AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

- SAN DIEGO FORWARD: THE REGIONAL PLAN: DRAFT TRANSPORTATION PROJECT EVALUATION CRITERIA

PLEASE TURN OFF CELL PHONES DURING THE MEETING

YOU CAN LISTEN TO THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING BY VISITING OUR WEBSITE AT WWW.SANDAG.ORG

MESSAGE FROM THE CLERK

In compliance with Government Code §54952.3, the Clerk hereby announces that the compensation for legislative body members attending the following simultaneous or serial meetings is: Executive Committee (EC) $100, Board of Directors (BOD) $150, and Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) $100. Compensation rates for the EC and BOD are set pursuant to the SANDAG Bylaws and the compensation rate for the RTC is set pursuant to state law.

MISSION STATEMENT

The 18 cities and county government are SANDAG serving as the forum for regional decision-making. SANDAG builds consensus, makes strategic plans, obtains and allocates resources, plans, engineers, and builds public transit, and provides information on a broad range of topics pertinent to the region's quality of life.
Welcome to SANDAG. Members of the public may speak to the Board of Directors on any item at the time the Board is considering the item. Please complete a Speaker’s Slip, which is located in the rear of the room, and then present the slip to the Clerk of the Board seated at the front table. Members of the public may address the Board on any issue under the agenda item entitled Public Comments/Communications/Member Comments. Public speakers are limited to three minutes or less per person. The Board of Directors may take action on any item appearing on the agenda.

Public comments regarding the agenda can be sent to SANDAG via comment@sandag.org. Please include the agenda item, your name, and your organization. Email comments should be received no later than 12 noon, two working days prior to the Board of Directors meeting. Any handouts, presentations, or other materials from the public intended for distribution at the Board of Directors meeting should be received by the Clerk of the Board no later than 12 noon, two working days prior to the meeting.

In order to keep the public informed in an efficient manner and facilitate public participation, SANDAG also provides access to all agenda and meeting materials online at www.sandag.org/meetings. Additionally, interested persons can sign up for e-notifications via our e-distribution list at either the SANDAG website or by sending an email request to webmaster@sandag.org.

SANDAG operates its programs without regard to race, color, and national origin in compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act. SANDAG has developed procedures for investigating and tracking Title VI complaints and the procedures for filing a complaint are available to the public upon request. Questions concerning SANDAG nondiscrimination obligations or complaint procedures should be directed to SANDAG General Counsel, John Kirk, at (619) 699-1997 or john.kirk@sandag.org. Any person who believes himself or herself or any specific class of persons to be subjected to discrimination prohibited by Title VI also may file a written complaint with the Federal Transit Administration.

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

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

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

如有需要，我们可以把SANDAG议程材料翻译成其他语言。
请在会议前至少72小时打电话（619）699-1900提出请求。

SANDAG offices are accessible by public transit. Phone 511 or see 511sd.com for route information. Bicycle parking is available in the parking garage of the SANDAG offices.
## PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

Public comments under this agenda item will be limited to five public speakers. Members of the public shall have the opportunity to address the Board on any issue within the jurisdiction of SANDAG that is not on this agenda. Other public comments will be heard during the items under the heading “Reports.” Anyone desiring to speak shall reserve time by completing a “Request to Speak” form and giving it to the Clerk of the Board prior to speaking. Public speakers should notify the Clerk of the Board if they have a handout for distribution to Board members. Public speakers are limited to three minutes or less per person. Board members also may provide information and announcements under this agenda item.

## REPORTS (2)

### +2. SAN DIEGO FORWARD: THE REGIONAL PLAN: DRAFT TRANSPORTATION PROJECT EVALUATION CRITERIA (San Diego Council President Todd Gloria, Transportation Committee Chair; Rachel Kennedy)

In May the SANDAG Board of Directors accepted the vision and goals for San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan. SANDAG uses transportation project evaluation criteria and performance measures informed by these goals to develop the revenue constrained multimodal transportation network. The Board of Directors is asked to discuss the draft transportation project evaluation criteria and either approve the criteria or provide direction to staff on further modifications.

### 3. CONTINUED PUBLIC COMMENTS

If the five speaker limit for public comments was exceeded at the beginning of this agenda, other public comments will be taken at this time. Subjects of previous agenda items may not again be addressed under public comment.

### 4. UPCOMING MEETINGS

The next Board Business meeting is scheduled for Friday, October 25, 2013, at 9 a.m.

### 5. ADJOURNMENT
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AGENDA ITEM NO. 13-10-2
ACTION REQUESTED – DISCUSSION/POSSIBLE ACTION

SAN DIEGO FORWARD: THE REGIONAL PLAN:
DRAFT TRANSPORTATION PROJECT EVALUATION CRITERIA

File Number 3102000

Introduction

In past Regional Transportation Plans (RTPs), SANDAG has utilized transportation project evaluation criteria and performance measures informed by the plan goals as elements of a multistep process to prioritize and evaluate transportation projects in the development of the preferred revenue constrained transportation network. The Board of Directors accepted the vision and goals for San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan on May 10, 2013, which provide policy guidance for this process.

Project evaluation criteria are applied to each modal category of projects in the Unconstrained Transportation Network, which is under development. Board members are asked to discuss and provide feedback on the initial draft Transportation Project Evaluation Criteria. The draft Transportation Project Evaluation Criteria were presented to the Transportation Committee and Regional Planning Committee at their September 6, 2013, and October 4, 2013, meetings. At its October 4, 2013, meeting, the Transportation Committee recommended that the Active Transportation system connectivity criterion be modified to include a component for providing direct multimodal access. The Transportation Committee recommended the modified criteria to the Board for approval. The Regional Planning Committee did not take action on the item and requested that their input documented in Attachment 4 be shared with the Board.

Transportation Project Evaluation Criteria Development

Using the evaluation criteria from the 2050 RTP and its Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) as a starting point, staff initiated the review and refinements of the transportation project evaluation criteria for San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan in February 2013 and retained a consultant team with strong technical expertise to assist in the development of the draft criteria. Revisions to the criteria and methodologies were made to align them with the vision and goals accepted for the Regional Plan and to take advantage of the recently enhanced modeling tools: the Activity Based Model, and the economic and land use microsimulation model known as Production, Exchange, and Consumption Allocation System.
Staff received input on the draft project evaluation criteria from regional stakeholders at meetings of the Active Transportation Working Group, Cities and County Technical Advisory Committee, community-based organization partners, Freight Stakeholders Working Group, Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee (ITOC), Public Health Stakeholders Working Group, Regional Planning Technical Working Group, and the Tribal Transportation Working Group. Staff also sought input from partner agencies including Caltrans, the Metropolitan Transit System, and the North County Transit District. Input on the prioritization of transportation projects also was solicited from the public at the San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan workshops held throughout the region and at Caltrans in June and August 2013.

A peer review panel also was convened to review and assess the criteria, and to consider feedback and input that are proposed to be incorporated into the criteria. The panelists, which include experts from academia, other metropolitan planning organizations, and the private sector, met on August 22, 2013, and provided recommendations for revision and enhancement to the draft criteria (further discussed below).

**Draft Project Evaluation Criteria**

Each individual criterion is nested into the three focus areas that reflect the Regional Plan’s goals: Innovative Mobility and Planning, Healthy Environment and Communities, and Vibrant Economy. The draft Transportation Project Evaluation Criteria are included in this report as Attachment 1.

The refinements that have been incorporated in the draft project evaluation criteria for San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan can be organized into three broad areas: model enhancement-related, new criteria, and reorganized criteria. The majority of proposed changes to the draft criteria have resulted from newer capabilities of the model enhancements, which allow greater analysis of household travel. Examples of draft project evaluation criteria that have benefited from model enhancements include: provides congestion relief, serves daily trips, facilitates FasTrak/carpool/transit, pedestrian and bicycle mobility, serves Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) Smart Growth areas, provides accessibility, serves goods movement, and project cost-effectiveness. Other new modal draft criteria are proposed, including physical activity, and access to schools, recreational areas, and beaches.

Draft active transportation criteria are proposed to be included as a modal category for the first time in the Regional Plan, and were developed through similar combined efforts with local jurisdictions, partner agencies, SANDAG working groups, other stakeholders, consultants, and the general public. The majority of the draft criteria are consistent with other modal categories, including serves daily trips, safety, greenhouse gas (GHG) and pollutant emissions, serves RCP Smart Growth areas, physical activity, accessibility, and cost-effectiveness.

