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, October 11, 2012
1:15 to 3:15 p.m.
SANDAG, Conference Room 7
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101-4231

Staff Contact: Susan Baldwin
(619) 699-1943
Susan.Baldwin@sandag.org

AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

• 2050 REGIONAL PLAN WORK PROGRAM: IMPLEMENTING THE PRIOR PLANNING COMMITMENTS:
  ➢ REGIONAL TRANSIT ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY
  ➢ REGIONAL COMPLETE STREETS POLICY
  ➢ LAND USE/TRANSPORTATION SCENARIOS AND GREENHOUSE GAS TARGET SETTING WORK

• SERIES 13 REGIONAL GROWTH FORECAST

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.
1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS

Members of the public will 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. Public speakers are limited to three minutes or less per person.

+3. MEETING MINUTES

The TWG should review and approve the meeting summary from its September 13, 2012, meeting.

CHAIR’S REPORT

+4. ANNOUNCEMENT: PUBLIC WORKSHOP ON 2050 REGIONAL PLAN (Susan Baldwin)

On Friday, October 19, 2012, SANDAG will be holding a public workshop to solicit input on the content and schedule of the 2050 Regional Plan, and on ideas for public involvement in the development of the plan. An invitation to the workshop is attached. TWG members are encouraged to attend and to forward the invitation to any individuals or groups that would be interested in participating in this event.

REPORTS

+5. 2050 REGIONAL PLAN WORK PROGRAM: IMPLEMENTING COMMITMENTS FROM THE 2050 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN/SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES STRATEGY

+5A. TRANSIT ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT POLICY/STRATEGY AND UPDATE OF THE SMART GROWTH CONCEPT MAP (Susan Baldwin)

+5B. REGIONAL COMPLETE STREETS POLICY (Stephan Vance)

+5C. LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION SCENARIOS AND GREENHOUSE GAS TARGET SETTING (Coleen Clementson)

Last month, the TWG received a report on the 2050 Regional Plan work program and schedule. The work program includes a task to finalize SANDAG’s prior planning commitments from the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (2050 RTP/SCS). At today’s meeting, staff will present information about three of the commitments, including (A) the Regional Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Strategy, (B) the Regional Complete Streets Policy, and (C) the Land Use/Transportation Scenarios and Greenhouse Gas Target Setting work. The attached reports provide background information and proposed work efforts for each of these topics. The TWG is asked to provide comments to help guide this process.
+6. SERIES 13 REGIONAL GROWTH FORECAST (Kirby Brady, Beth Jarosz) INFORMATION

SANDAG staff will provide a status update on the 2050 Regional Growth Forecast including progress on the regionwide growth projections, land use inputs, and constrained lands.

7. REGIONAL WALK SCORECARD (Kathleen Ferrier, WalkSanDiego) INFORMATION

WalkSanDiego is planning to release the region’s first Regional Walk Scorecard in Fall 2012. Kathleen Ferrier will provide an overview of the proposed scoring methodology, including the integration of BestWALK, a smart phone app developed by WalkSanDiego to crowdsource walking data around the region. TWG members are requested to provide input on the scoring methodology.

8. 2-1-1 SAN DIEGO (John Ohanian, Chief Executive Officer, 2-1-1) INFORMATION

2-1-1 San Diego is a resource and information hub that connects people with community, health, and disaster services through a free 24/7 stigma-free confidential phone service and searchable online database. 2-1-1 serves the entire population of the County. By dialing 2-1-1, clients are linked to a live highly-trained Client Service Representative who will navigate them through their situations by assessing their needs and then matching them to the best and closest resource in their community. Assistance is confidential and offered in more than 150 languages. 2-1-1 provides a wide range of immediate resources to local individuals and families. This is an informational report.

9. ADJOURNMENT AND NEXT MEETING INFORMATION

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

+ next to an agenda item indicates an attachment
Action Requested: APPROVE

MEETING SUMMARY OF THE SEPTEMBER 13, 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.

There were no public comments at this time.

Agenda Item 3: Approval of Meeting Minutes

TWG members were asked to review and approve meeting summaries for the June 14, 2012, Joint Meeting of the Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC), Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG), and Regional Housing Working Group (RHWG) and June 14, 2012, Joint Meeting of the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG) and Regional Housing Working Group (RHWG).

Action: Upon a motion by Barbara Redlitz (City of Escondido) and a second by Nancy Bragado (City of San Diego), the June 14, 2012, Joint CTAC, TWG, and RHWG and June 14, 2012, Joint TWG and RHWG meeting summaries were approved unanimously.

Agenda Item 4: Status Report on the Proposed Criteria for the TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program (Information)

Mr. Chopyk informed the TWG that on September 7, 2012, the Transportation and Regional Planning Committees met jointly to discuss the proposed criteria for the TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program (SGIP). While no changes were suggested for planning grants, three options were proposed for updating the criteria for capital grants. Options included maintaining criteria used in FY 2009 – FY 2010 funding cycle, recommending criteria presented at the July 6, 2012, Transportation and Regional Planning Committee meetings, or recommending criteria developed in response to discussion at the July Transportation and Regional Planning Committee meetings. Mr. Chopyk stated that the Regional Planning Committee recommended option two, the criteria
presented at the July 2012 Transportation and Regional Planning Committee meetings, for adoption by the SANDAG Board at its September 28, 2012, meeting. Option 2 was supported by the TWG at its June 14, 2012, meeting. Following adoption, SANDAG is expected to release a call for projects.

TWG members discussed the need to continuously assess the SGIP criteria in order to ensure the implementation of program goals and objectives. If challenges to the desired quality and scale of projects continued to persist, members suggested possibly incorporating elements of the Option 3 in future funding rounds.

**Agenda Item 5: SANDAG Agencywide Public Participation Plan Update (Discussion)**

Paula Zamudio (SANDAG) provided an overview of SANDAG’s effort to update its agency-wide Public Participation Plan (PPP). Ms. Zamudio informed the group that the PPP serves as an umbrella document governing all of the agency’s public outreach efforts. Since the PPP was last updated in 2009, Ms. Zamudio announced that SANDAG is currently conducting a survey to gain input on effective outreach strategies and evaluate existing initiatives. Ms. Zamudio encouraged TWG members to take the survey and circulate it among their communities. In addition, Ms. Zamudio solicited feedback from the TWG on strategies that have been successful at the local level and could be applied at the regional scale.

TWG members shared several strategies. The TWG’s suggestions included reaching out to seniors via mobile home parks and community centers, distributing information at existing gathering spots, such as grocery stores, coffee shops, and places of worship, and coordinating with cities to distribute information to local commissions and community groups that have been active in planning processes.

**Agenda Item 6: 2050 Regional Plan**

**A: Draft Work Program and Schedule (Discussion)**

Elisa Arias (SANDAG) presented the 2050 Regional Plan Draft Work Program and Schedule. Ms. Arias informed the group that feedback from the TWG and other groups would be incorporated into a revised work program to be presented to the SANDAG Board of Directors in the fall. Ms. Arias solicited input from the TWG on the proposed content of the plan.

TWG members inquired about the extent to which the existing 2050 Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS) would be revisited. Ms. Arias responded that significant levels of effort went into planning the 2050 Regional Transportation Network and anticipated that changes for the transportation component of the 2050 Regional Plan would include updated revenue projections and revised project evaluation criteria. These revisions would likely impact project phasing, but not result in an overhaul of the currently planned transportation network.

TWG members encouraged staff to address CEQA streamlining in the development of the new plan. Members also asked that SANDAG staff monitor the proposed Senate Bill 1156 (Steinberg, 2012). If adopted, this legislation would tie redevelopment to the implementation of Assembly Bill 32 (Pavley, 2006) and Senate Bill 375 (Steinberg, 2008).
B: Draft Public Involvement Plan (Discussion)

Carolina Gregor (SANDAG) introduced the 2050 Regional Plan Draft Public Involvement Plan (PIP). Ms. Gregor explained that the PIP serves as a project-specific public outreach and engagement strategy and complements the agency-wide PPP. Ms. Gregor solicited input from the TWG on specific public involvement techniques and strategies that could be effective for the 2050 Regional Plan.

TWG members shared a variety of techniques that have been successful at the local level. These include conducting “lunch and learns” at places of employment, taking advantage of smaller-scale media opportunities such as publishing articles in Home Owners Association newsletters, and providing educational workshops on various planning issues. TWG members also emphasized the need for web-based tools to complement, rather than replace traditional workshops and outreach. Additionally, the TWG emphasized the need for SANDAG to make regional issues relevant to the day-to-day life of individuals.

Ms. Gregor announced that SANDAG will host a workshop in mid-October to gain further input on the proposed content of the 2050 Regional Plan and solicit feedback on effective public involvement strategies. Members from the public and interested stakeholders will be welcome to attend. Ms. Gregor added that details for the workshop will be available soon.

Agenda Item 7: Public Review and Comment on the Housing and Community Development’s Draft Housing Element Update Guidance and Input on Site Identification/Analysis Issues (Discussion)

Coleen Clementson (SANDAG) informed that the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) published draft guidance for Housing Element preparation for public review and comment. Ms. Clementson shared that SANDAG has participated in a focus group over the past several months to assist HCD with streamlining the housing element review process. The next phase of the focus group will be to identify possible efficiencies in the site identification/analysis part of the housing element. Ms. Clementson asked for input from the TWG on both HCD’s draft guidance and suggestions for revising the site identification/analysis process.

In regards to HCD’s draft guidance, TWG members supported the concept of streamlining the Housing Element review process for jurisdictions currently in compliance. Members suggested, however, that the criteria to qualify for streamlined review were too narrow. Additionally, TWG members inquired how the reformatting and reorganization of General Plans would be taken into consideration during the review process.

For the site identification/analysis process, TWG members shared that meeting the current standards for site-by-site analysis requires much staff time. Members suggested that HCD consider exemptions from the site-by-site analysis for jurisdictions that comply and show a capacity beyond the assigned Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA).

