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, May 13, 2010

1:15 to 3:15 p.m.

SANDAG, 7th Floor Conference Room
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA  92101-4231

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

AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

• 2010 NATIONAL APA PLANNING AWARDS
• UPDATE ON THE URBAN AREA TRANSIT STRATEGY (UATS)
• 2050 RTP: PROPOSED PLAN PERFORMANCE MEASURES
• HIGHLIGHTING SMART GROWTH: CITY OF ENCINITAS GENERAL PLAN UPDATE

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.
ITEM # | RECOMMENDATION
--- | ---
1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS
2. PUBLIC COMMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS | COMMENT

Members of the public will have the opportunity to address the Technical Working Group (TWG) on any issue within the jurisdiction of the Working Group that is not on this agenda. Speakers are limited to three minutes each.

CONSENT ITEM (#3)

+3. MEETING SUMMARY | APPROVE

The Working Group should review and approve the April 15, 2010, meeting summary of the joint meeting of the Regional Planning TWG and the Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC).

REPORT ITEMS (#4 through #8)

+4. 2010 NATIONAL APA PLANNING AWARDS | INFORMATION

Last month, the American Planning Association (APA) honored innovative planning efforts, planners, and advocates with the 2010 National Planning Excellence, Achievement, and Leadership Awards in New Orleans. Two awards were awarded to local plans and planners: the City of San Diego’s General Plan received the Daniel Burnham Award for a Comprehensive Plan and Jane Clough-Riquelme of SANDAG received the Advancing Diversity & Social Change Award in Honor of Paul Davidoff. Congratulations! A video of the award winners will be shown at the TWG meeting.

+5. UPDATE ON THE URBAN AREA TRANSIT STRATEGY (UATS) | REVIEW/COMMENT
(Carolina Gregor, Dave Schumacher, and Heather Werdick)

Last month, staff unveiled the alternative transit networks being developed for the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) as part of the UATS. The networks were then reviewed by an independent Peer Review Panel in mid-April and were presented at the 2050 RTP public workshops in late-April and early-May for public input. The attached staff report, being which was prepared for the SANDAG Board of Directors for its May 14, 2010, meeting, describes the networks, summarizes comments received to-date, proposes transit mode share goals, and discusses the process for developing the 2050 Unconstrained Transportation Network (this report to be mailed under separate cover). A more detailed overview of the performance of the networks will be presented, and discussion on initial concepts for complementary highway networks will be initiated. Recommendations on an initial unconstrained transportation network will be made to the SANDAG Board of Directors at its June 11, 2010, Policy Meeting. The TWG should review and comment on the performance of the transit networks and provide input on the complementary highway networks.
+6. 2050 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN: PROPOSED PLAN PERFORMANCE MEASURES (Scott Strelecki)

SANDAG staff will provide a report on the proposed plan performance measures. This will include refinements that have been made by the Transportation Project Evaluation Criteria Ad Hoc Working Group (TPEC). TWG members will be asked to discuss and provide feedback on the proposed plan performance measures.

7. COMMUNICATING THE 2050 REGIONAL GROWTH FORECAST: WEB APPLICATION AND FACTSHEET (Beth Jarosz)

SANDAG staff is working on a forecast factsheet and associated online information kiosk. Staff would like to spotlight local projects that demonstrate implementation of the core principles of the Regional Comprehensive Plan. TWG members are asked to provide input on proposed content for the factsheet and Web site.

+8. FEDERAL AND STATE SMART GROWTH FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES (Coleen Clementson)

The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) will be issuing a Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) for a new grant program – the Sustainable Communities Planning Grant Program. The State of California also has approximately $60 million available for the Sustainable Communities Planning Grant and Incentives Program funded by Proposition 84. Staff will discuss these grant programs with the TWG.

9. HIGHLIGHTING SMART GROWTH: CITY OF ENCINITAS GENERAL PLAN UPDATE (Patrick Murphy)

The TWG periodically hears about general plan and smart growth efforts happening around the region. The City of Encinitas has embarked upon a General Plan Update. City staff will highlight work to date, tools for public outreach, and challenges and opportunities associated with the process.

10. ADJOURNMENT AND NEXT MEETING INFORMATION

The next TWG meeting will be held on Thursday, June 10, 2010, from 1:15 - 3:15 p.m.
MEETING SUMMARY OF THE APRIL 15, 2010, JOINT MEETING BETWEEN
THE REGIONAL PLANNING TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP (TWG) AND
THE CITIES/COUNTY TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CTAC)

Please note: Audio file of meeting is available on the SANDAG Web site
(www.sandag.org) on both the TWG and CTAC Home Pages.

Agenda Item #1: Welcome and Introductions
Vice Chair Bill Chopyk (La Mesa) called the Regional Planning TWG meeting and
Chair Maryam Babaki (National City) called the Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee
(CTAC) to order at 9:30 a.m. Self-introductions were conducted.

Agenda Item #2: Public Comments and Communications
There were no public comments.

CONSENT (ITEM #3)

Agenda Item #3: Meeting Summaries (Approve)
The Working Groups were asked to approve the March 4, 2010, meeting summary (CTAC) and the
March 11, 2010, meeting summary (TWG).

Action: Frank Rivera (Chula Vista) motioned and Zoubir Ouadah (Poway) seconded to approve the
CTAC meeting minutes. The meeting minutes were approved unanimously.

Action: Andy Hamilton (Air Pollution Control District) motioned and Ed Batchelder (Chula Vista)
seconded to approve the TWG meeting minutes. The meeting minutes were approved unanimously.

REPORT (ITEMS #4 through #9)

Agenda Item #4: Electric Vehicles in the San Diego Region (Information)
Joel Pointon (SDG&E) provided an overview of electric vehicle (EV) activities in the region and the
utility's role. Keiichi Kitahara (Nissan) provided information about the Leaf, its new all-electric
vehicle that will be available in the San Diego region before 2011. Andy Hoskinson (e-Tec) discussed "The EV Project," the largest EV undertaking in U.S. history, and the region's role.

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

Keiichi Kitahara (Nissan) explained that the Leaf is a zero emissions electric vehicle that will be available in eight months (December 2010), it can be reserved on-line through the Nissan Web site, and the listed price is $32,700, but after rebates and tax credits, it will be available for $20,000.

Jay Petrek (Escondido) asked about the life span of the battery.

Melissa Ayres (El Cajon) asked for an explanation on photovoltaic bumpers.

Keiichi Kitahara provided responses to questions regarding estimated battery life and the use of photovoltaic bumpers on the vehicle.

Greg Wade (Imperial Beach) asked about permit fees, timing, and how many electric vehicles can plug into a work place charge device at one time? Responses were provided in the additional presentation provided by SDG&E and e-Tec.

Bill Chopyk (La Mesa) asked if there were any limits on the Federal tax credit. Keiichi Kitahara responded that he was not aware of any limits.

Joel Pointon (SDG&E) provided information regarding permit support for infrastructure, price elasticity, and the challenges for incorporating charging stations in multi-unit dwellings.

Andy Hoskinson (e-Tec) provided information about the overall project in terms of what, where, how, and when the vehicles would be deployed.

**Agenda Item #7: Regional Bike Plan (Information)**

The San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan (Plan) is being developed to support implementation of both the Regional Comprehensive Plan and the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). This report, presented to the Transportation Committee at its March 19, 2010, meeting, presented an overview of the key elements to the Plan. The draft Bike Plan and its Preliminary Draft Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration is out for a 30-day public review and comment period, through April 24, 2010. The revised draft plan will be submitted to the Transportation Committee on May 21, 2010, and then to the SANDAG Board of Directors on May 28, 2010. Chris Kluth (SANDAG) made the presentation on the Plan.

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

Bill Anderson (City of San Diego) asked about including an analysis of the maintenance cost per bike rider versus the maintenance cost per car.
Agenda Item #5: Planning for Healthy Communities (Information)

SANDAG has an opportunity to support the County Health and Human Services Agency over the next two years in a region-wide effort to combat obesity under a $16 million economic stimulus grant from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. A portion of this initiative will provide pass-through grants to local agencies for efforts to address public health issues in local plans, for active community transportation plans, and for safe routes to school plans and programs. The scope of work for SANDAG’s component of the grant envisions local agency participation on an ad hoc working group for planning and public health. Stephan Vance (SANDAG) presented the information for this item.

Action: This item was presented for information only.

Pat Murphy (Encinitas) asked about a timeline for developing health impact assessment tools, and if it was too late for cities that are developing general plan updates to obtain grants for health elements. He suggested that the program focus on cities that are currently working on their general plans.

Agenda Item #6: Complete Streets/Livable Streets: Rethinking Street Design (Information)

Fundamental to encouraging more people to walk, bike, and use transit is creating street environments where people feel safe and welcome. Andy Hamilton (Air Pollution Control District) presented examples of new approaches to street design, from New York to Seattle. New modal performance criteria coming in the 2010 Highway Capacity Manual were also discussed.

Agenda Item #8: Urban Area Transit Strategy: Draft Regional Transit Networks and Revised Performance Measures (Discussion)

As part of the development of the 2050 RTP, staff has developed initial transit concepts and associated draft transit networks for the Urban Area Transit Strategy (UATS). The draft networks and revised performance measures were presented for input and discussion. The draft networks will also be presented at the upcoming RTP workshops in late April and early May, providing additional opportunities for public input. Carolina Gregor (SANDAG) and Dave Schumacher (SANDAG) provided the presentation. Carolina Gregor (SANDAG) also thanked TWG and CTAC members for attending the workshop on the UATS co-hosted by the San Diego Council of Design Professionals and SANDAG earlier that week.

Action: This item was presented for information only.

TWG Chair Bill Anderson (City of San Diego) asked about comparing cost competitiveness between the three strategies as well as compared to roads expansions.

Jay Petrek (Escondido) commented on the connection between Riverside and I-15.
**Agenda Item #9: 2050 RTP: Transportation Project Evaluation Criteria Weightings and Proposed Plan Performance Measures (Discussion)**

Scott Strelecki (SANDAG) provided a report on the transportation project evaluation criteria weightings and proposed plan performance measures. This report includes refinements that have been made by the Transportation Project Evaluation Criteria Ad Hoc Working Group (TPEC). Due to time constraints, RPTWG and CTAC members were asked to e-mail any comments on the transportation project evaluation criteria weightings and proposed plan performance measures to Scott Strelecki by the close of business day.

**Agenda Item #10: Adjournment and Next Meetings (Information)**

The next CTAC meeting will be held Thursday, May 6, 2010, from 9:30 to 11:00 a.m. The next RPTWG meeting will be held Thursday, May 13, 2010, from 1:15 to 3:15 p.m.

Action: CTAC Chair Maryam Babaki (Nation City) adjourned the meeting.

Greg Wade (Imperial Beach) announced that a workshop on climate change coastal adaptation will be held at the Tijuana International Estuary on May 14, 2010, at 8:30 a.m.

Andy Hamilton (Air Pollution Control District) announced the Walk San Diego awards banquet gala on April 22, 2010.
For Immediate Release: April 5, 2010
Contact: Roberta Rewers, APA, 312.786.6395; rrewers@planning.org

NEWS RELEASE

APA Announces 2010 National Planning Award Recipients

CHICAGO—The American Planning Association honors innovative planning efforts, planners and advocates with the 2010 National Planning Excellence, Achievement, and Leadership Awards.

