MEETING NOTICE
AND AGENDA

REGIONAL PLANNING TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP (TWG)
The Regional Planning Technical Working Group may take action on any item appearing on this agenda.

Thursday, July 8, 2010

1:15 to 2:30 p.m.   TWG Meeting
2:30 to 4 p.m.     Joint Meeting between TWG and Regional Housing Working Group (RHWG)

SANDAG Board Room
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101-4231

Staff Contacts: Carolina Gregor         Susan Baldwin
(619) 699-1989          (619) 699-1943
cgr@sandag.org  sba@sandag.org

AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

• 2050 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN (RTP): PREFERRED UNCONSTRAINED TRANSPORTATION NETWORK
• ENERGY ROADMAP PROGRAM LAUNCH
• CITY OF ENCINITAS GENERAL PLAN UPDATE

A PORTION OF THIS MEETING WILL BE HELD JOINTLY WITH THE RHWG.

AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS FROM JOINT MEETING INCLUDE:

• REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY

SANDAG offices are accessible by public transit.
Phone 511 or see www.511sd.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                INFORMATION

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS        COMMENT

Members of the public will have the opportunity to address the Technical Working Group 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)


APPROVE

The Working Group should review and approve the meeting summary of the June 10, 2010, TWG meeting and joint meeting between the TWG and the Regional Housing Working Group.

REPORT ITEMS (4 through 7)

+4. 2050 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN (RTP): PREFERRED UNCONSTRAINED TRANSPORTATION NETWORK (Heather Werdick and Carolina Gregor)

DISCUSSION

Defining the Unconstrained Transportation Network is an important step in developing an RTP because it establishes the broadest network, from which funding scenarios will be identified. Once the Unconstrained Network is identified, staff will prioritize all of the future projects, using the updated transportation project evaluation criteria approved by the SANDAG Board of Directors. Based on input from SANDAG working groups, the public, Policy Advisory Committees, and the Board of Directors, staff has begun developing a preferred Unconstrained Transportation Network. TWG members are asked to discuss and provide feedback on the Unconstrained Network. The Board will be asked to accept the Unconstrained Transportation Network at its July 2010 meeting. Attached for background purposes are two reports that were presented to the Board in June.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM #</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+5.</td>
<td>ENERGY ROADMAP PROGRAM LAUNCH (Susan Freedman and Julie Ricks, SDG&amp;E) PPT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INFORMATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SANDAG is coordinating a program to offer energy planning assistance to local governments in the San Diego region through an energy-efficiency partnership with San Diego Gas and Electric (SDG&amp;E). The Energy Roadmap Program identifies energy use at municipal buildings and provides a framework for jurisdictions to save energy. This framework, or “energy roadmap,” is organized into two categories: (1) Saving Energy in Local Government Operations; and (2) Saving Energy in the Community. On Thursday, July 15, SANDAG and SDG&amp;E will launch the Energy Roadmap Program at a luncheon for local jurisdiction staff members. The luncheon will run from 11:30 a.m. to 1 p.m. in the SANDAG Board Room.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>CITY OF ENCINITAS GENERAL PLAN UPDATE (Patrick Murphy, Director of Planning and Building, City of Encinitas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INFORMATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2:30 to 4 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JOINT MEETING WITH THE REGIONAL HOUSING WORKING GROUP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>PUBLIC COMMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COMMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Members of the public will have the opportunity to address the Technical Working Group on any issue within the jurisdiction of the Working Group that is not on this agenda. Speakers are limited to three minutes each.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+8.</td>
<td>REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT (RHNA) METHODOLOGY (Susan Baldwin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DISCUSSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The TWG and RHWG will begin to discuss the development of a methodology for the RHNA allocation. Attached is the RHNA report for the Board of Directors Policy meeting that will be held on Friday, July 9, 2010, from 10 a.m. to 12 noon. The methodologies used during previous RHNA’s will be presented and input on the methodology for the 2010 – 2020 RHNA will be sought.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. ADJOURNMENT AND NEXT MEETINGS INFORMATION

The next TWG meeting will be held jointly with the Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee on Thursday, August 5, 2010, from 9:30 to 11:30 a.m.

The next RHWG meeting will be held on jointly with the TWG on September 9, 2010, from 2:30 to 4 p.m.

+ next to an item indicates an attachment

Please note: Audio file of meeting is available on the SANDAG Web site (www.sandag.org) on the TWG home page.

Agenda Item 1: Welcome and Introductions

Agenda Item 2: Public Comments and Communications

Members of the public had the opportunity to address the TWG on any issue, within the jurisdiction of the Working Group that is not on this agenda. Jim Schmidt, member of the RHWG, commented that there is a problem for the future of affordable housing within San Diego. The slow processing within the County of San Diego, City of San Diego, and the other incorporated areas risks discouraging builders from building within these areas.

CONSENT ITEM (3)

Agenda Item 3: Meeting Summaries (Approve)

The TWG approved the following meeting summaries:

a. April 15, 2010, Joint Meeting with the Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC)

b. May 13, 2010, Regular TWG Meeting

Action: Bill Chopyk (La Mesa) made a motion and Rich Whipple (Solana Beach) seconded approval of the April 15, 2010, joint CTAC meeting summary and the May 13, 2010, TWG meeting summary.

REPORT ITEMS (4 through 8)

Agenda Item 4: 2009 Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) Performance Monitoring Draft Report (Discussion/Comment)

Monitoring progress in implementing the RCP occurs on an annual basis. On June 4, 2010, the Regional Planning Committee authorized release of the draft 2009 Annual Performance Monitoring Report for a 30-day public review and comment period.
Christine Eary (SANDAG) reported that the Regional Planning Committee is recommending to the Board that this report be completed every other year rather than on an annual basis. John Conley (Vista) noted that the report does not discuss potential solutions to the continued housing affordability problem in the region, and suggested that it would be useful for the TWG to discuss potential solutions for providing affordable and moderate income housing at future meetings. Additional comments on the RCP Performance Monitoring Report can be sent to Ms. Eary at cea@sandag.org.

**Agenda Item 5: 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP): Development of the Initial Unconstrained Transportation Network (Discussion)**

Based on feedback received from SANDAG working groups, the public, the Peer Review Panel, and the Policy Advisory Committees, staff has assembled initial recommendations for a preferred 2050 transit network, building upon the initial transit alternatives evaluated as part of the Urban Area Transit Strategy (UATS). This transit network, combined with highway improvements and other management strategies, form the basis for the initial 2050 Unconstrained Transportation Network. TWG members were asked to discuss and provide feedback on the draft Unconstrained Transportation Network. This item also was presented to the Board on June 11, 2010, at its policy meeting.

Heather Werdick, Carolina Gregor, and Dave Schumacher (SANDAG) made a presentation on the UATS and performance and presented information on the proposed transit mode share goals by corridor and community. An overview was provided on the initial Revenue Unconstrained Transportation Network being prepared for the 2050 RTP and the status of the highway plans and potential modifications. Staff also identified the initial elements that were selected from each transit scenario of the UATS to be tested in the Unconstrained Hybrid Transit Scenario. Further conversation ensued with respect to mode shares and funding between highway and transit.

Chair Bill Anderson (City of San Diego) noted that Duncan Mc Fetridge from Save our Forests and Ranchlands (SOFAR) is concerned that the evolving 2050 RTP is too similar to the current 2030 RTP, which expands freeway capacity while simultaneously enhancing transit.

**Agenda Item 6: “Communities Putting Prevention to Work” Grants (Discussion)**

SANDAG, in a partnership with the County Health and Human Services Agency, is responsible for implementing a mini-grant program under the Communities Putting Prevention to Work program that is funded through the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. The grants, which will fund public health assessments in local plans, Safe Routes to School plans and programs, and active community transportation studies, must be awarded and completed by February 2012. Stephan Vance (SANDAG) proposed having SANDAG develop an on-call list of consultants to support these planning activities to facilitate the timely delivery of these grants.

Mr. Vance provided an overview of the grant and SANDAG’s responsibilities as the administrator of the grants. Mr. Vance also explained a proposal to meet the tight deadlines of the grants. The proposal would consist of SANDAG facilitating the procurement process by developing a list of “on-call” consultants that could be called upon by local jurisdictions to conduct the work in a timely manner. TWG members asked staff to explain the qualification criteria and administrative process to acquiring and utilizing the grants. Mr. Vance explained that the consultant list would be an option
to grant recipients, but recipients could alternatively use in-house staff with the necessary qualifications. The qualifying criteria will be issued in early fall and grants will be awarded in December. Grants will be limited to the County and cities, except for the Safe Routes to School plans and programs grants. Chair Anderson suggested that if a non-city/county grant is awarded, that a requirement exist for endorsement or support from the local jurisdiction for consistency purposes. Mr. Chopyk commented that streamlining the process would be helpful because of time constraints.

