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MISSION STATEMENT

The Regional Planning Committee provides oversight for the preparation and implementation of the Regional Comprehensive Plan that is based on the local general plans and regional plans and addresses interregional issues with surrounding counties and Mexico. The components of the plan include: transportation, housing, environment (shoreline, air quality, water quality, habitat), economy, borders, regional infrastructure needs and financing, and land use and design.
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Welcome to SANDAG. Members of the public may speak to the Regional Planning Committee on any item at the time the Committee is considering the item. Please complete a Speaker’s Slip, which is located in the rear of the room, and then present the slip to Committee staff. Also, members of the public are invited to address the Committee on any issue under the agenda item entitled Public Comments/Communications/Member Comments. Public speakers are limited to three minutes or less per person. The Regional Planning Committee may take action on any item appearing on the agenda.

This agenda and related staff reports can be accessed at www.sandag.org under meetings on the SANDAG Web site. Public comments regarding the agenda can be forwarded to SANDAG via the e-mail comment form also available on the Web site. E-mail comments should be received no later than noon, two working days prior to the Regional Planning Committee meeting. Any handouts, presentations, or other materials from the public intended for distribution at the Regional Planning Committee meeting should be received by the Clerk of the Board no later than 12 noon, two working days prior to the meeting.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), SANDAG will accommodate persons who require assistance in order to participate in SANDAG meetings. If such assistance is required, please contact SANDAG at (619) 699-1900 at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting. To request this document or related reports in an alternative format, please call (619) 699-1900, (619) 699-1904 (TTY), or fax (619) 699-1905.

SANDAG offices are accessible by public transit. Phone 511 or see 511sd.com for route information.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM #</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>APPROVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPROVAL OF DECEMBER 3, 2010, MEETING MINUTES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

Members of the public shall have the opportunity to address the Regional Planning Committee (RPC) on any issue within the jurisdiction of the Committee that is not on this agenda. Anyone desiring to speak shall reserve time by completing a “Request to Speak” form and giving it to the Clerk prior to speaking. Public speakers should notify the Clerk if they have a handout for distribution to Committee members. Public speakers are limited to three minutes or less per person. Committee members also may provide information and announcements under this agenda item.

CHAIR’S REPORT (3)

3. REMINDER: JOINT MEETING WITH COUNTY WATER AUTHORITY’S WATER SUPPLY PLANNING COMMITTEE NEXT MONTH (Chair Jim Janney)

This is a reminder that the February 11, 2011, RPC meeting will be held jointly with the San Diego County Water Authority’s Water Supply Planning Committee at the Water Authority offices from 12:30 to 2:30 p.m., immediately following the SANDAG Board Policy meeting. Additional information will be included with the agenda mail-out. RPC members are requested to mark their calendars for this special meeting.

REPORTS (4 through 7)

4. OVERVIEW OF SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL AND THE 2050 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN – DRAFT WHITE PAPER (Bridget Enderle)

The preliminary draft white paper, “Overview of Safe Routes to School and the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP),” describes the role of Safe Routes to School strategies in regional planning and proposes a preliminary strategic framework for potential integration into the 2050 RTP. Model regional strategies are identified as well as implications for next steps. The white paper will be presented for the RPC’s information.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM #</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>REGIONAL BEACH SAND PROJECT (RBSP) II ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT/ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT PUBLIC REVIEW PERIOD (Shelby Tucker) INFORMATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The public review period for the Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Assessment (EIR/EA) for the RBSP II will open on January 20, 2011, for 45 days. All interested parties are encouraged to provide comments on the document. Certification of the final EIR/EA is anticipated in June 2011, and if certified, project construction is slated to begin in spring 2012.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>SAN DIEGO REGION AGGREGATE SUPPLY STUDY (Cheryl Mason) INFORMATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At the June 2008 RPC meeting, staff presented an overview of an aggregate shortage facing the San Diego region and informed the Committee that staff would collaborate with Caltrans and apply for a Transportation Planning Special Studies grant to explore the topic more fully. SANDAG received the grant in 2009 to prepare a report identifying issues surrounding aggregate and develop geographic information system and other tools that policymakers could use to help identify potential aggregate sources. The Executive Summary of the report is attached. The full report will be distributed at the meeting. Staff will present the major findings from this study for the RPC’s information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>HIGHLIGHTING SMART GROWTH: THE VILLAGE AT MARKET CREEK (Jennifer Vanica, President/CEO, Jacobs Center for Neighborhood Innovation) INFORMATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The RPC periodically receives presentations on smart growth efforts happening in the San Diego region. Earlier this year, three local projects were designated by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) as “Catalyst Projects” for the California Sustainable Strategies Pilot Program, funded by Proposition 1C funds. The “Catalyst Project” designation supports projects that encourage sustainable communities and test innovative strategies to increase housing supply and affordability, employment opportunities, and transportation choices. Ms. Vanica will make a presentation on “The Village at Market Creek,” one of the recipients of the Catalyst Project designation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>UPCOMING MEETINGS INFORMATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The next meeting of the RPC is scheduled for February 11, 2011, from 12:30 to 2:30 p.m. at the offices of the San Diego County Water Authority in Kearny Mesa, at 4677 Overland Avenue, San Diego, CA 92123. This special meeting will occur on the second Friday in February. Please note the 12:30 p.m. start time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>ADJOURNMENT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+next to an item indicates an attachment
The meeting of the Regional Planning Committee (RPC) was called to order by Chair Jim Janney (South County) at 12:20 p.m. See the attached attendance sheet for RPC member attendance.

1. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES (APPROVE)

   Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Lesa Heebner (North County Coastal) and a second by Chairwoman Pam Slater-Price (County of San Diego), the RPC unanimously approved (1a) the minutes from the September 10, 2010, RPC meeting; and (1b) the October 15, 2010, Joint Regional Planning and Transportation Committee meeting.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

   Action: There were no public comments/communications/member comments.

3. ANNOUNCEMENT: UPCOMING JOINT MEETING WITH SAN DIEGO COUNTY WATER AUTHORITY’S WATER SUPPLY PLANNING COMMITTEE (INFORMATION)

   Chair Janney informed a joint meeting between SANDAG’s RPC and the San Diego County Water Authority’s (CWA) Water Supply Planning Committee will be held on Friday, February 11, 2011, from 12 noon to 2:30 p.m. at the CWA office. Additional information will be provided as the meeting date approaches. RPC members were asked to mark their calendars for this joint meeting.

   Renée Wasmund, Chief Deputy Executive Director (SANDAG), said the meeting’s time will be adjusted due to the morning Executive Committee and Board Policy meetings on that date.

   Action: This item was presented for information only.
REPORTS (4 through 8)

4. TransNet FIVE-YEAR FUNDING STRATEGY UPDATE, FY 2011 FUNDING ALLOCATION, AND FY 2011 LAND MANAGEMENT GRANT CRITERIA (RECOMMEND)

Keith Greer, Senior Planner, reported on the minor updates to the approved five-year Environmental Mitigation Program funding strategy, the allocation of FY 2011 funding for regional management and monitoring activities, and modifications to land management grant criteria for FY 2011. The RPC’s recommendations will be presented to the Board of Directors on January 28, 2011, for review and approval.

Action: Upon a motion by Chairwoman Pam Slater-Price (County of San Diego) and a second by Councilmember Lesa Heebner (North County Coastal), the RPC unanimously recommended to the SANDAG Board of Directors to: (1) approve the updated Five-Year Conceptual Funding Strategic Plan, the proposed management and monitoring activities and budget for FY 2011 totaling $4 million, and, subject to Board Policy No. 017, authorize staff to solicit proposals and enter into contracts or amend existing contracts accordingly; and (2) adopt the modifications to the eligibility and evaluation criteria for land management grants for FY 2011 as described in Attachment 4 of the report.

Chair Janney announced Agenda Item #6 would be taken before Agenda Item #5 due to the relationship of the two items.

6. SAN DIEGO REGION: PLANNING FOR HEALTHY COMMUNITIES (INFORMATION)

Stephan Vance, Senior Planner, reported on the white paper which has been developed to describe the relevant issues and potential approaches to determine how public health considerations could be taken into account in the planning, funding, and project development process, as part of the Communities Putting Prevention to Work (CPPW) project that SANDAG is working on in conjunction with the County Health and Human Services Agency to combat obesity.