Ms. Clementson informed the group that revisions to the Housing Element review process and sites identification/analysis may require legislative changes. Ms. Clementson stated that she will share the TWG’s input at upcoming focus group meetings and announced that a representative from HCD will
be present at the October 12, 2012, SANDAG Board meeting to discuss the draft guidance for Housing Element preparation.

**Agenda Item 8: Public Health Initiatives at SANDAG – The Community Transformation Grant (Discussion)**

Vikrant Sood (SANDAG) announced that in March 2012, the San Diego County Health and Human Services Agency (HHSA) contracted with SANDAG for $2.5 million in Community Transformation Grant (CTG) funds. The CTG will allow the County and SANDAG to continue to implement built environment projects that increase physical activity and access to healthy food and nutrition. As a part of this initiative, SANDAG will reconvene the Public Health Stakeholder Group (PHSG). To include local planning staffs on the PHSG, Mr. Sood solicited input on possible strategies to ensure the TWG’s representation.

Mr. Chopyk expressed his support to have representatives from both public works and planning staffs involved in the PHSG. TWG members agreed to nominate individuals from local planning staffs for consideration by SANDAG. Nominations can be submitted by contacting Mr. Sood at Vikrant.Sood@sandag.org. Mr. Sood added that PHSG meetings would be open to the public and additional staff and interested parties would be welcome to attend.

**Agenda Item 9: Highlighting Smart Growth: Vista General Plan Update (Information)**

John Conley (City of Vista) provided an overview of Vista’s General Plan update. Adopted in February 2012, the update incorporates a variety of new planning elements, including complete streets policies, land use controls, overlays, and zoning that allow for mixed-use development and habitat preservation, and a “Healthy Vista” chapter that discusses public health considerations. Mr. Conley shared several lessons learned from this initiative. These include distributing information through faith-based organizations to reach underrepresented groups and developing strategies to address disruptions in the planning process. Additionally, Mr. Conley emphasized the need to incorporate flexible policies and criteria into local general plans.

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

The next TWG meeting will be held on Thursday, October 11, 2012, from 1:15 to 3:15 p.m.

**Action:** The TWG meeting was adjourned by Bill Chopyk (City of La Mesa), Chair TWG.
JOIN SANDAG IN CREATING AN AMBITIOUS REGIONAL PLAN

Get involved in shaping our future.

The San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) wants to hear your voice on how best to engage the community and all stakeholders in creating the region’s first-ever combined regional plan. Participate in this journey to address the community’s most critical issues, including transportation, land use, economic prosperity, affordable housing, social equity, public health, and the environment.

Share your voice with SANDAG on October 19th:

» Learn about the integration of the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy with the Regional Comprehensive Plan — the region’s two primary long-term planning documents.

» Dig into the proposed content of the new plan and voice your priorities.

» Try out web-based public participation tools.

» And, most importantly… tell us how YOU see yourself, your organization, and your community being involved in this process!

YOU'RE INVITED!

Take COASTER, Trolley, or bus to Old Town Transit Center and cross Taylor Street to Caltrans’ offices. Phone 511 or visit 511sd.com/transit for route information. Limited parking also available.

JOIN US FOR THIS PUBLIC WORKSHOP

(Free Event with Complimentary Lunch)

Friday, October 19, 2012
11:30 a.m. to 2 p.m.
Caltrans District 11 Headquarters
4050 Taylor Street
Garcia Room
San Diego, CA 92110

RSVP Paula Zamudio, SANDAG community outreach coordinator, at paula.zamudio@sandag.org, (619) 595-5610, or via the SANDAGRegion Facebook page by attending the “Regional Plan Workshop” event.
ÚNASE A SANDAG PARA CREAR UN AMBICIOSO PLAN REGIONAL

Participe en dar forma a nuestro futuro.

La Asociación de Gobiernos de San Diego (SANDAG, por sus siglas en inglés) desea escuchar su opinión sobre la mejor forma de involucrar a la comunidad y a todas las partes interesadas en crear el primer plan regional combinado de la región. Participe en este trayecto para atender los asuntos más críticos de la comunidad, incluyendo el transporte, el uso de suelos, la prosperidad económica, las viviendas accesibles, la equidad social, la salud pública y el medio ambiente.

Comparta su opinión con SANDAG el 19 de octubre:

» Obtenga más información sobre la integración del Plan Regional de Transporte y la Estrategia de Comunidades Sustentable 2050 con el Plan Regional Integral: los dos principales documentos de planificación a largo plazo de la región.

» Analice detalladamente el contenido propuesto del nuevo plan y exprese sus prioridades.

» Pruebe las herramientas de participación pública basadas en internet.

» Y, lo más importante de todo…cuéntenos cómo se ve a USTED mismo, a su organización y a su comunidad participando en este proceso.

ÚNASE A NOSOTROS EN ESTE IMPORTANTE TALLER PÚBLICO

(Evento gratuito con almuerzo de cortesía)

Viernes, 19 de octubre de 2012
De 11:30 a.m. a 2 p.m.

Oficinas centrales de Caltrans Distrito 11
4050 Taylor Street
Garcia Room
San Diego, CA 92110

Tome el COASTER, Trolley o autobús hasta el Centro de Transporte Público Old Town y cruce la Calle Taylor hasta llegar a las oficinas de Caltrans. Llame al 511 o visite 511sd.com/transit para obtener información sobre las rutas. También hay espacio limitado de estacionamiento.

Confirmar asistencia con Paula Zamudio, coordinadora de enlace con la comunidad de SANDAG, en paula.zamudio@sandag.org, (619) 595-5610, o a través de la página de Facebook SANDAGRegion señalando que asistirá al evento “Taller del plan regional.”
2050 REGIONAL PLAN WORK PROGRAM: IMPLEMENTING
COMMITMENTS FROM THE 2050 REGIONAL
TRANSPORTATION PLAN/SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES
STRATEGY – TRANSIT ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT
POLICY/STRATEGY AND UPDATE OF THE SMART GROWTH
CONCEPT MAP

Introduction

The 2050 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (2050 RTP/SCS), adopted by the SANDAG Board of Directors in October 2011, included several implementation actions and commitments. These actions and commitments have been incorporated into the work program of the 2050 Regional Plan, the new combined plan that will merge the update of the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) with the update of the next RTP/SCS. The proposal to integrate these two plans was approved by the SANDAG Board of Directors in May 2012. The CTAC, along with other working groups, received an introductory report last month for review and input on the draft work plan and public involvement plan for the new Regional Plan.

One of the commitments included in the 2050 RTP/SCS, and now included in the work program of the Regional Plan, is the preparation of a Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Policy/Strategy and comprehensive policy update of the Smart Growth Concept. Funding for this project has been obtained from the state of California Strategic Growth Council.

The purpose of this report is to initiate the dialogue with SANDAG working groups, Policy Advisory Committees and regional stakeholders about the TOD Policy/Strategy and policy update of the Smart Growth Concept Map. This project is intended to develop policies and strategies that will facilitate TOD at existing and planned transit stations and along transit corridors in the region to help create more sustainable communities and reduce Greenhouse Gas emissions from cars and light trucks.

CTAC is asked to provide input on the proposed key tasks outlined in this report, and particularly the project scope of work.
Background

The Smart Growth Concept Map (adopted in 2006 with technical updates in 2008 and 2012) will be one of the starting points for developing the TOD Policy/Strategy for the San Diego region. This map identifies Existing/Planned Smart Growth Opportunity Areas, where areas with existing or planned regional transit service have been planned and/or zoned by local jurisdictions at densities that are consistent with the residential and employment densities associated with the Smart Growth Concept Map place types (e.g. Community Centers, Town Centers, Urban Centers, etc.). The map also identifies Potential Smart Growth Opportunity Areas where land use changes need to be made to meet the density targets and/or regional transit service would be needed. Building on the Smart Growth Concept Map and the Smart Growth Tool Box (which includes the Smart Growth Incentive Program) this project will undertake a comprehensive review of the maps land use density targets and place types and develop tools to facilitate TOD in the region.

Proposed Key Tasks

The following are the proposed key tasks to prepare the TOD Policy/Strategy and Update of the Smart Growth Concept Map:

1. **Scope of Work.** Develop and refine the scope of work and schedule for the TOD Policy/Strategy and initiate the procurement process for consultant assistance. Generally, the scope of work is anticipated to include review of the Smart Growth Concept Map place types and associated density targets and transit service requirements, potential prioritization of TOD areas in relation to the Smart Growth Incentive Program, incentives and policies that promote and facilitate TOD development, and tools to provide affordable housing that will result in equitable TOD.

2. **Input on TOD Policy/Strategy and Smart Growth Concept Map Update.** Solicit input from the SANDAG Board, Policy Advisory Committees, working groups, and other stakeholders in the development of the TOD Policy/Strategy and Smart Growth Concept Map Update (including the Scope of Work for the project) through regularly-scheduled SANDAG meetings, public workshops, and other outreach mechanisms currently being developed as part of the Regional Plan Public Involvement Plan.

3. **Preliminary Concepts/Outline Report for TOD Policy/Strategy and Smart Growth Concept Map Recommendations.** A report will be prepared with the preliminary concepts and potential policies and strategies associated with the scope of work.

4. **Regional TOD Summit.** Plan and hold a TOD summit to provide information, educate, and obtain input from elected officials, working group members, and other stakeholders regarding potential policies, strategies and opportunities identified in the Preliminary Concepts/Outline report for TOD in the San Diego region.

5. **Final TOD Policy/Strategy Report and Smart Growth Concept Map Update.** Prepare a final report that will be used in the development of the Regional Plan, and prepare an updated Smart Growth Concept Map.
**Next Steps**

Per the draft work program presented last month, the Regional Planning and Transportation Committees will serve as the key Policy Advisory Committees for the development of the Regional Plan and TOD Policy/Strategy and Smart Growth Concept Map Update. CTAC, the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG), and the Regional Housing Working Group (RHWG) will serve as the key working groups for this project. Workshops and other public involvement mechanisms in combination with other related topics (such as the Land Use and Transportation Scenarios, the Complete Streets Policy, and other issue areas), are anticipated during the planning timeframe.

