MEETING NOTICE
AND AGENDA

JOINT MEETING OF THE REGIONAL PLANNING TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP AND REGIONAL HOUSING WORKING GROUP

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

Thursday, September 8, 2011
1:15 to 3:15 p.m.
SANDAG, 7th Floor Conference 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

• PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE DRAFT 2050 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN
• COMPLETE STREETS POLICY AND IMPLEMENTATION IN THE SAN DIEGO REGION
• DRAFT REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT PLAN
• UPDATE ON BOARD POLICY NO. 033
• HOUSING ELEMENT ISSUES

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.
JOINT MEETING OF THE REGIONAL PLANNING TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP AND REGIONAL HOUSING WORKING GROUP
Thursday, September 8, 2011

ITEM #

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS

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

CONSENT (3 through 4)

+3. MEETING SUMMARY OF AUGUST 11, 2011

The TWG and RHWG should review and approve the meeting summary from the joint August 11, 2011, meeting.

+4. 2011 HOUSING AND URBANIZED DEVELOPMENT SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES REGIONAL PLANNING GRANT (Coleen Clementson)

The U.S. Department of Housing and Urbanized Development (HUD) announced its 2011 Sustainable Communities Regional Planning Grant program. The program focuses on providing funding for improving regional planning efforts to integrate housing, transportation, economic development, and environmental infrastructure investment decisions, and increase state, regional, and local capacity to incorporate livability, sustainability, and social equity into land use plans and zoning. The pre-application was due August 25, 2011. Those regional planning entities who meet the requirements will be asked to submit a full application due September 26, 2011. Attached is a report to the Executive Committee which provides a summary of the grant program, outline of proposed activities, and potential consortium partners. This report is provided for information purposes.
REPORTS (5 through 10)

+5. PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE DRAFT 2050 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN (Heather Adamson)  

On April 22, 2011, the SANDAG Board of Directors accepted the Draft 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and its Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) for public distribution and comment. The public comment period for the Draft 2050 RTP and its SCS closed on July 8, 2011. Staff will provide an overview of the proposed changes to the Draft 2050 RTP. This information was discussed by the Transportation Committee at its meeting on September 2, 2011, and will be discussed at the Board of Directors meeting on September 9, 2011. The Board of Directors will be asked to approve the Final 2050 RTP in October. A copy of the September 2, 2011, Transportation Committee report is attached.

6. COMPLETE STREETS POLICY AND IMPLEMENTATION IN THE SAN DIEGO REGION (Stephan Vance)  

The National Complete Streets Coalition is a national alliance of transportation professionals working to enact Complete Streets policies across the country to build road networks that are safer, more livable, and welcoming to everyone. The Coalition is providing technical assistance (TA) to the San Diego County Health and Human Services Agency (HHSA) as part of the Healthy Works/CPPW Project. As part of this TA program, four Healthy Works grant recipients (La Mesa, Chula Vista, Encinitas, and the City of San Diego) are participating in a two-day workshop on complete streets policy development. In conjunction with this workshop, SANDAG and HHSA staff have invited the Coalition to make a presentation to the TWG on national trends as well as issues and opportunities in the San Diego region related to complete streets. The presenter, Michael Moule, is a member of the Coalition and a national expert on complete streets. Kathleen Ferrier from WalkSanDiego, a local advocacy group promoting walkable and bikable communities, will be available to answer questions as well.

7. STATUS OF TECHNICAL UPDATE OF SMART GROWTH CONCEPT MAP (Carolina Gregor)  

Staff will report on progress being made to update the Smart Growth Concept Map.

8. DRAFT REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT PLAN (Susan Baldwin)  

An updated draft of the Regional Housing Needs Assessment Plan (RHNA) will be posted online before the meeting and distributed at the meeting. The TWG and RHWG are asked to make a recommendation to the Regional Planning Committee on the RHNA Plan. The RHNA Plan with the RHNA Methodology and Allocation is expected to be adopted by the SANDAG Board on October 28, 2011, in conjunction with the 2050 RTP and its SCS.
+9. UPDATE ON BOARD POLICY NO. 033 (Susan Baldwin)  

INFORMATION

Board Policy No. 033 was adopted in conjunction with the RHNA for the fourth housing element cycle (2005-2010). This policy affects how discretionary funds such as the Smart Growth Incentive Program (SGIP) and Active Transportation Funding Program are allocated. An update on the work of the Board Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Board Policy No. 033 will be provided. Proposed revisions presented to the Board Ad Hoc Subcommittee by Chula Vista Mayor Cheryl Cox are attached.

10. HOUSING ELEMENT ISSUES (Susan Baldwin)  

INFORMATION

A. Housing Element Assistance - SANDAG staff will provide additional information regarding housing needs data assistance that could be provided by the Service Bureau.

B. State Housing Element Review Issues - Based on the discussion at the August 11 meeting, staff will provide a list of issues related to the California Department of Housing and Community Development’s review of housing elements. Further input from the TWG and RH WG is requested.

11. ADJOURNMENT AND NEXT MEETING  

INFORMATION

The next TWG meeting is scheduled for on October 13, 2011, from 1:15 to 3:15 p.m. However, the San Diego Housing Federation’s Annual Conference will be held that day. The TWG may wish to reschedule the October TWG meeting to October 6 or October 20. This may be a joint meeting with the RH WG, depending upon the content of the agenda items.

+ next to an agenda item indicates an attachment
September 8, 2011

AGENDA ITEM NO.: 3

Action Requested: APPROVE

MEETING SUMMARY OF AUGUST 11, 2011

Please note: Audio file is available on the SANDAG Web Site (www.sandag.org) on the TWG page.

Agenda Item 1: Welcome and Introductions

The Regional Planning Technical Working Group was called to order by Chair Bill Chopyk (City of La Mesa) at 1:15 p.m. Self-introductions were conducted. Regional Housing Working Group Co-chair Duane Roth also attended the meeting.

Agenda Item 2: Public Comments/Communications/Member Comments

Members of the public are provided an opportunity to address the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG) and Regional Housing Working Group (RHWG) on any issue within the jurisdiction of the respective group that was not on the agenda.

Chris Schmidt (Caltrans) announced the grant recipients of the Caltrans community-based environmental justice program were National City, City of San Diego in conjunction with the Southeast Development Corporation (SEDC), and SANDAG. There will be a new call for grant applications at the end of the year with grants due to be disbursed sometime in the spring of 2012.

Jim Schmidt (RHWG Member) stated that he is disappointed with the updated San Diego County General Plan because of the downzoning it proposes. Devon Muto noted the plan was adopted on August 3, 2011; the plan is a major change for regional growth in the County which focuses growth in villages and reduces growth capacity in the rural areas. Susan Baldwin (SANDAG) added that there is a fact sheet which summarizes the plan changes on the County of San Diego Web site.

CONSENT ITEMS (3 through 4)

Agenda Item 3: Meeting Summaries (Approve)

The TWG reviewed the meeting summary from the August 11, 2011, TWG meeting. Ed Batchelder (City of Chula Vista) moved to accept the summary. The motion was seconded by Rich Whipple (Solana Beach) and it was unanimously approved by TWG members.
Agenda Item 4: Status of Technical Update of the Smart Growth Concept Map (Information)

Susan Baldwin (SANDAG) said an updated Smart Growth Incentive Program (SGIP) schedule and a status report on the technical update of the Smart Growth Concept Map will be announced at a future meeting. Due to the volume of comments received on the Draft 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Sustainable Communities Strategy, SANDAG will be delaying the call for projects for the SGIP by about three months. This delay provides more time for SANDAG and the local jurisdictions to complete the technical update of the Smart Growth Concept Map.

REPORT ITEMS (5 through 9)

Agenda Item 5: Airport Multimodal Accessibility Plan Draft Report (Discussion)

Senate Bill 10 (Kehoe, 2007) requires airport multimodal planning to be conducted and coordinated by SANDAG and the San Diego County Regional Airport Authority (Airport Authority). SANDAG is the lead for the Airport Multimodal Accessibility Plan (AMAP), which developed a multimodal strategy to improve surface transportation access to airports identified in the Airport Authority’s Regional Aviation Strategic Plan. Major findings in terms of aviation and surface transportation infrastructure and facilities have been used as inputs into the Draft 2050 RTP.

Linda Culp (SANDAG) reviewed the strategic assessment used to produce the draft report which evaluates 22 public airports in the region. Ms. Culp identified three phases of the AMAP development:

- High speed rail connections
- Additional roadways and transit improvements at the airports
- Policy statements and financial recommendations

She said the AMAP addresses the option of express bus services, with either Park and Rides or remote terminals. She added the AMAP evaluates the Interstate 5 and Interstate 15 corridors for Lindbergh Field and the Interstate 15 corridor for the San Diego-Tijuana Crossborder Facility, which is proposed to provide access to Tijuana International Airport. Ms. Culp noted the AMAP also identifies the constrained and unconstrained costs for future enhancements of the airports. The official public comment period for the draft AMAP is open through August 24, 2011. Finally, Ms. Culp had a brief discussion with members about acreage for runway access, the Crossborder Facility, bus rapid transit, tunnel access for vehicles to the airports, and trolley station access related to transit-oriented development in the region.

