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Public comments regarding the agenda can be sent to SANDAG via comment@sandag.org. Please include the agenda item, your name, and your organization. Email comments should be received no later than 12 noon, two working days prior to the Transportation Committee meeting. 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.
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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。
TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE
Friday, October 4, 2013

ITEM #

+1. APPROVAL OF SEPTEMBER 20, 2013, MEETING MINUTES

The Transportation Committee is requested to review and approve the minutes.

+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)

+3. TransNet ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION PROGRAM: LAND MANAGEMENT GRANT PROGRAM QUARTERLY STATUS UPDATE (Katie Levy)

The Board of Directors has approved six cycles of the TransNet Environmental Mitigation Program Land Management Grant Program. This report provides information to the Transportation Committee on the quarterly status of active projects.

REPORTS (4 through 6)

+4. PROPOSED FY 2014 BUDGET AMENDMENT: EAST COUNTY BUS MAINTENANCE FACILITY (John Dorow)

The Transportation Committee is asked to recommend the Board of Directors approve the transfer of $5,000,000 from the SANDAG East County Bus Maintenance Facility (ECBMF) Project 1049600 to the Metropolitan Transit System ECBMF Compressed Natural Gas Station Project 11482.

+5. SAN DIEGO FORWARD: THE REGIONAL PLAN: DRAFT TRANSPORTATION PROJECT EVALUATION CRITERIA (Rachel Kennedy)

On September 6, 2013, the Transportation Committee discussed and provided input on the draft transportation project evaluation criteria. This report addresses these comments and the Transportation Committee is asked to further discuss the draft transportation project evaluation criteria for use in San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan.
+6. **SAN DIEGO FORWARD: THE REGIONAL PLAN: DRAFT OUTLINE OF WHITE PAPER ON ECONOMIC PROSPERITY (Jim Miller)**

The purpose of this item is to provide opportunities for the Transportation Committee to discuss economic strategies and approaches in San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan. Comments from various SANDAG working groups, and from the public workshops held earlier this year will be relayed.

7. **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.

8. **UPCOMING MEETINGS**

The next meeting of the Transportation Committee is scheduled for Friday, October 18, 2013, at 9 a.m.

9. **ADJOURNMENT**

+ next to an agenda item indicates an attachment
TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

September 20, 2013

AGENDA ITEM NO.: 1

Action Requested: APPROVE

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE DISCUSSION AND ACTIONS
MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 6, 2013

The meeting of the Transportation Committee was called to order by Chair Todd Gloria (City of San Diego) at 9:04 a.m. See the attached attendance sheet for Transportation Committee member attendance.

1. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

Action: Upon a motion by Chairman Harry Mathis (Metropolitan Transit System [MTS]), and a second by Mayor Sam Abed (North County Inland), the Transportation Committee approved the minutes from the July 19, 2013, Transportation Committee meeting.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

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

Gary Gallegos, Executive Director, announced SANDAG’s award of the recent Tiger Grants. Three applications were submitted and SANDAG received $14 million to help replace bridges along the LOSSAN corridor.

Paul Jablonski, Chief Executive Officer, MTS, announced the launch of a new mobile ticketing app. The app will be used to target trolley riders at the stadium and an express line will be offered for riders using this app. MTS implemented a successful soft launch at a recent Aztec game.

Mayor Cheryl Cox (South County) thanked Caltrans and SANDAG staff for a job well done on the recent removal of the Palomar Bridge on I-805.

CONSENT (3 through 4)

3. ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION WORKING GROUP (APPROVE)

The Transportation Committee was 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 (RECOMMEND)

The Transportation Committee was 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.
Action: Upon a motion by Mayor Abed, and a second by MTS Chairman Mathis, the Transportation Committee approved consent items 3 through 4.

CHAIR’S REPORT (5)

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

Chair Gloria introduced the item and said more than 500 people participated in various workshops and outreach efforts led by SANDAG staff.

Phil Trom, Senior Regional Planner, gave a brief overview of the workshops and summarized the extensive input received. Mr. Trom spoke about next steps, including a workshop to be held in mid-October on the scenario planning efforts.

REPORT (6 through 10)

6. 2012 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM: AMENDMENT NO. 8 ADMINISTRATIVE MODIFICATION (APPROVE)

Michelle Merino, Associate Financial Analyst, gave the report and said this amendment is administrative and is being processed outside of the regular quarterly amendment cycle.

Action: Upon a motion by Mayor Abed, and a second by Mayor Mary Sessom (East County), the Transportation Committee approved Amendment No. 8 - Administrative Modification to the 2012 RTIP.

7. TransNet ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION PROGRAM: FISCAL YEAR 2014 MANAGEMENT AND MONITORING ALLOCATIONS AND COMPETITIVE LAND ACQUISITION GRANT CALL FOR PROJECTS (RECOMMEND)

Keith Greer, Senior Regional Planner, presented the item.

Action: Upon a motion by Mayor Sessom, and a second by Deputy Mayor Lisa Shaffer (North County Coastal), the Transportation Committee recommended that the Board of Directors approve: (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 (DISCUSSION)

Phil Trom, Senior Regional Planner, presented the item and asked the Transportation Committee 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.

Emily Serafy Cox, Mid-City CAN, spoke in opposition of the deletion of Light Rail Transit (LRT) Route 550, and spoke about concerns discussed at the Community Based Organization (CBO)
partners’ meeting. Ms. Serafy Cox suggested updating the modeling on this route to determine if there are social equity concerns related to the potential deletion.

The Transportation Committee discussed the item.

Staff will seek additional input from other various working groups, community-based organizations, tribal governments, Regional Planning and Borders Committees.

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

9. SAN DIEGO FORWARD: THE REGIONAL PLAN: DRAFT TRANSPORTATION PROJECT EVALUATION CRITERIA (DISCUSSION)

Rachel Kennedy, Senior Regional Planner, presented the preliminary draft evaluation criteria to be used for prioritizing a list of transportation projects for San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan.

Miguel Aguirre, San Ysidro Planning Group, spoke about optimizing existing current infrastructure at the San Ysidro Port of Entry, and suggested moving the trolley station above grade to allow mobility.

