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, June 12, 2008
1:15 to 3:15 p.m.
SANDAG, 7th Floor Conference Room
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101-4231

Staff Contact: Carolina Gregor
(619) 699-1989
cgr@sandag.org

AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

• ELECTION OF NEW TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR
• TransNet SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM
• TOOLS TO INCREASE THE REGION’S HOUSING SUPPLY: RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE REGIONAL ECONOMIC PROSPERITY STRATEGY AND REGIONAL HOUSING AND SMART GROWTH FINANCING STRATEGY
• REGIONAL CLIMATE ACTION PLAN (RCAP) GREENHOUSE GAS ANALYSIS RESULTS

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.
# REGIONAL PLANNING TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP

Thursday, June 12, 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM #</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>PUBLIC COMMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Members of the public will have the opportunity to address the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG) on any issue within the jurisdiction of the Working Group. Speakers are limited to three minutes each.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONSENT ITEMS (#3 and #4)**

| +3. | MEETING SUMMARIES | APPROVE |
|     | The Working Group should review and approve the attached meeting summaries: |
|     | 3a. March 13, 2008 |
|     | 3b. April 10, 2008 |
|     | 3c. May 22, 2008 |

| +4. | TECHNICAL UPDATE TO THE SMART GROWTH CONCEPT MAP (Carolina Gregor) | INFORMATION |
|     | Attached is the June 6, 2008, report to the Regional Planning Committee on the technical update to the Smart Growth Concept Map. The maps and site descriptions are posted on line at www.sandag.org/RCP. The SANDAG Board of Directors is scheduled to take action on this item at its June 27, 2008, meeting. Staff will report back to the TWG next month on the Board’s action. |

**REPORT ITEMS (#5 through #11)**

| 5. | ELECTION OF NEW TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR | ELECT |
|    | Jim Sandoval of Chula Vista has retired, leaving the TWG Chair position vacant. Jon Brindle, Planning and Building Director for the City of Escondido, currently serves as the TWG Vice Chair. Nominations for Chair and for Vice Chair will be conducted. The TWG should elect its new officers. |

| 6. | RECOGNITION OF LANCE SCHULTE, FORMERLY OF THE NORTH COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT (NCTD) | INFORMATION |
|    | The TWG will recognize Lance Schulte, formerly of NCTD, who represented NCTD on the TWG and worked on transit issues in North County, including the development of master plans for the Carlsbad, Escondido, and Oceanside transit stations. Thank you for your regional service, Lance! |
7. **LOCAL AWARDS BY THE SAN DIEGO CHAPTER OF THE AMERICAN PLANNING ASSOCIATION (SDAPA) (Bill Chopyk, City of La Mesa and SDAPA President)**

On June 5, 2008, the San Diego Chapter of the American Planning Association held its annual awards banquet. Bill Chopyk will announce the award winners, including the San Marcos Creek Specific Plan, which won an Award of Merit.

8. **TransNet SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM (Stephan Vance)**

The TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program ad hoc working group has developed a set of criteria for evaluating and ranking proposed capital improvement projects under the program and has initiated discussion on criteria for evaluating the planning grant projects. The TWG will be asked to provide comments and a recommendation to the Regional Planning Committee (RPC) on the capital improvement criteria, and to provide input on the planning grant criteria.

9. **TOOLS TO INCREASE THE REGION’S HOUSING SUPPLY: RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE REGIONAL ECONOMIC PROSPERITY STRATEGY AND REGIONAL HOUSING AND SMART GROWTH FINANCING STRATEGY (Susan Baldwin and Marney Cox)**

A. The RPC received a report on the Regional Economic Prosperity Strategy (REPS) in August 2007. The Strategy sets forth nine goals toward increasing economic prosperity in the region, including a goal to increase the region’s housing supply. Staff will discuss the REPS recommendations regarding how to increase housing supply in the region. The TWG should discuss the role of local jurisdictions in the implementation of these recommendations.

B. In addition to the work on developing planning tools to support smart growth in the San Diego region, SANDAG staff is working on the initial components of a Regional Housing and Smart Growth Financing Strategy to support implementation of the Smart Growth Concept Map. The attached report outlines existing and potential funding sources that will be included in the strategy. The TWG should review these sources and provide input on the development of this strategy.

10. **REGIONAL CLIMATE ACTION PLAN (RCAP) GREENHOUSE GAS ANALYSIS RESULTS (Brian Holland)**

As part of a two-year agreement with the California Energy Commission, SANDAG is preparing a Regional Climate Action Plan. Staff will present an analysis of greenhouse gas emissions forecasts and mitigation scenarios from the transportation sector. TWG members will be invited to provide feedback on the analysis and on RCAP planning activities going forward.
+11. PROGRESS REPORT ON LOCAL I-PLACE3S PILOT PROJECTS (Carolina Gregor)  INFORMATION

Last fall, as part of the Smart Growth Tool Box to implement the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP), SANDAG and local planning staffs initiated work on three local I-PLACE3S pilot projects. This report summarizes the progress made on the projects. A presentation will be made featuring highlights from each project.

+12. DRAFT REGIONAL SEDIMENT MANAGEMENT PLAN: REQUEST FOR INPUT (Andrea Groves, SANDAG Staff; Chris Webb, Moffatt and Nichol)  DISCUSSION

The Regional Sediment Management Plan (RSMP) seeks to identify regional sediment sources and efficient methods of providing sediment to nourish local beaches. Staff and the consultant team will provide an overview of the Draft RSMP and solicit comments from the TWG. Comments are due on June 26, 2008.

13. ADJOURNMENT AND NEXT MEETING  INFORMATION

The next TWG meeting will be held on Thursday, July 10, 2008, from 1:15 p.m. to 3:15 p.m.

+ next to an item indicates an attachment
SUMMARY OF MARCH 13, 2008, TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP MEETING  File Number 3000200

Agenda Item #1: Welcome and Introductions
Jim Sandoval, City of Chula Vista, chaired the meeting. Tina Christiansen and Rich Whipple from the City of Solana Beach were welcomed. Nancy Bragado, City of San Diego, was congratulated on the completion of the General Plan Update. Lance Schulte, North County Transit District, was congratulated for opening of the SPRINT Line, which is now up and running. Self-introductions were conducted.

Agenda Item #2: Public Comments and Communications
Carolina Gregor, SANDAG, announced that the “Walk San Diego Brown Bag Luncheon” will be held March 19th from 12 noon to 1 p.m. The luncheon will focus on the various programs, both past and present, that SANDAG has undertaken to make San Diego a more walkable city.

Bill Chopyk, City of La Mesa, presented an award to SANDAG on behalf of the American Planning Association for co-sponsoring the “Regional Planning Commissioner’s Lunch Workshop.”

Ms. Gregor announced that the National Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is offering technical assistance through its Smart Growth Implementation Program. Additionally, the EPA is calling for smart growth projects to be entered to receive 2008 National Achievement Awards.

Christine Eary, SANDAG, announced that SANDAG and a consultant will be preparing a Smart Growth Trip generation study and parking demand guidelines. SANDAG will use these to update the San Diego Traffic Generator’s Manual and the Not-so-Brief Guide to Trip Generation for the San Diego Region. SANDAG is currently in contract negotiations with a consultant but it intends to have 40-60 potential study areas by the time the consultant arrives. The initial basis for the locations will come from the Smart Growth Photo Library List, but only the locations that have built on-the-ground projects will be applicable. In two weeks SANDAG will send out e-mails with location descriptions, at which point cities may make additions or revisions.

CONSENT ITEMS (Items 3 through 5)

Agenda Item #3: Summary of January 10, 2008, Technical Working Group Meeting
TWG Minutes were approved.
Agenda Item #4: Updated TWG Roster and Form 700 Statement of Economic Interests

Ms. Gregor announced that the TWG roster is now up-to-date. She explained that SANDAG has a list of TWG members from which we have yet to receive a Form 700. She requested that cities on the list forward their Form 700 directly to Deborah Gunn at SANDAG.

REPORT ITEMS (Items 5 through 10)

Agenda Item #5: Reports from TWG Members

Mr. Sandoval shared that Ms. Gregor, on behalf of SANDAG, recently gave a Smart Growth Visualization Tools presentation at the City of Chula Vista’s Brown Bag Lunch Series. The presentation showed how these visualization tools could be applied. The presentation was met with a large turnout.

Roger Post, City of National City, announced that the city is partnering with the Urban Land Institute (ULI) for a study on the transit access corridor along the 24th Street Trolley Station. The study will begin the first week in April.

Agenda Item #6: Regional Quality of Life Measure Overview

Rob Rundle, SANDAG, spoke on the Quality of Life measure and how it is being implemented to fund transportation and non-transportation infrastructure needs in the region. The purpose of the Quality of Life measure is to identify a funding source to fill the significant gap regional infrastructure needs.

Mr. Rundle provided some background on the Quality of Life measure. He explained that it all began by looking at the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP). The RCP ties together the transportation, land use, and infrastructure plans for the region. A component of the RCP, the Integrated Regional Infrastructure Strategy (IRIS), examines other aspects of infrastructure, such as education, stormwater conveyance systems, and other infrastructure services. At the Board of Directors meeting in January 2007, the Board began to address the issue of how these infrastructure needs would be funded, with an emphasis on seeking an ongoing revenue source.

The Board of Directors concluded that there were four main areas in need of an ongoing funding source. SANDAG did not commit to providing funding; however, agreed to seek out a funding source. Various revenue sources were discussed, but none were agreed upon. It seemed that there would need to be further research into the topic to fully understand the scope and cost of the infrastructure needs.

It was decided that this topic would be the central focus of the Board retreat held in January 2008. The result was, for various reasons, that they would be unable to pursue a ballot measure by the previously stated deadline (four years after the passage of the TransNet Extension).

SANDAG currently lacks the legislative authority to put a sales tax measure on the ballot to fund these types of issues because these infrastructure needs do not have a direct nexus with transportation. The thinking is that as separate issues, these infrastructures areas are not likely to
receive the voter support necessary to pass. An effort is being made to bundle these issues together so that they have a greater chance of gaining voter approval. The following is a summary estimate of funding needed for the four infrastructure areas:

- Beach Sand Replenishment: $200 million
- Habitat Conservation: $1.8-$2.4 billion
- Stormwater: $1.5-$3.4 billion
- Transit Enhancements: $9.6-$11.8 billion

The data on beach sand replenishment is based on previous efforts, and its exact costs will vary based on how often replenishment efforts would occur (every five years, every ten years, etc.). The basis of the stormwater information comes from the Integrated Regional Water Management Plan (IRWM), which was put together by the City of San Diego, County of San Diego, and the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). This plan includes a list of projects and proposition money, and it serves as a starting point. The transit data comes from the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), which currently lacks sufficient revenue to fully fund the transit improvements.

There is a substantial need for more polling information, especially since previous polls did not include transit. The board is interested in seeing whether the various components will culminate in a favorable voting package in the eyes of voters.

Bob Leiter, SANDAG, added that with respect to public transit, a real impetus for that came out of recent state budget cuts in transit subsidies. Public transit is a major quality of life issue because combined with smart growth planning, it is one of most effective means available for addressing climate change issues.

Mr. Sandoval inquired as to whether there had been discussion from elected officials on tying issues of fire safety to habitat mitigation. Perhaps, incorporating issues such as responsible brush clearing into habitat mitigation might help garner public support.

Mr. Rundle responded that that is part of the reason for the large range in costs for habitat conservation. Many details need to be worked out, but the issue of fire safety was discussed.

Mr. Sandoval asked whether any responsible entity had been designated for mitigation, monitoring and maintenance.

Mr. Rundle replied that the Board allocates funds on an annual basis in accordance with certain milestones met based on the Environmental Mitigation Program. One of the milestones met was to get an agreement signed with Caltrans and the resource agencies, which occurred at the last Board meeting. The result was the release of funds to evaluate the structure of habitat conservation services.

Bill Chopyk, City of La Mesa, noted the wide cost range and the lack of plan specifics, particularly in the area of water quality. He asked whether Mr. Rundle was seeking input or providing more of an update.

Mr. Rundle replied that the purpose of today was to give the Technical Working Group a sense of what happened at the board retreat, and there will be many opportunities to get specific input.
Mr. Leiter commented that water quality is by far the most complex of the areas. At a staff level, SANDAG worked with Chandra Waller and the San Diego County Public Works Department staff, as well as the City Manager of Imperial Beach and John Robertus of the RWQCB, to create a regional water quality plan. The Committee intended to educate itself and the board on the issues it faces as well as the cost parameters. Water quality is the most uncertain of the issues and there seems to be a lot of frustration with the program itself, and the impacts of funding on local jurisdictions.

**Agenda Item #7: Draft Technical Update of the Smart Growth Concept Map**

Carolina Gregor, SANDAG, stated that in anticipation of the call for projects for the TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program (SGIP) this summer, SANDAG is conducting a technical update of the Smart Growth Concept Map. The update will ensure that the map reflects updates to the transportation network based on the recently adopted 2030 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and any recent updates to local land use plans.

Ms. Gregor reminded the group that the map was used in preparation of the RTP, and that transit services to many of the Potential smart growth areas that met the land use targets. As a result, many of the sites have since changed status from potential to existing/planned. In addition, SANDAG has been working with jurisdictions to determine whether they would like to request any additions or deletions to the map. SANDAG has received many boundary modifications and several areas were replaced with other areas, but the actual number of Smart Growth areas has not changed. The status and timeline of rural villages is currently under evaluation.

In addition, SANDAG is currently in the process of evaluating military areas as they relate to housing and employment centers. In addition, in light of a letter from the Attorney General right before the RTP was adopted in November, SANDAG is looking at ways to incorporate possible changes into the Smart Growth Concept Map that could still be looked upon as technical updates. One option is to remove the areas that are designated as Potential because of their lack of meeting the land use targets and where SANDAG was unable to add transit service. She asked for input on this issue.

Ms. Gregor also explained that SANDAG will be taking the Smart Growth Concept Map to the Regional Planning Committee in the following month. Following the Regional Planning Committee meeting, the final draft will be taken to the Board for approval in time for the TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program “call for projects.”

Mr. Sandoval commented that last month the Regional Planning Committee had a lively discussion in the context of the Attorney General’s letter. He suggested that while the rural areas give you less bang for your buck in terms of reaching smart growth objectives, it is still important to recognize rural areas.

Coleen Clementson, SANDAG, stated that the focus of this effort was to conduct a technical update of the map, noting which areas changed status due to transit improvement and land use changes. Discussions are ongoing with the Attorney General. Eventually, SANDAG might be required to make policy level changes. At the moment, however, SANDAG is considering technical steps which might be viewed more favorably by the Attorney General, such as eliminating areas without transit and that have not met land use requirements.
Mr. Sandoval inquired as to whether, because this update is more technical, the board will have the opportunity to comment on policy changes in the future. Ms. Clementson confirmed that it would.

