MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

REGIONAL PLANNING TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP

The Regional Planning Technical Working Group may take action on any item appearing on this agenda.

Thursday, July 9, 2009

12:15 to 2:15 p.m. (General Plan Update Workshop) ↔ ↔
2:15 to 3:15 p.m. (TWG Business Meeting) ↔ ↔

SANDBAG 7th Floor Conference Room
401 B Street, 7th Floor
San Diego

GENERAL PLAN UPDATE WORKSHOP

(BRING YOUR OWN LUNCH)

• GROUP DISCUSSION SESSION: FACILITATED QUESTIONS DIRECTED AT JURISDICTIONS THAT HAVE RECENTLY COMPLETED OR ARE CURRENTLY UNDERTAKING GENERAL PLAN UPDATES

• BREAK-OUT SESSIONS ON VARIOUS TOPICS

TWG BUSINESS MEETING

• 2050 REGIONAL GROWTH FORECAST: STATUS UPDATE

• 2050 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN: WORK PROGRAM AND SCHEDULE

• UPDATE ON SENATE BILL 575 (STEINBERG)

SANDAG offices are accessible by public transit. Phone 1-800-COMMUTE or see www.sdcommute.com for route information.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), SANDAG will accommodate persons who require assistance in order to participate in SANDAG meetings. If such assistance is required, please contact SANDAG at (619) 699-1900 at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting.

To request this document or related reports in an alternative format, please call (619) 699-1900, (619) 699-1904 (TTY), or fax (619) 699-1905.
12:15 p.m. CONVENE GENERAL PLAN UPDATE WORKSHOP

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

2. GROUP DISCUSSION SESSION: FACILITATED QUESTIONS DIRECTED AT JURISDICTIONS THAT HAVE RECENTLY COMPLETED OR ARE CURRENTLY UNDERTAKING GENERAL PLAN UPDATES
   a. General Approaches, Biggest Challenges, Budget Issues, and Mix of Staff/Consultants
   b. Lessons Learned

3. BREAK-OUT SESSIONS (PARTICIPANTS TO CHOOSE 2 TOPICS; SESSIONS TO LAST 20 MINUTES EACH)
   a. SB 375 / AB 32 / Coordination with Regional Plans
   b. Sustainability
   c. Water Supply
   d. Public Outreach and Community Buy-In
   e. Other Suggestions by TWG Members

4. CONCLUSIONS

2:15 p.m. ADJOURN GENERAL PLAN UPDATE WORKSHOP

2:15 p.m. CONVENE TWG BUSINESS MEETING

5. PUBLIC COMMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS

Members of the public will have the opportunity to address the Technical Working Group on any issue within the jurisdiction of the Working Group. Speakers are limited to three minutes each.

CONSENT

6. NEW SANDAG PARKING POLICY

Effective July 1, 2009, parking validation shall only be provided for the period of time you are conducting business at SANDAG and shall be limited to a maximum of two hours. Please ask the receptionist for a list of lesser-priced on-street parking facilities and information regarding public transportation to our office. Thank you for your cooperation.
ITEM # | RECOMMENDATION
--- | ---
+7. | JUNE 11, 2009, MEETING SUMMARY
The Working Group should review and approve the June 11, 2009, Regional Planning Technical Working Group meeting summary.

+8. | SMART GROWTH DESIGN GUIDELINES (Stephan Vance)
The development of design guidelines for smart growth areas is one of the strategic initiatives of the Regional Comprehensive Plan. Working in collaboration with local agency staff, SANDAG and its consultants developed draft guidelines covering a broad array of topics pertaining to good design and great place-making. The Board of Directors, at its June meeting, accepted Designing for Smart Growth, Creating Great Places in the San Diego Region for distribution and for use as a resource in the SANDAG smart growth toolkit.

+9. | FY 2010 TDA/TransNet BICYCLE, PEDESTRIAN, AND NEIGHBORHOOD SAFETY/TRAFFIC CALMING FUNDING RECOMMENDATIONS (Chris Kluth)
SANDAG is responsible for the allocation of Transportation Development Act (TDA) and TransNet funds to local agencies for bicycle, pedestrian, and neighborhood safety projects. The Board of Directors, at its June meeting, approved (1) the list of projects for funding as shown in Attachment 6; and (2) Resolution No. 2009-30 approving the FY 2010 TDA Article 3 allocation as shown in Attachment 7.

REPORTS

10. | 2050 REGIONAL GROWTH FORECAST: STATUS UPDATE (Beth Jarosz)
SANDAG staff will provide the TWG with an update on the status of the 2050 Regional Growth Forecast, including feedback from the SANDAG Board of Directors and options for moving forward with the 2050 forecast. The report for the July 10, 2009, SANDAG Board meeting will be distributed at the TWG meeting.

+11. | 2050 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN: WORK PROGRAM AND SCHEDULE (Heather Werdick)
This report provides an overview of the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) work program and schedule. The 2050 RTP 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 new components as required by Senate Bill 375. Additionally, responsibilities and roles of various working groups and the Policy Committees are outlined. This report was presented on June 26, 2009, to the Board of Directors for information.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM #</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>UPDATE ON SENATE BILL 575 (STEINBERG) (Genevieve Morelos)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff will update the TWG regarding Senate Bill (SB) 575 (Steinberg), clean-up legislation for SB 375 as it related to housing element, and Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) issues. The report for the July 10, 2009, SANDAG Executive Committee will be distributed at the TWG meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>ADJOURNMENT AND NEXT MEETING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The next TWG meeting will be held on Thursday, September 10, 2009, from 1:15 to 3:15 p.m. Please note: The August meeting is canceled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔➔ 3:15 p.m. ADJOURN TWG BUSINESS MEETING ⇪ ⇪</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ next to an item indicates an attachment
JUNE 11, 2009, MEETING SUMMARY
REGIONAL PLANNING TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP (TWG) MEETING

Agenda Item #1: Welcome and Introductions
Chair Bill Anderson (City of San Diego) called the meeting of the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG) to order at 1:15 p.m. Self-introductions were conducted.

Agenda Item #2: Public Comments and Communications
Roger Post, City of National City, announced his retirement. TWG members congratulated him and reminisced on his career in the planning profession.

Carolina Gregor, SANDAG, reminded the TWG of SANDAG’s new parking policy that beginning July 1, 2009, parking validations will be available for a maximum of two hours. Patrick Murphy, City of Encinitas, suggested that the COASTER schedule should be considered when arranging special meetings.

CONSENT ITEMS (#3 and #4)

Agenda Item #3: Summary of the May 14, 2009, TWG Meeting (ACCEPT)
Upon a motion by Jon Brindle (Escondido) and a second by Bill Chopyk (La Mesa), the minutes of the May 14, 2009, Regional Planning Technical Working Group meeting were unanimously approved.

Agenda Item #4: Distribution of Smart Growth Photo Library DVD Sets to TWG Members (INFORMATION)
The Smart Growth Photo Library DVD sets are now available. Each jurisdiction received one free DVD set. Additional sets can be ordered for $15 from the SANDAG Web site.

Action: This item was presented for information only.

REPORT ITEMS (#5 through #11)
Agenda Item #5: Options for TWG Workshop on Local General Plan Updates (INFORMATION)
At the last TWG meeting, Working Group members suggested that SANDAG organize a workshop for local jurisdictions to exchange information about their general plan updates (underway, recently completed, or in-the-works). Staff proposed that a portion of the July 9, 2009, TWG meeting be dedicated to this purpose. This could be structured as a “Bring-Your-Own-Lunch”
workshop from 12 noon to 2 p.m., with remaining TWG business to be conducted from 2 p.m. to 3:15 p.m. Staff solicited ideas on this proposal, and asked for two to three TWG members to help shape the format of the workshop.

Action: This item was presented for information only. Patrick Murphy (Encinitas), Devon Muto (County of San Diego), and Jon Brindle (Escondido) volunteered to assist with planning the workshop. Mr. Murphy requested that the workshop begin at 12:15 p.m. to accommodate the COASTER schedule.

Agenda Item #6: Status Update on the 2050 Regional Growth Forecast (INFORMATION)

The 2050 Regional Growth Forecast options were presented to a joint meeting of the Regional Planning and Transportation Committees on June 5, 2009. The staff report was attached. Staff provided the TWG with a status report from that meeting.

