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AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

• SAN DIEGO FORWARD: THE REGIONAL PLAN:
  DEVELOPMENT OF DRAFT POLICY OBJECTIVE TOPIC AREAS

• TransNet SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM:
  GRANT APPLICATION SCORING RESULTS FOR THE FY 2013 CYCLE

• INTRODUCTION TO THE JOINT LAND USE STUDY PROGRAM

PLEASE TURN OFF CELL PHONES DURING THE MEETING

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

MISSION STATEMENT

The Regional Planning Committee provides oversight for the preparation and implementation of the Regional Comprehensive Plan that is based on the local general plans and regional plans and addresses interregional issues with surrounding counties and Mexico. The components of the plan include: transportation, housing, environment (shoreline, air quality, water quality, habitat), economy, borders, regional infrastructure needs and financing, and land use and design.

San Diego Association of Governments · 401 B Street, Suite 800, San Diego, CA 92101-4231
(619) 699-1900 · Fax (619) 699-1905 · www.sandag.org
Welcome to SANDAG. Members of the public may speak to the Regional Planning Committee on any item at the time the Committee is considering the item. Please complete a Speaker’s Slip, which is located in the rear of the room, and then present the slip to Committee staff. Members of the public may address the Committee on any issue under the agenda item entitled Public Comments/Communications/Member Comments. Public speakers are limited to three minutes or less per person. The Regional Planning Committee may take action on any item appearing on the agenda.

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

Public comments regarding the agenda can be forwarded to SANDAG via the e-mail comment form available on the website. E-mail comments should be received no later than 12 noon, two working days prior to the Regional Planning Committee meeting. Any handouts, presentations, or other materials from the public intended for distribution at the Regional Planning Committee meeting should be received by the Clerk of the Committee no later than 12 noon, two working days prior to the meeting.

SANDAG operates its programs without regard to race, color, and national origin in compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act. SANDAG has developed procedures for investigating and tracking Title VI complaints and the procedures for filing a complaint are available to the public upon request. Questions concerning SANDAG nondiscrimination obligations or complaint procedures should be directed to SANDAG General Counsel, John Kirk, at (619) 699-1997 or john.kirk@sandag.org.

Any person who believes himself or herself or any specific class of persons to be subjected to discrimination prohibited by Title VI also may file a written complaint with the Federal Transit Administration.

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

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

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

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

SANDAG offices are accessible by public transit. Phone 511 or see 511sd.com for route information. Bicycle parking is available in the parking garage of the SANDAG offices.
REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE  
Friday, June 7, 2013

ITEM # | RECOMMENDATION
--- | ---
+1. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES | APPROVE
The Regional Planning Committee (RPC) is asked to review and approve the minutes of May 3, 2013.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS
Members of the public shall have the opportunity to address the RPC 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. UPDATES TO SHORELINE PRESERVATION WORKING GROUP CHARTER (Katie Levy) | APPROVE
The Shoreline Preservation Working Group recommends that the RPC approve an amendment to the Working Group charter in substantially the same form as Attachment 1. Updates include adding management of sediment resources and monitoring lagoon efforts to the Working Group’s purpose, changing the process of selection of the Working Group’s Chair and Vice Chair, and meeting quarterly instead of bimonthly.

CHAIR’S REPORTS

+4. REMINDER: SAN DIEGO FORWARD PUBLIC WORKSHOPS UNDERWAY (Phil Trom) | INFORMATION
The regional plan workshops are currently underway, with five workshops to be held throughout the region in June (flyer attached). The June 21 workshop will be focused on land use and transportation and will serve as an opportunity for the public to provide input on the alternative land use and transportation scenarios to further reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Next month, staff will report back on feedback received and will seek Committee input on a proposed range of initial land use scenarios to test over the summer. Committee members are encouraged to attend the workshops and to invite others that might be interested.

+5. FIFTH CYCLE HOUSING ELEMENT STATUS REPORT (Susan Baldwin) | INFORMATION
A report on the status of local housing element adoptions and findings of compliance by the California Department of Housing and Community Development is attached for information. The housing element due date for local jurisdictions in the San Diego region was April 30, 2013; local jurisdictions that do not adopt a housing element within 120 calendar days of the due date will be required to revise their housing element every four years instead of every eight years.
REPORTS

+6. TransNet SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM: GRANT APPLICATION SCORING RESULTS FOR THE FY 2013 CYCLE (Stephan Vance)

SANDAG received 29 eligible applications for the FY 2013 Smart Growth Incentive Program funding cycle. Staff presented the project rankings that resulted from the scoring process at the May 3 RPC meeting. The RPC is asked to recommend that the Board of Directors approve for funding the Smart Growth Incentive Program FY 2013 cycle list of recommended projects as included in the report.

+7. SAN DIEGO FORWARD: THE REGIONAL PLAN: DEVELOPMENT OF DRAFT POLICY OBJECTIVE TOPIC AREAS (Phil Trom)

In May, the Board of Directors approved the vision and goals for San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan. Staff has identified several policy objective areas for the plan based on public input and shared this initial list with the Board. The RPC is asked to discuss the draft policy objective areas for the regional plan.

+8. INTRODUCTION TO THE JOINT LAND USE STUDY PROGRAM (Amanda Fagan, Project Manager, Office of Economic Adjustment, Department of Defense)

A Joint Land Use Study (JLUS) is a cooperative planning effort to encourage compatibility between the military training and operational missions and civilian land use and development. JLUS are community-led efforts, initiated upon a nomination by the military department, and funded by a grant from the Department of Defense Office of Economic Adjustment (OEA). The Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Energy, Installations and Environment) nominated Naval Base (NB) Point Loma, NB Coronado, and NB San Diego for a regional JLUS for Fiscal Year 2013. The OEA Project Manager, Amanda Fagan, and OEA Navy Liaison, CAPT Dan Schebler, will conduct an initial site visit June 4-7, 2013, to validate the need for and interest in conducting a JLUS. This item is being presented to the RPC for information.

9. UPCOMING MEETINGS

The next RPC meeting is scheduled for Friday, July 19, 2013, from 10:30 a.m. to 12 noon. This will be a joint meeting with the Transportation Committee. Please note that due to the Independence Day holiday, the Committee will not meet on July 5.

10. ADJOURNMENT

+ next to an agenda item indicates an attachment
REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

June 7, 2013

AGENDA ITEM NO.: 1

Action Requested: APPROVE

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION AND ACTIONS
MEETING OF MAY 3, 2013

The meeting of the Regional Planning Committee was called to order by Chair Sessom, City of Lemon Grove (East County), at 12:02 p.m. See the attached attendance sheet for Regional Planning Committee member attendance.

1. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES (APPROVE)

   Action: Upon a motion by Supervisor Dave Roberts (County of San Diego) and a second by Mayor Sam Abed (North County Inland), the Regional Planning Committee (RPC) approved the minutes from its April 5, 2013, meeting.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

   There were no public comments.

CONSENT

3. NEW MEMBER ORGANIZATIONS FOR REGIONAL ENERGY WORKING GROUP (APPROVE)

   The Regional Energy Working Group (EWG) Charter allows up to 20 voting members and states that the RPC approves membership changes. The RPC was asked to approve the addition of two member organizations: CleanTECH San Diego and the San Diego County Water Authority. The addition of these two members will bring total EWG membership to 20.

   Action: Upon a motion by Vice Chair Lesa Heebner, Councilmember, Solana Beach (North County Coastal), and a second by Supervisor Dave Roberts (County of San Diego), the RPC approved the addition of two member organizations: CleanTECH San Diego and the San Diego County Water Authority.
CHAIR’S REPORT

4. SAN DIEGO FORWARD: THE REGIONAL PLAN: UPCOMING PUBLIC WORKSHOPS (INFORMATION)

A series of workshops on the various proposed topic areas of the regional plan will be held in May, June, and July. The attached flier provided the schedule and content of the upcoming series of workshops. RPC members were encouraged to attend, to post the invitation on their local websites, and to invite others that might be interested.

Action: This item was presented for information purposes only.

REPORTS

5. SAN DIEGO REGIONAL MILITARY WORKING GROUP CHARTER (APPROVE)

The San Diego Regional Military Working Group (Military Working Group) provides a collaborative forum for the various branches of the military and SANDAG to address areas of mutual interest including growth management, habitat, transportation, regional growth, housing, water, energy, and other related topics. The Military Working Group met for the first time on April 22, 2013. The RPC was asked to review and approve the attached draft Charter.

Chair Sessom introduced the item and speaker.

Dave Roberts, Supervisor (County of San Diego), and Bob Nelson, Port Commissioner (Port of San Diego), asked various questions regarding the Military Working Group, including possible Port District representation.

Mike Woiwode, Councilmember, Coronado (South County), and Chair of the Military Working Group, provided comments and additional information.

Chair Sessom directed the Port of San Diego to send a representative to the next Military Working Group meeting for discussion regarding potential Port membership.

Jane Clough, Senior Regional Planner (SANDAG), presented the item to the Committee and responded to questions.

Action: Upon a motion by Supervisor Dave Roberts (County of San Diego) and a second by Mayor Sam Abed (North County Inland), the RPC approved the attached draft Charter, with additional discussion by the Military Working Group at its next meeting to consider membership of the San Diego Unified Port District.
6. **TransNet ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION PROGRAM: LAND MANAGEMENT GRANTS PROGRAM QUARTERLY STATUS UPDATE AND PROPOSED GRANT AMENDMENT (APPROVE)**

The SANDAG Board of Directors has approved five cycles of the TransNet Environmental Mitigation Program (EMP) Land Management Grants Program. This report provided information to the RPC on the quarterly status of active projects. Additionally, pursuant to SANDAG Board Policy No. 035: Competitive Grant Program Procedures, the grantee, Chaparral Lands Conservancy, is seeking schedule changes related to TransNet-funded Proctor Valley Vehicle Barriers grant project No. 5001971. This schedule change was for more than six months and required review by the Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee (ITOC) and approval by the RPC. At its April 10, 2013, meeting the ITOC recommended that the RPC approve the time-only schedule extension request.

Chair Sessom, introduced the item and speaker.

Katie Levy, Regional Planner I (SANDAG), shared background information on the TransNet EMP Land Management Grants Program, and presented this item.

**Action:** Upon a motion by Supervisor Dave Roberts (County of San Diego) and a second by Councilmember Mike Woiwode, City of Coronado (South County), the RPC approved the time-only schedule extension request by Chaparral Lands Conservancy (grantee) for the TransNet EMP-funded Proctor Valley Vehicle Barriers project until June 2014, pursuant to the SANDAG Board Policy No. 035: Competitive Grant Program Procedures.

7. **TransNet ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION PROGRAM: LAND MANAGEMENT FY 2013 GRANT FUNDING RECOMMENDATIONS (RECOMMEND)**

SANDAG received 34 proposals for the TransNet EMP Land Management Grants FY 13 Call for Projects on January 29, 2013. Staff presented information on the evaluation process and results at the April 5 RPC meeting. The RPC was asked to recommend that the SANDAG Board of Directors approve the award of 15 projects under the TransNet EMP FY 13 Land Management Grants Program.

Chair Sessom introduced the item and speakers.

Councilmember Lorie Zapf (City of San Diego) commented on this item and asked questions about procedural issues related to projects that did not receive full funding.

Keith Greer, Senior Project Planner (SANDAG), spoke about the evaluation process and eligibility to submit a grant application.

Katie Levy, Regional Planner I (SANDAG), introduced herself, presented the item, and responded to questions.

**Action:** Upon a motion by Supervisor Dave Roberts (County of San Diego) and a second by Councilmember Lorie Zapf (City of San Diego), the RPC recommended that the SANDAG Board of Directors approve the award of 15 projects under the TransNet EMP FY 13 Land Management Grants Program as shown in Attachment 2.
8. INVENTORY OF LOCAL PARKING POLICIES IN THE SAN DIEGO REGION (INFORMATION)

In December 2010, the SANDAG Board of Directors directed staff to consider parking policy options in the update of the Regional Comprehensive Plan. In January 2013 staff interviewed all SANDAG member agencies regarding their local parking policies and management strategies. The purpose of the inventory was to establish a baseline for parking practices in the region that can guide future discussions on how parking could be considered in San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan. Staff presented the outcomes of the parking inventory.

Chair Sessom introduced the item and speaker.

Ed Gallo (North County Transit District); Dave Roberts, Supervisor (County of San Diego); Lori Zapf, Councilmember (City of San Diego); John Aguilera, Councilmember, City of Vista (North County Inland); Jerry Jones, Councilmember, City of Lemon Grove (East County); Lesa Heebner, Vice Chair, Solana Beach (North County Coastal); Gary Felien, Councilmember, City of Oceanside (North County Coastal); and Bob Nelson, Port Commissioner (Port of San Diego), asked questions and made comments about various aspects relating to the management of public parking, the regulation of private parking supply under the jurisdiction of local governments, and parking standards by mode for transit stations. They expressed concerns about a regional one-size-fits-all approach, and expressed support for a toolbox approach that highlights best practices and provides a variety of options for consideration by local jurisdictions.

Chris Olson, Pacific Beach resident and board member of the Pacific Beach Planning Group (member of public), commented on this item and spoke in support of alternative transportation methods instead of cars, which require parking and take up land that could be used for more walkable development.

Antoinette Meier (SANDAG Associate Transportation Planner) and Marisa Mangan (SANDAG Transportation Programs Intern) presented the item and responded to questions.

Action: This item was presented for information purposes only.

