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**REGионаl Pлannиng Committee**  
Friday, September 2, 2005

**11:00 A.M. - CONVEnE JOINT MEETING With TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE**

### ITEM #  
### RECOMMENDATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSENT ITEMS (A and B)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+A. APPOINTMENT OF NEW MEMBERS TO THE REGIONAL PLANNING STAKEHOLDERS WORKING GROUP (RPSWG) (Chairs Lori Holt Pfeiler and Joe Kellejian)</td>
<td>RECOMMEND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last November, the SANDAG Board approved the creation of the new Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group (RPSWG). Two members of the RPSWG have recently resigned. Regional Planning Committee Chair Lori Holt Pfeiler and Transportation Committee Chair Joe Kellejian, in consultation with Jack Dale, Chair of the RPSWG, have reviewed potential replacement candidates from the original list of candidates. Attached is the recommended slate of replacements. The Transportation and Regional Planning Committees are requested to forward the recommendation to the SANDAG Board of Directors for approval.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| +B. REVISED SCHEDULE For COMPREHENSIVE 2007 RTP (Mike Hix) | APPROVE |
| The completion of the comprehensive 2007 RTP Update has been delayed at least three months, until June 2007. The cause of the delay is the staff effort to produce a technical 2006 RTP update by March 2006, meeting the federal three-year cycle for air quality conformity. The Transportation and Regional Planning Committees are asked to recommend that the SANDAG Board of Directors approve the revised 2007 RTP work program and schedule. |

### REPORTS (C and D)

| +C. PILOT SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM – PROJECT APPROVAL (Stephan Vance) | APPROVE |
| SANDAG has received 34 applications totaling $46.6 million for the $19.11 million Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program. The projects have been reviewed and ranked by an evaluation panel consisting of members from the Stakeholders Working Group and the San Diego Council of Design Professionals. The panel has recommended 14 projects for funding under this pilot program. |
D. SHOWCASING LOCAL SMART GROWTH PROJECTS: SMART GROWTH IN LEMON GROVE (City of Lemon Grove Councilmember Jerry Jones, and Graham Mitchell, City Manager)

The Transportation and Regional Planning Committees have received periodic presentations featuring local smart growth efforts throughout the region. Representatives from the City of Lemon Grove will make a presentation on smart growth efforts happening in their city.

**ADJOURN JOINT MEETING WITH THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE**

+1. APPROVAL OF JULY 1, 2005, MEETING MINUTES

APPROVE

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

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

3. ENERGY WORKING GROUP (EWG) UPDATE
   (Councilmember Henry Abarbanel, EWG Co-Chair)

Henry Abarbanel, Co-Chair of the Energy Working Group, will provide an update on the Long-Term Resource Planning effort and an overview of the legislation that the EWG is tracking.

+4. STATUS REPORT ON SMART GROWTH CONCEPT MAP (Carolina Gregor)

At its last meeting, the Regional Planning Committee discussed the preliminary draft Smart Growth Concept Map. Initially, workshops were planned for this September. However, due to changes to the 2007 comprehensive RTP update schedule, the workshops have been rescheduled for January 2006. The attached status report includes comments on the map to date and a revised schedule.

5. UPCOMING MEETINGS

The next Regional Planning Committee meeting will be held on Friday, October 7, 2005, from noon to 2 p.m.

6. ADJOURNMENT

+ next to an agenda item indicates an attachment
REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

Meeting of July 1, 2005

The Regional Planning Committee (RPC) meeting was called to order at 12:07 p.m. by Committee Chair Lori Holt Pfeiler (North County Inland). The attendance sheet for the meeting is attached.

Chair Holt Pfeiler thanked and welcomed all for attending today’s meeting.

1. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

   Action: A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of the June 3, 2005 meeting.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBERS COMMENTS

   None.

   CONSENT

3. OVERVIEW OF COMMITTEES AND WORKING GROUPS REPORTING TO THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE (INFORMATION)

   SANDAG’s Executive Committee has completed its annual review of committees and working groups to determine the need to maintain the committees/working groups and to approve any revisions in functions or membership. Some of these groups are designated to report to the Regional Planning Committee. This report provides a status report of those groups, with an emphasis on the Shoreline Preservation Working Group and the Regional Housing Working Group.

   Action: Councilmember Jones (City of Lemon Grove) moved and Councilmember Peters (City of San Diego) seconded the motion to approve the Consent item.

   Chair Holt Pfeiler noted that the Regional Planning Committee voted at its last meeting to add several new members, representing the Environmental Mitigation Program (EMP) Working Group. She asked that all new members introduce themselves.
The new EMP members and alternates introduced themselves. They included: Susan Wynn, US Fish and Wildlife Service; Michael Mulligan, from the California Department of Fish & Game; Al Wright, representing the Wildlife Conservation Board; and Mark Durham and Jeannette Baker, from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. All members indicated that they were looking forward to participating on the Committee.

Chair Holt Pfeiler stated that the agenda has been structured to allow for the EMP items to be listed first. She mentioned that the RPC was mindful of the new members and their time and wanted to be respectful of them for coming from other areas of the state to be here today.

**ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION PROGRAM (EMP) REPORTS**

4. **APPROVING A CHARTER AND APPOINTING A CHAIR FOR THE ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION PROGRAM WORKING GROUP (APPROVE)**

Staff indicated that the TransNet Ordinance includes funding for an Environmental Mitigation Program (EMP), and sets forth principles for the implementation of that program. On May 27, 2005, the SANDAG Board of Directors designated the RPC as the policy committee responsible for implementing certain provisions of the EMP, and provided direction regarding the establishment of an EMP Working Group to advise the RPC and Board of Directors on this program. It is recommended that the Regional Planning Committee approve a charter for the EMP Working Group, and appoint Coronado Councilmember Carrie Downey as the Chair of the Working Group.

Staff indicated that the Working Group will work on the Regional Habitat Conservation Fund and the various components of the mitigation program.

Staff stated that the Charter outlines the purpose and responsibilities of the Working Group and designates organizations that would be included on it such as the Nature Conservancy, Conservation Resource Network, U.S. Geological Survey, Endangered Habitats League, and Building Industry Association. In addition, staff representatives from the City of San Diego, County of San Diego, and the four subregions (North County Coastal, North County Inland, East County and South County) will also be part of the Working Group. Staff also stated that Councilmember Carrie Downey has agreed and is excited to be the Chair of this Working Group, if appointed. Once the organizations designated for membership select individuals to participate on the Working Group, SANDAG staff will schedule the group’s first meeting.

Staff added that two letters were received from other organizations (Coastal Conservancy and Alliance for Habitat Conservation) requesting membership on the EMP Working Group. Staff requested that the Committee refer this issue to legal counsel for review.

**Public Comment**

Craig Benedetto, representing the Alliance for Habitat Conservation (AHC), stated that the AHC has been involved in multiple species habitat issues over the last decade and a half. The AHC has been heavily involved in the creation of the EMP as
well as the extension of TransNet. He believes that the AHC could provide technical expertise to SANDAG in its efforts and requested to be included on the EMP Working Group.

Councilmember Peters commented that this is a great project and approach. He made the motion to approve the staff recommendation and also to include the addition of the Alliance for Habitat Conservation to the EMP Working Group membership.

Deputy Mayor Davis seconded the motion.

Councilmember McCoy pointed out that there are two other groups that are missing from the list of organizations that are proposed to be part of this Working Group. Those two groups are the San Diego Community Foundation and the San Diego International Community Foundation. Both organizations have environmental components as well as funding that can be used toward future projects. She requested that staff consider both organizations for inclusion of membership.

**Action:** Councilmember Peters moved and Deputy Mayor Davis seconded the motion to approve the charter for the EMP Working Group which outlines its purpose and responsibilities, designate the proposed organizations that would be included on it, and appoint Coronado Councilmember Carrie Downey as the Chair of the Working Group. The RPC also asked that staff review the recommendations to add the following organizations to the Working Group: the Coastal Conservancy, the Alliance for Habitat Conservation, the San Diego Foundation, and the San Diego International Community Foundation. Staff will bring back recommendations for final membership to the Committee at a future meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

### REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE (RPC) REPORTS

5. **SHOWCASING LOCAL SMART GROWTH PROJECTS: TRAFFIC CALMING EFFORTS IN THE BIRD ROCK COMMUNITY (INFORMATION)**

Councilmember Peters introduced this item by stating that the smart growth project in the Bird Rock Community underwent an interesting planning process and resulted in a very unique project. The project began several years ago when residents in the Bird Rock community expressed complaints about La Jolla Blvd. (i.e., high traffic levels, failing businesses, and streets in disrepair). He mentioned that he met many times with the Bird Rock Community to discuss new plans for the area, and that the response was overwhelming. A new plan was developed and presented to the City Council, but it was vocally opposed at the Council meeting. In the process, he learned that he hadn’t listened to the broader community. Therefore, Councilmember Peters challenged the larger community to develop a plan reflecting what it really wanted. A walkability consultant from Florida was hired, and a Task Force was appointed to revitalize the community. He introduced several members of the community to describe the project and the process.

Pam Wagner, an attorney with two young children and a resident of the Bird Rock Community, stated that the community was supportive of the upgrades as long as it was
kept informed in the planning process. She mentioned that she feels good about the end result of the project. The Bird Rock area is between Pacific Beach and La Jolla. There are two major routes to get into La Jolla, including La Jolla Blvd., a heavily-traveled traffic route with approximately 22,000 cars per day. In addition, La Jolla Blvd. bisects the community between the beach and Bird Rock elementary school. Some of the challenges that the community faced were speeding, pedestrian safety, cut-through traffic, and parking shortages. She provided the RPC with the history of the project. A Task Force consisting of 15 people was created. The Task Force met every other week for two years and came up with two conclusions: (1) they needed an expert on walkable communities to develop a traffic management plan, and (2) community support would be needed to implement the plan. The community held a three-day event and developed a preliminary traffic management plan. It then took an additional two years to get the plan approved by the various community groups. After fine-tuning the plan and approval of the three community groups, the Task Force took the concept to the San Diego City Council for approval. A maintenance assessment district (MAD), which the community helps to fund, was created.

Siavash Pazargadi, a Senior Engineer with the City of San Diego Transportation Planning Division, assisted the community with the development and coordination of this project. Major concerns along La Jolla Blvd. included high speed, traffic volumes, and street width and safety issues (one fatality). Other concerns included cut-through traffic, school congestion, aesthetics, and financial solutions. This project is a good example of a community-driven process. The community worked together to develop a traffic management plan, which included community coordination, traffic innovations, ten roundabouts/circles; and 25 other major improvements. Mr. Pazargadi noted that roundabouts don’t have traffic signals. Crosswalks near the roundabouts measure about one to two vehicles in length and are placed behind yield signs, allowing pedestrians to cross the streets safely. As a result, roundabouts have far fewer “conflict” points than high-volume traditional intersections. Characteristics of roundabouts include safety, increased capacity, aesthetics, and no traffic signals.

Paul Metcalf, a Bird Rock resident and parent, has been involved in the project since inception. It was made clear that traffic reduction and air pollution reduction would have to be included in the project. However, the community needed to be willing to support the taxes and fees associated with maintenance and upkeep of the improvements.