Beth Jarosz, SANDAG, provided the staff report and solicited feedback on the “stretch” option for the growth forecast alternative scenarios and reducing VMT in the region.

Ms. Gregor and Clint Daniels, SANDAG, responded to TWG member questions.

Action: This item was presented for information only.

Agenda Item #7: Regional Climate Action Plan (INFORMATION)

Staff presented an update on the draft report and new schedule for the completion of the Regional Climate Action Plan (RCAP). The TWG was asked to review the attached materials and provide feedback on the policy measures included. In addition, information was presented on the California Air Resources Board (CARB) local government toolkit on climate change.

Andrew Martin, SANDAG, provided the staff report. Ms. Gregor, Heather Werdick, and Susan Freedman (SANDAG) responded to TWG member questions.

Action: This item was presented for information only.

Agenda Item #8: Regional Alternative Fuels, Vehicles, and Infrastructure Draft Report (INFORMATION)

As part of the CEC partnership, SANDAG will write a report on available alternative fuels, vehicles, and infrastructure for government fleet applications; sample ordinances and procurement policies local governments can use; funding opportunities to accelerate deployment of alternative fuel vehicles; and specific areas in the region where fueling infrastructure could be sited. A final report is due to the CEC on September 15, 2009.

Mr. Martin provided the staff report. Ms. Gregor and Ms. Werdick responded to TWG member questions.

Action: This item was presented for information only.
**Agenda Item #9: Stimulus Funding Opportunities from the U.S. Department of Energy and California Energy Commission (INFORMATION)**

In addition to Energy Efficiency and Conservation Block Grant (EECBG) Program monies that local governments can apply for, there are other energy-related funding opportunities available. Staff presented an overview of anticipated sources of funding from the Department of Energy and the California Energy Commission. TWG members were asked to express their level of interest in SANDAG undertaking any regional efforts for stimulus dollars.

Ms. Freedman and Andrew McCallister, Director of Programs at California Center for Sustainable Energy, presented the report.

**Action:** This item was presented for information only.

**Agenda Item #10: Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) Issues (INFORMATION)**

A. Status of the next Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA)/Housing Element Cycle and SB 575 (Steinberg).

Staff updated the TWG regarding SB 575 (Steinberg), clean-up legislation for SB 375 as it relates to housing element, and Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) issues.

B. Draft Work Plan for 2012-2020 Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA)

Staff presented a draft work plan to begin discussing an approach to the next Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) for the 2012-2020 housing element cycle that will be done in conjunction with the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) in accordance with SB 375 (Steinberg).

Susan Baldwin and Genevieve Morelos of SANDAG provided the staff reports.

**Action:** This item was presented for information only.

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

Chair Anderson adjourned the meeting at 3:15 pm. The next TWG meeting will consist of a “Special General Plan Workshop” from 12:15 to 2:15 p.m., immediately followed by the TWG business meeting from 2:15 to 3:15 p.m.
SMART GROWTH DESIGN GUIDELINES

Introduction

The urban form chapter of the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) created a framework for smart growth planning and development in the region by focusing on where and how the region could support its growing population in a sustainable way. The plan recognized that good urban design appropriate to its setting would be a critical factor for making more compact, mixed use development successful in the region. However, there are many elements to well-designed communities that could not be adequately addressed in the RCP, so the development of smart growth design guidelines became one of the implementation strategies that emerged from the plan.

Development of the smart growth design guidelines, entitled Designing for Smart Growth, Creating Great Places in the San Diego Region, has been underway over the past 12 months under the guidance of the Regional Planning Committee (RPC). The RPC established an ad hoc working group that consisted of members from the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG), Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC), and the Stakeholders Working Group from the last Regional Transportation Plan update to assist in this process. The full document has been reviewed by the TWG and the transportation-related chapters have been reviewed by CTAC and the San Diego Traffic Engineers Council. In addition, the document was made available for public comment this spring. The final draft, discussed in more detail below, is the result of this process.

Discussion

Development of the Guidelines

Designing for Smart Growth, Creating Great Places in the San Diego Region is one component of the SANDAG smart growth toolkit. It is intended to be a resource for local agencies, planning and design professionals, and interested citizens to help in the development of local plans and design requirements. With an audience this broad, the challenge in writing the document was to provide enough detail to be truly informative while keeping the document brief and user-friendly. The objective is to provide useful guidance without being overly prescriptive that is relevant to the San Diego region’s unique environment.

The ad hoc working group met over the course of nine months to review draft materials and to provide feedback. In addition, two public workshops, one in Encinitas and one in the City of...
San Diego, were held to provide an opportunity for broad public input. More than 130 people attended the two workshops and provided a significant amount of feedback. The feedback received at the workshops confirmed that the document as proposed would respond to the needs of its intended audience.

Content of the Guidelines

Good design is applicable everywhere, but Designing for Smart Growth focuses on design elements that are particularly important in smart growth areas within the San Diego region. It includes ten chapters that address design in both private and public development. While specific recommendations are made in each topic area, the guidelines are not meant to dictate such things as development densities or building heights. Rather, the guidelines discuss the important elements of design across a range of scales and intensity of development. The objective is to make the guidelines applicable to all of the place types identified in the RCP.

The subjects addressed in each chapter are briefly described below:

Introduction- Provides an overview of the principles of smart growth, how and why the guidelines were developed, and how they relate to other SANDAG documents and policies.

Designing for the Region- Explains what makes places great, how smart growth fits into the context of this region, and provides examples of how existing places could be transformed into smart growth places.

Site Design- Describes how sites can be developed to connect to and be integrated into their communities, and how site design can promote sustainability.

Building Design- Describes how building design can help define the public realm and fit into the existing context while helping to meet the region’s development intensity and sustainability goals.

Multimodal Streets- Describes how to create “complete streets” that serve everyone whether they are driving, walking, riding a bike, or taking transit, in order to provide transportation choices, an essential element of smart growth development.

Transit Stations- Explains how to design transit stations in a way that promotes convenient and universal accessibility.

Civic Buildings- Discusses how to create public buildings as community focal points and gathering places.

Parks and Civic Space- Explains how creating public open spaces contributes to creating attractive communities, increases environmental quality, and creates healthy, active neighborhoods.

Parking- Discusses how to help reduce the demand for parking, provide no more than necessary, and design it in a way that supports walkable, pedestrian-oriented streets.

Smart Growth Score Card- A multifactor score card for evaluating projects in smart growth areas that can be customized to address local priorities.

References- Provides more than fifty references from around the region and across the country on the topics covered in the design guidelines.
In addition to the specific chapter topics, the guidelines address how sustainability and accessibility apply to each subject area. They also include information on specific topics such as form-based codes and crime prevention through environmental design.

**Distribution**

Interest in the guidelines has been high. Comments received from local agency staff, private developers, design professionals, and academics indicate that the document is eagerly awaited and will be used in a number of settings. If accepted by the Board of Directors, copies of Designing for Smart Growth, Creating Great Places in the San Diego Region will be made available on compact disc, and it will be posted on the SANDAG Web site at [www.sandag.org/smartgrowthdesign](http://www.sandag.org/smartgrowthdesign). A limited number of hard copies also will be made available upon request.

GARY L. GALLEGOS  
Executive Director

Attachment: 1. Designing for Smart Growth, Creating Great Places in the San Diego Region, Final Version (Board members and alternates only)

Key Staff Contact: Stephan Vance, (619) 699-1924, sva@sandag.org

Funds are budgeted in Work Element #3000200
FY 2010 TDA/TransNet BICYCLE, PEDESTRIAN, AND NEIGHBORHOOD SAFETY/TRAFFIC CALMING FUNDING RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction
Each year, the SANDAG Board of Directors allocates Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 3 and TransNet funds to support nonmotorized transportation projects in the San Diego region as part of the Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Neighborhood Safety/Traffic Calming Program. For FY 2010, approximately $7.8 million is available for allocation from these two programs.

