TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE AGENDA

Friday, September 6, 2013
9 a.m. to 12 noon
SANDAG Board Room
401 B Street, 7th Floor
San Diego

AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

- **TransNet ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION PROGRAM: FY 2014 MANAGEMENT AND MONITORING ALLOCATIONS AND COMPETITIVE LAND ACQUISITION GRANT CALL FOR PROJECTS**

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

- **2012 STATE OF THE COMMUTE REPORT**

PLEASE TURN OFF CELL PHONES DURING THE MEETING

YOU CAN LISTEN TO THE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MEETING BY VISITING OUR WEBSITE AT WWW.SANDAG.ORG

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 Transportation Committee on any item at the time the Committee is considering the item. Please complete a Speaker’s Slip, which is located in the rear of the room, and then present the slip to the Clerk of the Committee seated at the front table. Members of the public may address the Committee on any issue under the agenda item entitled Public Comments/Communications/Member Comments. Public speakers are limited to three minutes or less per person. The Transportation Committee may take action on any item appearing on the agenda.

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. Any handouts, presentations, or other materials from the public intended for distribution at the Transportation Committee meeting should be received by the Clerk of the Committee no later than 12 noon, two working days prior to the meeting.

SANDAG operates its programs without regard to race, color, and national origin in compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act. SANDAG has developed procedures for investigating and tracking Title VI complaints and the procedures for filing a complaint are available to the public upon request. Questions concerning SANDAG nondiscrimination obligations or complaint procedures should be directed to SANDAG General Counsel, 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.
TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE
Friday, September 6, 2013

ITEM #

+1. APPROVAL OF JULY 19, 2013, MEETING MINUTES

The Transportation Committee is requested to review and approve the minutes of July 19, 2013.

+2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/ MEMBER COMMENTS

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

CONSENT (3 through 4)

+3. ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION WORKING GROUP (Chris Kluth)

In February 2013 the Transportation Committee approved the formation of the new Active Transportation Working Group (ATWG) charter and membership with the suggestion to include higher education and high school district representatives. The ATWG provides input on regional active transportation policy, planning, and implementation activities. The Transportation Committee is asked to approve the amended charter and membership for the ATWG.

+4. PROPOSED FY 2014 PROGRAM BUDGET AMENDMENT: ORANGE AND GREEN LINE FIBER OPTIC CABLE PROJECT (Chip Finch)

The Transportation Committee is asked to recommend that the Board of Directors authorize the Executive Director to enter into a Memorandum of Understanding with Metropolitan Transit System to accept $1,317,617 for the Orange and Green Line Fiber Optic Cable Project (CIP 1144400) and approve the proposed amendment to the FY 2014 Program Budget.

CHAIR’S REPORT (5)

+5. SAN DIEGO FORWARD: THE REGIONAL PLAN: SUMMARY OF INPUT RECEIVED FROM 2013 POLICY WORKSHOP SERIES (Phil Trom)

SANDAG held a series of nine public workshops throughout the region on the topics of the Regional Plan from May through August, 2013. This report summarizes the extensive input received from the workshops and describes next steps, including a workshop to be held in mid-October on the scenario planning efforts. Feedback from the workshops is being used to refine the draft policy objectives, which will be presented to the Board of Directors later this month.
REPORTS (6 through 10)

+6. **2012 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM: AMENDMENT NO. 8 - ADMINISTRATIVE MODIFICATION** (Michelle Merino)

   On September 28, 2012, the Board of Directors adopted the 2012 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP), the multiyear program of proposed major transportation projects in the San Diego region covering the period of FY 2013 to FY 2017. SANDAG processes amendments to the RTIP on a quarterly basis based on requests from member agencies. This amendment is administrative and is being processed outside of the regular quarterly amendment cycle. The Transportation Committee is asked to approve Amendment No. 8 - Administrative Modification to the 2012 RTIP.

+7. **TransNet ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION PROGRAM: FY 2014 MANAGEMENT AND MONITORING ALLOCATIONS AND COMPETITIVE LAND ACQUISITION GRANT CALL FOR PROJECTS** (Keith Greer)

   The Transportation Committee is asked to recommend to the Board of Directors approval of: (1) funding allocations totaling $4 million toward implementation of regional land management and biological monitoring activities, and (2) release of the Call for Projects for a competitive land acquisition grant program using economic benefit funding, pursuant to an executed Memorandum of Agreement with state and federal agencies on the implementation of the Environmental Mitigation Program.

+8. **SAN DIEGO FORWARD: THE REGIONAL PLAN: DEVELOPMENT OF DRAFT UNCONSTRAINED TRANSPORTATION NETWORK** (Phil Trom)

   Defining the Unconstrained Transportation Network is an important step in developing the Regional Plan as it establishes the broadest network from which revenue constrained scenarios will be identified. The Transportation Committee is asked to review the current 2050 Regional Transportation Plan Unconstrained Network along with changing demographic, jobs, housing, and population trends from the draft regional growth forecast. SANDAG staff will seek input from various working groups, community-based organizations, tribal governments, and the Regional Planning and Borders Committees in September. The Transportation Committee will be asked to review any potential revisions to the Unconstrained Transportation Network in October for use in the development of San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan.

+9. **SAN DIEGO FORWARD: THE REGIONAL PLAN: DRAFT TRANSPORTATION PROJECT EVALUATION CRITERIA** (Rachel Kennedy)

   The Board of Directors accepted the San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan vision and goals on May 10, 2013. In past Regional Transportation Plans SANDAG has utilized transportation project evaluation criteria that support these goals as elements of a multistep process to develop the revenue constrained multimodal transportation network. SANDAG has developed preliminary draft evaluation criteria to be used for prioritizing a list of transportation projects for San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan. The Transportation Committee will be asked to discuss and provide input on the preliminary draft evaluation criteria.
10. 2012 STATE OF THE COMMUTE REPORT (Ellison Alegre)

As part of ongoing performance monitoring efforts, SANDAG reports on various statistics related to the performance of the transportation system. Staff will present the 2012 State of the Commute Report, which provides data on the region’s urban highways, bus systems, and rail services.

11. 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.

12. UPCOMING MEETINGS

The next meeting of the Transportation Committee is scheduled for Friday, September 20, 2013, at 9 a.m.

13. ADJOURNMENT

+ next to an agenda item indicates an attachment
The meeting of the Transportation Committee was called to order by Chair Todd Gloria (City of San Diego) at 9:03 a.m. See the attached attendance sheet for Transportation Committee member attendance.

1. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

Action: Upon a motion by Mayor Cheryl Cox (South County) and a second by Chairman Bill Horn (North County Transit District [NCTD]), the Transportation Committee approved the minutes from the June 21, 2013, meeting.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

Laurie Berman, Caltrans District 11, reminded the committee and members of the public of the Steer Clear campaign for upcoming freeway closures. Southbound Interstate 15 (I-15) will be closed from Ted Williams Parkway to Poway Road beginning Saturday, July 27, at 7 p.m. through Monday, July 29, at 4 a.m. Detour information will be posted at www.keepsandiegomoving.com. Interstate 805 north and south will be closed Sunday, August 18, at 3 p.m. through August 19, for a 14-hour period. Alternate routes include the I-5 and State Route 125 (SR 125) Toll Road. No tolls will be collected on the SR 125 during this timeframe.

Jim Varnadore, member of the public, invited committee members to attend the Fifth Annual Lantern Festival at Hoover High School this evening and over the weekend. The Lantern Festival is sponsored by the Little Saigon Foundation. Mr. Varnadore also requested a future Transportation Committee agenda item to review the High Occupancy Vehicle proposal for SR 94.

John Wotzka, member of the public, spoke about various transportation matters.

Nicole Burgess, member of the public, spoke about North County transportation matters. Ms. Burgess also spoke about the COASTER and SPRINTER schedules and costs.

CONSENT (3 through 4)

3. SOCIAL SERVICES TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP APPOINTMENTS (APPROVE)

The California Public Utilities Code Section 99238 requires one-third of the members of the Social Services Transportation Advisory Council to be appointed each year.
4. SPECIALIZED TRANSPORTATION GRANT PROGRAM STATUS UPDATE (INFORMATION)

SANDAG manages three competitive grant programs for specialized transportation projects: Job Access and Reverse Commute, New Freedom, and TransNet Senior Mini-Grant. This report provided an overview of the progress made to date by the grant recipients in each program.

Action: Upon a motion by Mayor Mary Sessom (East County) and a second by Vice Chair Judy Ritter (North County Inland), the Transportation Committee approved consent items 3 through 4.

Item 5 was pulled from the consent agenda.

5. 2012 STATE OF THE COMMUTE REPORT (INFORMATION)

As part of ongoing performance monitoring efforts, SANDAG reports on various statistics related to the performance of the transportation system. This report provided data on the region’s urban highways, bus systems, and rail services.

Jack Shu, Cleveland National Forest Foundation, encouraged SANDAG to provide additional information including: cost benefit factors and ratios; ridership information; and impacts on air quality, community, and the economy.

Action: This item was presented for information only.

REPORTS (6 through 8)

6. 2012 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM: AMENDMENT NO. 6 (APPROVE)

Michelle Merino, Financial Programming Analyst II, presented the item.

On September 28, 2012, the Board of Directors adopted the 2012 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP). The 2012 RTIP is the multiyear program of proposed major transportation projects in the San Diego region covering the period FY 2013 to FY 2017. Amendment No. 6 is a regular quarterly formal amendment and reflects changes to projects as requested by member agencies.

Jack Shu, Cleveland National Forest Foundation, questioned some of the Whereas’ information in the Resolution.

Action: Upon a motion by Mayor Cox and a second by Chair Gloria, the Transportation Committee adopted Resolution No. 2014-03 approving Amendment No. 6 to the 2012 RTIP.

7. TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT TRIENNIAL PERFORMANCE AUDIT (RECOMMEND)

The Triennial Transportation Development Act (TDA) audits of Metropolitan Transit System (MTS), NCTD, and SANDAG have been completed. Brian Lane, Senior Transit Planner, and Mark Chang, CH2M Hill, presented the report that included a compliance review of state requirements for each agency, a review of management control and reporting, performance trends, and recommendations for each agency.
Action: Upon a motion by Vice Chair Ritter and a second by Chair Gloria, the Transportation Committee recommended that the Board of Directors authorize the Executive Director to: (1) transmit the performance audit report of SANDAG to the Caltrans Director as required; (2) certify in writing to the Caltrans Director that the performance audits of operators located in the area under its jurisdiction have been completed; (3) implement the performance audit recommendations pertaining to SANDAG TDA activities; and (4) transmit the other recommendations to the transit operators for implementation.

8. REGIONAL BIKE PLAN EARLY ACTION PROGRAM (DISCUSSION)

Chris Kluth, Senior Regional Planner, presented the item.

In 2011 the Board of Directors made a major commitment to Active Transportation with the adoption of the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy, which included integration of Riding to 2050: San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan (Bike Plan) previously approved by the Board of Directors in 2010. The final action by the Board included the development of a Bike Plan Early Action Program (EAP) for the projects included in the Bike Plan. In April 2012, the Transportation Committee accepted the goals of the EAP framework and approved funding to conduct preliminary engineering work and refine construction cost estimates. These estimates have been used to prepare funding scenarios and implementation options for consideration by the Transportation Committee.

Jim Stone, Walk San Diego, spoke in favor of the EAP and encouraged SANDAG to maximize investment in the program.

Sarah Strang, General Dynamics NASSCO, spoke in favor of the Bayshore Bikeway Project.

Kelly Sanderson, member of the public, spoke in favor of the Bike Plan and bicycle facilities. Ms. Sanderson also spoke about safety concerns.

Andy Hanshaw, San Diego County Bicycle Coalition, spoke in favor of the EAP and asked SANDAG to move forward with the program as soon as possible in an effort to keep bicycle riders safe in the region.

Samantha Ollinger, Bike San Diego, spoke in favor of this item.

Nicole Burgess, member of the public, spoke in favor of the EAP and stated the program will help reduce gas emissions in the region and will improve bicycle safety.

Action: This item was presented for discussion only.

9. CONTINUED PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no additional public comments.

10. UPCOMING MEETINGS

The August 2 and August 16 meetings have been cancelled. The next meeting of the Transportation Committee is scheduled for Friday, September 6, 2013, at 9 a.m.
11. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Gloria adjourned the meeting at 10:19 a.m.

Attachment: Attendance Sheet
### CONFIRMED ATTENDANCE
**SANDAG TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MEETING**
**JULY 19, 2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GEOGRAPHICAL AREA/ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>JURISDICTION</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>MEMBER/ALTERNATE</th>
<th>ATTENDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North County Coastal</td>
<td>City of Encinitas</td>
<td>Lisa Shaffer</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Del Mar</td>
<td>Lee Haydu</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North County Inland</td>
<td>City of Vista</td>
<td>Judy Ritter (Vice Chair)</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Escondido</td>
<td>Sam Abed</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East County</td>
<td>City of Lemon Grove</td>
<td>Mary Sessom</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of La Mesa</td>
<td>Art Madrid</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South County</td>
<td>City of Chula Vista</td>
<td>Cheryl Cox</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Coronado</td>
<td>Mike Woiwode</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Todd Gloria (Chair)</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Marti Emerald</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Ron Roberts</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Greg Cox</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>___</td>
<td>Dianne Jacob</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Transit System</td>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>Harry Mathis</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>Al Ovrom</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North County Transit District</td>
<td>NCTD</td>
<td>Bill Horn</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NCTD</td>
<td>Rebecca Jones</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NCTD</td>
<td>John Aguilera</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego County Regional Airport Authority</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tom Smisek</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lloyd Hubbs</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADVISORY/LIAISON Caltrans</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Laurie Berman</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>___</td>
<td>Bill Figge</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCTCA</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>Raymond Hunter Sr.</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Allen Lawson</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Attendees</td>
<td>Matt Tucker</td>
<td>NCTD</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paul Jablonski</td>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jack Dale</td>
<td>Chairman, SANDAG</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION WORKING GROUP

Introduction

Planning and funding of bicycle infrastructure has long been a part of SANDAG’s role in building a regional transportation network. The original form of the Bicycle-Pedestrian Working Group (BPWG) goes back to the late 1970s. Over the years, SANDAG’s role in bicycle transportation has grown from administering a modest grant program into a comprehensive work element that includes implementation of the Regional Bicycle Plan, planning for pedestrians, safe routes to school, safe routes to transit, and Complete Streets. Together, these efforts comprise what is now referred to as the Active Transportation Program.

In February of this year, the Transportation Committee approved the charter and membership for the Active Transportation Working Group (ATWG), with the recommendation to amend the membership to include high school and post-secondary education group members. The amended charter and proposed membership for approval are shown in Attachments 1 and 2, respectively.

Discussion

A summary of the proposed changes to the ATWG membership are as follows:

- Move Civic San Diego to the Local Governments category from Other Regional and State Agencies category;

- To promote the integration of public health into active transportation planning efforts, it is proposed that a representative from the SANDAG Public Health Stakeholders Working Group be added; and

- To provide a broader range of input from more educational institutions, it is proposed that the interests of high schools be represented by an appointee from the San Diego County Department of Education, community colleges be represented by an appointee to be determined, and post-secondary schools be represented through an annual appointee from the University of California, San Diego; San Diego State University; California State University, San Marcos; or University of San Diego.

Recommendation

The Transportation Committee is asked to approve the amended charter and membership for the Active Transportation Working Group as shown in Attachments 1 and 2, respectively.
A summary of the proposed changes to the ATWG charter are as follows:

- Total number of members increased from 32 to 34 to reflect additional representation as suggested by the Transportation Committee; and
- Now that the ATWG has met several times, the meeting time was adjusted to reflect availability of the membership.

**Next Steps**

Should the Transportation Committee approve the proposed amendments to the ATWG charter and membership, staff will incorporate the updated charter and membership into the activities of the ATWG.

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

Attachments: 1. Proposed Committee/Working Group Charter - Active Transportation Working Group  
2. Proposed Active Transportation Working Group Membership - September 2013

Key Staff Contact: Chris Kluth, (619) 699-1952, chris.kluth@sandag.org
COMMITTEE/WORKING GROUP CHARTER

ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION WORKING GROUP

PURPOSE

The Active Transportation Working Group (ATWG) provides input on regional active transportation policy, planning, and implementation activities. The ATWG makes recommendations and fosters cooperation among the jurisdictions, agencies, and stakeholders within the San Diego region to plan for and support the development of local and regional improvements for active transportation modes (bicycling and walking), including Safe Routes to Transit, Safe Routes to School, facility development, operation and maintenance, education, encouragement, and evaluation.

LINE OF REPORTING

The ATWG acts in an advisory capacity to the Transportation Committee on active transportation policy, planning, and implementation activities.

RESPONSIBILITIES

The ATWG provides input on active transportation policy, planning, and implementation activities. These activities include the development, update, and implementation of the following:

- Active Transportation elements of the Regional Plan
- Regional Bicycle Plan
- Planning and Designing for Pedestrians
- Active Transportation Implementation Strategy
- Regional Safe Routes to Transit plans, programs, and projects
- Safe Routes to School Strategic Plan
- Regional Active Transportation projects and programs

The ATWG also serves as a forum for information exchange regarding active transportation policy, practice, and design considerations.

MEMBERSHIP

The membership consists of one representative appointed by each member agency at SANDAG as well as representatives from active transportation advocacy groups and other related stakeholders, initially comprising a total of 34 members. Members are appointed in writing by the bodies they represent. Members are allowed to have alternates, which like members, are selected by the bodies they represent. Should participation by a member cause the ATWG to have difficulty reaching a quorum, the group will have the discretion to modify membership to optimize participation. The
number of representatives from SANDAG member agencies shall constitute a majority of members. All members are eligible to vote on motions and recommendations. A detailed list of representatives is provided separately.

MEETING TIME AND LOCATION

The ATWG generally meets quarterly on the second Thursday of the month from 10 a.m. to 12 noon at the SANDAG offices, as well as other times as may be set by the Chair. Meetings shall be noticed according to and shall otherwise fully comply with the Ralph M. Brown Act.

SELECTION OF THE CHAIR

The Chair and Vice Chair of the ATWG are chosen by the members of the Working Group on an annual basis.

DURATION OF EXISTENCE

This is a standing SANDAG Working Group.
### Active Transportation Working Group Membership
#### September 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REPRESENTATION</th>
<th>JURISDICTION/ORGANIZATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Governments</strong></td>
<td>One member from each city in the region and the County of San Diego (or City and County Planning and Engineering Departments) Carlsbad, Chula Vista, Coronado, Del Mar, El Cajon, Encinitas, Escondido, Imperial Beach, La Mesa, Lemon Grove, National City, Oceanside, Poway, San Diego, San Marcos, Santee, Solana Beach, Vista, Civic San Diego, County of San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Regional and State Agencies</strong></td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Civic San Diego Moved to Local Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>County of San Diego Air Pollution Control District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metropolitan Transit System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North County Transit District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bicycle Advocacy</strong></td>
<td>Bike San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>San Diego County Bicycle Coalition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Health</strong></td>
<td>Public Health Stakeholders Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pedestrian Advocacy</strong></td>
<td>WalkSanDiego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Safe Routes to School Advocacy</strong></td>
<td>San Diego Safe Routes to School Coalition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transit Advocacy</strong></td>
<td>Move San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Development</strong></td>
<td>Business Improvement Districts/Bicycle Friendly Business Improvement Districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Schools</strong></td>
<td>San Diego County Department of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Colleges</strong></td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Universities/Post-Secondary Education</strong></td>
<td>Rotating representative from UCSD, SDSU, CSUSM, USD (SDSU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of California, San Diego (UCSD)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Action Requested: RECOMMEND

PROPOSED FY 2014 PROGRAM BUDGET AMENDMENT: File Number 1144400
ORANGE AND GREEN LINE FIBER OPTIC CABLE PROJECT

Introduction

This action recommends a transfer of funding from MTS to SANDAG for construction of fiber optic cable for the Orange and Green Line Fiber Optic Cable Project (CIP 1144400). The high speed fiber optic network carries data for video surveillance, train location, and communications to the MTS Control Center. The MTS Board has approved the transfer of $1,317,617 to SANDAG for the project.

Discussion

The Orange and Green Line Fiber Optic Cable Project is one of several projects that expand the fiber optic communications network for the San Diego Trolley system, with the goal of creating a redundant fiber optic network. Once completed, this network will provide reliable data transmission for security cameras, train location, visual and audible public address systems, and alarms for facilities and equipment. MTS has made completing the fiber optic network a priority, and thus, has approved transferring $1,317,617 in MTS Proposition 1B Transit Security funds from MTS capital projects 11279 and 11271 to SANDAG CIP 1144400. The additional funds will construct fiber optic cable in the existing gap between Grossmont Summit and Arnelle Station. Following completion of the final design, should the engineer’s estimate indicate that the remaining funding in the revised project budget be sufficient, additional areas may be added to this project. The funding changes summarized in Table 1 received MTS Board approval at its June 20, 2013, Board meeting (Attachment 2).

Recommendation

The Transportation Committee is asked to recommend that the Board of Directors authorize the Executive Director to enter into a Memorandum of Understanding with Metropolitan Transit System to accept $1,317,617 for the Orange and Green Line Fiber Optic Cable Project (CIP 1144400) and approve the proposed amendment to the FY 2014 Program Budget, in substantially the same form as attached to the report.
Table 1
Budget Change Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project (CIP #)</th>
<th>FY 2013 Budget</th>
<th>Proposed Budget</th>
<th>Budget Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orange and Green Line Fiber Project (1144400)</td>
<td>$7,761,315</td>
<td>$9,078,932</td>
<td>+$1,317,617</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

JIM LINTHICUM

Director of Mobility Management and Project Implementation

Attachments: 1. CIP 1144400 Orange and Green Line Fiber Optic Cable Budget Amendment
2. MTS Board of Directors Agenda Item #9, June 20, 2013

Key Staff Contact: Chip Finch, (619) 595-5617, chip.finch@sandag.org
**PROJECT NUMBER:** 1144400  
**Project Name:** Orange and Green Line Fiber Optic Cable  
**Project Manager:** Andre Tayou  
**Phone Number:** (619) 699-7340

### Project Description
This project will install a high-speed fiber-optic network, which will be used to implement future signaling, communications, closed-circuit television, and traction power upgrades. This project will be built in five phases. Phase 1 will cover Qualcomm to Mission Valley Center, Phase 2 will cover Mission Valley Center to Old Town, Phase 3 will cover 12th and Imperial station to Baltimore Junction, Phase 4 will Cover Baltimore Junction to Santee, and Phase 5 will cover Santa Fe Depot to Old Town.

### Project Justification
This project is essential to SANDAG’s Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) projects, including the regional automated fare collection project. It also paves the way for regional, multi-agency efforts in infrastructure and data-sharing.

### Site Location
Not Applicable

### Progress to Date
Design and construction are complete for phases 1, 2, and 3. Design is complete for phases 4 and 5. Construction will commence on phases 4 and 5 in FY 2014.

### Milestone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>FY 14</th>
<th>FY 15</th>
<th>FY 16</th>
<th>FY 17</th>
<th>FY 18</th>
<th>FUTURE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$475</td>
<td>$475</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Equipment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; Design</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Management</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>4,620</td>
<td>4,988</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Contingency</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Services</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Outreach</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$3,115</td>
<td>$4,670</td>
<td>$5,988</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Funding Plan ($000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>PRIOR YEARS</th>
<th>FY 14</th>
<th>FY 15</th>
<th>FY 16</th>
<th>FY 17</th>
<th>FY 18</th>
<th>FUTURE YEARS</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FEDERAL:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA Section 5307</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>3,115</td>
<td>4,170</td>
<td>5,488</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL:</td>
<td>$3,115</td>
<td>$4,670</td>
<td>$5,988</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$7,805</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Contact:** 1144400 Andre Tayou  
**Telephone:** (619) 699-7340  
**Fax:** (619) 699-7340  
**Email:** andre.tayou@sandag.org  
**Address:** 1144400, SANDAG, 1300 South Jamboree Road, Suite 200, San Diego, CA 92101
Agenda Item No. 9

MEETING OF THE METROPOLITAN TRANSIT SYSTEM
BOARD OF DIRECTORS

June 20, 2013

SUBJECT:

ORANGE/GREEN LINES FIBER-OPTICS CABLE PROJECT – FUND TRANSFER

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Board of Directors approve an amendment to Addendum No. 17 Project Scope of Work No. 11 authorizing the purchase of labor, materials, and supplies to install additional fiber-optic cables between the Grossmont Summit and Arnele Avenue Station on the MTS Trolley’s Green Line.

Budget Impact

The cost of this additional work would not exceed $1,317,617 and would be funded with the following budgets:

- SANDAG Pass Thru (MTS CIP-11279) - $1,069,445
- LRV On-Board CCTV (MTS CIP-11271) - $204,260
- Security Prop 1B Interest Earned - $43,912

DISCUSSION:

In 2011, the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) launched a project to install fiber-optic communication cables on various segments of the MTS Green and Orange trolley lines. At completion, these cables will carry fare information from ticket vending machines (TVMs), video images from MTS’s closed-circuit television (CCTV) network, visual message sign (VMS) information, and Supervisor Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA) to Central Control. This project was funded by MTS and completed by SANDAG.