Agenda Item 6: TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program and Active Transportation Grant Status Update and Request for Approval of Proposed Amendments (Information)

SANDAG approved the first round of SGIP projects under TransNet in May 2009, and the first round of Active Transportation Program grants in June 2009. Oswaldo Perez (SANDAG) reported on the quarterly status of projects through March 31, 2011. Mr. Oswaldo stated that between May and June 2009, SANDAG awarded $9.4 million in funding for 14 TransNet SGIP projects and 7.8 million dollars in funding for 30 TDA and TransNet projects under the Active Transportation Grant Program. Mr. Perez added staff will continue to monitor grantee progress. Finally, there was a
member comment made that this funding is integral to the implementation of the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) process and should be forward programmed in TransNet in the RTP process.

**Agenda Item 7: Draft Regional Housing Needs Assessment Plan and Comments Received on the Draft Regional Housing Needs Assessment Methodology and Allocation**

The Draft Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) Plan and comments received on the Draft RHNA Methodology and Allocation were presented to the TWG and RHWG on Thursday, August 11, 2011. The RHNA Plan summarizes housing element law; documents how the regional housing needs were determined; and describes the Draft RHNA Methodology and Allocation, its various components, how it meets the objectives of state law, and the process used to develop it. The Draft RHNA Plan and the comments received on the Draft RHNA Methodology and Allocation are expected to be presented to the Regional Planning Committee and SANDAG Board of Directors in September.

Susan Baldwin (SANDAG) reminded the working groups that the Board of Directors (Board) accepted the Draft RHNA Methodology and Allocation for distribution at the May 27, 2011, meeting. Ms. Baldwin noted that SANDAG received ten letters of comment, which fell into three general categories: support, opposition, and proposals to link the RHNA with incentives by amending Board Policy No. 033 to reward jurisdictions with higher RHNA lower income housing allocations. The Draft RHNA Plan and the comments received on the Draft RHNA Methodology and Allocation will be presented to the SANDAG Board on Friday, September 23, 2011. Ms. Baldwin also informed the working groups (Item 9) that the SANDAG Board appointed an ad hoc subcommittee of its members (Carlsbad Mayor Matt Hall, Chula Vista Mayor Cheryl Cox, Lemon Grove Mayor Mary Sessom, San Diego Councilmember Lorie Zapf, San Marcos Mayor Jim Desmond, and Supervisor Pam Slater-Price) to discuss and make recommendations on potential amendments to Policy No. 033. The first meeting of the ad hoc subcommittee will be held on August 30.

The Draft RHNA plan document includes:

- RHNA Methodology and Allocation Option 2(b), which was accepted by the Board of Directors for distribution on May 27, 2011
- A description of the RHNA process
- RHNA objectives in state housing element law
- RHNA consistency with the Draft 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS)
- Relationship of RHNA to 2050 Growth Forecast

Discussion about the Draft RHNA plan included:

- The discussion of Board Policy No. 033 should be included with the Draft RHNA Plan dialogue at the next Board meeting (Answer: The Board Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Policy No. 033 will review and make recommendations on amendments to the policy.
- Will the Draft RHNA Plan be discussed at a future TWG/RHWG meeting(s) for further input by the working groups? (Answer: Yes, the TWG/RHWG members may provide comments on the RHNA Plan, which will be discussed at the joint TWG/RHWG meeting on Thursday, September 8, 2011.)
• It was suggested that challenges experienced during the RHNA process, recommendations for changes in state law, and lessons learned could be included in the RHNA Plan as an appendix.
• Will written responses to the comments received on the Draft RHNA Methodology and Allocation be provided when they are presented at the September 23, 2011, Board meeting? (Answer: Staff will prepare a report that discusses and responds to the comments.)
• Adequate public outreach should be undertaken during the housing element update process as required by state law;
• Will the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) review the RHNA for compliance with the requirements of state law? (Answer: Following SANDAG Board approval, the RHNA Plan will be sent to HCD. HCD is required to provide a determination regarding consistency with state law to SANDAG.)
• The Board Ad Hoc Subcommittee should address Board Policy No. 033 amendments and other factors in a way that addresses social equity issues associated with RHNA.
• Housing and employment density maps should be included in the RHNA Plan, along with the transit map, to demonstrate consistency with the SCS land use pattern map.
• Additional text should be included to explain how the RHNA factors were addressed (for example jobs/housing balance and social equity).
• The RHNA Plan should include a discussion of how it relates to the principles of the SCS.
• SANDAG should discuss with HCD how density bonus and infill projects are counted in the identification of adequate sites based on state housing law.
• The City of La Mesa announced that it is holding a Housing Element/Historic Preservation Element workshop on August 25, 2011, at 6 p.m. at the La Mesa Community Center.

**Agenda Item 8: Data Assistance with Local Housing Elements (Discussion)**

The deadline for completion of the fifth housing element (2013-2020) is April 27, 2013. Susan Baldwin (SANDAG) led a discussion with TWG members about whether they are interested in obtaining assistance with housing element data needs from SANDAG’s Service Bureau. There was an informal dialogue with Ms. Baldwin and Kirby Brady (SANDAG) about current census data, geographic levels of statistics, data sets, economic analysis, and SANDAG assistance fees. SANDAG staff will put together a cost estimate for preparing housing element data.

**Agenda Item 9: Update on SANDAG Board Policy No. 033 (Information)**

SANDAG Board Policy No. 033 was adopted in conjunction with the RHNA for the fourth housing element cycle (2005-2010). This policy affects how discretionary funds such as the SGIP and Active Transportation Funding Program are allocated. Points are given to projects based on the jurisdiction in which they are located and five housing-related factors. An information report about SANDAG Board Policy No. 033 was presented at a joint meeting of the Regional Planning Committee and Transportation Committee on July 15. On July 22, the Board appointed an ad hoc subcommittee with sub-regional representation to review and make recommendations to the Board regarding SANDAG Policy No. 033.

Discussion about Board Policy No. 033 issues included:

• A non-competitive approach for allocating smart growth investment funds to jurisdictions because of limited staff resources and budget cuts was suggested.
• Density capacity factors and project delivery factors should be considered separately.
• A stronger tie to housing element compliance and grant requirements was encouraged.
• SGIP requirements should allow infrastructure proposals to support the overall success of the project.

**Agenda Item 10: Adjournment and Next Meeting (Information)**

The next TWG meeting will be held on Thursday September 8, 2011, from 1:15 to 3:15 p.m.
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

September 9, 2011

AGENDA ITEM NO.: 3

Action Requested: APPROVE

PROPOSED FUNDING OPPORTUNITY: File Number 3100000
HOUSING AND URBANIZED DEVELOPMENT
SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES REGIONAL PLANNING GRANT

Introduction

On July 28, 2011, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) posted a Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) for the Sustainable Communities Regional Planning Grant Program to support the development and implementation of regional plans, such as the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP). The Program places a priority on investing in partnerships, including nontraditional partnerships that reflect the federal Livability Principles1 established by HUD, the U.S. Department of Transportation, and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (Attachment 1).

The SANDAG Chair announced this potential funding opportunity at the July 22, 2011, Board of Directors meeting and the potential for this funding to be used to update the RCP and to assist local planning efforts that implement the RCP. The Program has a two-step process. The first step is the submittal of a pre-application intended for HUD to determine the eligibility of potential candidates; staff submitted the pre-application on August 25, 2011 (Attachment 2). The second step is the submittal of the full application, which is due no later than September 26, 2011.

Discussion

Preferred Sustainability Status

Last year, the San Diego region applied for the first round of this HUD funding with the City of San Diego as the lead agency of a consortium of partners, including SANDAG. Although the application was not successful, the region received a qualifying score to attain Preferred Sustainability Status, which offers benefits, including bonus points on this year’s application. Major components of the 2010 application that will be incorporated into the 2011 proposal include plans to address RCP gaps, expand the role of the Smart Growth Concept Map, and identify catalyst

---

1 The six federal Livability Principles include: Provide More Transportation Choices; Promote Equitable, Affordable Housing; Enhance Economic Competitiveness; Support Existing Communities; Coordinate Policies and Leverage Investment; and Value Communities and Neighborhoods.
Transit-Oriented Development projects. Revisions to the application will be made to better identify a strategy and implementation plan to address social equity goals, more clearly integrate economic development strategies into the sustainability plan, and strengthen knowledge sharing.