The Transportation Committee discussed the item and provided their input on the draft criteria.

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

10. 2012 STATE OF THE COMMUTE REPORT (INFORMATION)

Ellison Alegre, Associate Transportation Planner, presented the 2012 State of the Commute Report, which provided data on the region's urban highways, bus systems, and rail services.

Elyse Lowe, Move San Diego, asked staff to measure and report transportation performance evaluation criteria such as reduced greenhouse gas emissions, impacted transit travel trip times, and other criteria in future State of the Commute reports.

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

11. CONTINUED PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no additional public comments.

12. UPCOMING MEETINGS

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

13. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Gloria adjourned the meeting at 10:59 a.m.
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</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>___</td>
<td>Dianne Jacob</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>No</td>
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<td>Alternate</td>
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<td>___</td>
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<td>Member</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
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<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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Introduction

The Board of Directors entered into a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with state and federal agencies on the implementation of the Environmental Mitigation Program (EMP). The MOA was originally signed on February 22, 2008, and recently amended on April 26, 2013.

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 is done on an annual basis by the Board of Directors pursuant to a Five-Year Funding Strategy (originally approved on December 15, 2006, and last updated by the Board on December 21, 2012).

The Five-Year Funding Strategy is designed to strategically allocate funding for land management and monitoring activities under the EMP, as approved annually by the Board. The Board of Directors allocates a portion of the $4 million annually for the TransNet EMP Land Management Grant Program. The purpose of this report is to provide information to the Transportation Committee on the quarterly status of active land management grant projects (Attachment 1).

Discussion

The TransNet Extension Ordinance and Expenditure Plan, approved by the voters in November 2004, includes the EMP, which provides funding to mitigate habitat impacts from regional and local transportation projects, and provides funding for regional land management and biological monitoring. A portion of this funding is distributed through a competitive land management grant program, which is administered consistent with the requirements identified in Board Policy No. 035: Competitive Grant Program Procedures.

Seventy land management grants totaling $11.5 million in TransNet funding have been provided to land management entities in the region through a competitive grant program. Eligible applicants include land managers from private, non-profit organizations; local jurisdictions; and other government agencies. Twenty-eight grants were completed as of May 3, 2013, when the FY 2013 3rd Quarter status report was presented to the Transportation Committee. Subsequently, three more grant projects have been completed, including one project that was on the “watch list.”

Projects under the EMP Land Management Grant Program are placed on the “watch list” if a grantee is not making timely progress toward their milestones (which are defined in Board Policy No. 035) and the grantee has not yet sought corrective action. Delays in tasks leading up to either the award of a contract or project completion may place grantees on the “watch list.” As noted in Attachment 1, one grantee, the City of San Diego, was placed on the “watch list” for the
San Pasqual Valley Weed Management Project due to delays that would potentially result in the grantee not meeting its project deadlines. The delay is due to a more time-intensive contracting process than previously planned which delayed completion of invasive plant eradication that had already begun. On August 5, 2013, after this grant reporting period, SANDAG staff met with the grantee to discuss corrective actions. SANDAG and the grantee have worked out a timeline that will conclude the project within six months of its current contract deadline without additional cost to SANDAG. As such, the grantee has requested, and SANDAG is administratively processing, a six-month time-only extension for approval by the SANDAG Executive Director, or designee, pursuant to Board Policy No. 035. The results of this corrective action will be documented in the next quarterly update.

Attachment 1 provides the FY 2013 4th Quarter status report of the 24 active land management grants as of June 30, 2013. The Board of Directors approved 15 projects under the FY 2013 Call for Projects that are in the process of contract execution, and will be added to the next quarterly status report.

Grant Oversight

SANDAG staff provides ongoing oversight of projects under the TransNet-funded EMP Land Management Grant Program through review of quarterly reports and invoices. Annual and quarterly status updates are provided to the TransNet Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee (ITOC) and Regional Planning and Transportation Committees.

Staff reviews quarterly reports to ensure that grantees are making timely progress with respect to Board Policy No. 035 provisions (described below), and to ensure that the project submission of deliverables matches the scopes of work in their grant contract agreements.

Policy Governing Timely Use of Grant Funds (Board Policy No. 035)

The applicable Board Policy No. 035 states that all projects must be completed according to the project schedule provided in the grantee’s respective grant agreement, and that at the latest, operations projects (the category which EMP Land Management Grant Program projects fall under) must award any necessary services contracts within one year of an executed grant agreement with SANDAG, and start the project within six months of an executed contract. Board Policy No. 035 also states that, if no services contract for operations is necessary, the operations project must start within one year of execution of the grant agreement.

Schedule extension requests of up to six months may be approved by the SANDAG Executive Director, or designee, per Section 2.1 of Board Policy No. 035. However, per Section 3.1, TransNet grant project schedule extension requests require approval by the appropriate Policy Advisory Committee if the request exceeds six months and/or causes the project to miss a Board Policy No. 035 milestone deadline. Additionally, if sufficient time is available, grants utilizing TransNet funds must first submit their schedule extension requests to the ITOC for recommendation to the appropriate Policy Advisory Committee, which is currently the Regional Planning Committee for EMP Land Management Grant Program projects.
Next Steps

The FY 2014 1st Quarter status report (covering July to September 2013) is expected to be presented in the December 2013/January 2014 timeframe to the ITOC, Regional Planning Committee, and Transportation Committee.