Action: This item was provided for information only.

5. COMMUNITIES PUTTING PREVENTION TO WORK: GRANT PROGRAMS EVALUATION CRITERIA AND PROCESS (RECOMMEND)

Vikrant Sood, Public Health Specialist, presented the proposed grant program objectives, eligibility, evaluation criteria, selection process, and timelines for the Healthy Community Planning Grants, Active Community Transportation Grants, Safe Routes to School Capacity Building and Planning Grants, and the Safe Routes to School Education, Encouragement, and Enforcement Grants.

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Lesa Heebner (North County Coastal) and a second by Chairwoman Pam Slater-Price (County of San Diego), the RPC unanimously recommended that the Board of Directors approve the proposed grant program objectives, eligibility, evaluation criteria, and process as shown in Attachment 2.
7. REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT DETERMINATION (INFORMATION)

Housing and Community Development provided SANDAG with the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) Determination for the RHNA planning period, which extends from January 2, 2010, through December 31, 2020 (11 years), for the fifth housing element cycles. The fifth housing element covers the time period of January 1, 2013, to December 31, 2020. Susan Baldwin, Senior Planner, reported on the RHNA process and determination.

Action: This item was provided for information only.

8. HIGHLIGHTING SMART GROWTH: LA MESA GENERAL PLAN UPDATE (INFORMATION)

Bill Chopyk, Community Director of the City of La Mesa, provided an overview of the process, the kinds of issues under consideration, and “lessons learned” during the early stages of the update of the General Plan for the City of La Mesa.

Action: This item was provided for information only.

9. UPCOMING MEETINGS

The next meeting of the RPC is scheduled for Friday, January 7, 2011, at 12 noon.

10. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Janney adjourned the meeting at 1:36 p.m.

Attachment: Attendance Sheet
## CONFIRMED ATTENDANCE
### SANDAG REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING
#### DECEMBER 3, 2010 — 12 noon to 2 p.m.

<table>
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<th>ATTENDING</th>
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<td>North County Coastal</td>
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<td>Lesa Heebner</td>
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<td>✓</td>
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<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Encinitas</td>
<td>Teresa Barth</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East County</td>
<td>City of Lemon Grove</td>
<td>Jerry Jones, Vice Chair</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Lemon Grove</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Jerry Sanders</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Sherri Lightner</td>
<td>1st Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
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<tr>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Pam Slater-Price</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Bill Horn</td>
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<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Members</td>
<td>Caltrans, District 11</td>
<td>Laurie Berman</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bill Figge</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>San Diego County Water Authority</td>
<td>Elsa Saxod</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Howard Williams</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>Department of Defense</td>
<td>Steve Chung</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>San Diego Unified Port District</td>
<td>Lou Smith</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Steve Padilla</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>Al Ovrom</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>NCTD</td>
<td>Carl Hilliard</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sam Abed</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG)</td>
<td>Bill Anderson</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bill Chopyk</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>Southern California Tribal Chairmen’s Association</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Allen Lawson (San Pasqual)</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Denis Turner (SCTCA)</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Mitigation Program Advisory Member</td>
<td>Wildlife Conservation Board</td>
<td>Dave Means</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Mitigation Program Advisory Member</td>
<td>California Department of Fish and Game</td>
<td><strong>Vacant</strong></td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Mitigation Program Advisory Member</td>
<td>US Army Corps of Engineers</td>
<td>Steve Juarez</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Mitigation Program Advisory Member</td>
<td>US Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
<td>David Mayer</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Mitigation Program Advisory Member</td>
<td>US Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
<td>Therese O’Rourke</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Mitigation Program Advisory Member</td>
<td>US Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
<td>Michelle Matson</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Mitigation Program Advisory Member</td>
<td>US Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
<td><strong>Vacant</strong></td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Mitigation Program Advisory Member</td>
<td>US Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
<td>Susan Wynn</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OVERVIEW OF SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL AND THE
2050 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN: DRAFT WHITE PAPER

Introduction

The draft white paper, Overview of Safe Routes to School and the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), describes the role of Safe Routes to School strategies in regional planning and proposes a preliminary strategic framework for potential integration in the 2050 RTP. Model regional strategies are identified as well as implications for next steps.

Discussion

SANDAG is in the process of developing a regional Safe Routes to School strategy that will establish regional policies and implementation actions to facilitate local, comprehensive Safe Routes to School programs throughout the region. The initial stage in this process includes developing a draft white paper to identify broad strategic focus areas and actions for possible integration into the RTP and to serve as the foundation for the Safe Routes to School strategy.

Throughout November and December 2010, staff has solicited input on the preliminary draft white paper from the following SANDAG working groups and committee: the Public Health Stakeholders Group, Bicycle-Pedestrian Working Group, Regional Planning Stakeholder Working Group, Regional Planning Technical Working Group, and Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee. The attached draft white paper addresses comments provided by these working groups and committee.

Next Steps

SANDAG already is aggressively pursuing some of the actions presented in this white paper, whereas others may be more appropriately reserved for future analysis. SANDAG will work with its member agencies, key stakeholders, and professionals with expertise in Safe Routes to School, to expand upon and refine the proposed framework. Crucial to this process is identifying participating agencies and their respective roles in implementing the strategy. Anticipated in March 2012, the San Diego Regional Safe Routes to School Strategic Plan will present the complete regional Safe Routes to School strategy which will include detailed recommendations and responsible agencies required to effectively implement the strategy.

CHARLES “MUGGS” STOLL
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachment: 1. Overview of Safe Routes to School and the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan – Draft White Paper

Key Staff Contact: Bridget Enderle, (619) 595-5612, ben@sandag.org
THE OVERVIEW OF SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL AND THE 2050 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN - DRAFT WHITE PAPER

INTRODUCTION

Safe Routes to School programs share the principal goals of increasing the number of children and adolescents walking and bicycling to school, improving pedestrian and bicycle safety, and decreasing school-related vehicle trips to improve air quality and reduce traffic congestion in school zones. Safe Routes to School efforts also heighten awareness about the built environment, air quality, health, and quality of life benefits associated with these programs. To accomplish these goals, Safe Routes to School programs utilize five strategies: planning and evaluation, infrastructure improvements, traffic law enforcement, education, and other activities that encourage children to walk and bicycle to school. Comprehensive Safe Routes to School programs encompass all of these components commonly referred to as the “Five E’s” (engineering, education, enforcement, encouragement, and evaluation).

Safe Routes to School programs initially emerged in response to child pedestrian safety issues in school areas and to a precipitous decline in the numbers of children walking and biking to school and acknowledgement that this trend contributed to an overall decrease in physical activity amongst children. Largely correlated with physical inactivity, childhood obesity rates have risen exponentially over the last few decades and currently persist at critical levels, with approximately 32 percent of United States youths ages two to 19 classified as overweight and 17 percent considered obese. This trend is equally severe in the San Diego region, with approximately 31 percent of fifth, seventh, and ninth grade students categorized as overweight.

Numerous studies have examined the impact of school mode choice on physical activity levels, finding that children who walk or bike to school tend to meet recommended physical activity levels and have a greater propensity to be active throughout the day. Further, physical activity has proven to have a significant impact on cognitive functioning and academic performance amongst youths.

In addition to positive effects on youth health, Safe Routes to School programs have been shown to significantly reduce traffic congestion, and consequently, improve air quality. In Marin County, for example, school-related trips constitute 21 percent of morning peak period trips compared to 11 percent in most United States geographic areas. Responding to this challenge, Marin County’s robust Safe Routes to School program is credited with decreasing single-student automobile school trips by 15 percent.

Studies examining the impact of California’s state-legislated Safe Routes to School grant program indicate that Safe Routes to School-funded infrastructure projects significantly influence mode choice in favor of walking and biking. The body of research that examines the impacts of Safe Routes to School programs on travel behaviors and safety is relatively diminutive, yet growing. In recent years, Safe Routes to School programs have generated significant attention among planners, policymakers, and public health professionals, increasing the amount of research, data collection and standardization, and funding devoted to Safe Routes to School.