Key Staff Contact: Susan Baldwin, (619) 699-1943, Susan.Baldwin@sandag.org
Introduction

The complete streets concept is based on the premise that our streets are complete when they serve all of the public: motorists, public transit and transit users, pedestrians, bicyclists, the young and old, the able-bodied, and the disabled. The concept has been gaining recognition and acceptance, in part, because it supports the need to provide the array of transportation choices called for by smart growth policies like the policy framework that underlies the SANDAG Regional Comprehensive Plan. Complete streets policies have been adopted across the country at all levels of government. SANDAG has addressed complete streets for projects funded under the TransNet transportation sales tax ordinance.

The 2050 Regional Transportation Plan, adopted by SANDAG in October 2011, calls for the development of a comprehensive regional complete streets policy. This report is a first step in outlining what the elements of that policy might be. It begins the dialog among regional stakeholders about what SANDAG can do through this policy to address complete streets in its planning and project development activities, and how its policy can support the efforts of other agencies to address complete streets.

Discussion

Complete Street Background

In 2004, voters in the San Diego region approved a complete streets requirement as part of the TransNet Ordinance Extension. The requirement is included in Section 4(E)(3) of the Ordinance, which reads:

All new projects, or major reconstruction projects, funded by revenues provided under this Ordinance shall accommodate travel by pedestrians and bicyclists, except where pedestrians and bicyclists are prohibited by law from using a given facility or where the cost of including bikeways and walkways would be excessively disproportionate to the need or probable use. Such facilities for pedestrian and bicycle use shall be designed to the best currently available standards and guidelines.

Implementation rules for this section of the TransNet Ordinance Extension were adopted in February 2008 as Rule 21 of SANDAG Board Policy No. 031 (see Attachment 1).

State policy regarding complete streets was established when Caltrans adopted Deputy Directive 64 in 2001, requiring Caltrans to provide for “the needs of travelers of all ages and abilities in all
planning, programming, design, construction, operations, and maintenance activities and products on the State highway system.” This document was revised in 2008 (see Attachment 2). Also in 2008, the California Complete Streets Act was enacted into law, requiring all cities and counties to plan for complete streets in the circulation elements of their general plans. As a result, local jurisdictions have begun developing complete streets policies as part of their general plan update processes.

An effective regional policy will need to be grounded in these existing policies and support the state statutory requirement, but development of the regional policy also provides an opportunity to learn from, and incorporate where appropriate, the best of other complete policies from around the state and the country.

**What Should a Regional Complete Streets Policy Look Like?**

“Complete streets” is not a design prescription. It is a process for decision-making about street design and operating practice. That is why the National Complete Streets Coalition recommends adopting a broad complete streets policy that:

- Includes a vision for how and why the community wants to complete its streets
- Specifies that the policy applies to all users, including pedestrians, bicyclists and transit passengers of all ages and abilities, as well as trucks, buses, and automobiles
- Applies to both new and retrofit projects, including design, planning, maintenance, and operations, for the entire right-of-way
- Makes any exceptions specific and sets a clear procedure that requires high-level approval of exceptions
- Encourages street connectivity and aims to create a comprehensive, integrated, connected network for all modes
- Is adoptable by all agencies to cover all roads
- Directs the use of the latest and best design criteria and guidelines while recognizing the need for flexibility in balancing user needs
- Directs that complete streets solutions will complement the context of the community
- Establishes performance standards with measurable outcomes
- Includes specific next steps for implementation of the policy

A scan of existing regional complete streets policies will reveal an array of approaches to complete streets, from a simple policies statement to detailed implementation guidelines like those governing the TransNet Ordinance requirement. For the SANDAG regional policy to be effective, it should be grounded in the context of the existing policies and requirements established at the local, regional, state and federal levels. It also should recognize that, with the exception of the requirements of the TransNet Ordinance and the operation of the State Route 125 toll road, SANDAG does not own or operate the elements of the region’s transportation system and cannot make policy for the local or state agencies that do. In recognition of this limitation, SANDAG typically encourages implementation of its policies with financial incentives through its grant programs and by providing technical support. Examples of this approach include the TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program and the Smart Growth Toolbox.
The Costs and Benefits of Complete Streets

It likely will always be the case that the cost of developing and operating our transportation systems will exceed the revenue dedicated for that purpose. That is why most local jurisdictions choose to budget discretionary funds for these purposes. Given this inevitable fiscal constraints, a good complete streets policy should include a mechanism for evaluating both the costs and the benefits of implementing that policy. However, the metrics traditionally used to evaluate the performance of our transportation system may not be adequate to fully make this evaluation. That is because the complete streets concept broadens the mission of the public right of way from moving vehicles to providing mobility and access for all people using all modes of travel.

Studies of complete streets policy implementation also suggest that there are benefits to the community that extend beyond enhanced travel opportunities. The National Complete Streets Coalition has documented how supporting more transportation choices can help some families reduce their transportation costs, how local businesses have seen increases in business where streets have been modified to attract more pedestrians and bicyclists, and how complete streets projects that make the street more attractive can attract private investment. And as investment and commercial activity increase, property values can increase as well. With these potential advantages in mind, complete streets policies can be seen as opportunities for community enhancement. One of the challenges of complete streets implementation is to capture these values and consider them along with the other metrics used to evaluate how to invest in the transportation system.

Complete Streets Policy Development

The process for developing the regional complete streets process is proposed to include the following elements:

- A review of existing policies, including policies from local jurisdictions and regional agencies
- An analysis of the costs and benefits of complete streets implementation
- Consultation with stakeholders from local, regional and state agencies
- Development of a white paper on complete streets
- Development of a draft regional complete streets policy

The draft policy will be vetted through the Bicycle-Pedestrian Working Group, the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG), the San Diego Traffic Engineers Council, and the Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee, and presented to the SANDAG Transportation Committee for recommendation to the Board of Directors. Input from the TWG is requested at this time to help refine this process.


Key Staff Contact: Stephan Vance, (619) 699-1924, Stephan.Vance@sandag.org
TransNet ORDINANCE AND EXPENDITURE PLAN RULES

The following rules have been adopted and amended by the SANDAG Board of Directors in its role as the San Diego County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC). The purpose of these rules is to implement the provisions of the original TransNet Ordinance (87-1) and the TransNet Extension Ordinance (04-01) and amendments thereto.

Rule #21: Accommodation of Bicyclists and Pedestrians

Adoption Date: February 22, 2008

Text: Adequate provisions for bicycle and pedestrian travel is determined within the context of the roadway type, its existing and planned surrounding land uses, existing bicycle and pedestrian plans, and current or planned public transit service. When addressing the access needs dictated by land use, the responsible agency must consider demand created by current and expected land uses (as determined by the local general plan) within the useful life of the TransNet project. The table Appropriate Bicycle and Pedestrian Accommodation Measures provides a guide to appropriate accommodation measures for each transportation facility type and land use context. In the table, “urban” means within the urbanized area as defined by U.S. Census Bureau.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appropriate Bicycle and Pedestrian Accommodation Measures¹</th>
<th>Context/Facility Type</th>
<th>Bicycle Measures</th>
<th>Pedestrian Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban Highway</td>
<td>• Required facility type will be based on the recommendations for any regional bikeway corridors in urban highway alignments developed through the 2007 Regional Bicycle Plan. Pending completion of this plan, appropriate bicycle accommodation will be developed on a project by project basis by local and regional authorities in consultation with appropriate stakeholders.</td>
<td>• Continuous sidewalks and marked crosswalks through freeway interchanges where sidewalks exist or are planned on the intersecting roadway. • Where new freeway construction severs existing pedestrian access, grade separated pedestrian crossings with no more than 0.3 mile between crossings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Freeways and freeway interchanges may not eliminate existing bikeways or preclude planned bikeways on local streets and roads.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹The table Appropriate Bicycle and Pedestrian Accommodation Measures provides a guide to appropriate accommodation measures for each transportation facility type and land use context. In the table, “urban” means within the urbanized area as defined by U.S. Census Bureau.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context/Facility Type</th>
<th>Bicycle Measures</th>
<th>Pedestrian Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transit Project</td>
<td>• Bicycle lockers and racks at stations sufficient to meet normal expected demand. • Bicycle access to all transit vehicles except those providing exclusive paratransit service to the disabled as required by the Americans with Disabilities Act. • Transit priority measures on roadways may not prevent bicycle access.</td>
<td>• Direct sidewalk connections between station platforms and adjacent roadway sidewalks. • Pedestrian crossings where a new transit way severs existing pedestrian access with no more than 0.3 miles between crossings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Urban Street</td>
<td>• Class 2 bike lanes</td>
<td>• Continuous sidewalks or pathways, both sides of the street with marked crosswalks at traffic controlled intersections. • ADA compliant bus stop landings for existing and planned transit service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Collector Street (design speed &gt;35 mph)</td>
<td>• Class 2 bike lanes</td>
<td>• Continuous sidewalks or pathways, both sides of the street with marked crosswalks at traffic controlled intersections. • ADA compliant bus stop landings for existing and planned transit service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Collector Street (design speed ≤ 35 mph)</td>
<td>• Shared roadway. Where planned average daily motor vehicle traffic exceeds 6,500, the outside travel lane should be at least 14 feet wide.</td>
<td>• Continuous sidewalks or pathways both sides of the street. • ADA compliant bus stop landings for existing and planned transit service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Local Street</td>
<td>• Shared roadway</td>
<td>• Continuous sidewalks or pathways both sides of the street. • ADA compliant bus stop landings for existing and planned transit service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Highway</td>
<td>• Minimum 8-foot paved shoulder</td>
<td>• ADA compliant bus stop landings for existing bus stops.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appropriate Bicycle and Pedestrian Accommodation Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context/Facility Type</th>
<th>Bicycle Measures</th>
<th>Pedestrian Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Rural Collector Road | • Minimum 8-foot paved shoulder | • Not required with no fronting uses.  
  • Paved or graded walkway consistent with community character on streets with fronting uses.  
  • ADA compliant bus stop landings for existing bus stops. |
| Rural Local Road     | • Minimum 6-foot paved shoulder | • Not required with 85th percentile speeds ≤ 25 mph.  
  • Paved or graded walkway consistent with community character on streets with fronting uses and 85th percentile speeds > 25 mph.  
  • ADA compliant bus stop landings for existing bus stops. |

---

1 Application of these accommodation measures is subject to sound planning and engineering judgment to ensure the facility is reasonable and appropriate within the land use and transportation context of the overall project.