Because of funding constraints, two remaining segments were not included in the original project. These are the Grossmont Summit to Arnele Avenue Station segment, and the Chemtronics to Santee Station segment—both on the Green Line. The projected cost to complete the two remaining fiber loops is estimated to be $1.8 million. Currently,
the total available funding is $1,317,617 for this project. This will be enough to complete the Grossmont Summit to Arnele Avenue Station segment only. SANDAG expects to release a competitive solicitation for this in September 2013.

When additional funding becomes available, the Chemtronics to Santee Station segment will also be completed. Staff will submit a separate request to the Board for approval of this segment once a funding source is identified.

The funding and authorizations for this project are accomplished through a series of agreements with SANDAG. This action will result in an amended agreement, adding the Grossmont Summit to Arnele Avenue Station segment to the project, and allocating an additional $1,317,617 of funds for this purpose. The amendment also adds clarifying language identifying the source of funds for earlier stages of the project.

The chart below illustrates the budget allocations for each stage of the project. The shaded portion represents the Grossmont to Arnele segment work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Funding Year</th>
<th>$ Amount</th>
<th>Fiber Lines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security Prop 1B</td>
<td>FY 08-09</td>
<td>$2,578,655</td>
<td>12th/Imperial – Baltimore Junction (Orange)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSGP</td>
<td>FY 10</td>
<td>$3,361,790</td>
<td>Old Town – Baltimore Junction (Green)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Prop 1B</td>
<td>FY 09-10</td>
<td>$900,870</td>
<td>12th/Imperial – Baltimore Junction (Orange)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal 5307/TDA</td>
<td>FY 12</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>12th/Imperial – Baltimore Junction (Orange)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Prop 1B</td>
<td>FY 10-11</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>Old Town – Santa Fe (Green)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Prop 1B Interest 8/09</td>
<td>FY 08/09</td>
<td>$29,515</td>
<td>Grossmont - Arnele (Green)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Prop 1B Interest 9/10</td>
<td>FY 09/10</td>
<td>$14,397</td>
<td>Grossmont - Arnele (Green)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Prop 1B 09/10</td>
<td>FY 09/10</td>
<td>$204,260</td>
<td>Grossmont - Arnele (Green)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Prop 1B</td>
<td>FY 11-12</td>
<td>$1,069,445</td>
<td>Grossmont - Arnele (Green)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$9,078,932</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Paul C. Jablonski  
Chief Executive Officer

Key Staff Contact: Sharon Cooney, 619.557.4513, Sharon.Cooney@sdmts.com

Addendum 17 Project Scope of Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MTS File No.</th>
<th>SANDAG Reference No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G0630.17-04.11.1</td>
<td>5000710 SOW 11.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CIP Title:</th>
<th>Operating Agency:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orange and Green Line Fiber Optic Cable</td>
<td>MTS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CIP No.</th>
<th>Project Manager:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>114400</td>
<td>Andre Tayou</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead Agency:</th>
<th>Estimated Start Date:</th>
<th>Estimated Completion Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SANDAG</td>
<td>September 2011</td>
<td>September 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Budget:</th>
<th>Effective Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$9,078,932</td>
<td>6/11/2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intended Source of Funds:** (Describe types and amounts of local, state and/or federal funding and attach any unique pass-through requirements):

Current funding as shown in IFAS from MTS Revenues (see MOU No. 5001820/G1367.0-11):
- State Prop. 1B - $2,578,455
- Federal TSA Grant - $3,381,790

Additional future funding from MTS:
- LRV On-Board Cameras Project (MTS CIP 11271) - $900,870
- SANDAG SCADA Project - $500,000
- Fiber Optic Link Project (MTS CIP 11340) - $400,000
- Security Prop 1B earned interests - $43,912
- LRV On-Board CCTV (MTS CIP 11271) - $204,260
- SANDAG Pass Thru (MTS CIP 11279) - $1,069,445

**Describe Any Necessary Transfers of Project Funds Between the Parties:**

SANDAG shall reimburse MTS via purchase order(s) for services described herein.

**Project Description:**

This project will install a high-speed fiber optic network, which will be used to implement future signaling, communications, closed-circuit television, and traction power upgrades.

**Scope of Work to be Performed by MTS:**

Flagging services by San Diego Trolley, Inc. (SDTI) personnel in the MTS right-of-way during construction. Any work which involves personnel or equipment within 15 feet of the center line of any active track must have an SDTI supplied flagperson for the duration of the work.

**Scope of Work to be Performed by SANDAG:**

- Task Order Management
- Construction Management
- Network Topology Study
- Job Order Management

- Fiber Optic Plans Preparation
- Network Switches Procurement
- Fiber Splicing Diagram Development
- Oversee Acceptance Testing

**Any Additional Project-Specific Conditions (Any special conditions will require legal review of this document):**

This project scope of work is amending and restating the originally executed scope of work.

**APPROVED BY:**

SANDAG

METROPOLITAN TRANSIT SYSTEM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jim Linthicum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of MMPI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paul Jablonski</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Executive Officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SAN DIEGO FORWARD: THE REGIONAL PLAN:
SUMMARY OF INPUT RECEIVED FROM 2013 POLICY WORKSHOP SERIES

Introduction

Last winter, the Public Involvement Plan for San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan set forth goals and strategies to provide sustained engagement with the public during the development of the Regional Plan. Between May and August, a series of nine daytime and evening public workshops were conducted to solicit public input on various policy areas that will feed into the Plan. Staff is presenting a summary of the workshop results to the Transportation Committee for its information.

Background

In October 2012, SANDAG held a kick-off workshop to gather ideas about the initial concepts of the Regional Plan. The kick-off workshop was structured in an interactive manner, with a focus on minimizing staff presentations, engaging in facilitated discussions, and listening to the thoughts and perspectives of workshop attendees. This interactive workshop structure served as a model for the most recent series of workshops. Also in 2012 and 2013, staff started engaging the various SANDAG working groups and other stakeholders on the development of the Regional Plan. Concurrent with these efforts, SANDAG initiated contracts with 11 Community Based Organizations (CBOs) throughout the region to collect feedback from various “hard to reach” communities over the next two years. One of the key themes that arose in all of this engagement was a desire for SANDAG to use an interactive and highly inclusive process throughout the development of the Regional Plan.

Discussion

Similar to the format of the October 2012 kick-off workshop, the emphasis of the policy outreach series was on listening. More than 500 people participated in the workshops, with many discussions held in Spanish and one discussion held in Arabic. Workshop topics were based on Regional Plan elements drawn from the recently approved vision and goals for San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan.

In an effort to engage with a variety of stakeholders, workshops were advertised in both English and Spanish and held in both the daytime and in the evening throughout the region. The six evening workshops were conducted in the various subregions (listed below) to generate broad participation and enable discussion on all of the policy areas. The daytime workshops at Caltrans Headquarters in Old Town focused on exploring more specific themes, which enabled a greater depth of discussion on those topics. Spanish-speaking staff members were available at all workshops. The following workshops were conducted:
• May 17, 2013, Central Workshop #1 – Caltrans (focused discussion on healthy environment, energy, climate change, and public health)

• June 6, 2013, South County – San Ysidro (discussion on all policy topics; bilingual workshop)

• June 13, 2013, North County Inland – Escondido (discussion on all policy topics)

• June 20, 2013, North County Coastal – Oceanside (discussion on all policy topics)

• June 21, 2013, Central Workshop #2 – Caltrans (focused discussion on land use and transportation)

• June 27, 2013, East County – La Mesa (discussion on all policy topics)

• June 29, 2013, South County – National City (discussion on all policy topics)

• July 19, 2013, Central Workshop #3 – Caltrans (focused discussion on economic prosperity, public facilities, and borders)

• August 21, 2013, Central – Jacobs Center (discussion on all policy topics)

Following an introduction by Board of Directors Chair Jack Dale, attendees participated in three sets of small group discussions, rotating between several tables with the assigned topic areas. The five broad policy areas discussed at the subregional workshops were: Mobility; Healthy Communities; Healthy Environment; Energy and Climate Change; and Economic Prosperity and Borders. The rotating table topic format produced a total of over 200 small group discussions on a variety of topics as shown in the chart below. The associated color scheme shows the relationship between the broader level policy area and the in-depth policy areas from the workshops held at Caltrans.

During the table discussions, SANDAG staff members asked the groups a series of questions on the topics, promoting free-flow discussion among the participants. The discussions were transcribed and are available on the SANDAG website at www.sandag.org/sandiegoforward.

2013 Public Workshop Series – What We Heard

The roughly 200 small group discussions (over 66 hours of conversations) yielded about 4,500 comments. Attachment 1 includes “e-blast summaries” emailed to workshop participants capturing a snapshot of the comments from each workshop. Because of the volume of comments, a database was developed with 36 searchable categories to assist with the development of various components of the Regional Plan, with many comments relating to more than one category. The tabulation of those categories in alphabetical order is shown in the chart below.
Figure 1: Comments by Comment Category

The volume and number of comments and comment categories shown in the chart above speaks to the variety of comments voiced at the workshops, in addition to the connections to the Regional Plan’s adopted goals of Innovative Planning and Mobility; Healthy Environment and Communities; and Vibrant Economy.
Attendee Demographics

An analysis of the attendee demographics also was conducted based on the self-identified registration information provided by participants. Stakeholders identified themselves as either solely members of the general public (32 percent), members of public or government agencies (20 percent), CBOs (16 percent), and members of various non-governmental organizations and non-profit groups (14 percent). The private sector represented 10 percent of attendees, while professional organizations comprised 4 percent of the participants, followed by academia with 3 percent.

Additionally, more than half of all workshops attendees voluntarily provided demographic information. Compared to the racial and ethnic makeup of San Diego County, overall workshop participation had a slightly higher rate of White (Non-Hispanic) participants, but overall suggested a fair racial and ethnic representation of the region (Reference Chart). A comparison of the attendees with the regional percentages by race and ethnicity is shown below:

### Next Steps

In August, SANDAG held two additional workshops: one focused specifically on the Transportation Project Evaluation Criteria and another to begin engaging economic stakeholders. Over the coming months staff will continue to use the input received to develop the Regional Plan, including the preparation of various policy white papers (e.g., Public Health, Emerging Technologies, Climate Change and Adaptation, and Parking Strategies). The comments received from the workshops will also be included in the analysis of related planning efforts that will be folded into the Regional Plan, including the Active Transportation Implementation Strategy, Habitat Management Strategic Plan, and others.
Plan, Regional Transit Oriented Development Strategy, Land Use and Transportation Scenarios, and Complete Streets Policy.

On October 11, 2013, SANDAG plans to conduct its next Regional Plan workshop, which will focus on reviewing the simulated planning results of the alternative land use and transportation scenario work currently underway and discussing related transportation concepts.

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

Attachment: 1. E-Blast Summaries from Each Workshop

Key Staff Contact: Phil Trom, (619) 699-7330, phil.trom@sandag.org
WORKSHOP SUMMARY: FOCUS ON HEALTHY ENVIRONMENT, ENERGY, CLIMATE CHANGE AND PUBLIC HEALTH - MAY 17, 2013, AT CALTRANS

Thank you to the more than 150 participants who took part in last Friday’s workshop on San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan on Regional Bike to Work Day!

Your input and feedback are keys to the process of creating a vision and plan that will keep the San Diego region a great place to live now and in the future. If you attended Friday – remember, there are more workshops coming up, so please stay involved. And if you couldn’t make it, consider attending an upcoming event – the next one will be held on the evening of June 6, in English and Spanish, at Casa Familiar Civic Center in San Ysidro. For more information, visit www.sandag.org/sandiegoforward.

Below is a summary of the thoughtful and extensive input provided by stakeholders during 30 facilitated roundtable sessions held at the May 17 event. This input will be used to shape policy objectives related to healthy environment, energy, public health, and climate change in San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan.

Listed below are just some of the ideas and concerns expressed by participants at the workshop, and some pictures, too.

Thanks again – and we hope to see you at one of our upcoming workshops.
Climate Change

- Place greenhouse gas (GHG) reductions at the center of the identified Regional Plan goals and objectives.
- Provide strong regional policy guidance on GHG emissions reductions.
- Address Environmental Justice (EJ)/Public Health issues associated with climate change and the measures to reduce GHGs.
- Explain the full set of options that the SANDAG Board has in expending TransNet funds (e.g., what percent/amount of funding and category/function/program can’t be modified but every 10 years, what requires 2/3 vote to modify, and portion of the allocation is discretionary).
- Comprehensively add both climate adaptation and mitigation (without silos) and promote the synthesis between the two plans (the Regional Transportation Plan and the Regional Comprehensive Plan).
- Prepare for the impacts of climate change on both the natural and built environments. Key concerns include increases in wildfires and heat waves, sea-level rise, water supply and demand, public health impacts, agriculture and food-security, and disproportionate impacts on low-income, minority, and senior populations.
- Pursue regional coordination on climate change and adaptation efforts. We need scalable solutions – from the parcel to the regional to the state level.
- Promote best practices that provide co-benefits, such as xeriscaping, graywater re-use, tree planting, and other low-impact development solutions.
- Prioritize transportation investments based on their benefits to the environment.
- SANDAG should provide a forum for regional collaboration, incentives for adaptation and mitigation, guidance on design standards, and other resources to address climate change.
- Build transportation infrastructure that can withstand the adverse effects of climate change, like sea level rise.
- Incorporate greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction and climate change efforts into the regional plan (including goals, policy measures, and funding opportunities).
- Plant more vegetation/trees now as a low-cost mitigation measure that will ultimately absorb more GHGs in the future and enhance communities.
- Empower the community to address climate-related behaviors at an individual and neighborhood level. Start with educating the children.

Air & Water Quality

- Address respiratory problems with better public transportation, more carpooling and vanpooling, and communities where people can bike and walk more.
- Bring air quality issues down to the micro level, for example, by bringing small hand-held air quality monitoring devices to community members.
- More urban forestry/vegetation can help reduce air and water pollution, and improve economic conditions in local communities.
- Work within the environment: create more attractive spaces using native species – these don’t require a lot of water and fertilizer.
- Create a regionally driven policy for reclaimed water.
- Look at all impacts related to water quality, not just the impacts related to new development projects.
- Address both health and social equity issues related to air and water quality – need to focus on impacted communities, those that suffer the most.

Habitat & Shoreline
San Diego has been successful in preserving habitat. Focus on restoring and providing access to these areas.

- Incentivize higher density development around transit. That would allow people to get around easier and also preserve open space.
- Make access to open spaces more equitable.
- Wetlands protection needs to be done on a larger scale; wetlands protect shorelines and act as carbon sinks.
- Wetland rehabilitation efforts that remove concrete linings of channels and restore the riparian habitat are important, and we should also incorporate bike lanes so that people can enjoy it.
- Make policy changes that incorporate permeability and other green infrastructure codes that help mitigate urban run-off.
- Create open spaces and trails for residents in developed areas.
- Create policies that require upland development projects to include a sand mitigation component as this material can no longer flow naturally from inland to the coast.
- Balance preservation and recreation – providing access while protecting habitat.
- Develop bicycle trails along the San Diego River to mix the green corridor into open space – like the San Antonio River Walk.

Healthy Communities

- The ability to walk and bike within communities and to school is important.
- Consider rethinking the methodology of how trips are calculated within a complete streets framework, using something other than Level of Service (LOS) and moving toward a multi-modal analysis.
- Look at the inequities and health disparities between neighborhoods and focus the investments in areas of need.
- Look at areas with concentrations of obesity and diabetes and examine current transportation infrastructure to find the gaps. Shift transportation modes toward active transportation.
- Make public health a line item within the policy making process, and not an afterthought – focus on how to bridge disparities.
- Consider the needs of all populations including the aging population.
- Create bike facilities for commuting AND recreation.
- Marry functionality and safety in neighborhood design to encourage more walkable communities which can lead to greater social interaction.
- Need walkability connections to grocery stores, creating access to healthy foods.
- Leverage existing resources with the Human Health and Services Agency (HHSA) and other organizations.
- Provide more diverse bike options. Class 1 lanes are not very common in California, but for women in particular, they could help lower stress levels for biking.
- Social equity is important to address with public health because many communities have suffered from years of disinvestments, and have higher rates of chronic diseases, including diabetes.
- Healthy communities and public facilities should address the needs of the homeless.
- Healthy communities should have a robust urban forestry program, and a lot of green space. This can impact food, safety, and health.
- Where one lives should not determine the quality and length of life.
- Promote policies that motivate healthier food options to move into low-income neighborhoods, and provide incentives to those companies which promote healthy eating.

Clean Energy, Clean Fuels & Innovation
• Place a high value on issues that will be important for the younger generations.
• Plan and build facilities for safely riding bikes to and from school.
• Alternative energy sources:
  o Energy efficiency and roof-top energy needs to be a priority in making communities more self-sufficient.
  o Need to fit the communities that we already have with photovoltaics, and deemphasize fitting the back country with large energy plants.
• Transit centers could have conference rooms attached so people can rent a room and hold meetings at a place that is accessible by transit.
• The net energy use by communities should be evaluated.
• Encourage roof-top photovoltaic: public buildings, industrial and residential.
• The only practical way to get people to use the good stuff is to highly tax the bad stuff. This is politically unpopular, but economically popular.
• Presentations to high school students nearing driving age should be made regarding affordable energy-efficient cars.
• Car2Go is good program because buying a zero-emission vehicle is out of reach to many families
• There are programs that help seniors with the bills and they talk to them about other ways to save money. Many seniors have inquired about ways they can be more environmentally friendly
• Border crossing wait-times should be improved to reduce emissions and health impacts.
• Provide opportunities for and promote mobility options that produce low emissions or no emissions at all (bicycling and walking).
• Create community garden opportunities to reduce emissions related to the transportation of fruits and vegetables.
• Focus on renewable energy (e.g. wind, solar, geothermal) and increasing low carbon fuel standards.
• Focus on distributed (on-site) generation of green energy. Solar, wind, biofuel require less infrastructure and protect open space/habitat areas; industrialized solar/wind energy is destructive and requires transmission lines.
• Build more infrastructure to support electric cars.
• Develop apps or ways people can determine how much water and energy they are consuming to help them conserve and use these resources more efficiently.
• Focus on green jobs related to transportation, buildings, etc.; support entrepreneurs.
• Reduce energy use by buying local food and creating food hubs.
WORKSHOP SUMMARY / RESUMEN DEL TALLER:
JUNE 6, 2013 / 6 DE JUNIO DE 2013
CASA FAMILIAR, SAN YSIDRO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENGLISH</th>
<th>ESPAÑOL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thank you to the almost 100 participants who took part in the June 6th workshop on San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan!</td>
<td>¡Gracias a los casi 100 participantes que tomaron parte en el taller del jueves 6 de junio en Adelante San Diego: El Plan Regional!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your input and feedback are keys to the process of creating a vision and plan that will keep the San Diego region a great place to live now and in the future. If you attended – remember, there are more workshops coming up, so please stay involved. And if you couldn’t make it, consider attending an upcoming event – the next one will be held on the evening of June 13 in Escondido. For more information, visit <a href="http://www.sandag.org/sandiegoforward">www.sandag.org/sandiegoforward</a>.</td>
<td>Su aporte y retroalimentación son claves para el proceso de crear una visión y un plan que mantendrá la región de San Diego como un gran lugar para vivir ahora y en el futuro. Si usted asistió al taller, le recordamos que habrá más talleres para seguir involucrado. Y si no pudo participar, considere asistir a un próximo evento. El próximo taller se llevará a cabo en la tarde del 13 de junio en la ciudad de Escondido. Para obtener más información, visite <a href="http://www.sandag.org/sandiegoforward">www.sandag.org/sandiegoforward</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below is a summary of the thoughtful and extensive input provided by stakeholders during 30 facilitated roundtable sessions held at the June 6 event, and some pictures are included, too. This input will be used to shape policy objectives in San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan.</td>
<td>A continuación se encuentra un resumen de las ideas y reflexiones que los participantes expresaron en las 30 mesas redondas facilitadas en el taller del 6 de junio y se incluyen algunas fotos, también. Esta retroalimentación será utilizada para dar forma a los objetivos de política en Adelante San Diego: El Plan Regional.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In addition to this summary, a complete set of notetakers’ notes has been posted on the website. We have also added notetakers’ notes from the May 17 workshop to the website.</td>
<td>Además, un resumen completo con las notas que se tomaron en el taller se ha publicado en la página de internet. También hemos agregado las notas del taller del 17 de mayo a la página de internet.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Mobility**

- Promote a well-integrated, multimodal transportation system with an emphasis on transit access and frequent service, safe walkable streets for all ages, and bikeable communities to provide access to daily uses such as groceries, healthcare, and jobs, and to promote healthy lifestyles and a strong sense of family and community.
- Add more frequent Trolley services at the border, recognizing that the Trolley provides transportation for both the local community and international travelers.
- Add localized transportation options, such as jitneys, within the San Ysidro community.
- Focus on walkability as a key priority for residents in San Ysidro. Barriers include wide roads, large parking lots, missing/inadequate sidewalks, and not enough street lighting.
- Balance regional and local transportation needs by adding criteria considering transit service to particular neighborhoods.
- The San Ysidro Transit Center is the busiest Trolley station in the region and represents the beginning of the Trolley line at the border. It is a perfect opportunity to take it above grade.
- Adopt policy changes similar to Portland’s that build upon a pyramid of pedestrians first, bicyclists next.

---

**Movilidad**

- Se necesitan rutas de transporte público más directas, rápidas y con mejores conexiones.
- El tipo de transporte público cerca de la frontera está en malas condiciones. Los Trolleys hacia el norte son más nuevos y están en mejor condición.
- En los fines de semana, el servicio de transporte público no cumple con las necesidades y no es suficiente.
- Los operadores de los autobuses no tienen paciencia con los adultos mayores.
- No hay espacio en el Trolley o autobuses durante las horas pico.
- Hacen falta pasos a desnivel en la ruta del Trolley.
- Compass Card no es adecuado y es muy caro. Una familia de cuatro personas sin carro no puede pagar el costo para cuatro pases mensuales.
- Se necesitan baños en las estaciones.
- Se necesitan banquetas para acceder a las escuelas. No hay la seguridad para caminar.
- No hay rutas disponibles para bicicletas.
- Cuando atardece, es peligroso para los niños que caminan y no hay suficientes autobuses.
- Se necesita más transporte público para los niños. Caminar no es posible cuando hay distancias largas a la escuela.
• Focus on infrastructure for pedestrians and bicyclists to improve safety, especially safe routes to schools.
• Explore better greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reduction alternatives.
• Use urban growth boundaries to maximize infill opportunities.
• Provide more security on the bus/trolley.

Healthy Communities

• Provide more access to organic products and healthy foods.
• Invest in more public transit and bike paths.
• Create a more attractive pedestrian environment – wider sidewalks; places to sit; shaded areas, trees.
• To improve air quality, create more green areas, plant more trees, and provide a natural buffer between homes and freeways.
• Add security to the Trolley and remove trash from the Trolley cars.
• Address idling from cars at the border crossing.
• Reduce high levels of toxins in the soil to promote gardening.
• Invest in special paint that attracts carbon to the walls.
• Improve crosswalks; design streets and communities for people, not cars; promote more ways to connect.
• Address safety concerns of children when there aren’t enough sidewalks near schools – they have to go through paths in canyons – no lighting, sometimes encounter dangerous wildlife.
• Provide more open spaces such as small pocket parks that can be within the neighborhood for families to stop by; place to socialize.
• Provide access to The Tijuana River Valley – beautiful but no trails.
• Close down a street for a street fair or farmers market and promote a community garden.
• Provide incentives/shared bike program for people who use their bikes at the border.
• Build a Class 1 Bicycle path from the international border to the Bayshore Bikeway.

Comunidades Saludables

• Atraer mercados que ofrezcan comidas y productos orgánicos.
• Mejorar la promoción del uso del transporte público a la comunidad.
• Mejores calles; arreglar los hoyos que existen en las calles; construir más banquetas para la seguridad del peatón y la juventud.
• Deben de haber rutas seguras a la escuela para los alumnos.
• Crear mejor acceso para el peatón al transporte público.
• Se necesitan mercados que sean más económicos, saludables y sustentables.
• Combatir y eliminar el uso de drogas dentro de la comunidad.
• Contaminación – el smog ha causado el incremento de casos de asma; se debe reducir el uso de carros para reducir la contaminación.
• El tiempo que se toma para cruzar la frontera es demasiado. La demora causa una “tortura” y causa un estrés muy grande.
• Necesitamos educación para el ciclista, el conductor, y para la comunidad para mejorar la seguridad de todos.
• Se debe ampliar los carriles para ciclistas sobre la calle para mejorar la seguridad.
• Necesitamos sembradillos locales – se debe usar lotes vacíos para la educación y para mejorar la comunidad.
• No hay hospital en San Ysidro.
• Necesitamos mejores parques y que estén bien cuidados y seguros y que cuenten con baños. Crear un programa como “Park and Ride” en la comunidad y aumentar el acceso a “van pools”.

