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### REGIONAL PLANNING TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP (TWG)

**Thursday, October 12, 2006**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM #</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>APPROVE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**+1. SUMMARY OF THE SEPTEMBER 14, 2006, TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP (TWG) MEETING**

The TWG should review and approve the attached meeting summary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC COMMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Members of the public will have the opportunity to address the TWG on any issue within the jurisdiction of the working group. Speakers are limited to three minutes each.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REPORTS FROM TWG MEMBERS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Members of TWG may report on their activities, upcoming events, and/or planning-related conferences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROUNDTABLE DISCUSSION: REFLECTING ON RECENT STATEWIDE, REGIONAL, AND LOCAL PLANNING INITIATIVES (All)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recent statewide planning initiatives have facilitated the integration of broad-based planning principles, such as land use and transportation connections, smart growth, and sustainable development, into local and regional planning processes. In addition, recent dialogues on the public health impacts of land use and transportation plans have resulted in local action plans to address obesity and related health issues. This roundtable discussion provides an opportunity to reflect upon lessons learned and discuss ways in which these initiatives can be strengthened and integrated. Presentations will be made on the following initiatives, and members are welcome to share information on additional efforts.

(a) **“Blueprint Planning in California: Forging Consensus on Metropolitan Growth and Development” (Elisa Barbour and Mike Teitz, Public Policy Institute of California (PPIC))** - The PPIC recently completed a study entitled “Blueprint Planning in California: Forging Consensus on Metropolitan Growth and Development.” The study focused on the best practices of regional planning efforts in the four major metropolitan areas of California: Sacramento, the San Francisco Bay Area, Los Angeles, and San Diego. The Executive Summary of the report is attached, and the full report can be accessed via the internet at www.ppic.org. Elisa Barbour and Mike Teitz will present the major outcomes of the study.
4. ROUND TABLE DISCUSSION: (CONTINUED) DISCUSSION (CONT'D)

(b) **California Regional Blueprint Planning Program (Bob Leiter, SANDAG)** - California's Business, Housing, and Transportation Agency is administering the Regional Blueprint Planning Program and has established the Blueprint Learning Network to work with the Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) and Councils of Government (COGs) to advance regional planning and transportation issues throughout the state. SANDAG received grant funding from the blueprint program last year to implement several initiatives from the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) and is applying for additional funding this year. The blueprint effort has included a series of meetings with stakeholders throughout the state. Bob Leiter made a presentation at the most recent meeting in Oakland and will provide an update.

(c) **Public Health Impacts of Land Use and Transportation Plans (Tracy Delaney, County of San Diego Health and Human Services)** - Childhood obesity is a significant and growing health concern that has reached epidemic proportions. The San Diego County Childhood Obesity Action Plan addresses this challenge through multiple strategies and domains. Tracy Delaney from the County of San Diego Health and Human Services will discuss childhood obesity and the emerging connections between public health, land use, transportation planning, and urban design.

5. ADJOURNMENT AND NEXT MEETING INFORMATION

The next TWG meeting will be held on Thursday, December 14, 2006, from 1:15 to 3:15 p.m. Note: *The November TWG meeting is cancelled*. Please remove the November meeting from your calendars.

+ next to an item indicates an attachment
SUMMARY OF SEPTEMBER 14, 2006, TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP MEETING

AGENDA ITEM NO. 3

Action Requested: APPROVE

SUMMARY OF SEPTEMBER 14, 2006, File Number 3000200
TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP MEETING

Agenda Item #1: Welcome and Introductions

Niall Fritz, City of Poway, chaired the meeting. Self-introductions were conducted. New members Lance Schulte, North County Transit District (NCTD), and Gary Halbert, City of Santee, were introduced and welcomed.

Agenda Item #2: Public Comments and Communications

Andy Hamilton, Vice President of WalkSanDiego, announced that WalkSanDiego will be holding its first bimonthly Brown Bag Forum on Wednesday, September 20, 2006, at 225 Broadway in downtown San Diego. He mentioned that he will be the first speaker and will discuss the “State of Walking in San Diego.” The forum will begin at 12 noon.

Shelby Tucker, SANDAG staff, announced that the San Diego County Water Authority (CWA) is planning a water conservation summit. Tim Bombardier, CWA, stated that the purpose of the summit is to develop consensus for water conservation in the next decade focusing on outside landscaping. He added that the summit will take place on September 29, 2006, at the Joan B. Kroc Institute at the University of San Diego from 8 a.m. to 4 p.m.

Anne Steinberger, SANDAG staff, stated that TWG member Linda Niles, City of Del Mar, requested discussion of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Public Involvement Program. Ms. Steinberger stated that she is interested in any comments TWG members may have regarding the ideas and strategies for public review. She noted that she will be taking the RTP Public Involvement Program to the SANDAG Board of Directors in October. Ed Batchelder, City of Chula Vista, asked if a workshop schedule has been decided. Ms. Steinberger answered that the workshops will begin in the spring of 2007. Coleen Clementson, SANDAG staff, added that as the planning for the workshops begin, SANDAG will look for input from TWG members on host locations.

CONSENT ITEM (3)

Agenda Item #3: Summary of the July 13, 2006, and July 21, 2006, Regional Planning Technical Working Group Meetings

A motion and second were made to approve the July 13, 2006, and July 21, 2006, TWG meeting summaries. The motion passed unanimously.
Agenda Item #4: Reports from TWG Members

No reports were made by TWG members.

Agenda Item #5: Summary of Recommendations of the Independent Transit Planning Review Panel Related to Land Use and Smart Growth Concept Map

This item was continued from the July 13, 2006, TWG meeting.