**Agenda Item 7: Data Collection Effort For New Land Use Model (PECAS) (Information)**

SANDAG staff is mid-way through a three-year model development process to improve our land use and transportation models. As part of that process, there is an intensive data collection effort underway. Ed Shafer (SANDAG) provided a brief refresher on the new models and requested development impact fee data from the local jurisdictions. He also introduced Liz Doroski (SANDAG) who will be working on this project.

TWG members articulated concern about how the model will account for the relationship between fees and residual land value, as well as recalibrating as fees change over time. Staff responded that this is a 1.5- to 3-year process. At this point, it is essential to gather as much information as possible for the model to be able to respond to these concerns. The model will recalibrate every time it is run to accommodate the changes in fees over time. Preliminary research indicates that cities will have geographic variations in types of fees. Therefore, staff is suggesting a generalized measurement, such as fees per square foot of building to be able to compare against jurisdictions. Ms. Doroski will be contacting jurisdictions to collect the information.

**2:30 to 4 p.m.**

**JOINT MEETING WITH THE REGIONAL HOUSING WORKING GROUP**

**Public Comments**

Mr. Schmidt commented on the impending housing problem in San Diego as a result of slow processing within the County of San Diego, City of San Diego, and the other incorporated areas, which discourages builders from wanting to develop in these areas.

**Agenda Item 8: Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) (Discussion/Comment)**

The TWG and RHWG held their first joint meeting to begin discussing the RHNA for the fifth housing element cycle (January 1, 2013 to December 31, 2020). The focus of the discussion was on principles and factors to be used in the RHNA methodology, RHNA objectives from state housing element law, and past RHNA methodologies. TWG and RHWG members were asked to provide input in the development of the RHNA methodology for the upcoming cycle.

Susan Baldwin (SANDAG) gave the presentation on the RHNA and provided a general RHNA process timeline. Additional factors for the RHNA methodology were expressed, such as including both low and extremely low income housing, military housing, and social equity and environmental justice (EJ) factors. Devon Muto (County of San Diego) asked SANDAG to continue providing assistance to
jurisdictions with regards to factors that may not be included in the RHNA, but are important to specific jurisdictions.

TWG Chair Anderson (City of San Diego) asked for an explanation of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) guidelines for the Sustainable Communities Strategy and the Regional Transportation Plan. Muggs Stoll (SANDAG) responded that the CEQA legislation provides incentives for better land use decisions, but there are various differing legal opinions on implementation and streamlining provisions. Mr. Stoll cautioned that any use of streamlining provisions is likely to be tested in court.

**Agenda Item 9: Adjournment and Next Meetings (Information)**

The TWG and RHWG discussed holding future joint meetings on RHNA, and concluded that future joint meetings would be beneficial.

The next TWG meeting will be held on Thursday, July 8, 2010, from 1:15 to 2:30 p.m., and the next joint TWG/RHWG meeting will be held on July 8, 2010, from 2:30 to 4 p.m.
2050 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN: UPDATE ON THE URBAN AREA TRANSIT STRATEGY

Introduction

Every four years, SANDAG updates its Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The current RTP, which extends to the year 2030, was adopted in 2007. SANDAG is currently preparing a 2050 RTP, which is scheduled for adoption in 2011.

An important part of the development of the 2050 RTP is the preparation of an innovative and visionary "Urban Area Transit Strategy." The Urban Area Transit Strategy will serve as the basis for development of the regional transit network to be included in the 2050 RTP along with all of the other modal networks (highway, high occupancy vehicle (HOV)/Managed Lanes, bicycle and pedestrian improvements, freight improvements, etc.). As part of the strategy, three draft transit network alternatives have been developed for analytical purposes.

The purpose of today's report is threefold: (1) to introduce the draft transit network alternatives and summarize feedback received to-date; (2) to review proposed transit mode share goals for key corridors/communities; and (3) to present a preliminary summary of the performance of each network. These items will help inform Board discussion on Item 3B, the development of the 2050 Unconstrained Transportation Network.

Initial Transit Scenarios and Feedback Received

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) will be incorporated into the unconstrained transportation network in the 2050 RTP. 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**: 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
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 and Regional Planning Committees, various SANDAG working groups, an outside Peer Review Panel, and at the five 2050 RTP public workshops (held April 26 – May 6, 2010). 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.

In Item 3B of today’s report, staff is recommending initial routes for incorporation into an unconstrained regional transit network for the 2050 RTP that is a combination of network elements from 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 (discussed below); the performance of specific routes and modes; and other factors. The report goes on to assess the regional highway network in order to set the stage for developing a comprehensive transportation network.

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 Stakeholder Working Group. Earlier this month, the networks also were presented to the Regional Planning Committee. 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. Suggestions also have been received 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. Attachment 6 provides a sampling of some of the comments received. SANDAG is encouraging additional comments via the Web site at www.sandag.org/uats.
Peer Review Panel Key Findings

As a unique part of the planning process, SANDAG assembled an outside 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 7.)

Generally, the Peer Review Panel felt that the 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-scale ones, thereby promoting “smarter” smart growth.

In addition, the Panel provided broader, more global observations summarized in Attachment 8, focusing on issues such as economic competitiveness; technological savviness; world-class region; sustainability and co-benefits; land use development around transit stations; land use, freeways, and parking; project prioritization; leadership and champions; and dedicated funding sources. 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 9.

Interestingly, many of the observations by the Peer Review Panel reinforce some of the key “Overarching Themes” and “Considerations for San Diego” summarized in the Executive Summary of the Lessons Learned from Peer Regions report produced by the SANDAG consultant team on this project when it began late last year. These overarching themes and considerations are contained in Attachment 10.
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. 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 appropriate mode share goals 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 11 illustrates the travel corridors, major employment areas, and high-activity areas for use in identifying peak-period transit mode share goals.

After conducting research, it is staff’s conclusion that very few areas have actually established transit mode share goals for corridors or communities. As a result, an approach similar to one used in Brisbane, Australia, is being proposed to develop the mode share goals. This approach involved aiming to increase the proportion of trips made on public transit by 50 percent between the plan’s initial and target year. The 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, given community lifestyle and travel patterns, but the plan left open the possibility of revisiting the target in future plans.

Proposed Approach

In the case 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 set peak-period, home-to-work transit mode share goals 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-

---

1 The 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.
period transit mode share over this base year assumption. (This approach is different than the Brisbane method, which used an existing base year of 1997 as the starting point for a 50 percent increase.) The approach would be applied to the urban area, as well as to the identified corridors/areas.  

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 80 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 120 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 the goals be generalized into “goal ranges” based on patterns of geographic groupings. This would result in a 10-15 percent transit mode share goal range for the urban area. This would more than double the peak-period, home-to-work transit mode share in the urban area during this time period. When considering the proposed mode share increases from existing levels to the year 2030 in the current RTP, it seems reasonable to set 25 percent as an ambitious, yet achievable, goal.

Proposed Goal Ranges

Attachment 12 contains the information described above and the peak-period, home-to-work transit mode share goal ranges based on the geographic groupings for the various corridors/areas. Attachments 13a, 13b, and 13c illustrate the 2008 peak-period 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.

Next Steps for Mode Share Goals

Over the next few months, staff proposes to conduct sensitivity tests by corridor/area to see how various adjustments could further affect peak-period 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.

The Transportation and Regional Planning Committees are discussing the proposed methodology and the resulting transit mode share goal ranges at their joint meeting on June 4, 2010, and any comments made will be provided verbally at the June 11 Board Policy meeting. Staff will report the modeled transit mode share performance at a future meeting.

2 Having 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.
Performance of Transit Network Alternatives

Analysis is underway to compare the three transit networks against one another, as well as against a baseline scenario, which consists of an overlay between the 2030 RTP transportation network and the land use assumptions included in the 2050 Regional Growth Forecast. The analysis is organized according to performance measures that line up with the following 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
- Address the need for environmental justice/social equity
- Make transit more time competitive with the car

These transit-specific objectives also are consistent with the overall 2050 RTP goals and objectives. (The detailed set of performance measures was presented to the Transportation Committee at its April 16, 2010, meeting, and is available on the Web site at www.sandag.org/uats.)

Attachment 14 contains initial data comparing the performance of the three transit alternatives against the 2008 transit network and the baseline scenario described above. In order to isolate the performance of transit in each alternative, staff held constant the highway network and the land use assumptions of each transit network.3

Initial analysis shows that all three scenarios yield significantly better results than the existing (2008) transit network, and that all three scenarios result in modest to significant improvements in most performance measures when compared against the baseline scenario. The baseline scenario places the region at an aggressive starting point for comparison purposes, given the high level of transit investment included in the 2030 RTP. The overall concept was to test three varying strategies for expanding the role of transit in the region beyond that outlined in the current RTP.