Mr. Pazargadi highlighted the traffic management plan in the area. La Jolla Blvd. was the focal point of this project. Two lanes, one on each side, were removed, vertical parking spaces were added, and two buffer lanes were added for drivers entering and exiting parking spaces. La Jolla Blvd. has two major bus routes, so the community worked with the transit agency to ensure that the buses would be able to maneuver in the roundabouts.

Councilmember Peters indicated that an old hotel was turned into a mixed-use development project, which includes condominiums. He showed several areas that will include future mixed-use developments in the community. He added that the San Diego City Council did not "drive" the project but rather empowered the community to do so. Councilmember Peters thanked his staff members for their assistance on this project, and suggested that the project and its public involvement process can be a model for other communities in the region.
Mr. Pazargadi showed the Committee a traffic simulation on La Jolla Blvd.

Mr. Anderson (Stakeholders Working Group) asked how much the assessment fees cost. Mr. Metcalf responded that the assessments are different for homes, condominiums, and businesses. The highest assessment is $1,500.

 Supervisor Slater-Price (County of San Diego) commented that the City of Del Mar has many of the same problems that this area has. It is difficult to get people through Del Mar without making road improvements that would significantly change the quality of life in the area. She applauded the use of traffic circles as an alternative that should be considered in more communities. This is a beautiful plan and is addresses a quality of life issue relevant to everyone in the region. She concluded that residents have high expectations of what government should do, but in fact the community itself can initiate many of the improvements at a relatively low cost.

Mr. Pazargadi mentioned that he has received inquiries from the Cities of Sacramento and Encinitas, as well as Caltrans, regarding the plan.

 Supervisor Slater-Price stated that the County has been looking to find solutions for traffic congestion for years. She noted that Supervisor Horn has funded a study to try to resolve some of these issues in the unincorporated areas.

Mr. Pazargadi noted that roundabouts work well for communities that feel that stop signs and stop lights are intrusions to the community.

 Supervisor Slater-Price asked how to address the perception that traffic improvements often result in additional traffic. Ms. Wagner noted that they used SANDAG’s forecast and have not experienced problems with increases in traffic to date. They are happy with the model that they have.

 Supervisor Slater-Price asked if traffic spilling over into the neighborhoods is an issue. Mr. Pazargadi replied that that was a significant community concern and that many traffic calming features on the side streets were integrated into the plan to address that concern.

Ms. Wagner added that the Task Force spent over a year looking at different tools that would work for the neighborhoods. In the end, all of the issues were addressed, and the Task Force was able to achieve consensus from the community.

Mr. Metcalf stated that the community required that the Task Force move forward with the plan and continue its work into the implementation phase. The Task Force will maintain what has already been done and keep options open for the future.

Councilmember McCoy commented that community coherence and buy-in is the golden rule. It is important to bring people along and invest in the project.
Councilmember Peters stated that he was fortunate to have worked with such a progressive group in his district. He added that there are likely many older communities in urban areas in the region in need of similar improvements; his community just happened to be in La Jolla.

Councilmember McCoy mentioned that roundabouts have been used for years in Europe.

Chair Holt Pfeiler thanked all for sharing their experience today.

**Action**: The Regional Planning Committee accepted this item for information.

6. **DRAFT SMART GROWTH CONCEPT MAP AND INITIAL IDEAS FOR PUBLIC WORKSHOPS (DISCUSSION/COMMENT)**

Chair Holt Pfeiler stated that a lot of work has been done on the Draft Smart Growth Concept Map up to this point, but there is still more work to do.

Staff noted that today’s presentation will focus on two parts of the Smart Growth Concept Map – the maps developed to date and the public outreach workshops. The Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) contains goals aimed at improving transportation and land use coordination. A key recommendation is to identify smart growth areas and opportunities throughout the region and place a high priority on directing transportation facility improvements and other infrastructure resources toward those areas. One of the early actions is the development of a Smart Growth Concept Map. The Urban Form chapter of the RCP defines seven smart growth place types which range from “metropolitan center” to “rural community.” Smart growth takes place in different ways in different places in the region. Smart growth categories include existing and planned smart growth areas as well as potential smart growth areas. Two key uses of the concept map include its use in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) update and the long-term smart growth incentive program. Staff discussed the general approach on how the map was developed, emphasizing the connection between regional transit corridors and place types. Staff walked the Committee through the four steps taken to create the Smart Growth Map, and the preliminary results for each subregion. The next version of the map will include the additional place types from the City of San Diego.

Staff asked the Committee two questions: (1) are we moving in the right direction, and; (2) does the Smart Growth Concept Map help accomplish the goals of land use and transportation integration?

Councilmember Jones pointed out that the Smart Growth Concept Map showed a lack of Town Centers as opposed to Community Centers. He asked if there a difference. Staff responded in the affirmative. The key differences include additional civic and cultural uses, a subregional draw, and higher employment intensities in the Town Centers.

Councilmember Jones questioned whether the definitions are correct. For example, if there are cities that have Town Centers within their boundaries but don’t have Town Centers identified on the Concept Map, do the definitions need to be reconsidered? Staff stated they worked with local jurisdiction staffs, other stakeholders, and the policy committees to
develop the definitions during the development of the RCP. However, based on the latest process of identifying the smart growth areas, several questions have come up, and there may be a need to go back and refine the RCP Smart Growth matrix.

Councilmember Jones stated that those locations need to be identified and those areas need to be serviced. Staff replied that this issue will be taken back to the planning directors for additional discussion. Staff noted that both existing and planned areas include transit service.

Councilmember Jones mentioned that he could see places on the Smart Growth Concept Map where additional areas need to be identified.

Councilmember Peters asked what will happen next and what directives will come out of the Smart Growth Concept Map. Will the RPC be making recommendations to jurisdictions or mandating that they make changes? Staff stated that the Committee will not make mandates but that when the RTP is updated, SANDAG will consider giving higher funding priority to corridors that have smart growth. The purpose of the Smart Growth Concept Map is to try to enhance the connection between land use and transportation.

Councilmember Druker commented that overall, the Concept Map represents what the Committee has been doing and where it's going. He expressed concern that the map does not show all of the major job centers in the region. These major employment areas will need transportation services that connect them to the smart growth areas where people live. These employment areas need to be identified on the map even though they may not be smart growth areas. Staff responded that this issue also was raised at the working group level, and that staff would evaluate how to link the areas on the Smart Growth Concept Map to major employment centers in the region.

Mr. Anderson expressed concern that public transit wouldn't be made available to the employment areas. There is a need to encourage people to take transit to work but it won't happen if transit is not available.

Councilmember Druker stated that the map should identify where major employment centers are located to provide some context. Staff stated that refining the definition of a Special Use Center may be a good place to start. SANDAG will need to distinguish how transit services are to be provided to areas designated as Special Use Centers.

Mr. Anderson questioned why Kearny Mesa and Otay Mesa are not listed on the Map. Staff responded that discussions with the City of San Diego are not complete, and that they will be having additional meetings with the City of San Diego staff to identify and refine locations of smart growth areas within the City.

Councilmember McCoy mentioned that she took a tour in Chula Vista and the greater South Bay area showing the last industrial lands available in South County and where Chula Vista is planning to build housing. There is no coordination of efforts in those areas. It is a fluid area and needs attention as the map is being formulated.
Mayor Pro Tem Hall (North County Coastal) commented that the Palomar corridor is an area where opportunity for revitalization was missed. There are projects that are going on in that area but are hard to define on the Smart Growth Concept Map.

Councilmember Peters stated that he thinks that the Committee is moving in the right direction and that the Smart Growth Concept Map will help to accomplish SANDAG’s goals of better integrating land use and transportation.

Staff provided the RPC with a preview on what is being anticipated for the workshops. The workshops will be an open house style and will be held subregionally. The format used will be similar to the format used for the RCP workshops. Staff provided the Committee with the proposed workshop dates. Staff indicated that the Stakeholders Working Group (SWG) felt that five or six workshops would not be sufficient to gain enough input on the Concept Map. In response, staff is proposing to develop a speakers bureau to get the word out to the communities. Staff asked what the role of the Committee and the SANDAG Board members should be in the public outreach process.

Vice Chair Davis noted that in looking at the proposed workshop schedule, September 8, 2005, may not be a good date for South County.

Councilmember Peters indicated that he likes the proposed format; people feel comfortable in open house forums and will not be afraid to ask questions.

Chair Holt Pfeiler stated that the Committee and Board members need to be available as resources at the workshops. People are not afraid to speak in a smaller setting.

Councilmember Peters stated that he is willing to participate in the workshops. Staff reminded the Committee that this is not a SANDAG map but rather is a regional map based on local inputs. Each jurisdiction has to take ownership and make the proposed developments happen.

Chair Holt Pfeiler commented that the critical piece of the public outreach is the speakers bureau. She asked if the Committee members should help with the speakers bureau outreach. Staff responded that it would be ideal for Committee members to be involved in the presentations. That approach worked very well in the development of the RCP.

Supervisor Slater-Price indicated that there wouldn’t be a problem for the County Supervisors to participate in the workshops for their respective jurisdictions.

As the Vice Chair of the SWG, Mr. Anderson noted that discussion by the SWG on this topic included suggestions that the workshops should be held in locations convenient to the people attending, and that information presented on the Smart Growth Concept Map at the workshops should be easier to understand than the information currently presented to the various SANDAG working groups and committees. Staff replied that there will be two different sets of maps developed; both will have the same information, but the information will be broken down into different categories. The maps will consist of pictures, illustrations, and sketches to help people visualize what is taking place and understand what is happening.
Staff added that they want to give all 18 cities and the County every opportunity to develop smart growth wherever they can in their respective jurisdictions. Staff noted that they are willing to meet with each City Council and the Board of Supervisors on an individual basis to provide an overview and help identify any additional areas.

Councilmember Jones stated that it is important to bring all players to the table regarding this issue.

Vice Chair Davis commented that the City of Chula Vista created a speakers bureau for its general plan update and so far, it has been a useful tool. She added that another way to distribute information is through homeowners’ associations.

Staff concluded that the Draft Smart Growth Map will be presented to the SANDAG Board of Directors at its July 2005 meeting. The updates will be brought back to the RPC at its September 2005 meeting, and final map will be brought back to the Committee in November 2005.

Action: The Regional Planning Committee accepted this item for information.

7. UPCOMING MEETINGS

The meeting of the Regional Planning Committee, scheduled for 12 to 2 p.m. on Friday, August 5, 2005, will be cancelled. The next meeting will be held from 11 a.m. to 1 p.m. on September 2, 2005, and will be a joint meeting with the Transportation Committee. Chair Holt Pfeiler polled the group about attendance for the September 2nd meeting, given that it is on a holiday weekend. Committee members generally indicated that they would be available.

Staff noted that the meeting on September 2, 2005, is an important one. The Committees will be asked to take action on the $17 million funding of projects for the Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program.

8. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Holt Pfeiler adjourned the meeting at 1:44 p.m.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GEOGRAPHICAL AREA</th>
<th>JURISDICTION</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>MEMBER/ ALTERNATE</th>
<th>ATTENDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North County Inland</td>
<td>City of Escondido</td>
<td>Lori Holt-Pfeiler, Chair</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Vista</td>
<td>Judy Ritter</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South County</td>
<td>City of Chula Vista</td>
<td>Patty Davis, Vice Chair</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Imperial Beach</td>
<td>Patricia McCoy</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North County Coastal</td>
<td>City of Carlsbad</td>
<td>Matt Hall</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Carlsbad</td>
<td>Bud Lewis</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East County</td>
<td>City of Lemon Grove</td>
<td>Jerry Jones</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of La Mesa</td>
<td>Barry Jantz</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Scott Peters</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Jim Madaffer</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Bill Horn</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Pam Slater-Price</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>Caltrans, District 11</td>
<td>Pedro Orso-Delgado</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bill Figge</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>San Diego County Water Authority</td>
<td>Howard Williams</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>Department of Defense</td>
<td>Susannah Aguilera</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>San Diego Unified Port District</td>
<td>William Hall</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bill Briggs</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>MTDB</td>
<td>Leon Williams (Chairman)</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bob Emery</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>NCTD</td>
<td>Dave Druker</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>Regional Planning Technical Working Group</td>
<td>Gail Goldberg</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group</td>
<td>Bill Anderson</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
San Diego Association of Governments

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

September 2, 2005

AGENDA ITEM NO.: 4

Action Requested: INFORMATION

STATUS REPORT ON SMART GROWTH CONCEPT MAP

File Number 3000200

Introduction

At its July 1, 2005, meeting, the Regional Planning Committee (RPC) reviewed and discussed the preliminary regional-scale Smart Growth Concept Map and its related subregional maps. The Regional Planning Stakeholders and Technical Working Groups (RPSWG and RPTWG) also reviewed the preliminary maps at their June and July meetings. Staff is revising the maps based on comments from the three groups. The revised maps will be presented to the RPC in November.

Revised Schedule

At the last meeting, staff reported that the Smart Growth Concept Map would need to be finalized by November in order to serve as the basis for the development of the alternative land use scenarios for the 2007 comprehensive update of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). As reported to the SANDAG Board at its July meeting, 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 delay the development of the 2007 comprehensive RTP update, which will, in turn, extend the schedule for the Smart Growth Concept Map. Because the due date for the 2007 RTP update has been extended by several months (to June 2007), various deadlines associated with the Concept Map also have been extended. This will provide additional time for the public workshops and the development of the final map.

The extended deadline provides additional time to continue to work refining smart growth areas with the City of San Diego planning staff, and ensures greater accuracy for the map. This also will allow more time to integrate the results of general plan update efforts currently underway by the Cities of San Diego and Chula Vista, and the County of San Diego. The final draft Smart Growth Concept Map now is anticipated for completion by March 2006.

Discussion

Comments Received on the Draft Smart Growth Concept Map

At their June and July meetings, the RPC, RPTWG, and RPSWG discussed the preliminary draft regional-scale Smart Growth Concept Map and its related subregional maps. The preliminary 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 at that time had 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 have worked together over the summer to refine the proposed areas within San Diego. Those refinements will be reflected on the updated maps that will undergo review by the Working Groups during September and October, and will be presented to the RPC in November.

**Comments Received by the RPC, RPTWG, and RPSWG**

Generally, comments by the RPC, RPTWG, and RPSWG have been supportive of the draft Smart Growth Concept Map. At its last meeting, the Regional Planning Committee reaffirmed that the Concept Map is an important first step toward implementing a key goal of the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP)—better integrating land use and transportation.

A major concern expressed by all three groups centered on the lack of major employment areas depicted on the map. In particular, their concern was whether the omission of major employment areas would negatively affect the development of a transit network that connects smart growth areas to 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.

Other major comments included:

- Questions about the differences between community centers and town centers, with recommendations that certain community centers (e.g., in Lemon Grove) be re-evaluated and considered as town centers instead;

- Suggestions to research case studies in the United States or Europe where modern business parks have been developed and work successfully with transit and mixed land uses, examining issues such as what makes those areas work successfully and what types of incentives could be provided to local jurisdictions to apply those concepts here;

- Suggestions that major employment areas in northern Baja California be reflected;

- Suggestions that major activity centers, such as tourist sites, also be reflected;

- Suggestions that the definitions of the smart growth place types be illustrated in a hierarchical format to assist people in understanding the map;

- Clarifications regarding how often the map will be updated, particularly as related to eligibility qualifications for smart growth incentive funds;

- Suggestions that the smart growth areas identified on the final map serve as “epicenters” for smart growth development so that strict boundaries are not the final factor in determining eligibility for potential projects competing in the smart growth incentive program.
Staff and the consultant are working on these and other issues, and will present alternative responses and mapping approaches to the working groups for their consideration and discussion. Additional refinements will be made to the maps, and the resulting reports and refined maps will be presented to the RPC this fall.

**Upcoming Workshops**

Given that the due date for the 2007 comprehensive RTP update has been extended, the workshops on the Smart Growth Concept Map are being rescheduled from September (as discussed at the last meeting) to January 2006. Holding the workshops early next year will provide time for additional progress on the general plan update efforts of the Cities of San Diego and Chula Vista, and the County of San Diego, allowing more time for the results of those efforts to be integrated into the Concept Map. In addition, holding the workshops in January also will allow for additional time to plan and advertise the workshops, and conduct additional public outreach.

At their last meetings, the RPC, RPTWG, and RPSWG made a number of comments regarding the workshops. Major comments included:

- The workshops should focus on the transportation network alternatives that can best connect the smart growth place types.
- Additional public outreach, beyond the planned five or six subregional workshops, should be conducted.
- Creative advertising should be used to attract the average resident to attend the workshops.
- Additional time is necessary for public review.

As a result of these comments, as well as from the schedule changes to the 2007 comprehensive RTP update, staff is recommending that the workshops be combined with the public outreach efforts of the comprehensive RTP update. This would provide an opportunity for SANDAG to obtain input on both the smart growth concepts as well as the related transportation issues. In addition, this approach also helps address the issue regarding the need for additional public outreach, as staff anticipates various rounds of workshops associated with the comprehensive RTP update.

In addition, at the last RPC meeting, staff recommended supplementing the workshops with a "speakers bureau," similar to that established during the development of the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP). The speakers bureau presentations would complement the outreach efforts generated by the workshops, and would serve as part of an extended public review period. The Regional Planning Committee expressed support for this idea and requested that staff schedule presentations to local city councils and the Board of Supervisors as part of the public review process. Those presentations will be scheduled during November and December 2005 to coincide with the January 2006 workshops.

The consultant is assisting staff with the preparation of a draft agenda for the workshops and with tools and techniques to facilitate interactive discussions. Staff will obtain input from the working groups at their upcoming meetings and present more detailed materials to the Regional Planning Committee this fall.
**Revised Schedule**

As stated previously, the schedule for preparing the Smart Growth Concept Map is tied to the 2007 comprehensive RTP update. In order to allow sufficient time to develop the land use scenarios for the environmental analysis, the SANDAG Board would need to accept the final draft Smart Growth Concept Map by March 2006. The following milestones are anticipated within this time frame:

- Preliminary Draft Concept Map – June/July 2005 (Completed)
- Revised Draft Concept Map – October/November 2005
- Public Workshops – January 2006
- Final Draft Concept Map – February/March 2006
- SANDAG Board Action – March 24, 2006

A revised draft Smart Growth Concept Map will be available for review by the Regional Planning Committee at its November 4, 2005, meeting.

BOB LEITER  
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Key Staff Contact: Carolina Gregor, (619) 699-1989, cgr@sandag.org
JOINT MEETING OF THE REGIONAL PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEES

September 2, 2005

APPOINTMENT OF NEW MEMBERS TO THE REGIONAL PLANNING STAKEHOLDERS WORKING GROUP

File Number 3000200

Introduction

Last November, the SANDAG Board of Directors approved the creation of the Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group (RPSWG). The purpose of the RPSWG is to review and provide input into key activities associated with the implementation of the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) and the update of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The RPSWG acts in an advisory capacity to both the Regional Planning and Transportation Committees.

The RPSWG has 26 voting members (Attachment 1). The members were selected based on their individual qualifications, and were approved by the Board on January 28, 2005. The RPSWG Charter specifies that in the event that any members need to be replaced, the Regional Planning and Transportation Committees will recommend new members to the Board of Directors from the original candidate list. The Board will make final replacements.

Two members of the RPSWG recently resigned - Anne Fege and Bill Garrett. Their letters of resignation are attached (Attachments 2 and 3). In addition, the RPSWG Charter specifies that if a stakeholder misses two meetings in a row or three meetings over the course of one year, he/she will be replaced. Several members have missed one or more meetings, and could possibly need to be replaced if they miss one or two more meetings this year.

The Chairs of the Regional Planning and Transportation Committees, in consultation with the Chair of the RPSWG, have reviewed the original candidate list and are recommending two replacements and two back-up replacements. Additional information on the four candidates is included in Attachment 4.

Recommendation

The Regional Planning and Transportation Committees are asked to recommend the following to the SANDAG Board of Directors for approval:


- Designate Kristen Kjero and Helene Radzuk as back-up candidates in the event that additional vacancies arise on the Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group.
Discussion

Background

In December 2004, SANDAG received 97 applications from residents from throughout the region to serve on the RPSWG. An ad hoc Selection Committee was formed to review the applications and make membership recommendations to the two policy advisory committees and the SANDAG Board of Directors. The Selection Committee consisted of Supervisor Pam Slater-Price, Councilmember Jim Madaffer, Councilmember Jack Dale, Councilmember Maggie Houlihan, Councilmember Phil Monroe, and Mayor Lori Holt Pfeiler, as well as representatives from the Regional Planning Technical Working Group and the Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee.

In late 2004, the Selection Committee met to narrow the pool of 97 applicants to approximately 50 candidates. The Committee met again in early 2005 and identified a list of 26 candidates that the Board ultimately appointed. In narrowing the group down to its final membership, the Selection Committee emphasized the importance of balancing subregional representation as well as subject matter interest. In approving the RPSWG membership, the SANDAG Board indicated that should replacements be necessary, additional representation from South County should be considered.

With the two recent resignations, Regional Planning Committee Chair Lori Holt Pfeiler, Transportation Committee Chair Joe Kellejian, and RPSWG Chair Jack Dale used the narrowed pool of applicants (50 candidates minus 26 appointees) as the starting point for evaluating replacements. Based on the priorities advocated by the original Selection Committee and SANDAG Board direction, the Chairs further narrowed down the choices, and have recommended Greg Alabado and Gary Nordstrom (both residents of South County) to fill the two existing vacancies. In addition, the Chairs have identified two other back-up candidates in case other RPSWG members need to be replaced before the end of the year.