9. TransNet SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM: GRANT APPLICATION SCORING RESULTS FOR THE FY 2013 CYCLE (INFORMATION)

SANDAG received 29 eligible applications for the FY 2013 Smart Growth Incentive Program. The projects have been reviewed and scored based on the criteria approved by the Board of Directors in September 2012. Staff presented the project rankings that resulted from the scoring process. Staff provided the list of proposals and evaluations to the RPC for information and indicated that a request for a recommendation will be sought at the June meeting.

Chair Sessom introduced the item and speaker.
Chris Olson, Pacific Beach resident and board member of the Pacific Beach Planning Group (member of public), encouraged SANDAG to allocate funding for the Pacific Beach Boardwalk and Parks Neighborhood District project, which focuses on multimodal connections and represents a grassroots-based effort.

Dave Roberts, Supervisor (County of San Diego), thanked SANDAG Executive Director Gary Gallegos for the courtesy of spending time with him and his staff to explain the funding process for the TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program.

Gary Felien, Councilmember, Oceanside (North County Coastal); Lori Zapf, Councilmember (City of San Diego); Jerry Jones, Councilmember, City of Lemon Grove (East County); John Aguilera, Councilmember, City of Vista (North County Inland); Ed Gallo (North County Transit District); and Allen Lawson, Chairman (SCTCA), asked questions and commented on this item.

Stephan Vance, Senior Regional Planner (SANDAG), presented the item and responded to questions.

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

10. **UPCOMING MEETINGS (INFORMATION)**

    The next meeting of the RPC is scheduled for Friday, June 7, 2013.

11. **ADJOURNMENT**

    Chair Sessom adjourned the meeting at 1:35 p.m.
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AGENDA ITEM NO.: 3

Action Requested: APPROVE

UPDATES TO SHORELINE PRESERVATION WORKING GROUP CHARTER

File Number 3200200

Introduction

The Shoreline Preservation Working Group (Working Group) was established in the late 1980s as the Shoreline Erosion Committee. The Working Group’s current status is that of a standing working group that advises the Regional Planning Committee (RPC) on shoreline management issues related to the implementation of the Shoreline Preservation Strategy, Regional Comprehensive Plan, and Coastal Regional Sediment Management Plan. Based on the Working Group’s input, the RPC makes policy recommendations to the SANDAG Board of Directors.

Discussion

As stated in the current Working Group charter, the SANDAG Executive Committee’s annual committee/working group review process includes an evaluation of each SANDAG Working Group.

The charter describes the group’s purpose, line of reporting, responsibilities, membership, and other details. A draft revised charter is outlined in Attachment 1 and includes adding management of sediment resources and monitoring lagoon efforts to the Working Group’s Purpose, changing the process of selection of the Working Group’s Chair and Vice-Chair, and meeting quarterly instead of bimonthly.

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

Attachments: 1. Draft Shoreline Preservation Working Group Charter
2. Shoreline Preservation Working Group Membership List

Key Staff Contact: Katie Levy, (619) 699-7312, katie.levy@sandgag.org

Recommendation

The Shoreline Preservation Working Group recommends that the Regional Planning Committee approve an amendment to the Working Group Charter in substantially the same form as Attachment 1.
WORKING GROUP CHARTER
Shoreline Preservation Working Group

PURPOSE
The Shoreline Preservation Working Group (Working Group) was formed as a committee in the 1980s and currently advises the Regional Planning Committee on issues related to the implementation of the Shoreline Preservation Strategy (Strategy) adopted in 1993, the SANDAG Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) adopted in 2004, and the Coastal Regional Sediment Management (RSM) Plan adopted in 2009.

The Strategy proposes an extensive beach building and maintenance program for the critical shoreline erosion areas in the region. It contains a comprehensive set of recommendations on the beach building program and on financing and implementation. The RSM Plan incorporates the goals and objectives laid out in both the Strategy and RCP. It is a guidance and policy document that addresses how management of sediment targeted at coastal erosion can be implemented throughout the San Diego region.

The Working Group has technical expertise and background knowledge of regional shoreline issues, which is useful in applying the principles and goals laid out in the Strategy, RCP, and the RSM Plan. Continuing to support the region’s ongoing and future beach nourishment efforts is a top priority for the Working Group. Additionally, in 1996, SANDAG enacted a Regional Shoreline Monitoring Program and the Working Group will continue to oversee and implement this program. The Working Group also will monitor the region’s lagoon efforts and projects as part of the larger effort for effective management of sediment resources.

GUIDING PRINCIPLES
• Commitment to unified approach for local decisions on sand replenishment and management of sediment resources
• Address local needs and maximize positive regional impacts
• Encourage cooperation and coordination
• Promote opportunities for beach sand replenishment

LINE OF REPORTING
The Working Group, established by the Board of Directors, advises the Regional Planning Committee (RPC) on issues relating to the implementation of the Strategy, RCP, and RSM Plan. Based on the Working Group’s input, the RPC makes policy recommendations to the SANDAG Board of Directors. Regular updates on Working Group activities should be made to the RPC to update them on current programs and projects and further strengthen the connection between the two groups.

RESPONSIBILITIES
The Working Group’s main responsibilities are to make recommendations to the RPC on issues related to the implementation of the adopted Strategy, RCP, and RSM Plan, focusing on future beach nourishment opportunities and the shoreline monitoring program.
MEMBERSHIP
The Working Group has 11 voting members, which are elected officials from coastal cities, the County of San Diego, and a representative from the San Diego Unified Port District and the U.S. Navy. Additionally, the Working Group has several non-voting advisory members which are representatives from community groups and organizations, environmental groups, state and federal agencies, and other interested stakeholders. Voting members of the Working Group and their alternates are selected by the bodies they represent. Non-voting members of the Working Group are also selected by the bodies they represent and are categorized as either Technical or Community Advisors and provide added knowledge and input to the Working Group. In the event of a lack of participation by a member of the Working Group or the group/agency the member represents, the RPC may will consider for approval any potential modifications approving the Working Group to modify the membership roster in order to achieve a quorum and full participation.

MEETING TIME AND LOCATION
The Working Group meetings are generally held bimonthly quarterly at 11:30 a.m. on the first Thursday. Meetings are normally held in the 7th floor conference room at the SANDAG offices. Additional meeting may also be scheduled as deemed necessary by the Working Group Chair.

SELECTION OF THE CHAIR
Selection of the Shoreline Preservation Working Group’s Chair and Vice-Chair is selected by the Chair of the SANDAG Board of Directors and shall serve until replaced, done simultaneously and begins with recommendations made by Working Group members. The final decision is then made based on a vote of the Group’s voting members.

DURATION OF EXISTENCE
The Shoreline Preservation Working Group was originally created as a committee in the 1980s. The Working Group’s current status is that of a standing working group. An evaluation of the group’s work will be conducted annually as part of the SANDAG Executive Committee’s annual committee/working group review process.
SHORELINE PRESERVATION WORKING GROUP

MEMBERSHIP

This standing working group advises the SANDAG Regional Planning Committee on issues related to the implementation of the Shoreline Preservation Strategy, Regional Comprehensive Plan, and the Coastal Regional Sediment Management Plan. It has 11 voting members, which are elected officials from coastal cities, the County of San Diego, and a representative from the San Diego Unified Port District and the U.S. Navy. Additionally, the Working Group has several non-voting advisory members which are representatives from community groups and organizations, environmental groups, state and federal agencies, and other interested stakeholders.

The Shoreline Preservation Working Group generally meets quarterly at 11:30 a.m., on the first Thursday of the month.

Staff contact: Katie.Levy, (619) 699-7312; katie.levy@sandag.org

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHAIR</th>
<th>VICE CHAIR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dave Roberts</td>
<td>Lorie Zapf/ Kevin Faulconer (Alternate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor, County of San Diego</td>
<td>Councilmember, City of San Diego</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEMBERS</th>
<th>ALTERNATES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lorraine Wood</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councilmember, City of Carlsbad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Denny</td>
<td>Richard Bailey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councilmember, City of Coronado</td>
<td>Councilmember, City of Coronado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherryl Parks</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councilmember, City of Del Mar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teresa Barth</td>
<td>Tony Kranz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor, City of Encinitas</td>
<td>Councilmember, City of Encinitas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian P. Bilbray</td>
<td>Robert Patton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councilmember, City of Imperial Beach</td>
<td>Councilmember, City of Imperial Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esther Sanchez</td>
<td>Jerome Kern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councilmember, City of Oceanside</td>
<td>Councilmember, City of Oceanside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Nichols</td>
<td>Lesa Heebner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor, City of Solana Beach</td>
<td>Councilmember, City of Solana Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eileen Maher</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unified Port of San Diego</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitch Perdue</td>
<td>Walter Wilson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Navy</td>
<td>U.S. Navy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TECHNICAL ADVISORS</th>
<th>COMMUNITY ADVISORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lee McEachern</strong></td>
<td><strong>Steve Aceti</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Coastal Commission</td>
<td>California Coastal Coalition (CalCoast)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bryant Chesney</strong></td>
<td><strong>August Felando</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Marine Fisheries Service</td>
<td>California Lobster and Trap Fishermen’s Association (CLTFA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kim Sterrett</strong></td>
<td><strong>Marco Gonzalez</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Dept. of Boating &amp; Waterways</td>
<td>Coastal Environmental Rights Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Loni Adams</strong></td>
<td><strong>Michelle Okihiro</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Department of Fish &amp; Wildlife</td>
<td>Scripps Institution of Oceanography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Darren Smith</strong></td>
<td><strong>Vacant</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Department of Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>Southern California Tribal Chairmen’s Association (SCTCA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kenneth Foster</strong></td>
<td><strong>Julia Chunn-Heer</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Lands Commission</td>
<td>Surfrider Foundation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Heather Schlosser** U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Help Shape Our Region’s Future

Bring your ideas to the table on the biggest issues facing the San Diego region between now and 2050 — issues like the economy, the environment, transportation, public health, and social equity.

Get involved in the on-going conversation about how best to tackle our challenges today, and preserve our quality of life for the future.

The San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) and its partners have embarked on creating San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan. It will build upon local planning efforts, and incorporate emerging issues and innovative concepts, to form an overall vision for the region’s future, including specific actions aimed at turning that vision into reality.

Now is the time to make your voice heard! Take part in a series of workshops that will be held throughout the region in May, June, and July 2013 — in the daytime and in the evening.

Evening Community Workshops
Every Thursday in June — all include complimentary sandwiches, cookies, and beverages

All four community workshops will seek input on the same topics — land use, transportation, housing, healthy environment, public health, economic prosperity, public facilities, energy, climate change, and borders.

South County
June 6, 6 to 8 p.m.
Casa Familiar Civic Center
212 W. Park Avenue, San Ysidro

North County Inland
June 13, 6 to 8 p.m.
Escondido City Hall, Mitchell Room
201 North Broadway, Escondido

North County Coastal
June 20, 6 to 8 p.m.
Oceanside City Hall Community Rooms
300 North Coast Highway, Oceanside

East County
June 27, 6 to 8 p.m.
La Mesa Community Center,
Arbor View Room
4975 Memorial Drive, La Mesa

Weekday Central Workshops
The third Fridays in May, June, and July — all include complimentary sandwiches, cookies, and beverages

May 17 – Focused discussions on healthy environment, energy, climate change, and public health
June 21 – Focused discussions on land use and transportation
July 19 – Focused discussions on economic prosperity, public facilities, and borders

Caltrans District 11
All weekday workshops from
11:30 a.m. to 1:30 p.m.
Garcia Room & Gallegos Room
4050 Taylor Street, San Diego

Spanish-speaking staff members will be available at all seven workshops and Spanish translators will be available at the four evening workshops. All locations are transit accessible. Call 511 or visit 511sd.com/transit for route information. Limited parking also available.

RSVP to Sarah Strand at sarah.strand@sandag.org, (619) 595-5609, or via the SANDAGRegion Facebook page by attending “Regional Plan Workshop” events.

For more information, visit sandag.org/sandiegoforward
Ayude a determinar el futuro de nuestra región

Los talleres abordarán cuestiones importantes que enfrenta la región

Aporte sus ideas sobre los asuntos más importantes que la región de San Diego enfrentará de ahora al año 2050; cuestiones como la economía, el medio ambiente, el transporte, la salud pública y la justicia social.

Participe en un diálogo abierto sobre cómo abordar, de la mejor manera, nuestros retos actuales y preservar nuestra calidad de vida para el futuro.

La Asociación de Gobiernos de San Diego (SANDAG, por sus siglas en inglés) y sus socios han iniciado el desarrollo de San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan (San Diego Adelante: El Plan Regional). Se basará en los esfuerzos de planificación local e incorporará cuestiones emergentes y conceptos innovadores para formar una visión general del futuro de la región, incluyendo acciones específicas para convertir esa visión en una realidad.

¡Ahora es el momento de hacer que su voz se escuche! Participe en una serie de talleres que se llevarán a cabo por toda la región en mayo, junio y julio de 2013, durante el día y por la noche.

Talleres comunitarios por la noche
Cada jueves del mes de junio. En todos los talleres se ofrecerán sándwiches, galletas y bebidas de cortesía

En los cuatro talleres comunitarios se solicitará retroalimentación sobre los mismos temas: usos de suelo, transporte, vivienda, medio ambiente saludable, salud pública, prosperidad económica, instalaciones públicas, energía, cambio climático y fronteras.

