MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

REGIONAL PLANNING TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP

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

Thursday, November 10, 2005
1:15 – 3:15 p.m.

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

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

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

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

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

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS

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

CONSENT (Items 3 - 5)

3. SUMMARY OF THE OCTOBER 20, 2005 TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP MEETING

   The TWG should review and approve the October 20, 2005 meeting summary.

4. WORKSHOPS ON THE SAN DIEGO METROPOLITAN TRANSIT SYSTEM (MTS) COMPREHENSIVE OPERATIONAL ANALYSIS (COA) (Dave Schumacher)

   The San Diego Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) is conducting a Comprehensive Operational Analysis (COA) of its bus and trolley services. MTS is holding a series of community meetings to provide information on proposed system, route, and schedule changes. MTS passengers, area residents, business owners, and other interested individuals are invited to attend one of the community meetings listed in the attached schedule.

5. DRAFT 2006 LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM (Susan Baldwin)

   Each year SANDAG develops a legislative program that includes policies and proposals related to federal and state legislation and local activities. The attached report contains SANDAG’s proposed legislative goals for calendar year 2006. The goals address smart growth, housing, fiscal reform, transportation, and habitat conservation among others.

REPORTS (Items 6 - 9)

6. SMART GROWTH CONCEPT MAP: UPDATE ON TECHNICAL ISSUES AND DRAFT POSTER (Susan Baldwin / Coleen Clementson)

   The TWG will discuss technical and policy issues that have arisen during the subregional working group meetings, TWG meetings, and individual discussions with local jurisdiction staff. The TWG also will review an updated draft poster that has been revised to reflect the comments of TWG members and SANDAG staff.
7. REGIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN (RCP) MONITORING PROGRAM: STATUS REPORT (Christine Eary)

The RCP includes a set of performance indicators to monitor the region's progress toward achieving the goals and objectives of the RCP. The monitoring program consists of two components: a baseline monitoring report, and the establishment of short- and long-term targets to track the region's progress over time. Staff will provide an update on the status of this work and anticipated next steps.

8. 2007 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN (RTP) UPDATE: TRANSPORTATION PROJECT EVALUATION CRITERIA AD HOC WORKING GROUP (Elisa Arias)

Evaluation criteria were applied to regional arterial, highway, freeway connectors, high occupancy vehicle (HOV) connectors, and transit projects to prioritize transportation projects in MOBILITY 2030. Staff proposes to form an Ad Hoc Working Group to lead the updates of the transportation project evaluation criteria. Staff recommends the TWG appoint two members to the Project Evaluation Criteria Ad Hoc Working Group.

9. WORKFORCE HOUSING REWARD PROGRAM: HOUSING ELEMENT REQUIREMENT (Susan Baldwin)

Eligibility for the California Department of Housing and Community Development Workforce Housing Reward Program for the 2005 program year requires that jurisdictions have a housing element that has been adopted by the jurisdiction’s governing body and submitted to the Department by December 31, 2005. In addition, the Department must find the housing element in compliance with housing element law by April 1, 2006. For more information on the program, go to http://www.hcd.ca.gov/fa/whrp/.

10. ADJOURNMENT AND NEXT MEETING

The next TWG meeting will be held on Thursday, December 8, 2005 from 1:15 – 3:15 p.m.

+ next to an agenda item indicates an attachment.
SUMMARY OF THE OCTOBER 20, 2005 TWG MEETING

Agenda Item #1: Welcome and Introductions
Patrick Murphy, City of Encinitas, chaired the meeting. Self-introductions were conducted.

Agenda Item #2: Public Comments and Communications
No public comments or communications.

CONSENT ITEMS (3-4)

Agenda Item #3: Summary of the September 22, 2005 Regional Planning Technical Working Group Meeting
A motion and second were made to approve the meeting summary. The motion passed unanimously.

Agenda Item #4: Regional Blueprint Planning Program
The Board report and resolution of support for the application to the state for this grant were included in the agenda packet. The TWG did not discuss this item.

REPORTS (5-7)

Agenda Item #5: Update on the Series 11 2030 Regional Growth Forecast for the 2007 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)
Ed Schafer, SANDAG staff, reminded TWG members that they need to let us know if the residential and employment capacities we sent to them are acceptable for use in the Series 11 Regional Growth Forecast. SANDAG had requested that we receive a reply from each jurisdiction by October 7; we have not heard from all the jurisdictions. Mr. Schafer also asked jurisdictions to consider whether we are using the correct point in the density ranges for vacant and redevelopment/infill residential land (generally at the mid-point of the density range for vacant land and 75-100 percent of the density range for redevelopment/infill land. Different density assumptions (e.g. 75-100 percent of the density range for vacant residential land) could be used if jurisdictions would like.