GHG reductions, communities of concern served by the project, and cost-effectiveness criteria have been added to the rail grade separation category to provide greater consistency of analysis across modal categories.

**Project Cost-Effectiveness Criterion**

---

1 Working with the San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan community-based organization network, staff proposes to define “Communities of Concern” as low-income (200 percent of Federal Poverty Rate), minority, seniors (75+), and single-parent households with children under 18 years of age.
A more comprehensive cost-effectiveness criterion has been proposed that builds upon the 2050 RTP/SCS method, which evaluated the person hours saved or ridership of the project relative to its capital costs and operating and maintenance costs. For the Regional Plan, the revised draft cost-effectiveness criterion proposes to monetize the travel time savings benefits as well as potentially incorporate other factors such as fuel costs, GHG emissions, smog-forming pollutants, health and physical activity, and safety, which would result in a more comprehensive cost-benefit approach. While analyses such as the proposed cost-effectiveness criterion attempt to capture the economic effects of the projects as comprehensively as possible, such analyses may not fully reflect the importance of individual factors to the project prioritization process. As a result, some components of the proposed cost-effectiveness criterion also are reflected in other proposed evaluation criteria, to capture the relative importance of these factors. Person hours saved traditionally represents the largest component of benefit-cost results. Staff received significant comments of support for the enhanced cost-effectiveness calculation from the public health and active transportation stakeholders, community-based organization partners, workshop participants, and the peer review panelists.

Proposed Project Evaluation Criteria Weightings

In early 2013, the Board of Directors provided input to frame questions for a statistically significant telephone survey intended to gauge public opinion and to inform the development of the vision and goals as the policy foundation for the Regional Plan. Based on the results of the telephone survey, the broad categories with the most support, in order of overall preference, included:

- Improving the regional economy, business climate, and local job opportunities
- Maintaining what we’ve built, including streets, highways, and public facilities
- Protecting the environment, reducing air pollution, and making better use of renewable energy sources
- Improving the transportation system to improve the flow of people and goods
- Locating future housing and new businesses near major employment centers and transit services to reduce commute times and traffic congestion

After discussion of the survey results, the Board crafted the vision and three goals for the plan: Innovative Mobility and Planning, Healthy Environment and Communities, and Vibrant Economy.

The proposed project evaluation criteria weighting allocates roughly one-third of the total possible points for each of the goal focus areas. These proposed weightings reflect the highest regional priority areas, which are nested in the accepted goals.

Therefore, the draft project evaluation criteria weightings take into account the accepted vision and goals for the Regional Plan and new criteria proposed to be added. All mode categories have a 100-point scale, with each individual criterion allocated a specified maximum score. Feedback from the ITOC, as well as other SANDAG working group members, stakeholders, and the general public, was considered during the development of the proposed criteria weightings. As a result, additional weight was given to the GHG and pollutant emissions and cost-effectiveness criteria in the active transportation evaluation criteria, providing greater consistency with weighting of these criteria across modes.
Public Outreach

Public input on the draft project evaluation criteria was solicited as part of the Regional Plan workshop series held in June 2013 throughout the San Diego region. In addition to the workshop series, a public workshop was held on August 5, 2013, at Caltrans, with more than 75 participants. The comments received at the August public workshop are included as Attachment 2.

More than 400 comments were collected from local jurisdictions, partner agencies, stakeholders, and the general public. This feedback provided valuable information that was considered for the development of the draft project evaluation criteria. Based on comments received at the public workshop, the provides access to communities of concern criterion was removed from the Highway Corridor criteria, as it was felt that the travel time savings for community of concern users was captured in the provides congestion relief criterion and the accessibility criterion might result in awarding points to highway projects located in low-income and minority communities regardless of these communities’ ability to access the project. The facilitates FasTrak/carpool and transit mobility criterion was expanded to also include pedestrian and bicycle access. A more comprehensive cost-effectiveness criterion, which will evaluate the project travel time, safety, health, and air quality benefits, also is proposed.

Peer Review

A five-person peer review panel was created to review and assess the draft project evaluation criteria. A meeting was held at SANDAG on August 22, 2013, concluding with a session open to the general public. Prior to the meeting, the panelists were provided with the 2050 RTP/SCS project evaluation criteria, the proposed revisions/modifications to the Regional Plan draft project evaluation criteria, and a public outreach comment matrix. Attachment 3A includes a summary of the peer review panel’s findings and recommendations and Attachment 3B provides the panelists’ biographies.

Based on the panel’s review and comments received from working groups and the public, the following refinements were made: the serves daily trips criterion was eliminated from the highway corridor criteria, as traveler volumes also are captured in the provides congestion relief criterion. Similarly, the highway corridor and freeway connector serves goods movement criterion was revised to focus on the total time savings for medium- and heavy-duty trucks; a measure that evaluated the number of medium- and heavy-duty truck trips was eliminated, as the travel time savings measure accounts for truck volumes. A provides access to evacuation routes criterion was added to the transit services projects. Additionally, individual criterion weightings were adjusted to provide greater consistency of common measures across modal categories. These refinements are included in the draft criteria shown in Attachment 1.

During the public session the panel shared its findings and recommendations, and participants posed questions to the panel and SANDAG staff as to how the panel’s recommendation for fewer criteria might be accomplished. Clarifications on the inclusion of health impacts in the cost-effectiveness criteria and inquiries as to the modeling methods also were made. Comments also were received regarding minimizing impacts, including air quality on communities of concern with respect to highway corridor projects and connector projects, and the consistency of transportation projects with local plans.
Next Steps

After the draft Transportation Project Evaluation Criteria have been approved by the Board of Directors they will be used to rank the projects in the San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan Unconstrained Transportation Network. The ranked lists of projects, along with other factors such as funding availability, project readiness, and overall network connectivity, will be utilized when developing the initial revenue constrained transportation network scenarios for the Regional Plan. Performance measures will be used to provide comparative assessments between these network scenarios, and will be presented to the Board of Directors at future meetings for discussion.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Attachments: 1. Preliminary Draft Project Evaluation Criteria
   3A. SANDAG Peer Panel Review Discussion - August 23, 2013
   3B. Draft Transportation Project Evaluation Criteria - Peer Review Panel Biographies
   4. Regional Planning Committee Summary of Comments, October 4, 2013

