BOARD OF DIRECTORS POLICY AGENDA

Friday, September 11, 2009
10 a.m. to 12 noon
SANDAG Board Room
401 B Street, 7th Floor
San Diego

AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

- REGIONAL PLANNING STAKEHOLDERS WORKING GROUP MEMBERSHIP

- 2050 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN: VISION AND GOALS

PLEASE TURN OFF CELL PHONES DURING THE MEETING

YOU CAN LISTEN TO THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING BY VISITING OUR WEB SITE AT WWW.SANDAG.ORG

MISSION STATEMENT
The 18 cities and county government are SANDAG serving as the forum for regional decision-making. SANDAG builds consensus, makes strategic plans, obtains and allocates resources, plans, engineers, and builds public transit, and provides information on a broad range of topics pertinent to the region's quality of life.

San Diego Association of Governments · 401 B Street, Suite 800, San Diego, CA 92101-4231
(619) 699-1900 · Fax (619) 699-1905 · www.sandag.org
Welcome to SANDAG. Members of the public may speak to the Board of Directors on any item at the time the Board is considering the item. Please complete a Speaker’s Slip, which is located in the rear of the room, and then present the slip to the Clerk of the Board seated at the front table. Also, members of the public are invited to address the Board on any issue under the agenda item entitled Public Comments/Communications/Member Comments. Speakers are limited to three minutes. The Board of Directors may take action on any item appearing on the agenda.

This agenda and related staff reports can be accessed at www.sandag.org under Meetings on the SANDAG Web site. Public comments regarding the agenda can be forwarded to SANDAG via the e-mail comment form also available on the Web site. E-mail comments should be received no later than 12 noon, two working days prior to the Board of Directors meeting.

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.

SANDAG offices are accessible by public transit. Phone 511 or see 511sd.com for route information.
## BOARD OF DIRECTORS POLICY AGENDA
Friday, September 11, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM #</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Members of the public shall have the opportunity to address the Board on any issue within the jurisdiction of SANDAG that is not on this agenda. Anyone desiring to speak shall reserve time by completing a “Request to Speak” form and giving it to the Clerk of the Board prior to speaking. Public speakers should notify the Clerk of the Board if they have a handout for distribution to Board members. Speakers are limited to three minutes. Board members also may provide information and announcements under this agenda item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>REPORTS (2 through 3)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+2.</td>
<td>REGIONAL PLANNING STAKEHOLDERS WORKING GROUP MEMBERSHIP (First Vice Chair Jerome Stocks; Jane Clough-Riquelme) APPROVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At its May 22, 2009, meeting, the Board of Directors approved the establishment of the Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group to advise on the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan and other related initiatives. The Transportation and Regional Planning Committees recommend that the Board of Directors approve the slate of members and alternates indicated in Tables 1 and 2 to serve as at-large citizen representatives on the Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+3.</td>
<td>2050 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN: VISION AND GOALS DISCUSSION (Heather Werdick)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Solutions to our region’s transportation needs require a comprehensive planning effort that coordinates land use and transportation and develops an integrated, multimodal transportation system. The Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) contains specific public policies and strategies, as well as projects and programs aimed at meeting the diverse mobility needs of our growing and changing region. In June 2009, the Board of Directors received a report on the work program and schedule for the 2050 RTP, which is scheduled for adoption in July 2011. The Board of Directors is asked to discuss and provide policy direction for the 2050 RTP goals and objectives. Interactive technology will be used to pose questions and promote discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>UPCOMING MEETINGS INFORMATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The next Business meeting is scheduled for Friday, September 25, 2009, at 9 a.m. The next Policy meeting is scheduled for Friday, October 9, 2009, at 10 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>ADJOURNMENT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+next to an agenda item indicates an attachment
REGIONAL PLANNING STAKEHOLDERS WORKING GROUP MEMBERSHIP

File Number 3100000

Introduction

The Board of Directors approved the establishment of the Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group (SWG) in May 2009. The SWG will provide feedback to both the Regional Planning and Transportation Committees on the development of the 2050 RTP and its components; development and implementation of the SANDAG Public Participation Plan; and preparation for a future Regional Comprehensive Plan update.

The call for SWG membership applications for at-large citizen representatives was issued on June 1, 2009, with a deadline of June 30. More than 70 applications were received and reviewed by a selection committee consisting of members of the Transportation and Regional Planning Committees, the Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC), and the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG).

The selection committee recommended approval of a slate of 19 members and nine alternates, as shown in Tables 1 and 2. (The alternates would replace regular members if those members could no longer serve over the course of the planning period.)

Discussion

The following outlines the selection process for members of the SWG:

Membership Categories

The SWG provides a unique opportunity for SANDAG to involve citizens with expertise in subject matter areas of regional interest as well as individuals who reflect the demographics of the region, with particular emphasis on communities that are not traditionally involved in regional planning processes. The SWG charter (Attachment 1) includes two categories of membership: At-Large Citizen Representatives and Community-based Outreach Grant Recipients from Environmental Justice Communities. The recommendation in this report concerns the At-Large membership category only. The Board of Directors delegated authority to the SANDAG Executive Director to coordinate the selection and grant-making process for the second category.

Recommendation

The Board of Directors is asked to approve the slate of members and alternates indicated in Tables 1 and 2 to serve as at-large citizen representatives on the Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group.
Selection Committee – A committee was assembled to select the at-large citizen representatives to the SWG. At their meetings on May 1, 2009, the Transportation Committee appointed Councilmembers Matt Hall (City of Carlsbad) and Tony Young (City of San Diego), and the Regional Planning Committee appointed Councilmember Lesa Heebner (Solana Beach) and Supervisor Pam Slater-Price (County of San Diego) to serve on the selection committee. CTAC appointed Paul Vo (City of San Marcos) and Maryam Babaki (City of National City) at its meeting of June 4, 2009, and on May 14, 2009, TWG appointed Gary Halbert (City of Chula Vista) and Bill Chopyk (City of La Mesa). The selection committee was chaired by SANDAG First Vice Chair Jerome Stocks.

Recruitment Announcements – Advertisements and articles announcing the call for SWG membership applications were placed in The San Diego Union-Tribune, North County Times, La Prensa, and Asian Journal. A full-page article was published in Spanish in El Latino. A press release was distributed to all regional and local media; e-mail notification was distributed to SANDAG e-mail lists; notices and a featured project were posted on the SANDAG Web site; and an item was featured in rEgion, the monthly SANDAG electronic newsletter.

Selection Criteria – The selection committee reviewed the membership applications and selected candidates based upon balancing the group by geography and interests, maximizing the number of groups the candidate is associated with, skills and abilities, experience with regional planning issues, and a demonstrated commitment to serve on the working group for approximately two years.

Replacement Process – Should at-large members resign, or miss three meetings in a row or four meetings over the course of one year. They will be replaced by an alternate (from Table 2). Alternates will be appointed by subregion alphabetically. Should the alternate list be exhausted, the selection committee will reconvene to review the remaining pool of applicants.

Recommended Membership

The selection committee recommended the following individuals to serve as at-large members on the SWG.

RECOMMENDED REGIONAL PLANNING STAKEHOLDERS WORKING GROUP
AT-LARGE CITIZEN MEMBERSHIP SLATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City of San Diego</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cary D. Lowe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elyse Lowe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eddie Price *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Russell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry J. Schultz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandor Shapery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea Skorepa *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County of San Diego</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michael D. Pitts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oliver J. Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Warner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>North County Coastal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Holly S. McGoldrick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ervin Poka, Jr.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>North County Inland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gary Knight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margarete Morgan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>East County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Todd Galarneau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis J. Wahl</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The selection committee recommended the following individuals as alternates to replace at-large members as needed.

