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**REGIONAL PLANNING TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP**  
December 11, 2008

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

**CONSENT ITEMS**

**+3.** | TWG MEETING SUMMARY | APPROVE |
| The Working Group should review and approve the November 13, 2008, Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG) meeting summary. | |

**+4.** | TWG MEETING SCHEDULE FOR 2009 | INFORMATION |
| Attached is the 2009 TWG meeting schedule. The TWG meets on the second Thursday of the month from 1:15 – 3:15 p.m. at SANDAG. | |

**5.** | AFFORDABLE HOMES IN OUR NEIGHBORHOOD PUBLICATION (Susan Baldwin) | INFORMATION |
| SANDAG staff recently worked with the San Diego Housing Federation to prepare the publication, *Affordable Homes in our Neighborhood*, which illustrates the types of affordable homes being built in neighborhoods throughout the San Diego region by for-profit and non-profit developers and how they are financed. This publication will be distributed at the TWG meeting for information purposes and is available on the SANDAG Web site at [www.sandag.org/RCP](http://www.sandag.org/RCP). | |

**REPORTS**

**6.** | OVERVIEW OF SANDAG BOARD WORKSHOP ON LONG-RANGE REGIONAL PLANNING EFFORTS (Coleen Clementson and Additional SANDAG Staff) | DISCUSSION |
<p>| On December 5, 2008, a joint meeting of the SANDAG Board of Directors and the SANDAG Transportation and Regional Planning Committees was held to provide an overview of new state laws and regulations that require regional and local governments to reduce transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions through integrated transportation, housing, and climate change planning activities. Presentations were provided on regional climate change and transportation and housing planning efforts currently underway. In particular, presentations were made on the EPIC Greenhouse Gas Inventory, SB 375, and related long-range regional planning. Similar presentations will be made at the TWG meeting. | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM #</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>DISCUSSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERIES 12 REGIONAL GROWTH FORECAST (Beth Jarosz)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At the last meeting, staff presented an overview of Phases 1 and 2 of the regional growth forecast update. Staff will report on the progress made on Phase 1 (collecting the local land use inputs) and will begin discussion on Phase 2 regarding possible options for addressing the projected long-term housing capacity shortfall. This will be conducted as a brainstorming effort for consideration by the SANDAG policy committees.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>INFORMATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 CONGESTION MANAGEMENT PROGRAM UPDATE (Heather Werdick)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On November 7, 2008, the Transportation Committee approved the 2008 Congestion Management Program (CMP) Update and discussed options for future direction of the CMP. The November 7, 2008, Transportation Committee report is attached and staff will provide an update to the TWG on these activities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>INFORMATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUSING AND SMART GROWTH FUNDING UPDATE (Susan Baldwin)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) PROPOSITION 1C FUNDING UPDATE. Staff will update the TWG on the Proposition 1C Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Housing Program, Infill Infrastructure Grant Program, and Multifamily Housing Program awards, and next Notices Of Funding Availability (NOFA).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) PERMANENT SOURCE FUNDING. The Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) is working on a report regarding a permanent source of funding for affordable housing and smart growth. Staff will report on this effort.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>INFORMATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADJOURNMENT AND NEXT MEETING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The next TWG meeting will be held on Thursday, January 8, 2009, from 1:15 - 3:15 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUMMARY OF NOVEMBER 13, 2008, REGIONAL PLANNING TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP (TWG) MEETING

AGENDA ITEM NO. 1: MEETING SUMMARIES

The Working Group approved the following TWG meeting summaries:

1A. September 30, 2008
1B. October 9, 2008

AGENDA ITEM NO. 2: WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

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

AGENDA ITEM NO. 3: PUBLIC COMMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS

Jim Schmidt, a housing advocate, distributed an article he wrote four years ago. His article describes the housing and growth issues from a historical perspective. He attends the Building Industry Coalition for Economic Recovery meetings, where he learned that builders are being shafted by the big banks. All local governments face impediments which slow the process, such as environmental issues. In the future there will be fewer builders, fewer construction workers, and fewer people investing in homes. Unless there is support to cut down the processing time, there will be more problems in the future. SANDAG did a study which shows that in 2030, the people over age 65 are going to increase by 134%. This growth is not due to people moving here, it is due to the fact that people are living longer. When the subprime issue has passed, there is going to be a shortage of builders and housing. Jurisdictions need to get together to ensure that this does not happen.

REPORTS

AGENDA ITEM NO. 4: ANNUAL REVIEW OF AND PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO BOARD POLICY NO. 33: DISCUSSION OF CALCULATION OF INCENTIVE POINTS FOR FIVE FACTORS

On November 7, 2008, the Regional Planning Committee (RPC) recommended that the SANDAG Board of Directors approve the proposed recommendations to Board Policy No. 33, but asked the TWG to work on the calculations of points for the five factors. Susan Baldwin, SANDAG, presented a background on Policy 33 and asked the TWG to make a recommendation on the methodology for this calculation to be given to the SANDAG Executive Committee. The following is the recommendation on the award of incentive points that was taken to the Executive Committee on
Friday, November 13, 2008, as a result of the TWG recommendations. The following summary was taken directly from the Executive Committee report.

Award of Incentive Points

After discussing a number of ways to award the incentive points included in the original RHNA memorandum (25 percent of the total points for each funding program subject to the policy), the Executive Committee, RPC, and TWG recommend that a significant change be made to how these points are awarded. Instead of calculating lower-income housing production based only on one factor (affordable housing produced in relation to RHNA Alternative 3 as the policy calls for now), it is proposed that affordable housing performance be assessed using five factors. Each factor, described below, would be worth one-fifth of the total points. (The Proposed Amendments to Policy No. 033 attached to this report includes a new Attachment 1.5, Description of How to Calculate the Board Policy No. 033 Incentive Points, which describes the five factors and how to calculate them as recommended by the TWG and Executive Committee, and replaces the original Attachment 1.5, Hypothetical Allocation of Incentive Points.)

1. Housing Element Compliance: One-fifth of the total Policy No. 033 points associated with a funding program would be awarded to projects located in jurisdictions with a housing element found in compliance with state housing element law by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) at the time of the funding program’s application deadline. No points would be awarded to projects in jurisdictions that have not received a letter of compliance from HCD. (Note: Jurisdictions without completed housing elements, however, would be eligible to apply for funding subject to the proposed amendments to Policy No. 033.)