Healthy Environment

• Transit, commercial vehicles, taxis, then single vehicles last.
• Manage water runoff more effectively since the water eventually goes out to our beaches.
• There is a new global climate law in Mexico, so work together to achieve certain greenhouse (GHG) emission goals.
• Address air pollution and the negative health impacts caused by idling cars at the border.
• Promote more connections to the Tijuana Estuary so that people can appreciate the natural resources and become more active in that area.
• Address beach closures in Imperial Beach due to high levels of contamination and sewage.
• Encourage more public areas to be non-smoking.
• Climate change and sea level rise is a concern. Everything is interconnected and sea level rise will make crops harder to grow.
• Work with the Environmental Health Coalition, Wildcoast, and Ocean Force to look at salinity of the oceans, tide levels, and effects on ecosystems.
• Reinstate the bike incentive for crossing the border.
• Reduce crime. Crime is an aspect of healthy environment, because it restricts people from going out on walks or letting their children outside when it is not safe, and this limits activity levels and community participation.
• Increase children’s education programs focused on the outdoors.

Energy and Climate Change

• Increase awareness and understanding of how climate change relates to the average person.
• Tailor the message to different population segments, taking factors such as language and culture into consideration.
• Provide more green space, which can help address pollution and climate change.
• Expand Car2Go car-sharing throughout the region.
• Demonstrate the benefits of making individual changes to reduce GHG emissions.
• Invest more in sustainable energy.
• Increase gas prices to encourage alternative forms of transportation.
• Synchronize stoplights to reduce idling, traffic, and pollution.
• Proactively and naturally reduce fuel for wildfires, for example, by using goats.
• Change building codes to allow gray water to drain directly into gardens/landscaping.

Energía y Cambio Climático

• En la frontera, hay más contaminación que se siente más por la cercanía a la garita.
• Revisar las emisiones de vehículos que cruzan la frontera.
• Educar más a los niños acerca del cambio climático.
• Publicar los horarios de la escuela y qué relación tienen con los niveles de emisiones.
• Simplificar la información para que gente entienda.
• Agilizar el cruce fronterizo para los peatones.
• Implementar paneles solares y sistemas eólicos.
• Difundir la información de planes y programas de desarrollo en lenguaje coloquial.
• Sembrar más áreas verdes y jardines para respirar aire más puro.
• Aprovechar la energía solar.
• Mejorar la eficiencia de los vehículos y reducir las emisiones.
• Caminar y andar en bicicleta como medio de transporte.
• Collect rain water as a sustainable way of conserving water.
• Provide electric vehicle (EV) charging stations, raise gas prices, and offer incentives to encourage people to use alternative fuel vehicles.
• Demonstrate cost comparisons and provide education on the benefits of electric/alternative fuel cars.
• Build better bike lanes and dedicated bike lanes.
• Spend less money on highways and more on public transit.
• Invest more money into each individual community, not just transportation but infrastructure, so that people don’t have to leave the community in order to find medical services or grocery stores, or meet other basic needs.

**Economic Prosperity and Borders**

• Reduce border wait times. Lengthy wait times affect prosperity, health, pollution, and the environment.
• Invest more in border infrastructure as this can lead to more jobs and a healthier environment.
• SR 905 interstate was a great addition.
• Assist seniors. Currently it is difficult for seniors to find work since finding ways to commute can be a challenge. They also have difficulty accessing social services, groceries, medical care, and housing.
• Address the mismatch between skills of individuals and skills needed in jobs.
• Invest more in schools and motivate students.
• Invest more in communities that haven’t received as much; social equity.
• Increase the focus on education & school achievement. In San Ysidro, create more STEM (science, technology, engineering, math) programs and add a college in South Bay.
• Recognize that many people own business in Tijuana but live in San Diego, and that they are contributing to both economies.
• Think of San Diego and Tijuana as a mega-region.
• Collaborate on transportation. Continue rail service south of the border. Integrate rapid transit from Baja to Alta California, with no need to transfer at the border.
• Acknowledge that trade at our border affects many states. For example, items manufactured in maquiladoras don’t just stay in San Diego...what

**Prosperidad Económica y Fronteras**

• La frontera y la prosperidad económica están profundamente vinculadas porque hay mucho comercio entre las comunidades de San Diego y Tijuana.
• Por los altos costos de vida en San Diego, mucha gente se va a vivir a Tijuana. Rentar una casa puede costar $300 dólares, lo que en San Diego no existe.
• No se puede cruzar la frontera para ir de visita o de compras debido a las demoras actuales, y eso está impactando de manera negativa la economía fronteriza; muchos negocios están cerrando porque no hay suficiente comercio.
• Hay que hacer la gestión de la frontera una prioridad.
• Los tiempos actuales de espera impactan de manera negativa la salud mental y física de las personas quienes tienen que cruzar.
• Hay que invitar a los agentes federales a eventos comunitarios para que participen en las discusiones sobre cómo mejorar el funcionamiento de la frontera y para que escuchen las preocupaciones de la comunidad, pues ellos viven aquí, van a nuestras escuelas, usan nuestras calles, etc.
• Se deberían enfocar más recursos en las instalaciones públicas para la comunidad en lugar de invertirlos en el turismo.
• Se debe generar más trabajos mejor renumerados para que la gente pueda salir adelante económicamente.
• Se deben aumentar las opciones o alternativas de
happens if they are delayed due to border crossing waits?
- Learn from each other regardless of language or cultural barriers.
- Consider smart parking; build up instead of across.
- Implement a marketing campaign with San Diego and Tijuana ambassadors, including tours on how Tijuana really is. Should be able to say “Let’s go to Tijuana to grab dinner, see a show and come back.” It’s done in other borders throughout the world, why not this one?
- There is a need for more:
  - Understanding of diversity.
  - Community action to bridge the border.
  - Blur the separation, as we move forward… it seems like the division gets stronger and we need more collaboration.
  - Easier border crossing system – enhances the regional economy & better relations.
  - Concerted campaign to engage everyone.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>transporte público en la frontera.</th>
<th>Deben de haber más carriles para peatones que cruzan la frontera.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Se tiene que desarrollar un centro de transporte y comercio en la frontera de San Ysidro que inspire orgullo y brinde a la gente los servicios que necesita.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Para lograr la prosperidad económica hay que atender también la educación y la salud pública de las comunidades fronterizas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La ciudad de San Diego junto al sector privado debe de invertir fondos para construir un nuevo centro de transporte en San Ysidro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hay una gran oportunidad para prosperidad económica en la región fronteriza de Tijuana-San Diego, pero solamente se podría aprovechar de ella si se mejora la organización del cruce fronterizo.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WORKSHOP SUMMARY: JUNE 13, 2013, ESCONDIDO

Thank you to the 30 participants who took part in the June 13th workshop on San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan! Your input and feedback are keys to the process of creating a vision and plan that will keep the San Diego region a great place to live now and in the future. Below is a summary of the input provided by stakeholders during the facilitated roundtable sessions. This input will be used to shape policy objectives in San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan.

For more information and the detailed Note-takers Notes, visit www.sandag.org/sandiegoforward.

Mobility

- Provide more transportation options to people as they age.
- Address barriers to transit, including: infrequent transit service, transfers, the timing of connections, and the design of the pedestrian environment (small sidewalks, massive parking lots, auto-centric roadway design).
- Provide more flexible pricing for transit passes, such as options that allow for two days a month, one day a week, ten uses, etc.
- In Fallbrook, use a mini-bus rather than large buses during off-peak periods.
- Focus on family mobility concepts, such as riding bikes, skateboards, walking, safety, and sidewalks, particularly around schools.
- Decrease bus fares, provide shade at bus stops, and increase transit frequencies.
- Consider raising gas taxes to generate money for more transit options. Revenue from gas tax could be used for transit along the I-15 corridor that would provide equivalent transit travel times compared to a car.
• Front-load the construction of transit projects, and push back freeway projects.
• Recognize that our region is very car dependent.
• Invest in simple infrastructure improvements such as crosswalks and street lights to promote walkability and safety.
• Address traffic congestion during commute times, especially from Escondido to Oceanside.
• In North County, make improvements such as more bike lanes, creek flood mitigation, and increased frequencies on the SPRINT, COASTER, and buses.
• From the North County perspective, the region should balance transportation investments around the county, even if the majority live in San Diego.
• Explain how the plan will incorporate all of this feedback.

**Healthy Communities**

• Increase access to active recreation spaces to address childhood obesity.
• Include greater emphasis on “making connections” in grant criteria to improve connectivity from creek crossings or major arterials to schools and parks.
• Provide pedestrian access to destinations that provide social and family services.
• Include greater emphasis on walkability and multi-modal transportation as part of the transportation project evaluation criteria.
• Create clean and aesthetically pleasing streets to encourage walking and being on the street.
• Provide multiple options for accessing healthy foods.
• Concentrate services such as clinics, dentists, and grocery stores in central locations accessible by walking and transit.
• Increase the number of bikes that can fit on a bus rack to help support active lifestyles.
• Don’t invest in bike infrastructure for commuters. Commuting to work by bike is not convenient or efficient.
• Increase pedestrian safety by addressing dangerously wide boulevards.
• Focus bike and pedestrian infrastructure in areas where fewer people own cars, for example, in college communities.

**Healthy Environment**

• Include buffer zones/set-backs from freeways for new housing developments.
• Maintain existing agricultural lands and industrial zones for a diverse economy.
• Focus on indirect potable water reuse and conservation in addition to imported water.
• Decrease the amount of water used on landscaping in our arid region.
• Use grey water to water plants and yards.
• Focus on the resilience of our food supply as related to climate change.
• Work harder toward the goal of zero emissions at the ports and borders.
• Encourage more grey water use and rainwater harvesting for residents.
• Preserve open spaces to provide people with places to walk, hike, bike, etc.
• Plan neighborhoods in a way that draws people to walking, biking, and using transit to get to places. Make the walkable areas more inviting.
• Support beach sand nourishment along the shoreline.
• Distinguish between conservation and preservation. Some land should be off limits to the public and the public should be informed why.
• Encourage the construction of underground parking garages and underground parking lots.
• Provide continuity between open space trails. Pursue a complete Trail Master Plan to help connect the city trails with county, state, and federal trails.
• For water quality, tie in green infrastructure and permeability.
• Provide incentives for projects that go above and beyond Best Management Practices.
• Encourage water pricing to protect crop production.
• Address zoning issues related to community gardens and use empty lots for growing crops, like in Seattle.

**Energy & Climate Change**

• Expand installation of solar panels in urban areas.
• Incorporate solar panels into new developments, and use “wasted spaces,” i.e. rooftops, parking lots, etc. for solar.
• Increase use of solar energy in transportation – it has the portability/utility of gasoline and can work with our existing infrastructure.
• Reduce passenger trips and make vehicles more efficient.
• Increase alternative fuel vehicles.
• Encourage the development and use of virtual meetings.
• Promote electrified truck stops in Otay Mesa.
• Continue expanding port on-shore electricity connections for ships.
• Promote organic farming throughout the county’s farms.
• Increase community gardens in urban areas, especially as a teaching tool for children.
• Generate electricity from garbage incineration.
• Install more reservoirs that can capture rain water and install more rain water recovery systems.
• Expand grey water infrastructure and availability.
• Do not expect the business community or developers to finance everything.
• If the cost of doing business increases too drastically, then it becomes economically infeasible for companies to stay here.
• Support strong climate action plans at the city level.

**Economic Prosperity & Borders**

• Educational debt is a big issue. Reduce high student debt rates and increase job opportunities for graduating students.
• Provide transportation options, especially for college kids who can’t afford a car and gas.
• Explore how the increasing use of online education will affect travel patterns.
• Build more border crossing lanes to reduce border wait times.
• Ensure that there’s a level of prosperity for everyone, not just the top end of income groups.
• Promote jobs with livable wages.
• Coordinate more bike and pedestrian infrastructure in the county – many studies show that these types of investments have positive localized economic impacts.
• Need more job opportunities for people who don’t earn degrees; this has correlation with crime.
• Charge a “cover charge” for commuters coming down the I-15 from the Temecula area.
• Developments within tribal nations can have regional impacts on water quality. Coordinate discussions with tribal nations.
• Retrofit suburbia to draw people in; SANDAG can serve as a partner.
• Increase the reliability of our transportation system to take people to job interviews and work. People are shut out of jobs if the transportation system is not reliable.
WORKSHOP SUMMARY: JUNE 20, 2013, OCEANSIDE

Thank you to the 75 participants who took part in the June 20th workshop on San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan! Your input and feedback are keys to the process of creating a vision and plan that will keep the San Diego region a great place to live now and in the future. Below is a summary of the input provided by stakeholders during the facilitated roundtable sessions. This input will be used to shape policy objectives in San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan.

For more information and the detailed note-takers notes, visit www.sandag.org/sandiegofoward.

Mobility

- Place higher priority on transportation projects in North County, especially to alleviate congestion on the north end of I-5 near Camp Pendleton.
- Accommodate more travel alternatives to the freeway.
- Overcome the LOGUT (Let the other guy use transit) mentality.
- Explore the transportation needs of each unique community – Downtown/urban areas differ greatly from suburban neighborhoods.
- Increase transit frequency and operating hours, especially on Sundays and in the evenings.
- Make bike paths work. Learn from Frankfurt, Germany, where bike paths exist throughout the city on sidewalks rather than in the way of oncoming traffic.
- Promote and build bike corrals, like was done in City of Long Beach.
- Place greater focus on bike security at transit stations.
- Prioritize the double-tracking of the COASTER to make this project happen sooner.
- Move the COASTER station from Sorrento Valley to the University Town Center (UTC).
- Promote reciprocal fare arrangements between Amtrak and COASTER/SPRINTER.
• Improve connectivity across the COASTER rail tracks, particularly in Encinitas for individuals trying to get to school.
• Add transportation connections and safe places to park bicycles at SPRINTER stops.
• Apply I-15 principles (e.g. FasTrak, premium express buses, vanpools, etc.) to I-5.
• Extend car-sharing to North County.
• Support electric bicycles.
• Use technology to its full extent in terms of transportation planning.
• Unbundle parking.
• Consider physically impaired veterans who have special parking and transportation needs and the aging population since many Baby Boomers will be incapable of driving in the future.
• Put a price on carbon emissions to promote market incentives for sustainable travel behaviors.

Healthy Communities

• Offer active transportation options and convenient multi-modal travel choices for all age groups that reduce greenhouse gas emissions.
• Widen and improve sidewalks to promote walking, bicycling, wheel-chair access, and stroller accessibility, and to provide safety and connectivity within the community.
• Provide affordable access to basic necessities such as food, water, and housing.
• Employ local residents, regardless of age, income level, or ethnicity.
• Accommodate and prioritize the needs of the homeless, the aging population, and those with mental illnesses.
• Provide multi-modal and complete streets, increased access to transit for seniors, more senior-friendly buses, and safe housing options for the elderly.
• Promote farmers markets.
• Promote a Walk to Work Day.
• Do more to limit smoking in public areas.
• Encourage new sustainable farming concepts such as the “key-hole garden” – a drought tolerant circular raised bed with a compost pile in center which distributes nutrients to surrounding areas.
• Develop and embody characteristics of resilient communities.

Healthy Environment

• Encourage replacing non-native plants that are used in landscaping by native plants to help conserve water.
• Provide more incentives, such as competitions, to encourage reductions of energy and water use.
• Build more community gardens in the North County Coastal area.
• Create better habitat protection links with watersheds.
• Improve water quality of oceans – can’t swim in the water because of sewage system breakdowns in North County related to old water pipeline infrastructure. Modernize sewage infrastructure.
• Acknowledge that population growth will affect everything; think proactively about ecological and economic issues.
• Recognize and address the barriers to achieving our goals, which include: 1) public mind-set, 2) political mind-set and division of jurisdictional lines, and 3) honest assessment of costs.
• Ensure steady supply of water.
• Consider requiring each city to have a certain percentage of open space.
• Focus on climate stabilization; if we don’t do that, we will lose everything, including habitat.
• Do more than the bare minimum with regard to climate change and environmental issues.
• Build better and more sustainably – everything should be sustainable.
• Understand the trade-offs between desalinization to increase water supply and impacts to the environment and marine life.
• Focus on the quality of drinking water as a #1 priority.
Energy & Climate Change

- Use existing and proven technologies, such as solar power.
- Expand installation of solar panels in urban areas.
- Shade parking lots with solar panels.
- Promote electric-powered vehicles.
- Implement a carbon fee to help solve the GHG emissions problem.
- Promote free markets to handle GHG reductions.
- Strengthen legislation for reducing GHG emissions and keep agencies accountable.
- Promote more public education in schools about climate change at all levels.
- Provide more options for public transportation.
- Create reliable technology for bus stop times on computers and cell phones.
- Work with employers to incentivize ride share and shuttle programs.
- Create tools for disaster planning.
- Create safer and complete streets (cars, biking, walking).
- Maximize “low technologies” such as active transportation (bikeways, walking).
- Support programs that allow individuals to produce biofuels.
- Include regional water issues in the new plan (desalination is very energy intensive).
- Raise personal awareness about energy and water footprint through visual tools.
- Make transportation maps and data more accessible.
- Look for strategies to reduce growth. Population growth is directly correlated with energy use. The easiest way to reduce our energy demand is to reduce growth.

Economic Prosperity & Borders

- Focus on the kinds of businesses you want to attract, such as business clusters with green tech.
- Reduce regulations. The free market will come up with ideas to protect the environment and deal with growth. Regulation is stifling businesses from creating innovative ideas and causing businesses to leave California.
- Encourage job creation closer to people living in Oceanside to improve commutes.
- Increase public transportation between Escondido and Temecula.
- Move people more efficiently across our international border crossings. It takes less time to travel on a plane from Mexico to the United States than to cross the border at San Ysidro.
- Encourage cooperation and cross-border economic development.
- Improve utilization of all border crossing lanes, including the SENTRI and Ready Lanes.
- Address the conflicts between security and ease of crossing at the international border.
- Protect our borders because there are many types of potential threats.
- Consider a train that travels across the U.S./Mexico border. This could help with the time it takes to process individuals through customs.
- Decrease water rates to promote and preserve agriculture in the region.
- Improve wages for lower paying jobs.
- Provide education as a means for acquiring higher paying jobs.
- Encourage apprentice programs and job training programs.

Español

**Comunidades Saludables**

- Necesitamos acceso a comida saludable y económica, incluyendo verduras frescas.
- Queremos una ciudad limpia; que no tiren basura en la calle y que controlen los animales e insectos.
- Necesitamos calles bien pavimentadas sin baches y hoyos y con banquetas.
- Banquetas son importantes para la gente con discapacidad.
- Es un riesgo para los niños caminar a la orilla de la calle sin banquetas.
• Necesitamos centros comunitarios para que los jóvenes tengan acceso a actividades educativas.
• Es importante alocar los recursos de manera equitativa.
• Deberían plantar árboles en las calles y en los parques.
• Necesitamos más alumbrado/iluminación.
• SANDAG debe de invitar a más jóvenes para escuchar sus puntos de vista también.

Energía y Cambio Climático

• Debemos disminuir el uso de la energía para frenar el cambio climático.
• Los calentadores solares son buenos para ahorrar energía al largo plazo.
• Los paneles solares son ahora más accesibles que antes, pero hay que educar a la gente sobre los beneficios de instalar los paneles solares.
• Hay una falta de infraestructura para cargar vehículos eléctricos.
• Si uno no gana suficiente dinero, no puede comprar una casa, y si uno renta su casa, no se puede instalar paneles solares, o hacer otras renovaciones que ayudan ahorrar energía.
• Deben de haber programas de asistencia que eduquen a la gente sobre cuales tecnologías alternativas se pueden implementar.
• Deben de haber programas de incentivar a la gente tomar medidas de disminuir el uso de la energía, y también utilizar tecnologías alternativas.
• Se necesita reforestar por el bien del medio ambiente y también para el beneficio de la gente y las comunidades.
• Se debe plantar árboles, y también mantenerlos.
• Tenemos que estar preparados para los efectos causados por el cambio climático.
• El cambio climático está conectado al transporte y la salud pública.
• Toma demasiado tiempo usar el transporte público, y el servicio debe ser más frecuente y deben de haber más rutas.
• Las paradas de autobús y del Trolley deben de contar con tejados ya que hay muchas que no los tienen.

Prosperidad Económica y Fronteras

• Queremos mejores sueldos, más trabajos, más oportunidades de educación, y también programas de entrenamiento.
• Empresas privadas deben de ofrecer programas de entrenamiento laboral.
• Necesitamos inversiones económicas en nuestras comunidades.
• La movilidad impacta a la economía; hay comunidades en que no es fácil trasladarse a ciertos destinos.
• Demora de 2 a 4 horas para cruzar la frontera, tanto en coche como a pie.
• Mucha gente, especialmente los de la tercera edad, cruzan a Tijuana para obtener servicios y bienes más económicos, y debe de ser más fácil cruzar.
• Los carros que esperan en la línea fronteriza causan mucha contaminación del aire.
• El smog que está saliendo de los carros en la frontera causa un impacto negativo.
• Las largas esperas en la frontera impactan negativamente a la economía porque personas quiénes quisieran cruzar la frontera para fines comerciales o para hacer compras no lo hace por las demoras.
• Sería una buena idea tener un carril dedicado a las bicicletas, pero tendrían que controlar el tráfico para que la gente no lo abuse.
• Sería buena idea empezar un programa de compartir bicicletas en la frontera.
Thank you to the over 125 participants who took part in the June 21st workshop on San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan!

Your input and feedback are keys to the process of creating a plan that will keep the San Diego region a great place to live now and in the future. Below is a summary of the input provided by stakeholders during the facilitated roundtable sessions. This input will be used to shape policy objectives and other core components of San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan.

For more information and the detailed note-takers notes, visit [www.sandag.org/sandiegoforward](http://www.sandag.org/sandiegoforward).

**Mobility**

- Focus on intra-regional mobility which can bring money to outlying areas which can foster regional economic vitality.
- Consider a child bike-share program with helmets as a part of a larger bike-share program.
- Create reliability for developers to invest around transit stations.
- Consider moving air freight travel out of Lindbergh, separating passenger from freight and moving freight to Carlsbad or Brown Field.
- Any type of bike-share program needs to include infrastructure to support safer routes to ride.
- Expand traveler information to ease of use of the systems (e.g., ”Next Bus” signs)
- Develop a “transit ambassador” program for seniors.
- Make transit competitive with driving in terms of travel time.
• Apply a complete streets model for main boulevards accommodating multiple modes of travel.
• Provide transit service that reaches hard-to-access job centers (e.g. North County).
• Design transit so that it accounts for different areas (e.g. higher density areas merit light rail projects).
• Improve walk/bike/other connections between bus and rail and to/from destinations.
• Direct growth through transportation investments.
• Encourage growth along Smart Growth transportation corridors.
• Consider public health in decision-making.
• Consider including punitive measures to effect change, rather than just incentivizing change; the 18 cities and Port District should be required to follow the Regional Plan goals and principles.
• Include transportation options for all demographics (e.g. youth without licenses trying to get to beach as well as aging population of baby boomers).
• Promote telecommuting and encourage businesses to offer telecommuting to their employees 1-2 days per week.
• Consider sidewalk access and improvements.
• Look at impacts of freight movement versus other modes – do the needs of trucks conflict with the needs of bikes, for example.
• Make transit convenient, cost-effective, and reliable so that transit is competitive with driving.

Parking and Pricing

• Integrate parking with purposeful economic returns.
• Balance demand management strategies (congestion pricing) with alternative transportation modes (public transit, active transportation, etc.).
• Make car-sharing a more attractive option for transit users.
• Develop park-once strategies where people are encouraged to ‘park once’ during a day/trip.
• Use metered parking in a manner that creates turnover of spaces in high demand (for shopping or dining purposes, for example) and allows longer term metered parking (for work/employment) further away.
• Use emerging technologies to connect the public with available parking (available parking spots/vacant lots, variably priced metered parking, etc.).
• Survey communities to better understand their specific needs, in order to create more tailored solutions rather than a one-size-fits-all.
• Consider shared parking strategies that balance the peak AM/PM use and off-peak uses.
• Allocate the parking revenues to contribute to not only to the enhancement of the transit experience, but the walkability of the street.
• On the private side, we need to give carpools priority parking. Cities should require it.
• Companies should be incentivized to reduce employee parking and to subsidize transit passes.

Land Use Scenarios

• Give more priority to protecting our urban open space, recreation, and habitat areas.
• Expand the higher density core to include Chula Vista and the border area.
• Include the area south of the border for affordable housing opportunities.
• Explore the impacts of each scenario on the economy, health, environment, and quality of life.
• Explore smart growth scenarios that help with transportation choices, transportation costs, and health benefits.
• Consider second units close to the transit oriented development areas.
• Look at the redevelopment of the region’s commercial areas and development of shopping malls near transit hubs.
• Address jobs/housing fit and try to do a better job of matching income levels with housing choices to address the range of types of income levels in a job place (i.e., high-paying jobs versus service workers working in high-tech buildings). SANDAG’s modeling process should look at the implications of jobs/housing fit.
• Modify scenarios to acknowledge and better integrate the major employment clusters.
• Conduct a market feasibility analysis on all of the scenarios.
• Map topographic land constraints; many slopes are uninhabitable for human development. River valleys and steep slopes are not suitable for human development.
• Create a scenario with urban growth boundaries.
• Address sea level rise in the scenarios.
• Consider placing just as much emphasis on creating more walkable and bikeable communities than is placed on transit oriented (TOD) communities so we do not have to invest in so much public transit.
• The TOD scenario is more reflective of where job centers are throughout the region.
• Consider housing costs and affordability in scenarios.
• Consider quality of life issues and transit access to parks, healthcare, education, family resource centers, clinics, childcare, and other community resources/social service facilities.
• Adapt to current trends such as telecommuting, co-work spaces, etc. which are becoming more popular and more sustainable.

