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AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

- TransNet SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM
- ANNUAL REVIEW OF AND AMENDMENTS TO BOARD POLICY NO. 033
- PROPOSAL FOR "ON-CALL" SMART GROWTH VISUAL SIMULATION SERVICES

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, September 11, 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>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

## CONSENT ITEMS (#3 through #5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>+3.</th>
<th>MEETING SUMMARY</th>
<th>APPROVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The working group should review and approve the July 10, 2008, Regional Planning Technical Working Group meeting summary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>+4.</th>
<th>SANDAG BOARD ACTION ON THE TECHNICAL UPDATE OF THE SMART GROWTH CONCEPT MAP (Carolina Gregor)</th>
<th>INFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On July 25, 2008, the SANDAG Board of Directors accepted the technical update of the Smart Growth Concept Map. The report is attached, and the updated regional-scale map, subregional maps, and site descriptions are posted to the SANDAG Web site at <a href="http://www.sandag.org/rcp">www.sandag.org/rcp</a>. The updated Smart Growth Concept Map will be used to determine eligibility to compete for <em>TransNet</em> Smart Growth Incentive Program funds and for other planning purposes. Local jurisdictions are encouraged to reference their smart growth areas in local planning documents and on their Web sites. Copies of the maps and site descriptions will be available at the meeting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5.</th>
<th>2008 CONGESTION MANAGEMENT PROGRAM UPDATE (Heather Werdick)</th>
<th>INFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Draft 2008 Congestion Management Program (CMP) is expected to be released for 30-day public comment by the Transportation Committee on September 19, 2008. Staff will provide an overview of the Draft 2008 CMP at the October 9, 2008, TWG meeting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ITEM # | REPORT ITEMS (#6 through #12) | RECOMMENDATION
--- | --- | ---
6. REPORTS FROM TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP (TWG) MEMBERS | DISCUSSION

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

+7. TransNet SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM (Stephan Vance) | RECOMMEND

At its August meeting, the Regional Planning Committee requested that staff propose an alternative approach to the matching funds criterion that accounts for each jurisdiction’s ability to contribute matching funds toward potential projects. The original proposal, as well as the alternative developed in response to this request, are presented for TWG review and recommendation.

+8. ANNUAL REVIEW OF AND AMENDMENTS TO BOARD POLICY NO. 033 (Susan Baldwin) | RECOMMEND

A. Amendments to Board Policy No. 033 - Staff has prepared an annual review of Board Policy No. 033 and is suggesting several amendments. The TWG should review the proposed changes and make a recommendation to the Executive Committee and RPC regarding these changes. The Regional Housing Working Group also will review these changes on September 25.

B. Extension – The Housing and Community Development (HCD) has granted a one-year extension of the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) and housing element deadlines to June 30, 2010, and June 30, 2011, respectively.

+9. PROPOSAL FOR "ON-CALL" SMART GROWTH VISUAL SIMULATION SERVICES (Carolina Gregor) | DISCUSSION

As part of the Smart Growth Tool Kit, SANDAG and various consultants have been developing visual simulations to demonstrate what smart growth and transit oriented development (TOD) could look like in local areas in the San Diego region. The 2-D simulations have been completed, and the 3-D simulations are underway. SANDAG is considering developing a program to offer member agencies the possibility of “on-call” simulation services for their own local projects. To gauge demand for the proposed on-call services, staff will be conducting an online survey. The completed 3-D simulations will be presented at the meeting, and the survey topics are attached for discussion.
10. TRAINING SESSION FOR 3-D VISUAL SIMULATIONS (Carolina Gregor)  

DISCUSSION

As part of the 3-D visual simulations contract, Stantec will be offering a half day training course on creating visualizations. The course has been scheduled on the morning of Wednesday, November 12, 2008, and is geared toward GIS and graphics staffs of local jurisdictions. SANDAG staff is trying to gauge interest in the training session to determine whether the course should be held. The TWG should discuss this item.

11. SERIES 12 REGIONAL GROWTH FORECAST (Beth Jarosz)  

INFORMATION

SANDAG is beginning a new forecast, the Series 12 Regional Growth Forecast, this fall. Staff will provide an overview of the expected schedule and review the land use input process for the jurisdictions.

12. ADJOURNMENT AND NEXT MEETING  

INFORMATION

The next TWG meeting will be held on Thursday, October 9, 2008, from 1:15 to 3:15 p.m.

+ next to an item indicates an attachment
SUMMARY OF JULY 10, 2008, MEETING

Agenda Item #1: Welcome and Introductions

Bill Anderson, City of San Diego, presided. Self-introductions were conducted.

Agenda Item #2: Public Comments and Communications

Chair Anderson welcomed Melissa Ayres from the City of El Cajon, and announced that Linda Niles, City of Del Mar, would be retiring. Carolina Gregor, SANDAG, congratulated Ms. Niles on her retirement and thanked her for her regional contributions, insights and perspectives. Roger Post, City of National City, stated that he was very happy for Ms. Niles and grateful for having the opportunity to work with her over many years.

Ms. Gregor announced that SANDAG has hired a photographer, Brett Schoaf of Artistic Visuals, for the Smart Growth Photo Library. Several months ago, jurisdictions submitted fairly detailed descriptions of locations to be photographed. Ms. Gregor requested that jurisdictions call the photographer back promptly if he has questions about the locations. The Smart Growth Photo Library will be completed this fall.

Christine Eary, SANDAG, announced that SANDAG is seeking technical feedback from members of the TWG, SANTEC, and CTAC on the Trip Generation and Parking Demand Study being conducted by Fehr & Peers. The next meeting will be on Thursday, July 13th, from 1:30 to 3:30 p.m., at SANDAG.

Mike Bullock, resident of Oceanside, distributed materials and gave a presentation on smart growth and parking. Mr. Bullock spoke of eleven different charts, but formally displayed five charts to the TWG. His charts provided information on the following topics: 1) An index of the contents of the other charts; 2) Mr. Bullock’s personal background; 3) Mr. Bullock’s personal background continued; 4) Components of Smart Growth Design; 5) The New Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Guidelines; 6) The New RTP Guidelines Continued; 7) Money Matters; 8) Car-parking Cash Out and Places of employment; 9) Cover sheet of a twenty page discussion on transit-oriented development downtown; 10) Cash-out results; and 11) Improved Smart Growth Incentive Part II.

Mr. Bullock stated that the Smart Growth Design Guidelines are mostly about parking and how the issue of parking is addressed. He referred to “Chart 4: Components of Smart Growth Design” and stated that the components of smart growth are good transit and higher-density mixed-use with good parking policy. Mr. Bullock posited that parking is the pivotal aspect of smart growth design,
according to his definition of smart growth as reduced Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT). Charts 5 and 6 are the addendum to the 2007 RTP.

CONSENT ITEM

Agenda Item #3: Summary of June 12, 2008, Regional Planning Technical Working Group Meeting

Jon Brindle, City of Escondido, commented that on page eight, the third paragraph from the bottom of the minutes, that the phrase “but did not have road improvements designed yet” should be deleted. On the top of page nine, the phrase the “Community Finance Distribution” should be changed to “Community Finance District.”

The minutes were approved with these changes.

REPORT ITEMS (4 through 10)

Agenda Item #4: Urban land Institute “Smart Growth Awards” (Bill Anderson, TWG Chair)

Chair Anderson announced the recipients of the Urban Land Institute (ULI) “Smart Growth Awards.” There were several project winners and four plan winners. The four Plan Award recipients were: the City of Chula Vista for its “Chula Vista Urban Core Specific Plan,” the City of San Marcos for its “San Marcos Creek Specific Plan,” SANDAG and Tijuana for the “Otay Mesa-Mesa de Otay Strategic Plan” and the City of San Diego for its “General Plan.” Mr. Anderson congratulated everyone for their good work.

Chair Anderson added that the ULI has been very supportive of smart growth efforts and policies. The ULI has been a great resource, particularly with respect to economic issues related to development projects, including parking.

Ed Batchelder, City of Chula Vista, concurred that the ULI has been very helpful in promoting smart growth in the region, adding that it provided various forums to discuss economic issues surrounding smart growth.