2. Greater RHNA Share Taken: One-fifth of the total Policy No. 033 points would be awarded to projects located in jurisdictions that accepted a greater share of the lower-income RHNA goals in the adopted RHNA (Modified Alternative 1) as compared to Alternative 3. Jurisdictions whose lower income RHNA goals were the same in Modified Alternative 1 and Alternative 3 would receive half the points, and jurisdictions that received a lesser share of the lower-income RHNA goals in the adopted RHNA would receive no points associated with this factor.

3. Regional Share of Cumulative Total of Lower-Income Units Produced: One-fifth of the total Policy No. 033 points would be awarded based on each jurisdiction’s share of the total number of lower-income units produced using the four following intervals: 0 percent share or no units produced (0 points); >0 to 5 percent produced (1/3 of the points); >5 to 10 percent produced (2/3 of the points); and >10 percent produced (the total number of points for this factor).

The RPC and TWG also recommended that units that are acquired and rehabilitated, and are rent restricted at affordable levels for lower-income households for a period of 30 years or longer, receive 50 percent credit (one half a unit). These units also would be counted in the same way in calculating the fourth factor described below. Units that are acquired/rehabilitated/rent restricted that were counted in a housing element to meet the site identification requirements of a jurisdiction’s lower-income RHNA goals per housing element law would be counted as a full unit.
4. **Percent of Cumulative Alternative 3 Lower-Income RHNA Goal Met:** One-fifth of the total Policy No. 033 points would be awarded based on the percentage of affordable lower-income housing produced in each jurisdiction as compared to the Cumulative Alternative 3 RHNA Lower-Income Goal (Alternative 3 lower-income goal divided by the time frame (months/years) covered). For example, if a jurisdiction produced 100 percent of its cumulative Alternative 3 goal, it would receive the total points associated with this factor, and if a jurisdiction produced 20 percent of its Alternative 3 goal the points would be calculated as follows: 
\[ 0.2 \times \left( \frac{1}{5} \times \text{total Policy No. 033 points} \right) = X \text{ points} \]

5. **Percent of Lower-Income Households:** One-fifth of the total Policy No. 033 points would be awarded based on the percent of lower-income households residing in each jurisdiction based on the 2000 U.S. Census using the following three intervals: 0 to 40 percent lower-income households (\( \frac{1}{3} \) of the points); >40 to 50 percent lower-income households (\( \frac{2}{3} \) of the points); and >50 percent lower-income households (the total number of points for this factor).

To calculate the points associated with factors three and four above, jurisdictions will need to provide SANDAG with the number of units that were acquired/rehabilitated and rent restricted during the current housing element cycle, as this data was not previously collected.

Also, jurisdictions will need to provide SANDAG with new residential building permits and permits for units that were acquired and rehabilitated between January 1, 2003, and June 30, 2005, to correctly assess the progress made during the 2005–2010 housing element cycle to date. This 2½-year period of time is included in each jurisdiction’s RHNA goals, which covers a 7½-year period.

**Agenda Item #5: SERIES 12 REGIONAL GROWTH FORECAST**

Beth Jarosz, SANDAG, reported that in preparation for the next Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), SANDAG is beginning to update the existing regional growth forecast and prepare the new “Series 12” growth forecast. As part of the forecast process, staff is requesting input from each jurisdiction to ensure that the land use inputs to the forecast are updated accurately to reflect existing plans and policies and to assist the region in preparing the next Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA). In addition, prior forecasting efforts have shown that the region will continue to grow beyond current general plan capacity.

Ms. Jarosz made a presentation about the forecast, as follows. SANDAG produces forecasts for use in the Regional Transportation Plan, the Regional Comprehensive Plan (including the Smart Growth Concept Map and the Smart Growth Incentive Program), and the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA). The forecasts have other local uses including: water planning, public safety, traffic impact, and education.

The forecasting process consists of combining the Demographic and Economic Forecasting Model (DEFM), Interregional Commute Model, local land use plans and policies, the Regional Transportation Plan, the Urban Development Model (UDM), and the Transportation Forecasting Model to create the “Series 12 Regional and Subregional Forecast of Population, Jobs, and Housing.”

SANDAG has produced forecasts since the 1970s. The forecasts are updated every four years (previously every three years) and are denoted by a series number. The 2030 Regional Growth
Forecast Update was “Series 11.” The forecast has undergone extensive testing and refinement of methods. It has been subject to peer review by state and regional experts. SANDAG’s regional forecasts average only +/- 0.4 percent error per year. The population, housing and job forecasts have been very accurate over the years.

A key problem in preparing the forecast is that there is insufficient housing capacity in the region. The past scenarios for modeling growth to address this issue have included:

- **General Intensification (Series 8)**
  Increased density throughout the region without respect to smart growth principles

- **Transit Focus Areas (Series 9)**
  150 transit focus areas, but increased density not aligned with local plans and policies

- **Interregional Commute (Series 10 and 11)**
  Solely based on general plans and policies and assumed that some employees commute to Riverside County and Baja California to live. Smart Growth Concept Map scenario, based on local input, also analyzed for Series 11 Environmental Impact Report.

The Series 12 Forecast will be conducted in two phases. Phase 1 will be based on existing plans and policies and Phase 2 will be based on policies to provide for housing capacity beyond 2030.

In reference to the “Existing Policies” land use inputs, SANDAG is required by federal air quality law to produce a reasonably-expected growth forecast. As a result, there are three maps for review by jurisdictions, which include:

- Current General Plans
- Existing Land Use & Vacant Land
- Redevelopment, Infill, and Site-specific Plans

The inputs used in marking the maps should be consistent with housing elements, habitat plans, and other constraints (such as slopes and floodplains). Any information on college/university master plans and any information on adopted transit station area master plans should also be taken into consideration.

For Phase 1, jurisdictions should review maps and mark any necessary changes. SANDAG staff will then meet with local staffs to review edits and obtain the maps. SANDAG will determine housing capacity based on these general plan land use inputs. Future growth will exceed currently adopted general plans beyond 2030, and therefore, additional land use alternatives will need to be proposed. In the past these alternatives have included general intensification (Series 8), transit focus areas (Series 9), and interregional commute (Series 10 and 11).