A. Dave Schumacher, SANDAG staff, provided a presentation on the Initial Transit Scenario Concepts for the 2007 RTP. The SANDAG Board of Directors accepted the draft Independent Transit Planning Review (ITPR) report for planning purposes for the 2007 RTP at its June 23, 2006, meeting. He stated that staff has developed several initial transit scenario concepts incorporating input from the report.

Questions and comments included:

Mr. Batchelder asked if there were any specific corridors that were under consideration for possible guideways and noted that H Street in Chula Vista may be a corridor to consider. Mr. Schumacher replied that no corridors have been specified as of yet. Nancy Bragado, City of San Diego, also asked a similar question about road treatments and guideways for Bus Rapid Transit (BRT). Mr. Schumacher responded that grade-separated transit will focus on key nonfreeway corridors. He added that signal priority and queue jumpers will be looked at in other corridors because guideways cannot be used everywhere.

Andy Hamilton, Air Pollution Control District (APCD), asked what the testing of the alternative transportation scenarios means. Mr. Schumacher answered that the tests are conducted to get a sense of how the scenarios compare to one another in terms of transit ridership and costs. He added that a revised RTP approach, including a “hybrid” of the scenarios, may yield the best results. Mr. Hamilton also asked if this model was sensitive to market satisfaction. Mr. Schumacher stated that this model is not due to the difficulty in obtaining that data.

Bill Anderson, City of San Diego, asked if TWG members will have the opportunity to work with Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) in further developing the scenarios. Mr. Schumacher stated that MTS and SANDAG have already begun doing that. Mr. Anderson also asked if TWG members will be able to provide input on certain corridors that jurisdictions may want to include. Mr. Schumacher replied that this item will be going to the Board in November 2006, and that the process has only just begun, and jurisdictions will have plenty of opportunities to comment and provide input. Ms. Clementson added that SANDAG plans to have the network for significant model runs by early 2007 and that TWG member’s input will be requested. Mr. Anderson stated that there may be land use changes not reflected in current plans. Ms. Clementson asked Mr. Anderson where land use changes may occur, and
Mr. Anderson replied that areas like the Qualcomm site redevelopment, Quarry Falls, and Otay Mesa, where two possible smart growth areas are being considered.

Jerry Backoff, City of San Marcos, commented that North County seems to be ignored and that bus lines need to be looked at. He stated that next May, the City of San Marcos’ smart growth plans will be made, and he would like to see a BRT route designated now, before it is too late. Mr. Schumacher responded that BRT has a broad definition, and the advantage of BRT is that it can be tailored to fit the needs of specific corridors.

B. Ms. Clementson discussed the recommendations by the Independent Transit Planning Review (ITPR) relating to land use and the Smart Growth Concept Map. She stated that staff went through the report and highlighted recommendations regarding land use, urban design, and further definitions of smart growth areas and place types. Ms. Clementson cited specific recommendations made by the ITPR including creating Urban Centers in Escondido or Oceanside, as well as connecting smart growth parking with the Smart Growth Incentive Program.

Questions and comments included:

Mr. Anderson asked if traffic impact modeling reflects mixed-mode/mixed-use transit service since it would be helpful as the City of San Diego updates their plans; for example, in Barrio Logan. Ms. Clementson responded that staff should discuss that with the City of San Diego and noted that there have been changes made to the model; however, it is still a regional model. Mr. Anderson also commented that the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) analysis works against jurisdictions in terms of smart growth. Ms. Clementson stated that staff will follow up on Mr. Anderson’s comment.

Mr. Batchelder commented that he was concerned with air quality in relation to highway corridors. He stated that smart growth increases densities, but does not take into account health impacts. Mr. Batchelder asked if there were any regional studies or design guidelines available that would help jurisdictions reconcile these issues. Mr. Hamilton responded that the APCD is working on that issue, yet there are not many studies on people’s health throughout California that live close to freeways. He stated that a five hundred foot buffer seems to be the standard distance; however, depending on winds, a one thousand foot buffer may be necessary. Mr. Hamilton added that this requires a very significant effort in the region.

Agenda Item #6: Status Report on the I-15 Interregional Partnership-Phase II

This item was continued from the July 13, 2006, TWG meeting.

Jane Clough-Riquelme, SANDAG staff, provided an update on the status of the I-15 Interregional Partnership–Phase II. SANDAG and the Western Riverside Council of Governments (WRCOG) received a $240,000 grant from Caltrans to continue the San Diego-Riverside Interregional Partnership (I-15 IRP). Ms. Clough-Riquelme stated that Phase II focuses on economic development, transportation, and housing strategies identified in Phase I.
Questions and comments included:

Rosemary Rowan, County of San Diego, asked if any of the surveys conducted identified the destination of people traveling on I-15. Ms. Clough-Riquelme responded that the surveys occurred during Phase I and that the results showed that a significant number of people would be willing to take a cut in pay not to have to travel on I-15. Ms. Clough-Riquelme also stated that there are both short-term and long-term goals and that the partnership began because Caltrans District 8 and District 11 were showing a mismatch between planned freeway lanes on I-15, which led to a need for the cluster study to determine how Riverside’s and San Diego’s economies are related.

Barbara Redlitz, City of Escondido, asked if staff could elaborate on the workforce housing effort in North County. Susan Baldwin, SANDAG staff, stated that the Partnership is looking for more moderate-income workforce housing, particularly along the SPRINTER line. She added that California State University, San Marcos (CSUSM) and Pomerado Palomar Health are being discussed as areas where more affordable housing may be possible. She also mentioned that housing in Temecula is not as affordable as it once was.

Mr. Anderson asked if the surveys looked at housing preferences and if that had any connection to the willingness to commute in order to obtain a larger home. Ms. Clough-Riquelme answered that the follow-up study from WRCOG is asking households more questions about quality of life and what things people would be willing to sacrifice.