**Active Transportation**

• Focus on Safe Routes to Transit as a key goal.
• SANDAG is doing an admirable job at trying to connect with communities but needs to do a better job in reaching out.
• SANDAG’s efforts to reach-out and invite participation from groups that traditionally are not engaged in the process are appreciated and beneficial.
• Broaden the active transportation goal to include skateboarding, scooters, etc.
• Implement separated bicycle infrastructure facilities on major corridors.
• Plan according to younger generations that want to live in communities where they can walk and bike.
• Improve systems for carrying bicycles on transit vehicles.
• Engage schools as a method of encouraging kids to walk and bike to school.
• Consider expanding wayfinding signage to direct users to transit stops which would encourage people to bike.
• Develop infrastructure like bike stations to encourage more people to bike to transit.
• Separation between bicyclists and vehicles is critical since a fear of safety is a barrier.
• Incorporate the complete streets concept into SANDAG’s planning.
• Offer incentives to encourage more biking; encourage employers to provide more shower and locker room facilities to employees.
• Encourage bicycle education.
• Emphasize utilitarian trips and not just commuter trips.
• Having an Active Transportation discussion puts health first and foremost including individual and environmental health.

**Emerging Technologies**

• The ability to track the bus is important when people are going somewhere.
• Self-driving vehicles can help reduce accidents.
• When considering emerging technologies, include sustainability, mobility/accessibility, and safety.
• The idea of crowd sourcing would be easy to focus on and easy to do. Provide the cloud to interested individuals and go beyond what is traditionally done.
• Expand Car2Go system geographically so that there is coverage across the whole county.
• Expand the availability of plug-in charging.
• Use technology for information such as real-time traffic information. This would help people decide what mode of transit to take and what route.
• Provide a greenhouse gas calculator application to help change peoples’ behavior
• Apply emerging technology to infrastructure improvements that reduce reliance on vehicles.
• Consider security and loss of privacy.
• Keep up with technology – signal detection, loops, etc.
• Technology can help with lowering costs.
• Autonomous vehicles are an easy solution to reckless drivers; they would allow more cars on the road without building more lanes, and the idea holds promise.
• The shared economy (Car2Go, etc.) is growing. Consider this in the planning process.
• Provide better traveler information.
• Consider equity as an issue since there are barriers to entry for technology, and not everyone can afford a smart phone, car, or Google glasses.

**Transportation Project Evaluation**
• Consider sustainability and return on investment. Can you sustain what you are building?
• Incorporate public health into the evaluation criteria and prioritization of transportation projects.
• Balance return on investment and use of transportation facilities.
• Provide a complete analysis of the costs and benefits of the projects, on other forms of transportation, and compare between all modes of transportation.
• Encourage smart growth, neighborhood shuttles.
• Add reduced GHG emissions to the criteria.
• Place greater value on community involvement and input in the evaluation of these projects. Make sure the community’s voice is heard.
• Focus priority on moving the most people at the least cost and increasing transit frequency.
• Consider density as a factor in determining transit project priorities.
• Think about health costs, too.
• Keep equity in mind... neighborhoods that don't have many transportation options should be focused on first.
• Think about students, where they need to get to, and how they get to school, and how they make their connections.
WORKSHOP SUMMARY: JUNE 27, 2013, LA MESA

Thank you to the nearly 90 participants who took part in the June 27th workshop on San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan! Your input and feedback are keys to the process of creating a vision and plan that will keep the San Diego region a great place to live now and in the future. Below is a summary of the input provided by stakeholders during the facilitated roundtable sessions. This input will be used to shape policy objectives in San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan.

For more information and the detailed note-takers notes, visit www.sandag.org/sandiegofoward.

Mobility

- We need to change the mentality of “us” versus “them” between bicyclists and automobile users.
- Having kids makes it challenging to take public transit. Transit should be more family friendly.
- Change SANDAG’S current policy goal from expanding local freeways and roads, to one that focuses instead on no-automotive mobility approaches.
- Focus on infrastructure for pedestrians and bikes to improve safety including the development of a region-wide bike path network that does not require bikes to share the streets and roads with multi-ton cars and trucks.
- The public perception of transit needs to change to increase ridership.
- Automobile use is easy and convenient; therefore if you make transit and biking more convenient, then more people will use alternative transportation.
- Build bus and transit directly to the airport and to the beach, in rapid fashion.
- Focus on connecting and developing older neighborhoods as well as newer neighborhoods. Include all neighborhoods in the process.
- Encourage density, mixed use development, and active transportation so there can be more growth in smaller neighborhoods so that people don’t have to travel outside of their communities.
• Education and outreach need to be made a priority.
• Seniors have limited transportation options regarding access to food, medicine, and amenities.
• Busses should be converted to alternative/non-polluting types of vehicles.
• Keep jobs and housing in one specific area. Make it so people don’t have to travel as often to achieve their daily tasks.
• Access to reasonably priced healthy food, health care facilities and services is lacking in rural areas.
• SANDAG should consider opportunities for a bi-national convergence using a form of smart growth in a rural setting.

Healthy Communities

• We need to plan for mother-in-law flats so that elderly and disabled or ill can age in place or be cared for by their families.
• The first and last mile for transit becomes a greater challenge due to hilly topography.
• It is preferable to live with a grocery store within walking distance. La Mesa residents are concerned about the emergence of 7-11 and the sale of alcohol, cigarettes and unhealthy foods.
• There needs to be more affordable housing to support the large refugee population in San Diego.
• Smoke free parks and trolley stations would support a healthy community. Secondhand smoke inhibits the health of others and is a big problem.
• Accessibility, safety, and engagement are important in a community. People need destinations and a sense of place to feel safe.
• The ability to grow your own healthy food could support a healthy community. Since not everyone has a yard, community gardens and urban agriculture regulation reform can improve access.
• There needs to be safety for children in order for parents to allow them to walk or bike to school.
• Walking school busses are brilliant. Encourage more ideas like this.
• Connectivity in La Mesa is important. Freeways break up communities. We need to provide better pedestrian access to circumvent freeways and reconnect communities.
• We need interregional connectivity. There should be a comprehensive bike network connecting the region.
• Support policies and programs that integrate health in the planning process. Transportation planners should interact with health care districts to educate the public on how vehicle emissions affect personal health and community health.
• Implement effective and informative signage, especially that which transcends language barriers.
• Consider placing distance markers along trails and sidewalks to encourage pedestrians to monitor their physical activity. For example, some seniors set a pedometer goal of 10,000 steps each day.
• Green spaces should be accessible by walking and accessible to all demographics. Parks are important because there is a correlation between access to green spaces and mental health.
• Acknowledge the health-wealth disparity in transportation planning; Public policies should reflect the fact that some people are more impacted by policy decisions.
• Make public transit economically attractive and time efficient.
• Update the iCommute webpage so that it is more user-friendly.
• Support a concentrated effort to provide mental health support to homeless people.
• Consider mitigation strategies to address the noise and air pollution near Gillespie Field.
• Encourage programs and policies that promote community gardens and parks.

Healthy Environment

• The local and state trails are disconnected. We need a forest system to link everything together.
• Shoreline is important for our regional economy, but it sounds like we’re destroying one ecosystem for ours through the beach sand replenishment program.
• We need to have better land use controls upstream – we let people build so close to the shoreline that it degrades environment.
• Provide more funding for active transportation projects and invest in systems (like BRT) and technologies that produce less exhaust.
• Runoff from roads impacts shoreline, habitat, water quality.
• I like the current habitat preservation goals, and would like to see a greater emphasis on that as the plan develops.
• We need more shade trees that cool the environment.
• We need for better education programs to foster understanding and stewardship for natural resources, especially in schools.
• Use porous materials for roads and sidewalks, which will replenish aquifer
• We need to restore our watersheds as much as possible. Watersheds that have been compromised have a higher occurrence of natural
• A lot of energy goes into making potable water – use it appropriately.
• Secure the local water supply by including desalinization.
• Encourage complete communities and ensure access to affordable local produce so that less energy and emissions are used for transporting goods. This is especially important for disadvantaged communities.
• People are not able to enjoy the open space if they are not able to get to it. However, the idea of people driving to the natural spaces is very unfavorable. People driving to these locations means that the fresh mountain air that is so valued will become polluted.
• There should be more agricultural lands for crop production in San Diego.
• More grey water should be used for watering plants.
• It should be a requirement for new housing developments to use drought tolerant and native plants.
• More public transportation is needed to reduce the cars on the road and the pollution in the air.
• It is important to keep the open spaces staffed so that they stay maintained.
• There needs to be brush management to prevent fires.

Energy & Climate Change

• The closure of San Onofre has caused a push for increased fossil fuel power plants. SANDAG should try to oversee this to ensure that fossil fuel plants don’t pop up as a result.
• San Diego lacks a natural tree scape, as the worst performing region in the US in terms of where our tree canopy needs to be. Planting trees in vacant space (small specimens) and keeping them maintained is the solution to this problem.
• Standardize codes to make permitting easier for solar technology to take hold.
• SANDAG should encourage local agencies to follow green building codes through incentives.
• If you can’t measure it, it doesn’t exist – we need to have systems that recognize the intrinsic value of the environment and show current regional greenhouse gas (GHG) statistics. We can’t move forward if we don’t know where we are at.
• The expression of changing a lifestyle scares people; it is more approachable to suggest making small changes to improve one’s life and create a healthier environment.
• Incentivize electric vehicles
• Cross border issues – Mexico air pollution and sewage
• The most polluted areas in the region are lower-income neighborhoods. Asthma and cancer rates are higher in sensitive populations, including lower-income, elderly, and disabled populations.
• Gillespie field should be relocated because it is the highest polluting airport in the region.
• Generate more power and energy locally instead of outsourcing. The region should be more self-sufficient and self-generating.
• Implement better landfill models by switching to an anaerobic digestion-model which better captures methane and gets more organics out of the landfills.
• Convert all trash trucks to Compressed Natural Gas (CNG).
• Encourage more rooftop solar. Currently, there are disincentives to putting generated energy back onto grid. SANDAG should stand up against the utility.
• Electric vehicle charging stations at solar panel covered parking lots which will encourage people to buy electric cars (e.g., San Diego Zoo parking lot).
• Educate people on water/energy nexus (embedded energy in water).
• Support Community choice aggregation (CCA), where cities can ban together to buy energy and gives consumers a choice in what kind of energy they want.

**Economic Prosperity & Borders**

• Hiring locally boosts the local economy.
• Economic prosperity needs to be tied with transit investments. Too many people live far away from where they work.
• We need to foster a creative class of young professionals as many leave San Diego due to lack of affordability coupled with the lack of desirable jobs in the region.
• Border wait times are too long - at least two hours. We can’t continue to allow this time barrier to exist as many people who live in Tijuana are commuting to San Diego (many via SENTRI Pass).
• There is a lack of diversity in the job market. Lower paying jobs go to minority communities and we must change this imbalance. Latinos are not encouraged to go to college in the same way as other groups are and it’s very divisive.
• There are many farmers markets now, but the products are a bit out of reach despite SNAP acceptance. More healthy food can be purchased at a conventional grocery store for the same amount of money.
• If there is no local prosperity, there is no culture or street activity.
• Encourage a diversification of the economy in San Diego to go beyond biotech and hospitality.
• Fund economic development in rural areas. We don’t support sprawl but we want something self-contained to elevate our standard of living, as 87% of our communities are living in poverty.
• Big box retail removed many small businesses beginning in the 1960s/70s. The ability to shop local has diminished. We want money to circulate locally in La Mesa, not go out of state.
• The big box retail issue is a real dilemma with no quick solution. One can save 25 cents on toilet paper at a big box store but it doesn’t justify lower wages and the lack of employee benefits. There are repercussions associated with a decreased quality of life.
• The SANDAG RTP places smart growth nodes too far out (e.g. Ramona) due to the political process.
• SANDAG should invest more in the Blue Line; it has high ridership and boasts a 70% cost recovery rate, yet it does not receive the financial support it deserves.
• We can improve economic prosperity and bring jobs and commerce into the region by improving the flow of traffic at the Border.
• Implement zoning laws that allow for more multi and mixed uses.
• Our transportation system divides us rather than integrates us – with car you drive right thru neighborhoods.
### ENGLISH

Thank you to the almost participants who took part in last Saturday’s workshop on June 29th on San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan!

Your input and feedback are keys to the process of creating a vision and plan that will keep the San Diego region a great place to live now and in the future. If you attended last Saturday – remember, there are more workshops coming up, so please stay involved. And if you couldn’t make it, consider attending an upcoming event. Visit [www.sandag.org/sandiegoforward](http://www.sandag.org/sandiegoforward) for more info.

Below is a summary of the thoughtful and extensive input provided by stakeholders during 4 facilitated roundtable sessions held at the June 29 event. This input will be used to shape policy objectives in San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan.

Listed below are just some of the ideas expressed by participants at the workshop, and some pictures, too.

### ESPANOL

Gracias a los participantes que tomaron parte en el taller del sábado 29 de junio en Adelante San Diego: El Plan Regional!

Su aporte y retroalimentación son claves para el proceso de crear una visión y un plan que mantendrá la región de San Diego como un gran lugar para vivir ahora y en el futuro. Si usted asistió al taller del sábado 29 de junio, le recordamos que habrá más talleres para seguir involucrado. Y si no pudo participar, considere asistir a un próximo evento. Visite [www.sandag.org/sandiegoforward](http://www.sandag.org/sandiegoforward) para obtener más información.

A continuación se encuentra un resumen de las ideas y reflexiones que los participantes expresaron en las 4 mesas redondas facilitadas en el taller del 29 de junio. Esta retroalimentación será utilizada para dar forma a los objetivos de política en Adelante San Diego: El Plan Regional.

A continuación se enumeran algunas de las ideas expresadas por los participantes en el taller, y se incluyen algunas fotos, también.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENGLISH TABLES</th>
<th>MESA EN ESPAÑOL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mobility</strong></td>
<td><strong>Movilidad</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The mind-set needs to change that accessibility for biking is just as important as cars.</td>
<td>• Información de mapas en español, folletos en español en trolley y camiones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ensure that sound barriers and walls are factored into the cost of expanding freeways.</td>
<td>• Actualizar información ofrecida al público en transporte público.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A bullet train will be necessary in future and should be built in center of the freeway with a station every 4-5 miles underneath.</td>
<td>• Fines de semanas no hay muchas rutas disponibles (Ruta 961).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Create a stronger public transit network so it’s more</td>
<td>• Parada de camión (18th y Highland) la parada de camión no tiene protección para el sol (techo).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
connected, timely, and frequent.
- Expand bus service in South County.
- South County lacks access to healthy foods.
- Encourage Farmers Markets in National City.
- People will just take their car if they have to walk far to get to a bus.
- Improve transit to the Airport.
- We need better transportation to key destinations throughout the county.
- Transit networks need to be expanded in communities with higher dependency, such as low-income and senior residency areas.
- Operate transit into the evening so that people can attend night events.
- SANDAG needs to use demographic trends to increase bus routes and tailor increased service to communities that are most dependent on transit.
- Focus on transit projects rather than automobile infrastructure.

Healthy Communities
- All streets should have safe bike lanes and sidewalks, especially along routes to schools to promote walking and biking to schools.
- Implement more engaging and participatory outreach to promote Safe Route to schools – there is an opportunity for SANDAG to have a presence in schools and educate children.
- Improve water quality in schools– currently children are discouraged from drinking water, as it tastes like drinking from corroded pipelines.
- Convert all buses to run on compressed natural gas.
- Implement policies to invest in and install existing technology that helps reduce energy uses.
- A healthy community means friendly people and an inclusive community where people feel safe.
- Kids should be able to walk to school, but parents and kids are concerned with safety.
- Schools should design loading/unloading zones to support a safe environment for pedestrians.
- There should be more bike lanes and better signage for bikes and pedestrians.
- Wider sidewalks would help calm traffic and make streets safer.
- We need more housing in National City, the right kind where people can walk to their daily needs.
- It is important to focus on children and seniors who are more dependent and at risk.
- Our community suffers from high obesity and diabetes, and high asthma rates.
- SANDAG should focus their funding on infrastructure to mitigate air pollution, especially around freeways.

Comunidades Saludables
- Vivir en ambiente limpio, libre de toxinas, libre tránsito, áreas verdes.
- Áreas verdes para los niños (no existen parques).
- Enfrente Iglesia existe terreno que se pudiera acondicionar para área verde, atrás de la escuela en el centro comunitario existe solo un pequeño centro.
- Seguridad de tráfico para los niños (escuela en la calle 18 – intersección de Highland y 18th) semáforo atrás de la escuela. Los carros no se detienen, reforzar respeto al peatón además que el semáforo peatonal no dura mucho. La alcantarilla bloquea el cruce peatonal.
- Gas para mina está localizado a pie de calle en la gasolinera y es peligroso por accidentes de choque o conductores en estado de ebriedad.
- Iluminación en la misma zona. Así como falta de iluminación en Old-Town National City.
- Determinar límites de velocidad por la misma zona para la seguridad de los niños que van a la escuela.
- El programa ‘Bus Caminante al Escuela’ está empezando a ser impulsado por las escuelas.
- 16th y D St. Necesita arreglos incluyendo la banqueta para los peatones. Siempre hay accidentes en esta zona.
- Impulsar jardín comunitario, no existen tiendas cerca de la gente para conseguir comida sana como fruta y verduras.
- No es seguro usar bicicletas por las avenidas pero si por las calles vecinales.
- Los carriles de bicicletas no son respetados porque la gente estaciona sus carros en los carriles de bicicleta.
- Los talleres y fábricas contaminan todos los aspectos de la comunidad.
Economic Prosperity and Borders

- Create a border crossing efficient process for the people and goods that regularly move to and from our region.
- Strengthen relationship with the military.
- Improve public transit so that people can get to jobs.
- Attracting more businesses, and not fast food or taco shops.
- Encourage home-ownership and regulate the up-keep of rental properties.
- Make it easier/faster to cross the border.
- Provide more secure bike parking and storage to prevent bicycle theft.
- National City has the highest taxes in the county, but is the most impoverished.
- National City isn’t seen as a business environment. It’s somewhere you live, but you have to go other places to work.
- There should be more educational opportunities in National City, such as trade Schools.
- Improve the cleanliness and aesthetics of the city to attract more employers/businesses. The way things look can drive people away.
- Increase street sweeping frequencies and remove dumped trash.
- Improve the responsiveness and oversight of local and regional government.
- South County is lacking tourism.
- National City needs to be more welcoming and create destinations and events to attract business and activity. People don’t want to visit a dirty city that makes them feel unsafe and uncomfortable.

Prosperidad Económica y Fronteras

- Más acceso a mercados, gimnasios, lugares comunes.
- Civic Center y Wilson interseccion. No quieren un negocio más sino un negocio que ayude a la comunidad como un supermercado.
- Fuentes de empleo cerca de la comunidad.
- Área de bicicletas en el trolley. (seccion especial para gente con bicicletas).
- Reducir costos de trolley (pase mensual).
WORKSHOP SUMMARY: FOCUS ON ECONOMIC PROSPERITY, PUBLIC FACILITIES AND BORDERS
JULY 19, 2013, CALTRANS

Thank you to the more than 70 participants who took part in the July 19th workshop on San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan!

Your input and feedback are keys to the process of creating a plan that will keep the San Diego region a great place to live now and in the future. Below is a summary of the input provided by stakeholders during the facilitated roundtable sessions. This input will be used to shape policy objectives and other core components of San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan.

For more information and the detailed note-takers notes, visit www.sandag.org/sandiegoforward.

Borders

- Government entities should coordinate more and reduce paperwork and red tape.
- Include the Border Master Plan in the Regional Plan.
- Recognize that border issues such as air pollution aren’t restricted to geographic borders; health issues and different diseases cross border-lines.
- Coordinate natural corridors and open spaces with fire and forest management.
- Expedite border crossings to capitalize on Tijuana’s projected economic growth.
- Promote bike lanes at the border crossing to alleviate the pressure at the border and allow quicker crossings.
- Decentralize border-crossing ports-of-entries (POE).
• Promote better movement of goods across the border, not just passengers.
• Recognize that the tribes have more to offer than just casinos; tourism prospects are good for them and for the county. Tourists will go to the casinos, but most likely will use other facilities in the region as well.
• Acknowledge Temecula as an important economic partner for goods movement along I-15.
• Minimize travel time between San Diego and Imperial Valley so that San Diego can capitalize on the renewable energy effort that is occurring in Imperial County.
• Increase weekend service for public transportation, especially to and from Orange and Riverside Counties.
• Increase connections between employment locations and affordable housing.
• Increase the safety of public transit by encouraging more people to take transit; crime is a deterrent for many potential transit riders.

**Public Facilities**

• SANDAG should coordinate with other agencies and community based organizations to better provide and promote public facilities, serving as the “glue” that brings people, organizations, and cities together.
• Use SANDAG data and information as planning tools.
• Facilitate conversations about funding so cities don’t have to “re-create the wheel” and spend a lot of time searching for funding sources.
• Prioritize funding for maintaining public facilities first versus fixing broken infrastructure later.
• Take social equity into consideration when planning new facilities. Consider a holistic approach to planning that links public facilities to the needs of communities.
• Integrate parking with purposeful economic returns.
• Perform regular maintenance on roads and construct sidewalks to make communities more walkable.
• Provide planning at the “complete streets” level by constructing and regularly maintaining streets and pedestrian sidewalks, parks, public restrooms, trash cans, and community centers in urban areas.
• Provide safe routes to school.
• Collaborate with local agencies to promote green infrastructure that can improve air quality, water quality, and ultimately quality of life.
• Encourage the maintenance and delivery of water facilities.
• Promote collaboration on all levels to discuss water retention from storm water in an effort to reuse water.
• Consider the use of water desalination in the region.
• Fund maintenance improvements for the piping network in San Diego.
• Provide regional coordination to prohibit housing development in fire-prone areas.
• Make roads more truck accessible.

**Economic Prosperity**

• Provide education for a variety of skill sets in the region.
• Support and encourage “high tolerance communities”—diverse, college-bound communities with no ethnic barriers.
• Find ways to tap into the highly-educated immigrant and refugee population to support our economy.
• Subsidize bus passes for students to get between jobs, home, and school.
• Support local food and our local economy.
• Connect farmers and agriculture with the public through Farmers Markets. Encourage cities to support local farmers.
• Promote more collaboration with other organizations, such as non-profits in the county and the city; this collaboration should outweigh competition and personalities.
• Focus on a cost-effective, consistent water supply for the region in the future, especially for farmers and businesses.
• Promote the development of multiple economic hubs to allow people to live close to work.
• Support the development of job centers in South Bay to improve social equity. It will take people off the freeway by providing jobs close to where people live.
Enhance opportunities for disadvantaged populations.
Align the cost of housing with levels of income for more people to afford to live here.
Support bike parking in the business districts. Include more urban furniture, forestry, traffic calming, etc. to bring people to these areas and increase economic prosperity.
Provide safe routes to school for the local neighborhood communities to encourage economic prosperity.
Facilitate small businesses by creating collaborative workspaces and facilities (e.g. business incubators).
Support trucking and transportation needs in the region. If we can't get goods and people around, the economy won't be prosperous.
Plan for moving goods in all contexts, including the border, the port, and by air.
Transit oriented development should be paired with job development to help prepare for a growing population.
Balance regional growth geographically.
Consider moderate densities of 3-4 stories.
Support infrastructure that improves connections for bicyclists and pedestrians to access transit services.
Fill up empty storefronts to support economic development.

All Topics - Arabic

Economic Prosperity

Prosperity first starts within the family, then the community, each company, organization, and city.
Recognize that small local economies drive larger economies.
Provide more affordable housing for new family arrivals as the refugee and immigrant population continues to increase.
Encourage more affordable housing throughout the San Diego region.
Consider implementing rent control in the San Diego region.
Use empty lots throughout San Diego for farming and agriculture.
Address transportation barriers that keep immigrants away from workforce development programs. For example, provide more gas cards as incentives, and teach people how to use the transit system to get to these programs.

Public Facilities

Better allocate the structure and planning for parks. For example, while dog parks and open space portions are large, the actual playground portions for children are small.
Provide more benches and seating in public spaces and parks, and at beaches, for people to enjoy the public realm in El Cajon and downtown San Diego.
Develop partnerships, such as those in New York City, where indoor and outdoor public spaces such as atriums are privately owned, but the public has free access to these areas.
Support more de-centralized public composting for waste management.
Provide more recycling bins in public spaces and along sidewalks.
Develop improved signage to make it easy for people to place recyclables into appropriate bins.

