MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

REGIONAL PLANNING TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP

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

Thursday, March 8, 2012

1:15 to 3:15 p.m.

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

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

AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

- SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM: SCORING CRITERIA UPDATE PROCESS
- HEALTHY WORKS™/ COMMUNITIES PUTTING PREVENTION TO WORK “HEALTHY COMMUNITIES ATLAS”
- INTEGRATING TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT INTO THE PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT PROCESS
- LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY PLAN

SANDAG offices are accessible by public transit. Phone 511 or see www.511sd.com for route information. Secure bicycle parking is available in the building garage off Fourth Avenue.

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.
## REGIONAL PLANNING TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP
### Thursday, March 8, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM #</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>PUBLIC COMMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

## CONSENT ITEMS

+3. MEETING SUMMARY

The TWG should review and approve the Meeting Summary from its February 9, 2012, meeting.

+4. TransNet SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM AND TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT/TransNet ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION GRANTS STATUS UPDATE (Oswaldo Perez)

SANDAG approved the first round of Smart Growth Incentive Program 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.

## REPORTS

+5. SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM: SCORING CRITERIA UPDATE PROCESS (Christine Eary)

The call for projects for the TransNet Incentive Program is anticipated to be released in 2012. This report provides an overview of program objectives, lessons learned from the first cycle, SANDAG plans and programs developed since the last cycle that will help inform updates to the scoring criteria, and the proposed process to update the criteria. The TWG is invited to provide feedback on the proposed process.
6. ZONING DATA AND THE SERIES 13 REGIONAL GROWTH FORECAST (Kirby Brady)  

As discussed at the last TWG meeting, SANDAG is developing a new forecasting model for use in the 2015 Regional Transportation Plan. This new model, PECAS, requires land use plans and zoning information. Since SANDAG has not historically used zoning in the regional growth forecast, staff will continue to work with the TWG regarding zoning data collection and interpretation.

+7. HEALTHY WORKS®/COMMUNITIES PUTTING PREVENTION TO WORK “HEALTHY COMMUNITIES ATLAS” (Stephan Vance)  

In May 2011, the TWG reviewed the initial draft Healthy Communities Atlas for the San Diego region and provided comments. Based on those comments and on an internal review by SANDAG staff, a final version of the Atlas was prepared by Urban Design 4 Health. The consultant will provide an overview of the changes incorporated into the Atlas. In addition, the Working Group members will be asked to identify a member of their staff to be trained in the use of the Atlas and other planning tools developed under the Healthy Works program. Copies of the Atlas will be available at the meeting and are posted on the SANDAG Web site at www.sandag.org/healthyworks.

+8. INTEGRATING TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT INTO THE PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT PROCESS (Antoinette Meier)  

iCommute, the Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Division of SANDAG, is developing a reference for local jurisdictions on integrating TDM throughout the local planning and development process. The purpose of this study is to provide jurisdictions with case studies and resources for implementing TDM throughout the various land development stages from long-range planning to site development. Additionally, the study will provide recommendations for managing, monitoring, and evaluating TDM strategies. iCommute staff will provide an overview of the framework of the study.
+9. LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY PLAN (Paula Zamudio)  DISCUSSION

SANDAG is preparing a Limited English Proficiency Plan using guidelines set by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). The plan will ensure Title VI compliance for transportation and regional planning efforts. Staff is requesting input from TWG members on their efforts to engage limited English-proficient residents in local planning efforts as ideas to consider for inclusion in the regional Limited English Proficiency Plan.

+10. HOUSING ELEMENT WORKSHOP ANNOUNCEMENT  (Susan Baldwin)  INFORMATION

The California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) will conduct a housing element workshop at SANDAG on Thursday, March 15, 2012, from 9:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. HCD is interested in obtaining input on questions or subjects that TWG members would like addressed in the workshop. Suggestions can be e-mailed to Susan Baldwin at Susan.Baldwin@sandag.org. This workshop will be primarily technical in nature. Planning, housing, and legal staff are encouraged to attend, as well as other interested parties.

11. ADJOURNMENT AND NEXT MEETING  INFORMATION

The next TWG meeting is scheduled for Thursday, April 12, 2012, from 1:15 to 3:15 p.m.

+ next to an agenda item indicates an attachment
MEETING SUMMARY OF THE FEBRUARY 9, 2012,
REGIONAL PLANNING TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP

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

Agenda Item 1: Welcome and Introductions

The meeting was called to order by Bill Chopyk (City of La Mesa), Chair of the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG).

Agenda Item 2: Public Comments and Communications

Members of the public had the opportunity to address the TWG on any issue within the jurisdiction of the respective group that was not on the agenda.

Agenda Item 3: Meeting Summary (Approve)

TWG members were asked to review and approve the Joint TWG-CTAC December 1, 2011, and TWG January 12, 2012, meeting summaries.

Action: Upon a motion by Nancy Bragado (City of San Diego) and a second by John Conley (City of Vista), the Joint TWG-CTAC December 1, 2011, meeting summary and TWG January 12, 2012, meeting summary were approved unanimously.

CONSENT

Agenda Item 4: Updated Regional Planning Technical Working Group Roster and Form 700 Statement of Economic Interests (Information)

Bill Chopyk (La Mesa, Chair TWG) reminded all TWG members and alternates that they must submit a Form 700 Statement of Economic Interests for calendar year 2011 to Deborah Gunn of SANDAG. The deadline is Wednesday, March 28, 2012.
**REPORT ITEMS**

**Agenda Item 5: SANDAG Board Actions on Smart Growth Concept Map and Board Policy No. 33 (Information)**

Mr. Chopyk and SANDAG staff updated the TWG on recent SANDAG Board Actions regarding the Smart Growth Concept Map and Board Policy No. 33.

Coleen Clementson (SANDAG) informed the TWG that on January 27, 2012, the SANDAG Board of Directors accepted the Technical Update of the Smart Growth Concept Map for planning purposes and for use in SANDAG smart growth incentive programs. Ms. Clementson thanked the TWG for its contributions to the update process. Additionally, Ms. Clementson notified members that SANDAG staff will distribute binders containing the updated regional and subregional maps and the associated Site Descriptions. Additionally, these items are available on-line at www.sandag.org/rcp.

Ms. Clementson also announced that on January 27, 2012, the SANDAG Board of Directors unanimously approved amendments to Board Policy No. 033. The updated policy, which now reflects the latest Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA), will be used in the evaluation of applications for the Smart Growth Incentive Program and Active Transportation Program. Calls for projects for these programs will be issued in the late spring or early summer of 2012.

**Agenda Item 6: Housing Element Workshop Announcement (Information)**

Susan Baldwin (SANDAG) announced that the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) will conduct a housing element workshop at SANDAG on Thursday, March 15, 2012, from 9:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. This workshop will be primarily technical in nature. Ms. Baldwin requested that interested TWG members e-mail her at Susan.Baldwin@sandag.org with input on questions and subjects for the workshop. Ms. Baldwin encouraged planning, housing, legal staff, and other interested parties to attend.

**Agenda Item 7: Regional Comprehensive Plan Update: Proposed Timeline and Initial Scoping (Discussion)**

Carolina Gregor (SANDAG) presented an overview of the proposed timeline and major anticipated tasks regarding the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) update. Ms. Gregor noted that several key accomplishments arose from the current RCP, which the SANDAG Board of Directors adopted in 2004. Most importantly, the RCP established a regional vision and goals.

Between 2012 and 2015, several concurrent processes will be incorporated into the RCP update, including the Series 13 Regional Growth Forecast and testing of alternative land use and transportation scenarios, among others. The adoption of the final RCP will feed into the update of the next 2050 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy and feature an integrated Public Outreach and Education Strategy.

The Regional Planning Committee will lead the RCP update and look to groups, such as the TWG, for technical input. With the scoping process underway, Ms. Gregor asked the TWG for input on possible issue areas to consider in the RCP update.
Bill Chopyk (Chair TWG, La Mesa) noted that several local jurisdictions have used the current RCP in general plan updates and the Smart Growth Concept Map for local planning purposes. Mr. Chopyk suggested that SANDAG look at ways to better coordinate planning between neighboring cities and regions, especially in regards to bikeways and transportation systems.

Pat Murphy (Encinitas) suggested that the RCP update address issues regarding redevelopment and the current economic climate. Mr. Murphy expressed the need for an expanded discussion on housing due to the lack of redevelopment. Mr. Murphy also saw an opportunity for the RCP update to identify ways to simplify development processes and feature new elements, such as public health and climate adaptation strategies.

Brad Raulston (National City) stated that the City of National City used the RCP for its local general plan update. Mr. Raulston suggested that the RCP update provide guidance to areas that face challenges with coordinating planning efforts among multiple jurisdictions and consider the development of subregional plans.

Nancy Bragado (City of San Diego) added that the City of San Diego used the RCP to explain “big picture” issues in its general plan. Ms. Bragado noted that the RCP has been helpful for grant applications and that the City of San Diego has looked to the RCP’s monitoring report for information on regional and local trends. Ms. Bragado suggested that, as a part of the RCP update, SANDAG collect and share data on a smaller geographic level for monitoring purposes and use by local jurisdictions.

Robert Barry (LAFCO) saw the opportunity to enhance coordination between neighboring service providers for fire coverage, water, and sewage services.

Ed Batchelder (Chula Vista) suggested that that the RCP update leverage the San Diego Foundation’s scenario planning work and look at subregional issues, such as jobs/housing balance. Mr. Batchelder also saw the need for greater emphasis on the relationship between sustainability, energy, and carbon efficiency and land use planning, and assess how new versus existing development could contribute to the region’s growth.

Manjeet Ranu (El Cajon) highlighted that a key challenge for local jurisdictions is financing infrastructure. Mr. Ranu saw the opportunity to link the RCP update to the Quality of Life effort and added that doing so could help the public see tangible benefits to financing and coordinating RCP implementation.

Rich Whipple (Poway) noted that the current RCP was developed in good economic times and emphasized that the RCP update focus on current and future economic challenges. Mr. Chopyk echoed Mr. Whipple’s concerns regarding the RCP’s economic components and saw the need to address new financial challenges.

Chris Schmidt (Caltrans) mentioned from the state perspective that the original RCP was ahead of its time. Mr. Schmidt framed the RCP update as an opportunity for SANDAG to proactively set high standards that others might follow.
Coleen Clementson (SANDAG) summarized items from the TWG’s discussion regarding the RCP update, such as promoting tools to ease the development process and providing greater consideration to economic challenges. Ms. Clementson added the need to incorporate public outreach appropriate to the level of the RCP update and to use the RCP update as an opportunity to market the plan and highlight work with partners.