Mr. Anderson commented on the issue of cargo and stated there is a debate in Otay Mesa as to whether warehouse distribution industries are in the best interest of the City of San Diego, or whether it would be better to transition those industries to Riverside or San Bernardino County where wages and land prices are more consistent. Ms. Clough-Riquelme replied that the economists from Riverside are thinking that the logistics industry is the up-and-coming industry, yet the cluster study is not showing that this is necessarily the case. She mentioned that SANDAG Chief Economist, Marney Cox will be speaking on the results of the cluster study at the Southern California Economic Development Council quarterly luncheon.

Mr. Batchelder asked how much of the study will look at strategizing for employment clusters and higher-paying jobs and noted that many residents in Chula Vista are going to Downtown San Diego and Sorrento Mesa for work. He also asked what the regional and subregional employment strategies are to prevent employment land from being turned into housing under these pressures. Ms. Clementson responded that SANDAG will be updating the Regional Economic Prosperity Strategy next year.

Mr. Schulte asked if there has been any dialogue with major employers about clustering their facilities around transit to encourage housing around transit. Ms. Clough-Riquelme stated that several members of the IRP Working Group are employers in Riverside County. Mr. Schulte then asked if any individual dialogue has taken place, and Ms. Baldwin stated that not many conversations have occurred and that Mr. Schulte made an important point that higher-density employment should also be provided around transit.
Agenda Item #7: Enhanced Smart Growth Land Use Scenario for the 2007 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)

Carolina Gregor, SANDAG staff, discussed the smart growth land use alternative being prepared for the 2007 RTP. Ms. Gregor explained that the smart growth alternative is based on the Smart Growth Concept Map accepted for planning purposes earlier this year by the SANDAG Board. Generic assumptions were applied to the “Potential” smart growth areas on the Smart Growth Concept Map. The generic overlay assumptions were developed by averaging the residential and employment densities for the existing/planned smart growth areas for each place type. She mentioned that for the special use centers, generic assumptions were not able to be determined because all special use centers are different. As a result, SANDAG staff developed assumptions for each type of special use center. She stated that employment at colleges and universities would be based on actual and projected student enrollment; employment at hospitals would be based on the number of actual and projected beds in the hospital; and for the Del Mar Race Track, there are no set assumptions. Ms. Gregor also noted that the City of San Diego requested the addition of two smart growth areas on the Smart Growth Concept Map in the Otay Mesa area. She stated that the SANDAG Board will be considering the requested additions to the Board in October. She stated that staff believes that the additions will go forward since they are a direct request from a jurisdiction.

Ed Shafer, SANDAG staff, presented the specific assumptions and methodologies used in applying the generic overlay assumptions. Mr. Shafer stated that a capacity file containing the enhanced smart growth land use scenario was created and resulted in an additional 88,000 housing units and 198,000 additional jobs. He stated that the first thing SANDAG does when it creates a capacity file is run the file through the interregional commuting model. This model looks at the housing units within our region compared to the units being developed outside the region. Mr. Shafer noted that only 68,000 of our region’s units will be used within this time frame, which results in decreased projections of interregional commuting, and the additional employment sites will not be used.

Ms. Rowan commented that even though there was additional potential employment and housing on those sites, it did not occur in the model since there was not enough demand for it. Mr. Shafer stated that from the model’s perspective there are some locations outside the region that appear more desirable and, therefore, the capacity is not used. Ms. Rowan asked what was the specific reduction in trips from Riverside County. Mr. Shafer replied that he did not have that information on hand.

Ms. Rowan stated that she assumed that during the RTP process, these are alternatives and not the primary project. Ms. Clementson stated that the RTP is based on existing plans and policies. She added that when SANDAG determines the transportation networks, they will be based on adopted plans, and all the changes SANDAG plans to make to that network will be based on existing plans. Ms. Clementson stated that the purpose of the smart growth scenario is to show what could happen regionally if we made these sorts of land use changes and if the region has an enhanced transit network. This would serve as a future vision for the region and will also be used as an alternative in the RTP Environmental Impact Report (EIR). Ms. Rowan stated that we still do not know to what degree the traffic model incorporates transit. Mr. Shafer responded that the traffic model does incorporate transit.
Ed Kleeman, City of Coronado, asked if the land use distribution columns in Attachment 1 are based on net figures and if the column includes right-of-way (ROW). Mr. Shafer stated that the column does include ROW. Mr. Kleeman commented on the mixed-use and stated that for Town Centers, 5 percent of the land is designated as mixed-use and asked if SANDAG had an assumption on how much is residential and how much is employment. Mr. Shafer answered that there are no specific assumptions, but it is generally assumed that most mixed-use is residential with some company employment. Mr. Kleeman stated that he wanted to see if by using these figures that an estimate can be determined for a site. He commented that for a Town Center, 25 percent of the land is residential, 40 percent of the land is employment, and that there is no figure for mixed-use as to employment versus residential and no figure in the other category. Mr. Shafer stated that the other is ROW, parks, open space, and not employment land. He added that this is generic and that when SANDAG was looking for existing types of development, there was not a lot of mixed-use yet in the region. Mr. Shafer stated it is difficult to identify structures and noted a parking structure with employment and housing near it would be coded as parking. He noted that SANDAG is just now starting to catch up on that in terms of existing land use databases. Mr. Kleeman noted that the only two place types that have relatively specific land use areas are the Transit Corridor and the Community Center. He stated that the other areas are more nebulous as to how much area is being included. Mr. Shafer stated that SANDAG was not rigid on the size and worked closely with the jurisdictions to get the potential and existing smart growth areas tailored to each jurisdiction’s need.