Borders

If there were more affordable medical and dental services in the San Diego region, then people wouldn't go across the border as frequently.
Agriculture and industrial projects should be built along the border to provide jobs for both sides.
Address traffic at the border.
Improve border crossing times to improve the economies of both regions.
Provide better coordination of schedules for people traveling to and from San Diego to Los Angeles on public transit.
2012 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM: File Number 1500300
AMENDMENT NO. 8 – ADMINISTRATIVE MODIFICATION

Introduction

On September 28, 2012, the Board of Directors adopted the 2012 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP), the multiyear program of proposed major transportation projects, including transit, highway, arterial, and bikeway projects in the San Diego region covering the period FY 2013 to FY 2017. The 2012 RTIP is a multibillion dollar program of projects funded by federal, state, TransNet local sales tax, and other local funding sources. The 2013 Federal Statewide Transportation Improvement Program, which incorporates the SANDAG 2012 RTIP, received federal approval on December 14, 2012.

Background

There are two types of processes to update the RTIP; administrative modifications and formal amendments. Formal amendments require, among other things, a 15-day public notice period, while administrative modification are considered minor in nature and do not require a public notice period. Chapter 2 of the adopted 2012 RTIP provides additional details regarding the differences between formal amendments and administrative modifications. Amendment No. 8 is considered an administrative modification because it is consistent with the federally accepted administrative modification procedures. The federal agencies delegated the approval of administrative modifications to the state, thereby streamlining the approval process.

Discussion

On July 6, 2012, the new federal transportation reauthorization, Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21), was signed into law. The new law made changes to certain Federal Transit Administration (FTA) programs, including Section 5339, Bus and Bus Facilities Formula Grants Program. Whereas the previous law allowed transit agencies to apply for this grant directly, under MAP-21, SANDAG, as the San Diego Metropolitan Planning Organization, is the only agency that can apply for this program.

On March 22, 2013, the SANDAG Board approved the FY 2014 Regional Transit Capital Improvement Program, which included projects funded by Section 5339 for both North County Transit District (NCTD) and Metropolitan Transit System (MTS). In order to ensure both NCTD and MTS are made whole, this amendment proposes to exchange FTA Section 5339 funds with TransNet-Major

Recommendation

The Transportation Committee is asked to approve Amendment No. 8 – Administrative Modification to the 2012 Regional Transportation Improvement Program.
Corridors and State Transit Assistance (STA) funding. This fund exchange would allow all three agencies to move forward with their respective projects without interruption. The proposed exchange is for FY 2014. In order to reflect current law, FTA Section 5339 funds programmed in years beyond FY 2014 are proposed to be unprogrammed with this amendment, with a future reprogramming action planned when SANDAG and the transit agencies have reached agreement on its use. In addition, the full year’s apportionment for FTA Section 5339 has now been provided and the programming of 5339 funds in this amendment reflects the updated funding estimates.

The proposed revisions included in this amendment are described below, with additional information included in Table 1 (Attachment 1).

Caltrans

Grouped Projects for Pavement Resurfacing and/or Rehabilitation – State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP) Roadway Preservation Program (CAL46E) – This amendment proposes to increase funds and revise funding from FY 2015 to FY 2014. Total programmed increases to $176,488,000.

Grouped Projects for Safety Improvements – SHOPP Mandates Program (CAL46I) – This amendment proposes to reduce funding for this lump sum. Total programmed decreases to $44,238,000.

North County Transit District

Bus/Americans with Disabilities Act/Revenue Vehicle Purchases and Related Equipment (NCTD05) – As stated above, this amendment proposes to swap FTA Section 5339 funds with TransNet – MC funds with the South Bay Maintenance Facility Project (SAN133). The remaining FTA Section 5339 funds have been removed from FY 2014 through FY 2017. Total project decreases to $64,365,000.

San Diego Association of Governments

Metropolitan Planning (SAN40) – In August 2013, SANDAG was made aware of additional federal Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) funding available for the State Route 11 Pre-deployment study, which must be obligated prior to September 30, 2013 (OWP ID 34200). In order to obligate these funds, the funding needs to be programmed in an approved RTIP. This amendment proposes to program $200,000 of ITS funds in FY 2013 with a budget amendment pending. Total project increases to $17,834,000.

East County Bus Maintenance Facility (SAN52) – This amendment proposes to exchange $3,522,125 in STA funds with FTA Section 5339 funds with MTS28. This amendment also reconciles changes from prior years and FY 2013. Total project remains at $50,007,000.

South Bay Bus Rapid Transit Maintenance Facility (SAN133) – This amendment proposes to exchange $1,509,000 in FTA Section 5339 funds with TransNet – MC funds with NCTD05. Total project remains at $60,535,000.
San Diego Metropolitan Transit System

**Bus and Rolling Stock Purchases and Rehabilitations (MTS28)** – This amendment proposes to reduce funding for this project by moving approximately $7,653,000 in FTA Section 5307 funds and $1,913,000 in Transportation Development Act (TDA) funds to preventive maintenance, project ID MTS32A (see below). Also, this amendment proposes to exchange $3,522,125 of FTA 5339 funds with STA funds, with the East County Bus Maintenance Facility Project (SAN52), while removing FTA 5339 funding from FY 2014 through FY 2017. Total project decreases to $317,960,000.

**Preventive Maintenance (MTS32A)** – This amendment proposes to add FTA Section 5307 and TDA funding from MTS28, as stated above. Total project increases to $455,509,000.

**Various Agencies**

**Grouped Projects for TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program (V10)** – On June 18, 2013, the SANDAG Board approved projects for the TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program for the FY 2013 cycle. This amendment proposes to program the City of National City’s project so that it can move forward with issuing a notice to proceed for its Downtown-Westside Community Connections Project. All other projects from the approved list will be programmed in the next formal amendment to the 2012 RTIP (12-09) scheduled for October 18, 2013. Total programmed increases to $9,090,000.

**Fiscal Constraint Analysis**

Federal regulations require the 2012 RTIP to be a revenue-constrained document with programmed projects based upon available or committed funding and/or reasonable estimates of future funding. Funding assumptions are generally based upon: (1) authorized or appropriated levels of federal and state funding from current legislation; (2) conservative projections of future federal and state funding based upon a continuation of current funding levels; (3) the most current revenue forecasts for the TransNet Program; and (4) the planning and programming documents of the local transportation providers.

As an administrative modification, an updated fiscal constraint analysis is not required. The proposed change included in Amendment No. 8 does not affect the fiscal constraint submitted as part of Amendment No. 6 to the 2012 RTIP, the last federally approved formal amendment that updated the financial capacity for the 2012 RTIP. Chapter 4 of the Final 2012 RTIP discusses in detail the financial capacity analysis of major program areas, including discussion of available revenues. The 2012 RTIP, including Amendment No. 8, continues to be reasonable when considering available funding sources.

**Air Quality Analysis**

On September 28, 2012, SANDAG found the 2012 RTIP in conformance with the Regional Air Quality Strategy/State Implementation Plan (SIP) for the San Diego region. All of the required regionally significant capacity increasing projects were included in the quantitative emissions analysis conducted for the 2050 San Diego Regional Transportation Plan: Our Region Our Future (2050 RTP) and the 2012 RTIP. The Federal Highway Administration and the FTA jointly approved the conformity determination for the 2012 RTIP and the conformity redetermination for the 2050 RTP on December 14, 2012. On May 24, 2013, the Board of Directors approved the 2012 RTIP,
Amendment No. 2, including the air quality conformity analysis and redetermination of the 2050 Revenue Constrained RTP, and received federal approval on June 28, 2013.

The proposed amendment does not reflect a change in the design, concept, or scope of the project or the conformity analysis years as modeled for the regional emissions analysis of the 2012 RTIP and 2050 RTP. Projects in Amendment No. 8 meet the conformity provisions of the Transportation Conformity Rule (40 CFR §93.122(g)). SANDAG followed interagency consultation procedures to determine that these projects are exempt. Amendment No. 8 does not interfere with the timely implementation of Transportation Control Measures. The 2012 RTIP, including Amendment No. 8, remains in conformance with the SIP.

ANDRÉ DOUZDJIAN
Director of Finance

Attachment: 1. Table 1, 2012 Regional Transportation Improvement Program, Amendment No. 8 – Administrative Modification

Key Staff Contact: Michelle Merino, michelle.merino@sandag.org; (619) 595-5608
### Table 1
2012 Regional Transportation Improvement Program
Amendment No. 8 - Administrative Modification
San Diego Region (in $000s)

**Caltrans**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MPO ID: CAL46E</th>
<th>RTIP #: 12-08</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Title:</strong></td>
<td>Grouped Projects for Pavement Resurfacing and/or Rehabilitation - SHOPP Roadway Preservation Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Description:</strong></td>
<td>Projects are consistent with 40 CFR Part 93.126 Exempt Table 2 categories – pavement resurfacing and/or rehabilitation, emergency relief (23 USC 125), widening narrow pavements or reconstructing bridges (no additional travel lanes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change Reason:</strong></td>
<td>Increase funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Est Total Cost:</strong></td>
<td>$176,488</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>13/14</th>
<th>14/15</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SHOPP (AC)-Rdside Preserv NHS</td>
<td>$43,150</td>
<td>$43,150</td>
<td>$43,150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHOPP (AC)-Rdway Presrv NHS</td>
<td>$133,338</td>
<td>$85,751</td>
<td>$47,587</td>
<td>$133,338</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$176,488</td>
<td>$85,751</td>
<td>$90,737</td>
<td>$176,488</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROJECT LAST AMENDED 12-04**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>13/14</th>
<th>14/15</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SHOPP (AC)-Rdside Preserv NHS</td>
<td>$43,150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$43,150</td>
<td>$43,150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHOPP (AC)-Rdway Presrv NHS</td>
<td>$131,129</td>
<td>$85,751</td>
<td>$24,461</td>
<td>$20,917</td>
<td>$131,129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$174,279</td>
<td>$85,751</td>
<td>$24,461</td>
<td>$64,067</td>
<td>$174,279</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MPO ID: CAL46I**

| **Project Title:** | Grouped Projects for Safety Improvements - SHOPP Mandates Program |
| **Project Description:** | Projects are consistent with 40 CFR Parts 93.126 and 93.127 Exempt Tables 2 and 3 categories - railroad/highway crossing, safer non-federal-aid system roads, shoulder improvements, traffic control devices and operating assistance other than signalization projects, intersection signalization projects at individual intersections, pavement marking demonstration, truck climbing lanes outside the urbanized area, lighting improvements, emergency truck pullovers |
| **Change Reason:** | Reduce funding |
| **Est Total Cost:** | $44,238 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>13/14</th>
<th>14/15</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SHOPP (AC)-Mandates</td>
<td>$44,238</td>
<td>$9,738</td>
<td>$20,916</td>
<td>$13,584</td>
<td>$44,238</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$44,238</td>
<td>$9,738</td>
<td>$20,916</td>
<td>$13,584</td>
<td>$44,238</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROJECT LAST AMENDED 12-04**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>13/14</th>
<th>14/15</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SHOPP (AC)-Mandates</td>
<td>$46,866</td>
<td>$9,738</td>
<td>$30,705</td>
<td>$6,423</td>
<td>$46,866</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$46,866</td>
<td>$9,738</td>
<td>$30,705</td>
<td>$6,423</td>
<td>$46,866</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
North County Transit District

**Project Title:** Bus/ADA/ Revenue Vehicle Purchases & Related Equipment

**Project Description:** NCTD service area - purchase replacement vehicles and related equipment; Compressed Natural Gas (CNG) buses, Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) vans and shuttle vehicles

**Change Reason:** Reduce funding, Fund swap with SAN133

**Capacity Status:** NCI

**Exempt Category:** Mass Transit - Purchase new buses and rail cars to replace existing vehicles or minor expansions of fleet

**Est Total Cost:** $64,365

---

### Funding Breakdown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>13/14</th>
<th>14/15</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTA 5307</td>
<td>$27,755</td>
<td>$9,453</td>
<td>$104</td>
<td>$4,239</td>
<td>$4,706</td>
<td>$4,568</td>
<td>$4,686</td>
<td>$23,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA 5309 (Bus)</td>
<td>$4,622</td>
<td>$4,622</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA 5311</td>
<td>$2,036</td>
<td>$2,036</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA Funds - AR-5311</td>
<td>$578</td>
<td>$578</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCRP</td>
<td>$7,700</td>
<td>$7,700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - MC</td>
<td>$1,509</td>
<td>$1,509</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,509</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - Transit (Cash)</td>
<td>$1,155</td>
<td>$1,155</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Funds</td>
<td>$19,010</td>
<td>$8,698</td>
<td>$4,263</td>
<td>$1,429</td>
<td>$1,549</td>
<td>$1,518</td>
<td>$1,552</td>
<td>$17,458</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** $64,365

---

**PROJECT LAST AMENDED 12-03**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>13/14</th>
<th>14/15</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTA 5307</td>
<td>$27,755</td>
<td>$9,453</td>
<td>$104</td>
<td>$4,239</td>
<td>$4,706</td>
<td>$4,568</td>
<td>$4,686</td>
<td>$23,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA 5309 (Bus)</td>
<td>$4,622</td>
<td>$4,622</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA 5311</td>
<td>$2,036</td>
<td>$2,036</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA 5339</td>
<td>$7,454</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,461</td>
<td>$1,476</td>
<td>$1,491</td>
<td>$1,505</td>
<td>$1,521</td>
<td>$5,933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA Funds - AR-5311</td>
<td>$578</td>
<td>$578</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCRP</td>
<td>$7,700</td>
<td>$7,700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - Transit (Cash)</td>
<td>$1,155</td>
<td>$1,155</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Funds</td>
<td>$19,010</td>
<td>$8,698</td>
<td>$4,263</td>
<td>$1,429</td>
<td>$1,549</td>
<td>$1,518</td>
<td>$1,552</td>
<td>$17,458</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** $70,310

---

Tuesday, August 20, 2013
San Diego Association of Governments

**MPO ID: SAN40**

**Project Title:** Metropolitan Planning

**Project Description:** Countywide - ongoing regional transportation planning as well as administrative oversight for various TransNet programs, the federal JARC and New Freedom programs, and the SR 11 project that would research ITS applications in order to enable rapid implementation of innovative ITS solutions for a bi-national border system. Toll Credits of $50 will be used to match FY13 federal funds for the PE phase.

**Capacity Status:** NCI

**Exempt Category:** Other - Non construction related activities

**Est Total Cost:** $17,834

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FTA 5307</th>
<th>TOTAL (万公里)</th>
<th>PRIOR 12/13</th>
<th>13/14</th>
<th>14/15</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$13,976</td>
<td>$3,345</td>
<td>$3,250</td>
<td>$3,618</td>
<td>$3,763</td>
<td>$13,976</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - BPNS</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - SGIP</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - SS</td>
<td>$84</td>
<td>$42</td>
<td>$42</td>
<td></td>
<td>$84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Funds</td>
<td>$3,494</td>
<td>$836</td>
<td>$812</td>
<td>$905</td>
<td>$941</td>
<td>$3,494</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$17,834</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,463</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,144</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,523</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,704</strong></td>
<td><strong>$17,834</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROJECT LAST AMENDED 12-06**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FTA 5307</th>
<th>TOTAL (万公里)</th>
<th>PRIOR 12/13</th>
<th>13/14</th>
<th>14/15</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$13,976</td>
<td>$3,345</td>
<td>$3,250</td>
<td>$3,618</td>
<td>$3,763</td>
<td>$13,976</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - BPNS</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - SGIP</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - SS</td>
<td>$84</td>
<td>$42</td>
<td>$42</td>
<td></td>
<td>$84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Funds</td>
<td>$3,494</td>
<td>$836</td>
<td>$812</td>
<td>$905</td>
<td>$941</td>
<td>$3,494</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$17,634</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,263</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,144</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,523</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,704</strong></td>
<td><strong>$17,634</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tuesday, August 20, 2013
San Diego Region (in $000s)

**Project Title:** East County Bus Maintenance Facility  
**Project Description:** In El Cajon - construction of new bus facility to provide capacity for operation and maintenance for 100-150 vehicles  
**Change Reason:** Revise Fund Source, Fund swap with MTS28

**Capacity Status:** NCI  
**Exempt Category:** Mass Transit - Const of new bus or rail storage/maint facilities excluded in 23 CFR part 771

**Est Total Cost:** $50,007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>13/14</th>
<th>14/15</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CMAQ</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA 5307</td>
<td>$9,629</td>
<td>$9,630</td>
<td>$4,910</td>
<td>$4,719</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA 5309 (Bus)</td>
<td>$4,385</td>
<td>$4,385</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA 5311</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA 5337</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA 5339</td>
<td>$3,522</td>
<td>$3,522</td>
<td>$3,522</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STA</td>
<td>$12,320</td>
<td>$7,320</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$12,320</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Funds</td>
<td>$3,989</td>
<td>$2,310</td>
<td>$1,679</td>
<td>$1,628</td>
<td>$2,361</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDA</td>
<td>$5,912</td>
<td>$1,194</td>
<td>$4,717</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,912</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$50,007</td>
<td>$25,089</td>
<td>$24,918</td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,538</td>
<td>$43,469</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROJECT LAST AMENDED 12-03**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>13/14</th>
<th>14/15</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CMAQ</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA 5307</td>
<td>$9,629</td>
<td>$9,630</td>
<td>$4,910</td>
<td>$4,719</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA 5309 (Bus)</td>
<td>$4,385</td>
<td>$4,385</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA 5311</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STA</td>
<td>$32,239</td>
<td>$27,239</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$32,239</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Funds</td>
<td>$2,310</td>
<td>$2,310</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,628</td>
<td>$682</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDA</td>
<td>$1,194</td>
<td>$1,194</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,194</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$50,007</td>
<td>$45,008</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,538</td>
<td>$43,469</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
San Diego Association of Governments

MPO ID: SAN133  RTIP #: 12-08

Project Title: South Bay BRT Maintenance Facility  SANDAG ID: 1201513

Project Description: In Chula Vista - expansion of maintenance facility to accommodate maintenance of BRT vehicles - property acquisition, site preparation, lighting, parking and bus servicing facilities

Change Reason: Revise Fund Source, Fund swap with NCTD05

Capacity Status: NCI  Exempt Category: Mass Transit - Const of new bus or rail storage/maint facilities excluded in 23 CFR part 771

Est Total Cost: $60,535

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTA 5307</td>
<td>$8,760</td>
<td>$8,760</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,996</td>
<td>$4,791</td>
<td>$973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA 5339</td>
<td>$1,509</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,509</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,052</td>
<td>$2,300</td>
<td>$1,898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STA</td>
<td>$5,250</td>
<td>$5,250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,300</td>
<td>$8,989</td>
<td>$32,679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - MC</td>
<td>$33,170</td>
<td>$42</td>
<td>$8,989</td>
<td>$15,580</td>
<td>$8,420</td>
<td>$139</td>
<td>$491</td>
<td>$9,658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Funds</td>
<td>$9,658</td>
<td>$9,658</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,300</td>
<td>$8,989</td>
<td>$34,188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDA</td>
<td>$2,188</td>
<td>$2,187</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,190</td>
<td>$2,300</td>
<td>$369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$60,535</strong></td>
<td><strong>$25,897</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10,498</strong></td>
<td><strong>$15,580</strong></td>
<td><strong>$8,420</strong></td>
<td><strong>$139</strong></td>
<td><strong>$8,281</strong></td>
<td><strong>$47,086</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROJECT LAST AMENDED 12-06

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTA 5307</td>
<td>$8,760</td>
<td>$8,760</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,996</td>
<td>$4,791</td>
<td>$973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STA</td>
<td>$5,250</td>
<td>$5,250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,300</td>
<td>$8,989</td>
<td>$34,188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - MC</td>
<td>$34,679</td>
<td>$42</td>
<td>$8,989</td>
<td>$17,089</td>
<td>$8,420</td>
<td>$139</td>
<td>$491</td>
<td>$9,658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Funds</td>
<td>$9,658</td>
<td>$9,658</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,300</td>
<td>$8,989</td>
<td>$34,188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDA</td>
<td>$2,188</td>
<td>$2,187</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,190</td>
<td>$2,300</td>
<td>$369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$60,535</strong></td>
<td><strong>$25,897</strong></td>
<td><strong>$8,989</strong></td>
<td><strong>$17,089</strong></td>
<td><strong>$8,420</strong></td>
<td><strong>$139</strong></td>
<td><strong>$8,281</strong></td>
<td><strong>$47,086</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tuesday, August 20, 2013
San Diego Metropolitan Transit System

**MPO ID:** MTS28

**Project Title:** Bus & Rail Rolling Stock purchases and Rehabilitations

**Project Description:** MTS service area - purchase replacement buses, replacement Light Rail Vehicles, procurement of materials and services for the rehabilitation or retrofit of mechanical components, electrical components, and coach bodies of Light Rail Vehicles and buses

**Change Reason:** Reduce funding. Fund swap with SAN52

**Capacity Status:** NCI

**Exempt Category:** Mass Transit - Purchase new buses and rail cars to replace existing vehicles or minor expansions of fleet

**Est Total Cost:** $317,960

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>13/14</th>
<th>14/15</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTA 5307</td>
<td>$107,299</td>
<td>$33,156</td>
<td>$12,146</td>
<td>$19,610</td>
<td>$20,775</td>
<td>$21,611</td>
<td>$107,299</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA 5309 (Bus)</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop 1B - PTMISEA</td>
<td>$33,076</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$33,076</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop 1B Transit Sec Grant Prg</td>
<td>$6,338</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,779</td>
<td>$2,779</td>
<td>$779</td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,338</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STA</td>
<td>$16,750</td>
<td></td>
<td>$16,750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$16,750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - Transit (Cash)</td>
<td>$2,200</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDA</td>
<td>$149,297</td>
<td>$11,211</td>
<td>$5,659</td>
<td>$28,035</td>
<td>$34,143</td>
<td>$34,794</td>
<td>$35,456</td>
<td>$149,297</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**

$317,960 $49,567 $22,409 $40,181 $73,070 $74,886 $57,846 $317,960

**PROJECT LAST AMENDED 12-03**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>13/14</th>
<th>14/15</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTA 5307</td>
<td>$114,952</td>
<td>$33,156</td>
<td>$7,653</td>
<td>$12,146</td>
<td>$19,610</td>
<td>$20,775</td>
<td>$21,611</td>
<td>$114,952</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA 5309 (Bus)</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA 5339</td>
<td>$17,392</td>
<td>$3,409</td>
<td>$3,444</td>
<td>$3,478</td>
<td>$3,513</td>
<td>$3,548</td>
<td>$17,392</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop 1B - PTMISEA</td>
<td>$33,076</td>
<td>$3,409</td>
<td>$16,538</td>
<td>$16,538</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$33,076</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop 1B Transit Sec Grant Prg</td>
<td>$6,338</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,779</td>
<td>$2,779</td>
<td>$779</td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,338</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STA</td>
<td>$13,228</td>
<td></td>
<td>$13,228</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$13,228</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - Transit (Cash)</td>
<td>$2,200</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDA</td>
<td>$151,210</td>
<td>$11,211</td>
<td>$7,572</td>
<td>$28,035</td>
<td>$34,143</td>
<td>$34,794</td>
<td>$35,456</td>
<td>$151,210</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**

$341,396 $49,567 $31,862 $43,625 $76,548 $78,399 $61,394 $341,396

Tuesday, August 20, 2013
San Diego Metropolitan Transit System

**MPO ID:** MTS32A  **RTIP #:** 12-08

**Project Title:** Preventive Maintenance  
**Project Description:** MTS service area - maintenance of equipment, rolling stock, and facilities for bus and rail systems  
**Change Reason:** Increase funding  
**Capacity Status:** NCI  
**Exempt Category:** Mass Transit - Transit operating assistance  
**Est Total Cost:** $455,509

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>13/14</th>
<th>14/15</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTA 5307</td>
<td>179,073</td>
<td>110,623</td>
<td>20,229</td>
<td>12,370</td>
<td>12,162</td>
<td>11,951</td>
<td>11,739</td>
<td>179,073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA 5309 (FG)</td>
<td>81,830</td>
<td>81,830</td>
<td>81,830</td>
<td>81,830</td>
<td>81,830</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>81,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA 5337</td>
<td>105,202</td>
<td>20,624</td>
<td>20,830</td>
<td>21,038</td>
<td>21,249</td>
<td>21,461</td>
<td></td>
<td>105,202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Funds</td>
<td>7,383</td>
<td>7,383</td>
<td>10,213</td>
<td>8,300</td>
<td>8,300</td>
<td>8,300</td>
<td>8,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDA</td>
<td>82,021</td>
<td>38,608</td>
<td>12,576</td>
<td>12,370</td>
<td>12,162</td>
<td>11,951</td>
<td>11,739</td>
<td>82,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>445,943</td>
<td>238,444</td>
<td>41,500</td>
<td>41,500</td>
<td>41,500</td>
<td>41,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>445,943</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROJECT LAST AMENDED 12-03**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>13/14</th>
<th>14/15</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTA 5307</td>
<td>171,420</td>
<td>110,623</td>
<td>12,576</td>
<td>12,370</td>
<td>12,162</td>
<td>11,951</td>
<td>11,739</td>
<td>171,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA 5309 (FG)</td>
<td>81,830</td>
<td>81,830</td>
<td>81,830</td>
<td>81,830</td>
<td>81,830</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>81,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA 5337</td>
<td>105,202</td>
<td>20,624</td>
<td>20,830</td>
<td>21,038</td>
<td>21,249</td>
<td>21,461</td>
<td></td>
<td>105,202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Funds</td>
<td>7,383</td>
<td>7,383</td>
<td>8,300</td>
<td>8,300</td>
<td>8,300</td>
<td>8,300</td>
<td>8,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDA</td>
<td>80,108</td>
<td>38,608</td>
<td>8,300</td>
<td>8,300</td>
<td>8,300</td>
<td>8,300</td>
<td>8,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>445,943</td>
<td>238,444</td>
<td>41,500</td>
<td>41,500</td>
<td>41,500</td>
<td>41,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>445,943</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tuesday, August 20, 2013
### Various Agencies