Within the regional planning context, Safe Routes to School is gaining prominence as an effective transportation demand management (TDM), air quality, and greenhouse gas reduction strategy in addition to an essential component to regional active transportation planning. It also plays a developing role in addressing transportation equity by targeting public health impacts and serving low-income communities. Accordingly, this paper provides an overview of model regional Safe Routes to School strategies and delineates a potential Safe Routes to School policy direction for the San Diego region.

Relative to the goals of the SANDAG 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (2050 RTP), the objectives of this white paper are to:

- Provide contextual information about Safe Routes to School.
- Summarize Safe Routes to School strategies initiated by regional planning agencies throughout the United States that may prove applicable within the San Diego region.
- Propose preliminary strategic actions for potential inclusion in the 2050 RTP and as a possible framework for developing a regional strategy to advance Safe Routes to School within the region.

This white paper is an initial task in the development of the San Diego Regional Safe Routes to School Strategic Plan, which will articulate the details of the regional strategy, including specific implementation actions, responsible agencies, and estimated costs required for successful

---

7U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Highway Administration (August 2007) National Household Travel Survey Brief.
8Transportation Authority of Marin County (2009) Measure A Transportation Sales Tax Measure Strategic Plan.
10Weigand, L. (June 2008) “A Review of the Literature: the Effectiveness of Safe Routes to School and Other Programs to Promote Active Transportation to School.” Initiative for Bicycle and Pedestrian Innovation, CUS-CTS-0801.
implementation. The San Diego Regional Safe Routes to School Strategic Plan development is funded by the County of San Diego Health and Human Services Agency “Communities Putting Prevention to Work” (CPPW) program.\footnote{11}{Note: Communities Putting Prevention to Work is a program of the County of San Diego Health and Human Services Agency funded by the federal Centers for Disease Control and Prevention through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA).}

**BACKGROUND**

In the United States, a proliferation of programs to facilitate safe walking and biking to school has occurred in response to a drastic decline in the numbers of children walking and biking to school, from approximately 48 percent of youths 5 to 14 years old in 1969 to 13 percent in 2009.\footnote{12}{National Center for Safe Routes to School (April 8, 2010) News Release: “U.S. Travel Data Show Decline in Walking and Bicycling to School has Stabilized.”}

The safety and health implications of this trend spurred several local efforts in New York, Florida, and Chicago beginning in the mid-1990s and ultimately led to state and federal legislation to authorize Safe Routes to School programming and funding.

California’s pioneering Safe Routes to School program was established in October 1999 with the passage of California Assembly Bill 1475 (AB 1475). AB 1475 allocated one-third of California’s federal Surface Transportation Program (STP) safety funds toward Safe Routes to School, thus creating the first statewide Safe Routes to School construction program in the United States. A coalition of urban planning, engineering, public health, education, law enforcement, active transportation advocacy groups, and other professional organizations were instrumental in advancing the bill.

The initial two-year program administered by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) restricted funding to infrastructure projects. However, succeeding program cycles have authorized funds to be used for education and encouragement programs at the schools that the infrastructure projects serve. Under the current grant program guidelines (Cycle 9), incorporated cities and counties are eligible to apply for up to $450,000 toward construction projects that target grades K–12 schools and may apply ten percent of project funding toward education, enforcement, and encouragement activities and/or school grounds improvements. A ten percent match of funds is required for the California state program. The non-infrastructure program allowance is sometimes underutilized; however, in many communities this component of the program is a pivotal part of the strategy to support travel behavior change.

At the federal level, Safe Routes to School commenced in 2000 when the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) awarded $50,000 each to launch pilot programs in Marin County, California and Arlington, Massachusetts geared toward increasing rates of walking and biking to school. The successes of these and other programs, particularly in Marin County, ultimately led to federal Safe Routes to School legislation. In 2005, the federal surface transportation bill, Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), authorized $612 million in funding under Section 1404 to state departments of transportation for Safe Routes to School programs through September 2009. The funding is allotted to states based on
their relative proportions of total enrollment in primary and middle schools. The federal surface transportation bill is currently operating under another short-term extension through March 4, 2011.

Under the current federal Safe Routes to School grant program guidelines, state, regional, and local agencies, school districts and non-traditional entities are all eligible to apply for funding toward infrastructure or non-infrastructure projects that affect children in grades K-8. California’s approximate allocation of funds over this five-year period is $68 million, with a target of 70 percent of those funds provided to infrastructure projects and 30 percent toward education, encouragement and enforcement activities.

While primary funding for Safe Routes to School programs has historically derived from the state and federal programs, the planning and implementation of Safe Routes to School programs is inherently local, relying on collaboration between local jurisdictions, school districts, schools, and community-based and nonprofit organizations. A substantial number of cities and local communities are working together to develop Safe Routes to School plans that include the following key components:

- Existing conditions and needs assessments;
- Priority infrastructure improvements to facilitate safe walking and biking to school routes;
- Education, encouragement, and enforcement strategies; and
- Monitoring and evaluation strategies.

Nonprofit organizations, such as the National Center for Safe Routes to School, Safe Routes to School National Partnership, and California Active Communities also play a vital role in Safe Routes to School, providing extensive information and resources to communities interested in initiating programs.

The role of regional planning agencies in Safe Routes to School has been relatively limited except in a few locations, although this tendency is changing. In California and throughout the United States, regional planning agencies are increasingly integrating Safe Routes to School initiatives into their work programs and planning efforts to advance Safe Routes to School programs regionally.

**DISCUSSION**

The emerging role of Safe Routes to School in regional planning has significant implications for the San Diego region. While several effective Safe Routes to School programs exist throughout the region, there is an opportunity to coordinate and build upon the accomplishments of these programs. This section of the white paper provides a brief synopsis of Safe Routes to School efforts in the San Diego region and then summarizes other regions’ Safe Routes to School strategies with the purpose of identifying model approaches to a possible San Diego Regional Safe Routes to School Strategy. The following discussion is not exhaustive; greater detail on current local initiatives and relevant model strategies will be included in the future Regional Safe Routes to School Strategic Plan.
Safe Routes to School in the San Diego Region

Several cities in the San Diego region have planned or implemented successful Safe Routes to School programs within the region; however, the region currently lacks an overall strategy to build on these successes.

In 2007, Chula Vista launched a two-part Safe Routes to School program, expanding upon two years of Safe Routes to School infrastructure improvements. The City of Chula Vista and Chula Vista Elementary School District (CVESD) partnered to submit complementary federal-legislated Safe Routes to School grant applications for approximately $620,000 toward infrastructure improvements led by the City and about $500,000 in programmatic activities led by CVESD.

The City of La Mesa’s Safe Routes to School program also consists of a combination of infrastructure improvements and programs and is a critical element of its citywide health and wellness policies. Both of these jurisdictions are continuing these programs with 2010 state-legislated Safe Routes to School grant awards.

The cities of National City, Lemon Grove, and San Marcos and the County of San Diego also received Safe Routes to School funding through the current state program cycle, generating a combined total of $1.6 million toward Safe Routes to School related infrastructure improvements.13

The City of San Diego has submitted grant applications since the inception of the state Safe Routes to School program, resulting in nine grant awards totaling approximately $4.3 million toward infrastructure and non-infrastructure activities. For several years, the City of Encinitas has prioritized and secured funding for Safe Routes to School improvement projects and programs. Many cities, including Encinitas, also have integrated Safe Routes to School assessments and project identification into broader planning efforts, such as their bicycle master plans and pedestrian master plans. Collaboration with non-governmental organizations is a vital element to Safe Routes to School implementation throughout the San Diego region. Walk San Diego, Rady Children’s Hospital, City Heights Community Development Corporation, and several community-based organizations partner with cities to implement non-infrastructure program components.