Sustainable Communities Regional Grant Program Requirements

The Sustainable Communities Regional Planning Grant Program specifies that it supports metropolitan planning efforts that integrate housing, land use, economic and workforce development, transportation, and infrastructure investments in a manner that empowers jurisdictions to consider the interdependent challenges of:

- Economic competitiveness and revitalization
- Social equity, inclusion, and access to opportunity
- Energy use and climate change
- Public health and environmental impact

The Program requires that a consortium include entities that have the capacity to carry out a comprehensive regional planning process and at a minimum includes: the metropolitan planning organization (MPO); the local government with the largest population located within the region; and additional local jurisdictions, and/or Indian Tribes. The consortium must represent no less than 50 percent of the population residing within the region. It also must include a nonprofit organization, foundation, or educational institution within the region that has the capacity to engage a diverse representation of the general population, and the ability to work in partnership with the local governments and the MPO to advance the program objectives of the Sustainable Communities Planning Grant Program.

Grant Proposal

SANDAG, on behalf of the consortium partners, proposes to apply for $5 million from this Program for a comprehensive RCP update and to advance local implementation of the RCP. The activities would include:

- Incorporation of the six Livability Principles into the RCP to provide more transportation choices; promote equitable, affordable housing; enhance economic competitiveness; support existing communities; coordinate policies and leverage investment; and value communities and neighborhoods.
- Expanded role of the regional Smart Growth Concept Map through preparation of a regional Transit-Oriented Development strategy to evaluate the role of individual transit stations and smart-growth areas within the regional network in support of the Livability Principles.
- Support for catalyst plans and projects with regional significance in the City of San Diego that foster economic development and affordable housing in areas with the greatest needs and support the Livability Principles.
- Support catalyst plans and projects in smaller jurisdictions, rural villages, and tribal land areas for non-gaming tribes that support the Livability Principles.
- Development and implementation of a participatory outreach program based upon a methodology developed with our Social Equity Partners (described below) and facilitated by a social equity advisory agency (to be determined).
- Incorporation of additional measures into the existing RCP monitoring program to measure progress toward meeting the goals of the RCP and the six Livability Principles.
Proposed Consortium

SANDAG is proposing an initial consortium of partners including:

- The City of San Diego – the region’s largest and most populous city with 1.37 million people
- The County of San Diego – the jurisdiction with the largest land area and responsible for land use in the unincorporated/rural portion of the region with a population of 500,000
- The Southern California Tribal Chairmen’s Association – representing the 17 federally-recognized tribal governments in the region
- The San Diego Housing Commission – the Public Housing Authority within the City of San Diego
- Social Equity Partners – made up of community-based collaboratives which would include social institutions, social service providers, ethnic associations, schools, churches, chambers of commerce, and other community-based organizations representing residents in identified low-income/minority communities in the region. These would include but are not limited to our existing partners from the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan process:
  - Casa Familiar
  - Chula Vista Community Collaborative
  - El Cajon Community Collaborative
  - Jacobs Center for Neighborhood Innovation
  - Linda Vista Collaborative

Attachment 3 is a draft of a “Partnership Agreement, Letter of Intent” which fulfills the grant requirements for the full application. If funded, the consortium partners would need to enter into a formal agreement within 120 days of the effective start date of the cooperative agreement with HUD.

Next Steps

Pending Executive Committee action, staff from the proposed consortium partners will be working on the various elements of the full application in anticipation of the announcement that the San Diego region is eligible and invited to apply. The deadline for the full application is September 26, 2011.

CHARLES ‘MUGGS’ STOLL
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachments: 1. Sustainable Communities Regional Planning Grant, Category 2 Pre-Application Narrative Statement
               2. Partnership for Sustainable Communities/Federal Livability Principles

Key Staff Contact: Coleen Clementson, Principal Planner (619) 699-1944, ccl@sandag.org
The San Diego region is home to 3.1 million people. Most of the homes and jobs are located in the western third of the region, along the Pacific Ocean. The eastern two-thirds of the region are largely open space, consisting of park land, habitat preserve areas, and environmentally-constrained lands. We are a one-county binational region with 18 cities, and the busiest border crossing in the world with Mexico. The region is home to 17 federally-recognized tribal governments with jurisdiction over 18 reservations, more than any county in the United States. The San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG), the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the region, is governed by a Board of Directors composed of elected officials from the 18 cities and County of San Diego (a map of the region showing the project geography has been uploaded in this pre-application).

In 2004, SANDAG adopted a Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP), which serves as the foundation for integrating land uses, transportation systems, infrastructure needs, and public investment strategies within a regional smart-growth framework. It provides a regional vision and a broad context in which local and regional decisions can be made that foster a healthy environment, a vibrant economy, and a high quality of life for all San Diegans. It balances regional population, housing, and employment growth with habitat preservation, agriculture, open space, and infrastructure needs. It strives to move the region toward a more sustainable future through smart-growth planning principles and policies - improving the quality of life for all San Diegans - regardless of age, race, color, national origin, income, or physical agility. The RCP is based upon three key themes: 1) improving the links between land use and transportation planning; 2) using land use and transportation plans to guide other infrastructure investments; and 3) making it happen through incentives and collaboration (a PDF of the RCP has been uploaded in this pre-application).

In 2009, the San Diego region initiated work on a comprehensive update of our Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). This RTP is subject to new California climate change mandates requiring that all RTPs include a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) demonstrating how regions will meet greenhouse gas emission targets set by the state. The San Diego region is the first MPO in the state to develop an integrated RTP and SCS. Slated for adoption in October 2011, the 2050 RTP/SCS includes land use and transportation management strategies as well as improvements to public transit and active transportation that will enable the region to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and plan for a more sustainable future. It sets forth a number of bold actions that will need to be implemented; the actions are the basis for this grant request.

Amount of Housing and Urbanized Development Funds Requested

The San Diego Regional Sustainability Partnership is requesting $5 million to support a comprehensive RCP update and to advance local implementation. The update is necessary to integrate the 2050 RTP and its SCS with the RCP and to strengthen integration of the six Livability Principles established by the U.S. Partnership for Sustainable Communities at the regional and local level. As the MPO, SANDAG, in collaboration with our consortium partners, is responsible for ensuring delivery of all grant-related activities.
List of Core Consortium Partners

SANDAG will serve as the lead agency, with consortium partners including:

- The City of San Diego – the region’s largest and most populous city with 1.37 million people.
- The County of San Diego – the jurisdiction with the largest land area and responsible for land use in the unincorporated/rural portion of the region with a population of 500,000.
- The Southern California Tribal Chairmen’s Association – representing the 17 federally-recognized tribal governments in the region.
- The San Diego Housing Commission – the public housing authority within the City of San Diego.
- Social Equity Partners – made up of community-based collaboratives which include social institutions, social service providers, ethnic associations, schools, churches, chambers of commerce, and other community-based organizations representing residents in identified low-income/minority communities in the region. These include:
  - Casa Familiar
  - Chula Vista Community Collaborative
  - El Cajon Community Collaborative
  - Jacobs Center for Neighborhood Innovation
  - Linda Vista Community Collaborative

Grant-Funded Activities

The grant funds would support a comprehensive update to the RCP that will include:

1. Development and implementation of a participatory outreach program based upon a methodology developed with our Social Equity Partners and facilitated by a social equity advisory agency (to be determined).
2. Incorporation of the six Livability Principles into the RCP to provide more transportation choices, promote equitable, affordable housing; enhance economic competitiveness; support existing communities; coordinate policies and leverage investment; and value communities and neighborhoods.
3. Expand the role of the regional Smart Growth Concept Map though preparation of a regional Transit-Oriented Development strategy to evaluate the role of individual transit stations and smart-growth areas within the regional network in support of the Livability Principles.
4. Support for catalyst plans and projects with regional significance in the City of San Diego that foster economic development and affordable housing in areas with the greatest needs and support the Livability Principles.
5. Support catalyst plans and projects in smaller jurisdictions, rural villages, and tribal land areas that support the Livability Principles.
6. Incorporate additional measures into the existing RCP Monitoring program to measure progress toward meeting the goals of the RCP and the six Livability Principles.

Submitted 8/25/2011
Partnership for Sustainable Communities/Federal Livability Principles

The Partnership for Sustainable Communities (Partnership) was conceived to advance development patterns and infrastructure investment programs that achieve improved economic prosperity and healthy, environmentally sustainable, and opportunity-rich communities. Recognizing the fundamental role that public investment plays in achieving these outcomes, the Administration charged three agencies whose programs most directly impact the physical form of communities, Housing and Urbanized Development (HUD), Department of Transportation (DOT), and Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), to lead the way in reshaping the role of the Federal Government in helping communities obtain the capacity to embrace a more sustainable future. As a result, HUD, DOT, and EPA formed the Partnership.

In this interagency partnership, each agency is incorporating the Livability Principles into their policies and funding programs, to the degree possible.

Livability Principles

A. Provide More Transportation Choices. Develop safe, reliable, and affordable transportation choices to decrease household transportation costs, reduce energy consumption and dependence on foreign oil, improve air quality, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and promote public health.

B. Promote Equitable, Affordable Housing. Expand location- and energy-efficient housing choices for people of all ages, incomes, races, and ethnicities to increase mobility and lower the combined cost of housing and transportation.