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


Key Staff Contact: Katie Levy, (619) 699-7312, katie.levy@sandag.org
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grantee</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description of Project Activities</th>
<th>Grant Amount</th>
<th>Contract Execution Date</th>
<th>Contract / Project Expiration Date</th>
<th>Watch List*</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
<td>Shinohara Vernal Pools</td>
<td>Continuation of existing vernal pool project. Needs continued weeding to keep weeds from invading created vernal pools. Thirty new pools to be created.</td>
<td>$ 308,238.00</td>
<td>07/02/09</td>
<td>12/31/14</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward their milestones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 City of Chula Vista</td>
<td>Cactus Wren Restoration</td>
<td>Coastal cactus wren habitat enhancement project - active management of suitable cactus wren habitat, restore degraded and/or fragmented cholla patches, and initiate activities to reduce edge effects.</td>
<td>$ 373,048.00</td>
<td>01/01/09</td>
<td>09/30/14</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward their milestones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
<td>SDNWR Cactus Wren Habitat Enhancement</td>
<td>Enhance coastal cactus wren habitat in high priority area in San Diego National Wildlife Refuge.</td>
<td>$ 180,070.00</td>
<td>07/02/09</td>
<td>12/31/14</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward their milestones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 San Dieguito River Park Joint Powers Authority</td>
<td>Invasive Species Removal and Habitat Restoration</td>
<td>Invasive control, habitat restoration, and access control and management.</td>
<td>$ 347,090.00</td>
<td>01/01/09</td>
<td>11/01/13</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward their milestones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 County San Diego</td>
<td>Salt Creek Cactus Wren Habitat Restoration</td>
<td>Enhance, restore, expand, and monitor coastal cactus wren habitat in the Salt Creek area</td>
<td>$ 125,000.00</td>
<td>01/01/09</td>
<td>05/30/15</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward their milestones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 City of Carlsbad</td>
<td>Calavera Preserve Planning Area</td>
<td>Provide access control, habitat restoration, and public outreach for the 735-acre Calavera Preserve Planning Area.</td>
<td>$ 286,667.00</td>
<td>09/30/09</td>
<td>12/31/14</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward their milestones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 San Diego River Conservancy</td>
<td>San Diego River Habitat</td>
<td>Invasive species control, re-treatment, restoration of native species, access control, increased park patrol and landowner outreach along the river in San Diego, Santee, and El Monte Valley.</td>
<td>$ 527,736.15</td>
<td>02/15/11</td>
<td>03/01/15</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward their milestones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 County of San Diego</td>
<td>Lusardi Creek</td>
<td>Removal and treatment of non-native grasslands in order to restore ecological and hydrological functions of riparian areas of the Lusardi Creek Preserve that were burned in the 2007 wildfires.</td>
<td>$ 107,060.00</td>
<td>04/12/11</td>
<td>01/31/15</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward their milestones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 City of San Diego, Public Utilities Department</td>
<td>San Pasqual Valley Weed Management</td>
<td>Geographic Information System (GIS) database and an Integrated Weed Management Plan for San Pasqual Valley through data collection, mapping, and plan preparation.</td>
<td>$ 184,623.00</td>
<td>04/01/11</td>
<td>09/30/13</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Project is NOT making timely progress toward their milestones.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Watch List Projects are those grantees not making timely progress toward their milestones (which are defined in Policy No. 35 and Use-It-or-Lose-It) and not yet sought corrective action. Delays in tasks leading up to either the award of a contract or project completion may place grantees on the watch list.
### Status of Land Management Grants FY 2013 4th Quarter
Reporting period through June 30, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2010</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grantee</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Description of Project Activities</td>
<td>Grant Amount</td>
<td>Contract Execution Date</td>
<td>Contract / Project Expiration Date</td>
<td>Watch List*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Conservation Biology Institute</td>
<td>South County Grassland</td>
<td>Develop detailed habitat assessments and conceptual models to control invasive grasslands and standardize invasive species removal protocols and prioritization of management actions. Determine cost per acre of alternative invasive control and restoration techniques.</td>
<td>$283,292.00</td>
<td>02/01/11</td>
<td>09/30/13</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 County of San Diego</td>
<td>Lakeside Linkage</td>
<td>Plant coast prickly pear cactus on 5 acres adjacent to cactus wren populations, and control invasive plant species.</td>
<td>$200,824.00</td>
<td>04/12/11</td>
<td>01/31/17</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 City of Chula Vista</td>
<td>Chula Vista Tarplant</td>
<td>Restoration and enhancement for San Diego thornmint and Otay tarplant. Invasive control, dethatching, fencing, and monitoring.</td>
<td>$268,428.00</td>
<td>05/03/11</td>
<td>11/30/14</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Rocks Biological Consultants</td>
<td>Crest Canyon Invasive Removal</td>
<td>Invasive species mapping, and native species planting in Crest Canyon Open Space Park. Access control of unauthorized trail use through public outreach.</td>
<td>$74,480.00</td>
<td>03/28/11</td>
<td>10/31/13</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FY 2011

| Grantee                     | Project                        | Description of Project Activities                                                                                                                                       | Grant Amount | Contract Execution Date | Contract / Project Expiration Date | Watch List*                                                                 | Status                                                                 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 14 San Elijo Lagoon Conservancy | Carlsbad Hydrologic Unit | Throughout the Carlsbad Hydrologic Unit treat and monitor invasive plants, plant, and restore habitat. Map invasive plant infestations within the MHCP Core and Linkage Areas identified in Carlsbad Habitat Management Plan. | $194,455.00 | 04/06/12               | 01/31/14             | No | Project IS making timely progress toward their milestones. |
| 15 San Diego Audubon Society | Mission Bay Park | Use habitat evaluation program to establish baseline habitat health to implement invasive species control and habitat restoration in Mission Bay Park.                                         | $98,200.00  | 04/06/12               | 12/01/14             | No | Project IS making timely progress toward their milestones. |
| 16 Chaparral Lands Conservancy | Proctor Valley Vernal Pools | Restore and enhance quality of vernal pools and habitat at a 6-acre site in Proctor Valley.                                                                              | $183,605.00 | 05/09/12               | 09/30/15             | No | Project IS making timely progress toward their milestones. |
| 17 Conservation Biology Institute | Brachypodium Removal | Develop and implement treatment strategies for the emerging invasive plant species Brachypodium. Restore impacted habitat on South Crest properties within the San Diego National Wildlife Refuge and Crestridge Ecological Reserve. | $233,975.00 | 04/05/12               | 06/30/14             | No | Project IS making timely progress toward their milestones. |

*Watch List Projects are those grantees not making timely progress toward their milestones (which are defined in Policy No. 35 and Use-It-or-Lose-It) and not yet sought corrective action. Delays in tasks leading up to either the award of a contract or project completion may place grantees on the watch list.
# Status of Land Management Grants FY 2013 4th Quarter

