REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

Friday, July 15, 2011

10:30 a.m. Joint Meeting with Transportation Committee

SANDAG Board Room
401 B Street, 7th Floor
San Diego

A PORTION OF THIS MEETING WILL BE HELD JOINTLY WITH THE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

- INTERSTATE 5 NORTH COAST CORRIDOR PROJECT
- PROPOSED REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS FROM INTERSTATE 5 NORTH COAST CORRIDOR PROJECT IN THE 2050 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN
- REVIEW OF BOARD POLICY NO. 033
- 2010 CENSUS

PLEASE TURN OFF CELL PHONES DURING THE MEETING

YOU CAN LISTEN TO THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING BY VISITING OUR WEB SITE AT WWW.SANDAG.ORG

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.
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. Members of the public may 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. 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 12 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 staff no later than 12 noon, two working days prior to the meeting.

SANDAG operates its programs without regard to race, color, and national origin in compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act. SANDAG has developed procedures for investigating and tracking Title VI complaints and the procedures for filing a complaint are available to the public upon request. Questions concerning SANDAG nondiscrimination obligations or complaint procedures should be directed to SANDAG General Counsel, Julie Wiley, at (619) 699-6966 or jwi@sandag.org. Any person who believes himself or herself or any specific class of persons to be subjected to discrimination prohibited by Title VI also may file a written complaint with the Federal Transit Administration.

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 agenda materials can be made available in alternative languages. To make a request call (619) 699-1900 at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting.

Los materiales de la agenda de SANDAG están disponibles en otros idiomas. Para hacer una solicitud, llames al (619) 699-1900 al menos 72 horas antes de la reunión.

如有需要，我们可以把SANDAG议程材料翻译成其他语言。

请在会议前至少 72 小时打电话 (619) 699-1900 提出请求。

SANDAG offices are accessible by public transit. Phone 511 or see 511sd.com for route information. Bicycle parking is available in the parking garage of the SANDAG offices.
REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE
Friday, July 15, 2011

ITEM #

10:30 a.m. – 12 noon

CONVENE JOINT MEETING WITH TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

A. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

Members of the public will have the opportunity to address the Regional Planning and Transportation Committees on any issue within the jurisdiction of the Committees 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.

REPORTS (B through E)

+B. INTERSTATE 5 NORTH COAST CORRIDOR PROJECT (Allan Kosup, Caltrans) INFORMATION

Staff will present an update on the Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor, including the recent selection of the preferred alternative by Caltrans and the Federal Highway Administration and efforts underway for the upcoming release of the Final Environmental Document.

+C. PROPOSED REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS FROM INTERSTATE 5 NORTH COASTAL CORRIDOR PROJECT IN THE 2050 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN (Elisa Arias) RECOMMEND

As described in Item B, Caltrans and the Federal Highway Administration recently selected a preferred alternative for the Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor project, which has lower construction costs than the alternative included in the Draft 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (2050 RTP). The Regional Planning and Transportation Committees are asked to recommend that the Board of Directors approve the proposed redistribution of funding from the Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor project to the transit and transportation system supporting investments in substantially the same form as shown in Table 1 of the report for inclusion in the final 2050 RTP. As described in Item B, Caltrans has selected the preferred alternative for the Interstate 5 North Coast Corridor (I-5 NCC) project. The alternative selected results in lower construction costs than those included in the Draft 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Based on the Caltrans’ decision and after an initial review of comments on the Draft 2050 RTP processed to date, it is proposed that the funds not applied to the I-5 NCC project be used to: (1) modify the transit network by advancing a light rail transit project, and (2) to add more funds to transportation system supporting investments. The Regional Planning and
Transportation Committees are asked to discuss the proposed revised distribution of future revenues and recommend that the Board of Directors approve it in substantially the same form as attached to the report for inclusion in the final 2050 RTP.

+D. SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM AND ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION GRANTS STATUS UPDATE AND REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS (Oswaldo Perez)

SANDAG approved the first round of Smart Growth Incentive Program (SGIP) projects under TransNet in May 2009, and the first round of Active Transportation Program grants in June 2009. This report provides an overview of the progress made to date by the grant recipients. In addition, the Cities of Lemon Grove and San Diego are requesting schedule amendments. The Use-It-or-Lose-It Policy requires Transportation and Regional Planning Committees approval for these requests.

The Regional Planning Committee is asked to approve the proposed project schedule amendment to the Lemon Grove Trolley Plaza project in the TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program, per the Use-It-or-Lose-It Policy governing the FY 2009-FY 2010 TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program grants.

The Transportation Committee is asked to approve the proposed project schedule amendments to two City of San Diego TDA/TransNet Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Neighborhood Safety projects, per the Use-It-or-Lose-It Policy governing the FY 2009-FY 2010 Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Neighborhood Safety grants.

+E. REVIEW OF BOARD POLICY NO. 033 (Susan Baldwin)

Board Policy No. 033 was adopted in conjunction with the 2005-2010 Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA). The Board of Directors will be asked to provide policy direction on options for its continued use or revision. This is an information item to provide context for Board discussion at its July 22, 2011, meeting.

>>> ADJOURN JOINT MEETING <<<
WITH TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

12 noon – 2:00 p.m.

CONVENE
REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING

+1. APPROVAL OF MAY 6, 2011, MEETING MINUTES

The RPC is requested to review and approve the minutes from the May 6, 2011, meeting.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

Members of the public will 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.

REPORTS (3)

+3. 2010 CENSUS (Beth Jarosz and Kristen Rohanna)

A presentation on the 2010 Census will be provided, highlighting general trends,
and providing an opportunity for questions and answers by Committee
members.

4. UPCOMING MEETINGS

The next meeting of the RPC is scheduled for Friday, September 2, 2011.
(Note: the August 5, 2011, RPC meeting is cancelled.)

5. ADJOURNMENT

+ next to an agenda item indicates an attachment
INTERSTATE 5 NORTH COAST CORRIDOR PROJECT

Introduction

The Interstate 5 (I-5) North Coast Corridor (NCC) Project is one component of a comprehensive program of improvements that meet the long-term transportation needs of a corridor that extends 27 miles from La Jolla Village Drive to Vandegrift Boulevard. This comprehensive program includes coastal rail and transit enhancements, environmental protections and increased coastal access, as well as highway improvements. The program will provide a balanced transportation system providing travelers new solutions for the future and enhancing the quality of life within and throughout the North Coast Corridor.

To address the highway improvements, Caltrans circulated a draft environmental document in summer 2010. The document analyzed four build alternatives and one no-build alternative. All four build alternatives included construction of two express lanes in each direction, auxiliary lanes where needed, Direct Access Ramps (DARs), and various environmental, coastal, and community enhancements. The key difference between the four build alternatives included:

1. Should the express lanes be separated by a physical barrier or a four-foot painted buffer?
2. Should there be one additional general purpose lane in each direction?

After review of all technical studies and consideration of community and resource agency input, Caltrans and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) have selected the Express Lanes only option (referred to as “8+4 buffer”) as the Locally Preferred Alternative that best balances the project’s benefits and impacts. Caltrans and the FHWA have determined that the construction of additional general purpose lanes is not recommended.

Discussion

The I-5 corridor is frequently referred to as the "gateway to San Diego." The route not only allows for local and commuter trips in the region, but is a lifeline for the Southern California/Baja California region, providing a critical link for commercial vehicles traveling between the U.S./Mexico Border and the greater Los Angeles basin. As such, the corridor is a key transportation facility for not only the region, but also the State of California and the nation. In addition, the facility is situated in an environmentally sensitive corridor that includes important natural, visual, and community resources. Consequently, any improvements must balance the transportation needs with the needs of the environment and neighboring communities. Since the original construction of I-5 approximately 50 years ago, traffic conditions have deteriorated while only minimal improvements have been constructed along the route.
The I-5 Express Lanes project is a high-priority project under the President’s Executive Order (EO) 13274 Environmental Stewardship and Transportation Infrastructure Project Review to “promote environmental stewardship” for major transportation infrastructure projects. Additionally, the project is included in the TransNet Early Action Program.

The objectives of the I-5 Express Lanes Project are to: (1) develop options that maintain or improve travel times; (2) protect and enhance the environment and coastal communities; (3) build transportation flexibility for the future; and (4) identify the best value. Construction of the Locally Preferred Alternative meets the project’s purpose and need to maintain or improve the existing and future traffic operations on the I-5 North Coast Corridor. The addition of two Express Lanes provides a congestion-free alternative for carpools, vanpools and single occupancy vehicles using FasTrak®. This alternative also would have the least overall environmental impact, the smallest project footprint, require the fewest right-of-way acquisitions and property relocations, and the lowest construction costs estimated at $3.5 billion.

Construction would be completed in phases. The initial phase would construct two high-occupancy vehicle lanes in the median from Manchester Avenue to State Route 78 at a cost of $300 million. With funding and permits, it is estimated the initial construction phase would begin in 2013.

An update on project coordination with the California Coastal Commission for the development of the Transportation and Resource Enhancement Program and Highway Public Works Plan (TREP/PWP) will be provided by Caltrans at the meeting. The TREP/PWP has been developed to provide the California Coastal Commission with a comprehensive plan that addresses community, environment, and transportation enhancement projects as it relates to the California Coastal Act.

JIM LINTHICUM
Director of Mobility Management and Project Implementation

Key Staff Contact: Allan Kosup, (619) 688-3611, allan_kosup@dot.ca.gov
PROPOSED REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS FROM INTERSTATE 5 NORTH COAST CORRIDOR PROJECT IN THE 2050 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Introduction

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) selected the Locally Preferred Alternative for the Interstate 5 (I-5) in the North Coast Corridor (NCC) on July 6, 2011. The Express Lanes Only option will add four Express or Managed Lanes from La Jolla Village Drive to Vandegrift Boulevard. This alternative has the lowest cost of the alternatives studied, with an estimate of $3.5 billion in 2010 dollars.

The Draft 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and its Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) includes $4.3 billion (in 2010 dollars) for the I-5 NCC project (two general purpose lanes and four Managed Lanes with barrier alternative). This report presents a proposed redistribution of $800 million (in 2010 dollars) in future revenues for inclusion in the Final 2050 RTP.

Discussion

Federal and state revenues make up the $800 million that would become available between 2030 and 2035, based on the preferred alternative decision for the I-5 NCC project. These revenue sources (Regional Surface Transportation Program, State Transportation Improvement Program, and future infrastructure bond measures) provide flexible funding for capital improvements, but are not available for transit or highway operations.

Based on the Caltrans and FHWA’s decision on the I-5 NCC project and after an initial review of comments on the Draft RTP/SCS processed to date, it is proposed that the funds be used to modify the transit network by advancing a high-ranking light rail transit project to the 2035 timeframe. In addition, funds for investments that support land use and transportation connections would be augmented as described in the following sections. The timing of the augmentations will be finalized as all project comments received on the Draft 2050 RTP are fully assessed.
Proposed Phasing Modification

The Draft 2050 RTP included the transition of the Mid-City Rapid Bus project, which is anticipated to be in service in late 2012, to light rail transit (LRT) between 2041 and 2050. The conversion to LRT is estimated to cost $1.921 billion (in 2010 dollars). It is proposed that the Mid-City LRT project be split into two phases. Under the proposed redistribution, the first phase of the LRT project, between Mid-City/I-15 Transit Plaza and downtown San Diego, would be advanced to 2035 at an estimated cost of $577 million (in 2010 dollars). Phase 1 would take up most of the I-5 NCC project funding by 2035 and free up funding in later phasing periods. Phase 2 improvements from Mid-City/SR 15 Transit Plaza to San Diego State University would remain in the 2041-2050 phasing period.

Proposed Funding Augmentation

- Rail Grade Separations: The Draft 2050 RTP includes $1.31 billion (in 2010 dollars) in rail grade separations associated with SPRINTER, COASTER, and Blue and Orange Line Trolley Corridors improvement projects. The proposed redistribution of funds would augment funding for regional rail grade separations by $300 million, bringing total funding to $1.61 billion (in 2010 dollars). As rail transit projects move forward in the development process, further evaluation and refinement of rail grade separations will be conducted at the project level. It is estimated that up to three additional COASTER grade separations or up to seven additional LRT grade separations could be funded with the proposed $300 million.