Key Staff Contact: Rachel Kennedy, (619) 699-1929, rachel.kennedy@sandag.org
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan Goals</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Criteria Description</th>
<th>Proposed Calculation</th>
<th>Max Score</th>
<th>Total Percent</th>
<th>Policy Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Innovative Mobility &amp; Planning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Provides Congestion Relief</td>
<td>A) What is the number of daily person-hours saved from implementing the project?*</td>
<td>Change in daily person-hours saved</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mobility Choices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B) What is the number of daily person-hours saved for communities of concern?</td>
<td>Change in daily person-hours saved for communities of concern population</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Project Safety</td>
<td>How does the project compare against the statewide average for collisions?*</td>
<td>Project percentage of collisions measured against statewide average</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Preservation and Safety of the Transportation System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Provides Access to Evacuation Routes</td>
<td>How will the project provide evacuation access for regional hazard areas?</td>
<td>Proximity analysis of hazard areas (dam failure, earthquake, flood, and landslide, liquefaction, tsunami, and wildfire), weighted by population and employment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Preservation and Safety of the Transportation System, Partnerships and Collaboration, Binaional Collaboration with Baja California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Facilitates FasTrak/Carpool/Transit, Pedestrian and Bicycle Mobility</td>
<td>How will the project facilitate FasTrak/carpool/Managed Lane facilities and/or regional or corridor transit services and/or pedestrian and bicycle access?</td>
<td>Projects will receive points if they include FasTrak/carpool/Managed Lane facility, and/or regional or corridor transit services, and/or pedestrian and bicycle facilities, which is then weighted by combined carpool person volume + transit person volume</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mobility Choices, Complete Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Environment &amp; Communities</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Minimizes Habitat and Residential Impacts</td>
<td>How will the project minimize negative habitat and residential impacts?*</td>
<td>Proximity analysis of preserve areas, native habitats, and housing (more than 2 dwelling units per acre)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Habitat and Open Space Preservation, Environmental Stewardship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>GHG and Pollutant Emissions</td>
<td>A) What is the reduction in CO2 emissions from implementing the project?*</td>
<td>Reduction in CO2 emissions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Environmental Stewardship, Energy and Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B) What is the reduction in smog forming pollutants from implementing the project?*</td>
<td>Reduction in smog-forming pollutants</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Serves RCP Smart Growth Areas</td>
<td>What are the share of trips on the facility serving RCP Smart Growth Areas (Metropolitan Center, Urban Center, and Special Use Center)?*</td>
<td>Share of trips on facility serving existing/planned or potential Metropolitan Center, Urban Center, and Special Use Center is calculated, using select link analysis</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Complete Communities, Regional Economic Prosperity, Habitat and Open Space Preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Physical Activity</td>
<td>What is the increase in physical activity?</td>
<td>Increase in time engaged in moderate transportation-related physical activity</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mobility Choices, Complete Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vibrant Economy</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>A) What is the improved access to jobs and schools?</td>
<td>Weighted average number of jobs and school enrollment accessible in 30 minutes by auto</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mobility Choices, Regional Economic Prosperity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B) How will the project support access to recreational areas and beaches?</td>
<td>Acres of parkland/recreational areas and beaches within 1/4 mile of project</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Complete Communities, Habitat and Open Space Preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C) What percentage of users of the project access Indian reservations?</td>
<td>Select link used to determine origins and destinations served, total trips to/from Indian reservation areas</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mobility Choices, Partnerships and Collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Serves Goods Movement and Relieves Freight System Bottlenecks/Capacity Constraints</td>
<td>What is the improved average travel time for freight?**</td>
<td>Total travel time savings for medium and heavy truck classes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mobility Choices, Regional Economic Prosperity, Complete Communities, Binaional Collaboration with Baja California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Project Cost-Effectiveness</td>
<td>What is the cost-effectiveness of the project?*</td>
<td>Enhanced cost-effectiveness measure may incorporate the following components: Project cost, Generalized delay costs, Fuel costs, GHG emissions, Smog-forming pollutants, Health and physical activity safety</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Mobility Choices, Regional Economic Prosperity, Complete Communities, Binaional Collaboration with Baja California, Preservation and Safety of the Transportation System, Environmental Stewardship, Energy and Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Provides dual evaluation for both passenger vehicles and trucks

Attachment 1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan Goals</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Criteria Description</th>
<th>Proposed Calculation</th>
<th>Max Score</th>
<th>Total Percent</th>
<th>Policy Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Innovative Mobility &amp; Planning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Provides Time Competitive/Reliable Transit Service</td>
<td>What is the percentage of the route located in priority treatment? Analysis of percentage of transit route within dedicated transit guideway, dedicated arterial lane, interrupted rail, or Managed Lane; or HOV lane or arterial spot treatment</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mobility Choices, Complete Communities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Serves Daily Trips</td>
<td>What is the number of additional daily transit trips resulting from the project? Change in daily transit linked trips</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Provides Access to Evacuation Routes</td>
<td>How will the project provide evacuation access for regional hazards? Proximity analysis of hazard areas (dam failure, earthquake, flood, landslide, liquefaction, tsunami, and wildfire), weighted by population and employment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Daily System Utilization</td>
<td>What is the daily transit utilization? Daily passenger miles/daily service seat miles (system wide)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Environment &amp; Communities</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>GHG and Pollutant Emissions</td>
<td>A) What is the reduction in CO2 emissions from implementing the project? Reduction in CO2 emissions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Environmental Stewardship, Energy and Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Serves RCP Smart Growth Areas</td>
<td>What are the share of trips on the transit service serving RCP Smart Growth areas? Share of trips on transit service serving all existing/planned or potential Smart Growth Areas is calculated, using select link analysis</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Physical Activity</td>
<td>What is the increase in physical activity? Increase in time engaged in moderate transportation-related physical activity</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vibrant Economy</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>A) What is the increase in job and school trips by transit? Change in daily transit linked work and school trips</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mobility Choices, Regional Economic Prosperity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B) How will the project support access to recreational areas and beaches? Acres of parkland/recreational areas and beaches within 1/4 mile of project</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Complete Communities, Habitat and Open Space Preservation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C) What is the increase in transit trips by communities of concern? Change in total transit trips by communities of concern population</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mobility Choices, Partnerships and Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D) How will the project facilitate pedestrian and bicycle access? Project located within 1/4 mile of pedestrian and bicycle facilities access?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E) What is the increase in transit trips to federally recognized Indian reservations? Change in total transit trips to/from Indian reservations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Project Cost-Effectiveness</td>
<td>What is the cost-effectiveness of the project? Enhanced cost-effectiveness measure may incorporate the following components: - Project cost - Generalized delay costs - Fuel costs - GHG emissions - Smog forming pollutants - Health and physical activity - Safety</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Mobility Choices, Regional Economic Prosperity, Binational Collaboration with Baja California, Preservation and Safety of the Transportation System, Environmental Stewardship, Energy and Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