Some support is currently provided at the regional level to encourage local Safe Routes to School programs. SANDAG iCommute’s SchoolPool Program is a free matching system to connect parents of children who attend the same school and are interested in carpooling. Approximately 400 parents from 41 schools currently participate in the SchoolPool program. Carpooling is a vital element to many Safe Routes to School programs, particularly for schools where a significant portion of the student population live further from school than is a reasonable distance to walk or bike. Carpooling reduces vehicle congestion in school zones, which promotes cleaner air and safety around the school. With funding from the County of San Diego Health and Human Services Agency CPPW program, iCommute is developing a “Walk, Ride and Roll to School” campaign to expand school and parent participation in SchoolPool and to launch “Walking School Bus” and “Bike Buddies” elements to the program. These program elements encourage students to walk or bike to school as a group, supported by adult-supervision and safety education.

13California Department of Transportation, Cycle 9 SR2S Final Project List (October 14, 2010).
The regional Active Transportation Program funds bicycle, pedestrian, and neighborhood safety (traffic calming) projects and programs including projects that improve access and safety in school areas. Funding for the Active Transportation Program derives from the TransNet ½-cent transportation sales tax program and the Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 3 Non-motorized funds. Since the program’s inception in FY 1988, SANDAG has provided approximately $28 million in TransNet revenues and $37 million TDA funds to active transportation projects throughout the region, primarily through a local competitive grant process. Including TransNet and TDA, future revenues for the Active Transportation Program between FY 2011 and FY 2048 are projected to be approximately $373 million in 2010 dollars.

Regional plans also note the importance of Safe Routes to School programs. Riding to 2050: San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan provides a description of Safe Routes to School, emphasizing the process of launching new programs. Chapter 8 of the current 2030 RTP, entitled Demand Management: How can we Take the Pressure off the System, includes a brief discussion of Safe Routes to School, encouraging local jurisdictions to aggressively pursue state and federal Safe Routes to School grant funding. In the 2030 RTP, Safe Routes to School is presented as one facet to promoting “Walkable Communities,” which is one of six subsections to the region’s TDM strategy.

To enhance support for local Safe Routes to School efforts, SANDAG is in the process of developing the San Diego Regional Safe Routes to School Strategy. The anticipated benefits of this strategy are substantial and would help contribute to meeting the regional greenhouse gas reduction targets for the 2050 RTP Sustainable Communities Strategy. Specifically, implementing the Safe Routes to School Strategy is anticipated to increase school walk and bike trips by 10 percent in 2020 and 20 percent by 2035, resulting in about 8,900 fewer pounds of CO₂ by 2020 and approximately 18,300 fewer pounds by 2035. Other benefits derived from implementing the strategy will be captured through a comprehensive evaluation process.

**Model Strategies**

This section of the white paper describes exemplary strategies employed by other regional planning agencies to advance Safe Routes to School within their jurisdiction. Several initiatives not presented in this white paper also have been reviewed, and elements are under consideration, including those initiated in Pima, Maricopa, and Coconino counties, Arizona; Miami-Dade, and Orange counties, Florida; the Nashville metropolitan area; Benton County, Oregon; and San Luis Obispo and Riverside counties, California. In this section, emphasis is placed on agencies with comparable authority and responsibility as SANDAG; however, nonprofit organizations and other public agencies also play vital roles in regionwide implementation of Safe Routes to School efforts. Common elements between model strategies include:

- Institutionalizing Safe Routes to School in regional planning strategies;
- Utilizing partnerships to implement programs;
- Committing funding;
- Providing technical planning and program development assistance; and
- Delivering select education and encouragement programs to participating communities.
This review is intended to assist in developing the San Diego Regional Safe Routes to School Strategy.

**Metropolitan Transportation Commission**

The San Francisco Bay Area Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) recently committed to a substantial investment in Safe Routes to School programs within its nine-county jurisdiction. In 2009, MTC allocated $80 million over three years toward its Climate Initiatives Program. The funding for the Climate Initiatives Program derives from the agency’s anticipated $1.4 billion six-year (Cycle 1 and 2) STP and Congestion Mitigation & Air Quality (CMAQ) federal revenues.

A key component of the Climate Initiatives Program is the MTC Safe Routes to School Program, composed of $17 million in funding to Bay Area counties. This $17 million investment is allocated in two ways: $2 million is awarded through a competitive grant program intended to advance innovative Safe Routes to School-related greenhouse gas emission reduction strategies; and $15 million is distributed directly to counties proportionate to their percentage of the region’s total school enrollment population. Leveraged with county, state, federal, and other sources of funding, funding support from MTC is expected to contribute to some of the most comprehensive and effective Safe Routes to School programs in the United States.\(^{14}\)

**Transportation Authority of Marin County**

Marin County’s Safe Routes to School initiative is nationally recognized for its innovative and comprehensive approach, extensive participation levels, and effectiveness at shifting school travel modes from single-student vehicle trips to alternative modes. During the 2007/2008 school year, 90 percent of students living within a half-mile of school walked or bicycled to school. The program continues to impact countywide mode choice, with a three percent shift from single-student automobile trips to active transportation modes between fall 2006 and spring 2007.\(^ {15}\) The Transportation Authority of Marin (TAM) attributes the program with more than 15 percent mode shift since its inception.\(^ {16}\)

The Marin County Bicycle Coalition initiated the effort in 2000 as a pilot program funded with monies from the Marin Community Foundation, California Department of Public Health, and the federal NHTSA. Since its inception, the scope and impact of the program has grown significantly particularly after TAM acquired administration of the program in 2005. Currently, the initiative consists of three main components: the Safe Routes to School program, Crossing Guards, and Safe Pathways to School.

The Safe Routes to School program facet of the Marin County effort focuses on education and encouragement, program delivery, technical planning assistance, and program evaluation. TAM contracts with a consulting firm, Parisi Associates, and its subconsultants, the Marin County Bicycle Coalition, to implement the program. The consultant team develops, facilitates, and recruits schools to participate in school teams and task forces, classroom curriculums, and events and contests such

---

\(^{14}\)Attachment A to MTC Resolution No. 3925, Revised, New Surface Transportation Authorization Act Cycle 1 STP/CMAQ Project Selection Criteria and Programming Policy.

\(^{15}\)Transportation Authority of Marin County (June 2008) “Safe Routes to School Evaluation and Recommendations for the School Years 2006-2007 and 2007-2008.”

\(^{16}\)Transportation Authority of Marin County (2009) Measure A Transportation Sales Tax Measure Strategic Plan.
as SchoolPool, Pollution Punch Card, and Walk and Roll to School Days. The TAM Safe Routes to School Web site provides downloadable guidebooks for each of its major education and encouragement programs to assist schools in the implementation of these programs. In coordination with school teams, the contractor also develops Safe Routes to School Travel Plans. The plans include capital improvement plans and program recommendations. Another key element of the Safe Routes to School program is a two-fold annual evaluation that measures participation levels and school-specific mode shift.

The Crossing Guards component of the initiative provides up to 70 crossing guards (63 during the 2009/2010 school year) at high-priority locations identified by criteria developed by TAM and the region’s public works directors, with input from the Marin County Measure A Technical Advisory Committee. Crossing Guards is implemented through a contract with a professional traffic safety company.

Safe Pathways is the capital improvement facet of the TAM initiative. The program funds the design and construction of capital projects identified in Safe Routes to School Travel Plans developed through the Safe Routes to School program. Approximately $1.5 million will be available in FY 2011 to fund Safe Pathways projects.

The Marin County initiative is funded by Measure A, the half percent transportation sales tax approved by local voters in 2004 to span a 20-year period. Eleven percent of Measure A revenues are allotted for the Safe Routes to School initiative and distributed among the three efforts as follows: Crossing Guards (4.2%), Safe Pathways (3.5%), and Safe Routes to School Program (3.3%).

**Safe Routes to School Alameda County**

Safe Routes to School Alameda County provides a variety of educational, encouragement, and planning resources to participating schools throughout the County. The program is coordinated through the Alameda County Safe Routes to School Partnership, a countywide collaborative effort among TransForm, the Alameda County Public Health Department, Cycles of Change, and several other agencies with smaller roles. TransForm, the lead agency, and Cycles of Change are nonprofit organizations focused on advancing alternative transportation in the Bay Area. The Partnership works with school staff and parent volunteers to deliver programs, such as pedestrian rodeos, bicycle physical education classes, family cycling clinics, walking school buses, parent workshops, and school assemblies.