- Safe Routes to Transit: Often the biggest impediment to using transit is the challenge of getting to and from a transit stop or station. Auto-oriented land use patterns, poor pedestrian sidewalk/crosswalk design, lack of bicycle facilities, disconnected street networks, varying topography, and long distances between trip origins and transit stations (“first-mile”) or transit stations and trip destinations (“last-mile”) all create barriers to using transit. Potential strategies to facilitate Safe Routes to Transit include first-mile/last-mile solutions such as enhanced pedestrian crosswalks near transit stations, bicycle lanes that connect to transit and bike parking at transit stations, feeder-distributor bus/shuttle routes, car sharing/station cars, and ridesharing. The Draft 2050 RTP includes $500 million (in 2010 dollars) in the Active Transportation program for a Safe Routes to Transit program. The proposed redistribution would increase funding for Safe Routes to Transit improvements by $200 million for a total of $700 million (in 2010 dollars).

- Smart Growth Incentive Program (SGIP): This program was established through the TransNet Extension Ordinance “to provide funding for a broad array of transportation-related infrastructure improvements that will assist local agencies in better integrating transportation and land use, such as enhancements to streets and public places, funding of infrastructure needed to support development in smart growth opportunity areas consistent with the Regional Comprehensive Plan, and community planning efforts related to smart growth and improved land use/transportation coordination.” The Draft 2050 RTP includes $299 million (in 2010 dollars) for both capital and planning grants. Under the proposed redistribution, the SGIP would be increased by an additional $300 million for a total of $599 million (in 2010 dollars), providing funding for additional capital improvement projects in smart growth areas throughout the region.
Table 1 summarizes the proposed redistribution of $800 million in future funds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Redistribution of Funds for the Final 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) (in 2010 dollars)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Phasing Modification from 2050 to 2035</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advance an estimated $577 million for the transition of the Mid-City Bus Rapid project to Light Rail Transit (LRT) Phase 1 between downtown San Diego and Mid-City/SR 15 Transit Plaza.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Funding Augmentation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail Grade Separations: Additional $300 million for a Regional Rail Grade Separations Fund.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Routes to Transit: Additional $200 million for Safe Routes to Transit improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smart Growth Incentive Program: Additional $300 million for the capital component of the Smart Growth Incentive Program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Total Funding Augmentation:</strong> $800 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Next Steps**

Pending recommendation from the Regional Planning and Transportation Committees, at its July 22, 2011, meeting, the Board of Directors will be asked to approve the redistribution of funds for inclusion in the final 2050 RTP. Staff will continue to review and respond to all the comments received on the Draft 2050 RTP and its SCS. Comments and responses plus proposed changes will be brought to the Transportation Committee and Board of Directors in September. During July and August staff will work on any revised model runs and modifications that need to be incorporated into the final 2050 RTP based on changes that may be approved by the Board of Directors on July 22.

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

Key Staff Contact: Elisa Arias, (619) 699-1936, ear@sandag.org
SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM AND
ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION GRANTS STATUS UPDATE
AND REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Introduction

In May 2009, SANDAG awarded $9.4 million in funding to 14 projects (six planning grants and eight capital grants) for the first two-year cycle of the TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program (SGIP). The program was established through the TransNet Extension Ordinance “to provide funding for a broad array of transportation-related infrastructure improvements that will assist local agencies in better integrating transportation and land use, such as enhancements to streets and public places, funding of infrastructure needed to support development in smart growth opportunity areas consistent with the Regional Comprehensive Plan, and community planning efforts related to smart growth and improved land use/transportation coordination.”

In June 2009, SANDAG also awarded $7.8 million in Transportation Development Act (TDA) and TransNet funding to 30 projects (12 planning, parking, and program grants and 18 capital grants) under the Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Neighborhood Safety (BPNS) Program, now commonly referred to as the Active Transportation grant program. This was the first annual cycle of the TransNet BPNS/Traffic Calming Program under the TransNet Extension, but SANDAG has been funding bicycle and pedestrian projects with TDA funds since 1972, and bicycle projects under the original TransNet Ordinance since FY 1989. The TransNet Extension Ordinance specifies that the funds be used “for bikeway facilities and connectivity improvements, pedestrian and walkable community projects, bicycle and pedestrian safety projects and programs, and traffic calming projects.” Both programs are included in this report in order to demonstrate how these related programs work together.

Recommendation

1. The Regional Planning Committee is asked to approve the proposed project schedule amendment to the Lemon Grove Trolley Plaza project in the TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program, per the Use-It-or-Lose-It Policy governing the FY 2009-FY 2010 TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program grants.

2. The Transportation Committee is asked to approve the proposed project schedule amendments to two City of San Diego TDA/TransNet Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Neighborhood Safety projects, per the Use-It-or-Lose-It Policy governing the FY 2009-FY 2010 Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Neighborhood Safety grants.

Action Requested: APPROVE
This report provides an update on grant-funded projects through March 31, 2011, and asks the Transportation Committee (TC) to approve schedule extensions for TDA/TransNet BPNS projects and the Regional Planning Committee (RPC) to approve a schedule extension for a TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program project per the Use-It-or-Lose-It Policy.

Discussion

FY 2009-FY 2010 Grants and Progress through March 31, 2011

Shortly after the first cycles of TransNet SGIP and TDA/TransNet BPNS/Traffic Calming grants were awarded in May and June 2009, SANDAG staff began establishing grant agreements with the local jurisdictions that received grants. Largely because this is the first TransNet grant cycle, establishing grant agreements has taken longer than anticipated. Staff has therefore spent a significant amount of time working with grantees to establish scopes of work, budgets, and schedules that will provide enough information to adequately monitor each grantee’s progress with respect to the programs’ Use-It-or-Lose-It Policy (Attachment 1) that was in effect when the grants were awarded in 2009. At the time of this report, grant agreements have been executed with all grantees, with the exception of one that is still pending.

Grantee performance has been timely in most cases. Largely, grantees have been making progress according to their milestones as laid out in their scopes of work. For the BPNS/Traffic Calming Program, nine projects have already been completed. Grantee progress is described in Attachment 2. The attachment includes a “watch list” that will continue to appear in subsequent staff reports to denote those grantees that appear in danger of missing their Use-It-or-Lose-It milestone deadlines. This quarter there are three grants on the watch list, which are seeking approval for schedule extensions from the TC and RPC. Four grantees are currently receiving schedule extensions from SANDAG staff in accordance with the Use-It-or-Lose-It Policy.

The City of San Diego has a grant that is not on the watch list, but execution is still pending for this agreement. SANDAG is working with City of San Diego staff to execute this grant agreement as soon as possible. Staff anticipates that this will be resolved by the next status report to the TC and RPC.

Two City of San Diego projects in the TDA/TransNet BPNS/Traffic Calming and one project from the City of Lemon Grove in the TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program are requesting schedule extensions that require policy advisory committee approval per the applicable Use-It-or-Lose-It Policy, as discussed below.

Use-It-or-Lose-It Policy

The applicable Use-It-or-Lose-It Policy (Attachment 1) states that all projects must be completed according to the project schedule provided in the grantee’s respective grant agreements, and that, at the latest, a capital improvement project must award a construction contract within two years of an executed grant agreement with SANDAG and complete the project within 18 months of an executed construction contract. A planning project must award a consultant contract within one year an executed grant agreement with SANDAG and complete the project within two years of an executed consultant contract.
Schedule amendment requests must be approved by the RPC for TSGIP projects and the TC for BPNS projects when the amendment requests meet any one of the following conditions:

- Time requested exceeds 12 months; and/or
- Time requested causes the project to miss a Use-It-or-Lose-It milestone deadline (consultant or construction contract award or project completion).

Minor schedule adjustments that do not meet these criteria may be approved by SANDAG staff.

In compliance with the applicable Use-It-or-Lose-It Policy, the City of Lemon Grove and City of San Diego identified project schedule delays, notified SANDAG of their intent to request an amendment to their respective grant agreements, and submitted formal requests to SANDAG for schedule extensions. Each city's proposed work plans demonstrate that they can achieve the milestones and complete the projects under the revised timelines, if approved by the RPC and TC, respectively.

**Proposed Amendments**

City of Lemon Grove – Trolley Plaza (5001352)

The City of Lemon Grove is requesting an additional ten months to award its construction contract, and an additional 20 months to complete the Lemon Grove Trolley Plaza project. The delay occurred because the processes for right-of-way acquisition and achieving consensus on the project design took longer than anticipated. The formal request by the City of Lemon Grove for this project schedule extension is included as Attachment 3.

City of San Diego – Bicycle Master Plan EIR and Feasibility Study (5001225)

This amendment request is proposing a project schedule extension that would cause the project to miss the Consultant Contract award milestone by an additional nine months and miss the Project Completion milestone by an additional four months beyond the applicable Use-It-or-Lose-It Policy deadlines. The project was delayed due to additional analysis needed to complete the City's Bicycle Master Plan Update, the City’s extensive public input and procurement processes, and an initial bid release which did not receive the minimum required number of responses from consultants. The formal request by the City of San Diego for this project schedule extension is included as Attachment 4.

The City of San Diego also proposes an amendment to the project’s Scope of Work to provide a work plan consistent with its proposed project schedule extension. Staff reviewed the proposed revised Scope of Work and determined that it was consistent with the original project’s Scope of Work, which was the basis for this project receiving a grant award.

The original objectives of this project and of the BPNS grant program would still be met under the revised Scope of Work. The additional four months requested in the schedule extension would allow the City of San Diego adequate time to complete the work outlined in the revised Scope of Work, which can be found in strikethrough and full revised formats on pages 6-10 in Attachment 4. The TC is asked to approve only the schedule amendment request, outlined in Page 12 of Attachment 4, per the Use-It-or-Lose-It Policy.
City of San Diego – Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Education Program (5001361)

This amendment request is proposing a project schedule extension that would cause the project to miss the Consultant Contract award milestone by an additional five months beyond the Use-It-or-Lose-It Policy deadline. However, this schedule amendment will not impact the project completion milestone deadline. The project was delayed because the consultant contract had to be revised to be consistent with new accounting procedures for non-capital projects. The formal request by the City of San Diego for this project schedule extension is included as Attachment 5. The TC is asked to approve the schedule amendment request outlined in Attachment 5, per the Use-It-or-Lose-It Policy.

Next Steps

With TC and RPC approval of the schedule extension requests, staff will amend the respective grant agreements to reflect the updated project schedules and work plans. Staff will continue to monitor grantee progress and will provide regular status reports to the TC and RPC.

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

Attachments: 1. TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program and Bicycle Pedestrian Neighborhood Safety/Traffic Calming Program Use-It-or-Lose-It Requirements


3. City of Lemon Grove - Request for a Time Extension for the Lemon Grove Trolley Plaza (SANDAG Grant Agreement No. 5001352)

4. City of San Diego - Request for a Time Extension for the Environmental Document and Feasibility Study for the Bicycle Master Plan (SANDAG Grant Agreement No. 5001225)

5. City of San Diego - Request for a Time Extension for the Pedestrian & Bicycles Safety Education Project (SANDAG Grant Agreement No. 5001361)

Key Staff Contact: Oswaldo Perez, (619) 595-5609, ope@sandag.org
**TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program and Bicycle Pedestrian Neighborhood Safety/Traffic Calming Program Use-It-or-Lose-It Requirements**

1. **Project Milestone and Completion Deadlines**

1.1. This policy applies to all Smart Growth Incentive Program grant funds, whether from TransNet or another source. By signing a grant agreement for the Smart Growth Incentive Program, grant recipients agree to the following project delivery objectives.

1.1.1. Capital Grants. The project must be completed according to the schedule provided in the grant agreement, but at the latest, a construction contract must be awarded within two years following execution of the grant agreement, and construction must be completed within eighteen months following award of the construction contract.

1.1.2. Planning Grants. The project must be completed according to the schedule provided in the grant agreement, but at the latest, a consultant contract must be awarded within one year following execution of the grant agreement, and the planning project must be complete within two years following award of the consultant contract.

Failure to meet the above deadlines may result in revocation of all grant funds not already expended.

1.2. Grant funds made available as a result of this process may be awarded to the next project on the recommended project priority list from the most recent project selection process, or they may be added to the funds available for the next project funding cycle, at SANDAG’s discretion. Any project that loses funding due to failure to meet the deadlines specified in this policy may be resubmitted to compete for funding in a future call for projects.

2. **Project Milestone and Completion Deadlines**

2.1. Grant recipients may receive extensions on their project schedules of up to one year for good cause. Extensions of up to twelve months aggregate that would not cause the project to miss a deadline in Sections 1.1.1 or 1.1.2 may be approved by the SANDAG Program Manager for the Smart Growth Incentive Program. Extensions beyond twelve months aggregate or that would cause the project to miss a deadline in Sections 1.1.1 or 1.1.2 must be approved by the Regional Planning Committee. For an extension to be granted under this Section 2, the following conditions must be met:

2.1.1. For extension requests of up to six months, the grant recipient must request the extension in writing to the SANDAG Program Manager at least two weeks prior to the earliest project schedule milestone deadline for which an extension is being requested.