#### Project Title:

Grouped Projects for *TransNet* Smart Growth Incentive Program

#### Project Description:

Projects are consistent with CFR Parts 93.126 and 93.127 Exempt Tables 2 and 3 categories: transportation enhancement activities (except rehabilitation and operation of historic transportation buildings, structures, or facilities)

#### Change Reason:

Increase funding

#### Est Total Cost:

$9,090

#### Capacity Status:

NCI

#### Exempt Category:

Other - Transportation enhancement activities

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>13/14</th>
<th>14/15</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>TransNet</em>- LSI Carry Over</td>
<td>$563</td>
<td>$563</td>
<td>$563</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>TransNet</em>- SGIP</td>
<td>$8,527</td>
<td>$3,808</td>
<td>$2,719</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$1,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$9,090</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,808</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,282</strong></td>
<td><strong>$200</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,800</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$9,090</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>13/14</th>
<th>14/15</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>TransNet</em>- LSI Carry Over</td>
<td>$563</td>
<td>$563</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>TransNet</em>- SGIP</td>
<td>$6,527</td>
<td>$3,808</td>
<td>$2,719</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$7,090</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,808</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,282</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$7,090</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### RTIP Fund Types

#### Federal Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CMAQ</td>
<td>Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA Section 5307</td>
<td>Federal Transit Administration Urbanized Area Formula Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA Section 5309 (Bus)</td>
<td>Federal Transit Administration Discretionary Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA Section 5309 (FG)</td>
<td>Federal Transit Administration Fixed Guideway Modernization Formula program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA Section 5311</td>
<td>Federal Transit Administration Rural Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA Section 5337</td>
<td>Federal Transit Administration State of Good Repair Grant Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA Section 5339</td>
<td>Federal Transit Administration Bus and Bus Facilities Formula Grant Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM</td>
<td>Interstate Maintenance Discretionary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS</td>
<td>Intelligent Transportation System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHS</td>
<td>National Highway System (administered by Caltrans)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMAQ/RSTP Conversion</td>
<td>Reimbursement of advanced federal funds which have been advanced with local funds in earlier years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### State Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PTMISEA</td>
<td>Public Transportation Modernization, Improvement, and Service Enhancement Account (State Prop 1B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>State Highway Operation &amp; Protection Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STA</td>
<td>State Transit Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCRP</td>
<td>Traffic Congestion Relief Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Local Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Funds AC</td>
<td>Local Funds - Advanced Construction; mechanism to advance local funds to be reimbursed at a later fiscal year with federal/state funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDA</td>
<td>Transportation Development Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDA-B</td>
<td>Transportation Development Act-Bicycle &amp; Pedestrian Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-B</td>
<td>Prop. A Local Transportation Sales Tax - Bike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-BPNS</td>
<td>Prop. A Local Transportation Sales Tax extension - Bicycle, Pedestrian and Neighborhood Safety Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-L</td>
<td>Prop. A Local Transportation Sales Tax - Local Streets &amp; Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-LSI</td>
<td>Prop. A Extension Local Transportation Sales Tax - Local System Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-LSI Carry Over</td>
<td>TransNet - LSI funds previously programmed but not requested/paid in year of allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-MC</td>
<td>Prop. A Extension Local Transportation Sales Tax - Major Corridors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-MC AC</td>
<td>TransNet - Major Corridors - Advanced Construction; mechanism to advance TransNet funds to be reimbursed at a later fiscal year with federal/state funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-SS</td>
<td>Prop. A Extension Local Transportation Sales Tax - Senior Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet-T</td>
<td>Prop. A Local Transportation Sales Tax - Transit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introduction

The TransNet Extension Ordinance and Expenditure Plan, approved by the voters in November 2004, includes the Environmental Mitigation Program (EMP), which provides funding to mitigate habitat impacts from regional and local transportation projects, and provides funding for regional land management and biological monitoring. The EMP is a unique component of the TransNet Extension Ordinance in that it goes beyond traditional mitigation for transportation projects by including a funding allocation for habitat acquisition, management, and monitoring activities to help implement the regional habitat conservation plans. This funding allocation is tied to mitigation requirements and the environmental clearance approval process for projects outlined in the Regional Transportation Plan.

Each year the Board of Directors allocates $4 million toward implementation of regional land management and biological monitoring pursuant to a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with state and federal agencies on the implementation of the EMP. On April 26, 2013, the Board of Directors amended the MOA to include the release of funding for land acquisition using economic benefit funding and to direct SANDAG staff to develop a competitive grant program for future consideration. The purpose of this report is to present recommendations for the allocation of FY 2014 funding for management and monitoring, and the Call for Projects for a competitive land acquisition program.

Discussion

On February 22, 2008, the Board of Directors entered into an MOA with state and federal resource agencies on the implementation of the EMP. A provision of the MOA allocates $4 million annually for ten years to implement regional habitat management and monitoring efforts to help maintain the region’s biological integrity, thus avoiding the future listing of endangered species. Allocation of the $4 million over the ten years of the MOA is done on an annual basis by the Board of Directors.

Recommendation

The Transportation Committee is asked to recommend to the Board of Directors approval of: (1) funding allocations totaling $4 million toward implementation of regional land management and biological monitoring activities, and (2) release of the Call for Projects for a competitive land acquisition grant program using economic benefit funding, pursuant to an executed Memorandum of Agreement with state and federal agencies on the implementation of the Environmental Mitigation Program.
pursuant to a funding strategy that covers a five year increment (originally approved on December 15, 2006, and last updated by the Board of Directors on January 28, 2011).

On April 26, 2013, the Board of Directors approved the execution of an amended MOA to include a set of 11 policy points that clarified the definition, use, and process for release of funding related to the “economic benefit” provision of the TransNet Ordinance. Under the amended MOA, regional and local transportation projects that have received all of the required local, state, and federal permits for construction are eligible to release economic benefit funding pursuant to a pro-rata share formula included in the MOA. This milestone in the construction process of transportation infrastructure was identified to correspond with the last environmental clearance milestone that sets the final required mitigation obligations. After this time, no additional mitigation obligations can be added. To date, 11 projects totaling approximately $20 million in economic benefit funds have received all of the required permits.

**FY 2014 ANNUAL ALLOCATION FOR MANAGEMENT AND MONITORING**

Funding totaling $4 million is being recommended for regional land management and biological monitoring, as shown in Attachment 1. The recommendations were developed by the Environmental Mitigation Program Working Group (EMPWG) (an advisory committee to the Regional Planning Committee) and unanimously recommended for approval at its July 9, 2013, meeting. The allocation of the $4 million is consistent with the funding needs necessary to continue the implementation of the five-year funding strategy in FY 2014; no new tasks are being added at this time.

**LAND ACQUISITION CALL FOR PROJECTS**

In addition to the $4 million of regional management and monitoring funding, the Board of Directors approved the execution of an amendment to the 2008 MOA, which would allow for the release of $20 million of economic benefit funding in FY 2014. The funds can be used for land acquisition, land management, and/or regional biological monitoring. After review of the regional funding needs for land management and biological monitoring, the EMPWG is unanimously recommending that the $20 million of economic benefit funding be directed towards land acquisition for FY 2014.

As a means to distribute the $20 million of economic benefit funds, the Board of Directors directed SANDAG staff to develop a Call for Projects for land acquisition using economic benefit funds for its future consideration. Pursuant to the amended MOA, a committee comprised of representatives from Caltrans, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, California Department of Fish and Wildlife, U.S. Geological Survey, and SANDAG would evaluate all proposals resulting from a competitive grant program for land acquisitions and provide its recommendation to the Board of Directors. On June 5, 2013, SANDAG staff met with these agencies to discuss the development of a Call for Projects utilizing the existing SANDAG Board Policies and Procedures (SANDAG Board Policy No. 035 - Competitive Grant Program Procedures). Experts in real estate acquisition and appraisal from the California Wildlife Conservation Board and Caltrans Right-of-Way division also were in attendance to provide insight into the state’s land acquisition process.

SANDAG staff is recommending that the competitive grant process follow the existing SANDAG process used for the TransNet Environmental Mitigation Program Land Management grants. If
approved by the Board of Directors, a Call for Project would be issued in November (see Attachment 2 for draft Grant Program Overview and Instructions as well as proposed timeline). Applicants would be required to fill out an application form (Attachment 2A), which would be assessed for eligibility and ranked using eligibility and evaluation criteria (Attachment 2B) by an evaluation committee made up of the five agencies identified in the MOA. The top-ranked projects totaling up to $20 million would be appraised by SANDAG to determine the fair-market value of the property. The top-ranked projects with a combined appraised value of up to $20 million would be brought to the SANDAG Regional Planning and Transportation Committees for a recommendation to the Board of Directors. The Board of Directors would consider approval to award funding to the top projects in September 2014 (FY 2015), along with a budget amendment. SANDAG staff is recommending the issuance of a Call for Projects in substantially the same form as proposed in Attachment 2, to be used to implement a competitive land acquisition grant program.

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

Attachments: 1. Recommended FY 2014 Funding Allocation for Habitat Conservation Fund (CIP 1200300)
   2. San Diego Association of Governments Environmental Mitigation Program FY 2014 Land Management Grants - Program Overview and Instructions
   2A. Grant Application Form
   2B. Economic Benefit Land Acquisition Eligibility and Evaluation Criteria

Key Staff Contact: Keith Greer, (619) 699-7390, keith.greer@sandag.org
## Recommended FY 2014 Funding Allocation for Habitat Conservation Fund (CIP 1200300)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>TASK</th>
<th>Prior Years FY 06-13</th>
<th>Proposed Funding FY 2014</th>
<th>Comments/ Recommend Approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Regional Coordination</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Program Developer/Administrator</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
<td>$220,000</td>
<td>Current funding allows for a half-time Program Developer. Increase funding to allow for hiring of a full-time administrator after current contract expires.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Biologist</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$215,000</td>
<td>Continue to fund through existing contract with USGS for FY 2014.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Management &amp; Monitoring Coordinator</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>Continue to fund through existing contract for FY 2014.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>GIS Support</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>Continue to fund through existing contract with USGS for FY 2014.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Database Development and Support</td>
<td>$480,000</td>
<td>$130,000</td>
<td>Continue to fund through existing contract with USGS for FY 2014.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Administrative &amp; Science Support</td>
<td>$275,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>Funding for administrative and scientific support for regional coordination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$3,605,000</td>
<td>$925,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Regional Management</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Conserved Lands Database Management</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>SANDAG to continue update and refine database with stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Land Management Implementation</td>
<td>$13,315,000</td>
<td>$975,000</td>
<td>Existing and proposed funding should go towards implementation of Management Strategic Plan using various contracting methods including competitive grants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Emergency Land Management Fund</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>Provide annual funding of $50,000 until fund reaches $500K as indicated in Five-Year Funding Strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Invasive Plant Species Management</td>
<td>$375,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>Existing and proposed funding should go towards implementation of Invasive Plant Strategic plan. No more than 25% should go towards administrative costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Invasive Animal Species Management</td>
<td>$270,000</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>TransNet funds should go towards matching funds to assist with the regional feral pig eradication effort, existing predator control in Mission Bay, and recovery effort for southwestern pond turtle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Updated Vegetation Mapping</td>
<td>$850,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>No new funding required. Contracts to complete work are in place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Enforcement</td>
<td>$370,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>Continue contracts with State game wardens and SD Sheriffs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Preserve level management plan standardization</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>Provide incentive funding to develop 2-3 operational plans for preserve management using recently developed framework plan standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Pro-active Wildfire Planning and Management</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>Existing and proposed funding should be used to implement pro-active wildfire management recommendations once vetted with regional stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$16,055,000</td>
<td>$2,275,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Regional Monitoring</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Post Fire Monitoring and Recovery</td>
<td>$2,300,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Task completed. No new funding required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Vegetation and Landscape Monitoring</td>
<td>$645,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Review monitoring protocols in FY 2014 prior to funding implementation in future fiscal years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Rare and Endemic Plant Monitoring and Recovery</td>
<td>$515,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Task under contract for this FY 2014. No additional funding needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Vertebrate Monitoring and Recovery</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>Fund recovery of species identified as high priority in the Management Strategic Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Invertebrate Monitoring and Recovery</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>Fund recovery of species identified as high priority in the Management Strategic Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Wildlife Corridor and Linkages Monitoring (including genetic studies)</td>
<td>$945,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>Continue to funding implementation of Wildlife Connectivity Strategic Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Other Species Monitoring (e.g. priority 2 species)</td>
<td>$490,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>No new funding required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$7,340,000</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL FUNDING STRATEGY</strong></td>
<td>$27,000,000</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
San Diego Association of Governments Environmental Mitigation Program  
FY 2014 Land Management Grants – Program Overview and Instructions

Program Description

The TransNet Extension Ordinance and Expenditure Plan, as approved by the voters on November 2, 2004, includes an Environmental Mitigation Program (EMP). The EMP is a funding allocation category for the costs to mitigate habitat impacts for regional transportation projects. The EMP is a unique component of the TransNet Extension Ordinance in that it goes beyond traditional mitigation for transportation projects by including a funding allocation for habitat acquisition, management, and monitoring activities as needed to help implement regional habitat conservation plans.

On September 27, 2013, the SANDAG Board of Directors approved the Call for Projects for land acquisitions of up to $20 million to promote the regional habitat conservation plans. The SANDAG Board may choose to acquire one or more properties that will not exceed $20 million. Project applicants are encouraged to provide matching funds. Funding is contingent on SANDAG Board adoption of the FY 2015 budget and subsequent approval of the land acquisition grants.

Eligible Projects

SANDAG has proposed up to $20 million to assist with land acquisition that promotes the success of the Natural Communities Conservation Planning (NCCP) Program through conservation of habitat areas critical to promote endangered species and wildlife movement.

All project proponents would be required to fill out an application form (Attachment 2A), which will help SANDAG staff determine if a proposed acquisition is eligible for grant funding and how it ranks among other eligible grant proposals. The Eligibility and Evaluation Criteria for the grant are provided as Attachment 2B. Projects must first be determined to be eligible for funding before being ranked.

Process for Allocating Funds

SANDAG will accept project proposals from applicants in San Diego County that will benefit regional habitat conservation planning under the NCCP Program. The applicant must own the land or have documentation that the owner is a willing seller. The owner of the property does not need to be the applicant or co-applicant on the grant proposal. Applicants will need to estimate the total cost of the project and provide information on how the costs were determined.

The land must be acquired or conserved as open space for natural resources. The application must include a discussion of who will own the property, who will manage the property, and who will be responsible for the financial management of any funds associated with the acquisition and/or management.

Applicants must complete a Grant Submission Application (Attachment 2A) that does not exceed 10 pages (not including attachments).
All project proposals will be reviewed for eligibility, ranked, and prioritized using the criteria in Attachment 2B. The top-ranked projects that cumulatively total up to $20 million will be appraised by SANDAG through its on-call appraisers. The appraisal will follow the Uniformed Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice by a member of the Appraisal Institute. SANDAG will use this appraisal to determine the value of the property for its highest and best use. SANDAG will only fund the appraised value of the property as part of the grant.

A list of recommended projects and their appraised value will be submitted for consideration to the Environmental Mitigation Program Working Group (EMPWG) and Regional Planning and Transportation Committees for a recommendation to the SANDAG Board of Directors. The SANDAG Board of Directors would authorize any funding for grants in FY 2015.

If approved by the SANDAG Board of Directors, successful applicants will be required to enter into escrow for the acquisition of the property, providing a conservation easement or similar restrictive covenant to SANDAG and a management agreement that spells out the terms of management of the property.

Who Will Score the Projects?

An evaluation committee will be made up of representatives from SANDAG, Caltrans, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, California Department of Fish and Wildlife, and U.S. Geological Survey; and would rank all applications.

Submittal Requirements and Application Deadline

One (1) signed hardcopy of the grant proposal and one (1) copy on a disc as a PDF file shall be submitted. Proposals submitted by facsimile or email are not acceptable and will not be considered.

The applicant is responsible for submitting its entire proposal package with all required submittal documents and any modifications or revisions, so as to reach the SANDAG office as designated in the Call for Projects by the time specified below. Any proposal, modification, or revision received by SANDAG after the exact time specified for receipt of proposals is “late” and will not be considered unless it is received before award is made and the Chief Deputy Executive Director determines that accepting the late proposal would not unduly delay the procurement process; and:

(1) The proposal was received, with all required submittal documents, by SANDAG before proposals were distributed for evaluation or within 24 hours after the exact time specified for receipt, whichever is earlier; or

(2) There is acceptable evidence to establish that the proposal was received, with all required submittal documents, at the SANDAG location designated for receipt of proposals and was under SANDAG control prior to the time set for receipt of proposals; or

(3) There is acceptable evidence to establish that the proposer submitted its proposal, with all required submittal documents, to a third-party carrier for guaranteed delivery to SANDAG by the specified “Closing Time/Date” written below; however, due to an unforeseen event beyond the proposer’s reasonable control, such as poor weather, an act of God, or a delivery mistake by a third-party carrier, the proposal package arrived after the “Closing Time/Date”; or
(4) It is the only proposal received.

The proposal must be addressed to and received no later than 4 p.m., local time, on January 29, 2014, at the office of:

Katie Levy, Grant Administrator
San Diego Association of Governments
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, California 92101

Postmarks will not be accepted in lieu of this requirement.

Proposed Schedule

**November 1, 2013** – A Call for Projects is provided to interested stakeholders included in the SANDAG EMP TransNet EMP stakeholder database. A Call for Projects also will be posted on the SANDAG website.

**December 4, 2013** – A public workshop will be provided to address any questions on the Call for Projects or the process. Staff from SANDAG will be present to address questions and provide information on the eligibility, approval, contracting, and specific requirements of this grant program.

**January 29, 2014** – Applications are due to SANDAG. One signed hard copy to:

Katie Levy, Grant Administrator
San Diego Association of Governments
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, California 92101

and one electronic version emailed to katie.levy@sandag.org.

**February 2014** – SANDAG staff will determine the eligibility of all submitted grant proposals. Eligible projects will be submitted to the evaluation committee for review and prioritization.

**March 2014** – The list of prioritized grant projects, including those projects to be appraised, will be presented for information to the Regional Planning and Transportation Committees.

**March 2014 - May 2014** – Projects receiving the top ranks totaling up to $20 million will be appraised by SANDAG through its agents.

**June 2014** – The final prioritized list of projects, including the appraised value of the property, will be presented to the EMPWG for its recommendation to the Regional Planning Committee.

**July 2014** – The final prioritized list of projects, including the appraised value of the property, will be presented to the Regional Planning and Transportation Committees for information.
**September 2014** – The final prioritized list of projects, including the appraised value of the property, will be presented to the Regional Planning and Transportation Committees, who will be asked to recommend a list of land management projects for funding.

**September 2014** – The list of projects will be presented to the SANDAG Board of Directors for consideration.

**October 2014** – Approved grant projects will enter into escrow.
Grant Application Form

For Consideration for TransNet Environmental Mitigation Program (EMP)
Fiscal Year 2014 Land Acquisition Grant

(Applications cannot exceed ten 10 pages, not including attachments.)

Applicant Name: ____________________________________________
Address: __________________________________________________
Phone and Email Address: _____________________________________
Name of Property: ____________________________________________
General Location: ____________________________________________
Jurisdiction: _________________________________________________
Land Use Designation: _________________________________________
Total Acres: _________________________________________________
A.P.N.s _____________________________________________________
Estimated Acres Requiring Management: _________________________
Owner(s) of Property: _________________________________________
Long-term Management Entity¹: _________________________________
Financial Manager¹: _________________________________________

Brief Project Summary that includes location of property (200-word maximum)
________________________________________

¹ Attach Statement of Qualifications to Application
FUNDING NEEDS SUMMARY

1. Please indicate how much funding is being requested from SANDAG and any matching funding proposed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Item</th>
<th>Requested Funding Amount</th>
<th>Proposed Matching Funds*</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Acquisition Cost</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>Include all estimated closing costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Administrative Expenses</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>Includes all staff time to administer the goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-time Management Costs</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>Include one-time cost to secure and/or restore property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-going Management Costs</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>Include total cost for long-term management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Costs*</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>Describe costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>$</strong></td>
<td><strong>$</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*if applicable

Explain how the acquisition cost was determined (200-word maximum). ____________________________

Explain how the management cost was determined (200-word maximum). ____________________________

2. Are there matching funds available? If yes, how are the matching funds assured (200-word maximum)?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

Explain how matching funds are assured. ____________________________
PROJECT SUMMARY

(Maps and/or graphics can be referenced and pasted at the end of this Word document or attached as a separate digital file.)

The summary will include the location of the acquisition property(ies), the proposed strategy for acquisition, identification of matching funds, discussion of both short-term and long-term land management, and the method to assure financial accountability of management funds.

A. Project Purpose

Address the following in the proposal.

1. Describe how the property will contribute to the success of the San Diego regional Natural Community Conservation Planning by acquiring and restoring unique habitat areas, key populations of endangered species, lands adjacent to existing conserved habitat lands, and/or promoting wildlife linkages. Describe the location of the property in relation to the regional open space plans (e.g., Multiple Species Conservation Plan South, Multiple Habitat Conservation Plan, Multiple Species Plan North, etc.) and existing or proposed conserved lands. PROVIDE A MAP as an attachment.

2. Describe the designation of the property in the local jurisdiction’s long-range land use and transportation plans, and discuss any conflicts. If the use of the site as habitat conservation/open space is not consistent, a letter from the City Council or its designee will be required indicating that the jurisdiction does not object to the site being purchased for habitat conservation/open space. PROVIDE LETTER as an attachment.

3. Describe how the property will provide benefit for federal and/or state-listed species and/or unlisted sensitive species. Identify all known federal or state-listed endangered species, species that are candidate for listing, or unlisted sensitive species (e.g., County of San Diego’s Sensitive Plant List, California Department of Fish and Wildlife list of species of special concern), and the source of the information. Discuss to the extent known, if there are any core populations of listed or sensitive species on or near the property. PROVIDE A MAP of species on property if available.

4. Describe the property’s benefit to ecosystem functions and services. Describe the existing biotic and abiotic condition of the property in relation to its disturbance and need for management. Discuss the level of required management need to (1) restore and (2) maintain the abiotic, biotic, and ecological processes of the property when considered in context of the surrounding landscape. Biotic factors include the structure and composition of plant and animal communities. Abiotic factors include soil, hydrology, natural topography, and salinity gradients. Ecological processes include succession, trophic energy flows, and disturbance regimes.

5. Include a discussion of how the acquisition of the property would contribute to overall open space connectivity throughout the region and how this acquisition could fill a void in the matrix of protected open space lands.
6. Describe how the acquisition of the property removes or minimizes threats on the species identified in number 2, above. Examples of threats/stressors include fragmentation; edge effects; loss of habitat from proposed development, conversion to agriculture, or lack of or inappropriate management.

7. Describe the likelihood that the land targeted for acquisition will be converted from natural habitat in the near term. Explain why.

8. Describe how the land proposed for acquisition will increase the likelihood that species and their habitats will be able to respond/adapt to climate changes (e.g., temperature and precipitation) or remove potential impediments to response to climate change.

9. Describe who would own the title of the property and who would manage the property. Describe the qualification of the land manager. Describe how the management cost, both one-time and on-going, have been determined. Discuss the proposed funding strategy for long-term management, including who would fund management and where funds would be held. Describe the experience of the financial manager (proposed entity to hold any endowments for management and/or monitoring) and assurances of long-term funding.

10. Describe the approach for the development of a long-term management plan for the property.

11. Describe any special considerations of the proposed acquisition. Special considerations may include but are not limited to: percentage of matching funds; cost per acre for acquisition and/or management; significantly facilitates broader management goals beyond the targeted parcel boundaries; ancillary benefits (e.g., supports water quality, flood control, or wildfire management needs); completes or significantly benefits a local or regional acquisition strategy/opportunity.

NOTICE REGARDING PREVAILING WAGES

SANDAG EMP Land Management Grants are funded with TransNet revenues consistent with the Transnet Extension Ordinance adopted by the voters in November 2004 (SANDAG Ordinance 04-01). While SANDAG does not require grantees to pay prevailing wages, recent California appellate court opinions (Reliable Tree Experts v. Baker, 200 Cal. App. 4th 785 [2011]; Reclamation Dist. No. 684 v. Department of Industrial Relations, 125 Cal. App. 4th 1000 [2005]) and Department of Industrial Relations advisory opinions strongly suggest that many EMP Land Management Grant-eligible projects, especially those involving habitat restoration and maintenance or environmental remediation, will be subject to prevailing wage law. Grant applicants are encouraged to review the provisions of Labor Code §§ 1720 and 1771, and California Code of Regulations, title 8, § 16000. These outline activities constituting public works for purposes of prevailing wage law. Grant applicants are further encouraged to seek advice from an attorney to determine the applicability of the aforementioned statutory provisions and regulation to their proposed grant-funded projects. If awarded an EMP Land Acquisition Grant, the grant agreement between SANDAG and the grantee requires grantee’s compliance with all federal, state, and local laws and ordinances applicable to the agreement.
REQUIRED STATEMENTS FROM GRANTEE

☐ Yes ☐ No  The owner of the property is a willing seller and a letter of interest, purchase agreement, or similar commitment from the owner has been attached to this application.