Agenda Item #5: Reports from TWG Members

No reports were made.

Agenda Item #6: TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program (Stephan Vance)

Stephan Vance, SANDAG, presented the TWG with information on the Smart Growth Incentive Program. The previous staff report dealt with project evaluation criteria for capital projects. This staff report addresses draft criteria for selecting planning projects. The staff report includes a suggested list of project types, but this is not an exclusive list of projects. It includes everything from
specific plans and planned activities that lead to zone-changing to incorporate smart growth and qualify potential Smart Growth Opportunity Areas for “existing/planned” status, down to the preliminary work for actual capital projects that would be funded under the capital component of the incentive program. As a result of including such a broad list of project types, this creates a challenge for developing criteria for the evaluation panel. The chosen approach was to be broad in criteria to give considerable discretion to the evaluation panel. The panel will consist of SANDAG staff, TWG, and CTAC representatives (from jurisdictions not submitting projects), academics, planning and design professionals and a representative from the San Diego Council of Design Professionals. Just as with the capital projects, there are screening and eligibility criteria. The planning eligibility criteria are similar to that of capital projects, with the exception that applications in Potential Smart Growth Opportunity Areas will be eligible only for planning grants. Otherwise, the planning and capital projects have the same screening criteria: consistency with the TransNet ordinance, located within a smart growth area, qualifies with Policy 33, and a resolution committing to matching funds and staff resources.

The criteria themselves are in Attachment 1 of the report in Section II: Project Evaluation Criteria. The proposed criteria include: proximity to transit (with the exception of rural villages, whose scores will be normalized so that they will not be affected by this factor); potential for smart growth development in the project area; how well the proposed project would meet smart growth objectives; the quality of the Scope of Work; proposed outcomes (what will be the concrete result of the project); evidence of local commitment to smart growth based on past efforts (specific plans, mixed-use, etc); and the amount of matching funds. The relative points and weights attached to the criteria can be found in Attachment 1. As with other SANDAG grant programs, 25 percent of points will be awarded based on low-income housing units produced in the jurisdiction in accordance with Policy 33. Mr. Vance opened the floor for comments and recommendations.

Pat Murphy, City of Encinitas, commented on page 20, Section F in reference to the criteria which mandates evidence of local commitment. He stated that a potential area might not have any evidence of smart growth at that location but there might be evidence elsewhere in the city. In terms of demonstrating commitment through a district ordinance, he inquired as to what that would entail. Mr. Murphy continued that although he was not aware of a city entirely lacking a past demonstrated commitment to smart growth, it seems wrong to penalize a city wishing to engage in smart growth without a prior record of doing so. If a city wants to take the leap, try something new and educate their citizenry, they should not be dissuaded from their efforts. Mr. Murphy suggested allotting fewer points to the commitment criteria, so that such a city would not be kept from scoring well.

Ms. Niles responded that it seemed that most cities had adopted a resolution to move forward with sustainable design or had committed in some way to the smart growth concept. She asked staff to clarify this.

Ms. Gregor elaborated that every jurisdiction has, at a minimum, one location on the Smart Growth Concept Map. Prior to this, when SANDAG was involved in the REGION2020 Program, SANDAG asked the jurisdictions for resolution of support for smart growth. All jurisdictions signed a resolution. These resolutions go back a few years.

Mr. Vance added that the criteria will be supported by guidance for the evaluation panel in the program guidelines.
Coleen Clementson, SANDAG, stated that it could be the case that a jurisdiction has made a demonstration of commitment within the area it intends to plan. In such a sense, it has a degree of previously demonstrated commitment. Although it might not be comparable to the level of commitment demonstrated by other jurisdictions, by agreeing to put an area on the Smart Growth Concept Map, that jurisdiction has taken a step toward smart growth. In effect, by adding that example as a means of demonstrating commitment to smart growth, it could give an area that is trying to make a dramatic shift a chance to compete. A jurisdiction with a really good planning proposal would not be ruled out.

Robert Larkins, City of Lemon Grove, voiced concern as well, stating that if it is truly an incentive program, then it should encourage jurisdictions that do not have anything on the ground or do not have a track record. If the intention is to encourage smart growth activity, making previous demonstration of smart growth a requirement might be seen as a hurdle.

Mr. Post contended that evidence of local commitment seems pretty general. In such a sense, there are many ways in which a community could demonstrate commitment.

Mr. Larkins stated that if a jurisdiction currently has no ordinances, is starting from zero and just putting forward the idea of a specific plan for smart growth, then this is not an incentive, but rather an obstacle.

Jerry Backoff, City of San Marcos, noted that most jurisdictions have identified a potential smart growth area on the Smart Growth Concept Map and as such would get points. If a jurisdiction has yet to even designate a potential area, it should not receive points.

Mr. Vance clarified that at a minimum, without a potential smart growth area, a jurisdiction cannot compete in the program.

Mr. Larkins agreed that designating a potential area on the Smart Growth Concept Map should be sufficient commitment.

Devon Muto, County of San Diego, agreed with the suggestion provided by Ms. Clementson, that the criteria should be more project-specific. As it is written, it seems as though it is simply a general evaluation of a jurisdiction and, in such a sense, a jurisdiction’s rating could be decided today. Mr. Muto expressed dissent at approaching the demonstrated commitment criteria in such a manner, suggesting instead that it gauge commitment in a more site-specific fashion.

Andy Hamilton, APCD, stated that because this is a pilot program and there is not a great deal of funding available, there needs to be some level of assurance that the investment in the project will pay off. There is a fear that funds would be allotted to a jurisdiction, only for it to hold workshops and ultimately be shot down by the community. It is probable that a vast variety of evidence will be used to demonstrate commitment and it will be up to the evaluation panel to ultimately decide how to allocate points.

Chair Anderson inquired about grant amounts.
Mr. Vance answered that staff is still waiting to hear from the Regional Planning Committee (RPC) on this issue; however, staff intends to recommend that 15-20 percent of the total TransNet SGIP funds be allocated for planning grants, with a maximum size of $300,000 per planning grant.

Mr. Backoff informed the group that at the RPC meeting, San Marcos recommended an increase in the funding amount for the planning grants. San Marcos would like to see the amount of the planning grants increased to 25 percent with a cap of $500,000 because this would be closer to covering the costs associated with larger planning projects. Additionally, Mr. Backoff asked whether proximity to transit would be evaluated.

Mr. Vance responded that the area that a jurisdiction is intending to plan would need to have transit located within it.

Mr. Backoff asked whether transit plans or the ability to fund a shuttle service would be rated comparably.

Mr. Vance responded that the way the criteria are currently written, plans for a shuttle service would not score comparably to having transit located within the area.

Chair Anderson drew attention to Section H (Percentage of Lower Income Housing Units per RHNA) and inquired to as whether it included moderate or only low and very low income housing.

Mr. Vance replied that no, it did not focus specifically on the issue of moderate versus low-income housing when developing this criterion. The establishment for how that is dealt with is set by Board policy.

Mr. Batchelder noticed that the number of points for the housing category significantly outweighs the other categories. He asked about the breakdown of the points, especially with regard to percentages. For example, a jurisdiction with a 10,000 or 15,000 unit Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) requirement that builds 500 units would have a lower percentage than a jurisdiction with a RHNA of ten units that builds eight units, even though the absolute number of units generated is larger. He wondered why so many points were placed in the housing category.

Mr. Vance stated that that is how Board Policy 33 is set up, but there has been discussion amongst the staff and the elected officials about revisiting the policy.

Mr. Batchelder said that the percentage was not in question, but rather why there were so many points associated with this particular category of the criteria.

Mr. Vance answered that Board policy mandates that the housing category must receive 25 percent of the points.

Chair Anderson added that the City of San Diego has the same concern and that it is worth revisiting the Board policy.

Mr. Brindle suggested reworking the methodology by measuring both the actual number of units built and the percentage of the overall share of the RHNA number.
Mr. Vance stated that that methodology is being considered.