Mr. Backoff commented that some of the densities seem to be unrealistic for suburban areas in North County and asked for discussion on that issue. He stated previous scenario numbers were lower for San Marcos, and now numbers are going higher and that suburban urban centers may not be the same as downtown San Diego urban centers. Ms. Gregor responded that all these numbers are based on place types, and SANDAG took all existing/planned place types and looked at the average. She added that there may be some regional or subregional differences and that these numbers are for analysis purposes only for the RTP update. Ms. Gregor stated that as local plans get approved, SANDAG will incorporate those into the next forecast. Mr. Backoff stated that the City of San Marcos is planning an urban center; however, based on these numbers, he was unsure as to whether the numbers are attainable. Ms. Gregor stated that jurisdictions do not have to meet these numbers; they are for regional transportation planning and evaluation purposes. Mr. Backoff also stated that the City of San Marcos is looking to submit more areas of mixed-use. Mr. Shafer stated that most jurisdictions were not ready to provide any sort of input as to how the potential smart growth areas are to be developed. He mentioned that SANDAG wanted to do a generic, regionwide assumption knowing that each jurisdiction would develop each of the place types as they wish.

Dennis Turner, County of San Diego, asked what the alternative smart growth scenarios will be used for in addition to the CEQA alternatives for the EIR. Mr. Shafer responded that they will be used for a transit vision that SANDAG would eventually like to have 30 years from now.

Mr. Schulte asked about the next steps related to identifying performance characteristics particularly, with regard to increased transit use or increased pedestrian flows. Ms. Clementson answered that those will be identified at the regional level. She added that SANDAG would report on metrics related to the vision. Steps are being taken now and will show the benefits at a generic level.
Mr. Anderson stated that on a regional level, it may be important to reconcile the number of retail versus nonretail jobs that are implied in this model, located in these place types, that are consistent with where the region’s economic base is going, and what kind of space those industries need. He added that the City of San Diego is trying to push back on colocation issues due to environmental health issues. He noted that if this is going to be a tool for educating the public, then the employment assumptions need to be consistent with the economic prosperity assumptions. Mr. Shafer agreed and stated that the employment assumptions are done by sector. Mr. Anderson commented that, what if, as a next step, it is decided that the region is better off if employment is clustered around transit centers because there are more service sector or biotechnology jobs going into multistory buildings? There would then be a need to reinforce the benefits and address the concerns of colocation. Ms. Clementson mentioned that SANDAG is somewhat limited by that issue because there may be areas in the region that may be good smart growth areas but were not identified for whatever reasons. She stated that in regard to those areas that were identified by jurisdictions, particularly with urban centers that are in employment areas where growth is expected and the housing will be added in, the region may begin to see colocation.

Jeff Tayman, SANDAG staff, added that the kinds of studies and analysis that will be conducted for future RTPs are different. He added that the kind of intensive study of colocation and land use value has not been scoped out and is not in the SANDAG work program. Mr. Tayman stated that in the next months, SANDAG will begin outlining the 2008 work program and, perhaps a study that really gets at the colocation issue needs to be considered for the next RTP.

Ms. Rowan asked if a cost analysis will be done to go along with the alternatives, primarily public infrastructure costs. Mr. Tayman responded that yes, but mainly on the transportation side.

Mr. Shafer thanked all TWG members for their cooperation and input with SANDAG staff on the development of the regional forecast. Mr. Tayman stated that the SANDAG Board approved the forecast earlier this month.

Mr. Batchelder stated that he hopes that when the smart growth alternatives get published, public issues are kept in mind. Mr. Shafer agreed and added that SANDAG will report the alternatives at a regional level.

**Agenda Item #8: Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP): Draft Baseline Report for Performance Monitoring**

Christine Eary, SANDAG staff, provided a presentation on the baseline report for RCP monitoring. The Performance Monitoring chapter of the RCP identifies a set of performance indicators to monitor the region’s progress toward achieving the goals and objectives of the RCP. Ms. Eary stated that the set of performance indicators identified to monitor the region’s progress included urban form and transportation, housing, healthy environment, economic prosperity, public facilities, and borders.

Questions and comments included:

Mr. Anderson asked if there will be any effort to present this to The San Diego Union-Tribune so that the public can see this is not just a technical document. Ms. Clementson stated that SANDAG wanted to get the draft out to obtain public comment before releasing it to the press. She added
that when this document is taken to the SANDAG Board, a press release will be made. Mr. Anderson asked whether it would simply be a press release or if a press conference may be held. Ms. Clementson stated that she was unsure of what method would be used by SANDAG to release the document.

Mr. Turner stated that he liked the additional measures on electricity on page 48 of the agenda packet.

Mr. Hamilton commented that congestion is over-measured and that the report doesn’t reflect the trade-offs. He noted that queue jumpers for a bus might increase delay, just as ramp metering moves congestion around. Mr. Hamilton stated that he would like to see a reflection of the trade-offs, as well as a safety component in the report. He also noted that the Healthy Environment section was not what he anticipated. Mr. Hamilton stated that the infrastructure to support facilities, as well as the percentages of children and adults who are obese, should be included. He commented that all the arguments against smart growth can be combated by a public safety component. Ms. Clementson stated that the indicators in the report were adopted with the RCP. She stated this doesn’t mean SANDAG will not add different indicators over time. Ms. Gregor mentioned that the Urban Form chapter addresses some of Mr. Hamilton’s comments.

Mr. Turner stated he would caution against expanding the number of measures too much because this is the baseline report. He noted that the next report will be comparing this baseline to the new data.

Mr. Kleeman commented that the timing of this document’s release is very important particularly close to an election season. He added that findings that imply a move in the right direction are good for an incumbent. Ms. Clementson stated that this report will be taken to the Board in October.

Mr. Schulte stated the report was great and that perhaps SANDAG should provide a 30-minute soundbite for the public to explain where the region is heading.