In summary, the initial analysis shows that while none of the scenarios performs the best in all of the categories, the Many Centers scenario appears to have the highest overall performance, although it also requires the highest level of capital and operating cost support. That being said, the analysis shows that there are effective features in the Transit Propensity, Commuter Point-to-Point, and Many Centers alternatives that could be incorporated into a combined strategy. As a result, there appears to be an opportunity to combine the most effective features of all three scenarios into a “Hybrid” alternative that could then be further evaluated and refined as cost estimates and revenue assumptions become available. More detail on the “Hybrid” approach is contained in Item 3B of this report.

---

3 All transit network alternatives hold the highway networks and land use assumptions constant. The highway network for each alternative consists of the highway network included in the 2030 RTP and the land use assumptions are those assumed in the 2050 Regional Growth Forecast.
Next Steps

Based on discussion today on both Items 3A and 3B of this report, staff will return to the Board of Directors in July with a report on the transit mode share performance for the geographic areas and with a refined list of transit projects for possible incorporation into the 2050 Unconstrained Transit Network.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Attachments: 1. Transit Propensity Subway-Style Map
                2. Commuter Point-to-Point Subway-Style Map
                3. Many Centers Subway-Style Map
                4. Draft Initial Transit Concepts
                5. Study Area for Urban Area Transit Strategy
                6. Sampling of Comments on the UATS from 2050 RTP Public Workshops
                7. Peer Review Panel Biographies
                8. Peer Review Panel Global Observations
                9. Peer Review Panel Individual Perspectives
               10. Executive Summary of Lessons Learned from Peer Regions Report
               11. Major Travel Corridors and Areas for Use in Identifying Initial Transit Mode Share Goals
               12. Proposed Transit Mode Share Goal Ranges for Identified Corridors and Areas
               13. Peak-Period, Home-to-Work Transit Mode Share Maps
                    a. 2008 Transit Mode Share
                    b. 2030 RTP Transit Mode Share (with 2050 Land Uses)
                    c. 2050 Proposed Transit Mode Share Goal Ranges
               14. Initial Performance of Transit Network Alternatives
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Funds are budgeted in Work Element #31003
Transit Propensity

Expanding Transit in the Most Urbanized Areas

Legend
- High Speed Rail
- COASTER Rail
- Light Rail Transit
- Bus Rapid Transit
- Rapid Bus
- Streetcar/Shuttle-Circulator
- High Frequency Local Bus Services
Commuter Point-to-Point
Emphasizing Quick Access to Work
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- High Frequency Local Bus Services
Many Centers
Connects Smart Growth Areas and Activity Centers
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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 in-line 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.
Sampling of Comments on the Urban Area Transit Strategy from 2050 RTP Public Workshops

- 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.
Urban Area Transit Strategy

Peer Review Panel Biographies

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.
Peer Review Panel’s Global Observations

The Peer Review Panel convened in San Diego from April 19 – 21, 2010, to review and assess the work completed to date on the Urban Area Transit Strategy in relation to the preparation of the broader 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). In addition to the Panel’s comments on the three alternative transit networks summarized in the staff report, the Panel also made a number of 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.
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.
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

With the preparation of the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) is seeking a new and innovative vision for transit that will result in a more significant role for transit in addressing the region’s mobility, land use, and sustainability goals. To help guide development of a new transit strategy, a review has been conducted of other regions that have successful transit systems, relatively high levels of transit use, and unique transit services or facilities. These areas offer examples of how transit has been applied successfully, and provide a point of reference or a standard from which comparisons can be made.

Three regions that might be considered “benchmark” cities for San Diego were researched in some detail. These cities are:

- Portland, Oregon
- Sydney, Australia
- Vancouver BC, Canada

Seven additional “comparison cities” are highlighted because they have characteristics similar to San Diego or provide examples of unique transit applications that have helped raise the profile of transit in their regions. These cities are:

- Brisbane, Australia
- Bordeaux, France
- Denver, Colorado
- Los Angeles, California
- Melbourne, Australia
- Minneapolis, Minnesota
- Seattle, Washington

Appendix A contains comparative data for U.S. cities to help provide a point of reference for San Diego.

Overarching Themes and Considerations for San Diego

Several overarching themes emerged from the benchmark and comparison cities evaluation, many of which may be appropriate for consideration as SANDAG develops the 2050 Transit Strategy. The overarching themes found as part of the case study review are presented on the left side of the following table and their potential applicability to San Diego is presented on the right.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overarching Theme</th>
<th>Considerations for San Diego</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The “success” of transit did not happen overnight.</td>
<td>San Diego embarked on an innovative new transit strategy in the early 1980s with the opening of the region’s (and nation’s) first urban rail transit line since WWII from downtown San Diego to the International Border. Over the next 25 years, the region expanded the rail network to provide a backbone transit infrastructure and service network, to one that now includes 75 miles of light rail (San Diego Trolley and Sprinter) and 40 miles of commuter rail (Coaster). Between 1975 and 2005, transit ridership increased 150 percent while regional population increased approximately 75 percent. As the original regional rail program nears completion (the 11-mile Mid-Coast corridor between Old Town and University City is the only remaining rail extension in the Regional Transportation Plan), the regional transit strategy has shifted to a multi-modal, shared right-of-way approach (transit on managed lanes and arterial streets). Looking to the experiences of the case study regions, San Diego may need to develop a new “dramatic strategy” for transit for the next 30-40 years – one that combines past, present, and future strategies to recapture the transit momentum experienced in the 1980s. The new strategy will need to include a stronger connection between transit investment and land use policies to achieve SANDAG’s vision for a larger transit mode share in the urban core, and key corridors and communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit success depends on regional plans and visions that guide the integration of land use and transportation.</td>
<td>SANDAG’s Regional Comprehensive Plan and Smart Growth strategy have established a hierarchy of centers that are designed to be supported by transit, as well as policies for integrating land use and transportation. Development of a new regional transit strategy should draw heavily on the policies and goals in the Regional Comprehensive Plan for both the region and specific corridors/communities. To achieve success, agencies, transit providers, and stakeholders must work together towards agreed upon transit and land-use goals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transit success depends on regional plans and visions that guide the integration of land use and transportation. Many regional plans create a hierarchy of centers focused around transit that provide good design, sufficient density, and a land use mix that supports non-auto access to transit. Success is also dependent on a number of agencies working collaboratively to achieve the success of the regional plans and visions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overarching Theme</th>
<th>Considerations for San Diego</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ** Regions use a variety of tools to achieve transit success. **  
Regions used a variety of policy, regulatory, and financial tools that contributed to the success of transit in these regions. Tools were modified or new tools added when they were no longer effective for encouraging ridership or investment along transit corridors. | SANDAG and the region already have a variety of policy tools to support transit as defined in the Regional Comprehensive Plan and Smart Growth strategy. Additional policies and tools found in the peer regions/cities that promote and support existing and future transit services for consideration by SANDAG include: improvements to the pedestrian environment, urban growth boundaries, cooperative agreements between public agencies and private developers, tax incentives to foster transit oriented development, parking maximums or limitations, and legislation requiring commute trip reductions by major employers. |
| ** Regions generally experienced a shift in policy and investment toward transit over the past few decades.**  
Regions moved toward transit as a tool for improving mobility and sustainability in response to public pressures related to sprawl, the environment, livable communities, and quality of life issues. These regions also made significant investments in permanent transit infrastructure, which not only improved transit, but also helped generate awareness and understanding of the transit system and spur transit-oriented development. | The San Diego region is also experiencing similar pressures to contain sprawl, protect the environment, promote livable communities, and maintain and improve the quality of life. Through the Regional Comprehensive Plan, the San Diego region has made the policy connection between investments in transit and achieving these goals. Looking toward the future, new transit policies and strategies designed to increase transit mode share will need to understand the effects of regional highway investments and policies on the potential success of the transit investments and system. |
| ** Local bus networks are essential for successful transit systems to provide efficient connections and access to the backbone system.**  
To efficiently support higher frequency transit stations, feeder services are essential components of the transit system and, depending on the local geography, are often structured along grids or hub-and-spoke networks. | San Diego’s existing transit network leans toward hub-and-spoke structure with feeder buses connecting to rail based transit centers. However, many trips rely solely on bus transit. A new transit strategy will need to build off the existing rail transit investment, while also considering how best to serve key travel markets (origins/destinations, work trips, etc.) that may not be well served by existing bus/rail connections. The strategy will also need to define the role of local and feeder bus service in relation to the major transit infrastructure investments. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overarching Theme</th>
<th>Considerations for San Diego</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Parking requirements in transit-supportive communities are reduced.**  
Most transit successful regions have coordinated parking policy with land use and transit policy. Parking strategies often differ between central and outlying areas. | Abundant and inexpensive parking have proven to be key deterrents to transit use. A new transit strategy for the San Diego region should evaluate how parking policies (location, availability, and cost), particularly in the city center and urban core, impact transit use. |
| **Successful transit systems include a variety of transit modes.**  
Cities and regions with successful transit have systems that include combinations of transit modes applied for the particular conditions, objectives and circumstances (i.e., heavy rail, commuter rail, light rail, bus rapid transit, rapid bus, local bus, streetcar, shuttles, electric bus, etc.) | All regions include a combination of transit facility and service applications to create their transit networks and systems. |
| **Unique applications of transit have occurred in the central cities.**  
While all of the studied regions have a wide range of transit modes that provide area- and location-appropriate transit, these cities have also incorporated special applications of transit infrastructure, services, and policies in their downtowns in ways that raise the profile of transit, promote transit use, and support higher density environments. | Even cities with similar transit histories and land use characteristics as San Diego have invested heavily in innovative transit facilities and services in their central cities (transit malls, streetcars, underground bus terminals, fare free zones). These investments have proven highly successful in generating transit ridership, supporting the regional transit network, achieving land use objectives, increasing transit mode share, and contributing to the vitality of their downtown core. Many of these strategies may have applicability to downtown San Diego and other key activity centers. |
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 Trips¹