Safe Routes to School Alameda County is funded in part through the Bicycle and Pedestrian Grant Program of Measure B, Alameda County’s half-cent transportation sales tax. Over a 20-year period, Measure B will generate more than $3 billion for transportation improvements, including $80 million (five percent) allocated toward improving bicycle and pedestrian safety and access. This $80 million is distributed through two avenues: 75 percent is pass-through funding allocated to cities and the County of Alameda based on population, and 25 percent funds countywide efforts including a Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Coordinator and the competitive grant program. Measure B is administered by Alameda County Transportation Improvement Authority (ACTIA),

17See: www.tam.ca.gov/index.aspx?page=95
18TAM (2009) Measure A Transportation Sales Tax Strategic Plan Update.
19TAM (September 2010) Public Notice: “2010 Measure A Transportation Sales Tax Strategic Plan Update.”
which recently merged with Alameda County Congestion Management Agency (ACCMA) to form a new countywide transportation agency, Alameda County Transportation Commission (Alameda CTC).

In 2009, the Safe Routes to School Alameda County program was awarded $820,000 through the Measure B grant program, which was matched with an additional $1,075,000 from foundations, Caltrans Safe Routes to School program, Kaiser Permanente, and the Bay Area Air Quality Management District. The current grant cycle spans two school years, 2009/2010 and 2010/2011. It builds on the successes of the first program cycle initiated in 2007, which supported the establishment of 50 comprehensive Safe Routes to School programs.20

Sacramento Area Council of Governments

The currently adopted Metropolitan Transportation Plan 2035 (MTP 2035) for the Sacramento region commits Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) to strengthening its existing Safe Routes to School efforts. SACOG currently facilitates Safe Routes to School by providing technical assistance such as: consulting with local jurisdictions or schools that are initiating a program; providing input on outreach, educational, and other materials; assisting agencies with completing grant applications and reporting requirements; and suggesting general planning strategies. SACOG also maintains a Safe Routes to School list serve and offers related presentations by request through their Speakers Bureau.

As outlined in the current MTP 203521, SACOG will do the following: develop a regional policy to promote Safe Routes to School; convene cities, counties, school districts, and transit operators in workshops to identify opportunities to collaborate on reducing greenhouse gas emissions, including Safe Routes to School strategies; and launch a pilot Safe Routes to School mini-grant program. SACOG was recently awarded the mini-grant funding through Caltrans and plans to release a call for projects in late winter/early spring 2011.22

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on a review of model strategies and guidelines, this section presents a preliminary Safe Routes to School strategic framework for possible integration into the 2050 RTP and to guide the ongoing development of a Regional Safe Routes to School Strategic Plan. First, general recommendations for the 2050 RTP are presented. Then, a preliminary framework is outlined that consists of strategic areas and potential actions intended to advance the region within those respective areas.

Considerations for the 2050 RTP

The chief recommendation for the 2050 RTP is to develop a more robust discussion of Safe Routes to School than is included in the current 2030 RTP. Consideration should be given to integrating the following elements into the 2050 RTP Safe Routes to School section.

---

20ACTIA (2009) “Safe Routes to Schools Alameda County Partnership Fact Sheet”
21Note: SACOG is in the process of updating the MTP 2035: Blueprint for Sustainable Communities.
22Personal communication with SACOG staff (September 17, 2010)
• Contextual information such as Safe Routes to School overarching goals and key components, state and federal funding programs, methods to collect data, and the role of Safe Routes to School programs in TDM.

• A summary of the Safe Routes to School strategic framework that consists of preliminary actions within the following focus areas:

**Regional Planning and Evaluation:** Integrating Safe Routes to School into regional planning efforts establishes a vision for Safe Routes to School throughout the region and helps local jurisdictions, schools, and communities to administer effective programs. It also advances the region’s goals of monitoring, projecting, and promoting active transportation.

**Funding:** Strategically funding Safe Routes to School initiatives is essential to broadening participation and leveraging existing funding sources, particularly as interest in Safe Routes to School and competition for resources increases.

**Technical Training and Support:** Providing trainings and technical support to encourage local Safe Routes to School programs helps ensure that programs will be effective and comprehensive.

**Collaboration and Partnerships:** Establishing partnerships and fostering collaboration with agencies and organizations that may play a vital role in advancing Safe Routes to School within the region is crucial to sustainable program implementation.

**Outreach and Education:** Identifying and administering select education and encouragement programs provides communities beneficial tools, such as SchoolPool, that might otherwise be too costly or onerous for local administration. Also, serving as an information clearinghouse to local jurisdictions, school districts, and schools facilitates local Safe Routes to School program development and maintenance. Additionally, raising awareness through public outreach efforts and regional campaigns can increase school and parent participation in Safe Routes to School initiatives.

**Table 1** proposes preliminary actions within the strategic areas identified above. The forthcoming Regional Safe Routes to School Strategic Plan will more thoroughly define these potential actions, indicate implementing agencies, outline an implementation schedule, and identify cost estimates and potential funding sources.
## Table 1: Preliminary Safe Routes to School Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Area</th>
<th>Potential Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Regional Planning and Evaluation| 1. Include a Safe Routes to School Strategy in all subsequent RTPs and Regional Comprehensive Plans.  
2. Capture active transportation demand by incorporating active transportation trip data into future transportation models including journey to school data, if possible.  
3. Develop a Regional Safe Routes to School Strategic Plan to articulate the Regional Safe Routes to School Strategy and implementation actions.  
4. As a component to an overall active transportation monitoring and evaluation program, establish a program to evaluate Safe Routes to School program participation levels, impact on mode shares, and potential program improvements. |
| Funding                         | 1. To catalyze local Safe Routes to School programs, develop and administer a pass-through Safe Routes to School grant program with funding awarded to SANDAG through the County of San Diego Health and Human Services Agency CPPW program. The pass-through grant program consists of $250,000 toward comprehensive Safe Routes to School planning and capacity building efforts and $50,000 toward education, enforcement, and encouragement programming.  
2. As part of the Safe Routes to School Strategic Plan, develop cost estimates and a funding strategy to implement the plan.                                                                                                                                                        |
| Technical Training and Support  | 1. Review and provide input to local jurisdictions, school districts, and nonprofit organizations on planning efforts, including:  
   o Comprehensive plans;  
   o Infrastructure improvement plans;  
   o Suggested route maps;  
   o Education, encouragement, and enforcement program strategies and materials;  
   o Monitoring and evaluation plans.  
2. Promote successful, local grant writing by reviewing, providing feedback, and offering technical assistance to grant applicants for state and federal Safe Routes to School funds.  
3. Provide the Safe Routes to School National Course by request to groups of local planners, policy-makers, school administrators and teachers, parent organizations, and other community members.                                                                                       |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Area</th>
<th>Potential Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Collaboration and Partnerships** | 1. Foster communication and cultivate partnerships by soliciting input on the Regional Safe Routes to School Strategy from SANDAG Policy Advisory Committees and working groups, nonprofit organizations, school districts, and other Safe Routes to School implementers, experts, and local agencies.  
2. Facilitate the convening of a Regional Safe Routes to School Coalition that will serve as a forum to connect implementing agencies and share relevant information.  
3. Work with universities and community colleges, County of San Diego Health and Human Services Agency, and other agencies and institutions to identify opportunities to collaborate on Safe Routes to School program development and implementation.  
4. Work with school districts and schools to identify school-related institutional barriers to walking and biking to school and to support curricula, school transportation policies, and school wellness policies that facilitate walking and biking to school.  
5. Participate in the California Safe Routes to School State Network meetings and Action Teams.  |
| **Outreach and Education**     | 1. Continue to promote and administer the iCommute SchoolPool program.  
2. Work with Safe Routes to School experts and implementers, including local jurisdictions and schools, to identify and develop one or more high-priority programs that may be best administered at a regional level by SANDAG, or through another countywide agency, institution, or organization.  
3. Consider developing a San Diego region Safe Routes to School Web page that consists of the following possible elements:  
   o A summary or listing of Safe Routes to School programs and resources offered throughout the San Diego region;  
   o Announcements of Safe Routes to School events or related activities in the region;  
   o Links to Safe Routes to School resources and publications available throughout the United States including the National Center for Safe Routes to School, iWalk International Walk to School Day, and California Active Communities Safe Routes to School Technical Assistance Resource Center Web sites; and  
   o Integration with the iCommute SchoolPool interfaces.  
4. Raise awareness about Safe Routes to School resources and opportunities through public awareness campaign efforts such as the upcoming iCommute SchoolPool “Walk, Ride and Roll” campaign. |
CONCLUSION