Mr. Batchelder echoed Mr. Schulte and added that in the context of the RTP and the strategies of the RCP, this information should be laid out in an executive summary-type document. He also commented that the CWA service area, as a measure of sprawl, may be criticized since just because a location is within the service area does not mean it is low-density and located near transit. He added that water quantity and water usage is such a regional issue, and information on what is being done would be helpful.

Ms. Gregor mentioned that she attended the San Diego Green 2006 Conference that morning and gave a presentation on the RCP, the Smart Growth Concept Map, the Smart Growth Incentive Program, and the performance measures. She stated that many people were impressed to see that a regional plan was in place and that they advocated that the performance indicators should be used as an educational material as well.

Ms. Baldwin added that SANDAG is also developing a portable exhibit to show the Smart Growth Concept Map, other materials to distribute, and now, possibly information on the RCP to take to community groups and meetings to make people more aware of the work being done in the region.
Mr. Anderson asked if some of the metrics will be benchmarked against other cities. Ms. Clementson replied that this is something SANDAG is looking at and determining how to use this report in the future. Ms. Gregor stated that the San Diego Economic Development Corporation (EDC) conducted a joint study with SANDAG in 2005 that compared the San Diego region with 20 or so other metropolitan areas across the United States.

Mr. Batchelder asked if questions have been asked regarding setting targets. Ms. Clementson stated that some of these indicators do have targets and that setting targets will be one of the next steps. Ms. Eary added that the initial approach for setting targets will be based on if there is legislation that requires certain targets and if agencies like the CWA update their plans.

**Agenda Item #9: Status Report: Smart Growth Urban Design Guidelines**

Stephan Vance, SANDAG staff, provided an update on the process of developing regional smart growth urban design guidelines as part of RCP implementation. An ad hoc working group was formed to assist with this effort, consisting of members from the TWG, the Stakeholders Working Group (SWG), and the Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC). TWG members, Linda Niles and Rosemary Rowan (tentative), are representing the TWG on the ad hoc working group, with Andy Hamilton serving as the alternate. Mr. Vance reported that $75,000 has been budgeted this year for the urban design guidelines; however, that is not enough to complete the project so it will be phased. He added that the general structure of the document will include a discussion of good urban design principles for the San Diego region and for the RCP smart growth place types, and then discuss such things as proper building placement, parking issues, street design, and sustainable development. He stated that this item will be taken to the RPC in October for feedback and will establish a scope of work and choose a consultant to begin the work.

**Agenda Item #10: Subregional Planning Activities/Proposal to Form a SPRINTER Ad Hoc Working Group**

Ms. Clementson informed the TWG that SANDAG has divided the region into subregional planning areas and assigned Carolina Gregor as the South County team leader, Stephan Vance as the Central and East County team leader, and Susan Baldwin as the North County team leader. These teams are made up of the mentioned land use planners, as well as transportation planners and transit planners. The teams are organized to work with the jurisdictions, particularly on projects in smart growth areas on the Smart Growth Concept Map. She stated this is still evolving, and that SANDAG is looking at potential subregional studies in Oceanside and Carlsbad that the appropriate subregional team is working on. Ms. Clementson reported Ms. Baldwin would like to tell the TWG about a proposal going to the RPC to form an ad hoc working group to work on the land use planning and transportation planning occurring at transit stations along the SPRINTER line. She mentioned that RPC member Pam Slater-Price suggested bringing on representatives from the jurisdictions along the SPRINTER line and NCTD.

Ms. Baldwin stated that SANDAG went to CTAC and requested feedback on the ad hoc working group concept. She noted that the focus of this group would be to share ideas about what is working and what is not working regarding implementing smart growth around the SPRINTER stations. She stated that the jurisdictions that would be included would be the Cities of Oceanside,
San Marcos, Escondido, the County of San Diego, and NCTD, and the meetings would be held quarterly and at a location in North County.

Questions and comments included:

Mr. Backoff stated that in San Marcos, there are no plans for development around SPRINTER stations right now and the only plans are mixed-use areas across from the Palomar station.

Linda Niles, City of Del Mar, mentioned that there were some problems in the City of Vista with opposition against the densities located around the SPRINTER stations. She suggested that the ad hoc working group brainstorm on how to introduce densities and mixed-uses to the community since the SPRINTER line is already in place.

Ms. Rowan noted that the County has increased density significantly around the SPRINTER line and needs to do more detail planning in order to gain more support from the community.

Chris Schmidt, Caltran’s representative, commented that he hoped TWG members were aware that Oceanside has already completed a study, that Caltrans funded of its stations and that other jurisdictions can learn from what came out of those studies. He added that for those jurisdictions interested in submitting projects for Caltran’s planning grants to conduct similar studies, the deadline is in October. Ms. Redlitz stated her jurisdiction would be interested and asked how these studies could be related to the SPRINTER workshops.

Ms. Baldwin stated that the previous study completed by Oceanside would be useful to other SPRINTER and COASTER station sites.

Mr. Hamilton commented that an air quality study was conducted ten years ago in Oceanside, and he hopes that that study does not go unused when looking at these transit stations.

**Agenda Item #11: American Planning Association’s Inaugural “National Community Planning Month”**

Ms. Baldwin informed the TWG about the American Planning Association's (APA) declaration of the month of October as “National Community Planning Month” to highlight the contributions of planning in communities, regions, and states. She stated that SANDAG will be taking a proposed resolution to the RPC to acknowledge this program. Mr. Schulte, who is the San Diego APA section director, stated that at the State Board Conference, it was decided there was not enough time to prepare events at the state level. He stated that this is an opportunity to plan for next year, and at the section level this year there will be a “Planner's Night Out” held at St. Tropez on October 19. Ms. Baldwin mentioned that the sample proclamation is located on the state APA Web site. Chair Fritz suggested that each city council adopt a proclamation recognizing the month. Ms. Baldwin stated that SANDAG would provide TWG members with additional information regarding the inaugural event.