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

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

E. Coordinate Policies and Leverage Investment. Align federal policies and funding to remove barriers to collaboration, leverage funding, and increase the accountability and effectiveness of all levels of government to plan for future growth, including making smart energy choices such as locally-generated renewable energy.

F. Value Communities and Neighborhoods. Enhance the unique characteristics of all communities by investing in healthy, safe, and walkable neighborhoods, rural, urban, or suburban.

DRAFT LETTER OF INTENT REGARDING THE FORMATION OF A SAN DIEGO MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL WORKING PARTNERSHIP

This Letter of Intent (“LOI”) regarding the formation of a San Diego Multi-Jurisdictional Working Partnership (“WORKING PARTNERSHIP”) is made by and between the City of San Diego (“San Diego”), the County of San Diego (“County”), the Southern California Tribal Chairmen’s Association (“SCTCA”), the San Diego Housing Commission (“SDHC”), Casa Familiar, the Chula Vista Community Collaborative, the El Cajon Collaborative, the Jacobs Center for Neighborhood Innovation, the Linda Vista Collaborative, and the San Diego Association of Governments (“SANDAG”), collectively referred to herein as the “Parties,” and individually as a “Party,” as follows:

RECITALS

A. This Working Partnership is made to express the general willingness of the Parties to form a Working Partnership on terms to be negotiated by the Parties, and to express the Parties’ general intent to form and participate in the Working Partnership, pursuant to attached “San Diego Regional Partnership: Organizational and Governance Structure.”

B. This LOI shall not be a legally binding agreement, or an amendment to any existing agreement. However, it contains some initial principles that may form the basis for the formation of the Working Partnership.

C. Each Party will carry out its program responsibilities as described in the approved application.

D. Each Party authorizes SANDAG to act in the representative capacity with the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (“HUD”) on behalf of all members of the Working Partnership and to assume administrative responsibility for ensuring that the Working Partnership’s program is carried out in compliance with all HUD requirements.

E. SANDAG would hold fiscal and administrative responsibility for regular interaction with HUD, however, this would not restrict the Parties from developing a governance structure that reflects the diversity of its partners and allows for maximum participation in strategy development and decision-making.

F. The Parties agree that a formal agreement(s) will be executed no later than 120 days after the effective start date of the grant award. Such agreement(s) will include each Party’s specific activities under the program, timetables for completion, and amount and use of grant funds.

NOW, THEREFORE, IN CONSIDERATION OF THE RECITALS ABOVE, the Parties support the potential for the formation of the Working Partnership, as follows:

1. The Working Partnership will ensure timely and accurate reporting of all reporting mandated by HUD, and/or any local reporting requirements associated therewith.

2. The Working Partnership will ensure coordination of each Party’s programs and services.
3. The Working Partnership agrees that SANDAG is the managing lead agency of the partnership, responsible for its administration and fiscal management.

4. While this LOI represents the good faith intentions of each Party to form the partnership, this LOI shall not be construed as a final commitment to approve the formation of the Working Partnership by any Party. Any Party may, at any time prior to the execution and delivery of any formal agreement(s), propose different terms from those summarized here, and may unilaterally terminate all negotiations without any liability whatsoever to the other Parties. Each Party shall pay its own fees, costs, and other expenses incurred in conjunction with the negotiation and preparation of this LOI and the negotiation and preparation of formal agreement(s) made following this LOI.

5. The Parties reserve their rights to exercise their discretion as to all matters which they are by law entitled or required. In addition, any agreements, amendments, or approvals processed by a Party’s governing authority shall be subject to, and considered in accordance with, all applicable legal requirements.

6. The Working Partnership will not constitute an agreement to joint liability among the Parties. The Parties are independent legal entities and will remain as such during the course of performance of all activities associated with this LOI.

7. This LOI may be executed in any number of counterparts, each of which shall be deemed an original, and shall collectively constitute one and the same document.

8. This LOI represents the entire understanding of the Parties regarding the subject matter herein. Any modification of this LOI shall be in writing and signed by the Parties.
9. Each individual executing this LOI on behalf of another person or legal entity represents and warrants that they are authorized to execute and deliver this LOI on behalf of such person or entity in accordance with duly adopted resolutions or other authorizing actions which are necessary and proper and under such legal entity’s articles, charter, bylaws, or other written rules of conduct or governing agreement. Each person executing this LOI on behalf of another person or legal entity shall, upon request of another Party, provide satisfactory evidence that such authority is valid.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, this LOI shall be effective as of the Effective Date.

SAN DIEGO ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
A California Municipal Corporation

BY:_______________________________________________________________  Date:   
    Gary Gallegos, Executive Director

CITY OF SAN DIEGO
A California Municipal Corporation

BY:_______________________________________________________________  Date:   
    Jay M. Goldstone, Chief Operating Officer

COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO
A Health and Human Services Agency

BY:_______________________________________________________________  Date:   
    Nick Macchione, Director of HHSA

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA TRIBAL CHAIRMEN’S ASSOCIATION
A Multi-Service Tribal Organization

BY:_______________________________________________________________  Date:   
    Denis Turner, Executive Director
SAN DIEGO HOUSING COMMISSION
A California Municipal Organization

BY: ____________________________________________________________ Date: __________
    Richard Gentry, President and CEO

CASA FAMILIAR
A Non-Profit Service Organization

BY: ____________________________________________________________ Date: __________
    Andrea Skorepa, Executive Director

CHULA VISTA COMMUNITY COLLABORATIVE

BY: ____________________________________________________________ Date: __________
    Margarita Holguin, Executive Director

EL CAJON COLLABRATIVE

BY: ____________________________________________________________ Date: __________
    Suzanne Moser, Executive Team Chair

JACOBS CENTER FOR NEIGHBORHOOD INNOVATION
A Non-Profit Service Organization

BY: ____________________________________________________________ Date: __________
    Roque Barros, Interim President

LINDA VISTA COLLABORATIVE

BY: ____________________________________________________________ Date: __________
    Monica Fernandez, Coordinator
ADDITIONAL PARTNERS (to be included as part of the final application submittal)

BY:_______________________________________________________________  Date:  __________

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND LEGALITY:

JAN I. GOLDSMITH, San Diego City Attorney

BY:_______________________________________________________________  Date:  __________
Andrea Contreras-Dixon, San Diego Deputy City Attorney

COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO, County Counsel

BY:_______________________________________________________________  Date:  __________
Deputy County Counsel

SAN DIEGO ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS

BY:_______________________________________________________________  Date:  __________
JULIE D. WILEY, SANDAG General Counsel
2050 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN: SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS AND PROPOSED CHANGES

Introduction

On April 22, 2011, the SANDAG Board of Directors accepted the Draft 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and its Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) for public distribution and comment. The public comment period for the Draft 2050 RTP and its SCS closed on July 8, 2011. The Draft 2050 RTP/SCS Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was released for public comment on June 7, 2011. The public comment period on the Draft 2050 RTP/SCS EIR closed on August 1, 2011.

As of August 22, 2011, SANDAG had received more than 4,000 comments on the Draft 2050 RTP/SCS from over 1,500 different contributors. These comments were submitted at public workshops and public hearings, and also via e-mail, the Envision 2050 interactive visualization tool, the 2050 RTP Web page, a SANDAG toll free telephone line, postcards, fax, and letters. Of the total 4,000 comments, approximately 2,500 were identical comments submitted by members of a few organizations. The notable changes proposed for the Final 2050 RTP/SCS are discussed in this report and are summarized in Attachment 1. A summary of the comments and preliminary responses on the Draft 2050 RTP/SCS is included as Attachment 2. Responses to the Draft EIR comments will be provided with the Final EIR and presented to the Board of Directors at its October 28, 2011, meeting.

Minor edits to text, tables, and figures to clarify or expand explanations of the projects, programs, services, and actions that are included in the Draft 2050 RTP/SCS will be made in the Final 2050 RTP/SCS.

Discussion

Draft 2050 RTP/SCS Public Comments

The comments received on the Draft 2050 RTP/SCS covered the following broad issues:

Advancing Transportation Projects – Hundreds of comments were received expressing support to move various transportation projects forward in the proposed phasing plan. The majority of these comments focused on advancing transit projects in the 2050 RTP.

Support for/Opposition to Transportation Modes and Specific Projects – Hundreds of comments were received that supported public transportation, active transportation, and alternatives to freeway expansion. Additionally, numerous comments either supported or opposed specific transit, highway, or local street and road projects. For example, SANDAG received many comments
supporting the new Trolley lines, including the Mid-City light rail transit (LRT) line. Regarding highways, comments were received in support of Interstates 5, 15, and 805 and State Routes 56 and 67. Some commenters also opposed additional lanes on I-5 North.

Comments on the SCS, SB 375, and Greenhouse Gases – Thousands of comments were received relating to the SCS, SB 375, and greenhouse gases (GHG). Most comments supported the SCS included in the Draft 2050 RTP although some requested additional information regarding SB 375 streamlining provisions. Many comments related to the relationship between vehicle miles traveled and GHG reductions, which will be clarified in the Final 2050 RTP/SCS.