Mr. Batchelder referred to the section on “level of commitment.” He asked about the way in which points are given. He suggested focusing more on the level of the outcome which would result from the planning project proposal. If it is a superb project that will result in something real, it should take precedence over a less-impressive project from a jurisdiction that has demonstrated more commitment. The emphasis should not be on past commitment, but rather accomplishments intended through the project.

Chair Anderson asked if the local matching funds must be secured prior to the application.

Ms. Clementson responded that there must be a resolution supporting the grant application, and once grants are awarded, SANDAG and the jurisdiction will enter into an agreement that will require council action again for that commitment of funds or matching funds.

Chair Anderson inquired if the process entails submitting the grant first and then securing the matching funds, or securing the local financial commitment up front and then applying for the grant.

Ms. Clementson responded that the resolution states that the jurisdiction will follow through on the grant guidelines and know what those guidelines are when applying for funding.

Mr. Anderson commented that this is a way of showing local commitment.

Mr. Batchelder said that it is certainly part of demonstrating local commitment, but that it is more important for funding to go toward efforts that will result in a tangible plan. For example, an effort that moves a zoning ordinance forward for actual smart growth development would be more productive than an input/output effort without the planning.

Ms. Clementson suggested looking at evidence of local commitment, taking those questions, and incorporating them into Section E: Implementation. This would be a way to shift some of the weight.

Mr. Vance responded that shifting points from Section F: Local Commitment to Section E: Implementation might be a good way to address some of the issues raised.

Mr. Backoff asked if a jurisdiction in the middle of a project could still apply for funding if that project has yet to be approved or adopted.

Mr. Vance said that there is nothing in the criteria which addresses that situation. The idea is not to fund projects that are already funded.

Mr. Backoff shared that San Marcos is just starting a project, with some momentum and that it would be nice to receive additional funding. It is the biggest demonstration of commitment to a project, if the project will proceed whether or not the grant is received.
Ms. Niles stated that there may be some jurisdictions that are starting projects but that because of costs, might have to phase them over several years, so it seems that these types of projects should especially be eligible for funds.

Chair Anderson commented that it would be important to demonstrate that the proposed project is not included in a scope of work that has already been funded.

Mr. Vance stated that this argument has been heard regarding the capital funding improvements as well. The argument is that funds should not be given to a project that has already been funded.

Ms. Clementson suggested adding clarifications in the grant guidelines package with respect to supplementing existing planning projects or adding another component to the project that had not been budgeted or even consolidating a two-year project into a one-year project.

Mr. Backoff stated that even if there is a budget for a project, the money has not been spent. There should not be a penalty for planning for smart growth projects in advance, especially if adding to the initial scope.

Mr. Brindle inquired whether the language was flexible enough to allow “bricks and mortar” planning projects to compete well against traditional regulatory projects. The threshold for capital projects is much higher, but they might need planning projects to help prepare them. This will be fairly narrow and fairly focused when compared to form-based codes that reach across the spectrum. Perhaps there should be preference for bricks and mortar because it actually achieves an outcome, even though it is not as flashy as a broader planning project.

Mr. Vance stated that it is unknown how the planning portion of the TransNet SGIP will evolve. It is envisioned that both feasibility studies and planning efforts will be eligible for funds.

Ms. Clementson added that plans for capital projects that are in areas that have existing or planned smart growth development should do well in the process, and will likely score better than plans for capital projects in areas that cannot demonstrate a greater potential for smart growth.

Gary Barberio, City of Carlsbad, stated there needs to be criteria for what can be funded. He wondered if the funds could be used for CEQA clearances. It is not currently included in the list of eligible planning activities.

Mr. Vance responded that funding for CEQA would be eligible if it is part of the expense of a capital project.

Mike Bullock stated that there were no criteria regarding VMT reduction, which is what smart growth is all about.

Mr. Vance responded that because the planning grants focus on planning activities, they will not immediately result in tangible traffic changes. Although VMT reduction is one of the overall objectives, it can only be assessed when looking at capital infrastructure grants. He asked what sort of quantifiable measure Mr. Bullock is referring to.
Mr. Bullock gave the example of creating a new parking ordinance to unbundle parking, resulting in a 20 percent reduction in use of the automobile.

Mr. Vance stated that this could be considered.

Chair Anderson asked for a motion.

Mr. Batchelder made a motion to approve the staff recommendation, with a caveat to move 5-10 points from Section F (Evidence of Local Commitment) to Section E (Implementation).

Mr. Muto suggested that the clarification be made that it is not the jurisdiction’s commitment to smart growth, but rather the jurisdiction’s commitment to the project. This could be in conjunction with the redistribution of the weight.

Mr. Batchelder recommended moving 10 points from Section F to Section E.

Mr. Backoff suggested increasing the planning grant portion of the TransNet SGIP to 25 percent of the overall program.

Mr. Batchelder responded that that is a separate issue. He asked staff how the dollar amounts would break down with each percentage.

Mr. Vance responded that 20 percent would represent approximately $2 million of the first cycle toward the planning grants, depending on actual revenues.

Mr. Batchelder responded that 20 percent with a $300,000 cap for the planning grants seems okay if approximately $2 million is available.

Chair Anderson suggested making the percentage a separate motion.

Mr. Batchelder accepted changes to the motion. He motioned to shift 10 points from Section F to Section E and to focus demonstrated smart growth commitment on the project rather than the jurisdiction.

Mr. Post observed that it seems like the motion overemphasizes support for the project.

Mr. Muto countered that all jurisdictions will argue that they support smart growth. It is more tangible to judge applications based on commitment vis-à-vis support for the project.

Ms. Niles stated that Section D (Proposed Method of Meeting Project Objectives) addresses the project specifically and that Section F (Evidence of Local Commitment) deals more with general support for smart growth.

Mr. Batchelder suggested that Section F remain as intended, but with fewer points.

Mr. Brindle voiced that there are different degrees of commitment with different levels of support.

Mr. Batchelder motioned to move 10 points from Section F to Section E.
The motion was seconded and approved.

Mr. Backoff motioned to increase the planning grants to 25 percent of the overall TransNet SGIP, with a cap of $500,000 per grant.

The motion was seconded.

Rich Whipple, City of Solana Beach, suggested placing clarifications on the cap and the number of potential projects that could receive the $500,000 grants.

Mr. Vance explained that 10 percent was originally proposed for planning and although the RPC expressed support for more funding for planning, staff did not sense that there was support for a lot more funding. Staff felt that 15 percent was probably appropriate, but that 15-20 percent would allow for flexibility. Flexibility would be up to $2 million under 20 percent. In the worse case scenario, the grants would fund five to six planning projects at $300,000 each.

Mr. Whipple stated that the group should discuss the concept of minimizing the cap based on the limited amount of funds.

Mr. Brindle suggested the idea of having the capital grants compete against the planning grants.

Mr. Murphy agreed that the cap should remain at $300,000. He suggested that the funding be monitored and subsequently changed if necessary.

Gary Halbert, City of Santee, commented that specifying the percentage at 20 percent would be better than providing flexibility between 15 and 20 percent. He argued that leaving the percentage flipping between 15 and 20 percent is tricky because there are advocates between different departments in jurisdictions.

Mr. Backoff expressed shock, adding that if the intent is to push smart growth planning, both the percentage of the overall program and the cap amount should be higher for the planning grants.

Chair Anderson suggested 20 percent with $400,000.

Mr. Backoff amended the motion.

The motion was seconded and passed with two opposed.

Agenda Item #7: Smart Growth Design Guidelines (Stephan Vance, SANDAG, and consultants from Design Community and Environment (DC&E))

Tom Ford and Jeff Williams, consultants from Design Community and Environment (DC&E), spoke on the Smart Growth Design Guidelines.

Mr. Ford gave a brief background on the project and asked the TWG to respond to the following question: For usefulness of the document, is it more important for the Design Guidelines to be
structured as a “primer” or a best practices guide, or would the TWG prefer more specific metrics, such as number of stories, setbacks, etc.?

Chair Anderson inquired as to how the Smart Growth Design Guidelines would be used, as a resource for the local jurisdictions, or as a metric of performance for future cycles of the SGIP?

Ms. Clementson replied that the Design Guidelines would be used to put more description into what makes a smart growth area work. It is very possible, however, that what comes out of this may be used to evaluate proposals for future SGIP grants.