**Agenda Item #12: Adjournment and Next Meeting**

The next TWG meeting will be held on Thursday, October 12, 2006, from 1:15 to 3:15 p.m.
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Summary

For the past decade, California's cities, counties, and regional agencies have been engaged in a remarkable, if largely unheralded experiment in the governance of metropolitan urban growth. Although California has been developing rapidly for more than a century, certain eras comprise turning points in the state's approach to planning and investment for growth and development. The 1990s saw such a turning point. The existing planning system proved unable to address urban growth problems effectively, and what has become known as "blueprint planning" emerged as one result. The results of this experiment are still not entirely clear, but it is now advanced enough to merit serious examination. That is the purpose of this paper.

Blueprint planning emerged by the late 1990s as a means for local governments and regional agencies within metropolitan regions to coordinate long-range plans for transportation investment, air quality, and land use. Regional transportation planners faced a practical imperative to meet air quality mandates and address congestion problems with scarce resources - and they turned to land use as one lever for improving outcomes, promoting, for example, denser "infill" development near transit to increase ridership. Growing market interest in more compact housing development facilitated their efforts.

Blueprint planning has represented a way to reconcile "pro-growth" and "anti-growth" forces and attitudes, such as concerns about the need for housing production and regional economic development, on the one hand, and resistance to community change and environmental disruption, on the other. It has appealed to many local governments as a means to build the local economic base and improve quality of life through coordination with neighboring governments. The blueprint process has provided a venue for broad-based regional "visioning" and consensus-building about preferred growth scenarios for the future.

We studied the blueprint planning process in the four major metropolitan regions of California - Sacramento, the San Francisco Bay Area, Los Angeles, and San Diego - originally in response to a request from the California Resources Agency to assess best practices in multi-jurisdictional, multi-issue planning for growth and development, and subsequently in conjunction with both the California Center for Regional Leadership and the State Department of Transportation (CalTrans).

During and after the late 1990s, "visioning" processes were organized in each of the four regions to devise "preferred scenarios" for growth and development - land use projections that

---

1 The term "blueprint planning" was adopted by the state in 2005 with establishment of CalTrans' California Regional Blueprint Planning Program. The program provided $5 million for grants for Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) "to conduct comprehensive scenario planning that results in consensus by regional leaders, local governments and stakeholders on a preferred growth scenario - or 'blueprint' - for a twenty-year planning horizon... It is anticipated that the regional blueprint planning grants will build capacity for regional collaboration and integrated planning that will in turn enable regions to plan to accommodate all their future growth, thereby reducing need for sprawl" (program website). The governor's current state budget proposal would renew funding for the program in the upcoming fiscal year.
would then lay a basis for regional transportation investment and air quality plans. These processes involved multiple stakeholders – local elected officials; regional and local planners; representatives from interest groups such as homebuilders, environmentalists, and affordable housing advocates; and members of the public. They have enabled more coordinated, deliberative, and strategic growth planning than has been possible through most other governmental decision frameworks in the state in recent years. Most regions envision expanding the blueprint scope to include multiple infrastructure areas (energy, water supply) and environmental areas (habitat planning, parks). This expansion could turn the blueprints into truly comprehensive regional growth plans.

The potential of blueprint planning to articulate consensus and improve decisionmaking on growth policy is promising, but the blueprint process entails certain weaknesses. Ironically, in spite of the comprehensive, deliberative nature of blueprint planning, it is undertaken by governmental agencies with no independent authority – namely, Councils of Governments (COGs) and Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs). COGs, established in most urban areas in the state, operate as voluntary forums for local governments to consider matters of common concern. They generally coincide with MPOs, which are designated under federal law for developing long-range plans for regional transportation investment.

COG/MPOs have been the institutional nexus for blueprints because they bring together regional systems-level planning functions (for transportation and air quality, in response to state and federal mandates) and the community-level land use authority of local governments (cities and counties). But COG/MPOs have no actual land use authority; they can only influence local policy through identifying funding incentives from their own resources, or through peer pressure, advice, or technical assistance. This lack of direct authority presents a difficult challenge for implementing blueprint land use objectives – that is, for translating the merely advisory “preferred scenarios” into reality on the ground. Currently, in the four regions we studied, blueprint planners are engaged in the implementation phase.

Our review of blueprint processes identified the following major components and best practices that may help ensure more effective outcomes.

1) Identifying goals and objectives

In each of the four regions, a first step was articulating smart growth goals and objectives to help focus blueprint visioning. The importance of the goal-setting stage was in allowing participants to exchange views and define shared values, ultimately translating them into quantifiable objectives and performance measures for modeling such regional outcomes as transportation mobility, environmental quality, and jobs-housing balance.

At this stage, one “best practice” is to include among blueprint objectives regional jobs-housing balance, in other words “housing our own,” by accommodating all housing growth associated with projected job growth within the region, rather than allowing commuting from other areas to function as an escape valve. Two regions failed substantially in meeting this objective in recent blueprint efforts. As metropolitan development extends beyond existing COG/MPO boundaries, and sometimes spills over to neighboring regions, jurisdictional boundaries may need to be changed and inter-regional planning frameworks strengthened. In
any case, planning processes that fail to integrate anticipated housing and job locations with mobility strategies for metro residents cannot be considered fully comprehensive or effective.

2) Creating an effective decision process for blueprint development

Another key to success is gaining widespread support for goals and objectives, given that the whole process is largely voluntary. Leadership needs to be fully integrated across governmental and non-governmental boundaries, and across the COG/MPO and regional and local divides.