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachments:
1. Original Membership of the RPSWG
2. Anne Fege's Resignation Letter dated 6/20/05
3. Bill Garrett's Resignation Letter dated 4/20/05
4. Recommended RPSWG Replacement Candidates

Key Staff Contact: Carolina Gregor, (619) 699-1989, cgr@sandag.org
MEMBERSHIP OF THE REGIONAL PLANNING STAKEHOLDERS WORKING GROUP
APPROVED BY THE SANDAG BOARD OF DIRECTORS ON JANUARY 28, 2005
(Members that have submitted resignation letters are shown in highlighted fonts)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sub - Region</th>
<th>Areas of Interest</th>
<th>Brief Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bill Anderson</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>• Urban Form&lt;br&gt;• Economic Prosperity&lt;br&gt;• Public Facilities</td>
<td>Bill Anderson received a Masters in City and Regional Planning at Harvard University, has served as president of C-3, worked as a consultant, and served on the City of San Diego’s Planning Commission as well as on the Urban Land Institute (ULI) Board of Directors. Bill recognizes the importance of a successful regional plan, specifically one that integrates economic development, environmental protection, community design, and public facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaine Cooluris</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>• Transportation&lt;br&gt;• Economic Prosperity&lt;br&gt;• Social Equity &amp; Environmental Justice</td>
<td>Elaine Cooluris is an employee of an organization representing San Diego citizens with disabilities. Elaine’s experience is diverse, including multi-term service as president of San Diego’s Job Training Associates, Affirmative Action / Americans with Disabilities Act technical assistance, and service on 13 City of San Diego Task Forces. Elaine hopes she will bring awareness to the needs and accommodations of universal access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Fege</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>• Urban Form&lt;br&gt;• Housing&lt;br&gt;• Environmental Protection</td>
<td>Anne Fege believes quality of life is directly affected by land use decisions, specifically those dealing with defensible space, water conservation, and Transit Oriented Development. Anne’s work experience includes 30 years in natural resource management, as well as organizing community groups, and leading strategic planning efforts concerning biodiversity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Membership of the Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group - continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Focus Areas</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jeff Figler</strong></td>
<td>North County</td>
<td>- Transportation</td>
<td>Jeff Figler has become aware of the issues facing the region through his participation on LEAD San Diego and as a member and chairperson on several strategic planning groups. He became interested in housing and mass transportation issues, specifically concerning North County. Through his involvement on the RPSWG, Jeff would like to develop a plan for growth that encourages economic prosperity and preserves the region's quality of life and the natural environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inland</td>
<td>- Housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Economic Prosperity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paul Fiske</strong></td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>- Economic Prosperity</td>
<td>Paul Fiske has 30 years combined experience working in city financial management, environmental analysis, and long-range strategic planning. Paul's related experience includes preparation of the Public Facilities and Services Element of the City of San Diego General Plan and previous membership on the Regional Planning Technical Working Group. Paul feels his formal education and practical work experience will add to the participative decision-making process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Public Facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Social Equity &amp; Environmental Justice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bill Garrett</strong></td>
<td>East County</td>
<td>- Economic Prosperity</td>
<td>Bill Garrett is the former City Manager of the City of El Cajon. As the city manager, Bill made a commitment to regional planning, community participation, and economic prosperity. Bill has had experience participating in regional forums and has had many years of experience in attempting to build consensus for the common good. Bill will bring an East County perspective to the regional table.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Larry Glavinic</strong></td>
<td>North County</td>
<td>- Urban Form</td>
<td>Larry Glavinic would like the transportation issues in rural and semi-rural areas to be more adequately addressed. He believes further consideration should be given to incentives that would encourage a change in attitudes towards transportation and its infrastructure. Larry's practical experience includes serving on a SANDAG transportation working group, and serving on the Valley Center Community Planning Group for 14 years, five of which he served as Chair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inland</td>
<td>- Transportation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Valley Center)</td>
<td>- Economic Prosperity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Key Focus Areas</td>
<td>Biography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy Gompper Graves</td>
<td>South County</td>
<td>Urban Form, Transportation, Economic Prosperity</td>
<td>Cindy Gompper Graves recognizes the importance of a collaborative effort in solving regional issues and brings a unique binational perspective to the table. She would like to ensure decisions are made while keeping both sides of the border in mind. Cindy's related work experience in building, planning, economics and local government, and participation in many community and regional planning organizations will make her a productive member of the working group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolf Gunnarson</td>
<td>North County Inland</td>
<td>Urban Form, Transportation, Economic Prosperity, Public Facilities</td>
<td>Rolf Gunnarson has worked as a city planner, redevelopment director and city manager, resulting in 30 years of local government service. Rolf has worked with policy makers, community leaders and planners, and has been a member of various committees. As a member of the RPSWG, Rolf plans to help the region develop effective tools that will guide its growth and development, while protecting the natural environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Henderson</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>Housing, Economic Prosperity, Public Facilities</td>
<td>Todd Henderson is familiar with affordable housing development, redevelopment activities, and community development project management. Todd regularly interacts with local jurisdictions, community groups, and non-profit organizations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Hinchy</td>
<td>North County Coastal (Rancho Santa Fe)</td>
<td>Transportation, Environmental Protection, Social Equity &amp; Environmental Justice</td>
<td>William Hinchy believes that transportation issues are best addressed in a comprehensive manner and recognizes the importance of both the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP). William is most interested in solving regional traffic issues, specifically those affecting North County. William's experience with transportation issues is a result of his involvement with the Rancho Santa Fe Association, as Chair of the Association's Road &amp; Traffic Committee. William hopes to represent the views of North County residents and promote a balance between transportation improvements and environmental preservation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Focus Areas</td>
<td>Contributions and Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Kathy Keehan     | North County Inland | • Urban Form  
• Transportation | Kathy Keehan is the Executive Director of the San Diego County Bicycle Coalition and has six years of experience in planning bicycle facilities. She has participated on various working groups, within and outside of SANDAG. Kathy would like to provide the opinion of the non-motorized transportation user and notes that bicyclists and pedestrians are also impacted by land-use decisions. |
| Steven Otto      | South County    | • Economic Prosperity  
• Border Transportation  
• Social Equity & Environmental Justice | Steven Otto’s work experience includes 25 years managing economic and community development programs in the United States and abroad. For the past five years, Steve has served as the Executive Director of “Start-up” San Ysidro Business Improvement District. Steve hopes to convey his aspirations for revitalizing San Ysidro, the world’s busiest land border crossing. |
| Ron Pennock      | East County     | • Urban Form  
• Housing  
• Economic Prosperity | Ron Pennock’s interest is primarily in East County. He is concerned with the residential population allocation and providing for the future needs of commercial/industrial businesses. He would also like to ensure that East County’s needs are understood and taken into consideration. Ron has been involved with the General Plan 2020 process for the past several years, has served as chairman of the East County Construction Council, and also as chair for the City of El Cajon’s Condo Conversion Task Force. |
| Don Preis        | East County     | • Urban Form  
• Transportation  
• Housing | Don Preis hopes to encourage the completion of SR 52, economic and business growth in east county, and the development of Fanita Ranch. He would also like to promote adherence to Santee’s General Plan. Don has experience working within Santee’s local government, works as a consultant to small businesses, and has served as chairman of the Santee Mobile Home Rent Control Commission. |
| **Brad Raulston** | Central | • Urban Form  
• Economic Prosperity  
• Border Transportation | Brad Raulston is the President of the Binational Organizing Committee, a civilian non-profit binational organization, and is also chairman of the Bird-Rock Traffic Task Force. Brad believes that the implementation of smart growth is important and hopes to encourage sustainable development while bringing a binational perspective to the working group. |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Kevin Reese** | Central | • Urban Form  
• Transportation  
• Social Equity & Environmental Justice | Kevin Reese believes poor planning has resulted in few alternatives to driving, which is the cause of the region's present traffic problems. He believes San Diego's social, cultural, physical, and environmental health will depend on efforts to reduce automobile dependency. Kevin has a Masters in City Planning, has worked as a research coordinator with Active Living Research, and currently works as an associate planner for a local planning, policy, and urban design firm. He hopes to ensure walking is prioritized as a safe and viable option for everyone. He feels he can be utilized as an informational resource for other stakeholders and would like to be a voice for pedestrians. |
| **Clive Richard** | Central | • Urban Form  
• Transportation  
• Social Equity & Environmental Justice | Clive Richard has been a member of MTDB’s Trolley Access Advisory Committee for the past seven years and has done independent research on transit issues for the past 20 years. Through his involvement on the working group, Clive hopes to encourage development patterns that would reduce the need for automobile trips and encourage the use of alternate modes of transportation, specifically transit and walking. |
| **Allison Rolfe** | **South County** | • Urban Form 
• Environmental Protection 
• Social Equity & Environmental Justice |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>For the past ten years Allison Rolfe’s professional focus has been to advocate for environmental protection. She serves on the Chula Vista Citizen Advisory Committee, and is vice president of a Community Development Corporation (CDC) for Ocean Beach. As policy director for San Diego Bay Keeper, Allison has gained expertise in land use and regional habitat conservation planning. Allison hopes to promote wise land use decisions, which integrate the RCP and RTP.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Jim Schmidt** | **East County** | • Transportation 
• Housing 
• Economic Prosperity |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jim Schmidt is a retired business professional who worked in the banking and real estate industries. He was appointed as a public member to SANDAG’s Toll Bridge Committee in 1993 and currently serves on the board of directors of the San Diego East County Chamber of Commerce. Jim has experience with transportation issues and is an affordable housing advocate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Bob Sergeant** | **North County Coastal** | • Urban Form 
• Transportation 
• Border Transportation |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bob Sergeant works as a transportation professional with experience in planning, designing, and constructing highways and transit facilities and has helped in the preparation of several general plan documents. He has also participated in planning efforts encouraging the building of new border crossings and improvements to existing facilities. Bob’s perspective incorporates that of a transportation professional, employer and long-term resident. He would like to ensure people have opportunities to live within a reasonable commuting time to their place of work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Sandor Shapery** | **Central** | • Urban Form 
• Transportation 
• Environmental Protection |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sandor Shapery would like to improve the quality of life in San Diego by implementing plans and programs to address the region’s transportation challenges. He believes a proactive approach must be taken to integrate the many components of community development. Presently, Sandor is a member of the San Diego Chamber of Commerce’s Infrastructure Committee and has served on various other committees. Sandor is also a licensed attorney, specializing in real estate and business law as well as land use and zoning issues. He has also taken part in the design, development, and ownership process for a number of high-rise buildings in downtown San Diego.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Kevin Siva         | East County     | • Transportation  
                    • Border Transportation  
                    • Social Equity & Environmental Justice | Kevin Siva is the Board Chairman for the Reservation Transportation Authority (RTA) and believes it is important that the voice of the region’s many Tribal Governments is represented in the regional planning process. Kevin’s experience includes serving as the director for road planning and maintenance for his tribe and participating on a number of the Southern California Association of Governments’ (SCAG) committees and working groups. |
| Sandy Smith        | North County Inland (Valley Center) | • Urban Form  
                    • Transportation  
                    • Environmental Protection | Sandy Smith will provide the working group with a rural perspective, but also has a stake in downtown San Diego. Additionally, she would like to see the transportation options in North County improved. Sandy brings the unique experience and background of a professional mediator. For the past 4 years, Sandy has worked on the County’s General Plan 2020 update as it relates to Valley Center. She also participated on a number of the subcommittees and was named Chair of the Roads Subcommittee. |
| Rick Van Schoik    | North County Coastal | • Border Transportation  
                    • Environmental Protection  
                    • Social Equity & Environmental Justice | Rick Van Schoik sees an important connection between transportation and environmental issues. Rick will bring the US/Mexico perspective to the working group as well as that of an environmental policy and science professor. |
| David Weil         | Central         | • Urban Form  
                    • Environmental Protection  
                    • Public Facilities | David Weil believes San Diego’s future quality of life will depend on the planning decisions made today, specifically those concerning land use, environmental sustainability, and transportation. David offers 20 years of experience as a civil engineer with the Navy Civil Engineer Corps (CEC) and currently holds the position of Building Commissioning and Sustainability Director for UCSD. David has a dear understanding of the procedures associated with plan implementation and public works projects. Additionally, he can be used as a resource on green building, sustainable design, and energy efficiency. |
June 20, 2005

Ms. Carolina Gregor, Senior Regional Planner
San Diego Association of Governments
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA  92120

Dear Ms. Gregor:

With this letter, I resign my appointment on Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group.