35
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Proposed Calculation</th>
<th>Max Score</th>
<th>Total Percent</th>
<th>Policy Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Innovative Mobility &amp; Planning</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Serves Daily Trips</td>
<td>What is the change in the number of active transportation trips?</td>
<td>Change in active transportation mode trips or transit accessed by active transportation mode trips</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mobility Choices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Project Safety</td>
<td>Is the project located in an area with a high bicycle and pedestrian traffic incident rate?</td>
<td>Number of bicycle and pedestrian traffic incidents within 1/4 mile of project</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Preservation and Safety of the Transportation System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>System Connectivity</td>
<td>A) Does the project provide enhanced connectivity to/from transit station/stop areas, highway project areas, or rail grade separations?</td>
<td>Project located within 1/4 mile of transit, highway, or rail grade separation project areas</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Mobility Choices, Complete Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B) Does the project provide multimodal connections?</td>
<td>Project provides direct access to other transit, highway, rail grade separation, or active transportation projects</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Consistency with local plans</td>
<td>Is the improvement identified in a locally adopted plan?</td>
<td>Project is in a locally adopted plan</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Partnerships and Collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Healthy Environment &amp; Communities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Reduced Bicycle/Pedestrian Stress Level</td>
<td>Does the project result in a safer facility for bicyclists and pedestrians?</td>
<td>Project area is currently unsafe for pedestrian and bicycle activity due to speeds, vehicular traffic volumes, conflict points such as freeway on/off-ramps, etc.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mobility Choices, Preservation and Safety of the Transportation System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>GHG and Pollutant Emissions</td>
<td>A) What is the reduction in CO2 emissions from implementing the project?</td>
<td>Reduction in CO2 emissions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental Stewardship, Energy and Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B) What is the reduction in smog forming pollutants from implementing the project?</td>
<td>Reduction in smog forming pollutants</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Serves RCP Smart Growth Areas</td>
<td>Is the project located near population and employment?</td>
<td>Population and employment in all smart growth areas within 1/4 mile distance of project</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Complete Communities, Regional Economic Prosperity, Habitat and Open Space Preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Physical Activity</td>
<td>What is the increase in physical activity?</td>
<td>Increase in time engaged in moderate transportation-related physical activity</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mobility Choices, Complete Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Range of Users/Skill Levels Served</td>
<td>For major arterial street, are alternative routes attractive to all riders considered, or are the arterial or alternative routes traffic calmed?</td>
<td>Project results in route attractive to all riders</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mobility Choices, Preservation and Safety of the Transportation System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Vibrant Economy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>A) Does the project support access to jobs and schools?</td>
<td>Employment and schools within 1/4 mile of project</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mobility Choices, Regional Economic Prosperity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B) Does the project support access to recreational areas, parks, and beaches?</td>
<td>Acres of parkland/recreational areas and beaches within 1/4 mile of project</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete Communities, Habitat and Open Space Preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C) What percentage of the project users are from communities of concern?</td>
<td>Communities of concern population within 1/4 mile of project</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mobility Choices, Partnerships and Collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Project Cost-Effectiveness</td>
<td>What is the cost-effectiveness of the project?</td>
<td>Enhanced cost-effectiveness measure may incorporate the following components:</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Mobility Choices, Regional Economic Prosperity, Binational Collaboration with Baja California, Environmental Stewardship, Energy and Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation, Preservation and Safety of the Transportation System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Project cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Generalized delay costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Fuel costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- GHG emissions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Smog forming pollutants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Health and physical activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan Goals</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Proposed Calculation</td>
<td>Max Score</td>
<td>Total Percent</td>
<td>Policy Objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative Mobility &amp; Planning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Provides Congestion Relief</td>
<td>What is the number of daily person-hours saved from implementing the project?</td>
<td>Change in daily person-hours saved</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Provides Access to Evacuation Routes</td>
<td>How will the project provide evacuation access for regional hazard areas?</td>
<td>Proximity analysis of hazard areas (dam failure, earthquake, flood, landslide, liquefaction, tsunami, and wildfire), weighted by population and employment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Facilitates FasTrak/Carpool/Transit, Pedestrian and Bicycle Mobility</td>
<td>How will the project facilitate FasTrak/carpool/Managed Lane facilities and/or regional or corridor transit services and/or pedestrian and bicycle access?</td>
<td>Projects will receive points if they include FasTrak/carpool/Managed Lane facility, and/or regional or corridor transit services, and/or pedestrian and bicycle facilities, which is then weighted by combined carpool person volume + transit person volume</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Environment &amp; Communities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Minimizes Habitat and Residential Impacts</td>
<td>How will the project minimize negative habitat and residential impacts?</td>
<td>Proximity analysis of preserve areas, native habitats, and housing (more than 2 dwelling units per acre)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>GHG and Pollutant Emissions</td>
<td>A) What is the reduction in CO2 emissions from implementing the project?</td>
<td>Reduction in CO2 emissions</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B) What is the reduction in smog forming pollutants from implementing the project?</td>
<td>Reduction in smog forming pollutants</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vibrant Economy</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Project Cost-Effectiveness</td>
<td>What is the cost-effectiveness of the project?</td>
<td>Enhanced cost-effectiveness measure may incorporate the following components: - Project cost - Generalized delay costs - Fuel costs - GHG emissions - Smog forming pollutants - Health and physical activity - Safety</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan Goals</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Proposed Calculation</td>
<td>Max Score</td>
<td>Total Percent</td>
<td>Policy Objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative Mobility &amp; Planning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Provides Congestion Relief</td>
<td>What is the number of daily person-hours saved from implementing the project?^*</td>
<td>Change in daily person-hours saved</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Mobility Choices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Project Safety</td>
<td>How does the project compare against the statewide average for collisions?^*</td>
<td>Project percentage of crash rates measured against statewide averages</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Preservation and Safety of the Transportation System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Provides Access to Evacuation Routes</td>
<td>How will the project provide evacuation access for regional hazard areas?</td>
<td>Proximity analysis of hazard areas (dam failure, earthquake, flood, landside, liquefaction, tsunami, and wildfire), weighted by population and employment</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Preservation and Safety of the Transportation System, Partnerships and Collaboration, Binational Collaboration with Baja California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Environment &amp; Communities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Minimizes Habitat and Residential Impacts</td>
<td>How will the project minimize negative habitat and residential impacts?^*</td>
<td>Proximity analysis of preserve areas, native habitats, and housing (more than 2 dwelling units per acre)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Habitat and Open Space Preservation, Environmental Stewardship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>GHG and Pollutant Emissions</td>
<td>A) What is the reduction in CO2 emissions from implementing the project?^*</td>
<td>Reduction in CO2 emissions</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Environmental Stewardship, Energy and Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B) What is the reduction in smog forming pollutants from implementing the project?^*</td>
<td>Reduction in smog forming pollutants</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vibrant Economy</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Serves Goods Movement and Relieves Freight System Bottlenecks/Capacity Constraints</td>
<td>What is the improved average travel time for freight?^*</td>
<td>Total travel time savings for medium and heavy truck classes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Mobility Choices, Regional Economic Prosperity, Binational Collaboration with Baja California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Project Cost-Effectiveness</td>
<td>What is the cost-effectiveness of the project?^*</td>
<td>Enhanced cost-effectiveness measure may incorporate the following components: - Project cost, - Generalized delay costs, - Fuel costs, - GHG emissions, - Smog forming pollutants, - Health and physical activity, - Safety</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Mobility Choices, Regional Economic Prosperity, Binational Collaboration with Baja California, Preservation and Safety of the Transportation System, Environmental Stewardship, Energy and Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Provides dual evaluation for both passenger vehicles and trucks
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan Goals</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Proposed Calculation</th>
<th>Max Score</th>
<th>Total Percent</th>
<th>Policy Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Innovative Mobility &amp; Planning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Peak-Period Exposure Index (PPEI) Factor</td>
<td>Product of the existing high directional traffic and the total measured blocking delay during the same three hours of the day experiencing the highest congestion at the crossing</td>
<td>Calculation based on vehicle traffic during a selected three-hour period, total blocking delay during same period, and mathematical constant for time period</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Mobility Choices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility Choices</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Peak-Day Total Delay Exposure Index (PDEI) Factor</td>
<td>Product of the existing average daily traffic (ADT), the total number of trains, and an average train crossing delay time factor</td>
<td>Calculation based on average daily traffic, total number of trains, train crossing delay factor, and mathematical constant</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Mobility Choices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian and Bicycle/Communities of Concern Benefits</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Number of pedestrians and bicyclists served in top 4 hours</td>
<td>Grade separation pedestrian bicycle crossing counts</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mobility Choices, Complete Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Operations Benefits</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Number of buses served an hour, as well as proximity to transit center</td>
<td>Number of buses served by the grade separation</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mobility Choices, Complete Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit to Emergency Services</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Proximity to emergency service provider and lack of nearby alternative grade-separated crossing</td>
<td>Proximity analysis based on emergency service providers and alternative grade separation crossing</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mobility Choices, Complete Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Environment &amp; Communities</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Accident history in the past five years</td>
<td>Number of qualifying accidents involving vehicles, pedestrians, and bicycles with trains, not including accidents involved in attempted suicides</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Mobility Choices, Preservation and Safety of the Transportation System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to Noise Sensitive Receptors</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Proximity to sensitive receptors</td>
<td>Proximity analysis based on rail crossing located within 200-500 feet of sensitive receptors</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Complete Communities, Partnerships and Collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHG Emissions</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>What is the reduction in CO2 emissions from implementing the project?</td>
<td>Reduction in CO2 emissions</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Environmental Stewardship, Energy and Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serves RCP Smart Growth Areas</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Is the project located near RCP Smart Growth Areas?</td>
<td>Population and employment in all smart growth areas within 1/4 mile distance of project</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Complete Communities, Regional Economic Prosperity, Habitat and Open Space Preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vibrant Economy</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Percentage of daily truck traffic</td>
<td>Percentage of daily traffic of Class 4-Class 13 (as defined by FHWA)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mobility Choices, Regional Economic Prosperity, Binational Collaboration with Baja California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Request</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Percentage of total project costs contributed by the local agency including funds already committed from state, federal, or other source</td>
<td>Percentage of local contribution</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Partnerships and Collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Cost-Effectiveness</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>What is the cost-effectiveness of the project?</td>
<td>Enhanced cost-effectiveness measure may incorporate the following components: Number of trains per day; AADT; Gate down time; Percent truck traffic; Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mobility Choices, Regional Economic Prosperity, Binational Collaboration with Baja California, Environmental Stewardship, Energy and Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation, Preservation and Safety of the Transportation System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>RHNA-related criteria as described in Board Policy No. 033 adopted January 2011</td>
<td>Based on Board Policy No. 033 Criteria: RHNA Share Taken; Regional Share of Cumulative Total of Lower Income Units Produced; Total Number of Affordable Housing Units; Percent of Lower Income Households</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Complete Communities, Partnerships and Collaboration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Active Transportation

General Comments:

• Access to food, medical care, recreation on weekends/summer
• Affordability
• Criteria to identify benefits for bike & pedestrian separately
• Explicitly from houses to transit stops
• Safe access, comfortable waiting areas
• Public facilities/parking at major transit stations, shopping centers, entertainment centers
• Access to colleges/universities & military bases
• Project education
• Minimizes travel time
• Employment/employer’s involvement/support
• Pedestrian friendly signals
• Does the project provide access and/or improvements to locally-adopted community trail plans?
• There should be a criterion that includes public wants; i.e., if SANDAG presents a projects and a vast majority of the community living within the project area does not want the project to be constructed, there should be points against it. However, if the public was for the project and wants to see it built, then I think more points should be given to that specific project.
• Weighting: #1 (10 pts), #4 (10 pts), and 10 (25 pts)
• Active transportation – proposed calculations should be based on Federal Transit Administration catchment area guidance – 0.5-mile walking radius; 3-mile bicycle radius
• Bike lanes at Virginia Avenue
• More weight for smart growth areas

Criterion 3: Consistency with Local Plans

• Does it include consistency with community plans or city plans? What about community support?
• Description should also include “community demand”

Criterion 4:

• Make changes as “located in a high-crash area and poorly designed corridors”
• It may be more useful to use 0.5-mile radius for bike/pedestrian crash, etc., if the proposed facility is expected to consolidate trips from adjacent corridors due to improved facilities

Criterion 8: Physical Activity

• Add – does the project support multi users?