2 Unpaved pathways of decomposed granite or other suitable material that are set back from the roadway where feasible would be considered appropriate only on roads serving areas that are rural in nature.

Where a local jurisdiction has a bicycle or pedestrian master plan adopted by the city council or Board of Supervisors and approved by SANDAG, the local agency may use that plan to determine the appropriate means of accommodating bicyclists and pedestrians in a given project and at a minimum provide the facilities called for in the plan. These plans must be updated and approved no less than every five years to qualify as a means of satisfying this provision.

**Best Available Standards.** All bicycle facilities must be designed to the standards established in the California Highway Design Manual, Chapter 1000. Bicycle parking facilities should conform to the guidelines established in the Regional Bicycle Plan adopted by SANDAG. Shared roadways on collector streets should have a curb lane or curb lane plus shoulder that measures at least 14 feet. Where parallel parking is in place, consideration should be given to installing the shared lane pavement marker. All sidewalks must be designed consistent with the design standards established in the AASHTO Guide for the Planning, Design, and Operation of Pedestrian Facilities, the Department of State Architect’s California Access Compliance Reference Manual, and the U.S. Department of Transportation’s ADA Accessibility Guidelines for Buildings and Facilities (ADAAG). Consistency with the design recommendations in SANDAG’s Planning and Designing for Pedestrians is encouraged.

**Bicycle and Pedestrian Accommodation in Reconstruction Projects.** Street and road reconstruction is the time to re-evaluate the function of a road and its context, and to reallocate the right-of-way if appropriate to meet the needs of bicyclists and pedestrians. An agency is not required to acquire additional right of way to improve bicycle and pedestrian access. However, the agency should consider reduced motor vehicle lanes and lane widths, and reduced median widths as
a means of providing the appropriate bicycle or pedestrian facility. While such an evaluation is recommended for reconstruction projects of any size, compliance with these guidelines is required for “major” reconstruction projects meeting the definitions established under Rule 18 of SANDAG Board Policy No. 031 regarding the guidelines for implementing the “70/30” requirement.

When Provisions for Bicyclists and Pedestrians Accommodation May Be Excluded.
Section 4(E)(3) is based on the premise that pedestrians and bicyclists need safe and convenient access to the same destinations as other users of the public right of way. Consequently, those portions of the transportation network where pedestrians and bicyclists need not be accommodated are the exception, and the decision not to provide for them in a construction or major reconstruction project must be made by the responsible agency for good cause such as severe topographic or biological constraints. Any impacts on the roadway's motor vehicle capacity that result from providing for pedestrian and bicycle access would not, in themselves, justify excluding bicycle and pedestrian facilities. However, these impacts and their mitigation costs should be considered in determining if the cost of providing the facilities is disproportionate to the probable use.

This provision only requires an agency to provide appropriate bicycle or pedestrian facilities that are within the construction or reconstruction area of the project. Consideration of the provision of sidewalks as part of major rehabilitation roadway projects involving only new pavement overlays of 1-inch thickness or greater (see Rule 18 under Board Policy 031) on streets where sidewalks do not currently exist would only be required if curb, gutter, and related drainage facilities were already in place.

The cost of providing for bicycle and pedestrian access can vary significantly relative to the overall project cost. For this reason, specifying a proportional or absolute limit on spending for bicycle or pedestrian improvements relative to probable use would not allow the kind of discretion necessary to make a significant investment in facilities when necessary, or to withhold an investment when the benefits are marginal. Therefore, the decision to exclude accommodations for bicyclist and pedestrians must be a policy-level decision made by the Board or city council based on the body of information about context, cost, and probable use available at the time. Such a decision must be made in the public hearing required by Section 5(A) of the Ordinance.

Pedestrian Access. Sidewalks or other walkways may be excluded from a project when it can be demonstrated that there are no uses (including bus stops) that would create demand for pedestrian access. In making this determination, the agency must consider the potential for future demand within the useful life of the project. Access to and from public transit, including crossing improvements, also must be considered and accommodated where there is existing or planned transit service.

Bicycle Access. A new project or major reconstruction project may not include the expected bikeway treatment when a suitable parallel route with the appropriate accommodations exists that would require no more than ¼-mile total out of direction travel.

Procedures for Excluding Accommodations for Pedestrians and Bicyclists from Projects.
When an agency determines not to include bicycle or pedestrian accommodations in a project because the cost of doing so would be excessively disproportionate to the need or probable use, the agency must include a notice of that decision in the notice of the public hearing required by Sections 5(A) and Section 6 of the Ordinance. In submitting the project to SANDAG for inclusion in the TransNet Program of Projects as part of the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) process, the agency must notify SANDAG that bicycle and/or pedestrian facilities, as described
in Table 1 or in its bicycle or pedestrian master plan, will not be included in the project along with written justification for that decision. The decision and justification is subject to review and comment by SANDAG through the Bicycle-Pedestrian Working Group, which would forward its comments to the SANDAG Transportation Committee. The Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee also would review and comment on such projects as part of its role in the RTIP process. The Transportation Committee in approving the TransNet Program of Projects must make a finding that the local decision not to provide bicycle or pedestrian facilities is consistent with the provisions of this Ordinance prior to approving the project for funding under the TransNet Program. If this consistency finding is not made, the agency would have the opportunity to revise its fund programming request for consideration in a future RTIP amendment.

Effective Implementation. This rule will be effective for projects added to the TransNet Program of Projects subsequent to their adoption by the SANDAG Board of Directors. Within three years of their adoption, the rule will be re-evaluated by SANDAG to ensure they are effectively encouraging provision of a balance transportation network without imposing an excessive cost burden on projects funded under the program.
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TITLE
Complete Streets - Integrating the Transportation System

POLICY
The California Department of Transportation (Department) provides for the needs of travelers of all ages and abilities in all planning, programming, design, construction, operations, and maintenance activities and products on the State highway system. The Department views all transportation improvements as opportunities to improve safety, access, and mobility for all travelers in California and recognizes bicycle, pedestrian, and transit modes as integral elements of the transportation system.

The Department develops integrated multimodal projects in balance with community goals, plans, and values. Addressing the safety and mobility needs of bicyclists, pedestrians, and transit users in all projects, regardless of funding, is implicit in these objectives. Bicycle, pedestrian, and transit travel is facilitated by creating “complete streets” beginning early in system planning and continuing through project delivery and maintenance and operations. Developing a network of “complete streets” requires collaboration among all Department functional units and stakeholders to establish effective partnerships.

DEFINITIONS/BACKGROUND
Complete Street – A transportation facility that is planned, designed, operated, and maintained to provide safe mobility for all users, including bicyclists, pedestrians, transit riders, and motorists appropriate to the function and context of the facility.
The intent of this directive is to ensure that travelers of all ages and abilities can move safely and efficiently along and across a network of “complete streets.”

State and federal laws require the Department and local agencies to promote and facilitate increased bicycling and walking. California Vehicle Code (CVC) (Sections 21200-21212), and Streets and Highways Code (Sections 890 – 894.2) identify the rights of bicyclists and pedestrians, and establish legislative intent that people of all ages using all types of mobility devices are able to travel on roads. Bicyclists, pedestrians, and nonmotorized traffic are permitted on all State facilities, unless prohibited (CVC, section 21960). Therefore, the Department and local agencies have the duty to provide for the safety and mobility needs of all who have legal access to the transportation system.

Department manuals and guidance outline statutory requirements, planning policy, and project delivery procedures to facilitate multimodal travel, which includes connectivity to public transit for bicyclists and pedestrians. In many instances, roads designed to Department standards provide basic access for bicycling and walking. This directive does not supersede existing laws. To ensure successful implementation of “complete streets,” manuals, guidance, and training will be updated and developed.

RESPONSIBILITIES

Chief Deputy Director:
- Establishes policy consistent with the Department’s objectives to develop a safe and efficient multimodal transportation system for all users.
- Ensures management staff is trained to provide for the needs of bicyclists, pedestrians, and transit users.

Deputy Directors, Planning andModal Programs and Project Delivery:
- Include bicycle, pedestrian, and transit modes in statewide strategies for safety and mobility, and in system performance measures.
- Provide tools and establish processes to identify and address the needs of bicyclists, pedestrians, and transit users early and continuously throughout planning and project development activities.
- Ensure districts document decisions regarding bicycle, pedestrian, and transit modes in project initiation and scoping activities.
- Ensure Department manuals, guidance, standards, and procedures reflect this directive, and identify and explain the Department’s objectives for multimodal travel.
- Ensure an Implementation Plan for this directive is developed.
Deputy Director, Maintenance and Operations:
- Provides tools and establishes processes that ensure regular maintenance and operations activities meet the safety and mobility needs of bicyclists, pedestrians, and transit users in construction and maintenance work zones, encroachment permit work, and system operations.
- Ensures Department manuals, guidance, standards, and procedures reflect this directive and identifies and explains the Department’s objectives for multimodal travel.