2.1.2. For extension requests that will cause one or more project milestones to be delayed more than six months, but less than twelve months aggregate, the grant recipient must request an extension in writing to the SANDAG Program Manager at least six weeks prior to the earliest project schedule milestone deadline for which an extension is being requested.

2.1.3. The project sponsor seeking the extension must document previous efforts undertaken to maintain the project schedule, the reasons for the delay, and why they were unavoidable, and demonstrate an ability to succeed in the extended time frame.

2.1.4. If the Program Manager denies an extension request under this Section 2, the project sponsor may appeal within ten business days of receiving the Program Manager’s response to the Regional Planning Committee.

2.1.5. Extension requests that are rejected by the Regional Planning Committee will result in termination of the grant agreement and obligation by the project sponsor to return to SANDAG any unexpended funds. Unexpended funds are funds for project costs not incurred prior to rejection of the extension request by the Regional Planning Committee.

3. **Project Delays and Extensions of up to One Year**

3.1. Requests for extensions beyond one year or that will cause a project to miss a deadline in Sections 1.1.1 or 1.1.2 (including those projects that were already granted extensions by the SANDAG Program Manager and are again falling behind schedule) will be considered by the Regional Planning Committee. The Regional Planning Committee will only grant an extension under this Section 3 for extenuating conditions beyond the control of the project sponsor, defined as follows:
3.1.1. Capital Grants

3.1.1.1. Environmental. An extension may be granted when, during the environmental review process, the project sponsor discovers heretofore unknown sites (e.g., archeological, endangered species) that require additional investigation and mitigation efforts. The project sponsor must demonstrate that the discovery is new and unforeseen.

3.1.1.2. Right-of-Way. Extensions for delays necessary to complete right-of-way acquisition may be granted only when right-of-way needs are identified that could not have been foreseen at the time the grant agreement was signed.

3.1.1.3. Permitting. Delays associated with obtaining permits from external agencies may justify an extension when the project sponsor can demonstrate that every effort has been made to obtain the necessary permits and that the delay is wholly due to the permitting agency.

3.1.1.4. Construction Schedule. Extensions may be granted when unavoidable construction delays create a conflict with restrictions on construction during certain times of the year (for instance, to avoid nesting season for endangered species).

3.1.1.5. Litigation. Extensions may be granted when a lawsuit has been filed concerning the project being funded.

3.1.1.6. Other. Extensions may be granted due to changes in federal/state policies or laws that can be shown to directly affect the project schedule.

3.1.2. Planning Grants

3.1.2.1. Changed Circumstances. An extension may be granted for a planning project when circumstances not within the control of the grant recipient, such as an action by an outside agency, require a change in the scope of work for the project.

3.2. The grant recipient shall make its request directly to the Regional Planning Committee, providing a detailed justification for the requested extension, including a revised project schedule and work plan, at least six weeks prior to the earliest project schedule milestone deadline, or deadline in Sections 1.1.1 or 1.1.2, for which an extension is being requested.

3.3. Extension requests that are rejected by the Regional Planning Committee will result in termination of the grant agreement and obligation by the project sponsor to return to SANDAG any unexpended funds. Unexpended funds are funds for project costs not incurred prior to rejection of the extension request.
# Status of TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program FY 2009-FY 2010 Grants

**Reporting period up to March 31, 2011, as of July 15, 2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>GRANT TYPE</th>
<th>GRANT AMOUNT</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>WATCH LIST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Mid-City SR 15 BRT Station Area Planning Study</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
<td>Work on community outreach and existing conditions in progress.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Chollas Triangle Master Plan</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>$275,000</td>
<td>Work on community outreach and existing conditions in progress.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Palomar Gateway District Specific Plan and EIR</td>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>Existing Conditions report and Specific Plan document complete; Work on Market Study and Mobility/Traffic Study in progress; EIR consultant selected and in negotiations with City.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Euclid and Market Village Master Plan</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>Request for Proposals and contracting complete.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Imperial Avenue and Commercial Street Corridor Plan</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>Request for Proposals and contracting complete.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>8th Street Corridor Smart Growth Revitalization</td>
<td>National City</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>Work on 90% construction plans and specs in progress; utility undergrounding 75% complete 12-month schedule extension amendment executed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Lemon Grove Trolley Plaza</td>
<td>Lemon Grove</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$1,895,000</td>
<td>Completed 60% construction plans; experienced unexpected delays; schedule extension pending RPC approval. Please refer to Attachment 3.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Park Boulevard/Essex Street Pedestrian Crossing &amp; Traffic Calming</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$224,000</td>
<td>Initiated project prioritization, environmental review, and ADA requirement assessment. Project slightly behind schedule on design but is within Use-It-or-Lose-It timeframe.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Watch List projects are those whose Use-It-or-Lose-It milestones appear to be in danger of falling behind schedule and therefore require additional monitoring. Projects not able to be awarded have been removed from list and funds reverted back to the SGIP.*
### Status of TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program FY 2009-FY 2010 Grants

Reporting period up to March 31, 2011 as of July 15, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>GRANT TYPE</th>
<th>GRANT AMOUNT</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Park Boulevard/City College/San Diego High Pedestrian and Transit Access Improvements</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>Grant agreement pending; SANDAG is working with the City of San Diego to resolve grant agreement execution issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Fourth Avenue/Quince Pedestrian Crossing &amp; Traffic Calming</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$233,000</td>
<td>Initiated project prioritization, environmental review, and ADA requirement assessment. Project slightly behind schedule on design but is within Use-It-or-Lose-It timeframe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Industrial Boulevard Bike Lane &amp; Pedestrian Improvements</td>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$283,900</td>
<td>Completed 50% design; 3-month schedule amendment in progress, in compliance with Use-It-or-Lose-It.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Third Avenue Streetscape Implementation Project</td>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>100% construction plans nearing completion; experienced delays due to additional needed outreach to community and stakeholders; schedule extension amendment in progress, in compliance with Use It or Lose It; progress is satisfactory to date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Fourth and Fifth Avenue/Nutmeg Pedestrian Crossing &amp; Traffic Calming</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$619,000</td>
<td>Initiated project prioritization, environmental review, and ADA requirement assessment. Project slightly behind schedule on design but is within Use-It-or-Lose-It timeframe.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Watch List projects are those whose Use-It-or-Lose-It milestones appear to be in danger of falling behind schedule and therefore require additional monitoring. Projects not able to be awarded have been removed from list and funds reverted back to the SGIP.
## Status of TDA/TransNet Bicycle Pedestrian Neighborhood Safety/Traffic Calming Program FY 2010 Grants

Reporting period up to March 31, 2011, as of July 15, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>GRANT TYPE</th>
<th>GRANT AMOUNT</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>WATCH LIST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Chula Vista Bikeway Master Plan Update</td>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>PROJECT COMPLETE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Coronado Bicycle Master Plan</td>
<td>Coronado</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>PROJECT COMPLETE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Downtown Escondido Bike Racks</td>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>$14,378</td>
<td>City Appearance Committee and Public Works Division approved final rack designs and placement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>La Mesa Bicycle Facilities Master Plan</td>
<td>La Mesa</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>Draft Bike Plan being reviewed by City staff; Scope of Work and schedule amendment in progress, consistent with Use-It-or-Lose-It.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>National City Bicycle Master Plan</td>
<td>National City</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>PROJECT COMPLETE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>EIR and Feasibility Study for Bike Master Plan Update</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>Schedule extension pending TC approval. Please refer to Attachment 4.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Education Program</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>$290,000</td>
<td>Schedule extension pending TC approval. Please refer to Attachment 5.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>San Diego Pedestrian Master Plan Phase 4</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>Consultant contract awarded in May 2011.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>UCSD Bicycle/Pedestrian Master Plan</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>Schedule extension amendment executed; City held kick-off meeting with UCSD staff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Bicycle Locker Wireless Communication</td>
<td>SANDAG</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>Software system in need of upgrade; One month behind schedule; staff to continue work in FY2012; still within Use-It-or-Lose-It.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Bicycle Locker Retrofits and Upgrades</td>
<td>SANDAG</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>Project on schedule; staff to continue work in FY2012.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Bicycle Map Printing and Distribution</td>
<td>SANDAG</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>PROJECT COMPLETE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Spring Street Trolley Station Pedestrian Access</td>
<td>La Mesa</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$88,000</td>
<td>Construction underway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Watch List projects are those whose Use-It-or-Lose-It milestones appear to be in danger of falling behind schedule and therefore require additional monitoring. Projects not able to be awarded have been removed from list and funds reverted back to the SGIP.
### Status of TDA/TransNet Bicycle Pedestrian Neighborhood Safety/Traffic Calming Program FY 2010 Grants

Reporting period up to March 31, 2011, as of July 15, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>GRANT TYPE</th>
<th>GRANT AMOUNT</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>WATCH LIST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Escondido Creek Bike Path</td>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$524,100</td>
<td>Grant agreement executed on 1/20/11 with Notice to Proceed; project is underway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Ash Street Undercrossing</td>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$457,357</td>
<td>Grant agreement executed on 1/20/11 with Notice to Proceed; City agency permits and approvals have been completed and issued.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Escondido Creek Bike Path Lighting and Restriping</td>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$157,500</td>
<td>Grant agreement executed on 1/20/11 with Notice to Proceed; project is underway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>La Mesa Boulevard/El Cajon Boulevard Intersection Improvements and Pedestrian Infrastructure</td>
<td>La Mesa</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$361,000</td>
<td>Construction underway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Inland Rail Trail Phase III B – Right-of-Way Engineering</td>
<td>Vista</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>Project schedule extension executed; City submitted easement acquisition documents to NCTD; submitted plans to SDG&amp;E and met with Right-of-Way agent; received proposed “Trail License Agreement” from SDG&amp;E.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Bicycle Detection at Signalized Intersections</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$73,500</td>
<td>Making progress in awarding construction contract; project accounting, GIS coordination system, and CIP established; General Requirements Contract (GRC), used to install the bike detector loops, is in progress.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Safe Pedestrian Crossing at Longhorn Drive</td>
<td>Vista</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$50,649</td>
<td>PROJECT COMPLETE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Barham Drive Urban Trail Improvement Project</td>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>Aerial ground survey and utility relocation complete; 100% landscape/civil plans complete; construction contract out to bid; project making timely progress.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Watch List projects are those whose Use-It-or-Lose-It milestones appear to be in danger of falling behind schedule and therefore require additional monitoring. Projects not able to be awarded have been removed from list and funds reverted back to the SGIP.
**Status of TDA/TransNet Bicycle Pedestrian Neighborhood Safety/Traffic Calming Program FY 2010 Grants**

Reporting period up to March 31, 2011, as of July 15, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>GRANT TYPE</th>
<th>GRANT AMOUNT</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Sidewalk Safety Program – I Street Sidewalk Improvements</td>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$116,220</td>
<td>Preliminary Engineering &amp; Design complete; Construction contract out to bid; Three month schedule extension in progress, in compliance with Use-It-or-Lose-It.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Sweetwater River Bike Path Gap Closure Design – Plaza Bonita Road</td>
<td>National City</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$130,000</td>
<td>PROJECT COMPLETE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Carlton Oaks Drive Class II Bike Lanes</td>
<td>Santee</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$30,200</td>
<td>PROJECT COMPLETE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>SR 15 Bike Path Final Design and Environmental Document</td>
<td>San Diego/ Caltrans</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>Environmental studies and existing conditions surveys are underway; project is on track.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Installation of Audible Pedestrian Signals and Countdown Pedestrian Signals</td>
<td>Carlsbad</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$150,660</td>
<td>Schedule extension amendment recently executed; construction contract awarded; project is on track.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Kelton Road Midblock Pedestrian Improvements</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$248,400</td>
<td>Preparing final design; 30% design complete; progress is satisfactory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Boys and Girls Club Sidewalk Improvements</td>
<td>Vista</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$146,844</td>
<td>PROJECT COMPLETE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Bayshore Bikeway Segments 7 and 8</td>
<td>SANDAG</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$1,078,000</td>
<td>Construction contract out to bid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>West Bernardo Bike Path and Cantilever</td>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$1,425,000</td>
<td>PROJECT COMPLETE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Watch List projects are those whose Use-It-or-Lose-It milestones appear to be in danger of falling behind schedule and therefore require additional monitoring. Projects not able to be awarded have been removed from list and funds reverted back to the SGIP.
Regional Planning Committee
SANDAG
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101

Re: Request for Timeline Extension
Lemon Grove Trolley Plaza, Grant Agreement 5001352

Ladies and gentlemen,

The Lemon Grove Trolley Plaza project is now at the 18 month mark from grant contract execution. With construction plans rapidly moving toward 90% completion, the City of Lemon Grove requests a contract time extension to reflect grant guidelines of 24 months for design and 18 months for construction.