Modeling and Other Technical Issues – SANDAG received hundreds of comments regarding the transportation modeling process and growth forecasts, project rankings, and performance measures.

Funding – Hundreds of comments were received on the qualifying uses of transportation funding and the need for increased funding for new transportation projects.

**Proposed Changes to the Draft 2050 RTP/SCS**

Based on public comments received, minor edits will be made to text, tables, and figures to clarify or expand explanations of the projects, programs, services, and actions that were included in the Draft 2050 RTP/SCS. Previous modifications to the Draft 2050 RTP/SCS recommended by the Board in July include phasing modifications to the I-5/State Route (SR) 78 connectors, Mid-City LRT, and an additional $800 million (in 2010 dollars) for regional rail grade separations, smart growth improvements, and safe routes to transit investments. These modifications resulted from the selection of the preferred alternative for the I-5 North project by Caltrans and the Federal highway Administration, which calls for four express or Managed Lanes between La Jolla Village Drive and Vandegrift Boulevard, and will be incorporated in the Final 2050 RTP. The Draft 2050 RTP included the I-5 North alternative with two additional general purpose lanes to ensure that full funding would be in the Plan should that alternative ultimately be selected. Other proposed modifications and changes are discussed in Attachment 1. None of the changes proposed in Attachment 1 would trigger recirculation of the RTP or its EIR under federal or state law.

Based on the revisions outlined in Attachment 1, the Final 2050 RTP/SCS would be based on a Revenue Constrained Scenario totaling $213.8 billion (in year of expenditure). The bulk of this increase is due to the addition of the high speed rail project ($16.6 billion in year of expenditure).

**Next Steps**

Pending the Board of Directors’ acceptance of the proposed changes, staff will prepare the Final 2050 RTP/SCS. On October 7, 2011, the Transportation Committee will be asked to recommend adoption of the 2050 RTP/SCS to the Board. On October 28, 2011, the Board of Directors will be asked to certify the Final EIR prepared for the 2050 RTP/SCS, make a finding that the 2050 RTP and the 2010 Regional Transportation Improvement Program, as amended, are in conformance with the State Implementation Plan for air quality, and adopt the Final 2050 RTP/SCS.

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

Attachments: 1. Additional Proposed Changes from Draft 2050 RTP to Final 2050 RTP
               2. Draft 2050 RTP/SCS Public Comments and Responses

Key Staff Contact: Heather Adamson, (619) 699-6967, had@sandag.org
Additional Proposed Changes from Draft 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) to Final 2050 RTP

Proposed Network Modifications

Transit

1. Add three new airport express routes serving San Diego International Airport and the proposed San Diego-Tijuana Crossborder Facility based on the Draft Airport Multimodal Accessibility Plan (AMAP). These routes are revenue neutral for the 2050 RTP (i.e., services by private operators or funded by aviation funds).

2. Extend the terminus of the University Towne Centre (UTC) to Chula Vista LRT from the Palomar Street Trolley station to San Ysidro via the Blue Line Trolley (Route 562).

3. Re-route BRT service between Sorrento Mesa and Otay Mesa via Otay Ranch to operate on Interstate 805 (I-805) to a new terminus at the San Ysidro Trolley station (Route 688).

4. Add a new Rapid Bus in the State Route 56 (SR 56) corridor between Solana Beach and Sabre Springs Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) station via Carmel Valley to the Unconstrained Transportation Network (Route 103).

Roadway

1. Update improvements for SR 15 through Mid-City – The Draft 2050 RTP includes two managed lanes on SR 15 from I-8 to SR 94 through Mid-City. Due to the alternative selected for the SR 15 Mid-City BRT project after the Draft 2050 RTP was prepared, it is proposed to change the improvements on SR 15 from two managed lanes to two transit lanes from I-8 to I-805. The managed lanes between I-805 and SR 94 are proposed to be phased in the 2031-2035 period to align with the high occupancy vehicle (HOV) connectors at SR 15/SR 94.

2. Revise phasing for I-15/SR 78 HOV Connectors – The Draft 2050 RTP includes HOV connectors at I-15 and SR 78 in the 2021-2030 phasing period. It is proposed to move this project to the 2011-2018 phasing period to coordinate with the I-15 and SR 78 Managed Lanes improvements planned for the same period in these corridors.

3. Revise phasing for I-805 – The Draft 2050 RTP includes four managed lanes on I-805 from SR 52 to Carroll Canyon by 2020. It is proposed to advance two HOV lanes to the 2011-2018 phasing period with the full improvement (additional two lanes) by 2020.

4. Update arterial projects to reflect minor changes requested by local jurisdictions such as changes to phasing or modifications to project descriptions.

Proposed SCS Modifications

Based on a review of the comments in Attachment 2, the following modifications are proposed for the SCS (Chapter 3):

1. Add an implementation action to the Final 2050 RTP to prepare a regional Transit Oriented Development strategy as part of the Regional Comprehensive Plan update.

2. Add an implementation action to the Final 2050 RTP to provide additional guidance on Senate Bill 375 (SB 375) California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) streamlining provisions.
3. Modify two implementation actions for the Final 2050 RTP to provide additional language to support complete streets principles.

4. Include a new map to better demonstrate the land use and transportation connection and additional discussion of the GHG reduction targets.

5. Clarify greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and vehicle miles traveled (VMT) reductions for all vehicle types and SB 375 vehicle classes (passenger vehicles and light-duty trucks). Table 1 shows the GHG emissions and VMT decreases for SB 375 vehicle classes from a 2005 base year that would be achieved with the implementation of the Draft 2050 RTP.

Table 1 - Draft 2050 RTP Revenue Constrained Transportation Network

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>CARB Target</th>
<th>GHG</th>
<th>VMT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2050</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SANDAG and California Air Resources Board (CARB)

Table 2 presents the GHG emissions and VMT reductions for all vehicles (such as public transit buses, heavy-duty trucks, and school buses, in addition to passenger vehicles and light-duty trucks) from a 2008 base year based on the Draft 2050 RTP.

Table 2 - Draft 2050 RTP Revenue Constrained Transportation Network

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>GHG</th>
<th>VMT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2050</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SANDAG
Proposed RTP Revenue/Cost Adjustments

Table 3 summarizes the project costs estimates that are proposed to be revised for the Final 2050 RTP. Project revenues are proposed to be adjusted accordingly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SR 15 between SR 94 and I-8&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$65</td>
<td>$78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 56&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>$221</td>
<td>$135</td>
<td>$244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-805 between SR 905 and I-5 Merge&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>$3,904</td>
<td>$3,868</td>
<td>$4,845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 11/Otay Mesa East POE&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>$356</td>
<td>$755</td>
<td>$755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetcars&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>$67</td>
<td>$661</td>
<td>$868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Express Routes</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$51</td>
<td>$55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Costs revised to reflect alternative selected for the SR 15 Mid-City BRT project.
2. Correction to cost estimates.
3. The Draft 2050 RTP includes the revenues and cost for SR 11. The revenues and cost for the Otay Mesa East Port of Entry are proposed to be included in the Final 2050 RTP as funded by tolls.
4. The Draft 2050 RTP includes only 10 percent of the revenues and capital cost. The full amount of the revenues and costs of the streetcars is proposed to be included in the Final 2050 RTP. However, only 10 percent of the capital cost and none of the operating costs are assumed from regional funding.

Additionally, although the High-Speed Rail (HSR) project is not a regionally sponsored project in the 2050 RTP, it is proposed to include the HSR cost estimate and funding in the Final 2050 RTP for informational purposes ($16.6 billion in year of expenditure).

Proposed Final 2050 RTP Actions

Based on a review of the comments in Attachment 2, in addition to the proposed implementation actions listed in the Proposed SCS Modifications section, the following implementation actions are proposed to be added:

1. Consider development of an Active Transportation Early Action Program (Chapter 6).
2. Consider development of a regional Complete Streets policy (Chapter 6).
3. Modify an implementation action for the Final 2050 RTP to add language to provide ongoing complete streets educational opportunities (Chapter 6).

Proposed Technical Appendices Modifications

1. Update Technical Appendix 3 to include the benefit/cost analysis and economic impact methodologies.
2. Revise description of Otay Mesa Southbound Truck Route Improvements to indicate City of San Diego local streets and roads, under Projects of Interest (Technical Appendix 4, Table 4.23).
3. Include the Draft AMAP, released in June 2011, as part of Technical Appendix 12.
4. Update Travel Demand Model Documentation to include more detailed information on mode share methodology and off-model methodology to estimate greenhouse gas emissions reductions of several strategies. (Technical Appendix 15)

5. Add more detailed information regarding the congestion management process (Chapter 6), including a new technical appendix. (Technical Appendix 20)


Proposed Additional Modifications

1. Revise methodology for calculating the access to amenities (schools, airport, healthcare, and parks/beaches) by transit, in response to comments received. The Draft 2050 RTP includes more than 40 performance measures, including several social equity indicators. The methodology developed for the Draft 2050 RTP calculated access to amenities using the nearest transit stop as the access point. The proposed new methodology would use the best transit stop as the access point (e.g., the transit stop may be further away but provides more direct service and therefore the minimum overall travel time). (Chapter 4)

2. Clarify the fuel consumption and toll facilities revenue assumptions (Chapter 5).

3. Add more detailed information to project descriptions in project tables (e.g., grade separations, transit routing, phase year, etc.) and other minor modifications (Chapter 6 and Appendix A).