Criterion 9: Range of Users/Skill Levels Served

• Modify the description to “balance needs of all users”

Criterion 10B: Accessibility

• Does the project support access to the county’s regional trail system (per county-adopted general plan)?

Criterion 10D: Accessibility

• Define more clearly; and break community of concerns into different groups – low income, disability, etc.

Freeway and HOV Connectors:

General Comments:

• Storm water re-use
• Consider life-cycle costs and operations
• Prioritize “bang for the buck”
• Consider health impacts in the area where the project is built, in particular with communities of concern
• Connectors should address jobs access for Communities of Concern
• Emphasize goods movement and cost-effectiveness
• Facility design should encourage active transportation users (pedestrian/bike)
• Add attractive bike/ped crossings and access to all connectors (High Occupancy Vehicle [HOV]/Freeway) projects
• Include bike parking at stations
• Consider combining the HOV and Freeway connector criteria

**Freeway Connectors:**

**General Comments:**

• Increase “Healthy Community & Environment” weighting

• Emphasize greenhouse gas (GHG)/pollutant emissions

**Criterion 1: Provides Congestion Relief**

• Ensure model looks at surface streets (key corridors) and how can we prioritize projects to alleviate congestion on these vital corridors for transit and active transportation

**Criterion 4: Minimizes Habitat and Residential Impacts**

• Calculation does not specify if success will be defined by increase or decrease in percentage of people accessing Smart Growth Areas using Hwy. Criteria should rank Hwy. projects that promote sprawl and easy vehicle access to these areas lower than projects that reduce vehicle trips

**HOV Connectors:**

**General Comments:**

• Increase “Healthy Community & Environment” weights

• Emphasize GHG/pollutant emissions

• Consider safety in ped/bike access to HOV connectors and secure bike parking at those transit stations and park-and-ride lots

**HOV Connectors continued:**

**Criterion 3: Facilitates FasTrak/Carpool and Transit Mobility**

• #3 is most important (and automatically impacts #1, #5, #6)

**Goods Movement:**

**General Comments:**

• Otay Mesa truck routing – treat truck route as “route”. Like Cesar Chavez in Barrio Logan. Treat La Media as trade

• Consider emissions from diesel

• Route trucks from I-15 via 805/163 (avoid City Heights)
• Keep trucks off narrowly constrained I-15 through City Heights
• Otay Mesa – doorway to nation – congestion dangerous for people – carbon monoxide particulate matter
• Flooding in October: Caltrans contributing - Otay Mesa
• Projects that have community support get more points
• Desert line – looking for benefits/planning + analysis for freight – existing/future (potential)
• Mountain Empire region – look at potential for rail – three tribal areas in rural east
• Include “excursion” line on Desert Line
• Consider multimodal evaluation criteria
• Was there a report done about this? (on multimodal criteria) – make this available
• Invite Otay Planning group and property owners
• Restricting trucks during certain hours
• Cleaner trucks in urban areas
• Encourage/incentivize smaller electric vehicles – charging stations
• Air quality impacts/Port of Entry (POE) drift, particulates – private industry
• Freight train impacts (pollution) to communities – noise, vibration, at grade crossing impacts)
• Sound walls/quiet zones
• Recuperate revenue from commercial users on freeways (via commercial license)
• FasTrak for trucking movement
• Include active transportation projects in project development
• More bikes on Trolley/bike lockers (no inspection needed)
• Bike lockers at stations
• Expansion of Desert Line
• Quit fighting the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan and its Sustainable Communities Strategy lawsuit
• Improve La Media Road
Goods Movement Air Cargo:

Criterion 4: Minimizes Community Impacts

- Residential buffer – more points for bigger buffers

Criterion 6: Minimizes Communities of Concern Impacts

- Attention to communities of concern

Goods Movement Maritime:

Criterion 4: Minimizes Community Impacts

- Residential buffer – more points for bigger buffers

Criterion 6: Minimizes Communities of Concern Impacts

- Attention to communities of concern

Goods Movement Rail:

General Comments:

- Goods movement – rail: “pedestrian benefits“ and “accident history” should be added as criteria if there are crossings that intersect with local streets, arterials, or highways

Criterion 4: Minimizes Community Impacts

- Residential buffer – more points for bigger buffers

Criterion 6: Minimizes Communities of Concern Impacts

- Attention to communities of concern

Highway:

General Comments:

- Rank Healthy Environment greater than Innovative Mobility/Planning
- Increase the weighting for the Healthy Community goal
- Safety for all users and ranked highways
- Where is system preservation?
- Highway Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) Smart Growth Areas not clear, on transit focus on Smart Growth
• Highway construction induces sprawl & each project should be analyzed on this

• Highway projects reduce viability of transit

• SR 905 storm water issues need more consideration

• Consider a ‘FasTrak’ like fee/charge for trucks on highways (commercial users). Also charge trucks by time (more time = higher fee charged)

• Pay attention to sensitivities of the Mid-City community for I-15 projects in the area

• Thank you for meeting and lunch. Please study the impact of lead from airplanes, especially Gillespie Field. Planes run their engines on “full rich” when practicing touch and go’s in El Cajon, Santee, Lakeside; install monitors in Santee, Lakeside

• Whether planes are hauling cargo or teaching student pilots. The planes are putting out emissions, please study emissions, heavy touch and go’s put emissions in one spot. Lead does not dissipate

• Please give me more information on the status of the Bradley exchange from Highway 67. Also what criteria will be used for that exchange?

• The HOV’s freeway criteria should include an overriding criterion that provides greater service to low and moderate income areas, even if that means continued congestion for middle and upper-middle class commuters. In particular, the HOV lane project proposed for SR94 from downtown San Diego to the I-805 connectors should be abandoned. The money not spent - $450 million or so – should be spent in the surrounding communities instead

• The highway corridor criteria must have an overriding criterion to propose only projects that conform to the community plans of the communities within which the projects are proposed

• A new criterion: Community demand and consistency with local plans

• Highways facilitate sprawl. That should be reflected in a criteria

• Highways take away from transit ridership, which reduces resources for adequate transit. That should be a criterion

  Criterion 1: Provides Congestion Relief

    • Should be weighted 10 points

  Criterion 1A: Provides Congestion Relief

    • Maximum score should be 5 points

    • Decrease weight
Criterion 1B: Provides Congestion Relief

- Should be removed because these increases the likelihood that freeways will be located in communities of concern
- A criterion should be “minimize impact to community of concern”

Criterion 4: Facilitates FasTrak/Carpool/Transit, Pedestrian and Bicycle Mobility

- What does “facilitate” mean? How is bike/pedestrian access considered? The criteria is not clear
- Should be weighted more
- Remove “Fastrak”
- Should be weighed 10 points

Criterion 7A: GHG and Pollutant Emissions

- Should be at least 15 points
- Increases in GHG emissions should get negative points
- Highway and connectors criteria include how much GHGs and pollutants are avoided. But they should actually get negative number.