On April 3, 2009, the Transportation Committee approved the evaluation criteria and program guidelines (Attachments 1 thru 5) and authorized the FY 2010 call for projects. SANDAG received 38 applications requesting $9.9 million. A total of 26 applications were submitted for capital projects requesting $8.5 million, and 12 applications were submitted for bicycle master plans, pedestrian master plans, bicycle parking, and bicycle support programs requesting $1.4 million. Program applicants presented their projects to the Bicycle-Pedestrian Working Group (BPWG) on May 20, 2009. Project applications also were posted on the SANDAG Web site for public review. On May 21, 2009, a Review Panel was assembled to review project eligibility and the accuracy of the evaluation scoring as measured by the adopted program guidelines.1

The BPWG met on May 27, 2009, and recommended a list of projects for funding, which is shown in Attachment 6. On June 10, 2009, the Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee (ITOC) reviewed the projects to verify eligibility and compliance with the TransNet ordinance.

Discussion

FY 2010 Funding Availability
The Board of Directors is able to approve programming of approximately $3 million in TDA funding and $4.8 million in TransNet funding for FY 2010 for a total of $7.8 million. The breakdown of this year's funding availability is outlined in Attachment 8. It is recommended that a modest reserve of approximately $27,000 be maintained to account for potential increases in project costs and to allow some buffer for potential reductions in TDA or TransNet allocations.

Recommended FY 2010 Funding Allocations
During the review and evaluation process the Review Panel determined that five of the original 26 project applications were ineligible. One project for routine maintenance was not an eligible expense under the program guidelines. Four project applications were deemed incomplete.

1 Participation on the Review Panel is voluntary and is open to any member of the BPWG.
Bicycle Plans, Pedestrian Plans, Bicycle Parking, and Support Programs

The Program guidelines encourage and fund bicycle plans, pedestrian plans, bicycle parking, and support programs. Consistent with the adopted program guidelines, these projects are not part of the competitive process and can be funded up to the amounts set in the guidelines. The projects that are proposed for funding total $1,154,378 and are shown in Attachment 6. The recommended projects include seven bicycle or pedestrian master plans, three bicycle parking projects, a bicycle and pedestrian safety program for elementary and middle-school students, and support for printing and distribution of the regional bicycle map produced by SANDAG.

In accordance with the program guidelines, it is recommended that two projects in this category be funded at less than the requested amount. In the first case, the program guidelines require all bicycle parking facilities be accessible to the public. The City of Escondido Bike Lockers and Racks project proposed bike racks that would be available to the public and bike lockers that would be for use by City employees only. It is recommended that funding be provided only for the publicly accessible bike racks in the amount of $14,378, down from the original $42,034 request. In the second case, the program guidelines also identify a maximum funding amount of $150,000 for planning studies. It is therefore recommended that the City of San Diego Bicycle Master Plan Environmental Documentation and Feasibility Study be funded at $150,000, down from the $350,000 request.

Capital Projects

There were 26 applications for capital projects. The project applications were evaluated according to the program guidelines and criteria adopted by the Transportation Committee. After funding for the plans, bicycle parking, and support programs is deducted from the overall FY 2010 funding allocation, there is approximately $6.5 million in funding available for capital projects. Funding is recommended for the top 18 scoring projects as shown in Attachment 6. It is recommended that the top 18 projects receive the full amount applied for. The total amount of recommended funding for capital projects is $6,587,430.

Next Steps

Upon approval of funding allocations for the FY 2010 TDA/TransNet Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Neighborhood Safety/Traffic Calming Program by the Board of Directors, SANDAG staff will establish grant agreements with each grant recipient to specify a scope and expected outcomes for each of the projects.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Attachments
1. TDA/TransNet Bicycle and Pedestrian Program Claim Guidelines
2. FY 2010 Annual Grant Application
3. FY 2010 TDA/TransNet Bicycle and Pedestrian Application Checklist
4. FY 2010 Bicycle Project Evaluation Criteria Matrix
5. FY 2010 Pedestrian Project Evaluation Criteria Matrix
6. FY 2010 TDA/TransNet Bicycle Pedestrian Project Scores and Rankings
7. Draft Resolution No. 2009-30
8. Proposed FY 2010 TDA/TransNet Bicycle and Pedestrian Funding Program

Key Staff Contacts: Chris Kluth, (619) 699-1952, ckl@sandag.org
Sookyung Kim, (619) 699-6909, ski@sandag.org
BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN CLAIM GUIDELINES

Introduction

The following describes the claim process for Transportation Development Act (TDA) Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects and TransNet Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Neighborhood Safety Projects.

TDA Project Eligibility

The law specifies that funds should be allocated according to the regulations adopted by SANDAG as the regional transportation planning agency. It also identifies certain categories of eligible projects. These specific project types represent neither an exhaustive list nor are they listed as priorities (Public Utilities Code [PUC] Sections 99233.3 and 99234). They are summarized below for reference. Project evaluation criteria, established by SANDAG Board policy, are discussed later.

- Construction, including related engineering expenses, of bicycle and pedestrian facilities.
- Maintenance of bicycle trails provided they are closed to motorized traffic.
- Projects serving the needs of commuting bicyclists, including but not limited to, new paths serving major transportation corridors, secure bicycle parking at employment centers, park-and-ride lots, and transit centers where other funds are not available.
- A comprehensive bicycle and pedestrian facilities plan (no more than once every five years), with an emphasis on bicycle projects intended to primarily accommodate non-recreational bicycle trips.
- Up to 20 percent of the cost to restripe Class II bicycle lanes.
- Up to 5 percent of the amount available to a city or the county may be expended in conjunction with other funds to support bicycle safety education programs, so long as the funds are not used to fully fund the salary of any one person.

TransNet Project Eligibility

TransNet bicycle, pedestrian, and neighborhood safety funds may be expended for all purposes necessary and convenient to the design, right-of-way acquisition, and construction of facilities intended for use by bicyclists, pedestrians, and neighborhood safety/traffic calming projects. These funds also may be used for programs that help to encourage bicycling and walking, such as secure parking facilities, bicycle/pedestrian promotion programs, and safety programs.

Certain costs at times associated with bicycle and pedestrian projects are not eligible when the benefit provided is not the exclusive use of bicyclists or pedestrians. These instances are listed below.
Curb and gutter are part of the roadway drainage system. As such, newly installed curb and gutter cannot be considered an improvement exclusively for the benefit of the sidewalk or bike lane and are not an eligible expense.

Driveway ramps installed across sidewalks are not for the benefit of pedestrians, and in fact, degrade the pedestrian environment. Claimants may not include the cost of driveway ramps in applications for sidewalk projects. However, the distance across the driveway may be included when computing the per-square-foot cost of the sidewalk.

Where roadway design standards require a roadway shoulder width at least as wide as would be required for a standard bike lane, the cost of the shoulder construction will not be eligible. Appropriate bikeway signage is eligible.

Under some circumstances, it may be necessary to remove and replace curb and gutter, driveway ramps, drainage facilities, and other existing improvements in order to construct a bikeway or sidewalk. In such cases the cost of this work is most likely eligible, but claimants should carefully document why this is so in the claim submittal.

**SANDAG Claim Requirements**

SANDAG has the authority to establish criteria applicable to analyzing and evaluating claims for non-motorized transportation facilities (PUC Section 99401). To be considered for funding, a claim must be consistent with the SANDAG-adopted non-motorized plans and meet the requirements for community support and geometric design standards, as described in Categories 1 and 2 of the Project Evaluation Criteria. In addition, the following requirements must be met, if applicable:

- If the project abuts other jurisdictions, it must be shown on the adopted plans of the adjacent jurisdictions, or a letter must be submitted from the abutting jurisdiction showing that cooperative efforts are underway.

- Other sources of funding for cooperative projects must be identified. Please attach supporting documentation that shows matching funds have been secured. Matching funds that have not been secured will not be considered in the matching funds section of the project scoring matrix.

- Projects which are a required element of a larger capital improvement project are not eligible for funding.

- No single agency may submit an application, or applications, that are greater than the total available allocation for that fiscal year.

**Application Process**

Applications for TDA and TransNet non-motorized claims must be received by SANDAG by May 6, 2009. To be considered for funding, the Annual Grant Application must be fully completed. In addition, please consider the following, if applicable:

- All claims, including those supporting educational or promotional programs and claims for planning projects, must include a project budget, work program, and project schedule.
• No later than May 20, 2009, include a certified copy of a resolution or minute order in which the planning group, planning commission, or governing body of the claimant authorizes the claim.