Phase 2 of the forecasting process will consist of policy discussions for addressing the housing capacity shortfall, development of alternative land use scenarios, testing of scenarios, and finalization of the forecast.

The schedule is as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>Develop baseline regional forecast; Collect updated land use information from jurisdictions (December 2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 08-09</td>
<td>Determine regional housing/employment capacity based on updated land use inputs; Develop policy strategies for growth beyond 2030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 09</td>
<td>Review capacity assumptions with jurisdictions; Peer review of forecast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer/Fall 09</td>
<td>Run Urban Development Model for subregional forecast; Review subregional forecast with jurisdictions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 09</td>
<td>Revise subregional forecast, if necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 2010</td>
<td>Finalize subregional forecast, including committee and Board approvals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tait Galloway, City of San Diego, explained that one of the issues it is facing is dealing with water supply assessments for large-scale developments as defined in the state water code. It relies on the Urban Water Management Plan, which is based on the SANDAG Forecast. The problem is that the City is dealing with projects that require more growth than is projected in the forecast. The City would like to have Series 12 as part of Urban Water Management Plan so that it can stay ahead of the curve. With the proposed two-phase process, that does not seem to be an option. He wondered if it would be possible to use a two-pronged approach as follows: Phase 1 - a published forecast that could be used for water management planning, and Phase 2 - next longer-horizon year forecast.

Ms. Jarosz asked what date it would need for the forecast.

Mr. Galloway replied that it would need to be brought to the County Water Authority (CWA) by early 2010, so there would need to be a SANDAG published forecast by fall of next year.

Ms. Jarosz answered that even if SANDAG were to get all of the existing plan information in, it is not certain that the staff time and resources would be sufficient to produce a forecast in such a limited time frame. The forecasting process requires land use and transportation inputs, modeling, and planning.

Chair Anderson stressed how critical this topic is because it could lead to a moratorium on development. There is no capacity right now in the forecast for dealing with plan amendment proposals and so now it is requiring each project to fully mitigate its water demands. This is difficult with community plan updates and urban infill projects. It is creating a real quandary for both jurisdictions and the development community.

Bob Leiter, SANDAG, recommended that SANDAG, CWA, and City of San Diego staff have a meeting before the next TWG to address whether it is necessary to have a Series 12 forecast for the Urban Water Management Plan. SANDAG does not want its forecasting process to interfere.

Ms. Jarosz suggested that the CWA put a buffer into the water forecasting process so that that gives the City some flexibility. As the process is now, the public perceives amendments as additional water demand when in reality it is just shifting the growth to different parts of the city.
Mr. Leiter explained that different jurisdictions have different methodologies and that various methodologies are being debated throughout the state.

Dana Friehauf, San Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA), voiced that the more in sync we can get these processes, the better. As it is now, SANDAG will release its forecast too late to be incorporated into the current water plan. She reinforced the importance of consistency between local plans and the regional forecast.

Jon Brindle, City of Escondido, added that several jurisdictions are conducting general plan updates, which will result in additional challenges.

Mr. Leiter responded that SANDAG worked through that last time with the City of San Diego and the City of Chula Vista. There are ways to align them.

Ms. Jarosz shared that in the last couple rounds, SANDAG worked with the County of San Diego to incorporate its draft general plan update as opposed to its currently adopted general plan. SANDAG is happy to accommodate general plan updates in the forecast.

Gary Barberio, City of Carlsbad, asked what the horizon year will be and wondered why it would be any further out than 2034.

Ms. Jarosz answered that for transportation purposes, the horizon year has to be at least 2035. CWA has requested it be 2040. For the purposes of TransNet, the year 2050 is being considered. SANDAG will inform jurisdictions once a horizon year is determined.

Bill Chopyk, City of La Mesa, inquired as to how this relates to the 2010 census.

Ms. Jarosz replied that SANDAG will be done with the forecast by the time the 2010 census is completed. It is using a parcel-level data analysis, so it will be geographically consistent with the census.

Mr. Chopyk asked if it accounts for transient and homeless populations.

Ms. Jarosz shared that the census counts transient and migrant populations by looking at past population trends, regardless of domicile.

Brad Raulston, City of National City, asked if in marking up the maps, jurisdictions should include naval and port facilities.

Ms. Jarosz said that if jurisdictions have access to any of those types of master plans, SANDAG would take them. For lands that are state-owned or federally-owned, SANDAG defers to that jurisdiction.

Mr. Chopyk pointed out that in reference to the transient population there are 2,500 marina slips with transient populations that are doubtfully counted in the Census. There is no residential land use taken into account in the port master plan.
Ms. Jarosz replied that the Census Bureau does take into account populations living on boats. It also tracks group quarters populations living on ships, outside of the barracks.

Karen Brindley, City of San Marcos, asked how SB 375 will impact the forecast.

Ms. Jarosz answered that as an agency, SANDAG has yet to determine how SB 375 will affect the forecast. A discussion of SB 375 will be taken to the Board of Directors (BOD) meeting on December 5 and to the December TWG meeting.

Coleen Clementson, SANDAG, explained that SANDAG will notify everyone about the joint workshop between the SANDAG Board of Directors, the Transportation Committee, and the Regional Planning Committee taking place on December 5th. It will be a two-hour meeting focusing on what will be new in next Regional Transportation Plan, the RHNA, the growth forecast, and climate change planning. This will be a workshop setting with a number of presentations and staff will report back at the December TWG meeting.

Mr. Leiter added that under SB 375, SANDAG has to prepare a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS). This will likely be based on local plans and, if it does not meet the state’s Greenhouse Gas reduction targets, then we will have to prepare an Alternative Planning Strategy (APS). Jurisdictions will not be required to adopt or to change general plans based on the APS.

Chair Anderson asked how employment density is being handled and what it demonstrates as far as the future of the economy is concerned.

Ms. Jarosz shared that regionwide numbers are based on an econometric model, which seems to indicate a trend toward service jobs. SANDAG is working on the new PECAS model that is more spatially-related. This forecast is more traditional and trend-based, but the next one will be based more on spatial uses.