Chair Anderson replied that he thought that that was problematic because the planning process must take the culture of the community into account. For example, the debate between 65 and 150 foot building heights - in both circumstances, the areas are examples of urban smart growth. He suggested that the Guidelines include more ideas of how to address common problems, such as transitioning from commercial to residential zones, sidewalks in the public realm, fire safety, and other issues.

Ms. Clementson added that SANDAG wants these guidelines to be useful to the jurisdictions. Ideally, each jurisdiction could take what is particularly useful for them and integrate those components into the appropriate local documents.

Mr. Batchelder concurred with Chair Anderson, stating that Chula Vista’s Urban Core Specific Plan is a first form-based code. It contains illustrative examples that seem to work well together, with a menu of options of how to accomplish walkable street designs, dealing with intensity but still keeping the public realm.

Mr. Halbert encouraged the consultants to include many smart growth references and examples, so that the communities in the San Diego region can avoid the homogeneity of Orange County.

Mr. Muto encouraged including designs that help creating great places with distinct character; distinct communities.

Mr. Ford agreed and referred to Section II-B.

Mr. Larkins expressed concern with use of the word “consistency.” He expressed fear that this might lead to a lack of creativity. Each jurisdiction should celebrate its diversity yet maintain smart growth principles. He requested examples so that jurisdictions could promote their own spin.

Mr. Brindle inquired as to whether the intent was to have guidelines for all of the smart growth place types.

Nancy Bragado, City of San Diego, stated that there are so many guidelines that are specific to San Diego, for example the transit-oriented development (TOD) guidelines developed in 1992 and the more recent pedestrian guidelines, and suggested that the consultants build upon these existing documents. She also suggested that it might be helpful to have an on-line set of guidelines for cutting and pasting into local documents as an “electronic toolbox.”
Mr. Bullock thought that the guidelines should focus more on reducing VMT, which has to do with economics, real choice, and application of free market. A person pays for what is used and does not pay for what is not used. Unbundling the costs of parking really works. Train station parking only benefits riders that drive and park. Chapter 9 should focus on intelligent parking.

Mr. Ford spoke about the public outreach effort. Two workshops will be held with various stations for feedback for various topics. One workshop will be held at SDSU and another one will be held the next day in North County. The consultants want to make sure that jurisdiction staffs and members of community can participate.

Chair Anderson asked whether there would be any benefit in having a workshop specifically dedicated to the design community, for example: Council of Design Professionals, AIA, APA, ULI, etc.

Mr. Vance explained that in the next month, the guidelines would be taken to design professionals.

Ms. Clementson explained that SANDAG is definitely interested in hearing from the design professionals and that SANDAG wants to make best use of these workshops.

Mr. Bullock asked how people would be made aware of the workshops in such a large county.

Mr. Vance explained that there would be press releases to all papers.

**Agenda Item #8: Smart Growth Visual Simulations**

Ms. Gregor introduced Steve Price of Urban Advantage, Inc. Mr. Price was commissioned to create 2-D smart growth visual simulations of various locations throughout the region as a component of the Smart Growth Tool Box. Mr. Price spoke about Urban Advantage and presented the “before” and the “conceptual after” of the seven locations. Through these visual simulations, Mr. Price was able to model street and pedestrians improvements, as well as mixed-use development, innovative parking concepts, and landscaping catered to address a variety of needs. He explained the various challenges encountered and the community feedback received through the extent of his work.

Mr. Muto expressed gratitude for the work Mr. Price conducted in Alpine. The simulation was instrumental in generating discussion among the community group, and Supervisor Diane Jacob has expressed support for the project.

Ms. Clementson commented that the visual simulations provide an example of some of the smart growth designs that were previously discussed. Mr. Price has agreed to provide written descriptions of the types of improvements demonstrated in the presentation. SANDAG will distribute these materials for the TWG.

Ms. Gregor added that these simulations, as well as the draft criteria for the capital infrastructure grants proposed for the TransNet SGIP, would be brought to the RPC the following day. The visual simulations will be presented first so that the RPC will have a sense of the types of projects the SGIP is promoting. The simulations will be available on-line soon. She encouraged jurisdictions to share these visual simulations with their communities.
Agenda Item #9: 2008 Congestion Management Program Update (Heather Werdick)

SANDAG is mandated by the state and federal law to conduct a biennial Congestion Management Program (CMP). Ms. Werdick attended the joint TWG/CTAC meeting in May, explaining that the 2008 CMP update was underway and that staff would return with some initial results before the draft CMP would be released. This presentation summarizes the initial findings.

There are three topic areas in the report. The first part of the report is the draft 2007 Level of Service (LOS) summary. SANDAG has been working with the public works directors and the traffic engineers from all the local jurisdictions. Some of the LOS results are being refined based on the revised data. Overall, the LOS has improved from the last CMP.

The second item was evaluated at the request of the Transportation Committee. It evaluated whether additional arterials should be added to the CMP network. The second part of report deals with proposed additions, and staff is currently meeting with various jurisdictions that might be affected.

The main purpose of presenting this report deals primarily with the third item: prioritizing Subregional Planning Studies. While conducting subregional studies is not new, what is new is that SANDAG is exploring the idea to require funding commitments from local jurisdictions for these studies. In the past, SANDAG has absorbed the entire cost of the studies but have focused the emphasis on corridor issues. This could provide a benefit to local jurisdictions, especially if evaluating local access transportation issues and a way of identifying future projects to go into future Regional Transportation Plans (RTPs). The staff report suggests a 50/50 contribution. Staff received feedback from CTAC that the split is too high. Ms. Werdick requested TWG members to e-mail her feedback. The draft 2008 CMP will be released for public comment in September.

Mr. Backoff commented that on SR 78, there is only a small segment listed in terms of CMP freeway. San Marcos dealt last year with SANDAG and Caltrans on a large project and predicted that the auxiliary lines would be incomplete between Oceanside and Escondido. Seeing as how this is no longer in the funding cycle, he wondered what happens to the project.

Ms. Werdick responded that on SR 78, between Interstates 5 and 15, the initial draft data from Caltrans indicates that SR 78 is no longer a deficient CMP segment. This analysis was based on 2007 data, and that in the future, this corridor may once again be deemed deficient with future CMP updates.

Agenda Item #10: Adjournment and Next Meeting

The next TWG meeting will be held on Thursday, September 11, 2008, from 1:15 to 3:15 p.m.
TECHNICAL UPDATE TO THE SMART GROWTH CONCEPT MAP

File Number 3000200

Introduction

In response to SANDAG 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 and the local jurisdictions have been working together to review and complete a technical update to the Smart Growth Concept Map (Attachment 1) and corresponding Site Descriptions (Attachment 2). In addition, in response to the Settlement Agreement on the 2030 RTP Environmental Impact Report, the Concept Map, and the site descriptions reflect additional information on timing and phasing of transit projects in the 2030 RTP.

This report summarizes the changes to the Concept 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 the City of Carlsbad.

Recommendation

The Regional Planning Committee recommends that the Board of Directors accept the updated Smart Growth Concept Map for use in the TransNet SGIP and for ongoing planning purposes.

Discussion

In 2004, the Board adopted the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP), which provides an overall vision and policy framework for better connecting transportation and land use within the region, and promotes smart growth and sustainability as key principles. One of the RCP 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 Board of Directors 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 initial 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.

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

a. 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:”

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

b. 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, San Marcos Creek Specific Planning Area (SM-4) now qualifies as an Existing/Planned Mixed Use Transit Corridor.

c. 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 San Diego-Coronado 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 updated 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.

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 County General Plan Update 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: Ramona (CN-5) and Alpine (CN-8). 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 Regional Planning Technical Working Group (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.