**Reporting period through June 30, 2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grantee/Project</th>
<th>Description of Project Activities</th>
<th>Grant Amount</th>
<th>Contract Execution Date</th>
<th>Contract / Project Expiration Date</th>
<th>Watch List*</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grantee</strong></td>
<td><strong>Project</strong></td>
<td><strong>Amount</strong></td>
<td><strong>Date</strong></td>
<td><strong>Date</strong></td>
<td><strong>List</strong></td>
<td><strong>Details</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Groundwork San Diego-Chollas Creek</td>
<td>Maintain, monitor, and diversify recently created habitat. Restore and revegetate recently cleared areas and prepare plan for long-term stewardship.</td>
<td>$154,965.00</td>
<td>04/05/12</td>
<td>11/01/13</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward their milestones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Zoological Society of San Diego</td>
<td>Develop and begin initial implementation of a subwatershed-level management plan to restore and manage native habitat to support Coastal Cactus Wren population in the San Pasqual Valley/Lake Hodges region of the San Dieguito Watershed.</td>
<td>$269,339.00</td>
<td>05/31/12</td>
<td>12/31/13</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward their milestones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 City of Chula Vista</td>
<td>Restore and enhance degraded habitat for the Coastal Cactus Wren within the Salt Creek Canyon of the Otay Ranch Preserve. Conduct invasive species control, propagate cacti, and monitor Coastal Cactus Wren.</td>
<td>$182,282.00</td>
<td>04/30/12</td>
<td>08/31/15</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward their milestones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 U.S. Geological Society</td>
<td>Conduct habitat suitability surveys for the Western Pond Turtle (WPT) on Marine Corps Base Camp Pendleton. Remove aquatic invasives and trap WPT.</td>
<td>$133,263.79</td>
<td>06/27/12</td>
<td>06/27/14</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward their milestones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Center for Natural Lands Management</td>
<td>Assess sites and collect plant materials, conduct local adaptation genetic study. Use the most appropriate molecular techniques to determine the genetic differences among occurrences.</td>
<td>$41,250.00</td>
<td>04/01/12</td>
<td>04/30/14</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward their milestones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
<td>Enhance two existing rock ledges to be used as nest sites for Golden Eagles in the Jamul area. Monitor the area for eagle use.</td>
<td>$23,865.00</td>
<td>08/31/12</td>
<td>03/31/14</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward their milestones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Chaparral Lands Conservancy</td>
<td>Install Off-Road-Vehicle barriers to close section of fencing between City of San Diego and CA Dept. of Fish and Game fencing in order to improve effectiveness of barriers in reducing illegal access.</td>
<td>$155,780.00</td>
<td>05/09/12</td>
<td>06/30/14</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward their milestones.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Watch List Projects are those grantees not making timely progress toward their milestones (which are defined in Policy No. 35 and Use-It-or-Lose-It) and not yet sought corrective action. Delays in tasks leading up to either the award of a contract or project completion may place grantees on the watch list.*
SAN DIEGO ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE
October 4, 2013

AGENDA ITEM NO.: 4

Action Requested: RECOMMEND

PROPOSED FY 2014 BUDGET AMENDMENT: EAST COUNTY
BUS MAINTENANCE FACILITY

File Number 1049600

Introduction

SANDAG is implementing a project to reconstruct and expand the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) East County Bus Maintenance Facility (ECBMF). The total project budget is $50,006,977, of which $5,000,000 is for construction of a Compressed Natural Gas (CNG) facility. Since the procurement of the CNG facility will include long-term operation and maintenance, MTS has proposed they be responsible for the procurement and construction of this element of the project. This requires a transfer of $5,000,000 from the SANDAG project to the MTS project.

Discussion

MTS uses the same vendor to construct, operate, and maintain its CNG facilities. In order not to separately award the construction from the operations and maintenance procurement, it is proposed to transfer the budget for the CNG facility to MTS for one procurement. The MTS Board of Directors approved this strategy at its September 12, 2013, meeting, as shown in Attachment 2. The remaining balance of $45,006,977 is adequate to fund the construction of the remaining work, which includes a new maintenance building, administrative offices, bus wash, fueling lanes, bus parking, chassis wash, employee parking, lighting, and street improvements. The revised SANDAG budget document for 1049600 is included as Attachment 1.

Recommendation

The Transportation Committee is asked to recommend the Board of Directors approve the transfer of $5,000,000 from the SANDAG East County Bus Maintenance Facility (ECBMF) Project 1049600 to the Metropolitan Transit System ECBMF Compressed Natural Gas Station Project 11482 in substantially the same form as shown in Attachment 1.

Jim Linthicum
Director, Mobility Management and Project Implementation

Attachments: 1. Proposed Budget Amendment for CIP 1049600, East County Bus Maintenance Facility
2. September 12, 2013, MTS Board of Directors Agenda Item No. 13

Key Staff Contact: John Dorow, (619) 699-1915, john.dorow@sandag.org
PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This project will provide for an operations and maintenance facility for up to 120 vehicles used by Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) bus contractors to provide fixed route service in the MTS region. The project includes the demolition of existing buildings, site surface enhancements, development of a steam-cleaning area, and construction of a new maintenance building and CNG fueling facilities.

PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

This project will provide for bus maintenance and operations of MTS East County bus contractors, including fueling, washing, cleaning, maintenance, training, and administrative office and improve the existing site and provide new maintenance and operations facilities, thereby improving the efficiency of operations and allowing more vehicles to be parked and serviced at this facility.

PROGRESS TO DATE

All three initial parcels have been purchased and are in use. Demolition of existing buildings, site surface enhancements, development of a steam-cleaning area, and remodel of existing maintenance buildings for electrical service upgrades was completed in February 2008. Design of the final facility is complete.