Andy Hamilton, Air Pollution Control District (APCD), asked if the concept map would be used in the future to enable grant money and as a means to target transit service. He wondered if the data on the map might influence the County of San Diego to change the zoning in rural areas, such as Fallbrook and Ramona.

Devon Mutto, County of San Diego, replied that much of the changes on the map are reflective of planning efforts underway. The map is being used to designate core areas to focus development and thus reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

Mr. Hamilton asked if the concept map would be used in the future to enable grant money and as a means to target transit service. He wondered if the data on the map might influence the County of San Diego to change the zoning in rural areas, such as Fallbrook and Ramona.

Devon Mutto, County of San Diego, replied that much of the changes on the map are reflective of planning efforts underway. The map is being used to designate core areas to focus development and thus reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

Mr. Hamilton asked if the concept map would be used in the future to enable grant money and as a means to target transit service. He wondered if the data on the map might influence the County of San Diego to change the zoning in rural areas, such as Fallbrook and Ramona.

Devon Mutto, County of San Diego, replied that much of the changes on the map are reflective of planning efforts underway. The map is being used to designate core areas to focus development and thus reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

Mr. Hamilton asked if the concept map would be used in the future to enable grant money and as a means to target transit service. He wondered if the data on the map might influence the County of San Diego to change the zoning in rural areas, such as Fallbrook and Ramona.

Devon Mutto, County of San Diego, replied that much of the changes on the map are reflective of planning efforts underway. The map is being used to designate core areas to focus development and thus reduce greenhouse gas emissions.
other approaches such as higher intensities and higher transit, per AB 32 requirements to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. SANDAG has informed the Attorney General that this sort of planning analysis will generate more information. Timing has been a source of difficulty.

Mr. Sandoval summarized that he did not hear support for removing the potential areas from the map as suggested earlier and added that in order to implement smart growth, we need support for transit funding. Intolerance for congestion leads people to switch to transit.

**Agenda Item #8: Status Report on Visual Simulation Efforts and Draft Locations for Smart Growth Photo Library**

Ms. Gregor reported that a report to the Regional Planning Committee is included in the agenda packet, announcing the final locations selected for the 2-D and 3-D visualization projects that are part of the Smart Growth Tool Box. In addition, also attached is a list of tentative locations of existing smart growth projects for inclusion in the regional Smart Growth Photo Library. Any changes to this list are due by March 14, 2008. All images and simulations will be electronically linked to the Smart Growth Concept Map on SANDAG’s Web site and will be available to local jurisdictions for smart growth presentations and brochures.

**Agenda Item #9: TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program**

Stephan Vance, SANDAG, stated that the first call for projects for the TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program (SGIP) will be issued in Fiscal Year 2009. Staff has been working with an ad hoc working group to develop the program guidelines and project selection criteria. He explained that guidelines are scheduled for approval by the Regional Planning Commission and the SANDAG Board in June. A call for projects is set for July, projects will be reviewed in September and October, and by the end of October the projects will be selected. He asked the TWG for feedback on the initial program design components.

Mr. Schulte stated that the objective criteria should be as quantifiable as possible, such as reductions in Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) and increases in transit ridership.

Mr. Chopyk inquired as to whether or not a planning/project feasibility project would be eligible. He suggested that in the case of a project dependent on entitlements, funds should be withheld until those entitlements are in place. He added that $1 million is not a lot of money for capital improvements and that perhaps a $1.5 million cap should be considered, with planning grants reduced to $150,000.

Chris Schmidt, Caltrans, provided the example of the Park Blvd. Project, which received $20 million in transportation improvement funds from a variety of sources, including many private investments. This corridor provides an excellent case study in obtaining funding resources and an opportunity to learn from the problems the project encountered.

Patrick Murphy, City of Encinitas, voiced concern that grants awarded as part of the Pilot program were not being spent.
Mr. Vance replied that SANDAG has discussed a “use it or lose it” policy, which would present the idea of an annual status check on the status of approved projects. The status check would help ensure that approved projects were under construction within two years.

Ed Batchelder, City of Chula Vista, suggested adding a “how close are you” type of criteria to build readiness into the program.

Mr. Sandoval contributed the concept of adding a “purgatory provision,” in which a project would be put aside until it was ready to move forward.

Mr. Schulte proposed a different idea, that funding should go to built projects only. In this way, jurisdictions that are producing smart growth projects would be rewarded with funding to support additional improvements based on past progress.

Linda Niles, City of Del Mar, responded that smaller cities simply do not have the resources to fund planning projects themselves. If a city is not able to do the planning, it will never be able to compete for capital funds. She explained that the group felt that $200,000 was the lowest planning grants should go.

Vicki Parker, City of Vista, concurred, adding that it is a double-whammy because when the housing element is taken into account, cities do not get full credit.

Mr. Sandoval suggested considering design and engineering.

Mr. Murphy voiced his approval for the purgatory concept. He stated that readiness needs to be a serious consideration. Funds must be spent in order to build projects and can be examples of smart growth. He put forth the idea of reallocating Policy 33 points to project readiness.

Mr. Vance clarified that the discussion circulated around project readiness being a component of the screening criteria.

Mr. Chopyk stated that a $200,000 cap was fine for planning, but that a $1 million cap for capital is too low.

Mr. Sandoval agreed, adding that at that level, the capital grant serves more as gap financing.

Mr. Vance expressed that the program would encourage applications with matching funds.

Mr. Chopyk shared that in La Mesa, $7 million was going into the gap financing of a project.

Ms. Niles clarified that $1 million had been suggested because it provided the ability to fund more projects.

Mr. Leiter observed that this issue was worth returning to with more information. He explained that SANDAG is currently conducting interviews with mixed-use developers, and input from them can be considered.
Mr. Sandoval added that timing should also be brought to discussion because it is worth looking at what point in the process there is project certainty.

**Agenda Item #10: TransNet Environmental Mitigation Program**

Keith Greer, SANDAG, stated that in February 2008, the SANDAG Board approved entering into a Memorandum of Agreement with the wildlife agencies and Caltrans to implement the TransNet Environmental Mitigation Program (EMP). In addition, the Board approved $5.3 million in funding for land management and biological monitoring. Of this amount, $2.9 million will be made available for land management through a competitive grant process.

He stated that the purpose of this memorandum is to obtain funding for project mitigation long before projects are being built so that land can be acquired to ensure that land set aside works in favor of the regional conservation plans. Double the benefit is reaped by both buying the land early (at a lower cost) and implementing the regional conservation plans.

The Memorandum of Agreement does three things:

1) Identifies TransNet regional transportation projects, as well as local streets and roads  
2) Aligns those projects to regional conservation needs  
3) Puts caps on the amount of funding that can be spent on a per-year basis for 10 years

The memorandum will develop a strategy for which lands get acquired, how those lands meet transportation mitigation needs, and put a cap on how much funding can be spent. The second provision allocates $4 million annually over the next 10 years for regional management and monitoring of the species covered by the conservation plans. This funding will provide land management activities (invasive removal, signage on trails) and regional monitoring of the species that are supposed to be covered by the plans.

The MOA for land acquisition is tied to transportation but is also intended to help the regional conservation plans by buying land in advance of need. Over the next four years it will generate $340 million. In the next couple months SANDAG will work with Caltrans and wildlife agencies to identify a type of process and selection criteria before going forward with an opportunity for solicitations. The criteria will likely focus around project readiness, biological need, urgency, and areas affected by fire. The competitive grant for land management in 2008, $2.9 million, will go to invasive control, fire recovery, restoration, access, and control and management.

In April the criteria will be taken to the SANDAG Board, and by May, there should be a call for projects. Applications will be reviewed in June and then ranked, prioritized, and brought to the Board in July. This process will be repeated on an annual basis to ensure that the environmental needs of the region are addressed.

Mr. Sandoval noted that SANDAG seems to be mitigating by habitat type. He asked whether mitigation was regionwide, tied to a subarea plan, or focused on the area where impacts are occurring.
Mr. Greer responded that SANDAG initially wanted to develop a program in which it provides a certain amount of funding annually, no questions asked, and, in reciprocation, it would receive permits. Within a year, SANDAG learned that this idea would not be legally feasible. The next option was for SANDAG to guarantee a certain amount of funding in return for a certain amount of assurances and allow funding to be distributed freely. SANDAG learned that its mitigation efforts could be carried out without much restriction geographically, so long as it mitigated on the coastal side of SR 67. The caveat was that because wetlands and uplands are dissimilar, SANDAG would need to mitigate in both types of habitats. Funds will be directed by habitat areas proportionate to the size and location of developments.

Mr. Chopyk inquired about what agency has the ultimate authority over monitoring and mitigation and to whom is the report sent.

Mr. Greer responded that all reports end up on his desk and, from those, Mr. Greer generates an annual report on the allocation of funds. No one is responsible for approving the reports because the regional monitoring program is in such a process of infancy that it is not yet known exactly what needs to be monitored. However, similar to transportation planning, it has been concluded that monitoring must be done on a regional scale.

Mr. Greer added that funding allocation gets approved by the board for regional monitoring, and ultimately the agencies weigh in as part of a technical working group. The agencies prioritize conservation efforts and compile data. For example, their research may lead to the conclusion that cactus wren gnatcatcher conservation is currently more vital than gnatcatcher conservation. As of yet, it is not known exactly how that information is utilized by the agencies. In the realm of research, SANDAG continues to record information which will eventually be posted on the Web site. This is part of a 10-year project, which will then have a comprehensive review.

**Agenda Item #11: Adjournment and Next Meeting**

There was discussion as to whether the TWG should conduct a field trip of the SPRINTER line recently opened by the North County Transit District, and it was concluded that SANDAG should arrange the tour in the morning to maximize attendance. The meeting was adjourned.
San Diego Association of Governments  
REGIONAL PLANNING TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP  

June 12, 2008  

AGENDA ITEM NO.: 3b  

Action Requested: APPROVE  

SUMMARY OF APRIL 10, 2008, JOINT MEETING BETWEEN THE REGIONAL PLANNING TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP AND THE SPRINTER SMART GROWTH WORKING GROUP  

Agenda Item #1: SPRINTER Tour and Walking Tour of Downtown Oceanside  
Lance Schulte of the North County Transit District (NCTD) and staff members from the cities of Oceanside and Vista led the working groups on a tour of the western segment of the SPRINTER and on a walking tour of downtown Oceanside.  

Agenda Item #2: Welcome and Introductions (Business Meeting)  
Members of the Regional Planning Technical Working Group and the SPRINTER Smart Growth Working Group introduced themselves. Jim Sandoval, TWG Chair, chaired the meeting.  

Agenda Item #3: Public Comments and Communication  
Mike Bullock, resident of Oceanside, suggested shared parking in industrial, transit-oriented development (TOD) settings. This would enable cash out in both settings.  

Note: Several speakers made public comments on site CB-2 on the Smart Growth Concept Map. Because these comments were made during the discussion of that item, they have been reflected under Item #5.  

CONSENT ITEM (#4)  
Agenda Item #4: Proposed Legislation for Increasing Housing Production in the San Diego Region through Regional Contribution Agreements  
Attached was a February 8, 2008, report to the Regional Planning Committee asking the Committee to discuss a proposal for increasing housing production in the region through regional contribution agreements. The report reflects previous discussions on this topic with the TWG.  

The consent agenda was approved.  

REPORT ITEMS (#5 through #6)  
Agenda Item #5: Revised Draft Smart Growth Concept Map  
Carolina Gregor, SANDAG, stated that a report to the Regional Planning Committee on the technical update of the Smart Growth Concept Map was included in the agenda packet, and that the most recently updated regional and subregional maps and corresponding Site Descriptions have been posted to the SANDAG Web site at www.sandag.org. Ms. Gregor reviewed the items in the report, in particular a new recommendation to add a transit layer in the urbanized areas of the
region to show where Community Centers would qualify to meet the transit service targets. She explained that this would be a refinement/clarification to the transit service requirements for Community Centers, and that these urban zones are areas where the transit agencies are focusing their high-frequency local bus services as reflected in the update of the 2030 Regional Transportation Plan, and as contained in the Coordinated Transit Plan. Ms. Gregor added that the staff recommendation is for the TWG to review the revised maps and site descriptions for accuracy, discuss remaining issues, and recommend to the Regional Planning Committee that SANDAG accept the Technical Update of the Smart Growth Concept Map for use in the TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program and for ongoing planning purposes. In addition, she asked for comments on the proposed transit layer approach.

Mike Bullock inquired about the legal challenge to SANDAG in regards to the Attorney General’s letter calling attention to the spread out nature of the smart growth areas on the map. In reference to page 21 of the staff report, he asked if high transit ridership was the suggested means of generating fewer trips. He mentioned that transit is expensive and that operational costs are expensive as well. He felt that this all leads back to the parking issue and that SPRINTER ridership would return to the status quo after a few trips.

Tina Christiansen, City of Solana Beach, inquired as to whether the urban/suburban boundary map on page 28 only affected the Community Center place type. Ms. Gregor responded in the affirmative.

Jerry Backoff, City of San Marcos, commented on land use and transportation targets in suburban areas. He felt that the Community Center density target minimum should be lowered below the current minimum of 20 dwelling units per acre.

Coleen Clementson, SANDAG, explained that SANDAG would take another look at the place type densities during the peer review that will be happening as part of the preparation process of the Smart Growth Design Guidelines.

Nancy Bragado, City of San Diego, commented that it is good to recognize local high-frequency transit in the more urbanized areas in the region. Doing so helps with mobility in urban areas. She expressed support for this concept.

Devon Muto, County of San Diego, voiced concern about the use of the term “urban zones” from the Coordinated Transit Plan on the Smart Growth Concept Map, given the use of the terms urban, suburban, and rural in other local and regional plans within the region. He explained that it seemed as though these areas/boundaries should be defined using different terms that more clearly reflect transit service issues.

Bill Chopyk, City of La Mesa, expressed interest in seeing a more detailed map of the urban/suburban boundary. He stated that it would be beneficial to see a parcel level map with specific boundaries.

Lance Schulte, NCTD, stated that we should think of the urban/suburban boundary as more conceptual, similar to a general plan map level, adding that the transit service area is much less specifically drawn than the term “boundary” suggests. He commented that it should not be thought of at the parcel level and noted that disclaimers in the legend should indicate that the areas depicted are conceptual.
Mr. Sandoval agreed and suggested the use of a conceptual representation for the transit areas. Mr. Sandoval noted that some members of the public had arrived at the meeting, to speak about the Smart Growth Concept Map, and invited them to make their comments.

Michele Fahley, California Indian Legal San Luis Rey Band, contended that the El Salto Falls site should be removed from the Smart Growth Concept Map. El Salto Falls, site CB-2 in Carlsbad, is a sacred Native American site and a culturally significant area. Ms. Fahley added that cultural issues can not be mitigated.