**Sur del Condado de San Diego**
**6 de junio, de las 6 a las 8 p.m.**
Centro Cívico Casa Familiar
212 W. Park Avenue, San Ysidro

**Norte del Condado de San Diego - Interior**
**13 de junio, de las 6 a las 8 p.m.**
Salón Mitchell del Ayuntamiento de Escondido
201 North Broadway, Escondido

**Norte del Condado de San Diego - Costa**
**20 de junio, de las 6 a las 8 p.m.**
Salones comunitarios del Ayuntamiento de Oceanside
300 North Coast Highway, Oceanside

**Este del Condado de San Diego**
**27 de junio, de las 6 a las 8 p.m.**
Salón Arbor View del Centro Comunitario de La Mesa
4975 Memorial Drive, La Mesa

**Talleres en el centro de San Diego en días de entre semana**
El tercer viernes de mayo, junio y julio. En todos los talleres se ofrecerán sándwiches, galletas y bebidas de cortesía

**17 de mayo** – Diálogos enfocados en el medio ambiente saludable, energía, cambio climático y salud pública

**21 de junio** – Diálogos enfocados en el uso de suelo y el transporte

**19 de julio** – Diálogos enfocados en la prosperidad económica, instalaciones públicas y fronteras

**Caltrans Distrito 11**
Todos los talleres de entre semana se llevarán a cabo de las 11:30 a.m. a la 1:30 p.m. en:
Salón García y Salón Gallegos
4050 Taylor Street, San Diego


**Favor de confirmar asistencia**
con Sarah Strand en sarah.strand@sandag.org, o al (619) 595-5609, o a través de la página de Facebook, SANDAGRegion, al participar en uno de los eventos “Talleres del Plan Regional”.

Para mayor información, visite sandag.org/sandiegoforward
FIFTH CYCLE HOUSING ELEMENT STATUS REPORT

Introduction

On October 28, 2011, the SANDAG Board of Directors approved the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) Plan in conjunction with the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy (2050 RTP/SCS). SANDAG is assigned this responsibility by state housing element law, and undertakes this process prior to each housing element cycle.

The fifth housing element cycle covers the time period of April 30, 2013, to April 30, 2021 (eight years), and state law requires that housing elements be completed by April 30, 2013, 18 months following the adoption of the 2050 RTP/SCS (California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) website). The synchronization and improved integration of transportation, housing, and land use planning are one of the objectives of Senate Bill 375 (SB 375), which will help the region meet the greenhouse gas reduction targets set by the California Air Resources Board.

Background

A report on the status of local housing element adoptions and findings of compliance by HCD is attached for information. Local jurisdictions that do not adopt a housing element within 120 calendar days of the April 30, 2013, due date will be required to revise their housing element every four years instead of every eight years.

All but two jurisdictions in the San Diego region have either draft or final housing elements that have been found in compliance with state law by HCD.

- Twelve jurisdictions have adopted final housing elements that have been found in compliance by HCD (Chula Vista, Coronado, Escondido, Imperial Beach, Lemon Grove, National City, Oceanside\(^1\), San Diego, Santee, Solana Beach, Vista, and the County of San Diego).

- Five jurisdictions have completed draft housing elements that have been found in compliance by HCD (Del Mar, El Cajon, La Mesa, Poway, and San Marcos). Jurisdictions with draft elements found in compliance need to adopt a final housing element and send it to HCD for review and a letter of compliance.

\(^1\) Although Oceanside has adopted a housing element that meets the requirements of state law, the city's previous housing element (4\(^{th}\) cycle) included a program for emergency shelters which has not been implemented. HCD will find the 5\(^{th}\) cycle housing element in compliance upon program implementation.
Two jurisdictions are preparing their housing elements as part of a comprehensive update of their general plans and have not submitted their draft housing elements to HCD for review (Carlsbad and Encinitas).

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


Key Staff Contact: Susan Baldwin, (619) 699-1943, susan.baldwin@sandag.org
## San Diego Region Housing Element Status
### May 30, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>5th Cycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carlsbad</td>
<td>Preparing housing element as part of general plan update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>In compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronado</td>
<td>In compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Mar</td>
<td>Draft in compliance (City Council approved final housing element 5/20/13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Cajon</td>
<td>Draft in compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encinitas</td>
<td>Preparing housing element as part of general plan update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>In compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Beach</td>
<td>In compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Mesa</td>
<td>Draft in compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemon Grove</td>
<td>In compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National City</td>
<td>In compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside</td>
<td>Adopted housing element will be in compliance upon adoption of zoning for emergency shelters pursuant to SB 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poway</td>
<td>Draft in compliance (City Council approved final housing element 5/21/13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>In compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>Draft in compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santee</td>
<td>In compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solana Beach</td>
<td>In compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista</td>
<td>In compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>In compliance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Updated based on California Department of Housing and Community Development website, May 30, 2013 ([http://www.hcd.ca.gov/hpd/hrc/plan/he/status.pdf](http://www.hcd.ca.gov/hpd/hrc/plan/he/status.pdf)) and correspondence with Robin Huntley, HCD Division of Housing Policy Development
San Diego Association of Governments

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

June 7, 2013

AGENDA ITEM NO.: 6

Action Requested: RECOMMEND

TransNet SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM:

GRANT APPLICATION SCORING RESULTS FOR THE FY 2013 CYCLE

File Number 3300100

Introduction

Each year the Board of Directors allocates 2 percent of annual TransNet revenues for the Smart Growth Incentive Program (SGIP). The SGIP provides funding for local transportation-related infrastructure and planning efforts that support smart growth development in the region. Applicants may submit requests for funding for two types of projects: capital and planning. All funding is awarded through a competitive basis.

On September 28, 2012, the Board of Directors approved the eligibility and scoring criteria, and authorized the release of the SGIP FY 2013 Call for Projects. SANDAG conducted an applicant workshop for local jurisdictions on October 29, 2012, and held roughly a dozen preliminary application review meetings with prospective applicants. In total, SANDAG received 32 applications, 16 for capital projects and 16 for planning projects. Of the 32 applications received, three were deemed ineligible because they were not focused on a Smart Growth Opportunity Area as required by the program guidelines approved by the Board. The remaining 29 applications (15 capital projects and 14 planning projects) were scored and ranked according to the approved scoring guidelines included as Attachment 3. A scoring panel was assembled in January 2013 consisting of three SANDAG staff members, one Caltrans staff member, and three local agency staff members from jurisdictions that did not apply for SGIP funding. All applicants presented their project proposals to the scoring panel at a workshop held on February 5, 2013.

SANDAG presented the SGIP FY 2013 cycle final project rankings to the Regional Planning and Transportation Committees, the Regional Planning Technical Working Group, and the TransNet Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee (ITOC) at their May meetings for information. The ITOC conveyed its support for the SGIP scoring results. Staff also presented the list of recommended projects to the Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee at its June meeting.

Discussion

For the FY 2013 cycle, $9.6 million is available. As approved by the Board of Directors in the program guidelines, at least 80 percent of the available funding ($7.68 million) should be awarded for capital projects and up to 20 percent of available funding ($1.92 million) for planning projects. In total, six capital projects and seven planning projects are recommended to receive funding as shown in Attachment 1. Descriptions of all project applications are included in Attachment 2.

Recommendation

The Regional Planning Committee is asked to recommend that the Board of Directors approve for funding the Smart Growth Incentive Program FY 2013 cycle list of recommended projects as shown in Attachment 1.
**Next Steps**

At its June 7, 2013, meeting, the Transportation Committee also will be asked to approve the attached list of recommended projects. Based on the Committees’ recommendations, staff will request approval from the Board of Directors in June. Should the list of recommended projects be approved by the Board, the selected grantees will be issued a Notice to Award and will be invited to participate in a kick-off meeting with SANDAG staff to initiate the grant agreement process. It is anticipated that grant agreements will be executed in late summer/early fall 2013.

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

Attachments:  
1. SGIP Project Ranking Summary  
2. SGIP Project Descriptions  
3. SGIP Project Criteria and Scoring Guidelines

Key Staff Contact: Stephan Vance, (619) 699-1924, stephan.vance@sandag.org
# SGIP CAPITAL GRANTS PROJECT RANKING SUMMARY

## Capital SGIP Grant Proposals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Sum of Ranks</th>
<th>Overall Rank</th>
<th>SGIP Funds Requested</th>
<th>Cumulative Funds Requested</th>
<th>Recommended Project Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>Armorlite Complete Street Corridor</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National City</td>
<td>Downtown-Westside Community Connections Project</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Mesa</td>
<td>Downtown Village Streetscape Improvement Project</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Island Avenue Green Street Mobility Improvements</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$6,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Wayfinding Signage</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$6,500,000</td>
<td>$335,329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>Third Avenue Streetscape Implementation Project, Phase 2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$2,005,000</td>
<td>$8,505,000</td>
<td>$1,344,671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside</td>
<td>Mission Avenue Improvement Project, Phase 2</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$1,930,000</td>
<td>$10,435,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista</td>
<td>Paseo Sante Fe Streetscape &amp; Infrastructure Project, Section A</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$11,435,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National City</td>
<td>Highland Avenue Smart Growth Corridor</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$1,300,000</td>
<td>$12,735,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Five Points Neighborhood/ Washington Street Pedestrian &amp; Median Improvements</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$360,000</td>
<td>$13,095,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemon Grove</td>
<td>Lemon Grove Avenue Realignment</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$950,000</td>
<td>$14,045,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlsbad</td>
<td>Connect the Village: Wayfinding &amp; Traffic Calming</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$470,000</td>
<td>$14,515,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>Bicycle Path - Missing Link</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$340,500</td>
<td>$14,855,500</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>Creekside Drive Multi-Modal Corridor Enrichment Project</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$15,855,500</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>University Avenue &amp; 54th Street Roadway Improvements</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$1,440,000</td>
<td>$17,295,500</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Available Funding**: $7,680,000  **Total Recommended Funding**: $7,680,000
**Total Funding Requested**: $17,295,500  **Total Requested Funding Over Available**: ($9,615,500)

**FULLY FUNDED**
**PARTIALLY FUNDED**
**NOT FUNDED**
## SGIP PLANNING GRANTS PROJECT RANKING SUMMARY

Planning SGIP Grant Proposals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Sum of Ranks</th>
<th>Overall Rank</th>
<th>SGIP Funds Requested</th>
<th>Cumulative Funds Requested</th>
<th>Recommended Project Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>East Village Green/ 14th Street Promenade Master Plan</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Morena Boulevard Station Area Study Phase 2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista</td>
<td>Vista Downtown Specific Plan Update</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$148,383</td>
<td>$848,383</td>
<td>$148,383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemon Grove</td>
<td>Main Street Promenade Extension Planning Project</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$1,248,383</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>Healthy Communities Program</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$1,348,383</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Beach</td>
<td>Palm Avenue Mixed-use &amp; Commercial Corridor Master Plan</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$1,748,383</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>The Complete Boulevard Planning Study</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$2,148,383</td>
<td>$171,617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlsbad</td>
<td>Plan the Village: A New Master Plan for Carlsbad Village</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$230,000</td>
<td>$2,378,383</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Sixth Avenue Bridge Promenade Feasibility Study</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td>$2,553,383</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Pacific Beach Boardwalk &amp; Parks Neighborhood District</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$2,953,383</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>Grape Day Park Master Plan</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$3,033,383</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside</td>
<td>Oceanside Mixed-use Public Parking Structure</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$3,433,383</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santee</td>
<td>Town Center Pedestrian Connection Feasibility Study</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$3,468,383</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Mar</td>
<td>Parking Management Plan</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>$3,513,383</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Available Funding**: $1,920,000  **Total Recommended Funding**: $3,513,383  **Total Funding Requested**: $3,513,383  **Total Recommended Funding Over Available**: ($1,593,383)