Criterion 8: Serves RCP Smart Growth Areas

- Should be 10 points
- Should be at least 15 points

Criterion 9: Physical Activity

- Should be weighted higher. Also because it relates (replaces) to #5, #7, #9, #10, #12
- Should be weighted 10 points

Criterion 10C: Accessibility

- Current criterion is not clear how success will be measure to positively impact of community of concern
- Make criteria “what is increase in trips by communities of concern” - similar to criteria under transit
- Should be removed because these increase likelihood that freeways will be located in communities of concern. A criterion should be “minimize impact to community of concern”
**Criterion 11: Serves Goods Movement and Relieves Freight System Bottlenecks/Capacity Constraints**

- Should be weighed 5 points

**Criterion 12: Project Cost-Effectiveness**

- Proposed calculation should be expanded to be multimodal and address how many jobs are accessible by transit, walking and bicycle too

**Rail Grade Separations:**

**General Comments:**

- Incorporate transfer speed – station design
- Top 4 hours for bikes? Cars?
- Convert Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) to Rail in future
- Add criteria: improvements in rail efficiency
- Rail under-crossings: coastal access should be weighted as it is a statewide and statutory goal. Rail under-crossing encourages mode splits to the beach, reducing parking demand and exacerbated traffic. Reductions in auto mode shift with positively influence economy and give business more ability to attract patronage.
- The points awarded to Board Policy No. 033 for undercrossing should be low as it does not relate to propensity of undercrossing use. Also, the incentive for housing element compliance should be reconsidered since the state has stepped up the risks to local agencies for noncompliance, and for jurisdictions in San Diego that don’t satisfy Board Policy No. 033 – grant funding is not the silver bullet.

**Criterion 3A/B: Bicycle and Pedestrian Benefits**

- Weight of pedestrian/bike = 11 points, take from Peak Period Exposure Index factors
- Higher weight for pedestrian and bike
- Move to Healthy Environment
- 3B should be separate from 3A

**Transit:**

**General Comments:**

- Under mobility – add in connections to other transport services (e.g. Amtrak, medical shuttles)
- Consider ferry services
• Take into account access to transit stops/centers (walk, bike, park-n-ride). First mile concept
• Shade and benches at transit stops
• Restrooms at transit centers
• Better bus feeders (local bus) to large transit centers (Trolley, BRT long dist.)
• Promotional fares (e.g., Sunday transit for shopping)
• Lower transit fares, tiered for seniors, students etc.
• All buses should have racks for 3 bikes (like in North County) – especially ones going to beach areas/Coronado
• Peer panel should include person w/expertise in public/population health
• Neighborhood integrity – potential impacts
• How a transit projects decreases auto trips/vehicle miles traveled should be considered
• Serving areas of high senior population
• Increase access for seniors (also children) that are dependent on transit
• More direct service, fewer transfers should score higher
• Service – more service to rural communities
• Degree of connectivity w/local/feeder bus
• Weighting (total max score = 125): #1 (5), #2 (10), #3 (15), #4 (1), #6 (5 pts), #7 (20 points)
• This format was confusing and difficult to get more suggestions and we could not hear ideas of others
• I am interested in better access to transport from neighborhoods where people live
• Safe bike routes
• Streets and roads that are safe and convenient for pedestrian
• Cheaper fares for public transportation
• Trees for shade and beauty at transit stop centers
• Thanks for having this. I understand better the complexity and magnitude of the issues
• We need more buses in East County
• Saturday and Sunday routes in the rural areas

• Lakeside and further out need buses to add pick-up times

• The “transit services” require two overriding criteria: (1) to provide services that take low and moderate income workers to the better jobs north of Clairemont Mesa Blvd, and (2) the transit planning agency should ask people who don’t use transit to say where they might want a bus trip to begin, to end, at what time(s) of which days. Then we can design an intelligent public transit system.

• Focus on design – easy connections between transit and active transportation modes

• Could there be a criteria for minutes served in transfer between modes/buses?

• Accommodate bikes

• Transit concerns: Affordability (low-income); accessibility (seniors and disabled); connectivity to food, healthcare, education, and employment

• There should be a criterion that connects to other transit/bus lines. The more connections, the higher the points. (Side comments: (1) interior of buses are often dirty and MTS needs to clean the bus at the end of the route at-least once a day, (2) many people on the bus do not follow the rules. The bus driver should enforce the rule; i.e., people putting both feet on the seats, (3) more signs to advise transit riders to respect elders and keep the bus clean, similar to disabled sign, (4) many people, who are not using a trained aid dog, bring their pets on the bus and Trolley in El Cajon. The dogs sit in the seats allocated for regular riders. There should be some regulation about dogs sitting on the floor of the buses and Trolleys.)

• Discuss and develop assessments for transitioning from BRT (fossil fuel) to rail/electric buses

  Criterion 1: Provides Time Competitive/Reliable Transit Service

  • Consider higher weighting

  Criterion 2: Serves Daily Trips

  • Redundancy between #2 (daily trips) and #7 (accessibility)? Should #7 be a substitute of #2?

  Criterion 3: Daily System Utilization

  • Include weekend and after hours

  Criterion 7A: Accessibility

  • Access – add in affordability (fares), medical care & food
  • Connectivity to major job centers (not covered enough with increase in work trips criteria)
  • Give more points to this criterion
• In “access” category, add access to beach areas and transit destinations - airport

Criterion 7B: Accessibility

• Proximity to recreational spaces should also consider the intensity of that space (example: lagoon w/no active recreation vs. major destination beach

• Proximity to recreational spaces should also consider: a. the intensity of the potential mode split resulting from project

Criterion 7E: Accessibility

• Clarify that this means bike/pedestrian facilities allow bike/pedestrian access

Criterion 8: Cost-Effectiveness

• Cost-effectiveness should also consider: (a) Long-term effectiveness, not just short; (b) Maintenance assumed over the life of the project

Additional General Comments:

• I live in Talmadge (zip code 92115) and it is practically impossible to get to the airport or train station or Trolley, without a private car or taxi...and then there is no parking. What a mess! I suggest more buses, north to south, and vice-versa, going into residential neighborhoods.

• SANDAG should give highest project priority to bicycle transportation projects! Use recreational dollars for recreation projects. These are transportation dollars. Thanks!

• The list of candidates for the expert review panel should be available to the public. Please include an email address to which comments should be returned. Finally, please include a link to the meeting dates/times/locations for the expert review panel. Some of us would like to attend.

• Overlapping criteria. Too many criteria. Private/public match of funds should be considered.

• Increase maximum available points for active transportation and transit to 125 and leave highway corridor projects at 100.

• Active transportation criteria should be more comprehensively incorporated into criteria for other modes such as Highway Corridor.

• Thank you for lunch. The format of this workshop was not conducive to soliciting public input. The cramped quarters made it difficult to hear comments/responses or give feedback. The criteria sheets should have been distributed first to all participants to digest before proceeding to the boards. The presentation should have summarized content of the criteria, rather than more general information, to prepare and engage the audience. The pens don’t work.

• This format was not very productive. I would have preferred whole group and small group input. The tables were too crowded and the lead person at each table was overly occupied. Perhaps there were more people here than expected.
• We did not like your format today.

• Question: How do we evaluate varying factors in ranking future transportation projects?

• The San Ysidro Trolley Terminal, currently under project expansion study, has the highest ridership volume, by far, in the entire MTS Trolley System. It is reportedly the only light rail platform in the United States serving an international border. Accessibility and mobility surrounding this station has deteriorated due to the largest POE expansion in U.S. history. The San Diego Trolley is an icon at the San Ysidro Pedestrian Port of Entry.

• Important criteria in planning and ranking future transportation projects must involve a measure of overall benefits to society. An evaluation needs to undergo a comprehensive assessment of all interrelated factors, including intended functions, goals and further reaching issues.

• Public Safety, Mobility & Accessibility: is project readily and conveniently accessible to its users and community? In high volume locations, does it increase public safety and eliminate vehicle-pedestrian conflicts for efficient flow of public transit-pedestrian-vehicle travel?

• Economy: how can the project help create jobs, directly and indirectly, and spawn new economic growth? Can public-private collaboration play a key role in beneficial development?

• Environment: will the project promote mass transportation as a strong alternative to help reduce traffic congestion, concrete highway sprawl and improve the quality of urban life?

• Public Health: the project should be instrumental in reducing vehicle use/gas emissions by utilizing alternative mixed-uses such as smart parking structures, people movers and pedestrian friendly open spaces in order to encourage non-motorized healthy activity.

• Social Equity: In underserved communities and regions, does project incorporate new public infrastructure and large scale transit oriented development to stimulate the local economy? Is public infrastructure needed, or is community adversely impacted by public right-of-ways?