While the first several months utilized extra time to work through a myriad of moving parts, the Project has also made steady, significant progress over the past 18 months. Although the grant agreement’s initial schedule anticipated having construction documents complete by December 2010 (at the end of year one of two years available for design), the Project is now on track to complete construction documents by fall 2011 and complete construction by spring 2013. The project remains well within the “Use it or Lose It” requirements.

Following is a brief overview of work completed to date:

- Concept development began in January 2010. A detailed approach, community involvement, council presentation, coordination with utility agencies (specifically the 27" water line located within the Project corridor, the relocation of a major SDG&E transmission line, and MTS coordination), along with coordination with the two proposed developments adjacent to the north end of the Project (an apartment complex and a major roadway realignment); it took longer than anticipated to finalize the layout and fine-tune all of the components for the future Trolley Plaza.

- As refinements were made to the roadway realignment (grade changes and utility relocations adjacent to the north end of the project site), adjustments to the Project followed.

- Six parcels along the west side of the project were acquired. Relocation of residents and businesses is nearing completion.

- Right-of-way and ownership were established.

- A fair amount of unanticipated redesign work reflects the City Council’s desire to develop a fully sustainable corridor (wind, solar, reuse of storm water) that also minimizes
operations and maintenance costs to stay within extremely tight constraints. The final design also incorporates restrooms into the Project.

- The design team submitted 30% plans in November 2010, and the City Council gave final approval for the project concept on January 4, 2011. KHA submitted 60% plans in March 2011.

While the many changes in direction extended the design timeline, the process has greatly enhanced the project – in appearance, in functionality, in sustainability, and all within the original budget.

Thank you for your consideration of this timeline extension. We are now in a much better position to both coordinate with the other adjacent projects during construction and build a dramatic and much-needed project that showcases Smart Growth principles.

Sincerely,

Graham Mitchell
City Manager
July 5, 2011

Mr. Charles “Muggs” Stoll
Land Use and Transportation Director
San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG)
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101

Dear Mr. Stoll:

SUBJECT: Request for a Time Extension for the Environmental Document and Feasibility Study for the Bicycle Master Plan (SANDAG Grant Agreement No. 5001225)

The City sent you a letter, dated April 7, 2011 (attached for reference), requesting a time extension for the subject study. The letter also included a revised scope of work and timeline for the subject grant. We received SANDAG’s approval for the revised scope of work and we are proceeding with the procurement process for consultant services. However, the approval of the timeline extension is pending the decision of the Transportation Committee, scheduled for July 15, 2011.

Please be advised that upon further consultation with the City’s Purchasing & Contracting and due to the City establishing a new process to implement Equal Opportunity Contracting Program policies, recently approved by the City Council, the timeline that was attached to the April 7, 2011 letter is no longer valid. Henceforth, attached is a new timeline that is reflective of the steps necessary to award a contract to the consultant and complete the study.

Thank you for your consideration. If you have any questions, please contact Samir Hajjiri at (619) 533-6551.

Sincerely,

Mary P. Wright
Deputy Director, Development Services Department

Attachments: 1. Letter dated April 7, 2011
2. Revised Timeline
April 7, 2011

Mr. Charles "Muggs" Stoll  
Land Use and Transportation Director  
San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG)  
401 B Street, Suite 800  
San Diego, CA 92101

Dear Mr. Stoll:

SUBJECT: Request for a Time Extension for the Environmental Document and Feasibility Study for the Bicycle Master Plan (SANDAG Grant Agreement No. 5001225)

The City of San Diego City Planning & Community Investment Department is officially requesting a time extension for the Environmental Document and Feasibility Study for the Bicycle Master Plan Update. Specifically, we are requesting a time extension to the agreement’s requirement that the City award a consultant contract within one year following execution of the grant agreement. The milestone dates for this project will be also impacted. However, we are confident that we will still be able to complete the project by the end of November, 2012, as currently stated in the grant agreement.

The selection and award of a consultant contract is delayed due to the following reasons:

1. The need to first complete the Bicycle Master Plan Update. This project was delayed due to additional analysis and an extensive public input process.

2. Additional delay was realized due to the City’s long procurement process to have a new contract to determine the feasibility and cost estimates of the new priority projects.

3. The scope of services for the subject project was released in February of 2011. Due to limited available funds for the project, the City was not able to receive minimum required responses from the consultants.
We have subsequently prepared a new scope of work for the consultant portion of the project. As a result, the scope of work is simplified and the City staff will be performing a larger portion of the project tasks to complete the project as specified in the grant agreement. The revised scope of work and schedule are included as Attachments 1 and 2, respectively. City staff expects to release the revised scope of service in April of 2011, following SANDAG’s approval. Consultant selection is expected in May of 2011 and award of the contract is expected in August of 2011. Attachments 3 and 4 are strikeout/underline versions of scope of work and schedule, respectively.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

William Anderson, FAICP
Director of City Planning & Community Investment

Attachments:  1. Revised Scope of Work for BMP PEIR
               2. Revised Schedule for BMP PEIR
               3. Strikeout/underline version of the scope of work
               4. Strikeout/underline version of schedule
City of San Diego
Bicycle Master Plan Update
Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR)

BACKGROUND

The City of San Diego began the process to update its 2002 Bicycle Master Plan in September 2008 (Phase I). The preparation of the Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) for the Bicycle Master Plan Update is Phase II of the project. The Program Environmental Impact Report will also keep the City of San Diego compliant with the requirements of the State of California’s Bicycle Transportation Account (BTA).

The City of San Diego is seeking proposals from qualified CEQA specialists, environmental consultants, transportation planning and traffic engineering consultants specializing in bicycle planning for forming and leading an interdisciplinary team to prepare a Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) for the City of San Diego’s Bicycle Master Plan Update (BMP).

SCOPE OF WORK

General
The City of San Diego is seeking proposals from qualified CEQA specialists, environmental consultants, transportation planning, and traffic engineering consultants specializing in bicycle planning to submit proposals for forming and leading an interdisciplinary team to complete the Phase II of the City of San Diego’s Bicycle Master Plan Update (BMP). Phase II will address environmental analysis and document preparation. Completion of the BMP may require content revision based on the results of environmental analysis in order to implement recommended projects.

Project Description
The following scope of work provides an outline of services that are expected to be offered to prepare the PEIR.

A. Strategy Development
The Consultants will meet initially with City of San Diego’s Mobility Planning staff and Development Services’ Environmental Analysis section to determine a strategy for the process and sequence for preparation of the PEIR.

Deliverables: Timeline, meeting schedules, meeting minutes, documentation of verbal and written comments and responses.

B. Document Review
The Consultants will review the BMP, Capital Improvement Program, and other relevant documents for planned and on-going projects to determine the need to include such projects in a cumulative analysis for the PEIR.
Deliverable: Summary report

C. Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR)
The Consultants will develop a PEIR as the appropriate CEQA document to evaluate the potential environmental effects of the Bicycle Master Plan Update. The document will include the notice of preparation, scoping letter, initial study, significance criteria, impacts and mitigation measures, alternatives, CEQA conclusions, preparation of PEIR documents, public hearings to incorporate comments, final PEIR report, including responses to public comments, and preparation of a Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Program. As part of document preparation, the Environmental Consultants will submit screen check copies for staff review, after distribution of the notice of preparation.

Deliverables: The Consultants will provide all text, maps, tables, charts, photographs, presentations, and other graphics sufficient to convey final products to staff and the public. The Consultants will format the PEIR as a companion document to the Bicycle Master Plan Update. The selected firm shall provide CD copies (quantity is to be determined by City) each of the draft and final report as well as provide a Microsoft-compatible electronic format version. PDF format is acceptable.

C.1 Environmental Analysis
The PEIR analysis will evaluate the potential impacts of the proposed Bicycle Master Plan Update on the City of San Diego’s transportation system and identify improvements or policies to mitigate those impacts where feasible. The PEIR will incorporate the programmatic level of analysis appropriate to the fundamental program nature of the Bicycle Master Plan Update. The PEIR will apply CEQA and City of San Diego thresholds of significance. The Consultants will also identify and evaluate potential significant impacts of the proposed Bicycle Master Plan based on CEQA and City of San Diego thresholds of significance.

Deliverables: Report to include analyses, maps, tables, charts, photographs, presentations, and other graphics for the Environmental Analyses.

D. City Provided Services
The City will provide to the selected Consultants information contained in the 2002 Bicycle Master Plan, Bicycle Master Plan Update, Street Design Manual, and other relevant documents.

E. Technical Studies
Working with City Staff, the Consultants will prepare technical studies for the Draft PEIR for the Bicycle Master Plan Update. The technical studies prepared by the Consultants will focus on, but not be limited to, Traffic Technical Study prepared in accordance with City’s Traffic Impact Study, Air Quality Technical Report, Greenhouse Gas Emissions (GHG) analysis, Biological Technical Report, Water Quality Technical Report, and Historical Resources Report.

Deliverables: Report to include analyses, maps, tables, charts, photographs, presentations, and other graphics for all the Technical Studies.

All deliverables are to be submitted in predetermined quantities of hard and soft copies.
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Project Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Deliverables</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Submit revised scope to SANDAG</td>
<td>Revised scope</td>
<td>4/4/11</td>
<td>4/15/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide consultants with new scope</td>
<td>Approved scope</td>
<td>4/15/11</td>
<td>4/29/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign new agreement with SANDAG</td>
<td>New agreement</td>
<td>4/14/11</td>
<td>5/20/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant Selection</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5/2/11</td>
<td>5/20/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Award</td>
<td>Signed contract</td>
<td>5/23/11</td>
<td>8/1/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy Development</td>
<td>Timeline, meeting schedules, meeting minutes, documentation of verbal and</td>
<td>8/1/11</td>
<td>9/1/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>written comments and responses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Review</td>
<td>Summary report</td>
<td>8/1/11</td>
<td>9/16/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Studies</td>
<td>Reports to address traffic, air quality, Green-House Gas Emissions, biological,</td>
<td>9/16/11</td>
<td>2/17/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>water quality, And historical issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Analysis</td>
<td>Report including text, maps, tables, charts, photographs, etc., to convey the</td>
<td>2/17/12</td>
<td>5/18/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>final product to staff and general public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program EIR</td>
<td>Report including text, maps, tables, charts, photographs, etc., to convey the</td>
<td>5/18/12</td>
<td>11/30/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>final product to staff and general public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bicycle Master Plan Update
Phase II
Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR)

Changes to the Original Scope of Work

BACKGROUND

The City of San Diego began the process to update its 2002 Bicycle Master Plan in September 2008 (Phase I). The preparation of the Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) for the Bicycle Master Plan Update is Phase II of the project. The Program Environmental Impact Report will also keep the City of San Diego compliant with the requirements of the State of California’s Bicycle Transportation Account (BTA).

The City of San Diego is seeking proposals from qualified CEQA specialists, environmental consultants, transportation planning and traffic engineering consultants specializing in bicycle planning for forming and leading an interdisciplinary team to prepare a PEIR for the City of San Diego’s Bicycle Master Plan Update (BMP). The consultant is to complete a focused PEIR on a set of top 40 high-priority proposed bicycle projects, and adequately address the remaining proposed bicycle projects that are identified in the BMP Update.

SCOPE OF WORK

General
The City of San Diego is seeking proposals from qualified CEQA specialists, environmental consultants, transportation planning, and traffic engineering consultants specializing in bicycle planning to submit proposals for forming and leading an interdisciplinary team to complete the Phase II of the City of San Diego’s BMP Update. Phase II will address environmental analysis and document preparation. Completion of the BMP may require content revision based on the results of environmental analysis in order to implement recommended projects. The consultants are to complete a focused, programmatic environmental review on the BMP and a set of top 40 high-priority projects that are identified in the BMP. Also, adequately address the environmental issues for the remaining recommended projects in the BMP.

Project Description
The following scope of work provides an outline of services that are expected to be offered to prepare the PEIR.

A. Strategy Development
The consultant will meet initially with City of San Diego’s Mobility Planning staff and Development Services’ Environmental Analysis section to determine a strategy for the process and sequence for preparation of the PEIR.