I have recently become an employee of EDAW, Inc., which has a current contract with the San Diego Association of Governments. Therefore, my continued service on the Working Group could be a conflict of interest.

Sincerely,

Anne S. Fege, Ph.D.
April 20, 2005

Jack Dale, Councilmember
City of Santee
10601 Magnolia Av
Santee, CA 92071

Dear Jack:

Re: Resignation from Stakeholders Working Group

I am unfortunately finding that my schedule with the Grossmont-Cuyamaca Community College District Board of Trustees is in such conflict with the SANDAG Stakeholders Working Group that I must resign my position on the SWG.

Initially I had thought that even though the College District Board meetings were on the same day as the SWG meetings that I could arrange my schedule sufficiently that I could do both. However, I find that there are a number of meetings of the District that begin earlier (study sessions, closed sessions, etc) than the regularly scheduled meetings and I have an obligation to be in attendance.

It is disappointing to me that I have had to come to this conclusion because I thought that I would not only find the SWG to be of considerable interest to me but that I could provide some small amount of expertise to the issues.

Sincerely,

Bill Garrett
2533 Brown Dr
El Cajon, CA 92020

cc/Carolina I. Gregor
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sub - Region</th>
<th>Areas of Interest</th>
<th>Brief Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greg Alabado</td>
<td>South County</td>
<td>• Transportation • Housing</td>
<td>Greg Alabado has experience in transportation planning, having worked as Assistant Transit Coordinator in the Transit Division of the City of Chula Vista. Greg is a current member of Chula Vista’s General Plan Update Steering Committee and Housing Advisory Commission. He would like to introduce some degree of balance in the deliberation of issues, options and/or alternatives that come before the group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Nordstrom</td>
<td>South County</td>
<td>• Urban Form • Transportation • Economy</td>
<td>Gary Nordstrom has past involvement with many local, regional, and global organizations (he has chaired or been president of many) including the City of Chula Vista and the County of San Diego. Gary’s experience includes participation on the General Plan Update Committee, Core Specific Plan Committee, Chair of the Growth Management Oversight Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristin Kjaero</td>
<td>East County</td>
<td>• Urban Form • Transportation • Public Facilities</td>
<td>Kristin Kjaero is active in the community with a number of local organizations and land use issues. Kristin participated in the Regional Comprehensive Plan workshops and has attended SANDAG Board meetings. She founded “Save Our Corner” which worked successfully with the Valley de Oro Planning Group, the Unincorporated County, the La Mesa City Council, Caltrans, and the Sierra Club, to resolve a proposed development/general plan amendment in her neighborhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helene Radzuk</td>
<td>East County</td>
<td>• Urban Form • Transportation • Social Equity &amp; Environmental Justice</td>
<td>Helene Radzuk holds a Bachelor’s Degree from California State University at San Marcos and a paralegal certificate in business and environmental law from the University of San Diego. Elaine is a member elect of the Ramona Community Planning Group and serves on its subcommittee dealing with trails and transportation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
San Diego Association of Governments

JOINT MEETING OF THE REGIONAL PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEES

September 2, 2005

AGENDA ITEM NO.: B

Action Requested: RECOMMEND

REVISED SCHEDULE FOR COMPREHENSIVE 2007 RTP

File Number 3000400

Introduction

On April 28, 2005, the SANDAG Board approved the work program and schedule for updating the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), MOBILITY 2030. The work program contained schedules for both a technical RTP update in 2006 and a comprehensive RTP update in 2007. The last RTP update was completed in March 2003, and the next regularly scheduled update would occur no later than March 2006. However, staff hoped to focus only on the 2007 update, given that pending federal transportation legislation would have changed the requirement that SANDAG make an air quality conformity determination of the long-range transportation plan from every three years to four years.

The federal transportation reauthorization legislation (SAFETEA-LU) was passed by Congress and signed by the President, but not until August 2005. This was too late to negate SANDAG’s need to proceed with a technical 2006 RTP update. As a result, the Board approved a revised schedule for the 2006 RTP update on July 22, 2005. The 2006 RTP update is scheduled for adoption by the Board in February 2006.

The more comprehensive update of the RTP in 2007 will still incorporate a new regional growth forecast, strategic initiatives from the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP), the Independent Transit Planning Review, and several other issue papers on topics not previously covered in the RTP. However, some of the tasks for the 2007 RTP will be delayed by staff efforts to produce the 2006 RTP over the next six months. The overall impact to the 2007 RTP schedule is a delay of approximately three months, with adoption by the Board now expected in June 2007.

Recommendation

The Transportation and Regional Planning Committees are asked to recommend that the SANDAG Board of Directors approve the revised 2007 RTP work program and schedule.
**Discussion**

Attachment 1 is the updated 2007 RTP Schedule. Attachment 2 is the revised 2007 RTP Work Program, outlining the major tasks and timeframes associated with the 2007 RTP update. The contents of the work program have not changed, but the schedule has been adjusted to reflect reallocation of staff resources to the 2006 RTP update.

BOB LEITER  
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachments:  
1. Updated 2007 RTP Schedule  
2. Revised 2007 RTP Work Program

Key Staff Contact: Michael Hix, (619) 699-1977, mhi@sandag.org
### 2007 Regional Transportation Plan Schedule - Updated 8/19/05

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR TASKS</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop/Review Issue Papers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Outreach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Revenues and Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update Land Use Forecasts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update Project Evaluation Criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update Performance Indicators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalize RTP/EIR Scenarios</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Produce Draft RTP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Produce Draft EIR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Final RTP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopt Final RTP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2007 RTP Updated Work Program
Updated August 19, 2005

1. **Establish Work Program** (April 2005)
   - 2007 RTP intended to be comprehensive and incorporate better land use and transportation coordination, as outlined in the RCP.
   - Review work program with SWG, RPTWG, CTAC (March/April 2005).
   - Take to the Transportation Committee/Regional Planning Committee (April 2005)
   - Adoption by Board of Directors (April 2005)

   - Incorporate RCP directives and Strategic Initiatives
   - Incorporate Caltrans RTP Supplement guidelines
   - Obtain direction from the Board of Directors for 2007 RTP

3. **Develop and Review Issue Papers** (September 2005 - September 2006). These reports will be reviewed by the advisory and policy committees. Attachment 3 discusses these topics and their content in more detail.

4. **Public Outreach and Involvement**
   - Subregional workshops (May 2006 and January 2007)
   - Mini-grants for outreach to minority/low income groups
   - Work with communications staff to schedule events and outreach products; bring results to Transportation Committee/Regional Planning Committee (ongoing).

5. **Update Revenue and Project Cost Projections, with improved operating forecasts**
   - Incorporate improved operating costs in the projections, as directed by Federal Highways and Federal Transit Administration after the 2003 RTP.
   - Select new base year to be used for 2007 RTP. Revise project costs and revenue forecasts for the Revenue Constrained and Reasonably Expected funding scenarios (May 2006).
   - Review project costs and revenue forecasts for the Revenue Constrained and Reasonably Expected funding scenarios, incorporating TransNet II and SAFETEA-LU. (August 2006).
6. **Incorporate Recommendations from Corridor/Subarea Studies/Deficiency Plans** (September 2006). These studies could possibly be summarized as an issue paper(s) and brought to the Working Groups for review.

- I-805 Corridor and Direct Access Ramp (DAR) study
- I-5 North Coast
- Central I-5 HOV analysis
- North South Transportation Corridor Analysis


- Create Capacity File for Existing Plans and Policies (August 2005)
- Generate New Existing Policies Forecast (December 2005)
- Use Smart Growth Land Use Concept Map from March 2006 to generate land use alternative(s) for 2007 RTP analysis (April 2006)
- Board of Directors accept Land Use Plan for use in the 2007 RTP (June 2006)


- Review/revise criteria with a focus on stronger linkage to Smart Growth development
- Explore potential Cost Effectiveness criteria to apply across all modes

9. **Update Performance Indicators for 2007 RTP**

- The performance indicators used to measure the success of transit and highway networks should be reevaluated and updated to be consistent with the goals and policy objectives of the Board of Directors (May 2006).
- Update base year and projected Levels of Service, travel time, speed, and other indicator data for the 2007 RTP (June – September 2006).

10. **Develop Network and/or Land Use Alternatives**

- Land Use and network alternatives need to be developed by June 2006. Recommended changes and analyses from the Independent Transit Planning Review need to be developed in time to meet these deadlines.

11. **Analyze Alternatives and Select Preferred Unconstrained Network for 2007 RTP** (June – September 2006)

- Perform travel forecasts
• Apply updated performance measures, such as overall LOS and average corridor travel times, to provide a grid of overall effectiveness of each alternative.

• Select Preferred Network; review with WGs, Committees and gain Board of Directors approval (September 2006).

12. **Create Final RTP and EIR Scenarios** (September – October 2006)

• Create new Revenue Constrained and Reasonably Expected funding scenarios

• Employ revised evaluation criteria to assist in project selection for 2007 RTP scenarios

• Create EIR alternatives

• Review with Working Groups and gain approval from Transportation Committee and Board

13. **Perform Air Quality (AQ) forecasts**

• Address FTA/FHWA requirement for better documentation on SOV alternatives for AQ analysis

• Follows the selection of the Revenue Constrained scenario of the preferred network alternative

• AQ for 2007 RTP provided along with draft EIR (February 2007); revisions for final RTP (June 2007).

14. **Produce Draft RTP**

• Preliminary drafts sent to Transportation Committee (November 2006)

• 2007 RTP (January 2007)

15. **EIR Preparation**

• Draft EIR (February 2007)

• Final EIR (June 2007)

16. **Revised Draft Final RTP** (May 2007)

17. **Final RTP/EIR Adoption** (June 2007)

18. **Air Quality Conformity** (August 2007)
PILOT SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM – PROJECT APPROVAL

Introduction

On April 22, 2005, the SANDAG Board of Directors approved project evaluation criteria and program guidelines for the Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program (SGIP), and authorized staff to issue a call for projects. That action authorized the first SANDAG funding program specifically designed to use transportation funds to encourage local land use decisions that support regional planning goals. This Pilot SGIP fulfills the recommendation for an incentive program proposed in SANDAG’s Regional Transportation Plan, MOBILITY 2030. It also is a precursor to the longer-term smart growth incentive program called for in the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) that will be funded by the TransNet local sales tax extension.

As a pilot program, the SGIP was developed to perform two program functions. First, it is intended to identify public improvement projects that can facilitate smart growth land development and serve as examples of how smart growth principles can be implemented around the region. Second, it serves as a test of project selection and program administration processes for the future TransNet-funded incentive program.

SANDAG received 34 applications in response to a call for projects. This report discusses the projects received, and the process for evaluating those projects. It recommends 14 projects for funding, and explains the basis for the staff recommendation.

Recommendation

The Regional Planning and Transportation Committees are asked to approve the list of 14 projects and funding levels recommended in Attachment 1 of this report for Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program funding, and to direct staff to prepare an amendment to the Regional Transportation Improvement Program identifying these projects for funding under the federal Transportation Enhancements Program.