- Carlsbad Village COASTER Station (CB-3): Expanded to include the Barrio area immediately south
- Downtown Escondido (ES-1): Expanded boundaries of Downtown Specific Plan to the west, north, and east
- Downtown Lemon Grove (LG-3): Expanded boundaries westward
- Downtown National City (NC-1): Expanded boundaries westward
- National City (NC-2): Replaced previous potential Filipino Village Community Center with a new potential Mixed Use Transit Corridor along Plaza Boulevard from D Avenue to Euclid Avenue
- National City (NC-3): Extended Highland Avenue Mixed Use Transit Corridor to include Highland Avenue and the Sweetwater Road Transit Corridor
- Poway (PW-1): Expanded boundaries of Town Center area in various directions to better reflect local planning efforts
- San Marcos (SM-3): University Mixed Use Area: Expanded boundaries to include the University Village area
- Santee (ST-2): Moved this potential Community Center eastward
• Vista (VS-5): 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 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 provide a sufficient level of transit service for this place type. Subsequently, the recently updated 2030 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.”

During the preparation of the 2030 RTP, SANDAG staff worked closely with transit planning staff from the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) and the North County Transit District (NCTD) to prioritize local high-frequency transit services in the more heavily populated areas of the region. Transit routes and frequencies were increased in these populated areas, which are now represented on the Smart Growth Concept Map as “Transit Priority Areas.” Staff has evaluated the applicability of these refined transit service types to the “Community Center” place type, and has recommended that “high-frequency local bus service” in these areas qualify as an appropriate minimum transit service level for Community Centers. The TWG and the Regional Planning Committee (RPC) support this approach.

**General Mapping Edits**

a. Refinements to major employment areas

Based on direction from the RPC, 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” layer

As referenced above, a new overarching transit layer, labeled “Transit Priority Areas,” has 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 NCTD and MTS 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

The Carlsbad Quarry Creek Potential Community Center (CB-2) 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 has been 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 the TransNet SGIP.

The RPC unanimously recommended that the Board accept this technical update. If the Board accepts this update, the revised Smart Growth Concept Map and corresponding Site Descriptions will be used to determine eligibility 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.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Attachments: 1. Regional and Subregional-Scale Smart Growth Concept Map (posted on SANDAG Web site at www.sandag.org/rcp)
2. Site Descriptions (posted on SANDAG Web site at www.sandag.org/rcp)

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

Funds are budgeted in Work Element #3000200
Introduction

In July and August, the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG) reviewed and commented on recommendations about funding cycles, funding levels and project types, and on the project selection criteria for the TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program. The Regional Planning Committee (RPC) has also reviewed and supported the staff recommendations for these program features as well.

While work on the basic program features and selection criteria have been completed, one item in the selection criteria related to matching funds remains to be resolved. As requested by the RPC, this report proposes an option for how the size of a jurisdiction, and therefore its capacity to provide matching funds for projects, could be taken into account when awarding points to projects.

Recommendation

The Technical Working Group is asked to recommend an option for distributing project evaluation points for matching funds using one of the options described below.

Discussion

The TransNet Ordinance requires that the Smart Growth Incentive Program (SGIP) be used “to match federal, state, local, and private funding to maximize the number of improvements to be implemented.” In response to that requirement, the project selection criteria award points for matching funds as an incentive for local agencies to contribute funds toward the total project cost.

Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program

For reference, the Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program project selection criteria allocated 10 percent of the available points based upon the local funding match relative to total project cost. All but one of the 33 projects submitted in the Pilot Program included matching funds. Of the 14 projects that were awarded funding, matching fund ratios ranged from 10 to 84 percent.
Current Proposal

Under the current proposal, points would be awarded by computing the percentage of matching funds relative to total project cost and ranking projects based on those percentages. The points available under the matching funds criterion would be distributed proportionately with the highest percentage application receiving 20 points and the lowest one point. The higher the match as a proportion of total project cost, the higher the score assigned.

Modified Proposal – Adjusting the Match Percentage for Population

The RPC asked staff to develop a methodology for awarding points to account for the large variance in the size of local agency budgets. The concern is that smaller jurisdictions, with smaller budgets, would have to commit a greater percentage of their total discretionary resources toward matching funds. In response to the RPC request, SANDAG has developed an alternative that splits the points in this category into ten for total match as a percentage of the total project cost, and 10 for the match percentage adjusted for population. Ten points of the available 20 points would be awarded as described in the current proposal (above), based solely on percentage of the project cost covered by matching funds. The remaining ten points would be distributed based on a similar calculation, adjusted for the size of the jurisdiction as described below.

Population is a readily available measure of jurisdiction size, but the range of population is very large, from 1.3 million for the City of San Diego to 4,500 for Del Mar. That is a ratio of 289:1 which is too wide to be useful for this application. A narrower range that preserves the relationships between the populations can be derived by computing the log of each population. This results in a ratio from highest to lowest (Del Mar to San Diego) of 1.67:1. By calculating this ratio for each jurisdiction, it is possible to construct an array of adjustment factors on a five point scale as shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Del Mar</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solana Beach</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Vista</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronado</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>El Cajon</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemon Grove</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Carlsbad</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Beach</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poway</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Oceanside</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santee</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Mesa</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>County Unincorporated Area</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National City</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encinitas</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The resulting factors can then be used as multipliers to adjust the matching fund amounts proposed by a jurisdiction. The resulting calculation would be:

\[
\text{matching funds} \times \text{adjustment factor} \div \text{total cost}
\]

The resulting percentage would then be used to award the remaining ten points in the manner described above where the highest percentage earns ten points, the lowest one point, with those in between distributed proportionately.
Next Steps

The TWG recommendation regarding matching funds will be presented to the RPC for a recommendation to the SANDAG Board of Directors.

Meanwhile, SANDAG staff is working with the ad hoc working group to complete the program guidelines, which document the process that SANDAG will use to administer the program. Staff will present the draft program guidelines to the TWG for review and comment prior to issuing a call for projects.

It is anticipated that the SANDAG Board of Directors will be asked to approve the final project selection criteria and authorize a call for projects in November.

Key Staff Contact: Stephan Vance, (619) 699-1924; sva@sandag.org
ANNUAL REVIEW OF AND AMENDMENTS TO BOARD POLICY NO. 033

Introduction


This policy sets forth guidelines for incentives related to the RHNA for the 2005-2010 housing element cycle, which was adopted by the Board on February 25, 2005. As part of the approval of the final RHNA for the San Diego region, the Board agreed to grant certain financial incentives to jurisdictions based on the status of their housing elements and share of affordable housing.

Board Policy No. 033 identifies the funding programs that will be subject to the RHNA policy, the housing element-related eligibility requirements for the funding programs affected by the policy, and how incentive points will be allocated based upon lower-income housing production.

The policy also states that an annual review shall be prepared to determine whether changes to the guidelines are needed. It further states that issues to be considered during the annual review include, but are not limited to: lessons learned during the prior year, the relationship between the RHNA memorandum and SANDAG smart growth goals, and new funding sources proposed to be subject to the memorandum.

In June 2007, staff recommended and the Executive Committee and Board of Directors concurred that no changes be made to the policy because full application of the policy had only occurred with one funding program – the 2008 TDA/TransNet Bicycle and Pedestrian Program. It was agreed that the policy be reviewed again following the FY 2009 TDA/TransNet Funding cycle and in anticipation of the TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program in 2008. Although a call for projects was not issued for the bicycle/pedestrian funding program in 2008, staff and the Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) Leadership agreed to review several issues associated with Board Policy No. 033 at this time.

Recommendation

The Regional Planning Technical Working Group should review the proposed revisions to Board Policy No. 033 in the Discussion section below and make its recommendations to the Regional Planning Committee (RPC).
Discussion

Use of Board Policy No. 033 for 2008 TDA/TransNet Bicycle Pedestrian Funds

Full application of Board Policy No. 033 took place for the first time during the FY 2008 TDA/TransNet Bicycle and Pedestrian funding cycle. The policy required that prior to the application due date jurisdictions must have:

1. adopted a housing element that has been found in compliance with state law by the Housing and Community Development (HCD) (Section 2.4.2 of Policy No. 033);
2. submitted information to SANDAG regarding the actual production of housing units in all four income categories (very low, low, moderate, and above moderate) (Sections 2.4.3 and 2.4.3.1); and
3. provided (if applicable) information to SANDAG regarding progress toward complying with any rezoning programs contained in its housing element that are required to meet the adequate site identification requirements of state law (Sections 2.4.3 and 2.4.3.1).