EXEMPLARY PLAN ($000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK</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>Administration</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</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>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; Design</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3,400</td>
<td>3,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Management</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way</td>
<td>7,109</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,109</td>
<td>7,109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>12,100</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>6,200</td>
<td>6,200</td>
<td>28,400</td>
<td>28,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>0</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>Legal Services</td>
<td>0</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>0</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNG Facility</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$13,436</td>
<td>$26,000</td>
<td>$24,400</td>
<td>$24,641</td>
<td>$7,171</td>
<td>$7,171</td>
<td>$50,007</td>
<td>$45,007</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 - Earmark</td>
<td>2,910</td>
<td>3,475</td>
<td>3,475</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA Section 5307 - Earmark</td>
<td>0</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>FTA Section 5339</td>
<td>2,910</td>
<td>3,475</td>
<td>3,475</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22,568</td>
<td>12,320</td>
<td>12,641</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32,329</td>
<td>12,320</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>TDA</td>
<td>2,690</td>
<td>814</td>
<td>814</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,504</td>
<td>3,504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>4,226</td>
<td>4,226</td>
<td>7,171</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11,647</td>
<td>11,647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$13,436</td>
<td>$26,000</td>
<td>$24,400</td>
<td>$24,641</td>
<td>$7,171</td>
<td>$7,171</td>
<td>$50,007</td>
<td>$45,007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUBJECT:

EAST COUNTY BUS MAINTENANCE FACILITY PROJECT – FUNDING TRANSFER

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Board of Directors approve the transfer of funds from the San Diego Association of Governments' (SANDAG's) East County Bus Maintenance Facility Project to MTS for the procurement of compressed natural gas (CNG) facilities at the East County Bus Maintenance Facility.

Budget Impact

Funds are available within SANDAG’s Capital Improvement Program (CIP) 1049600 (East County Bus Maintenance Facility) in the amount of $50,006,977--$5,000,000 of which would be transferred to MTS CIP 11482 (ECBMF CNG Station).

DISCUSSION:

SANDAG is overseeing a design-bid-build project for the East County Bus Maintenance Facility with a total budget of $50,006,977, of which $5,000,000 was budgeted for construction of CNG facilities. With the considerable experience and knowledge of MTS’s own project manager in regard to construction of CNG facilities, MTS will be responsible for procuring the CNG facilities portion of this project. This requires a transfer of $5,000,000 from the SANDAG project to the MTS project. The requested funding of $5,000,000 consists of $4,000,000 in federal funds (State of Good Repair) and $1,000,000 of local funds.

Paul C. Jablonski
Chief Executive Officer

Key Staff Contact: Sharon Cooney, 619.557.4513, Sharon.Cooney@sdmts.com
SAN DIEGO FORWARD: THE REGIONAL PLAN:       File Number 3102000
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. Project evaluation criteria are applied to each modal category of projects in the Unconstrained Transportation Network, which is under development. 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.

At the September 6, 2013, Transportation Committee and Regional Planning Committee meetings staff provided a comprehensive overview of the project evaluation criteria for discussion and feedback. The two primary points that were raised by both committees related to the rationale of the criteria weightings and further clarification regarding potentially duplicative criteria elements that make up the cost-effectiveness criterion. To address these comments, this report elaborates on proposed criteria weighting and the cost-effectiveness criterion.

Transportation Committee members are asked to discuss the draft Transportation Project Evaluation criteria and review the attached comment summaries. The Committee may take action to recommend the criteria to the Board of Directors, or may request additional changes to the Project Evaluation Criteria. The draft Transportation Project Evaluation Criteria are anticipated to be presented to the SANDAG Board of Directors in October for action.

Transportation Project Evaluation Criteria Development

Using the evaluation criteria from the 2050 RTP and its Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) as a starting point, staff initiated the review and refinements of the transportation project evaluation criteria for San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan in February 2013 and retained a consultant team
with strong technical expertise to assist in the development of the draft criteria. Revisions to the criteria and methodologies were made to align them with the vision and goals accepted for the Regional Plan and to take advantage of the recently enhanced modeling tools, the Activity Based Model, and the economic and land use microsimulation model - Production, Exchange, and Consumption Allocation System.

Staff received input on the draft project evaluation criteria from regional stakeholders at meetings of the Active Transportation Working Group, Cities and County Technical Advisory Committee, community-based organization partners, Freight Stakeholders Working Group, Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee (ITOC), Public Health Stakeholders Working Group, Regional Planning Technical Working Group, and the Tribal Transportation Working Group. Staff also sought input from partner agencies including Caltrans, the Metropolitan Transit System, and the North County Transit District. Input on the prioritization of transportation projects also was solicited from the public at the San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan workshops held throughout the region and at Caltrans in June and August 2013.

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

**Draft Project Evaluation Criteria**

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

The refinements that have been incorporated in the draft project evaluation criteria for San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan can be organized into three broad areas: model enhancement-related, new criteria, and reorganized criteria. The majority of proposed changes to the draft criteria have resulted from newer capabilities of the model enhancements, which allow greater analysis of household travel. Other new modal draft criteria are proposed, including physical activity, and access to schools, recreational areas, and beaches.

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

Project Cost-Effectiveness Criterion

A more comprehensive cost-effectiveness criterion has been proposed that builds upon the 2050 RTP/SCS method, which evaluated the person hours saved or ridership of the project relative to its capital costs and operating and maintenance costs. For the Regional Plan, the revised draft cost-effectiveness criterion proposes to monetize the travel time savings benefits as well as potentially incorporate other factors such as fuel costs, GHG emissions, smog-forming pollutants, health and physical activity, and safety, which would result in a more comprehensive cost-benefit approach. While analyses such as the proposed cost-effectiveness criterion attempt to capture the economic effects of the projects as comprehensively as possible, such analyses may not fully reflect the importance of individual factors to the project prioritization process. As a result, some components of the proposed cost-effectiveness criterion are also reflected in other proposed evaluation criteria, to capture the relative importance of these factors. Person-hours saved traditionally represents the largest component of benefit-cost results. Staff received significant comments of support for the enhanced cost-effectiveness calculation from the public health and active transportation stakeholders, community-based organization partners, workshop participants, and the peer review panelists.