Peak-Period, Home-to-Work Transit Mode Share

<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 2050 Land Uses²</td>
<td>25% Increase Over 2030 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>Sorrento Mesa</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kearny Mesa</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otay Mesa/Otay Ranch</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palomar Airport</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</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>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside/Escondido Corridor</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</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>10%</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>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East County/El Cajon</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East County/Santee</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Area Transit Strategy Study Area</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Values represent peak period home-to-work trip transit mode-share for destination districts.
² 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.

2008 Transit Mode Share
Values represent peak period home-to-work transit mode share for destination districts.
Values represent peak period home-to-work transit mode share for destination districts.

2050 Proposed Transit Mode Share Goal Ranges

- Under 5%
- 5% to 10%
- 10% to 15%
- 15% to 20%
- 20% to 25%
- 25% to 30%
- Over 30%
**Urban Area Transit Strategy - Initial Performance of Transit Network Alternatives**

**Key:**
- ⬤ Most Effective
- ⬤ Middle
- ⬤ Least Effective
- □ No Significant Change

### A. Mode Share

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode Share Measures</th>
<th>2008 Existing</th>
<th>Transient Propensity</th>
<th>Commuter Propensity</th>
<th>Many Centers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1. Peak-Period Transit Mode Share as Applied to the Identified Corridors/Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2. All-Day Transit Mode Share as Applied to the Identified Corridors/Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3. Change in Peak Period Urban Area Transit Mode Share</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B. Transit Ridership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ridership Measures</th>
<th>2008 Existing</th>
<th>Transient Propensity</th>
<th>Commuter Propensity</th>
<th>Many Centers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1. Change in Transit Person Trips (Regional)</td>
<td>202,000</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2. Change in Transit Passenger Miles (Regional)</td>
<td>1,593,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3. Change in Transit Peak-Period Person Trips (Regional)</td>
<td>79,000</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4. Change in Mode of Access to Transit (Non-Motorized and Auto)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk/Bike to Transit</td>
<td>85.4%</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto (drove and driven) to Transit</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C. Cost-Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost-Effectiveness Measures</th>
<th>2008 Existing</th>
<th>Transient Propensity</th>
<th>Commuter Propensity</th>
<th>Many Centers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1. Rough Order of Magnitude (ROM) Capital Cost Estimate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2. Cost-Effectiveness of Network (Region)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3. Operating Subsidy Required (Region)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4. Total Transit System Capital Cost vs. SANDAG Revenue-Constrained Funding Scenario</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5. Ability to Phase Major System Components/Elements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### D. Efficient Transportation Network

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Efficiency Measures</th>
<th>2008 Existing</th>
<th>Transient Propensity</th>
<th>Commuter Propensity</th>
<th>Many Centers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transit System Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1. Passenger Miles to Transit Seat Mile Ratio</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Transportation System Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2. Change in Auto Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) per capita</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3. Change in Auto Vehicle Hours Traveled (VHT) per capita</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4. Change in Auto Vehicle Trips per capita</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1Baseline scenario consists of an overlay between the highway and transit networks included in the 2030 RTP and the land use assumptions included in the 2050 Regional Growth Forecast.
## Urban Area Transit Strategy - Initial Performance of Transit Network Alternatives

### E. Sustainability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Measures</th>
<th>2008 Existing</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Transit Propensity</th>
<th>Commuter Point to-Point</th>
<th>Many Centers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greenhouse Gas Reduction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1. Estimated Change in GHG (tentative)</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>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3. All-Day Non-Motorized Mode Share in Urban Area</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</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>146</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</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>38.9%</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</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>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E6a. % of Housing Units within 1/2 Mile of Major Transit Stations</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E6b. % of Housing Units w/in 1/2 Mile of Major Transit Stations with 10 Minute or Better Service</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</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>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E7. Compatibility with current Regional Activity Centers (Hospitals, Universities/Colleges, Shopping Malls, and Tourist Attractions within 1/2 Mile of Major Transit Stations)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### F. Social Equity/Environmental Justice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Equity/Environmental Justice Measures</th>
<th>2008 Existing</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Transit Propensity</th>
<th>Commuter Point to-Point</th>
<th>Many Centers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title VI Requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1a. % Minority Populations within 1/2 Mile of Major Transit Stations (% Improvement)</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1b. % Non-Minority Populations within 1/2 Mile of Major Transit Stations (% Improvement)</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1c. % Low-Income Households within 1/2 Mile of Major Transit Stations (% Improvement)</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1d. % Non-Low-Income Households within 1/2 Mile of Major Transit Stations (% Improvement)</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Meaningful Social Equity/Environmental Justice Measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2a. % of 75+ Population within 1/4 Mile of Major Transit Stations</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2b. % of 75+ Population within 1/4 Mile of All Stations</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
<td>58.7%</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3. % Zero-Car Households within 1/2 Mile of Major Transit Stations (2000 census data)</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Title VI requires analysis of the burdens of regional transportation system investments on low-income and minority populations. Measures in this category evaluate the comparative percent improvement between low-income and non-low-income populations and minority and non-minority populations.

Key: A "1" indicates disparate impact and a "2" indicates no disparate impact.
## G. Time-Competitiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Competitiveness Measures</th>
<th>2008 Existing</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Transit Propensity</th>
<th>Commuter Point to-Point</th>
<th>Many Centers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>G1. Oceanside - Downtown San Diego Travel Times (in Minutes)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOV</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit - Walk Access</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit - Drive Access</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G2. Escondido - Downtown San Diego Travel Times (in Minutes)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOV</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit - Walk Access</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit - Drive Access</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G3. El Cajon - Downtown San Diego Travel Times (in Minutes)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOV</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit - Walk Access</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit - Drive Access</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G4. Mid City San Diego - Sorrento Valley Travel Times (in Minutes)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOV</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit - Walk Access</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit - Drive Access</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G5. Chula Vista - Sorrento Valley Travel Times (in Minutes)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOV</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit - Walk Access</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit - Drive Access</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G6. San Ysidro - Downtown San Diego Travel Times (in Minutes)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOV</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit - Walk Access</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit - Drive Access</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G7. El Cajon - Sorrento Valley Travel Times (in Minutes)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOV</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit - Walk Access</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit - Drive Access</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2050 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN: DEVELOPMENT OF THE INITIAL UNCONSTRAINED TRANSPORTATION NETWORK

File Numbers 3100300 and 3100500

Introduction

During April and May, staff presented the Urban Area Transit Strategy alternative transit networks to the Transportation and Regional Planning Committees, various SANDAG working groups, and at the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) public workshops for public input. The networks also were reviewed by an outside Peer Review Panel. Based on feedback received so far, staff has assembled initial recommendations for a preferred 2050 transit network based on the initial three alternatives evaluated as part of the Urban Area Transit Strategy. This transit network, highway improvements, and other management strategies form the basis for the initial 2050 Unconstrained Transportation Network.

Board members are asked to discuss and provide feedback on the initial Unconstrained Transportation Network. Recommendations for a preferred Unconstrained Transportation Network will be presented at the July 2010 Board meeting for further discussion and use in the development of the Draft 2050 RTP.

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 multimodal network from which revenue constrained network scenarios will be developed.

Once the Unconstrained Network is defined, staff will prioritize all of the future projects in this network, using the updated transportation project evaluation criteria (see Agenda Item No. 4). Based on revenue projections, various Revenue Constrained transportation network scenarios will be developed using this prioritized project list and other factors. The Revenue Constrained network scenarios will attempt to build and operate as much of the Unconstrained Network as possible, given revenue availability and flexibility, and project priorities. These scenarios will be evaluated using performance measures leading to the eventual selection of a preferred Revenue Constrained Network by the Board of Directors.

As previously discussed with the Board, Senate Bill 375 (Steinberg, 2008) (SB 375) requires that the 2050 RTP include a Sustainable Communities Strategy (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.