**Summary**

- **FULLY FUNDED**
- **PARTIALLY FUNDED**
- **NOT FUNDED**
## Smart Growth Incentive Program Project Descriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carlsbad</td>
<td>Connect the Village: Wayfinding &amp; Traffic Calming</td>
<td>Construct &quot;Livable Streets&quot; through traffic calming measures in the Barrio and innovative pedestrian and bicyclist wayfinding signage to better connect people in surrounding neighborhoods to the Village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chula Vista **</td>
<td>Third Avenue Streetscape Implementation Project (TASIP), Phase 2</td>
<td>Construct streetscape and traffic calming improvements such as, medians, bulb-outs, decorative pavers, a road diet, cool paving elements, expanded bike parking, marked bicycle routes, relocated transit stops, landscaping, street trees, pedestrian lighting, wayfinding/ informational signs, and street furnishings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>Bicycle Path – Missing Link</td>
<td>Construct a section of the missing Class I Bike Path to provide a direct connection from the existing Regional Class II bike lanes along Centre City Parkway to the Escondido Transit Center, the Inland Rail Trail, and Escondido's Downtown area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Mesa *</td>
<td>Downtown Village Streetscape Improvement Project</td>
<td>Enhance the La Mesa Downtown Village sense of place and walkability through construction of new sidewalks, wide curb ramps, bollards, enhanced crosswalks, bulb-outs, pavement, decorative lighting, street trees, street furniture, wayfinding signage, bike parking, and a new public plaza.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemon Grove</td>
<td>Lemon Grove Avenue Realignment</td>
<td>Realign/reconstruct segments of Lemon Grove Ave. and North Ave. including striping, installation of traffic signals, upgrading existing substandard improvements at the trolley/ railroad crossing, relocate and replace sewer, water and storm drains, and underground SDG&amp;E, COX, and AT&amp;T transmission and/ or distribution overhead lines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National City</td>
<td>Highland Avenue Smart Growth Corridor</td>
<td>Implement corridor enhancements such as new benches, shelters, recycling receptacles, and potentially electronic signs at bus stops, install bike racks, corner bulb-outs, curb ramps, enhanced crosswalks, pedestrian refuges, traffic calming/ road diet, landscaping, ornamental street lighting, public art, and diagonal on-street parking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National City*</td>
<td>Downtown-Westside Community Connections Project</td>
<td>Enhance the City right-of-way through improvements such as new benches, shelters, recycling receptacles, public art and electronic signs at bus stops, install bike racks, corner bulb-outs, curb ramps, enhance crosswalks, pedestrian refuges, landscaping, street lighting, wayfinding signage, and diagonal on-street parking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside</td>
<td>Mission Avenue Improvement Project, Phase 2</td>
<td>Implement pedestrian, bicycle and roadway improvements such as, reduce travel lanes, implement reversed-angled parking, and construct streetscape enhancements such as widened sidewalks, curb bulb-outs, and class III bicycle improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego*</td>
<td>Island Avenue Green Street Mobility Improvements</td>
<td>Construct a series of new/ widened sidewalks and corner bulb-outs along sections of Island Avenue, and include a bike sharrow marking along Island Ave. from Front Street to Interstate 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Five Points Neighborhood/ Washington Street Pedestrian &amp; Median Improvements</td>
<td>Improve safety, walkability and transit access for pedestrians by constructing curb ramps, popouts, median improvements, landscaping, neighborhood signage, an improved crosswalk landing, and installing visual countdown/ audible signals and directional signage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>University Avenue &amp; 54th Street Roadway Improvements</td>
<td>Implement principles of the Complete Streets Act and Sustainable Communities Strategy by eliminating both free westbound/ southbound right turn lanes, install Class II bike lanes, and improve transit stations with wider waiting areas, shelters, improved street lighting, wider sidewalks, and upgraded signals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego**</td>
<td>Wayfinding Signage</td>
<td>Install approximately 300 new pedestrian and vehicular oriented signs throughout the Downtown Community Plan Areas to direct downtown residents, visitors and workers to popular destinations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos*</td>
<td>Armorlite Complete Street Corridor</td>
<td>Construct multimodal improvements to Armorlite Drive including enhanced walkways, bike racks, street furnishings, pedestrian lighting, mid-block crossings a Class I bike path on the North side of the street, and extension of Class II or III bike facilities to the Mission Sports Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>Creekside Drive Multimodal Corridor Enrichment Project</td>
<td>Construct two 12’ travel lanes, 18’ diagonal parking, 8’ parallel parking, 15’ sidewalks with street furniture/ landscaping, paved crosswalks, and 12’ multi-use trail, seat walls, pedestrian bridge and bio swells.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista</td>
<td>Paseo Sante Fe Streetscape &amp; Infrastructure Project Catalyst Section A</td>
<td>Implement the first capital improvements for a high priority revitalization project including the construction of wide sidewalks, streetlights, street furniture, a linear park, undergrounding overhead utilities, reconstruction of the roadway, implement a &quot;road diet,&quot; traffic calming measures, bulb-outs, and a roundabout.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Indicates projects recommended for full funding  
** Indicates projects recommended for partial funding
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carlsbad</td>
<td>Plan the Village: A New Master Plan for Carlsbad Village</td>
<td>Conduct a comprehensive planning process to update the Carlsbad Village Master Plan to include components such as a Health Impact Assessment, encourage compact, mixed-use development around public transit, support the community's revitalization effort, support transit, walking and bicycling trips, and enhance the sense of place in the Village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chula Vista*</td>
<td>Healthy Communities Program</td>
<td>Develop a city-wide Healthy Communities Program encompassing all 15 smart growth areas, amend the General Plan Subdivision Manual, Design Standards Manual and other implementing documents, and implement a Healthy Corridors Pilot Project in the smart growth area, CV-1, including the preparation of design concept plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Mar</td>
<td>Parking Management Plan</td>
<td>Develop a Parking Management Plan to address immediate to long-term management strategies for appropriately managing parking facilities in the Central Commercial District, beach area and seasonal impact areas of Del Mar, engage stakeholders, and create a distinctly urban, compact, walkable mixed-use district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>Grape Day Park Master Plan</td>
<td>Create a Park Master Plan for Grape Day Park to plan for recreational opportunities for a growing population through a formal, open process to garner greater community support and foster a shared sense of identity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Beach*</td>
<td>Palm Avenue Mixed-use &amp; Commercial Corridor Master Plan</td>
<td>Prepare design and development drawings (30% completeness level) and the associated environmental documents necessary to cover implementation of all proposed elements of transforming the existing six-lane highways (Palm Ave./ SR-75) into a “Main Street” through public right-of-way, traffic calming, pedestrian, bicycle and transit improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemon Grove*</td>
<td>Main Street Promenade Extension Planning Project</td>
<td>Enliven the Main Street Promenade Extension corridor through public right-of-way enhancements for pedestrians and bicyclists, create a place for recreational and social activities, design for shared circulation of bicycles, pedestrians and vehicles, improve health, and create an amenity for generations to come.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside</td>
<td>Oceanside Mixed-use Public Parking Structure</td>
<td>Complete a feasibility study and concept plan for a mixed-use public parking structure on existing City owned public parking lot three blocks from the Oceanside Intermodal Transportation Center to provide much-needed public parking downtown and new office/retail spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego**</td>
<td>The Complete Boulevard Planning Study</td>
<td>Conduct a study to realize the transformative potential of BRT in Mid-City through the enhancement of two primary areas along the soon-to-be completed Boulevard Rapid Bus line including improvements to connect surrounding residential communities to the new route, and create landmark destinations that contribute to the sustainability, economic vitality, and well-being of communities that the BRT serves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego*</td>
<td>East Village Green/14th Street Promenade Master Plan</td>
<td>Develop a Master Plan for East Village Green (the proposed largest public open space in downtown San Diego (4.1 acres)) and the 14th Street Promenade (a linear park that will expand much needed open space in the city’s densest community) to provide a safe pedestrian and bicycle connection traversing East Village from City College to Barrio Logan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego*</td>
<td>Morena Boulevard Station Area Study, Phase 2</td>
<td>Prepare amendments to the Linda Vista Community Plan, the Linda Vista Facilities Community Plan, the Clairmont Mesa Facilities Financing Plan, process rezones, and prepare a programmatic environmental document to support mixed-use, transit-oriented development in the Mid-Coast Trolley Line station areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Pacific Beach Boardwalk &amp; Parks Neighborhood District</td>
<td>Create a Pacific Beach Parks Plan and Action Plan to implement ocean-front pocket parks, traffic calming, and improved multimodal use and beach access, create a Healthy Community/Eco-District, improve the beach boardwalk, and integrate arts and culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Sixth Avenue Bride Promenade Feasibility Study</td>
<td>Complete a Feasibility and Design Study to provide an enhanced pedestrian connection between Downtown and Balboa Park through the elimination of the free right-turn lane off northbound I-5 off-ramp, and the removal of parking and one travel land to construct an enhanced pedestrian pathway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santee</td>
<td>Town Center Pedestrian Connection Feasibility Study</td>
<td>Develop alternatives for implementation with future development to connect the residential area north of Town Center Parkway to the transit/trolley station and commercial area to the south to promote safe walking and bicycling trips.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista*</td>
<td>Vista Downtown Specific Plan Update</td>
<td>Conduct an update to the Vista Downtown Specific Plan to improve parking management, incorporate health policies, evaluate health impacts of the plan, encourage multi-family and mixed-use development, streamline the process for project review, add a new Arts &amp; Culture District, and revise parking and other standards and design guidelines to support smart growth and multimodal connections.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SCORING AND SELECTION PROCESS

After applications have been received and reviewed for eligibility by SANDAG staff, proposed projects will be scored and selected according to the processes outlined below.

SCORING

The proposed projects will be scored by a scoring panel consisting of SANDAG staff, Caltrans, and a member(s) of the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG) and/or the Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) from jurisdictions that have not submitted applications for funding under the current grant cycle. Panel members may not have had prior involvement in any of the submitted projects, nor may they (nor the jurisdictions they represent) receive compensation for work on any of the funded projects in the future. The scoring criteria are specified in the Project Scoring Criteria Guidance and Scoring Matrix in the next section.

Applicants will be asked to prepare and deliver presentations regarding their proposed projects at a public workshop consisting of the scoring panel and members of the Regional Planning Technical Working Group and the Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee. Applicants will be notified of the presentation date.

SELECTION

Once all submitted projects have been scored, SANDAG staff will present a list of proposed projects to the SANDAG Regional Planning Committee for recommendation to the SANDAG Board of Directors.
SCORING CRITERIA GUIDANCE

HOW WILL PROJECTS BE SCORED?

Once a project has been deemed eligible, it will be scored based on the criteria for its project type. Because the planning activities and capital improvements are very different, each will be scored under its own set of criteria. The project scoring criteria for capital projects are discussed in detail below.

LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION CHARACTERISTICS

The following criteria will determine competitiveness of the location of the proposed grant project, in terms of the project area’s land use and transportation characteristics at present, and in the near-term future.

Land use and transportation characteristics will be scored by SANDAG staff using current SANDAG land use and transportation data. Planned densities and land uses must be in adopted general plans and/or community plans. Pending amendments will not be considered. It is the responsibility of local jurisdictions to ensure that SANDAG has current land use data, and to submit information regarding entitled development within the project area.

A. Intensity of Planned Development in Project’s Smart Growth Opportunity Area

A1. Planned Densities Relative to Smart Growth Opportunity Area Place Type Thresholds

Up to 6 points are available. This criterion will be scored by SANDAG, comparing PLANNED land use densities for the project area to the density thresholds prescribed for the project’s smart growth opportunity area place type. Densities will be based on the land use designations in SANDAG’s currently adopted regional growth forecast.

Projects in areas with planned residential and/or employment densities that exceed the minimum density threshold for its smart growth place type will score highest in this category.

A2. Expedited Approval Process

A total of 4 points are available, if an applicant can demonstrate that a specific plan, master Environmental Impact Report, or other mechanism is in place to allow for administrative approval of development projects. This criterion will be scored by SANDAG.

B. EXISTINGS AND ENTITLED LAND DEVELOPMENT IN THE PROPOSED CAPITAL PROJECT AREA

B1. EXISTING Development Density

Up to 6 points are available. EXISTING development density around the proposed capital project will be calculated by SANDAG, comparing EXISTING densities within ¼-mile of the project to the density thresholds prescribed for the project’s smart growth opportunity area place type. The ¼-mile area around a project will extend for the full length of linear projects. Project areas where residential and/or employment development exceeds the minimum density threshold for its smart growth place type will score the highest in this category.

B2. ENTITLED Development Density

Up to 6 points are available. ENTITLED development projects within a ¼-mile radius of the proposed capital project will qualify if any portion of the development project boundary is within the ¼-mile area surrounding the proposed capital project. Densities will be scored relative to minimum threshold for the area’s smart growth place type. To receive points, applicant must describe entitled developments in the application. This criterion will be scored by SANDAG.

B3. Mix of Uses

Up to 3 points are available. Mix of Uses will be calculated by SANDAG by counting the number of current uses in the project area. Multi-family residential does not count toward these points; it must exist within the project area in addition to the other uses in order to earn points (i.e. projects without multi-family residential within ¼ mile of the
The categories of land uses counted include single-family residential, retail, office, civic, parks, and visitor-serving.

**B4. New Uses**

A total of 2 points are available. The applicant must provide evidence of any new uses that would be added to the project area as a result of land development that the proposed capital project would support.

**C. NEW AFFORDABLE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT**

**C1. New Affordable Housing Development**

Up to 3 points are available. The applicant will identify new affordable housing that will be produced in conjunction with the entitled land development within ¼-mile of the project. “Affordable housing” means housing that serves extremely low, very low, or low income households (between zero to 80 percent of area median income adjusted for household size). Affordable housing costs are defined in Section 6918 for renters and Section 6920 for purchasers of Title 25 of the California Code of Regulations, and in Sections 50052.5 and 50053 of the Health and Safety Code, or by the applicable funding source or program. Acquired and rehabilitated affordable housing qualifies under this criterion. This criterion will be scored by SANDAG.

**C2. Low to Very-Low Income Affordable Units**

A total of 2 points are available, if 50-100% of units in the development are restricted to low to very-low income residents.

**D. TRANSPORTATION CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PROJECT AREA**

SANDAG staff will score these criteria based on the transportation facilities within ¼-mile walking distance of the project boundary. Walking distance will be determined through GIS transit and bicycle networks, and network of actual available walking paths.

**D1. Relation to Transit**

Up to 12 points are available. Transit facilities must be either existing or funded for construction to qualify.

**D2. Bicycle Facilities**

Up to 2 points are available. Bicycle facilities will be identified by the current San Diego Regional Bike Map unless the applicant provides additional information about existing or planned bike facilities not on the current map.

Only bicycle facilities built consistent with California Highway Design, Chapter 1000 standards will qualify. One point will be awarded where bicycle facilities exist within a 1/4 mile of the proposed project, and 2 points when those facilities connect directly to the project.

**D3. Walkability**

Up to 4 points are available. Walkability will be determined by the intersection density of the street network in the project area based on the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection Density (per Square Mile)</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>290 or greater</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225-290</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-224</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 100</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D4. Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Strategies

Up to 2 points are available. Transportation Demand Management strategies within the project area must be described in the project application.

Existing TDM programs within the project area, such as requiring TDM plans as part of the development review process, or parking management strategies such as shared parking or allowing reductions in parking requirements receive two points, and proposed programs or policies receive one point.