**Agenda Item 8: Kick-Off for Series 13 Regional Growth Forecast (Discussion)**

Clint Daniels (SANDAG) introduced the Series 13 Regional Growth Forecast as the first step to updating the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (2050 RTP/SCS), and Beth Jarosz (SANDAG) thanked the TWG for making Series 12 a successful forecast.

To explain the Series 13 forecast, Ms. Jarosz relayed that it is based upon an entirely new model called Production Exchange Consumption Allocations System (PECAS). PECAS is an economic model for future land use projections that can predict economic flows at the neighborhood level. PECAS differs from previous models in the factors used to produce subregional forecasts. Additionally, PECAS can better predict redevelopment by accounting for the economic feasibility of redeveloping a parcel by considering the costs of construction and return on investment (ROI). In order to do so, PECAS looks at the same types of data used in previous models, such as land use and general plans, but also incorporates zoning, land value, and fee information.

An on-line tool will be available in March 2012 for TWG members to review and correct zoning data. Ms. Jarosz emphasized the need for information regarding possible conditional uses from local jurisdictions. Several TWG members emphasized that due to the nature of conditional use permits, providing such information would be challenging. Ed Batchelder (Chula Vista) suggested that SANDAG look at existing conditional uses that have been permitted in local jurisdictions as a starting point for gathering data.

Ms. Jarosz stated that a draft forecast for Series 13 would be available by fall of 2013. Karen Brindley (San Marcos) inquired about how jurisdictions updating their general plans would be accounted for in the new model. Mr. Daniels responded that SANDAG has the ability to change the forecast until six months before the next 2050 RTP/SCS adoption and jurisdictions can provide zoning information based on likely adopted plan changes.

**Agenda Item 9: Walk San Diego “Safe for All” Complete Streets Report (Information)**

Kathleen Ferrier (Walk San Diego) provided an overview of Walk San Diego’s “Safe for All” publication, which surveys complete streets policies and implementation procedures for each of the local jurisdictions in the region. The findings from Walk San Diego’s survey highlight a current disconnect between land use policies and transportation implementation and the need to increase monitoring for bike and pedestrian projects. The publication also features best practices, such as “road diets” and flexible levels of service, from local jurisdictions that can serve as models for complete streets implementation. Copies of “Safe for All” are available at [http://www.walksandiego.org/resources/publications/](http://www.walksandiego.org/resources/publications/).
Agenda Item 10: Update of Traffic Study Impact Guidelines (Information)

Peter Thompson (SANDAG) presented an overview of SANDAG’s San Diego Traffic Engineering Council’s (SANTEC) efforts to update to the region’s Traffic Impact Study (TIS) guidelines. Currently, SANTEC has formed an “Ad Hoc Working Group” to identify issue areas and develop a draft scope of work for a comprehensive update. So far, SANTEC’s “Ad Hoc Working Group” has found that the TIS guidelines are inconsistent with recent state mandates, regional goals, and local general plans.

Agenda Item 11: Adjournment and Next Meeting Information

The next TWG meeting will be held on March 8, 2012, from 1:15 to 3:15 p.m.

Action: The TWG meeting was adjourned by Bill Chopyk (La Mesa, Chair TWG).
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. While this was the first annual cycle of the TDA/TransNet Active Transportation Program under the TransNet Extension Ordinance, 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. This report provides an update on grant-funded projects through December 31, 2011.

Discussion

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

Shortly after the first cycles of TransNet SGIP and TDA/TransNet Active Transportation grants were awarded in May and June 2009, SANDAG staff issued grant agreements with the local jurisdictions that received grants.

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 and project schedules. Fourteen Active Transportation Grant projects have already been completed. Grantee progress is described in
Attachment 2. The attachment includes a “watch list,” which denotes those grantees that appear in danger of missing their Use-It-or-Lose-It milestone deadlines. In addition to the watch list, the tracking instrument has been revised to include the contract expiration date for each project in order to avoid inadvertently missing the date and to assure timely action on projects experiencing delays or other development challenges. This quarter there are six grants on the watch list. Four projects have missed or appear in danger of missing a Use-It-or-Lose-It milestone deadline. The other two projects on the watch list sought approval for a schedule extension from the Transportation Committee at its March 2, 2012, meeting. These projects were from the City of San Diego and the City of Vista in the Active Transportation Grant Program.

**Policy Governing Timely Use of Grant Funds (“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 of an executed grant agreement with SANDAG and complete the project within two years of an executed consultant contract.

While minor schedule adjustments may be approved by SANDAG staff, Active Transportation project schedule amendment requests have historically been presented to the Transportation Committee for consideration when the 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).

**Next Steps**

Staff will continue to monitor grantee progress and will provide regular status reports to the TWG.

**Attachments:** 1. TransNet SGIP and BPNS/Traffic Calming Program Use-It-or-Lose-It Requirements  

**Key Staff Contact:** Oswaldo Perez, (619) 595-5609, Oswaldo.Perez@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
as of December 31, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>GRANT TYPE</th>
<th>GRANT AMOUNT</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>NEXT MILESTONE</th>
<th>MILESTONE DATE</th>
<th>CONTRACT EXPIRATION</th>
<th>WATCH LIST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>Industrial Boulevard Bike Lane &amp; Pedestrian Improvements</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$283,900</td>
<td>Construction started Nov-11</td>
<td>Project Completion</td>
<td>Jul-12</td>
<td>Jul-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>Palomar Gateway District Specific Plan &amp; EIR</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>Market Study &amp; Mobility Study complete; preparing Specific Plan &amp; EIR</td>
<td>Project Completion</td>
<td>Jun-12</td>
<td>Jun-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>Third Avenue Streetscape Implementation Project</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>Awarding construction contract</td>
<td>Award Construction Contract</td>
<td>Feb-12</td>
<td>Aug-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lemon Grove</td>
<td>Lemon Grove Trolley Plaza</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$1,895,000</td>
<td>Awarding construction contract</td>
<td>Project Completion</td>
<td>May-13</td>
<td>May-13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>National City</td>
<td>8th Street Corridor Smart Growth Revitalization</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>Completing 90% plans</td>
<td>Award Construction Contract (Phase 2 of 2)</td>
<td>Dec-11</td>
<td>Feb-13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Mid-City SR 15 BRT Station Area Planning Study</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
<td>Urban design vision strategy completed; Land Use, Mobility, &amp; Economic Feasibility Analyses in progress</td>
<td>Project Completion</td>
<td>Sep-12</td>
<td>Sep-12</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 that were not awarded have been removed from this list and funds have reverted back to the SGIP pool.
### Status of TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program FY 2009 - FY 2010
as of December 31, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>GRANT TYPE</th>
<th>GRANT AMOUNT</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>NEXT MILESTONE</th>
<th>MILESTONE DATE</th>
<th>CONTRACT EXPIRATION</th>
<th>WATCH LIST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Chollas Triangle Master Plan</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>$275,000</td>
<td>Existing Conditions Analysis complete; Master Plan concept refinements in progress</td>
<td>Project Completion</td>
<td>Sep-12</td>
<td>Sep-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Euclid &amp; Market Village Master Plan</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>Master plan concepts complete</td>
<td>Project Completion</td>
<td>Oct-12</td>
<td>Oct-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Imperial Avenue &amp; Commercial Street Corridor Plan</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>Existing conditions, master plan concepts, &amp; draft preferred plan report complete</td>
<td>Project Completion</td>
<td>Oct-12</td>
<td>Oct-12</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 that were not awarded have been removed from this list and funds have reverted back to the SGIP pool.
# Status of TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program FY 2009 - FY 2010