• Smart Growth Planning: It must build on previous research, related studies, reports and modern transportation culture to utilize global best practices that yield future social benefits.

• National & Local Security: Intelligent design should promote high security technology and surveillance measures in prioritizing law and order for public safety.

• Binational Mega Region: The project should facilitate crossborder travel and access to jobs, business centers, school, shopping and tourism.

• International Symbolism: The project should showcase our diverse San Diego – Tijuana culture and symbolize our unique reputation as home of the world’s busiest border crossing.

• Historical: The current San Ysidro Intermodal Transportation Center Study involves a historic window of opportunity. It should focus on how best we can celebrate our closest international alliance and brand for the first time a meaningful historic footprint on a cornerstone of the Americas, right here in San Diego, as the world’s finest international gateway.
SANDAG Peer Panel Review Discussion – August 23, 2013

**Key Strengths of SANDAG Approach**

- Goal structure
- Data-driven, rather than qualitative
- Moving towards cost-effectiveness approach, while still recognizing value of Board priorities

**Recommendations for Improvement**

**Overall Comments**

- Fewer measures would be better
  - Suggested measures for removal include: measures of existing or new volumes (already captured elsewhere), superfluous accessibility measures (such as access to beaches or Native American reservations)
  - Removal of volume-based measures would avoid potential bias towards low-benefit projects on high-volume facilities
- Ranking approach: ranking based on top project is flawed
  - Could pursue alternative approach to avoid “outlier introduction bias”
- Adverse impacts should be considered whenever applicable
  - Doesn’t highlight drawbacks of certain modes
  - Could consider both positive and negative point scale for some criteria

**Modal Silos**

- Need to have consistent criteria across modes
  - Reduce modal silos, particularly between highway and transit
  - Even within highway category, too many categories, consider combining highway corridors, High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) connectors, and freeway connectors into one list
  - Improved criteria could simplify approach
  - Merged criteria would help to minimize mode-specific criteria’s excessive weights
  - If you start measuring the right things, do you need the FasTrak/HOV/transit criteria for highways?
  - Active transportation and rail grade crossing excluded
• Need to consider corridor improvements, regardless of mode
  o Can’t see which project is best for corridor, regardless of mode
  o Benefits from all modes, not just mode being analyzed
  o Broad concept of mobility, rather than hours of auto time saved
• Remove congestion - instead mobility
• Add or remove consistently for both highway and transit projects
• Have consistent weightings for criterion that are featured in multiple modal categories

Cost-Effectiveness and Benefit-Cost
• Scale benefits in points system based on cost
• Differences between benefit-cost and cost-effectiveness for identified metrics
• Need benefit/cost ratio if cost-effectiveness for each measure?
  o Folks will want to see this
  o Business folks will want to see benefit/cost ratio return to analysis
  o Need to fix cost-effectiveness weight (make the same across modes)
• Pull benefit/cost ratio out and display in conjunction with points score

Land Use
• Need more emphasis on smart growth/land use; need to prioritize smart growth areas
  o May not be at the point to incorporate land use/Regional Housing Needs Assessment across them
  o Focus on improved accessibility for focused growth area
  o But need to encourage live/work in same areas – improve their ability to travel
  o Projects should be regional-serving in Regional Transportation Plan
  o Internal capture not important
  o Smaller smart growth areas have lower numbers of people/jobs, lower scores

Arterials
• Lack of inclusion of arterials is shortcoming for road-based smart growth
Reliability

- Add reliability measure
- Qualitative measure for now
- Transition to quantitative measures next time
- Lack of Intelligent Transportation Systems in analysis recognized as shortcoming

Design Elements

- How to deal with this via policies
- Transit has better impacts on smart growth via design
- Need to consider these categories but recognize shortcomings when reporting results

Lower-Cost Projects

- Time intensive for minimal analysis
- Don’t separate multimodal elements from major projects; e.g., highways

Safety

- Relates to urban design issue
  - Behavioral, not engineering, challenge
  - Current approach and weight is satisfactory
  - Data source is decent
  - No satisfactory solution
- Vehicle technology is also critical
- Active transportation adequately captures traffic safety issues
- Collision forecasting is difficult

Accessibility

- Sub-measures should not be equally weighted
- Native American tribes should be communities of concern
Peer Review Panel: Public Comments and Questions

- Why does the Active Transportation category have an evaluation criterion for consistency with local plans but other modes do not?

- Would the panel's recommendation be expected to result in a significant shift in the currently projected transportation mode use for the population?

- Could you please elaborate on the comment related to superimposing highway projects and subtracting transit projects and how this will help create better performance measures?

- Will the cost/benefit (cost-effectiveness) analysis consider health impacts?

- You said adverse impacts are not considered, please define “adverse impacts” or how should SANDAG define.

- The criteria currently awards a highway corridor project points for proximity in communities of concern. Would it be more appropriate for a highway corridor project to be awarded points for minimizing impact on communities of concern? What is the reasoning behind incentivizing highway corridor projects in communities of concern where air quality is the worst?

- You recommended fewer measures so which would you take out and which would you leave in?

- We support the panel's recommendation to combine the highway corridor, HOV connector, and freeway connector criteria into one category. We’d appreciate it if the recommendation would be accepted by SANDAG.
PEER REVIEW PANEL BIOGRAPHIES

Dr. Jennifer Dill
Professor, Nohad A. Toulan School of Urban Studies & Planning, Portland State University
Dr. Jennifer Dill is a professor in the Nohad A. Toulan School of Urban Studies and Planning at Portland State University and Director of the Oregon Transportation Research and Education Consortium (OTREC). Dr. Dill’s research interests include the relationship between transportation policy and planning and land use, health, and the environment, with a focus on non-motorized travel behavior. Prior to entering academia, Dr. Dill worked as an environmental and transportation planner for the Bay Area Air Quality Management District and US Environmental Protection Agency. She was also research director at the Local Government Commission, where she worked on energy, land use, and transportation issues. Dr. Dill has a Ph.D. in City and Regional Planning from UC Berkeley, an MA in Urban Planning from UCLA, and a BS in Environmental Policy Analysis and Planning from UC Davis.

Joel Freedman
Manager, Systems Analysis Technical Resource Center, Parsons Brinckerhoff
Joel Freedman is a manager in the Systems Analysis Technical Resource Center at Parsons Brinckerhoff. He specializes in the development of travel demand forecasting models, software applications, and the analysis of travel demand modeling results. He is also an expert in developing integrated land-use/transport models. He has successfully applied models for transportation planning, toll and revenue studies, as well as major Federal Transit Administration New Starts projects. His experience estimating and/or applying travel demand models spans metropolitan areas throughout the United States, including San Diego, Atlanta, Honolulu, Houston, Las Vegas, Phoenix, Portland, San Francisco, and Tucson. Joel has served as adjunct faculty to the School of Urban Planning at Portland State University, and is the lead instructor for the National Highway Institute course on travel demand forecasting.

Charlie Howard
Transportation Planning Director, Puget Sound Regional Council
Charlie Howard is the Transportation Planning Director for the Puget Sound Regional Council, a position that he has held since February 2005. Prior to joining PSRC, Charlie worked with the Washington State Department of Transportation for 18 years, most recently as the Director of Strategic Planning and Programming. Charlie has been involved in state and regional transportation issues for the past 30 years, including an active role in developing and implementing the state’s growth management act.

David Vautin
Associate Transportation Planner, Metropolitan Transportation Commission
David Vautin is a Transportation Planner at the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) in Oakland, California, specializing in transportation performance assessment. His analytical work informs regional policy decisions by monitoring adherence to adopted goals and targets and by identifying high-performing transportation investments that support the region’s sustainability objectives. As part of Plan Bay Area, the region’s first Sustainable Communities Strategy, David’s work on project-level performance assessment helped policymakers to prioritize the region’s top transit expansion priorities for future New Starts and Small Starts funding opportunities, in addition to highlighting cost-ineffective and sprawl-inducing projects as low performers.