Dennis Turner, County of San Diego, asked SANDAG staff to bring back a timeline on the RTP and forecast at the next meeting.
Agenda Item #6: Smart Growth Concept Map

Carolina Gregor, SANDAG staff, distributed a progress report on the Smart Growth Concept Map, which included a discussion of the recurring themes and remaining issues that have come up during the October 13 subregional working sessions and individual jurisdictional meetings. This report was emailed to TWG members on October 21.

Some of the issues discussed by SANDAG staff and TWG members related to the report included:

- flexibility with respect to densities in Community Centers and Transit Corridors when the residential density is just below the target and employment density is relatively high (though not a target for these areas) (Item 3);
- minimum percentage of residential land or minimum number of housing units to qualify (Item 4); and
- clarification of the Special Use Place type definition (Item 3).

Comments from TWG members included:

The group discussed **Item 3**.

Dave Witt, City of La Mesa, noted that we should combine the residential and employment factors in evaluating whether an area qualifies as an Existing/Planned smart growth area.

Patrick Murphy, City of Encinitas, stated that we should take a balanced approach and that it shouldn't be a hard number.

Dave Witt also stated that sometimes the Community Center circle boundary reaches over a freeway into another neighborhood and that we need to have a way to address this issue.

Jim Griffin, City of El Cajon, pointed out that there are limited funds available in the Smart Growth Incentive Program, so funding will be competitive for these Existing/Planned smart growth areas. He also asked how these funds will be allocated. (Answer: The allocation methodology will be developed in the future.)

Patrick Murphy noted that employment density fluctuates and is more variable, while residential densities are easier to determine.

Dennis Turner, County of San Diego, asked how the employment densities are calculated?

Paul Kavanaugh, SANDAG staff, explained that they are empirically derived based on real world examples of different types of employment land uses. We apply these densities to the different types of employment to determine the densities.

Dennis Turner suggested that there is the potential to get rid of lower employees/acre land uses such as warehouses and golf courses.

Barb Redlitz, City of Escondido, mentioned that transit ridership should be considered as a factor.

Coleen Clementson, SANDAG staff, stated that we will need to look for other funding sources for non-Smart Growth areas.

Carolina Gregor, SANDAG staff, also noted that some areas do not meet the Smart Growth criteria and that jurisdictions may want to consider higher densities in those locations.

The TWG generally agreed that SANDAG staff should research the idea of some sort of transit equivalency factor to address the need for flexibility related to the targets for the smart growth place types.
The group discussed **Item 4** in the progress report regarding whether there should be a minimum percentage or number of housing units to qualify as an Existing/Planned smart growth area.

Dennis Turner noted that in some areas homes are not appropriate and that the main concern is number of trips generated.

Karen Brindley, City of San Marcos, stated that in the area in San Marcos with a small percentage of residential acreage that they anticipate more residential uses in the future.

Dave Witt asked about what happened with El Cajon Boulevard and University Avenue in La Mesa. He noted that we are asking two different questions – inputs for the forecast regarding what development they think will occur, versus what could happen in these smart growth areas. He suggested that jurisdictions should check their forecast inputs. Also, for housing element purposes it hurts a jurisdiction to identify more residential capacity. When we are trying to maximize our efficiency in gathering information, we may not get the best answers.

Ed Kleeman, City of Coronado, stated that we should recognize and reward smart growth. Is smart growth defined by density or mixed use? Big box retail uses have the potential to be converted in the future.

Dennis Turner stated that he disagreed with Mr. Kleeman. He believes that our purpose is to reward good planning using funds to provide incentives for better development and improved transit use. The purpose of this project is not to reward jurisdictions for what they have done in the past.

Stephan Vance, SANDAG staff, noted that mixed use is important for transit because we need trips going in both directions to make the most efficient use of the system.

Patrick Murphy stated that it is problematic to change the rules (with respect to adding a minimum amount or percentage of residential) at this point.

The group discussed **Item 5** (the Special Use Center place type).

Some of the areas brought up during this discussion included Lindberg Field and casinos.

The TWG generally agreed that Special Use Centers be limited (as proposed by SANDAG staff) to regional institutions such as colleges and universities, community colleges, medical complexes, and similar types of institutional uses that generate high frequency transit demand throughout the day.

With respect to the smart growth concept map/brochure/poster, the TWG made the following comments:

- Need to better tie themes related to land use and transportation planning on the cover of the map.
- Need to explain in the brochure why we are doing this, e.g. tie to Smart Growth Incentive Program and other funding.
- Need to include a date on the poster.

Staff will bring back a revised concept map/brochure/poster at the next meeting.

Susan Baldwin, SANDAG staff, communicated comments from Stefan Marks, NCTD, regarding the Smart Growth concept map. Mr. Marks noted his concern regarding the number (3-4) of areas in North County that would qualify as existing/planned smart growth areas (and therefore be eligible for infrastructure funds); the importance of documenting where the threshold criteria came from; and the need to find funds to enhance service along successful transit corridors.
Agenda Item #7: Regional Urban Design Guidelines

Stephan Vance, SANDAG staff, reviewed his report on this item.