District Directors:
- Promote partnerships with local, regional, and State agencies to plan and fund facilities for integrated multimodal travel and to meet the needs of all travelers.
- Identify bicycle and pedestrian coordinator(s) to serve as advisor(s) and external liaison(s) on issues that involve the district, local agencies, and stakeholders.
- Ensure bicycle, pedestrian, and transit needs are identified in district system planning products; addressed during project initiation; and that projects are designed, constructed, operated, and maintained using current standards.
- Ensure bicycle, pedestrian, and transit interests are appropriately represented on interdisciplinary planning and project delivery development teams.
- Provide documentation to support decisions regarding bicycle, pedestrian, and transit modes in project initiation and scoping activities.

Deputy District Directors, Planning, Design, Construction, Maintenance, and Operations:
- Ensure bicycle, pedestrian, and transit user needs are addressed and deficiencies identified during system and corridor planning, project initiation, scoping, and programming.
- Collaborate with local and regional partners to plan, develop, and maintain effective bicycle, pedestrian, and transit networks.
- Consult locally adopted bicycle, pedestrian, and transit plans to ensure that State highway system plans are compatible.
- Ensure projects are planned, designed, constructed, operated, and maintained consistent with project type and funding program to provide for the safety and mobility needs of all users with legal access to a transportation facility.
- Implement current design standards that meet the needs of bicyclists, pedestrians, and transit users in design, construction and maintenance work zones, encroachment permit work, and in system operations.
- Provide information to staff, local agencies, and stakeholders on available funding programs addressing bicycle, pedestrian, and transit travel needs.
Chiefs, Divisions of Aeronautics, Local Assistance, Mass Transportation, Rail, Transportation Planning, Transportation System Information, Research and Innovation, and Transportation Programming:

- Ensure incorporation of bicycle, pedestrian, and transit travel elements in all Department transportation plans and studies.
- Support interdisciplinary participation within and between districts in the project development process to provide for the needs of all users.
- Encourage local agencies to include bicycle, pedestrian, and transit elements in regional and local planning documents, including general plans, transportation plans, and circulation elements.
- Promote land uses that encourage bicycle, pedestrian, and transit travel.
- Advocate, partner, and collaborate with stakeholders to address the needs of bicycle, pedestrian, and transit travelers in all program areas.
- Support the development of new technology to improve safety, mobility, and access for bicyclists, pedestrians, and transit users of all ages and abilities.
- Research, develop, and implement multimodal performance measures.
- Provide information to staff, local agencies, and stakeholders on available funding programs to address the needs of bicycle, pedestrian, and transit travelers.

Chiefs, Divisions of Traffic Operations, Maintenance, Environmental Analysis, Design, Construction, and Project Management:

- Provide guidance on project design, operation, and maintenance of work zones to safely accommodate bicyclists, pedestrians, and transit users.
- Ensure the transportation system and facilities are planned, constructed, operated, and maintained consistent with project type and funding program to maximize safety and mobility for all users with legal access.
- Promote and incorporate, on an ongoing basis, guidance, procedures, and product reviews that maximize bicycle, pedestrian, and transit safety and mobility.
- Support multidisciplinary district participation in the project development process to provide for the needs of all users.

Employees:

- Follow and recommend improvements to manuals, guidance, and procedures that maximize safety and mobility for all users in all transportation products and activities.
- Promote awareness of bicycle, pedestrian, and transit needs to develop an integrated, multimodal transportation system.
- Maximize bicycle, pedestrian, and transit safety and mobility through each project’s life cycle.

**APPLICABILITY**

All departmental employees.

"Caltrans improves mobility across California"
"Caltrans improves mobility across California"
Purpose

The United States Department of Transportation (DOT) is providing this Policy Statement to reflect the Department’s support for the development of fully integrated active transportation networks. The establishment of well-connected walking and bicycling networks is an important component for livable communities, and their design should be a part of Federal-aid project developments. Walking and bicycling foster safer, more livable, family-friendly communities; promote physical activity and health; and reduce vehicle emissions and fuel use. Legislation and regulations exist that require inclusion of bicycle and pedestrian policies and projects into transportation plans and project development. Accordingly, transportation agencies should plan, fund, and implement improvements to their walking and bicycling networks, including linkages to transit. In addition, DOT encourages transportation agencies to go beyond the minimum requirements, and proactively provide convenient, safe, and context-sensitive facilities that foster increased use by bicyclists and pedestrians of all ages and abilities, and utilize universal design characteristics when appropriate. Transportation programs and facilities should accommodate people of all ages and abilities, including people too young to drive, people who cannot drive, and people who choose not to drive.
**Policy Statement**

The DOT policy is to incorporate safe and convenient walking and bicycling facilities into transportation projects. Every transportation agency, including DOT, has the responsibility to improve conditions and opportunities for walking and bicycling and to integrate walking and bicycling into their transportation systems. Because of the numerous individual and community benefits that walking and bicycling provide — including health, safety, environmental, transportation, and quality of life — transportation agencies are encouraged to go beyond minimum standards to provide safe and convenient facilities for these modes.

**Authority**

This policy is based on various sections in the United States Code (U.S.C.) and the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) in Title 23—Highways, Title 49—Transportation, and Title 42—The Public Health and Welfare. These sections, provided in the Appendix, describe how bicyclists and pedestrians of all abilities should be involved throughout the planning process, should not be adversely affected by other transportation projects, and should be able to track annual obligations and expenditures on nonmotorized transportation facilities.

**Recommended Actions**

The DOT encourages States, local governments, professional associations, community organizations, public transportation agencies, and other government agencies, to adopt similar policy statements on bicycle and pedestrian accommodation as an indication of their commitment to accommodating bicyclists and pedestrians as an integral element of the transportation system. In support of this commitment, transportation agencies and local communities should go beyond minimum design standards and requirements to create safe, attractive, sustainable, accessible, and convenient bicycling and walking networks. Such actions should include:

- Considering walking and bicycling as equals with other transportation modes: The primary goal of a transportation system is to safely and efficiently move people and goods. Walking and bicycling are efficient transportation modes for most short trips and, where convenient intermodal systems exist, these nonmotorized trips can easily be linked with transit to significantly increase trip distance. Because of the benefits they provide, transportation agencies should give the same priority to walking and bicycling as is given to other transportation modes. Walking and bicycling should not be an afterthought in roadway design.

- Ensuring that there are transportation choices for people of all ages and abilities, especially children: Pedestrian and bicycle facilities should meet accessibility requirements and provide safe, convenient, and interconnected transportation networks. For example, children should have safe and convenient options for walking or bicycling to school and parks. People who cannot or prefer not to drive should have safe and efficient transportation choices.
• Going beyond minimum design standards: Transportation agencies are encouraged, when possible, to avoid designing walking and bicycling facilities to the minimum standards. For example, shared-use paths that have been designed to minimum width requirements will need retrofits as more people use them. It is more effective to plan for increased usage than to retrofit an older facility. Planning projects for the long-term should anticipate likely future demand for bicycling and walking facilities and not preclude the provision of future improvements.

• Integrating bicycle and pedestrian accommodation on new, rehabilitated, and limited-access bridges: DOT encourages bicycle and pedestrian accommodation on bridge projects including facilities on limited-access bridges with connections to streets or paths.

• Collecting data on walking and biking trips: The best way to improve transportation networks for any mode is to collect and analyze trip data to optimize investments. Walking and bicycling trip data for many communities are lacking. This data gap can be overcome by establishing routine collection of nonmotorized trip information. Communities that routinely collect walking and bicycling data are able to track trends and prioritize investments to ensure the success of new facilities. These data are also valuable in linking walking and bicycling with transit.

• Setting mode share targets for walking and bicycling and tracking them over time: A byproduct of improved data collection is that communities can establish targets for increasing the percentage of trips made by walking and bicycling.

• Removing snow from sidewalks and shared-use paths: Current maintenance provisions require pedestrian facilities built with Federal funds to be maintained in the same manner as other roadway assets. State Agencies have generally established levels of service on various routes especially as related to snow and ice events.

• Improving nonmotorized facilities during maintenance projects: Many transportation agencies spend most of their transportation funding on maintenance rather than on constructing new facilities. Transportation agencies should find ways to make facility improvements for pedestrians and bicyclists during resurfacing and other maintenance projects.

Conclusion

Increased commitment to and investment in bicycle facilities and walking networks can help meet goals for cleaner, healthier air; less congested roadways; and more livable, safe, cost-efficient communities. Walking and bicycling provide low-cost mobility options that place fewer demands on local roads and highways. DOT recognizes that safe and convenient walking and bicycling facilities may look different depending on the context — appropriate facilities in a rural community may be different from a dense, urban area. However, regardless of regional, climate, and population density differences, it is important that pedestrian and bicycle facilities be integrated into transportation systems. While DOT leads the effort to provide safe and convenient accommodations for pedestrians and bicyclists, success will ultimately depend on transportation agencies across the country embracing and implementing this policy.