Deliverables: Timeline, meeting schedules, meeting minutes, documentation of verbal and written comments and responses.
B. Document Review
The consultant will review the BMP, Capital Improvement Program, and other relevant documents for planned and ongoing projects to determine the need to include such projects in a cumulative analysis for the PEIR.

Deliverable: Summary report

C. PEIR
The consultant will develop a PEIR as the appropriate CEQA document to evaluate the potential environmental effects of the top 40 high-priority recommended projects in the Bicycle Master Plan Update. The document will include the notice of preparation, scoping letter, initial study, significance criteria, impacts and mitigation measures, alternatives, CEQA conclusions, preparation of PEIR documents, public hearings to incorporate comments, final PEIR report, including responses to public comments, and preparation of a Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Program. As part of document preparation, the environmental consultant will submit screen check copies for staff review, after distribution of the notice of preparation.

Deliverables: The consultant will provide all text, maps, tables, charts, photographs, presentations, and other graphics sufficient to convey final products to staff and the public. The consultant will format the PEIR as a companion document to the BMP Update.

The selected firm shall provide CD copies (quantity is to be determined by City) each of the draft and final report as well as provide a Microsoft-compatible electronic format version. PDF format is acceptable.

C.1 Feasibility Analysis
The consultant shall prepare engineering feasibility analysis of the top 40 high-priority proposed bicycle projects to determine that the proposed projects can be implemented which includes application of one of several standard street cross-sections in the City’s Street Design Manual.

Deliverables: Report to include analyses, maps, tables, charts, cost-estimates, photographs, presentations, and other graphics for the Feasibility Analysis.

C.2 Environmental Analysis
The PEIR analysis will evaluate the potential impacts of the proposed Bicycle Master Plan Update on the City of San Diego’s transportation system and identify improvements or policies to mitigate those impacts where feasible. The PEIR will incorporate the programmatic level of analysis appropriate to the fundamental program nature of the BMP Update and project-level analyses that incorporates the detailed analyses for the top 40 high-priority proposed projects. The PEIR will apply CEQA and City of San Diego thresholds of significance. The PEIR will identify appropriate project-level mitigation.

The consultant will prepare the applicable sections of the PEIR, incorporating the programmatic and project-level analysis for the recommended projects in the BMP Update. The consultant will also identify and evaluate potential significant impacts of the proposed BMP based on CEQA and City of San Diego thresholds of significance.
Deliverables: Report to include analyses, maps, tables, charts, photographs, presentations, and other graphics for the Environmental Analyses.

C.3 Focused Programmatic Environmental Impact Report
The Consultants and the City staff are to finalize the PEIR work scope and confirm the
final assumptions to be used in the PEIR analyses, including those related to the project
description including the specific top 40 high-priority projects, baseline conditions, anticipated
range of alternatives to be examined, impact significance criteria, the bases for cumulative impact
analyses, and any other analytic assumptions that may require further resolution.

As part of this task, the consultant will identify and review available and relevant information,
which the City shall provide, relating to the BMP Update and specific project areas within the
BMP area. This task will include review of the various available projects and planning documents
and relevant technical studies for this project, and environmental documents. In addition, the
Consultants will use related environmental documents from other agencies as a point of reference.

The consultant also will conduct any necessary field study of the BMP area. The consultant will
identify any additional information that may be required to prepare the PEIR. The Consultants
will make every effort to make maximum use of available information and previous technical
work which it will verify and supplement.

Deliverables: Report to include analyses, maps, tables, charts, photographs, presentations, and
other graphics for this task.

D. Feasibility Assessment
The consultant shall prepare a general high level engineering feasibility assessment for the
remaining proposed bicycle projects in the BMP to determine the proposed projects’
implementation feasibility, using the bikeway classifications identified in the City’s Street Design
Manual.

Deliverables: Report to include analyses, maps, tables, charts, preliminary cost estimates,
photographs, presentations, and other graphics for the feasibility analysis.

E. Environmental Review
The PEIR will incorporate the feasibility analysis to identify the subsequent level of
environmental review required for the remaining bicycle projects under section D above.

Deliverable: Summary report.

F. Environmental Reconnaissance
The consultant, in accordance with the CEQA requirement guidelines and in conformance with
City CEQA procedures, will conduct an Environmental Reconnaissance for the remaining
recommended projects in the BMP Update. The consultant is to provide satisfactory language for
Class I, Class II, Class III, Cycle Track, and Bicycle Boulevard projects in the BMP that are
identified to be located within built environment or in natural habitat/open space.

Deliverables: Report to include text, analyses, maps, tables, charts, photographs, presentations,
and other graphics for the Environmental Reconnaissance.
GD. City Provided Services
The City will provide to the selected Consultants information contained in the 2002 BMP, BMP Update, Street Design Manual, and other relevant documents.

E. Technical Studies
Working with City Staff, the Consultants will prepare technical studies for the Draft PEIR for the Bicycle Master Plan Update. The technical studies prepared by the Consultants will focus on, but not be limited to, Traffic Technical Study prepared in accordance with City's Traffic Impact Study, Air Quality Technical Report, Greenhouse Gas Emissions (GHG) analysis, Biological Technical Report, Water Quality Technical Report, and Historical Resources Report.

Deliverables: Report to include analyses, maps, tables, charts, photographs, presentations, and other graphics for all the Technical Studies.

All deliverables are to be submitted in predetermined quantities of hard and soft copies.
# ATTACHMENT A

## APPROVED PROJECT BUDGET, SCOPE OF WORK, AND PROJECT SCHEDULE

### PLANNING PROJECT

**TD/TRANSET BICYCLE, PEDESTRIAN, & NEIGHBORHOOD SAFETY PROGRAM BUDGET, SCOPE OF WORK, & SCHEDULE**

Project: Environmental Documentation and Feasibility Study  
Project Location: City of San Diego  
Project Description: EIR and Feasibility Study for Bicycle Master Plan Update

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Deliverables</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Submit Draft RFP to SANDAG for review</td>
<td>Draft RFP</td>
<td>4/11</td>
<td>Feb-10</td>
<td>4/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue RFP</td>
<td>Consultant Proposals</td>
<td>4/11</td>
<td>Feb-10</td>
<td>4/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit Consultant Proposals to SANDAG</td>
<td>Consultant Proposals</td>
<td>4/11</td>
<td>Feb-10</td>
<td>4/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award Consultant Contract</td>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>5/1</td>
<td>Mar-10</td>
<td>Mar-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Strategy Development</td>
<td>Timeline, meeting schedules, meeting minutes, documentation of verbal and written comments and responses.</td>
<td>5/1</td>
<td>Mar-10</td>
<td>May-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Document Review</td>
<td>Summary report</td>
<td>5/1</td>
<td>May-2010</td>
<td>June-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Program EIR</td>
<td>Text, maps, tables, charts, photographs, presentations, and other graphics to convey the final product to staff and general public</td>
<td>5/1</td>
<td>11/12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Feasibility Analysis</td>
<td>Report to include analyses, maps, tables, charts, preliminary cost estimates, photographs, presentations, and other graphics</td>
<td>June-2010</td>
<td>January-2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Environmental Analysis</td>
<td>Report to include analyses, maps, tables, charts, photographs, presentations, and other graphics</td>
<td>2/1 January-2011</td>
<td>July-2011</td>
<td>5/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Focused Programmatic EIR</td>
<td>Analyses, maps, tables, charts, photographs, presentations, and other graphics</td>
<td>July-2011</td>
<td>Nov-2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Feasibility Assessment - Technical Studies</td>
<td>Report to include analyses, maps, tables, charts, preliminary cost estimates, photographs, presentations, and other graphics</td>
<td>Nov-2011</td>
<td>March-2012</td>
<td>2/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Environmental Reconnaissance</td>
<td>Report to include analyses, maps, tables, charts, photographs, presentations, and other graphics</td>
<td>July-2012</td>
<td>Nov-2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Completion: **EIR and feasibility study**  
Start Date: Jul-12  
Completion Date: Nov-12  
Total: $150,000

### Planning Project Revenues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>FY 2010</th>
<th>FY 2011</th>
<th>FY 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TD/TRANSET</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Project Schedule**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Deliverables</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revive SANADAG for timeline</td>
<td>Notification form SANDAG</td>
<td>4/7/11</td>
<td>7/29/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide consultants with new scope</td>
<td>New scope</td>
<td>7/1/11</td>
<td>7/7/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign new agreement with SANDAG</td>
<td>New agreement</td>
<td>8/1/11</td>
<td>8/12/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant Selection</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>8/15/11</td>
<td>9/30/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Award</td>
<td>Signed contract</td>
<td>10/3/11</td>
<td>12/30/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy Development</td>
<td>Timeline, meeting schedules, meeting minutes, documentation of verbal and written comments and responses</td>
<td>1/2/12</td>
<td>1/31/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Review</td>
<td>Summary report</td>
<td>2/1/12</td>
<td>2/28/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Studies</td>
<td>Reports to address traffic, air quality, Green-House Gas Emissions, biological, water quality, And historical issues</td>
<td>3/1/12</td>
<td>8/31/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Analysis</td>
<td>Report including text, maps, tables, charts, photographs, etc., to convey the final product to staff and general public</td>
<td>9/1/12</td>
<td>12/31/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program EIR</td>
<td>Report including text, maps, tables, charts, photographs, etc., to convey the final product to staff and general public</td>
<td>1/2/13</td>
<td>6/30/13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
May 19, 2011

Mr. Charles "Muggs" Stoll  
Land Use and Transportation Director  
San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG)  
401 B Street, Suite 800  
San Diego, CA 92101

Dear Mr. Stoll:

SUBJECT: Request for a Time Extension for the Pedestrian & Bicycles Safety Education Project (SANDAG Grant Agreement No. 5001361)

The City of San Diego Transportation Engineering Operations Division is officially requesting a task time extension for the Pedestrian & Bicycle Safety Education Project. Specifically, we are requesting a time extension of seven (7) months to the agreement’s task: Consultant Selection & Award Contract, from June 2011 to January 2012. This request will not impact the project completion date of June 2013.

The selection and award of a consultant contract is delayed because we were advised to revise the project’s budget to reflect a new accounting procedure dealing with non-capital projects.

A strikeout version of the project schedule is included as Attachment 1. The revised project schedule is included as Attachment 2.

Sincerely,

Linda Marabian, P.E.  
Acting Deputy Director

Attachments: 1. Revised project schedule  
2. Strikeout version of the project schedule

cc: Christine Eary, SANDAG  
Oswaldo Perez, SANDAG
Attachment 1
Strikeout Version of the Project Schedule

Attachment A
Project Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Deliverables</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
<th>SANDAG Funds</th>
<th>Matching F Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultant Selection &amp; Award</td>
<td>Draft RFP and Consultant Proposals to SANDAG, consultant contract</td>
<td>Sep-10</td>
<td>Jun-12</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>List of schools and schedule dates, workshops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>materials/curriculum, marketing materials per workshop/rodeo</td>
<td>Jun-11</td>
<td>Jun-13</td>
<td>$245,000</td>
<td>$245,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$290,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$290,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Revenues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>FY 2010</th>
<th>FY 2011</th>
<th>FY 2012</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TDA/TransNET</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>$245,000</td>
<td>$290,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local (specify source)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State (specify source)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal (specify source)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Kind</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>$245,000</td>
<td>$290,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Attachment 2
### Revised Project Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Deliverables</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
<th>SANDAG Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultant Selection/Award</td>
<td>Draft RFP and Consultant Proposals to SANDAG, consultant contract</td>
<td>Sep-10</td>
<td>Jan-12</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>List of schools and scheduled dates, workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct Workshops &amp; Rodeos/Project Completion</td>
<td>materials/curriculum, marketing materials per workshop/rodeo</td>
<td>Jan-12</td>
<td>Jun-13</td>
<td>$245,000</td>
<td>$245,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$290,000</td>
<td>$290,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Project Revenues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>FY 2010</th>
<th>FY 2011</th>
<th>FY 2012</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TDA/TransNet</td>
<td></td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>$245,000</td>
<td>$290,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local (specify source):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State (specify source):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal (specify source):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Kind</td>
<td></td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>$245,000</td>
<td>$290,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>$245,000</td>
<td>$290,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Review of Board Policy No. 033

Introduction

On April 28, 2006, the Board of Directors (Board) adopted Board Policy No. 033 (Policy No. 033): Implementation Guidelines for SANDAG Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) Memorandum. Policy No. 033 sets forth guidelines for incentives related to the San Diego region RHNA for the 2005-2010 housing element cycle and is subject to review by the Board on an annual basis. By way of background on the history of Policy No. 033, the Board approved a memorandum (Attachment 1 of Policy No. 033) concurrent with the approval of the final RHNA on February 25, 2005, which included certain financial incentives for jurisdictions based on housing element compliance and lower income housing production in relation to discretionary funds awarded competitively to local jurisdictions. The memorandum became an attachment to Policy No. 033, which describes how the memorandum should be implemented.