Discussion

Initial Recommendations for a 2050 Unconstrained Transit Network

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 with the ultimate goal of incorporating one of the networks (or a combination or variation of the networks) into the 2050 RTP Unconstrained Network. The Urban Area is illustrated in Attachment 1.

As discussed in Agenda Item No. 3A, the transit alternatives under study were grouped into three themes: 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).

Based on feedback from the 2050 RTP public workshops, the Peer Review Panel, the performance analysis, and the public, staff recommends combining the best overall transit system strategies contained in all three alternatives as the focus for developing and testing a preferred RTP unconstrained transit network. This strategy focuses on developing a strong link between transit and transit-supportive land use patterns, a link that will ensure that future investments made in transit are maximized in terms of cost-effectiveness. Based on this approach, staff recommends developing a Hybrid strategy based on the following key points:

1. Improve the current transit network in communities that already have strong transit/land use integration (e.g., Mid-City, coastal South Bay communities, etc.). Improvements would focus on establishing 10-minute, all-day frequencies on most local routes, developing Rapid Bus services along major arterial corridors, and adding new light rail service to better serve high-demand corridors. Streetcar and/or other shuttle/circulator services also would help improve intra-community circulation within smart growth centers (e.g., downtown San Diego, downtown Escondido, downtown El Cajon, etc.). This strategy would incorporate much of Transit Propensity alternative.

2. Expand high-frequency local and Rapid Bus services into the largest-scale smart-growth areas that are emerging or planned in the near-term as suggested by the Many Centers alternative. These concentrations of future transit-friendly land uses help justify significant investments in transit infrastructure and services.
• Interconnect the existing, most highly-urbanized areas and future smart growth centers to major employment areas with a system of high-speed, high-frequency rail and Bus Rapid Transit lines that will facilitate easy and convenient access across the region. Using findings from the evaluation of the Commuter Point-to-Point alternative, the addition of selected peak commuter bus services that offer one-seat rides/competitive travel would facilitate access to key regional employment centers.

• Emphasize improvements to the pedestrian environment in and around rail and bus station areas to maximize convenient and safe walking access to transit, and also create interconnections between transit and the Regional Bike Plan as a means to facilitate access to transit stations from areas outside a walking distance and create new last-mile solutions.

These actions, taken together, could serve as a good starting point for the overall strategy for developing the long-range vision for the transit plan that will ultimately be incorporated into the 2050 RTP. The Transportation and Regional Planning Committees are discussing the proposed “Hybrid” approach at their joint meeting on June 4, 2010, and any comments made will be provided verbally at the June 11 Board Policy meeting. A draft list of transit projects for the 2050 Hybrid Unconstrained Transit Network is included as Attachment 2a. (Attachment 2b provides definitions of transit services and facilities for the Urban Area Transit Strategy for reference purposes.)

**Initial Recommendations for a 2050 Unconstrained Highway Network**

Similarly to the process being proposed for the transit network, SANDAG and Caltrans staffs are analyzing potential modifications to the 2030 RTP Unconstrained highway network. These modifications are based on supporting proposed transit investments in key corridors and communities while providing an adequate level of service for the overall transportation system. It is important to note that the 2030 RTP Unconstrained highway network includes an extensive Managed Lanes system that provides tremendous flexibility in serving transit and high occupancy vehicles (HOVs) by maximizing the available rights-of-way in several of the region’s major highway corridors. The goal in reviewing the highway network is to build upon this existing plan by integrating the revised transit network into it, thereby creating the most efficient and balanced transportation system.

Potential modifications include additional operational improvements to relieve bottlenecks, refinements of the HOV and Managed Lane network to support transit services, and adjustments to general purpose lane widening beyond what is included in the 2030 Reasonably Expected RTP for corridors that are projected to operate at acceptable levels of service. A map of the initial 2050 Unconstrained Highway Network is included as Attachment 3.
Next Steps

Based on discussion today, the initial Unconstrained Transportation Network will be presented to the working groups for discussion and feedback. Recommendations for a preferred Unconstrained Transportation Network will be presented at the July 2010 Board meeting for further discussion and use in the development of the Draft 2050 RTP.
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2b. Definitions of Transit Services and Facilities for Urban Area Transit Strategy
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Initial List of Transit Projects for the 2050 Hybrid Unconstrained Transit Network

An initial list of transit projects to be included in the 2050 Hybrid Unconstrained Transit Network is proposed below. (Definitions of transit services are included in Attachment 2b as a reference.) This initial list builds upon transit services currently in operation today and on planned transit services currently included in the 2030 Reasonably Expected Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

Based on results of upcoming model runs to test the performance of these transit projects, staff will propose modifications to the mix of projects and adjustments to the levels of service in order to maximize the cost-effectiveness for the unconstrained transit network that will eventually be incorporated into the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan.

Ultimately, the selected transit network will be accompanied by a series of policy recommendations that may enhance the performance of the networks. The policy recommendations may address issues such as urban design, parking, street connectivity, bike and pedestrian access, transit awareness and education, last mile solutions, etc. During the planning process, staff will conduct a series of sensitivity tests that may provide supplemental information on the effectiveness of any potential policies that could be considered in the planning process.

**Local Bus Services**

Within the Urban Area Transit Strategy study area, service frequencies on most existing local bus services would be increased to 10 minutes or better throughout the day to serve short-distance trip-making and provide connections to regional Rapid Bus, Bus Rapid Transit, and Rail services. Additional local bus services within the study area would include:

- Solana Beach-Carmel Valley-University City
- Carmel Valley-Pacific Highlands Ranch-Sabre Springs
- Mira Mesa-Scripps Ranch North-South Poway Industrial Park

Outside the study area, a basic level of local bus service (30-60 minute service throughout most of the day) would be provided to connect key communities to the urban areas, including:

- Fallbrook
- Valley Center
- Ramona
- Alpine
- Tribal nations

**Rapid Bus Services**

A network of limited-stop Rapid Bus services would operate in key travel corridors as overlay services to local bus services to serve medium-distance trip-making, including:

- Oceanside-University City via Coast Highway corridor
- Oceanside-Vista via Mission Avenue corridor
- Camp Pendleton-Mira Costa College-Plaza Camino Real
Bus Rapid Transit Services

All day bus rapid transit services would operate in key freeway/transit guideway corridors to serve long-distance regional tripmaking, including:

- Escondido-North I-15 communities, Kearny Mesa, Mission Valley, Downtown
- Otay Mesa-Otay Ranch-Chula Vista-National City-Downtown
- San Ysidro-Chula Vista-National City-Downtown-Old Town-University City

Peak-period commuter bus services would operate in key freeway/transitway corridors to provide point-to-point connections/one-seat ride service between key residential areas and regional employment centers, including:

- Escondido and north I-15 communities to Downtown
- Oceanside-Carlsbad-Encinitas to Sorrento Mesa
- Otay Ranch-Chula Vista to University City/Sorrento Mesa
- Southeastern San Diego communities-Mid-City to University City/Sorrento Mesa
- El Cajon-Santee to Kearny Mesa/University City/Sorrento Mesa
- Santee-El Cajon-Spring Valley to Eastern Urban Center/Otay Mesa
- Inland South Bay-Southeastern San Diego communities/Mid-City to Escondido/Palomar Airport Road corridor

Commuter and Light Rail Services

Double tracking of the COASTER would allow 15 minute peak/60 minute off-peak bi-directional service, while double tracking the Sprinter corridor would allow 10 minute all day service, along with express/limited stop service between Oceanside and Escondido.

A commuter rail overlay service on the proposed California High Speed Rail system would facilitate commuter travel needs between the Temecula-Escondido I-15 corridor and south county job centers.
Additional light rail services would operate in the following corridors:

- University City-Mira Mesa via Mira Mesa Boulevard
- University City-Kearny Mesa-Mission Valley-Mid-City-Southeastern San Diego communities-National City-Chula Vista via I-805 and I-15
- Downtown-SDSU via Park Blvd/El Cajon Boulevard
- Pacific Beach-Kearny Mesa-Mission Valley-SDSU-El Cajon via Balboa Avenue/Green Line

**Streetcar/Shuttle-Circulator Services**

Several streetcar and/or bus shuttle/circulator services would operate in key community center areas to facilitate both intra-area tripmaking and first-last mile connections to regional transit services.