as of December 31, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>GRANT TYPE</th>
<th>GRANT AMOUNT</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>NEXT MILESTONE</th>
<th>MILESTONE DATE</th>
<th>CONTRACT EXPIRATION</th>
<th>WATCH LIST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Park Boulevard/Essex Street Pedestrian Crossing &amp; Traffic Calming</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$224,000</td>
<td>60% design complete</td>
<td>Award Construction Contract</td>
<td>Sep-12</td>
<td>Jan-13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Park Boulevard/City College/San Diego High Pedestrian &amp; Transit Access Improvements</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>60% design complete. Experiencing challenges with redevelopment agency issues. Expects stabilization of redevelopment activities &amp; continued work on this project.</td>
<td>Project Completion</td>
<td>Feb-12</td>
<td>Feb-12</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Fourth &amp; Fifth Avenue/Nutmeg Pedestrian Crossing &amp; Traffic Calming</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$619,000</td>
<td>Starting on 30% design; design revised to address drainage issues. Project behind schedule &amp; may not meet construction contract award milestone deadline of September 1, 2012</td>
<td>Award Construction Contract</td>
<td>Sep-12</td>
<td>Mar-13</td>
<td>X</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 that were not awarded have been removed from this list and funds have reverted back to the SGIP pool.
Status of TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program FY 2009 - FY 2010
as of December 31, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>GRANT TYPE</th>
<th>GRANT AMOUNT</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>NEXT MILESTONE</th>
<th>MILESTONE DATE</th>
<th>CONTRACT EXPIRATION</th>
<th>WATCH LIST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Fourth Avenue/Quince Pedestrian Crossing &amp; Traffic Calming</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$233,000</td>
<td>Starting on 30% design; design revised to address drainage issues. Project behind schedule &amp; may not meet construction contract award milestone deadline of September 1, 2012</td>
<td>Award Construction Contract</td>
<td>Sep-12</td>
<td>Jan-13</td>
<td>X</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 that were not awarded have been removed from this list and funds have reverted back to the SGIP pool.
### Status of TDA/TransNet Bicycle Pedestrian Neighborhood Safety/Traffic Calming (Active Transportation) Program FY 2010 Grants as of December 31, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>GRANT TYPE</th>
<th>GRANT AMOUNT</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>NEXT MILESTONE</th>
<th>MILESTONE DATE</th>
<th>CONTRACT EXPIRATION</th>
<th>WATCH LIST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Carlsbad</td>
<td>Installation of Audible Pedestrian Signals &amp; Countdown Pedestrian Signals</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$150,660</td>
<td>Construction started November 2011; Work at 18 of 21 intersections completed</td>
<td>Project Completion</td>
<td>Feb-12</td>
<td>Feb-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>Chula Vista Bikeway Master Plan Update</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>PROJECT COMPLETE - FEBRUARY 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>Sidewalk Safety Program – I Street Sidewalk Improvements</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$116,220</td>
<td>PROJECT COMPLETE - SEPTEMBER 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Coronado</td>
<td>Coronado Bicycle Master Plan</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>PROJECT COMPLETE - MARCH 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>Downtown Escondido Bike Racks</td>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>$14,378</td>
<td>PROJECT COMPLETE - OCTOBER 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>Ash Street Undercrossing</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$457,357</td>
<td>Completed various construction tasks. Project making satisfactory progress.</td>
<td>Project Completion</td>
<td>Mar-12</td>
<td>Mar-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>Escondido Creek Bike Path</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$524,100</td>
<td>Preliminary engineering work near completion. Behind schedule in construction contract award milestone &amp; on pace to miss project completion milestone.</td>
<td>Award Construction Contract</td>
<td>Nov-11</td>
<td>Jul-12</td>
<td>X</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 that were not awarded have been removed from this list and any funds have reverted back to the Active Transportation grant pool.
### Status of TDA/TransNet Bicycle Pedestrian Neighborhood Safety/Traffic Calming (Active Transportation) Program
#### FY 2010 Grants
as of December 31, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>GRANT TYPE</th>
<th>GRANT AMOUNT</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>NEXT MILESTONE</th>
<th>MILESTONE DATE</th>
<th>CONTRACT EXPIRATION</th>
<th>WATCH LIST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>Escondido Creek Bike Path Lighting &amp; Restriping</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$157,500</td>
<td>Engineering design 30% complete</td>
<td>Award Construction</td>
<td>Sep-12</td>
<td>Dec-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>West Bernardo Bike Path &amp; Cantilever</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$1,425,000</td>
<td>PROJECT COMPLETE – MARCH 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>La Mesa</td>
<td>La Mesa Bicycle Facilities Master Plan</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>Draft Plan completed December 2011. Project is making satisfactory progress.</td>
<td>Project Completion</td>
<td>Feb-12</td>
<td>Feb-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>La Mesa</td>
<td>Spring Street Trolley Station Pedestrian Access Improvements</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$88,000</td>
<td>PROJECT COMPLETE – SEPTEMBER 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>La Mesa</td>
<td>La Mesa Boulevard/El Cajon Boulevard Intersection Improvements &amp; Pedestrian Infrastructure</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$361,000</td>
<td>PROJECT COMPLETE – SEPTEMBER 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>National City</td>
<td>National City Bicycle Master Plan</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>PROJECT COMPLETE – FEBRUARY 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>National City</td>
<td>Sweetwater River Bike Path Gap Closure Design – Plaza Bonita Road</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$130,000</td>
<td>PROJECT COMPLETE (DESIGN) – DECEMBER 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>EIR &amp; Feasibility Study for Bike Master Plan Update</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>Consultant contract awarded.</td>
<td>Project Completion</td>
<td>Feb-13</td>
<td>Feb-13</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 that were not awarded have been removed from this list and any funds have reverted back to the Active Transportation grant pool.
### Status of TDA/TransNet Bicycle Pedestrian Neighborhood Safety/Traffic Calming (Active Transportation) Program
### FY 2010 Grants
### as of December 31, 2011

**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 that were not awarded have been removed from this list and any funds have reverted back to the Active Transportation grant pool.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>GRANT TYPE</th>
<th>GRANT AMOUNT</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>NEXT MILESTONE</th>
<th>MILESTONE DATE</th>
<th>CONTRACT EXPIRATION</th>
<th>WATCH LIST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Pedestrian &amp; Bicycle Safety Education Program</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>$290,000</td>
<td>Finalized construction contract.</td>
<td>Project Completion</td>
<td>Jun-13</td>
<td>Jun-13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>San Diego Pedestrian Master Plan Phase 4</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>Finalized pedestrian routes types &amp; expanding inventories. Project making satisfactory progress.</td>
<td>Project Completion</td>
<td>Jun-13</td>
<td>Jun-13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>UCSD Bicycle/Pedestrian Master Plan</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>Draft Bicycle &amp; Pedestrian Master Planning Study in production.</td>
<td>Project Completion</td>
<td>Apr-12</td>
<td>Apr-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Bicycle Detection at Signalized Intersections</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$73,500</td>
<td>Finalizing construction contract award; requesting a 9-month project schedule extension to the Transportation Committee for approval at its March 2, 2012, meeting, in accordance with the Use-It-or-Lose-It policy.</td>
<td>Award Construction Contract</td>
<td>Mar-11</td>
<td>Aug-11</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Status of TDA/TransNet Bicycle Pedestrian Neighborhood Safety/Traffic Calming (Active Transportation) Program

**FY 2010 Grants**

as of December 31, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>GRANT TYPE</th>
<th>GRANT AMOUNT</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>NEXT MILESTONE</th>
<th>MILESTONE DATE</th>
<th>CONTRACT EXPIRATION</th>
<th>WATCH LIST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Kelton Road Midblock Pedestrian Improvements</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$248,400</td>
<td>100% Design complete; work started on consultant contract advertising. Project making satisfactory progress.</td>
<td>Award Construction Contract</td>
<td>Aug-12</td>
<td>Nov-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>San Diego/Caltrans</td>
<td>SR 15 Bike Path Final Design &amp; Environmental Document</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>Bike Path profile &amp; alignment complete; EIR near completion.</td>
<td>Project Completion</td>
<td>Sep-12</td>
<td>Sep-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>Barham Drive Urban Trail Improvement Project</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>PROJECT COMPLETE JANUARY 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>SANDAG</td>
<td>Bicycle Locker Wireless Communication</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>Worked with consultant to establish timeline for implementation; attended MTS required safety training; preparing for firmware upgrades</td>
<td>Project Completion</td>
<td>Feb-12</td>
<td>Feb-12</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 that were not awarded have been removed from this list and any funds have reverted back to the Active Transportation grant pool.
### Status of TDA/TransNet Bicycle Pedestrian Neighborhood Safety/Traffic Calming (Active Transportation) Program FY 2010 Grants as of December 31, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>GRANT TYPE</th>
<th>GRANT AMOUNT</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>NEXT MILESTONE</th>
<th>MILESTONE DATE</th>
<th>CONTRACT EXPIRATION</th>
<th>WATCH LIST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>SANDAG</td>
<td>Bicycle Locker Retrofits &amp; Upgrades</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>Finalized purchase order for new lockers &amp; submitted right-of-entry permits to MTS for installation. Locker materials were ordered &amp; are being manufactured. Developed a use agreement &amp; occupancy permit for lockers that will be placed at the airport.</td>
<td>Project Completion</td>
<td>Feb-12</td>
<td>Feb-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>SANDAG</td>
<td>Bicycle Map Printing &amp; Distribution</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>PROJECT COMPLETE - JULY 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>SANDAG</td>
<td>Bayshore Bikeway Segments 7 &amp; 8</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$1,078,000</td>
<td>Construction in progress &amp; near completion.</td>
<td>Project Completion</td>
<td>Mar-12</td>
<td>Mar-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Santee</td>
<td>Carlton Oaks Drive Class II Bike Lanes</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$30,200</td>
<td>PROJECT COMPLETE - MARCH 2010</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 that were not awarded have been removed from this list and any funds have reverted back to the Active Transportation grant pool.
### Status of TDA/TransNet Bicycle Pedestrian Neighborhood Safety/Traffic Calming (Active Transportation) Program

**FY 2010 Grants**

as of December 31, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>GRANT TYPE</th>
<th>GRANT AMOUNT</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>NEXT MILESTONE</th>
<th>MILESTONE DATE</th>
<th>CONTRACT EXPIRATION</th>
<th>WATCH LIST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Vista</td>
<td>Inland Rail Trail Phase IIIB – Right-of-Way Engineering</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>Experiencing issues with easement acquisition &amp; design. Behind schedule in obtaining preliminary title reports. Requesting a 15-month project schedule extension to the Transportation Committee for approval at its March 2, 2012 meeting, in accordance with the Use-It-or-Lose-It policy.</td>
<td>Project Completion</td>
<td>Feb-12</td>
<td>Feb-12</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Vista</td>
<td>Safe Pedestrian Crossing at Longhorn Drive</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$50,649</td>
<td>PROJECT COMPLETE - JUNE 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Vista</td>
<td>Boys &amp; Girls Club Sidewalk Improvements</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$146,844</td>
<td>PROJECT COMPLETE - JUNE 2011</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 that were not awarded have been removed from this list and any funds have reverted back to the Active Transportation grant pool.
SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM:  File Number 3100100
SCORING CRITERIA UPDATE PROCESS

Introduction

Staff is preparing for the second round of funding for the TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program (SGIP). Approximately $12 million will be available for the next call for projects, which is anticipated for later this year. A technical update to the SGIP scoring criteria is being prepared to reflect lessons learned, any policy changes resulting from the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (2050 RTP) and Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS), the Climate Action Strategy, Board Policy No. 033, and to incorporate new planning tools such as Designing for Smart Growth. This report provides a review of the program objectives, lessons learned from the first funding cycle, an overview of the planning documents and tools that will guide the update, and the proposed process to update the criteria. The Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG) and the Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) will be invited to provide feedback on the updated criteria at workshops and their regular meetings this year.

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 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 SGIP.

Discussion

Program Objectives

Before reviewing the program objectives and lessons learned from the first round of funding, a summary of the funding requests and awards will help to illustrate program demand. As prescribed by the Regional Planning Committee (RPC), 80 percent of the available funds were awarded to capital grants, and the remaining 20 percent were awarded to planning grants. In total, SANDAG received 17 applications for capital projects, and awarded funding to eight of those projects. Eighteen applications were received for planning projects, and six received funding. Please see Attachment 1 for a list of applications and funded projects.
The program objectives outlined in the first TransNet SGIP call for projects awarded in 2009 formed the basis for the scoring criteria. They provided guidance in measuring a project’s potential to help transform communities into exemplary smart growth places. The objectives prescribed that projects funded by the SGIP should:

- Be “ready-to-go” and serve as catalysts for further smart growth development;
- Influence land development by improving the public realm and encouraging private smart growth projects that, in combination, create great places;
- Contribute to the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions by encouraging travel by means other than private automobile. In particular, the projects should support public transit usage by being located in areas served by transit, and by improving access to transit;
- Support housing development; and
- Provide model examples of smart growth in a variety of settings in the region.