Martin Wachs
Senior Principal Researcher at RAND,
Distinguished Professor Emeritus in Urban Planning, UCLA Luskin School of Public Affairs
Martin Wachs is a senior principal researcher at RAND. He formerly served as director of the RAND Transportation, Space, and Technology Program. Prior to joining RAND, he was professor of civil and environmental engineering and professor of city and regional planning at the University of California, Berkeley, where he was also director of the Institute of Transportation Studies. Prior to this, he spent 25 years at UCLA. Wachs is the author of 160 articles and four books on subjects related to relationships between transportation, land use, and air quality; transportation finance and policy; transportation needs of the elderly; techniques for the evaluation of transportation systems and performance measurement in transportation planning. His research also addresses issues of equity in transportation policy.
Regional Planning Committee Summary of Comments
October 4, 2013

The San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan, draft Transportation Project Evaluation Criteria were presented at the October 4, 2013, Regional Planning Committee meeting. This attachment summarizes comments provided by members of the Committee and the public at the meeting.

Public Speaker Comments

- Some public speakers expressed interest in having a mode-neutral structure for evaluation criteria and including negative points to account for project negative impacts, where appropriate.

- One speaker noted an example of different methodologies in measuring access to jobs and school for the highway corridor and transit services criterion.

- Some public speakers also expressed interest in merging the highway corridors and freeway and high occupancy vehicle connector criteria into one category.

- Other statements included using caution when evaluating congestion and considering how to provide better wildlife connectivity within projects.

- One speaker noted that changes have been made to the California Environmental Quality Act and that automobile delay is no longer considered an impact on its own.

- Public speakers expressed support for the project cost-effectiveness criterion, which incorporates health and safety into the calculation and for the addition of the physical activity criterion.

Regional Planning Committee Member Comments

Regional Planning Committee members discussed the preliminary draft transportation project evaluation criteria in detail, but did not take action on this item. The following comments from the Regional Planning Committee meeting are provided for the Board's consideration:

Criteria Weighting and Goal Categories

- It was suggested that the accessibility criterion for Active Transportation projects could be moved to healthy environment and communities and that the point percentages could be shifted.

- Some questions regarding the categories for individual criteria were raised. One member suggested that the serves Regional Comprehensive Plan smart growth areas be included under the vibrant economy goal category.

- Some Committee members expressed interest in mode-neutral evaluation criteria, which would allow for multiple project types to be compared with one set of criteria.

- Some members expressed interest in utilizing a negative point scale for some criteria to account for negative project impacts.
• Some members noted interest in awarding points only for projects that provide congestion relief without increasing vehicles miles traveled.

• Transportation network connectivity should be considered when projects are selected for inclusion in the transportation network scenarios.

Potential Criterion Modifications

• Some members noted that there should be a criterion that awards points for connection between regional freeways and local roads. It was suggested that 5 points could be reallocated from provides access to evacuation routes criterion.

• Providing access to evacuation routes is important but not helpful if stuck on a freeway connector. Possibly remove 5 points from the freeway connector mode and add an additional connectivity criterion.

• In the accessibility criterion, maybe jobs and schools should not be combined. It was noted that 4 points does not seem high enough and jobs should have more weight.

• What about including transit frequencies: points could be taken from the serves daily trips and project cost-effectiveness criteria and added to the accessibility – increase in job and school trips by transit criterion.

• Concern was expressed that the provides access to evacuation routes criterion is not as applicable for transit services. Fixed-route transit service projects may be able to assist in such emergencies, or could be made inoperable by the event. Buses could be moved around the region as needed to support evacuation efforts.

• One member noted that the physical activity criterion is not beneficial to persons who are physically handicapped. This criterion seems counter-productive for highway corridors projects.
Draft Transportation Project Evaluation Criteria
October 11, 2013

Process and Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spring 2013</th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
<th>Winter 2014</th>
<th>Spring 2014</th>
<th>Fall 2014</th>
<th>Spring 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>We Are Here</strong></td>
<td>Policy Area Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Evaluation</td>
<td>All Modes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Development</td>
<td>All Modes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Land Use and Transportation Scenarios</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Performance</td>
<td>All Modes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision Goals Objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 Regional Growth Forecast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranked Projects by Category</td>
<td>Revenue Projections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unconstrained Network</td>
<td>Revenue Constrained SCS Network Scenarios</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Constrained Preferred Network Scenario</td>
<td>Draft San Diego Forward Regional Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply Performance Measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing Public Involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Project Evaluation Criteria

- Used in past regional transportation plans
  - Rank projects within modal categories
  - Utilized in the selection of projects in revenue constrained scenarios and project phasing

Scenario Development Based on Revenue Constraints

- Bike/Ped.
  1. -- 2. -- 3. --
- Transit
  1. -- 2. -- 3. --
- Highway
  1. -- 2. -- 3. --
- HOV Connectors
  1. -- 2. -- 3. --
- Freeway Connectors
  1. -- 2. -- 3. --
- Rail Grade Separation
  1. -- 2. -- 3. --
Project Evaluation Criteria Process

- Working group and partner agency input
- Public outreach
- Peer panel review
- Recommendations from Policy Committees

Project Evaluation Criteria Categories

- Highway corridors
- Transit services
- High occupancy vehicle (HOV) connectors and freeway connectors
- Rail grade separations
- Active transportation
Criteria Focus Areas and Weighting

- Regional Plan Goals
  - Innovative mobility and planning
  - Vibrant economy
  - Healthy environment and communities
- Developed weighted scores based on a 100 point scale

Transit Services Criteria

- Provides time competitive/reliable transit service
- Serves daily trips
- Access to evacuation routes
- Daily system utilization
- GHG and smog-forming pollutants
- Serves RCP Smart Growth areas
- Physical activity
- Provides accessibility
- Project cost-effectiveness

Proposed Modifications

- methodology enhancements
- criterion modifications
- new criterion
- no change
Highway Corridors Criteria

- Provides congestion relief
- Accidents/safety
- Access to evacuation routes
- Facilitates multi-modal mobility
- Minimizes habitat and residential impacts
- GHG and smog-forming pollutants
- Serves RCP Smart Growth areas
- Physical activity
- Provides accessibility
- Serves goods movement
- Project cost-effectiveness

Proposed Modifications
- methodology enhancements
- criterion modifications
- new criterion
- no change

Active Transportation Criteria

- Serves daily trips
- Accidents/safety
- System connectivity
- Consistency with local plans
- Reduced bicycle/pedestrian stress level
- GHG and smog-forming pollutants
- Serves RCP Smart Growth areas
- Physical activity
- Range of users/skills
- Provides accessibility
- Project cost-effectiveness
HOV and Freeway Connector Criteria

- Provides congestion relief
- Access to evacuation routes
- Minimizes habitat and residential impacts
- GHG and smog-forming pollutants
- Project cost-effectiveness
- Facilitates multimodal mobility (HOV only)
- Serves goods movement (freeway only)
- Accidents/safety (freeway only)

Proposed Modifications
- methodology enhancements
- criterion modifications
- new criterion
- no change

Rail Grade Separation Criteria

- Peak-period exposure index
- Peak-day total delay index
- Pedestrian, bicycle, communities of concern benefits
- Bus operation benefits
- Accidents/safety
- Proximity to noise sensitive receptors
- Benefit to emergency services
- GHG emissions
- Truck operations
- Local match
- Project cost-effectiveness
- Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA)

Proposed Modifications
- methodology enhancements
- criterion modifications
- new criterion
- no change
Schedule and Next Steps

- October 2013:
  Draft criteria to Board for acceptance

- Winter 2014:
  Apply criteria to Unconstrained Transportation Network projects

Process and Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spring 2013</th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
<th>Winter 2014</th>
<th>Spring 2014</th>
<th>Fall 2014</th>
<th>Spring 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vision Goals Objectives</td>
<td>Project Evaluation All Modes</td>
<td>Network Development All Modes</td>
<td>Alternative Land Use and Transportation Scenarios</td>
<td>Unconstrained Network</td>
<td>Revenue Constrained/SCS Network Scenarios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2050 Regional Growth Forecast</td>
<td>Ranked Projects by Category</td>
<td>Revenue Projections</td>
<td>Revenue Constrained Preferred Network Scenario</td>
<td>Draft San Diego Forward Regional Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing Public Involvement</td>
<td>We Are Here</td>
<td>Policy Area Development</td>
<td>Apply Performance Measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendation

The Board of Directors is asked to discuss the draft Transportation Project Evaluation Criteria and either approve the criteria or provide direction to staff on further modifications.

sandag.org/SanDiegoForward