Discussion

The call for projects for the Pilot SGIP was issued on May 9, 2005. The original notice indicated that $17 million in federal Transportation Enhancement funds was available for the program. However, the state subsequently increased its funding estimate for this program by $2.11 million, making a total of $19.11 million available for the program.

SANDAG received applications for 34 projects by the project submittal deadline, requesting over $46 million in funding. Applications were received from 11 cities, the County of San Diego, and the North County Transit District. The Metropolitan Transit System was a co-applicant on one application from the City of La Mesa.
One project application was determined to be non-responsive. The Paseo project, submitted by the City of San Diego, did not provide a resolution from the City Council authorizing the application. The remaining 33 project applications totaled over $44 million. When combined with the proposed $52 million in matching funds, these applications represented nearly $100 million in proposed improvements. Project applications ranged in size from the maximum allocation request of $2 million, to a low of $258,000.

**Project Evaluation Process**

The projects were evaluated by a panel that consisted of six volunteers from the Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group (RPSWG), a volunteer from the San Diego Council of Design Professionals, and a SANDAG staff member (see Attachment 2). The panel represented a variety of interests and geographic locations around the region.

The projects were evaluated based on criteria that were established by the Board after extensive input from the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (RPTWG), the Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC), the RPSWG, the Regional Planning and Transportation Committees, and the Board (see Attachment 3). The criteria are divided into five categories, with the potential points awarded in each category up to the maximums shown in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Category</th>
<th>Total Points</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Project Readiness</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Smart Growth and Land Use Characteristics</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Quality of Proposed Project</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Matching Funds</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Low-Income Household Bonus</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Points for Project Readiness were awarded based on the number of milestones toward project development that the project had already met. The points for Smart Growth and Land Use Characteristics were awarded based on how well, in the judgment of the panel, the project area exemplified one of the seven smart growth place types described in the RCP. This category also included points awarded based on the intensity of development allowed in the project area. These points were awarded based on SANDAG’s 2010 forecasts of housing units and employment within a quarter-mile radius of the project. Projects were evaluated in comparison to the range of intensities that the RCP identified for each smart growth place type. The panel also judged the Quality of the Proposed Project based on how well the applicant proposed to implement improvements in five categories: pedestrian improvements, bicycle improvements, transit facility improvements, streetscape enhancements, and traffic calming. Matching Funds points were awarded proportionately: those applicants with the highest percentage of proposed matching funds received the full 15 points. The Low-Income Household Bonus was awarded to projects based on Board-adopted policy (Attachment 4) that granted these points to jurisdictions whose average household income was below the regional average.

Once evaluated, each project was ranked based on the average scores from all evaluators. The evaluation panel met to discuss the outcome of the scoring process, and to develop a consensus on the projects recommended for funding. There was strong agreement among the panel members on which projects to fund. Each panel member had ranked at least 10 of the top 14 projects on their individual list among the top 14 projects, and all the recommended projects were ranked in the top 14 by at least a majority of the evaluation panel members.
Project Recommendations

The 14 projects recommended for funding are shown in rank order in Attachment 1 of this report. When combined with their matching funds, these projects represent a total of over $44 million in improvements. As a group, they meet the broad goals for a pilot incentive program established in the RCP: that it fund “public infrastructure improvements for ‘ready-to-go’ projects that will demonstrate smart growth principles and serve as a catalyst for additional smart growth development in key locations.” In addition, the projects address objectives discussed by the policy advisory committees and Board during the program development process. An overview of how these goals and objectives are met is discussed below.

• The Projects are “Ready-to-Go.” Of the projects recommended for funding, six are scheduled for completion in 2006, according to the project applications. The remaining eight projects are scheduled for completion during 2007 through 2009. These projects will serve as models for future development and as demonstration projects for the longer term SGIP that will be funded through TransNet starting in 2009.

• The Projects Influence Land Development. The projects recommended for funding will influence land development in a positive manner by helping to create an environment that promotes smart growth principles. In addition, the Pilot SGIP demonstrates that there is a range of ways that such funding can influence development. For some projects, Pilot SGIP funding helps to close the funding gap for projects at more advanced stages of development, such as the Grossmont Trolley Station Pedestrian Enhancements in La Mesa and the Bird Rock Area Traffic Management Plan in the City of San Diego. For other projects, such as those located in National City (Fountain Plaza-Promenade, National City Boulevard Sidewalk and Streetlight Improvement, and National City Boulevard Median and Landscape Improvement), Pilot SGIP funding lays down the groundwork for smart growth by helping to create a more attractive environment for private investment in land development.

• The Projects Support Public Transit. All of the projects are in areas directly served by public transit, and four are associated with light rail transit stations or a major bus transit corridor. The top-rated project, the University Avenue Mobility Project, will enhance the busiest bus transit corridor in the region. Trolley stations at Grossmont Center, Palomar Street, Commercial Street, and the future Boulevard Transit Plaza all will see improvements in the station area.

• The Projects Support Housing Development. According to the project applications, the recommended projects will directly support 3,800 units of new housing development, approximately 11 percent of which would be affordable housing.

• The Projects Demonstrate Smart Growth in a Variety of Settings. The projects recommended for funding are distributed through every subregional area except the North County Coastal and the unincorporated areas. Two are located in East County, three are located in South County, one is located in North County Inland, and eight are located in the Central area. The recommended projects also are located in areas exemplifying five of the seven smart growth place types in the RCP: Metropolitan Center, Urban Center, Town Center, Community Center, and Transit Corridor.

* The three National City projects are being considered as one project in this description.
The Program Provides a Learning Experience. One of the objectives of the Pilot SGIP was to gain experience in using transportation funds as an incentive for smart growth development. This will be an ongoing process. We will begin by soliciting comments from the review panel and applicants about the application process. The initial feedback from the evaluation panel has been positive. We will also monitor the progress of the approved projects and their impact on their communities as they move toward completion. A thorough report on lessons learned and on progress in developing the long-term TransNet-funded incentive program will be brought back to the Transportation Committee and Regional Planning Committee later in the fiscal year.

The last three projects on the list received identical average scores of 86 points. They include the Old Palm Avenue streetscape improvements in Imperial Beach, median and landscape improvements on National City Boulevard in National City, and the Maple Street pedestrian plaza in Escondido. Funding all three of these projects at the levels requested would require $1,591,000 more than is available in the program. The evaluation panel discussed alternatives to resolving this problem and recommended reduced funding for each. The panel felt the three National City projects recommended for funding really are components of improvement plans for one area and therefore should be treated as one project. As such, National City should be limited to the $2 million maximum funding level in the program. National City staff indicated they can accommodate a lower level of funding by reducing the number of blocks improved in the sidewalk and street lighting project from nine to six and one half. Staff from Escondido and Imperial Beach indicated they could accommodate this lower funding level by identifying other funds to make up the difference. All three of these changes are subject to the approval of the respective city councils. The staff recommendation for the Pilot SGIP is therefore contingent upon these actions being approved by the cities of National City, Imperial Beach, and Escondido.

Next Steps

Following approval of a list of projects, staff will contact the successful applicants and assist them with the process of including their projects in the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) as Transportation Enhancement (TE)-funded projects, and in the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). Each applicant will be required to submit a separate TE application for review and approval by the California Transportation Commission. Obtaining a STIP approval typically is a 90-day process at a minimum. Following the STIP amendment, successful applicants would be able to begin working with the Caltrans Office of Local Assistance to receive authorization to begin their projects. Throughout the project funding and development process, SANDAG staff will be involved to provide technical assistance and to monitor project development to ensure the projects are completed as proposed.

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachments: 1. Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program Funding Recommendations
               2. Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program Evaluation Panel
               3. Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program Project Evaluation Criteria
               4. Board Memorandum dated February 25, 2005