RECOMMENDED ALTERNATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>South County</th>
<th>City of San Diego</th>
<th>County of San Diego</th>
<th>North County Coastal</th>
<th>North County Inland</th>
<th>East County</th>
<th>South County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>David Krogh</td>
<td>Daniel Allen</td>
<td>Dennis Martinek</td>
<td>Dennis K. Ridz</td>
<td>Robert K. Leonard</td>
<td>Lynda Brophy</td>
<td>Tracey Rivera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditas Yamane*</td>
<td>Michael F. Boyle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Mitchell</td>
<td>Nico Calavita</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Affiliated with a minority organization with countywide constituent base

Environmental Justice Community-Based Outreach Grant Program

The Board of Directors delegated authority to the SANDAG Executive Director to administer the selection process for the Environmental Justice Community-Based Outreach Grant Program, which ran parallel to the selection process for the at-large citizen category. Through this program, SANDAG will provide between $5,000 and $7,000 each in funding to eight organizations that will implement outreach activities that result in: (1) public involvement from stakeholders in specific communities that traditionally may not have been involved in the regional planning process; (2) community-based participation in setting regional priorities; and (3) ongoing public input into the development of the 2050 RTP and key related components. These activities will coordinate with other public involvement activities being undertaken to help prepare the 2050 RTP.

Selection Committee: The applications were scored by a selection committee composed of three SANDAG staff members and two individuals outside the agency. The individuals invited to participate on the selection committee had previous experience with this type of grant program, such as evaluating applications for this grant program's previous cycle, evaluating applications for other similar grant programs, previously managing this grant program, and/or currently managing similar grant programs. Each selection committee member also signed a Conflict of Interest Declaration Form prior to participating.

Recruitment Announcements: Advertisements and articles announcing the call for applications were placed in The San Diego Union-Tribune, North County Times, Voice & Viewpoint, La Prensa, and Asian Journal. A full-page article was published in Spanish in El Latino. A press release was distributed to all regional and local media; e-mail notification was distributed to SANDAG e-mail lists; notices and a featured project were posted on the SANDAG Web site; and an item was featured in rEgion, the monthly SANDAG electronic newsletter. An electronic mailing list also was assembled to distribute the call for applications to community-based organizations throughout the region.
Selection Criteria: The Board of Directors approved both evaluation criteria and a selection process to award funding. Applications were evaluated based on criteria in six categories: (1) ability to meet schedule; (2) ability to reach identified communities; (3) cost-effectiveness; (4) understanding of the project; (5) similar types of work; and (6) commitment to have a representative serve on the SWG.

Results:

The results of the selection process were reviewed and approved by the SANDAG Executive Director, and all applicants have been notified of the status of their respective applications. In addition to receiving this funding, each organization awarded a grant also will select a representative to serve on the SWG as a member of the “Community-Based Outreach Grant Recipients from Environmental Justice Communities” category. Table 3 shows the list of grantees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Able-Disabled Advocacy, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. All Congregations Together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Casa Familiar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Chula Vista Community Collaborative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. El Cajon Collaborative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Friends of Adult Day Health Care Centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Linda Vista Collaborative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. San Ysidro Business Association</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next Steps

If the Board of Directors approves the membership slate for the at-large citizen category, the successful candidates would be notified and the first SWG meeting would be held on Wednesday, September 16, 2009, from 4 to 6 p.m. at the Caltrans offices on Taylor Street in Old Town. The SWG will meet monthly through the approval of the 2050 RTP (expected in summer 2011).

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Attachment: 1. Regional Stakeholders Working Group Charter

Key Staff Contact: Jane Clough-Riquelme, (619) 699-1909, jcl@sandag.org

No Budget Impact
Charter for Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group

PURPOSE
The purpose of the Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group (SWG) is to provide ongoing public input into key activities associated with developing the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and its key components, including its goals and objectives; a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) required by Senate Bill 375 (2008); and laying the foundation for the next Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) update.

LINE OF REPORTING
Depending on the activity or element being considered, the SWG will act in an advisory capacity to either or both the Regional Planning Committee and/or Transportation Committee on specific 2050 RTP, SCS, and RCP elements. The Regional Planning and Transportation Committees in turn report to the SANDAG Board of Directors, which will make final decisions on the 2050 RTP, SCS, and RCP.

RESPONSIBILITIES
The SWG will review and provide input that staff will use to develop the 2050 RTP, as well as lay the foundation for the next RCP update. These activities may include, but are not limited to, the development of the 2050 Regional Growth Forecast, SCS, Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA), Urban Core Transit Strategy, and the RTP/SCS Public Participation Plan. The SWG also will assist with associated public outreach and help inform and encourage diverse, inclusive, and active public participation in achieving the group’s purpose.

MEMBERSHIP
The SWG will have up to 25 members. Sixteen to 18 SWG members will be “at-large” members selected based on their individual qualifications as a citizen representative or their role as a community leader, and not as an organization’s designated representative. Of the 16 to 18 individual “at-large” members, up to four members will have experience with various minority organizations with countywide constituent bases (e.g., Chicano Federation of San Diego County, Council of Native American Organizations of San Diego County, San Diego Alliance for Asian Pacific Islanders, etc.).

Five to seven members will be “community-based network” members that represent community-based organizations that have been awarded a SCS/RTP Community-Based Environmental Justice Outreach Mini-Grant and have executed a Mini-Grant Agreement.

If an at-large SWG member misses three meetings in a row or four meetings over the course of one year, s/he will be replaced. Community-based SWG members may formally designate up to two alternates in writing. If a Community-based SWG member misses three meetings in a row or four meetings over the course of one year without representation by one of his/her alternates, s/he will be replaced. Replacement at-large members will be selected from the approved waiting list created by the SWG Membership Selection Committee. Replacement “community-based network” members will be selected from the Community Based Outreach Mini-Grant finalists who were not previously awarded a grant.
MEETING TIME AND LOCATION
The SWG will meet on a monthly basis. Meetings will typically be held on the third Tuesday of the month from 4 to 6 p.m. at the Caltrans District 11 offices on Taylor Street in San Diego.

WORKING GROUP LEADERSHIP
The Chair of the SWG will be a member of, and will be appointed by, the Chair of the SANDAG Board of Directors. The SWG Chair will be a nonvoting member, who will manage meetings and facilitate discussions amongst the membership. The SWG will elect two vice-chairs by a majority vote. One vice-chair will serve as an advisory member to the Regional Planning Committee while the other will serve as an advisory member to the Transportation Committee when invited by the applicable Policy Advisory Committee chair when a relevant item is placed on the agenda.

DURATION OF EXISTENCE
The SWG will complete its work with the adoption of the 2050 RTP (anticipated in summer 2011).

BROWN ACT AND CONFLICT OF INTEREST
Consistent with Government Code Section 54952(b), the SWG is subject to the Ralph M. Brown Act. Input from the SWG will undergo intervening analysis by staff, the Regional Planning Committee, the Transportation Committee, and other committees and working groups. Therefore members of the SWG will not be required to submit Statements of Economic Interest (Form 700).
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AGENDA ITEM NO. 09-09-3
ACTION REQUESTED – DISCUSSION

2050 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN:
VISION AND GOALS

Introduction

Solutions to our region’s transportation needs require a comprehensive planning effort that coordinates land use and transportation and develops an integrated, multimodal transportation system. The Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) contains specific public policies and strategies, as well as projects and programs aimed at meeting the diverse mobility needs of our growing and changing region.