Comments from the TWG members included:

Dennis Turner asked about the purpose for the proposed guidelines. He noted that the title included the word "urban," and wondered about how they would apply to suburban and rural areas.

Stephan Vance replied that the guidelines are proposed to be "smart growth" design guidelines for the various smart growth place types.

Dave Witt questioned whether the guidelines would be mandatory/regulatory, or if they were intended as guidance to promote creativity in design. He noted that the latter is preferable.

Stephan Vance noted that they would likely be similar to the pedestrian design guidelines, which are being used to review projects.

Dave Witt asked if they would be project review criteria for reviewing grant proposals.

Coleen Clementson asked if the group sees a way that these could be helpful.

Patrick Murphy suggested that they could be an educational tool used to help jurisdictions and residents understand smart growth. He likes the format of the pedestrian guidelines and uses them in staff reports. They help frame issues for decision-makers.

Dave Witt suggested that they be used to show in pictures what we mean by smart growth.

Stephan Vance noted that competition is stiff for funds, and that guidelines often become a standard to meet. Also, the question of the quality of design features of projects was raised during the Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program evaluation process.

Dave Witt suggested that we describe design principles by showing examples, and that we not slip into the regulatory mode.

Dennis Turner expressed the concern that we would hire a consultant who does not know the area, and that SANDAG could end up being at odds with the local jurisdictions. We should have a local oversight committee work on this project.

Stephan Vance noted that we had a group working with SANDAG staff and the consultants when we developed "Planning and Designing for Pedestrians," and would use a similar process for this project.

Patrick Murphy stated that he was not sure he wants the guidelines to be used for evaluating grants. He sees it more useful as an educational tool. A PowerPoint presentation that could help educate people about smart growth would be useful. Basic ideas regarding FARs, mixed use, and quantification of other issues would help.

Barb Redlitz suggested that guidelines that address mixed use conflicts such as entrances, loading zones, noise issue, etc. would be helpful.

Mark Stephens, City of Chula Vista suggested consulting with school districts regarding the guidelines.

Dennis Turner noted that there are generic subjects that need to be discussed in all place types.
Agenda Item #8: Adjournment and Next Meeting

The next regular TWG Meeting will be held on Thursday, November 10, 2005 from 1:15 to 3:15 p.m. in the 7th Floor Conference Room.
COMMUNITY MEETINGS FOR COMPREHENSIVE OPERATIONAL ANALYSIS OF METROPOLITAN TRANSIT SYSTEM BUS AND TROLLEY SERVICES

The San Diego Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) is conducting a Comprehensive Operational Analysis (COA) of its bus and trolley services. The project is divided into two phases: the first phase was implemented in summer 2005 and optimized the system to improve efficiencies to achieve a balanced operating budget. The second phase will seek to redevelop and optimize transit services to better reflect travel demand patterns and reduce trip times. This second phase is currently being developed and the results will affect the majority of MTS bus and trolley services; including substantial schedule and routing changes. Adopted proposals from the COA will be implemented beginning in June 2006.

MTS is holding a series of community meetings to provide information on proposed system, route, and schedule changes. MTS passengers, area residents, business owners, and other interested individuals are encouraged to attend one of the following community meetings, held in different locations throughout the MTS service area:

**City of San Diego**
- Old Town Transit Center
  - Tue., Nov. 1, 4pm – 6pm
  - Map

- San Diego Mesa College, H117
  - Tue., Nov. 8, 6pm – 8pm
  - 7250 Mesa College Dr.
  - San Diego, CA 92111
  - Map

- Malcom X Library
  - Wed., Nov. 16, 5:30pm – 7:30pm
  - 5148 Market St.
  - San Diego, CA 92114
  - Map

**East County**
- R. Reagan Community Center
  - Wed., Nov. 9, 6pm – 8pm
  - 195 E. Douglas Ave.
  - El Cajon, CA 92020
  - Map

**South Bay**
- Iris Trolley Station
  - Thur., Nov. 3, 4pm – 6pm
  - Map

- H Street Trolley Station
  - Fri., Nov. 11, 4pm – 6pm
  - Map

- Southwestern College, Bldg 750
  - Thur., Nov. 10, 6pm – 8pm
  - 900 Otay Lakes Rd.
  - Chula Vista, CA 91910
  - Map