Mel Vernon, San Luis Rey Band/Buena Vista, explained that this issue had been brought up at a SANDAG meeting a couple of years ago, but it went unacknowledged. CB-2 is undoubtedly one of the most controversial sites on the map, but the lack of response to the discontent voiced by community groups does not speak highly of the effectiveness of community input. The Smart Growth Concept Map is a tool, and people build based on the tools in the box. In that sense, the map sets a precedent for regional development. The McMillan Company is proposing 600 units, on the site. Mr. Vernon expressed appreciation for the Smart Growth Concept Map work in general, but contended that the valley should be a “no-build” area. The valley encompasses hundreds and thousands of years of history. It is astonishing that the dot was able to get on the map in the first place because its impact on the cultural corridor is significant. He recognized that there is a vision for the area and he requested to be involved in that vision. He questioned what it would take to get this smart growth dot removed from the map -- its presence is impacting people. He concluded that when something is passed on to generations to come, it should not be a Wal-Mart; it should be the non-renewable resources.

Shelley Hayes Caron, resident of the Marron Adobe, is a direct descendent of the area. She brought visual aides, including photos of the El Salto Waterfall and the quarry site before mining took place. Ms. Caron explained that the proposal is to scrape out the creek bed and allow development. The developers intend to eliminate the waterfall and move the creek bed 150 feet. The plan is currently undergoing environmental review. She explained how they had previously fought against the Wal-Mart shopping center, but that they are facing a pro-development city council. This is a location where school tours are conducted. Eight million dollars of public funds have been spent on the Sherman property to the west, and additional sums of money have been raised, so now half of the valley is an ecological reserve. The proposal to put a road through the new ecological reserve seems absurd. This land serves as a last connective path for wildlife. She advised the Working Group to come see the valley first-hand. She stated that this location should not be part of the Smart Growth Concept Map.

Dennis Huckabay, Buena Vista/Audubon Society, explained that natural resources thrive in the riparian habitat. Mr. Huckabay operates the nature center at the Buena Vista Creek and Lagoon, which is rich in natural resources, including birdlife and wildlife. He shared that students tour the center and that additional restoration and enhancements have been proposed. The Waterfall to Waves corridor is a much-anticipated project, which would create a gathering stream to restore the lagoon. Mr. Huckabay foresees the possibility of an ecological open space with trails and wildlife corridors in this location. He expressed that a new and enhanced Buena Vista Lagoon is an example of smart growth, not the concentration of development proposed by the McMillan Company.

Don Christiansen, citizen of Carlsbad, commented on Item 5 in the addendum, in which staff recommends retaining areas that do not meet both land use and transit targets. He asked if site
CB-2 is one of the sites in question. He voiced that various grassroots organizations want to see more open space around CB-2.

Mr. Christiansen observed that there are no smart growth areas in the Palomar Industrial Area along Palomar Airport Rd. and El Camino Real. He inquired as to why this had not been designated a smart growth area considering the sub-area is a major employment center.

In reference to the Quarry Creek site (CB-2), Mr. Christiansen commented that locating a smart growth area adjacent to a habitat reserve does not make any sense. The area has 9,000 years of history and it was the site of the Portola Expedition of 1769. He commented that, if preserved, this area could end up as something truly unique in North County. Additionally, Carlsbad has three lagoons, which could potentially create a lot of economic benefit if the demand for eco-tourism is capitalized upon.

Mr. Chopyk asked what would be the best way to see the valley.

Mr. Christiansen instructed Mr. Chopyk to take SR 78 and exit south on College Blvd then make a right on Marron and go west toward the Wal-Mart and Kohl’s stores. Looking west one can see the 134 acres preserved for permanent open space as well as El Salto Falls and the Quarry Creek site (CB-2).

Ms. Hayes Caron invited everyone to come to the adobe and see with their own eyes the area in dispute.

Ms. Clementson shared that SANDAG staff had joined many of the speakers and members of the Carlsbad planning staff at the adobe and smart growth site a few months ago. Ms. Clementson suggested setting up a meeting with Carlsbad and organization representatives for additional discussion. She noted that each jurisdiction decided which smart growth areas should be placed on the map. She expressed the desire to ensure that the policymakers have all of the information, and that the concerns about this site are reflected in the staff report to the RPC.

Mr. Vernon stated that cutting this area in half is not acceptable. He explained that compromise would be detrimental in this situation, equating it to cutting a turkey in half. The problem is that the hypothetical turkey is alive, so cutting it would kill it. In such a sense, development on this precious land would damage its function as a vibrant, ecological corridor. He explained that community groups are moving forward with talks with Carlsbad and a meeting is scheduled with Senator Kehoe. He expressed an eagerness to speak with people about this issue, and acknowledged that the people that spoke here today have come in good will with a genuine message.

Mr. Sandoval voiced appreciation for the participation and honesty of the public speakers and thanked Ms. Clementson for her proposal to facilitate additional discussions regarding CB-2. Mr. Sandoval asked staff if there were any additional items related to the map.

Ms. Gregor stated that any updates to the site descriptions would be needed within the next week, and reminded the group that a recommendation was desired.

Tina Christiansen, City of Solana Beach, responded that Solana Beach would submit site description changes to SANDAG.
Andy Hamilton, Air Pollution Control District, made a motion to accept the staff recommendation on the Smart Growth Concept Map, with the understanding that some issues/areas of clarification may still be underway. The motion was seconded, and the group passed the motion unanimously.

**Agenda Item #6: TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program (SGIP)**

Stephan Vance, SANDAG, stated that a report to the Regional Planning Committee on the TransNet SGIP was included in the agenda packet. He discussed proposed changes in the program design resulting from comments from the March TWG meeting, as well as ad hoc working group and internal staff feedback. He also mentioned that the Regional Housing Working Group will meet again later this month and will focus more specifically on the housing-related issues.

Mr. Vance stated that while it is difficult to be objective with urban design characteristics, SANDAG is proposing to do this through an evaluation process which would include a panel including planning and design professionals. The panel would evaluate projects and present recommendations to policymakers.

Funding levels are a lingering issue with the program. A $1 million cap was originally recommended. That cap is still being looked at but it is open to changes. SANDAG intends to contact some developers and seek recommendations from the Regional Planning Committee. There is a trade-off between funding a larger number of projects with less funding or granting more significant funding to fewer projects.

Additionally, the ad hoc working group has begun developing criterion for planning projects. It has done so by looking at criteria from other areas and running test scenarios with previously submitted projects. SANDAG will need to develop program guidelines and grant agreements, which designate roles and responsibilities, in order to formalize the process. There remains quite a bit of work left.

Draft recommendations were intended to be provided to the RPC in May, but will not be ready. The new plan is to have the RPC comment or approve project selection criteria in June. If the criteria are not ready in May, approval would then be postponed until July. Additionally, the funding cap issue is also scheduled to be discussed at the May RPC meeting.

Mr. Sandoval commented that the idea behind the independent evaluation committee is great, and suggested involving Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) members and TWG members that aren’t submitting projects. In terms of the funding cap, if the goal is to look for the best smart growth examples, and to fund the projects with the biggest bang for the buck, the cap should be flexible rather than fixed. Mr. Sandoval suggested letting the evaluation committee decide the funding cap, so that in different rounds it might fund different numbers of projects.

Mr. Vance replied that if a $2 million cap is set, the applications will all be for $2 million.

Mr. Sandoval suggested having applicants demonstrate a need for funding and financing from other sources.

Mr. Vance acknowledged that it is important to understand the gap, but reminded that often times that gap is negotiated. He stated that the challenge comes in determining the gap.
Mr. Sandoval suggested adding a developer to the panel who understands the economics of development.

Mr. Backoff commented that this should not discourage the need for funding to jump-start these projects. He agreed with the flexible approach proposed by Mr. Sandoval. He agreed that emphasis should be placed on capital improvements, but noted that it is important to fund planning projects up-front.

Linda Niles, City of Del Mar, commented that this issue has been discussed extensively by the Working Group. Mr. Vance confirmed this, adding that it has also been discussed by the Regional Housing Working Group. He explained that SANDAG is trying to strike a balance between the interests of involved parties.

Mr. Backoff inquired as to whether the projects would have to be new projects in order to receive financing. Mr. Vance emphasized the need to be precise when speaking about the project. The project refers to the capital improvement.

**Agenda Item #7: Adjournment and Next Meetings**

Mr. Sandoval announced that the next TWG meeting will be a joint meeting with the CTAC. The joint meeting will be held on Thursday, May 22, 2008, from 8:30 - 11 a.m. in the SANDAG Board Room. The next SPRINTET Smart Growth Working Group meeting will be held on Wednesday, July 9, 2008, from 1:30 - 3:30 p.m.

Mr. Sandoval also announced that Bob Leiter was awarded a fellow of the American Institute of Certified Planners (AICP). He congratulated Mr. Leiter on behalf of the TWG for this honor.

Mr. Leiter thanked Mr. Sandoval. He also shared that he was asked to comment on SB 375, the state global climate change initiative, and the idea of consolidating the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) schedule and RTP schedule. This initiative would delay the RHNA cycle for the next 2½ years. General support was expressed for this approach. Mr. Leiter indicated that staff would bring the TWG more information on this issue at future meetings.

**Agenda Item #8: Walking Tour of Downtown Oceanside (Optional)**

SANDAG staff thanked the Lance Schulte of NCTD, Vicki Parker of Vista, and Jerry Hittleman of Oceanside for their participation in leading the SPRINTET Tour. Working Group members were then invited to participate in the optional “Part 2” walking tour of downtown Oceanside as the members returned to the Oceanside Transit Center to catch the southbound COASTER and the eastbound SPRINTET.

Mr. Sandoval adjourned the meeting just before 12 noon.
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MEETING SUMMARY OF MAY 22, 2008, TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP (TWG) AND CITIES/COUNTY TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CTAC)

Agenda Item #1: Welcome and Introductions

Frank Riviera, CTAC Chair, and Jim Sandoval, TWG Chair, both from the City of Chula Vista, presided over the meeting. Self-introductions were conducted.

Agenda Item #2: Public Comments and Communications

There were no public comments.

CHAIR’S REPORT

Agenda Item #3: RECOGNITION OF JIM SANDOVAL, CHAIR OF THE REGIONAL PLANNING TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP

Jim Sandoval, Planning and Building Director for the City of Chula Vista, is retiring, culminating a planning career of over 30 years. He served as the Chair of the TWG for the last year, representing the TWG on the SANDAG Regional Planning Committee and at other SANDAG meetings. Mr. Sandoval was praised by TWG members for being a voice of reason, a great planner, a good source of information, and an inspiration to young planners throughout the region.

Mr. Sandoval was presented with a certificate of recognition signed by members of the working groups. He was wished the best in his retirement.

CONSENT ITEMS (#4 and #5)

Agenda Item #4: SAN DIEGO REGIONAL BICYCLE PLAN

Work has begun on the development of the San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan. Funded by a Caltrans community-based transportation planning grant, the Plan will ultimately be a component of the Regional Transportation Plan. The Plan will represent the combined efforts of SANDAG staff, SANDAG’s Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Working Group (BPWG), local jurisdictions, local agencies, advocacy groups, and citizens in the San Diego region. The Plan is regional in focus and concentrates on broader policies and programs, while providing a framework for local decision makers to determine specific local routes and facilities. Some of the primary products coming out of
the Plan will be a detailed regional bicycle network, prioritization of regional bicycle projects, and short- and long-term funding strategies coupled with the implementation strategy.

Agenda Item #5: SMART GROWTH DESIGN GUIDELINES

SANDAG has contracted with a consultant team lead by Design Community & Environment from Berkeley, California, to develop the smart growth design guidelines called for in the Regional Comprehensive Plan. Work on this project will be starting this month and be completed next spring.

Consent Items were approved.

REPORT ITEMS (#6 through #14)

Agenda Item #6: TransNet SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM OVERVIEW AND UPDATE

Stephan Vance, SANDAG, gave an overview of the Smart Growth Incentive Program (SGIP). Mr. Vance explained that SANDAG has been working with an Ad Hoc Working Group on the program guidelines and criteria and would be seeking advice from both the CTAC and the TWG. The TransNet Ordinance provides a great deal of latitude on the incentive program and the process of developing the guidelines is meant to gain wide buy-in and build consensus. The objectives will be run through the Regional Planning Committee (RPC). Mr. Vance discussed the following key objectives for SGIP projects:

1) Project readiness
2) Infill land development
3) Reduction of GHG emissions (increase transit)
4) Housing development
5) Good examples smart growth in variety of settings

Funding
In the first year of the program, beginning this July, revenues will amount to $5 million. For the first call for projects, the Ad Hoc Working Group (AHWG) advises accumulating “extra money in the pot” in order to fund more projects or fund projects at a higher level. As a result, the AHWG is proposing a biannual program, in which two years of funding would be combined.

Project types
The SGIP is seeking to fund transportation improvements that foster land use and transportation coordination improvements. The RPC has expressed a preference for an emphasis on capital projects but will endorse a marginal amount of planning projects. The proposed cap per planning project is $200,000 or around 10% of available funds. As far as capital projects are concerned, a cap has yet to be determined. The issue will be taken to the RPC in June. A wide array of funding caps have been considered such as $1 million, $2 million, $5 million, or no cap at all.

Evaluation process
The evaluation process provides the opportunity for all groups to weigh in. SANDAG has tried to develop as many objective criteria as possible, but some criteria will need to remain qualitative. The qualitative analysis will look at components such as the quality of urban design. The aim is to
provide an “unbiased, independent review.” The panel will be composed of independent experts including TWG and CTAC volunteers, non-involved agencies, academics, San Diego Council of Design Professionals, and SANDAG staff.

An outline of the project evaluation for capital projects is included in the report. It assigns various points and weights to a series of criteria. The project evaluation criteria will receive additional input from the Ad Hoc Working Group, internal review by SANDAG staff, and outside sources. SANDAG has received input from the AHWG and the TWG, as well as from the Settlement Agreement with SOFAR on the 2030 Regional Transportation Plan. The planning project criterion is close to completion and is likely to be defined within a month. Staff will be going to the RPC in June to get feedback on funding cycles and amounts. Staff will then return in July with a recommendation regarding the program. The recommendation will then be taken to the SANDAG Board and a call for projects will be announced this summer. The program should be ready for Board approval by late fall or early winter.

Mr. Sandoval inquired as to whether this item would return to the TWG following theRPC in June.

Mr. Vance confirmed that it would in fact pass through both the TWG and the CTAC after the RPC meeting.

Stephan Kirkpatrick, City of Lemon Grove, mentioned that several years ago, $17 million was awarded in the pilot program. He wondered if staff had considered looking at how that money was spent, with an emphasis on how successful projects were able to meet the criteria.