- Downtown areas in San Diego, Oceanside, Escondido, El Cajon, National City, Chula Vista
- Community centers in University City/Sorrento Mesa, Kearny Mesa, Mission Valley, Hillcrest/North Park, Eastern Urban Center (Chula Vista)
## Definitions of Transit Services and Facilities
### For Urban Area Transit Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High-Speed Rail:</th>
<th>Designed for very high-speed long-distance intercity trips with long station spacing and dedicated grade-separated lines. Examples include the Shinkansen in Japan, the TGV in France, and the AVE in Spain. California High-Speed Rail (HSR) is currently being planned from Sacramento to San Diego.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles are steel wheel on steel track electrically-powered bidirectional train sets.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Speed: 220 miles per hour (mph), but 150 mph maximum expected from San Diego to Escondido and 200 mph maximum from Escondido to Riverside.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level boarding.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Capacity: Not yet determined in CA. Examples from around the world range from approximately 300 to 1,300 per train but most single level trains have about 400-500.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operates on dedicated high speed track with no at-grade crossings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California HSR system will be over 600 miles.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commuter Rail:</th>
<th>Designed for higher-speed, longer-distance regional trips with stations spacing every four to five miles on average. Examples include the San Diego COASTER, Dallas/Fort Worth Trinity Railway Express, and Southern California Metrolink.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commuter rail lines use diesel or electric locomotives (diesel are more common and are used in Southern California).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical speed: 80 mph.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typically low floor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supported by Park and Ride lots.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical passenger capacity: 130 seats per car operating with 3-8 car trains (typically no standees).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operates on a dedicated right-of-way separate from other vehicles.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical length of line: 25-100 miles.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Light Rail Transit (LRT):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Image</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="San Diego Trolley" /></td>
<td>Designed for medium-distance trips with station spacing about every mile on average. Examples include the San Diego Trolley, the San Diego SPRINTER, Portland MAX, Minneapolis Hiawatha Line, and Houston MetroRail.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| ![San Diego Sprinter](image) | - Electric or diesel-powered rail vehicles.  
- Typical speed: corridor speed limit, generally not exceeding 55 mph.  
- Designed for high-capacity corridors.  
- Integrates well with street traffic, signals, and pedestrians.  
- Operates on a dedicated guideway within separate right-of-way or on-street.  
- Typical passenger capacity: 60-140 seated plus standees (per car), with 1-4 cars.  
- Typical length of line: 6-25 miles.  
- Typically low floor. |

### Streetcar/Shuttle-Circulator:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Image</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Portland Modern Streetcar" /></td>
<td>Designed for short-distance trips with station spacing every few blocks or every quarter-mile on average. Streetcar examples include Portland Modern Streetcar, Seattle Streetcar, and San Francisco Historic Streetcar. Shuttle-circulators include MTS Shuttle, University City SuperLoop.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| ![San Francisco Historic Streetcar](image) | - Typical speed: speeds up to the speed limit of the street they operate on, generally averaging 12 mph (with stops).  
- Designed for dense urban areas, such as downtown areas.  
- Integrates well with street traffic, signals, and pedestrians.  
- Streetcars operate either in mixed-traffic with automobiles or on a dedicated right-of-way.  
- Typical passenger capacity for streetcars: up to 100 seated and standees per car (vehicles generally provide few seats due to short distance nature of trips). Operate as single vehicles.  
- Typical passenger capacity for shuttles-circulators: up to 20-25 seated, depending upon vehicle size.  
- Typical length of line: 2-6 miles. |
| ![MTS Shuttle](image) | |
Bus Rapid Transit (BRT):

San Diego I-15 BRT

Los Angeles Orange Line

Designed for longer-distance, higher-speed, regional trip-making on a dedicated bus guideway or freeway Managed Lanes/High-Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) facilities. All-day, all-stop trunk BRT services can be complemented with peak-period commuter express services designed to provide very limited stop connections to major employment centers. Examples include San Diego Interstate 15 BRT, Los Angeles Orange Line, Eugene, Oregon EmX, and the Brisbane South-East Busway.

- Diesel or CNG/alternative fuels standard.
- Typical speed: corridor speed limit, typically 40-60 mph on average.
- Supported by Park and Ride lots.
- Designed for high-capacity corridors.
- Low floor design.
- Operates on dedicated guideway and sometimes in mixed-traffic with automobiles.
- Typical passenger capacity: 50-60 seated plus standees on arterial routes, 50-80 seated on freeway routes (per bus).
- Typical length of line: 8-15 miles on arterial segments, 10-30 miles on freeway segments.
- Typical station spacing: 0.5-1 mile on arterial segments, 4-5 miles on freeway segments.

Continued on next page...
Rapid Bus:

Los Angeles Metro Rapid

Future Mid-City Rapid Bus

Provides higher-speed alternatives to local bus services in high volume arterial corridors and utilizes a range of lower-capital cost signal priority treatments, short segments of transit-only lanes, and limited station stops to achieve faster travel times. Rapid Bus services can be upgraded to BRT over time through implementation of dedicated transit lanes to bypass congested arterial segments. Examples include Los Angeles Metro Rapid and Boston Washington Street Silver Line.

- Diesel or CNG/alternative fuels standard.
- Typical speed: speeds up to the speed limit of the street they operate on, averaging about 25 mph (with stops).
- Low floor design.
- Designed for high-capacity corridors.
- Integrates well with street traffic, signals, and pedestrians.
- Typical passenger capacity: 40 seated plus standees (per bus).
- Typical length of line: 8-15 miles.
- Typical station spacing: 0.5-1 mile.

High-Frequency Local Bus:

San Diego Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) Bus

San Diego North County Transit District (NCTD) Bus

Facilitates mid-to-short-distance trip-making within local communities, with closer station spacing. Local bus services serve as the backbone of the transit system and provide the primary access into local communities where fixed-route services are warranted.

- Typically standard and single articulated buses.
- Typical speed: speeds up to the speed limit of the street they operate on, averaging 12 mph (with stops).
- Low-floor design.
- Integrates well with street traffic, signals, and pedestrians.
- Operates in mixed-traffic with automobiles, but can benefit from transit-signal priority and queue jump lanes.
- Typical passenger capacity: 37-57 seated plus standees (per bus).
- Typical length of line: ranges from under 5 miles up to 25 miles.
- Typical station spacing: 1-4 blocks.
ENERGY ROADMAP PROGRAM LAUNCH

Introduction

On Thursday, July 15, SANDAG and San Diego Gas and Electric (SDG&E) will launch the Energy Roadmap Program at a luncheon for local jurisdiction staff members. The luncheon will run from 11:30 a.m. to 1 p.m. in the SANDAG board room. At the kick-off, SANDAG and SDG&E will provide an overview of the Energy Roadmap Program, including the services offered, important dates, and how to participate. Each jurisdiction will receive a customized participation sheet that identifies services available to them and start dates offered. The program is voluntary.

Discussion

SANDAG is coordinating a program to offer energy planning assistance to local governments in the San Diego region through an energy-efficiency partnership with SDG&E. By saving energy, local jurisdictions can lower their utility bills and free up taxpayer dollars for important government services, while contributing to state and regional goals for saving energy and reducing emissions of greenhouse gases that contribute to climate change.

The Energy Roadmap Program provides energy management plans, or “energy roadmaps,” to local jurisdictions that have not previously had the resources to undertake energy management planning. The components of the Energy Roadmap were developed using lessons learned during pilot projects with the Cities of Carlsbad, Poway, Solana Beach, and Imperial Beach as part of the SANDAG Sustainable Region Program. The components are organized into two categories: (1) Saving Energy in Local Government Operations; and (2) Saving Energy in the Community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Saving Energy in Government Operations</th>
<th>Saving Energy in the Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Energy Assessments</td>
<td>Saving Energy through Local Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean Transportation</td>
<td>Smart Meters and the Smart Grid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Education and Training</td>
<td>Public Engagement and Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnerships, Grants, and Funding</td>
<td>Workforce Education and Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerging Technology Demonstrations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Energy Roadmap Program will help state, regional, and local governments reach their sustainability goals. It will implement the SANDAG Regional Energy Strategy (2009) and Climate Action Strategy (2010), as well as the California Public Utilities Commission Long-Term Energy Efficiency Strategic Plan (2009).
The program will run until December 2012, and will offer the same level of service over the entire period. Each Energy Roadmap will take approximately 9 to 12 months to complete. The Energy Roadmap team plans to start working with two jurisdictions each quarter. First priority will be given to the 11 jurisdictions that did not participate in pilot programs as part of the Sustainable Region Program and do not have their own energy-efficiency partnerships with SDG&E. In addition, work began with the City of Encinitas at the end of the pilot period, and continues now under the Energy Roadmap Program. These jurisdictions will be offered all Energy Roadmap Program services and are listed below.

- Coronado
- Del Mar
- El Cajon
- Escondido
- La Mesa
- Lemon Grove
- National City
- Oceanside
- San Marcos
- Santee
- Vista

The four pilot jurisdictions of Carlsbad, Imperial Beach, Poway, and Solana Beach will be offered Roadmap components that were not previously available. The Cities of San Diego and Chula Vista and the County of San Diego will be offered the Roadmap’s clean transportation component. Through their own partnerships with SDG&E, these three jurisdictions already have completed the other Roadmap components.