On November 21, 2008, the Board amended Policy No. 033 prior to the 2009 call-for-projects for the TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program (SGIP). Among those changes approved in 2008, were modifications to clarify that Policy No. 033 would apply only if SANDAG would be awarding funds solely to local jurisdictions (the cities or County) through a competitive process. The incentives described in Policy No. 033 have been used in conjunction with the SGIP, TransNet/Transportation Development Act Bicycle-Pedestrian, Neighborhood Safety and Traffic Calming Program (now commonly referred to as the Active Transportation Program), and Rail Grade Separation Grant Program.

A review of Policy No. 033 is being undertaken in association with the Board’s anticipated October 2011 adoption of the RHNA for the 2013 - 2020 housing element cycle and in conjunction with the anticipated approval of the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS). Staff plans to apply the current Policy No. 033 provisions to the upcoming call for projects for the Active Transportation Program, which is scheduled for the Fall of 2011. The next call-for-projects for the SGIP, however, is scheduled for 2012, which should provide sufficient time to apply any changes to Policy No. 033 to the SGIP call for projects.

Following today’s item for the joint meeting of the Regional Planning Committee and Transportation Committee, the Board will be asked to provide policy direction on potential revisions to Policy No. 033 on July 22, 2011.
Discussion

As amended in 2008, Policy No. 033 currently awards incentive points (25 percent of the total points for each funding program subject to the policy), based on five factors. Each factor is worth one-fifth of the total points. Attachment 1.5 of the policy, entitled “Description of How to Calculate the Policy No. 033 Incentive Points,” describes how to calculate the five factors. The five factors are summarized below:

1. Housing Element Compliance: One-fifth of the total Policy No. 033 points associated with a funding program is awarded to projects located in jurisdictions with a housing element found in compliance with state housing element law by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) at the time of the funding program’s application deadline. No points are awarded to projects in jurisdictions that have not received a letter of compliance from HCD. (Note: Jurisdictions without completed housing elements, however, are eligible to apply for funding.)

2. Greater RHNA Share Taken: One-fifth of the total Policy No. 033 points are awarded to projects located in jurisdictions that accepted a greater share of the lower income RHNA goals in the adopted RHNA (Modified Alternative 1) as compared to Alternative 3. Jurisdictions whose lower income RHNA goals were the same in Modified Alternative 1 and Alternative 3 receive half the points, and jurisdictions that received a lesser share of the lower income RHNA goals in the adopted RHNA receive no points associated with this factor.

3. Regional Share of Cumulative Total of Lower income Units Produced: One-fifth of the total Policy No. 033 points are awarded based on each jurisdiction’s share of the total number of lower income units produced using the four following intervals: 0 percent share or no units produced (0 points); >0 to 5 percent produced (1/3 of the points); >5 to 10 percent produced (2/3 of the points); and >10 percent produced (the total number of points for this factor).

Units that are acquired and rehabilitated, and are rent restricted at affordable levels for lower income households for a period of 30 years or longer, receive 50 percent credit (one half a unit). These units also are 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 are counted as a full unit.

4. Percent of Cumulative Alternative 3 Lower Income RHNA Goal Met: One-fifth of the total Policy No. 033 points are awarded based on 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 time frame (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.
5. Percent of Lower income Households: One-fifth of the total Policy No. 033 points are awarded based on the percent of lower income households residing in each jurisdiction based on the 2000 U.S. Census using the following three intervals: 0 to 40 percent lower income households \( (\frac{1}{3} \text{ of the points}) \); >40 to 50 percent lower income households \( (\frac{2}{3} \text{ of the points}) \); and >50 percent lower income households (the total number of points for this factor).

To calculate the points associated with factors three and four, jurisdictions need to provide SANDAG with the number of units that were acquired/rehabilitated and rent restricted during the current housing element cycle, as this data is not reported in the state-required Annual Housing Element Progress Reports that report building permits for new units. This information must be submitted to SANDAG at the same time it is submitted to HCD as an eligibility requirement for funding programs subject to Policy No. 033.

Time Period for Evaluation of Lower Income Housing Production

Unless otherwise requested by a local jurisdiction, SANDAG uses the most recent Annual Housing Element Progress Report for the preceding calendar year to award Policy No. 033 (or incentive) points to grant applicants. However, as an alternative, a jurisdiction may submit the latest building permit data up to the release date of a call for projects for use in calculating incentive points. Jurisdictions choosing this option are evaluated based on the percentage of new lower income residential units permitted from the beginning of the housing element cycle through the release date of the applicable call for projects (a longer time period than covered by the annual report).

Next Steps

The purpose of Policy No. 033 is to incentivize housing element compliance and reward jurisdictions for the production of affordable lower income housing units, which helps to implement the Regional Comprehensive Plan.

The Board will be asked to update Policy No. 033 in conjunction with the adoption of the final RHNA. The working groups and Executive Committee will also review Policy No. 33 prior to any final action by the Board.
IMPLEMENTATION GUIDELINES FOR SANDAG REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT MEMORANDUM

Purpose

The purpose of this policy is to provide guidelines on the implementation of the memorandum adopted by the SANDAG Board of Directors on February 25, 2005, in association with the adoption of the 2005–2010 Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) (Attachment 1, referred to herein as the “Memorandum”). The Memorandum laid out specific provisions regarding SANDAG’s allocation of discretionary funding to local agency projects in relation to local jurisdiction housing element compliance and lower income housing production.

These implementation guidelines restate the provisions of the Memorandum and define how they will be implemented. This policy shall be reviewed and evaluated annually to determine whether changes to the guidelines are needed. Issues to be considered during the annual review include, but are not limited to: lessons learned during the prior year, the relationship between the RHNA memorandum and SANDAG’s smart growth goals, and new funding sources proposed to be subject to the memorandum.

This policy was first approved by the SANDAG Board in April 2006. In November 2008, as part of the annual review of this policy, several amendments were made to refine the implementation of the Memorandum. These amendments removed the section of the original policy that referred to the Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program and the verbatim sections of the Memorandum.

1. The section of the Memorandum, “discretionary funding allocated to local agency projects by SANDAG” shall be defined as: funds allocated by SANDAG only to local jurisdictions (the cities or County) through a competitive process. These funds are listed in Attachment 2 and include the TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program, Transportation Development Act (TDA) Non-motorized Program, and TransNet Bicycle Program, among others.

2. The following types of funding shall not be subject to the provisions of the Memorandum:

   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, 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).

Attachment 3 provides a more detailed list of funding sources/programs that shall not be subject to the Memorandum.

3. As new funding sources become available, the Regional Planning Committee (RPC) shall review and make a recommendation to the Board of Directors regarding whether they should be subject to the Memorandum and this Policy shall be amended.

4. To be eligible to apply for future discretionary funding allocated by SANDAG to local agency projects, local jurisdictions shall do the following:

4.1 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.

4.2 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. The Memorandum ties the allocation of funding to local jurisdiction progress toward the 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) based on the number of lower income housing units produced in accordance with RHNA Alternative 3. During the 2008 annual review of this policy, the award of incentive points was expanded to include five factors, each of which was assigned a value of one-fifth of the total points including: (1) Housing Element Compliance, (2) Greater RHNA Share Taken, (3) Regional Share of Cumulative Total of Lower-Income Units Produced,
(4) Percent of Cumulative Alternative 3 Lower Income RHNA Goal Met (Attachment 4), and (5) Percent of Lower-Income Households.

5.1 Attachment 5 provides a detailed description of how the incentive points will be calculated for each of the five factors.

Attachments: 1. February 25, 2005, RHNA Memorandum to SANDAG Board of Directors
              2. Discretionary Funding Programs Subject to Board RHNA Memorandum
              3. Funding Programs Not Subject to Board RHNA Memorandum
              4. Final Regional Housing Needs Assessment Modified Alternative 1
                 (Adopted RHNA) and Alternative 3
              5. Description of How to Calculate the Board Policy No. 033 Incentive Points

Adopted April 2006
Amended November 2008
February 25, 2005

TO: SANDAG Board of Directors
FROM: Mayor Lori Pheller, Mayor Steve Padilla, and Councilmember Jim Madaffer
SUBJECT: Agenda Item No. 12 – Final Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA)

Our regional housing needs are significant — both now and in the future. Addressing these needs is often a complex process when dealing with the varied interests of the cities in our region. We are committed to doing everything we can to address our regional housing needs. Recognizing the differences between the cities, we are proposing an incentive-based compromise to the RHNA Modified Alternative 1. Simply put, for those cities that are willing and able to accommodate additional housing, those cities should be compensated through incentives that would help improve existing as well as future infrastructure.

We recommend the Board approve Modified Alternative 1, with the following provisions:

1. Jurisdictions whose 1999 lower income households as a percentage of total households is estimated to be greater than the regional average (Attachment 2, Column 1) shall receive 15 bonus points (out of 100 possible) for projects requesting funding through the Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program. (This would include National City, El Cajon, Imperial Beach, Lemon Grove, La Mesa, Escondido, Vista, Chula Vista, San Diego, and San Marcos.)

2. In addition to the current Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program, for all future discretionary funding allocated to local agency projects by SANDAG (following the adoption by jurisdictions of housing elements for 2005-2010), the following criteria shall apply:

   a. In order to qualify for such funding, a jurisdiction will be required to demonstrate that they are in compliance with provisions of their adopted housing element which set forth their commitment to providing adequate multi-family zoned land or other actions necessary to accommodate their share of lower income housing under the adopted RHNA.

   b. Incentive points (a minimum of 25 points out of 100 possible) will be given to projects in jurisdictions in which lower income housing units are being produced in accordance with the housing unit figures contained in Alternative 3 (Attachment 2, Column 13).

   c. In order to verify compliance with these provisions, each jurisdiction shall annually submit a report to SANDAG indicating their progress in complying with requirements of their housing element, as well as actual production of housing units within their jurisdiction by income category, during the preceding year.
## DISCRETIONARY FUNDING PROGRAMS
**SUBJECT TO BOARD RHNA MEMORANDUM**
*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>State</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>Local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• TransNet Bicycle, Pedestrian and Neighborhood Safety Program</td>
<td>$280 M*</td>
<td>2009 to 2048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program</td>
<td>$285 M*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local</strong></td>
<td></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
## FUNDING PROGRAMS NOT SUBJECT TO BOARD RHNA MEMORANDUM

### Funding Programs

#### Federal
- Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP)\(^2\)
- Congestion Mitigation & Air Quality (CMAQ)\(^2\)
- Transportation Enhancement (TE) Program\(^2\)
- Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Urbanized Area Formula Program (Section 5307)
- FTA Fixed Guideway Modernization Program (Section 5309 Rail Mod)
- FTA Section 5310 Elderly & Disabled Program
- FTA New Freedom Program
- FTA Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) Program

#### 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
  - Highway & transit capital projects
  - 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
  - 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.
### Final Regional Housing Needs Assessment
Modified Alternative 1 (Adopted RHNA) and Alternative 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Share</th>
<th>Modified Alternative 1**</th>
<th>Alternative 3***</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlsbad</td>
<td>8,376</td>
<td>1,022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>17,234</td>
<td>3,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronado</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Mar</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Cajon</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encinitas</td>
<td>1,712</td>
<td>392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>2,437</td>
<td>548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Beach</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Mesa</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemon Grove</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National City</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside</td>
<td>6,423</td>
<td>1,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poway</td>
<td>1,242</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego - Original</td>
<td>45,741</td>
<td>10,292</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Units Below

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unincorporated Area</th>
<th>353</th>
<th>268</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0 (621)</th>
<th>418</th>
<th>292</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>709</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Diego - Revised*</td>
<td>45,741</td>
<td>10,645</td>
<td>8,090</td>
<td>8,645</td>
<td>18,356</td>
<td>9,613</td>
<td>8,126</td>
<td>8,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>6,254</td>
<td>1,407</td>
<td>1,069</td>
<td>1,182</td>
<td>2,595</td>
<td>1,434</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>1,182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santee</td>
<td>1,381</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solana Beach</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista</td>
<td>2,267</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>941</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated Area - Original</td>
<td>12,358</td>
<td>2,781</td>
<td>2,113</td>
<td>2,336</td>
<td>5,129</td>
<td>3,217</td>
<td>2,251</td>
<td>2,336</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Units Below

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unincorporated Area</th>
<th>(353)</th>
<th>(268)</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>621</th>
<th>(418)</th>
<th>(292)</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>709</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated Area - Revised*</td>
<td>12,358</td>
<td>2,476</td>
<td>1,881</td>
<td>2,336</td>
<td>5,666</td>
<td>2,799</td>
<td>1,959</td>
<td>2,336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego Region</td>
<td>107,301</td>
<td>24,143</td>
<td>18,348</td>
<td>20,280</td>
<td>44,530</td>
<td>24,144</td>
<td>18,348</td>
<td>20,280</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Some jurisdiction allocations by income category were adjusted slightly to ensure that regional income category percentages provided by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) – 22.5 percent very low income, 17.1 percent low income, 18.5 percent moderate income, and 41.5 percent above moderate income – were met.