Mr. Galloway voiced that in the past, a surrogate people-per-acre number has been used. He asked if we had the ability to change density numbers based on more specific information and trends.

Ms. Jarosz answered yes, that densities can be overridden through both the general plan overlaying process and through an overrides table (where in a certain plan or certain area densities can be overridden). An example of this is in downtown San Diego where densities are based on CCDC projections.

Ms. Jarosz wondered if densities were based on the housing element.

Mr. Galloway said that yes, it is based on jurisdiction discretion.

Mr. Raulston asked how the forecast deals with the feasibility of projects and if the City should take off projects that do not have a high likelihood of being built.

Ms. Jarosz advised that this is only for the site-specific plans. If the general plan allows a particular project, and permits have been pulled, but the project is no longer moving forward, then it should be removed as a site-specific plan.
Mr. Chopyk pointed out that on the maps, uses are listed, but it did not see allowances for mixed uses. He wondered how jurisdictions should account for this. He also noted that cities are moving away from land uses and moving more toward form-based codes.

Ms. Jarosz stated that there is now a mixed-use land designation. SANDAG will ask for as much specific information as possible in relation to units or density ranges and how much space would be dedicated to employment uses, be they commercial or other nonresidential uses. Forecasting in the future will not be form-based but it will address that a variety of uses can occupy a space.

Mike Bullock, resident of Oceanside, stated that according to the new RTP guidelines regarding global warming, there is a section about pricing strategies. He stated that variable congestion pricing would be interesting to consider in the modeling.

Ms. Jarosz added that in climate action plan scenarios it was found that parking fees have the biggest bang for the buck in the reduction of VMT. This is not to say that SANDAG is not encouraging transit-oriented development, but is looking at a variety of climate change planning strategies.

Mr. Galloway asked if the two phases are to be done on separate maps how they will be shown.

Ms. Jarosz explained that staff has discussed whether jurisdictions should indicate where more growth can go, or if it should be more generic. SANDAG will ask for feedback on strategies for phase two at a later point.

John Swanson, City of Coronado, shared that the Hotel Del just approved hotel/condominium units in which people would reside there three months out of the year. He wondered if this would be included.

Ms. Jarosz explained that this is a common occurrence in many coastal communities. Some of the population is picked up and some is not.

Peggy Chapin, City of National City, referred to an earlier comment about whether the densities would be determined by the smart growth areas. She voiced concern that in some of the smart growth areas the City cannot accommodate densities, and as such it is better to project growth individually.

Ms. Jarosz replied that this would be taken into account. Hopefully this process will not be incredibly time-intensive. Also, in response to a question about funding to do this work, she noted that although there is no funding to look at the map, there is a definite benefit to jurisdictions supporting this process.

**Agenda Item #6: TransNet SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM GUIDELINES**

The TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program Ad Hoc Working Group has completed its review of the Draft Program Guidelines, to be released with the Call for Projects. The Draft Program Guidelines are provided for TWG review and comment.
Mr. Vance explained that the project structure and project selection criteria have been taken to the RPC. The RPC concurred with the TWG recommendation and passed it along to the Board of Directors for approval. The administrative tools are being assembled to permit this process to proceed. The Ad Hoc Working Group has been working on program guidelines, which will be passed out to jurisdictions along with information on the administrative process that will be used. There is still one piece that has yet to be developed and that is the grant agreement. It is currently being looked over by the legal staff. With the exception of that, the program guidelines before you for comment today is the final piece. The guidelines are separate for capital and planning grants, but for both project types the program guidelines include instructions for submitting applications, information on the evaluation criteria, and instructions on how the projects will be scored by the evaluation panel. The program oversight will be a stronger component because Caltrans will no longer be there to watch over the funds and the use-it-or-lose-it policy was strongly recommended. Staff is requesting feedback from the TWG.

Mike Bullock, resident of Oceanside, commented on the SGIP. He explained that on July 23, at the request of Susan Baldwin, he traveled to SANDAG and gave a 90-minute presentation on intelligent parking. Stephan Vance was in attendance. Mr. Bullock described car parking cashout at places of employment and his 20-page report on “Intelligent Parking.” He shared that he had made the report available to many at SANDAG and to Tom Ford from DCE Planning. Intelligent Parking is shared parking with unbundled cost, implemented with good technology. As far as he could tell, no one at SANDAG has read Intelligent Parking.

Due to our climate crisis, air pollution, and peak oil, he said we need to drive less, and that it is patriotic to work to reduce our dependence on foreign oil. SANDAG staff seems to have no such patriotism and no economic or environmental concerns. I have repeatedly asked that they define "Smart Growth." "Smart" has to mean less GHG emissions. But he feels his request has fallen on deaf ears. He has explained that when potential parking consumers are given a free economic choice by unbundling the cost of parking, driving is significantly and cost-effectively reduced. It is cheaper than free because less parking is needed and parking is expensive. Intelligent parking also enables perfect knowledge about parking use and therefore whether or not any block of off-street parking needs to be expanded or contracted, based on pure economics.

He told the TWG that he had read all of the SGIP documentation and not once does it mention "unbundled." He has e-mailed proposals. He shared that he is not an optimist and that he is therefore asking that SANDAG leadership help communicate the need to incorporate Intelligent Parking and other effective means of reducing driving into the SGIP documentation. SANDAG’s process should also forward citizens’ concerns and suggestions for improvement to all decision-makers at SANDAG.

Chair Anderson commented that the City of San Diego has tried this with various parking districts downtown and other places. In some parking districts the City was able to sell it to some communities by keeping 45% of the revenues within the district as opposed to going into the City's general fund. When it tried to introduce this in La Jolla it was slammed politically, so the problem is not at the planning level, it is at the level of community acceptance.

Mr. Bullock answered that it should be included in the SGIP criteria; even if no one wants to do it, the idea should still be presented.
Mr. Vance explained that SANDAG will make sure applicants know that it is interested in innovative ideas and projects.

Gary Halbert, City of Chula Vista, added that it says that specifically in the guidelines.

Mr. Bullock said that it does not specifically mention and explain unbundling.

Robert Larkins, City of Lemon Grove, asked about the schedule for the Call for Projects.