Federal and state laws require that SANDAG prepare a long-range transportation plan and make an air quality conformity determination every four years. A work program and schedule to develop the 2050 RTP, which is slated for adoption in 2011, were presented to the Board of Directors in June 2009.

To establish the policy foundation for the 2050 RTP, the Board should provide policy direction regarding the 2050 RTP vision and goals. Interactive technology will be used to pose questions and promote discussion.

Discussion

Emerging Issues

SANDAG is the first major metropolitan planning organization that will prepare an RTP that will include the provisions of Senate Bill (SB) 375 (Steinberg, 2008). One of the first steps in the 2050 RTP development is to review and update the goals and objectives from the 2030 RTP based on emerging issues such as the implementation of SB 375.

The Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) will be a new element of the RTP, as required by SB 375, and will be designed to show how regional greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction targets, to be established by the California Air Resources Board, would be achieved through development patterns, transportation infrastructure investments, and/or transportation measures or policies that are determined to be feasible. Additionally, the SCS must be consistent with the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) and must address protection of sensitive resource areas. If the SCS does not meet regional GHG reduction targets, an Alternative Planning Strategy (APS) must be developed to demonstrate how the targets could be achieved.

The adopted Smart Growth Concept Map, which identifies existing and planned smart growth areas linked to existing and planned public transit, along with habitat conservation areas, will serve as a basis for the SCS. Additionally, the Regional Climate Action Plan (RCAP) will provide options for additional transportation measures that could reduce GHG emissions.
Framework

Staff is proposing a progressive framework of goals, policy objectives, and performance measures to be used to guide the 2050 RTP. Draft policy goals are proposed for the 2050 RTP. Based on direction from the Board of Directors at the September 11 Board Policy meeting, policy objectives will be created to help reach these goals. Finally, performance measures will be established to measure how well the 2050 RTP performs.

The 2050 RTP should start with the core values from previous RTPs, and incorporate them into broader categories to reflect emerging issues such as climate change, aging population, and the economy. In addition to emerging issues, more traditional concepts, such as providing convenient travel options, optimizing the transportation systems’ productivity for people and goods, tailoring transportation improvements to serve compatible land uses, and promoting alternative travel modes also are critical to the development of the 2050 RTP.

In addition to policy direction from past RTPs, the Board has adopted goals and provided policy direction in the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP), as the strategic planning framework for the San Diego region, as well as other plans and strategies. The RCP calls for the application of principles of “smart growth” and “sustainability.” Smart growth means developing the region in a way that creates livable communities by connecting land use and transportation, improving the quality of travel by focusing on better urban design and walkability. The RCP’s principles of sustainability are based on achieving goals and objectives in three broad areas: a prosperous economy, a healthy environment, and social equity. These three Es together provide the foundation for achieving sustainable and livable communities.

Developing the 2050 RTP Vision, Goals, and Policy Objectives

Proposed 2050 RTP Vision

The RCP sets forth a vision for transportation in the San Diego region, as outlined below:

- We have many convenient transportation choices. Fast, frequent, and reliable public transit services interconnect our communities, and our major transit centers are integrated with housing, retail shops, food courts, shade-covered benches, and well-maintained restrooms. More of our residents who have cars opt to leave them at home and families need fewer cars per household. Overall, it’s easier and more convenient to get around by walking, biking, and using transit. As a result, many children walk or bike to school, as we used to do when we were younger.

- Many of our existing regional freeways, highways, and major roadways have been expanded and include an extensive managed lane network for transit and carpools. These systems are linked to the international airport, ensuring effective access to world markets. Roads, rails, and vehicles are better managed with technology, which increases public safety. In-road sensors and cameras help detect traffic incidents and slowing. Automated systems notify traffic-response teams in real-time and electronically adjust ramp meters and traffic signals to moderate traffic flow.

- Despite continued population and employment growth, the average commute time is less than 30 minutes, and traffic congestion in key corridors has improved. By better linking transportation and land use decisions in the past, more people now live close to their jobs and leave their cars at home. As a result, more people have additional leisure time and less travel-related stress.
Draft 2050 RTP Goals

Staff has drafted proposed goals for the 2050 RTP which expand upon goals from the 2030 RTP and incorporate recent Board policy discussions on smart growth, energy, economic, and quality of life issues. Once finalized, policy objectives and performance measures will be developed for each of the goals. The Board also should provide direction on other goals that staff should consider for the 2050 RTP.

The proposed 2050 RTP goals are structured into two overarching themes: Quality of Travel & Livability, and Sustainability. Quality of Travel & Livability relates to how the transportation system functions from the customers’ perspective, while Sustainability relates to making progress simultaneously in each of the Three “Es” (Healthy Environment, Prosperous Economy, and Social Equity).

In addition to the discussion below, to help clarify the relationship between past RTP policy goals and those proposed for the 2050 RTP, staff created a matrix showing their intersections. The matrix, shown in Attachment 1, provides a comparison of the proposed 2050 RTP goals to the current 2030 RTP goals. The matrix depicts how the existing goals have many linkages to the proposed 2050 RTP goals and also highlights some of the new concepts given other emerging issues.

**Quality of Travel & Livability**

Mobility – The transportation system should provide for convenient travel options for people and goods and maximize its productivity. The system should optimize both the time it takes to travel as well as the total costs of travel.

Reliability – The transportation system should be reliable so that travelers can expect relatively consistent travel times from day-to-day for the same trip by mode(s).

System Preservation & Safety – The public’s investment in transportation should be protected by maintaining the transportation system and keeping it in a good state of repair. It is critical to preserve and ensure a safe regional transportation system through engineering, education, enforcement, and emergency medical services.

**Sustainability**

Healthy Environment – The transportation system should focus on transportation investments that avoid and mitigate adverse environmental impacts and should promote environmental sustainability by reducing greenhouse gas and smog forming emissions from vehicles. Transportation investments should foster efficient development patterns that optimize travel, housing, and employment choices and encourage future growth away from rural areas and closer to existing and planned development.

Prosperous Economy – Investments to the transportation system should provide cost-effective solutions that maximize public benefits so that the region gets the most out of its investment and that encourage economic growth. The RTP should play a significant role in raising the region’s standard of living.

Social Equity – The transportation system should be designed to provide an equitable level of transportation services for low-income, minority, seniors, and youth populations.
Next Steps

The proposed 2050 RTP goals will be discussed with the Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group (SWG). Based on Board direction and input from the SWG, staff will develop policy objectives and performance measures for each of the goals and bring these back to a future Board meeting.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Attachment: 1. Proposed 2050 RTP Goals Compared to Existing 2030 RTP Goals

Key Staff Contact: Heather Werdick, (619) 699-6967, hwe@sandag.org

Funds are budgeted in Work Element #3100500
## Proposed 2050 RTP Goals Compared to Existing 2030 RTP Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED 2050 RTP GOALS</th>
<th>EXISTING 2030 RTP GOALS</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LIVABILITY</td>
<td>MOBILITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUALITY OF TRAVEL &amp; LIVABILITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOBILITY</td>
<td></td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RELIABILITY</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYSTEM PRESERVATION &amp; SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUSTAINABILITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEALTHY ENVIRONMENT</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROSPEROUS ECONOMY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL EQUITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ACCELERATOR COLLIDER ENERGY

1.7 Mev. H2+ Ion Collisions For Electric Power Generation

Average of 7 grams per hour of H2+ ions collided on carbon crystal foils could replace S. Bay Power Plant. Key work outlined in “Forward electron ejection in ion collisions”, by Dehaes, Neek, & Sommerville; Aarhus Denmark 1984.