Key Staff Contact: Stephan Vance, (619) 699-1924, sva@sandag.org
# Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program Funding Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Sponsoring Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Project Summary</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Total Project Cost</th>
<th>Funds Requested</th>
<th>Recomm. Funding</th>
<th>Project Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1   | University Avenue Mobility Project-Phase I        | City of San Diego        | **Project:** Improvements along University Avenue transit corridor in North Park: University Ave. from Florida St. to Boundary St., Lincoln Ave. from Utah St. to 32nd St., and North Park Way from 30th St. to 32nd St. landscaped/painted medians, restrripe University Ave., pedestrian popouts, new traffic signals, enhanced pedestrian crossings w/in-pavement flashers, pedestrian countdown signal heads, relocation of parking to side streets, new bike racks, enhanced North Park street name signs.  
**Setting:** This project serves a major transit corridor with the region’s most frequent bus service where 286 housing units are under development, including the City of Villages North Park Theater Pilot Project. The community plan encourages mixed use development with residential densities of at least 75 dwelling units per acre. | 108   | $2,550,000        | $2,000,000       | $2,000,000       | January 2009     |
| 2   | Park Boulevard at Harbor Drive Pedestrian Bridge | City of San Diego        | **Project:** Construction of a pedestrian bridge to serve as a grade-separated pedestrian crossing of Harbor Drive.  
**Setting:** The project area includes downtown San Diego’s East Village Ballpark District where anticipated adjacent development will include residential towers with up to 1,500 dwelling units and 300,000 square feet of retail space. | 105   | $13,000,000       | $2,000,000       | $2,000,000       | September 2006    |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Sponsoring Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Project Summary</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Total Project Cost</th>
<th>Funds Requested</th>
<th>Recomm. Funding</th>
<th>Project Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Grossmont Trolley Station Pedestrian Enhancements</td>
<td>City of La Mesa/Metropolitan Transit System</td>
<td><strong>Project:</strong> Grossmont Trolley station pedestrian improvements including a tower with 2 elevators and stairs to a bridge that will enable pedestrians/transit users to access employment and entertainment centers at the top of the hill. <strong>Setting:</strong> This is a developing urban center at a major suburban light rail hub with primarily retail and medical uses, and planned residential development under a joint-use agreement with MTS. Station area development will include 527 residential units.</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>$4,700,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Washington/Goldfinch Intersection Pedestrian Improvement Project</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td><strong>Project:</strong> Pedestrian popouts, enhanced crosswalks/sidewalks, lighted bollards, trees, shrubs, ground cover, transit shelter, bike racks, enhanced paving in the median, upgraded traffic signals on all four corners. <strong>Setting:</strong> A community center with recent mixed-use development, this project will serve the Paseo de Mission Hills, which will provide 69 housing units, ground-floor retail, and a variety of public improvements that will be coordinated with the intersection improvements.</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>$928,000</td>
<td>$684,000</td>
<td>$684,000</td>
<td>December 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Bird Rock Area Traffic Management Plan</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td><strong>Project:</strong> Improvements in the Bird Rock neighborhood including five modern roundabouts, a raised landscaped median, diagonal parking, new pedestrian crossings and sidewalks, and transit facility and pedestrian improvements. <strong>Setting:</strong> Bird Rock is a community center served by two bus lines where current development projects should increase densities to 25-30 units per acre. 139 condominium units are being constructed along the project.</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>$4,385,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>September 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Sponsoring Jurisdiction</td>
<td>Project Summary</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Total Project Cost</td>
<td>Funds Requested</td>
<td>Recomm. Funding</td>
<td>Project Completion Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Palomar Gateway Community Transit Area Project</td>
<td>City of Chula Vista</td>
<td><strong>Project:</strong> Street improvements along Palomar St. and Industrial Blvd., improvements to the Palomar Transit Station and its environs. <strong>Setting:</strong> This community center is at the Blue Line’s Palomar Street Trolley Station with bus service as high as 10 buses per hour. The Chula Vista General Plan update will allow low- to mid-rise residential development between 18-50 dwelling units per acre. Planned mixed-use development at the project area will provide 316 additional housing units.</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>$2,375,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>January 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Fountain Plaza-Promenade</td>
<td>City of National City</td>
<td><strong>Project:</strong> Construction of a central square for outdoor markets and fairs, including installation of a fountain, streetlights, landscaping, benches, and bicycle facilities, in downtown National City. <strong>Setting:</strong> This project is in the National City Town Center where the &quot;form-based&quot; Downtown Specific Plan allows commercial and residential uses with housing densities from 45-85 dwelling units per acre. The area is served by both local and regional buses and is within 1/4-mile of a Blue Line trolley station.</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>$516,000</td>
<td>$258,000</td>
<td>$258,000</td>
<td>August 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Allison Avenue-University Avenue Pedestrian Enhancements</td>
<td>City of La Mesa</td>
<td><strong>Project:</strong> Improvements to the pedestrian environment along Allison and University Aves within downtown La Mesa, including upgraded sidewalks, crosswalks, street trees, lighting, and transit stop improvements. <strong>Setting:</strong> This project is at the hub of the La Mesa town center, served by an Orange Line trolley station. It is also along a transit corridor. Current residential development ranges up to 50 dwelling units per acre. Planned development will intensify and increase the mix of uses in the area.</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>$3,156,000</td>
<td>$1,994,000</td>
<td>$1,994,000</td>
<td>September 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Sponsoring Jurisdiction</td>
<td>Project Summary</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Total Project Cost</td>
<td>FundsRequested</td>
<td>Recomm. Funding</td>
<td>Project Completion Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 9   | Mid-City Urban Trail & SR 15 Bikeway | City of San Diego       | **Project:** Pedestrian and bicycle right-of-way improvements along the I-15 corridor in Mid-City San Diego, including widened pedestrian paths, pedestrian lighting, street furniture, wayfinding and bikeway signage, bikeway striping, and signal improvements.  
**Setting:** This Mid-City town center is also served by a major transit corridor, and includes the City of Villages Boulevard Marketplace Pilot Village. The trail system will serve 386 planned residential units. | 94    | $2,966,000        | $1,600,000 | $1,600,000     | December 2009   |
| 10  | Commercial Street Streetscape Project | City of San Diego       | **Project:** New sidewalks, curbs, street trees, lighting, street furniture, traffic calming devices, a gateway element, and public plazas around the perimeter of a proposed mixed-use/mixed-income development in Logan Heights.  
**Setting:** This community center is focused around the Commercial Street Orange Line trolley station. The project will serve a mixed-use development with 39,300 square feet of commercial space and 263 housing units (68 units per acre) that are primarily affordable rental units. | 91    | $1,800,000        | $1,500,000 | $1,500,000     | June 2009       |
| 11  | National City Boulevard Sidewalk and Street Lighting Improvement Project | City of National City   | **Project:** Rehabilitation of a 6½ block area of National City Blvd., including replacement of sidewalks, installation of decorative streetlights, trees, tree grates, shrubbery, and bus benches.  
**Setting:** This project is in the National City Town Center where the "form-based" Downtown Specific Plan allows commercial and residential uses with housing densities from 45-85 dwelling units per acre. The area is served by both local and regional buses and is within ¼-mile of a Blue Line trolley station. | 90    | $3,280,000        | $2,000,000 | $1,022,000     | October 2006     |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Sponsoring Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Project Summary</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Total Project Cost</th>
<th>Funds Requested</th>
<th>Recomm. Funding</th>
<th>Project Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 12  | Old Palm Avenue Streetscape Improvement Project   | City of Imperial Beach         | **Project:** Pedestrian-oriented enhancements including widened/upgraded sidewalks and crosswalks, improved landscaping, street furnishing and signage, traffic calming features in a 2-3 block area along Palm Ave. between Seacoast Dr. and 3rd St.  
**Setting:** Old Palm Avenue is a community center that combines residential, commercial and retail uses, and is served by three bus routes. Allowable residential density is up to 29 dwelling units per acre. Ten residential units were recently constructed, and there is capacity for an additional 108.                                                                 | 86    | $2,000,000         | $1,000,000       | $685,000       | December 2006       |
| 13  | National City Boulevard Median and Landscape Improvement Project | City of National City          | **Project:** Installation of medians and landscaping on National City Blvd. from 7th St. to Division St. to improve traffic safety and the visual appeal of the street.  
**Setting:** This project is in the National City Town Center where the "form-based" Downtown Specific Plan allows commercial and residential uses with housing densities from 45-85 dwelling units per acre. The area is served by both local and regional buses and is within ¼-mile of a Blue Line trolley station.                                                                 | 86    | $1,440,000         | $720,000        | $720,000       | October 2006         |
| 14  | Maple Street Pedestrian Plaza Project             | City of Escondido               | **Project:** Reconstruction of a two-lane through street into a short two-lane cul-de-sac ending in a large pedestrian plaza.  
**Setting:** This project is in Escondido's town center, which is the traditional retail core area and the site of significant civic and cultural facilities. High-frequency local transit service connects to the future Sprinter Station at the Escondido Transit Center ½-mile away. 142 proposed condominium units would be served by the project.                                                                 | 86    | $1,100,000         | $945,000        | $647,000       | July 2008           |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Sponsoring Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Project Summary</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Total Project Cost</th>
<th>Funds Requested</th>
<th>Recomm. Funding</th>
<th>Project Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 15  | 25th Street Renaissance Project    | City of San Diego       | **Project:** Revitalization of a six-block area of 25th St., north of I-94, including pedestrian amenities, traffic calming, streetscape improvements, and parking.  
**Setting:** 25th St. is planned as a community center for Golden Hill. It is primarily a commercial area currently served by three bus routes. The surrounding community is largely residential at an average of 29 dwelling units per acre. | 85    | $1,589,000        | $1,425,000 | -               | December 2009    |
| 16  | Grand Avenue / El Mercado Project  | City of Escondido       | **Project:** Pedestrian lighting on Grand Ave. through the downtown area, reconstruction of Grand Ave. from Centre City to Quince in the Mercado area to include decorative paving and sidewalks.  
**Setting:** El Mercado is within the Escondido town center. Grand Avenue is served by three routes with 15-minute service to the Escondido Transit Center. Residential densities up to 45 dwelling units per acre are allowed. | 85    | $1,600,000        | $1,320,000 | -               | July 2008        |
| 17  | Reo Drive Revitalization Project-Phase II Improvements | City of San Diego | **Project:** Rehabilitation of a one-block commercial strip including widening Reo Dr. for installation of enhanced crosswalks, bus pads, diagonal parking, pedestrian-oriented street lights, new sidewalks, enhanced landscaping and shade trees, ADA-compliant pedestrian ramps and curb enhancements.  
**Setting:** This Skyline-Paradise Hills community has begun a revitalization process aimed at creating a commercially-oriented community center. It is served by two local bus routes. Allowable residential densities are up to 15 dwelling units per acre. | 84    | $939,563         | $447,282    | -               | June 2007         |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Sponsoring Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Project Summary</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Total Project Cost</th>
<th>Funds Requested</th>
<th>Recomm. Funding</th>
<th>Project Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 18  | H Street Transit Corridor Project | City of Chula Vista | **Project:** Beautification and improvements to pedestrian facilities along H St. between 3rd Ave. and Broadway.  
**Setting:** H St. is a planned transit corridor that serves a connector between east and west Chula Vista, and is planned to carry BRT service. Chula Vista’s Urban Core Specific Plan calls for residential densities up to 60 dwelling units per acre along the corridor. | 84 | $2,300,000 | $2,000,000 | - | November 2006 |
| 19  | San Ysidro Pilot Village Corridor Project | City of San Diego | **Project:** Transportation and streetscape improvements including bicycle lanes, sidewalk widening, pedestrian ramps, popouts, trees, street furniture, median landscape, and other improvements.  
**Setting:** This is the Mi Pueblo Pilot Village in the City’s City of Villages program. This community center is served by two bus routes. Residential densities are expected to be 70-75 dwelling units per acre. | 82 | $2,268,851 | $2,000,000 | - | March 2008 |
| 20  | Inland Rail Trail (Oceanside-to-Escondido) Project-Phase II | City of San Marcos | **Project:** Construction of a one-mile segment of the Oceanside to Escondido Rail Trail bicycle path, in San Marcos.  
**Setting:** This section of rail trail would be in a suburban setting between Sprinter stations, serving primarily single family residential development. | 80 | $5,600,000 | $1,500,000 | - | March 2007 |
| 21  | Rose Creek Bicycle Path and Pedestrian Bridge | City of San Diego | **Project:** A 280-foot-long pedestrian and bicycle bridge across Rose Creek in Mission Bay Park, and pedestrian and Class I bicycle trails leading to the bridge.  
**Setting:** The project lies outside and parallel to the Grand Avenue transit corridor. The immediate setting is Mission Bay Park, but it is surrounded by the relatively high-density beach communities of Mission Beach and Pacific Beach. There is no direct transit connection. | 77 | $3,100,000 | $2,000,000 | - | December 2007 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Sponsoring Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Project Summary</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Total Project Cost</th>
<th>Funds Requested</th>
<th>Recomm. Funding</th>
<th>Project Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 22  | Balboa Avenue Corridor Improvements Project- Phase I | City of San Diego      | **Project:** Traffic calming features and raised and landscaped medians, addition of two signalized intersections, reconfiguration of Balboa Ave., and other improvements.  
**Setting:** The project connects two proposed community centers that currently consist of auto-oriented retail development and a mixture of single- and multi-family residential development. | 76    | $6,000,000         | $2,000,000       | -                | December 2007       |
| 23  | Streetscape II Project                            | City of Encinitas       | **Project:** Improvements to Hwy 101 between F St. and the entrance to Swami’s Beach Park, including curb, gutter, and sidewalk improvements, landscaped corner safe crossings, street furniture and lighting, increased parking.  
**Setting:** This streetscape project lies within the downtown Encinitas community center. The project area includes the Lumberyard Shopping Center and is near the Encinitas Civic Center and Encinitas Transit Station. Planned residential density will reach 20 to 25 units in the surrounding area. | 74    | $3,105,000         | $300,000        | -                | April 2006           |
| 24  | Solana Beach Mixed Use Development                | North County Transit District | **Project:** Lighted walkways, improved signage, additional benches and sidewalks, covered pedestrian path from parking structure to platform, specialized bike facilities, doubling of drop-off zones, and dedicated bus parking space for NCTD Route 308.  
**Setting:** The Solana Beach Train Station project is a mixed-use development that will serve the LOSSAN rail corridor and two bus routes. The project includes 141 residential rental units, live/work units, retail, and office space, with three underground parking structures. Residential density will increase from 0 to 52 units per acre. | 73    | $3,400,000         | $2,000,000       | -                | June 2009            |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Sponsoring Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Project Summary</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Total Project Cost</th>
<th>Funds Requested</th>
<th>Recomm. Funding</th>
<th>Project Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>San Luis Rey Transit Center at North River Village</td>
<td>North County Transit District</td>
<td><strong>Project:</strong> Construction of transit center and public improvements such as sidewalks, landscaping, pedestrian and bike facilities. <strong>Setting:</strong> North River Village is planned as a mixed-use development that includes the proposed San Luis Rey Transit Center, 133 townhomes, and 13,684 square feet of retail and office space.</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>$6,000,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>September 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Coastal Rail Trail Project</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td><strong>Project:</strong> Construction of a 20-mile-long portion of the Coastal Rail Trail bicycle facility between Del Mar and downtown San Diego. <strong>Setting:</strong> This is part of a larger multi-jurisdictional bikeway project along the coast in the cities of Oceanside, Encinitas, Solana Beach, Carlsbad, Del Mar, and San Diego. This portion of the trail will serve the Sorrento Valley Coaster.</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>$1,712,900</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>August 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>San Diego River Bike Path Linkages</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td><strong>Project:</strong> Rio Courtyard/River Run bike path linkage - construction of a bridge over a drainage channel to link bike path segments in Mission Valley. <strong>Setting:</strong> This is part of a larger project in Mission Valley that will link gaps in an existing regional bikeway. One of the linkages will link the Rio Vista and Fenton Marketplace trolley stations.</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>$1,402,000</td>
<td>$371,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>August 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Alvarado Canyon Road Realignment Project</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td><strong>Project:</strong> Realignment of Alvarado Canyon Road to improve bike, pedestrian, bus, and trolley access in and around Grantville. <strong>Setting:</strong> This project will serve the recently constructed Grantville Trolley Station and the Grantville Redevelopment Area, which anticipates residential densities of up to 20 units per acre near the new trolley station.</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>$6,300,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>December 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Sponsoring Jurisdiction</td>
<td>Project Summary</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Total Project Cost</td>
<td>Funds Requested</td>
<td>Recomm. Funding</td>
<td>Project Completion Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>SR 75/282 Toll Removal Mitigation Measure Project</td>
<td>City of Coronado</td>
<td><strong>Project:</strong> A metering system for traffic entering Coronado from the bridge, traffic signals, sidewalk bulbouts, and enhanced landscaping along the corridor. <strong>Setting:</strong> This project results from the removal of the toll on the San Diego-Coronado Bridge in 2002. The project area is served by four bus routes. Negotiations are underway for development of 30 high-density, low-income senior housing units within two blocks of the project area.</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>$2,800,000</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>City of Santee Bike Path/ Walkway</td>
<td>City of Santee</td>
<td><strong>Project:</strong> Construction of a bike path, sidewalk, and landscaping within the Cuyamaca St. right-of-way. <strong>Setting:</strong> This project will serve planned mixed-use developments specified in Santee’s Town Center Specific Plan, including an entertainment complex, office buildings, and multi-family housing. Planned residential density will reach 30 units per acre on specific sites. The project will be located within ¼-mile of the MTS Transit Station.</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>$2,233,800</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>September 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Sweetwater Springs Boulevard Sidewalks</td>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td><strong>Project:</strong> Construction of sidewalks and installation of street lighting along portions of Sweetwater Springs Blvd. in Spring Valley. <strong>Setting:</strong> This community center includes residential and commercial uses, and two schools. The project is served by one bus route.</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>$935,000</td>
<td>$390,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>December 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Stage Coach Lane sidewalks at Fallbrook High School</td>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td><strong>Project:</strong> Construction of a curb, gutter, and sidewalk on the south side of South Stage Coach Lane in front of Fallbrook High School. <strong>Setting:</strong> This project will directly serve Fallbrook High School, and the Fallbrook Smart Growth Opportunity Area, a rural community within an unincorporated area of the county. The project is served by a nearby bus route.</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>$1,400,000</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>June 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Sponsoring Jurisdiction</td>
<td>Project Summary</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Total Project Cost</td>
<td>Funds Requested</td>
<td>Recomm. Funding</td>
<td>Project Completion Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Santee Trolley Square Raised Pedestrian Crossing</td>
<td>City of Santee</td>
<td><strong>Project:</strong> A raised pedestrian crossing between the MTS Transit Center in Santee Trolley Square and a future mixed-use development site. <strong>Setting:</strong> This project will be located in Santee's town center, adjacent to the MTS transit station located in Santee Trolley Square. Planned residential density will reach 30 units per acre on specific sites in the area surrounding the project.</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>$343,400</td>
<td>$343,400</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>June 2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total for Recommended Projects**