Mr. Vance explained that a lot had been learned from the Pilot program and that an effort had been made to look at similar programs across the state, such as in Sacramento and the Bay Area. Criteria related to matching grants will ensure that the grants awarded will have significant impacts.

Bill Chopyk, City of La Mesa, commented that since this is an incentive grant program, it is important to acknowledge that density is one of the greatest challenges that cities face with smart growth projects. There is a threshold density criterion in that those projects must have a certain densities to even qualify for the smart growth incentive grant. Mr. Chopyk suggested that additional points should be allocated for projects that go above and beyond the requirement. This would be a good incentive for smart growth projects, because higher density is the most challenging aspect for a city to achieve and for its citizens to accept.

Mr. Vance replied that the first criterion is that the project must be within one of the smart growth opportunity areas on the Smart Growth Concept Map, which means that underlying zoning for that area meets a certain threshold. Following this, the evaluation panel will award points to projects based on how high the density is relative to the thresholds. The more a project exceeds required thresholds, the greater the points it will receive. SANDAG will approach the issue of densities in two ways: at the Smart Growth Opportunity Area level and at the more focused project area level (what land use is happening in conjunction with the request public capital improvement).

Jerry Backoff, City of San Marcos, observed that the emphasis on the capital improvement project criteria list seems to emphasize transit and transit oriented development (TOD). This is important, but should not be the entire focus. The requirement now is that development is within ¼ mile of
transit station and many hubs are too small to qualify, which puts a lot of cities in North County at a
disadvantage. North County transportation is at the mercy of the North County Transit District
(NCTD). There should be points that go to cities that have actual implementation plans (specific
plans or form-based codes). The densities are too high for North County cities and there should be
more emphasis on planning. Also, the cap for planning is too small. San Marcos just finished the San
Marcos Creek Specific Plan and it was a $400,000 effort, so the proposed cap is shy of what is
needed for most projects.

Bob Johnson, City of Carlsbad, explained that incentives often encourage risk-taking, and promote
visionary projects. He inquired what SANDAG desired to see submitted in order to move smart
growth forward.

Mr. Vance elaborated that smart growth’s short definition is “compact, more intense development,
around public transit, that provides more transportation and housing choices.” It is seeking projects
which integrate land use with transit, a definite challenge considering much design is auto-
oriented. It aims to make streets more walkable despite California Environmental Quality Act
(CEQA) demanding more roadway capacities. There is a risk involved in taking on multi-modalism. It
is necessary to have good quality design in order to give transit the push it needs. Also, regarding
specific plans, staff would like to hear more ideas from others as to how to incorporate their plans
within the criteria.

Linda Niles, City of Del Mar, explained that many members of the Ad Hoc Working Group
advocated for a higher allocation for the planning grants; the cap was up to $500,000 at one point,
but the RPC seems to be focused on seeing that projects get built. In future years, possibly a higher
percentage of the funding will go to planning projects. Some jurisdictions will never have smart
growth unless they are helped to understand, through workshops and planning processes, how
smart growth can work in their communities. Many cities need that education before they can even
get capital improvement projects. She also clarified that this funding program is for public
infrastructure improvements to help with connectivity of smart growth projects, not necessarily for
private improvements.

Mr. Backoff commented that $1 million for streetscape improvements is great, but cities need to
have the ability, through adopted plans, to hold developers’ feet to the fire. It is important to give
more bonus points to jurisdictions that have smart growth plans in place.

Mr. Sandoval stated that the funding available is not enough to change a city, but that the funding
will help make projects feasible. Once projects are underway, cities might have access to federal
grants as part of the climate change initiative.

Ms. Niles added that the SGIP funding is not intended to cover the entire cost of projects; it is up to
the jurisdictions to find match funding.

Coleen Clementson, SANDAG announced that at the June 6th RPC meeting, staff would present
these issues brought up about the funding cycle and the split between planning and capital
projects. Staff will return to the TWG and CTAC, before going back to the RPC on July 11th. TWG
members were encouraged to attend AHWG on Tuesday. AHWG members were also invited to
participate at the RPC meeting so that policymakers could hear from members.
Roger Post, City of National City, explained that it is a difficult task to get meaningful criteria that will apply to all jurisdictions and commented that the draft program does a good job of hitting the high points. Soliciting for projects which deliver density, provide links to transit, encompass smart growth, and reduce trip generation truly ‘capture the flavor’ of what is intended.

**Agenda Item #7: SMART GROWTH TRIP GENERATION AND PARKING DEMAND STUDY**

Christine Eary, SANDAG, reported that as part of the Smart Growth Toolbox, SANDAG is developing a Smart Growth Trip Generation and Parking Demand Study. This study has two objectives: to update the SANDAG transportation model and to update the San Diego Traffic Generators manual and Not-So-Brief Guide to Vehicular Trip Generation Rates. Consultants have been hired for this effort. SANDAG will be working with Fehr & Peers, together with VRPA technologies, KTU+A, and Robert Cervero and Reid Ewing. The plan is to survey existing smart growth areas throughout the region. From this survey, observed vehicle and person trip rates will be determined for mixed-use, transit-oriented development, and infill development. The study will take into account a number of factors referred to as the “8Ds” (see report). The study will be completed this November or December. SANDAG will return to CTAC and TWG with study results this fall.

Jerry Walters, Fehr & Peers, explained that they were joined by Eric Ruehr of VRPA Technologies and Mike Singleton of KTU+A. Mr. Walters announced that all three consultants would be available to answer questions. Mr. Walters noted that the discussion of the SGIP was very interesting and important to this project. It is through discussion of smart growth that improved clarity and measurability can be achieved.

San Diego is at the forefront of these issues. SANDAG’s Traffic Generators manual is the second most widely-used manual in nation. The first is the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) manual, which has a nationwide data source. Mr. Walters regarded it as a privilege to add to that body of evidence and to bring to it a national perspective on smart growth in various regions and settings. Mr. Walters spoke about the 8 D’s.

Mr. Walters explained that by and large, the study will look at trip generation rates associated with transit-oriented development. The study will also look at mixed-use development and infill development. The benefits of infill development are truly recognized when paired with mixed-use and transit orientation, but the study will include some infill projects in which neither of the other components are present.

These are the primary categories of development. Walkability is sought to be present at all the sites surveyed because of the way in which it contributes to quality of life; however as an independent variable, it has relatively modest effects on trip generation. Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) is not central to the study. The study will instead focus on trip generation and its effects on parking. Parking, in turn, has an impact on VMT, which is the most quantifiable way of measuring emissions as a link to climate change.

The big challenge comes in determining which local development projects to include in the study. Geographic diversity is sought, both in terms of jurisdiction and smart growth place type. In order to account for this diversity, the list of locations for the study has grown rather quickly. Mr. Walters requested that jurisdictions provide assistance in identifying examples that span geographic
boundaries, in such a sense, good examples that might occur in other areas. The consultants will then pick examples in order to showcase what good smart growth can accomplish and extrapolate how others might perform in a similar setting. Undoubtedly, logistical issues will require certain sites to be ruled out. It is preferable that more sites are surveyed so that there will be a diverse array of examples, than to survey fewer sites in more detail. The logistical constraints of limited time and a limited budget require that a wide variety of examples comes at the expense of a more in-depth analysis.

The 8D’s in the study are: (1) density; (2) diversity; (3) design; (4) destination [regional access]; (5) distance to transit; (6) demographic; (7) development scale; (8) demand management. The study seeks to include a few examples where parking management and demand management are in place. The consultants are weighing the importance of regional distribution. They question if it is better to focus on transferability or to highlight best examples.

Mr. Sandoval asked whether, other than the availability of transit, the parking standards in place have big effects.

Mr. Walters answered that there are at least two categories of parking standards. In some locations, the City of San Diego has TOD zoning in place, which allows for a 20% decrease in parking.

Tina Christiansen, City of Solana Beach, stated that while geographic diversity is valuable, it is important that demographic diversity be considered. Demographics, as in who is living in the projects, often are of greater significance than geographic diversity.

Mr. Walters concurred. It has been found that income level, home ownership, number of years in the country and life-cycle demographics are also important. Life cycle issues have become increasingly important. Certain logistical challenges have been confronted in gathering ownership data.

Mr. Chopyk wondered if the consultants would survey residents of the projects and requested elaboration on the methodology.

Mr. Walters answered that they are currently discussing how far to go with interviewing residents and visitors. One of the central components of the core mission is to count traffic in and out of an area, but as of yet, they are unsure how deep to examine the subtleties. It is important to understand the trip purposes, such as if the person is just passing by or if it is the destination. They are trying to establish a balance between collecting data from a larger number of sites and evaluating fewer sites in greater detail. The study will compare that data with other data of its type in the nation in order to compare and contrast trip purpose, mode choice, and the aforementioned 8Ds.

Devon Muto, County of San Diego, commended the consultants for taking on this big task. He pointed out that the rural village place type was left off, but Mr. Muto felt it was important that this typology is not forgotten. Rural place types are characteristically different compared to other sites. It is valuable to also recognize areas that are not served by transit but are pursuing smart growth. Mr. Muto expressed interest in trip generation and parking demand for various segments of population, especially in the context of age and income-restricted residents. It would be desirable to be able to link the information from the study to these demographic indicators. This would
provide insight to the housing-to-parking demand ratio and help jurisdictions in making parking reductions.

Jon Brindle, City of Escondido, voiced that he would like to see the greatest number of examples studied and then extrapolate from those examples. That way, jurisdictions would be able to find the closest fit to their own projects and proposals.

Mr. Walters stated that they would also recommend data from other resources. When looking at the question on parking demand for various income levels, there is an opportunity to tap into other, broader surveys done in San Diego and in other regions.

Gary Barberio, City of Carlsbad, suggested that geographic distribution is very important. Decision-makers in North County will relate to examples in North County better than examples in other areas of the region.

Mr. Walters explained that there are two categories: areas in the region and smart growth place types.

Ms. Eary commented that it is a challenge to narrow down the locations in the region, and encouraged working group members to continue to provide the consultants with additional feedback.

**Agenda Item #8: 2008 CONGESTION MANAGEMENT PROGRAM UPDATE**

Heather Werdick, SANDAG, reported that SANDAG is required by state law to prepare and regularly update a Congestion Management Program (CMP) for the San Diego region. The 2008 CMP Update will incorporate the results of new 2007 roadway and transit monitoring and an analysis of Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) improvements on future roadway congestion.

The CMP was last updated in 2006. The CMP provides ongoing monitoring of the region’s transportation system and a program to evaluate and mitigate traffic impacts of new development projects. Also included is a mechanism to prepare deficiency plans for roadway segments that do not meet the CMP Level of Service Standard (LOS) E. The 2008 CMP will include an updated CMP roadway analysis, an updated transit corridor analysis, and an analysis of 2030 RTP improvements on the deficient segments identified in the CMP update, including any remaining deficiencies.

There are currently 11 CMP arterials that are included in the 2008 CMP Update. A map of the existing CMP network was included in the agenda packet. The basic legislative requirements of the CMP have been addressed through a CMP document that is updated every two years. Staff will be evaluating using alternative means of meeting the CMP requirements that incorporate existing SANDAG monitoring and planning activities and it may no longer be necessary to prepare a stand-alone CMP document in the future. The draft 2008 CMP will be released this summer.

Mr. Riviera requested information on roadway classification and volumes from the CMP system map. Ms. Werdick replied that staff is looking at the classifications for regional arterials to see if others should be included and will return with results to the CTAC and the TWG.
Zoubir Ouadah, City of Poway, inquired about the effect on local agencies. Ms. Werdick replied that the CMP arterial network has not changed since 1991. Once a roadway is added to the CMP network, it cannot be removed. Staff will evaluate adding new arterials to the CMP arterial network and potentially make a recommendation to the Transportation Committee. Mr. Ouadah pointed out that adding regionally-significant arterials to the CMP network could lead to disagreement between local jurisdictions. He asked about what happens in that type of scenario. Ms. Werdick explained that different options can be presented to the Transportation Committee and SANDAG Board of Directors but ultimately, it is up to the SANDAG Board to make the final decisions. Additionally, staff can develop a conflict resolution process in case disagreements arise.

Mr. Ouadah noticed that the Coronado Bridge is shown as a CMP arterial. He asked if it is a freeway or an arterial. Ms. Werdick replied that SR 75 is, in fact, a state highway but it is included in the regional arterial system for the City of Coronado to use its Regional Transportation Congestion Improvement Program funding.

**Agenda Item #9: SANDAG INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVIEW PROGRAM**

Travis Cleveland, SANDAG, gave an overview of the SANDAG Intergovernmental Review (IGR) program. SANDAG serves as the areawide clearinghouse for the San Diego region, and in that capacity, is responsible for monitoring, reviewing, and commenting on projects of regional significance. SANDAG also coordinates its IGR program with Caltrans District 11, the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS), and the North County Transit District (NCTD). Regional teams have been designated among SANDAG staff to coordinate on IGR, and a table attached to the staff report indicates specific staff assignments. SANDAG greatly appreciates the help received from many TWG and CTAC members to date. Mr. Cleveland also referenced that as part of the IGR program, SANDAG will be hiring a consultant to identify a funding methodology to assess development impacts on transit.

Ms. Clementson explained that there is a gap in transit funding. There is already a mechanism in place to fund impacts on roads and freeways, but not for transit. SANDAG is seeking consultant assistance on this question.

**Agenda Item #10: PROPOSITION 1B HIGHWAY-RAILROAD CROSSING SAFETY ACCOUNT**

John Haggerty, SANDAG, provided an update on the Proposition 1B Highway-Railroad Crossing Safety Account (HRCSA), including an overview of the final guidelines adopted by the California Transportation Commission from April 2008. It also included a list of projects with regional benefits proposed for submittal under this HRCSA program.

Mr. Haggerty announced that the application for grade separation funding would be going to the SANDAG Board the following day for four applications. Project applications are due on June 16, 2008. The application has already been presented to the SANDAG Transportation Committee, which recommended having a grade separation funding pot. The following sites will be recommended at the Board tomorrow: (1) E&H Streets in Chula Vista; (2) Taylor Street in San Diego; and (3) Sorrento Road in San Diego. Prop 1B funds are as follows: (1) $150 million funding (restrictions: 50% local match, construction beginning by 2010); and (2) $100 million (construction by 2014). The more matching funds a project has, the better it will compete. The application deadline is June 16, 2008.
SANDAG worked with CTAC to develop an evaluation formula which was approved by the TC. The CTAC formula criteria includes traffic volume, number of trains, number of accidents, amount of blocking delay, traffic blocking, and amount of crossing near stations. This formula was used as the basis for recommending the applications to the CTC.

Mr. Ouadah noticed that there was more emphasis on safety improvements, especially when looking at Hawthorn, Laurel, and Washington. Trips to the San Diego Airport are made by people throughout the region, so there is a high chance of accidents.

Dan Martin, SANDAG, added that based on the dialogue at the Transportation Committee, staff will bring the criteria back to CTAC for additional review.