The proposed strategic framework presented in this white paper is intended to serve as a foundation for developing a Safe Routes to School strategy for the region. SANDAG already is aggressively pursuing some of the actions presented, whereas others may be more appropriately reserved for future analysis. SANDAG will work with its member agencies, key stakeholders, and professionals with expertise in Safe Routes to School, to expand upon and refine the proposed framework. Crucial to this process is identifying participating agencies and their respective roles in implementing the strategy. Anticipated in March 2012, the San Diego Regional Safe Routes to School Strategic Plan will present the complete San Diego Regional Safe Routes to School Strategy, which will include detailed recommendations, responsible agencies, and estimated costs required to effectively implement the strategy.
BIBLIOGRAPHY

2009 Alameda County Transportation Improvement Authority. Safe Routes to Schools Alameda County Partnership Fact Sheet.


2010 California Department of Transportation, Cycle 9 Safe Routes to School Final Project List (October 14, 2010).


2009 Transportation Authority of Marin County Measure A Transportation Sales Tax Measure Strategic Plan.
2007  U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Highway Administration (August 2007) National Household Travel Survey Brief.

2008  Weigand, L. “A Review of the Literature: the Effectiveness of Safe Routes to School and Other Programs to Promote Active Transportation to School.” Initiative for Bicycle and Pedestrian Innovation, CUS-CTS-0801.
Introduction

SANDAG staff and the Shoreline Preservation Working Group (SPWG) have been working to prepare an Environmental Impact Report (EIR)/Environmental Assessment (EA) for the construction of the Regional Beach Sand Project II (RBSP II). As required by state and federal environmental law, the EIR/EA will be distributed for a 45-day public review period which begins on January 20, 2011.

In 2001, SANDAG placed 2.1 million cubic yards (cy) of sand on 12 beaches as part of a regional beach nourishment project. The proposed RBSP II project is designed to provide a second regional beach sand replenishment project in the San Diego region. The receiver sites are generally in the same location as those included in the RBSP completed in 2001, with some variations due to economic and recreational needs (Attachment 1).

Discussion

SANDAG is preparing a joint EIR/EA addressing the potential environmental consequences of the RBSP II which proposes dredging and placement of sand on numerous potential receiver sites in the San Diego region. SANDAG is the lead agency responsible for compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is the federal lead agency responsible for compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

The RBSP II proposes to replenish between 1.8 and 2.7 million cy of clean beach-quality sand on up to 11 receiver sites in the San Diego region. The receiver sites are located from Oceanside to Imperial Beach. Sand would be dredged from up to three offshore borrow sites. The EIR/EA analyzes three alternatives: a no project alternative, a rebuild of the first beach sand project, and a third alternative that increases quantities of material at some beaches.
In compliance with CEQA and NEPA, the EIR/EA will be distributed for a 45-day public review period which begins on January 20, 2011. After the environmental review is completed, final design plans will be prepared. It is anticipated that construction of the RBSP II would begin in March 2012 and continue through September 2012.

CHARLES “MUGGS” STOLL  
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning  
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SAN DIEGO REGION AGGREGATE SUPPLY STUDY

Introduction

For several years the cost and the supply of aggregate to the San Diego region has been a topic of concern for infrastructure providers in the construction community. The aggregate issue has several dimensions, including closure of several local aggregate sites, complicated environmental permitting issues, environmental issues related to transporting aggregate from other sites into the region, accompanied by the high cost of aggregate. The cost of aggregate in the region for transportation projects has become a critical issue. According to the California Geologic Survey, the highest priced aggregate in the state is in the San Diego region where high-quality aggregate ranges from $20 to $22 per ton. This compares to $7 to $8 per ton in the Yuba City-Marysville region where relatively abundant supplies exist.

Discussion

At their June 2008 meeting, the Regional Planning Committee (RPC) was briefed by EnviroMINE, Incorporated, a local firm specializing in mine permitting and environmental consulting, on the dimensions of the aggregate shortage in the region. The Committee was informed that staff would collaborate with Caltrans and apply for a Transportation Planning Special Studies grant to explore the topic more fully. SANDAG received the grant in 2009 and prepared a report documenting issues surrounding aggregate and developed GIS and other tools that policymakers could use to help identify potential aggregate sources. The findings of the study will be presented for information. The executive summary of the report is attached and the full report will be available in electronic (CD) and hard-copy formats at the January 7 RPC meeting.

KURT KRONINGER
Director of Technical Services
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

Aggregate materials include sand, gravel, and crushed stone. Aggregate is a key ingredient in concrete and asphalt and is essential for constructing and maintaining the physical framework of buildings and infrastructure for a modern society. In fact, simply stated, aggregate is the fundamental building block of society—it is impossible to maintain or build a region without it. For example, aggregate is used as base material under roads and rails to provide a solid foundation, and in commercial and residential buildings, new public facilities such as schools and hospitals, and public works projects such as sewer and water infrastructure.

According to the California Geologic Survey, aggregate supply sources within the San Diego region have dropped from 48 mines in 1980 to 27 mines in 1995. Since then, the number of significant and active mines declined to 16; this decline will likely continue over the next two decades as mining permits expire and/or resources are depleted. The California Geologic Survey projects a 40 percent shortfall in the statewide supply of aggregate material needed to meet demand through 2055. They also project an 83 percent shortfall in the region’s supply of aggregate material. As the locally based supply of aggregate decreases, needs are met by importing aggregate from other regions or other countries.

The San Diego region, as well as other areas in California, are experiencing shortages in permitted aggregate resources and are being forced to transport aggregate longer distances, which significantly increases the cost of aggregate. Because aggregate is a high-bulk, low-unit value product, costs can be minimized if the source is located in close proximity to the project, thereby reducing the transport miles by truck. According to the California Geological Survey, the highest priced aggregate in California is in the San Diego area, where high-quality sand is in very short supply, causing prices to range from $20-$22/ton, compared to $7-$8/ton in other parts of the state. The escalating cost of aggregate in the region for transportation projects has become a critical issue.

While the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) and the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) District 11 understand the importance of aggregate in meeting regional construction needs, the agencies also have a particular interest in the use of aggregate in transportation projects. In 2004, San Diego region voters approved a 40-year extension of TransNet, a half-cent sales tax, which should generate an additional $14 billion for public transit, highways, and local street and road improvements. The construction and maintenance of transportation infrastructure creates a need for basic construction materials such as aggregate.

3 Ibid.
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This study builds on previous and existing efforts of the GoCalifornia Industry Capacity Expansion (ICE) action plan that is a part of the Governor’s Strategic Growth Plan. The ICE effort identified strategies and actions that enable the heavy highway construction industry to better meet Caltrans’ future transportation program. A key part of the effort is to create a coordinated statewide strategy to work with communities and other agencies to secure adequate materials, including aggregate, for California’s needs and long-term quality of life.

One of the challenges facing the region is how to meet the increasing demand for aggregate at a time when the locally based supply is shrinking, while at the same time preserving environmentally sensitive lands and communities. An area may contain abundant aggregate suitable for mining, but conflicting land uses, zoning, regulations, or citizen opposition may preclude its development and production. Stakeholders have strong and often conflicting views about where and how aggregate is supplied to the region. Many individuals may not be aware of the community’s need for aggregate and its regional benefits. These conflicts have resulted in a decrease of local sites, lands not becoming available for mineral extraction, local jurisdiction guidelines that do not fully protect aggregate resources, and a time- and cost-prohibitive permitting process.

PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The San Diego Region Aggregate Supply Study is an analysis of aggregate supply in the region. SANDAG, in cooperation with Caltrans District 11, examined the issues regarding the supply of aggregate to provide background information and tools necessary to begin developing a framework to manage aggregate to address future projected shortfalls.