☐ Yes ☐ No  The site is consistent with the local jurisdiction’s land use plan as habitat conservation/open space, or the local jurisdiction does not object to the site being acquired for habitat conservation/open space and a letter from the jurisdiction has been included with this application.

☐ Yes ☐ No  A preliminary title report to the property(ies) has been included with the application.

☐ Yes ☐ No  If the property is selected for consideration to be acquired, the grantee understands that SANDAG will conduct through its proxies an appraisal consistent with the Uniformed Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice by a member of the Appraisal Institute. SANDAG will use this appraisal to determine the value of the property for its highest and best use. The grantee understands that SANDAG, at the sole discretion of the SANDAG Board of Directors, only will offer the appraised value of the property.

☐ Yes ☐ No  The grantee agrees to use the escrow account and instructions acceptable by SANDAG.

☐ Yes ☐ No  The grantee understands that upon review of the title report, hazardous waste assessments of the property, or any other real property document, SANDAG may choose to not pursue acquisition of the property at its sole discretion.

☐ Yes ☐ No  The grantee agrees to provide to record a conservation easement, deed restriction, or similar restrictive convent that will run with the title of the property and be binding on the grantee, heirs, successors, lessees, representatives, and other occupiers of the property.

☐ Yes ☐ No  The grantee understands that SANDAG would need to accept the identified land manager and the financial manager for management funds as part of the acquisition grant.

☐ Yes ☐ No  The grantee agrees to enter into a Management Agreement with SANDAG for the perpetual stewardship and biological management of the property.

☐ Yes ☐ No  The grantee agrees to complete a resource management plan within one year of the acquisition of the property for review by the state and federal wildlife agencies.

☐ Yes ☐ No  The grantee agrees to comply with SANDAG Board Policy No. 035 “Competitive Grant Program Procedures,” which outlines “use-it-or-lose-it” project milestone and completion deadlines. SANDAG Board Policy No. 035 is included in the
standardized agreement, and also is on the SANDAG website at the following link: http://www.sandag.org/organization/about/pubs/policy_035.pdf

☐ Yes  ☐ No  The proposed grantee understands that a resolution including the requirements of SANDAG Board Policy No. 035, Section 4.1, must be submitted to SANDAG at least two weeks prior to the recommendation by the Regional Planning Committee of the list of grant projects to be considered eligible. SANDAG will provide applicants with advance notice of the Regional Planning Committee's anticipated meeting date.

☐ Yes  ☐ No  The grantee understands that only the SANDAG Board of Directors can authorize any funding and costs borne by the grantee prior to SANDAG Board of Director approval is at the risk of the grantee and may not be reimbursed.

☐ Yes  ☐ No  The grantee understands that this grant is an opportunistic purchase by SANDAG and the SANDAG Board of Directors may at its sole discretion choose to fund all, part, or none of the proposal.

*I have the authorization to submit this grant on behalf of my organization.*

________________________________________________________________________

Grantee Name/Title (print or type) 

________________________________________________________________________

Grantee Signature   mm/dd/yy

________________________________________________________________________

Date
ECONOMIC BENEFIT LAND ACQUISITION ELIGIBILITY AND EVALUATION CRITERIA

PROJECT INFORMATION
Project Title: ________________________________________________________________
Jurisdiction: ________________________________________________________________
Acreage of land acquisition (break down acreage by parcel if more than one parcel is proposed for acquisition): ________________________________
Estimated total cost of land acquisition: _________________________________
Estimated total cost of management: _________________________________
Proposed land manager: ____________________________________________
Percent of cost to be borne by partners (list by entity and % of cost): ______________
Project submitted by: ____________________________________________
Submittal date: ____________________________________________

PART 1:
SANDAG will utilize the following findings for potential acquisition opportunities to determine their eligibility. A project must meet ALL five of the findings to be considered eligible:

Promotes Natural Community Conservation Planning: The proposed acquisition will contribute to the success of the San Diego regional Natural Community Conservation Planning by acquiring and restoring unique habitat areas, key populations of endangered species, lands adjacent to existing conserved habitat lands, and/or promoting wildlife linkages.

a. Jurisdictional Land Use Plans: Use of the site as habitat conservation/open space is consistent with the long-range land use and transportation policies of one or more local jurisdictions. If the use of the site as habitat conservation/open space is not consistent, the jurisdiction(s) does not object to the site being purchased for habitat conservation/open space.

b. Willing Seller: Owner of the property is a willing seller with clear title to the property and any hazardous material identified in a Phase I environmental site assessment has been evaluated and addressed to the satisfaction of SANDAG.

c. Appraisal: The property must be appraised by a qualified licensed appraiser in accordance with established acquisition and appraisal standards, and reviewed independently by an appraisal specialist working for SANDAG. The first written offer will reflect the fair market value of the property.

d. Owner/Manager: Perpetual ownership of the land has been identified as well as a qualified land manager. The identified owner is a public agency or nonprofit organization willing to provide a conservation easement or deed restriction to SANDAG or mutually agreed-upon third party. SANDAG and the land manager have agreed upon the annual cost to manage the land and the method for funding the annual management costs.
PART 2:

If a potential acquisition opportunity is deemed eligible, then the following Evaluation Criteria will be used to evaluate and prioritize the grant project:

SPECIES BENEFITS:

The purpose of this section is to evaluate how beneficial the land acquisition will be for listed and unlisted species.

Listed Species

1. Acquisitions that benefit more listed, proposed, or candidate species will score higher.
   
   **Score:** Number of state and federally listed, proposed, or candidate species (a species that is both state and federally listed only counts as 1) that will benefit from the land acquisition. (10 points maximum)
   
   0 species (0 pts.) - Skip to Question 3
   
   1 species (1 pt.)
   
   2-5 species (4 pts.)
   
   6-10 species (8 pts.)
   
   11+ species (10 pts.)

2. Acquisitions that provide greater benefit to listed species will score higher. The benefits to the listed species will be considered **major** if, through the acquisition, the majority of the species’ range-wide habitat or an essential piece (e.g., core or linkage) of habitat is protected, a major/critical/significant population necessary for recovery is protected, or major threats to the species are eliminated. The benefits to the listed species will be considered **minor** if, through the acquisition, only a small percentage of the species’ range-wide habitat is protected, etc.

   **Score:** Magnitude of benefits for listed species that will result from the land acquisition. (10 points maximum)

   **Score:** Magnitude of species benefits for listed species. (10 points maximum)

   Mostly minor benefits will result for the listed species (1 pt.)
   
   A combination of major and minor benefits will result for listed species (6 pts.)
   
   Mostly major benefits will result for the listed species (10 pts.)
**Unlisted Species**

3. Acquisitions that benefit more unlisted sensitive (e.g., on the County of San Diego’s Sensitive Plant List; California Department of Fish and Wildlife list of species of special concern) species will score higher. Unlisted species do not include species listed by the state or federal governments as listed as threatened or endangered or that are proposed or candidates for listing.

   **Score:** Number of unlisted, proposed, and candidate species that will benefit from the land acquisition. (10 points maximum)

   0 species (0 pts.) - Skip to Question 5

   1-5 species (3 pts.)

   6-10 species (6 pts.)

   11+ species (10 pts.)

4. Acquisitions that provide greater benefit to unlisted species will score higher. The benefits to the species will be considered major if, through the acquisition, the majority of the species’ range-wide habitat is protected, an essential piece of the habitat is protected, a major population necessary for conservation is protected, or major threats to the species are eliminated. The benefits to the species will be considered minor if, through the acquisition, only a small percentage of the species’ range-wide habitat is protected, etc.

   **Score:** Magnitude of species benefits for unlisted species. (10 points maximum)

   Mostly minor benefits will result for the unlisted species (1 pt.)

   A combination of major and minor benefits will result for unlisted species (6 pts.)

   Mostly major benefits will result for the unlisted species (10 pts.)

**ECOSYSTEM BENEFITS**

The purpose of this section is to evaluate how beneficial the land acquisition will be for the identified ecosystem function and services.

5. Lands that require little or no management or significant restoration to provide benefits for the identified species will score higher in this evaluation factor. This habitat can include occupied or suitable, unoccupied habitat. The level of management and/or restoration expected to be necessary is based on an evaluation of the biotic and abiotic components and ecological processes and known or anticipated threats. Biotic factors include the structure and composition of plant and animal communities. Abiotic factors include soil, hydrology, natural topography, and salinity gradients. Ecological processes include succession, trophic energy flows, and disturbance regimes.

   **Score:** When considered in the context of the surrounding landscape, what is the anticipated
need for management and/or restoration to maintain the ecological processes necessary to maintain a fully functioning ecosystem? (15 points maximum)

Continued management and/or restoration to maintain ecosystem functions

___Significant (0 pts.)

___Moderate (10 pts.)

___Little to none (15 pts.)

6. Land acquisitions that fill in critical components for land protection will score higher (e.g., lands that link two preserves together to reduce habitat fragmentation).

Score: Do the lands proposed for acquisition fill a critical void in the matrix of protected lands, such as a connection between protected areas or protection of a core population area? (15 points maximum)

To some degree for at least one identified listed species (5 pts.)
To a great degree for one identified listed species and some degree for one or more identified listed or unlisted species (10 pts.)
To a great degree for more than two identified listed species (15 pts.)

THREATS

This section includes consideration of how the acquisition removes or minimizes threats/stressors on the species identified above.

7. Acquisitions that address an imminent threat will score higher. Examples of threats/stressors include fragmentation; edge effects; loss of habitat from proposed development, conversion to agriculture, or lack of or inappropriate management. (15 points maximum)

Score: What is the lands likelihood that the land targeted for acquisition will be converted from natural habitat in the near term (2 years)?

___Not likely (0 pts.)

___Possible (e.g., land owner has been pursuing development permits, infrastructure is in, prime agricultural land adjacent to the site) (10 pts.)

___Highly likely (e.g., property has an approved development plan, identified species habitat is degrading due to lack of or current management practices) (15 pts.)

8. Land acquisition projects with a focus on climate change adaptation should be addressed here to identify the conservation benefits to be derived through acquisition of the property in support of the identified species (15 points maximum).

Score: Do the lands proposed for acquisition increase the likelihood that species and their
habitats will be able to respond/adapt to climate changes (e.g., temperature and precipitation) or remove potential impediments to those responses?

___Not likely (0 pts.)

___Possible (8 pts.)

___Highly likely (15 pts.)

**SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS** (15 points maximum).

This section documents special considerations that are not addressed in the above point scoring sections. Special considerations may include but are not limited to: percentage of matching funds; cost per acre for acquisition and/or management; significantly facilitates broader management goals beyond the targeted parcel boundaries; ancillary benefits (e.g., supports water quality, flood control, or wildfire management needs); completes or significantly benefits a local or regional acquisition strategy/opportunity; etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acquisition Project Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Point Range</th>
<th>Maximum Score Possible</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPECIES BENEFIT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listed Species</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Listed Species</td>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnitude of Benefit</td>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlisted Species</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Unlisted Species</td>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnitude of Benefit</td>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ECOSYSTEM BENEFIT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape Context</td>
<td>0-15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Linkage or Gap in Protection</td>
<td>5-15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>THREATS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Under Imminent Threat</td>
<td>0-15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessary for Climate Change Adaptation</td>
<td>0-15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS</strong></td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>115</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total points score ______ (Maximum available = 115)
SAN DIEGO FORWARD: THE REGIONAL PLAN: DEVELOPMENT OF DRAFT UNCONSTRAINED TRANSPORTATION NETWORK

Introduction

In developing the San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan, the Unconstrained Transportation Network represents the region’s vision for transit, highway, freight, bicycle, pedestrian, arterial improvements, and operations to meet travel demand in 2050. Defining the Unconstrained Transportation Network is an important step in developing a Regional Plan because it establishes the broadest multimodal network from which revenue constrained network scenarios will be developed. Ultimately, these transportation scenarios will support and provide connections to the other components of the Regional Plan, such as housing and jobs; retail and commercial destinations; healthcare; habitat, recreation, open space, and outdoor activities; education and job training opportunities as well as our neighboring binational and interregional areas. The revenue constrained transportation network scenarios also will be evaluated in such a way to take into account public health, social equity, the environment and the economy.

Transportation Committee members are asked to discuss and provide feedback on the initial draft Unconstrained Transportation Network. Recommendations for a preferred Unconstrained Transportation Network will be presented to the Transportation and Regional Planning Committees in October for further discussion and recommendation to the Board of Directors.

Background

As part of the preparation of the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan and its Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS), in spring 2010, the Transportation and Regional Planning Committees discussed and provided comments on the development of the unconstrained transit network and complementary highway network. Extensive work went into developing the Urban Area Transit Strategy (UATS) to increase the attractiveness of transit, walking, and biking in the more urbanized areas of the region. Three transit network alternatives were developed and evaluated. Staff sought public input from SANDAG working groups and at public workshops. The networks also were reviewed by an independent peer review panel. Ultimately, the Unconstrained Transportation Network incorporated a “hybrid” transit scenario from the UATS, highway improvements to provide mobility for people and goods, local streets and roads improvements, bicycle projects within the regional network, rail grade separations, and other management strategies. In addition, all projects, programs, and services from the TransNet Extension Ordinance through 2048 were included in the Unconstrained Transportation Network. The Board accepted the Unconstrained Transportation Network for use in the development of the 2050 RTP/SCS in July 2010.
Initial Recommendations for San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan Draft 2050
Unconstrained Transportation Network

SANDAG is currently working with staff from the Metropolitan Transit System, North County Transit District, and Caltrans to analyze potential modifications to the 2050 unconstrained transit and highway networks included in the 2050 RTP/SCS. The approved unconstrained transit and highway networks, as published in the 2050 RTP/SCS, are shown in Attachments 1 and 2, respectively. Proposed modifications are based on supporting transit investments along key corridors while taking into account changes to highway system planning that have occurred since the approval of the 2050 RTP/SCS in October 2011.

The draft Unconstrained Transportation Network also includes all projects in the Regional Bicycle Plan (Riding to 2050). An evaluation of regional pedestrian facilities (and which of those could be appropriate for inclusion in the Regional Plan) is currently underway. Including the Active Transportation Network (pedestrian and bicycle projects) along with the transit and highway networks helps to create a comprehensive and balanced transportation system that would be available to all users.

As described earlier in this report, the Unconstrained Transportation Network included in the 2050 RTP/SCS was accepted by the Board in mid-2010. Further evaluation of projects included in the Unconstrained Transportation Network was conducted up to the release of the draft Regional Transportation Plan in spring 2011. In addition, modifications were made to some supporting transit routes (e.g., Interstate 15 Bus Rapid Transit [BRT] and South Bay BRT) based on refined operating plans. As a result, the development of the Unconstrained Transportation Network for San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan presents an opportunity to align a handful of projects that were refined after the development of the 2050 RTP/SCS Unconstrained Transportation Network and also to reflect policy actions that led to changes in planned highway projects.

Proposed Transit Network Modifications

Potential modifications to the 2050 RTP/SCS Unconstrained Transportation Network are being explored along the following corridors:

- SPRINT extension to East Escondido (Route 399): Delete this route due to low modeled ridership potential
- Light Rail Transit (LRT) between San Diego State University and San Ysidro via East San Diego (Route 550): Delete this route due to redundancy with Route 562, which also serves Mid-City as part of its overall route between University Town Center (UTC) and San Ysidro via Kearny Mesa, Mission Valley, Mid-City, National City, and Chula Vista.
- LRT between Otay Mesa East Border Crossing and western Chula Vista (Route 564): Delete this route due to low potential ridership and redundancy with South Bay BRT (Route 628).
- BRT from Downtown to Kearny Mesa (Route 20): Modify this route to connect Sharp Hospital via an inline station on State Route 163 between Mesa College Drive and Genesee.

Proposed New Routes:

- LRT between UTC and Carmel Valley: Develop a new route from UTC (with connections to Mid-Coast LRT) to Carmel Valley via UTC-Campus Point and Sorrento Valley.
LRT between Downtown San Diego and Airport-Point Loma: Develop a new route from Santa Fe Depot east to Point Loma, directly serving Terminals 1 and 2 and the Commuter Terminal of the San Diego International Airport.

BRT between the Iris Trolley Station and Otay Mesa East Port of Entry: Add a new BRT line via State Route 905 (SR 905) with stops at the Otay Mesa East Port of Entry, Otay Mesa Intermodal Transit Center (with connections to South Bay BRT), and the Iris Trolley Station.

COASTER: Extend COASTER service south of Santa Fe Depot to National City.

Proposed Highway Network Modifications

The 2050 RTP/SCS includes an extensive Managed Lane system that provides flexibility in serving transit and High Occupancy Vehicles (HOVs) by maximizing the available rights-of-way in several of the region’s major highway corridors. Since the development of the 2050 RTP/SCS Unconstrained Transportation Network, two major actions have taken place which require changes to the highway network.

First, Caltrans and the Federal Highway Administration selected the Locally Preferred Alternative for the Interstate 5 (I-5) in the North Coast Corridor on July 6, 2011. The Express Lanes only option will add four Express or Managed Lanes from La Jolla Village Drive to Vandegrift Boulevard. This determination eliminated the potential for two additional general-purpose lanes in this corridor.

Second, SANDAG acquired the lease to operate the State Route 125 (SR 125) toll road from South Bay Expressway on December 21, 2011. As part of this transaction, the TransNet Extension Ordinance was amended to swap the funds allocated for construction of two reversible HOV lanes on Interstate 805 (I-805) between SR 905 and State Route 54 (SR 54), for a portion of the acquisition costs for the SR 125 lease. Through reduced tolls, SR 125 was predicted to accommodate, and indeed has accommodated more traffic, relieving congestion on I-805 and reducing the need for some improvements on the I-805 corridor in South County (construction is underway on two carpool lanes – one in each direction – on I-805 along and eight-mile segment from East Palomar Street to State Route 94). Based on the congestion relief provided by lowering of tolls on SR 125, the Board of Directors has concluded that it is unnecessary to add the two additional reversible HOV lanes on I-805 that were included in the 2050 RTP/SCS.

Therefore, the proposed refinements to 2050 RTP/SCS Unconstrained Highway Network include:

- I-5 North Coast (State Route 56 to Vandegrift Boulevard): Remove two general purpose lanes (from 10 to 8 lanes).
- I-805 South (SR 905 to SR 54): Remove 2 Managed Lanes (from 4 to 2 Managed Lanes)

SANDAG staff also will work with Caltrans to determine any opportunities for additional operational improvements to relieve bottlenecks and to improve overall highway functionality.

Active Transportation Network

The San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan proposed a vision for a diverse regional bicycle system of interconnected bicycle corridors, support facilities, and programs to make bicycling more practical and desirable to a broader range of people in our region. Implementation of the Plan will help the region meet its goals in reducing greenhouse gas emissions and improve mobility. It also provides
benefits to public health by encouraging more people to adopt a physically active mode of transportation for at least some of their trips. The San Diego Regional Bicycle Network is included as Attachment 3 and should be considered to represent the bicycle component of the draft Unconstrained Transportation Network. It should be noted that the unconstrained bike network may be modified as a result of work underway on the Safe Routes to School and Safe Routes to Transit programs and a comprehensive review of regional pedestrian facilities. Additionally, as part of the Active Transportation Implementation Strategy, bicycle and pedestrian improvements are being identified in 2050 RTP/SCS transit and highway corridor project areas. These projects, in addition to the Regional Bicycle Network, would comprise the active transportation component of the draft Unconstrained Transportation Network.

**Goods Movement**

The draft unconstrained goods movement system consists primarily of dual-use road and truckway projects (serving cars and trucks) that comprise the backbone of the freight distribution network. The unconstrained system outlined in the 2050 Goods Movement Strategy (GMS) as part of the 2050 RTP/SCS includes several maritime, rail, border, air cargo, and pipeline related projects. Refinements to the 2050 GMS are underway.

**Local Streets and Roads**

The draft Unconstrained Transportation Network also includes improvements to the local streets and roads. Local jurisdictions will provide SANDAG with the planned improvements for these facilities by November 2013.

**Intermodal Transportation Centers**

The draft Unconstrained Transportation Network also includes improvements to major intermodal centers such as the Intermodal Transportation Center at the San Diego International Airport (Destination Lindbergh), the San Ysidro Intermodal Transit Center, the Otay Mesa Intermodal Transit Center, and the Otay Mesa East Port of Entry Transit Center.

**Rail Grade Separations**

Grade-separation projects for the COASTER, SPRINTER, and Trolley corridors in the San Diego region will be incorporated in the Unconstrained Transportation Network.

**Transportation Demand Management**

The Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Program at SANDAG, known as iCommute, provides sustainable and flexible transportation programs that reduce traffic congestion and help reduce greenhouse gas emissions and other environmental pollutants that result from driving alone. These programs include: vanpool, carpool, SchoolPool, Guaranteed Ride Home, telework and bike programs, in addition to employer outreach, public education, and marketing. While transportation infrastructure, land use, and smart growth development patterns can take many years to implement, TDM strategies are cost-effective and can reduce pollutants and relieve congestion more immediately. Consequently, TDM programs are likely to play a larger role in achieving the near-term goals of the Regional Plan.
Transportation System Management

Our existing transportation system already benefits from a major investment of resources over the past several decades. While the Regional Plan identifies additional infrastructure investments needed to meet future transportation needs, it is critical that the region also place an increased focus on Transportation System Management (TSM). TSM is aimed at maximizing the efficiency of the facilities already in place while taking into account any emerging technologies on the horizon for future infrastructure investments to ensure maximum productivity and efficiency. TSM also aims at the development of multi-modal and multi-agency transportation management strategies in an effort to make the transit, arterial, and highway networks work together. Additional TSM strategies, as included in the recently developed Intelligent Transportation Systems Strategic Plan (such as signal- and ramp-metering coordination and optimization; improved performance monitoring and micro simulation; and advanced vehicle/roadside communication platforms), are aimed at providing our transportation partners with the ability to monitor, manage, and operate the transportation system as a unified and multi-modal network, enabling maximum throughput of the transportation systems and thus maximizing system efficiency and system productivity.

Next Steps

After receiving comments from the Transportation Committee, the initial draft Unconstrained Transportation Network will be presented to SANDAG working groups for discussion and feedback in September. Recommendations for a preferred Unconstrained Transportation Network are anticipated to be presented to the Transportation and Regional Planning Committees in October for recommendation to the Board of Directors.

After the Unconstrained Transportation Network is defined and accepted by the Board of Directors, staff will prioritize all of the future projects in this network, using the updated transportation project evaluation criteria (see Agenda Item No. 9). Based on revenue projections, various revenue constrained transportation network scenarios will be developed using this prioritized project list and other factors. The revenue constrained network scenarios will attempt to build and operate as much of the Unconstrained Transportation Network as possible, given revenue availability, flexibility, and project priorities. These scenarios will be evaluated using performance measures leading to the eventual selection of a preferred Revenue Constrained Network by the Board of Directors in 2014.

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

Attachments:  1. 2050 RTP/SCS Unconstrained Transit Network
              2. 2050 RTP/SCS Unconstrained Highway Network
              3. Regional Bicycle Plan Network

Key Staff Contact: Phil Trom, (619) 699-7330, phil.trom@sandag.org
Figure A.8
2050 Unconstrained Transit Network
October 2011
* High Speed Rail alignment based on the California High Speed Rail Authority’s 2005 Statewide Programmatic EIR/EIS preferred route.
Figure A.9
2050 Unconstrained Highway Network
October 2011
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SAN DIEGO FORWARD: THE REGIONAL PLAN: DRAFT TRANSPORTATION PROJECT EVALUATION CRITERIA

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 SANDAG 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.

The evaluation criteria for highway corridors, transit services, connector projects, active transportation, and rail grade separations will be used to evaluate projects for each of those categories and develop lists of ranked projects. 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 Transportation Committee and Regional Planning Committee at future meetings for discussion.

Project evaluation criteria are applied to each modal category of projects in the Unconstrained Transportation Network, which is under development. Transportation Committee members are asked to discuss and provide feedback on the initial draft Transportation Project Evaluation criteria. The draft Transportation Project Evaluation Criteria will be presented to the Transportation Committee and Regional Planning Committee in October for further discussion and recommendation to the Board of Directors.

Transportation Project Evaluation Criteria Development

SANDAG 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 take advantage of the recently enhanced modeling tools, the Activity Based Model, and the economic and land use microsimulation model - 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 Stakeholder Working Group, Independent
Taxpayer Oversight Committee (ITOC), Public Health Stakeholders Working Group, and the Regional Planning Technical 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 which is proposed to be incorporated into the criteria. The panelists, which include experts from academia, metropolitan planning organizations, and the private sector, met on August 22, 2013, and provided recommendations for revision and enhancement to the draft criteria.

