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ITEM #

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Members of the public shall have the opportunity to address the CTAC on any issue within the jurisdiction of SANDAG 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 CTAC coordinator prior to speaking. Public speakers should notify the CTAC coordinator if they have a handout for distribution to working group members. Public speakers are limited to three minutes or less per person. CTAC members also may provide information and announcements under this agenda item.

+3. +3a. MEETING SUMMARY OF THE MARCH 7, 2013, CITIES/COUNTY TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE

CTAC will review and approve the March 7, 2013, meeting summary.

+3b. MEETING SUMMARY OF THE MARCH 14, 2013, JOINT MEETING OF THE REGIONAL PLANNING TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP AND THE CITIES/COUNTY TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The meeting summary from the joint meeting with the Regional Planning Technical Working on March 14, 2013, are being provided for reference and information.

REPORT ITEMS (4 through 9)

4. ALTERNATIVE LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION SCENARIOS TO FURTHER REDUCE GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS (Carolina Gregor)

Last month, at a joint meeting of CTAC and the Regional Planning Technical Working Group, SANDAG kicked off the effort to initiate the development of alternative land use and transportation scenarios to further reduce greenhouse gas emissions beyond those projected in the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy between 2035 and 2050 and discussed how the scenario outcomes may be used in the development of San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan. A brief summary will be provided and next steps will be discussed.

+5. INVENTORY OF LOCAL PARKING POLICIES IN THE SAN DIEGO REGION (Antoinette Meier and Marisa Mangan)

In January 2013, staff interviewed all SANDAG member agencies regarding their local parking policies and management strategies. Staff is presenting the outcomes and initiating a discussion on potential next steps for how parking management strategies could be considered in the development of San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan.
6. **FREIGHT STAKEHOLDERS WORKING GROUP UPDATE** (Christina Casgar and Andrea Hoff)  

The first meeting of the Freight Stakeholders Working Group was held January 30, 2013. Staff will summarize information shared with the working group, including information about three critical freight planning studies: (1) Goods Movement section of the Regional Plan; (2) Freight Gateway Study Update; and (3) Analysis of Freeway Operational Strategies Related to the Use of Managed Lanes by Trucks.

7. **REGIONAL ARTERIAL MANAGEMENT SYSTEM UPDATE** (Stan Glowacki and Ellison Alegre)  

SANDAG staff will provide an update on the Regional Arterial Management System (RAMS) Regional Maintenance and Support on-going efforts and User Group activities. Specifically, Staff will provide a review of key quantitative and qualitative measures documenting the performance of the RAMS system operations in an effort to demonstrate level of effort and responsiveness for on-going maintenance and support activities carried out under the regional agreement.

8. **DRAFT FY 2012 TransNet TRIENNIAL PERFORMANCE AUDIT REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS** (Alex Estrella)  

In January 2013, the Independent Tax Payers Oversight Committee (ITOC) was presented with the CTAC Ad Hoc Working Group findings developed through CTAC and SANDAG staff. CTAC members will be provided with an update and summary of proposed next steps including possible reporting framework proposed by the CTAC Ad Hoc Working Group to be presented at the May ITOC meeting.

9. **CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION UPDATES**  

Caltrans will provide an update on various local programs, funding program deadlines, and announcements regarding upcoming conferences.

10. **ADJOURNMENT AND NEXT MEETING**  

The next CTAC meeting is planned for Thursday, May 2, 2013.

+ next to an agenda item indicates an attachment
SUMMARY OF THE MARCH 7, 2013, MEETING

**Agenda Item 1: Welcome and Introductions**

CTAC Chair, Zoubir Ouadah (City of Poway), called the meeting to order. Self-introductions were conducted.

**Agenda Item 2: Public Comments/Communications/Member comments**

Members of the public had the opportunity to address the CTAC on any issue. There were no public comments.

**Agenda Item 3: Meeting Summary (Approve)**

The CTAC members were asked to review and approve the CTAC meeting summary of February 7, 2013.

Action: The meeting summary notes were approved.

**Agenda Item 4 (Consent): TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program and Active Transportation Grant Program: Status Update (Information)**

The item but was pulled from Consent at the request of SANDAG staff. Suchi Mukherjee (SANDAG) introduced this item and included a review and summary of current efforts associated with the first round of Smart Growth Incentive Program projects approved in May 2009 under TransNet, and the first round of Active Transportation Program grants approved in June 2009. Specifically, staff announced that a project status report under the Active Transportation Program grants had been revised just recently which was currently listed as going before a proposed amendment for a no-cost extension in the corresponding agenda item staff report. CTAC members were informed that at the request of the sponsoring grant recipient, the City of Vista had requested that the Inland Trail Phase IIIB Right-of-Way Engineering project be discontinued. For further details or additional questions, CTAC members were encouraged to contact Suchi Mukherjee at Suchi.Mukherjee@sandag.org.

**Agenda Item 5: Joint Technical Working Group and Cities and County Transportation Advisory Committee Informational Meeting: Please Save the Date, March 14, 2013 (Information)**

Carolina Gregor (SANDAG staff) introduced this item and announced and requested CTAC member’s attendance at an upcoming joint meeting with the TWG and CTAC on Thursday, March 14, 2013. Staff indicated that the meeting will likely be the first of many future meetings that will focus on
work efforts for development of the Alternative Land Use and Transportation Scenarios as part of
the next Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) (San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan). Specifically,
staff indicated that the intent of the meeting is to introduce the overall efforts on how
development of Alternative Land Use and Transportation Scenarios could result in greenhouse gas
emission reductions, provide a background review of past RTP scenario development, and a high
level overview of anticipated next steps. For further details, additional questions, and to RSVP to
the meeting, CTAC members were encouraged to contact Carolina Gregor at
Carolina.Gregor@sandag.org.

Agenda Item 6: Active Transportation Working Group (Information)

Coleen Clementson (SANDAG staff) presented CTAC members with an overview of SANDAG’s plan
efforts for development of a new Active Transportation Working Group (ATWG). Specifically, CTAC
members were requested to provide input on potential revisions to the ATWG membership roster
included as attachment 3 of the corresponding agenda item staff report.