In addition to the eligibility requirements listed above for FY 2008, Board Policy No. 033 calls for points to be awarded for affordable lower-income (for very low and low income households) housing production in the evaluation of projects. A maximum of 50 points (25 percent of the total points) can be awarded to a project based on the number of affordable lower-income housing units produced in the jurisdiction in relation to their annualized RHNA goals.

For the FY 2008 program, six jurisdictions met the housing element eligibility criteria and submitted information regarding their housing production in four income categories (Chula Vista, El Cajon, Escondido, La Mesa, San Diego, and San Marcos) between July 1, 2005, and June 30, 2006 (the first year of the housing element cycle).

Proposed Revisions to Board Policy No. 033

A strike-out/underlined version with proposed revisions to Board Policy No. 033 (Attachment 1).

Award of Incentive Points

Based on comments received during the past year, staff recommends awarding incentive points based not only on the number of new residential units for which building permits were issued in comparison to RHNA Alternative 3, but also each jurisdiction’s share of the total lower income units permitted in the region with each being given equal weight (see the changes proposed in Section 2.5.1 of the policy and in Attachment 5 of the policy).
SANDAG Funding Sources Affected by Board Policy No. 033

The TWG should discuss the funding sources affected by Board Policy No. 033. Recently staff became aware of an inconsistency between two sections of the policy with respect to the Senior Transportation Mini-grant Program. Attachment 2.2 of the policy indicates that the program should be subject to the policy, while wording in Section 2.2.4 states that, “Funds which can be allocated to entities other than local jurisdictions (e.g., TransNet Environmental Mitigation Program Regional Habitat Conservation Fund), shall not be subject to the policy. The majority of the Senior Mini-Grant funds are proposed to be awarded to agencies other than local jurisdictions including non-profit agencies. Based on Section 2.2.4, Policy No. 033 would not apply to this funding program. SANDAG staff recommends removal of the Senior Mini-grant Program from the list of programs subject to the policy in Attachment 2, and that the program be added to the Local section of the FUNDING PROGRAMS NOT SUBJECT TO BOARD RHNA MEMORANDUM.

Time Period for Evaluation of Lower Income Housing Production

Board Policy No. 033 is silent on the time period that will be used in evaluating the production of lower income housing. Staff recommends using the report that is current (for the preceding calendar year) to award points for any call for projects. For example, calls for projects issued between April 1 and March 31 should use the report submitted to HCD for the preceding calendar year.

Requirement for “Making Progress” Toward Implementation of Rezoning Programs

In Section 2.4.2 and 2.4.3 the policy makes reference to the requirement that if a jurisdiction was not able to identify adequate sites to meet their RHNA goals and had to include a rezoning program in their housing element to identify additional sites that they must be able to demonstrate that they are making progress toward implementing the rezoning program in conformance with the schedule contained in their housing elements. “‘Making progress’ toward implementing the rezoning program is defined as having demonstrated a good faith effort in undertaking the rezoning program described in the housing element.” It is proposed that a jurisdiction provide the information submitted to HCD in its annual report to comply with this requirement. An alternative to this approach would be to remove this requirement from the policy.

Housing Element Compliance

Currently Board Policy No. 033 requires a jurisdiction to have a housing element that has been found in compliance by HCD or self-certified. Because a number of jurisdictions have completed a housing element but have not received a finding of compliance from HCD, staff is proposing that a jurisdiction that has adopted and made findings that their housing element is in compliance with state law, have submitted the final housing element to the state for review, but have not received a letter of compliance will receive 50 percent of the incentive points based on the number of new residential building permits issued for lower income units. Jurisdictions with a housing element found in compliance by HCD or self-certified will receive 100 percent of the incentive points awarded. An alternative to using 50 percent of the incentive points would be using 75 or 80 percent of the points.
Change Reporting to Building Permits and Request Submission of HCD Annual Housing Element Progress Reports

Staff recommends changing the requirement to report the number of new residential units from certificates of occupancy or final inspections to the number of building permits issued. This makes the reporting consistent with the Annual Housing Element Progress Reports required by state housing element law that each local jurisdictions submit as of April 1st of each year. We are asking that jurisdictions submit a copy of their annual reports to SANDAG at the same time they are submitted to HCD. SANDAG will prepare an annual Board Policy No. 033 report each year and the information also will be used in the Regional Comprehensive Plan Annual Performance Monitoring Report.

Next Steps

The purpose of Board Policy No. 033 is to incentivize housing element compliance and reward jurisdictions for the production of affordable lower-income housing units. The next program that this policy will be applied to is the TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program (SGIP).

On September 25, the Regional Housing Working Group also will make recommendations to the RPC, which is scheduled to meet on October 3. The Executive Committee also will review the proposed changes to the policy on October 10, with the Board of Directors making a final decision at its October 24, meeting.

Attachment: 1. Draft Revisions to Board Policy No. 033

Key Staff Contact: Susan Baldwin, 619-699-1943; sba@sandag.org
IMPLEMENTATION GUIDELINES FOR SANDAG REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT MEMORANDUM

Purpose

The purpose of this policy is to provide guidelines on the implementation of the memorandum adopted by the SANDAG Board of Directors on February 25, 2005, in association with the adoption of the 2005–2010 Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) (Attachment 1.1, referred to herein as the “Memorandum”). The Memorandum laid out specific provisions regarding SANDAG’s allocation of discretionary funding to local agency projects in relation to local jurisdiction housing element compliance and lower income housing production.

These implementation guidelines restate the provisions of the Memorandum and define how they will be implemented. The numbered italicized wording in this Policy is taken verbatim from the Memorandum; the implementation guidelines are contained in the text that follows. This policy shall be reviewed and evaluated annually to determine whether changes to the guidelines are needed. Issues to be considered during the annual review include, but are not limited to: lessons learned during the prior year, the relationship between the RHNA memorandum and SANDAG’s smart growth goals, and new funding sources proposed to be subject to the memorandum.

Pilot Smart Growth Implementation Program

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

   1.1 This provision of the Memorandum has been implemented. The Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program criteria, which were approved by the SANDAG Board on April 22, 2005, included the required bonus points for the cities noted above (22 points out of 147 points – 15 percent of the total points awarded).

Future Discretionary Funding Criteria

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

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

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

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

2.1 To implement Items 2.a. – 2.c. of the Memorandum, "discretionary funding allocated to local agency projects by SANDAG" shall be defined as: funds allocated by SANDAG only to local jurisdictions (the cities or County) through a competitive process. These funds are listed in Attachment 1.2 and include the TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program, Transportation Development Act (TDA) Non-motorized Program, and TransNet Bicycle Program, among others.

2.2 The following types of funding shall not be subject to the provisions of the Memorandum:

2.2.1 Formula funds allocated by population or number of miles, because they are not allocated on a competitive basis.

2.2.2 Discretionary funds allocated to Caltrans, the two transit agencies, and SANDAG because they are not local agencies.

2.2.3 Funds allocated directly by Caltrans to local jurisdictions because SANDAG is not involved in their allocation.

2.2.4 Funds which can be allocated to entities other than local jurisdictions (e.g., TransNet Environmental Mitigation Program Regional Habitat Conservation Fund and the Senior Transportation Mini-grant Program).

Attachment 1.3 provides a more detailed list of funding sources/programs that shall not be subject to the Memorandum.

2.3 As new funding sources become available, the Regional Planning Committee shall review and make a recommendation to the Board of Directors shall decide regarding whether they should be subject to the Memorandum and this Policy shall be amended.