Although most COG/MPOs are coincident in California, a few are not, and the two entities actually reflect a fundamental tension between equally important tasks – to facilitate interaction and consensus-building among localities (broad participation), on the one hand, and to facilitate processes that identify clear regional objectives for transportation, the environment, and other functional regional systems, on the other. Combining these capacities is much easier in smaller regions. Devolving planning to sub-regional entities can help, but only if the same two capacities remain integrated.

Extra-governmental stakeholders have been an important stimulus for blueprint planning in most cases. Experience suggests that blueprint processes need to fully integrate governmental/non-governmental participation, or outcomes may be disappointing. Strong leadership from the COG/MPO governing board is critical to success, but extra-governmental actors also add an important element, sometimes acting as “honest brokers” able to mediate long-standing inter-governmental political conflicts – even helping to rejuvenate COG/MPOs in the bargain – and sometimes pushing blueprint planning to tackle and integrate new policy areas.

Best practices we identified in governance arrangements include, first, establishing a regional policy committee of local elected officials that reports to the COG/MPO governing body and is responsible for overseeing blueprint development, and second, establishing other working committees of local planners, public works officials, and extra-governmental stakeholders to help implement the project at all stages.

3) Developing blueprint “visions”

The visioning stage of blueprint planning involves public outreach through workshops offered throughout a region. At these workshops, invited stakeholders and members of the public work together to test outcomes of alternate land use scenarios in relation to local and regional growth and quality of life indicators, such as traffic congestion, air quality, housing affordability, jobs-housing balance, transit use, and preservation of open space. Preferred scenarios from local workshops are then compiled and synthesized, and a small number of regional alternative scenarios are developed for final consideration.

An important best practice at the visioning stage is the use of urban simulation computer modeling, such as PLACE/S, which allows participants to visualize future land uses and gain immediate feedback in testing key indicators measured both regionally and locally. Such modeling educates participants on the impact of development choices; it may also facilitate conflict resolution by focusing on measurable outcomes.
Another best practice is to hold a workshop in each jurisdiction in the region, ensuring that elected officials play a key role and engaging local planners from all jurisdictions in helping synthesize workshop results into final alternative scenarios. These tasks are more difficult in very large regions of the state, and finding effective sub-regional coordinating mechanisms has proved to be a challenge. Below the metropolitan regional scale of the MPO, there are generally few institutions that act as “mini-COG/MPOs” – that is, by integrating both the functions.

4) Selecting and adopting a “preferred scenario”

The blueprint development phase culminates with the selection of one “preferred” land use and related population and employment scenario, often at a large regional workshop. A principal goal of the process has been for the COG/MPO subsequently to adopt the preferred scenario as its official projected regional land use pattern, which forms a basis for regional long-range transportation investment and air quality plans. Three of the four COG/MPOs did adopt land use projections reflecting “smart growth” scenarios that diverged from current local policies.

COG/MPO projections are estimates of likely population and employment patterns looking ahead a minimum of twenty years; they are not actual plans or mandates. So-called “policy-based” projections (those that envision “smart growth” development patterns that differ from existing local plans and policies) must be translated into local development choices to be realized. The regions with adopted policy-based projections face a fairly short (less than ten-year) window of time in which to ensure that the smart growth scenarios are actually implemented in local government land use policies, or they risk losing federal approval of the scenarios as the basis for transportation and air quality plans. One region reverted to using current land use policy as the basis for its transportation plan after recognizing that localities had failed to alter land uses to conform to a desired smart growth scenario.

Experience suggests that the gap between current and preferred land use practice in the scenarios might be wide enough to provide a push toward new planning and resource allocation strategies. However, this gap should be narrow enough to be realizable in the medium as well as the long term.

The definition of what is “realistic” may well be a bone of contention, considering the unpredictability not only of market forces but also of state and federal policy. However, achieving a widely-supported compromise (if not a uniform consensus) on a desired outcome is a critical objective for blueprint processes; without such agreement the momentum needed for implementation is less likely to be achieved. Because COG/MPO land use projections are updated continually on a four-year basis (in air quality non-compliance areas), blueprint visions need not be viewed as static and unchangeable. Rather, COG/MPOs are learning how visioning can be incorporated into iterative, ongoing processes for transportation, land use, and environmental planning.

5) Implementing the vision

The basic blueprint implementation task is to realize the region's preferred growth vision by supporting local communities in undertaking and approving development projects, zoning and general plan changes, and other measures aimed at closing the gap between the preferred scenario and current practice. In the four regions studied, implementation strategies
generally identify priority development areas and determine criteria for targeting resources to support projects in those areas. Resources range from basic technical assistance in updating local plans to funding development projects.

In general, best practices combine outcome-oriented performance objectives, flexible implementation, and incentives for participation. A common best practice is to devote a portion of regional transportation funds (either state and federal funds programmed by the COG/MPO or local funds raised through county sales tax measures) to incentive grants for localities that support regional objectives. Benefits of this competitive process include incentivizing better local planning proposals, creating “smart growth development examples” for the region, allowing the best ideas to float to the top, and retaining a voluntary participation framework. However, these grant programs also face pitfalls and challenges, in particular, a difficult trade-off between concentrating resources on fewer projects with greater impact and spreading resources more widely to maintain political buy-in.

Two MPOs adopted policies that go a step further, declaring that the extension of transit stops in their regions would be contingent on localities adopting supportive land use policies. Decisions about whether and how to bring this hammer to bear will test the voluntary COG/MPO governance model.

Organizational strategies are another key element of implementation; again, best practices establish stronger connections between regional and local objectives for transportation and land use, combining performance criteria, flexible implementation, and incentives. Programs organized at the scale of transportation corridors provide good examples; this scale brings localities together around a shared resource. Another organizational best practice is iterative “blueprint-style” transportation and land use modeling. In such a process, mutually supportive land use and transportation policies are developed, tested, and retailed. Increasingly flexible transit strategies being pursued in many regions facilitate such processes.