**Project Evaluation Criteria Focus Areas and Proposed Refinements**

Each individual criterion is nested into the three focus areas reflecting 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 proposed refinements that have been suggested for the draft project evaluation criteria 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
- Increases physical activity
- Provides accessibility
- Serves goods movement and relieves freight system bottlenecks/capacity constraints
- Project cost effectiveness

Draft active transportation criteria are proposed to be included as a modal category for the first time in the Regional Plan. The draft criteria 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.
Other new modal draft criteria have been proposed in a variety of ways within modal categories. Physical activity is proposed as a new draft criterion to reflect the added emphasis on the linkage between transportation and health. Access to schools, and recreational areas and beaches also has been added as new draft criteria. GHG reductions, communities of concern, and cost-effectiveness criteria have been added to the rail grade separation category to provide greater consistency of analysis across modal categories.

The areas where draft project evaluation criteria have been reorganized include: provides congestion relief, GHG and pollutant emissions, accessibility, and serves goods movement. The majority of these are a result of improved model enhancements. The accessibility draft criterion includes a combination of reorganized existing criteria and model enhancements with a new component for access to schools and recreation areas and beaches.

**Project Evaluation Criteria Weightings**

The draft project evaluation criteria weightings have been refined to take into account the accepted vision and goals for the Regional Plan, the potential addition of new criteria as well as the reorganization of the criteria mentioned above. All mode categories have a 100-point scale, with the individual criterion each having a specified maximum score. The ITOC, as well as other SANDAG working group members, stakeholders, and the general public have expressed feedback related to the draft criteria weightings, which were considered during the development process.

**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 and at Caltrans. 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 workshop are included as Attachment 2.

Over 400 comments have been collected from local jurisdictions, partner agencies, stakeholders, and the general public. This feedback has provided valuable information to be considered for the development of the draft project evaluation criteria.

**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 and its Sustainable Communities Strategy project evaluation criteria, the proposed revisions/modifications to the regional plan draft project evaluation criteria, and a public outreach comment matrix.

The panel complimented SANDAG’s use of data driven quantitative criteria and felt that the criteria were strongly linked to the Regional Plan’s goals. The panel also had a favorable reaction to the draft cost-effectiveness criteria, which provides for an initial benefit-cost analysis of transportation projects. The panel recommended that SANDAG look for opportunities to eliminate redundancy in criteria, particularly where elements of a project such as traffic volumes are accounted for in other criterion. The panel also recommended that the weighting of common individual criterion be standardized across the modal categories and that SANDAG consider combining highway corridor, High Occupancy Vehicle connectors, and freeway connectors into one project list, with one set of
evaluation criteria. Another idea raised by the panel was the possibility of including a negative point range for certain criteria where the project may offer a disadvantage, such as the GHG category. A summary of the peer review panel’s findings and recommendations is included as Attachment 3.

Based on the panel’s review and comments received from 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 which 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.

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**

The draft Transportation Project Evaluation Criteria are anticipated to be presented to the Transportation Committee and Regional Planning Committee in October for recommendation to the Board of Directors.

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

Attachment: 1. Preliminary Draft Highway Corridor Project Evaluation Criteria  
               3A. SANDAG Peer Panel Review Discussion - August 23, 2013  
               3B. Draft Transportation Project Evaluation Criteria - Peer Review Panel Biographies

Key Staff Contact: Rachel Kennedy, (619)-699-1929, rachel.kennedy@sandag.org
### Preliminary Draft Highway Corridor Project Evaluation Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan Goals</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Proposed Calculation</th>
<th>Max Score</th>
<th>Total Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Innovative Mobility & Planning            | 1   | Provides Congestion Relief | A) What is the number of daily person-hours saved from implementing the project?*  
B) What is the number of daily person-hours saved for communities of concern? | Change in daily person-hours saved  
Change in daily person-hours saved for communities of concern population | 10 | 35 |
| Project Safety                            | 2   | How does the project compare against the statewide average for collisions? | Project percentage of collisions measured against statewide average | 5 | |
| Provides Access to Evacuation Routes       | 3   | How will the project provide evacuation access for regional hazard areas? | Proximity analysis of hazard areas (dam failure, earthquake, flood, landslide, liquefaction, tsunami, and wildfire), weighted by population and employment | 5 | |
| Facilitates FasTrak/Carpool/Transit,      | 4   | How will the project facilitate FasTrak/carpool/Managed Lane facilities and/or regional or corridor transit services, and/or pedestrian and bicycle access? | 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 | 10 | |
| Healthy Environment & Communities         | 6   | How will the project minimize negative habitat and residential impacts? | Proximity analysis of preserve areas, native habitats, and housing (more than 2 dwelling units per acre) | 5 | |
| GHG and Pollutant Emissions               | 7   | A) What is the reduction in CO2 emissions from implementing the project?  
B) What is the reduction in smog forming pollutants from implementing the project? | Reduction in CO2 emissions  
Reduction in smog forming pollutants | 5 | 30 |
| Serves RCP Smart Growth Areas             | 8   | What are the share of trips on the facility serving RCP Smart Growth Areas (Metropolitan Center, Urban Center, and Special Use Center)?* | Share of trips on facility serving existing/planned or potential Metropolitan Center, Urban Center, and Special Use Center is calculated, using select link analysis | 10 | |
| Physical Activity                         | 9   | What is the increase in physical activity? | Increase in time engaged in moderate transportation-related physical activity | 5 | |
| Vibrant Economy                           | 10  | A) What is the improved access to jobs and schools?  
B) How will the project support access to recreational areas and beaches?  
C) What percentage of users of the project access Indian reservations? | Weighted average number of jobs and school enrollment accessible in 30 minutes by auto  
Acres of parkland/recreational areas and beaches within 1/4 mile of project  
Select link used to determine origins and destinations served, total trips to/from Indian reservation areas | 4 | 35 |
| Serves Goods Movement and Relieves Freight System Bottlenecks/Capacity Constraints | 11  | What is the improved average travel time for freight? | Total travel time savings for medium and heavy truck classes | 2 | |
| Project Cost-Effectiveness                 | 12  | 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  
- Criteria pollutants  
- Health and physical activity  
- Safety | 20 | |

*Note: Provides dual evaluation for both passenger vehicles and trucks
## Preliminary Draft Transit Services Project Evaluation Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan Goals</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Proposed Calculation</th>
<th>Max Score</th>
<th>Total Percent</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?</td>
<td>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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Serves Daily Trips</td>
<td>What is the number of additional daily transit trips resulting from the project?</td>
<td>Change in daily transit linked trips</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></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 hazards?</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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Daily System Utilization</td>
<td>What is the daily transit utilization?</td>
<td>Daily passenger miles/daily service seat miles (system wide)</td>
<td>5</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?</td>
<td>Reduction in CO2 emissions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></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>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?</td>
<td>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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</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>10</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?</td>
<td>Change in daily transit linked work and school trips</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></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>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C) What is the increase in transit trips by communities of concern?</td>
<td>Change in total transit trips by communities of concern population</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D) How will the project facilitate pedestrian and bicycle access?</td>
<td>Project located within 1/4 mile of pedestrian and bicycle facilities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E) What is the increase in transit trips to federally recognized Indian reservations?</td>
<td>Change in total transit trips to/from Indian reservations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</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; Criteria pollutants; Health and physical activity; Safety</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Proposed Calculation</td>
<td>Max Score</td>
<td>Total Percent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</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>35</td>
<td></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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>System Connectivity</td>
<td>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>10</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></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></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></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></td>
<td></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></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></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></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></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></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: Project cost, Generalized delay costs, Fuel costs, GHG emissions, Criteria pollutants, Health and physical activity, Safety</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan Goals</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Proposed Calculation</td>
<td>Max Score</td>
<td>Total Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Innovative Mobility &amp; Planning</strong></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></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></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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Healthy Environment &amp; Communities</strong></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>30</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></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><strong>Vibrant Economy</strong></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 - Criteria pollutants - Health and physical activity - Safety</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*GHG and Pollutant Emissions* includes the following pollutants:
- CO2
- Smog forming pollutants
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan Goals</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Proposed Calculation</th>
<th>Max Score</th>
<th>Total Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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></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>35</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, landslide, liquefaction, tsunami, and wildfire), weighted by population and employment</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></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>30</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></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></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 - Criteria pollutants - Health and physical activity - Safety</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</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>No.</th>
<th>Criteria Description</th>
<th>Proposed Calculation</th>
<th>Max Score</th>
<th>Total Percent</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian and Bicycle/ Communities of Concern Benefits</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>A) Number of pedestrians and bicyclists served in top 4 hours</td>
<td>Grade separation pedestrian bicycle crossing counts</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B) What is the share of communities of concern population in the proximity of the project?</td>
<td>Ratio of communities of concern share of population within 1/2 mile of project compared to community of concern share of regional population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bus Operations Benefits</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>4</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Environment &amp; Communities</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Accident History</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>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Proximity to Noise Sensitive Receptors</td>
<td>Proximity to sensitive receptors</td>
<td>Proximity analysis based on rail crossing located within 200-500 feet of sensitive receptors</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>GHG Emissions</td>
<td>What is the reduction in CO2 emissions from implementing the project?</td>
<td>Reduction in CO2 emissions</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Serves RCP Smart Growth Areas</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>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vibrant Economy</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Truck Freight Operations</td>
<td>Percentage of daily truck traffic</td>
<td>Percentage of daily traffic of Class 4-Class 13 (as defined by FHWA)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Funding Request</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>4</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: - Number of trains per day - AADT - Gate down time - Percent truck traffic - Safety</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA)</td>
<td>How many low income housing units are produced by the jurisdiction?</td>
<td>Based on number of lower income housing units produced in accordance with RHNA Alternative 3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan Draft Transportation Project Evaluation Criteria
Public Workshop – August 5, 2013 Comment Summary

Active Transportation

General Comments

• Access to food, medical care, recreation on weekends/summer
• Affordability
• Criteria to identify benefits for bike & ped 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
• Peds 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 project & 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 & want to see it build, than I think more points should be given to that specific project.
• Weighting: #1 (10 pts), #4 (10 pts), and 10 (25 pts)
• Active transport – proposed calculations should be based on FTA catchment area guidance – 0.5 mile walking radius; 3 mile bicycle radius.
• Bike lanes @Virginia Ave.
• 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/ped 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.”

**Active Transportation continued:**

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 COC.
- Emphasize goods movement and cost effectiveness.
- Facility design should encourage active transportation users (ped/bike).
- Add attractive bike/ped crossings and access to all connectors (HOV/Fwy) projects.
- Include bike parking at stations.
- Consider combining the HOV and Freeway connector criteria.
**Freeway Connectors:**

**General comments:**

- Increase “Healthy Community & Environment” weighting.
- Emphasize GHG/pollutant emissions.

**Criterion 1: Provides Congestion Relief**

- Ensure model looks at surface streets (key corridors) & how can we prioritize projects to alleviate congestion on these vital corridors for transit & Active Transport.

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

- Calculation does not specify if success will be defined by increase or decrease in % 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-n-Ride lots.

**HOV Connectors continued:**

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

- #3 is most important (& 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 – CO+PM.
- 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 @ potential for rail – 3 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 & property owners.
- Restricting trucks during certain hours.
- Cleaner trucks in urban areas.
- Encourage/incentivize smaller electric vehicles – charging stations.
- Air quality impacts/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).
- Fastrack for trucking movement.
- Include active transport 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 RTP/SCS lawsuit.
- Improve La Mesa 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 comment:

- 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 + ranked highways.
- Where is system preservation?
- Hwy RCP Smart Growth Areas not clear, on transit focus on Smart Growth.
- Hwy construction induces sprawl & each project should be analyzed on this.
- Hwy projects reduce viability of transit.
- SR 905 storm water issues need more consideration.
- Consider a ‘Fastrak’ like fee/charge for trucks on Hwys (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 + 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 + 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 SR-94 from downtown, SD 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 pts.

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/ped access considered? The criteria is not clear.

• Should be weighted more.
• Remove “Fastrak”

• Should be weighed 10 pts.

**Criterion 7A: GHG and Pollutant Emissions**

• Should be at least 15 pts.

• Increases in GHG emissions should get negative points.

• Highway & connectors criteria include how much GHGs & pollutants are avoided. But they should actually get negative number.

**Criterion 8: Serves RCP Smart Growth Areas**

• Should be 10 pts.

• 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 pts.

**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 increases the 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 pts.

**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 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 33 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 33 – grant funding is not the silver bullet.

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

• Weight of ped/bike = 11 pts, take from PPEI factors

• Higher weight for ped 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 project decreases auto trips/VMT 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 pts).
- 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 Claremont 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. For ex. 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 his means bike/ped facilities allow bike/ped 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 Hwy 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.

• Bi-national Mega Region: The project should facilitate cross-border 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, 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 B/C ratio if cost-effectiveness for each measure?
  o Folks will want to see this
  o Business folks will want to see B/C ratio return to analysis
  o Need to fix cost-effectiveness weight (make the same across modes)
• Pull B/C 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/RHNA 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 RTP
  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 ITS 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.
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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.
Introduction

The FY 2013 Program Budget included a number of performance reporting tasks that focus on monitoring, tracking, and collecting an assortment of data in the region. These efforts include the analysis of transportation data in order to understand how the region’s transportation system is operating. The presentation of this analysis is provided through the annual State of the Commute (SOC) Report. The 2012 SOC Report provides an overview of freeway, transit, and local roadway usage and performance data gathered through December 2012. The SOC Report also presents “before and after” statistics that document the benefits in transportation system performance based on project improvements completed in the region.

The 2012 SOC Report was initially made available to the Transportation Committee at its July 19, 2013, meeting.

Discussion

The development of the 2012 SOC Report (Attachment 1) represents an ongoing effort to document the performance and operation of our regional transportation system. The information provided in the 2012 SOC Report is consistent with transportation performance indicators documented in the Regional Comprehensive Plan Performance Monitoring Report and regular performance monitoring reports provided to the TransNet Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee.

The 2012 SOC Report includes information in narrative and graphical form on key transportation statistics that have been divided into three sections:

- Getting Around the Region – This section provides a broad level perspective and overview of regional travel trends. It comprehensively quantifies traffic flows on our freeways and regional arterials, as well as overall transit ridership levels.

- How is the System Working? – This section provides a breakdown of performance statistics, including regional and corridor travel delay, along with information on the most heavily used transit routes.

- My Corridor Commute – This section provides a commuter perspective on the performance of a number of specific travel corridors in the region. It provides an annual comparison for usage, travel times, and other key statistics, highlighting completed or planned projects designed to reduce congestion and minimize delay.
The 2012 SOC Report shows travel by transit in the San Diego region (in terms of passenger-miles traveled) has decreased by 5 percent during the last 5 years (2008-2012); however, overall operating efficiency (in terms of passengers per revenue-mile) has experienced a 4 percent increase during the same period. Much of these efficiency gains are a result of restructuring, restoration, or expansion of existing service routes by the region’s two transit operators. Reflective of the region’s economic recovery, overall highway vehicle travel (in terms of vehicle miles traveled) during weekdays has increased by approximately 5 percent since 2008. Key roadway infrastructure improvements, including the completion of the Interstate 15 Express Lanes in January 2012, continue to provide reductions in travel times or commute delays.

Next Steps

As an ongoing effort, staff continues evaluating enhancements for future reports, including the addition of arterial performance and transit data for key projects. These efforts will further the ability of SANDAG to determine how the region is making progress in achieving the regional mobility goals and objectives to be established in our upcoming San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan.

The 2013 SOC Report will provide detailed, before and after data analysis that documents performance trends thru December 2013, including data and statistics linked to key transportation project improvements that were completed in 2013.

JIM LINTHICUM
Director of Mobility Management and Project Implementation

Key Staff Contacts: Ellison Alegre, (619) 699-0729, ellison.alegre@sandag.org
James Dreisbach-Towle, (619) 699-1914, james.towle@sandag.org


*Hard copies will be provided at the Transportation Committee meeting and are available by contacting the Public Information Office at (619) 699-1950.*
Summary of Workshop Input Received
September 6, 2013

Workshop Attendees

2013 Policy Area Outreach Series
Who Attended The Workshops?

- Resident: 32%
- CBO: 16%
- NGO/Non-Profit: 14%
- Private Sector: 11%
- Public/Government Agency: 20%
- Professional Organizations: 4%
- Academia: 3%
Population Comparison – San Diego Region and Workshops

Population Breakdown by Race and Ethnicity in San Diego County
(Census 2010)

- Hispanic: 32%
- White: 48%
- Black: 5%
- Asian: 11%
- Other Races: 1%
- 2 or More Races: 3%

Reported Race and Ethnicity of 2013 Policy Outreach Series Participants
(2013 Workshop Survey)

- Black: 3%
- Asian: 10%
- Hispanic: 27%
- White: 60%

Comment Categories

- Alphabetical Order
- Connection to Regional Phone Survey
Next Steps

• Utilize input in all Regional Plan activities
• October 11 workshops focusing on alternative land use and transportation scenarios
ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION PROGRAM

FY 2014 MANAGEMENT AND MONITORING ALLOCATIONS AND COMPETITIVE LAND ACQUISITION GRANT CALL FOR PROJECTS

September 6, 2013

TransNet
Environmental Mitigation Program

Large scale acquisition, management, and monitoring

Reduce cost, accelerate delivery, implement habitat plans, and reduce listing of species
Environmental Mitigation Program Costs
(In Millions, 2002 Dollars)

- Total Program
  - $850 Million

- Transportation Project Mitigation Fund
  - $650 M

- Major Highway & Transit Project Mitigation
  - $450

- Local Transportation Project Mitigation
  - $200

- Regional Habitat Conservation Fund
  - $200 M

Plus up to $30 M in financing costs for advanced habitat acquisition

Habitat Conservation Fund

Implementation Process

MOA (2/22/08) amend (4/26/13)

- $4 million annually for ten years
  
  - Five-year funding strategy
  
  - Annual funding approved by SANDAG Board of Directors
FY 14 Management and Monitoring Allocations

No New Tasks Proposed
- Regional coordination
- Regional management
- Regional monitoring

Total $4 Million Consistent with MOA

Land Acquisition Call for Projects

BOD amended MOA
- Economic benefit funding
- Land acquisition program
- Competitive grant
- Draft call for projects
- Eligible projects would be evaluated and ranked
- Proposed timeline
Next Steps

- Regional Planning Committee
  Sept 6, 2013
- ITOC Sept 11, 2013
- Recommendations provided to the Board of Directors on Sept 27, 2013
- If approved, staff would implement the management and monitoring activities for FY 14 and issue the call for projects by Nov 1, 2013

Recommendation

The Regional Planning Committee is asked to recommend to the Board of Directors approval of:

1. funding allocations totaling $4 million toward implementation of regional land management and biological monitoring activities, and
2. release of the Call for Projects for a competitive land acquisition grant program using economic benefit funding, pursuant to an executed Memorandum of Agreement with state and federal agencies on the implementation of the Environmental Mitigation Program.
ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION PROGRAM
FY 2014 MANAGEMENT AND MONITORING ALLOCATIONS AND COMPETITIVE LAND ACQUISITION GRANT CALL FOR PROJECTS

September 6, 2013
Draft Unconstrained Transportation Network
September 6, 2013

San Diego Forward Unconstrained Transportation Network Development
Scenario Development Based on Revenue Constraints

Unconstrained Multimodal Network

$\rightarrow\ A \ B \ C$

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>Vision Goals Objectives</td>
<td>2050 Regional Growth Forecast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Evaluation All Modes</td>
<td>Network Development 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 All Modes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranked Projects by Category</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Projections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unconstrained Network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Constrained SCS Network Scenarios</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Constrained Preferred Network Scenario</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft San Diego Forward Regional Plan</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>
Proposed Modifications

**New Routes**
- LRT between UTC & Carmel Valley
- LRT between Downtown/Airport
- BRT between Iris Trolley & Otay Mesa
- COASTER to National City

**Modified Routes**
- SPRINTER extension to east Escondido
- LRT between SDSU & San Ysidro via east San Diego
- LRT between east Otay Mesa & western Chula Vista
- BRT between Downtown & Kearny Mesa

Proposed Modifications

**Unconstrained Transit Network**

- I-5 North Coast (SR 56 to Vandegrift Blvd.)
  - Delete two general purpose lanes per the North Coast Corridor project

- I-805 South (SR 905 to SR 54)
  - Delete two additional Managed Lanes per the TransNet Extension Ordinance change as a result of the SR 125 lease
Unconstrained Active Transportation Network

- Regional Bicycle Network
- Safe Routes to Transit projects
- Bicycle/pedestrian projects at freeway interchanges
- Safe Routes to School

Additional Multi-Modal Components
Next Steps

• **September/October:** Draft Unconstrained Transportation Network discussion with working groups

• **October:** Unconstrained Transportation Network to Transportation and Regional Planning Committees for recommendation to the Board

• **October:** Preferred Unconstrained Transportation Network presented to Board for action

• **November/December:** Unconstrained Network project evaluation and ranking
To provide innovative mobility choices and planning to support a sustainable and healthy region, a vibrant economy, and an outstanding quality of life for all.
Draft 2050 Regional Growth Forecast: Housing Density

Draft 2050 Regional Growth Forecast: Job Density
Habitat Conservation Planning Areas in the San Diego Region

Project Evaluation Criteria

• Used in past Regional Transportation Plans
  – Rank projects within modal categories
  – Determine inclusion of projects in revenue constrained scenarios and project phasing
Project Evaluation Criteria Process

- Consultant assistance with draft criteria
- Working group and partner agency input
- Public outreach
- Peer panel review
- Recommendations from Policy Committees
- SANDAG Board acceptance

Public Workshops

- July 29, 2013: Draft Active Transportation Criteria
  - 40 attendees
  - 23 comments
- August 5, 2013: All Draft Criteria
  - 75 participants
  - 190 comments
- August 22, 2013: Peer Review Panel
Project Evaluation Criteria Categories

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

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
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

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
- Funding request
- Project cost effectiveness
- Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA)

Proposed Modifications
- Methodology enhancements
- Criterion modifications
- New criterion
- No change
Criteria Focus Areas and Weighting

- Innovative mobility and planning
- Vibrant economy
- Healthy environment and communities
- Will develop weighted scores based on a 100 point scale

Schedule and Next Steps

- September 2013: Draft criteria to Policy Committees for discussion
- October 2013: Draft criteria to Policy Committees for recommendation and to Board for acceptance
- Winter 2014: Apply criteria to Unconstrained Transportation Network projects
State of the Commute Annual Report

- Getting Around the Region
- How is the System Working
- My Corridor Commute
State of the Commute Data

Highways
- Travel (vehicle miles travelled)
- Delays (vehicle miles of delay)
- Travel Time & Reliability (minutes)

Transit
- Travel (passenger miles travelled)
- Ridership (passenger boardings)
- Productivity (passengers per revenue mile)

Getting Around the Region

Freeway Travel

Which Roads Do We Use?

Source: Freeway Performance Measurement System (PeMS), Caltrans

Source: San Diego Regional Model, Series 12 Forecast, 2012 Network
Getting Around the Region

Weekday Transit Ridership

Weekday Transit Passengers per Revenue Mile

Source: San Diego Metropolitan Transit System, North County Transit District, SANDAG

How is the System Working

Freeway Delay

Key Freeway Segment Bottlenecks

Source: Freeway Performance Measurement System (PeMS), Caltrans
How is the System Working?

Top 10 Transit Routes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Route Description</th>
<th>Transit Mode</th>
<th>Avg. Daily Passengers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Blue Line Trolley</td>
<td>San Ysidro to America Plaza via Chula Vista / National City</td>
<td>Light Rail</td>
<td>52,953 / 50,274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Green Line Trolley</td>
<td>Connects to Downtown SD via 126th &amp; Imperial via La Mesa / Mission Valley***</td>
<td>Light Rail</td>
<td>19,763 / 19,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Orange Line Trolley</td>
<td>El Cajon to Downtown SD / America Plaza via Southeastern Communities***</td>
<td>Light Rail</td>
<td>30,704 / 19,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4T</td>
<td>Downtown SD to La Mesa via North Park / City Heights</td>
<td>Local Bus</td>
<td>12,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5T</td>
<td>Connects to Escondido</td>
<td>Light Rail</td>
<td>8,947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6T</td>
<td>Skyline Hills to San Diego State University via Downtown SD</td>
<td>Local Bus</td>
<td>8,941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7T</td>
<td>Trolley via Chula Vista / National City</td>
<td>Local Bus</td>
<td>9,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8T</td>
<td>24th Street Trolley to Kearny Mesa via Southwestern Communities</td>
<td>Local Bus</td>
<td>7,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9T</td>
<td>Downtown SD to UTC / VA Medical Center via Pacific Beach</td>
<td>Local Bus</td>
<td>7,824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10T</td>
<td>Connects to UTC / VA Medical Center</td>
<td>Local Bus</td>
<td>7,796</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My Corridor Commute

I-15/SR 163 Commute Corridor

Year 2012 A.M. Travel Times
- Southbound: 35 minutes
- Northbound: 35 minutes

Year 2012 P.M. Travel Times
- Southbound: 30 minutes
- Northbound: 30 minutes

Average Daily Traffic
- I-15 at I-5 in 2011: 155,686

15 Express Bus Service
- Year 2012 Average Weekly Ridership: 6,114
My Corridor Commute

I-15 Corridor – Project Benefits

(Fig. 3.13) Corridor Travel and Delay
I-15 from SR 163 to SR 78

State of the Commute – Future Efforts

- Regional Arterial Data
- Corridor-Level Performance
- Active Transportation Projects