**Downtown Information Cntr**
- Wed., Nov. 2, 11am – 1pm
- 225 Broadway
- San Diego, CA 92101
- Map

**Fashion Valley Transit Center**
- Fri., Nov. 4, 4pm – 6pm
- Map

**Doyle Park Community Center**
- Mon., Nov. 14, 6:15pm – 8pm
- 8175 Regents Rd.
- San Diego, CA 92122
- Map

**North Park Rec. Center**
- Tue., Nov. 15, 6pm – 8pm
- 4044 Idaho St.
- San Diego, CA 92104
- Map

**Mira Mesa Community Center**
- Thur., Nov. 17, 6pm – 8pm
- 8575 New Salem St.
- San Diego, CA 92126
- Map

**24th Street Trolley Station**
- Fri., Nov. 18, 6pm – 8pm
- Map

*Please note that dates and times of the Transit Center Outreach events are liable to change due to inclement weather or other unforeseen circumstances. Check the Web site often for updated information.*
DRAFT 2006 LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Introduction

Each year, the Executive Committee recommends action on the legislative program for the next calendar year to the Board of Directors. Consistent with past programs, the proposed 2006 Legislative Program includes policies and proposals for possible federal and state legislation and local activities.

Recommendation

The Executive Committee is asked to discuss and begin the development of potential legislative goals and objectives for the 2006 Legislative Program with the intention of finalizing a Draft Legislative Program to recommend to the Board of Directors in December 2005.

Discussion

The Executive Committee recommended the 2005 Legislative Program in December 2004. This program served as a road map for Board members and staff to follow when various positions and activities were requested. As you will recall, the format indicating committee jurisdiction was developed two years ago. Last year, the Committee recommended a further refinement by distinguishing goals into levels of effort by categorizing them into three areas: (1) sponsor, (2) support/oppose, and (3) monitor. The eight goals listed as SANDAG-sponsored in the 2005 Legislative Program, along with its status to date (in italics) are as follows.

Goal 1: FY 2005/2006 Federal Appropriation Funding Requests

**Status:** Based on a Transportation Committee recommendation, SANDAG staff submitted funding requests totaling $199 million for inclusion in the FY 2005/2006 Transportation Appropriations Act. The United States Senate and House of Representatives have approved their respective versions of the FY 2005/2006 Transportation Appropriations Act. A reconciliation of the two versions to be handled in conference has not been scheduled. The House bill did not include any earmarks, and the Senate only included earmarks related to New Starts funding with some bus earmarks. New Start earmarks in San Diego include $12.2 million for the Oceanside-Escondido Rail Project (SPRINTER) and $7.7 million for the Mission Valley East Trolley project, nearly completing the projects’ federal funding commitments. In addition, $7.2 million has been identified for the San Diego Mid-Coast Trolley Extension project. We have been informed that any additional earmarks would be addressed during conference.

Goal 2: Reauthorization of a six-year transportation bill at highest levels of funding possible for highway and transit programs, railroad, and highway safety, goods movement and other
programs such as the New Starts and Smart Starts Program, Intelligent Transportation Systems, Borders, and Bus and Bus Related, including the eligibility of Bus Rapid Transit (BRT). Support for inclusion of Board-adopted principles, including increased flexibility, environmental streamlining, change to the requirement for Regional Transportation Plans (RTPs) from three years to five years, requests for earmarks for projects, and flexibility for San Diego and Arizona Eastern (SD&AE) Railway funding.

**Status:** SAFETEA-LU (Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users) was signed by the President on August 10, 2005, authorizing $286.45 billion over a six-year period representing a 42 percent increase. Many of the Board’s principles were included in the bill, including the creation of a Small Starts program, the eligibility of BRT, changing the requirement of the RTP from every three years to every four years, flexibility, and environmental streamlining. Without a gas tax increase or another mechanism to increase revenues, providing higher levels of funding for all of the transportation needs could not be accomplished. The San Diego region received over $258 million in project earmarks, and a language change, to allow flexibility for the SD&AE Railway, was included in the bill.

**Goal 3:** Seek funds to implement the Regional Energy Strategy (RES), and respond to legislation related to energy consistent with RES principles.

**Status:** To continue the implementation of the RES and to support the Energy Working Group (EWG), San Diego Gas & Electric provided $100,000 in FY 2006 that was matched with SANDAG funding. The EWG has been working to identify sources of federal and state funds to continue its work beyond FY 2006. The EWG continues to respond to energy legislation and regulatory proceedings consistent with RES principles and within available funding.

**Goal 4:** Aggressively seek Homeland Security Funding for Automated Regional Justice Information System (ARJIS), transit, freight, regional public safety initiatives, and ports of entry.

**Status:** Over $2.6 million in Homeland Security funds was granted to the transit agencies in the San Diego region specifically for use on the buses and rail systems for FY 2005/2006. The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) also awarded ARJIS/SANDAG $875,000 to implement law enforcement data-sharing research findings throughout the southwest region and to expand the functionality of the wireless system, currently accessible through personal digital assistants.

**Goal 5:** Participating in activities related to legislative and administrative reform of the state housing element law.

**Status:** Last year, SANDAG Board and staff participated in various groups working towards these efforts. State legislation is anticipated next year.
Goal 6: Allow for publication of an ordinance by summary.

**Status:** Language providing SANDAG with this authority was included in SB 966, the Local Government Omnibus Act of 2005.