Lessons Learned

Lessons learned from the first round can be considered relative to how well the scoring criteria resulted in projects that meet the above objectives. The lessons learned indicate where updates to the criteria should be considered.

Lesson Learned #1

Of the resulting capital projects, slightly over half focused on improvements at single intersections or short roadway segments, rather than comprehensive project areas such as transit station areas or mixed-use corridors. These projects appear to have been too small in scale, scope, and impact to successfully achieve the program’s objectives of neighborhood transformation and “placemaking.” Of the seven funded capital projects, only three addressed broad area improvements over a station area or multiple-block corridors. Each of these received approximately $2 million in funding. The remaining four funded capital projects, which cost less than $500,000 each, focused on single intersection improvements or short segments. In the first round of funding, the combination of points dedicated to the project location and cost-effectiveness (in total, 56% of the points) gave the latter projects an advantage.

Proposed Revisions:
To emphasize catalytic and transformational projects, staff is considering an increased emphasis on points for the quality of the proposed project and a minimum funding request amount for capital projects.

Lesson Learned #2

Of the projects funded for both capital and planning grants, one was located in North County, and one in East County. However, almost half of the projects applied for were located in North or East County (8 out of 18 planning grants and 7 out of 17 capital grants). Achieving geographic diversity throughout the region is particularly important in order to address emerging smart growth areas where planning for jobs-housing balance and bicycle, pedestrian, and transit access is critical to smart growth in the region.
**Proposed Revision:**
Greater emphasis on the same criteria addressed above, specifically the quality of the proposed project, with perhaps less emphasis on the land use and transportation characteristics of the project area may help increase the likelihood that the funded projects are spread throughout the region. Capital and planning grant eligibility and scoring criteria from the first round can be found in Attachments 2 and 3.

**Planning Documents to Guide the Criteria Update**

The criteria should be updated to reflect policies and objectives outlined in planning documents and tools that have been adopted by the Board of Directors. These include the 2050 RTP and strategies contained therein, such as the SCS, the Urban Area Transit Strategy, the San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan, the Climate Action Strategy, and Board Policy No. 033. Policies that will be considered in the update of the criteria include greater emphasis in the new RTP on active transportation and social equity. Additionally, staff will consider how to incorporate the Smart Growth Scorecard and design principles outlined in Designing for Smart Growth, the design guidelines for smart growth areas that were approved by the Board of Directors in June 2009, and the Regional Bicycle Plan.

**Criteria Update Process and Next Steps**

A discussion of lessons learned from the first SGIP funding cycle has already begun with the TWG and CTAC. Staff will prepare a draft set of updated program objectives, criteria, and funding allocation for review by members of the TWG and the CTAC at two voluntary workshops, proposed on Wednesday, March 28, and Wednesday, April 25. Updates may reflect the revisions suggested above, and social equity, public health, and other areas of focus may be addressed as well. The workshops will be followed by presentations to the full TWG and CTAC membership. The Regional Housing Working Group will be invited to the workshops as well. Staff will present the updated criteria for RPC consideration in the summer, at which time the RPC would be asked to make a recommendation to the Board of Directors on the criteria and the release of the call for projects.

Attachments: 1. FY 2009-2010 TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program Capital Project Priority Recommendations
2. FY 2009-2010 TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program Capital Project Evaluation Criteria
3. FY 2009-2010 TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program Planning Project Evaluation Criteria

Key Staff Contact: Christine Eary, (619) 699-6928, Christine.Eary@sandag.org
### TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program
**Capital Project Priority Recommendations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>SGIP Funds Requested</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of National City</td>
<td>8th St. Corridor Smart Growth Revitalization</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$3,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Lemon Grove</td>
<td>Lemon Grove Trolley Plaza</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>$1,895,000</td>
<td>$5,067,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>Park Blvd./Essex St. Pedestrian Crossing and Traffic Calming</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>$224,000</td>
<td>$320,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>Park Blvd./City College/San Diego High Ped and Transit Access Improvements</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$429,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>Fourth Ave./Quince Pedestrian Crossing and Traffic Calming</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>$233,000</td>
<td>$333,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Chula Vista</td>
<td>Industrial Blvd. Bike Lane &amp; Pedestrian Improvements</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>$283,900</td>
<td>$429,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Chula Vista</td>
<td>Third Ave. Streetscape Implementation Project</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$3,070,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>4th and 5th Ave./Nutmeg Ped Crossing and Traffic Calming</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>$619,000</td>
<td>$885,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Recommended Funding**

$7,554,900 $14,033,200

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>SGIP Funds Requested</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of La Mesa</td>
<td>Downtown Streetscape Project</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$2,502,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Marcos</td>
<td>Creekside Dr. Construction Project</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Oceanside</td>
<td>Coastal Rail Trail - Tyson St. to Oak St</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Chula Vista</td>
<td>Palomar Street Pedestrian Improvements</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>$122,000</td>
<td>$172,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Vista</td>
<td>South Santa Fe Infrastructure Improvements</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$11,823,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Oceanside</td>
<td>Mission Ave. Improvements</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Encinitas</td>
<td>Parking Lot B Project</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>$1,080,000</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>Oceanfront Walkway Pedestrian Improvements</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>$1,552,000</td>
<td>$1,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of La Mesa</td>
<td>La Mesa Blvd./El Cajon Blvd. Intersection Improvements</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>$465,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**

$18,073,900 $38,631,030

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2009 Funds</th>
<th>$4,673,039</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2010 Funds</td>
<td>4,766,397</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Available**

$9,439,436

**Minimum 80% Capital Funds**

$7,551,549

- **Recommended Capital Projects**
  - $7,554,900
- **Recommended Planning Projects**
  - $1,860,000
- **Total**
  - $9,414,900

**Total Requested Funds (Capital and Planning)**

$22,614,900

**Amount Oversubscribed**

$13,175,464
### TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program
### Planning Project Priority Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Recommended Projects</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>SGIP Funds Requested</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>Mid-City SR 15 BRT Station Area Planning Study</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>Chollas Triangle Master Plan</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>275,000</td>
<td>555,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>Palomar Gateway District Specific Plan and EIR</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>550,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>Euclid and Market Village Master Plan</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>440,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside</td>
<td>Oceanside Blvd. Corridor Specific Plan and EIR</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>929,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>Imperial Ave. and Commercial St. Corridor Plan</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>440,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Recommended Funding**

- $1,860,000
- $3,364,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Recommended Projects</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>SGIP Funds Requested</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>Mid-Coast South Station Area Plan</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>660,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>San Ysidro Blvd. Mobility and Village Plan</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>E St. Transit Focus Area Precise Plan and Implementation Strategy</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>155,000</td>
<td>170,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>General Plan Update to Support Smart Growth Communities</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside</td>
<td>Coast Highway Corridor Parking Demand Management Plan, Infrastructure and Traffic Capacity Study</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>240,000</td>
<td>485,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>East Urban Center Transit Optimization Study</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>116,000</td>
<td>176,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Cajon</td>
<td>Downtown Photo simulations</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>108,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Mesa</td>
<td>Spring Street Station Smart Growth Implementation Plan</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>165,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlsbad</td>
<td>Carlsbad Barrio Land Use Study</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>215,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Imperial Beach</td>
<td>Palm Avenue Corridor Master Plan</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>265,000</td>
<td>337,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>Valley Center Rural Villages Master Plan</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Mar</td>
<td>Village Center District Specific Plan and Form Based Code</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**

- $4,541,000
- $7,380,350

**Total TransNet Funding Available**

- $9,439,436

**Maximum 20% Planning Funds**

- $1,887,887

**Total Recommended for Planning Projects**

- $1,860,000

**Total Recommended for Capital Projects**

- $7,554,900

**Remainder Available for Contingency**

- $24,536
Smart Growth Incentive Program
Capital Project Evaluation Criteria Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>% of Score</th>
<th>% of Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION CHARACTERISTICS OF THE AREA AROUND THE PROPOSED CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Intensity of Planned Development in the Project’s Smart Growth Opportunity Area (maximum 6 points)*

For Metropolitan Center, Urban Centers & Town Centers
1. Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 100% or more
2. Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 25-49%
3. Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 100% or more
4. Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 25-49%

AND

3 2 12 4%

For Community Centers, Rural Villages, or Mixed-Use Transit Corridors
6. Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 100%
4. Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 50-99%
2. Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 25-49%

OR

6 2 4

Where a specific plan, master EIR, or other mechanism allows for administrative approval of development projects, add 4 points

B. Existing and Entitled Land Development Around the Proposed Capital Project

1. Existing Development Density within ½ mile radius of proposed capital project site (maximum 6 points)*

For Metropolitan Center, Urban Centers & Town Centers
3. Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 100% or more
2. Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 25-49%
1. Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 50-99%
3. Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 100% or more
2. Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 25-49%
1. Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 50-99%

AND

3 1 6 2%

For Community Centers, Rural Villages, or Mixed-Use Transit Corridors
6. Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 100%
4. Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 50-99%
2. Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 25-49%

OR

6 1 4

2. Entitled Development Density within ½ mile radius of proposed capital project site (maximum 6 points)*

For Metropolitan Center, Urban Centers & Town Centers
3. Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 100% or more
2. Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 25-49%
1. Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 50-99%
3. Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 100% or more
2. Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 25-49%
1. Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 50-99%

AND

3 1 6 2%

For Community Centers, Rural Villages, or Mixed-Use Transit Corridors
6. Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 100%
4. Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 50-99%
2. Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 25-49%

OR

6 1 4

3. Mix of Uses (maximum 3 points)*
(Single-family residential, retail, office, civic, parks, visitor in ½ mile of project site)
3. Residential + 6 other uses
2. Residential + 4-5 other uses
1. Residential + 2-3 other uses

If a new use will be added to the project area, add 2 points.