Examples of TDM policies and programs that can be considered for this points category are included in (but not limited to those found in) *Integrating Transportation Demand Management into the Planning and Development Process*, which can be found at www.sandag.org/smartgrowth.

E. COMMUNITY DESIGN FEATURES AND CONTEXT OF THE PROJECT AREA

E1. Urban Design Characteristics and Community Context

Up to 6 points are available. This criterion will be scored by the panel, using aerial imagery, Google Street View and/or site visits, and guidance from the following sections in *Designing for Smart Growth: Creating Great Places in the San Diego Region*:

- Smart Growth Scorecard 3 – Consistent Street Edge (for large developments)
- Smart Growth Scorecard 4 – Street Frontages
- Connectivity (3.4 in Chapter 3 Site Design)
- Site Access (3.3 in Chapter 3 Site Design)
- Building Frontage (4.1 in Chapter 4 Building Design)
- Parking (Chapter 9 Parking)

The highest scoring projects will be located in project areas that exemplify the principles in all or a majority of the above sections. Lower scoring projects will be located in project areas that minimally exemplify principles in only one or a few of the above sections. Panel members will be provided with the above sections from *Designing for Smart Growth*.

Points are also available under this criterion if the local jurisdiction has developed design guidance for the project area that is in line with the above principles, such as:

- Design guidelines
- Form-based codes
- Renderings of proposed development

QUALITY OF PROPOSED CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT

The following criteria will determine competitiveness of the actual proposed grant project, in terms of how well the project meets the objectives of this grant program.

A. SUPPORT FOR PUBLIC TRANSIT

Up to 5 points are available. This criterion will be scored by the panel, using guidance from the following sections in *Designing for Smart Growth: Creating Great Places in the San Diego Region*:

- Smart Growth Scorecard 10 – Transit Access (for streetscapes)
- Chapter 5 – Multimodal Streets – in terms of guidance for stops and stations, as well as bicycle and pedestrian access to transit
- Chapter 6 – Transit Stations

The highest scoring projects will propose elements that exemplify the principles in all or a majority of the above sections. Lower scoring projects will include minimal elements that exemplify principles in only one or a few of the above sections. Panel members will be provided with the above sections from *Designing for Smart Growth*. 
B. PROVIDING TRANSPORTATION CHOICES

Up to 5 points are available. This criterion will be scored by the panel, using guidance from the following sections in Designing for Smart Growth: Creating Great Places in the San Diego Region:

- Smart Growth Scorecard 8 – Street Connectivity (for streetscapes)
- Smart Growth Scorecard 9 – Pedestrian Realm
- Smart Growth Scorecard 13 – Vehicle and Bicycle Parking (for streetscapes)
- Smart Growth Scorecard 14 – Parking Demand Management (for streetscapes)
- Chapter 5 – Multimodal Streets

The highest scoring projects will propose elements that exemplify the principles in all or a majority of the above sections. Lower scoring projects will include minimal elements that exemplify principles in only one or a few of the above sections. Panel members will be provided with the above sections from Designing for Smart Growth.

Additionally:

- Pedestrian facility design must be consistent with the recommendations in SANDAG’s Planning and Designing for Pedestrians, should improve street crossings where necessary, and/or connect the community and its activity centers.

- Bicycle facilities should be designed consistent with the requirements of Chapter 1000 of the California Highway Design manual, or the California MUTCD. Projects may also use AASHTO standards. Bicycle parking should be designed consistent with the bicycle parking guidelines in the San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan. Highest scoring projects will provide continuity with bike routes beyond the immediate project area and connect to important community destinations, especially public transit.

- Projects that do not directly facilitate travel, such as public gathering areas should contribute to reducing vehicle travel by bringing needed public places into walking or bicycling range of community members.

- Changes to vehicle parking should significantly reduce the role of the automobile for travel in the area as well as the impact of parking on the community design of the area.

C. COMMUNITY ENHANCEMENT

Up to 5 points are available. This criterion will be scored by the panel, using guidance from the following sections in Designing for Smart Growth: Creating Great Places in the San Diego Region:

- Smart Growth Scorecard 12 – Plazas and Seating
- Neighborhood Context (3.2 in Chapter 3 Site Design)
- Chapter 8 – Parks and Civic Space

The highest scoring projects will propose elements that exemplify the principles in all or a majority of the above sections, and contribute toward a setting that is more likely to attract private investment. Lower scoring projects will include minimal elements that exemplify principles in only one or a few of the above sections, and lack features that would help to accomplish the goal of placemaking. Panel members will be provided with the above sections from Designing for Smart Growth.

D. ADDRESSING PROJECT AREA ISSUES

Up to 5 points are available. This criterion will assess how well the project addresses issues specific to the community, which will be unique in each location, depending on demographics and specific needs; and how well the project preserves and integrates existing cultural and natural resources in the project area.
Specific issues to be addressed may pertain to specific populations such as the elderly or disabled or other low-mobility populations, or may address area issues such as crime, or work toward a goal of economic revitalization for existing businesses.

In the example of specific populations, the proposed project could reduce roadway speeds and employ other traffic calming improvements that will ensure safer access for elderly residents from a residential street to a senior center or retail district around the corner.

In the example of crime, the proposed project could seek to improve public safety by employing crime prevention through environmental design strategies, cleaning up an eyesore, or removing a nuisance that attracts crime.

The applicant should demonstrate how the project will effectively integrate and preserve existing cultural and natural resources in the area that help shape the identity of that community. Natural resources could include (but are not limited to) creeks and open space.

Cultural resources could range from (but are not limited to) locally owned small businesses, murals, memorials and monuments, and historical buildings, bridges, or other infrastructure that represent landmarks in the community.

Highest scoring projects will address area issues comprehensively and effectively, and with design features that artfully integrate community resources into the project. Capital projects should preserve and protect important cultural and natural resources in the project area, and when appropriate, integrate such resources into the project design.

Smart Growth Scorecard 5 – Historic and Natural Features from *Designing for Smart Growth* will also be used to score this criterion.

**E. SUSTAINABILITY**

Up to 2 points are available. This criterion will be scored by the panel, using guidance from the following sections in *Designing for Smart Growth: Creating Great Places in the San Diego Region*:

- Smart Growth Scorecard 6 – Sustainable Design (for streetscapes)
- Energy Conservation and Landscaping (3.5 in Chapter 3 Site Design)
- Stormwater Runoff (5.5 in Chapter 5 Multimodal Streets)

The highest scoring projects will propose elements that exemplify the principles in all or a majority of the above sections. Lower scoring projects will include minimal elements that exemplify principles in only one or a few of the above sections. Panel members will be provided with the above sections from *Designing for Smart Growth*.

**F. UNIVERSAL DESIGN**

Up to 2 points are available. This criterion will be scored by the panel, using guidance from the following sections in *Designing for Smart Growth: Creating Great Places in the San Diego Region*:

- Smart Growth Scorecard 7 – Universal Access
- Universal Design (6.2 in Chapter 6 Transit Stations)

Additionally, intersection improvements must include pedestrian signals and detectable warnings designed for pedestrians with visual and hearing impairments.

The highest scoring projects will propose elements that exemplify the principles of universal design. Lower scoring projects will include minimal elements that exemplify principles in only one or a few of the above sections. Projects that only meet Public Rights-of-Way Accessibility Guidelines will not receive points. Panel members will be provided with the above sections from *Designing for Smart Growth*. 
For more information and resources on universal design principles, please visit:

- http://www.design.ncsu.edu/cud/
- http://www.access-board.gov/prowac/

PROPOSED CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT READINESS AND GRANT-SCORE RATIO

A. MAJOR MILESTONES COMPLETED

Up to 4 points are available. SANDAG will score projects based on the project development milestones completed.

- Environmental clearance under CEQA and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) if appropriate is worth one point.
- Completion of right-of-way acquisition, all necessary entitlements, or evidence provided by the applicant that no right-of-way acquisition is required, earns one point.
- Completion of final design (plans, specifications, and estimates) also earns one point.
- One point will be awarded if the applicant can provide evidence that the project is fully funded, OR the grant will fully fund the project.

B. EVIDENCE OF LOCAL COMMITMENT

Up to 2 points are available. The applicant should demonstrate that the project is supported by the community, as a result of a comprehensive public participation process that significantly involved a diverse group of stakeholders.

Projects that can provide evidence of a comprehensive, community-based planning process leading to the project and endorsement of community groups will be awarded 2 points.

Projects that cannot demonstrate that their planning process involved a diverse group of community stakeholders and that the project has the support of some, but not most community groups will receive one point.

Evidence of opposition from individuals within the community will not reduce the points awarded unless there is an ad hoc organization of opposition, or the number of individuals in opposition is significant.

C. GRANT-SCORE RATIO

Up to 16 points are available. The grant-score ratio is scored by dividing the sum of the weighted points earned on the criteria in categories I and II by the grant request. The projects will be ranked based on the resulting ratio and the available 16 points will be distributed proportionately. The project(s) with the highest ratio receives 16 points, and the one(s) with the lowest receives one point.

MATCHING FUNDS

Up to 10 points are available. Points for matching funds are awarded by dividing the total project cost as proposed in the application by the grant request. The projects will be ranked based on the resulting ratio and the available 10 points distributed proportionately. The project(s) with the highest ratio receives 10 points, and those with the lowest receive one point.

SANDAG BOARD POLICY NO 033 POINTS FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING PRODUCTION

Up to 75 points are available. See Board Policy No.033 for detailed methodology.
## TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program
### Capital Project Scoring Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>Pts.</th>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>POINTS POSSIBLE</th>
<th>WEIGHT</th>
<th>SCORE POSSIBLE</th>
<th>%(^1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION CHARACTERISTICS OF THE AREA AROUND THE PROPOSED CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>Intensity of Planned Development in the Project’s Smart Growth Opportunity Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Planned Densities Relative To SGOA Place Type Thresholds</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>For Metropolitan Centers/Urban Centers/Town Centers Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 100% or more</td>
<td>Up to 6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 50-99%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 25-49%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 100% or more</td>
<td>AND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 50-99%</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 25-49%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>For Community Centers/Rural Village/Mixed-Use Transit Corridor Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 100% or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 50-99%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 25-49%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>Expedited Approval Process</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Specific plan, master EIR, or other mechanism allows for administrative approval of development projects</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^1\) Percentages are rounded to the nearest whole number.
### TransNet SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM DRAFT CRITERIA – CAPITAL GRANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B.</th>
<th>EXISTING and ENTITLED Land Development Around the Proposed Capital Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>EXISTING Development Density within ¼ mile radius of proposed capital project site – ON THE GROUND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For Metropolitan Centers/Urban Centers/Town Centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 100% or more 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 50-99% 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 25-49% 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 100% or more 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 50-99% 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 25-49% 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For Community Centers/Rural Village/Mixed-Use Transit Corridor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 100% or more 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 50-99% 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 25-49% 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| B2 | ENTITLED Development Density within ¼ mile radius of proposed capital project site – IN THE PIPELINE |
|    | For Metropolitan Centers/Urban Centers/Town Centers                      |
|    | Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 100% or more 3               |
|    | Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 50-99% 2                    |
|    | Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 25-49% 1                    |
|    | AND                                                                      |
|    | Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 100% or more 3               |
|    | Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 50-99% 2                     |
|    | Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 25-49% 1                     |
|    | OR                                                                      |
|    | For Community Centers/Rural Village/Mixed-Use Transit Corridor          |
|    | Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 100% or more 6              |
|    | Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 50-99% 4                    |
|    | Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 25-49% 2                    |
### TransNet SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM DRAFT CRITERIA – CAPITAL GRANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B3</th>
<th>Mix of Uses</th>
<th>(Single-family residential, retail, office, civic, parks, visitor w/in ¼ mile of project site)</th>
<th>Up to 3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>2%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Multi-family residential + 6 other uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Multi-family residential + 4-5 other uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Multi-family residential + 2-3 other uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| B4 | New Use | New use will be added to the project area | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1% |

| C. | New Affordable Housing Development | | | | | |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C1</th>
<th>New Affordable Housing</th>
<th>% of income-restricted affordable housing provided in proposed new development (within ¼ mile of project site)</th>
<th>Up to 3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>2%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>100% of units affordable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>99-75% of units affordable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>74-25% of units affordable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| C2 | Low to very-low income affordable units | 50-100% of units in the development are restricted to low to very-low income residents | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1% |

| D. | Transportation Characteristics (within walking and biking distance of proposed capital project) | | | | | |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D1</th>
<th>Relation to Transit</th>
<th>Scale of actual walking distance to existing or programmed station or transit hub:</th>
<th>Up to 12</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>4%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Regional station or Corridor station or a Transit Center – Project abuts or is onsite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Project is within ½ mile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Transit hub – Project is within ¼ mile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Stop with high frequency local bus service (15 mins, all day) – Project is within ¼ mile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