**Adjusted to reflect transfer of lower income units from Unincorporated Area to City of San Diego.

**Modified Alternative 1 was approved by the SANDAG Board on February 25, 2005.

**Alternative 3 is referenced in the memorandum approved by the SANDAG Board in conjunction with the approval of the Final RHNA.

Totals may be affected by rounding.

March 18, 2005
Description of How to Calculate the Board Policy No. 033 Incentive Points

The following five factors, 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. Housing Element Compliance: One-fifth of the total Policy No. 033 points would be awarded to projects located in jurisdictions with a housing element found in compliance with state housing element law by HCD 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. (Note: Jurisdictions without completed housing elements would, however, be eligible to apply for funding subject to Policy No. 033 and can receive points based on factors two through five.)

2. Greater RHNA Share Taken: One-fifth of the total Policy No. 033 points would be awarded to projects located in jurisdictions that accepted a greater share of the lower income RHNA goals in the adopted RHNA (Modified Alternative 1) as compared to Alternative 3. Jurisdictions whose lower income RHNA goals were the same in Modified Alternative 1 and Alternative 3 would receive half of the points, and jurisdictions that received a lesser share of the lower income RHNA goals in the adopted RHNA would receive no points associated with this factor.

3. 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 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; and 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 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.

4. Percent of Cumulative Alternative 3 Lower Income RHNA Goal Met: One-fifth of the total Policy No. 033 points would be awarded based on 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).

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 (2000 Census) 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).
North Coast Corridor
A Better Environment for the Future

July 15, 2011

North Coast Corridor (NCC) is Essential to the Region

• 27 miles – six cities – six lagoons
• Economic lifeline for the region
• Different customers, different needs
• 40 years of good service
**A Balanced Solution for the Future**

Highway Project Objectives:

1. Develop options that maintain or improve travel times
2. Protect the environment and enhance coastal communities
3. Build transportation flexibility for the future
4. Identify best value for taxpayers

**Locally Preferred Alternative: Express Lanes Only**

- Two Express Lanes in each direction (8+4 Buffer/Striping)
- Balance of benefits and impacts
  - Smallest footprint
  - Fewest right-of-way impacts
  - Prioritizes moving people
  - Greater environmental opportunities
  - Least cost
Direct Access Ramps (DARs)

New ramps providing direct access to Express Lanes

- Provides DARs at:
  - Voigt Drive
  - Manchester Avenue
- Defers decision on proposed DARs at:
  - Oceanside Boulevard
  - Cannon Road
- Modifies and reduces scale of proposed DAR at Manchester Avenue

Part of a Comprehensive Approach

Coastal Protection Plan

$6.5 billion program
- $3.5 billion for highway projects
- $2.8 billion for coastal rail and transit
- $200 million for natural resource protections and enhancements

North Coast Corridor Program
- Extends FasTrak® to accommodate carpools and vanpools
- Accelerates development of new coastal rail projects over the next 5 years
- Doubles track length with new double tracks over the next 10 years
- Reduces congestion in general purpose lanes
- Invests $400 million in new coastal rail projects over the next 5 years
- Double tracks eight miles over the next 10 years
- Results in 20-minute headway during commute hours, 60-minute off-peak
- Develops Rapid Bus Service along corridor for coastal communities
- Lengthens lagoon bridges for enhanced tidal flows
- Incorporates community design elements
Next Steps

• Early 2012 – Public review of Coastal Protection Plan (PWP)
• Early 2012 – Submit PWP to Coastal Commission
• Late 2012 – Coastal Commission hearings and final environmental report
• 2013 – Begin highway construction
• Continue collaborative outreach
North Coast Corridor Video
PROPOSED REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS FROM INTERSTATE 5 NORTH COAST CORRIDOR PROJECT IN THE 2050 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Introduction

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) selected the Locally Preferred Alternative for the Interstate 5 (I-5) in the North Coast Corridor (NCC) on July 6, 2011. The Express Lanes Only option will add four Express or Managed Lanes from La Jolla Village Drive to Vandegrift Boulevard. This alternative has the lowest cost of the alternatives studied, with an estimate of $3.5 billion in 2010 dollars.

The Draft 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and its Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) includes $4.3 billion (in 2010 dollars) for the I-5 NCC project (two general purpose lanes and four Managed Lanes with barrier alternative). This report presents a proposed redistribution of $800 million (in 2010 dollars) in future revenues for inclusion in the Final 2050 RTP.

Discussion

Federal and state revenues make up the $800 million that would become available between 2030 and 2035, based on the preferred alternative decision for the I-5 NCC project. These revenue sources (Regional Surface Transportation Program, State Transportation Improvement Program, and future infrastructure bond measures) provide flexible funding for capital improvements, but are not available for transit or highway operations.

Based on the Caltrans and FHWA’s decision on the I-5 NCC project and after an initial review of comments on the Draft RTP/SCS processed to date, it is proposed that the funds be used to modify the transit network by advancing a high-ranking light rail transit project to the 2035 timeframe and to modify the highway network by advancing the I-5/State Route 78 (SR 78) high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) and missing freeway connectors to the same timeframe. In addition, funds for investments that support land use and transportation connections would be augmented as described in the following sections.

The timing of the augmentations will be finalized as all project comments received on the Draft 2050 RTP are fully assessed.

Recommendation

The Regional Planning and Transportation Committees are asked to recommend that the Board of Directors approve the proposed phasing modifications and redistribution of funding from the I-5 North Coast Corridor project to the projects transit and transportation system supporting investments in substantially the same form as shown in Table 1 of the report for inclusion in the Final 2050 RTP.
Proposed Phasing Modifications

The Draft 2050 RTP included the transition of the Mid-City Rapid Bus project, which is anticipated to be in service in late 2012, to light rail transit (LRT) between 2041 and 2050. The conversion to LRT is estimated to cost $1.921 billion (in 2010 dollars). It is proposed that the Mid-City LRT project be split into two phases. Under the proposed redistribution, the first phase of the LRT project, between Mid-City/I-SR 15 Transit Plaza and downtown San Diego, would be advanced to 2035 at an estimated cost ranging from $400 million to $500 million (in 2010 dollars). The FY 2012 Program Budget includes a new work element to evaluate a number of new transit lines included in the Draft 2050 RTP, which will assist in refining the cost estimates for projects such as the Mid-City LRT. Phase 1 would take up most of the I-5 NCC project funding by 2035 and free up funding in later phasing periods. Phase 2 improvements from Mid-City/SR 15 Transit Plaza to San Diego State University would remain in the 2041-2050 phasing period.

The Draft 2050 RTP included the construction of the I-5/SR 78 HOV connectors (South to East and West to North as well as North to East and West to South) and the I-5/SR 78 missing freeway connectors (West to South and South to East) in the 2036 to 2040 timeframe at an estimated range of $300 million to $400 million (in 2010 dollars). It is proposed that all I-5/SR 78 connectors be advanced to the 2031-2035 timeframe to better align with the completion of the I-5 Express Lanes project anticipated during the same period.

These proposed phasing modifications would free up funding in later periods of the 2050 RTP.

Proposed Funding Augmentation

- Rail Grade Separations: The Draft 2050 RTP includes $1.31 billion (in 2010 dollars) in rail grade separations associated with SPRINTER, COASTER, and Blue and Orange Line Trolley Corridors improvement projects. The proposed redistribution of funds would augment funding for regional rail grade separations by $300 million, bringing total funding to $1.61 billion (in 2010 dollars). As rail transit projects move forward in the development process, further evaluation and refinement of rail grade separations will be conducted at the project level. It is estimated that up to three additional COASTER grade separations or up to seven additional LRT grade separations could be funded with the proposed $300 million.

- Safe Routes to Transit: Often the biggest impediment to using transit is the challenge of getting to and from a transit stop or station. Auto-oriented land use patterns, poor pedestrian sidewalk/crosswalk design, lack of bicycle facilities, disconnected street networks, varying topography, and long distances between trip origins and transit stations (“first-mile”) or transit stations and trip destinations (“last-mile”) all create barriers to using transit. Potential strategies to facilitate Safe Routes to Transit include first-mile/last-mile solutions such as enhanced pedestrian crosswalks near transit stations, bicycle lanes that connect to transit and bike parking at transit stations, feeder-distributor bus/shuttle routes, car sharing/station cars, and ridesharing. The Draft 2050 RTP includes $500 million (in 2010 dollars) in the Active Transportation program for a Safe Routes to Transit program. The proposed redistribution would increase funding for Safe Routes to Transit improvements by $200 million for a total of $700 million (in 2010 dollars).

- Smart Growth Incentive Program (SGIP): This program was established through the TransNet Extension Ordinance “to provide funding for a broad array of transportation-related infrastructure improvements that will assist local agencies in better integrating
transportation and land use, such as enhancements to streets and public places, funding of infrastructure needed to support development in smart growth opportunity areas consistent with the Regional Comprehensive Plan, and community planning efforts related to smart growth and improved land use/transportation coordination.”

The Draft 2050 RTP includes $299 million (in 2010 dollars) for both capital and planning grants. Under the proposed redistribution, the SGIP would be increased by an additional $300 million for a total of $599 million (in 2010 dollars), providing funding for additional capital improvement projects in smart growth areas throughout the region.

Table 1 summarizes the proposed redistribution of $800 million in future funds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Phasing Modification from 2050 to 2035</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advance an estimated $577-$400 million-$500 million for the transition of the Mid-City Bus Rapid project to Light Rail Transit Phase 1 between downtown San Diego and Mid-City/SR 15 Transit Plaza.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advance an estimated $300 million-$400 million for the I-5/SR 78 HOV and missing freeway connectors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposed Funding Augmentation

| Rail Grade Separations: Additional $300 million for a Regional Rail Grade Separations Fund. |
| Safe Routes to Transit: Additional $200 million for Safe Routes to Transit improvements. |
| Smart Growth Incentive Program: Additional $300 million for the capital component of the Smart Growth Incentive Program. |

Proposed Total Funding Augmentation: $800 million

Next Steps

Pending recommendation from the Regional Planning and Transportation Committees, at its July 22, 2011, meeting, the Board of Directors will be asked to approve the redistribution of funds for inclusion in the final 2050 RTP. Staff will continue to review and respond to all the comments received on the Draft 2050 RTP and its SCS. Comments and responses plus proposed changes will be brought to the Transportation Committee and Board of Directors in September. During July and August, staff will work on any revised model runs and modifications that need to be incorporated into the final 2050 RTP based on changes that may be approved by the Board of Directors on July 22.

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

Key Staff Contact: Elisa Arias, (619) 699-1936, ear@sandag.org
The meeting of the Regional Planning Committee (RPC) was called to order by Vice Chair Carl Hilliard (North County Coastal) at 12:05 p.m. See the attached attendance sheet for Regional Committee member attendance.

1. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES (APPROVE)
   
   **Action**: Upon a motion by Councilmember Sherri Lightner (City of San Diego) and a second by Chairman Bill Horn (County of San Diego), the RPC unanimously approved the minutes from the April 1, 2011, meeting. Mayor Pro Tem Jerry Jones (East County) abstained.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS
   
   **Action**: There were no public comments/communications/member comments.

**CHAIR’S REPORT (Item 3)**

3. RECOGNITION OF BILL ANDERSON, CHAIR OF THE REGIONAL PLANNING TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP (INFORMATION)

Vice Chair Carl Hilliard thanked Bill Anderson for his three years’ of leadership and service as Chair of the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG).