Mr. Vance answered that the program is going to the Board for feedback on November 21, so staff will try to post the Call for Projects by December 1. The packet distributed today describes a scenario in which an application workshop would be held a week after it goes to the Board and applications would be due in mid-January. Given the holidays this seems to be too short of a time frame, so the date may be pushed back to the end of January.

Mr. Brindle thanked Stephan Vance and Christine Eary for the time and effort invested in this project. He pointed out that on page 41, under the capital projects, it references preliminary engineering, which it seems would already be in the eligibility criteria. This contradicts the eligibility criteria feasibility requirement. It suggests that the project should already be further along, whereas this criterion contradicts that notion. He suggested having contingencies set aside for any legitimate changes in scope. There is rarely a project that does not warrant changes down the road.

Mr. Vance explained that staff had not contemplated any kind of reserve. As the program matures, projects will be awarded based on funding projections, and, in better economic times, there should be more revenue than projected, which should create the capacity for a reserve. The way the grant agreement is set up is that the SANDAG contribution is set as maximum amount of contribution. Because one of the criteria is matching funds, the grant will not be the sole revenue source for the project. He brought up the question of if there is a cost increase, whether it would be SANDAG’s responsibility.

Mr. Brindle drew attention to the Right-of-Way component on page 41 of the capital criteria. He explained that this can be a very lengthy process, which might cause the project to lose its eligibility. He felt that this ran contrary to the criteria.

Mr. Vance answered that for capital projects, the threshold is completion of the feasibility analysis. The use-it-or-lose-it policy requires that the project would be in the ground in two years.

Ms. Brindley commented on the eligibility threshold of a project that is within an existing/planned smart growth area versus a potential area. Considering recent actions with Policy 33, San Marcos would request that existing/planned projects be eligible because they are still within a SGOA. She recommended changing it from a threshold requirement to a point system. San Marcos keeps missing the boat because it has some projects that would be perfect, such as an area between two SGOA areas, but will be included in the future. Another location abuts Cal State University San Marcos, but it barely misses the density target. It is a perfect type of project, but it is stuck because it is within an area in transition. She recommended that the criteria be re-evaluated before the next cycle.
Ms. Clementson explained that it is part of its standard procedure to re-evaluate each cycle, but it will add it to the program guidelines.

Mr. Galloway asked if an existing corridor study could be eligible for a planning grant if the grant were to increase the scope of the project.

Mr. Vance confirmed this.

Mr. Chopyk observed that scoring seems complicated and it would be helpful to see an example. He wanted to know who is responsible for the design review.

Mr. Vance explained that SANDAG staff does that and that the purpose of the review is to ensure that the project underway is the project that was approved for the grant.

Mr. Chopyk shared that some jurisdictions conduct their own Design Review. He asked what would happen if there is a disagreement between the two reviews.

Ms. Clementson added that we will need to think of a new terminology. The purpose is to ensure that there has been a reasonable amount of progress.

Mr. Larkins agreed with changing the term to something along the lines of “progress review” because design implies an aesthetic determinant.

Ms. Chapin suggested the term consistency review.

**Agenda Item #7: ADJOURNMENT AND NEXT MEETING**

The next TWG meeting will be held on December 11, 2008, from 1:15 - 3:15 p.m.

Mr. Vance announced that in September there was a workshop, “Growing Green, Growing Healthy,” hosted by the County Health and Human Services. This included a presentation by the Planning Director of the City of Richmond on how it integrated health impacts into its general plan. The presentation was well received, so it is being brought back on Friday, December 12, at Caltrans for a half day workshop from 8 a.m. to 12 noon.

Devon Muto, County of San Diego, announced that the County of San Diego Draft General Plan will be available for review starting tomorrow and it is seeking public comment.

The meeting was adjourned.
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PUBLIC HEARING: 2008 CONGESTION MANAGEMENT PROGRAM UPDATE

Introduction

SANDAG is required by state law to prepare and regularly update a Congestion Management Program (CMP) for the San Diego region. The purpose of the CMP is to monitor the performance of the transportation system, develop programs to address near-term and long-term congestion, and better integrate transportation and land use planning. The last CMP update was adopted by SANDAG in 2006.

At the September 19 meeting, the Transportation Committee accepted the Draft 2008 CMP Update for distribution and 30-day public comment period, and scheduled a public hearing for the November 7, 2008, Transportation Committee meeting. Subsequent to the Committee action, copies of the Draft 2008 CMP Update were distributed to SANDAG technical working groups, local jurisdictions, and other interested parties. The Draft CMP also was posted on the SANDAG Web site.

Discussion

In order to meet state legislative requirements, the CMP provides: (1) ongoing monitoring of the region’s transportation system; (2) a program to evaluate and mitigate the traffic impacts of new development projects; (3) a number of congestion management strategies to mitigate congestion; and (4) a mechanism to prepare deficiency plans for roadway segments that do not meet the CMP Level of Service standard (LOS E).

The focus of the 2008 CMP Update is to provide:

- An updated CMP roadway network Level of Service (LOS) analysis based on 2007 traffic data;
- An updated CMP transit corridor analysis based on 2007 transit data; and
- An analysis of the effect of 2030 RTP improvements on the deficient segments identified in this CMP update.
2008 CMP Update Highlights

Updated CMP Roadway LOS Analysis

Based upon the 2007 data, there is a decrease of 15 deficient freeway and conventional highway segments equaling a decrease in deficient mileage of almost 51 miles compared to the 2006 CMP Update. For CMP arterials, there also has been a decrease of 12 deficient segments with deficient mileage declining by almost 16 miles.

Updated CMP Transit Corridor Analysis

Eleven CMP transit corridors were evaluated in terms of miles of service provided, number of trips operated, ridership, and average bus speed. Between 2005 and 2007, there has been an overall 12.8 percent increase in the number of trips operated, a 9.2 percent increase in ridership, and a 0.8 percent decrease in average vehicle speed.