• Review Panel. A review panel of six to eight working group members will conduct a full preliminary review of the project applications to identify significant issues and request clarification from the project applicants, if necessary. Participation on the review panel is open to any active working group member. Applicants must submit multiple hard copies of their applications for distribution to the review panel.

• Completed applications will be made available online. Applicants must submit their application in PDF format as well as hard copy. Electronic version of the applications will be posted to the internet to give any working group member the opportunity to review the applications.

Evaluation Process

The evaluation process for TDA bicycle and pedestrian projects and TransNet bicycle, pedestrian, and neighborhood safety projects is consistent with the way SANDAG evaluates and prioritizes other components of the transportation system, such as arterial, highway, and transit projects. Transportation project priorities are established in planning documents like the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Priorities also are used for funding decisions that are programmed in the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP). In addition, the evaluation criteria supports the overall goals and objectives SANDAG has for improving the regional transportation system and promoting smart growth in the region by giving priority to projects that enhance the existing transportation network as a whole. The criteria to be used in the evaluation process are specified in the Project Evaluation Criteria matrix.

Claimants for TDA bicycle and pedestrian projects and TransNet bicycle, pedestrian, and neighborhood safety projects will be responsible for accurately filling out the Annual Grant Application and the accompanying Project Evaluation Criteria Matrix. SANDAG will be responsible for performing the Geographic Information System (GIS) Analysis in Category 6 and the Cost Benefit Analysis in Category 11 of the Project Evaluation Criteria based on the process outlined below. SANDAG will compile the results from the Grant Applications and produce a prioritized list of projects that will be reviewed by the Bicycle-Pedestrian Working Group (BPWG). The committee then will recommend a final priority list of projects to the Transportation Committee, which will then be approved by the Board of Directors.

- Regional Housing Needs Incentive. To qualify for funding from this program the applicant must meet the eligibility criteria prescribed in Section 4 of “Implementation Guidelines for SANDAG Regional Housing Needs Assessment Memorandum” from Board Policy No. 033. Points will be awarded based on the “Description of How to Calculate the Board Policy No. 033 Incentive Points” detailed in Attachment 5 of the Policy.

- The GIS Analysis will be based on the following five factors: total population, total employment, population density, employment density, and number of activity centers. Using the project limits provided by the claimant, SANDAG will perform the GIS Analysis using data for population and employment forecasts for 2015. A buffer will be created around each
project area. Pedestrian projects will be given a half-mile buffer and bicycle projects will be given a one-mile buffer. The buffered areas will be used along with the population and employment data to generate population and employment densities. The number of Activity Centers, as identified by the SANDAG data warehouse, will be identified and tallied. Each factor will be scored from one to four points, for a possible total of 20 points for the GIS Analysis category. Projects will be scored in each category relative to each other by taking the raw scores and distributing them from highest to lowest. The highest 25 percent will receive four points, the second highest quartile will receive three points, the third highest quartile will receive two points, and the lowest quartile will receive one point.

- The Cost Benefit Analysis will be computed by taking the subtotal score from Categories 1 through 8 on the Project Evaluation Criteria matrix and dividing that subtotal by the grant application amount. Projects will be scored relative to each other by taking the raw scores and distributing them from highest to lowest, with the project with the highest cost benefit ratio receiving 15 points and the project with the lowest cost benefit ratio receiving one point.
FY 2010 Annual Grant Application
Transportation Development Act/TransNet Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects

Applicant (Agency):

Project Name:

Application Amount:

Project Type:

Project Limits:

Project Description:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feasibility Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Engineering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Documentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Contract</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Cost** $_____

Funding Sources:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TDA/TransNet Claim Amount</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** $_____ -

Attachment 2
Project Location Map:

Contact Person: ____________________________________________
Title: _____________________________________________________
Address

__________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________
Phone: ___________________________ Fax: ______________________
E-mail: __________________________

Person Authorized to Submit Application:
I certify that I have reviewed the Bicycle and Pedestrian Claims Guidelines and the information submitted in this application is accurate and in accordance with these guidelines.

______________________________________________ Title

______________________________________________ Date
Project Funding:

**Total Estimated Project Cost** (Please attach a detailed project estimate based on best available engineering) $______________

Project Cost Estimates – On a separate sheet provide an itemized cost estimate for all eligible expenses. Be as accurate as possible to avoid future cost overruns. Projects with cost overruns have three options for moving the project forward depending on what percentage over the original grant amount the revised project cost will be. Applicants may ask for a recommendation from the BPWG to amend original allocation for up to five percent of the original cost estimate (up to the amount available in the reserve). Projects that require more than five percent additional funding can resubmit the project in a subsequent funding cycle with the adjusted project amount. Lastly, the applicant can choose to complete the project with their own funding.

Matching Funds (Category 9 of Project Evaluation Criteria)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$_______</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TDA/TransNet** (Application Amount as shown in Category 10 of Project Evaluation Criteria) $___________

**Total Revenues** $___________

Scope of Work

In the section below, state the project deliverables (including specific quantities and locations of improvements) and anticipated completion dates. Please note that if this project is funded, this scope of work will be added to the grant agreement and the grantee will be held to this scope of work for the purpose of project oversight.

**Example:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverables</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design for intersection reconfiguration to better accommodate bicycle and pedestrian travel</td>
<td>December 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue construction contract</td>
<td>March 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete construction of intersection improvements</td>
<td>July 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Supporting Materials

A. Community Support/Consistency with Community Plan (Category 1) - The council or governing board of the applicant must authorize this grant application. Please attach a copy of the resolution or minute order documenting that action. Or, if the project is part of an approved Bicycle Plan, please attach a copy of the section that includes the project.

B. Minimum Design Standards (Category 2) - Projects applying for construction funds must provide actual drawings or cross-sections from the project itself, not generic standard drawings. If the applicant is seeking funding for the design and construction of a project, proposed cross-sections may be used in lieu of the actual plan drawings. If any part of a project is substandard, clearly illustrate that (provide photographs, if applicable) and provide an explanation as to why the minimum design standard is not being met.

C. Connect to Regional Transportation Corridor or Transit Linkage or Regional Bikeway Map (Category 3) - Provide a map which clearly illustrates the project’s relationship to existing facilities. Show the project’s direct linkages to any regional bikeway (for bicycle projects) or direct continuous link to a local bus stop or direct link to an LRT/regional transit station. A direct link for a bicycle project is defined as connecting immediately to a regional bikeway with no gaps. A direct link between a pedestrian project and a transit facility is defined as one in which some part of the facility comes within 600 feet of a local bus stop or LRT/regional transit station.

D. Completes Connection/Linkage in Existing Bicycle/Pedestrian Network (Category 4) - List and briefly describe the linkages or connections to existing bicycle or pedestrian network. Provide a map which clearly illustrates the project’s relationship to existing facilities.

E. Project Readiness (Category 5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Begin</th>
<th>Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feasibility Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Document/Certification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertise for Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begin Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Completion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F. Geographic Factors/GIS Analysis (Category 6) - SANDAG will perform a GIS analysis as described in the Bicycle and Pedestrian Claims Guidelines based upon a project map provided by the applicant. Briefly describe project limits and provide a location map clearly showing the project alignment. In addition, clearly show and label the following elements:
a. major traffic generators within the project area (within ½-mile for pedestrian projects and within 1-mile for bicycle projects)
b. linkage or connections to existing bicycle or pedestrian facilities
c. linkage to any regional bikeway or public transit stop

G. Geographic Factors/GIS Analysis (Category 6) – List and briefly describe major traffic generators served by the project.

H. Safety Improvements (Category 7) – Describe the safety issues addressed by the project. Please attach support documentation for safety and accident history. If collision data is provided, it must be specific in pointing out which collisions are applicable to the project and why it is relevant.

I. Innovation and Design (Category 8) – Describe any design innovations for bicycle/pedestrian priority measures that are included within the project limits.

Is this project in your agency’s adopted capital improvement program (Y/N) ____

If the project is part of a larger capital improvement project, briefly discuss how the bicycle or pedestrian project costs were identified and a description of the other sources of funds for the overall project.

Briefly describe any other aspects of the project that is relevant to its evaluation.