This is a low energy 1.7 Mev [million electron volt] phenomenon, which creates a sharp peak in forward ejected electrons [8000 electrons per H2+ breakup H2+→ H[+] + H[0]] moving at the same velocity as the impacting H2+ ions ~ 54,000,000 ft per sec. Single H+ ions could be recycled to each create streams of 1000 electrons upon impact.

Short linear acceleration sections could theoretically step up velocities of H2+ ions by thirteen incremental accelerations, 0 to 13,183.6 ft. per sec. 26367.2, 52734.4, 105468.8, 210937.6, 421875.2, 843750.4, 1687500.8, 3375001.6, 6750032.2, 13500009.4, 27000017.8, 54,000,025.6. This is a velocity doubler. Stored in a 25 ft. radius synchrotron, 0.000002 grams of H2+ ions [2 micrograms] would create a force of 8 tons*. A beam the length of the circumference~157 ft., would create a centrifugal force of about 100 pounds per foot.

*Centrifugal force = mass, times velocity squared, divided by the radius

Each packet of 2 micrograms [2 ug.] of H2+ ions collided would create a 400 ampere ‘convoy electron’ jet, [the electron beams are at 1000 Ev [electron volts]], and the power would be 400 megawatts for 1000 packets per sec. Assuming recycling atomic H+ ions, plus lower energy consumption overnight, roughly 7.2 grams times 24 hours as average daily operation ~ 172.8 grams of H2+ ions collided per day, even with 75% conversion of the raw beam power through toroidal power pickup coils into electrical energy, would potentially be able to replace the S. Bay 700 megawatt power plant.

The results for Aarhus Denmark’s symposium on forward ejected electrons in ion collisions mentioned supra have established empirical results, and the H2+ ion collisions here being considered measured yields for an angle of 1 degree of convoy electrons ejected in the forward direction. The difficulty involved in establishing sufficiently optimal energy yields vis a vis operating energy requirements is related to the expense of creating an optimal ion accelerator for the very low 1.7 Mev energy level where peak production of “convoy electrons” occurs. High energy collisions are extremely interesting to collision physicists searching for the gravitational coupling, they would prefer money be spent on the high energy facilities. But the energy peaks are where they are, in the low Mev range, and wisdom would put funding into optimal designs for low wattage requirements for this range of acceleration. Thick copper pipes may not be the best design to run the ion beams through because the electric currents have to penetrate all that copper to reach the ion beams traveling inside.

Typically, partial beams are very thin whips to help isolate single events for clear observation, also the terrific centrifugal [centrifugal] acceleration of ~ 9 trillion “G’s” for a radius curve of 10 feet.,[for velocities of 54 million ft. per sec.], establishes limits on mass densities of beams even at low energy. Short linear acceleration sections keep energy requirements low because of the absence of centrifugal force that would otherwise have to be contained by electromagnetic fields when accelerating on a curve.

Michael Toney 9/9/9
MEMORANDUM

TO: City Council, City of Solana Beach

FROM: James Moose JSM

DATE: September 3, 2009

RE: SB 375 CEQA streamlining provisions

This memorandum discusses the provisions of the California’s Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act, or SB 375, that streamline environmental review for certain transit priority projects (“TPP”) under the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”). SB 375 requires each metropolitan planning organization (“MPO”) to include a Sustainable Communities Strategy (“SCS”) in its regional transportation plan (“RTP”) or to adopt an Alternative Planning Strategy (“APS”), for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gas (“GHG”) emissions, aligning planning for transportation and housing needs, and creating incentives for the implementation of the strategies, such as CEQA streamlining and transportation funding.

Generally, under the streamlining provisions, if a project qualifies as a TPP, is consistent with the SCS adopted as part of an RTP for which an environmental impact report (“EIR”) was prepared and meets various other criteria discussed below, it shall be exempt from further CEQA review. Public Resources Code section 21155 sets forth the requirements for a project to qualify as a TPP. Along with requirements for project density and location, the TPP must be consistent with the “general use designation, density, building intensity, and applicable policies specified for the project area in either a sustainable communities strategy or an alternative planning strategy,” for which the State Air Resources Board “has accepted [an MPO’s] determination that the [SCS] or the
alternative planning strategy would, if implemented, achieve the GHG emission reduction targets.”

Public Resources Code section 21155.1 states that, “if the legislative body finds, after conducting a public hearing,” that a TPP, as defined above, meets all of the requirements of section 21155.1, subdivisions (a) and (b), and one of the requirements of subdivision (c), the TPP “is declared to be a sustainable communities project and shall be exempt from this division. . . .” Subdivisions (a), (b) and (c) set forth environmental and land use criteria, along with an affordable housing component, that must be met for the exemption to apply.

1. The Plain Language of Public Resources Code Section 21155.1 Requires Application of the Exemption

In our opinion, the language of Public Resources Code section 21155.1 effectively eliminates an agency’s discretion to conduct CEQA review for a project that meets its requirements. We base this conclusion on the plain meaning of the statutory mandate that states the project “shall be exempt.” (California School Employees Assn. v. Governing Board (1994) 8 Cal.4th 333, 338; Janken v. GM Hughes Electronics (1996) 46 Cal.App.4th 55, 60 [“primary determinant” of legislative intent is words used by the Legislature].) Where the language is clear and unambiguous, the plain meaning must be followed. There is no ambiguity in the legislative language of 21155.1, and if a TPP meets the listed criteria, it “shall be exempt” from CEQA.

We understand that San Diego Association of Governments (“SANDAG”) staff has asserted that the “CEQA streamlining provisions are not mandatory and are intended to be a tool that local jurisdictions may use, if desired.” We disagree with this assertion, particularly in light of our understanding that SANDAG staff based this interpretation not on the plain statutory language, but on communications with members of SB 375 author Darrell Steinberg’s staff. As stated above, the plain meaning of statutory language must be followed. If the statutory language is clear and unambiguous, there is no need for further interpretation. (California School Employees Assn., supra, 8 Cal.4th at p. 340; Halbert’s Lumber, Inc. v. Lucky Stores, Inc. (1992) 6 Cal.App.4th 1233, 1239.) Only if the plain meaning of the statute’s text does not resolve the interpretive question, would a court look to the legislative history to assist in an interpretation. (Flannery v. Prentice (2001) 26 Cal.4th 572, 579; Dyna-Med, Inc. v. Fair Employment & Housing Com. (1987) 43 Cal.3d 1379, 1387.) Here, because the language “shall be exempt” is clear and unambiguous, we do not believe a court would consider communications with staff to interpret the plain language in a different manner, particularly if those communications could only be substantiated with hearsay evidence.

We understand that another option presented by SANDAG staff would be to include a site on the RTP/SCS map, but have an asterisk next to it indicating additional
environmental review would be required. Again, it is our opinion that this is contrary to the statutory language of Public Resource Code section 21155.1 and is therefore not in fact a viable option. We also note that, should a city attempt to "volunteer" to be excluded from consideration in the RTP and SCS, this would likely result in a loss of transportation funding, and could make the city vulnerable to a lawsuit to the extent its actions were interpreted as trying to thwart the purposes of SB 375.