2.4 To be eligible to apply for future discretionary funding allocated by SANDAG to local agency projects, local jurisdictions shall do the following:

2.4.1 During the first year of the housing element cycle (July 1, 2005 – June 30, 2006), a jurisdiction shall have submitted a draft of its housing element to HCD or have self-certified its housing element in compliance with state law by the due date for the grant application. This screening criterion shall apply for any discretionary funding programs subject to the Memorandum whose application due date is between July 1, 2005, and December 31, 2006.
2.4.2 Starting January 1, 2007, jurisdictions shall be required at a minimum to have adopted a housing element (which has been found in compliance with state law by HCD or self-certified), or which has been submitted to HCD for final review. Jurisdictions with a housing element that has been found in compliance with state law by HCD or self-certified will receive 100 percent of the incentive points the calculation of which is shown in 2.51. Jurisdictions who have adopted and made findings that their housing element is in compliance with state law, have submitted the final housing element to the state for review, but have not received a letter of compliance will receive 50 percent of the incentive points. Also, those jurisdictions that were not able to identify adequate sites to meet their RHNA goals and were required to include a program in their housing elements to identify additional sites by rezoning must be able to demonstrate that they are making progress toward implementing the rezoning program in conformance with the schedule contained in their housing elements. "Making progress" toward implementing the rezoning program is defined as having demonstrated a good faith effort in undertaking the rezoning program described in the housing element.

2.4.3 Starting in 2006, jurisdictions shall be required to submit an annual report with the information described in Section 2.4.3.1 below in order to be eligible for funding programs for the following calendar or fiscal year, whichever is applicable. This annual report shall include the same information that HCD requests for the Annual Housing Element Progress reports, and shall be submitted to SANDAG by the same date it is required to be submitted to HCD. The report must be have been submitted to SANDAG prior to the application due date for the funding source. The first annual reports are due on October 1, 2006, and cover the first fiscal year of the 2005-2010 housing element cycle (July 1, 2005 – June 30, 2006). Starting in 2007, the reports will be due on April 1 per Senate Bill 253 (Torlakson), which changed the state’s reporting time frame to the calendar year and the reporting due date to April 1 of each following year. SANDAG will prepare a report with this information for review by the Regional Planning Technical Working Group, Regional Housing Working Group, and Regional Planning Committee each year. Funding applications subject to this policy shall be evaluated based on the annual report for the preceding year that was submitted to SANDAG and HCD.

2.4.3.1 The annual report shall provide information regarding the number of building permits issued for new residential construction actual production of housing units by all four income categories (very low, low, moderate, and above moderate) using the forms provided by HCD. If the report is submitted for the first time in years two, three, four, or five of the housing element cycle, it shall include the total number of units produced and building permits issued for new residential construction by income category during each year of the housing element cycle. The annual report also shall indicate (if relevant) progress toward complying with any rezoning programs contained in the housing element that are required to meet the adequate site identification requirements of state law (as noted in paragraph 2.4.2 above). The information about progress on the rezoning program and other housing element programs is
required to be submitted in the Annual Housing Element Progress Reports to HCD.

2.5 Memorandum Item 2.b. ties the allocation of funding to the production of lower income housing through the award of incentive points based on the number of new lower income residential units for which building permits were issued during the housing element cycle between July 1, 2005 and June 30, 2010 produced in accordance with RHNA Alternative 3 (Attachment 1.4). (An adjustment may be made for those jurisdictions that reduced their RHNA goals in their housing elements based on lower income units that were permitted between January 1, 2003 and June 30, 2005.

2.5.1 Production of lower income housing units will be evaluated and points awarded for each application for discretionary funds based on the percentage of lower income (total very low and low combined) units for which building permits were produced in the jurisdiction. The number of lower income units will be calculated for each year of the housing element cycle (July 1, 2005 to June 30, 2010) on a cumulative basis, and compared to annualized RHNA Alternative 3 numbers and to each jurisdiction’s share of the total number of building permits issued for new residential construction. The two percentages calculated will be given equal weight in the award of incentive points. An example of the methodology used to calculate the incentive points is shown in Attachment 1.5 using data provided by the jurisdictions for the July 1, 2005 to December 31, 2007 time period. Units shall be counted based on building permits issued for new residential construction, which is the information HCD requests for the Annual Housing Element Progress Report, certificates of occupancy or final inspection. Lower income units for which building permits were issued for acquisition and rehabilitation may only count toward the RHNA Alternative 3 goals when this type of unit was used to meet the site identification requirements for the RHNA numbers as permitted in state law.

Attachments:

- 2.1.1. February 25, 2005, RHNA Memorandum to SANDAG Board of Directors
- 2.1.2. Discretionary Funding Programs Subject to Board RHNA Memorandum
- 2.1.3. Funding Programs Not Subject to Board RHNA Memorandum
- 2.1.4. Final Regional Housing Needs Assessment Modified Alternative 1 (Adopted RHNA) and Alternative 3
- 2.1.5. Hypothetical Example of Allocation of Incentive Points Based on 100 Point Funding Program

Adopted April 2006
Draft Revisions September 11, 2008
February 25, 2005

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**SUBJECT TO BOARD RHNA MEMORANDUM**

**LOCAL JURISDICTION PROJECTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Program</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
<th>Timeframe Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Transportation Enhancements (TE) Program - Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program</td>
<td>$19.1 M $6.4 M</td>
<td>FY 2006 to FY 2010 FY 2010 to FY 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 3 - Non-motorized Program</td>
<td>$2.4 M (FY 2006 allocation) $2.5 M (FY 2007 allocation)</td>
<td>Annual apportionments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• TransNet Bicycle Program</td>
<td>$3 M</td>
<td>$1 M annually from 2006 to 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Future</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal(^1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To be determined (TBD)</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State(^2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• TransNet Bicycle, Pedestrian and Neighborhood Safety Program</td>
<td>$280 M*</td>
<td>2009 to 2048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program</td>
<td>$285 M*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• TransNet Senior Transportation Mini-grant Program</td>
<td>$73 M*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Rail Grade Separation Program (Funding source TBD)</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• $100 M in Revenue Constrained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• $200 M in MOBILITY 2030 Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* In 2002 dollars

---

\(^1\) In prior funding cycles, the SANDAG Board of Directors has allocated funding to local jurisdictions through a competitive process for Regional Arterial System, Traffic Signal Optimization, Highway Noise Barrier, Regional Bikeway, and Transportation Enhancements programs. To the extent that such competitive funding programs are made available in the future, they would be subject to the Board RHNA memorandum.
## Current Funding Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federal¹</th>
<th>State²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP)²</td>
<td>- State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) – Regional Improvement Program (RIP)²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Congestion Mitigation &amp; Air Quality (CMAQ)²</td>
<td>- STIP – Interregional Improvement Program (IIP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Transportation Enhancement (TE) Program²</td>
<td>- State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Urbanized Area Formula Program (Section 5307)</td>
<td>- TDA Article 4 – General Public Transit Services (Fixed Transit Route Services)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- TDA Article 4.5 – Community Transit Service (Accessible Service for the Disabled)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- TDA Article 8 – Special Provisions (Express Bus and Ferry Services)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- TDA Planning and Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- State Transit Assistance (STA)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Local
- TransNet Highway Program
- TransNet Transit Program
- TransNet Local Streets & Roads Program
- [TransNet Senior Transportation Mini-grant Program](#)

## Future Funding Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federal</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal – same as current programs above</td>
<td>State – same as current programs above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ There are a variety of federal and state discretionary funding programs allocated directly by Caltrans that provide funding to local jurisdictions (e.g., Highway Bridge Repair & Replacement [HBRR], Safe Routes to School, etc.). Because SANDAG does not have decision-making authority over these funding programs, they would not be subject to the Board RHNA memorandum.