Proposed Project Evaluation Criteria Weightings

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

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

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

---

1 Working with the San Diego Forward community-based organization network, staff proposes to define “Communities of Concern” as low-income (200% of Federal Poverty Rate), minority, seniors (75+), and single-parent households with children under 18 years of age.
The proposed project evaluation criteria weighting allocates roughly one third of the total possible points for each of the goal focus areas. These proposed weightings reflect the highest regional priority areas, which are nested in the accepted goals.

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

**Public Outreach**

Public input on the draft project evaluation criteria was solicited as part of the Regional Plan workshop series held in June 2013 throughout the San Diego region 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 were collected from local jurisdictions, partner agencies, stakeholders, and the general public. This feedback provided valuable information that was considered for the development of the draft project evaluation criteria. Based on comments received at the public workshop, the provides access to communities of concern criterion was removed from the Highway Corridor criteria, as it was felt that the travel time savings for community of concern users was captured in the provides congestion relief criterion and the accessibility criterion might result in awarding points to highway projects located in low-income and minority communities regardless of these communities’ ability to access the project. The facilitates FasTrak/carpool and transit mobility criterion was expanded to also include pedestrian and bicycle access. A more comprehensive cost-effectiveness criterion, which will evaluate the project travel time, safety, health, and air quality benefits, is also proposed.

**Peer Review**

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

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

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

Next Steps

The draft Transportation Project Evaluation Criteria are anticipated to be presented to the Board of Directors in October for action.

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

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

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

## San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Proposed Calculation</th>
<th>Max Score</th>
<th>Total Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1   | Innovative Mobility & Planning | 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 |
| 2   | Project Safety | How does the project compare against the statewide average for collisions?* | Project percentage of collisions measured against statewide average | 5 | 5 |
| 3   | Provides Access to Evacuation Routes | 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 | 5 |
| 4   | Facilitates FasTrak/Carpool/Transit, Pedestrian and Bicycle Mobility | How will the project facilitate FasTrak/carpool/Managed Lane facilities 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 | 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 | 10 |
| 5   | Healthy Environment & Communities | Minimizes Habitat and Residential Impacts | 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 | 5 |
| 6   | GHG and Pollutant Emissions | A) What is the reduction in CO2 emissions from implementing the project?* | Reduction in CO2 emissions | 5 | 5 |
| 7   | | B) What is the reduction in smog forming pollutants from implementing the project?* | Reduction in smog-forming pollutants | 5 | 5 |
| 8   | Serves RCP Smart Growth Areas | 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 | 10 |
| 9   | Physical Activity | What is the increase in physical activity? | Increase in time engaged in moderate transportation-related physical activity | 5 | 5 |
| 10  | Vibrant Economy | Accessibility | A) What is the improved access to jobs and schools? | Weighted average number of jobs and school enrollment accessible in 30 minutes by auto | 4 | 4 |
| 11  | | B) How will the project support access to recreational areas and beaches? | Acres of parkland/recreational areas and beaches within 1/4 mile of project | 4 | 4 |
| 12  | | C) What percentage of users of the project access Indian reservations? | Select link used to determine origins and destinations served, total trips to/from Indian reservation areas | 2 | 2 |
| 13  | Serves Goods Movement and Relieves Freight System Bottlenecks/Capacity Constraints | What is the improved average travel time for freight?* | Total travel time savings for medium and heavy truck classes | 5 | 5 |
| 14  | Project Cost-Effectiveness | What is the cost-effectiveness of the project?* | Enhanced cost-effectiveness measure may incorporate the following components:  
- Project cost  
- Generalized delay costs  
- Fuel costs  
- GHG emissions  
- Smog-forming pollutants  
- Health and physical activity  
- Safety | 20 | 20 |

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

<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; Smog forming pollutants; Health and physical activity; Safety</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The total percent column is calculated by dividing each item's score by the total max score (35) and multiplying by 100.*
<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>Serves Daily Trips</td>
<td>What is the change in the number of active transportation trips?</td>
<td>Change in active transportation mode trips or transit accessed by active transportation mode trips</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<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 area</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Environment &amp; Communities</td>
<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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<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>
</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>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 area</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vibrant Economy</td>
<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 area</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<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 area</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<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 area</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<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, Smog forming pollutants, Health and physical activity, Safety</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Preliminary Draft Project Evaluation Criteria - HOV Connector

<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>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>35 (35%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Facilitates FasTrak/Carpool/Transit, Pedestrian and Bicycle Mobility</td>
<td>How will the project facilitate FasTrak/carpool/Managed Lane facilities and/or regional or corridor transit services and/or pedestrian and bicycle access?</td>
<td>Projects will receive points if they include FasTrak/carpool/Managed Lane facility, and/or regional or corridor transit services, and/or pedestrian and bicycle facilities, which is then weighted by combined carpool person volume + transit person volume</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>GHG and Pollutant Emissions</td>
<td>A) What is the reduction in CO2 emissions from implementing the project?</td>
<td>Reduction in CO2 emissions</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30 (30%)</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>Project Cost-Effectiveness</td>
<td>What is the cost-effectiveness of the project?</td>
<td>Enhanced cost-effectiveness measure may incorporate the following components: - Project cost - Generalized delay costs - Fuel costs - GHG emissions - Smog forming pollutants - Health and physical activity - Safety</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35 (35%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Preliminary Draft Project Evaluation Criteria - Freeway Connector