Deficient CMP Segment Analysis and Deficiency Plans

An analysis of CMP-identified roadway deficiencies (segments with LOS F) was conducted to assess the impacts of recommended improvements contained within the 2030 RTP on roadway congestion. The results of this analysis are summarized below. Remaining deficient roadway segments that still require Deficiency Plans or equivalent analysis are included in Attachment 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing LOS F 2007</th>
<th>Projected LOS F 2030 No Build</th>
<th>Projected LOS F 2010</th>
<th>Projected LOS F 2020</th>
<th>Projected LOS F 2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deficient Segments¹</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deficient Mileage¹</td>
<td>105.31</td>
<td>100.75</td>
<td>80.90</td>
<td>79.86</td>
<td>81.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ CMP roadway segments operating at LOS “F”

Source: 2030 RTP; Reasonably Expected Revenue Scenario

As this analysis shows, even with the planned 2030 RTP improvements, there still will be congestion in the future in some corridors. Population and employment growth coupled with future changes in land use and additional planned development make tackling congestion a challenge that should continue to be addressed.

Under state law, the local jurisdiction or jurisdictions in which the deficiency occurs are responsible for the preparation of Deficiency Plans. The purpose of a Deficiency Plan is to evaluate the cause of the existing roadway deficiency and to propose remedial actions necessary to address the deficiency. As previously discussed, the initial deficiency plan requirements are met through the RTP deficiency analysis. For those remaining deficient roadway segments, SANDAG and Caltrans are available to assist local agencies in preparing individual Deficiency Plans.

SANDAG, Caltrans, and local jurisdictions are working on a number of subregional and corridor studies that may eliminate the need for specific Deficiency Plans. Corridor System Management Plans are underway for the Interstate 5 (I-5) North and I-805 Corridors in addition to a corridor study for the I-5 South Corridor. Additional travel demand modeling to evaluate the cause of the
deficiency also may help address the requirements of Deficiency Plans. SANDAG staff in collaboration with local jurisdictions will develop additional implementation strategies for preparing Deficiency Plans that will be proposed as part of the FY 2010 budget process.

**Changes to the Draft 2008 CMP**

The 30-day public comment period ended on October 22, 2008. SANDAG received comments on the Draft 2008 CMP Update from four agencies. The comments and responses are shown in Attachment 2. The comments focus on minor wording changes, Deficiency Plans, and future additions to the CMP arterial network. Minor corrections and edits will be incorporated into the Final 2008 CMP Update, however, there are no substantive changes proposed for the Final 2008 CMP Update.

**Options for Future Direction of the CMP**

Staff evaluated two strategies for future CMP analysis to determine whether the state CMP process can be conducted on a more cost effective manner, and whether the efficiencies gained would outweigh the policy considerations. One strategy is to streamline the SANDAG CMP process and the other is to opt out of the state CMP process. A description of these strategies and some of the consequences of each are discussed below.

**Streamlined CMP Approach**

As previously described, the basic state legislative requirements of the CMP are to monitor the performance of the transportation system, develop programs to address near- and long-term congestion, and better integrate transportation and land use planning. Since 1991, SANDAG has addressed these requirements through a CMP document that is updated biennially.

Staff evaluated incorporating the CMP requirements and monitoring into other SANDAG ongoing planning and monitoring activities, such as the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) Annual Performance Monitoring Report and Intergovernmental Review Program. To continue to follow the state CMP requirements, the Office of General Counsel and staff believe it is not necessary to prepare a stand-alone CMP document in the future.

In order to implement the streamlined approach for the CMP monitoring and reporting process, the RCP Annual Monitoring Report would continue to include CMP deficiency analysis information, but it would be expanded to include the other information that is required to be reported for the CMP. The current public review process for the RCP Annual Monitoring Report could serve as the public review process for the CMP as well. This streamlined approach for state mandated CMP monitoring would be fully incorporated into the 2010 RCP performance monitoring report.

**CMP Opt Out**

The CMP legislation allows congestion management agencies to “opt out” of the state CMP process. In order to opt out, a majority of the local jurisdictions representing a majority of the population in the county must adopt resolutions electing to be exempt from the state congestion management program. All six counties in the Sacramento region, as well as Fresno County, have opted out of the state CMP requirement. One major reason to consider opting out of the State CMP process is that under the law, local jurisdictions are responsible for preparing Deficiency Plans for deficient
segments. Additionally, the Congestion Management Agency (SANDAG) is required to report a local jurisdiction’s failure to prepare and adopt a sufficient Deficiency Plan within the time allowed by statute, and is obligated to provide notification to the state if the local jurisdiction does not meet the statutory deadlines. The state may then withhold state gas tax funds from a local jurisdiction without an adopted Deficiency Plan.

Under this option, SANDAG would still comply with federal congestion management provisions; however, this could be done through existing SANDAG planning and performance monitoring activities, such as the RTP.

Benefits and limitations of the state CMP are outlined below as well trade-offs of opting out of the state CMP requirement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits of the State CMP</th>
<th>Limitations of the State CMP</th>
<th>Trade-offs of Opting Out</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Ensures that monitoring of the region’s transportation system is conducted on a regular basis</td>
<td>• Mandates use of one measure (peak hour LOS) to determine roadway deficiencies</td>
<td>• Local jurisdictions would not be required to prepare and adopt Deficiency Plans or be subject to loss of gas taxes if found noncompliant with state CMP requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identifies Deficiency Plans that local jurisdictions must prepare for deficient segments</td>
<td>• Requires that Deficiency Plans be prepared and adopted, but not implemented</td>
<td>• Resources allocated to prepare, implement, and enforce the CMP could be used on other planning activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identifies Deficiency Plans that local jurisdictions must prepare for deficient segments</td>
<td>• Requires that Deficiency Plans be prepared and adopted, but not implemented</td>
<td>• The process of “opting out” would require a one-time investment of staff time from SANDAG and local jurisdictions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluation on Potential Addition of Arterials to CMP Network**

At its March 21, 2008, meeting, the Transportation Committee requested that SANDAG staff evaluate whether additional arterials should be added to the CMP network. The following criteria were developed and discussed with the Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) and the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG) to conduct this evaluation. Currently, there are 11 CMP arterial corridors that are included in the 2008 CMP Update.