² With the exception of the EMP funds, these funds (STIP-RIP, RSTP, CMAQ, TE) are being used to match the TransNet Early Action Program (EAP) and other high priority regional projects. If, however, some portion of these funds were allocated by the SANDAG Board of Directors to local jurisdictions through a competitive process, they would be subject to the Board RHNA memorandum and this policy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Funding Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. TransNet Congestion Relief Program – Major Transportation Corridor Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Highway &amp; transit capital projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Operating support for bus rapid transit (BRT) &amp; rail transit capital improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. TransNet Congestion Relief Program – Transit System Services Improvements &amp; Related Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. TransNet Congestion Relief Program – Local System Improvements &amp; Related Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Local Street &amp; Road Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Environmental Mitigation Program (EMP)²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. TransNet Administration and Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee (ITOC)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Final Regional Housing Needs Assessment
#### Modified Alternative 1 (Adopted RHNA) and Alternative 3

#### Modified Alternative 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Share</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Above Moderate</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Above Moderate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carlsbad</td>
<td>8,376</td>
<td>1,922</td>
<td>1,460</td>
<td>1,583</td>
<td>3,411</td>
<td>2,506</td>
<td>1,816</td>
<td>1,583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>17,224</td>
<td>3,875</td>
<td>2,945</td>
<td>3,255</td>
<td>7,148</td>
<td>3,730</td>
<td>2,592</td>
<td>3,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronado</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Mar</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Cajon</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encinitas</td>
<td>1,712</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>2,437</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>1,011</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Beach</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Mesa</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemon Grove</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National City</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside</td>
<td>6,423</td>
<td>1,445</td>
<td>1,098</td>
<td>1,214</td>
<td>2,666</td>
<td>1,454</td>
<td>1,042</td>
<td>1,214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poway</td>
<td>1,242</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego - Original</td>
<td>45,741</td>
<td>10,292</td>
<td>7,822</td>
<td>8,645</td>
<td>18,983</td>
<td>9,195</td>
<td>7,834</td>
<td>8,645</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Alternative 3***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Share</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Above Moderate</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Above Moderate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Diego - Revised*</td>
<td>45,741</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>0 (621)</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>0 (709)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego - Revised*</td>
<td>50,950</td>
<td>10,645</td>
<td>8,090</td>
<td>8,645</td>
<td>18,362</td>
<td>9,613</td>
<td>8,126</td>
<td>8,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>6,254</td>
<td>1,407</td>
<td>1,069</td>
<td>1,182</td>
<td>2,595</td>
<td>1,434</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>1,182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santee</td>
<td>1,381</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solana Beach</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista</td>
<td>2,267</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>941</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated Area - Original</td>
<td>12,358</td>
<td>2,781</td>
<td>2,113</td>
<td>2,336</td>
<td>5,129</td>
<td>3,217</td>
<td>2,251</td>
<td>2,336</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Units to/from Unincorporated Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unincorporated Area</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Above Moderate</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Above Moderate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Diego - Revis*</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(621)</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(709)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego - Revised*</td>
<td>50,950</td>
<td>10,645</td>
<td>8,090</td>
<td>8,645</td>
<td>18,362</td>
<td>9,613</td>
<td>8,126</td>
<td>8,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>6,254</td>
<td>1,407</td>
<td>1,069</td>
<td>1,182</td>
<td>2,595</td>
<td>1,434</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>1,182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santee</td>
<td>1,381</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solana Beach</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista</td>
<td>2,267</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>941</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated Area</td>
<td>12,358</td>
<td>2,781</td>
<td>2,113</td>
<td>2,336</td>
<td>5,129</td>
<td>3,217</td>
<td>2,251</td>
<td>2,336</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Some jurisdiction allocations by income category were adjusted slightly to ensure that regional income category percentages provided by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) -- 22.5 percent very low income, 17.1 percent low income, 18.9 percent moderate income, and 41.5 percent above moderate income -- were met.

*Adjusted to reflect transfer of lower income units from Unincorporated Area to City of San Diego.

**Modified Alternative 1 was approved by the SANDAG Board on February 25, 2005.

***Alternative 3 is referenced in the memorandum approved by the SANDAG Board in conjunction with the approval of the Final RHNA.

Totals may be affected by rounding.
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## Policy 33 Formula for Calculating Points in SANDAG Discretionary Funding Programs

**September 5, 2008**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housing Element Compliance?</td>
<td>Lower Income Unit Goal (5 years)</td>
<td>Cumulative (2.5 yr) Lower Income Unit Goal</td>
<td>Number of Lower Income Units Permitted</td>
<td>Percent of Cumulative (2.5 yr) Lower Income Units Goal Permitted</td>
<td>Regional Share of Total Lower Income Units Permitted</td>
<td>Average of Columns E and F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlsbad</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4,322</td>
<td>2,161</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>6,322</td>
<td>3,161</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronado</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Mar</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Cajon</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encinitas</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Beach</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Mesa</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemon Grove</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National City</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2,496</td>
<td>1,248</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poway</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>17,739</td>
<td>8,869</td>
<td>2,668</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santee</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solana Beach</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4,758</td>
<td>2,379</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>42,492</td>
<td>21,241</td>
<td>3,756</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Totals may be affected by rounding
PROPOSAL FOR “ON-CALL” SMART GROWTH VISUAL SIMULATION SERVICES   File Number 3000200

Introduction

As part of the Smart Growth Tool Kit to implement the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP), SANDAG and various consultants have been developing visual simulations to demonstrate what smart growth and transit oriented development (TOD) could look like in local areas in the San Diego region. The 2-D simulations have been completed, and the 3-D simulations are underway. The completed simulations are posted on the SANDAG Web site at www.sandag/rcp.

Based on the positive responses received to date, SANDAG is considering developing a program to offer local jurisdictions and member agencies such as Caltrans and the transit agencies the possibility of “on-call” visual simulation services for their own projects. This service, intended to facilitate the local procurement process and result in the expanded use of visual simulations, particularly for smart growth plans and projects, would become a part of the Smart Growth Tool Kit and would be provided by the SANDAG Service Bureau for a fee.

To gauge demand for the proposed on-call services, staff will conduct an on-line survey using “Survey Monkey.” Draft survey topics are attached for discussion. The survey will be e-mailed to the TWG this month and distributed to other appropriate groups, including the Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC), following brief presentations on the concept.

If the survey results demonstrate that there is sufficient demand for this service, it is anticipated that the service could be available beginning next summer for a period of up to five years.

Discussion

Regional Benefits

Regional benefits could be realized by offering on-call visual simulation services to local member agencies through the Service Bureau. Under this scenario, the Service Bureau would issue a Request for Proposal, evaluate proposals, and select one or more qualified consultants as “on-call” consultant teams to assist local member agencies with visual simulation needs as requested.

Member agencies would benefit from the service because they would not need to enter into the RFP process themselves. The agencies would instead contract with the Service Bureau and the Service Bureau would coordinate the work with the on-call consultants, thereby simplifying the process for the member agencies. The Service Bureau would provide this service for a fee in
exchange for a quicker and potentially less expensive local procurement process. By establishing this service through the Service Bureau and developing one RFP, fewer public dollars would be spent on administrative requirements and could go directly toward simulation projects.

The overall value of the vendor contract(s) would be determined based upon the realistic demand for this service. Based on the contract value amount, a Caltrans audit would likely be necessary as part of the procurement process. It is anticipated that it would take about one year to complete the procurement and audit process. As a result, it is expected that the on-call consultant list would be available by next summer, and task orders could be issued at that time.

**Survey Issues**

To gauge interest in this service, SANDAG will conduct a survey of the local planning and community development directors, the public works directors, member agencies, and other appropriate parties. If it is determined that there is enough interest, SANDAG will proceed with this concept and add this service to the Smart Growth Tool Kit.

Issues to be addressed in the survey include: interest and demand; service features; and convenience of service. Attached for discussion is a more comprehensive list of possible survey topics. TWG members are asked for feedback on the topics included in the survey and on the overall concept.

Attachment: 1. Possible Survey Topics

Key Staff Contact: Carolina Gregor, (619) 699-1989; cgr@sandag.org
Proposal for “On-Call” Smart Growth Visual Simulation Services

Possible Survey Topics

Interest and Demand

- Level of interest for this type of service (2-D and/or 3-D visual simulations)
- Types of projects this service might be used for (i.e., land use, transportation and capital, environmental)
- Level of interest from a department standpoint
- Level of interest from an overall jurisdiction standpoint
- Level of interest in the next 1-2 fiscal years
- Ability and willingness to allocate funding for this type of product

Service Features

- Complete 3-D video sequence
- Aerial-view simulation
- Pedestrian-view simulation
- Speaking points for presentations
- Other (opportunity to list potential products)

Convenience of Service

- Familiarity with Service Bureau
- Past experiences contracting with Service Bureau, if any
- Jurisdiction procurement costs for this type of service

Note: Survey wording will be refined by an in-house research analyst with this area of expertise.