2. The City Cannot Avoid Application of an Exemption by Not Holding a Public Hearing

We also understand that staff from the League of California Cities has pointed to the language in Public Resources Code section 21155.1, which states that "if the legislative body finds, after a conducting a public hearing. . .," to conclude that a city does not actually have to make such a determination. The argument appears to be that if a city never holds a public hearing to make the determination, then the TPP is not exempt and presumably would have to be subject to independent CEQA review. League of Cities staff opined that SB 375 "invites, but does not require, a lead agency to hold a public hearing to determine whether the TPP meets the requirements for a statutory exemption" and further concludes that a writ of mandate could not be brought because the determination of whether to hold a public hearing is within the discretion of the local agency.

We disagree with this interpretation. Under the general provisions of CEQA, if an agency proposes to "approve" a "project," then the agency must consider whether the project is covered by an exemption. Where the project involves the issuance of a lease, permit, license, certificate, or other entitlement for use, the agency must determine whether the proposed activity is exempt from CEQA during the 30-day "preliminary review" period after the agency has received a project application and accepted it as complete. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21080.2; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15102, 15061, 15062.17.) If the agency finds that the project is subject to a statutory exemption, then no further analysis is required. (CEQA Guidelines, § 15061, subd. (b)(2).)

While these provisions require that an agency take some action to determine whether a proposal is exempt from CEQA, the agency typically need not follow any particular procedure to make such a determination. In other words, the provisions requiring preliminary review do not require that an agency provide the public or other agencies with an opportunity to review, or hold a public hearing on, its exemption determination. (See CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15060 [preliminary review], 15061 [review for exemption]; see also Magan v. County of Kings (2002) 105 Cal. App. 4th 468, 477 [even where an exemption is contested, an agency need not provide a hearing on the record for such contest].) We therefore conclude that the public hearing requirement exists in Public Resources Code section 21155.1 to ensure that a public hearing will be held as part of the
process for determining whether a TPP is exempt from CEQA review. We do not believe it absolves an agency from making the determination.

Further, we disagree with the notion that a writ of mandate could not be brought because the determination of whether to hold a public hearing is within the discretion of the local agency. An applicant (or other interested party) could indeed seek a writ compelling the agency to make a determination, and could also seek a writ compelling the agency to exempt the project from CEQA.

In one case, the Court of Appeal determined that a project was exempt from CEQA even though the agency's record made no mention of an exemption. (Erven v. Board of Supervisors (1975) 53 Cal. App. 3d 1004, 1013-1014.) The decision suggests that whether a project qualifies for an exemption is a question of law, and a reviewing court can consider whether a project qualifies for an exemption even where the agency did not first consider the issue. (Cf. Elk County Water District v. Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (1997) 53 Cal. App. 4th 1, 10 [question of whether exemption falls with certified regulatory program involves purely legal questions that are "unaffected by any fact-finding below"].) For that reason, it is reasonable to conclude that a court reviewing such a decision would hold that the determination of whether a project is a TPP and statutorily exempt under 21155.1 is a question of law, and not subject to the "abuse of discretion" standard.

3. The City May Exercise its Land Use Authority to Ensure That a TPP Otherwise Exempt from CEQA Review is Consistent with the City's General Plan

Under State Planning and Zoning Law, the general plan is a city's basic planning document and provides the blueprint for development throughout the community. Since the general plan is the guide for all future development, any decision by a city affecting land use and development must be consistent with the general plan. (See Citizens of Goleta Valley v. Board of Supervisors (1990) 52 Cal.3d 553, 570.) A determination regarding consistency is a legislative decision, and will not be set aside by a court unless the city has acted arbitrarily, capriciously, or without evidentiary notice as required by law. (See San Franciscans Upholding the Downtown Plan v. City and County of San Francisco (2002) 102 Cal.App.4th 656, 668.) While the decision is legislative, it does necessitate some level of factual determination. (Building Industry Ass'n v. City of Oceanside (1994) 27 Cal.App.4th 744, 761.)

Pursuant to these general principles, a city may require that certain studies be conducted in order to ensure that enough information has been provided to determine whether a proposal is in fact consistent with the general plan. The city may also impose conditions on development to ensure that general plan policies and principles will be met. For example, we understand that the Circulation Element of the City's General Plan includes
LOS policies that the City is required to impose. The City could therefore require a traffic study to ensure that a proposed project would be consistent with these General Plan policies, and impose conditions that require compliance with the policies.

4. CEQA Review for the RTP/SCS

We understand that SANDAG is currently at work on the 2050 RTP work program, which will be based on the 2050 Regional Growth Forecast, will incorporate the results of the many regional and corridor studies currently underway, and will include the SCS as a new element of the RTP. The SCS will be designed to show how regional GHG reduction targets, to be established by the California Air Resources Board (“CARB”), would be achieved through development patterns, infrastructure investments, and/or transportation measures or policies that are determined to be feasible. Additionally, the SCS must be consistent with the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (“RHNA”) and must address protection of sensitive resource areas. If the SCS does not meet regional GHG reduction targets, an APS must be developed to demonstrate how the targets can be achieved.

An EIR will be prepared for the 2050 RTP, and will include GHG emissions baseline measurements and projections, as well as potential mitigation measures to reduce emissions. The EIR also will include analysis of the SCS. We understand that the adopted Smart Growth Concept Map, which identifies existing and planned smart growth areas linked to existing and planned public transit, along with the identified habitat conservation areas, will serve as a basis for the SCS.

While we do not know how SANDAG plans to analyze the impacts associated with areas identified as “mixed use” on the Smart Growth Concept Map, we understand that the City is concerned that SANDAG might analyze those areas as if they contained only residential uses, without any commercial use component. While we do not know how SANDAG intends to proceed, generally, if an agency is approving a project with a land plan component, then it should analyze the impacts in a way that is consistent with the land plan. Analysis of environmental effects need not rely on speculative assumptions, but will be judged in light of what was reasonably feasible, and the document should provide a sufficient degree of analysis to allow decision-makers to make intelligent judgments. (CEQA Guidelines, § 15151.) “[T]he adequacy of an EIR is determined in terms of what is reasonably feasible, in light of factors such as the magnitude of the project at issue, the severity of its likely environmental impacts, and the geographic scope of the project.” (CEQA Guidelines, § 15204, subd. (a).)

Given that mixed use zoning designations include both residential and commercial use components, we believe that a reasonable approach would be to include both residential and commercial uses where mixed use designations are analyzed for the RTP EIR. A reasonable assumption about the amounts of each type of development that could be
allowed could be made based on review of the zoning codes of each city in the region. Such an approach seems feasible, since the maximum number of each component of mixed uses can be determined based on a review of city zoning codes, and would give a reasonably accurate depiction of the impacts associated with the RTP. A more conservative approach would err on the side of maximizing commercial uses.

We note that the City will have opportunity during the EIR process to make comments and offer input on the scope of the RTP EIR’s analysis. (See Pub. Resources Code, § 21080.4; CEQA Guidelines, § 15082 [scoping requirements]; Pub. Resources Code, §§ 21104, 21153; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15086, 15087.) Further, a CEQA challenge could be brought by any affected city or interested citizen who has exhausted its administrative remedies by raising objections during the administrative process. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21177.)