## San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>1</td>
<td>Innovative Mobility &amp; Planning</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Project Safety</td>
<td></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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Innovative Mobility &amp; Planning</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Healthy Environment &amp; Communities</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Healthy Environment &amp; Communities</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Healthy Environment &amp; Communities</td>
<td>GHG and Pollutant Emissions</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Vibrant Economy</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Vibrant Economy</td>
<td>Project Cost-Effectiveness</td>
<td>What is the cost-effectiveness of the project?*</td>
<td>Enhanced cost-effectiveness measure may incorporate the following components: - Project cost - Generalized delay costs - Fuel costs - GHG emissions - Smog forming pollutants - Health and physical activity - Safety</td>
<td>20</td>
</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</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Proposed Calculation</th>
<th>Max Score</th>
<th>Total Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Innovative Mobility &amp; Planning</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Peak-Period Exposure Index (PPEI) Factor</td>
<td>Product of the existing high directional traffic and the total measured blocking delay during the same three hours of the day experiencing the highest congestion at the crossing</td>
<td>Calculation based on vehicle traffic during a selected three-hour period, total blocking delay during same period, and mathematical constant for time period</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Peak-Day Total Delay Exposure Index (PPEI) Factor</td>
<td>Product of the existing average daily traffic (ADT), the total number of trains, and an average train crossing delay time factor</td>
<td>Calculation based on average daily traffic, total number of trains, train crossing delay factor, and mathematical constant</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pedestrian and Bicycle/ Communities of Concern Benefits</td>
<td>A) Number of pedestrians and bicyclists served in top 4 hours</td>
<td>Grade separation pedestrian bicycle crossing counts</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<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>4</td>
<td>8</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>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Benefit to Emergency Services</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>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Healthy Environment &amp; Communities</strong></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>
<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>
<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>
<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>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vibrant Economy</strong></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>
<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>
<td>15</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>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA)</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) (per Board Policy No. 033 adopted January 2012)</td>
<td>RHNA-related criteria as described in Board Policy No. 033. Eligibility for Policy 33 points requires housing element compliance and submittal of Annual Housing Element Progress Reports to SANDAG.</td>
<td>Based on Board Policy No. 033 Criteria: RHNA Share Taken; Regional Share of Cumulative Total of Lower-Income Units Produced; Total Number of Affordable Housing Units; Percent of Lower Income Households</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Active Transportation

General Comments:

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

Criterion 3: Consistency with Local Plans

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

Criterion 4:
• Make changes as “located in a high-crash area and poorly designed corridors”
• It may be more useful to use 0.5-mile radius for bike/pedestrian crash, etc., if the proposed facility is expected to consolidate trips from adjacent corridors due to improved facilities

Criterion 8: Physical Activity
• Add – does the project support multi users?

Criterion 9: Range of Users/Skill Levels Served
• Modify the description to “balance needs of all users”

Criterion 10B: Accessibility
• Does the project support access to the county’s regional trail system (per county-adopted general plan)?

Criterion 10D: Accessibility
• Define more clearly; and break community of concerns into different groups – low income, disability, etc.

Freeway and HOV Connectors:

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

**Freeway Connectors:**

**General Comments:**

• Increase “Healthy Community & Environment” weighting

• Emphasize greenhouse gas (GHG)/pollutant emissions

**Criterion 1: Provides Congestion Relief**

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

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

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

**HOV Connectors:**

**General Comments:**

• Increase “Healthy Community & Environment” weights

• Emphasize GHG/pollutant emissions

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

**HOV Connectors continued:**

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

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

**Goods Movement:**

**General Comments:**

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

• Consider emissions from diesel

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

Criterion 4: Minimizes Community Impacts

• Residential buffer – more points for bigger buffers

Criterion 6: Minimizes Communities of Concern Impacts

• Attention to communities of concern

Goods Movement Maritime:

Criterion 4: Minimizes Community Impacts

• Residential buffer – more points for bigger buffers

Criterion 6: Minimizes Communities of Concern Impacts

• Attention to communities of concern

Goods Movement Rail:

General Comments:

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

Criterion 4: Minimizes Community Impacts

• Residential buffer – more points for bigger buffers

Criterion 6: Minimizes Communities of Concern Impacts

• Attention to communities of concern

Highway:

General Comments:

• Rank Healthy Environment greater than Innovative Mobility/Planning

• Increase the weighting for the Healthy Community goal

• Safety for all users and ranked highways

• Where is system preservation?

• Highway Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) Smart Growth Areas not clear, on transit focus on Smart Growth
• Highway construction induces sprawl & each project should be analyzed on this

• Highway projects reduce viability of transit

• SR 905 storm water issues need more consideration

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Criterion 1: Provides Congestion Relief**

• Should be weighted 10 points

**Criterion 1A: Provides Congestion Relief**

• Maximum score should be 5 points

• Decrease weight
Criterion 1B: Provides Congestion Relief

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

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

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

Criterion 7A: GHG and Pollutant Emissions

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

Criterion 8: Serves RCP Smart Growth Areas

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

Criterion 9: Physical Activity

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

Criterion 10C: Accessibility

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

- Should be weighed 5 points

Criterion 12: Project Cost-Effectiveness

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

Rail Grade Separations:

General Comments:

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

Criterion 3A/B: Bicycle and Pedestrian Benefits

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

Transit:

General Comments:

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

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

• Focus on design – easy connections between transit and active transportation modes
• Could there be a criteria for minutes served in transfer between modes/buses?

• Accommodate bikes

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

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

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

**Criterion 1: Provides Time Competitive/Reliable Transit Service**

• Consider higher weighting

**Criterion 2: Serves Daily Trips**

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

**Criterion 3: Daily System Utilization**

• Include weekend and after hours

**Criterion 7A: Accessibility**

• Access – add in affordability (fares), medical care & food

• Connectivity to major job centers (not covered enough with increase in work trips criteria)

• Give more points to this criterion
• In “access” category, add access to beach areas and transit destinations - airport

Criterion 7B: Accessibility

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

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

Criterion 7E: Accessibility

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

Criterion 8: Cost-Effectiveness

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

Additional General Comments:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Key Strengths of SANDAG Approach

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

Recommendations for Improvement

Overall Comments

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

Modal Silos

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

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

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

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

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

Design Elements

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

Lower-Cost Projects

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

Safety

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

Accessibility

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- We support the panel's recommendation to combine the highway corridor, HOV connector, and freeway connector criteria into one category. We’d appreciate it if the recommendation would be accepted by SANDAG.
Dr. Jennifer Dill  
**Professor, Nohad A. Toulan School of Urban Studies & Planning, Portland State University**

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

Joel Freedman  
**Manager, Systems Analysis Technical Resource Center, Parsons Brinckerhoff**

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

Charlie Howard  
**Transportation Planning Director, Puget Sound Regional Council**

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

David Vautin  
**Associate Transportation Planner, Metropolitan Transportation Commission**

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

Martin Wachs  
**Senior Principal Researcher at RAND, Distinguished Professor Emeritus in Urban Planning, UCLA Luskin School of Public Affairs**