Ray LaHood, United States Secretary of Transportation
APPENDIX

Key Statutes and Regulations Regarding Walking and Bicycling

Planning Requirements

The State and Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) planning regulations describe how walking and bicycling are to be accommodated throughout the planning process (e.g., see 23 CFR 450.200, 23 CFR 450.300, 23 U.S.C. 134(h), and 135(d)). Nonmotorists must be allowed to participate in the planning process and transportation agencies are required to integrate walking and bicycling facilities and programs in their transportation plans to ensure the operability of an intermodal transportation system. Key sections from the U.S.C. and CFR include, with italics added for emphasis:

- The scope of the metropolitan planning process "will address the following factors…(2) Increase the safety for motorized and **non-motorized users**; (3) Increase the security of the transportation system for motorized and **non-motorized users**; (4) Protect and enhance the environment, promote energy conservation, improve the quality of life…" 23 CFR 450.306(a). See 23 CFR 450.206 for similar State requirements.
- Metropolitan transportation plans "…shall, at a minimum, include…existing and proposed transportation facilities (including major roadways, transit, multimodal and intermodal facilities, pedestrian walkways and bicycle facilities, and intermodal connectors that should function as an integrated metropolitan transportation system…" 23 CFR 450.322(f). See 23 CFR 450.216(g) for similar State requirements.
- The plans and transportation improvement programs (TIPs) of all metropolitan areas "shall provide for the development and integrated management and operation of transportation systems and facilities (including accessible pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities)." 23 U.S.C. 134(c)(2) and 49 U.S.C. 5303(c)(2). 23 CFR 450.324(c) states that the TIP "shall include …trails projects, pedestrian walkways; and bicycle facilities…"
- 23 CFR 450.316(a) states that "The MPOs shall develop and use a documented participation plan that defines a process for providing…representatives of users of pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities, and representatives of the disabled, and other interested parties with reasonable opportunities to be involved in the metropolitan planning process." 23 CFR 450.210(a) contains similar language for States. See also 23 U.S.C. 134(i)(5), 135(f)(3), 49 U.S.C. 5303(i)(5), and 5304(f)(3) for additional information about participation by interested parties.
Prohibition of Route Severance

The Secretary has the authority to withhold approval for projects that would negatively impact pedestrians and bicyclists under certain circumstances. Key references in the CFR and U.S.C. include:

- "The Secretary shall not approve any project or take any regulatory action under this title that will result in the severance of an existing major route or have significant adverse impact on the safety for nonmotorized transportation traffic and light motorcycles, unless such project or regulatory action provides for a reasonable alternate route or such a route exists." 23 U.S.C. 109(m).
- "In any case where a highway bridge deck being replaced or rehabilitated with Federal financial participation is located on a highway on which bicycles are permitted to operate at each end of such bridge, and the Secretary determines that the safe accommodation of bicycles can be provided at reasonable cost as part of such replacement or rehabilitation, then such bridge shall be so replaced or rehabilitated as to provide such safe accommodations." 23 U.S.C. 217(e). Although this statutory requirement only mentions bicycles, DOT encourages States and local governments to apply this same policy to pedestrian facilities as well.
- 23 CFR 652 provides "procedures relating to the provision of pedestrian and bicycle accommodations on Federal-aid projects, and Federal participation in the cost of these accommodations and projects."

Project Documentation

- "In metropolitan planning areas, on an annual basis, no later than 90 calendar days following the end of the program year, the State, public transportation operator(s), and the MPO shall cooperatively develop a listing of projects (including investments in pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities) for which funds under 23 U.S.C. or 49 U.S.C. Chapter 53 were obligated in the preceding program year." 23 CFR 332(a).

Accessibility for All Pedestrians

- Public rights-of-way and facilities are required to be accessible to persons with disabilities through the following statutes: Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (Section 504) (29 U.S.C. §794) and Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA) (42 U.S.C. §§ 12131-12164).
- The DOT Section 504 regulation requires the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) to monitor the compliance of the self-evaluation and transition plans of Federal-aid recipients (49 CFR §27.11). The FHWA Division offices review pedestrian access compliance with the ADA and Section 504 as part of their routine oversight activities as defined in their stewardship plans.
- FHWA posted its Clarification of FHWA's Oversight Role in Accessibility to explain how to accommodate accessibility in policy, planning, and projects.
Selected Regional and National Complete Streets Resources


National Complete Streets Coalition: [www.smartgrowthamerica.org/complete-streets](http://www.smartgrowthamerica.org/complete-streets)


2050 REGIONAL PLAN WORK PROGRAM: IMPLEMENTING
COMMITMENTS FROM THE 2050 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN/
SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES STRATEGY - LAND USE AND
TRANSPORTATION SCENARIOS AND GREENHOUSE GAS
TARGET SETTING

Introduction

The 2050 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (2050 RTP/SCS), adopted by the SANDAG Board of Directors in October 2011, included several implementation actions and commitments. These actions and commitments have been incorporated into the work program of the 2050 Regional Plan, the new combined plan that will merge the update of the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) with the update of the next RTP/SCS. The proposal to integrate these two plans was approved by the SANDAG Board of Directors in May 2012. The TWG, along with other working groups, received an introductory report last month for review and input on the draft work plan and public involvement plan for the new Regional Plan.

One of the commitments included in the 2050 RTP/SCS, and now included in the work program of the Regional Plan, is the preparation of alternative land use and transportation scenarios that could further reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, including the evaluation of potential parking strategies. Funding for this project has been obtained from the state of California Strategic Growth Council (SGC).

The purpose of this report is to initiate the dialogue with SANDAG working groups, Policy Advisory Committees and regional stakeholders about the land use and transportation scenarios, and the role of the scenarios in the next GHG emission target-setting process as part of the RTP/SCS update, as required by Senate Bill 375 (SB 375) (Steinberg, 2008). SB 375 went into effect in 2009 and added statutes to the California Government Code to encourage planning practices that create sustainable communities and reduce GHG emissions from cars and light trucks.

TWG is requested to provide input on the proposed key tasks outlined in this report.

Background

The development of alternative land use and transportation scenarios is proposed to test strategies that could result in further reductions of GHG emissions beyond those forecasted in the 2050 RTP/SCS.
GHG Emission Reduction Targets and Projected Reductions per 2050 RTP/SCS

The 2050 RTP/SCS contained two targets to reduce GHG emissions from cars and light trucks on a per capita basis from 2005 levels. These targets were established by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) in the target-setting consultation process, as called for in SB 375. As shown in Table 1, the first target was to reduce GHG emissions by seven percent by 2020, and the second was to reduce GHG emissions by thirteen percent by 2035. The modeling and analysis in the 2050 RTP/SCS indicated that the plan met these two targets, achieving reductions of 14 percent by 2020 and 13 percent by 2035. Although no target was set by CARB for 2050 (the horizon year for the 2050 RTP/SCS), the plan anticipated GHG emission reductions of ten percent by 2050.

Table 1: 2050 RTP/SCS: Results of GHG Emissions - Average Weekday Per Capita CO2 for Cars and Light Trucks from 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Year</th>
<th>CARB Reduction Target</th>
<th>GHG Emission Reductions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2050</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Forecasting and Modeling Efforts

Concurrent with this effort, SANDAG is also working on developing the new “Series 13” or 2050 Regional Growth Forecast update (Forecast) and new land use and transportation models (including PECAS and the Activity Based Model), which are anticipated to be ready by summer 2013.

Initial work on defining the scenario assumptions will begin in early 2013, and scenario testing will begin in summer 2013, when the Series 13 Forecast and new modeling tools will be available. Through this planning process, SANDAG expects to prepare three to four scenarios, and anticipates that all scenario testing, analysis, and refinement will be completed by February 2014, so that the results can be used to help develop the Revenue Constrained Transportation Network Scenarios.

Proposed Key Tasks

The following are the proposed major tasks to develop the alternative scenarios.

1. **Scope of Work.** Develop and refine the scope of work and schedule for the alternative land use and transportation scenarios and initiate the procurement process for planning and modeling consultant assistance. Generally, the scope of work is anticipated to include developing land use assumptions, transportation assumptions (including parking strategies),

---

1Page 3-3 of the SANDAG 2050 RTP/SCS states, “The 2050 horizon year extends well beyond the target years of 2020 and 2035 outlined in SB 375. So what happens beyond 2035? While growth will continue in the region, after the urbanized areas have been developed according to current local general plans, development could gradually move toward more remote areas where fewer transportation options are available if local plans are not changed. The growth forecast shows this happening simply because most local general plans have a horizon year prior to 2050. Although, it is expected that local plans will be updated and revised between now and 2050 to reflect more development in the urbanized areas of the region, based on current plans, the projected growth beyond 2040 would likely result in an increased demand for driving. The results for 2050 are best estimates based on historical and current empirical observations in the region and do not reflect future attitude changes about transportation and where people will choose to live and work as a result of significant investments in transportation options. In addition, the GHG modeling for 2050 uses emission factors for the year 2040 (EMFAC 2007 includes emissions factors through 2040 only) and assumes no technological improvements to vehicles or fuels in the final ten years of the plan (this is due to the lack of accepted published data beyond 2040).”
indicators for testing the scenarios, public outreach mechanisms, visualization tools, and assistance with policy development resulting from the scenarios.

2. **Input on Land Use and Transportation Concepts and Indicators.** Solicit input from the SANDAG Board, Policy Advisory Committees, working groups, and other stakeholders to define specific land use and transportation assumptions that could be tested, and indicators by which the scenarios will be evaluated. It is assumed that three to four scenarios would be developed and analysis would be based on approximately ten primary indicators. The development of the land use and transportation assumptions and associated indicators would happen through regularly-scheduled SANDAG meetings, public workshops, and other outreach mechanisms currently being developed as part of the Regional Plan Public Involvement Plan (PIP).

3. **Scenario Analysis.** Model, test, evaluate, and refine the scenarios based on feedback from the SANDAG Board, Policy Advisory Committees, working groups, and other stakeholders. This would result in a report and/or graphic images summarizing the performance of the alternative scenarios and a list of proposed refinements for next round of scenario testing.

4. **Scenario Refinement and Finalization, and Integration into Related Efforts.** Refine and finalize the scenarios for use in selecting alternative Revenue Constrained Transportation Networks of the Regional Plan, and for developing potential supporting policies for consideration in the Regional Plan. This would result in a report summarizing the performance of the refined scenarios and analysis of how the scenario results could be considered in the development of the Revenue Constrained Transportation Networks of the Regional Plan and potential supporting policies.

Attached as background information is a report to the SANDAG Board prepared in 2010 regarding the scenario testing that occurred as part of the GHG emission target-setting process related to SB 375. Attachment 1 of the report summarizes the alternative scenarios that were prepared as part of that effort.

**Next Steps**

Per the draft work program presented last month, the Regional Planning and Transportation Committees will serve as the primary Policy Advisory Committees for the development of the Regional Plan and the alternative scenarios. The Cities-County Transportation Advisory Committee, TWG, and the Regional Housing Working Group will serve as the primary working groups in the scenario development process. Workshops and other public involvement mechanisms on the scenarios, in combination with other related topics (such as the Regional Transit Oriented Development Strategy, the Complete Streets Policy, and other issue areas), are anticipated during the planning timeframe.