Agenda Item #11: REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD PLANNING REVIEWS

Chiara Clemente from the Regional Water Board (RWQCB) presented information on lessons learned from projects in the San Diego region and discussed the current proactive planning efforts underway on the TransNet Early Action projects. In addition, she solicited interest from local agencies with respect to involvement in a similar program.

Ms. Clemente explained that with limited resources, the Water Quality Board needs to prioritize work. The RWQCB receives hundreds of draft CEQA documents per day. To issue a permit or certification, staff searches archives or asks a project proponent to submit the final document. That is usually when the RWQCB staff reviews them thoroughly for the very first time. If the staff sees no problem with the final plans, it will go ahead and grant a permit. If there are concerns, however, one of two things can happen. Either staff will ask the project proponents to modify their project, which frequently results in a new CEQA document and possibly new local agency permits. Or sometimes staff simply cannot issue a permit. This is a losing situation for both the RWQCB and the project proponents.

By looking at project-specific scenarios, RWQCB staff can apply case-specific conditions, and also improve the permitting and regulating process. This method also presents an opportunity to analyze a project more comprehensively, not just whether this project will comply with existing regulations. Under the traditional review method, there is often not much time for specific comments. Preferred alternatives are frequently no longer viable by the time the project proposal gets around to the permitting process. This happens frequently in the 401 certification world, usually because of property acquisitions, funding contract design limitations, project completion requirements, or general project momentum. The local planning agencies and the project proponents also lose with the situation as it is. Regional Board Requirements to comply are not always as clear as they seem to the RWQCB staff. Last minute design changes tend to be expensive and cause extreme time delays. Lastly, when the RWQCB tries to shoehorn a water quality measure into a project that is already 90% complete or more, it ends up with something that just does not fit well into the project.

In April 2007, the RWQCB executed a contract between SANDAG and the State Board that would reimburse the regional board for TransNet Early Action work, up to a certain amount, as directed by SANDAG. Specifically, the tasks it works on are listed in the scope of work. It is difficult to measure long term benefits after only one year, but to date, the RWQCB has benefited from increased
familiarity with the planning process and the agency contacts. Conversations and consultations have improved because of a better overall understanding of the projects. With a single point of contact and no turnover, interagency coordination has improved and permits have been expedited.

Mr. Sandoval asked if there has been any consideration of developing partnerships between local governments, the RWQCB, and developers, to provide an opportunity to get an early look at what is being done and address issues such as runoff early in the process.

Ms. Clemente answered yes, but the more parties that are involved, the more difficult it becomes to structure and adhere to the contract. With consideration of the perceived conflict of interest, it is better to have the contract with the government agency, not the party not seeking the permit.

Mr. Ouadah inquired as to whether the RWQCB has guidelines for the local agencies, so that when a project is started, whether private or public, expectations are know.

Ms. Clemente explained that the RWQCB has guidelines, but much of the staff knowledge is gained through experience and different staff members focus on different things. The possibility of memorializing some of these guidelines with reimbursable funds has been discussed.

Mr. Muto stated that the program sounds interesting and asked how local jurisdictions could start pursuing a similar process with their own projects.

Mr. Martin stated that SANDAG currently has an agreement with RWQCB, so it is possible for local agencies to work through the SANDAG Service Bureau in order to get this sort of relationship in place.

Mr. Muto inquired as to whether this process was available for public projects only.

Mr. Martin responded that it was for public projects, but private projects could be considered.

Mr. Chopyk stated that it would be helpful to know which type of projects would be looked at, such as the ones with the 404 permit. There is a great deal of regulation at the local level.

Ms. Clemente answered that it would not necessarily be only the 404 projects. She is most familiar with 401 and 404 program, so she would point toward these when referring to lessons learned. She stated that the RWQCB would like to expand this process to MS4 work.

Mr. Chopyk added that it would be very helpful if the RWQCB conveyed what type of projects it is looking to coordinate with. He also noted that there appear to be very limited resources.

Agenda Item #12: ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Backoff announced that the courts overruled the CEQA challenge on the Palomar station project in San Marcos.

Mr. Sandoval announced that a land agreement had been reached on the university site in Chula Vista. Mr. Sandoval and the Chula Vista City Attorney spent many hours negotiating two contracts. The City of Chula Vista was able to secure 385 acres, 400 acres of mitigation land, 13,000 residential
units, SPA (specific) plans, and tentative map approval. A site is now secured for a future university with 15,000 students as well as a 70-80 acre technological park. This process is similar to a transfer of development rights process. This is a new, interesting venture for Chula Vista and a unique opportunity in which the city was able to secure free land for the public.

Mr. Muto announced that the notice of preparation for the Environmental Impact Report for the General Plan Update of the County of San Diego is now available. Comments are due next Wednesday.

Mr. Chopyk announced that San Diego chapter of the American Planning Association will be hosting a program on density this October.

Carolina Gregor, SANDAG staff, announced that the 2D and 3D smart growth visual simulations are well on their way and should be completed by the fall.

Jason Janis, Caltrans Local Assistance, announced that the Disadvantaged Business Enterprises (DBE) program will now move from race neutral to race conscious. RSTP and CMAC funds have been spent and will be redistributed in May or June. The national redistribution should occur after this summer. Requests for authorization for 2007-2008 Fiscal Year are due July 2nd. Federal safe routes to school applications are due to Caltrans on July 18th. Please forward questions to: Jason.janis@dot.ca.gov

Frank Riviera again congratulated Jim Sandoval on his retirement and thanked him for his service to the region. He presented Mr. Sandoval with a certificate signed by the TWG/CTAC members for his contributions, and was joined in a standing ovation.

Mr. Martin announced that an item for the next CTAC meeting will feature Nate Gauff from the California Integrated Waste Management Board to present grant opportunities for rubberized concrete program.

**Agenda Item #13: Adjournment and Next Meeting**

The CTAC Meeting was adjourned, and the TWG remained in session to discuss Item #14. The next CTAC meeting will be on Thursday, June 5, 2008, from 9:30 - 11 a.m. The next TWG meeting will be held on Thursday, June 12, 2008, from 1:15 -3:15 p.m.

**Agenda Item #14: PROPOSED EXTENSION OF THE REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT**

Ms. Clementson presented this item, which asks the TWG to make a recommendation on whether or not to proceed with the proposed extension of the RHNA process. Without an extension, the process for the next RHNA cycle would generally be starting now. State law permits an extension of up to two years for the RHNA process in order to align with the RTP and the next regional growth forecast. SANDAG is proposing to pursue this extension. The coordination/alignment of these three key work elements would make sense from the standpoint of efficient use of staff resources and from the perspective of better connecting these three related projects. The Regional Planning Committee and Board will need to approve this request to the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD). This item requires a formal vote.

Roger Post asked whether there would be any setbacks with HCD if the extension were pursued.
HCD recently reminded SANDAG of the new state law which allows for an extension. Los Angeles and the Bay area have made use of the extension, so there is an existing precedent. Pursuing an extension would not cause any sort of complications in funding or the like.

Jerry Backoff wondered if this action would require a bill. He recounted a similar circumstance in which a bill was required for an earlier extension.

Ms. Clementson replied that a bill would not be necessary.

Jon Brindle asked about changes in the RTP.

Coleen answered that one of the biggest benefits is that the same forecast would be used for both the RHNA and the RTP. Much of the information necessary to do the forecast for the RTP and the RHNA will be gathered at the same time.

Linda Niles, City of Del Mar, wondered if the one year extension would be enough considering that the deadline for the RTP is not until later – November 2011.

Ms. Clementson answered no, because a one year extension will align well with the RTP and growth forecast processes.

Devon Muto commented that it seemed like there would be a benefit to pursuing the two year extension in order to align with the state. As it is now, San Diego is always the first one in the state through the door. There may be some benefit to a two year extension.

Ms. Clementson explained the challenge would be that the reason for the extension is so that the same population forecast for the RHNA would be used as for the RTP. The way the forecast gets fit into the RTP, there is about a year of work that needs to be done from the time of the forecast to the time the RTP goes to the Board. This is because of all the model runs conducted for the RTP scenarios. In order to get the RHNA information into the forecast and still meet the RTP deadline, any longer than a year will not work. One option is to say up to a two year extension, so that is available to fall back on.

Linda Niles agreed, adding that as it moves further into the process there will be a greater understanding of the necessary timeframe. She advised maintaining open communication throughout the process.

Bill Chopyk added that the region’s next housing element updates are due in 2010. 2010 is only 1½ years from now. The timing is pretty critical and if it goes beyond the one year extension it will impact when housing elements get updated. The jurisdictions rely on their housing elements to qualify for grant funding. He expressed reluctance for anything beyond a one year extension.

Mr. Sandoval suggested requesting up to two year extension but intend to stick to a one year schedule.

Gary Barberio presented the possibility of a case where a two year extension is requested and jurisdictions are left without certified housing elements. Ms. Clementson explained that there are two different types of funding that are affected by housing element compliance -- Propositions 46
and 1C statewide funding. Locally Board Policy 33 affects local funding. If the jurisdiction has its housing element according to RHNA, it should not be a problem.

Devon Muto asked how the update of the RCP fits into the schedule.

Coleen Clementson answered that there is no set update schedule for the RCP. With the general plan, it is looked at every 5 or so years and updated every 10 years. This year it is in the work program to review it for areas to update. It is very likely that SANDAG would not do an update until after the next round of the RTP.

Mr. Muto asked about the possibility that recent climate change legislation, particularly in regards to AB 375, could affect the RCP.

Possibly, Ms. Clementson replied, stating that San Diego is one of the model regions because it has a regional comprehensive plan. If there are things SANDAG has to do because of climate change issues SANDAG staff will need to look at that.

Mr. Sandoval commented that between the baseline analysis and the annual update, it might also be helpful to give an indication of when the RCP might need to be updated.

Ms. Clementson explained that this is true and noted that the monitoring report will assist in that analysis.

Mr. Chopyk noticed that in the timeline the local jurisdictions are slated to prepare housing elements after the SANDAG Board approves the RHNA. In effect, June 2010 is when the local jurisdictions would begin to prepare their housing elements. He asked if there is anything that would preclude jurisdiction from starting earlier than that.

Ms. Clementson responded that this would not preclude jurisdictions from getting started on their housing elements.

Ms. Baldwin clarified that the draft allocations are usually known sometime in the middle of that year. Once the overall housing need number for the region is known, SANDAG will work with the jurisdictions on how to allocate them.

Ms. Clementson noted that there seemed to be suggestion for making a recommendation to the RPC that SANDAG pursue a one year but up to two year extension of the RHNA process and that it include an attached schedule as the stated overall goal of accomplishing such a task.

Mr. Chopyk expressed discomfort with the concept of the two-year extension but made a motion to approve a one year extension. He moved for staff recommendation.

Ms. Baldwin said that ABAG (Association of Bay Area Governments) and SCAG both got two year extensions, but that was to coincide with their RTP and forecasting processes. In looking at the SANDAG process, a one year extension coincides with our RTP work program. HCD will want to see a schedule, and would be unlikely to approve an up to two year extension.

Mr. Sandoval asked if SANDAG were to receive a one year extension and then mid-stream it was decided that another extension were necessary, would it be possible request another extension.
Ms. Baldwin expressed that we may be able to request a second extension because the law allows for up to a two year extension. If it could be justified, it should not present an issue.

Mr. Sandoval postulated that the purpose in providing a schedule was to demonstrate good intent.

Ms. Baldwin concurred, continuing that it was a means of demonstrating how the processes would be aligned, which was the very purpose of the extension.

Ms. Clementson added that another reason to provide a timeline is that the HCD does have data collection and analysis that needs to be done to give us the housing need number for the region.

Ms. Christiansen asked if it would help to say that the process may be extended if the RTP is delayed.

Jon Brindle asked if the two year extension would lead to delays in HCD’s delivery of data.

Susan Baldwin clarified that HCD has to deliver information to SANDAG based on the time schedule that SANDAG specifies.

Mr. Sandoval asked if the issue would go to the RPC in June and if it was critical that decision was made now or if it was possible to be delayed.

Ms. Clementson suggested that the TWG could move forward with this recommendation, and that staff could ask HCD if another extension beyond the one year could be requested.

Mr. Sandoval added that if they say we can only ask once for an extension, then it will be problematic.

Ms. Baldwin illuminated that there was probably some flexibility for a second extension if it is requested before HCD gives us our housing need numbers.

Mr. Chopyk conveyed that he was reluctant to agree to the two year extension because HCD might drag their feet. Mr. Chopyk endorsed a one year extension and schedule. He foresaw that an additional year could create problems with the housing element schedule.

Ms. Niles voiced that she would not vote for the motion because it would be unwise to limit the extension to one year considering all of the issues that might come up.

Devon Muto expressed the same concern. Over time, level of effort going into housing elements has gone up.

Ms. Baldwin explained that voting for one year, does not preclude the option to go back to request more time if necessary.

Tina Christiansen, City of Solana Beach, commented that if it is a one time only extension, it would be unwise to lose options. She inquired as to if it is possible to ask for one year extension with caveat that second extension is allowed. If not, request a two year extension.

Mr. Sandoval suggested checking with HCD. If HCD agrees that we could ask for more time if neededs, then the recommendation for a one year extension would move forward.
Bill Chopyk amended the motion to a one year extension upon confirmation that HCD will allow an extension of up to another year upon request.

The second was approved and the motion was passed unanimously.

Mr. Sandoval adjourned the meeting noting that the region is in good hands and thanked everyone for attending.
TECHNICAL UPDATE TO THE SMART GROWTH CONCEPT MAP

Introduction

In response to the Board’s adoption of the 2030 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and in anticipation of a call for projects for the TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program (SGIP), SANDAG staff and the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG) have been working together over the past several months to review and complete a technical update to the Smart Growth Concept Map and corresponding Site Descriptions. In addition, in response to the Settlement Agreement on the 2030 RTP, staff has met with the petitioners of the settlement agreement and has made several additional adjustments to the map and site descriptions.

This report summarizes the changes to the map, provides the most recently-updated versions of the regional and subregional maps, and contains the updated Site Descriptions. It also provides information on an issue pertaining to the Quarry Creek site in Carlsbad.

Discussion

In 2004, the SANDAG Board of Directors adopted the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP), which provides an overall vision and policy framework for better connecting transportation and land use within our region, and promotes smart growth and sustainability as key principles. One of the RCP’s early actions was the development of a “Smart Growth Concept Map” illustrating the location of existing, planned, and potential smart growth areas for use in updating the RTP and determining eligibility for smart growth-related incentives. The SANDAG Board accepted the original Smart Growth Concept Map in June 2006 for planning purposes for the 2030 RTP. SANDAG and the local jurisdictions worked collaboratively to prepare the map.