2 Transit station or hub qualifies if corresponding implementation or construction funding has been programmed in the RTIP.
3 Transit hub will be defined as an intersection of three or more bus routes, where at least one route has a minimum scheduled headway of 15 minutes from 7 a.m. to 7 p.m.
4 Regional service is defined as COASTER or freeway-based Bus Rapid Transit.
5 Corridor service is defined as SPRINT, Trolley, and arterial-based Rapid Bus.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D2</th>
<th>Bicycle Facilities</th>
<th>EXISTING bicycle lanes, bike boulevards, cycle tracks, or separated bike paths (Class I), or PLANNED bicycle lanes, bike boulevards, cycle tracks, or separated bike paths (Class I) (as identified in San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan or local bicycle master plan)</th>
<th>Up to 2</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>2%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct connection to proposed project Facilities within ¼ mile radius of project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3</td>
<td>Walkability</td>
<td>Intersection Density per square mile: 290 or greater 225-290 100-224 Less than 100</td>
<td>Up to 4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4</td>
<td>TDM Strategies</td>
<td>EXISTING TDM programs or policies in place PROPOSED TDM programs or policies, including implementation strategy</td>
<td>Up to 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.</td>
<td>Community Design Features</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1</td>
<td>Urban Design Characteristics and Community Context</td>
<td>Design characteristics of existing community, AND/OR proposed design characteristics prescribed by documented guidance for the area or jurisdiction through design guidelines, form-based codes, or renderings of proposed development; area will be assessed relative to the following sections in Designing for Smart Growth: Consistent Street Edge (Smart Growth Scorecard) Street Frontages (Smart Growth Scorecard) Connectivity (3.4 in Chapter 3 Site Design) Site Access (3.3 in Chapter 3 Site Design) Parking (Chapter 9 Parking) Building Frontage (4.1 in Chapter 4 Building Design)</td>
<td>Up to 6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## II. QUALITY OF PROPOSED CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>Support for Public Transit</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>How well does the project support use of regional public transit service in the project area?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>Providing Transportation Choices</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>How well does the project support transportation choices that would reduce vehicle miles traveled, specifically walking and bicycling?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>Community Enhancement</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>How well does the proposed project enhance the public realm in the project area, to engender support for smart growth, through place making and creating regional destinations?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>Addressing Project Area Issues</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>How well does the project address identified special needs and concerns of the community, such as improving access for elderly, disabled, or low-mobility populations or increasing public safety? How well does the project preserve and appropriately integrate cultural and natural resources in the project area?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.</td>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>How well does the proposed project incorporate Green Streets/Low-Impact Development principles, to address stormwater runoff, energy conservation, and landscaping/street trees?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.</td>
<td>Universal Design</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>How well does the project incorporate Universal Design principles, to ensure access for users of all ages and abilities?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## III. PROJECT READINESS

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>Major Milestones Completed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Environmental Clearance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Right-of-way Acquisition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Final Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Project Fully Funded (matching funds secured OR grant will fully fund project)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>Evidence of Local Commitment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Project is supported by the community, and is the result of a comprehensive public participation process that significantly involved a diverse group of stakeholders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## IV. COST EFFECTIVENESS

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ratio of grant request to project score</td>
<td>Project grant request, divided by score up to this point; ranked relative to each other</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## V. MATCHING FUNDS

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relative amount of match</td>
<td>All projects scored on a curve, from most to least matching funds</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## VI. POLICY NO. 033 POINTS

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL PROJECT SCORE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SCORING AND SELECTION PROCESS

After applications have been received and reviewed for eligibility by SANDAG staff, proposed projects will be scored and selected according to the processes outlined below.

SCORING

The proposed projects will be scored by a scoring panel consisting of SANDAG staff, Caltrans, and a member(s) of the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG) and/or the Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) from jurisdictions that have not submitted applications for funding under the current grant cycle. Panel members may not have had prior involvement in any of the submitted projects, nor may they (nor the jurisdictions they represent) receive compensation for work on any of the funded projects in the future. The scoring criteria are specified in the Project Scoring Criteria Guidance and Scoring Matrix in the next section.

Applicants will be asked to prepare and deliver presentations regarding their proposed projects at a public workshop consisting of the scoring panel and members of the Regional Planning Technical Working Group and the Cities/County Transportation Advisory. Applicants will be notified of the presentation date.

SELECTION

Once all submitted projects have been scored, SANDAG staff will present a list of proposed projects to the SANDAG Regional Planning Committee for recommendation to the SANDAG Board of Directors.
SCORING CRITERIA GUIDANCE

HOW WILL PROJECTS BE SCORED?

Once a project has been deemed eligible, it will be scored based on the criteria for its project type. Because the planning activities and capital improvements are very different, each will be scored under its own set of criteria. The project scoring criteria for planning projects are discussed in detail below.

1. RELATIONSHIP TO REGIONAL TRANSIT

Up to 5 points are available. Transit Infrastructure and Service within the Smart Growth Opportunity Area will be scored as indicated below.

- SGOAs with existing regional or corridor transit infrastructure (5 points)
- SGOAs with programmed regional or corridor transit infrastructure or existing high frequency local transit infrastructure and service (3 points)
- SGOAs with planned regional or corridor transit infrastructure, or programmed or planned high frequency local transit infrastructure and service (1 point)

Note: Rural Villages are not scored on this criterion because the place type does not require transit service. Consequently, Rural Village scores will be normalized to the total 200 points available to other place types.

2. SMART GROWTH DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL

Up to 5 points are available. Evidence of opportunities to develop smart growth plans or projects in the proposed planning area: Can the area appropriately accommodate smart growth? Is there land available for redevelopment or rezoning? Would the existing urban form support smart growth development? How well does the proposed planning effort support development at or above the intensity of use targets for the area’s smart growth place type?

3. PLANNING PROJECT GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Up to 6.67 points are available. How well do the proposed project objectives support smart growth development in the project area? Would the plan result in development that increases transportation and housing choices?

4. METHOD TO ACCOMPLISH THE SGIP PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

Up to 6 points are available. How does the proposed project plan to accomplish stated objectives? How well does the proposed project scope of work facilitate meeting project objectives? Does the scope of work include significant public outreach?

5. IMPLEMENTATION

Up to 7 points are available. Will the proposed planning process lead to timely change in the project area? Is the planning process ready to go? Will it result in regulatory mechanisms that facilitate smart growth or lead directly to an implementable development or capital project? In particular, is a plan in place, or will the project develop a plan that will facilitate smart growth development through a master EIR or other mechanism that allows for administrative approval of development projects? Does the plan area include significant environmental concerns that may delay or prevent successful implementation of the plan? How will the public participation process significantly involve a diverse group of stakeholders and help develop consensus for smart growth?
6. **EVIDENCE OF LOCAL COMMITMENT AND COMMUNITY SUPPORT**

Up to 2.5 points are available. How has the jurisdiction or agency demonstrated a commitment to implement smart growth? This commitment may be demonstrated through existing ordinances, policies, or incentives. Is the proposed planning project supported by the community?

7. **MATCHING FUNDS**

Points for matching funds are awarded by dividing the total project cost as proposed in the application by the grant request. The projects will be ranked based on the resulting ratio and the available 20 points will be distributed proportionately. The project(s) with the highest ratio will receive 20 points, and the project(s) with the lowest ratio will receive one point.

8. **POLICY NO.033 POINTS**

Up to 50 points are available. See Board Policy No.033 for detailed methodology.
### FY 11-12-13 PLANNING GRANTS PROJECT
#### SCORING CRITERIA MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>POINTS POSSIBLE</th>
<th>WEIGHT MULTIPLIER</th>
<th>TOTAL POINTS POSSIBLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Relationship to Regional Transit</td>
<td>Is the transit infrastructure and service within the SGOA existing, programmed or planned?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Smart Growth Development Potential</td>
<td>Evidence of opportunities to develop smart growth plans or projects in the proposed planning area</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Proposed Project Goals and Objectives</td>
<td>How well do the proposed project objectives support smart growth development in the project area? Would the plan result in development that increases transportation and housing choices?</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Method to Accomplish Program Objectives</td>
<td>How does the proposed project plan to accomplish stated objectives? How well does the scope of work facilitate meeting project objectives and include public outreach?</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Is the project ready to go, will it result in specific implementation actions such as zoning changes or a master EIR?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Evidence of Local Commitment/Community Support</td>
<td>How has the applicant demonstrated a commitment to implement smart growth? (ordinances, policies, incentives)? How will the plan process engage the community?</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Matching Funds</td>
<td>Points awarded in proportion to the percentage of proposed matching funds to total project cost.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Policy No.033 Points</td>
<td>Points are awarded per jurisdiction based upon the methodology adopted in Policy No.033</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL POINTS POSSIBLE 200**
SAN DIEGO FORWARD: THE REGIONAL PLAN: DEVELOPMENT OF DRAFT POLICY OBJECTIVE TOPIC AREAS

Introduction

On May 10, 2013, the Board of Directors approved the vision and goals for San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan. An initial list of policy objective areas also was presented to the Board. The Regional Planning Committee is asked to discuss and provide additional input into the development of the draft policy objective topic areas.

Background

A key component in setting the foundation for San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan is the development of a clear vision statement, goals, and policy objectives for the plan. Vision statements are typically aspirational. Next, the role of goals is to put a finer point on the vision and to set in motion the actions needed to achieve it. Finally, policy objectives are more action-oriented, specific, and measurable, providing more detail on how to achieve the goals.

The vision for San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan, as approved by the Board, is:

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.
After weighing goal options developed by staff, the Board refined one of those options and approved the following goals:

The approved goals represent the major policy areas to be covered in the plan, as follows:

- “Healthy Environment and Communities” includes healthy, walkable, bikeable and vibrant communities with a variety of housing choices, access to goods, services, recreation and jobs as well as well-preserved open space, natural topography, agricultural lands and rural areas.

- The “Vibrant Economy” goal is designed to include jobs, trade, borders and goods movement, and the components of our region that foster and advance our economy.

- “Innovative Mobility and Planning” includes the transportation network and the planning decisions that are made at the regional level. This goal also includes preservation of our existing system along with a transportation network that is open to new ideas and that can continue to expand mobility options.

**Draft Policy Objective Topic Areas**

The potential topics that could be developed into subsequent policy objectives include (in no particular order) the following:

- Mobility choices
- Walkable, bikeable, healthy and safe communities
- Habitat and open space preservation
- International trade and goods movement
- Partnerships with Native American tribes, U.S. Military, Mexico, neighboring counties
- Variety of jobs
- Variety of housing choices
- Public health
- Access to goods, services, education, and recreation
- Preservation and safety of the transportation system
- Managing the demand on the transportation system
- Emerging technologies
- Clean air and water
- Energy reliability
- Climate change and adaptation
- Shoreline preservation
- Coordination with infrastructure and service providers, educational institutions, community-based organizations, and the private sector
Next Steps

On June 7, 2013, the Transportation Committee also will be asked to discuss and provide input on the policy objective topics. Additionally, feedback will be collected from the public at the ongoing public outreach series focusing on the policy areas of the plan. With this input, staff will develop proposed policy objectives and will present them to the Board of Directors for discussion in July 2013. The policy objectives will provide the framework for more detailed implementation actions, which will be developed in a later phase of the planning process.

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

Key Staff Contact: Phil Trom, (619) 699-7330, phil.trom@sandag.org
Department of Defense
Office of Economic Adjustment
Compatible Use Program

Joint Land Use Study

A Tool to Promote Compatible Use
and
Military Mission Sustainment
The Office of Economic Adjustment (OEA), in coordination with other resources of the Federal Government, will assist states and communities to:

- Plan and carry out local adjustment strategies;
- Engage the private sector in ventures to plan and undertake community economic development and base redevelopment; and
- Work with the Military Departments in support of DoD’s missions.

Directs Defense Economic Adjustment Program on behalf of the Office of the Secretary of Defense and staffs the Economic Adjustment Committee

Functions as an Independent Defense Field Activity to provide technical and financial assistance to eligible state and local governments
Defense Economic Adjustment Program

- OEA manages on behalf of the Office of the Secretary of Defense

- Program created to help state and local governments plan and carry out adjustment and diversification programs in response to major Defense actions, including:
  - Base closures or realignments
  - Base expansions
  - DoD Personnel reductions
  - Industry/contractor reductions
  - *Operational/training impacts, civilian encroachment upon a military installation likely to impair continued operational utility of the installation*
Collaboration Needed to Promote Compatible Use

- Military installations, ranges, and military training routes play a vital role in national defense in support of military testing, training and base support operations.

- Military installations serve as major economic engines accounting for thousands of jobs and billions in economic activity.

- Pressures from incompatible civilian development can create restrictions on use of installations, ranges and training corridors.

- Incompatible civilian development can also threaten public safety, exposing population to artillery fire, aircraft noise, dust, and even accidents.