2

C. New Affordable Housing Development (maximum 3 points)
% of income restricted affordable housing provided in proposed new development
(Within ½ mile radius of project site)
3. 100% of units affordable
1. 10-99% of units affordable

When 50-100% of units in the development are restricted to low to very-low income residents, add 2 points

2 6 2%

D. Transportation Characteristics (within walking distance of proposed capital improvement project)

1. Relation to Transit (maximum 12 points)*
Scale of actual walking distance to existing or programmed station or transit hub
12. Project is next to a Regional or Corridor service station or a Transit Center
10. Project is within ½ mile of a Regional or Corridor station or a Transit Center
8. Project is within ½ mile of a high frequency (15 min all day) local bus service and at least two additional bus services (transit hub)
6. Project is within ½ mile of a stop for a high frequency (15 min all day) local bus service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>% of Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 1 12 4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Bicycle facilities* (up to 2 points based on quality and utility)*
4. Walkability measured by intersection density (up to 4 points)*
2 1 1 1%
Smart Growth Incentive Program Guidelines and Call for Projects – FY 2009 to 2010

1. Urban Design Characteristics and Community Context (maximum 6 points)
   Project review panel scoring based on existing community structure and design characteristics in project area, and planned or proposed design characteristics in the area based on documented guidance such as design guidelines for area or jurisdiction, form-based codes, or renderings of proposed development. Consideration also given to the appropriate mix of land uses in the project area.

2. Sustainability
   Where existing or entitled buildings in the project area include sustainable building principles, add 2 points.

3. Universal Design
   Where existing or entitled buildings in the project area include universal design features, add 2 points.

II. QUALITY OF PROPOSED CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT

(Scale: 5=excellent, 4=very good, 3=good, 2=fair, 1=minimal benefit, 0=no improvement)

| A. Support for Public Transit (maximum 5 points) | 5 | 5 | 25 | 8% |
| B. Providing Transportation Choices (maximum 5 points) | 5 | 5 | 25 | 8% |
| C. Community Enhancement (maximum 5 points) | 5 | 4 | 20 | 7% |
| D. Addressing Project Area Issues (maximum 5 points) | 5 | 2 | 10 | 3% |

III. PROPOSED CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT READINESS (maximum 5 points)

| A. Major Milestones Completed (maximum 3 points) |
| Environmental Clearance | 3 | 5 | 15 | 5% |
| Right-of-Way Acquisition | 1 |  |  |
| Final Design | 1 |  |  |

| B. Evidence of Local Commitment (maximum 2 points) |
| Demonstrated Community Support$ | 2 | 5 | 10 | 3% |
| Subtotal | 15 |  |  |

IV. COST EFFECTIVENESS (ratio of grant request to project score (maximum 20 points))

Project grant request (Example: $2,000,000)
Grant request divided by project evaluation points (Example: $2,000,000 divided by 185 = $10,811)

All projects graded on a curve from most to least matching funds.

V. MATCHING FUNDS

20  7%  7%

VI. POLICY NO. 033 POINTS

75  25%  25%

TOTAL PROJECT SCORE

300 100%

---

1. Transit station or hub qualifies if corresponding implementation or construction funding has been programmed in the RTIP.
2. Transit hub will be defined as an intersection of three or more bus routes, where at least one route has a minimum scheduled headway of 15 minutes from 7 a.m. to 7 p.m.
3. Regional service is defined as COASTER or freeway-based Bus Rapid Transit.
4. Corridor service is defined as SPRINTER, Trolley, and arterial-based Rapid Bus.
5. All day is defined as 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m.
6. Bike facilities will be defined as bike lanes, bicycle boulevards, or a designated bike path.
7. TDM strategies can include transit pass programs for employees or residents in the area, vanpool/carpool programs, parking cashout programs for employees, car, or bike sharing programs, or shuttle services to rail stations or major destinations.
8. Support is defined as endorsement of community planning groups, business associations, and community development corporations in the project area.
9. Score to be computed by SANDAG based on current land use and transportation databases.
# Smart Growth Incentive Program
## Planning Project Evaluation Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Weight Factor</th>
<th>Maximum Points</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relation of Proposed Planning Area to Regional Transit</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Infrastructure and Service within Smart Growth Opportunity Area (SGOA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. SGOAs with existing regional or corridor transit infrastructure</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. SGOAs with programmed regional or corridor transit infrastructure or existing high frequency local transit infrastructure and service</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. SGOAs with planned regional or corridor transit infrastructure, or programmed or planned high frequency local transit infrastructure and service</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note: Rural Villages would not be scored on this criterion because the place type does not require transit service. Consequently, Rural Village scores would be normalized to the total 200 points available to other place types. The following criteria will be scored on a 5-point scale as follows:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5=excellent, 4=very good, 3=good, 2=adequate (some deficiencies), 1=marginal benefit, 0=no benefit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence on how to apply the criteria to applications will be provided for the evaluation panel in the program guidelines.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Potential of Proposed Planning Effort Area</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of opportunities to develop smart growth plans or projects in the proposed planning area: Can the area appropriately accommodate smart growth? Is there land available for redevelopment or rezoning? Would the existing urban form support smart growth development? How well does the proposed planning effort support development at or above the intensity of use targets for the area’s smart growth place type?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Project Objectives</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How well do the proposed project objectives support smart growth development in the project area? Would the plan result in development that increases transportation and housing choices?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Method of Meeting Project Objectives</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How does the proposed project plan to accomplish stated objectives? How well does the proposed project scope of work facilitate meeting project objectives? Does the scope of work include significant public outreach?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will the proposed planning process lead to timely change in the project area? Is the planning process ready to go? Will it result in regulatory mechanisms that facilitate smart growth or lead directly to an implementable development or capital project? In particular, is a plan in place, or will the project develop a plan that will facilitate smart growth development through a master EIR or other mechanism that allows for administrative approval of development projects? Does the plan area include significant environmental concerns that may delay or prevent successful implementation of the plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of Local Commitment and Community Support</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How has the jurisdiction or agency demonstrated a commitment to implement smart growth? This commitment may be demonstrated through existing ordinances, policies, or incentives. Is the proposed planning project supported by the community? How will the public participation process help develop consensus for smart growth?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matching Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The project will receive points in proportion to the percentage of proposed matching funds to total project cost.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Lower Income Housing Units per RHNA</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 25 percent of total allowable points, based on amount of affordable housing produced as a percentage of the agency’s annualized affordable housing target.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total points available equal 200
HEALTHY WORKS℠/COMMUNITIES PUTTING PREVENTION TO WORK
“HEALTHY COMMUNITIES ATLAS”

Introduction

SANDAG has been working with the County of San Diego Health and Human Services Agency (HHSA) since March 2010 on the Healthy Works℠/Communities Putting Prevention to Work (CPPW) project. The objective of the project is to address rising obesity rates in the San Diego region through built environment strategies that promote increased rates of physical activity and improved access to healthy food and nutrition. The project is funded by a $373 million nationwide program of the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) through the federal American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009. HHSA received $16.1 million through this program and has contracted with SANDAG for about $3 million to implement six projects (Attachment 1).

One of these projects is to develop planning tools that can analyze health benefits and impacts of proposed projects, policies, and programs. As part of this project, SANDAG has hired a consultant to assemble and map conditions in the built environment that affect health outcomes and disparities. These built environment conditions, or “determinants of health,” range from access to parks and grocery stores to air quality and pedestrian safety. Significant research and evidence in the field of public health supports the link between these determinants of health and actual health outcomes.

The Healthy Communities Atlas was developed with input from HHSA and the Public Health Stakeholder Group (PHSG). Copies of the Atlas will be available in printed form at the meeting and through the SANDAG Web site at www.sandag.org/healthyworks. Underlying data for the Atlas as well as the research and analysis methodologies will be made available by SANDAG to local jurisdictions for use in local planning and policy projects through a GIS-based tool. These projects may range from general plan updates and zoning codes to capital improvement programs (CIPs).

Discussion

A first draft of the Healthy Communities Atlas was presented to the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG) on May 12, 2011. SANDAG staff and the consultant have incorporated TWG comments into the revised document, which is being presented today. Below is a brief description of the Atlas.
The Healthy Communities Atlas is an evidence-based guide to San Diego County's “health landscape.” The Atlas compiles and maps existing health-related data on a variety of indicators relating to the following health and built environment themes:

- Physical Activity and Active Transportation
- Injury Prevention
- Nutrition
- Air Quality

Existing data was used to develop measures of health and built environment conditions at the Census block group level. Most of the indicators are related to physical activity promotion and obesity prevention, the focus of the Healthy Works Project. Using block groups as a consistent geography allows comparison between indicators. It also allows layering, querying, and mapping of multiple indicators in order to illustrate phenomena of spatial clustering or convergence of numerous factors. The Atlas includes a number of Composite Maps, which query multiple indicators to identify areas of the region where multiple factors converge to support or conversely detract from positive health outcomes.

Reviews of the academic literature were used to identify and support the indicators included in the Atlas. In the case of the Composite Maps, the indicators included in each Composite Map were identified in the research as having a connection to the outcome being examined. Although it is evidence-based, the mapping in the Atlas is purely descriptive and has not been subjected to statistical validation in the San Diego region. With the exception of a regional sidewalk inventory (still being completed), the scope of the Atlas did not include the collection of any original data. The list of indicators was therefore limited by data availability.

A GIS-based tool called the Healthy Communities Framework accompanies the Atlas. This tool can be used by SANDAG, HHSA, and other regional and local partners to perform customized queries and geographic analyses. The maps in the Atlas and in the Healthy Communities GIS Framework can be used to identify areas in the region that currently support health or need investments to improve health outcomes. The Atlas can also be used by cities and the County as a starting point for more detailed health analysis as input into local planning and implementation projects.

**Next Steps**

The current version of Atlas and the underlying GIS data will be available through SANDAG’s Web site by the end of April 2012. To access the data earlier, please contact Stephan Vance at sva@sandag.org or (619) 699-1924.

TWG members are also asked to nominate a planner from their jurisdiction for a half-day orientation workshop on the Atlas and other planning tools being developed through the Healthy Works project. A date and time for the workshop will be determined in consultation with the attendees.

Attachment: 1. Communities Putting Prevention to Work Fact Sheet

Key Staff Contact: Stephan Vance, (619) 699-1924, Stephan.Vance@sandag.org
Communities Putting Prevention to Work (CPPW) is a $372 million nationwide grant program of the U.S. Center for Disease Control and Prevention to combat obesity and tobacco use. Under this program, the County of San Diego’s Health and Human Services Agency (HHSA) received $16.1 million to fight obesity through projects that support physical activity and access to healthy food and nutrition. Collectively, these projects fall under the county’s Healthy Works: Paths to Healthy Living initiative.

HHSA has partnered with SANDAG to implement regional planning, active transportation, and Safe Routes to School projects that address the design of the built environment. This work is supported by $3 million in grant funds.

Program Schedule
The grant program is funded through the federal American Recovery and Reinvestment Act and must be completed by March 2012.