APA’s national awards program, the profession’s highest honor, is a proud tradition established more than 50 years ago to recognize outstanding community plans, planning programs, and initiatives, public education efforts, and individuals for their leadership on planning issues. Twelve award recipients will be recognized during a special luncheon on April 12, 2010, during APA’s National Planning Conference in New Orleans.

San Diego General Plan, San Diego, California
The Daniel Burnham Award for a Comprehensive Plan
The City of San Diego General Plan sets out a long-range vision and policy framework for how the city should plan for growth, provide public services, and maintain the qualities that define San Diego. It was structured to work in concert with the city’s 40-plus community plans and is part of a regional and statewide smart growth strategy.

Indianapolis Regional Center Design Guidelines, Indianapolis, Indiana
National Planning Excellence Award for Best Practice
The design guidelines focus on the Regional Center, a 6.5 square mile area that functions as the “downtown” for the City of Indianapolis. Hoping to maintain its reputation for well-designed urban spaces and achieve a more livable community, the guidelines provide a community standard for urban design. They support five design principles: mobility; health, safety and opportunity; adaptability and sustainability; the public realm; and character and vitality.

Campus Partners’ University District Revitalization, Columbus, Ohio
National Planning Excellence Award for Implementation
Campus Partners is a university-led partnership that has succeeded in revitalizing the economically and racially diverse district around The Ohio State University. OSU formed Campus Partners in 1995 with an independent mission and board responsible to stakeholders beyond its university to address physical, social, and environmental issues facing an entire urban district with a population of 40,000.

-More-
Wicker Park Bucktown Master Plan, Chicago, Illinois

*National Planning Excellence Award for Public Outreach*

Wicker Park and Bucktown (WPB), two Chicago neighborhoods facing rapid change, were at risk of losing their beloved "grittiness" and "edge." The plan's outreach was tailored to fit WPB’s personality using humorous attention-getting posters, videos, a photo suggestion box, and a do-it-yourself budgeting exercise that engaged residents in the planning process. The result was honest public input that yielded a comprehensive, unique, and high-quality master plan that reinforced the community's collective values and goals.

Hilltop Hanover: A Westchester County Farm and Environmental Center, Westchester County, New York

*National Planning Excellence Award for Innovation in Best Practices for Sustainability*

Hilltop Hanover was previously a 180-acre dairy farm that was turned into a farm and environmental center to educate the residents of Westchester County about sustainable agriculture and environmentally sensitive practices. Acquisition of the old dairy farm also preserved open space and protected a public drinking water supply watershed. Programs offered at Hilltop Hanover are designed to expand awareness of the environmental impacts of human activity, offer alternatives to existing practices, and demonstrate practical methods for implementing new strategies.

Plan for the Valleys, Baltimore County, Maryland

*National Planning Landmark Award*

In the early 1960s, the Green Spring and Worthington Valleys, a rural region of Baltimore County, Maryland, was facing intense urbanization pressure. The community had the foresight to realize that if uncontrolled, the growth would surely wipe out the historic character and natural amenity of the area. The Plan for the Valleys, prepared by WRT, is the first long-range development plan based on the application of principles of ecological determinism.

New Orleans City Park – From Devastation to Recovery, New Orleans, Louisiana

*National Planning Achievement Award for a Hard-Won Victory*

Hurricane Katrina caused $43 million in damage to the 1,300-acre City Park—flooding the park with eight feet of water, destroying more than 2,000 trees, and damaging or destroying more than 120 buildings. The park's recently adopted master plan, Vision for the 21st Century, became the organizing feature for recovery efforts. The recovery plan focused on cleaning up debris, reopening revenue generating facilities, pursuing an ambitious public and private fund-raising effort, and using the new master plan to organize the recovery.

Jane Clough-Riquelme, San Diego, California

*Advancing Diversity & Social Change in Honor of Paul Davidoff*

As the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) tribal liaison, Jane Clough-Riquelme has been instrumental in facilitating the involvement of the 17 federally recognized tribal nations in the San Diego area in the regional planning process. Her work has resulted in the increased mobility of tribal communities through the creation of key institutional mechanisms for coordination in SANDAG, the development of a collaborative planning agenda, supporting RTA's pursuit of funding
sources, and technical assistance in the implementation of tribal transportation projects involving multiple agencies for the benefit of all tribal nations in the region.

Brookhaven Town Councilwoman Connie M. Kepert, Town of Brookhaven, New York

National Planning Leadership Award for a Planning Advocate

A tireless supporter of planning, Brookhaven Town Councilwoman (District 4) Connie M. Kepert is a firm believer in the benefits planning can bring to all communities. She has supported and worked towards making high-quality planning a community and town priority as both an executive officer of civic organizations and as an elected official. Her efforts have illustrated that community-driven planning is the best way to provide vision for the future betterment of communities. She has empowered community members to trust in their ability to affect change and demand good planning.

Taryn Hanano, San Jose State University, San Jose, California

National Planning Leadership Award for a Student Planner

Taryn Hanano has exemplified exceptional scholarship and ongoing commitment to advancing the visibility and recognition of the urban planning profession through her education and professional endeavors. As a full-time graduate student at San Jose State University's Urban and Regional Planning Department, Hanano has maintained an impressive GPA of 3.93, while working full time.

William E. Borah, New Orleans, Louisiana

National Planning Leadership Award for a Distinguished Contribution

Land use planning in New Orleans has traditionally been described as "planning by surprise." On November 4, 2008, voters opted to change that by approving the Home Rule Charter Amendments, which require the city to prepare a master plan with the force of law. One of the main advocates for the amendments was William E. Borah, a New Orleans-based land use attorney and member of Smart Growth for Louisiana. Borah drafted the initial proposed charter amendment, sought comment from planning experts around the country, and organized a support campaign.

Enterprise Green Communities, Enterprise Community Partners, Inc., Columbia, Maryland

HUD Secretary’s Opportunity and Empowerment Award

The Enterprise Green Communities initiative is a national green building program focused entirely on affordable housing. The initiative provides financing, funding, and expertise to enable developers to build or rehabilitate homes that are environmentally sustainable without compromising affordability. Since 2004, Enterprise has invested $700 million to create 15,800 green affordable homes in 350 developments in 30 states.

To learn more about each of the 2010 award recipients, please visit: www.planning.org/awards/2010. The recipients also will be featured in the April 2010 issue of Planning magazine.

The American Planning Association is an independent, not-for-profit educational organization that provides leadership in the development of vital communities. APA and its professional institute, the
American Institute of Certified Planners, are dedicated to advancing the art, science and profession of
good planning -- physical, economic and social -- so as to create communities that offer better choices for
where and how people work and live. Members of APA help create communities of lasting value and
encourage civic leaders, business interests and citizens to play a meaningful role in creating communities
that enrich people's lives. APA has offices in Washington, D.C., and Chicago, Ill. For more information, visit
www.planning.org.

# # #
UPDATE ON THE URBAN AREA TRANSIT STRATEGY (UATS)

Introduction

Last month, staff unveiled the alternative transit networks being developed for the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) as part of the UATS (Transit Propensity, Commuter Point-to-Point, and Many Centers). The networks were then reviewed by an independent Peer Review Panel in mid-April and were presented at the 2050 RTP public workshops in late-April and early-May for public input.

The attached staff report, which was prepared for the SANDAG Board of Directors for its May 14, 2010, meeting, describes the networks, summarizes the comments received to-date, proposes transit mode share goals, and discusses the process for developing the 2050 Unconstrained Transportation Network.

A more detailed overview of the performance of the networks will be presented at the TWG meeting, and discussion on initial concepts for complementary highway networks will be initiated.

Discussion

The TWG should review and comment on the performance of the transit networks and provide input on the complementary highway networks. Recommendations on an initial unconstrained transportation network will be made to the SANDAG Board of Directors at its June 11, 2010, Policy Meeting.

Attachment: 1. Report to the SANDAG Board of Directors, dated May 14, 2010 (this report to be mailed under separate cover, pgs. 13-34)

Key Staff Contacts: Carolina Gregor, (619) 699-1989; cgr@sandag.org
Dave Schumacher, (619) 699-6906; dsc@sandag.org
Heather Werdick, (619) 699-6967; hwe@sandag.org
2050 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN (RTP): DRAFT URBAN AREA TRANSIT STRATEGY NETWORK ALTERNATIVES, PROPOSED TRANSIT MODE SHARE GOALS, AND APPROACH FOR DEVELOPING THE 2050 RTP UNCONSTRAINED TRANSPORTATION NETWORK

Introduction

As part of the Urban Area Transit Strategy of the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), three draft transit network alternatives have been developed for analytical purposes and for consideration in the development of a preferred transit network for inclusion in the 2050 RTP.

The purpose of today's report is threefold: (1) to introduce the draft transit network alternatives and summarize feedback received from the 2050 RTP public workshops, the SANDAG working groups, and a Peer Review Panel held April 21 - 23, 2010; (2) to propose transit mode share goals for key corridors/communities; and (3) to present a preliminary summary of the performance of each network. In addition, the initial approach for developing the overall 2050 RTP Unconstrained Transportation Network also will be presented.

The Board of Directors is asked to discuss and provide comments on the alternative transit networks, the proposed transit mode share goals, and the approach for developing the 2050 RTP Unconstrained Transportation Network.

Discussion

Initial Transit Scenarios and Feedback Received

The Urban Area Transit Strategy will serve as the basis for development of the regional transit network to be included in the 2050 RTP. Through the planning process, staff has developed and begun testing three transit network alternatives with a focus on the urban areas of the San Diego region. Ultimately, one of the networks (or a combination or variation) would be incorporated into the 2050 RTP and its Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS). The overarching goal is to create a world-class transit system for the San Diego region in 2050 that significantly increases the use of transit, walking, and biking in the urbanized areas of the region, makes transit more time competitive with the automobile, maximizes the use of transit during peak periods, and reduces greenhouse gas emissions and vehicle miles traveled in the region.
The transit alternatives under study are grouped into three themes and illustrated conceptually as follows:

- **“Transit Propensity”** (expanding transit in the most urbanized areas);
- **“Commuter Point-to-Point”** (emphasizing quick access to work); and
- **“Many Centers”** (connecting local smart growth areas and activity centers).

The three transit alternatives have been intentionally designed to vary significantly from one another in order to test how different transit strategies might function in the long-term when compared across a number of performance measures.

The draft networks have been presented to the Transportation Committee, various SANDAG working groups, the Peer Review Panel, and at the five 2050 RTP public workshops (held from April 26 – May 6). The networks also will be presented at the May 14 Board meeting, along with an initial high-level summary of their performance. Subway-style maps of each draft alternative are provided in Attachments 1 – 3, and a brief description of the initial concept behind each alternative is provided in Attachment 4. The study area for the Urban Area Transit Strategy is provided in Attachment 5 for reference purposes. More detailed maps, including transit routes and station locations, are available on the SANDAG web site at www.sandag.org/uats.

Ultimately, staff will recommend to the Board a preferred regional transit network for incorporation into the 2050 RTP that will most likely be a combination of network elements from one or more of the draft transit alternatives based on comments by the policymakers, stakeholders, the public, and the Peer Review Panel; the overall performance of the networks with respect to identified performance measures (below); the performance of specific routes and modes; and other factors.