- Arterial must be included in the Regional Arterial System
- Arterial must be classified as a principal or prime arterial in the local jurisdiction’s circulation element/general plan
- Arterial must carry a high volume of traffic (at least 50,000 average daily traffic)
- Arterial is not near an existing CMP facility (within two miles or within one mile if the arterial has regional transit)
- Arterial provides connectivity and regional coverage to the CMP network
If SANDAG continues to update the state CMP, staff proposes adding the following arterials to the CMP network:

- Telegraph Canyon Road/Otay Lakes Road: I-805 to SR 125 (City of Chula Vista)
- Mira Mesa Boulevard: I-805 to I-15 (City of San Diego)

City of Chula Vista staff concurs with SANDAG staff on the proposed addition of Telegraph Canyon Road. However, City of San Diego staff disagrees with the criteria used to evaluate new arterials. SANDAG staff modified the criteria based on suggestions from CTAC and staff from the City of San Diego. City of San Diego staff requested additional changes to the criteria, such as a higher threshold of average daily trips, developing a new definition for prime arterials, and an exception for arterials that are located adjacent to or within smart growth areas. SANDAG staff feels the additional proposed changes are not appropriate and could result in a majority of the existing CMP arterials not meeting revised indicators. Therefore, SANDAG staff recommends that both Telegraph Canyon Road/Otay Lakes Road and Mira Mesa Boulevard be added to the CMP network and be included in future CMP updates, should they be continued. New CMP arterials would be required to participate in biennial roadway monitoring and would be subject to the deficiency plan requirements if found deficient.

**Next Steps**

Based on direction received from the Transportation Committee, staff will bring back further information regarding the options for future CMP updates as outlined above, as well as possible modifications to the CMP arterial network, for action at a future Transportation Committee meeting.