- State and local governments share, with the federal government, inherent responsibilities to support national defense.¹

- Need for state and local governments to play strong role in supporting DoD missions.¹

Compatible Use Issues

- Air Space and Land Restrictions
- Airborne Noise
- Urban Growth
- Spectrum Encroachment
- Endangered Species/Critical Habitat
- Energy Compatibility and Availability
- Air Quality
- Water
- Cultural Resources
- UXO and Munitions
- Marine Resources
- Security
- Natural Factors and Climate
Impacts to Training and Operations

- Reduces usage days
- Prohibits certain operational, training and testing events
- Reduces range access
- Segments training and reduces realism
- Limits new technologies
- Restricts flight altitudes
- Inhibits new tactics development
- Reduces live fire proficiency
- Complicates night and all weather operations and training
- Increases personnel tempo
- Increases costs or risks
Shared Compatibility Issues

- Commercial Development
- Population Encroachment
- Maritime Needs
- Light Pollution
- Mission Realignment & Consolidation
- Dust & Smoke
- Air Quality
- Endangered Species and Provision of Wildlife Habitat
- Radio Frequency Needs
- Noise Generation & Abatement
- Radio Frequency Requirements
- Munitions Constituents
- Military Airspace
- Need for Water
- Wilderness Designations
- Commercial Airspace
- Alternative Energy Sources
DoD Definitions: Incompatible Development

• Incompatible civilian development defined as land use activity and civilian development activity that adversely affects the utility or training and readiness missions of a military installation.¹

• Encroachment defined as external influences threatening or constraining range and operating area activities required for force readiness and weapons research development testing and evaluation. It can include, but is not limited to, endangered species and critical habitat, unexploded ordnance and munitions, electronic frequency spectrum, maritime, airspace restrictions, air quality, airborne noise, and urban growth.²

¹DoD Instruction 3030.3, Joint Land Use Study Program
²DoD Directive 3200.15, Sustainment of Ranges and Operating Areas
DoD shall take the leadership role in assisting State and local governments in preventing the encroachment of civilian communities from impairing the operational utility of military installations.¹

It is DoD policy to work toward achieving compatibility between military installations and neighboring civilian communities by a joint compatible land use planning and control process conducted by the local community in cooperation with the local military installation.²

¹ DoD Instruction 5410.12, “Economic Adjustment Assistance to Defense-Impacted Communities,” reissued July 5, 2006
² DoD Instruction 3030.3, “Joint Land Use Study Program (JLUS),” July 13, 2004
OEA Program Authorities for Compatible Use

- 10 USC 2391(b)(1)
- Executive Order 12788, as amended, “Defense Economic Adjustment Program”
- DoD Directive 3030.01, “Office of Economic Adjustment (OEA)”
- DoD Directive 5410.12, “Economic Adjustment Assistance to Defense-Impacted Communities”
- DoD Instruction 3030.3, “Joint Land Use Study Program (JLUS)”
OEA provides **technical and financial assistance** to state and local governments to undertake a Joint Land Use Study (JLUS) and carry out the recommendations.

- **Cooperative effort** between the Military and jurisdictions surrounding installations, ranges and/or military training corridors to plan and carry out strategies promoting compatible civilian development.
- Initiated upon a **Military Department nomination**.
- Based upon Military Departments’ **technical data describing the military missions and operations**.
- Serves as **comprehensive strategic plan** with specific implementation actions to address and prevent incompatible civilian development that could impair the operational utility of military missions or impact available resources, i.e. air, land, water, and electromagnetic spectrum.
- JLUS process **promotes open, continuous dialogue** between the Military, surrounding jurisdictions, and states to support long-term sustainability and operability of military missions.
Military Operations Footprint Defines Study Area

- Air Installations Compatible Use Zones (AICUZ) Program
  - Clear Zone
  - Accident Potential Zones (APZ 1 and APZ 2)
  - Noise Contours
  - Land Use Compatibility Guidelines for Clear Zone and APZs

- Range Compatible Use Zones Program (RCUZ)

- Range Air Installations Compatible Use Zones Program (RAICUZ)

- Operational Noise Management Program

- Encroachment Action Plan (EAP), Encroachment Control Plan (ECP) and Installation Complex Encroachment Management Action Plan (ICEMAP)

Under these programs, the Military Departments develop technical information and maps indicating areas of military operations to support the JLUS planning process.
JLUS: The Installation Role

- Recommend and support JLUS nomination
- Represent installation interests
- Coordinate updates and integrate Military Department studies to define the military mission footprint
- Provide leadership, guidance, and technical support to the JLUS Policy Committee and Technical Advisory Committees
- Provide data and information to study
- Installation Commander, or designated senior leader, participates on JLUS Policy Committee as Ex-Officio member
- Provide comments on study drafts
Sponsor the JLUS effort
Administer the OEA grant
Fund its part of the JLUS effort (10% non-Federal match)
Provide staff time & expertise
Provide the leadership to complete JLUS
Ensure broad based community input and participation
Engage diverse group of stakeholders
Provide public information
Identify issues and opportunities
Resolve issues
Implement JLUS recommendations
  • Seek and coordinate Federal, State, local and private resources
JLUS: OEA Role

- Confirm need for JLUS
- Provide guidance to initiate, conduct and complete a community-driven JLUS
- Provide technical assistance to the local jurisdiction and installation
- Provide funding assistance to the local jurisdiction to prepare a JLUS and implement recommendations
- Facilitate communications between the local jurisdiction and the installation
JLUS Planning Process

Organize  Plan  Implement  Monitor

Continuous Dialogue and Sharing of Information
Responsibilities

- Control
- Coordination
- Accountability
- Grant Management
- Policy Direction
- Study Design/ Oversight
- Budget Approval
- Monitoring
- Report Adoption
- Technical Issues
- Alternatives
- Report Development
- Recommendations

Participants

- Council of Government
- Local or State Government
- Airport Authority
- Economic Development Entity
- City Officials
- County Officials
- Base Leadership
- Private Sector Leaders
- State Officials
- Local and Base Planners
- Community Staff
- Business Representatives
- Residents
- Conservation Organizations
- Homebuilders Association
- Board of Realtors
JLUS: Implementation Tools & Actions

- Establish Military Influence Area or Overlay District
- Small Area Plans
- Amend land use, zoning, subdivision, site plan and/or building code regulations (sound attenuation)
- Unified Development Ordinance
- Establish Joint Airport Zoning Board
- Real estate disclosure
- Modify Capital Improvement Plans
- Transfer/purchase of development rights
- Purchase avigation/conservation buffer easements
- Land acquisition/lease
- State legislation to support compatible development
JLUS: Implementation Tools & Actions

- **Fairchild AFB, WA**
  - Developed model Comprehensive Plan goals and policies
  - County and Cities adopted JLUS Implementing Ordinance

- **Camp Rilea, OR**
  - Sub-Area Plan to address residential densities, access control, beach and trail management, water quality issues, and utility extensions

- **NAS Oceana, VA**
  - State legislation to expand real estate disclosure and noise level reduction standards
  - AICUZ Overlay Zoning Ordinance to incorporate compatibility criteria
  - City Acquisition Program to “roll back” incompatible development in Clear Zone and APZ 1

- **NSA Panama City, FL**
  - Identified Critical Parcels in Line of Site Corridors
  - Military Influence Overlay District Zoning Ordinance
  - Zoning Standards for Structures in Water
  - Frequency Ordinance for Parcels in Military Influence Areas

- **Malmstrom AFB, MT**
  - Seven County Region Red-Yellow-Green Map to Designate Appropriate Location for Tall Structures and Frequency Generating Facilities (wind turbines, transmission and cell towers)
Contact Information

Amanda Fagan
Project Manager

Office of Economic Adjustment
Western Regional Office
1325 J Street, Suite 1500
Sacramento CA 95814
(916) 557-7365
Amanda.Fagan@wso.whs.mil

www.oea.gov
Siting of wind turbines and solar towers can pose electromagnetic interference and flight safety hazards.

DoD Siting Clearinghouse created to facilitate siting of energy projects while protecting vital test, training and operational assets - [http://www.acq.osd.mil/dodsc/](http://www.acq.osd.mil/dodsc/)

Interim Rule (32 CFR Part 211) published to guide the energy siting review process.

Development of state regulations and local development ordinances can further facilitate siting of energy projects.
Integrating Conservation as a Land Use Alternative

- Community-driven JLUS planning process can support identification of parcels suitable for conservation partnering initiatives

- Role of the Installation’s Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan

- DoD Conservation Partnering Authority
  - Congress authorized agreements in 2002 under 10 U.S.C. § 2684a
  - Readiness and Environmental Protection Integration (REPI)
    [www.repi.mil](http://www.repi.mil)
  - Army Compatible Use Buffer (ACUB)
  - Provides funding to Military Departments to enter into agreements with private conservation organizations, State and local governments
  - Partners use DoD and other public and private sector funds to acquire property or property interests, i.e. conservation easements, from willing sellers to preserve critical buffers and habitat areas near installations and ranges
(b) Adjustment and Diversification Assistance –

(1) The Secretary of Defense may make grants, conclude cooperative agreements, and supplement funds available under Federal programs administered by agencies other than the Department of Defense in order to assist State and local governments in planning community adjustments and economic diversification required by the encroachment of a civilian community on a military installation,

if the Secretary determines that an action described in clause (D) is likely to have a direct and significantly adverse consequence on the affected community or, in the case of an action described in clause (D), if the Secretary determines that the encroachment of the civilian community is likely to impair the continued operational utility of the military installation.

(4)

(A) In the case of a State or local government eligible for assistance under paragraph (1), the Secretary of Defense may also make grants, conclude cooperative agreements, and supplement other Federal funds in order to assist the State or local government to carry out a community adjustment and economic diversification program (including State industrial extension or modernization efforts to facilitate the economic diversification of defense contractors and subcontractors) in addition to planning such a program.

(B) The Secretary shall establish criteria for the selection of community adjustment and economic diversification programs to receive assistance under subparagraph (A). Such criteria shall include a requirement that the State or local government agree – (i) to provide not less than 10 percent of the funding for the program from non-Federal sources

Title 10 USC 2687(e)(1) defines military installation as a base, camp, post, station, base, yard, center, homeport facility for any ship, or other Activity under the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense, including any leased space facility

Title 10 USC 2391 – The term “military installation” means any camp, post, station, base, yard, or other installation under the jurisdiction of a Military department that is located within any of the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or Guam.
Joint Land Use Study Organization
Examples & Considerations

Local Sponsor

• AKA Fiscal Agent
• Roles & Responsibilities
  – Coordination
  – Accountability
  – Grant Management
  – Contract Management
Policy Committee

• AKA Advisory or Executive Committee
• Roles & Responsibilities
  – Policy Direction
  – Project Oversight
  – Monitoring Progress
  – Study Adoption

Technical Committee

• AKA Working Group
• Roles & Responsibilities
  – Provide technical expertise
  – Identify issues
  – Develop and evaluate alternatives
  – Report development
  – Recommendations to Policy Committee
**JLUS Organization**

**Responsibilities**
- Control
- Coordination
- Accountability
- Grant Management
- Policy Direction
- Study Design/Oversight
- Budget Approval
- Monitoring
- Report Adoption
- Technical Issues
- Alternatives
- Report Development
- Recommendations

**Participants**
- Council of Government
- Local or State Government
- Airport Authority
- Economic Development Entity
- City Officials
- County Officials
- Base Leadership
- Private Sector Leaders
- State Officials
- Local and Base Planners
- Community Staff
- Business Representatives
- Residents
- Conservation Organizations
- Homebuilders Association
- Board of Realtors

---

**Policy Committee Formation Considerations**

- **Composition**
  - Participating Jurisdictions, Agencies, and/or Stakeholders
- **Decision-making**
  - Voting vs. Consensus-based
  - Chair/Vice-Chair vs. Facilitator from Consultant Team
- **Establishment**
  - Formal Agreement, such as Joint Powers Agreement
  - Resolutions by Participating Jurisdictions
- **Member Appointment**
  - Appointed by Local Sponsor
  - Appointed by Respective Jurisdiction
Potential Stakeholders

• Military
• Cities, Counties & Special Districts in Study Area
• State agencies and legislative representatives, i.e. OPR, PUC, DOT, others
• Federal agencies, i.e. BLM, FAA, USFWS, USFS...
• Tribal Governments
• Neighborhood Associations
• Building Industry Associations
• Environmental and Conservation Groups
• Realtor Associations
• Military Affairs Committees
• Chambers of Commerce
• Farm Bureau/Agriculture & Ranching Groups
• Land Owners & Area Residents
• Recreational Users
• Energy Developers / Transmission Line Authorities
• Major industries and businesses in the Study Area
• Others...

Public Outreach

• Committee Members reach back to their respective constituencies
• Public Workshops/Meetings/Open Houses
• Brochures or other publications
• Media outreach
• Stakeholder interviews
• Mailings to property owners and residents
• Educational efforts
• Cast a wide net!
For more information

http://www.oea.gov

Office of Economic Adjustment
Western Regional Office
1325 J Street, Suite 1500
Sacramento CA 95814
(916) 557-7365
### Remaining Workshops

**Evening Community Workshops**

**North County Inland**  
**June 13, 6 to 8 p.m.**  
Escondido City Hall, Mitchell Room  
201 North Broadway, Escondido

**North County Coastal**  
**June 20, 6 to 8 p.m.**  
Oceanside City Hall Community Rooms  
300 North Coast Highway, Oceanside

**East County**  
**June 27, 6 to 8 p.m.**  
La Mesa Community Center,  
Arbor View Room  
4975 Memorial Drive, La Mesa

**Weekday Central Workshops**

**June 21** – Focused discussions on land use and transportation

**July 19** – Focused discussions on economic prosperity, public facilities, and borders

**All weekday workshops from 11:30 a.m. to 1:30 p.m.**  
**Caltrans District 11**  
Garcia Room & Gallegos Room  
4050 Taylor Street, San Diego
FY 2013 TransNet
SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM
FUNDING RECOMMENDATIONS
June 7, 2013

Funding Availability

• Available funding: $9.6 million
• At least 80 percent for capital projects: $7.68 million
• Up to 20 percent for planning projects: $1.92 million
• Received 29 eligible applications
  • 15 capital projects
  • 14 planning projects

Imperial Beach Palm Avenue Corridor Plan
# Capital Projects Recommended for Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Recommended Funding Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fully funded projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>Armorlite Complete Street Corridor</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National City</td>
<td>Downtown-Westside Community Connections</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Mesa</td>
<td>Downtown Village Streetscape Improvement</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Island Avenue Green Street Mobility</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially funded projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Wayfinding Signage</td>
<td>$335,329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>Third Avenue Streetscape Implementation</td>
<td>$1,344,671</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Recommended Funding:** $7,680,000

---

# Planning Projects Recommended for Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Recommended Funding Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fully funded projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>East Village Green / 14th Street Promenade Master Plan</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Morena Boulevard Station Area Study Phase 2</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista</td>
<td>Vista Downtown Specific Plan Update</td>
<td>$148,383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemon Grove</td>
<td>Main Street Promenade Extension Planning Project</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>Healthy Communities Program</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Beach</td>
<td>Palm Avenue Mixed-use &amp; Commercial Corridor Master Plan</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially funded projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>The Complete Boulevard Planning Study</td>
<td>$171,617</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Recommended Funding:** $1,920,000
Recommendation

The Regional Planning Committee is asked to recommend that the Board of Directors approve for funding the Smart Growth Incentive Program FY 2013 cycle list of recommended projects as shown in Attachment 1.
Policy Objective Topic Areas
June 7, 2013

Our Regional Plans
Vision and Goals

ADOPTED VISION
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.