While there were no specific comments to the overall ATWG membership roster and planned roles
and responsibilities, the key input provided to SANDAG staff by CTAC included the recommendation
for having CTAC serve as the platform for the planned ATWG meetings. Members expressed that
consideration be given to such approach since it is generally the agency public works or engineering
departments that are closely involved with infrastructure changes along public agency right-of-ways
for improving and planned active transportation facilities. CTAC members expressed that by serving
as the platform for the ATWG, it will provide opportunity for greater coordination and
understanding across all those involved from planning to implementation. SANDAG staff thanked
CTAC members for the input and agreed to return to CTAC once their consideration was discussed
with SANDAG staff and Management.

Agenda Item 7: TransNet Regional Transportation Congestion Improvement Program Fee
Adjustment (Information)

This item was introduced by Ariana zur Nieden (SANDAG staff) and provided a review of the
anticipated annual Regional Transportation Congestion Improvement Program (RTCIP) fee
adjustment as required by the TransNet Extension Ordinance. In accordance with the TransNet
Extension Ordinance, SANDAG is required to annually adjust the minimum RTCIP fee amount on
July 1 of each year. This is based on an analysis of construction cost indices and other relevant
indices to ensure the RTCIP retains its purchasing power to improve the regional arterial system.
Staff reviewed the RTCIP fee adjustment presented and approved during February 22, 2013,
SANDAG Board of Directors meeting.

The RTCIP fee minimum adjustment is 2 percent; therefore, the adjustment approved by the Board
will be an increase from $2,165 to $ 2,209 beginning July 1, 2013. CTAC members were reminded
that as part of the next process, local agencies are required to submit certification that their RTCIP
funding programs are still in place and include the necessary components to fulfill the TransNet
Extension Ordinance. Members were informed that certifications must be submitted by April 1,
2013. For further details and questions, members were encouraged to contact Ariana zur Nieden at
Ariana.zurNieden@sandag.org.
Agenda Item 8: San Diego Forward: Status Update and Approach for Refining, Developing, and Incorporating the Policy Areas from the Regional Comprehensive Plan (Information)

This item was presented by Phil Trom (SANDAG) and was introduced with a showing of the SANDAG Forward video. The discussion then followed with and included an overview of the proposed approach for how the various regional policy areas that were addressed in the Regional Comprehensive Plan and some new emerging policy areas will be incorporated into the new RTP, San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan. Accordingly, SANDAG staff developed a detailed work program and schedule which incorporates a variety of planning efforts, activities, and also highlighted SANDAG working group roles anticipated for attaining input, feedback, and recommendations throughout the process. Staff indicated that by combining the RCP and the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy it would result in a single, more easily accessible regional planning document and is expected to cover the following areas:

- Public Health
- Land Use, Regional Growth, Urban Form and Housing
- Healthy Environment (Habitat Conservation, Energy, Climate Change, Climate Adaptation, Shoreline Preservation, Water Quality, Air Quality)
- Infrastructure/Public Facilities (Water Supply, Wastewater, Storm Water, Solid Waste, Access to Educational Facilities, Parks and Open Space)
- Social Equity and Environmental Justice
- Economic Strategies
- Borders (Binational, Tribal, and Interregional)
- Military
- Transportation

CTAC members were also presented with a listing of anticipated major tasks that will be presented before them for review, comment, and input throughout the process. Staff indicated the CTAC will be presented with specific discussion items throughout the development of the San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan in the form of general update discussion items, or input to white paper policy areas. The listed major tasks, included but limited to:

- Work Program
- Vision, Goals, and Objectives
- Transportation Project Evaluation Criteria
- Performance Measures and Economic Analysis
- Policy Areas; Public Health, Infrastructure/Public Facilities, Social Equity and Environmental Justice, Economic Strategies, Borders, Military, Transportation
- Network Scenarios

Staff reiterated that CTAC will be asked to provide input and recommendations throughout and in an ongoing basis as the plan is developed as appropriate.

Agenda Item 9: FY 2012 TransNet Triennial Performance Audit Report Recommendations Update (Information)

This item was introduced by Alex Estrella (SANDAG staff) and included an update on the CTAC Ad Hoc Working Group findings and discussion efforts. Specifically, staff indicated that based on staff
and Ad Hoc Working group member discussion, possible options of likely reporting data and/or information to be provided to ITOC on an annual basis may include reporting planned and actual lane miles of pavement/resurfacing work, PCI, and some form of mobility performance statistics. CTAC members expressed some concern over the anticipated level of effort that may be required to put such data together but all were generally open to further investigating if such data/information is readily available from their agencies. CTAC members agreed to coordinate with staff and provide insight or information if such data/information is already available. Staff agreed to coordinate with CTAC members to request such data and then meet once again with the CTAC Ad Hoc Working Group to go over the findings and discuss next possible steps prior to the CTAC April meeting.

**Agenda Item 10: California Department of Transportation Updates (Information)**

Caltrans announcements were passed out. Announcements included, but not limited to:

1. **Map 21 Moving ahead for progress in the 21st century Handout**  
   - The President signed the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21) into law on July 6, 2012.
2. **Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)**  
   - Caltrans Division of Local Assistance, Office of Bridge and Safety Programs is preparing for the next HSIP call for projects and formal announcement will be made in April 2013.
3. **SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL**  
   - Caltrans and the SRTS Technical Assistance Resources Center will be hosting a webinar beginning at 10 a.m., PST on March 11, 2013.
4. **Bicycle Transportation Account (BTA) Program**  
   - Due to the Governor’s budget proposal, there will not be a BTA Call for Projects in FY 2013-14. The Active Transportation Program proposed by the Governor will consolidate the BTA along with the federal and state Safe Routes to Schools Programs, the state Environmental Enhancement and Mitigation (EEM) Program and the federal Transportation Alternatives Program with one solicitation to be determined.

**Agenda Item 11: Adjournment and Next Meeting**

The next CTAC meeting will be held on Thursday, April 4, 2013, from 9:30 to 11 a.m.
SUMMARY OF THE MARCH 14, 2013, MEETING

Please note: Audio file of meeting is available on the SANDAG Web site (www.sandag.org) on the TWG and CTAC pages.

Agenda Item 1: Welcome and Introductions

The meeting was called to order by Bill Chopyk (City of La Mesa), Chair of the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG), and Zoubir Ouadah (City of Poway), Chair of the Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC).

Agenda Item 2: Public Comments and Communications

Members of the public had the opportunity to address the TWG and/or CTAC on any issue within the jurisdiction of the respective group that was not on the agenda. There were no public comments.