Kick-Off Luncheon

SANDAG and SDG&E will hold a kick-off meeting for local government staff and stakeholders from 11:30 a.m. to 1 p.m. at SANDAG on Thursday, July 15, 2010. A letter of invitation will be sent to the City Managers and/or County Administrative Officer of each jurisdiction. The program also was announced at the most recent meetings of the SANDAG Board of Directors, the County and City Managers Association, and the Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee.

Key Staff Contact: Susan Freedman, 619-699-7387, sfr@sandag.org
REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT
AND THE UPCOMING HOUSING ELEMENT CYCLE

Introduction

SANDAG is beginning the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) for the next (fifth) housing element cycle. This responsibility is assigned to SANDAG by state housing element law, and SANDAG undertakes this process prior to each housing element cycle as described in the statutory excerpts in Attachment 1.

Recent legislation, Senate Bill 375 (SB 375) (Steinberg, 2008) and SB 575 (Steinberg, 2009), affect the RHNA and fifth housing element cycle in several ways. The main differences for this cycle include the timing of the RHNA process, required coordination/consistency with the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and its Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) per SB 375, and the length of the housing element cycle. The fifth cycle for the San Diego region will cover an eight-year time period from January 1, 2013, to December 31, 2020. Past housing elements covered a five-year cycle.

Attachment 2 of this report is a timeline for the RHNA process as it relates to the development of the 2050 RTP and its SCS. Staff will give a presentation regarding the history of housing element law, related statewide housing issues, the relationship of the RHNA to the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP), and challenges and opportunities presented by the RHNA process.

Discussion

State Housing Element Law and Regional Comprehensive Plan Objectives

State housing element law (Government Code Section 65584 (d)) states that the RHNA shall be consistent with the four following objectives. These objectives are consistent with the SANDAG RCP and Smart Growth Concept Map and include:

1. Increasing the housing supply and the mix of housing types, tenure, and affordability in all cities and counties within the region in an equitable manner, which shall result in all jurisdictions receiving an allocation of units for low- and very low-income households.

2. Promoting infill development and socioeconomic equity, the protection of environmental and agricultural resources, and the encouragement of efficient development patterns.

3. Promoting an improved intraregional relationship between jobs and housing.

4. Allocating a lower proportion of housing need to an income category when a jurisdiction already has a disproportionately high share of households in that income category, as compared to the countywide distribution of households in that category from the most recent decennial United States census.
Consistency Between RHNA and SCS

SB 375 requires that the RHNA be consistent with the development pattern of the SCS, that the SCS show that it accommodates the RHNA, and that the SCS land use pattern, and therefore the RHNA, assist the region in meeting the greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction targets that will be set by the California Air Resources Board (CARB). The CARB established draft GHG targets on June 24, 2010, and plans to issue final GHG targets by September 30, 2010. SANDAG will need to develop the RHNA and the SCS in such a way that they assist the region in meeting these GHG targets.

Role of SANDAG Working Groups in RHNA Process

In its charter, the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG) – composed of the planning directors of the 18 cities and County of San Diego – is given the responsibility of reporting to the Regional Planning Committee on the RHNA. The Regional Housing Working Group (RHWG) advises the Regional Planning Committee on regional housing-related issues. Because of their common responsibilities, the TWG and RHWG will meet jointly to discuss and formulate recommendations to the Regional Planning Committee on the RHNA process, allocation methodology, and allocations. The first joint meeting of the two working groups occurred on June 8, 2010.

At that meeting, comments from working group members were focused on factors to be used in developing the RHNA. Interest was expressed in considering the following factors as the RHNA is developed:

- Subregional allocations
- Rural vs. urban areas
- Jobs/housing fit (as discussed in the Regional Targets Advisory Committee (RTAC) report)
- Transportation and housing costs
- Reducing GHG emissions
- Social equity and environmental justice
- Employment capacity
- Constraints to development such as airport influence areas, habitat, etc.
- Fair housing

The two working groups will meet again on Thursday, July 8, to further discuss the factors to be used in the development of the RHNA methodology.

Regional Planning Committee

The Regional Planning Committee discussed the RHNA schedule and RHNA objectives contained in state housing element law on April 2, 2010. Comments from members of the Committee included:

- Expression of interest in providing for socio-economically balanced communities that include housing for households in all four income categories (very low-, low-, moderate-, and above moderate-income);

- Expression of interest in considering state legislation that would allow counting (to a greater degree than currently allowed) affordable units that have been acquired, rehabilitated, and rent restricted (often referred to as “acq/rehab” units) in the identification of adequate sites section of the housing element and that would reflect the SANDAG RCP;
• A question regarding whether granny flats/second units can be used in the identification of adequate sites (state law allows such units to be counted); and

• A question regarding what affect the Palmer v. City of Los Angeles (2009 California Court of Appeals) decision will have on inclusionary housing. Based on this court decision, local jurisdiction inclusionary housing requirements may not be able to be applied to rental units unless the units are subsidized through a direct financial contribution or receive a density bonus incentive, because of preemption by a state law known as the Costa-Hawkins Rental Housing Act. This case is causing jurisdictions to consider changes to their inclusionary housing ordinances and could result in the construction of fewer affordable units.

Consultation with California Department of Housing and Community Development

Prior to the determination by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) of the region’s housing needs by income category for the next housing element cycle, SANDAG and HCD staff are required to consult with each other to exchange information about the assumptions and methodology (population projections, vacancy rates, household formation rates, etc.) used in the determination. HCD staff met with SANDAG staff on June 21, 2010, to continue the consultation that started during the formulation of the 2050 Regional Growth Forecast. Linda Wheaton from HCD and Mary Heim from the California Department of Finance both participated in the expert review meetings that took place during the development of the SANDAG 2050 forecast. SANDAG expects to receive its regional housing determination from HCD by the end of July.

Another issue that HCD and SANDAG staff discussed at the June 21 meeting was the requirement in SB 575 that SANDAG inform HCD of the adoption date for the 2050 RTP. Per SB 375, local jurisdiction housing elements are due within 18 months of adoption of the RTP. SANDAG staff is planning to inform HCD that the 2050 RTP is scheduled to be adopted on July 22, 2011 (at the regular Board of Directors meeting scheduled in July 2011). Based on that adoption date, local housing elements would be due no later than January 21, 2013. (If the RTP is adopted later than July 22, 2011, the due date for local housing elements also would be later.)

Next Steps

SANDAG staff will be keeping the Board of Directors informed and seeking its direction regularly during the RHNA process regarding the development of the RHNA methodology, the regional housing need determination from HCD, and the draft allocation numbers.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Attachments: 1. Excerpts from Housing Element Law (65584 and 65584.04) – Regional Housing Needs Assessment Objectives, Methodology, and Factors
   2. Key Dates for Regional Housing Needs Assessment Fifth Housing Element Update

Key Staff Contact: Susan Baldwin, (619) 699-1943, sba@sandag.org
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Excerpts from Housing Element Law (65584 and 65584.04)  
Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA)  
Objectives, Methodology, and Factors

65584. (a) (1) For the fourth and subsequent revisions of the housing element pursuant to Section 65588, the department shall determine the existing and projected need for housing for each region pursuant to this article. For purposes of subdivision (a) of Section 65583, the share of a city or county of the regional housing need shall include that share of the housing need of persons at all income levels within the area significantly affected by the general plan of the city or county.

(2) While it is the intent of the Legislature that cities, counties, and cities and counties should undertake all necessary actions to encourage, promote, and facilitate the development of housing to accommodate the entire regional housing need, it is recognized, however, that future housing production may not equal the regional housing need established for planning purposes.

(b) The department, in consultation with each council of governments, shall determine each region’s existing and projected housing need pursuant to Section 65584.01 at least two years prior to the scheduled revision required pursuant to Section 65588. The appropriate council of governments, or for cities and counties without a council of governments, the department, shall adopt a final regional housing need plan that allocates a share of the regional housing need to each city, county, or city and county at least one year prior to the scheduled revision for the region required by Section 65588. The allocation plan prepared by a council of governments shall be prepared pursuant to Sections 65584.04 and 65584.05 with the advice of the department.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the due dates for the determinations of the department or for the councils of governments, respectively, regarding the regional housing need may be extended by the department by not more than 60 days if the extension will enable access to more recent critical population or housing data from a pending or recent release of the United States Census Bureau or the Department of Finance. If the due date for the determination of the department or the council of governments is extended for this reason, the department shall extend the corresponding housing element revision deadline pursuant to Section 65588 by not more than 60 days.
(d) The regional housing needs allocation plan shall be consistent with all of the following objectives:

1. Increasing the housing supply and the mix of housing types, tenure, and affordability in all cities and counties within the region in an equitable manner, which shall result in each jurisdiction receiving an allocation of units for low and very low income households.

2. Promoting infill development and socioeconomic equity, the protection of environmental and agricultural resources, and the encouragement of efficient development patterns.