**Working Group and Public Feedback Received**

In general, staff has received positive feedback on the concept of developing and testing alternative transit strategies, and on the draft networks developed to date. At its April 16, 2010, meeting, Transportation Committee members articulated support for the networks being tested in the three alternatives and expressed excitement at the prospect of building a robust transit network that can enhance regional mobility options and potentially influence the region’s reduction of greenhouse gas emissions.
During the remainder of April, staff presented the transit networks to the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG), the Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC), the Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group (SWG), and the Quality of Life Stakeholders Working Group. Comments by the working groups generally have been positive. While some working group members are concerned that the alternatives do not sufficiently emphasize transit in the less urbanized areas, others are concerned that the networks are too broad and there is insufficient focus on the urban core. In addition, working group members have encouraged staff to conduct analysis on the effects of land use assumptions, user charges, and transportation demand management, before finalizing mode share goals. Staff also has received suggestions to identify regionally-based transit mode share figures, in addition to corridor-based mode share figures. Other ideas included evaluating a broader range of ideas for last mile solutions that could include the use of taxicabs, addressing parking pricing, and considering fare free zones or fare free routes as a way of increasing mode share.

A wide range of comments were made at the RTP public workshops. The following is a sampling of some of the comments received:

- Strong support for more bike projects, more bike racks on buses and trolleys, and related connections to transit stations;
- Suggestions on transit line extensions in particular areas (e.g., streetcar from Park Blvd. to I-805 along University Avenue; light rail to North County; streetcar along Monroe Avenue);
- Observation that places with great transit systems (e.g., London, Paris, Sydney, Moscow, San Francisco) have underground stations and lines;
- Support for extension of the planned high speed rail system to the international U.S./Mexico border;
- Support for building an extensive transit system (“build it and they will come” notion);
- Concern over the lack of funding for transit services and the related suggestion to be less ambitious in the transit planning process;
- Need for more real-time information at transit stations;
- Encouragement for the use of smaller buses to increase efficiency;
- Preference for the “Many Centers” alternative;
- Support for priority measures to bypass areas with traffic congestion and improve travel times;
- Concern about future mobility for seniors and the need to plan ahead to meet their needs for “aging in place;”
- Encouragement for expanding sidewalks and planting street trees to make walking and biking more pleasant, particularly at transit stations;
- Appreciation for the Spanish translation at the workshops.

SANDAG also is encouraging additional comments via the web site through on-line comment cards at www.sandag.org/uats.
Peer Review Panel Key Findings

As a unique part of the planning process, SANDAG assembled a Peer Review Panel to critically assess the alternative networks. The Peer Review Panel, which consisted of two public sector and two private sector panelists with extensive professional experience in land use, economics, transportation, congestion management, transit management, and transit oriented development, convened in San Diego during the week of April 19, 2010. (Peer Review Panel biographies are included in Attachment 6.)

Generally, the Peer Review Panel felt that Transit Propensity and Many Centers transit networks had merit and could each result, to varying degrees, in a successful long-term transit network. The Panel stated that while the 2050 RTP will define the region’s long-term mobility vision, the plan’s ultimate success will be grounded in the implementation of near-term demonstration or “catalyst” projects that showcase elements of the transit vision, particularly the integration of transit into smart growth areas. More specifically, the following observations were made about the alternative transit scenarios:

- **Transit Propensity**: The Panel observed that this scenario may be too focused on some geographically-concentrated areas to the exclusion of other areas (such as major employment areas, University City, and North County) to meet the region’s long-term mobility goals.

- **Commuter Point-to-Point**: The Panel expressed nervousness about promulgating a type of mobility that supports a dispersed land use pattern. The Panel felt that this scenario may encourage longer trips by both autos and transit, and that this scenario portrayed a more “business as usual” approach that may not have the ability to influence land use decisions toward more integrated communities and sustainability.

- **Many Centers**: The Panel commented that this scenario provides a solid vision, but may need to be refined. Panelists suggested focusing transit investments into a smaller number of smart growth centers that either already have high housing and employment densities, or have smart growth plans in the early phases of the regional growth forecast, thereby placing a priority on existing and near-term smart growth. The Panel recommended that SANDAG revisit its Smart Growth Concept Map and consider making changes that might coalesce the smaller smart growth areas into larger ones, thereby promoting “smarter” smart growth.

In addition, the Panel provided broader, more global observations, as follows:

- **Economic Competitiveness**: Transportation is seen as the major driver of regions’ economic competitiveness, and an increased focus on developing public transit systems is seen as a key factor in cities around the world for meeting mobility needs that ensure long-term economic sustainability.

- **Technological Savviness**: All over the world, technology is increasingly being used to market transportation options and other services to individuals based on user-preferences. Integrated electronic cards, such as the Octopus Card in Hong Kong and the Oyster Card in England, are providing tremendous potential to the private sector for marketing goods and
services to end users; to the public sector for tailoring, directing, and providing incentives for transit/transportation services to end users; and for users who receive incentives and discounts for many kinds of products and services based on established purchasing choices. Global technology firms are actively seeking opportunities to develop markets. The Compass Card in the San Diego region is a solid start, and the region should proactively work to expand the Compass Card services beyond transportation to provide users with more convenience and incentives, and to maximize the region’s ability to direct future transportation marketing decisions.

- **World Class Region**: The San Diego region has true potential of becoming a world class region. The focus of the Urban Area Transit Strategy should shift from developing a “world class transit system” to developing a “transportation system that supports a world class region and its local communities.”

- **Sustainability and Co-Benefits**: In addition to pursuing transit as a means to help meet the Senate Bill 375 (SB 375) (Steinberg, 2008) regulatory mandates to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, transit also can help provide alternative transportation options, reduce foreign energy dependency, improve air quality, and reduce the proportion of American budgets spent on transportation. In addition, any co-benefits from smart growth development patterns and integrated transit systems should be highlighted and promoted, including internal trip capture, increased walking and biking, and carbon reductions in energy, waste, and water resulting from green building programs.

- **Land Use Development around Transit Stations**: Land use developers around the world recognize the economic potential for redevelopment around transit stations. Increasingly, the public sector is participating more directly with the private sector in the planning, design, and implementation of these types of redevelopment projects that result in more transit-oriented uses and direct economic benefits to the public sector that can then be invested back into transit infrastructure development. The Panel cited the proposed Tecolote Road, Clairemont Drive, and Balboa Avenue station sites along the Mid-Coast light-rail transit alignment as prime examples where such public/private partnerships could be forged. Additionally, the Panel expressed concern over the proposed Genesee Avenue alignment in the University City area, where an elevated trackway and station are currently proposed in order to minimize impacts on auto traffic. The Panel felt that the added costs of grade-separation versus an at-grade alignment may not be justified given the benefit that would accrue to the overall transportation system with the addition of the Mid-Coast project. They emphasized the importance of having transit facilities at the ground level as a means to better integrate into the surrounding community rather than forcing a separation from vehicle traffic as a traditional method of addressing congestion.

- **Land Use, Freeways, and Parking**: Land use density, design, and mix are essential components of a successful urban fabric and transit system. Locations that have limited parking and freeway expansions, and have simultaneously added an array transit services, have increased the overall performance of their transit systems and have increased transit mode share. The Panel felt that SANDAG should more directly reward communities that currently have high land use densities near transit stations, and should more directly influence land development in areas that currently have regional transit services. In addition, the Panel encouraged SANDAG to work more directly with the development
community to build higher-density projects at stations, and to evaluate the allocation of affordable housing through the Regional Housing Needs Assessment process. In addition, the Panel expressed concerns that the region’s Managed Lanes could be counterproductive toward transit if not properly implemented and operated, and suggested that SANDAG should monitor transit productivity as the Managed Lanes and Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) systems are implemented.

- **Project Prioritization**: The process to prioritize the funding of transportation projects needs to be easily understood by policymakers and the public, and needs to be conducted through a transparent process. A “policy audit table” example was provided. The audit helps to bridge the gap between the goals and objectives included in policy documents and the proposed transportation projects to help identify which transportation projects align with which policies, and alternatively which policies may not be addressed by any transportation projects.

- **Leadership and Champions**: Places that have successful transit systems have had strong leaders and champions to promote transit. Increasingly, bicycle and pedestrian advocates are supporting transit when they see opportunities for enhancements between the various modes. All successful transit systems need proactive and well-informed champions.

- **Dedicated Funding Sources**: Obtaining dedicated funding sources for transit is critical. In some cases, placing initiatives on the ballot solely for transit (versus for additional transportation modes and/or for other services) has culminated in success. (Within this context, the Panel recognized the difficulty of reaching California’s two-thirds voter approval threshold for new special taxes.) The Panel also noted the potential of exploring a subregional funding approach in San Diego as an innovative concept that should be pursued.

In addition to the group findings, several Peer Review Panelists also contributed individual opinions, summarizing their observations of the region’s strengths and weaknesses. Those individual viewpoints are contained in Attachment 7.

**Proposed Transit Mode Share Goals**

The Urban Area Transit Strategy work program includes developing peak period transit mode share goals for regionally significant corridors / communities for 2050. As presented to the Transportation Committee in April, there are two general issues that must be addressed in identifying mode share goals: first, how to determine the most suitable corridors/communities for which to establish mode share goals; and second, how to set an appropriate mode share goal for the selected areas. Theoretically, the goals should be ambitious yet achievable; based on quantifiable trends and patterns; and have the ability to be measured over time. As a starting point for identifying where transit mode share goals would be most appropriate, staff identified geographic areas and travel corridors based on:

- High volume travel corridors (all motorized trips), both current and future, that factor in trip purpose, trip origins and destinations, and time of day (such as peak-period vs. off-peak);

- Major job centers that attract large volumes of peak period trips;
• Land use patterns that focus on locations with transit-supportive land uses (such as higher densities, walkable communities) and where access to transit (and often existing transit mode share) is high; and

• Existing transit markets that have been identified through the Metropolitan Transit System Comprehensive Operational Analysis (COA) and the North County Transit District Mobility Plan to ensure that RTP transit mode share goals are consistent with current short-range transit plans.

Attachment 8 illustrates the travel corridors, major employment areas, and high activity areas for use in identifying peak period transit mode share goals. As an initial methodology, staff suggested to the Transportation Committee that a preliminary range of mode share goals be developed for the identified areas by using peak period transit mode share projections from two “baseline” scenarios for a low and high end of the range.

The Reasonably Expected Revenue scenario and the Unconstrained scenario in the adopted 2030 RTP overlaid onto the land use inputs from the 2050 Regional Growth Forecast were originally intended to serve as the baseline scenarios, or starting points, for developing the transit mode share goal ranges. However, the initial model runs indicate that there is insufficient variation in the range between these baseline scenarios to yield meaningful low and high mode share ranges.

As a result, staff is proposing an alternative approach similar to one used in the 1997 South East Queensland Integrated Transport Plan in Brisbane, Australia. Very few areas have actually established transit mode share goals for corridors or communities. The Brisbane approach involved aiming to increase the proportion of trips made on public transit by 50 percent between 1997 and the plan’s target year, which was 2011. The Brisbane plan recognized that achieving a 50 percent increase in public transit’s share of all travel would be an ambitious, yet achievable target over the 14-year planning period. There was initial discussion of doubling the mode share (increasing it to 100 percent), and it was found that that goal would be impossible without requiring significant revisions to curtail the expansion of urbanization and strict new measures to restrain single-occupancy vehicle use during peak-period commute times. Neither of those actions appeared to be possible at that time in Brisbane, given community lifestyle and travel patterns, but the plan left open the possibility of revisiting the target in future plans.