Item C: TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program and Active Transportation Grant Program Status Update (Consent)

This was a consent item. There were no questions or comments regarding this item.

Item D: Initiating the Development of Alternative Land Use and Transportation Scenarios to Further Reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions (Information/Discussion)

As part of the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS) adopted by the SANDAG Board in October 2011, SANDAG committed to preparing a range of scenarios to explore what it would take to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from cars and light trucks between 2035 and 2050. Carolina Gregor (SANDAG) introduced the primary staff members that will be involved with this exercise, and the consultant team, Cambridge Systematics.

Item D1: Anticipated Steps and Review of Previous SANDAG Scenario Planning Efforts

Ms. Gregor explained in more detail that the purpose of this exercise is to create a broad range of land use and transportation scenarios to reduce GHG emissions and address the so-
called “backsliding” issue (described below). The results will be considered in the development of the San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan by helping to inform the land use patterns of the Sustainable Communities Strategy (as required by Senate Bill 375 [SB 375]), the transportation scenarios for both the revenue constrained and unconstrained networks, and a menu of supporting land use, transportation, and parking and pricing policies that will be considered for possible incorporation in the plan.

Per SB 375, the California Air Resources Board (CARB) is required to establish GHG emission reduction targets for every region in California for incorporation into their Regional Transportation Plans for 2020 and 2035. CARB provided SANDAG with GHG reduction targets of 7 percent by 2020 and 13 percent by 2035. No target was required for 2050, the horizon year of the 2050 RTP/SCS. The 2050 RTP/SCS resulted in GHG reductions of 14 percent by 2020, 13 percent by 2035, and 10 percent by 2050. Some stakeholders felt that this pattern of decreasing percentages indicated a move in the wrong direction and this was coined as the “backsliding” issue. Ms. Gregor informed the TWG and CTAC that the key objective of this exercise will be to address this issue and explore policies and actions that could further reduce GHG emissions between 2035 and 2050.

Ms. Gregor described the various modeling tools associated with the Series 13 2050 Regional Growth Forecast and the alternative scenarios, including the Production Exchange and Consumption Allocation System land use model (PECAS) and the transportation-related Activity Based Model (ABM), and a sketch modeling tool called UrbanFootprint. The proposed constants for this exercise include the regional population, housing units, and employment totals for 2035 and 2050, based on Series 13 Growth Forecast. Proposed variables include regional land use patterns, the phasing of transportation projects (both revenue constrained and unconstrained networks), pricing and parking policies, and other variables to be identified during this effort.

Ms. Gregor provided an overview of the anticipated steps for the development of the scenarios, including public participation and outreach. In response to an inquiry by Kathy Garcia (Del Mar), Ms. Gregor clarified that GHG emission reduction planning in the state of California relates to land use and transportation planning, fuel efficiency, and low carbon fuels. SANDAG can’t take credit for electric vehicles when calculating GHG emissions related to land use and transportation planning, but can consider this in the planning process.

Rob Rundle (SANDAG) further clarified that the model that will measure the outputs will assume state laws, so those factors will already be considered in the outputs produced.

Linda Marabian (City of San Diego) asked how GHG emissions are measured. Mr. Rundle explained that they are calculated based on vehicle miles travelled (VMT). Elisa Arias (SANDAG) added that the outputs of the Travel Demand Model then feed into the CARB emissions model, taking into account vehicle specifications, speeds, and different factors that feed into the air quality model that estimates carbon emissions.

For additional context, Ms. Gregor described previous scenario planning efforts undertaken by SANDAG, including the 2020 Cities/County Series 8 Growth Forecast that developed scenarios to address land consumption; the Series 12 2050 Regional Growth Forecast that
developed scenarios to address the SB 375 requirement to accommodate projected population growth within regional boundaries which became the basis for the land use assumptions in the 2050 RTP/SCS; the SANDAG Urban Area Transit Strategy, which developed three transit scenarios: Transit Propensity Strategy, Commuter Point-to-Point Strategy, and Many Centers Strategy for use in developing the 2050 Transit Network; the CARB target setting exercise that focused on GHG emission reductions through operational efficiency, efficiency of system, and pricing; and the 2050 RTP/SCS Environmental Impact Report.

**Item D2: Modeling Tools to be Used in this Effort**

Clint Daniels (SANDAG) was not available to present on this item. Ms. Gregor briefly covered this information in Item D1.

**Item D3: Examples and Lessons Learned from Scenario Planning Efforts in Other Regions**

George Mazur (Cambridge Systematics) presented on examples of broad scale planning. Mr. Mazur clarified that there is a difference between vision exercises versus exploratory analysis. Visioning is a broad based, educational tool that begins with a set of assumptions and looks at how they perform as an end product, while an exploratory analysis examines the interaction between land use and transportation components to support the goals. Denver, CO and Austin, TX were cited as examples of exploratory analysis, while SACOG and San Joaquin Valley are considered examples of visioning.

Mr. Mazur explained that it is useful to consider other scenario planning efforts to inform the process with lessons learned and also to convey that there is a wide variation in how the processes are undertaken. Key lessons learned included the importance of establishing a baseline scenario, being realistic about economic and market feasibility, implementing early and often outreach and engagement with the public and local jurisdictions, and to not let performance measures and analytical tools restrict or drive the scenarios.

Coleen Clementson (SANDAG) emphasized the importance of the role of TWG and CTAC members and local jurisdictions to help structure the public involvement effort as well as the scenario development. Ms. Clementson encouraged members to engage their elected officials by communicating key milestones to them.

Bill Chopyk (La Mesa) commented on the potential challenges of shifts in land use patterns, conveying the importance of recognizing that densification and parking pricing policies are a sensitive subject for many jurisdictions as we develop the scenarios. Mr. Chopyk expressed support for the use of the PECAS, stressing the importance of taking into account economic factors, feasibility, and lessons learned. Mr. Chopyk commented on the relationship between local dependence on sales tax revenues, and the effect of internet sales on commercial vacancy rates in our cities. He also pointed out the conflict between desired economic growth and opposition to higher densities.
Zoubir Ouadah (City of Poway, Chair CTAC) asked if safety will play a role in the plan, to which Mr. Mazur responded that safety could be added to a list of additional measures and indicators, but the primary focus is on SB 375 and reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Elisa Arias (SANDAG) added that safety is considered as an indicator in the development of the transportation project evaluation criteria, as well as in performance metrics, and that SANDAG is aware of MAP 21 goals and is developing a plan for incorporation into the criteria and performance metrics as the process develops.