In the event that SANDAG approves the RTP and certifies an EIR and no lawsuit is brought during the statute of limitations period, the RTP will thereafter be presumed adequate. Public Resources Code section 21167.2 creates a conclusive presumption that the EIR is legally adequate for purposes of its use be responsible agencies. “This presumption acts to preclude reopening of the CEQA process even if the initial EIR is discovered to have been fundamentally inaccurate and misleading in the description of a significant effect or the severity of its consequences.” (Laurel Heights Improvement Association v. Regents of the University of California (1993) 6 Cal.4th 1112, 1130.) Therefore, for purposes of determining whether a TPP qualifies for an exemption from further CEQA review under Public Resources Code section 21155.1, the City would be required to rely on the conclusions of the RTP EIR.

* * * * * *

Please feel free to contact me should you have additional questions.
September 7, 2009

Dear SANDAG Webmaster:

Please forward this message regarding Friday's meeting of the SANDAG Board of Directors to the Directors, in accordance with the policy on your website at http://www.sandag.org/index.asp?committeeid=31&fuseaction=committees.detail

Thank you for your assistance.

Best regards,

George Crissman
unclog@cox.net

Board Item: SANDAG Board of Directors Meeting for Friday, September 11, 2009
2050 Regional Transportation Plan: Vision and Goals
Agenda Item No. 09-09-3
File Number 3100500
Submitter: George Crissman
Organization: (Not Applicable)

Dear Board Member:

During the session regarding the vision and goals for the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan, would you please ask SANDAG staff to perform the necessary research and report back with answers to these questions:

1. In the agenda, the paragraph entitled "Mobility" (under the "Quality of Travel & Livability" headline) says "the system should optimize both the time it takes to travel as well as the total costs of travel". Why doesn't it say "the system should REDUCE both the time it takes to travel as well as the total costs of travel"?

Note: The agenda for Friday's meeting is online at http://www.sandag.org/uploads/meetingid/meetingid_2226_9991.pdf

2. Also in the agenda, the paragraph titled "Prosperous Economy" under the headline "Sustainability" says "investments to the transportation system should provide cost-effective solutions that maximize public benefits...". How will cost-effectiveness be determined? What methodology will be used, what is the source and accuracy of the data, and what calculations will be performed?
3. When "maximizing public benefits", will you give any weight to the results of SANDAG's "Transit Public Opinion Study" (December, 2008: http://www.sandag.org/uploads/publicationid/publicationid_1428_9419.pdf page 14) showing that 64% of travelers choose to drive alone and 20% choose to carpool, a ridership total of 84% that prefer cars and roads?

4. The agenda contains a comment that "... the transportation system should be designed to provide an equitable level of transportation services for ... seniors ..." (see: "Social Equity" paragraph under the "Sustainability" headline). A previous SANDAG study (December, 2006: http://www.sandag.org/uploads/meetingid/meetingid_1442_6208.pdf page 169, figure 28) revealed that mass transit ridership decreases as travelers get older.
   a) What non-transit modes of travel will be proposed or enhanced for senior citizens?
   b) Will "Neighborhood Electric Vehicles" be considered (proposed in http://www.nctimes.com/news/opinion/commentary/article_11d7daac-22f3-593c-b0fc-2ff5fa627b66.html)?
   c) Will scooters, mopeds, segways, and other powered vehicles be considered?

5. The "Healthy Environment" paragraph under the "Sustainability" headline in the agenda says "... the transportation system should focus on transportation investments that avoid and mitigate adverse environmental impacts...". What are the current vehicle emission levels on our freeways? What would the vehicle emissions be if the freeways were expanded with regular lanes to completely eliminate congestion?
   a) A line chart with "hour of the day" on the X-axis and "total emissions" on the Y-axis would satisfy this request.
   b) Plotting "before expansion" and "after expansion" lines on the chart would clearly show the difference.

6. Under the "Emerging Issues" headline in the agenda, it is stated "The adopted Smart Growth Concept Map, which identifies existing and planned smart growth areas linked to existing and planned public transit, along with habitat conservation areas, will serve as a basis for the SCS (Sustainable Communities Strategy)". Have the concepts of "smart growth" been previously implemented anywhere in the United States in the last hundred years? If the answer is "yes", please answer part a).
   a) If the answer is "no", please answer part b).
   a) If they have been tried: where were they tried, when were they tried, and what were the results?
   b) If they have not been tried: what is the evidence "smart growth" will provide an affordable, high quality of life to residents?

Note: Questions 7, 8, and 9 ask about the cost of construction (7), cost of operation (8), and cost of maintenance (9) of the various modes of travel. These questions are prompted by the reference to "... the public's investment in transportation ..." in the paragraph titled "System Preservation and Safety" under the "Quality of Travel and Livability" headline in the agenda and by the need for cost-effective transportation projects.
7. What are the costs to construct a freeway lane, a managed lane, light rail, heavy rail, and transit bus guideways on a passenger-mile basis? Two answers for each mode are desired:
   a) Use "full seated capacity" for each mode of travel (for the car, assume a vehicle capacity of 4 passengers). Omit standee capacity and "crush capacity" from the calculations.
   b) Use "one-quarter seated capacity" (for the car, assume 1 passenger -- the driver -- is in the car).

8. Along the same line of thought, what are the costs to operate a freeway lane, a managed lane, light rail, heavy rail, and transit bus guideways on a passenger-mile basis? Two answers for each mode are desired:
   a) Use "full seated capacity" for each mode of travel (for the car, assume a vehicle capacity of 4 passengers). Omit standee capacity and "crush capacity" from the calculations.
   b) Use "one-quarter seated capacity" (for the car, assume 1 passenger -- the driver -- is in the car).

9. Also, what are the costs to maintain a freeway lane, a managed lane, light rail, heavy rail, and transit bus guideways on a passenger-mile basis? Two answers for each mode are desired:
   a) Use "full seated capacity" for each mode of travel (for the car, assume a vehicle capacity of 4 passengers). Omit standee capacity and "crush capacity" from the calculations.
   b) Use "one-quarter seated capacity" (for the car, assume 1 passenger -- the driver -- is in the car).

Under the "Next Steps" headline in the agenda, it is noted that "... based on Board direction and input from the SWG, staff will develop policy objectives and performance measures for each of the goals and bring these back to a future Board meeting." The clear and detailed responses from SANDAG staff to these questions will greatly assist in setting the vision and goals necessary to meet future transportation needs.

Sincerely,

George Crissman
Interactive Question #3 - Rank the proposed 2050 goals in order of importance, with 6 being the most important and 1 the least important.

__________

**Mobility** - The transportation system should provide for convenient travel options for people and goods and maximize its productivity. The system should optimize both the time it takes to travel as well as the total costs of travel.

__________

**Reliability** - The transportation system should be reliable so that travelers can expect relatively consistent travel times from day-to-day for the same trip by mode(s).

__________

**System Preservation & Safety** - The public’s investment in transportation should be protected by maintaining the transportation system and keeping it in a good state of repair. It is critical to preserve and ensure a safe regional transportation system through engineering, education, enforcement, and emergency medical services.

__________

**Healthy Environment** - The transportation system should focus on transportation investments that avoid and mitigate adverse environmental impacts and should promote environmental sustainability by reducing greenhouse gas and smog forming emissions from vehicles. Transportation investments should foster efficient development patterns that optimize travel, housing, and employment choices and encourage future growth away from rural areas and closer to existing and planned development.

__________

**Prosperous Economy** - Investments to the transportation system should provide cost-effective solutions that maximize public benefits so that the region gets the most out of its investment and that encourage economic growth. The RTP should play a significant role in raising the region’s standard of living.