ADOPTED GOALS

Vision, Goals, and Policy Objectives
Policy Objective Topic Areas

- Mobility choices
- Walkable, bikeable, healthy, and safe communities
- Habitat and open space preservation
- International trade
- Partnerships
- Variety of jobs
- Housing choices
- Public health
- Access to goods, services, education, and recreation
- System preservation and safety
- Demand management
- Emerging technologies
- Clean air and water
- Energy reliability
- Climate change and adaptation
- Shoreline preservation
- Infrastructure coordination

Public Input On Healthy Environment, Energy, Climate Change, and Public Health

- The ability to walk and bike safely is important
- Build more infrastructure to support electric vehicles
- Include safety in neighborhood design to encourage more walkable communities
- Energy efficiency should be a priority in making communities more self-sufficient
- Create open spaces and trails for residents in developed areas
- Prepare for the impacts of climate change
Next Steps

- **May/June/July** – Public Workshops
- **June 7** – Input from Transportation and Regional Planning Committees
- **July 12** – Board of Directors discussion
- **Fall 2013** – Develop performance measures
- **2014** – Implementation actions

Policy Objective Topic Areas

- Mobility choices
- Walkable, bikeable, healthy, and safe communities
- Habitat and open space preservation
- International trade
- Partnerships
- Variety of jobs
- Housing choices
- Public health
- Access to goods, services, education, and recreation
- System preservation and safety
- Demand management
- Emerging technologies
- Clean air and water
- Energy reliability
- Climate change and adaptation
- Shoreline preservation
- Infrastructure coordination
Honorable Mayor Mary Sessom (Chair) and SANDAG Regional Planning Committee Members
SANDAG
410 B Street
San Diego, CA 92101

June 7, 2013

Subject: San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan and Development of Draft Policy Objective Topic Areas

Dear Chair Sessom and Regional Planning Committee Members:

The Nature Conservancy (TNC) has participated in SANDAG’s Public Involvement Plan/Process for obtaining public input to assist with the preparation of the next iteration of its Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS). Previously, SANDAG had committed to integrate the state-mandated RTP/SCS with its Regional Comprehensive Plan, a non-regulatory, regional planning document, and the joint document will be “San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan.” The SANDAG Board of Directors has approved three overarching goals for the Regional Plan: Healthy Environment and Community, Vibrant Economy, and Innovative Mobility and Planning.

Based on public input, SANDAG staff has identified nearly 20 potential topics that may be developed into subsequent policy objectives to assist with preparation of “San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan” and to meet those goals. Potential policy objectives include but are not limited to creating a variety of jobs and housing - and healthy and safe communities; managing transportation demand; clean air and water; and addressing climate change and adaptation.

In addition to those topics, TNC strongly recommends that SANDAG add “Urban Green Infrastructure” as a policy objective. Green infrastructure is the practice of utilizing the functions of the natural environment – and the retention or restoration of key natural processes – to enhance land use planning. Green infrastructure is an established approach that can produce substantial public health and air/water quality, energy reduction and other environmental benefits. Integrating “green” mitigation and adaptation measures to address climate change in the Regional Plan can be translated into ecosystem benefits with dollar values for the region (see “The Value of Green Infrastructure for Urban Climate Adaptation” http://www.cakex.org/sites/default/files/Green_Infrastructure_FINAL.pdf). A green infrastructure policy will help integrate greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reduction measures and climate change adaptation opportunities across our three major land uses – buildings, transportation, and open space. Those measures should also include performance-based metrics and a process to assess implementation compliance and effectiveness.

The Nature Conservancy believes that local governments represent the fundamental level at which many critical climate change mitigation (i.e., GHG emission reductions) and adaptation actions must occur. Vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and buildings (energy use) represent the largest sources of GHG emissions, and the decisions that local governments make to reduce those components will largely
determine whether the State of California will meet its GHG emission reduction and adaptation goals as expressed in AB 32, SB 375, Executive Orders S-3-05 and S-13-08 and other laws and orders.

TNC supports the efforts of other organizations and groups that are working to develop transportation/VMT and building energy use reductions approaches measures for inclusion in the Regional Plan. Where TNC can provide valuable assistance to SANDAG is in the area of green infrastructure policies and planning to prioritize “green over grey infrastructure” choices. Our staff is available to work with SANDAG and interested organizations to develop a green infrastructure policy that integrates with transportation and building policies, and other policies that may be included in the Regional Plan. We recommend the Regional Plan provide the policy framework and actionable mitigation and adaptation measures that local jurisdictions will include (modified as necessary to meet local conditions) in their individual general plans and climate plans. The Regional Plan should include development and selection of a land use alternative capable of attaining the levels of GHG reductions that conform to the state’s goals and that the local jurisdictions can and will implement to achieve the region’s goals for “Healthy Environment and Community, Vibrant Economy, and Innovative Mobility and Planning.”

Please feel free to have SANDAG staff contact me at btippets@tnc.org or (619) 822-4323 to discuss our comments in greater detail and provide additional information.

Sincerely,

Bill Tippets
Senior Project Director
The Nature Conservancy

cc: Councilman Todd Gloria (Chair) and SANDAG Transportation Committee
directly with officials responsible for zoning and land use policies affecting military installations. Private conservators — both national conservation groups and local land trusts — offer other advantages. Many conservators have conservation plans identifying regions and parcels of interest to them in the vicinity of military installations. They can also respond more quickly to land acquisition opportunities than can DoD and may be able to leverage other private and public sources of funds that are targeted to acquiring real estate interests in lands with conservation value.

This new DoD authority to partner with governmental and non-governmental conservation organizations is an important tool in an encroachment prevention toolbox.

By leveraging the AICUZ, JILUS and conservation partnering authority, a better balance in what once were conflicting public objectives can be achieved.

This is the fifth and most recent DoD program designed to respond to civilian encroachment of incompatible development near military installations.

Most military installations were originally located in remote areas, distant from urban areas due largely to the availability of land and for defense and security purposes. Over time however, installations drew people and businesses closer and closer to take advantage of civilian job opportunities offered by the installation and to provide the goods and services to support the installation’s operations. As urban growth and development increased near and around military installations land use conflicts between base operations and civilian development increased.

Military operations can be loud and can present safety concerns for nearby civilian communities. For example, low flying, high performance military aircraft create both noise and accident potential during landings, take-off, and training exercises. Likewise, ground-training exercises (e.g., artillery firing ranges, maneuver areas, and aerial bombing ranges) generate impact noise that can adversely affect the surrounding community if the civilian population chooses to locate too closely.

Conversely, urban development near the perimeter of active military bases can impact operational effectiveness, training, and readiness missions. If allowed to go unregulated, incompatible development may compromise the utility and effectiveness of a military installation and its mission. For example, certain types of land use activities, such as homes, places of assembly (i.e., schools or religious centers), childcare centers, nursing homes, hospitals, restaurants, theaters, shopping centers, etc. often are not compatible uses/activities if located close to military operations.

When people and communities are exposed to irritating noise and accident potential, they seek relief. Typically this results in public pressure on the military base commander to modify or curtail operations or transfer activities to other installations. Mission constraints can lead to base closure.

The commensurate reduction in installation personnel and mission activities can have a direct and detrimental effect on the jurisdiction through reduced economic activity and loss of jobs, impacting the local tax base and economic health. The extent of urban encroachment impacting the operational utility of an installation is one consideration in determining the future viability of an installation.

Is Smart Planning an Option? Through joint, cooperative military and community planning, growth conflicts can be anticipated, identified, and prevented. These actions help protect the installation’s military mission, and the public health, safety, quality of life and community economic stability.

The Department of Defense (DoD) supports several programs designed to provide technical information on noise and aircraft accident potential that communities can use to regulate urban encroachment while promoting economic growth and development.

---

1The term Urban Development as used here includes all forms of civilian development be it urban, suburban, exurban or rural in character.
The Air and/or Range Air Installation Compatible Use Zone (AICUZ/RAICUZ) and the Operational Noise Management Programs (ONMP): In the mid-1970's, the DoD established programs in response to the existing and potential threat of incompatible land development compromising the defense missions at military installations. These programs are designed to promote compatible development on and off military bases and include noise propagation studies of military activities to delineate on- and off-base areas most likely to be affected by unacceptable noise levels. The programs also identify aircraft landing and take-off accident potential zones that often extend from a base into the neighboring community. AICUZ/RAICUZ/ONMP studies are based on sophisticated, computer-based noise models, Federal Aviation Administration guidelines, DoD Directives, and community land use planning principles and practices.

Joint Land Use Study (JLUS) Program: In 1985, Congress authorized the Department of Defense (DoD) to make community planning assistance grants under Title 10 U.S.C. Section 2391 to State and local governments to help better understand and incorporate the technical data from the AICUZ/RAICUZ/ONMP into local planning programs. The Office of Economic Adjustment (OEA) manages the JLUS program.

**JLUS Program Purpose:** A JLUS is a cooperative land use planning effort between affected local government and the military installation. The recommendations presented a rationale and justification for the program, and provide a policy framework to support adoption and implementation of compatible development measures designed to prevent urban encroachment; safeguard the military mission; and protect the public health, safety, and welfare.

**JLUS Implementation Measures:** JLUS recommendations may involve revisions to the community’s comprehensive plan and traditional land use and development controls, such as zoning, subdivision regulations, structural height restrictions, and promotion of planned unit development concepts. Additional actions may include amending local building codes to require increased sound attenuation in existing and new buildings, land exchanges, transfer of development rights, and real estate disclosure.

**JLUS Project Initiation:** When a Military Service believes an installation may be experiencing encroachment problems or that there is the likelihood for encroachment that could adversely affect the military mission, the Service may nominate the installation for a JLUS to OEA. OEA staff visits the installation, meets with the local base command and local government officials. OEA will evaluate existing or potential encroachment problems, the availability of AICUZ/RAICUZ/ONMP information, and local development controls to determine if a JLUS is justified. A JLUS will proceed if there is both base command and local jurisdiction interest.

**JLUS assistance normally is technical, but can include funding as well, through a Community Planning Assistance Grant.**

**OEA Community Planning Assistance Grant:** The financial incentive for the community is a cost-shared Community Planning Assistance Grant to support the cost of a JLUS. OEA makes the grant to a sponsoring jurisdiction.

**Study Sponsor:** Normally the local governing body with land development regulatory oversight serves as the sponsor, but it can be a State governmental organization, an airport authority, community planning office, regional planning agency, or a qualified council of governments.

The sponsor, working with OEA and the military base, develops a scope of work, outlines the study contents, including goals and objectives, phases of the study, methods of public involvement, and implementation plan. The proposal also includes an estimate of the cost to produce the study, and the amount of local funds or in-kind resources that will be pledged by the sponsor. In-house staff can do the work or it can be a contracted effort with a consultant qualified in land use planning, zoning and environmental (principally noise) issues. Typically, OEA funding assistance is on a matching dollar for dollar basis. A typical JLUS can cost between $75,000 and $350,000 depending on the complexity of the issues involved. OEA can contribute up to 90 percent of the cost to produce a JLUS. However, not all JLUS efforts require planning grants.

OEA technical assistance is available to help with the preparation of the scope of services and grant application; to provide technical support and guidance during the JLUS; and to serve as liaison between the Military Department and the sponsoring jurisdiction, if needed.

**Consensus:** An important ingredient of a successful JLUS is building community consensus. If the JLUS is to have positive results, the participating jurisdiction and military installation must agree to make a good faith pledge to implement development controls to achieve compatibility.

**Program Experience:** A JLUS is usually completed in 12 months, although the degree of coordination and complexity may require more or less time to achieve the necessary community consensus and action measures.

Experiences from these studies have shown a high success rate. The JLUS effort can directly benefit both the jurisdiction and the installation by:

- Protecting the health and safety of residents living or working near military installations;
- Preserving long-term land use compatibility between the installation and the surrounding community;
- Promoting comprehensive community planning;
- Encouraging a cooperative spirit between the local base command and local community officials; and
- Integrating the local jurisdiction’s comprehensive plans with the installation’s plans.

**DoD Conservation Partnering Authority:** The FY-03 Defense Authorization Act (Title 10 U.S. Code § 2864a) includes a provision that authorizes the Military Departments to enter into agreements with eligible entities to acquire real estate interests in the vicinity of military installations. The purpose is to limit incompatible land use near a military installation by creating conservation buffers to protect natural features, endangered species and to preserve important habitat necessary to sustaining a quality ecosystem. Another benefit of the program is to remove lands from a developable status which may be subject to urban development that could affect military training and readiness. This legislation provides a powerful new tool for the Military Departments to help prevent incompatible civilian encroachment.

The new legislation authorizes DoD to enter into agreements with States, political subdivisions, and private conservation entities ("conservators"). State and local agencies can offer the advantage of cost sharing, taking title to property interests, and working...