4. Clarify that BRT Route 680 includes a transit station serving the Southeastern San Diego community located at I-805/47th Street Trolley station (Chapter 6).

5. Include a new map to show the local bus routes with 10-minute frequencies in key corridors by 2035 (Appendix A).
Please visit SANDAG’s Web site to view Attachment 2.
Summary of Chula Vista’s Proposed Revisions to Board Policy 33 (8/29/11)-

1. Purpose Section;
   A. General language/grammar updating and removal of references to old RHNA “alternatives” and the prior Memorandum.
   B. Item 4; Housing Element compliance is now an application threshold (new 4.1), rather than a scoring criteria (old Criteria 1).
   C. Old 4.1 re-numbered to 4.2, and old 4.2 is now included as a paragraph under new 4.2
   D. Item 5; language and reference clean ups. Reference to factors/criteria will need further refinement post outcomes of the Board Ad-Hoc committee’s discussions.

2. Attachments;
   A. Old #1 dropped (prior Memorandum).
   B. Others re-numbered. (old #4/new #3 revised to pending Final RHNA Option 2b).

3. Table 1; no change.

4. Table 2; no change.

5. Scoring Criteria;
   A. Old Criteria 1 (Housing Element Compliance); moved up as an application threshold (see 1.b above).
   B. New Criteria 1 (Old #2) – Greater RHNA Share Taken
      i. Retains the basis that those jurisdictions with higher RHNA shares (per pending final RHNA Option 2b) would receive more points. Drops old approach of comparing among RHNA now outdated “alternatives”.
      ii. Compares each jurisdiction’s Lower-Income RHNA allocation (Option 2b), to their portion of the region’s Lower Income RHNA total (64,150 units) based on each jurisdiction’s 2020 population as a percentage of the region’s 2020 population.
      iii. Produces a comparative LI RHNA allocation proportioned to each jurisdiction’s projected 2020 population (HE horizon year).
      iv. Scoring is based on the degree to which your Final (Option 2b) LI RHNA allocation either exceeds (more points), or is lower than (fewer points) than your population-based share.
         a. Over 1.0, all points
         b. .75 – 1.0, 2/3 points
         c. .50 - .75, 1/3 points
         d. .49 or less, no point
C. New Criteria 2 (Old #3) – Regional Share of Cumulative Total of Lower-Income Units Produced
   i. Maintained largely as is; would use most recent 3 years of lower-income unit production numbers, since annual production can significantly fluctuate.
   
   ii. Acquisition/rehab units (that are restricted for 30 years or longer) would get full credit.
   
   iii. References to old factor 4 deleted.
   
   iv. Adds note to define what counts as lower-income production.

D. New Criteria 3 - Cumulative Affordable Housing
   i. Deletes old #4 which was based on an inappropriate comparison of lower-income housing production to the RHNA which is a planning number.
   
   ii. Accounts for existing levels of lower-income housing in a jurisdiction in comparison to the jurisdiction’s total number of housing units.
   
   iii. Those jurisdictions with higher levels of lower-income affordable housing as a percentage of their total housing supply get more points. (Would generally favor smaller- to mid-sized jurisdictions with larger affordable housing supply).
   
   iv. Adds note clarifying source for inventory.

E. New Criteria 4- Jobs/Housing Balance
   i. Adds jobs / housing balance as a scoring criteria since the RHNA allocation (Option 2b) does not fully consider this, and State law indicates jobs and housing relationships must be taken into consideration.
   
   ii. Awards points based on the extent to which a jurisdiction’s projected 2020 jobs/housing balance ratio is either higher or lower than the projected 2020 regional average of 1.2003. Less than 1.0 (full points), over 1.0 & up (varying points based on how much over 1.0).

F. Criteria 5 – Percent of Lower-Income Households
   i. Retains largely as-is. Intended to address the issue of lower-income concentration which is a factor in State law.
   
   ii. Keeps same scoring increments, but now references 2009 American Community Survey data as source (rather than outdated 2000 Census).
BOARD POLICY NO. 033

IMPLEMENTATION GUIDELINES FOR SANDAG REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT MEMORANDUM

Purpose

The purpose of Policy No. 033 is to provide guidelines for the allocation of regional smart growth and active transportation grant funding in relation to lower-income housing distributions under the 2010-2020 Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) allocation. Policy No. 033 outlines specific provisions regarding SANDAG’s allocation of discretionary funding to local agency projects in relation to local jurisdictions’ housing element compliance and lower income housing production.

This policy shall be reviewed and evaluated as necessary to determine any needed changes. Issues to be considered during the review should include the relationship between the RHNA allocation and achievement of SANDAG’s smart growth goals and new or changed funding sources.

The Policy was initially approved by the SANDAG Board in April 2006 and was first amended in November 2008. This Policy reflects the second set of amendments approved by the Board in (date) 2011 in conjunction with the 2010-2020 RHNA.

1. This section of the Policy No. 033 defines “discretionary funds as: those funds allocated by SANDAG through a competitive process to local agencies (cities or County. These funds are listed in Table 1 (Attachment 1) and include the TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program, Transportation Development Act (TDA) Non-motorized Program, and TransNet Bicycle Program, among others.

2. The following funds are not subject to the provisions of Policy No. 033:

   2.1 Formula funds allocated by population or number of miles, because they are not allocated on a competitive basis.

   2.2 Discretionary funds allocated to Caltrans, the two transit agencies (MTS and NCTB), and SANDAG because they are not local agencies.

   2.3 Funds allocated directly by Caltrans to local jurisdictions because SANDAG is not involved in their allocation.
2.4 Funds which can be allocated to entities other than local jurisdictions (e.g., TransNet Environmental Mitigation Program Regional Habitat Conservation Fund and the Senior Transportation Mini-grant Program).

Table 2 (Attachment 2) provides a more detailed list of funding sources/programs that are not be subject to Policy No. 033.

3. As new funding sources become available, the Regional Planning Committee (RPC) shall review and recommend to the Board of Directors if they should be subject to Policy No. 033.

4. To be eligible to apply for future discretionary funding, as described in Table 1 and allocated by SANDAG to local Agency projects, local jurisdictions shall meet the following thresholds:

4.1 Housing Element Compliance: In order to qualify for funding under Policy No. 033, a jurisdiction must have an adopted Housing Element found to be in compliance by HCD or its equivalent at the time of the funding program’s application deadline. No points would be awarded to projects in jurisdictions that have not received a letter of compliance from HCD. A court upheld Housing Element would receive credit.

4.2 Annual Housing Element Progress Reports: Jurisdictions shall be required to submit an annual report with the information described below in order to be eligible for funding programs for the following calendar year. This annual report shall include the same information that HCD requests in the Annual Housing Element Progress reports required by housing element law, as well as the information described below, and shall be submitted to SANDAG by the deadline in state law, April 1 of each year. SANDAG will prepare a report with this information for review by the Regional Planning Technical Working Group, Regional Housing Working Group, and Regional Planning Committee each year. Funding applications subject to this policy shall be evaluated based on the annual report for the preceding year that was submitted to SANDAG and HCD. If a jurisdiction wishes to submit data through the date of the call for projects at the time of the application due date (i.e., covering a time period beyond the previous calendar year) it may do so and will be evaluated based on the time period for which the data was submitted.

The annual report shall provide information regarding the number of building permits issued for new residential construction by income category (very low, low, moderate, and above moderate) using the forms provided by HCD for its Annual Housing Element Progress Report. If the report is submitted for the first time in years two, three, four, or five of the housing element cycle, it shall include the total number of building permits issued for new residential construction by income category during each year of the housing element cycle (including the two and a half years preceding the housing element due date). The annual report also shall indicate how many acquired/rehabilitated/rent restricted units were permitted during each year.

5. Policy No. 033 ties the funding allocation to considering several criteria related to local jurisdictions’ planning for, and production of lower income housing through the award of incentive points (a minimum of 25 points out of 100 or 25 percent of the total points in a
funding program) in accordance with the adopted RHNA. During the 20011 review of this policy, the award of incentive points was structured to include five criteria, each of which was assigned a value of one-fifth of the total points including: (1) Greater RHNA Share Taken, (2) Regional Share of Cumulative Total of Lower Income Units Produced, (3) Cumulative Affordable Housing (4) Jobs/Housing Balance, and (5) Percent of Lower-Income Households.

5.1 The following attachment (Attachment 4) describes in detail how the incentive points are calculated for each of the five criteria.

