Other: 10% 13 acres
- Total: 100% 126 acres

**Community Center**

- Single Family: 20% 25 acres
- Multifamily: 25% 31 acres
- Office: 5% 6 acres
- Retail: 15% 19 acres
- Roads: 25% 32 acres
- Other: 10% 13 acres
- Total: 100% 126 acres

**Rural Community**

- Single Family: 20% 25 acres
- Multifamily: 10% 13 acres
- Office: 10% 13 acres
- Retail: 30% 37 acres
- Roads: 20% 25 acres
- Other: 10% 13 acres
- Total: 100% 126 acres