Goal 7: Seek funds for the Regional Substance Abuse Monitoring Program (SAM) that collects, analyzes, and disseminates information about drug use and other risky behavior from adult juvenile inmates residing in local jails.

**Status:** Local funding totaling $75,000 was obtained to implement SAM for the current year. The Public Safety Committee is currently developing goals for the 2006 Legislative Program, and it is anticipated that Goal 7 will be replaced with a broader goal.

Goal 8: Authorize sales tax for quality of life improvements, including habitat preservation, beach sand replenishment, and water quality improvements.

**Status:** It is likely that SANDAG already has sufficient authority for a "quality of life" sales tax, and this goal may no longer be necessary. However, due to the importance of this issue, an outside legal opinion will be sought to confirm the opinion of the Office of General Counsel. If outside legal counsel has a different opinion, the goal would be brought back to the Executive Committee for proposed reinstatement in the Legislative Program.

The language that the Office of General Counsel believes provides the authority is shown below:

Public Utilities Code Section 132320 For the purposes of this article, the following terms have the following meanings: (a) To "expand" the transactions and use tax means to expand the purposes for which the revenue derived from the tax may be expended to include covering the costs of implementing measures to manage the impacts of regional transportation improvements, including, but not limited to, impacts related to growth, and to maximize the efficiency of regional transportation and transit systems. These measures may include, but need not be limited to, any or all of the following: (1) Acquisition, management, maintenance, and monitoring of natural habitat and open space. (2) Development and implementation of watershed management. (3) Construction, repair, replacement, and maintenance of storm water conveyance systems. (b) To "extend" the transactions and use tax means to extend the imposition of the tax beyond any term stated in the tax ordinance originally imposing the tax.

Staff has modified last year’s program to initiate discussion for next year’s program. If a goal was accomplished or no longer determined to be needed, it is shown as a strike-out. A proposal for a new goal or a change to an existing goal is shown in **Bold Italics** (see Attachment 1).

To provide input into SANDAG’s 2006 Legislative Program, the Public Safety Committee (PSC) at its October 21, 2005, meeting, reviewed five proposed legislative goals that are consistent with their mission to promote public safety and justice through collaboration, information sharing, effective technology, and objective monitoring and assessment. At the meeting, the PSC proposed revisions to the five proposed goals and added an additional goal. The Committee intends to approve a
prioritized set of goals at its November 18, 2005, meeting and recommend to the Executive Committee inclusion of these goals in SANDAG’s overall Legislative Program. The PSC is unique because it is governed by the ARJIS Joint Powers Agreement and has the authority to act on legislative matters autonomously when acting in its role as the ARJIS governing board, so long as the actions are consistent with SANDAG’s policies and legislative program.

Also, consistent with previous years, SANDAG will incorporate the transit boards’ legislative programs into the regional program. The transit boards will be acting on their respective programs over the next few months. Their respective program documents will be presented to the Executive Committee when available.

As with last year, it is our intent to provide periodic status reports on legislative activity based on the goals recommended by the Executive Committee and approved by the Board of Directors, and if legislation or regulation is introduced related to SANDAG’s mission that is not part of the Board’s established legislative goals, the item would be brought back to the Executive Committee for direction.

Finally, last January, the Board approved a listing of projects to submit for federal funding both in the reauthorization of the multi-year federal transportation bill and annual appropriations bill for the federal fiscal year 2005. As discussed above, the multi-year transportation federal bill was finalized and the FY 2005/2006 Transportation Appropriations bill is still pending conclusion. Although the FY 2005/2006 Transportation Appropriations bill is still pending, the FY 2006/2007 cycle will begin early next year. To enable participation in the process, a funding proposal listing for this next cycle is under development and will be presented to the Transportation Committee for its recommendation to the Board of Directors in January 2006.

ELLEN ROUNDTREE
Director of Government Relations

Attachment: 1. Summary of Legislative Goals for Calendar Year 2006

Key Staff Contact: Ellen Roundtree, (619) 699-6960, ero@sandag.org
## SUMMARY OF LEGISLATIVE GOALS FOR CALENDAR YEAR 2006

### SPONSOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF GOAL</th>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>PRIORITY</th>
<th>BOARD POSITION</th>
<th>POSITION DATE</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>FED</th>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>LOCAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2007 Appropriation Requests (under development; to be presented to the Transportation Committee in January 2006).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>Sponsor</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reauthorization of a six-year transportation bill, including highest levels of funding for highway and transit programs, railroad and highway safety, goods movement and other programs such as the New Starts and Small Starts Program, Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS), Borders, Bus and Bus Related, including the eligibility of Bus Rapid Transit. Support for inclusion of Board-adopted principles, including increased flexibility, environmental streamlining, change to the requirement for Regional Transportation Plans from 3 years to 5 years, and requests for earmarks for projects as included in list of priority projects; flexibility for San Diego and Arizona Eastern Railway funding.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>Sponsor/Support</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical clean-up language to the multi-year transportation bill, SAFETEA-LU (Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users), such as, but not limited to, revising and clarifying earmark language and policy changes if deemed appropriate.</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Sponsor/Support</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seek funds to implement the Regional Energy Strategy (RES); respond to legislation related to energy consistent with RES Principles.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>Sponsor</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressively seek Homeland Security Funding for Automated Regional Justice Information System (ARJIS), transit, freight, regional public safety initiatives, and ports of entry.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Sponsor</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allow SANDAG to conduct public meetings in Mexico and other jurisdictions that border SANDAG’S jurisdiction for the purpose of addressing projects, programs, and issues that affect multiple jurisdictions, but which are currently restricted under the Brown Act.</strong></td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Sponsor</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF GOAL</td>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>PRIORITY</td>
<td>BOARD POSITION</td>
<td>POSITION DATE</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>FED</td>
<td>STATE</td>
<td>LOCAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow for publication of an ordinance by summary.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Sponsor</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seek funds for the Regional Substance Abuse Monitoring Program that collects, analyzes,</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Sponsor</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and disseminates information about drug use and other risky behaviors from adult and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>juvenile inmates residing in local jails.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be replaced with a more general goal, pending Public Safety Committee action on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 18, 2005.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authorize sales tax for quality of life improvements, including habitat preservation,</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Sponsor/Support</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beach sand replenishment, and water quality improvements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend: T: Transportation; R: Regional Planning; P: Public Safety; B: Borders
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Board Position</th>
<th>Position Date</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>FED</th>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>Local</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal reform initiatives enabling regions to develop their own fiscal strategies and oppose unfunded mandates on local government. Pursue initiatives that balance the fiscal influence that sales tax revenue has upon local land use decisions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislation that rewards jurisdictions that produce more housing, especially affordable and transit-oriented developments; supports regional fair-share allocation of housing funds; and provides additional funding for affordable housing with greater local/regional control over the allocation of those funds.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislation assisting in the implementation of the Regional Comprehensive Plan, especially through funding incentives for smart growth (including, but not necessarily limited to, mixed-use projects, transit-oriented development, and/or walkable communities).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower the current 2/3rds voter requirement for special purpose taxes, such as transportation and quality of life improvements, to a simple majority vote.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>2002/2005</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efforts that would reduce transportation funding or challenge existing regional decision-making authority.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efforts consistent with financial strategies adopted in the Regional Transportation Plan, such as but not limited to, increase revenues for transportation and other related purposes through measures that would increase gas tax or equivalent revenue sources; pursue developer fees and public/private partnerships; oppose efforts that reduce revenues for transportation and other related purposes such as the borrowing of Proposition 42; and maximize flexibility of federal and state funding.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efforts to expand available methods of transportation project delivery, e.g., design-build, construction management at risk procurements, and other alternative delivery methods that expedite project delivery.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend: T: Transportation; R: Regional Planning; P: Public Safety; B: Borders
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>PRIORITY</th>
<th>BOARD POSITION</th>
<th>POSITION DATE</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>FED</th>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>LOCAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend: T: Transportation; R: Regional Planning; P: Public Safety; B: Borders

Full funding of the Census Bureau’s American Community Survey Program to ensure timely release of critical demographic and economic information for our region.

Efforts assisting in the implementation of key environmental efforts, including habitat conservation, planning, beach restoration and replenishment, and water quality-related issues.

Mechanisms and funding providing for the implementation of MOBILITY 2030, including value pricing, Managed Lanes, high occupancy toll (HOT) Lanes; the alleviation of current constraints on transponder technology; use of freeway shoulder lanes by transit and other transit priority treatments; and other mechanisms that provide for more efficient use of highways and local roads.

Transit boards’ legislative programs consistent with SANDAG policy.

Enhancing of border security and reducing border wait times; pursuit of funding, legislation, and other financing mechanisms supporting interregional partnerships and bi-national trade and border projects.

Participate in efforts related to legislative and administrative reform of the state housing element law. *(Moved from Sponsor section to Support/Oppose section)*

Generation of new revenue sources; maximize flexibility in use of federal and state dollars. *(Consolidated with goal number 13.)*

Maintain and increase regional decision-making authority in areas consistent with SANDAG’s mission/policies.

Legislation resulting in cost efficiencies and savings.