The study contributes to the understanding of aggregate issues and compiles information from many sources and organizes it into one document. The intent of the report is not to make policy recommendations, but rather to identify issues and develop tools that decision makers could use as a starting point in adaptive management strategies. Actual policy making rests with those agencies that have land use authority. The information, mapping, and tools developed through this process could be used to inform decision makers and offer a pilot approach for other regions of the state that are also grappling with aggregate supply issues.

The objectives of the study are to provide a comprehensive review of aggregate sources in the region, clarify the needs and issues surrounding the supply of aggregates, develop a regional Geographic Information System (GIS) database that would allow for comprehensive visualization of aggregate sources with informational overlays, and develop tools that local governments could use to identify potential locations of aggregate sites and estimate air quality impacts.

While the intended objectives were to provide a “comprehensive” review of aggregate sources, the aggregate supply issue proved to be very complex and there were many challenges obtaining geologic and economic data. The study developed a regional aggregate database as an important baseline tool and developed GIS analysis tools to identify potential sites for aggregate. However, additional groundwork will be required for determining the quality of the aggregate and potential marketability to narrow the number of potential aggregate sites. The study focused on estimating air quality impacts due to transport. A comprehensive analysis might include a broader look at
other environmental impacts. Consultation and coordination with local jurisdictions that have land use authority to look at zoning ordinances and other local policies would be appropriate steps to take in the future to build on the fundamentals documented in this study.

**STUDY APPROACH**

The study was divided into two phases. The first phase focused on the development of a GIS database to visualize and analyze the location of potential aggregate sources in the region. The second phase focused on the economic and environmental aspects of aggregate supply, including the development of tools for calculating aggregate need for Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) projects and estimating the impacts due to hauling aggregate such as greenhouse gas emissions. The analysis includes air quality impacts of several importation alternatives (e.g., importing more aggregate or developing more local resources).

An expert review panel was established to gather data and information and secure technical assistance where needed to improve the study. The expert review panel comprised representatives from environmental and resource agencies, local suppliers of aggregate, importers and transporters of aggregate, and users of aggregate. During meetings and focus group sessions, these representatives identified important issues with respect to aggregate supply and served as an invaluable resource for this study.

**SUMMARY OF FINDINGS**

The principal findings associated with the information and estimates presented in this study include the following:

**Local Aggregate Shortages**

- According to reports by the Department of Conservation and discussions with local miners, the San Diego region has ample sources of the necessary rock types to meet the anticipated future aggregate demand, but access is limited as aggregate needs compete with other community needs such as urban areas, open space, environmentally sensitive areas, and military lands with restricted access. Factors that would contribute to an increase in annual production within the region include (1) increasing annual production limits, (2) extending the permit duration of a mine (years), (3) expanding existing permitted mines; and (4) permitting new mines.

- Fine aggregates (i.e., sand) are in short supply in the San Diego region. According to local mining operators, sand makes up approximately 90 to 95 percent of all aggregate imported into the region. Sand is a critical component required to produce portland cement concrete. The sources for sand and gravel are predominantly located in river deposits. It is important to note that while these river deposits and drainage systems provide a high-quality source of sand and gravel, they may be considered to be environmentally sensitive areas or contain endangered species and habitats, so access is limited.
Executive Summary

- The San Diego region has historically produced a sufficient supply of coarse aggregates to meet local demand. However, if no new mines are permitted or permits of existing mines are not extended or expanded, the region will likely face shortages of coarse aggregates.

Environmental Regulatory Challenges

- Many concerns about the complexity of the environmental regulatory process were expressed during the expert review panel meetings. The purpose of the study is not to develop solutions for the environmental permitting process, but rather to document the issues so that policy makers and others are aware of the concerns. While the environmental regulations are important to protect environmentally sensitive lands and endangered species, the permitting process itself is perceived to have inherent inconsistencies that cause time delays and escalate cost. Improving the understanding and communication between industry and regulatory agencies may lead to a more consistent approach to permitting and more certainty in the outcome. The complexity of the permitting process has contributed to larger mine sites in the region.

Identification of Potential Aggregate Supply Sites

- The GIS analysis identified over 1,000 possible aggregate sites of 20 acres or greater in the region. These potential sites are not developed and have not been conserved for environmental reasons. It is important to note that the potential suitability of these sites for construction aggregate cannot be determined by a GIS exercise alone and need to be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. However, local governments could use the GIS tools developed by this study to develop overlays to help focus efforts on potential sites for aggregate development. This evaluation also would need to include the proximity to highways and freeways, proximity to the market, quality of the aggregate, and marketability of the aggregate.

- According to expert review panel representatives, while 20-acre mines do exist, a more ideal size for a mining operation is more likely to be in the 40- to 60-acre range or 100-acre or greater range. These experts commented that often large acreage is needed to accommodate required set asides for mitigation purposes and to be sure the site will be economically viable. Based on this information, the GIS overlay analysis was repeated for potential aggregate supply sites of 60 acres or more and for supply sites of 100 acres or more. The analysis showed that there are 553 potential aggregate supply sites of 60 acres or more and 390 potential supply sites of 100 acres or more. Most of the sites are located in the unincorporated parts of the region.

- The study also conducted a GIS spatial analysis to optimize the distance between the potential aggregate sites and demand points. Regional Transportation Projects (RTP) were used as demand points in the analysis. The location of the RTP projects coincides with areas of future growth. The study determined that the point of diminishing marginal benefit—that is, where the largest number of projects can be served with the least additional distance—occurs at the 20- to 25-mile driveshed. As transportation plays a major role in the
economic and environmental costs of aggregate, the farther the distance, the higher the costs; an important factor to keeping costs low and reducing CO₂ emissions from hauling aggregate is to reduce haul distance by truck.

Options for Import

- Options for importing aggregate into the region include import from nearby counties by truck as well as import from distant mines by train, barge, or ship. The region is currently importing aggregate by truck from nearby counties and Mexico. It has also imported aggregate by barge from Mexico.

- Importation by rail could be an option for consideration if necessary infrastructure improvements, including a transloading facility, were to be constructed. This option could bring in about one million tons of aggregate annually.

- Importation by ship could be an option for consideration with some access improvements from the Port of San Diego to major distribution freeway corridors and other infrastructure improvements at the port. The capacity could be about two million tons of aggregate annually.

Fuel Consumption and CO₂ Emissions

- The data emphasize the major role that transportation plays in calculating environmental costs and indicate that a key to reducing CO₂ emissions is to reduce haul distance by truck. Aggregate is a low-unit-value commodity with high transportation costs due to its bulk and weight. Since transportation substantially increases the cost to the purchaser, obtaining aggregate from a source close to the point of use reduces cost. This also reduces other direct costs, such as fuel consumption as well as the environmental and social costs of air pollution, traffic congestion, and road maintenance associated with truck travel.

- The fuel use and air quality analysis indicates that the transportation of aggregate by truck has the highest fuel consumption and CO₂ emissions per net ton-mile compared to other options of rail, ship, and barge. The lowest fuel consumption and CO₂ emissions per million tons of aggregate result from the transport of aggregate from local aggregate mines located close to projects. Even though ship and rail have lower CO₂ emissions per net ton-mile than truck or barge, the distance traveled is often long and they still have some component of truck travel once the material arrives in the region.