Attachments:
1. Discretionary Funding Programs Subject to Board Policy No. 033
2. Funding Programs Not Subject to Board Policy No. 033
3. Final Regional Housing Needs Assessment
4. Description of How to Calculate the Board Policy No. 033 Incentive Points

Adopted April 2006
Amended November 2008
Amended September 2011

Outlines the scoring criteria that will be used. These concepts are designed to align transportation and infrastructure dollars with areas that are accommodating lower income households.

Reference to previous Memorandum (2005) has been deleted from Attachments
### TABLE 1
DISCRETIONARY FUNDING PROGRAMS
SUBJECT TO BOARD POLICY NO. 033
(LOCAL JURISDICTION PROJECTS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding programs</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
<th>Timeframe Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Transportation Enhancements (TE) Program</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Transportation Development Act</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• (TDA) Article 3 – Non-motorized Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <em>TransNet</em> Bicycle, Pedestrian and Neighborhood Safety Program</td>
<td>$280 M*</td>
<td>2009 to 2048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <em>TransNet</em> Smart Growth Incentive Program</td>
<td>$285 M*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Rail Grade Separation Program</strong> (Funding source TBD)</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In 2002 dollars*
### TABLE 2  
FUNDING PROGRAMS NOT SUBJECT TO BOARD POLICY NO. 033

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP)&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Congestion Mitigation &amp; Air Quality (CMAQ)&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Transportation Enhancement (TE) Program&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Urbanized Area Formula Program (Section 5307)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• FTA Fixed Guideway Modernization Program (Section 5309 Rail Mod)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• FTA Section 5310 Elderly &amp; Disabled Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• FTA New Freedom Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• FTA Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) – Regional Improvement Program (RIP)&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• STIP – Interregional Improvement Program (IIP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• TDA Article 4 – General Public Transit Services (Fixed Transit Route Services)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• TDA Article 4.5 – Community Transit Service (Accessible Service for the Disabled)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• TDA Article 8 – Special Provisions (Express Bus and Ferry Services)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• TDA Planning and Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• State Transit Assistance (STA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <em>TransNet</em> Senior Transportation Mini-grant Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <em>TransNet</em> Congestion Relief Program – Major Transportation Corridor Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Highway &amp; transit capital projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Operating support for bus rapid transit (BRT) &amp; rail transit capital improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <em>TransNet</em> Congestion Relief Program – Transit System Services Improvements &amp; Related Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <em>TransNet</em> Congestion Relief Program – Local System Improvements &amp; Related Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Local Street &amp; Road Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Environmental Mitigation Program (EMP)&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <em>TransNet</em> Administration and Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee (ITOC)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<sup>1</sup> There are a variety of federal and state discretionary funding programs allocated directly by Caltrans that provide funding to local jurisdictions (e.g. Highway Bridge Repair & Replacement (HBRR), Safe Routes to School, etc.) Because SANDAG does not have decision-making authority over these funding programs, they would not be subject to the Board RHNA memorandum.

<sup>2</sup> With the exception of the EMP funds, these funds (STIP-RIP, RSTP, CMAQ, TE) are being used to match the *TransNet* Early Action Program (EAP) and other high priority regional projects. If, however, some portion of these funds were allocated by the SANDAG Board of Directors to local jurisdictions through a competitive process, they would be subject to the Board RHNA memorandum and this policy.
Final Regional Housing Needs Assessment
(Once adopted)
SCORING CRITERIA
How to Calculate Board Policy No. 033 Incentive Points

The following five criteria, weighted equally, will be used to calculate the incentive points (25 percent of the total points) for each program subject to Board Policy No. 033.

1. Greater RHNA Share Taken: Jurisdictions with an assigned Low Income RHNA higher than their population-based share of the region’s low income RHNA would receive these points.
   - 49 percent or less – 0 points
   - 50-74 percent (1/3 the total number of points);
   - 75-100 percent (2/3 the total number of points);
   - Above 100 percent (the total number of points for this factor).

2. Regional Share of Cumulative Total of Lower-Income* Units Produced: One-fifth of the total Policy No. 033 points would be awarded based on each jurisdiction’s share of the total number of lower-income units produced in the region over the most recent three years using the four following intervals:
   - 0 percent share or no units produced (0 points);
   - >0 – 5 percent (1/3 of the points);
   - >5 -10 percent (2/3 of the points)
   - greater than 10 percent (the total number of points for this factor).

Units that are acquired/rehabilitated and rent restricted at affordable levels for lower income households for a period of 30 years or longer, and are included in the jurisdiction’s annual report to HCD shall be included for the purposes of the above calculation.

*Units will be counted that are deed restricted to low income households at affordable prices as defined in the instructions for the HCD Annual Housing Element Progress Report. This number will be taken from the “Deed Restricted” rows in HCD Annual Housing Element Progress Report Table B.
3. Cumulative Affordable Housing: Actual number of Lower Income Residential Units** in a jurisdiction as a percentage of the total number of residential units in a jurisdiction. One-fifth of the total Policy No. 033 points would be awarded based on:

- >0 – 3 percent (1 point)
- >3 – 6 percent (2 points);
- >6 - 10 percent (4 points); and
- Greater than 10 percent (5 points).

** This number will be taken from the most current version of the Affordable Housing Inventory as updated by the San Diego Housing Federation.

4. Jobs/Housing Balance: One-fifth of the total Policy No. 033 points would be awarded to projects based on the jurisdictions’ projected (2020) jobs housing ratio per the adopted 2050 Regional Growth Forecast. (Note: the region’s 2020 jobs/housing ratio is 1.20).

- Jobs housing ratio over 1.5 (no points).
- Jobs housing ratio greater than 1.4 (1/3rd total points for this factor).
- Jobs housing ratio 1.0 – 1.3 (2/3 total points for this factor);
- Jobs housing ratio less than 1.0 (the total number of points for this factor);

5. Percent of Lower-Income Households: One-fifth of the total Policy No. 033 points would be awarded based on the percent of lower-income households residing in each jurisdiction (2009 American Community Survey) using the following three intervals:

- 0 – 40 percent lower-income households (1/3 of the points),
- >40 – 50 percent lower-income households (2/3 of the points), and
- >50 percent lower income households (the total number of points for this factor),

Criteria 3 (previously 4) accounts for existing levels of lower-income housing as a percent of all housing units.

Removes comparison of lower income housing production to the RHNA planning goal.

Criteria 4 adds a jobs/housing balance criteria since the proposed RHNA allocation does not fully consider this.

Criteria 5 remains largely as-is. Intended to address lower-income concentration, which is a RHNA factor in State law.

Change simply replaces Census data with American Community Survey data as the correct source.
BOARD POLICY NO. 033

IMPLEMENTATION GUIDELINES FOR SANDAG REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT MEMORANDUM

Purpose

The purpose of Policy No. 033 is to provide guidelines for the allocation of regional smart growth and active transportation grant funding in relation to lower-income housing distributions under the 2010-2020 Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) allocation. Policy No. 033 outlines specific provisions regarding SANDAG's allocation of discretionary funding to local agency projects in relation to local jurisdictions' housing element compliance and lower income housing production.

This policy shall be reviewed and evaluated as necessary to determine any needed changes. Issues to be considered during the review should include the relationship between the RHNA allocation and achievement of SANDAG's smart growth goals and new or changed funding sources.

The Policy was initially approved by the SANDAG Board in April 2006 and was first amended in November 2008. This Policy reflects the second set of amendments approved by the Board in (date) 2011 in conjunction with the 2010-2020 RHNA.

1. This section of the Policy No. 033 defines "discretionary funds as those funds allocated by SANDAG through a competitive process to local agencies (cities or County. These funds are listed in Table 1 (Attachment 1) and include the TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program, Transportation Development Act (TDA) Non-motorized Program, and TransNet Bicycle Program, among others.

2. The following funds are not subject to the provisions of Policy No. 033:

   2.1 Formula funds allocated by population or number of miles, because they are not allocated on a competitive basis.

   2.2 Discretionary funds allocated to Caltrans, the two transit agencies (MTS and NCTB), and SANDAG because they are not local agencies.

   2.3 Funds allocated directly by Caltrans to local jurisdictions because SANDAG is not involved in their allocation.
2.4 Funds which can be allocated to entities other than local jurisdictions (e.g., TransNet Environmental Mitigation Program Regional Habitat Conservation Fund and the Senior Transportation Mini-grant Program).

Table 2 (Attachment 2) provides a more detailed list of funding sources/programs that are not be subject to Policy No. 033.

3. As new funding sources become available, the Regional Planning Committee (RPC) shall review and recommend to the Board of Directors if they should be subject to Policy No. 033.

4. To be eligible to apply for future discretionary funding, as described in Table 1 and allocated by SANDAG to local Agency projects, local jurisdictions shall meet the following thresholds:

   4.1 Housing Element Compliance: In order to qualify for funding under Policy No. 033, a jurisdiction must have an adopted Housing Element found to be in compliance by HCD or its equivalent at the time of the funding program’s application deadline. No points would be awarded to projects in jurisdictions that have not received a letter of compliance from HCD. A court upheld Housing Element would receive credit.