3. Promoting an improved intraregional relationship between jobs and housing.

4. Allocating a lower proportion of housing need to an income category when a jurisdiction already has a disproportionately high share of households in that income category, as compared to the countywide distribution of households in that category from the most recent decennial United States census.

(e) For purposes of this section, “household income levels” are as determined by the department as of the most recent decennial census pursuant to the following code sections:


2. Lower incomes, as defined by Section 50079.5 of the Health and Safety Code.

3. Moderate incomes, as defined by Section 50093 of the Health and Safety Code.

4. Above moderate incomes are those exceeding the moderate income level of Section 50093 of the Health and Safety Code.

(f) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, determinations made by the department, a council of governments, or a city or county pursuant to this section or Section 65584.01, 65584.02, 65584.03, 65584.04, 65584.05, 65584.06, or 65584.07 are exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (Division 13 (commencing with Section 21000) of the Public Resources Code).

65584.04. (a) At least two years prior to a scheduled revision required by Section 65588, each council of governments, or delegate subregion as applicable, shall develop a proposed methodology for distributing the existing and projected regional housing need to cities, counties, and cities and counties within the region or within the subregion, where applicable pursuant to this section. The
methodology shall be consistent with the objectives listed in subdivision (d) of Section 65584.

(b) (1) No more than six months prior to the development of a proposed methodology for distributing the existing and projected housing need, each council of governments shall survey each of its member jurisdictions to request, at a minimum, information regarding the factors listed in subdivision (d) that will allow the development of a methodology based upon the factors established in subdivision (d).

(2) The council of governments shall seek to obtain the information in a manner and format that is comparable throughout the region and utilize readily available data to the extent possible.

(3) The information provided by a local government pursuant to this section shall be used, to the extent possible, by the council of governments, or delegate subregion as applicable, as source information for the methodology developed pursuant to this section. The survey shall state that none of the information received may be used as a basis for reducing the total housing need established for the region pursuant to Section 65584.01.

(4) If the council of governments fails to conduct a survey pursuant to this subdivision, a city, county, or city and county may submit information related to the items listed in subdivision (d) prior to the public comment period provided for in subdivision (c).

(c) Public participation and access shall be required in the development of the methodology and in the process of drafting and adoption of the allocation of the regional housing needs. Participation by organizations other than local jurisdictions and councils of governments shall be solicited in a diligent effort to achieve public participation of all economic segments of the community. The proposed methodology, along with any relevant underlying data and assumptions, and an explanation of how information about local government conditions gathered pursuant to subdivision (b) has been used to develop the proposed methodology, and how each of the factors listed in subdivision (d) is incorporated into the methodology, shall be distributed to all cities, counties, any subregions, and members of the public who have made a written request for the proposed methodology. The council of governments, or delegate subregion, as applicable, shall conduct at least one public hearing to receive oral and written comments on the proposed methodology.

(d) To the extent that sufficient data is available from local governments pursuant to subdivision (b) or other sources, each council of governments, or delegate subregion as applicable, shall include the following factors to develop the methodology that allocates regional housing needs:

(1) Each member jurisdiction’s existing and projected jobs and housing relationship.
(2) The opportunities and constraints to development of additional housing in each member jurisdiction, including all of the following:

(A) Lack of capacity for sewer or water service due to federal or state laws, regulations or regulatory actions, or supply and distribution decisions made by a sewer or water service provider other than the local jurisdiction that preclude the jurisdiction from providing necessary infrastructure for additional development during the planning period.

(B) The availability of land suitable for urban development or for conversion to residential use, the availability of underutilized land, and opportunities for infill development and increased residential densities. The council of governments may not limit its consideration of suitable housing sites or land suitable for urban development to existing zoning ordinances and land use restrictions of a locality, but shall consider the potential for increased residential development under alternative zoning ordinances and land use restrictions. The determination of available land suitable for urban development may exclude lands where the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) or the Department of Water Resources has determined that the flood management infrastructure designed to protect that land is not adequate to avoid the risk of flooding.

(C) Lands preserved or protected from urban development under existing federal or state programs, or both, designed to protect open space, farmland, environmental habitats, and natural resources on a long-term basis.

(D) County policies to preserve prime agricultural land, as defined pursuant to Section 56064, within an unincorporated area.

(3) The distribution of household growth assumed for purposes of a comparable period of regional transportation plans and opportunities to maximize the use of public transportation and existing transportation infrastructure.

(4) The market demand for housing.

(5) Agreements between a county and cities in a county to direct growth toward incorporated areas of the county.

(6) The loss of units contained in assisted housing developments, as defined in paragraph (9) of subdivision (a) of Section 65583, that changed to non-low-income use through mortgage prepayment, subsidy contract expirations, or termination of use restrictions.

(7) High-housing cost burdens.

(8) The housing needs of farmworkers.

(9) The housing needs generated by the presence of a private university or a campus of the California State University or the University of California within any member jurisdiction.
(10) Any other factors adopted by the council of governments.

(e) The council of governments, or delegate subregion, as applicable, shall explain in writing how each of the factors described in subdivision (d) was incorporated into the methodology and how the methodology is consistent with subdivision (d) of Section 65584. The methodology may include numerical weighting.

(f) Any ordinance, policy, voter-approved measure, or standard of a city or county that directly or indirectly limits the number of residential building permits issued by a city or county shall not be a justification for a determination or a reduction in the share of a city or county of the regional housing need.

(g) In addition to the factors identified pursuant to subdivision (d), the council of governments, or delegate subregion, as applicable, shall identify any existing local, regional, or state incentives, such as a priority for funding or other incentives available to those local governments that are willing to accept a higher share than proposed in the draft allocation to those local governments by the council of governments or delegate subregion pursuant to Section 65584.05.

(h) Following the conclusion of the 60-day public comment period described in subdivision (c) on the proposed allocation methodology, and after making any revisions deemed appropriate by the council of governments, or delegate subregion, as applicable, as a result of comments received during the public comment period, each council of governments, or delegate subregion, as applicable, shall adopt a final regional, or subregional, housing need allocation methodology and provide notice of the adoption of the methodology to the jurisdictions within the region, or delegate subregion as applicable, and to the department.

(i) (1) It is the intent of the Legislature that housing planning be coordinated and integrated with the regional transportation plan. To achieve this goal, the allocation plan shall allocate housing units within the region consistent with the development pattern included in the sustainable communities strategy.

(2) The final allocation plan shall ensure that the total regional housing need, by income category, as determined under Section 65584, is maintained, and that each jurisdiction in the region receive an allocation of units for low- and very low income households.

(3) The resolution approving the final housing need allocation plan shall demonstrate that the plan is consistent with the sustainable communities strategy in the regional transportation plan.
### Key Dates for Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA)

#### Fifth Housing Element Update

**July 9, 2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feb 2010</td>
<td>SANDAG Board accepts 2050 Regional Growth Forecast for planning purposes for use in preparing the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS), and RHNA. (The California Department of Finance (DOF) and Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) staff participated in SANDAG’s forecast advisory group.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 1, 2010</td>
<td>Eleven-year RHNA projection period for fifth housing element cycle starts (January 1, 2010 – December 31, 2020)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1, 2010</td>
<td>DOF issues 2010 E-5 estimates used in RHNA consultation process; SANDAG and HCD continue consultation started during development of 2050 Regional Growth Forecast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May – Dec 2010</td>
<td>Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG) and Regional Housing Working Group (RHWG) develop RHNA methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 10, 2010</td>
<td>Joint TWG/RHWG meeting to kick off RHNA methodology discussion: RHNA background, schedule, and principles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 2010</td>
<td>HCD provides SANDAG with regional housing need determination for RHNA projection period: January 1, 2010 – December 31, 2020 (11 years) (The SANDAG 2050 Regional Growth Forecast projects an additional 127,000 housing units during the 11-year RHNA projection period.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 9, 2010</td>
<td>SANDAG Board of Directors holds policy meeting to discuss RHNA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 23, 2010</td>
<td>SANDAG provides HCD and Caltrans date of expected adoption of 2050 RTP in writing as required by SB 575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul – Dec 2010</td>
<td>TWG and RHWG prepare draft jurisdiction/income RHNA allocations based on RHNA methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 2011</td>
<td>Draft of RTP/SCS/RHNA accepted for distribution/public review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 22, 2011</td>
<td>Final RTP/SCS/RHNA adopted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 21, 2013</td>
<td>Due date for January 1, 2013 – December 31, 2020 (8 year) housing elements due within 18 months after RTP is adopted)*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Housing elements are due every four years for:

1. Jurisdictions that did not adopt their fourth housing element revisions by January 1, 2009, and did not adopt the fourth revision by March 31, 2010, and complete any rezoning contained in the housing element program by June 30, 2010; and

2. Jurisdictions that do not adopt their housing element within 120 days from next housing element due date.