Resource Management Opportunities

- The research and the information and insight of the expert review panel indicate that there is no one solution for managing aggregate in the region, and a number of complementary strategies may be required to address projected shortfalls.
CONCLUSION

Future investments in essential infrastructure, such as new and improved roads, housing and commercial establishments, public facilities, rail links, airport facilities, and water and sewage infrastructure, all require aggregate. This analysis is designed to provide background information and tools to help planners plan effectively while minimizing negative impacts. It also may help decision makers understand key issues that need to be addressed to build consensus on how to manage aggregate as a strategic asset. Opportunities for effective planning today will help address the availability of aggregate required to meet the region’s future needs.
Safe Routes to School and the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan

January 7, 2011

Integrating Safe Routes to School in 2050 RTP

- Expand role in 2050 RTP
- Develop white paper
- Create a regional strategy
- Collaborate with partners, communities, and agencies
Implementing Safe Routes to School

- Increase school walk and bike trips
  - By 10% in 2020
  - By 20% in 2035

Regional Strategy Planning Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Draft SRTS</td>
<td>Grant Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy Framework</td>
<td>Program Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Air Quality, Congestion, and Safety

Activity Levels and Obesity Among Youths

Trends in Obesity Among Children and Adolescents

- Total
- 2-5
- 6-11
- 12-19
Review Existing Programs

- Regional, state, and federal programs
- Efforts in the San Diego region
- Other county and regional strategies

Strategic Framework Components
Collaboration and Partnership

Outreach and Education
Technical Training and Support

Communities Putting Prevention to Work (CPPW)

- San Diego County Health and Human Services Agency program to address obesity

- Funded by Centers for Disease Control and Prevention through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA)
Regional Beach Sand Project
Regional Planning Committee
January 7, 2011

Background
RBSP: Oceanside

Before

After

RBSP: Non-receiver site benefits (Encinitas)

Sand Level in May 2006

April 2001: Pre-Nourishment

May 2006: +5 Years
Background

- Funding provided primarily by the California Department of Boating and Waterways
- Matching funds provided by participating coastal cities
- Project managed by SANDAG

Project Overview

- Replenish between 1.8 and 2.7 million cubic yards
- 11 receiver sites from Oceanside to Imperial Beach
- Three offshore dredge sites
RBSP II Alternatives

- No Project

- Alternative 1 – 1.8 million cubic yard, similar to 2001 project

- Alternative 2 – 2.7 million cubic yards, additional sites

North County Sites
South County Sites

Construction Operation

Source: Great Lakes Dredge and Dock Company
## Sand Quantities by Alternative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Receiver Site</th>
<th>Alternative 1 (cubic yards)</th>
<th>Alternative 2 (cubic yards)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside</td>
<td>420,000</td>
<td>420,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carlsbad</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>225,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carlsbad North</td>
<td>158,000</td>
<td>220,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carlsbad South</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>142,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batiquitos</td>
<td>118,000</td>
<td>118,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leucadia</td>
<td>117,000</td>
<td>117,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moonlight Beach</td>
<td>105,000</td>
<td>105,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiff</td>
<td>101,000</td>
<td>101,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solana Beach</td>
<td>146,000</td>
<td>360,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torrey Pines</td>
<td>245,000</td>
<td>245,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Beach</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>650,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,755,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,703,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Next Steps

- Begin 45-day public review period for Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Assessment (EIR/EA) - January 2011
- Finalize EIR/EA - summer 2011
- Implement monitoring plan - fall 2011
- Construction - March 2012 through September 2012
What is Construction Aggregate?

- Sand, gravel, and crushed rock
- Invaluable building resource:
  - Homes, schools, and hospitals
  - Office and commercial centers
  - Airports and other public works
  - Freeways and railways
  - You name it
- Environmental aspects
Why Study Aggregate Supply?

- By 2055 CGS estimates shortages:
  - 40 percent shortfall in the state’s supply
  - 83 percent shortfall in the region’s supply
- Greenhouse gas emissions concerns
- High price

Aggregate Base ($ per cubic meter)

- San Diego
- Statewide
Study Objectives

- Provide a review of aggregate sources in the region and clarify the needs and issues surrounding the supply of aggregates
- Develop tools for estimating environmental impacts of hauling
- Develop a regional GIS database and model that could be employed by local agencies to assess potential aggregate sites
Possible Supply Options

- Imported sources of aggregate
  - By truck
  - By barge (and then truck)
  - By rail (and then truck)
  - By ship (and then truck)
- Local sources of aggregate
Sites 20 acres or larger

Available Land (20 acres or greater)

Mineral Resource Zone (MRZ) Classification

- MRZ 1: Not Present
- MRZ 2: Present
- MRZ 3: Potentially Present
- MRZ 4: Inconclusive
- Unclassified
Large Sites

Sites 100 acres or larger

Available Land
(100 acres or greater)

Mineral Resource Zone (MRZ) Classification

- MRZ-2: Resource Present
- MRZ-3: Resource Potentially Present
- MRZ-4: Inconclusive
- Unclassified

PROJECT DATA

CONSTRUCTION AGGREGATE 2,000,000 tons

MODE 1: LOCAL MINE SUPPLY
Percent of aggregate supplied from local mines by truck 50.0 %

MODE 2: IMPORT FROM ELSEWHERE BY TRUCK
Percent of aggregate imported by truck 50.0 %

MODE 3: IMPORT FROM ELSEWHERE BY RAIL
Percent of aggregate imported by rail 0.0 %

MODE 4: IMPORT FROM ELSEWHERE BY BARGE
Percent of aggregate imported by barge 0.0 %

MODE 5: IMPORT FROM ELSEWHERE BY SHIP
Percent of aggregate imported by ship 0.0 %

TOTAL PERCENT (must be 100) 100
Sample Results

Fuel Consumption

CO\textsubscript{2} Emissions

CO\textsubscript{2} Emissions for Supply Scenarios
Next Steps

- Present study to the SANDAG Transportation Committee and SANDAG Board
- Incorporate the study’s tools and findings into RCP
- Seek potential opportunities for linking aggregate supply to Environmental Mitigation Program
- Share tools with state and local agencies and industry
- Work with USGS and CGS for better mapping
- Local jurisdictions could establish criteria for prioritizing sites
SANDAG Regional Planning Committee

The Village at Market Creek
Gold-Level Catalyst Community,
State of California

Where We Are Located
Why We Chose This Community

- Large-scale blight
- “Four Corners of Death”
- Toxic environments
- Substandard housing
- High unemployment
- No supermarkets or retail serving 88,000 people
- Community divided by freeways, light rail, canyons, and creeks
The Diamond 10 Years Ago

**Opportunities**

- Multi-modal transit center
- Ability to assemble adjacent land for scale (TOD)
- Chollas Creek as a potential greenbelt
- $60 million in retail leakage
- Network of partners
- Potential as national model for neighborhood transformation

Progress and Accomplishments To Date
Impact to Date

The Village Today
- First grocery in 35 years
- Banks, restaurants, Class A office and conference facility
- 717 jobs
- $72.5 million in annual economic activity
- 74% HUBE contracts (200,000 sf of rehab or new construction)
- 2,100 linear feet of restored/enhanced wetlands
- 82% increase in Trolley ridership
- 50% reduction in violent crime
The Village as a Model

**Special Designations**
- State of California Gold-Level Catalyst Community
- SANDAG Smart Growth Incentive Program Planning Area
- U.S. EPA Brownfields Area-wide Assessment and Planning Pilot Project
- City of Villages Pilot Project for the City of San Diego

**Major Awards**
- Orchid Award Winner
- ULI Social Equity Award
- San Diego Architectural Foundation’s Community Vision Award
- Outstanding Brownfield Transformation Award (EPA)
- Public Works Project of the Year
- Concrete Structure/Bridge Project of the Year
- Award for Engineering Excellence

Where We are Headed:
A Large-Scale Catalyst
Catalyst Goals

• Safe, healthy, walkable neighborhoods (with emphasis on existing communities)
• Effective jobs/housing mix
• Integrated environmental sustainability and economic development plans
• Demonstrated community engagement and cross-sector collaboration
• Model for effective strategies

The Vision of The Village

• Vibrant 60-acre regional hub with 1,000 homes and 2,000 jobs
• 400,000 sf of open space and restored/enhanced wetlands
• Safe, healthy, walkable LEED Neighborhood
• A cultural destination that is resident planned, built, owned
• Model for large-scale smart growth development in an “EJ Community”
The Vision of The Village

The Village at Market Creek: The Next Chapter

What We Have Figured Out

- Large-scale resident mobilization
- Land acquisition (52 acres to date)
- Equity partnerships focused on triple-bottom-line
- Tax credit financing
- Stimulating retail demand
- Minority contracting
- Community investment and ownership

What We Have To Figure Out

- Infrastructure finance (for scale)
- Gap financing for housing
- Creating safe and efficient transportation linkages to the larger region
Euclid Trolley Intersection