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

**REPORTS (Items 4 and 5)**

4. RECOMMENDATION ON DRAFT REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY AND ALLOCATION (RECOMMEND)

On April 1, the RPC reviewed and discussed several RHNA methodology and allocation options. Following discussion, the RPC asked staff to prepare an additional RHNA concept and requested the participation of elected representatives from the cities of Carlsbad, Poway, and Santee in the May 6, RPC meeting. The RPC is asked to forward the RHNA
Methodology and Allocation option shown in Attachment 2, Table 2b (Lower Income Capacity Option), to the SANDAG Board of Directors to accept for distribution and 60-day public review period.

Mayor Pro Tem Jerry Jones, Chair, Regional Housing Working Group (RHWG), introduced the item.

Susan Baldwin, Senior Regional Planner (SANDAG), briefed the Committee on the joint meeting of the TWG and RHWG which was held on April 14, 2011; noted SANDAG staff’s recommendation; and reviewed the Summary of RHNA Allocation Options.

Bill Anderson, Chair, Technical Working Group (TWG), reported on the discussions at the joint TWG/RHWG meeting.

Vice Chair Hilliard introduced the elected representatives who were requested to participate at the May 6, RPC meeting, and noted that the representative from the City of Santee might not be able to attend due to a previous engagement.

City of Carlsbad Mayor Matt Hall expressed support for Table 2b.

City of Del Mar Mayor Don Mosier spoke in support of Table 2b and 2c.

City of Poway Councilmember John Mullin He stated support for Table 2b and Table 2c.

Vice Chair Hilliard introduced the public speakers.

Ed Batchelder, representing the City of Chula Vista, expressed support of Table 3c.

Russ Cunningham, representing the City of Oceanside, spoke in support of Tables 3a, 3c, and 3d.

Devon Muto, representing the County of San Diego, stated support for Tables 2b, 2c, and 3d.

Rich Whipple, representing the City of Solana Beach, spoke in support for Tables 3c and 3d.

Susan Tinsky, Executive Director of the San Diego Housing Federation, chair of Sustainable San Diego, and member of the Regional Housing Working Group, expressed support for all the options beginning with the number 3, and opposition to the options beginning with the number 2.

Vice Chair Hilliard noted the several letters received and closed the public portion of the meeting.

**Action:** Upon a motion by Chairman Bill Horn (County of San Diego) and a second by Councilmember Sherri Lightner (City of San Diego), the RPC recommended forwarding the RHNA Methodology and Allocation options shown in Table 2b and Table 3d, to the SANDAG Board of Directors for its consideration on May 27, 2011, with one nay vote from North County Inland.
5. **2050 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN: UPCOMING OUTREACH AND ADOPTION PROCESS (INFORMATION)**

The Draft 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) is the blueprint for keeping pace with the mobility and sustainability challenges in a growing region. The Plan is built on an integrated set of public policies, strategies, and investments to maintain, manage, and improve the transportation system so it meets the diverse needs of our changing region through 2050. The SANDAG Board of Directors accepted the Draft 2050 RTP and its Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) for distribution for public comments on April 22, 2011.

Elisa Arias, Principal Planner (SANDAG), provided a brief overview, details regarding the process to obtain public input, and next steps.

Councilmember Sherri Lightner (City of San Diego) announced that the City of San Diego Land Use and Housing Committee will hold a hearing on the Draft 2050 RTP on May 25, 2011 at 2:00 p.m.

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

6. **UPCOMING MEETINGS**

The next meeting of the RPC is scheduled for Friday, June 3, 2011, at 12 noon.

7. **ADJOURNMENT**

Vice Chair Hilliard adjourned the meeting at 1:24 p.m.

**Attachment:** Attendance Sheet
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBREGIONAL AREA</th>
<th>JURISDICTION</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>MEMBER / ALTERNATE</th>
<th>ATTENDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North County Inland</td>
<td>City of Escondido</td>
<td>Sam Abed</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Vista</td>
<td>John Aguilera</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South County</td>
<td>City of Imperial Beach</td>
<td>Jim Janney, Chair</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of National City</td>
<td>Alejandra Sotelo-Solis</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North County Coastal</td>
<td>City of Del Mar</td>
<td>Carl Hilliard, Vice Chair</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Solana Beach</td>
<td>Lesa Heebner</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East County</td>
<td>City of Lemon Grove</td>
<td>Jerry Jones</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Lemon Grove</td>
<td>George Gastil</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Bill Horn</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Pam Slater-Price</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<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>Howard Williams</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Elsa Saxod</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>Vacant</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>Mary England</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>NCTD</td>
<td>Mark Filanc</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ed Gallo</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>LaVonne Peck (La Jolla)</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>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></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Mitigation Program Advisory Member</td>
<td>California Department of Fish and Game</td>
<td>Steve Juarez</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>David Mayer</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Mitigation Program Advisory Member</td>
<td>US Army Corps of Engineers</td>
<td>Therese Bradford</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></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>Vacant</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>-- --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Susan Wynn</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2010 CENSUS

Introduction

Starting in March 2011, the U.S. Census Bureau began releasing San Diego results from the 2010 Census. In June 2011, the Census Bureau released the detailed “Summary File” tables for San Diego. SANDAG staff are processing the raw data for use in a wide variety of local planning projects.

Discussion

Background Information on the 2010 Census

As the Regional Census Data Center for San Diego County, SANDAG worked with the Census Bureau to prepare for the 2010 Census. SANDAG staff assisted the Census Bureau and local jurisdictions with local updates to census addresses and updating census geography, such as census tracts.

The first 2010 Census data release occurred this past March with the redistricting data, which included information on population by race and ethnicity. The Summary File 1 data were released in June. This most recent, and final, release of data from Census 2010 includes population data by age, gender, race/ethnicity, as well as housing data by occupancy and owner status. The 2010 Census data do not include socio-economic characteristic data, such as household income or how people commute to work. That information is now included in the Census Bureau’s American Community Survey (ACS).

The Census Bureau has a program to handle possible challenges to the 2010 Census count. The Count Question Resolution (CQR) Program allows State, local and Tribal area elected officials to challenge counts under three conditions:

1. If the Census Bureau has the incorrect jurisdiction boundary;
2. If the Census Bureau incorrectly address matched households into the wrong area; or
3. If the Census Bureau incorrectly added or deleted households or people due to processing errors.

More information about this program can be found at the Census Bureau’s Web site: http://2010.census.gov/2010census/about/cqr.php.
Population Growth in San Diego County 1910-2010

In the past 100 years, the San Diego Region (18 cities and unincorporated county) has grown from a small city of 60,000 people to a thriving metropolitan area of more than 3 million. In San Diego’s early years, Census figures show that the county’s population nearly doubled every ten years from 1910 to 1960. Between 1960 and 1990 growth slowed to an average increase of approximately 33 percent every ten years. Growth slowed again in the past two decades, with less than a 15 percent increase 1990-2000 and only 10 percent growth from 2000-2010. As of April 1, 2010, the San Diego region reached a total population of 3,095,313 residents. (See Figure 1.)

Figure 1: Population in San Diego County 1910-2010

The largest city in the county is the City of San Diego, with more than 1.3 million residents, and the smallest is Del Mar, with just under 4,200 residents. San Marcos, Chula Vista, and Carlsbad were the fastest growing between 2000 and 2010, increasing by 52 percent, 41 percent, and 35 percent, respectively. The City of San Diego added the most residents (74,566, a 6 percent increase). A handful of coastal cities showed no growth over the decade, including Del Mar, Imperial Beach, and Solana Beach; Poway also saw a small population decline from 2000 to 2010.

Race and Ethnicity

One of the biggest demographic shifts highlighted by the 2010 Census is confirmation that San Diego is now a “majority-minority” county. This means that no single race or ethnic group accounts for more than half of the region’s population. (See Figure 2.)

The Asian population, which grew fastest, increased by 34 percent (to 328,000 residents) between 2000 and 2010. The Hispanic/Latino population increased by 32 percent over the decade, and now accounts for approximately one third of the county’s total population (991,000 residents). Conversely, the non-Hispanic White, Black, and American Indian populations all declined slightly during the decade (by 3, 5, and 8 percent, respectively).
Aging Population

Another major demographic shift in the San Diego region is the aging of the population. Between 2000 and 2010 the median age of the population rose from 33.2 to 34.6. While the population as a whole grew by 10 percent over the decade, the population age 55 to 64 grew by approximately 60 percent and the population age 85 and older grew by nearly 50 percent. On the other hand the region’s population of children (grade school ages 5 through 14) declined, and the population of infants and toddlers (those younger than age 5) remained flat. The aging of the population has potentially wide-ranging implications for the region’s transportation system.

Housing - Occupancy and Household Size

While much talk about the Census revolves around the demographic characteristics of the population, the 2010 Census will also provide valuable information about neighborhood housing characteristics, including occupancy rates and average household size.

Household characteristics, such as average household size, are critical input into any transportation, parks, schools, public safety, or water and wastewater planning process. Average household size is the number of residents living in housing units, divided by the number of occupied housing units. The ratio excludes population living in group quarters facilities such as college dorms or military barracks, which are counted separately in the Census. The average household size ratio can be used to extrapolate future demand for facilities and services in residential developments. For planners working in the field of residential planning, the 2010 Census will provide useful information on current neighborhood conditions, including areas of high and low vacancy, and high and low average household size.
In 1950, the average household size in San Diego was more than 3.1 persons per household. This decreased steadily as birth rates and average family size fell during the 1960s and 1970s, and by 1980, the region hit a low of 2.6 persons per household. However, birth rates began to rise starting in the mid-1970s, and a similar upward trend can be seen in average household size in recent decades. (See Figure 3.)

Increasing average household size means that each new housing unit is likely to accommodate more residents, thus potentially increasing demand for transportation infrastructure, parks, libraries, and other public facilities in the future.

In addition to changes in household size, the vacancy rate has varied throughout the region’s history. The region’s lowest vacancy rates, were during the housing boom in the early 2000s, and have risen considerably - back to rates reminiscent of the 1970s and 1980s - in the past three years. Data from the 2010 Census shows a residential vacancy rate of 6.7 percent for San Diego County. (See Figure 3.)

**Figure 3: San Diego Region Household Size/Vacancy Rate 1950-2010**

Opposite the trend in larger average household size, rising residential vacancy means that each new housing unit is less likely to be occupied, resulting in fewer new residents per unit. Higher vacancy rates potentially reduce demand for parks, libraries, and other public facilities in the future. In general, it appears that the competing trends of higher average household size and higher vacancy rate appear to be cancelling each other out for the time being.
Next Steps

SANDAG staff will use the data from Census 2010 to inform future planning efforts, such as the Regional Comprehensive Plan, the Series 13 Regional Growth Forecast, criminal justice analysis, and other regional projects. In addition, in coming months staff will roll out a series of data products that reflect the results of the 2010 Census.

KURT KRONINGER
Director of Technical Services

Key Staff Contacts: Kristen Rohanna, (619) 699-6918, kroh@sandag.org
Beth Jarosz, (619) 699-6997, bja@sandag.org
Population Growth Rate is Slowing

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 1910 - 2010

Percent Population Change by Jurisdiction (2000-2010)

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 and 2010
Total Population Change by Jurisdiction (2000-2010)

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 and 2010

Race/Ethnic Mix is Changing

Population in 2000
- White: 55.0%
- Asian: 8.7%
- Hispanic: 26.7%
- Amer. Indian / Alaska Native: 0.5%
- Other: 0.2%

Two or More Races: 2.9%

Population in 2010
- White: 48.5%
- Asian: 10.6%
- Hispanic: 32.0%
- Amer. Indian / Alaska Native: 0.5%
- Other: 0.2%

Two or More Races: 3.1%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 and 2010
Household Size and Vacancy Rate Rose

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 1960 - 2010

Regionwide Age Structure: 1990

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 1990
Regionwide Age Structure: 2000

Regionwide Age Structure: 2010

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000
Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2010
Regionwide Age Structure: 2010 and 2050

Life-course: Disability Status by Age

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2010; SANDAG, 2050 Regional Growth Forecast, February 2010
Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2007-09
Means of Transportation to Work Varies Greatly by Age

![Means of Transportation to Work Varies Greatly by Age](image)

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 1990, 2000, and American Community Survey, 2007-09

---

2010 Census and the 2050 Regional Growth Forecast

![2010 Census and the 2050 Regional Growth Forecast](image)

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 1910 - 2010; SANDAG, 2050 Regional Growth Forecast, February 2010
Summary

• Between Census 2000 and 2010 the San Diego region
  – Slowed in rate of population growth
  – Became “majority-minority”
  – Increased in overall age

Next Steps

• Roll-out of data products (e.g., Profiles)
• Incorporate 2010 Census into upcoming planning projects
  – Regional Comprehensive Plan update
  – Next (Series 13) Regional Growth Forecast