The Smart Growth Concept Map played an important role in the preparation of the 2030 RTP. The map identifies two types of designations for smart growth areas: “Existing/Planned,” or “Potential.” These designations are based on whether the areas meet certain housing, employment, and transportation targets identified in the RCP. These targets, along with updated 2030 transit service descriptions, are shown in Attachment 2 (Site Descriptions).
The technical update of the Smart Growth Concept Map is important because the updated map will be used as a basis for determining local jurisdictions’ eligibility to compete for smart growth incentives from the upcoming TransNet SGIP. While the criteria for the SGIP are still being developed, it is likely that “Existing/Planned” smart growth areas may qualify to compete for both capital infrastructure and planning grants, while “Potential” smart growth areas may be limited to competing for planning grants only.

**Summary of Changes to the Smart Growth Concept Map and Site Descriptions**

The technical update of the Smart Growth Concept map has resulted in four general types of changes: (1) changes in status (from “Potential” to “Existing/Planned” and vice-versa); (2) changes in smart growth opportunity area boundaries; (3) refinements to transit service information; and (4) general edits.

**Changes in Status**

- **Areas that have changed from “Potential” to “Existing/Planned” due to the addition of planned transit service in the 2030 RTP**

  The new transit networks included in the Reasonably Expected revenue scenario of the 2030 RTP have been added to the Smart Growth Concept Map. Previously, several smart growth areas had been designated as “Potential” based on their lack of existing or planned transit service, even though they met the land use targets identified in the RCP. During the preparation of the 2030 RTP, SANDAG used the map to prioritize the placement of regional transit and high-frequency local transit in these areas. Due to the addition of planned transit to these areas, the designation of the following “Potential” areas has changed to “Existing/Planned:”

  - SD-MM-6 – San Diego – Mira Mesa – Camino Santa Fe and Carroll Canyon Road
  - SD-OB-1 – San Diego – Ocean Beach Commercial Core – Between Niagara Avenue and Santa Monica Avenue
  - SD-PA-1 – San Diego – Peninsula – Rosecrans Street from Talbot Street to Laning Road/Russell Street
  - SD-PA-2 – San Diego – Peninsula – Voltaire Street from Chatsworth Boulevard to Catalina Boulevard
  - SD-SM-1 – San Diego – Serra Mesa – Gramercy Drive, Ruffin Road, Village Glen Drive, and Glencolumb Drive

- **Areas that have changed from “Potential” to “Existing/Planned” due to local land use changes**

  SANDAG has been working with local jurisdictions to incorporate recent updates to local land use plans. The City of San Marcos recently adopted the San Marcos Creek Specific Plan, significantly increasing residential and employment intensity capacities within this smart growth area. As a result, SM-4 – the San Marcos Creek Specific Planning Area, now qualifies as an Existing/Planned Mixed Use Transit Corridor.

- **Areas that have changed from “Existing/Planned” to “Potential” due to transit service changes**
The minimum level of transit service for Town Centers is regional transit service, or five-minute shuttle distance from regional stations. MOBILITY 2030, the previous RTP, included regional transit service over the Coronado Bay Bridge connecting 3rd and 4th Streets in Coronado to Downtown San Diego and Sorrento Mesa. This regional service was connected to the Downtown Coronado “Town Center” by a local transit connection within five minutes, allowing the Town Center to qualify as Existing/Planned. However, the regional transit service connecting Coronado to San Diego is not included in the new 2030 RTP because the bulk of the ridership demand is concentrated between Downtown San Diego and Sorrento Mesa. The removal of this regional transit service connecting to Coronado has resulted in the re-designation of the Coronado Town Center (CO-1) from Existing/Planned to Potential.

In addition, due to refinements to transit service information for Community Centers (discussed further below), CV-13 (Chula Vista Otay Ranch Village 2) has also been re-designated from Existing/Planned to Potential.

d. Areas that have changed from “Existing/Planned” to “Potential” due to land use plans

On the original Smart Growth Concept Map, most of the “Rural Villages” in the County of San Diego were shown as “Existing/Planned” smart growth opportunity areas. This designation was based on an assumption made at that time that the County Board of Supervisors was nearing adoption of General Plan 2020 (GP2020), and that the rural core areas in the draft GP2020 contained densities supportive of smart growth principles as identified in the RCP. Based on delays to the adoption of the County General Plan Update, SANDAG re-evaluated the status of the Rural Village core areas based on residential and employment capacities included in the County’s existing general plan. This resulted in the re-designation of two Rural Villages from Existing/Planned to Potential: CN-5 (Ramona) and CN-8 (Alpine). The status of these areas will be re-evaluated when the County Board of Supervisors approves the updated General Plan and/or when the Smart Growth Concept Map is next updated.

Changes in Boundaries

SANDAG has been working with TWG members to identify any additions, deletions, and/or boundary changes to smart growth areas in their jurisdictions. None of the jurisdictions requested the addition of new areas or the deletion of existing areas on the map. However, several jurisdictions requested boundary changes, as listed below. These requests did not result in changes of status from Existing/Planned to Potential, or vice versa.

- CB-3 – Carlsbad Village Coaster Station: Expanded to include the Barrio area immediately south
- ES-1 – Downtown Escondido: Expanded boundaries of Downtown Specific Plan to the west, north, and east
- LG-3 – Downtown Lemon Grove: Expanded boundaries westward
- NC-1 – Downtown National City: Expanded boundaries westward
- NC-2 – National City: Replaced previous potential Filipino Village Community Center with a new potential Mixed Use Transit Corridor along Plaza Boulevard from D Avenue to Euclid Avenue
- NC-3 – National City: Extended Highland Avenue Mixed Use Transit Corridor to include Highland Avenue and the Sweetwater Road Transit Corridor
- PW-1 – Poway: Expanded boundaries of Town Center area in various directions to better reflect local planning efforts
• SM-3 – San Marcos: University Mixed Use Area: Expanded boundaries to include the University Village area
• ST-2 – Santee: Moved this potential Community Center eastward
• VS-5 – Vista: Replaced VS-5 potential Community Center at North Santa Fe Avenue and Bobier Avenue with a potential Mixed Use Transit Corridor along North Santa Fe Avenue from Orange Street to Weston Street

Refinements to Transit Service Information

a. Addition of new transit services to the Map and to the Site Descriptions

In response to the recent update of the 2030 RTP and in discussions with the petitioners of the 2030 RTP Settlement Agreement to distinguish between funded and unfunded transit services, SANDAG staff has added the new transit service networks identified in the Reasonably Expected Revenue Scenario of the 2030 RTP to the regional and subregional smart growth maps. Due to input resulting from the Settlement Agreement, the map legends now differentiate between two categories: (1) existing transit and programmed transit (transit funded in the short term through the Regional Transportation Improvement Program), and (2) planned transit (transit which assumes funding in the longer term but does not yet have secured funding). To help make these distinctions more clearly, staff has added a column to the Site Descriptions providing information on the type of transit services (Rail, Bus Rapid Transit [BRT], Rapid Bus, and Local High Frequency Bus), the status of those services (existing, programmed, or planned), and the phasing of the services in each smart growth area.

b. Corresponding Transit Service for the “Community Center” Place Type

The RCP calls for the “Community Center” place type to be served by regional or commuter transit service. However, during the formulation of the original Smart Growth Concept Map, it was decided that high-frequency local bus service could, in certain cases, provide a sufficient level of transit service for this place type. Subsequently, the recently updated RTP has further refined the types of transit service that are included in the Transit Network plan to include both BRT/Rapid Bus and “high-frequency local bus service.” Additionally, the 2007-2011 SANDAG Coordinated Plan for transit services has identified “urban service zones” in which high frequency local bus service will be provided.

Staff has evaluated the applicability of these refined transit service types to the “Community Center” place type, and is recommending that “high frequency local bus service” in “urban service zones” qualify as an appropriate minimum transit service level for Community Centers. The TWG discussed and expressed support for this approach. As a result of narrowing the definition of “high frequency local bus service” as discussed above, one Community Center would change in status from Existing/Planned to Potential (CV-13: Otay Ranch Village 2).

General Edits

a. Refinements to major employment areas

Based on previous direction from the Regional Planning Committee, staff has incorporated the populated areas of the region’s military facilities onto the map as “major employment areas.” In addition, based on an updated regional employment density map, staff has added the following major employment areas: San Diego State University (SDSU), the Sabre Springs employment area,
and the La Mesa Grossmont Center area. In general, the major employment areas on the map are defined as regionally-significant employment areas with average existing employment levels ranging between 50 and 500 employees per acre.

b. Addition of “Transit Priority Area” boundaries

As referenced above, two new overarching transit layers, labeled “Transit Priority Areas,” have been added to the map indicating where existing/planned local high frequency transit service appropriately serves the Community Center place type. The transit priority areas represent the transit agencies' efforts to prioritize local high frequency transit services in the more heavily populated areas of the region. These areas were used in the preparation of the 2030 RTP and are now shown conceptually on the Smart Growth Concept Map.

Additional Issues

Public Comments on Quarry Creek site in Carlsbad

CB-2 (Carlsbad Quarry Creek Potential Community Center) is located directly south of State Route 78 in Carlsbad on the boundary of Carlsbad and Oceanside. In several forums, members of the public have asked that the proposed smart growth area be removed from the map due to its historic, cultural, and environmental significance. The speakers have stated that some of the area contains significant cultural, environmental, and habitat resources; that the El Salto Falls have been designated as a Native American sacred site; and that they believe that the loss of these resources through development could not be mitigated.

SANDAG staff has met with planning officials from the City of Carlsbad and various community representatives on several occasions to discuss the issues raised. Carlsbad staff has requested the retention of CB-2 on the map and has modified the site description to include the concerns raised by community members.

Conclusion

The technical update of the Smart Growth Concept Map is being conducted to ensure internal consistency of the transportation networks between the recently adopted 2030 RTP and the Smart Growth Concept Map, and in anticipation of a call for projects for TransNet SGIP.

If the Regional Planning Committee recommends, and the SANDAG Board accepts, this technical update, the revised Smart Growth Concept Map and corresponding Site Descriptions will be used in the TransNet SGIP, and will be posted to the SANDAG Web site in an “interactive” format, as currently available online. In an effort to promote smart growth opportunities and incentives in these areas, local jurisdictions will be encouraged to provide this information on their local Web sites and through their local planning documents.

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachments: 1. Regional and Subregional-scale Smart Growth Concept Map
  2. Site Descriptions (www.sandag.org/rcp)

Key Staff Contact: Carolina Gregor, (619) 699-1989, cgr@sandag.org
Introduction

The TransNet-funded Smart Growth Incentive Program provides funding for both capital improvements and planning projects that support smart growth development. The ad hoc working group established to help develop this program has focused much of its attention on developing project selection criteria for the two grant types. At this point, the working group has established a set of draft criteria for capital projects, and is in the process of developing recommendations for the planning grant criteria. The capital project evaluation criteria are included as Attachment 1 to this report, and the outline of potential planning grant criteria are shown in Attachment 2.

The program development process has been guided by the Regional Planning Committee (RPC) and program objectives they articulated, which are included as Attachment 3. The discussion section below focuses on capital project criteria and how they address the program goals. The Technical Working Group (TWG) is asked to recommend to the RPC that these criteria be used to select capital improvement projects in the program. The TWG is also invited to provide comments on the outline of planning grant criteria, with the understanding that these criteria are very likely to undergo further refinement. The RPC is scheduled to take up the criteria and program guidelines this summer. The objective for the ad hoc working group is to complete the program development and issue a call for projects this summer or early in the fall.

Recommendation

The Technical Working Group is asked to recommend to the RPC that the criteria shown in Attachment 1 be used to select capital improvement projects in the TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program.

Discussion

Capital Project Evaluation Criteria

Based on the language in the TransNet ordinance and the framework for smart growth incentives established in the Regional Comprehensive Plan, the ad hoc working group developed a set of eligibility criteria that any capital project application would have to meet in order to compete for funding. These criteria include:

- Consistency with TransNet Ordinance: The project must be eligible under the TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program guidelines.
• **Smart Growth Opportunity Area Designation:** The proposed project must be located within an existing/planned Smart Growth Opportunity Area, as designated on the Smart Growth Concept Map.

• **Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA)/Policy 33 Compliance:** The applicant’s jurisdiction must have an adopted housing element that has been found in compliance with state law by HCD or self-certified, and submitted its annual report to SANDAG regarding actual housing unit production by income category.

• **Local Funding Commitment and Authorization:** The application must include a resolution or minute order from City Council, County Board of Supervisors, or Board of Directors authorizing the application, and committing to allocate the resources necessary to implement and complete the proposed activities and outcomes within the schedule identified in the project application.

Once a capital grant application qualifies under these basic eligibility criteria, the project would be evaluated based on the scoring matrix in Attachment 1. The matrix was developed to include criteria that will identify the highest quality projects in the Smart Growth Opportunity Areas with the greatest potential for smart growth development, and that will directly support regional transit investments with exemplary smart growth development projects. The scores for criteria in Section I (except paragraph E), III, and IV would be calculated by SANDAG based on our land use and transportation databases and information provided by the applicant. The ad hoc working group is proposing that the qualitative criteria in Section IE and Section II should be scored by an independent project evaluation panel.

The evaluation criteria were developed to evaluate the smart growth opportunity area of the proposed project, the land development, transportation choices, and urban design characteristics of the area immediately surrounding the proposed project, and quality of the project itself. How each criterion addresses one or more of these issues is described in the following outline.

**I. Land Use and Transportation Characteristics of the Area around the Proposed Capital Improvement Project**

A. **Intensity of Planned Development in the Project’s Smart Growth Opportunity Area:** How well does the existing local plan implement the intensity of development objectives identified for its place type in the Smart Growth Concept Map?

B. **Existing and Proposed Land Development Around the Proposed Capital Project:** How well does the existing and proposed land development in the vicinity of the proposed capital project implement the intensity of development and mix of uses objectives for its smart growth place type?

C. **New Affordable Housing Development:** What is the extent of affordable housing proposed in the project area?

D. **Transportation Characteristics:** What is the proximity of the project to regional transit facilities and high quality local transit service? How well does the project area serve pedestrians and bicyclists and encourage other transportation choices through demand management programs?

E. **Community Design Features:** How well does the project area, or proposed urban design based on adopted local design requirements represent smart growth design principles? Consideration is also given for sustainable development practices and universal design.
II. Quality of the Proposed Capital Improvement Project
   A. Support for Public Transit: How well does the project support use of regional public transit service in the project area?
   B. Providing Transportation Choices: How well does the project support transportation choices that would reduce vehicle miles traveled, such as walking and bicycling?
   C. Community Enhancement: How well does the proposed project contribute to the enhancement of the public realm in the project area to engender support for smart growth, attract private investment, and to activate public places?
   D. Addressing Project Area Issues: How well does the project address identified special needs of the community such as improving access and public safety?