There are several opportunities for local agencies and organizations to get involved in the program. A Public Health Stakeholder Group and Safe Routes to School coordination team have been formed to help SANDAG with the following projects.

Grant Funded Projects and Opportunities

Health Impact Assessment and Forecasting
» Develop a regional Health Atlas to identify key areas where public health disparities can be addressed with planning and infrastructure investments;
» Add health outcomes as a component to the SANDAG CommunityViz sketch planning tool;
» Support for the update of the SANDAG activity-based regional transportation model to better account for and forecast active transportation trips.

Regional Comprehensive Planning Policies
» Develop recommendations for health and wellness goals, policies, objectives, and implementation actions that may be included in the Regional Comprehensive Plan;
» Develop performance metrics to monitor progress;
» Provide technical assistance and trainings for local agencies on active design, complete streets, and healthy communities planning.

Healthy Communities Campaign
Develop, implement, and support two pass-through grant programs:
» Healthy Communities Planning grants to local agencies and tribal governments to

(Continued on reverse)
add public health components to local planning efforts;

» Active Community Transportation grants to local agencies, school districts, or community-based organizations to develop comprehensive approaches for creating bicycle- and pedestrian-friendly neighborhoods.

In addition, the Healthy Communities Campaign includes the following goals:

» Assess the feasibility of developing comprehensive, evidence-based design guidelines to promote physical activity and healthy communities in the San Diego region;

» Develop a Health Impact and Benefit Assessment (HIA) tool that may be used by SANDAG to integrate health considerations in project development and implementation;

» Provide trainings for agency staff, community-based organizations, health advocates, and education institutions on how to conduct HIAs.

Safe Routes to School
Develop a Regional Safe Routes to School Strategic Plan to make walking and bicycling to school safer and more attractive travel choices. The Plan will aim to support local communities in establishing new Safe Routes to School programs, as well as sustaining and enhancing existing efforts.

Two pass-through grant programs are part of this effort:

» Safe Routes School Planning and Capacity Building grants support comprehensive Safe Routes to School planning;

» Safe Routes to School Education, Encouragement, and Enforcement grants fund programs that encourage and educate students, parents, school officials, and other community stakeholders on walking and bicycling to school safely.

Active Commuter Transportation Campaign
Through its iCommute program, SANDAG expanded Bike to Work Day promotions through May 2011 and implemented the Walk, Ride, and Roll to School Campaign.

Regional Bicycle Plan Implementation

» Develop a bicycle wayfinding signage program for the regional bicycle network to direct bicyclists to useful destinations and encourage biking for practical purposes, such as commuting to work, shopping, and connecting to transit;

» Produce promotional materials about the regional bicycle network to encourage utilitarian bicycling and to communicate the public health, environmental, and quality of life benefits of bicycling.

For more information
Contact Stephan Vance at (619) 699-1924, or sva@sandag.org.
INTEGRATING TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT INTO
THE PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

Introduction

TDM is a key component of the San Diego 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) as a way to ease traffic congestion and reduce air pollution, while improving the commute for thousands of San Diego region residents. TDM programs play a critical role in achieving regional greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions to state-mandated levels and are incorporated into the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS), a required element of the RTP per California Senate Bill 375.

While the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) iCommute program is the regional TDM program, local governments play an equally important role in TDM planning and implementation. Land use, urban design, and parking policies are all under the jurisdiction of local governments and are essential in influencing travel choice and demand. Efficient land use and urban design can reduce the need for auto travel for daily trips, and appropriate parking supply and pricing can encourage the use of alternative modes.

Jurisdictions are becoming increasingly aware of the link between travel choices and land use patterns and policies. They are recognizing that an individual traveler’s mode choice—be it auto, carpool, vanpool, transit, walking, or biking—is significantly influenced by how communities are designed and developed. To support jurisdictions in their efforts to plan for smart growth and transportation-efficient development, iCommute is developing a report titled Integrating Transportation Demand Management into the Planning and Development Process – A Reference for Cities. The report will provide SANDAG member agencies (policymakers, planners, traffic engineers, and land development proposal reviewers) with:

- Case studies and resources for integrating TDM throughout the various land development stages from long-range planning to site development, and
- Recommendations for managing, monitoring, and evaluating the effectiveness of TDM strategies.

Staff will provide an overview of the proposed framework for the report, answer questions and take feedback from members of the working group.
Discussion

TDM strategies address key regional policy objectives related to quality of travel, livability, and sustainability. At the regional level, the SANDAG iCommute program coordinates a number of programs that increase the number of people who carpool, vanpool, use transit, bike, and walk to work, as well as support for telework and alternative work schedules. However, for TDM to be truly effective it must be supported by land use policies and neighborhood design that reduce the need to drive for daily tasks.

Including TDM in the municipal planning and development process offers a broad range of economic, environmental, and public health benefits for local governments:

- TDM is a cost-effective way to build capacity in a community’s transportation system by expanding participation in alternative modes (carpools, vanpools, transit, biking, walking, and teleworking) instead of widening or building new roads, which are costly to construct and maintain.
- TDM incorporated into development reduces auto trips and the need for parking, reducing the cost and burden for jurisdictions and developers to provide more parking capacity.
- TDM helps to meet environmental and air quality goals. TDM improves air quality by encouraging alternatives to the SOV, reducing congestion, and corresponding vehicle related emissions.
- TDM is adaptable and dynamic. It can be customized for specific events, neighborhoods, corridors, work sites, and time frames. Unlike new infrastructure, TDM programs can easily adapt and respond to economic and population changes.

The report’s proposed framework will be divided into three main sections. The first section focuses on TDM in the planning process. The second section focuses on implementing TDM plans through the development process, and the final section provides information on managing and monitoring TDM.

Integrating TDM into the Planning Process

This section of the report will identify specific opportunities for local governments to incorporate TDM into all stages of the planning process with best practices from around the world, highlighted throughout. These experiences will help illustrate how a multi-layered approach to planning provides the largest impact. For example, general plans that encourage transit-oriented development patterns and bicycle networks are best supported by design guidelines that require pedestrian consideration at intersections and parking policies that minimize free parking in business districts. The types of plans identified that could incorporate TDM strategies include:

- General Plans
- Climate Action Plans
- Specific Plans
- Corridor Plans
- Parking Management Plans
- Municipal TDM Plans
- TDM Plans for Construction Mitigation
Implementing TDM through the Development Process
This section provides a discussion on the policies and programs that realize the TDM goals laid out in the planning process. The information in this section demonstrates how TDM strategies and measures can be integrated and encouraged through urban design, site development, and parking management. Case studies will be provided to support each of the policies and programs as highlighted below.

- **Urban Design** – Design guidelines can advance or transform districts, neighborhoods, or corridors as part of a larger policy or planning effort to promote multi-modal communities. Requiring the integration of TDM features into building and community design can influence how individual buildings interact with the streetscape and the transportation network, and can encourage transportation alternatives.

- **Site Development** - TDM is often used as a mitigation strategy to minimize the impacts of traffic generated by new or expanded development. Establishing the appropriate regulatory framework for including TDM in the development review process has been a question for many jurisdictions. Many cities have codified the role of TDM in the site plan review process via Trip Reduction Ordinances. Others utilize a more informal negotiated processes that results in a development agreement. This section will provide guidance on developing, adopting and implementing policies that guide the integration of TDM in both commercial and residential developments.

- **Parking Management** - Many jurisdictions have realized that the attractiveness of transit and ridesharing is indirectly proportional to the availability and cost of parking at a location. If vehicle parking is readily available and free, the incentives to use other modes is greatly reduced. Parking policies complement many TDM efforts, and normally have included incentives or disincentives for fewer spaces per unit of development (parking maximums rather than minimums), shared parking among land uses (retail and office for example) and market rate fees for parking space. This section also discusses the advantages of a demand based approach to managing the supply of public parking.

Managing and Monitoring TDM
TDM policies and strategies must be planned, implemented, and monitored if they are to achieve maximum success. The local jurisdiction is typically in the best position to coordinate local TDM programs and either has, or can obtain, the needed regulatory and policy tools. This section of the report will provide information on how a local jurisdiction is typically involved in managing and monitoring TDM programs. This section will also provide a range of performance indicators that can be used by cities to evaluate and measure the success of TDM strategies and programs. A comprehensive matrix of program evaluation techniques and results from outside jurisdictions will be provided.

Next Steps
During March, staff is presenting the report framework to the Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee and the San Diego Regional Traffic Engineers Council, in addition to the TWG, for feedback. Based on the feedback received, staff will return in April 2012 to present a draft of the report. In May 2012, the final draft report will be presented to the Regional Planning Committee.

Key Staff Contact: Antoinette Meier, (619) 699-7381, Antoinette.Meier@sandag.org
LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY PLAN

Introduction

On December 14, 2005, the United States Department of Transportation (DOT) published revised guidance for its recipients on the implementation of Executive Order 13166: “Improving Access to Services for Persons with Limited English Proficiency (LEP).” According to the Executive Order, a LEP person is an individual who does not speak English as their primary language and who has a limited ability to read, write, speak, or understand English.1

The DOT guidance identifies metropolitan planning organizations such as the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG), or any other recipients of DOT assistance such as transit districts, as entities responsible for taking reasonable steps to ensure meaningful access to their programs and activities by LEP persons. Additionally, the guidance states that recipients providing written translation of vital documents for each eligible LEP language group that constitutes 5 percent or 1,000, whichever is less, will be considered strong evidence of compliance with the recipient’s written-translation obligations. The DOT describes the following “four-factor” analysis as the starting point to ensure meaningful access:

**Factor 1:** The number or proportion of LEP persons eligible to be served or likely to be encountered by a program, activity, or service of the recipient or grantee;

**Factor 2:** The frequency with which LEP individuals come in contact with the program;

**Factor 3:** The nature and importance of the program, activity, or service provided by the recipient to people’s lives; and

**Factor 4:** The resources available to the recipient and costs.

Background

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000d) states that: “No person in the United States shall, on the grounds of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be otherwise subjected to discrimination under any program or activity that receives Federal financial assistance.” In the 1974 case of Lau v. Nichols (414 U.S. 563), the Supreme Court ruled that states and local governments must make reasonable efforts to provide necessary language assistance to LEP individuals..