Finally, in multi-county regions an important organizational strategy involves engaging county-level transportation agencies. County transportation agencies control substantial transportation funding choices, but few have pursued integrated transportation-land use planning. Until their leverage is brought to bear, blueprint planning will not achieve its full potential.

Environmental Planning Issues

Environmental planning is sometimes called the third – and shortest – leg of the blueprint stool. Although regional environmental planning is a goal of each COG/MPO we studied, incorporating it into blueprint planning has not advanced as far as transportation or housing. However, a fully comprehensive regional plan requires more than designating priority areas for more concentrated development. The counterpart is designating natural resource and working landscape lands that are off-limits to development. Only through adding in this piece of the puzzle can political consensus be fully achieved between regional environmental and economic development goals. With most development in the state still occurring at the suburban and rural fringe of metropolitan areas, focusing only on infill
development while failing to address how development proceeds in “greenfield” areas may doom blueprints to failure.

In general, the state has established few planning requirements that link environmental mandates to local land use in regional frameworks. One significant exception provides a useful model for blueprint plans. The Natural Communities Conservation Planning Program (NCCP) was established in the early 1990s to create multi-species habitat preserves at a bioregional scale through cooperation among state, federal, and regional agencies; local governments; landowners; environmentalists; and other stakeholders. It exemplifies the same recipe for success described earlier, combining clear outcome-oriented standards with flexible implementation techniques. By streamlining environmental review and mitigation at the project scale, this program provides a model for a blueprint approach to environmental planning.

The State’s Role

What, if anything, should the state government do to support blueprint planning? Insofar as it provides a promising venue for resolving long-standing growth concerns, blueprint planning warrants state support. Without further support, blueprint planning may well prove ineffective. The state establishes the framework of regulatory and fiscal incentives and mandates that local governments face when they make land use choices, and to the degree that the current framework does not support smart growth principles, blueprints may be working against the tide.

Blueprints are fundamentally about re-distributing resources to promote certain objectives, and unless mutual benefits are very obvious to participants, policy consensus may be prone to collapse if some jurisdictions feel cheated. In general, when it comes to policies that redistribute resources, state action is likely to be necessary.

However, shifting resources to promote new outcomes requires some degree of consensus on desirable goals and objectives. Although smart growth strategies may not work well without state support, their success depends equally on gaining local support. For these reasons, the consensus-building aspect of blueprint planning could be very valuable to the state, which might mean the state government itself would choose to engage in blueprint planning as more participant than arbiter. State policies can support blueprint planning in certain basic ways: Supporting local smart growth activity, coordinating state growth policies, coordinating planning processes, and linking state goals and actions to blueprints.

Many blueprint participants advocate that the state provide incentives to localities that adopt smart growth strategies – in particular, building the capacity of local governments in inner urban areas to support infill housing production and associated infrastructure and services. The legislature took a big step in support of local smart growth activity in the spring of 2006 by passing a multi-billion dollar bond proposal to be placed on the November ballot. It includes, among other things, $300 million in assistance for transit-oriented development and $850 million largely for grants for capital outlay related to infill development. As of this writing, it remains up to the voters whether blueprint development objectives get this substantial boost in state support.
Another useful step would be for the state to provide direct support for local planning. Proactive community planning helps residents understand, evaluate, and obtain potential benefits of smart growth, for example by supporting long-term local development strategies to improve amenities, infrastructure, and services that new development could help finance.

However, many blueprint practitioners argue that the state needs to do more than reward local smart growth activities. They contend that the state should clarify and coordinate its growth goals, objectives, and policies to help ensure that its programs and investments do not work at cross-purposes. In this view, for example, it makes little sense for the state to direct either mandates or subsidies to locals to support housing production while state fiscal policies, particularly related to property taxes, serve to deter that production. Similarly, if the state wants to promote efficient development patterns and resource use, it might make sense to situate new university campuses in built-up urban areas with transit access rather than in greenfield locations, in spite of higher initial construction costs.

Many blueprint practitioners also believe the state could do more to align planning processes and to support ongoing planning coordination. A practical step would be to coordinate planning cycles, such as those for local government general plans, the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA), and Regional Transportation Plans. Given the extreme contentiousness of RHNA in recent years, it also might make sense to devolve its implementation to the more flexible strategies encompassed by blueprints.

Another important aspect of planning coordination will be for the state to consider how to strengthen sub-regional and intra-regional blueprint planning – for example, how to build stronger linkages between county transportation agencies and regional blueprints, and between COG/MPOs in areas where development has spilled across jurisdictional boundaries and now overlaps substantially. Ultimately, the state must consider how to promote inter-connected, nested planning at multiple scales.

How and whether to explicitly link state growth goals, objectives, and resources with blueprints is a complicated issue. At a minimum, a useful step would be continuing – or increasing – the state budget allocation of $5 million, provided annually for the last two years in the governor’s budget, for grants to support regional blueprint planning.

Some blueprint practitioners argue the state should go much further and conform its policies and resources to blueprint plans and their objectives. Others counter that it is more important for the state to clarify and align its own goals, objectives, and programs. Those can then work in tandem with regional and local strategies when and where appropriate.

Perhaps a middle ground would be for the state to determine whether a blueprint advances a few key, clearly-defined performance goals (such as promoting jobs-housing balance and housing affordability, improving air and water quality and species preservation, maintaining working landscapes and open space, and reducing vehicle miles traveled compared to a projected business-as-usual scenario) and then direct resources to support the plan’s strategies and objectives. This approach would exemplify the practices outlined above – establishing performance-oriented objectives and encouraging flexibility in implementation.
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