Mr. Ouadah responded that safer infrastructure should be encouraged and should have a role on the planning side of the process, rather than just the operational side.

Dave De Cordova (City of Carlsbad) suggested that more Transportation Demand Management policies/factors be considered in the exercise.

Coleen Clementson (SANDAG) confirmed that SANDAG is asking TWG/CTAC members to help identify the important factors that will help shape the scenarios. Alternatives that are pricing-related, incentive based, or demand based are all possibilities that can get incorporated into the scenarios.

Bob Leiter (subconsultant to Cambridge Systematics) discussed “cordon area pricing” as it has been explored by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), setting pricing policies for certain urban areas with heavy congestion and discouraging single occupancy driving in those areas, differing from highway congestion pricing as it focuses on a wider geographic area. Mr. Leiter highlighted this effort as a measure that straddles both land use and transportation and offered the topic for further future discussion.

**Item D4: Next Steps**

Ms. Gregor (SANDAG) described the process of input and iterative feedback with the working groups, policy advisors, stakeholders and the public which would ultimately result in a matrix of different scenarios displaying projected results for greenhouse gas emission reductions, which could be helpful in forming policy recommendations for discussion. Ms. Gregor asked TWG/CTAC members to discuss how they would like to participate in this exercise.

Discussion among members resulted in a preference for joint meetings, convening the full TWG and extending optional attendance to CTAC members.

Mr. Ouadah (City of Poway, Chair CTAC) committed to discussing this subject with the full CTAC at their next meeting.

Ms. Clementson (SANDAG) and Ms. Gregor (SANDAG) suggested the possibility of breakout sessions at future meetings to facilitate this effort, as well as developing a matrix to summarize assumptions examined in previous efforts as a starting point for brainstorming purposes. Nancy Bragado (City of San Diego) agreed that this would be helpful, and suggested the inclusion of scenario planning efforts from the San Diego Foundation, given the level of public participation in that effort.
**Item E: Active Transportation Implementation Strategy Framework (Discussion)**

Christine Eary (SANDAG) presented on a refined framework for an Active Transportation Implementation Framework following input from the CTAC meeting in February 2013. As part of the 2050 RTP/SCS, SANDAG committed to planning an Active Transportation Program including Safe Routes to School, Safe Routes to Transit, and the regional bike plan. The main feature of the framework proposes to integrate Active Transportation into SANDAG transit and highway corridor projects for inclusion in San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan with the objective of maximizing investments in transit highway infrastructure by enhancing safety and improving bike and walk access to transit.

Ms. Eary reported that this item will be presented to the Transportation Committee in April and that CTAC/TWG and Active Transportation Working Group (ATWG) will see reports on this topic over the next year.

TWG and CTAC members discussed the possibility of additional funding for active transportation grants for bike and pedestrian enhancements, as well as the possibility of developing a “regional pedestrian plan” that could identify major centers of activity that are pedestrian oriented and prioritize funding for active transportation enhancements in these areas, similar to SANDAG’s concept of Smart Growth Opportunity Areas.

Ms. Eary explained that pedestrian access is accounted for in the context of transit.

Coleen Clementson (SANDAG) indicated that such an effort might better be addressed on a local scale due to the level of detail.

Jim Nakagawa (Imperial Beach) commented on a related effort of the Coastal Conservancy to implement a Coastal Trails Program.

Barbara Redlitz (Escondido) suggested that a framework similar to that used by the Army Corps regarding regional general permits could be used to establish a “master approach” to a pedestrian plan.

Kathleen Ferrier (Walk San Diego) expressed strong support for a regional pedestrian plan, emphasizing the need to identify improvement projects on a regional scale and indicating the opportunity for SANDAG to take a leadership role in the process.

**Item F: Adjournment of the Joint CTAC/TWG and Next Meeting (Information)**

The next CTAC meeting will be held on April 4, 2013.

**Action:** The joint TWG/CTAC meeting was adjourned by Bill Chopyk (City of La Mesa), Chair TWG.
INVENTORY OF LOCAL PARKING POLICIES IN THE SAN DIEGO REGION

Introduction

In 2009, SANDAG staff surveyed local jurisdictions on their parking requirements and policies as part of the development of the SANDAG resource, “Parking Strategies for Smart Growth.” In January, 2013, staff interviewed all 18 cities in the region and the County of San Diego regarding their local parking policies and management strategies. Staff will provide an overview of the outcomes of the inventory and discuss next steps for how parking management strategies could be considered in the development of San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan.

Background

The management of public parking and the regulation of private parking supply are under the jurisdiction of local governments. Over the past several years, SANDAG has provided member agencies with several resources on parking strategies that encourage smart growth and the use of transportation alternatives. These efforts have laid the foundation for more detailed discussions regarding the development of a regional framework for parking management for consideration in San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan and a mechanism for incentivizing member agencies to develop and adopt individual parking management strategies/plans.

Parking Strategies for Smart Growth and Trip Generation for Smart Growth

In 2010, SANDAG resources, Parking Strategies for Smart Growth and Trip Generation for Smart Growth, identified the parking demand and trip generation associated with smart growth developments. Based on current literature and best practice review the studies took a conservative approach to establishing parking rates for specific development types. Parking Strategies for Smart Growth recommends 1.25 spaces per dwelling unit for multifamily residential, 2.9 spaces per 1,000 square feet for office, and 3.6 spaces per 1,000 square feet for retail. The study also suggests that further analysis and study on parking strategies is needed.

2050 Regional Transportation Plan – The Urban Area Transit Strategy

The Urban Area Transit Strategy of the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (2050 RTP) included a “Menu of Policy Options to Support the Transit Network.” This report identified policies and strategies that can influence transit ridership and mode share. The menu was organized into three categories: parking, land use, and funding. In the fall of 2010, the Regional Planning Technical Working Group, the Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee, and Regional Planning Stakeholder Working Group members, as well as members of the planning and design community, prioritized the list of parking policies to provide a starting point for discussion by policymakers for consideration in the 2050 RTP. The highest ranked parking policy options were a toolbox of
localized parking strategies for local jurisdictions, and resources to support local parking management efforts. Although no specific parking policies were included in the 2050 RTP, the SANDAG Board of Directors provided direction to staff to examine parking as part of the Regional Comprehensive Plan update.