III. Proposed Capital Improvement Project Readiness
Projects are evaluated based on milestones achieved in the project development process and demonstrated community support.

IV. Cost Effectiveness
What is the cost of the project relative to its ranking as indicated by the project evaluation criteria?

V. Matching Funds
What proportion of the project will be funded from other sources?

VI. Policy 33 Evaluation
Under Board Policy No. 33, 25 percent of the project evaluation points will awarded based on the sponsoring jurisdiction’s progress in meeting its goals for affordable housing production as defined by the Regional Housing Needs Assessment.

Planning Project Evaluation Criteria
The ad hoc working group is proposing a separate process for evaluating planning project grant applications. The set of evaluation criteria in Attachment 2 include eligibility criteria similar to the criteria for capital projects, but in this case planning projects in Potential Smart Growth Opportunity Areas would be eligible as well. The project evaluation criteria are almost entirely qualitative in nature, so applications would have to be scored by the project evaluation panel. The working group will discuss these criteria again at its next meeting on June 17, but we believe a consensus is forming around the basic structure of the criteria. In order to keep the program development process moving forward, we are soliciting comments from the TWG at this time. Should the planning grant criteria change substantially as a result of future work by the ad hoc working group, staff would bring these criteria back to the TWG for further review.

Next Steps
Based on progress made to date, the current objective is to complete development of the project evaluation criteria this month. Depending on the feedback received from the TWG, the Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee, and external stakeholders, the criteria could be ready to take to the RPC at their July meeting. As the program outline and project evaluation criteria are taking shape, staff is beginning to develop the program guidelines. The guidelines will
include the program application and application process guidelines, and a description of the roles and responsibilities of grant recipients and of SANDAG as the program administrator. A key aspect of the administrative process will be a use-it-or-lose-it policy. Assuming a consensus can be developed on the program guidelines in July, the RPC would be asked to make a final recommendation on the full program to the SANDAG Board in August. That would lead to a call for projects in September or October.

Key Staff Contact: Stephan Vance, (619) 699-1924, sva@sandag.org
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   3. TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program, Program Objectives
### A. Intensity of Planned Development in the Project’s Smart Growth Opportunity Area (maximum 6 points)\(^*\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>% of Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For Metropolitan Center, Urban Centers & Town Centers

1. Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 100% or more
2. Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 50-99%
3. Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 25-49%
4. Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 100% or more

**AND**

5. For Community Rapid Transit, Intermodal or Corridor station or a Transit Center
6. Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 100%
7. Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 25-49%
8. Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 100%

**OR**

9. If a specific plan, master plan, or other mechanism allows for administrative approval of development projects, add 4 points

### B. Existing and Proposed Land Development Around the Proposed Capital Project

#### 1. Existing Development Density Within ½ mile radius of proposed capital project site (maximum 6 points)\(^*\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>% of Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For Metropolitan Center, Urban Centers & Town Centers

1. Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 100% or more
2. Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 50-99%
3. Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 25-49%
4. Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 100%

**AND**

5. For Community Rapid Transit, Intermodal or Corridor station or a Transit Center
6. Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 100%
7. Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 25-49%

**OR**

8. If a specific plan, master plan, or other mechanism allows for administrative approval of development projects, add 4 points

#### 2. Proposed Development Density Within ½ mile radius of proposed capital project site (maximum 6 points)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>% of Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For Metropolitan Center, Urban Centers & Town Centers

1. Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 100% or more
2. Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 50-99%
3. Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 25-49%
4. Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 100%

**AND**

5. For Community Rapid Transit, Intermodal or Corridor station or a Transit Center
6. Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 100%
7. Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 25-49%

**OR**

8. If a specific plan, master plan, or other mechanism allows for administrative approval of development projects, add 4 points

### C. New Affordable Housing Development (maximum 3 points)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>% of Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 10-99% of units affordable
- 50-99% of units affordable
- 100% or more of units affordable

### D. Transportation Characteristics (in walking distance of proposed capital improvement project)

#### 1. Relation to Transit (maximum 12 points)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>% of Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Project is within ½ mile of a Regional Commuter Rail or Corridor station or a Transit Center
- Project is within ½ mile of a stop for a high frequency (15 min or less)* local bus service and at least two additional bus services (transit hub)
- Project is within ½ mile of all daily local bus service

#### 2. Bicycle facilities\(^*\) (up to 2 points based on quality and utility)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>% of Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AND**

- Quality and utility of bicycle facilities
- Bicycle parking

#### 3. Walkability measured by intersection density (up to 4 points)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>% of Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AND**

- Number of intersections within ½ mile of project site

#### 4. TOD strategies existing or proposed\(^*\) (up to 2 points)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>% of Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AND**

- Existing development
- Proposed development

### E. Community Design Features (within ¼ mile radius of project site)

#### 1. Urban Design Characteristics (maximum 6 points)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>% of Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Project review panel scoring based on existing community structure and design characteristics in project area, and planned or proposed design characteristics in the area based on documented guidance such as design guidelines for area or jurisdiction, form-based codes, or renderings of proposed development.

#### 2. Sustainability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>% of Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Where existing or entitled buildings in the project area include universal design features, add 2 points

#### 3. Universal Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>% of Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Where existing or entitled buildings in the project area include universal design features, add 2 points

### II. QUALITY OF PROPOSED CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT

#### Scale: Sound (good), Acceptable (fair), Unacceptable, Omission (zero)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>% of Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Project impact on the surrounding community
- Project impact on public safety
- Project impact on public life

### III. PROPOSED CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT READINESS (maximum 5 points)

#### A. Major Milestones Completed (maximum 3 points)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>% of Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### B. Evidence of Local Commitment (maximum 2 points)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>% of Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AND**

- Demonstrated Community Support
- Public hearing

### IV. COST EFFECTIVENESS (ratio of grant request to project score (maximum 20 points))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>% of Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Project grant request (Example: $2,000,000)
- Grant request divided by project evaluation points (Example: $2,000,000 divided by 185 = 11.081)
- All projects graded on a curve from most to least matching funds.

### V. MATCHING FUNDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>% of Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 20% of project cost
- 30% of project cost
- 40% of project cost

### VI. POLICY 33 POINTS (affordable housing production)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>% of Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 25% of project cost
- 25% of project cost
- 25% of project cost

### TOTAL PROJECT SCORE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>% of Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Potential Planning Project Evaluation Criteria

I. Project Eligibility Criteria

A. Consistency with TransNet Ordinance
   The project must be eligible under the TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program guidelines.

B. Smart Growth Opportunity Area Designation
   Project is located within a potential or existing/planned Smart Growth Opportunity Area, as designated on the Smart Growth Concept Map.

C. Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA)/Policy 33 Compliance
   The applicant’s jurisdiction must have an adopted housing element that has been found in compliance with state law by HCD or self-certified, and submitted its annual report to SANDAG regarding actual housing unit production by income category.

D. Local Funding Commitment and Authorization
   The application must include a resolution or minute order from City Council, County Board of Supervisors, or Board of Directors authorizing the application, and committing to allocate the resources necessary to implement and complete the proposed activities and outcomes within the schedule identified in the project application.

II. Project Evaluation Criteria

Each criterion will be scored on a 5-point scale as follows: 5 – excellent, 4 – very good, 3 – good, 2 – adequate (some deficiencies), 1 – marginal benefit, 0 – no benefit. Guidance on how to apply the criteria to applications will be provided for the evaluation panel in the program guidelines.

A. Location of Proposed Planning Effort (weight factor: 2, maximum points: 10)
   Evidence of opportunities to develop smart growth plans or projects in the proposed planning area: Can the area appropriately accommodate smart growth? Is there land available for redevelopment or rezoning? Would the existing urban form support smart growth development?

B. Relation of Proposed Planning Area to Regional Transit (weight factor: 2, maximum points: 10)
   Transit Infrastructure and Service within proposed plan area
   1. SGOAs with existing regional or corridor transit infrastructure (5 points)
   2. SGOAs with programmed regional or corridor transit infrastructure or existing high frequency local transit infrastructure and service (3 points)
3. SGOAs with planned regional or corridor transit infrastructure, or programmed or planned high frequency local transit infrastructure and service (1 point)

C. Planning Project Objectives (weight factor: 2, maximum points: 10)
   How well do the proposed project objectives support smart growth development in the project area? Would the plan result in a project that increases transportation and housing choices?

D. Proposed Method of Meeting Project Objectives (weight factor: 3, maximum points: 15)
   How does the proposed project plan to accomplish stated objectives? How well does the proposed project scope of work facilitate meeting project objectives? Does the scope of work include significant public outreach?

E. Implementation (weight factor: 2, maximum points: 10)
   Will the proposed planning process lead to timely change in the project area? Is the planning process ready to go? Will it result in regulatory mechanisms that facilitate smart growth?

F. Evidence of Local Commitment (weight factor: 2, maximum points: 10)
   How has the jurisdiction or agency demonstrated a commitment to implement smart growth? This commitment may be demonstrated through existing ordinances, policies, or incentives that support smart growth development.

G. Matching Funds (up to 10 points)
   The project will receive points in proportion to the percentage of proposed matching funds to total project cost.

H. Percentage of Lower Income Housing Units per RHNA (up to 25 points)
   Up to 25 percent of total allowable points, based on amount of affordable housing produced as a percentage of the agency’s annualized affordable housing target.

Maximum score equals 100.
TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program
Program Objectives

- Fund projects that are “ready-to-go” to put good examples of smart growth development on the ground as catalysts for further development.

- The projects should influence land development by improving the public realm and encouraging private smart growth projects that, in combination, create great places.

- The projects should contribute to the reduction of greenhouse gases by encouraging travel by means other than private automobile. In particular, the projects should support public transit usage by being within areas served by transit, and by improving access to transit.

- The projects should support housing development at densities appropriate for its place type.

- The projects should provide good examples of smart growth in a variety of settings in the region.
SMART GROWTH TOOL BOX: REGIONAL HOUSING
AND SMART GROWTH FINANCING STRATEGY

Introduction

SANDAG is developing a “Smart Growth Toolbox” to provide incentives and assistance to local member agencies and other participants in the local development process to promote and facilitate smart growth development in the areas identified on the Smart Growth Concept Map.

The toolbox includes Planning Tools such as Outreach Program to Local Planning Staffs and Commissions, Interactive Web-Based Smart Growth Concept Map, I-PLACE3S Sketch Modeling Tool, Visualization Tool, Smart Growth Design Guidelines, Smart Growth Trip Generation/Parking Study, and Regional Bike Master Plan.

This report focuses on the initial components of a Regional Housing and Smart Growth Financing Strategy, which is intended to provide local communities, planners, and developers with information about the financial resources available to help implement smart growth in locations identified on the Smart Growth Concept Map. The Financing Strategy will identify existing and potential funding sources for housing and smart growth development. It is SANDAG’s intent to include a list, description, and link to these funding sources on our Web site and to keep this information current to publicize their availability and to provide access to these sources in one location.

Discussion

A number of funding sources can be used to help finance smart growth projects in the region. The following is an initial list of these sources. The TWG should review this list and suggest any additions to the list. Comments/suggestions from the TWG on the approach to the Financing Strategy in general also are requested.

Local/Regional Financing Tools

- Traditional financing by the private sector such as banks and other financing institutions, including organizations like the Capital Collaborative Smart Growth Fund and Genesis Fund.
- Tax increment financing in redevelopment areas for infrastructure and affordable housing financing
• SANDAG’s Smart Growth Incentive Program (SGIP)
• SANDAG’s TDA/TransNet Bicycle/Pedestrian Neighborhood Safety Program
• Local housing trust funds (e.g. City of San Diego trust fund)
• Tax increment authority for transit/smart growth areas (Potential - state legislation pending)

State Financing Tools

• Proposition 1C – The Housing and Emergency Shelter Trust Fund Act of 2006
  o Multifamily Housing Program
  o Transit-oriented Development Program
  o Infill Program
  o Park funding
• State “Permanent Source” of funding for housing (Potential)
• State and federal Low Income Housing Tax Credits (9 and 4 percent)

Federal Financing Tools

• Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds
• HOME funds

Non-monetary Financing Tools

• CEQA streamlining
• Pre-approval of projects

Attachment: 1. Excerpt from Regional Economic Prosperity Strategy Adopted in March 2008

Key Staff Contact: Susan Baldwin, 619-699-1943; sba@sandag.org
Introduction

As part of the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) implementation program, SANDAG has been developing a "Smart Growth Tool Box." One of the programs in the Tool Box is the I-PLACE3S sketch modeling tool, an internet-based planning tool designed to provide communities with the opportunity to develop and evaluate alternative land use scenarios for selected areas.

During FY 2007, SANDAG partnered with the City of Escondido as part of a Pilot program to test the application of I-PLACE3S in a smart growth context. In FY 2008, SANDAG initiated three additional pilot projects in the Cities of Lemon Grove, San Diego, and Vista. This report provides an overview of the I-PLACE3S tool and a summary of how the tool was applied in each of the three pilot locations.

Discussion

Summary of Three Pilot Projects

Background

I-PLACE3S is a sketch modeling tool that is designed to provide planners, community members, and decision makers with the opportunity to develop alternative “what-if” land use scenarios for selected planning areas and evaluate the results of those scenarios based on indicators related to housing, jobs, and other public facilities. The primary value of the model is that it allows participants to gain immediate feedback to view the effects of each growth scenario at both the neighborhood and regional scales.

As part of the FY 2008 Work Program, SANDAG identified resources to conduct three pilot projects to continue to refine I-PLACE3S before the possible release of the program for general use in upcoming years. In preparation for the additional pilot projects, and in order to gauge interest in the use of the tool, SANDAG conducted two I-PLACE3S training workshops in May for local planners, transit agency staff members, and other interested parties. The workshops were well-attended, and resulted in broad interest in the use of the tool for local planning efforts. From the local perspective, I-PLACE3S can provide quantitative information about alternative land use scenarios to assist community members and decision makers in local planning processes. From the regional perspective, SANDAG is considering the possibility of offering I-PLACE3S as part of the quantitative analysis required for grant applications from the TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program (SGIP), and as a tool for areas identified on the Smart Growth Concept Map to undertake local planning.
efforts that may result in more smart growth. In addition, there is considerable potential for the use of I-PLACE³S in maintaining and updating the Regional Growth Forecast.

Last August, the Regional Planning Committee approved selection criteria for the pilot projects. SANDAG staff developed an application form and subsequently issued a call for applications. Five applications were submitted. All applications were based on areas identified on the Smart Growth Concept Map. A selection committee consisting of SANDAG staff, the I-PLACE³S consultant, and two local planners from jurisdictions that did not submit applications reviewed the applications. The committee recommended proceeding with the applications for Lemon Grove, the Grantville area in the City of San Diego, and a joint application from Oceanside/Vista, demonstrating good subregional distribution, differing project scales, and appropriateness for use of I-PLACE³S. These projects are summarized below, along with obstacles and changes that were encountered through the project development.