In the case of the San Diego region, the proposed approach would be even more ambitious than the Brisbane method. In the urbanized area of the San Diego region, the staff recommendation is to start with a more aggressive base year - a base year consisting of a combination of the 2030 RTP transportation network and the 2050 land uses1 as the foundation upon which to increase transit mode share in the urban area. This would provide a higher starting point for any proposed mode share increase. Staff then proposes applying a goal of a 25 percent increase in the peak period transit mode share over this 2030/2050 base. (This approach is different than the Brisbane method, which used their

---

1The base year assumes the higher mode share value of either the currently adopted 2030 Reasonably Expected RTP or the 2030 Unconstrained RTP, combined with the 2050 land uses.
existing base year of 1997 as the starting point for their 50 percent increase.) The approach would be applied to the urban area, as well as to the identified corridors/areas.2

For example, the current 2030 RTP Unconstrained network would increase the mode share for peak period, home-to-work trips within the Urban Area Transit Strategy study area from the 2008 level of 5 percent to the 2030 projected level of 9 percent, an increase of 90 percent between 2008 and 2030. Applying the 25 percent goal would mean increasing the 2030 RTP mode share an additional 25 percent from 9 percent to 11 percent as the starting point for the 2050 transit mode share goal for the study area. The end result would be a rise in the mode share by 141 percent between 2008 and 2050. Because the year 2050 is 40 years away, and the current tools to predict human travel behavior that far into the future are not completely accurate, staff is proposing that we generalize the goals into “goal ranges” based on patterns of geographic groupings. This would result in a 10-15 percent mode share goal range for the urban area. This would approximately triple the peak period home-to-work transit mode share in the urban area during this time period.

Attachment 9 contains the information described above, and the transit mode share goal ranges based on the geographic groupings for the various corridors/areas. Attachments 10a, 10b and 10c illustrate the 2008 transit mode shares, the mode shares for the 2030 RTP Network with the 2050 land uses, and the proposed 2050 transit mode share goal ranges from a geographic perspective.

Over the next few months, staff proposes to conduct sensitivity tests by corridor/area to see how various adjustments could further affect transit mode share. These may include options such as increasing transit frequencies, increasing transit travel speeds, testing parking pricing, adjusting land use assumptions, or other scenarios to help refine the peak period home-to-work transit mode share goal ranges.

In addition, in an effort to consider mobility options from a multimodal perspective, staff also will examine mode share goals for walking/biking, carpooling, and vanpooling, which when combined with transit mode share goals, can ultimately provide a more comprehensive view of overall non-single occupancy vehicle peak period mode share for incorporation into the 2050 RTP.

Initial Transit System Performance

The three alternative transit networks will be compared against one another, as well as against a baseline scenario, which consists of an overlay between the land use assumptions included in the 2050 Regional Growth Forecast and the 2030 RTP transportation network. The performance measures are organized into categories that line up with six objectives that support the overall transit goals for the San Diego region in 2050:

- Increase peak period mode share
- Maximize transit ridership
- Develop a cost-effective and implementable transit system
- Support an efficient and effective transportation system
- Address the need for sustainability and environmental justice
- Make transit more time competitive with the car

2Having transit mode share goals for the urban area and for several specific corridors/areas, rather than a single regionwide transit mode share goal better reflects how transit investments are made, that is, focused on specific areas where the propensity for using transit is the highest.
The full set of performance measures were presented to the Transportation Committee at its April 16, 2010, meeting, and are available on the website at www.sandag.org/uats. A preliminary, high-level summary of the performance of each network will be presented at the meeting.

2050 RTP Transportation Network Scenarios

In developing the 2050 RTP, the Unconstrained Transportation Network represents the region’s vision for reasonable transit, highway, and arterial improvements and operations to meet travel demand in 2050.

Defining the Unconstrained Network is an important step in developing an updated RTP because it establishes the broadest network, from which funding scenarios will be identified that will build and operate as much of the network as possible, given revenue availability and flexibility, and project priorities.

Once the Unconstrained Network is defined, staff will prioritize all of the future projects in this network, using the updated transportation project evaluation criteria. Alternative Revenue Constrained transportation network scenarios will be developed using this prioritized project list for discussion by the Board of Directors. These scenarios will be evaluated using performance measures leading to the selection of a preferred Revenue Constrained Network.

As previously discussed with the Board of Directors, SB 375 requires that the 2050 RTP include an SCS as a new element, in addition to the traditional policy, action, and financial elements. The 2010 Regional Transportation Plan Guidelines adopted by the California Transportation Commission on April 7, 2010, establish that the RTP must be an “internally consistent” document (i.e., all four elements of the RTP must be consistent with one another). As a result, transportation investments and the forecasted development pattern in the SCS should be complementary and not contradictory.

Federal regulations require that the RTP be financially constrained and include a financial plan that demonstrates how the adopted transportation plan can be implemented (Title 23 CFR Part 450.322(f)(10)). The financial plan must demonstrate that projects included in the RTP can be implemented using committed, available, or reasonably available revenue sources (Title 23 CFR Part 450.104).

Therefore, to achieve consistency among all RTP elements, the SCS must be developed to match the financially (or revenue) constrained plan. The 2050 RTP Environmental Impact Report (EIR) will analyze the Revenue Constrained plan as the Proposed Project. Project alternatives also will be analyzed in the EIR.

Similarly to the refinements being made to the Urban Area Transit Strategy alternatives, SANDAG and Caltrans staff are analyzing potential modifications to the 2030 RTP Unconstrained highway network. These modifications will be based on supporting proposed transit investments in key corridors and providing an adequate level of service for the overall transportation system.
Next Steps

Based on discussion today and on additional input to be received from SANDAG working groups, Policy Advisory Committees, and forums over the next month, staff will begin to assemble initial recommendations for a preferred 2050 transit network that will likely be a combination of the networks from the three alternatives being evaluated as part of the 2050 Urban Area Transit Strategy, combined with a preferred 2050 highway network that, together with transportation demand and system management measures, could form the basis of the preferred 2050 Unconstrained Transportation Network. Initial thoughts on a draft preferred Unconstrained Network will be presented next month.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director
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Draft Initial Transit Concepts

**Transit Propensity:**

*Expands Transit in the Most Urbanized Areas*

Builds on the San Diego region’s innovative trolley system - expands transit in the central core and in the region’s most urbanized areas, many of which are characterized by pre-World War II street grid patterns. Provides very frequent transit services, alleviating riders from schedules and allowing easy transfers. Major investments may include streetcars, grade separations, priority treatments, transit nodes, expanded light rail, enhanced bike and walk access, and improvements to the public realm.

**Commuter Point-to-Point:**

*Emphasizes Quick Access to Work*

Transit to work is an easy option - leverages new dedicated transit facilities and flexible use of Managed Lanes to serve work trips. A system of few transfers provides high speed, reliable commute options during peak periods with a variety of “last-mile” treatments. Major investments may include Managed Lanes with inline stations, park and ride lots, new fixed guideways, and some rail expansion.

**Many Centers:**

*Connects Local Smart Growth Areas and Activity Centers*

Supports the San Diego region’s local commitments to smart growth - consists of a multi-radial transit system serving the region’s larger-scale smart growth areas and major activity centers. Transit services are oriented toward the centers, and supported with frequent connections between the centers. Major investments may include a variety of transit priority treatments between centers, expanded light rail, enhanced transit centers, shuttles and streetcars connecting to the transit centers, enhanced bike and walk access, and improvements to the urban realm.
John M. Inglish – General Manager/CEO, Utah Transit Authority (UTA)

John Inglish has worked in the transportation industry for more than 35 years. With an engineering background, Mr. Inglish began his career in 1970 as a systems planning engineer for the Utah State Highway Department. In the early 1970s he began working for the Wasatch Front Regional council on the early initiatives that formed today’s UTA. In 1977, he became the director of Transit Development for UTA, and in August 1997, the UTA Board of Trustees appointed Mr. Inglish as the general manager for the Authority. Under his leadership, UTA has garnered national and worldwide recognition for its transportation systems. He oversaw funding and construction of the $312.5 million Sandy to Salt Lake TRAX light rail line, completing the 15-mile TRAX line one year ahead of schedule and under budget, as well as the $118.5 million University TRAX light rail line connecting downtown Salt Lake City and the University of Utah in time for the 2002 Winter Olympics.

Martin Tuttle – Deputy Director, Planning and Modal Programs for the California Department of Transportation

Martin Tuttle has more than 25 years of top transportation and innovative land use planning management experience at the local, regional and state levels of government. As Deputy Director of Planning and Modal Programs at Caltrans, Mr. Tuttle is responsible for the Caltrans Divisions of Local Assistance, Mass Transportation, Planning, Rail, Aeronautics and Transportation System Information. As the executive director of the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG), he launched its nationally-recognized “Blueprint” transportation and land use growth plan. Mr. Tuttle also has served as the executive director of the Solano Transportation Authority (STA). As a top staff member to Assembly Majority Leader Tom Hannigan in the California State Legislature for 13 years, Mr. Tuttle managed innovative land-use and transportation reform legislation, including the bill establishing the successful Capitol Corridor intercity rail service between Sacramento and San Jose. Prior to joining Caltrans, he oversaw transit oriented development and urban infill housing projects for URS Corporation and New Faze Development.

George Hazel – Chairman, MRC McLean Hazel Ltd

George Hazel has extensive experience in all aspects of transport and communications, both urban and rural. He has specific expertise in strategic planning and policy development, the integration of transportation with other related areas, the prioritization of projects with respect to economic, environmental, and social objectives, and innovative funding of transportation infrastructure around the world. He has studied all forms of transportation policy around the world, including congestion charging and demand management, mode shift, goods movement, and growth management. Mr. Hazel has worked in the public, private, and academic sectors at a senior level and has acted as advisor to the Academy of Sustainable Communities, the Commission for Integrated Transport, Transport for London, the Queensland State Government, the Greater Toronto and Hamilton Region, the City of San Diego and many government agencies around the United Kingdom. Currently an honorary professor at the Robert Gordon University and adjunct professor at the Queensland University of Technology, Mr. Hazel has published a book on Making Cities Work and presents at conferences around the world.

Aidan Hughes – Principal, Arup

Aidan Hughes is the leader of Arup’s planning practice in the US, which focuses on integrated urbanism and sustainable planning and design. Mr. Hughes brings over 20 years experience and a proven track record in the management of complex multi-disciplinary projects. He consults to municipal governments, transportation agencies, and developers, and is currently leading the sustainable redevelopment of the Concord Naval Weapons Station in Concord, CA. A major part of the redevelopment program is compliance with California AB 32 (global warming act) and evaluating and mitigating carbon emissions from transportation, energy, and other sources for each redevelopment alternative. He also is involved in the Treasure Island Sustainability Planning project in San Francisco. Mr. Hughes is a USGBC LEED Accredited Professional, has worked in Europe, Asia and the United States, and has a broad understanding of the global approaches to delivering successful planning and infrastructure projects.
AIDAN HUGHES – PRINCIPAL, ARUP

Strengths

1. SANDAG has a strong relationship with the two transit operators and has good relationships with the Cities. This allows you to establish bold visions and work together to deliver on the vision. A more fractured relationship can get mired in delay and compromise.

2. SANDAG and the two operators have a very capable and experienced staff complemented with strong and committed leadership at the political and executive level. This translates into an ambition for leadership – learning from global best practice and seeking innovation in delivery and operation.

3. The existing system is operating successfully with strong farebox recovery and good coverage in the core areas. Much of the backbone system is in place through the LRT, Coaster and Sprinter systems linked into regional and international transport networks. While from the “inside” there is a recognition of some of the operational difficulties (for example, operating the trolley in the downtown), the public perception appears to be very positive. This establishes a strong platform for getting acceptance of system expansion and support for raising new capital. This also brings a responsibility to continue to deliver high quality service with clear benefits for riders as new projects are delivered.