Other organizations’ legislative programs where consistent with SANDAG policy, i.e., CALCOG (California Association of Councils of Governments), APTA (American Public Transportation Association), AMPO (Association of Metropolitan Planning Organization), NARC (National Association of Regional Councils), and CTA (California Transit Association), **Self-Help Counties Coalition, League of California Cities, and California State Association of Counties, and Caltrans.**
| Efforts that expand free access by single occupant vehicles (SOVs) to high occupancy toll (HOT) lanes. | 22 | Higher | Monitor/Respond | 2004 | X | X | X |
| Legislation relating to personnel matters, i.e., workers' compensation, Public Employee Retirement Systems (PERS), benefits, and other labor-related issues. | 23 | Lower | Monitor/Respond | 2003 | X | X | X |
| Legislation affecting solid waste, water supply, and storm water; Support of funding opportunities to assist in these areas. | 24 | Lower | Monitor/Respond | 2003 | X | X | X |
| Legislation requiring local agencies to implement new administrative compliance measures. | TBD | TBD | TBD | 2005 | X | X |
REGIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN (RCP) MONITORING PROGRAM:
STATUS UPDATE

Introduction

Adopted by the SANDAG Board of Directors in July 2004, the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) is now moving into the implementation phase. Chapter 8 of the RCP describes using performance indicators as a tool to track our progress in implementing the plan. Many of the actions and paradigm shifts discussed in the plan will take years to develop and fund. Therefore, it is important to have a consistent and valid set of indicators that can reflect the sometimes subtle changes that occur over the long run. Future annual reports on these indicators will be used to assess the degree to which RCP implementation is having a positive impact on the region.

Monitoring our progress in implementing the RCP is both a good idea and a legal requirement. Assembly Bill 361 included the specific condition that SANDAG monitor progress through “realistic measurable standards and criteria, which must be included in the RCP itself and made available to the public.” The preliminary list of indicators was published as part of the RCP.

Staff is scheduled to release a draft first annual RCP performance monitoring report in spring 2006. This report will consist of a baseline report, targets for certain indicators, and analysis that will begin to assess where we are, and where we want to be in 10 years? In 30 years? Staff is assembling data for the baseline report and identifying the indicators where there is a mandated or otherwise established target. The next steps are to draft the baseline report and to identify initial targets that will be included in the first annual monitoring report.

In addition, staff is working to coordinate SANDAG’s various performance monitoring efforts, including those of the RCP, the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), the Sustainable Competitiveness Index, and the State of the Commute report. Performance monitoring coordination will ensure consistency among programs and greater efficiency in data collection. Coordination will occur concurrently with the development of the first annual RCP performance monitoring report.

Discussion

Role and Relationship of RCP Monitoring to Other SANDAG Monitoring Reports

In addition to monitoring the Regional Comprehensive Plan, SANDAG undertakes three other performance monitoring programs on a regular basis:
These programs are currently maintained independently, but work is underway to coordinate and integrate the above four performance monitoring programs. Integration of the programs will result in greater consistency at a policy level, and improved efficiency of data collection at an administrative level.

In integrating the programs, the RCP will provide the overarching framework for all performance monitoring at SANDAG, through which all the other programs must have relevance. For example, all monitoring efforts should use RCP monitoring indicators to the extent possible.

Staff responsible for each monitoring program is currently working to refine and integrate the programs, streamline the indicators required by each program, and perhaps even collapse or combine some of the reports or the indicators included therein.

**Baseline Monitoring Report**

In preparing the RCP, SANDAG’s Regional Planning Committee, the TWG, and the previous Regional Stakeholders Working Group discussed and developed a set of performance indicators to monitor the region’s progress toward achieving the goals and objectives of the RCP. Attachment 1 shows the resulting list of indicators. A primary prerequisite for all of the annual indicators was that they must be based on data that are available, consistent, and reliable.

The first annual RCP performance monitoring report is scheduled for release next spring. It will build upon the baseline report, and will include data and analysis for most indicators, status updates for those indicators where data is not currently available, and targets for a subset of indicators where there is a mandate or established policy.

**Establishing Initial Targets**

Setting targets will be a time- and resource-intensive exercise. Due to resource and time constraints, the initial set of selected targets will be related to existing federal, state, or local mandates, or to locally adopted plans. The first annual RCP performance monitoring report will include a discussion on our progress in meeting these initial targets. The direction and general approach for target-setting for the remaining indicators will be discussed in the report as well.

Setting targets based on existing mandates or adopted policies will cover certain indicators. Developing the remaining targets will be a research-intensive effort, which should be guided by both long-term objectives and reasonably-expected outcomes. Once the first annual monitoring report is released, staff will work with the TWG, the Stakeholders Working Group, and the Regional Planning Committee to develop targets for additional indicators for inclusion in future annual monitoring reports.
**Next Steps**

Between now and March, staff is developing the first annual RCP performance monitoring report, in conjunction with overall performance monitoring coordination. Staff will provide a copy of the first annual report to the TWG for review and comment prior to the Regional Planning Committee taking action.