Martin Wachs is a senior principal researcher at RAND. He formerly served as director of the RAND Transportation, Space, and Technology Program. Prior to joining RAND, he was professor of civil and environmental engineering and professor of city and regional planning at the University of California, Berkeley, where he was also director of the Institute of Transportation Studies. Prior to this, he spent 25 years at UCLA. Wachs is the author of 160 articles and four books on subjects related to relationships between transportation, land use, and air quality; transportation finance and policy; transportation needs of the elderly; techniques for the evaluation of transportation systems and performance measurement in transportation planning. His research also addresses issues of equity in transportation policy.
SAN DIEGO FORWARD: THE REGIONAL PLAN:
DRAFT OUTLINE OF WHITE PAPER ON ECONOMIC PROSPERITY

Introduction

SANDAG is preparing a white paper on economic prosperity as part of the process for San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan. Staff will present a proposed outline (Attachment 1) and solicit Committee input on topics and key considerations. Staff expects to have a draft white paper ready by December.

Discussion

In a survey conducted by SANDAG last spring, respondents rated economic development as their highest concern. The economic prosperity white paper is intended to present a background of SANDAG’s role in regional economic development and initiate discussion on key economic considerations and policies to be included in the Regional Plan.

A draft outline is attached that presents general discussion points and the overall format of the white paper. In a general sense, the paper will be challenging in that it will be limited in length, and the topics for discussion are many. Recognizing SANDAG’s appropriate role in economic development will be key to a fruitful discussion.

Next Steps

SANDAG staff is working to solicit input from economic stakeholders and working groups. An initial meeting with Economic Development Corporations, Chambers of Commerce, and municipal economic development staff was held on August 23, in addition to the Regional Plan public workshop on July 19, which focused on the economy, borders, and public facilities. During September and October, the outline will be presented to SANDAG working groups, policy advisory committees, and economic stakeholders for discussion and comment, and will then be used to draft the white paper and inform the economic component of the Regional Plan. Work on the economic analysis for the Regional Plan also is beginning, with the analysis including four areas: an economic impact component to measure the effects of construction activity on the regional economy; a benefit-cost analysis to examine the ratio of benefits such as time savings versus the costs of scenarios; an economic competitiveness analysis to investigate the broader economic effects of transportation improvements on the San Diego economy; and a fiscal analysis to focus on the costs to infrastructure providers from geographic outcomes of the Regional Plan. The white paper should provide valuable context for conducting and communicating the economic analysis.

KURT KRONINGER
Director of Technical Services


Key Staff Contact: Jim Miller, (619) 699-7325, jim.miller@sandag.org
DRAFT OUTLINE:
ECONOMIC PROSPERITY WHITE PAPER

Purpose: To provide opportunities to review existing plans, policies, and accomplishments in the region, and to update and adjust priorities. Will include background information and summary data, describe interrelationships between economic prosperity and other Regional Plan topic areas, and initiate discussion on key economic considerations and policies to be included in the Regional Plan. Approximately 10 pages in length.

A. Introduction

Discussion of the intersection between land use/transportation planning and economic prosperity, including historical context. Explain how implementation of San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan could influence the region's economy. Introduce contents of White Paper.

B. Current Economic Conditions in San Diego

- Existing Setting: Brief and not overly quantitative discussion of regional economic strengths and weaknesses (backed by and referring to the Regional Economic Prosperity Strategy, Indicators of Sustainable Competitiveness, etc.). Discuss differences among subregions and the impact of the 2008 economic downturn. Highlight changing demographics.

- Existing Plans, Programs, and Policies: Include list of historical and current SANDAG (and maybe other) initiatives on economic development.

- Emerging Concepts: Brief review of current research in regional planning and economics and list of some of the region's major economic concerns. Some that have been identified include: cooperation with Mexico, housing costs, job training, and redevelopment agency dissolution.

C. Interrelationships

- How Transportation and Regional Planning can Influence the San Diego Economy: Explore the concept of viewing the region’s transportation infrastructure (transit, freeways, airports, ports) as economic ‘habitat,’ enabling economic activity and providing essential freedom of choice. Examples include: transit-oriented development, revitalization of local downtown areas, housing affordability, commercial/industrial activity centers, border-related employment and trade opportunities, research/healthcare activity in the region, industrial land preservation, “Smart Growth” and economic growth, and the differences between economic development and economic growth. Highlight the importance of public investment to economic prosperity. Describe the economic analysis to be performed on the Regional Plan.

- Communities of Concern from an Economic Perspective:

  Explore inequity as a threat to prosperity, equity of opportunity, “Communities of Concern” as having high potential for economic development, and education and mobility “access” as a requirement for economic growth and public health.
• **Relationships between the Economy and Environment:**

  Explore environment as an asset (maybe some discussion of ‘externalities’), Sustainable Communities Strategy, and unique nature of the San Diego region as an example of how the economy and environment can both prosper.

**D. Future Funding, Trends, and Possibilities**

Discuss SANDAG's ability to directly influence economic prosperity, long-term global and regional trends, and San Diego's position and opportunities in the global economy. Explore potential strategies for influencing the region's economic prosperity.

**E. Key Policy Questions for Discussion**

Summarize and identify key questions for further discussion.
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.
Project Evaluation Criteria

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

Project Evaluation Criteria Process

- Consultant assistance with draft criteria
- Working group and partner agency input
- Public outreach
- Peer panel review
- Input from Policy Advisory Committees
- SANDAG Board acceptance
Project Evaluation Criteria Categories

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

Cost Effectiveness Criterion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Travel delay</td>
<td>$$$$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel cost</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHG emissions</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smog-forming pollutants</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and physical activity</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Benefits</td>
<td>$$$$$$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Benefits ÷ Project Cost = #
Criteria Focus Areas and Weighting

• Regional Plan Goals
  – Innovative mobility and planning
  – Vibrant economy
  – Healthy environment and communities

• Developed weighted scores based on a 100 point scale

Schedule and Next Steps

• October 2013: Draft criteria to Policy Advisory Committees for recommendation and to Board for acceptance

• Winter 2014: Apply criteria to Unconstrained Transportation Network projects