Weaknesses

1. The Smart Growth plan is valuable as a comprehensive tool and it is being used appropriately as the basis for the transit networks. However, it is a bottom-up plan (the best the Cities are prepared to do right now) and it is not directly related to the availability of transit. There is an opportunity for SANDAG to take a lead in punching up the Smart Growth plan by using the carrot of transit investment to encourage Smart(er) Growth. Where there are proposed transit investments, they should be directly linked to some “threshold” metrics for smart growth.

2. The discussion we had around elevated light rail was interesting. It points to a fundamental issue that will face all projects, namely whether a case can (or should) be made to give transit priority in terms of road space at the expense of the auto. A greater commitment should be made to support trade-offs in favor of transit – case studies around the nation and world have demonstrated that this can be achieved with little downside. The upside is an ability to increase ridership, demonstrate the benefits of transit and make more complete communities with transit at its core. In many ways, this philosophical change in emphasis will be the platform for the world class community vision.

3. As we noted “parking is a big issue” and it is interesting that you have experience of the negative consequences in relation to parking for the downtown ballpark. We didn’t have time to address parking in all its complexities as part of the peer review, but parking policies should be dealt with as essential complementary measures to support successful transit.

GEORGE HAZEL – CHAIRMAN, MRC MCLEAN HAZEL LTD

Strengths

1. Enthusiasm, understanding and competence of the team.

2. History of what you’ve done to date to build on.

3. In general, an exciting plan to deliver in a potentially world class city – you’re not there yet!

Weaknesses

1. Attitudes to not inconveniencing cars - unless you sort this out and the leadership backs and understands that it is the city’s and the car drivers’ best interests to have a world class transit system and give it top priority and road space, then you will find it very difficult. Discussion on elevated section of Mid-Coast is a key example.

2. Governance needs to be sorted - too many agencies saying different things and doing different things.

3. I worry about managed lanes as a transit policy, specifically that they could be counterproductive toward the performance of transit. I would suggest experimenting with peak time express transit service or local off-peak service and monitor the results.

In addition you should really look at the potential of Intelligent Commuting Technology (ICT) and the Transport Retail Model, building on the Compass Card you have, and also the potential regarding capturing increased land value to fund transit.
Major Travel Corridors and Areas for Use in Identifying Initial Mode Share Goals

- Major Travel Corridor
- Major Employment Area
- High Activity Area
### Urban Area Transit Strategy

Proposed Transit Mode Share Goal Ranges for Identified Corridors and Areas and Supporting Data

**Peak-Period, Home-to-Work Trips**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identified Corridors/Areas</th>
<th>Baseline Data</th>
<th>Supporting Data</th>
<th>Proposed Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008 Existing Transit</td>
<td>2030 RTP With 2050 Land Uses**</td>
<td>25% Increase Over 2030 RTP</td>
<td>Change From 2030 RTP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Major Employment Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>25% Increase Over 2030 RTP</th>
<th>Change From 2030 RTP</th>
<th>Change From 2008 Existing Transit</th>
<th>2050 Peak-Period Transit Mode Share Goal Ranges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Downtown San Diego</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30% ++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University City</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>442%</td>
<td>15%-20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorrento Mesa</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>588%</td>
<td>10%-15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kearny Mesa</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>358%</td>
<td>10%-15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otay Mesa/Otay Ranch</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>150%</td>
<td>5%-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palomar Airport</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>400%</td>
<td>5%-10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### High Activity Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>25% Increase Over 2030 RTP</th>
<th>Change From 2030 RTP</th>
<th>Change From 2008 Existing Transit</th>
<th>2050 Peak-Period Transit Mode Share Goal Ranges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Core</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>20%-25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside/Escondido Corridor</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>245%</td>
<td>10%-15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Other Urbanized Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>25% Increase Over 2030 RTP</th>
<th>Change From 2030 RTP</th>
<th>Change From 2008 Existing Transit</th>
<th>2050 Peak-Period Transit Mode Share Goal Ranges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North I-15 Corridor</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>1150%</td>
<td>5%-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central Coastal Area</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>426%</td>
<td>10%-15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Coastal Area</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>166%</td>
<td>10%-15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal South Bay</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>10%-15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East County/El Cajon</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>138%</td>
<td>10%-15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East County/Santee</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>159%</td>
<td>5%-10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Urban Area Transit Strategy Study Area | 5% | 9% | 11% | 25% | 141% | 10%-15% |

* Values represent peak period home-to-work trip transit mode-share for destination districts.
** Values reflect projected mode share of either the currently adopted 2030 Reasonably Expected RTP or the 2030 Unconstrained RTP, whichever is higher, combined with 2050 land uses.
Values represent peak period home-to-work transit mode share for destination districts.
2030 RTP
Transit Mode Share (with 2050 Land Uses)

Values represent peak period home-to-work transit mode share for destination districts.
2050 Proposed Transit Mode Share Goal Ranges

Values represent peak period home-to-work transit mode share for destination districts.

- Under 5%
- 5% to 10%
- 10% to 15%
- 15% to 20%
- 20% to 25%
- 25% to 30%
- Over 30%
Introduction

As part of the development of the 2050 RTP, the Executive Director and Chair of the SANDAG Board of Directors established the Transportation Project Evaluation Criteria Ad Hoc Working Group (TPEC). The TPEC provides input on transportation project evaluation criteria and plan performance measures, which will support the goals and objectives for the 2050 RTP. At the March 11th, Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG) meeting, SANDAG staff provided an update on proposed transit services project evaluation criteria and the transportation project evaluation criteria weightings. For this meeting, SANDAG staff will provide an update on the proposed plan performance measures.

In fall 2009, the Board of Directors established six policy goals for the 2050 RTP. These 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 individual customer perspective (Mobility, Reliability, and System Preservation & Safety). Sustainability relates to making progress simultaneously in each of the three “Es” (Social Equity, Healthy Environment, and Prosperous Economy) from a regional perspective.

The Board of Directors also discussed policy objectives to help reach these goals. The next step is to establish performance measures to measure how well the 2050 RTP is projected to perform. Once established, performance measures will be used to aid decision makers in developing a preferred transportation network alternative for the 2050 RTP revenue constrained funding scenario and to compare the preferred transportation network alternative to other transportation network alternatives such as a current, future no build, and land use alternative.

TWG members are asked to review and provide input on the proposed plan performance measures.

Discussion

The TPEC members include representatives from the Bicycle-Pedestrian Working Group, Cities/Counties Transportation Advisory Committee, Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group, Regional Planning Technical Working Group, Tribal Transportation Technical Working Group, Caltrans, Metropolitan Transit System, North County Transit District, Port of San Diego, and San Diego County Regional Airport Authority.
The TPEC has met nine times since September 2009 and has provided initial refinements to the proposed plan performance measures included in the 2030 RTP (Attachment 1).

Plan performance measures from the 2030 RTP have been refined to take into account the 2050 RTP goals and policy objectives. Refinements also have incorporated metrics from the environmental justice and initial economic analysis work efforts.

**Next Steps**

Staff will present the proposed plan performance measures to additional working groups for input. The 2050 RTP proposed plan performance measures are expected to be presented to the Transportation Committee in May 2010.

Attachment: 1. 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Proposed Plan Performance Measures

Key Staff Contact: Scott Strelecki, (619) 699-6954; sstr@sandag.org
### QUALITY OF TRAVEL & LIVABILITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Policy Objectives</th>
<th>Potential Plan Performance Measure(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mobility</strong> - The transportation system should provide for convenient travel options for people and goods and maximize its productivity. The system should reduce both the time it takes to travel as well as the total costs of travel.</td>
<td>Tailor transportation improvements to better connect people with jobs and other activities&lt;br&gt;Provide convenient travel choices including transit, intercity and high-speed trains, driving, ridesharing, walking and biking&lt;br&gt;Preserve and expand options for regional freight movement&lt;br&gt;Provide transportation choices to better connect the San Diego region with Mexico, neighboring counties, and tribal nations</td>
<td>Average work trip travel time (in minutes)&lt;br&gt;Average work trip travel speed by mode (in m.p.h.)&lt;br&gt;Percent of work and higher education trips accessible in 30 minutes in peak periods by mode&lt;br&gt;Percent of non work-related trips accessible in 15 minutes by mode&lt;br&gt;Travel time (by mode) in key travel corridors&lt;br&gt;Peak-period mode share in key travel corridors&lt;br&gt;Number of interregional transit routes&lt;br&gt;Freight network enhancements - freight capacity (rail yards, port terminals, and ports of entry in acres and rail mainline, highway connectors to terminals, and highway truck routes in miles)&lt;br&gt;Bikeability measure (methodology TBD)&lt;br&gt;Walkability measure (methodology TBD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reliability</strong> - 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).</td>
<td>Employ new technologies to make travel more reliable and convenient&lt;br&gt;Manage the efficiency of the transportation system to improve traffic flow</td>
<td>Percent of total travel in congested conditions (peak periods)&lt;br&gt;Percent of total travel in congested conditions (all day)&lt;br&gt;Daily vehicle delay per capita&lt;br&gt;Daily truck hours of delay on the regional freight network (hours per 1,000 VMT)&lt;br&gt;VMT by travel speed (measured in 10 m.p.h. increments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>System Preservation &amp; Safety</strong> - The public’s investment in transportation should be protected by maintaining the transportation system. It is critical to preserve and ensure a safe regional transportation system.</td>
<td>Keep the region’s transportation system in a good state of repair&lt;br&gt;Reduce bottlenecks and increase safety by improving operations&lt;br&gt;Improve emergency preparedness within the regional transportation system</td>
<td>Annual weekday projected number of crashes/fatalities per capita&lt;br&gt;Percent of transportation investments towards maintenance and rehabilitation&lt;br&gt;Percent of transportation investments towards operational improvements&lt;br&gt;Emergency preparedness measure (methodology TBD)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Bold performance measures were used in the 2030 RTP and non-bold performance measures represent potential new measures. Performance measures that compare metrics of different modes include the following: auto, transit, and carpool, unless otherwise noted.
## SUSTAINABILITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Policy Objectives</th>
<th>Potential Plan Performance Measure(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Equity</strong> - The transportation system should be designed to provide an equitable level of transportation services for all populations.</td>
<td>Create equitable transportation opportunities for all populations regardless of age, ability, race, ethnicity or income  &lt;br&gt; Ensure access to jobs, services and recreation for populations with fewer transportation choices</td>
<td>Environmental Justice (EJ) and Non-EJ Populations  &lt;br&gt; (These measures will be estimated for “low-income and minority” “mobility” and “community engagement:” community types as identified in the environmental justice work effort)  &lt;br&gt; Average travel time per person trip (in minutes) by mode  &lt;br&gt; Percent of work trips accessible in 30 minutes by mode  &lt;br&gt; Percent of homes within 1/2 mile of a transit stop  &lt;br&gt; Percent of population within 30 minutes  &lt;br&gt; - healthcare (hospitals, community clinics)  &lt;br&gt; - schools (elementary, secondary, higher education - including vocational)  &lt;br&gt; - parks and recreational areas  &lt;br&gt; - the airport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Healthy Environment</strong> - The transportation system should lead to environmental sustainability and 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.</td>
<td>Develop transportation improvements that respect and enhance the environment  &lt;br&gt; Reduce greenhouse gas emissions from vehicles and continue to improve air quality in the region  &lt;br&gt; Make transportation investments that result in healthy and sustainable communities</td>
<td>Gross acres of constrained lands consumed for transit and highway infrastructure  &lt;br&gt; Total on-road fuel consumption (all day) per capita  &lt;br&gt; Smog forming pollutants (tons/year) per capita  &lt;br&gt; Systemwide VMT (all day) per capita  &lt;br&gt; Transit passenger miles (all day) per capita  &lt;br&gt; Percent of peak-period and daily trips within 1/4 mile of a transit stop  &lt;br&gt; Work trip mode share (peak periods including bike/walk)  &lt;br&gt; Average trip distance  &lt;br&gt; CO2 emissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prosperous Economy</strong> - The transportation system should play a significant role in raising the region’s standard of living.</td>
<td>Maximize the economic benefits of transportation investments  &lt;br&gt; Enhance the goods movement system to support economic prosperity</td>
<td>Net benefits  &lt;br&gt; Return on investment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FEDERAL SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES INITIATIVE

Introduction

In 2009, the U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT), U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) embarked on a new partnership aimed at providing all communities – urban, suburban, and rural – better access to affordable housing, more transportation options, and lower transportation costs. This informational report provides an overview of the Administration’s Sustainable Communities Initiative and supportive efforts within the San Diego region.