*Integrating TDM into the Planning and Development Process – A Reference for Cities*

This study was accepted by the SANDAG Transportation Committee in 2012 and provided guidance on the range of local policies that support TDM. A section of the study was dedicated to parking management strategies with case studies presented for each strategy identified.

**Discussion**

*Parking Policy Inventory Highlights*

The survey of member agencies’ parking practices revealed that local jurisdictions could do more to take full advantage of parking management strategies that maximize use of transportation alternatives and support economic development goals. Attachment 1 provides a detailed overview of the data collected. A summary of key observations follows:

1. Parking is a politically sensitive issue for most jurisdictions. There is general consensus that parking decisions by the jurisdictions are often made in reaction to a perceived parking problem raised by residents or business owners, versus a comprehensive and strategic approach to aligning parking policies with land-use and transportation planning and economic development efforts. Specific parking policies are frequently adopted as a stand-alone solution versus a package of complimentary policies that have far-reaching results.

2. There appears to be a lack of public awareness of the relationship between parking, travel behavior, community design and economic development. Any effort to encourage parking alignment must start with an extensive educational process on the range of parking management strategies and the proven transportation and economic benefits associated with those strategies.

3. Charging for public, on-street parking is uncommon with only six cities pricing parking and one city vetting parking pricing through their City Council. Of those cities that are charging for on-street parking, prices do not tend to be coordinated with actual parking occupancy. Only the City of San Diego adjusts the price of on-street parking based on actual demand. Where public parking is priced, the fees are not typically coordinated with the fees charged by privately owned parking lots and structures.

4. Although several jurisdictions have updated aspects of their parking requirements to allow for strategies such as parking cash-out or shared parking, implementation of these strategies is inconsistent.

5. While some cities offer exceptions to their parking standards for affordable housing or mixed use developments, parking standards tend to be applied without full consideration for community context, demand, and availability of transportation alternatives. Fifteen of the 19 jurisdictions require more than 1 parking space per studio apartment; 8 out of 19 require at least 2 spaces per 1 bedroom unit, while another 9 state a minimum of 1.5 spaces per 1 bedroom unit. For commercial office uses, 12 jurisdictions require 1 space per 200 – 300 square feet. These rates are all higher than the conservative recommendations for parking rates suggested in Parking Strategies for Smart Growth (1.25 spaces for multi-family
residential; 2.9 spaces per 1,000 sq. feet of leasable office space; and, 3.6 spaces for 1,000 sq. feet of leasable retail space).

Parking Challenges
Parking presents a growing challenge for cities with reaching their transportation, community development, climate change, and economic development goals. The specific parking challenges identified as most problematic by many of the cities can be organized under the following categories:

1. Economic development: The cost of providing required parking is limiting new development (particularly redevelopment and Transit Oriented Development [TOD]) and commercial growth. It also limits change of use and new business in business districts. This concern was confirmed by the building and real-estate industry in recent TOD listening sessions conducted by SANDAG. Parking requirements were identified as the number one barrier to TOD. Cities also stated that financing public parking structures is a challenge.

2. Parking turn-over - Free parking, the lack of designated long-term parking for employees in business districts, and the lack of time limits for on-street parking lead to overuse by long-term or all-day parkers who occupy valuable spaces at the expense of short-term parkers trying to access retail businesses and services.

3. Parking spill-over - Parking from patrons and employees of the business districts is spilling over into surrounding residential neighborhoods that do not require residential parking permits.

4. Cruising for parking - local traffic is impacted by vehicles circling city streets in search of free parking spaces.

Next Steps
Based on the initial survey results, on the increasing challenges posed by disparate parking requirements within individual cities and across the region, and on a growing number of studies and data supporting the need to address parking more comprehensively to address land use, transportation, environmental, and economic issues, staff proposes an incremental and collaborative approach to begin aligning local parking policies and regional goals in San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan. In addition, the adoption of an activity based transportation model and the use of the visioning tool, Urban Footprint, will allow for parking strategies to be tested with different land use and transportation scenarios to evaluate and demonstrate their potential for the region. The following “next steps” are proposed for the CTAC’s discussion.

1. Develop a Parking Management Toolbox. The toolbox could:
   - Provide a menu of parking strategies that address specific issues identified by the local jurisdictions. Strategies could include, but would not be limited to, more flexible and relevant parking standards; parking management techniques (way-finding, advanced availability and pricing information; advanced metering technologies); unbundling; cash-out; remote parking; shared parking; improved pricing methods; permit parking; improved enforcement; etc.
• Evaluate the effectiveness of those strategies for achieving specific goals.
• Identify the types of communities where specific strategies work best (urban centers, town centers, employment centers, TOD, etc.) and describe how those strategies could be packaged to achieve maximum benefit.
• Present case studies that demonstrate successful approaches to parking management implemented in both urban and suburban settings. This will include information on the resources needed to manage and administer parking initiatives, sample enabling ordinances, lessons learned, etc.

2. Test various parking strategies (pricing and supply management) with the alternative land use and transportation scenarios that are currently getting started to determine the greenhouse gas emission reductions and other regional indicators that can be attributed to those strategies.

3. Build consensus on specific parking management strategies that best support local and regional land use and transportation system goals and that could become part of a regional framework to support the development and implementation of local parking management plans that support smart growth, sustainable development, and transit oriented development.

Attachments: 1A. Parking Management Telephone Questionnaire
   1B. Inventory of Local Parking Management Strategies
   1C. Summary of Off-Street Parking Standards by Jurisdiction
   1D. Summary of Parking Challenges Defined by Local Jurisdictions

Key Staff Contact: Antoinette Meier, (619) 699-7381, Antoinette.Meier@sandag.org
Parking Management Telephone Questionnaire

1. Parking Management Plans- Has your city developed any parking management plans/strategies (i.e., policies/programs designed to maximize efficient use of parking resources; to reduce traffic congestion; preserve residential parking for residents; or to achieve other objectives)?