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
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**Bicycle Master Plans, Pedestrian Master Plans, Education/Safety Programs and Bicycle Parking**

Bicycle Master Plans, Education/Safety Programs and Bicycle Parking projects will each be considered in a separate category. These types of projects are encouraged and will be evaluated by SANDAG staff.

**Basic Guidelines**

Bicycle Master Plans – Cities with population up to 75,000 will be eligible for a maximum of $75,000. Cities with population greater than 75,000 will be eligible for a maximum of $150,000. Beginning with the 2010 project application cycle, all cities will need to have a SANDAG-approved Bicycle Plan to be eligible for TDA/TransNet funds for individual projects.

Pedestrian Master Plans – An agency may submit an application for a pedestrian master plan no more frequently than once every five years. Jurisdictions with a population over 150,000 may submit applications for up to $150,000, and jurisdictions with a population under 150,000 may submit applications up to $100,000. In either case, the amount of the application must be substantiated by providing a scope of work and project budget to SANDAG.

Education/Safety Programs – An agency must submit a scope of work and a proposed schedule to be evaluated by SANDAG staff.

Bicycle Parking – Projects that conform to SANDAG's Bicycle Parking Guidelines and have a projected cost up to $50,000 will be eligible.

All claims, including those supporting educational or promotional programs and claims for planning projects, must include a project budget, work program, and project schedule.
FY 2010 TDA/TransNet Bicycle and Pedestrian Application Checklist

**Eligibility**

- Community Support Documentation
- Meets Minimum Design Standards
- Regional Housing Needs Incentives
  - Adopted Housing Element
  - Submitted housing production information

**Project Summary Sheet**

- Project name
- Project type
- Project description
- Project location
- Summary of cost estimate and funding
- Project location map
- Contact information
- Approval signatures
- Detailed Funding Sheet
- Matching Fund Documentation
- Community Support Documentation
Capital Projects

☐ Routine Accommodation - Project is not part of a larger project which requires this type of bicycle or pedestrian facility improvement

☐ Meets Minimum Design Standards

☐ Project Readiness (Schedule)

☐ Scope of Work with deliverables

☐ GIS/Traffic Generators

☐ Map – Network Linkages/Connections

☐ Safety Improvements/Crash Data

☐ Innovation in Design

☐ Map – Regional Transit Linkage or Regional Bike Network Linkage

Plans, Studies, and Safety and Education Programs

☐ Scope of Work with deliverables

☐ Budget

☐ Schedule
## FY 2010 Bicycle Project Evaluation Criteria Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Potential Points</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Community Support/Consistency with Community Plan</td>
<td>Must have at least one of the following to qualify: Please attach supporting documentation. 1. Resolution or minutes from City Council, County Board of Supervisors, local planning group, or Planning Commission. Or 2. Project is part of a Bicycle Plan that has been approved within the last five years</td>
<td>Pass/Fail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Minimum Design Standards</td>
<td>Must meet the minimum geometric standards set forth in the Caltrans Highway Design Manual. Design exceptions may be presented for consideration by the Bicycle-Pedestrian Working Group with the understanding that initial project proposals also must include a design that meets minimum standards.</td>
<td>Pass/Fail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Connect to Regional Transportation Corridor or Transit Linkage or Regional Bikeway Map - 20 Points Maximum</td>
<td>Project is a part of, or connects to, a regional bikeway corridor as identified in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Project provides a direct connection to local transit stop. Project provides a direct connection to regional transit station (light rail transit, transit center).</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Completes Connection/Linkage in Existing Bicycle Network - 20 Points Maximum</td>
<td>Provides segment of an identified and approved bicycle facility. Completes connection in existing network or upgrades existing facility.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Project Readiness * 20 Points Maximum</td>
<td>Projects are eligible for points following completion of each phase. Feasibility Study Preliminary Engineering ** Environmental Clearance Right-of-way Acquisition Final Design **</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Geographic Factors/GIS Analysis - 20 Points Maximum</td>
<td>Factors contributing to score are proximity to population and employment, population and employment densities, and activity centers.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Safety Improvements - 20 Points Maximum</td>
<td>Completes connection in existing network at location with documented safety or accident history. ** A. One to two correctable crashes involving non-motorized users within the last three years ** B. Three to four correctable crashes involving non-motorized users within the last three years ** C. Five or more correctable crashes involving non-motorized users within the last three years **</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Innovation and Design - 10 Points Maximum</td>
<td>Bicycle priority measures. Dedicated bicycle signal heads, queue jumpers, bike box, colored lanes, cul-de-sac connector, bike boulevard, and bike station.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Regional Housing Needs Incentive - 50 Points Maximum</td>
<td>Score is based on the formula provided in the currently adopted Policy No. 033.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Matching Funds - 25 Points Maximum</td>
<td>Matching funds can be from any of the following sources: ** 1. Identified and approved capital funding from identified source. Please provide proof in the form of a resolution or letter of approval. ** 2. Approved match grant. ** 3. In-kind services. Please provide adequate support documentation. * Previous project milestones must be met before qualifying for subsequent funding. ** Preliminary Engineering and Final Designs will be subject to design review by SANDAG.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Cost Benefit - 15 Points Maximum</td>
<td>Subtotal Score / Grant Application Amount</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal

Total Score

(Matching Funds) / (Project Cost) x 25

0 to 15
## FY 2010 Pedestrian Project Evaluation Criteria Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Potential Points</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Community Support/Consistency with Community Plan</td>
<td>Must have at least one of the following to qualify. Please attach supporting documentation.</td>
<td>Pass/Fail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Minimum Design Standards</td>
<td>Must meet the minimum geometric standards set forth in the SANDAG Planning and Designing for Pedestrians manual and the Americans with Disabilities Act. Design exceptions may be presented for consideration by the Bicycle-Pedestrian Working Group with the understanding that initial project proposals also must include a design that meets minimum standards.</td>
<td>Pass/Fail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Connect to Regional Transportation Corridor/Transit Linkage</td>
<td>Project is within 1/4 mile of a local transit stop or regional transit station.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Points Maximum</td>
<td>Project is within 600 feet of, and provides a direct continuous connection to local transit stop.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Points Maximum</td>
<td>Project is within 600 feet of, and provides a direct continuous connection to regional transit station.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Completes Connection/Linkage in Existing Pedestrian Network</td>
<td>Completes or improves connection in existing pedestrian network</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Project Readiness</td>
<td>Projects are eligible for points following completion of each phase.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Points Maximum</td>
<td>Feasibility Study</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Engineering</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Clearance</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-way Acquisition</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Design</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Geographic Factors/GIS Analysis</td>
<td>Factors contributing to score are proximity to population and employment, population and employment densities, and activity centers.</td>
<td>0 to 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Safety Improvements</td>
<td>Completes connection in existing network at location with documented safety or accident history.</td>
<td>20 Points Maximum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Points Maximum</td>
<td>A. One to two correctable crashes involving non-motorized users within the last three years.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Points Maximum</td>
<td>B. Three to four correctable crashes involving non-motorized users within the last three years.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Points Maximum</td>
<td>C. Five to six correctable crashes involving non-motorized users within the last three years.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Innovation and Design</td>
<td>Pedestrian priority measures such as pedestrian-controlled signals, bulb-outs, raised crosswalks, signal lead time, etc.</td>
<td>10 Points Maximum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Points Maximum</td>
<td>A. Animated eye indicators, countdown pedestrian signal, accessible push-button signal, flashing crosswalk</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Points Maximum</td>
<td>B. Early pedestrian release interval, passive pedestrian detection, audible pedestrian signal</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Points Maximum</td>
<td>C. Raised crosswalk, speed table, raised intersection, pedestrian refuge island</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Points Maximum</td>
<td>D. Pedestrian bulb-out, cul-de-sac connector</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Regional Housing Needs Incentive</td>
<td>Score is based on the formula provided in the currently adopted Board Policy No. 033.</td>
<td>50 Points Maximum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Points Maximum</td>
<td>(Matching Funds) / (Project Cost) x 25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Matching Funds</td>
<td>Matching funds can be from any of the following sources:</td>
<td>25 Points Maximum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Points Maximum</td>
<td>1. Identified and approved capital funding from identified source. Please provide proof in the form of a resolution or letter of approval.</td>
<td>(Matching Funds) / (Project Cost) x 25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Points Maximum</td>
<td>2. Approved match grant.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Points Maximum</td>
<td>3. In-kind services. Please provide adequate support documentation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Cost Benefit</td>
<td>Subtotal Score / Grant Application Amount</td>
<td>0 to 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Points Maximum</td>
<td>Subtotal Score / Grant Application Amount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Total Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Previous project milestones must be met before qualifying for subsequent funding.
## PROPOSED FUNDING - FY 2010 TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT AND TransNet BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN PROJECTS