Attachment

Key Staff Contact: Christine Eary, (619) 699-6928, [cea@sandag.org](mailto:cea@sandag.org)
### ANNUAL INDICATORS FOR MONITORING THE REGIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

#### 1. URBAN FORM / TRANSPORTATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A.</th>
<th>Share of new units and jobs located in Smart Growth Opportunity Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>Share of new housing units within County Water Authority water service boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>Annual weekday transit ridership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>Commute mode shares (single-occupancy vehicles, carpool, transit, walking, biking, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.</td>
<td>Travel times and volumes for key auto corridors and key transit corridors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.</td>
<td>Miles of deficient roads on Congestion Management Program network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.</td>
<td>Annual hours of delay per capita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.</td>
<td>Regional crime rates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2. HOUSING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A.</th>
<th>Housing Affordability Index (compares median home ownership costs to median income)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>Percent of households with housing costs greater than 35 percent of income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>Ratio of new jobs to new housing units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>Share of new and existing units by structure type (single family, multifamily) and income category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.</td>
<td>Vacancy rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.</td>
<td>Percent of households living in overcrowded conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.</td>
<td>Number of households on the waiting list for Section 8 (housing assistance) Vouchers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3. HEALTHY ENVIRONMENT

**Natural Habitats**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A.</th>
<th>Habitat conserved within designated preserve areas (acres and percent of preserve area)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>Percent of preserve area actively maintained (removal of invasive species, trash removal, fence repairs)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Water Quality**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A.</th>
<th>Number of beach closures and advisories per rainfall inch measured at Lindbergh Field</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>Impaired waterbodies (miles or acres) based on Federal Clean Water Act 303(d) criteria</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Shoreline Preservation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A.</th>
<th>Beach widths</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>Lagoon health (salinity, dissolved oxygen levels)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Air Quality**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A.</th>
<th>Air Quality Index (number of days &quot;unhealthy for sensitive groups&quot; with AQI &gt; 100)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 4. ECONOMIC PROSPERITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A.</th>
<th>Regional unemployment rate compared to state and nation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>Real per capita income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>Regional poverty rate compared to state and nation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>Employment growth in high-wage economic clusters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.</td>
<td>Educational attainment (Share of adult population with high school, college, and graduate education)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 5. PUBLIC FACILITIES

**Water Supply**
- A. Water consumption per capita and total
- B. Diversity of water supply (share of regional water supply, by source)
- C. Amount of reclaimed water used

**Energy**
- A. Kilowatt hours of electricity used per capita at peak hours
- B. Share of energy produced in the region vs. imported
- C. Share of energy produced from renewable resources

**Waste Management**
- A. Percent of waste that is recycled
- B. Landfill space available

### 6. BORDERS

- A. Border wait times for Secure Electronic Network for Travelers Rapid Inspection (Sentri) lanes, and non-Sentri lanes
- B. Interregional commute volumes into San Diego from surrounding counties and Baja California
- C. Participation in Sentri Lanes, pedestrian commuter program, Free and Secure Trade (FAST) program
SAN DIEGO ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
REGIONAL PLANNING TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP

November 10, 2005

AGENDA ITEM NO.: 8

Action Requested: APPOINT

2007 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN (RTP):
TRANSPORTATION PROJECT EVALUATION CRITERIA
AD HOC WORKING GROUP

Introduction

Over the years, SANDAG has developed and updated evaluation criteria for prioritizing projects for inclusion in the RTP. The last update took place during the preparation of MOBILITY 2030. Evaluation criteria are applied to regional arterial, highway, freeway connectors, high occupancy vehicle (HOV) connectors, and transit projects. These criteria will be reviewed and updated for the preparation of the 2007 RTP. Additional criteria for other categories, such as goods movement projects, also may be created.

Discussion

Staff proposes to form an Ad Hoc Working Group to lead the updates of the transportation project evaluation criteria. Representatives from the following standing committees and working groups will be invited to participate:

- Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group (SWG)
- Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC)
- Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG)
- Regional Housing Working Group (RHWG)
- Regional Freight Working Group (FWG)

In addition to SANDAG staff, staff from Caltrans, Metropolitan Transit System, and North County Transit District will be asked to join the Project Evaluation Criteria Ad Hoc Working Group.

On December 9, 2005, the Transportation Committee will be asked to confirm the formation of this Ad Hoc Working Group.

The Ad Hoc Working Group is expected to meet monthly through fall 2006, but may meet more frequently depending on key milestone dates for the 2007 RTP. Recommendations from the Ad Hoc Working Group would be discussed with each of the participants’ committees and working groups. Also, this Ad Hoc group may be convened to review the performance indicators used in the analysis of transportation alternatives of the RTP. The performance measures for the overall transportation system are closely related to the project evaluation criteria.
The first meeting is scheduled for Monday, January 23, from 1:30 to 3:30 p.m. at SANDAG. A meeting agenda will be sent to the appointed representatives in advance.

**Recommendation**

Staff recommends the TWG appoint two members to the Project Evaluation Criteria Ad Hoc Working Group.

**Key Staff Contact:** Elisa Arias, (619) 699-1936, ear@sandag.org