2. Parking Supply Management Strategies and Policies- Has your city implemented, or are you planning to implement any parking supply management strategies/policies such as:

   a. Shared parking (using the same parking for two or more uses that have different peak periods. For example, using a church parking lot for restaurant and retail uses during the evenings and weekdays)

   b. Unbundled parking (the cost of a parking space is separated from the cost of the lease for residential or commercial uses)

   c. Parking Cash-Out programs (allows employees to choose between subsidized parking or a cash allowance in lieu of the parking space)

   d. Parking reservation system (allows for parking spaces to be reserved on-line or via a website or mobile application)

   e. Real-time Parking Information (the number and location of vacant parking spaces is made available in real-time via signage, website or mobile application)

   f. Way-finding (guidance to parking spaces in garages, lots or metered spaces)

   g. Parking districts (residential parking permit zones or parking assessment districts)

   h. Parking maximums (limits the amount of parking that can be provided in a given development or for certain uses)

   i. Remote parking (parking structures are located off-site with shuttle service into the business district or employment center to reduce parking demand and traffic)

   j. Other

3. Parking Pricing Strategies:
   a. Is public parking priced in your city (i.e., motorists pay directly to use parking facilities)?

   b. If “yes,” is parking priced only in certain areas of the city (such as smart growth opportunity areas, or TOD zones)?

   c. Is the rate fixed or do prices vary? If prices vary, how is the rate determined? For example do rates vary by location or zone (such as Smart Growth Opportunity Areas or Transit Oriented Development zones), or are they based on demand, time of day and/or day of week? Other?
d. Are on-street and off-street parking pricing coordinated to discourage cruising for inexpensive on-street parking spaces?

e. How are parking revenues collected (traditional single space meters, multi space smart meters, pay by phone, other)?

f. How are parking revenues used?

g. Have you used parking revenues, or would your city consider using parking revenues, towards improvements in the areas where parking fees have been collected? Do you think the community would be more willing to embrace parking fees under these conditions?

4. **Parking Enforcement:** Are parking regulations enforced in your city and if so how are they enforced?

5. **Parking Inventory:** Has your city recently completed a parking inventory

6. What are the greatest challenges that parking presents for your city? (For example, parking turn-over in the business district, “cruising for parking” creating congestion on city streets, cost of providing parking in new developments is limiting development, parking requirements discourage new businesses, etc.)

7. What is the political climate around parking management in your city?
### Inventory of Local Parking Management Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carlsbad</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronado</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>√*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Mar</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Cajon</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encinitas</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Beach</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Mesa</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemon Grove</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National City</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poway</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santee</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solana Beach</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Existing strategy**
- **D Under development**
- **S Special events only**

* Municipal code/planning documents allow for it but not implemented
# Summary of Off-Street Parking Standards by Jurisdiction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Single-Family</th>
<th>Multi-Family Residences</th>
<th>Commercial Office</th>
<th>Retail</th>
<th>Eating/Drinking Establishments</th>
<th>Parking Reductions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Diego County</td>
<td>2 per du</td>
<td>1.5 per du</td>
<td>1.5 per du</td>
<td>2 per du</td>
<td>1 per 100 sf (medical)</td>
<td>Reduce for multi-use developments and one or more dwellings that have differently planned parking areas and in certain cases, reduced parking required if specific criteria are met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>2 per du</td>
<td>1.5 per du</td>
<td>1.5 per du</td>
<td>2 per du</td>
<td>1 per 100 sf (medical)</td>
<td>Reduce for multi-use developments and one or more dwellings that have differently planned parking areas and in certain cases, reduced parking required if specific criteria are met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North County</td>
<td>3.60 - 4.50</td>
<td>3.60 - 4.50</td>
<td>3.60 - 4.50</td>
<td>3.60 - 4.50</td>
<td>3.60 - 4.50</td>
<td>Reduce for multi-use developments and one or more dwellings that have differently planned parking areas and in certain cases, reduced parking required if specific criteria are met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronado</td>
<td>2 per du</td>
<td>1.5 per du</td>
<td>1.5 per du</td>
<td>2 per du</td>
<td>1 per 100 sf (medical)</td>
<td>Reduce for multi-use developments and one or more dwellings that have differently planned parking areas and in certain cases, reduced parking required if specific criteria are met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East County</td>
<td>3.60 - 4.50</td>
<td>3.60 - 4.50</td>
<td>3.60 - 4.50</td>
<td>3.60 - 4.50</td>
<td>3.60 - 4.50</td>
<td>Reduce for multi-use developments and one or more dwellings that have differently planned parking areas and in certain cases, reduced parking required if specific criteria are met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West County</td>
<td>3.60 - 4.50</td>
<td>3.60 - 4.50</td>
<td>3.60 - 4.50</td>
<td>3.60 - 4.50</td>
<td>3.60 - 4.50</td>
<td>Reduce for multi-use developments and one or more dwellings that have differently planned parking areas and in certain cases, reduced parking required if specific criteria are met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemon Grove</td>
<td>1 per 6 du</td>
<td>1.5 per du</td>
<td>1.5 per du</td>
<td>2 per du</td>
<td>1 per 100 sf (medical)</td>
<td>Reduce for multi-use developments and one or more dwellings that have differently planned parking areas and in certain cases, reduced parking required if specific criteria are met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santee</td>
<td>3.60 - 4.50</td>
<td>3.60 - 4.50</td>
<td>3.60 - 4.50</td>
<td>3.60 - 4.50</td>
<td>3.60 - 4.50</td>
<td>Reduce for multi-use developments and one or more dwellings that have differently planned parking areas and in certain cases, reduced parking required if specific criteria are met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside</td>
<td>1 per 6 du</td>
<td>1.5 per du</td>
<td>1.5 per du</td>
<td>2 per du</td>
<td>1 per 100 sf (medical)</td>
<td>Reduce for multi-use developments and one or more dwellings that have differently planned parking areas and in certain cases, reduced parking required if specific criteria are met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Mesa</td>
<td>3.60 - 4.50</td>
<td>3.60 - 4.50</td>
<td>3.60 - 4.50</td>
<td>3.60 - 4.50</td>
<td>3.60 - 4.50</td>
<td>Reduce for multi-use developments and one or more dwellings that have differently planned parking areas and in certain cases, reduced parking required if specific criteria are met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlsbad</td>
<td>2 per du</td>
<td>1.5 per du</td>
<td>1.5 per du</td>
<td>2 per du</td>
<td>1 per 100 sf (medical)</td>
<td>Reduce for multi-use developments and one or more dwellings that have differently planned parking areas and in certain cases, reduced parking required if specific criteria are met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encinitas</td>
<td>2 per du</td>
<td>1.5 per du</td>
<td>1.5 per du</td>
<td>2 per du</td>
<td>1 per 100 sf (medical)</td>
<td>Reduce for multi-use developments and one or more dwellings that have differently planned parking areas and in certain cases, reduced parking required if specific criteria are met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solana Beach</td>
<td>2 per du</td>
<td>1.5 per du</td>
<td>1.5 per du</td>
<td>2 per du</td>
<td>1 per 100 sf (medical)</td>
<td>Reduce for multi-use developments and one or more dwellings that have differently planned parking areas and in certain cases, reduced parking required if specific criteria are met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramona</td>
<td>3.60 - 4.50</td>
<td>3.60 - 4.50</td>
<td>3.60 - 4.50</td>
<td>3.60 - 4.50</td>
<td>3.60 - 4.50</td>
<td>Reduce for multi-use developments and one or more dwellings that have differently planned parking areas and in certain cases, reduced parking required if specific criteria are met.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Recommended parking ratios from the SHED/DMH publication, Parking Strategies for Smart Growth (2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Single-Family</th>
<th>Multi-Family</th>
<th>Commercial Office</th>
<th>Retail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential Multi-Family</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>3.00 - 3.50</td>
<td>3.00 - 3.50</td>
<td>3.00 - 3.50</td>
<td>3.00 - 3.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: For some jurisdictions, different parking ratios may apply depending on specific project characteristics and local planning regulations.*