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

SANDAG is in the process of developing its first Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) subject to the provisions of Senate Bill 375 (SB 375) (Steinberg, 2008). The 2050 RTP is scheduled for Board adoption in summer 2011. At the March Board of Directors Policy meeting, SANDAG staff provided an overview of the SB 375 implementation efforts currently underway. Staff outlined the status of the greenhouse gas (GHG) target-setting process as outlined by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) through the Regional Targets Advisory Committee (RTAC), and the approach to testing various planning scenarios to determine the effects of GHG reduction strategies on emissions.

Discussion

Baseline RTP Analysis

SANDAG staff, in coordination with the other metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs) in the state and the staff from CARB, has prepared an analysis of adopted RTPs to determine the base year (2005) per capita GHG emissions from the transportation sector (cars and light-duty trucks), as well as projected GHG per capita emissions in the years 2020 and 2035 – the target years outlined in SB 375. For SANDAG, the 2030 RTP, adopted in November 2007, is being used to evaluate this “base case” scenario. In addition, staffs at SANDAG and the other MPOs have developed alternative scenarios for evaluation that would include new and expanded strategies that could lead to reduced per capita GHG emissions as compared to the base case. It is anticipated that the results from any analysis performed will be provided to CARB staff for its consideration in recommending GHG emission targets for the transportation sector later this year. The SANDAG base case scenario (2005 per capita GHG emissions), as expressed from data in the 2030 RTP, and estimates for the target years 2020 and 2035 are outlined in Table 1.

1 While the information in Table 1 is based on Revenue Constrained transportation network from the 2030 RTP, it has been processed through the SANDAG four-step transportation model, which includes enhancements that were not available at the time the 2030 RTP was adopted. In addition, assumptions for the price of fuel and the trips that originate outside of the region and pass through the region to a destination outside of the region were not included in the numbers. Finally, the data relies on the recently completed 2050 Regional Growth Forecast.
Table 1 – SANDAG Greenhouse Gas Emissions
(Average Weekday Pounds Per Capita CO₂ Emissions from Passenger Vehicles and Light-Duty Trucks)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current Plan</th>
<th>Percentage Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005 Base Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>-8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>-5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From 2005 to 2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From 2005 to 2035</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The per capita emissions in 2020 are lower than the 2005 base case due to balanced transportation capital investments and balanced growth in jobs and housing throughout the region. However, per capita emissions increase from 2020 to 2035 due in part to a disparity in employment growth and housing growth that begins to emerge after 2020 as employment clusters in the South Bay and North County Inland areas grow more rapidly than housing. In addition, there is more funding available for capital improvements through 2020 than is available between 2020 and 2035.

SB 375 Scenario Testing Status

In March, SANDAG staff outlined three scenarios that the four largest MPOs (Southern California Association of Governments, Association of Bay Area Governments/Metropolitan Transportation Commission, SANDAG, and the Sacramento Area Council of Governments) agreed to test against their adopted RTPs. SANDAG also evaluated these three scenarios against two land use assumptions to evaluate the effects development patterns could have on GHG reduction. The first land use scenario that was evaluated includes the 2050 Regional Growth Forecast land uses recently accepted by the Board of Directors. The second land use scenario involved the intensified density assumptions for the ‘Urban Center’ and ‘Town Center’ place types identified on the SANDAG Smart Growth Concept Map. In addition, SANDAG assumed the areas listed as ‘potential’ smart growth areas are built out at the minimum density for that place type. The three scenarios are briefly described below.

System Efficiency and Transportation Demand Management

This scenario would focus on reducing GHG emissions through the implementation of Transportation Demand Management (TDM) and System Efficiency measures. Such measures include congestion relief at identified traffic bottlenecks, telecommuting, expanding ridesharing options, including enhancements to the vanpool program, the bus pool program with the military, and implementing Safe Routes to Schools strategies.

Systems Development

This alternative would focus on expansion of the regional transit system improvements and bicycle/pedestrian systems development to reduce vehicle trips in the San Diego region.

Pricing

This scenario would focus primarily on pricing as a strategy to reduce the demand on the transportation system. This scenario would evaluate the effect of adding additional high-occupancy toll (HOT) lanes to the regional transportation system, and operating this network in a manner that would optimize demand for transit and ridesharing in these corridors. In addition, this scenario
would evaluate the effectiveness of implementing a vehicle miles traveled (VMT) fee, which would increase the cost of driving. Finally, this scenario would include a parking pricing measure that would expand the requirement for private vehicles to pay for parking in certain locations. This scenario is similar in scope to one that was evaluated last year by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission for the San Francisco Bay Area, in conjunction with the update of its most recent RTP.

The three scenarios were developed to assess the effects of various bundles of measures and their ability to reduce GHG emissions. These scenarios were not developed with the same revenue constraints that are used to develop the RTP, only to assess how emissions could be reduced by assembling different GHG reduction measures. The revenue projections that will be used to determine investment levels that can be made in the RTP development are currently being prepared. Once the revenue projections are completed, SANDAG staff will use those projections to further refine these scenarios and to compile a hybrid scenario, based on input provided by the Board of Directors and the measures that perform the best in the scenario testing process. These scenarios, the funding assumptions to develop them, and their results will be submitted to CARB for their use in the target-setting process. After a draft target is issued to SANDAG on June 30, staff will continue to work with CARB and submit feedback on SANDAG’s ability to meet the proposed target. Table 2 includes the results of the scenario testing process.

Table 2 – SANDAG Greenhouse Gas Emissions Scenario Testing
(Average Weekday Pounds Per Capita CO₂ Emissions from Passenger Vehicles and Light-Duty Trucks and Percentage Change from 2005 Baseline)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2005 Baseline = 26.0 CO₂ lbs / person</th>
<th>Series 11 Revenue Constrained</th>
<th>Operations: System Efficiency &amp; TDM (Scenario A)</th>
<th>Development: System Development (Scenario B)</th>
<th>Pricing (Scenario C)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2050 Regional Growth Forecast</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-8.8%</td>
<td>-11.9%</td>
<td>-10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2035</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-5.4%</td>
<td>-9.2%</td>
<td>-7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2050 Regional Growth Forecast + All Urban &amp; Town Center Existing to Max Density Potential to Min Density</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-9.2%</td>
<td>-12.7%</td>
<td>-10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2035</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-6.2%</td>
<td>-10.4%</td>
<td>-8.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Due to existing modeling capabilities, budgetary constraints, and the fact that SANDAG will be migrating to a new transportation model that will be available for development of the next RTP (to be adopted in 2015), some GHG reduction measures cannot be modeled in the same way as the ones that are included in the scenarios outlined above. SANDAG is continuing to support implementation of additional measures despite the fact that they cannot be included in the GHG target-setting process. These additional measures are programs that are currently being implemented in the region for GHG reduction and other desirable outcomes. These measures include:
• Electric vehicle deployment
• Eco-driving\(^2\)

**Performance Measures**

While the scenario testing process is being refined to determine the effects of the various scenarios on GHG reduction, further analysis would be required if any of these measures were to be adopted as part of the 2050 RTP. In addition, staff will be presenting the Board of Directors with an initial set of performance measures to provide context beyond GHG emission reduction. In addition to GHG emission numbers, staff will provide the Board of Directors with additional performance measures consistent with the adopted RTP policy goals and objectives.

• Mobility
• Reliability
• System Preservation & Safety

• Social Equity
• Healthy Environment
• Prosperous Economy

The Board of Directors will be presented with options for achieving the GHG reduction targets as the development of the RTP proceeds. The development of the 2050 RTP will include considerations for meeting all the goals established by the Board of Directors.

**Next Steps**

Over the next several weeks, SANDAG staff will continue to participate in the SB 375 GHG target-setting process with CARB, Caltrans, and other MPOs in the state and will regularly report on progress to the Board of Directors and appropriate Policy Advisory Committees. SANDAG recently completed a set of five workshops to solicit input on the development of the RTP and to inform the public about the progress of the GHG target-setting process. In addition, staff solicited comments on the preparation of the environmental impact report for the 2050 RTP.

Staff will continue to seek direction from the SANDAG Board of Directors and Policy Advisory Committees and input from the public on this process throughout the development of the 2050 RTP and its SCS through regular meetings and public outreach activities. While the SB 375 target-setting process does allow MPOs to submit a target for CARB to consider, it is proposed to submit the results of the scenario development process to CARB and work with their staff after the draft target is set to ensure the target is both “ambitious and achievable,” in accordance with the RTAC recommendations.