- Total: $44,196,000
- Funds Requested: $20,701,000
- Recomm. Funding: $19,110,000

**Grand Total**

- Total: $97,225,514
- Funds Requested: $44,197,682
- Recomm. Funding: $19,110,000
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# Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program
## Project Evaluation Criteria

### I. Project Screening Criteria

Project screening criteria are meant to ensure the applicant is committed to the project, that the community supports it, and that it can be constructed within the schedule proposed. These criteria must be met in order for the project to be evaluated further.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Local Commitment/Authorization</td>
<td>The application must include a resolution or minute order from City Council, County Board of Supervisors, or Board of Directors authorizing the application, and committing to allocate the staff resources and matching funds necessary to complete the project as proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Funding Commitment</td>
<td>The applicant must certify that funding for related improvements are in place to ensure the proposed project can be completed within the schedule proposed in the project application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Funding Eligibility</td>
<td>The project must be eligible under the federal funding program guidelines.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### II. Project Evaluation Criteria

Project evaluation criteria are used to score and rank projects. These criteria are based on the requirements of the funding source, and the goals of the Smart Growth Incentive Program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Project Development</th>
<th>Feasibility Study</th>
<th>Preliminary Engineering</th>
<th>Environmental Clearance</th>
<th>Right-of-way Acquisition</th>
<th>Final Design</th>
<th>Max. Points</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Max. Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Projects receive 1 point for each completed phase to a maximum of 5 points</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### A. Project Readiness

To ensure the proposed projects can comply with the state's timely use of funds requirements, projects will be scored based on the how close they are to beginning construction.

#### B. Smart Growth Area Land Use Characteristics

To encourage projects in smart growth development areas, and to evaluate how well they support smart growth development, the proposed projects are scored based on the intensity of development, the diversity of land uses, the quality of urban design in the project area, the provision of additional housing in general and affordable housing in particular.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intensity of Development (0-5 points)</th>
<th>To what extent does the existing or planned project area meet the residential density levels identified in the RCP for its smart growth area type? Project areas at the minimum dwelling units per acre receive 1 point, and areas at the recommended upper end of the range receive 5 points.</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Use and Transportation Characteristics of Project Area (0-5 points)</td>
<td>How well does the existing or planned urban form in the project area meet the smart growth objectives of the RCP? Maximum points are given for areas that have, or are planned to have, a mix of residential and commercial uses appropriate to its smart growth area type, and have the appropriate transportation system characteristics.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Design Characteristics of Project Area (0-5 points)</td>
<td>How well does the existing or planned urban design in the project area conform to the smart growth design principles in the RCP? Maximum points are given for areas where the existing built environment, or the design standards for new construction provides a human-scale built environment. The street network and trail system should provide direct access to commercial and civic services, recreational opportunities, and transportation services. Building construction should be oriented to the pedestrian. Street design should accommodate bicyclists and pedestrians, including transit passengers.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related Land Development Projects (0-5 points)</td>
<td>Is there a current land development project associated with the proposed capital improvements? How well does it contribute to smart growth development by providing additional housing in the area?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Housing¹ (0-5 points)</td>
<td>Does the project serve affordable (subsidized) housing? How much additional affordable housing is provided?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Affordable housing includes units with below market or very low rent, or with below market or very low purchase price.
II. Project Evaluation Criteria (cont’d)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. Quality of Proposed Project.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Max. Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Pedestrian Access Improvements (0-5 points)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent does the project improve pedestrian access to a regional transit station, transit corridor, or rural village center? Maximum points should be awarded to projects that connect people to activity centers (especially transit) following the design principles in SANDAG’s Planning and Designing for Pedestrians.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bicycle Access Improvements2 (0-5 points)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent does the project improve bicycle access, and secure parking at a regional transit station, transit corridor, or rural village center? Maximum points should be awarded to projects that provide seamless bicycle access to transit areas, activity centers, and include secure bicycle parking.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Transit Facility Improvements (0-5 points)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent does the project improve the transit patron environment at transit stations, along transit corridors, or at access points immediately adjacent to the transit facility?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Streetscape Enhancements (0-5 points)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How well does the project include public art elements, public seating, pedestrian-scale lighting, enhanced paving or wayfinding signage?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Traffic Calming Features (0-5 points)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How well does the project include one or more of the traffic calming features recommended in Planning and Designing for Pedestrians?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Parking Improvements (0-5 points)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How well does the project provide appropriate levels of auto access to regional transit and the related project area without detracting from the quality of public spaces, and without detracting from transit, bicycle and pedestrian circulation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Matching Funds

| Matching Funds (0-15) | The higher the percentage of matching funds, the greater the number of bonus points the project will receive. | 15 |

PROJECT SCORE SUBTOTAL 125

E. Low Income Household Bonus Points3 (15 percent of Total Score) 22

TOTAL SCORE 147

Notes

1 Affordable housing is defined as income- or price-controlled housing. See the program guidelines for details.
2 All bicycle facility improvements must comply with the requirements of the California Highway Design Manual, Chapter 1000.
3 Low income household bonus points awarded per SANDAG Board policy (dated 2/25/05) to National City, El Cajon, Imperial Beach, Lemon Grove, La Mesa, Escondido, Vista, Chula Vista, San Diego, and San Marcos.
February 25, 2005

TO: SANDAG Board of Directors
FROM: Mayor Lori Pfeiler, Mayor Steve Padilla, and Councilmember Jim Madaffer
SUBJECT: Agenda Item No. 12 – Final Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA)

Our regional housing needs are significant – both now and in the future. Addressing these needs is often a complex process when dealing with the varied interests of the cities in our region. We are committed to doing everything we can to address our regional housing needs. Recognizing the differences between the cities, we are proposing an incentive-based compromise to the RHNA Modified Alternative 1. Simply put, for those cities that are willing and able to accommodate additional housing, those cities should be compensated through incentives that would help improve existing as well as future infrastructure.

We recommend the Board approve Modified Alternative 1, with the following provisions:

1. Jurisdictions whose 1999 lower income households as a percentage of total households is estimated to be greater than the regional average (Attachment 2, Column 1) shall receive 15 bonus points (out of 100 possible) for projects requesting funding through the Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program. (This would include National City, El Cajon, Imperial Beach, Lemon Grove, La Mesa, Escondido, Vista, Chula Vista, San Diego, and San Marcos.)

2. In addition to the current Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program, for all future discretionary funding allocated to local agency projects by SANDAG (following the adoption by jurisdictions of housing elements for 2005-2010), the following criteria shall apply:

   a. In order to qualify for such funding, a jurisdiction will be required to demonstrate that they are in compliance with provisions of their adopted housing element which set forth their commitment to providing adequate multi-family zoned land or other actions necessary to accommodate their share of lower income housing under the adopted RHNA.

   b. Incentive points (a minimum of 25 points out of 100 possible) will be given to projects in jurisdictions in which lower income housing units are being produced in accordance with the housing unit figures contained in Alternative 3 (Attachment 2, Column 13).

   c. In order to verify compliance with these provisions, each jurisdiction shall annually submit a report to SANDAG indicating their progress in complying with requirements of their housing element, as well as actual production of housing units within their jurisdiction by income category, during the preceding year.