**BOB LEITER**  
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

**Attachments:**  
1. CMP Roadway Segments Requiring Deficiency Plans  
2. Draft 2008 CMP Update Comments and Responses

**Key Staff Contact:** Heather Werdick, (619) 699-6967, hwe@sandag.org
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CMP Route</th>
<th>Limits</th>
<th>Affected Local Jurisdiction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Freeways</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 5</td>
<td>SR 54 to Pacific Highway Ramp</td>
<td>Cities of San Diego and National City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mission Bay Drive to Gilman Drive</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 8</td>
<td>I-5 to El Cajon Boulevard</td>
<td>Cities of San Diego and La Mesa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SR 125 to Johnson Avenue</td>
<td>Cities of La Mesa and El Cajon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 15</td>
<td>I-8 to Balboa Avenue</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SR 163 to Miramar Road</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 805</td>
<td>Telegraph Canyon Road to SR 54</td>
<td>Cities of Chula Vista and National City and San Diego County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Route 52</td>
<td>I-5 to I-805</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Route 94</td>
<td>I-5 to College Avenue</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Route 163</td>
<td>Ash Street to Friars Road</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conventional Highways</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Route 67</td>
<td>Mapleview Street to SR 78</td>
<td>San Diego County and City of Poway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Route 75</td>
<td>Toll Plaza to I-5 North</td>
<td>City of Coronado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Route 76</td>
<td>Melrose Avenue to South Mission Avenue</td>
<td>City of Oceanside and San Diego County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Route 94</td>
<td>Jamacha Boulevard to Jamacha Road</td>
<td>San Diego County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arterials</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miramar Road</td>
<td>Black Mountain Road to I-15</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Harbor Drive</td>
<td>Laurel Street to Hawthorne Street</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10/16/08</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10/16/08</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10/16/08</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10/16/08</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Name/Agency</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Chapter(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10/20/08</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>The City of San Diego is in support of the CMP and the monitoring of the Level of Service on our regions network of freeways, highways and prime arterials. Recognizing that CMP’s are Prime Arterials, we have concerns that SANDAG’s proposed criteria does not reflect the definition of Prime Arterials. We recommend the following modifications to the SANDAG proposed criteria: (1) ensure the roadway is designed and operating as a prime arterial and is planned to operate at this classification in the future; (2) increase the proposed daily traffic volumes from 50,000 ADT to 55,000 ADT. The ADT also should be reflective of the entire arterial, (not just one or two locations along an entire arterial). And, (3) CMP arterials should not travel through smart growth areas.</td>
<td>Comment noted. The SANDAG evaluation criteria on potential addition of arterials to the CMP network maintains that an arterial must be classified as a principal or prime arterial in the local jurisdictions’ circulation element or general plan. Based on initial comments from City staff and others, SANDAG staff increased the ADT threshold to 50,000 ADT and re-evaluated the potential arterials with this new threshold. SANDAG staff feels the additional proposed changes are not appropriate and could result in a majority of the existing CMP arterials not meeting revised criteria.</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10/20/08</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>The California Congestion Management Government Code (Chapter 2.6, Appendix F) states that the highway and roadway system of the CMP shall include all state highways and prime arterials. The Prime Arterial is intended to carry through trips to and from a community with minimal access points along its length and a design speed of 55 mph. Direct access to abutting property is not permitted on Prime Arterials. A good example of a prime arterial is Friars Road where there is minimal access along its length with acceleration and deceleration lanes to prevent the interruption of traffic flow. A Prime Arterial reaches LOS D at approximately 55,000 vehicles per day. Prime Arterials carry heavy vehicular movement while providing low pedestrian movement and moderate bicycle and transit movements.</td>
<td>Comment noted. See response to comment #5.</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>10/20/08</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>SANDAG proposes to add Mira Mesa Boulevard to the CMP arterial list. The Congestion Management Government Code states “no highway or roadway designated as a part of the system shall be removed from the system,” i.e. once a road is on the CMP network, it cannot be removed and always will be expected to operate with prime arterial standards. Mira Mesa Boulevard is a six lane roadway that was originally classified as a prime arterial but as development occurred and will continue to occur and smart growth plans develop, portions of the future operation of the roadway may no longer operate as a prime arterial. A significant portion of Mira Mesa Boulevard on the east consists of designated potential smart growth areas on both sides of the roadway. A prime arterial which focuses on the movement of vehicles should not be traveling through a smart growth area. Miramar road is a parallel roadway designated as a prime arterial on the CMP network. Miramar Road, is less than two miles away (as required in the CMP criteria) from Mira Mesa Boulevard and is sufficient for the creation of a sound CMP network in that area.</td>
<td>Comment noted. SANDAG’s evaluation criteria on potential addition of arterials to the CMP network maintains that an arterial is not near an existing CMP facility (within two miles or within one mile if the arterial has regional transit). In the 2030 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP): Pathways for the Future, Mira Mesa Boulevard will facilitate regional Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) service from Riverside County to University Towne Center/University of California, San Diego via Mira Mesa Boulevard. Mira Mesa Boulevard qualifies under the evaluation criteria and is recommended as an addition to the CMP network.</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Form</td>
<td>Name/Agency</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Chapter(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>10/20/08</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>Our goal as a region and local agencies should be to maintain the purpose and intent of the CMP network which is to connect and monitor the heaviest traveled regional arterials carrying primarily through trips throughout our region. We need to ensure that we are not just adding congested major roadways that connect freeways to the CMP arterial system. This is not the intent of the CMP.</td>
<td>Comment noted. See response to comment #5.</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10/20/08</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>In summary, we are not opposed to adding City streets that qualify as a high volume, capacity driven prime arterials. We are, however, concerned with incorrectly designating roadways that do not operate as a prime arterial.</td>
<td>Comment noted. See response to comment #5.</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10/21/08</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>City of Oceanside</td>
<td>Should local jurisdictions require traffic studies apply the 2000 Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) Computation Method to calculate LOS on CMP arterials? In the past, we’ve required volume to capacity relationship (V/C ratio) and HCS peak hour flow analyses.</td>
<td>The Draft 2008 CMP Update allows two options for LOS CMP roadway analysis utilizing either the HCM Computation Method or Floating Car Method. The method used is up to the local jurisdiction. The traffic impact studies (TIS) guidelines (see Appendix D of the Draft 2008 CMP Update) utilize 2000 HCM operational analysis. The purpose of the CMP relative to project development review of TIS is to provide mitigation strategies for significant project impacts. The CMP methodology associated in its biennial updates is not necessarily a requirement for methodologies within TIS.</td>
<td>CMP Roadway Monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>10/21/08</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>City of Oceanside</td>
<td>TDM are among the alternative mitigation measures allowed under the CMP. Will local jurisdictions be required to adopt a TDM ordinance and quantify the recommended TDM strategies for CMP facilities?</td>
<td>No, TDM is a suggested congestion mitigation strategy to mitigate significant impacts. Local jurisdictions may incorporate TDM strategies at their discretion.</td>
<td>Land Use Analysis Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>10/21/08</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>City of Oceanside</td>
<td>If a study intersection along a CMP facility is projected to be at LOS E without the project, and LOS E with the project (with an increase in delay over two seconds), would the project be required to mitigate the intersection back to pre-project delay values, but still at LOS E? Or would the project be required to mitigate the intersection to LOS D or better?</td>
<td>If a project exceeds the 2-second intersection delay threshold, that is an indication that the project’s impact is significant. Mitigation for all identified significant impacts should be provided for any project requiring CEQA analysis. The acceptable LOS for freeways, roadways, and intersections is generally “D” or otherwise noted in the jurisdiction’s general plan.</td>
<td>Land Use Analysis Program/Traffic Impact Summary Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>10/21/08</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>City of Oceanside</td>
<td>State Route (SR) 76 from Interstate 5 (I-5) to Melrose Drive is shown as a 6-lane expressway in the “unconstrained” scenario of the RTP. Would the City be required to complete a deficiency plan or corridor system management plan in order to get the additional lanes funded in the next RTP update? And would the City need to establish a MOU with Caltrans and possibly SANDAG in order to initiate such studies?</td>
<td>A Deficiency Plan is a state CMP requirement for CMP facilities that are found deficient (LOS F). It is the responsibility of the local jurisdiction(s) to prepare and adopt Deficiency Plans. Corridor System Management Plans (CSMP) are being prepared by Caltrans and SANDAG for the I-5 North and I-805 Corridors. This work may lay the groundwork for individual Deficiency Plans. A MOU is not required to conduct a Deficiency Plan. Transportation projects are evaluated, ranked, and prioritized in the RTP using various evaluation criteria.</td>
<td>Deficiency Plans/General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>10/21/08</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>City of Oceanside</td>
<td>The deficient roadway segments listed in the Draft CMP and in Appendix A includes SR 76 from Melrose to south Mission Avenue. The deficient segments seem to be based upon 2008 conditions, but shouldn’t the basis for determining if a deficiency plan is needed include buildout conditions too?</td>
<td>No, the LOS roadway analysis is mandated by state law to include the evaluation of existing system performance. The initial deficiency analysis that SANDAG performs involves assessing deficiencies through incorporating 2030 RTP improvements as a first step. Remaining deficient segments require Deficiency Plans.</td>
<td>Government Code/Deficiency Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Form</td>
<td>Name/Agency</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Chapter(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>10/21/08</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>City of Oceanside</td>
<td>Would SR 76 need to be assumed at only four lanes in 2030 since the six lanes is not funded in the RTP?</td>
<td>Yes. Regional facilities should assumed improvements within the Reasonably Expected Revenue Scenario only, not the Unconstrained.</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>10/22/08</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>The CMP Update indicates that one strategy that could be used to address the deficient segments is through the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The CMP Update states (page 24) that if the RTP improvements will improve operations on CMP deficient segments to operate at LOS E or better, then no future action is required. For those segments that are not addressed by the RTP improvements, additional analyses and recommendations are required. The CMP Update should clarify if the RTP improvements are based on the RTP’s Reasonably Expected scenario or the RTP Revenue Constrained scenario. The Revenue Constrained scenario only includes improvements to I-805 and SR 76. The Reasonably Expected scenario includes widening of SR 67 from Mapleview Street to Dye Road, but the widening does not extend to SR 78. Neither revenue scenario includes improvements to SR 94.</td>
<td>Comment noted. Please reference Table 6.1 on page 57 of the Draft 2008 CMP Update. This table sources the Reasonably Expected Scenario from 2030 RTP as the improvements resulting from deficiency analysis.</td>
<td>Deficiency Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>10/22/08</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>The County requests that the next RTP update consider and include planned improvements and/or strategies that would completely address the deficiencies identified in the current draft CMP update for deficient freeways and highways located within the County’s jurisdiction.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>