---

**Attachment 1C**

Text continues with details on parking strategies and regulations for different types of development in various jurisdictions, including considerations for transit accessibility, affordable housing, and mixed-use developments.
Summary of Parking Challenges Defined By Local Jurisdictions

1) Cost of providing parking and parking requirements are limiting new development, redevelopment, business opportunities, and change of use
   a. Private Sector Issues
      i. Parking requirements may discourage new restaurants from locating on a commercial corridor or business district
      ii. Parking requirements are driving site design
   b. Public Sector Issues
      i. Cost of providing parking in new developments limits the amount of affordable housing, park-and-ride capacity at transit stations, and ability to build mixed-use projects in activity centers.
      ii. Lack of resources to finance a shared public parking structure
      iii. Lack of parking enforcement funds and staffing
      iv. Unsuccessful parking in-lieu fee program – developers did not want to pay the fee
      v. Poor economy limits the creation of a parking district
      vi. Likelihood of supplying additional parking is low due to being built out
      vii. Facilitating new commercial growth while meeting parking demand
      viii. Developers continue to request more parking despite a municipal push for smaller off-street parking ratios

2) Parking turnover and spillover
   a. Long-term employee parking, delivery parking, and vehicle storage infringing upon resident, customer, and/or visitor parking
   b. Parking spillover from specific commercial or institutional uses onto residential and/or industrial streets

3) One size fits all approach
   a. Suburban parking standards not conducive to smaller parcels, redevelopment, village areas, and specific uses
   b. Limited supply of parking in specific areas (e.g. business districts, multi-family neighborhoods, strip malls)
4) Education on parking supply/demand, management, and regulations
   a. Perceived parking supply shortage on the part of residents and merchants
   b. Confusion over how to operate multi-space meters
   c. Confusion over use of reverse angled parking installed following streetscape projects

5) Coastal access issues
   a. Cruising for parking – a seasonal issue more common in coastal communities
   b. Setting standards sufficiently flexible for coastal parking needs
   c. Improving coastal access while abiding by Coastal Commission parking requirements

6) Abuse of free parking in transit stations or Park & Ride lots

7) Parking policies adopted but not implemented
Introduction

The first meeting of the Freight Stakeholders Working Group was held January 30, 2013. At that meeting, SANDAG staff provided information about three critical freight planning studies: (1) Goods Movement section of San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan, (2) Freight Gateway Study Update, and (3) Analysis of Freeway Operational Strategies Related to the Use of Managed Lanes by Trucks. Frank Rivera, City of Chula Vista; and Tim Thiele, City of Del Mar, are the CTAC representative and alternate on the Freight Stakeholders Working Group. This report provides an update on the three studies, including schedule, progress, and next steps.

Discussion

Goods Movement Strategy portion of San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan
The Regional Plan will contain a freight component that considers the growing importance of freight and goods movement to the region’s economic prosperity and seeks to balance regional and national freight priorities. The goods movement portion of the Regional Plan may produce a menu of projects that reflects the freight network needs of the region and balances freight benefits with sustainability objectives.

The goods movement portion of the Unconstrained Network will consist of road and truckway projects (accommodating more than 90 percent of freight by volume) that comprise the backbone of the freight distribution network as well as maritime, rail, border, air cargo, intermodal centers, and pipeline related projects.

In March 2013, CTAC received information about the schedule for the development of San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan, which is summarized below. The schedule for development of the Goods Movement Strategy is integrated into this larger effort as shown:

- Vision, Goals and Policy Objectives – May 2013
- Regional Plan Unconstrained Network
  - Development of unconstrained goods movement project list – July 2013
- Evaluation Criteria & Cost Estimates
  - Evaluation criteria and cost estimate for goods movement projects – October 2013
- Network Performance Measures – December 2013
- Alternative Land Use & Transportation Scenario research – February 2014
Freight Gateway Study Update
In March 2010, SANDAG published the Comprehensive Freight Gateway Study (Gateway Study), which provided a forecast of regional freight traffic in San Diego and Imperial Counties through 2050. The primary objective of the Gateway Study is to give SANDAG, the Imperial County Transportation Commission (ICTC), and other regional stakeholders access to timely freight flow forecast information as an estimation tool to better plan and manage a sustainable freight network.

The Freight Gateway Study Update will refresh the baseline estimates (from 2007 to 2012) and the forecast freight flows for 2035 and 2050, using updated data from freight stakeholders and commodity flow data. A procurement process is currently underway to hire consultant services to conduct the update as well as build SANDAG’s capacity to conduct future Gateway Study updates. It is anticipated that the update will be complete in late 2013 or early 2014.