Discussion

Interagency Partnership for Sustainable Communities

In March 2009, HUD and USDOT announced a new partnership agreement to implement joint housing and transportation initiatives. Shortly thereafter, in June 2009, the EPA officially joined HUD and USDOT to create the Interagency Partnership for Sustainable Communities. This partnership will coordinate federal housing, transportation, and other infrastructure investments to protect the environment, promote equitable development, and help to address the challenges of climate change. The three agencies developed a set of guiding Livability Principles (shown below), as well as a Partnership Agreement that will guide the joint agency efforts (Attachment 1).

- **Provide more transportation choices.** Develop safe, reliable, and economical transportation choices to decrease household transportation costs, reduce our nation’s dependence on foreign oil, improve air quality, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and promote public health.

- **Promote equitable, affordable housing.** Expand location- and energy-efficient housing choices for people of all ages, incomes, races, and ethnicities to increase mobility and lower the combined cost of housing and transportation.

- **Enhance economic competitiveness.** Improve economic competitiveness through reliable and timely access to employment centers, educational opportunities, services, and other basic needs by workers, as well as through expanded business access to markets.

- **Support existing communities.** Target federal funding toward existing communities — through strategies like transit oriented, mixed-use development, and land recycling — to increase community revitalization and the efficiency of public works investments and safeguard rural landscapes.
Sustainable Communities Planning Grant Program

In the federal FY 2010 budget, Congress provided a total of $150 million to HUD for the Sustainable Communities Initiative (SCI) to improve regional planning efforts that integrate housing and transportation decisions and increase the capacity to improve land use and zoning. Of that total, approximately $100 million will be available for regional integrated planning initiatives through the HUD Sustainable Communities Planning Grant Program.

To address this new federal funding opportunity, the City of San Diego, SANDAG, and the San Diego Housing Commission collaborated on a joint letter to HUD, USDOT, and EPA, in support of the SCI. The letter, included as Attachment 2, outlined existing planning and implementation work in the San Diego region, including regionwide efforts such as the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP), Smart Growth Concept Map, and TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program, and community-focused efforts, such as the City of San Diego General Plan and San Diego housing initiatives.

On February 2, 2010, City of San Diego Mayor Jerry Sanders, SANDAG Chair Lori Holt Pfeiler, San Diego Housing Commission Executive Director Rick Gentry, and other local and business leaders, participated in meetings held in Washington, DC with the USDOT, HUD, and the White House Office of Urban Affairs. Participants shared San Diego’s experience implementing integrated land use and transportation initiatives as successful regional and local models of sustainability.

On February 4, 2010, HUD issued an Advanced Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA), which announced the agency’s intention to offer funding through a competitive process for the Sustainable Communities Planning Grant Program. Through the Advanced NOFA, HUD sought input from states, local governments, and a broad range of stakeholders on how the Grant Program should be structured in order to have the most meaningful impact on regional planning for sustainable development. In response to the Advanced NOFA, the City of San Diego, SANDAG, and the San Diego Housing Commission submitted a second joint letter to advocate for funding to support ongoing regional and local strategies to coordinate strategic planning for housing, land use, and transportation (Attachment 3).

Next Steps

The federal SCI provides an important opportunity for the San Diego region to share its efforts and successes on coordinating land use and transportation planning and promoting sustainable communities. When the NOFA for the HUD Sustainable Communities Planning Grant Program is released, staff will work with our member agencies and other stakeholders on possible grant applications as well as on future funding opportunities that become available.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Attachments: 1. HUD/DOT/EPA Partnership Agreement
              2. Joint letter to HUD/DOT/EPA dated December 22, 2009
              3. Joint response letters to HUD/DOT/EPA Advanced NOFA dated March 12, 2010

Key Staff Contact: Victoria Stackwick, (619) 699-6926, vst@sandag.org
Summary of HUD/DOT/EPA Partnership Agreement
http://www.epa.gov/smartgrowth/partnership/index.html

The HUD/DOT/EPA partnership will:

- **Enhance integrated planning and investment.** The partnership will seek to integrate housing, transportation, water infrastructure, and land use planning and investment. HUD, EPA, and DOT propose to make planning grants available to metropolitan areas and create mechanisms to ensure those plans are carried through to localities.

- **Provide a vision for sustainable growth.** This effort will help communities set a vision for sustainable growth and apply federal transportation, water infrastructure, housing, and other investments in an integrated approach that reduces the nation's dependence on foreign oil, reduces greenhouse gas emissions, protects America's air and water, and improves quality of life. Coordinating planning efforts in housing, transportation, air quality, and water — including planning cycles, processes, and geographic coverage — will make more effective use of federal housing and transportation dollars.

- **Redefine housing affordability and make it transparent.** The partnership will develop federal housing affordability measures that include housing and transportation costs and other expenses that are affected by location choices. Although transportation costs now approach or exceed housing costs for many working families, federal definitions of housing affordability do not recognize the strain of soaring transportation costs on homeowners and renters, who live in areas isolated from work opportunities and transportation choices. The partnership will redefine affordability to reflect those costs, improve the consideration of the cost of utilities, and provide consumers with enhanced information to help them make housing decisions.

- **Redevelop underutilized sites.** The partnership will work to achieve critical environmental justice goals and other environmental goals by targeting development to locations that already have infrastructure and offer transportation choices. Environmental justice is a particular concern in areas where disinvestment and past industrial use caused pollution and a legacy of contaminated or abandoned sites. This partnership will help return such sites to productive use.

- **Develop livability measures and tools.** The partnership will research, evaluate, and recommend measures that indicate the livability of communities, neighborhoods, and metropolitan areas. These measures could be adopted in subsequent integrated planning efforts to benchmark existing conditions, measure progress toward achieving community visions, and increase accountability. HUD, DOT, and EPA will help communities attain livability goals by developing and providing analytical tools to evaluate progress, as well as state and local technical assistance programs to remove barriers to coordinated housing, transportation, and environmental protection investments. The partnership will develop incentives to encourage communities to implement, use, and publicize the measures.

- **Align HUD, DOT, and EPA programs.** HUD, DOT, and EPA will work to assure that their programs maximize the benefits of their combined investments in our communities for livability, affordability, environmental excellence, and the promotion of green jobs of the
future. HUD and DOT will work together to identify opportunities to better coordinate their programs and encourage location efficiency in housing and transportation choices. HUD, DOT, and EPA also will share information and review processes to facilitate better-informed decisions and coordinate investments.

- **Undertake joint research, data collection, and outreach.** HUD, DOT, and EPA will engage in joint research, data collection, and outreach efforts with stakeholders to develop information platforms and analytic tools to track housing and transportation options and expenditures, establish standardized and efficient performance measures, and identify best practices.
December 22, 2009

Re: HUD-DOT-EPA Interagency Partnership for Sustainable Communities

We would like to take this opportunity to applaud the efforts of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Department of Transportation (DOT), and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) on your new partnership to help create sustainable and livable communities. The San Diego region is looking forward to the exciting opportunities that will result from this partnership. This letter serves to highlight the success of our local programs which provide an existing framework from which to augment your efforts.

The strong partnership between the City of San Diego, San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG), and the San Diego Housing Commission is evidenced through coordinated and strategic transportation, housing and land use planning in the San Diego area. We are committed to continue this partnership in future transit and housing investments and have attached a list of recommendations for your consideration in crafting guidelines for the Sustainable Communities Initiative.

The San Diego region faces many challenges given high land values, varied topography, and sensitive habitats, an international and military presence, and multiple jurisdictions including tribal nations. As a result, we have instituted regional as well as local measures to address these challenges and have supported the integration of housing and transportation investments for almost two decades. SANDAG, our local Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), has developed numerous innovative plans that provide a framework for future transit oriented development efforts. The Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) provides a regional strategic planning framework that encourages increased residential and employment concentrations in areas with existing and future transit connections, while preserving open space in one of the most bio-diverse areas in the continental United States.

A key ingredient to successfully implementing the RCP is the Smart Growth Concept Map, which contains approximately 200 existing and potential smart growth locations where high density, compact development can be supported by existing or future transit. SANDAG also has programs and dedicated funding to support projects located in identified smart growth areas. The Smart Growth Incentive Program, a program that capitalizes current and future investment in transportation and transportation-related infrastructure and planning, serves as a vehicle to get projects on the ground and produce tangible results. The program is funded through a dedicated
Multiple jurisdictions within the region have updated general plans or are in the process of updating general plans to complement and support the RCP. The City of San Diego recently adopted a landmark General Plan designed to complement and support the region’s RCP. The 2008 General Plan is principled upon a “City of Villages” strategy that focuses growth into mixed-use activity centers that are pedestrian friendly districts linked to an improved regional transit system and offer a variety of housing types. This year, San Diego will receive the honor of their most prestigious award. The American Planning Association has named San Diego as the winner of its most prestigious award, The Daniel Burnham Award for a Comprehensive Plan, for its 2008 General Plan.

The plans and strategies that have been developed in the San Diego region with its 19 local jurisdictions have applicability to other metropolitan areas as well as smaller cities and towns. The region’s large land area comprised of coastline, mountains, desert and canyons requires an approach that that offers applicability at different scales and geographies to protect land forms and the environment. For example, the City of San Diego’s “City of Villages” strategy employs a scalable approach that increases housing supply and diversity through the development of compact, mixed-use villages in specified areas that are supported by multiple modes of mobility. These village and density contexts include lower-scale neighborhood “Main Streets,” the conversion of strip auto-oriented corridors into transit corridors, moderate scale community districts, and downtown San Diego, our highest density mixed-use area. On a broader scale, the jobs/housing relationship is being designed to reduce commutes by linking villages to employment centers and other specialized destination areas.

There are several incentives that are being used throughout the region to support affordable housing development including density bonuses, parking reductions and inclusionary housing requirements. These serve to increase the supply and diversity of housing opportunities and distribute them according to smart growth principles. The San Diego Housing Commission (SDHC) is currently engaged in an effort to develop an action plan that economically integrates housing affordable to surrounding employment opportunities and transportation infrastructure that is already in place and/or planned for the near future.

The SDHC has been an active participant in the national discussion on combining Transit Oriented Development (TOD) and housing development initiatives. In addition, in November 2009, SDHC began to develop a three year strategic plan, including specific activities and time frames that would establish a TOD Plan for the Housing Commission.