---

1 The DOT guidance also cites the U.S. Census Bureau’s statistical database of individuals speaking English “not well” or “not at all” as meeting LEP criteria.
Court interpreted Title VI regulations to hold that Title VI prohibits conduct that has a disproportionate impact on LEP persons.

On August 11, 2000, Executive Order 13166, “Improving Access to Services for Persons with Limited English Proficiency,” was signed by President Clinton. It directs federal agencies to examine the services they provide and develop and implement a system by which LEP persons can meaningfully access those services. Federal agencies were instructed to publish guidance for their respective recipients in order to assist them with their obligations to LEP persons under Title VI.

The U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) published updated guidance for its recipients on December 14, 2005, in the “Policy Guidance Concerning Recipients’ Responsibilities to Limited English Proficient (LEP) Persons,” (U.S. DOT, Volume 70, Number 239). The guidance states that Title VI and its implementing regulations require that DOT recipients take responsible steps to ensure meaningful access to the benefits, services, information, and other important portions of their programs and activities for individuals who are LEP. The guidance also suggests that recipients use the DOT LEP Guidance to determine how best to comply with statutory and regulatory obligations to provide meaningful access to the benefits, services, information, and other important portions of their programs and activities for individuals who are LEP.

The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) references the DOT LEP guidance in Circular 4702.1A, “Title VI and Title VI-Dependent Guidelines for FTA Recipients,” which was finalized on April 13, 2007. Chapter IV Part 4 of this Circular reiterates the requirement to take responsible steps to ensure meaningful access to benefits, services, and information for LEP persons and suggests that FTA recipients and sub-recipients develop a language implementation plan consistent with the provisions of Section VII of the DOT LEP Guidance. The FTA Office of Civil Rights also released a handbook in 2007 for transit providers (“Implementing the Department of Transportation’s Policy Guidance Concerning Recipients’ Responsibilities to Limited English Proficient (LEP) Persons” [FTA 2007]) to give technical assistance for the implementation of the DOT LEP guidance.

**Proposed Timeline and Next Steps**

The Four-Factor Analysis and corresponding Language Assistance Plan are slated to be completed by the end of April 2012. Factor 1 was completed in 2011 and recently updated with Census 2010 data. Work is already underway on Factors 2, 3, and 4, as well as the Language Assistance Plan that will accompany the Four-Factor Analysis.

Factors 2 and 3 largely deal with information gathering from community groups, limited English proficient individuals, SANDAG staff, partner agency staff, and other key stakeholders, including TWG members. Meetings with community leaders and groups are being organized, focus groups will be conducted, and surveys distributed to public facing staff.

Upon completion of the Four-Factor Analysis, the information learned will be used to develop a comprehensive Language Assistance Plan that will detail implementation steps for outreaching to limited English-speaking communities. The plan will include: identification and translation of vital documents, identification of necessary language assistance measures, recommendations for staff training, as well as documentation of how the plan will be monitored and updated moving forward.
Role of the Regional Planning Technical Working Group

SANDAG’s TWG is being asked to comment on its efforts for outreaching to limited English-speaking populations. In particular, any measures or training procedures that local jurisdictions have in place are of interest. Further individual conversations may be requested based on input provided. Information collected will be used to put together the Four-Factor Analysis.

Discussion will be solicited at the meeting.

Key Staff Contact: Paula Zamudio, (619) 595-6510, Paula.Zamudio@sandag.org
Purpose: To provide an interactive workshop for the preparation of the 2013 - 2020 housing element update that highlights changes to housing element law and provides additional expertise on difficult areas of the statute.

9:30 Welcome and Introductions – Regional Planning Technical Working Group and Regional Housing Working Group Chairs

9:40 Housing Element Overview – California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) Staff (15 minute presentation; 5 minute Q and A)
  - Purpose of workshop
  - General overview of housing element requirements
  - Public participation
  - Review and revise

10:00 Review of Recent Amendments to Housing Element Law – HCD Staff
  (40 minute presentation; 10 minute Q and A)
  - Senate Bill 2
  - Assembly Bill 1233
  - Persons with Developmental Disabilities
  - Adequate Sites Alternative
  - Senate Bill 375
  - Senate Bill 575

10:50 Break

11:00 Sites Inventory – HCD Staff
  (30 minute presentation; 15 minute Q and A)
  - Sites inventory walk through including pitfalls etc.
11:45 **Housing Programs** – HCD, SANDAG Staff and Workshop Participants (30 minutes)

- Outline of requirements – Including new timeframe and “beneficial impact”
- Implementation challenges including elimination of redevelopment funds – Interactive discussion
- Ideas and resources – Interactive discussion

12:15 **Next Steps** – HCD and SANDAG Staff (15 minutes)

- Implementation/Best Practices Workshop - exciting workshop and forum to examine how to achieve housing element objectives in San Diego in the current challenging environment. Open to all including working group members, City/County officials, advocates and housing industry representatives
- Office hours

12:30 **Open Forum and Individual Technical Assistance** (1 hour)

- Open forum for general questions related to housing element law, etc. Any part of the general statute not covered, etc.
- Personalized assistance to review/discuss specific questions relating to individual jurisdictions. Participants are encouraged to bring sections of their housing element or questions relating to their jurisdiction for feedback or questions.
**TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program**  
**FY 11 – FY 12 – FY 13 CALL FOR PROJECTS**  
**March 8, 2012 Regional Planning Technical Working Group**

1. **Timeline**

   March 29, 2012  
   Update Workshop #1 (TWG, CTAC, RHWG)

   April 26, 2012  
   Update Workshop #2 (TWG, CTAC, RHWG)

   May 2012  
   Proposed criteria and program guidelines (TWG, CTAC)

   June 2012  
   Approach and ideas to RPC, TC  
   Back to TWG/CTAC

   July 2012  
   Ask RPC, BOD to release Call for Projects

   September 2012  
   Application workshop

   November 2012  
   Applications due

   February 2013  
   Recommended projects list to TWG/CTAC/RPC/TC/BOD

   March 2013  
   Execute grant agreements

2. **Lessons Learned**

   See staff report

3. **Potential Updates for Consideration**

   **Minimum and maximum funding amounts**
   - Previous max of $2M for capital, $400K for planning
   - No minimum

   **Baseline data collection**
   - To be included in grant budget
   - Bicycle and pedestrian screenline and/or intersection counts
   - Safety and observed behavior
   - Intercept surveys
Program objectives

- Add health and social equity emphases, any others?

Scoring criteria

CAPITAL GRANTS

1. Weighting
   a. Rebalance transit and active transportation measures? (ID1, ID2, ID3)
   b. Increase quality of project? (IIA, IIB, IIC, IID)
   c. Decrease land use and transportation characteristics? (All of section I)

2. Health considerations
   a. Promotion of increased physical activity?
   b. Increasing access to healthy food, community gardens?
   c. Increasing access to parks, green space?
   d. Completion of health benefits assessments?
   e. Other?

PLANNING GRANTS

Health
   a. Health benefits assessments
   b. Addressing access to healthy food in plans

BOTH

Social equity
   a. Location within Communities of Concern
   b. Vehicle ownership rates
   c. Limited English proficiency
   d. Increase community support weighting? (IIB in Capital, 6 in Planning)

4. Potential Projects

Please provide feedback to Christine Eary:
Christine.eary@sandag.org or (619) 699-6928
Series 13 Forecast: Zoning Data
Regional Planning Technical Working Group
March 8, 2012

Overview

• Last month reviewed:
  • Forecast background
  • New models in Series 13 (PECAS)
  • New data needs
• This month:
  • (placeholder) Summary & Context (Ed?)
  • Demo of zoning review tools
    • Online Mapping Application
    • Spreadsheet Tool
(Review) translating from zoning to PECAS for each jurisdiction…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone Codes</th>
<th>Zone Desc.</th>
<th>Max FAR</th>
<th>Min Lot</th>
<th>Setback</th>
<th>Max Height</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R-1</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>15’ side, 8’ front</td>
<td>27’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS</td>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>40’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-M</td>
<td>Hotel/Motel</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>10’ side, 25’ front</td>
<td>40’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Floor Area Ratio, lot size, setback, and building height will be used to guide “how much” can be developed.

Permitted and Conditional Uses will be used to guide predicted development patterns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permitted &amp; Conditional Uses</th>
<th>Zone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF detached</td>
<td>R-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF attached</td>
<td>R-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Qtrs</td>
<td>R-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>OS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Park</td>
<td>OS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach</td>
<td>OS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undev. Natural</td>
<td>OS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>H-M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>H-M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>H-M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>H-M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Zoning data collection tools

- 2 tools to collect and generalize zoning data
  - Online tool to review zoning area boundaries
    - [http://gis2.sandag.org/regionalzoning/](http://gis2.sandag.org/regionalzoning/)
  - Spreadsheet tool to provide detail:
    - Floor Area Ratio (FAR) or building height and setback
    - Density
    - Permitted / by right and conditional uses

Image source: Princeton, MN
Spreadsheet tool

- Detailed information for each zone type

Schedule and next steps

March 2012
- Login and spreadsheets will be sent to each jurisdiction
- Request all jurisdictions begin to review and edit zoning data

June 2012
- Preliminary zoning data collection complete

Summer-Fall 2012
- Preliminary regionwide forecast (DEFM)
- Zoning data under review by SANDAG and local land use authorities

Winter / Spring 2013
- Zoning data review complete
- Preliminary subregional forecast results for TWG review

Summer / Fall 2013
- Draft forecast
“If We Want More Evidence Based Practice We Need More Practice Based Evidence”

Dr. Larry Green
Healthy Works Program

Countywide initiative to address the obesity epidemic through environmental and systems change

- Funded by the American Recovery & Reinvestment Act (ARRA), through the CDC Communities Putting Prevention to Work program
- Administered by the San Diego Health & Human Services Agency
- HHSA partnering with SANDAG on regional planning, active transportation and safe routes to school components

This Project:
Health Impact & Forecasting Assessment

- Healthy Communities Atlas / GIS Framework
- Development of regional sidewalk data layer (complete)
- Integrating health outcomes into predictive tools (in progress)
  - Scenario Testing Tool
    - CommunityViz
  - Regional Activity Based Model
    - Recommendations, methodology for incorporating health outcomes
  - Using local health & built environment data & analysis to generate region-specific models
Healthy Communities Atlas & GIS Framework