__________

**Social Equity** - The transportation system should be designed to provide an equitable level of transportation services for low-income, minority, seniors, and youth populations.
Interactive Question #12 - Rank the following indicators in order of importance to be used as guidelines in developing alternatives for the 2050, with 5 being the most important and 1 the least important.

__________  Job creation

__________  Median household income

__________  Sales/property tax increases

__________  Standard of living

__________  Unemployment rate
2050 RTP: Vision and Goals

- Overview
- Interactive technology
- Board discussion
**Framework**

- Progressive framework to guide development of the 2050 RTP
- Incorporate adopted goals from 2030 RTP and other plans into broader categories to reflect emerging issues

**Connecting the Dots**

Regional Comprehensive Plan

- Healthy Environment
- Economic Prosperity
- Public Facilities
- Borders
- Housing
- Transportation
- Urban Form
 Proposed 2050 RTP Vision

- Convenient and integrated transportation choices
- Fast, frequent, and reliable public transit
- Linking transportation and land use
- Using technology to better manage the transportation system

Draft 2050 RTP Goals

- Goals based upon 2030 RTP
  - Incorporate energy, economic, and quality of life issues
  - Expand smart growth
- Proposed 2050 RTP goals have many linkages to the existing 2030 RTP goals
- Organized into two themes
  - Quality of Travel & Livability
  - Sustainability
Quality of Travel & Livability

- **Mobility** – convenient travel options for people and goods
- **Reliability** – reliable and consistent travel times
- **System Preservation and Safety** – preserve and ensure a safe regional transportation system in a good state of repair

Sustainability

- **Healthy Environment** – avoid and mitigate adverse environmental impacts and promote environmental sustainability by reducing greenhouse gas emissions
- **Prosperous Economy** – provide cost-effective solutions that maximize public benefits and help raise region's standard of living
- **Social Equity** – provide equitable levels of transportation services
Next Steps

- 2050 RTP goals will be discussed with the Stakeholders Working Group
- Develop policy objectives and performance measures for each of the goals
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Overview

Federal and state laws require that SANDAG prepare a long-range transportation plan and make an air quality conformity determination every four years. The SANDAG regional transportation plan (RTP) update is slated for adoption in 2011. In order to begin discussions regarding the policy foundation for the 2050 RTP, real-time interactive survey technology was used to solicit the SANDAG Board of Directors’ opinions and promote discussion about the critical issues at its Policy meeting on September 11, 2009. This report presents the results of the interactive survey.

The interactive survey questions are presented in Appendix A. The survey questions were designed to gain understanding of the relative priority of each of the RTP goals and to provide direction to staff on developing policy objectives or each of the goals. The questions also try to elicit direction to staff on developing initial 2050 RTP alternatives. Performance measures will also be created to measure how well the 2050 RTP would meet the goals.

Questions #3 and #12 required the participants to rank a list of items. The Board was provided ranking sheets in its information packet to facilitate the ranking process. The ranking sheets are presented in Appendix B.

NOTE: The number of responses may vary among questions since each participant may not have responded to every question. Also, percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding.
Interactive Survey Results

The purpose of the following question was to seek input on level of support for basing the 2050 RTP vision on the transportation vision in the Regional Comprehensive Plan.

A- To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement?

The proposed 2050 RTP vision should be based on the transportation vision from the Regional Comprehensive Plan.

The RCP sets forth a vision for transportation in the San Diego region, as outlined below:

We have many convenient transportation choices. Fast, frequent, and reliable public transit services interconnect our communities, and our major transit centers are integrated with housing, retail shops, food courts, shade-covered benches, and well-maintained restrooms. More of our residents who have cars opt to leave them at home and families need fewer cars per household. Overall, it's easier and more convenient to get around by walking, biking, and using transit. As a result, many children walk or bike to school, as we used to do when we were younger.

Many of our existing regional freeways, highways, and major roadways have been expanded and include an extensive managed lane network for transit and carpools. These systems are linked to the international airport, ensuring effective access to world markets. Roads, rails, and vehicles are better managed with technology, which increases public safety. In-road sensors and cameras help detect traffic incidents and slowing. Automated systems notify traffic-response teams in real-time and electronically adjust ramp meters and traffic signals to moderate traffic flow.

Despite continued population and employment growth, the average commute time is less than 30 minutes, and traffic congestion in key corridors has improved. By better linking transportation and land use decisions in the past, more people now live close to their jobs and leave their cars at home. As a result, more people have additional leisure time and less travel-related stress.
This survey was structured to explore and understand the various perspectives of the participants. The results of the survey are not statistically representative of the community as a whole.

SANDAG Board Policy Meeting
2050 RTP: Vision and Goals
Interactive Survey Results

SANDAG is the first major metropolitan planning organization that will prepare an RTP that will include the provisions of Senate Bill (SB) 375 (Steinberg, 2008). The Board was asked its opinion regarding including protection of our climate in the 2050 RTP vision.

B- To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement?

The 2050 RTP vision also should include protection of our climate.

Staff has drafted the following proposed goals for the 2050 RTP, which expand upon goals from the 2030 RTP and incorporate recent Board policy discussions on smart growth, energy, economic, and quality of life issues. A more detailed explanation of each goal is presented in the ranking sheet for question 3 in Appendix B.

A. Mobility
B. Reliability
C. System Preservation & Safety
D. Healthy Environment
E. Prosperous Economy
F. Social Equity

The SANDAG Board was asked to rank the draft goals from most important to least important. The most important goal was rated a six, the second most important goal a five, etc. The results of the ranking are shown in the following table. The percentages indicate the percent of participants who ranked a proposed goal at a particular level. Percentages may not add to 100 % due to rounding and the fact that not all participants may have ranked every proposed goal.
This survey was structured to explore and understand the various perspectives of the participants. The results of the survey are not statistically representative of the community as a whole.

Relative Ranking of Proposed RTP Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Goal</th>
<th>Average Ranking</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Most</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Preservation &amp; Safety</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosperous Economy</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Environment</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Equity</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following question was asked to gain insight into the level of support for alternative modes of transportation such as transit, vanpooling, carpooling, bicycling and walking in existing and planned smart growth areas.

A- To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement?

The 2050 RTP should promote the development of alternative modes (transit, vanpooling, carpooling, bicycling, or walking) in the existing and planned smart growth areas.
The following questions were asked regarding the region’s goods movement transportation system.

**B-** To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement?

Improvements in the region’s goods movement transportation system and infrastructure are necessary to support economic prosperity and raise the region’s standard of living.

![Bar chart showing responses to B- question](chart-B.png)

- 95% (20) Strongly Agree
- 5% (1) Somewhat Agree
- 0% (0) Somewhat Disagree
- 0% (0) Strongly Disagree
- 0% (0) No Opinion

**C-** The 2050 RTP should focus on strategies to ____________ the region’s goods movement capacity and options for moving freight and participating in domestic and international trade.

![Bar chart showing responses to C- question](chart-C.png)

- 71% (15) Expand
- 29% (6) Preserve
- 0% (0) Reduce
- 0% (0) No Opinion

This survey was structured to explore and understand the various perspectives of the participants. The results of the survey are not statistically representative of the community as a whole.
The following questions were asked to understand the Board's perspective regarding the need to better manage, operate and maintain the existing transportation system versus the need for capital improvements.

A- To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement?

Instead of making major capital improvements (e.g. highways and regional transit), we need to better manage our existing transportation system.

C- To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement?

The 2050 RTP should dedicate funding for operational improvements and maintenance/rehabilitation to improve performance on the existing regional transportation system even if it requires a reduction of funding for capital projects.
The following question was asked regarding the extent to which the 2050 RTP should rely on new technology and transportation demand management measures to improve efficiency or provide additional capacity.