---

\(^2\) Eco-driving includes driver education and driving techniques that can reduce fuel consumption, accident rates, and GHG emissions.
## Schedule for SB 375 Target-Setting Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Submit final target-setting analysis to CARB staff</td>
<td>SANDAG</td>
<td>Early June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommend draft targets to CARB Board</td>
<td>CARB staff</td>
<td>June 30, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide comments on draft targets</td>
<td>MPOs</td>
<td>July-September 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approve final targets</td>
<td>CARB</td>
<td>September 30, 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GARY L. GALLEGOS  
Executive Director

**Attachments were not ready at the time of mailout and will be sent out under separate cover when completed.**

Key Staff Contact: Rob Rundle, (619) 699-6949, rru@sandag.org
## Scenario Categories & Measures

### System Efficiency & TDM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario Categories &amp; Measures</th>
<th>Existing RTP Level of Deployment</th>
<th>On Model/Off Model</th>
<th>2020 Level of Deployment</th>
<th>2035 Level of Deployment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bottleneck relief projects</td>
<td>Revenue Constrained highway network</td>
<td>On</td>
<td>2020 Revenue Constrained highway network updated to include 17 additional projects:</td>
<td>2030 Revenue Constrained highway network with 17 additional projects noted in the 2020 Level of Deployment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Plaza Bl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fletcher Pkwy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Centre City Pkwy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Valley Pkwy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Texas St/Mission Ctr</td>
<td></td>
<td>Capacity Improvements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>University Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aux Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-52 (AM/PM)</td>
<td>Mast Blvd</td>
<td></td>
<td>Interchange Improvements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>49th St.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aux Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>B St.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aux Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Barham Dr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aux Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Governor Dr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aux Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>La Jolla Village Dr</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aux Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Manchester Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aux Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>5th Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aux Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2 Telecommuting/flexible/alternative work schedules</td>
<td>On</td>
<td>30% of daily white-collar work trip reduction</td>
<td>Same as 2020 deployment level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>5% daily white-collar worker trip reduction</td>
<td>Off</td>
<td>175% increase in number of vanpools by 2035 (1,814 vans up from 662)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Projected 20% vanpool increase by 2010 already achieved</td>
<td>Off</td>
<td>75% increase in number of vanpools by 2020 (1,124 vans up from 662)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>10% increase in walk/bike school trips (159,775 trips up from 145,250) by 2020</td>
<td>Off</td>
<td>20% increase in walk/bike school trips (179,542 trips up from 149,618) by 2035</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>70% increase in number of carpoolers (214,724 carpoolers up from 126,587 carpoolers) from 2010 to 2020</td>
<td>Off</td>
<td>144% increase in number of carpoolers (309,342 carpoolers up from 126,587 carpoolers) from 2010 to 2035</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Buspool participation of 1% military personnel (1,482 buspoolers) by 2020</td>
<td>Off</td>
<td>Buspool participation of 40% military personnel (41,708 buspoolers) by 2035</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2020 Level of Deployment

- **I-805 NB**: Plaza Bl Aux Lane
- **I-8 WB**: Fletcher Pkwy Aux Lane
- **I-15 SB**: Centre City Pkwy Aux Lane
- **I-15 SB**: Valley Pkwy Aux Lane
- **I-8 WB**: Texas St/Mission Ctr Capacity Improvements
- **I-805 NB**: University Ave Aux Lane
- **SR-52 (AM/PM)**: Mast Blvd Interchange Improvements
- **SR-94 WB**: 49th St. Aux Lane
- **I-5 NB**: B St. Aux Lane
- **SR-78 EB/WB (AM/PM)**: Barham Dr. Aux Lane
- **I-805 SB**: Governor Dr. Aux Lane
- **I-805 NB**: La Jolla Village Dr Aux Lane
- **I-5 SB**: 29th St. Aux Lane
- **I-5 NB**: Manchester Ave Aux Lane
- **I-5 SB**: 5th Ave Aux Lane

### 2035 Level of Deployment

- **I-805 NB**: Plaza Bl Aux Lane
- **I-8 WB**: Fletcher Pkwy Aux Lane
- **I-15 SB**: Centre City Pkwy Aux Lane
- **I-15 SB**: Valley Pkwy Aux Lane
- **I-8 WB**: Texas St/Mission Ctr Capacity Improvements
- **I-805 NB**: University Ave Aux Lane
- **SR-52 (AM/PM)**: Mast Blvd Interchange Improvements
- **SR-94 WB**: 49th St. Aux Lane
- **I-5 NB**: B St. Aux Lane
- **SR-78 EB/WB (AM/PM)**: Barham Dr. Aux Lane
- **I-805 SB**: Governor Dr. Aux Lane
- **I-805 NB**: La Jolla Village Dr Aux Lane
- **I-5 SB**: 29th St. Aux Lane
- **I-5 NB**: Manchester Ave Aux Lane
- **I-5 SB**: 5th Ave Aux Lane
### Scenario Categories & Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Systems Development</th>
<th>Existing RTP Level of Deployment</th>
<th>On Model/Off Model</th>
<th>2020 Level of Deployment</th>
<th>2035 Level of Deployment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Transit system improvements</td>
<td>Revenue Constrained transit network</td>
<td>On</td>
<td>2020 Reasonably Expected transit network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Transit station park-and-ride facilities</td>
<td>Revenue Constrained park-and-ride network</td>
<td>On</td>
<td>Model was allowed to unconstrain number of park-and-ride spaces at suburban lots and transit stations (3,500 additional spaces utilized above 16,800 in the 2020 Revenue Constrained network)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bicycle network facilities</td>
<td>Not included in RTP assumptions</td>
<td>Off</td>
<td>Test full deployment of regional bicycle network (2035 network reduced by 50% to estimate 2020 time period) (280,031 bike trips)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Pedestrian network facilities</td>
<td>Not included in RTP assumptions</td>
<td>Off</td>
<td>10% increase in all walk trips by 2020 (494,203 walk trips up from 449,275)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Pricing

| HOV & HOT lanes | 2030 Revenue Constrained highway network: Managed Lanes (ML) on I-15, I-5, SR 52 and portions of I-805 HOV Lanes on I-5, SR 52, SR 94 and portions of I-805 | On | 2020 Reasonably Expected highway network including the following enhancements over the Revenue Constrained plan: SR 94 from I-805 to SR 125: +2HOV | 2030 Reasonably Expected highway network including the following enhancements over the Revenue Constrained plan: I-5 from SR 905 to SR 54: +2HOV I-5 from SR 54 to I-8: +2HOV SR 78 from I-15 to I-15: +2HOV SR 94/SR 125 from I-805 to I-8: +2HOV I-805 from SR 905 to I-5: +4ML |
| VMT fee* | Not included in RTP assumptions | On | Increase by 8 cents per mile (2005 base year fuel assumption is 17.4 cents per mile). | Same as 2020 deployment level |
| Regional parking pricing program | RTP model 5 zone parking: Zone 5 - Metropolitan Center: $8 per day Zone 4 - Urban Center: $6 per day Zone 3 - Town Center: $4 per day Zone 2 - Community Center: $1 per day Zone 1 - Other: $0 per day | On | Adjust 5 zone system pricing as follows: Zone 5 - Metropolitan Center: $24 per day Zone 4 - Urban Center: $18 per day Zone 3 - Town Center: $12 per day Zone 2 - Community Center: $1 per day Zone 1 - Other: $0 per day | Same as 2020 deployment level |

* Since the model does not tie the pricing adjustment to the policy, the VMT fee could also be stated as an increased fuel/carbon tax or for pay-as-you-drive insurance.
SERIES 13 REGIONAL GROWTH FORECAST

Introduction

A key step in updating the Regional Plan is producing the regional land use, demographic, and socioeconomic forecast that serves as the foundation for transportation alternatives analysis.

The forecast is completed through a multi-step, collaborative process that involves input from local jurisdictions, as well as review by outside experts. The forecasting process was described in detail at the February 2012 TWG meeting. This report provides a status update.

Discussion

For the Series 13 Regional Growth Forecast, SANDAG will be using a series of interrelated models: (1) the Demographic and Economic Forecasting Model (DEFM), (2) the Production Exchange Consumption Allocation System (PECAS), (3) a detailed demographic forecast (PASEF and PopSyn), and (4) the Activity Based Transportation Model (ABM).

In March, SANDAG staff began working with the region’s 18 cities and the County of San Diego to collect land use inputs that will inform the Series 13 Regional Growth Forecast. To date SANDAG staff has contacted each jurisdiction and have received preliminary zoning files back from half of the jurisdictions.

In addition to the zoning information collected over the summer, SANDAG staff will begin working with local jurisdictions to ensure that general plans, land use constraints, and permitted “site spec” projects are up to date in the forecast inventory.

The complete forecast schedule is described in more detail below.

Regionwide Forecast

This summer SANDAG staff updated the demographic and economic history and assumptions that drive the regionwide forecast. This update included data from Census 2010 and the most current information on housing units, jobs, income, and other factors.

The preliminary regionwide forecast is under internal review and is expected to be presented to the TWG later this year.
Local Land Use Plans

Local land use agencies will be asked to use an online review tool to review existing land use, general plan land use designations, planned density, and site-specific project information. This process is similar to the printed map review that was used in prior forecasts, but offers three major advantages:

- Jurisdictions will have the ability to zoom in or out to look at map details and will have a variety of map “layers” that can be turned on or off. This system offers greater flexibility to the reviewer than static printed maps.
- The online process will save both time and paper compared with the printed maps used in prior forecast updates.
- The turnaround time for reviewing, transmitting edit comments to SANDAG, and verifying the edits will be greatly reduced.

Constraints to Development

SANDAG staff has developed a GIS model for taking the following land use constraints into account:

- Habitat preserve areas including:
  - Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) South hardline preserves
  - Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) North hardline preserves
  - Multiple Habitat Conservation Program (MHCP) hardline preserves
  - Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA) hardline preserves
  - SANDAG Conserved Lands
- Steep slope areas: areas with slopes greater than 25%
- Wetlands: areas identified as wetlands in the National Wetland Inventory
- FEMA 100 year Floodplains and floodways
- Williamson Act Agriculture Preserve Lands

This GIS model will utilize these constraints in order to calculate the percentage of constrained area and effective developable area for each parcel.

Staff will work with each jurisdiction to ensure that the constraints are applied in accordance with local regulations so that land are appropriately constrained but are not inadvertently “double constrained” as may occur when planned density ranges already take constraints into account.

Proposed Schedule for the Series 13 Forecast

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2012</td>
<td>Collected and updated land use information from jurisdictions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring/Summer 2012</td>
<td>Began development of regionwide forecast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2012/Winter</td>
<td>Develop regional housing, jobs, and square footage capacity estimates for the region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review capacity assumptions with jurisdictions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expert review of regionwide forecast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter/Spring 2013</td>
<td>Run subregional forecast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jurisdiction review of subregional forecast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2013</td>
<td>Draft forecast (regional and subregional)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next Steps

In coming months jurisdictions will be asked to review land use plan and zoning information for use in the Series 13 Regional Growth Forecast. SANDAG requests that each jurisdiction review the information in detail to identify any discrepancies between the draft information provided and existing and/or planned land uses.

Key Staff Contacts: Beth Jarosz, (619) 699-6997, Beth.Jarosz@sandag.org
                Kirby Brady, (619) 699-6924, Kirby.Brady@sandag.org