### Recommended Plans, Bicycle Parking, and Support Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Limits</th>
<th>Application Amount</th>
<th>Recommended Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>Bikeway Master Plan Update</td>
<td>City of Chula Vista</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronado</td>
<td>Bicycle Master Plan</td>
<td>City of Coronado</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>Bike Lockers and Racks</td>
<td>Escondido City Hall and Downtown Specific Planning Area</td>
<td>$42,934</td>
<td>$14,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Mesa</td>
<td>Bicycle Facilities Master Plan</td>
<td>City of La Mesa</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National City</td>
<td>Bicycle Master Plan</td>
<td>City of National City</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>Environmental Documentation and Feasibility Study for Bike Master Plan Update</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Education Program</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>$290,000</td>
<td>$290,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>Pedestrian Master Plan Phase 4</td>
<td>San Ysidro, Midway, Old Town, Ocean Beach, College, Pacific Beach, and Kensington</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>UC San Diego Bicycle / Pedestrian Master Plan</td>
<td>UC San Diego campus, SID, and Hillcrest Medical Center</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANDAG/UCSD</td>
<td>Bicycle Locker Wireless Communication</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANDAG/MTS</td>
<td>Bicycle Locker Retrofits and Upgrades</td>
<td>Sandie Fe Depot/Imperial Ave/Pacific Fleet Station/8th Street/E Street/H Street/Palomar Street</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANDAG</td>
<td>Bicycle Map Printing and Distribution</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Allocation:** $1,154,378

### Ineligible Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Reason for Ineligibility</th>
<th>Application Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>Kearny Villa Rd Bicycle Lane Improvements</td>
<td>Routine Maintenance</td>
<td>$337,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>Balboa Ave West Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements Study</td>
<td>Incomplete Application</td>
<td>$135,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>Balboa Ave East Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements Study</td>
<td>Incomplete Application</td>
<td>$135,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>SR-56 Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge Feasibility Study</td>
<td>Incomplete Application</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>San Diego River Bike Path Study</td>
<td>Incomplete Application</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Ineligible Projects:** $1,215,172

### Other Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Limits</th>
<th>Recommended Allocation</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>La Mesa</td>
<td>Spring St Trolley Station Pedestrian Access Improvements</td>
<td>Intersection of Spring St and High St across from trolley station</td>
<td>$88,000</td>
<td>138.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>Escondido Creek Bike Path</td>
<td>Escondido Transit Center Bridge over Creek Channel to Center City Pkwy</td>
<td>$524,100</td>
<td>134.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>Ash Street Undercrossing</td>
<td>Ash Street (SR 76)</td>
<td>$457,357</td>
<td>134.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>Escondido Creek Bike Path Lighting and Restripping</td>
<td>Escondido Creek Bike Path from Broadway to Ash St</td>
<td>$157,500</td>
<td>134.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Mesa</td>
<td>La Mesa Blvd/E Cajon Blvd Intersection Improvements and Pedestrian Infrastructure</td>
<td>La Mesa Blvd and El Cajon Blvd intersection</td>
<td>$361,000</td>
<td>125.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista</td>
<td>Inland Rail Trail Phase III B - Right of Way Engineering</td>
<td>Buena Creek SPRINTER Station to Meilrose Ave Station</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>124.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>Bicycle Detection at Signalized Intersections</td>
<td>20 locations in the City of San Diego</td>
<td>$73,500</td>
<td>123.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista</td>
<td>Safe Pedestrian Crossing at Longhorn Dr</td>
<td>Longhorn Dr at Promontory Ridge Way</td>
<td>$50,849</td>
<td>123.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>Barham Dr Urban Trail Improvement Project</td>
<td>Twin Oaks Valley Rd to CSUSM/SPRINTER Station</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>113.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>Sidewalk Safery Program - 1 Street Sidewalk Improvements</td>
<td>N. side of I Street from Hilltop Dr to First Ave</td>
<td>$116,220</td>
<td>111.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National City</td>
<td>Sweetwater River Bike Path Gap Closure - Plaza Bonita Rd</td>
<td>Plaza Bonita Rd NW from Bonita Mesa Rd</td>
<td>$130,000</td>
<td>111.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santee</td>
<td>Carlton Oaks Dr Class II Bike Lanes</td>
<td>Carlton Oaks Dr from West Hills Pkwy to Carlton Hills Blvd</td>
<td>$30,200</td>
<td>108.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>SR-15 Bike Path Final Design and Environmental Document</td>
<td>East side of SR-15 between Camino del Rio S. and Adams Ave</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>108.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlsbad</td>
<td>Installation of audible pedestrian signals and count-down pedestrian signals</td>
<td>21 intersections in Carlsbad</td>
<td>$150,860</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>Kelton Rd Midblock Pedestrian Improvements</td>
<td>Kelton Rd between Zircon St and Luber St</td>
<td>$248,400</td>
<td>107.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista</td>
<td>Boys and Girls Club Sidewalk Improvements</td>
<td>W. California Ave from Avenida de Bonita Juarez to 100 ft west of Calle Chapultepec</td>
<td>$146,844</td>
<td>104.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANDAG/Chula Vista</td>
<td>Bayshore Bikeway Segments 7 and 8</td>
<td>Stella St to H St in Chula Vista</td>
<td>$1,078,000</td>
<td>101.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escondido/San Diego</td>
<td>West Bernardo Bike Path and Cantilever</td>
<td>Rancho Bernardo Community Park Dr to Lake Hodges Ped Bridge</td>
<td>$1,425,000</td>
<td>101.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Allocation:** $6,587,430

---

*Note: The table above includes all recommended projects, ineligible projects, and other projects that have been approved for funding.*
RESOLUTION NO. 2009-30

APPROVING THE ALLOCATION OF
FY 2010 TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT FUNDS
ARTICLE 3 BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES AND PROGRAMS

WHEREAS, the Transportation Development Act (TDA) claims listed below were submitted for the 2010 TDA funds pursuant to Chapter 4, Article 3, Section 99234 of the California Public Utilities Code (PUC); and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 29532 of the California Government Code (CGC), SANDAG has analyzed these claims and determined that it conforms substantially to the provisions of the Transportation Development Act of 1971, as amended; and

WHEREAS, SANDAG finds this claim for FY 2010 to be consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan; NOW THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED by the SANDAG Board of Directors as follows:

1. That the Board, pursuant to CGC 29532 and PUC 99234, does hereby approve the allocation of TDA funds for the following project in the amounts specified below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Claim No.</th>
<th>Claimant</th>
<th>Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10011000</td>
<td>Carlsbad</td>
<td>$150,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10011001</td>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10011002</td>
<td>Coronado</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10011003</td>
<td>Escondido (W. Bernardo)</td>
<td>$1,425,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10011004</td>
<td>Escondido (Bike Racks)</td>
<td>$14,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10011005</td>
<td>La Mesa</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10011006</td>
<td>National City</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10011007</td>
<td>San Diego (Kelton Road)</td>
<td>$248,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10011008</td>
<td>San Diego (Environ. Doc for Master Plan)</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10011009</td>
<td>San Diego (Safety Education)</td>
<td>$290,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10011010</td>
<td>San Diego (Pedestrian Master Ph. 4)</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10011011</td>
<td>San Diego/UCSD (Bike-Ped Master Plan)</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10011012</td>
<td>SANDAG (Bike Locker Wireless)</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10011013</td>
<td>SANDAG (Bike Locker Retrofit)</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10011014</td>
<td>SANDAG (Bike Map)</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$2,978,438</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. That the Board does hereby authorize the Executive Director to prepare and transmit allocation instructions and payment schedules to the San Diego County Auditor as are necessary and legal for payment of these claims.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 26th day of June 2009.