Lemon Grove

This project, located in close proximity to the existing trolley station in the heart of downtown Lemon Grove, used I-PLACE³S to assist in the process of expanding the Downtown Village Specific Plan. The specific purpose of I-PLACE³S was to create a range of mixed-use alternatives that would help to inform staff, the community, and decision makers about the magnitude of impacts and possibilities associated with the land use scenarios. Lemon Grove planners wanted to use the project to test the use of I-PLACE³S in a small-scale setting, and to help them understand future options available for undertaking a general plan update in the near future.

City staff generated the base land use scenario and two alternatives, and reviewed detailed statistics and project information available through the I-PLACE³S program. Lemon Grove staff performed a “mock” community participation exercise with other city staff to obtain feedback on the program and the scenarios. As a result of the pilot project, staff was able to adjust the ratio of office/residential/commercial in the mixed-use environment to a realistic and desirable level. This information will be used to move forward on the General Plan Amendment, Zoning Amendment, and the environmental analysis for the proposed project.

City of San Diego

This project initially proposed using I-PLACE³S to evaluate alternative land use scenarios for the creation of a master plan for the Grantville Redevelopment Project Area located adjacent to the existing Grantville trolley station along the I-8 transportation corridor. The project area was changed to Morena Boulevard after discussions with city staff which indicated that the plans for Grantville were not as far along as those for Morena Boulevard, where the light rail extension is planned, and therefore the Grantville project would not be able to take full advantage of the I-PLACE³S tool. The project area was modified to surround the proposed Mid-Coast Trolley extension corridor along Morena Boulevard, with the goal of evaluating the economic benefits and impacts associated with new land uses that support transit in the corridor. The City created two land use scenarios; one with city planners, and another with community members from the Clairemont Mesa planning group. The city found that while the program was easy for the planners to use, it was more challenging to use with the planning group members, especially those participants that were less familiar with the use of computer technologies. Although I-PLACE³S was helpful as a visual tool, city staff had to print and mark many of their own maps separate from the I-PLACE³S process.
This pilot project initially began as a multi-jurisdictional project between the Cities of Vista and Oceanside centered around the Melrose Avenue Sprinter Station. However, during the early phases of the project, the City of Oceanside withdrew from the project due to resource constraints. As a result, the boundaries of the project were re-drawn. The City of Vista used I-PLACE\textsuperscript{3}S to analyze potential redevelopment scenarios for a segment of North Santa Fe Avenue where land use changes are being contemplated in conjunction with the City’s current general plan update process (Vista 2030) and the implementation of the Vista Redevelopment Plan.

I-PLACE\textsuperscript{3}S was principally used to determine how the study area’s current zoning and development standards would need to change to accommodate a higher density standard. Planners generated two alternative land use scenarios for the study area, both characterized by three and four-story mixed-use and attached multifamily projects and a small amount of one and two-story strip commercial development. Subsequent analysis looked at how much additional housing and employment each scenario would produce beyond that anticipated at build-out under the current general plan. I-PLACE\textsuperscript{3}S was used to analyze the impacts that more intense development would have on traffic volumes, water service, and sewer flow capacity.

**Feedback from Local Planners**

Part of the pilot project process was for local planners to evaluate the challenges and opportunities encountered in using the I-PLACE\textsuperscript{3}S software. In order to gather feedback, SANDAG distributed a summary form and an evaluation survey for the participants to complete after the completion of their alternative scenarios. Attachment 1 is a sample summary form, and Attachment 2 is a sample evaluation survey. Attachment 3 is a graphic summary of the responses to the survey, which are also summarized below.

Overall, pilot project participants agreed that the I-PLACE\textsuperscript{3}S tool is useful for planning-related analysis and, if given the opportunity, would continue to use the program. All three also agreed that the indicators available in I-PLACE\textsuperscript{3}S are useful for planning analysis. Two out of three (with the other jurisdiction feeling “neutral”) felt that I-PLACE\textsuperscript{3}S is useful for making planning decisions, managing planning-related information, and would recommend use of the program to other cities.

There was some disagreement among jurisdictions regarding how user-friendly the program is and availability of indicators. Two of the three cities felt that I-PLACE\textsuperscript{3}S is easy to use, but one strongly disagreed. The reasons cited for this were lack of consistency of labels among different screens in the program and other aspects that can be continually improved. Two jurisdictions reported that the indicators they wanted to analyze were not available (the third was “neutral”). Two jurisdictions responded neutral (one agreed) to the question asking if they had access to the technological expertise needed to use I-PLACE\textsuperscript{3}S successfully. The only question that turned out “not applicable” to the majority of respondents (the third responded “neutral”) dealt with the usefulness of I-PLACE\textsuperscript{3}S for explaining implications of planning to community members; likely because two jurisdictions did not try using the tool with the public.

Several important qualitative suggestions were made by the local planners that will help improve technical aspects of the software for future projects. Reports from all three pilot projects indicated
that the assumptions and indicators included in I-PLACE3S need to be more transparent. In other words, it was felt that the indicators are useful to the extent that their underlying inputs/algorithms were accessible and understandable, but that the confidence in the validity of certain outputs (e.g. floor area ratio (FAR) and employment density) would be enhanced if the model were more transparent. In addition, it was suggested that in cases when I-PLACE3S is used for real-time analysis during collaborative and public planning activities, the numbers generated by the tool would not, in and of themselves, be that useful; they would have to be accompanied by quantified thresholds for level of service and capacity.

Finally, it was felt that the model would be more robust if it included indicators such as sales and property tax revenues; construction costs (for both on-site development and off-site improvements); auto and industrial emissions levels; parks and recreational facilities needs; and public school enrollment impacts.

SANDAG appreciates these observations and will work to integrate these comments and lessons learned into future improvements of I-PLACE3S. Many of the other comments provided in the evaluations indicate that SANDAG staff will need to provide additional training to the users of the program as the program is being used.

**Additional Uses of I-PLACE3S and Next Steps**

In conjunction with the use of I-PLACE3S for the local pilot projects, SANDAG staff had an opportunity to test the use of this program at a regional level on the development of the Regional Climate Action Plan (RCAP), discussed in Agenda Item #10. Staff found that using this tool was a very effective way to test alternative land use scenarios regionally, and that testing land use alternatives through existing models at SANDAG would have taken significantly longer. As a sketch modeling tool, it proved very useful in this context.

SANDAG has recently begun co-hosting a statewide I-PLACE3S “User Group” with the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) to assist other regions in California to familiarize themselves with the program and to learn about how other regional governments and local jurisdictions are using the program. SANDAG is also exploring the use of I-PLACE3S in the context of energy planning through the integration of an “energy module,” which is tentatively scheduled this fall.

Because of the interest associated with I-PLACE3S and the successful pilot project applications, SANDAG has identified resources for additional applications during FY 2009. However, because of budget constraints, resources are limited. As a result, SANDAG will be offering the use of this program through the Service Bureau. SANDAG will provide the TWG with additional details as the program details become available.

**Attachments:**

1. I-PLACE3S Summary Form
2. I-PLACE3S Evaluation Form
3. I-PLACE3S Evaluation Form Responses

**Key Staff Contact:** Carolina Gregor, (619) 699-1989, cgr@sandag.org
I-PLACE³S SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact Name:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Project:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Phone Number:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact E-mail Address:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please provide written responses to these questions regarding your use of I-PLACE³S in the local planning process. Your responses will be incorporated into various SANDAG reports.

Project Description

1. How did you use I-PLACE³S in the planning process? Describe the alternative land use scenarios you created using I-PLACE³S. What was the goal/purpose for creating these alternatives?

2. Describe the analysis you conducted using the alternative land use scenarios. (Did you compare scenario sub-areas? Which indicators and/or reports did you use?)

I-PLACE³S and the Local Planning Process

3. Did I-PLACE³S assist you in making any planning-related decision(s)? (Please describe how/why it did or did not.)

4. Describe the audience for which I-PLACE³S was used. (Was it used at a community meeting, internal staff use only, public meeting, planning commission, etc.?) Do you anticipate more or different audiences in the future?

5. What challenges (if any) did you face during implementation of the I-PLACE³S Pilot Project?

6. Describe the usefulness (if any) of the I-PLACE³S tool in the local planning process in your jurisdiction?

7. Please describe the process of creating localized, tailored place types. Was the process difficult? Was it easy? Could it have been improved? How?

8. Did you have any technical difficulties using I-PLACE³S? If so, please explain.

9. Did you have difficulty learning to use I-PLACE³S? Please explain.
10. Did you feel SANDAG’s initial training session on I-PLACE$^3$S was adequate? Please explain.

11. Could SANDAG improve the I-PLACE$^3$S trainings in the future? If so, how?

12. Did you find the I-PLACE$^3$S consultant to be helpful for using I-PLACE$^3$S? Please explain.

13. Did you find the “Helpdesk” useful for using I-PLACE$^3$S? Please explain.

**Additional Feedback**

Please list any comments you may have regarding the I-PLACE$^3$S software and program.

____________________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________________

Thank you for your time. We rely on your feedback to help us improve our software and program. Your input is greatly appreciated.
I-PLACE³S Evaluation Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact Name:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Project:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Phone Number:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact E-mail Address:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please complete the following questions so that we may improve the I-PLACE³S software and program for future users.

Please fill in the circle that best describes the following statements as they relate to your specific planning project.

1. I-PLACE³S was useful for planning-related analysis.
   - [ ] Strongly Agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Neutral
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly Disagree
   - [ ] N/A

2. I-PLACE³S was useful for planning-related decision-making.
   - [ ] Strongly Agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Neutral
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly Disagree
   - [ ] N/A

3. I-PLACE³S was useful for explaining implications of planning to community members.
   - [ ] Strongly Agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Neutral
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly Disagree
   - [ ] N/A

4. I-PLACE³S was useful for managing planning-related information.
   - [ ] Strongly Agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Neutral
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly Disagree
   - [ ] N/A
5. Your jurisdiction had access to the technological expertise needed to use I-PLACE³S successfully.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

6. You found I-PLACE³S easy to use (user-friendly).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

7. If given the opportunity, you would use I-PLACE³S again for planning purposes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

8. You would recommend the use of I-PLACE³S to planning departments in other cities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

9. I-PLACE³S indicators were useful for planning analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

10. All of the indicators you wanted to analyze were available in I-PLACE³S.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Additional Feedback

Please list any areas in which the I-PLACE³S software and program could be improved.

____________________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________________

Thank you for taking the time to fill out our survey. We rely on your feedback to help us improve our software and program. Your input is greatly appreciated.
I-PLACE^3's Evaluation Form Responses

1. I-PLACE^3's was useful for planning-related analysis.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Neutral
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree
   City of San Diego, City of Vista, City of Lemon Grove

2. I-PLACE^3's was useful for planning-related decision-making.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Neutral
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree
   City of San Diego, City of Vista, City of Lemon Grove

3. I-PLACE^3's was useful for explaining implications of planning to community members.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Neutral
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree
   City of San Diego, City of Vista, City of Lemon Grove

4. I-PLACE^3's was useful for managing planning-related information.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Neutral
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree
   City of San Diego, City of Vista, City of Lemon Grove

5. Your jurisdiction had access to the technological expertise needed to use I-PLACE^3's successfully.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Neutral
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree
   City of San Diego, City of Vista, City of Lemon Grove

6. You found I-PLACE^3's easy to use (user-friendly).
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Neutral
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree
   City of San Diego, City of Vista, City of Lemon Grove

7. If given the opportunity, you would use I-PLACE^3's again for planning purposes.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Neutral
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree
   City of San Diego, City of Vista, City of Lemon Grove

8. You would recommend the use of I-PLACE^3's to planning departments in other cities.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Neutral
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree
   City of San Diego, City of Vista, City of Lemon Grove

9. I-PLACE^3's indicators were useful for planning analysis.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Neutral
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree
   City of San Diego, City of Vista, City of Lemon Grove

10. All of the indicators you wanted to analyze were available in I-PLACE^3's.
    - Strongly Agree
    - Agree
    - Neutral
    - Disagree
    - Strongly Disagree
    City of San Diego, City of Vista, City of Lemon Grove
DRAFT REGIONAL SEDIMENT MANAGEMENT PLAN: REQUEST FOR INPUT

File Number 3002801

Introduction

The SANDAG Shoreline Preservation Working Group consists of representatives from the region's coastal cities, resource agencies, and other environmental stakeholders. The Working Group advises SANDAG on issues related to the Shoreline Preservation Strategy (Strategy) adopted in 1993. The Strategy is a long-term vision for restoring the region's beaches through sand nourishment, retention, protective structures, and regulations to guide the use and development of the shoreline.

One project underway that fits within the Strategy is the Regional Sediment Management Plan (RSMP). The RSMP effort is being funded by Department of Boating and Waterways and seeks consensus-driven regional sediment management guidance and policy. The goals of the RSMP are to identify sediment sources in the region and efficient methods of providing that sediment to nourish the region's beaches.

Your feedback is critical for the success of the RSMP. This agenda item requests feedback from this Working Group on the Draft RSMP. The Draft RSMP consists of an annotated outline, which is available on the SANDAG Web site at www.sandag.org/shoreline under the Coastal Regional Sediment Management Plan. Comments are requested by next week June 26, 2008.

Discussion

The Regional Sediment Management Plan (RSMP) seeks consensus-driven regional sediment management guidance and policy, in order to:

- restore and maintain coastal beaches and other critical areas of sediment deficit or excess;
- reduce proliferation of protective shoreline structures;
- sustain recreation and tourism;
- enhance public safety and access; and,
- restore coastal sandy habitats.

SANDAG has contracted with Moffatt and Nichol to work on the RSMP, which will be completed in fall 2008. To facilitate implementation and enhance the usefulness and economic feasibility of the RSMP, SANDAG is requesting input from this Working Group and other local and government stakeholders. Specifically, input should address the following questions and issues:
• Are there sources of sediment that were not included in the Draft RSMP that should be included?
• Will the RSMP help with sediment management in the region? Why or why not?
• Do you think the activities in the RSMP are economically feasible? Why or why not?
• Are there other activities that should be included in the RSMP?
• How can we let more people know about the RSMP?

Your feedback will be incorporated into the Final RSMP, which will be combined with other regional sediment management plans into the statewide Coastal Sediment Management Master Plan. When the RSMP is complete for the San Diego region, it will:

1. Be based upon region-specific coastal processes, economic, environmental, geographic and societal data;
2. Utilize current reports, data, educational, regulatory, and informational tools developed by the State of California through the Coastal Sediment Working Group; and
3. Be driven by the needs of local and regional governments and local stakeholders.

Comments are requested by June 26, 2008, and should be addressed to:

Andrea Groves
San Diego Association of Governments
401 B Street, Ste 800
San Diego, CA 92101-4231

Key Staff Contact: Andrea Groves, (619) 699-1983, agr@sandag.org