   4.2 Annual Housing Element Progress Reports: Jurisdictions shall be required to submit an annual report with the information described below in order to be eligible for funding programs for the following calendar year. This annual report shall include the same information that HCD requests in the Annual Housing Element Progress reports required by housing element law, as well as the information described below, and shall be submitted to SANDAG by the deadline in state law, April 1 of each year. SANDAG will prepare a report with this information for review by the Regional Planning Technical Working Group, Regional Housing Working Group, and Regional Planning Committee each year. Funding applications subject to this policy shall be evaluated based on the annual report for the preceding year that was submitted to SANDAG and HCD. If a jurisdiction wishes to submit data through the date of the call for projects at the time of the application due date (i.e., covering a time period beyond the previous calendar year) it may do so and will be evaluated based on the time period for which the data was submitted.

   The annual report shall provide information regarding the number of building permits issued for new residential construction by income category (very low, low, moderate, and above moderate) using the forms provided by HCD for its Annual Housing Element Progress Report. If the report is submitted for the first time in years two, three, four, or five of the housing element cycle, it shall include the total number of building permits issued for new residential construction by income category during each year of the housing element cycle (including the two and a half years preceding the housing element due date). The annual report also shall indicate how many acquired/rehabilitated/rent restricted units were permitted during each year.

5. Policy No. 033 ties the funding allocation to considering several criteria related to local jurisdictions’ planning for, and production of lower income housing through the award of incentive points (a minimum of 25 points out of 100 or 25 percent of the total points in a funding program) in accordance with the adopted RHNA. During the 20011 review of this policy, the award of incentive points was structured to include five criteria, each of which was assigned a value of one-fifth of the total points including: (1) Greater RHNA Share Taken, (2) Regional Share of Cumulative Total of Lower Income Units Produced, (3) Cumulative Affordable Housing,
(4) Jobs/Housing Balance, and (5) Percent of Lower-Income Households.

5.1 The following describes in detail how the incentive points are calculated for each of the five criteria.

Attachments:
1. Discretionary Funding Programs Subject to Board Policy No. 033
2. Funding Programs Not Subject to Board Policy No. 033
3. Final Regional Housing Needs Assessment
4. Description of How to Calculate the Board Policy No. 033 Incentive Points

Amended September 2011

ENTIRE MEMORANDUM HAS BEEN DELETED
### TABLE 1
DISCRETIONARY FUNDING PROGRAMS
SUBJECT TO BOARD POLICY NO. 033
(LOCAL JURISDICTION PROJECTS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding programs</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
<th>Timeframe Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Transportation Enhancements (TE) Program</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 3 – Non-motorized Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local</strong></td>
<td>$280 M*</td>
<td>2009 to 2048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• TransNet Bicycle, Pedestrian and Neighborhood Safety Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program</td>
<td>$285 M*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Rail Grade Separation Program (Funding source TBD)</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In 2002 dollars
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) ²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Congestion Mitigation &amp; Air Quality (CMAQ) ²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Transportation Enhancement (TE) Program ³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Urbanized Area Formula Program (Section 5307)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• FTA Fixed Guideway Modernization Program (Section 5309 Rail Mod)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• FTA Section 5310 Elderly &amp; Disabled Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• FTA New Freedom Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• FTA Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **State** |
| • State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) – Regional Improvement Program (RIP) ² |
| • STIP – Interregional Improvement Program (IIP) |
| • State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP) |
| • TDA Article 4 – General Public Transit Services (Fixed Transit Route Services) |
| • TDA Article 4.5 – Community Transit Service (Accessible Service for the Disabled) |
| • TDA Article 8 – Special Provisions (Express Bus and Ferry Services) |
| • TDA Planning and Administration |
| • State Transit Assistance (STA) |

| **Local** |
| • TransNet Senior Transportation Mini-grant Program |
| • TransNet Congestion Relief Program – Major Transportation Corridor Improvements |
| o Highway & transit capital projects |
| o Operating support for bus rapid transit (BRT) & rail transit capital improvements |
| • TransNet Congestion Relief Program – Transit System Services Improvements & Related Programs |
| • TransNet Congestion Relief Program – Local System Improvements & Related Programs |
| o Local Street & Road Program |
| • Environmental Mitigation Program (EMP) ² |
| • TransNet Administration and Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee (ITOC) |

---

1. There are a variety of federal and state discretionary funding programs allocated directly by Caltrans that provide funding to local jurisdictions (e.g., Highway Bridge Repair & Replacement (HBRR), Safe Routes to School, etc.). Because SANDAG does not have decision-making authority over these funding programs, they would not be subject to the Board RHNA memorandum.

2. With the exception of the EMP funds, these funds (STIP-RIP, RSTP, CMAQ, TE) are being used to match the TransNet Early Action Program (EAP) and other high priority regional projects. If, however, some portion of these funds were allocated by the SANDAG Board of Directors to local jurisdictions through a competitive process, they would be subject to the Board RHNA memorandum and this policy.
Deleted:

Modified Alternative 1 (Adopted RHNA) and Alternative 3

Note:

Alternative 1 approved by SANDAG Board on February 25, 2005.

Alternative 3 approved by the SANDAG Board with approval of the final RHNA. May 18, 2005.
### SCORING CRITERIA

How to Calculate Board Policy No. 033 Incentive Points

The following five criteria, weighted equally, will be used to calculate the incentive points (25 percent of the total points) for each program subject to Board Policy No. 033.

1. **Greater RHNA Share Taken**: Jurisdictions with an assigned Low Income RHNA higher than their population-based share of the region’s low income RHNA would receive these points:
   - 49 percent or less – 0 points
   - 50-74 percent (1/3 the total number of points);
   - 75-100 percent (2/3 the total number of points);
   - Above 100 percent (the total number of points for this factor).

2. **Regional Share of Cumulative Total of Lower-Income Units Produced**: One-fifth of the total Policy No. 033 points would be awarded based on each jurisdiction’s share of the total number of lower-income units produced in the region over the most recent three years using the following intervals:
   - 0 percent share or no units produced (0 points);
   - >0 – 5 percent (1/3 of the points);
   - >5 - 10 percent (2/3 of the points);
   - greater than 10 percent (the total number of points for this factor).

Units that are acquired/rehabilitated and rent restricted at affordable levels for lower income households for a period of 30 years or longer, and are included in the jurisdiction’s annual report to HCD shall be included for the purposes of the above calculation.

*Units will be counted that are deed restricted to low income households at affordable prices as defined in the instructions for the HCD Annual Housing Element Progress Report. This number will be taken from the “Deed Restricted” rows in HCD Annual Housing Element Progress Report Table B.*

3. **Cumulative Affordable Housing**: Actual number of Lower Income Residential Units** in a jurisdiction as a percentage of the total number of residential units in a jurisdiction. One-fifth of the total Policy No. 033 points would be awarded based on:
   - >0 – 3 percent (1 point)
   - >3 – 6 percent (2 points);
   - >6 - 10 percent (4 points); and
   - Greater than 10 percent (5 points).

**This number will be taken from the most current version of the Affordable Housing Inventory as updated by the San Diego Housing Federation.**
4. Jobs/Housing Balance:
One-fifth of the total Policy No. 033 points would be awarded to projects based on the jurisdictions’ projected (2020) jobs housing ratio per the adopted 2050 Regional Growth Forecast. (Note: the region’s 2020 jobs/housing ratio is 1.20).

- Jobs housing ratio over 1.5 (no points).
- Jobs housing ratio greater than 1.4 (1/3rd total points for this factor).
- Jobs housing ratio 1.0 – 1.3 (2/3 total points for this factor);
- Jobs housing ratio less than 1.0 (the total number of points for this factor).

5. Percent of Lower-Income Households:
One-fifth of the total Policy No. 033 points would be awarded based on the percent of lower-income households residing in each jurisdiction (2009 American Community Survey) using the following three intervals:

- 0 – 40 percent lower-income households (1/3 of the points),
- >40 – 50 percent lower-income households (2/3 of the points), and
- >50 percent lower-income households (the total number of points for this factor),
shall receive 50 percent credit (one half a unit). These units also would be counted in the same
way in calculating the fourth factor described below Units that are acquired/rehabilitated/rent
restricted that were counted in a housing element to meet the site identification requirements of
a jurisdiction’s lower-income RHNA goals per housing element law would be counted as a full
unit.

the percentage of affordable lower-income housing produced in each jurisdiction as compared
to the Cumulative Alternative 3 RHNA Lower-Income Goal (Alternative 3 lower-income goal
divided by the timeframe – months/years – covered). For example, if a jurisdiction produced 100
percent of its cumulative Alternative 3 goal, it would receive the total points associated with this
factor, and if a jurisdiction produced 20 percent of its Alternative 3 goal, the points would be
calculated as follows: 0.2 x 1/5 x total Policy No. 033 points= X points).