________________________________________           ATTEST: ________________________________________
CHAIRPERSON                   SECRETARY

MEMBER AGENCIES: Cities of Carlsbad, Chula Vista, Coronado, Del Mar, El Cajon, Encinitas, Escondido, Imperial Beach, La Mesa, Lemon Grove, National City, Oceanside, Poway, San Diego, San Marcos, Santee, Solana Beach, Vista, and County of San Diego.

ADVISORY MEMBERS: California Department of Transportation, Metropolitan Transit System, North County Transit District, Imperial County, U.S. Department of Defense, San Diego Unified Port District, San Diego County Water Authority, Southern California Tribal Chairmen’s Association, and Mexico.
Proposed FY 2010 TDA/TransNet Bicycle and Pedestrian Funding Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2010 Apportionment</th>
<th>TDA Reserves</th>
<th>Total TDA Funding Available for FY 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TDA - Article 3</td>
<td>2,174,095</td>
<td>812,328</td>
<td>2,986,423</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2010 Apportionment</th>
<th>TransNet Reserves</th>
<th>Total TransNet Funding Available for FY 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TransNet</td>
<td>4,686,734</td>
<td>96,116</td>
<td>4,782,850</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total FY 2010 Funds Available to Allocate | 7,769,273 |

Source: SANDAG Finance Department
Introduction

The current 2030 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) was adopted in 2007. Federal law requires that SANDAG prepare a long-range transportation plan and make an air quality conformity determination every four years. SANDAG staff has prepared a draft work program and schedule to develop the 2050 RTP, which is slated for adoption in 2011. SANDAG is the first major metropolitan planning organization that will prepare an RTP according to provisions of Senate Bill (SB) 375 (Steinberg, 2008). Additionally, proposed roles and responsibilities of various working groups and Policy Advisory Committees are outlined. The purpose of this informational report is to provide an overview of the proposed work plan and its key elements to the Board of Directors. This informational report also was presented at the June 5, 2009, joint meeting of the Regional Planning and Transportation Committees.

Discussion

2050 RTP Work Program: Key Inputs and Components

At the April 24, 2009, Board of Directors meeting, staff provided an overview of the proposed FY 2010 Integrated Work Plan to comply with SB 375. SANDAG staff now has developed a more detailed work program and schedule for the 2050 RTP that incorporates a variety of planning efforts. In accordance with state and federal guidelines, the 2050 RTP is scheduled for adoption by the Board of Directors in July 2011. The 2050 RTP Work Program and Schedule are included as Attachments 1 and 2, respectively. A number of key inputs and components that will shape the development of a 2050 RTP are highlighted below.

2050 Regional Growth Forecast

Work already is underway to produce the 2050 Regional Growth Forecast, which will be used in the preparation of the 2050 RTP. The forecast is being developed in two phases. The first phase takes into account existing land uses, planned land uses, and potential redevelopment and infill areas. The second phase involves preparing alternative land use scenarios that can be applied beyond the horizon year of local general plans. The Board of Directors will be asked to approve the 2050 Regional Growth Forecast for planning purposes in early 2010. Additional information about the forecast, including possible transportation and transportation demand management (TDM) measures and upcoming public outreach activities, will be presented for Board discussion at the July 10, 2009, Board Policy meeting.
Updated Goals and Objectives

The Board of Directors adopted seven policy goals to guide the development of the 2030 RTP. Policy objectives also were established to help the region achieve those goals. As part of the 2050 RTP development, the Board of Directors will be asked to review and update the goals and objectives from the 2030 RTP based on emerging issues such as the implementation of SB 375.

Urban Core Transit Strategy

In summer 2009, SANDAG will begin the development of an Urban Core Transit Strategy to evaluate possible regional transit strategies that maximize peak-period transit mode share in the urban core. The strategy will result in three or four long-range strategic transit network alternatives that will be factored into the 2050 RTP. Additionally, the study will include short-term action plans and implementation strategies. The Board of Directors will be asked to approve these alternatives for use in the 2050 RTP development in spring 2010.

Sustainable Communities Strategy

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, 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 can 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 the identified habitat conservation areas, will serve as a basis for the SCS. Additionally, the results of the Regional Climate Action Plan (RCAP) will provide options for additional measures that could reduce GHG emissions.

Other Key 2050 RTP Tasks

The results of related work efforts, such as the Regional Energy Strategy Update, RCAP, Regional Bicycle Plan, Comprehensive Freight Gateway Forecast, new border crossing at Otay Mesa East, airport multimodal planning, high-speed rail planning, corridor and subregional studies, collaborative projects with Tribal Nations, as well as interregional and binational strategies, will be incorporated.

Other major tasks include updates to the project evaluation criteria and plan performance measures, economic analysis of investment strategies, enhanced environmental justice analysis, new revenue projections, revised cost estimates for projects and services, and integration of technology and TDM measures into investment strategies. Additionally, the 2050 RTP will be subject to any new requirements established in the upcoming federal surface transportation reauthorization, which is anticipated to be passed in 2010, and will incorporate updated California Transportation Commission RTP Guidelines.
SANDAG regularly involves the public in regional planning efforts. A public participation plan is being prepared to help develop the 2050 RTP. On May 22, 2009, the Board of Directors approved the creation of a new Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group to provide input on the development of key work elements in the planning process, including the public participation plan. Additionally, there will be a series of public presentations and workshops and other means for involving the public and receiving input on the work products and draft 2050 RTP. The Board of Directors will be asked to approve the Public Participation Plan in winter 2009.

The Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the 2050 RTP will require analysis beyond what has been included in previous RTP EIRs. The RTP environmental analysis will include GHG emissions baseline measurements and projections, as well as potential mitigation measures that could reduce emissions. The EIR also will include analysis of the additional elements required by SB 375, such as the SCS.

In addition, as part of the environmental review process for the RTP, SB 375 includes California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) streamlining provisions as an incentive to encourage certain types of projects that help achieve the GHG reduction target and are consistent with the SCS (e.g., residential or mixed-use projects that conform to SCS and transit priority projects that meet specified criteria). Cities and counties that find the CEQA streamlining provisions useful will have the opportunity to align their planning policies with those of the regional SCS. It should be noted, however, that the CEQA streamlining provisions are not mandatory and are intended to be a tool that local jurisdictions may use, if desired.

A number of Policy Advisory Committees will provide oversight and policy direction for the development of the 2050 RTP. Several working groups also will provide input throughout the preparation of the plan. The new Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group will play an integral role in the development of the 2050 RTP, along with the region’s public works directors and planning directors, who are represented in the Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) and Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG), respectively. The San Diego Region Conformity Working Group (CWG) will be consulted on the development of the air quality conformity analysis. Additionally, staff will make sure that key elements of the 2050 RTP development are brought to the Tribal Transportation Working Group to allow for substantive feedback and input. Finally, the TransNet Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee’s responsibilities include participating in the ongoing refinement of the SANDAG transportation system performance measurement process and the project evaluation criteria used in the development of the RTP. Attachment 3 outlines the proposed roles and responsibilities of the Policy Advisory Committees and their working groups related to the development of the 2050 RTP.
Next Steps

In order to implement the proposed work plan, SANDAG will benefit from substantial work that is already underway. The adopted Smart Growth Concept Map together with regional habitat conservation areas will serve as a basis for the SCS. A number of planning efforts that will be incorporated in the 2050 RTP development have been initiated, such as the Interstate 5 South Multimodal Corridor Study, and Freight Gateway Forecast. Additionally, a discussion on new goals and policy objectives for the 2050 RTP will be brought to a future Board of Directors Policy meeting.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Attachments: 1. 2050 RTP Work Program
              2. 2050 RTP Schedule

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

Funds are budgeted in Work Element #3000400
2050 RTP WORK PROGRAM

1. Develop Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Work Program
   • Review work program with core working groups, Policy Advisory Committees, and Board of Directors

2. Review and Update RTP Goals and Policy Objectives
   • Confirm consistency with updated Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) directives and Strategic Initiatives
   • Monitor and incorporate new transportation act/bill and other legislation, including Senate Bill (SB) 375 (as needed)
   • Monitor and incorporate updated California Transportation Commission RTP Guidelines (as needed)

3. Public Outreach and Involvement
   • Set up 2050 RTP Project Web page and maintain throughout RTP development and adoption
   • Create new Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group and issue mini-grants for outreach to community based organizations
   • Develop Public Participation Plan (PPP) that meets federal transportation bill requirements and SB 375
   • Schedule events and develop outreach products
   • Conduct subregional workshops (3) on Draft 2050 RTP
   • Conduct public hearings (2) on Draft 2050 RTP
   • Analyze ongoing feedback and respond to comments received via the Web page, phone, e-mail, etc.