Important work in local and regional climate change planning also is underway. The San Diego region will be the first to implement California Senate Bill 375, which requires both the regions and local jurisdictions to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through a “Sustainable Communities
Strategy” that aligns transportation and land use. SANDAG has already begun the process to develop this strategy as part of its 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), which will be ideally suited for integration with federal initiatives. Likewise, SANDAG has developed a draft Regional Climate Action Plan that will include an inventory of regional GHG emissions and identify policy and planning methods to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in the region from a variety of sources. Additionally, the City of San Diego was the first city in California to update its General Plan and undergo review by the State Attorney General’s Office pertaining to climate change, following the passage of California Assembly Bill 32.

As evidenced above, the San Diego region is well positioned to enter into a new era that focuses on infill development and sustainable communities. As gas prices continue to rise and the need to reduce greenhouse gas emissions grows more urgent, the types of development and infrastructure investments fostered by our local and regional plans will help people adapt to, and prosper in, a reduced carbon and more sustainable future. We look forward to leveraging our local success to advance your interagency livability principles and we thank you for your consideration of our policy recommendations.

Sincerely,

HON. JERRY SANDERS
Mayor
City of San Diego

HON. LORI HOLT PFEILER
Chair
SANDAG

RICHARD C. GENTRY
Executive Director
San Diego Housing Commission
March 12, 2010

Office of Sustainable Housing and Communities
Department of Housing and Urban Development
451 7th Street, S.W., Room 10180
Washington, DC 20410

Re: Sustainable Communities Planning Grant Program Advance Notice and Request for Comments, Docket No. FR-5396-N-01

On behalf of the City of San Diego, the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) and the San Diego Housing Commission, we are writing in response to the Sustainable Communities Planning Grant Program Advance Notice and Request for Comments, Docket No. FR-5396-N-01. We commend the efforts and the leadership provided by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and look forward to working together to develop sound strategies that promote the sustainability and livability objectives set forth in this initiative.

The San Diego region recognized very early on that sustainable planning would be necessary in order to ensure that our communities develop and grow into thriving economic engines that maintain quality of life while accounting for growth. Regarding our diverse population and varied topography, the San Diego region has instituted regional as well as local measures to coordinate strategic planning for housing, land use, and transportation.

SANDAG has focused on integrating housing, economic development, and transportation decision-making through four major regional planning efforts: adoption of a Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP), a Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA), a Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), and the development of a Smart Growth Concept Map that identifies 200 existing and potential smart growth locations where high density, compact development can be supported by existing or future transit. Additionally, the City of San Diego adopted a landmark General Plan in 2008 which services as the comprehensive planning document for the City. It was designed to complement and support the region’s RCP.

San Diego’s success in achieving broad consensus is demonstrated through adopted plans and policies that support sustainable land use planning. Given our achievements in this area, we will not be responding to the first category of funding - Regional Plans for Sustainable Development. Rather, we have prepared the following comments in response to the second and third categories as well as comments about entities eligible for funding:
Comments Category 2 - Detailed Execution Plans and Programs

1) What types of activities should be eligible for funding?

Examples of eligible activities include:

- Developing corridor-level plans that incorporate affordable and workforce housing projects
- Preparing comprehensive land use and multi-modal plans and environmental impact reports for a network of Transit Oriented Development (TOD) mixed-use village plans that integrate mixed-income housing for all income levels, or housing along key transit corridor and stations
- Establishing financing mechanisms for infrastructure, public facilities, and feeder transportation systems to support implementation of TOD or corridor plans, such as community facilities districts, infrastructure financing districts, benefit assessment districts, etc.
- Developing tools to reduce regulatory barriers, such as multi-modal level of service analysis guidelines to evaluate potential transportation improvements from a multi-modal perspective
- Developing methodology for calculating environmental impacts on a per capita basis (such as water use, or vehicle miles traveled per person, as compared to a regional average), so that the overall environmental benefits of higher density, transit-oriented developments is more apparent
- Developing zoning tools to efficiently implement the plans through ministerial and low-level discretionary review that could be replicated elsewhere (examples would be by-right mixed-use zones, urban heat island regulations, innovative parking standards, and small lot townhouse zones to efficiently implement the plans)
- Development of multi-modal “complete streets” plans and standards for a transportation network designed with all users in mind, including bicyclists, public transportation passengers, and pedestrians of all ages and abilities.

2) What criteria should be used to evaluate consistency of adopted regional plan and Livability Principles?

Examples of eligible consistency criteria could include:

- Regional comprehensive plan with specific performance measures to assess the degree to which the plans are influencing quality of life; these measures should align with the six Livability Principles, and regular performance monitoring should be reported.
- Adopted local comprehensive plans and/or specific community or neighborhood plans that include smart growth principles and strategies that support and enhance:
  - transit oriented development
  - pedestrian and bicycle environment
  - multimodal transportation

- Applicants should be able to demonstrate prior planning and implementation efforts that successfully incorporate the Livability Principles set forth in this initiative.

- Dedicated local funding sources to leverage federal funds
- Policies to link jobs with commensurate employment opportunities either through transit oriented developments or via transit to employment centers
- Economic development policies that incentivize revitalization and community investment

- Adopted regulations that encourage higher density mixed-use development with tools such as:
  - shared parking and transit-area parking reductions
  - mixed-use parking reductions
  - small-lot single family and townhouse zones
  - commercial – mixed-use zones; pedestrian-oriented commercial zones

- Adopted water conservation measures
- Adopted climate protection strategies and action plans
- Green Building Code requirements or incentives, such as California’s CALGREEN standards

- Average density of at least 30 du/acre to support affordable housing development and transit ridership
- Measures that offer public health co-benefits such as; safe routes to schools, community gardens, and pedestrian connectivity improvements
- Adopted implementation initiatives such as a Smart Growth Concept Map that guide planning and development of the region’s transit services to link housing to major activity centers
- Demonstrated private sector involvement in employer-assisted housing initiatives that increases opportunities for workforce housing within employment areas or linked to these areas by transit.
- Development of monitoring methodologies and measures for assessing CO2 and other air quality impacts
3) Should the amount of local and contributed resources to support, expand, and enhance the development of implementation strategies be rewarded in application scoring or are there other means to leverage other funds and resources?

The Program should include a minimum of 30 percent local match and should serve as a reward for entities that leverage resources to implement strategies.

**Comments Category 3- Implementation Incentives**

Given the complexities and financial challenges associated with implementing sustainable policies, we encourage HUD through the Sustainable Communities Planning Grant Program to allocate sufficient funding for Category 3. Implementation funding would provide much needed support to effectuate advanced planning efforts. Further, the Housing Commission has identified a mixed-use, transit-oriented development that is ready to be implemented. The project is reflective of the community’s goals and desires. It is consistent with the vision of the community plan relative to the project’s overall value in the spirit of sustainable communities.

1) Would pre-certification be an added value and, if so, what programs should this approach apply to? What criteria should be considered for meeting the pre-certification status?

The region supports utilizing a pre-certification approach in this program. This would provide a valuable cost and time saving mechanism to the implementation process. To implement projects funded by this initiative, the region supports allowing state level environmental review (e.g., the California Environmental Quality Act, or CEQA) to suffice as the federal environmental clearance for funded projects. When implementing the San Diego region’s Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program using federal Transportation Enhancement (TE) funds, National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requirements significantly lengthened the schedule for implementation of relatively small infrastructure projects. The added time and expenses associated with “federalizing” a smaller project may substantially increase its overall cost.

In addition to environmental precertification, areas that are able to demonstrate that they have adopted a regional vision and comprehensive plan and have implementation policies in place should be pre-certified and receive priority for Category 3 funding.

2) Is the direct support of implementation activities appropriate within this Program given the limited amount of resources and the expected modest size of grants?

Yes. Direct support of implementation activities is appropriate within this Program, as most projects should be augmented by dedicated local matching commitments. As stated earlier, a minimum 30 percent match should be required for the federal funds. To truly implement key projects, the federal funds dedicated by HUD are expected to be matched with a variety of local
funding sources. This could include local smart growth funding, other state and local housing funds, among other sources.

3) What criteria should be used to judge that an applicant successfully demonstrates that it has an adopted regional vision and that the project for funding under this category is truly catalytic?

See answer to number 4 below.

4) Specifically, what criteria should be considered for a project to be catalytic?

To provide projects that are “catalytic,” applicants should be able to demonstrate that regional and local plans and policies are in place and provide measurable opportunities for economic growth in underinvested areas; achieve balanced jobs and housing opportunities; and link with public transit investments. In underinvested areas, providing a variety of travel choices that link communities to key job areas is of great importance. Furthermore, these activities should demonstrate a high level of transferability through the implementation of tools that can be replicated in other areas.

5) What types of activities might be included, the timeframe by what time the projects should be completed and how much leveraging should be considered appropriate for demonstrating that the proposed investment will serve as the region’s commitment to a sustainable future?

The following activities could be completed within a 3-5 year timeframe (assuming precertification is allowable):

- **Housing**
  - Affordable housing gap financing
  - Housing land purchases for affordable housing
  - Site specific infrastructure needs to support transit-oriented housing development

- **Pedestrian and Bicycle**
  - Pedestrian and bike facilities
  - Enhanced pedestrian crossings
  - Streetscape enhancements such as sidewalk furniture, median landscaping, street trees, pedestrian-scale lighting
  - Traffic calming features such as pedestrian bulbouts or traffic circles

- **Parks and Public Space**
  - Urban parks/green space
  - Public plazas
• Transit
  • Pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure need to connect housing to transit stop or stations ("last 100 yards")
  • Transit stop and station amenities
• Sustainability/Conservation
  • Green streets green that provide multiple sustainability benefits
  • Green public civic buildings that provide multiple sustainability benefits
  • Energy efficiency retrofits
  • Water wise tree planting
• Community Development
  • Wayfinding signage
  • Community gateway features

Entities Eligible for Funding

1) Should certain entities be required partners in multi-jurisdictional regions such as MPO, or a rural planning organization or network of rural planning organizations?

Yes. Partnerships should be required and should consist of local jurisdictions, metropolitan planning organizations, and local housing authorities.

2) What units of Government should be allowed to serve as a lead agency for funding purposes?

In regards to funding administered by the U.S Department of Housing and Community Development (HUD), local jurisdictions or housing authorities should be allowed to serve as lead agencies. (When U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) funding opportunities are provided, funding should be administered through MPO’s).

3) What should demonstrate commitment on the part of each member organization, and whether there should be a minimum number of member organizations?

Funding should only be available to units of general local government or regional entities composed of local governments. To the extent practicable, membership organizations should demonstrate partnerships that reflect the interagency goals of HUD/DOT/EPA. This could be achieved through Memorandums of Understanding or other partnership mechanisms and institutional frameworks. The federal government should not mandate the number of agencies needed for collaboration but rather look at the partnerships on a project-specific level and assess the proper degree of collaboration necessary to make the project successful.
As evidenced above, the San Diego region is committed to continued infill development and sustainable communities. We appreciate the opportunity to provide comments on HUD's future funding initiative and we look forward to leveraging our local success to advance your interagency livability principles.