**B- To what extent should the 2050 RTP rely on new technology and transportation demand management measures to improve efficiency or provide additional capacity?**

![Bar chart showing the distribution of responses]

The following question was asked to assess the extent to which the 2050 RTP should focus transportation investments to support existing and planned smart growth areas.

**A- To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement?**

The 2050 RTP should focus transportation investments to support existing and planned smart growth areas.

![Bar chart showing the distribution of responses]
SANDAG staff is currently evaluating alternative strategies and their cost effectiveness in addressing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions in the transportation sector and will bring results back to the Board at a later date. In order to obtain a preliminary understanding of the Board’s perspectives, the Board members prioritized the following list of strategies using a paired-comparison technique where two of the five strategies were presented and each participant selected which they preferred. After all possible pairs were presented, the relative preference was calculated based on the percentage of times each strategy was selected when presented as a choice.

The following table presents the list of preliminary strategies and their relative preference.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative GHG Strategies</th>
<th>Relative Preference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enhance current transit service in the existing and planned smart growth areas</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on system management programs/policies, such as signal synchronization, transit priority treatments, etc.</td>
<td>55.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide additional transportation improvements for bicycling and walking</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on transportation demand management programs, such as telecommuting, ridesharing, etc.</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide new transit services in the existing and planned smart growth areas</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The SANDAG Board was asked to rank the following economic indicators to assess which they preferred be used as guidelines in developing alternatives for the 2050 RTP.

A. Job Creation  
B. Median household income  
C. Sales / property tax increases  
D. Standard of living  
E. Unemployment rate

The economic indicators were ranked from most important to least important where the most important goal was rated a five, the second most important goal a four, etc. The results of the ranking are shown in the following table. The percentages indicate the percent of participants who ranked a proposed goal at a particular level. Percentages may not add to 100 % due to rounding and the fact that not all participants may have ranked every proposed goal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Economic Indicator</th>
<th>Average Ranking</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Most</td>
<td>Least</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Creation</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard of Living</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median household income</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales/property tax increases</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment rate</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interactive Questions for the September 11, 2009 Policy Board Meeting

The purpose of the following questions is to seek input on the relative priority for each of the RTP goals and to provide direction to staff on developing policy objectives for each of the goals. Performance measures will be created to measure how well the 2050 RTP would meet the goals. The questions also try to elicit direction to staff on developing initial 2050 RTP alternatives.

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement?

   The proposed 2050 RTP vision should be based on the transportation vision from the Regional Comprehensive Plan (page 2 of staff report).

   1. Strongly Agree
   2. Somewhat Agree
   3. Somewhat Disagree
   4. Strongly Disagree
   5. No Opinion

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement?

   The 2050 RTP vision also should include protection of our climate.

   1. Strongly Agree
   2. Somewhat Agree
   3. Somewhat Disagree
   4. Strongly Disagree
   5. No Opinion

(Facilitator to ask participants if there are other goals that should be considered?)

3. Please rank the proposed 2050 RTP goals in order of importance. (Separate handout).

   A. Mobility
   B. Reliability
   C. System Preservation & Safety
   D. Healthy Environment
   E. Prosperous Economy
   F. Social Equity
4. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement?

The 2050 RTP should promote the development of alternative modes (transit, vanpooling, carpooling, bicycling, or walking) in the existing and planned smart growth areas.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Somewhat Agree
3. Somewhat Disagree
4. Strongly Disagree
5. No Opinion

5. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement?

Improvements in the region’s goods movement transportation system and infrastructure are necessary to support economic prosperity and raise the region’s standard of living?

1. Strongly Agree
2. Somewhat Agree
3. Somewhat Disagree
4. Strongly Disagree
5. No Opinion

6. The 2050 RTP should focus on strategies to _____________ the region’s goods movement capacity and options for moving freight and participating in domestic and international trade.

1. Expand
2. Preserve
3. Reduce
4. No Opinion

7. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement?

Instead of making major capital improvements (e.g. highways and regional transit), we need to better manage our existing transportation system.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Somewhat Agree
3. Somewhat Disagree
4. Strongly Disagree
5. No Opinion
8. To what extent should the 2050 RTP rely on new technology and transportation demand management measures to improve efficiency or provide additional capacity?

   1. Major Contribution
   2. Minor Contribution
   3. Not At All
   4. No Opinion

9. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement?

   The 2050 RTP should dedicate funding for operational improvements and maintenance/rehabilitation to improve performance on the existing regional transportation system even if it requires a reduction of funding for capital projects.

   1. Strongly Agree
   2. Somewhat Agree
   3. Somewhat Disagree
   4. Strongly Disagree
   5. No Opinion

10. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement?

    The 2050 RTP should focus transportation investments to support existing and planned smart growth areas.

    1. Strongly Agree
    2. Somewhat Agree
    3. Somewhat Disagree
    4. Strongly Disagree
    5. No Opinion

11. Staff is currently evaluating alternative strategies and their cost effectiveness in addressing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions in the transportation sector and will bring results back at a later date. However, what is your initial opinion of potential GHG reduction strategies to be evaluated in the 2050 RTP? (Evaluate in paired comparisons for relative priority)

    A. Enhance current transit service in the existing and planned smart growth areas
    B. Focus on transportation demand management programs, such as telecommuting, ridesharing, etc.
    C. Focus on system management programs/policies, such as signal synchronization, transit priority treatments, etc.
    D. Provide additional transportation improvements for bicycling and walking
    E. Provide new transit services in the existing and planned smart growth areas
12. Rank the following indicators in order of importance to be used as guidelines in developing alternatives for the 2050 RTP. (Separate handout).

A. Job creation
B. Median household income
C. Sales/property tax increases
D. Standard of living
E. Unemployment rate
Interactive Question #3 – Rank the proposed 2050 goals in order of importance, with 6 being the most important and 1 the least important.

___________  **Mobility** – The transportation system should provide for convenient travel options for people and goods and maximize its productivity. The system should optimize both the time it takes to travel as well as the total costs of travel.

___________  **Reliability** – The transportation system should be reliable so that travelers can expect relatively consistent travel times from day-to-day for the same trip by mode(s).

___________  **System Preservation & Safety** – The public’s investment in transportation should be protected by maintaining the transportation system and keeping it in a good state of repair. It is critical to preserve and ensure a safe regional transportation system through engineering, education, enforcement, and emergency medical services.

___________  **Healthy Environment** – The transportation system should focus on transportation investments that avoid and mitigate adverse environmental impacts and should promote environmental sustainability by reducing greenhouse gas and smog forming emissions from vehicles. Transportation investments should foster efficient development patterns that optimize travel, housing, and employment choices and encourage future growth away from rural areas and closer to existing and planned development.

___________  **Prosperous Economy** – Investments to the transportation system should provide cost-effective solutions that maximize public benefits so that the region gets the most out of its investment and that encourage economic growth. The RTP should play a significant role in raising the region’s standard of living.

___________  **Social Equity** – The transportation system should be designed to provide an equitable level of transportation services for low-income, minority, seniors, and youth populations.
Interactive Question #12 – Rank the following indicators in order of importance to be used as guidelines in developing alternatives for the 2050 RTP, with 5 being the most important and 1 the least important.

__________  Job creation

__________  Median household income

__________  Sales/property tax increases

__________  Standard of living

__________  Unemployment rate