4. Prepare 2050 Regional Growth Forecast
   • Collect Existing Plans and Policies land use inputs (Phase 1)
   • Create demographic, housing, and economic estimates for Existing Plans and Policies
   • Generate New Growth Forecast (Population and Employment) for Existing Plans and Policies
   • Create and test alternative land use scenarios for capacity to 2050 (Phase 2) and review results with working group and Policy Committees
   • Conduct public workshops on select alternative land use scenarios
   • Generate preliminary draft Growth Forecast for review
   • Finalize 2050 Regional Growth Forecast
5. Incorporate Recommendations from Regional/Corridor/Subregional Studies into Development of Transportation Networks

- Studies include the Interstate 5 (I-5) South Multimodal Corridor Study, Downtown Transportation Plan, Urban Core Transit Strategy, Regional Bicycle Plan, Impediments to Public Transit, Safe Routes to School Strategy, Regional Climate Action Plan (RCAP), Regional Energy Strategy, State Route (SR) 11 and Otay Mesa East Port of Entry Financing Strategy, I-15 Interregional Partnership and Imperial Valley Association of Governments (IVAG) I-8 Corridor Strategic Plan, Tribal Transportation Plans, Corridor System Management Plans, TransNet Early Action project development, Otay Mesa–Mesa de Otay Binational Corridor Strategic Plan, California–Baja California Border Master Plan, and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA)/Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Guidebook on Congestion Management Process (as needed)

6. Develop Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) and Alternative Planning Strategy (APS) (if needed)

- Conduct workshop for SB 375 Implementation/Greenhouse Gases (GHG) Regional Targets/SCS development
- Information meeting(s) with elected officials to obtain input on SCS
- Develop draft SCS based on the adopted Smart Growth Concept Map and results from the Urban Core Transit Strategy and the RCAP
- Generate alternative(s) land use/transportation scenario for an APS (if needed)
- Develop draft APS if the SCS does not meet the regional GHG targets (if needed)

7. Update Revenue and Cost Projections for Projects and Services

- Develop or revise cost estimates for all Unconstrained highway and transit projects based on requirements from federal transportation bill
- Incorporate revised cost estimates for local streets and roads projects provided by the local jurisdictions
- Incorporate SR 11–Otay Mesa East Port of Entry Financing Strategy
- Develop initial revenue projections for the various local, state, and federal revenue sources for the Revenue Constrained and Reasonably Expected scenarios
- Refine and finalize initial revenue projections and cost estimates for the Revenue Constrained and Reasonably Expected scenarios

8. Update Regional Arterial System (as needed)

9. Airport Multimodal and Rail Planning

- Incorporate recommendations from the Airport Multimodal Action Plan (AMAP)
- Incorporate Air–Rail Network Plan
- Incorporate Regional Aviation Strategic Plan (RASP), including Destination Lindbergh
10. Develop Technology and Innovation Updates for the RTP
   - Incorporate transportation system management and monitoring systems into the RTP
   - Research future transportation infrastructure and architecture needs and incorporate into the RTP
   - Incorporate assumptions from Regional Energy Strategy Update relating to alternative fuels and vehicles into the RTP

11. Update the Goods Movement Action Plan (as needed)
   - Incorporate findings from the Comprehensive Freight Gateway Study

12. Update Transportation Project Evaluation Criteria
   - Review/revise criteria with a focus on updated goals and policy objectives

13. Update Performance Measures for RTP
   - Re-evaluate and update performance measures to be consistent with 2050 RTP goals and policy objectives
   - Develop measurable objectives consistent with updated RTP performance measures
   - Update base year and projected Levels of Service (LOS), Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT), GHG emissions, travel time, speed, and other indicator data for the RTP

14. Develop Network and/or Land Use Alternatives
   - Develop multimodal (transit, high-occupancy vehicle [HOV], Managed Lanes, highway, bicycle, and pedestrian) network alternatives in conjunction with SCS/APS
   - Select networks and land use alternatives to be included in the different financial scenarios of the RTP and in the EIR

15. Analyze Alternatives and Select Preferred Unconstrained Network for RTP
   - Perform travel forecasts and evaluate overall performance
   - Apply updated performance measures, such as overall LOS, VMT, GHG emissions, economic indicators, and average corridor travel times, to provide a grid of overall effectiveness of each alternative
   - Develop Draft Preferred Network for review

16. Conduct Economic Analysis of Transportation Investment Scenarios

17. Develop Environmental Justice Assessment

18. Create Final RTP/SCS and EIR Scenarios
   - Create new Revenue Constrained and Reasonably Expected funding scenarios
   - Apply revised evaluation criteria to assist in project selection for RTP scenarios
• Develop transportation networks for Revenue Constrained and Reasonably Expected Scenarios for review
• Create EIR alternatives

19. Perform Air Quality (AQ) Forecasts
• Discuss conformity criteria and procedures with San Diego Region Conformity Working Group (CWG)
• Address new Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)/FTA/FHWA requirements for AQ analysis (as needed)
• Prepare draft air quality conformity determination for Draft RTP for review
• Assist with AQ analysis for Draft and Final EIR
• Prepare final air quality determination

20. Produce Draft RTP

21. EIR Preparation
• Prepare and circulate Notice of Preparation for EIR
• Prepare Draft EIR, including enhanced analysis per SB 375
• Prepare Final EIR

22. Release Draft RTP/EIR for Public Comment

23. Prepare Draft Final RTP

24. Prepare Final EIR

25. Final RTP/EIR Adoption

26. Air Quality Conformity Determination by United States Department of Transportation
## 2050 Regional Transportation Plan Schedule

### Major Tasks

#### 2050 RTP Work Program
- Goals & Objectives

#### 2050 Regional Growth Forecast

#### Public Outreach / Workshops
- Stakeholders Working Group

#### Airport Multimodal Planning
- Destination Lindbergh
- Air - Rail / High Speed Rail
- RASP / AMAP

#### Regional / Subregional / Corridor Planning
- Urban Core Transit Strategy
- Impediments to Transit Study
  - I-5 South
- Regional Bicycle Plan
- Goods Movement

#### Energy / Climate Change Planning
- Economic Analysis
- Environmental Justice Analysis

#### Project Evaluation Criteria / Performance Measures

#### Revenue & Cost Projections

#### Initial 2050 RTP / SCS / RHNA Alternatives

#### Evaluation of Alternatives
- Economic Analysis

#### Final 2050 RTP / SCS / RHNA Scenarios

#### Draft 2050 RTP and Air Quality Conformity

#### Draft 2050 RTP EIR

#### Draft Final 2050 RTP and Air Quality Conformity

#### Adopt Final 2050 RTP / EIR / Air Quality Conformity

---

June 2009
# Roles and Responsibilities for the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Tasks</th>
<th>Working Groups</th>
<th>Policy Advisory Committees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Work Program</td>
<td>CTAC TWG SWG CWG ITOC Tribal TWG EWG BC RPC TC BOD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals and Policy Objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2050 Regional Growth Forecast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Evaluation Criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional/Corridor Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Core Transit Strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 5 South Multimodal Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Multimodal Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Freight Gateway Forecast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Energy Strategy Update/Regional Climate Action Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Outreach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial RTP/Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS)/Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) Scenarios</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final RTP/SCS/RHNA Scenarios</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft 2050 RTP and Air Quality (AQ) Conformity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft 2050 Environmental Impact Report (EIR)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Changes for the Draft Final 2050 RTP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopt Final 2050 RTP/EIR/AQ Conformity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Board of Directors (BOD)**
- Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC)
- Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group (SWG)
- Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG)
- Regional Working Group (EWG)
- San Diego Region Conformity Working Group (CWG)
- Tribal Transportation Technical Working Group (Tribal TWG)

**Policy Advisory Committees**
- Borders Committee (BC)
- Regional Planning Committee (RPC)
- Transportation Committee (TC)

**TransNet Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee (ITOC)**