Sincerely,

HON. LORI HOLT PFIEILER
Chair
SANDAG

HON. JERRY SANDERS
Mayor
City of San Diego

RICHARD C. GENTRY
Executive Director
San Diego Housing Commission
Purpose of Report

- Transit network alternatives
- Proposed transit mode share goals
- Performance of transit networks
- 2050 RTP Unconstrained Transportation Network
Urban Area Transit Strategy

Urban Area
Initial Transit Concepts

Transit Propensity
Expands Transit in the Most Urbanized Areas

Commuter Point-to-Point
Emphasizes Quick Access to Work

Many Centers:
Connects Local Smart Growth Areas and Activity Centers

All Scenarios

- High Speed Rail
- COASTER Rail
- Light Rail Transit
- Bus Rapid Transit
- Rapid Bus
- Streetcar
- High Frequency Local Bus Service
Transit Propensity
Expanding Transit in the Most Urbanized Areas

High Speed Rail
FASTER Rail
Light Rail Transit
Bus Rapid Transit
Rapid Bus
Streetcar
High Frequency Local Bus Services

Commuter Point-to-Point
Emphasizing Quick Access to Work

High Speed Rail
FASTER Rail
Light Rail Transit
Bus Rapid Transit
Peak Bus Rapid Transit Commuter
Rapid Bus
Streetcar
High Frequency Local Bus Services
Many Centers
Connects Smart Growth Areas and Activity Centers

What Are People Saying?
• Transportation Committee
• Working Groups
• RTP Public Workshops
• Peer Review Panel
Peer Review Panel

• Comments on Transit Networks
• More global observations

Peer Review Panel – Comments on Networks

• Preference for Transit Propensity and Many Centers alternatives
• Long term / short term balance
• Transit Propensity – too focused
• Commuter Point to Point – business as usual
• Many Centers – too broad
Peer Review Panel – Global Views

- Economic Competitiveness
- Technological Savvyness
- Land Use Development around Transit Stations
- Land Use, Freeways, and Parking
- Leadership and Champions
- Dedicated Funding Sources

Proposed Transit Mode Share Goals

- Two issues:
  - Identifying areas
  - Setting goals
- Initial methodology
- New methodology
  - 25% increase over 2030 RTP with 2050 Land Uses
  - Goal ranges
## Proposed Transit Mode Share Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identified Corridors/Areas</th>
<th>Baseline Data</th>
<th>Supporting Data</th>
<th>Proposed Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2008 Existing Transit</td>
<td>2030 RTP With 2150 Land Uses</td>
<td>25% Increase Over 2008 RTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Employment Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown San Diego</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University City</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoran Area</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keamy Area</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside/Oceanside County</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poway-Ramona</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Activity Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Core</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside/Oceanside County</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Urbanized Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North I-15 Corridor</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central Coastal Area</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Coastal Area</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal South Bay</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East County/C&amp;Q</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East County/San Die</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Area Transit Strategy Study Area</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Demonstration

- **University City**: 15-20% increase with 69% total change.
- **Central Core**: 20-25% increase with 442% total change.
- **Oceanside/Escando**: 10-15% increase with 245% total change.
- **Urban Area**: 10-15% increase with 141% total change.
Geographic Distribution of Transit Mode Share

2008 2030 2050

Performance of Transit Networks

• Measures
  – Peak period mode share
  – Transit ridership
  – Cost effectiveness
  – Efficiency
  – Sustainability and environmental justice
  – Time competitiveness

• Common Assumptions
  – Constant highway network
  – 2050 land uses
### Relative Performance of Transit Networks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Transit Propensity</th>
<th>Commuter Pt to Pt</th>
<th>Many Centers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily Transit Person Trips</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak Period Transit Person Trips</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Efficiency</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs w/in ½ mile of major transit stations</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing w/in ½ mile of major transit stations</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compatibility with Regional Bike Plan</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prelim ROM Cost Estimate - Capital</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Lowest</td>
<td>Highest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prelim ROM Cost Estimate - Operating</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Lowest</td>
<td>Highest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2050 RTP Transportation Network Scenarios

- Unconstrained Network
- Alternative Revenue Constrained scenarios
- SCS based on Revenue Constrained Scenario
- Integration of preferred transit network and highway network
2050 RTP Development Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Winter 2010</th>
<th>Spring 2010</th>
<th>Summer/Fall 2010</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th>Winter 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goals and Objectives</td>
<td>EIR NOP</td>
<td>Initial 2050 RTP/PCS Alternatives</td>
<td>Alternatives Evaluation</td>
<td>Draft 2050 RTP Scenarios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2050 Regional Growth Forecast</td>
<td>Climate Action Strategy</td>
<td>Draft GHG Reduction Target</td>
<td>Final GHG Reduction Target</td>
<td>Draft 2050 RTP and EIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Area Transit Strategy</td>
<td>Airport Multimodal Planning</td>
<td>Other Regional / Corridor Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2050 RTP Goals

- Reliability
- Mobility
- System Preservation & Safety
- Prosperous Economy
- Social Equity
- Healthy Environment
Proposed Plan Performance Measures
- 2050 RTP goals and policy objectives
- Coordinated work efforts
- 2030 RTP

Quality of Travel & Livability 2030 RTP Measures
- Average travel time by mode
- Average travel speed by mode
- Trip accessibility by mode
- Travel time & mode share (key travel corridors/communities)
- Out-of-pocket user costs per trip
- Congestion (peak and all day)
- Vehicle/truck delay
- Crashes/fatalities
Quality of Travel & Livability Proposed New Measures

- Interregional transit routes by service type
- VMT by travel speed
- Freight network enhancements by mode
- Percent of transportation investments towards maintenance and rehabilitation
- Percent of transportation investments towards operational improvements

Sustainability 2030 RTP Measures

- Environmental Justice (EJ) and non-EJ Population
  - Average travel time by mode
  - Trip accessibility by mode
  - Percent of homes within ½ mile of a transit stop
- Fuel consumption
- Smog forming pollutants
- VMT per capita
- Transit passenger miles per capita
- Work trip mode share (peak-period & all day including bike/walk)
**Sustainability Proposed New Measures**

- Percent of population (EJ and non-EJ) within 30 minutes of:
  - Schools
  - San Diego International Airport
- Percent of population (EJ and non-EJ) within 15 minutes of:
  - Healthcare
  - Parks
- Non work trip mode share (peak-period and all day including bike/walk)
- Total bike and walk trips
- CO2 emissions per capita
- Net benefits
- Return on investment
- Economic impacts

**Next Steps**

- May/June 2010 - Transportation Committee will be asked to recommend the 2050 RTP performance measures to the Board for approval
Comments/Questions
### Urban Area Transit Strategy Performance Measures — B. Transit Ridership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ridership Measures</th>
<th>2008 Existing</th>
<th>2050 RE Baseline</th>
<th>2050 Transit</th>
<th>2050 Commuter</th>
<th>2050 Many Centers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1. Change in Transit Person Trips (Regional)</td>
<td>201,792</td>
<td>401,178</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2. Change in Transit Passenger Miles (Regional)</td>
<td>1,592,769</td>
<td>5,196,725</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3. Change in Transit Peak Period Person Trips (Regional)</td>
<td>75,321</td>
<td>177,748</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4. Change in Mode of Access to Transit (Non-Motorized and Auto) Walking/Biking</td>
<td>85.4%</td>
<td>88.8%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>-0.5%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto (drive and driven)</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>-6.1%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Urban Area Transit Strategy Performance Measures — D. Efficient Transportation Network

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ridership Measures</th>
<th>2008 Existing</th>
<th>2050 RE Baseline</th>
<th>2050 Transit</th>
<th>2050 Commuter</th>
<th>2050 Many Centers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1. Transit Person Trips (Regional)</td>
<td>201,792</td>
<td>401,178</td>
<td>340,453</td>
<td>405,363</td>
<td>463,003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2. Transit Passenger Miles (Regional)</td>
<td>1,592,769</td>
<td>5,196,725</td>
<td>5,401,221</td>
<td>5,404,189</td>
<td>5,960,945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3. Transit Peak Period Person Trips (Regional)</td>
<td>75,321</td>
<td>177,748</td>
<td>190,902</td>
<td>185,170</td>
<td>208,949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4. Mode of Access to Transit (Non-Motorized and Auto) Walking/Biking</td>
<td>85.4%</td>
<td>89.8%</td>
<td>90.4%</td>
<td>89.0%</td>
<td>89.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto (drive and driven)</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Urban Area Transit Strategy Performance Measures — E. Sustainability and Environmental Justice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability and Environmental Justice Measures</th>
<th>2008 Existing</th>
<th>2050 RE Baseline</th>
<th>2050 Transit</th>
<th>2050 Commuter</th>
<th>2050 Many Centers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E1. Estimated Change in GHG (tentative)</td>
<td>Not yet available.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2. Peak-Period Non-Motorized Mode Share in Urban Area</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3. All-Day Non-Motorized Mode Share in Urban Area</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4. Compatibility with Regional Bike Plan (mi. of bike fac. within 1/2 mile of major station)</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land-Use/Transportation Connection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E5a. % of Jobs within 1/2 Mile of Major Transit Stations</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E5b. % of jobs within 1/4 Mile of Major Transit Stations</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E5c. % of Housing Units within 1/2 Mile of Major Transit Stations</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E6a. % of Housing units w/in 1/2 Mile of Major Transit Stations with 10 Minute or Better Service</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>88.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E6c. % of Housing Units w/in 1/2 Mile of Major Transit Stations with 15 Minute or Better Service</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E7. Compatibility with Regional Activity Centers (Hospitals, Universities/Colleges, Shopping Malls, and Transpoite Attractions within 1/2 Mile of Major Transit Stations)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Equity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E8a. % of Minority Populations within 1/2 Mile of Major Transit Stations</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E8b. % of Non-Minority Populations within 1/2 Mile of Major Transit Stations</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E8d. % of Low Income Populations within 1/2 Mile of Major Transit Stations</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E8e. % of Elderly Population within 1/4 Mile of Major Transit Stations</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E8f. % of Elderly Population within 1/4 Mile of All Stations</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
<td>58.7%</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E9a. % of Zero-Car Households within 1/2 Mile of Major Transit Stations (2000 census data)</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>54.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability and Environmental Justice Measures</th>
<th>2008 Existing</th>
<th>2050 RE Baseline</th>
<th>2050 Transit</th>
<th>2050 Commuter</th>
<th>2050 Many Centers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E1. Estimated Change in GHG (tentative)</td>
<td>Not yet available.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Motorized Travel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2. Peak-Period Non-Motorized Mode Share in Urban Area</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3. All-Day Non-Motorized Mode Share in Urban Area</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4. Compatibility with Regional Bike Plan (mi. of bike fac. within 1/2 mile of major station)</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land-Use/Transportation Connection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E5a. % of Jobs within 1/2 Mile of Major Transit Stations</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E5b. % of jobs within 1/4 Mile of Major Transit Stations</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E5c. % of Housing Units within 1/2 Mile of Major Transit Stations</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E6a. % of Housing units w/in 1/2 Mile of Major Transit Stations with 10 Minute or Better Service</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>88.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E6c. % of Housing Units w/in 1/2 Mile of Major Transit Stations with 15 Minute or Better Service</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E7. Compatibility with Regional Activity Centers (Hospitals, Universities/Colleges, Shopping Malls, and Transpoite Attractions within 1/2 Mile of Major Transit Stations)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Equity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E8a. % of Minority Populations within 1/2 Mile of Major Transit Stations</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E8b. % of Non-Minority Populations within 1/2 Mile of Major Transit Stations</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E8d. % of Low Income Populations within 1/2 Mile of Major Transit Stations</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E8e. % of Elderly Population within 1/4 Mile of Major Transit Stations</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E8f. % of Elderly Population within 1/4 Mile of All Stations</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
<td>58.7%</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E9a. % of Zero-Car Households within 1/2 Mile of Major Transit Stations (2000 census data)</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>54.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>