- Purpose: Identify areas where the spatial convergence of multiple indicators support or undermine health
- Products: Series of maps (Atlas) + GIS tool
- Uses existing data on social and physical environment
- Developed indicators across a consistent geography (Census block group)
- Focus on obesity prevention, physical activity promotion and active transportation
- The Atlas is the printed document; the GIS tool can be used as a tool for custom queries and mapping

Structure of the Atlas

26 Base Maps
- Single layer maps
- Evidence-based indicators: selected based on connection to health in the research, given data availability

7 Composite Maps
- Thematic queries across multiple Base Maps
- Evidence-based: Base Maps are associated with the outcome being examined

Not a predictive tool
- Descriptive only
List of Maps

**Regional Context**
- Population Density
- Communities of Concern

**Physical Activity and Active Transportation**
- Utilitarian-Walkability
- Sidewalks
- Access to Transit
- Parks and Open Space Access
- Non-motorized Trails Access
- Transportation Infrastructure Support
- Access to Social Support and Amenities
- Complete Communities and Community Support
- Youth Physical Activity Support
- Physical Disorder and Crime
- Road Design
- Physical Activity Inhibitors

**Injury Prevention**
- Traffic Crashes
- Pedestrian Traffic Safety
- Cyclist Safety
- Traffic Safety for Youth

**Nutrition**
- Access to Healthy Food
- Fast Food Density

**Air Quality**
Utilitarian Walkability

- Made up of: Residential density, retail Floor Area Ratio, intersection density, land use mix

Regional walkability distribution, by block group

(Dark lines correspond to map categories; higher access are more walkable)
Composite Map: Physical Activity Inhibitors

Physical Activity Inhibitors: Composite Map Methodology

Made up of the following Base Maps:
- Traffic Volume Density
- Arterial Density
- Vacant Parcels
- Physical Disorder
- Violent Crime

- To calculate the composite score:
  - Each Base Map measure was given a standardized value (z-score) for each block group.
  - The final composite score per block group is the average of the Base Map z-scores.
  - Block groups were separated into quintiles (5 groups with equal numbers of block groups in each) based on their composite score.
  - Although only the western third of the region is shown in the map, the analysis is based on all 1,762 block groups in the San Diego region.
Transportation Infrastructure Support: Composite Map Methodology

Made up of the following Base Maps:
- Access to Transit
- Sidewalks
- Non-motorized Trails Access

To calculate the composite score:
- Each Base Map measure was given a standardized value (z-score) for each block group.
- The final composite score per block group is the average of the Base Map z-scores.
- Block groups were separated into quintiles (5 groups with equal numbers of block groups in each) based on their composite score.
- Although only the western third of the region is shown in the map, the analysis is based on all 1,762 block groups in the San Diego region.
Access to Amenities

Percent of households within walking distance (0.6 m / 1 km, a 6-10 minute walk) of amenity, by block group

Amenities:
- High Quality Transit Service
- Parks & Open Space
- Non-motorized Trails (uses 1.2 m distance)
- Daycare Facilities
- Hospitals & Clinics
- Elementary Schools
- Libraries
- Healthy Food (Grocery Stores & Farmers’ Markets)

Wrapping up the Project / Next Steps

- Complete analysis and tool development
- Scheduling training for planning staff (time / date TBD)
Highlights of Analysis

• Differences in relationships by age group
• Importance of parks and sidewalks – significant in a number of models
• Large roads, high traffic volumes associated with a number of health outcomes
• The food environment emerged as a predictor of health outcomes – fast food, grocery stores, farmers’ markets

Extra slides of Atlas maps & CViz / case studies
Parks & Open Space Access

Note: Park Acreage is not part of the Atlas but it is part of the GIS tool.

Block groups were assigned the total acreage of any intersecting park, even if only a portion of the park is within the block group. Parks adjacent to a block group are not counted as part of that block group’s acreage.

Note: Park Acreage is not part of the Atlas but it is part of the GIS tool.
Access to Transit

• Percentage of households in block group within walking distance (0.6 m, a 6-10 minute walk) of high quality transit service
• High quality transit service = all rail and bus service with 15 minute headways or less

Healthy Food Access

[Map of Healthy Food Access with legend showing percentage of households with access in different categories.]
Complete Communities: Summary

block groups where over 50% of households have access to amenities within walking distance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># Amenities</th>
<th>Block Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>258 / 15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>297 / 17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>189 / 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 or 8</td>
<td>106 / 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>912 / 52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All categories</td>
<td>1,762</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Predictive Modeling & Tool Development

Integrate health outcomes into CommunityViz
- GIS-based scenario planning tool
- Currently being used by SANDAG

- Data collection & development complete
- Analysis being finalized
- Tool development, case studies continuing until late March

Tool Development Process
Health Outcomes in CViz Tool

California Health Interview Survey data
- Amount of physical activity, leisure walking / walking to school (all age groups)
- BMI, obese / overweight likelihood (all age groups)
- Likelihood of high blood pressure, diabetes (adults)
- Likelihood of asthma (all age groups)
- General health (adults)
- Likelihood of visiting a park (adults, teens)
- Walking to school (child, teens)
- Fast food consumption (child)

SWTRs data
- Pedestrian and bicycle collision rate

SANDAG travel survey data
- Likelihood of making a walk trip (adults, youth under 16)
- Daily minutes of walking (adults, youth under 16)
- Likelihood of making a car trip
- Daily minutes of driving/ riding in a car

Likelihood of being overweight or obese (adults)

- $N: 18,183$
- $R^2: 0.0769$; 2.3% of this predicted by built environment variables
- Model sensitivity: 10% changes in all of the built environment model variables = 9 percent decrease in the likelihood of being overweight/obese.

Positive relationships:
- Average daily traffic volume

Negative relationships:
- Percent area devoted to parks
- Percent of roads with steep slopes
- Retail FAR, intersection density
- Grocery store density
- Sidewalk coverage (%)

Socio-Demographic variables:
- Sex, age, education, income, employment status, race / ethnicity
Self-rated general health (adults)

- **N**: 18,183
- **R2**: 0.1680; 1.8% percent of the total R2 was explained by the built environment variables,
- **Model sensitivity**: 10% change in built environment variables produced less than 0.5% change in the outcome

***In this model, lower numbers mean better overall health***

**Positive relationships** (as these variables go up, general health index value goes up, i.e. gets worse):
- Walkable arterial density (mi / mi2)

**Negative relationships** (as these variables go up, general health index value goes down, i.e. gets better):
- Percent of parcel area devoted to parks
- Percent of walkable roads w/ steep slopes
- Density of grocery stores
- Retail FAR
- Sidewalk coverage

Walking to & from school (minutes/day, teens)

- **N**: 947
- **R2**: 0.0829; 30% of the R2 explained by built environment factors
- **Model Sensitivity**: 10% in built environment factors = 9% change in the outcome

**Positive relationships**:
- Density of middle schools
- Intersection density index
- Transit access index
- Sidewalk coverage

**Socio-demographic variables**:
- Sex, age, race
- Household / parents’ education, employment, marital status, and income
Likelihood of having current asthma (child)

- **N=3,406**
- **R²: 0.02377**, 4% of the total R² explained by built environment factors
- **Model sensitivity**: 10% change to the built environment factors = 3% change in the outcome.

**Positive relationships:**
- Average daily traffic volume

**Negative relationships:**
- Sidewalk density (mi / mi²)
- Percent of parcel area devoted to parks

---

**CommunityViz Health Assessment Tool**

Partnering with Placeways (CViz developer) to make enhancements

Tool will work at 2 scales:
- Parcel level for neighborhood (under 1000 parcels) scale studies
- MGRA level for larger (corridor / regional) scale studies

The challenge: to precisely replicate UD4H’s measurement methods in the tool while keeping processing time and data setup demands reasonable.
CViz Case Studies

2 scenarios per case study: “existing conditions” and “change”

1) Palomar Gateway project (City of Chula Vista)
   – Neighborhood / parcel level case study
   – Testing health impact of compact, walkable development around the Palomar Blue Line trolley station (implementation of proposed Specific Plan).

2) South Bay BRT project (SANDAG)
   – Regional / MGRA level case study
   – Testing health impact of enhanced transit service with the addition of BRT between Downtown San Diego and Otay Ranch.
What is TDM?

Strategies that change travel behavior (how, when, and where people travel) in order to improve transportation system efficiency and achieve key regional objectives, such as reduced traffic congestion, increased safety and mobility, energy conservation, and emission reductions.
Role of SANDAG in TDM

iCommute Programs and Services:
• Online Ride Matching
• Regional Vanpool Program
• Employer & Community Outreach
• Guaranteed Ride Home
• Bicycle Program
• SchoolPool
• Transit Resources & Promotion
• Carpool Incentive Pilot Program

Role of Cities in TDM

• Land use
• Urban Design
• Complete Streets
• Parking Policies
• Development Practices
Integrating Transportation Demand Management into the Planning and Development Process – A Reference for Cities

- Case studies and resources for integrating TDM throughout the various land development stages from long-range planning to site development.
- Recommendations for managing, monitoring, and evaluating the effectiveness of TDM strategies.

Why TDM?
Including TDM in the municipal planning and development process offers a broad range of economic, environmental, and public health benefits for local governments:

- TDM is a cost-effective way to build capacity in a community's transportation system
- TDM incorporated into development reduces auto trips and the need for parking
- TDM helps to meet environmental and air quality goals.
- TDM is adaptable and dynamic
Study Framework

1. Integrating TDM into the Planning Process
2. Implementing TDM through the Development Process
3. Managing and Monitoring TDM

TDM in the Planning Process

- General Plans
- Climate Action Plans
- Specific Plans
- Corridor Plans
- Parking Management Plans
- Municipal TDM Plans
- TDM Plans for Construction Mitigation
Implementing TDM through the Development Process

• Urban Design
  – Design Guidelines
  – Complete Streets

• Site Development
  – Trip Reduction Ordinances
  – Development Agreements

• Parking Management
  – Parking Maximums
  – Parking Pricing
  – Shared Parking
  – Demand Based Parking

Managing and Monitoring TDM

• Cities role in managing TDM
  – Funding and coordinating municipal TDM programs

• Monitoring the effectiveness of TDM programs
  – Performance indicators
  – Methods for evaluating the direct and indirect impacts of TDM programs
Next Steps

• March 2012 - Gather feedback from CTAC and TWG on study framework
• April 2012 – Return to CTAC, TWG and SANTEC with draft document
• May 2012 – Present Final Draft to the Regional Planning Committee

Questions or Comments?

Thank you