Analysis of Freeway Operational Strategies Related to the Use of Managed Lanes by Trucks
This study seeks to identify and analyze different strategies for accommodating and managing trucks on the region’s freeways. The overall study objectives are to:

- conduct a broad feasibility analysis of different freeway operational strategies for trucks
- summarize truck data in the region, including general characteristics of regional truck travel, data gaps, and recommendations for additional truck data collection
- recommend future studies or activities regarding promising strategies

SANDAG staff is working with a project study team, which includes representatives from Caltrans, Federal Highway Administration, the Port of San Diego, and local trucking industry representatives. Feedback is also being gathered from the larger Freight Stakeholders Working Group.

Several initial study deliverables have been completed. They include a Literature Review that summarizes the current regulatory framework in California as it relates to the use of Managed Lanes by trucks and looks at case studies and relevant studies relating to truck management strategies locally, nationally, and internationally; and an Issue Identification Memo, which identifies planning, policy, safety, operational, user acceptance, engineering, and cost/funding issues associated with possible truck management strategies. In addition, a list of seven broad truck management Strategies has been developed for analysis as part of the study.
The strategies range from simple short term and less capital-intensive strategies to more costly and complex infrastructure improvements. The next step is to gather and summarize a variety of data related to truck travel in the region in order to analyze these different strategies and determine potential applicability of different strategies in the region.

The seven general categories of strategies being analyzed are:

1. **Base Case Scenario** - consider what the future looks like for goods mobility in the region if no new actions are taken to address truck mobility.
2. **Traffic Organizational Strategies at Freight Gateways & Distribution Hubs** - Coordinated communication strategies (e.g. variable message signs, radio announcements, etc.) to optimize truck traffic flow at key locations like the port or border.
3. **Travel Demand Management Strategies with Truckers and Shippers/ Receivers** - facilitate the shifting of trucks to off-peak travel times, based on pricing incentives and fees.
4. **Restricted Access for trucks on the Planned Network of HOV/HOT Managed Lanes** - allow restricted access during, for example off-peak periods, off-peak directions, and/or assigned to certain lanes.
5. **Designated Truck Lanes** - construction of new lanes on existing facilities such as truck bypass lanes, truck routes, or climbing lanes.
6. **Separate dedicated truck-only facilities** - construction of new facilities dedicated for trucks.
7. **Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS)/Active Traffic Management and Lane Assignment** - uses technologies (both external and in-vehicle) to improve truck mobility and safety.

This study is a first step in exploring truck management strategies in the region and will provide background and exploratory research needed to better understand issues associated with different strategies. If promising alternatives are identified through this research, then phased additional studies may include a more detailed planning study for a specific corridor to further identify appropriate scenarios, policy and operational actions, cost, and potential phasing.

**Next Steps**
The Freight Stakeholders Working Group will be asked to provide feedback regarding the above mentioned studies. The next meeting is tentatively planned for late May. A similar update to the Regional Planning Technical Working Group is scheduled on April 11, 2013, and an overview of these planning efforts is anticipated to be presented to the Transportation Committee on May 3, 2013.

**Key Staff Contacts:** Christina Casgar, (619) 699-1982, Christina.Casgar@sandag.org
Andrea Hoff, (619) 699-1983, Andrea.Hoff@sandag.org
San Diego Association of Governments
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Action Requested: DISCUSSION

REGIONAL ARTERIAL MANAGEMENT SYSTEM UPDATE File Number 3311000

Introduction

The following report provides an update on current regional maintenance and support efforts for the Regional Arterial Management System (RAMS). At the April 2012 meeting, CTAC approved a one-year trial period for on-going RAMS operations based on a regional pooled-fund model recommended by staff and SANTEC members. The annual costs for the first year of RAMS operations were shared among the fourteen (14) participating local agencies, Caltrans, and SANDAG, based on the number of traffic signals within each jurisdiction. Operational costs of supporting and maintaining RAMS cover 1) QuicNet4+ software support by McCain, Inc., 2) warranties on the server and network hardware, and 3) telecommunications support.

This staff report will update members on the status of the regional fund pool and supporting RAMS Users Group. Members will be asked to discuss the current performance of the RAMS and provide input regarding potential for continuing the regional model for RAMS support and maintenance.

Background

Staff has worked with CTAC and SANTEC on the development of various components of on-going RAMS operations, consisting primarily of the monitoring of RAMS performance, the regional pooling of agency funds, and on-going interagency coordination via a RAMS Users Group.

Regional Fund Pool

The annual cost for regional RAMS operations in FY 2013 is $236,000 for the sixteen (16) participating agencies. Based on the April 2012 CTAC recommendation, staff worked with local agencies on the transfer of funds into the regional pool established for on-going SANDAG operations. Staff provided local agencies with three options for transferring local funds to SANDAG:

1. Withhold Local TransNet Funding Allocation - Eight (8) local agencies opted to have a portion of their respective FY 2013 TransNet funding allocation withheld in the amount of their RAMS cost share.

2. Reprogram Local TransNet Funds via RTIP Amendment – Five (5) agencies opted to reprogram existing transportation funds from other projects to cover the RAMS cost share. These agencies provided updated project information as part of the 2012 RTIP update cycle.

3. Direct Payment – Two (2) agencies opted to fund their respective RAMS cost share with other local funds and pay SANDAG directly. Direct payment by local agencies requires entering into an interagency funding agreement with SANDAG.
The agency cost shares and fund transfer options for FY 2013 RAMS Operations are shown on Attachment 1. Regional RAMS operations efforts were included in the approved FY 2013 SANDAG Budget and Overall Work Program (OWP) under ITS Operations (OWP #6311000).

Upon further analysis, staff has concluded that fund transfer Option #1 (Withhold TransNet Allocation) does not provide participating local agencies with sufficient financial transparency to document the transfer of TransNet LSI funds via Local Resolution only. A local agency using Option #1 have no mechanism in their respective financial accounting system or the RTIP (ProjectTrak) to capture annual or cumulative activity of its TransNet allocations, which would then provide no means to “gross up” the activity in its general ledger or annual TransNet compliance audit.

In order to provide increase financial transparency with the transfers into the FY 2013 RAMS fund pool, funds withheld from the eight (8) local agencies selecting Option #1 in FY 2013 will be documented as revenue under a SANDAG RTIP project for ITS Operations (SAN54) in FY 2013. For future RAMS operations, staff will no longer offer Option #1 to participating local agencies. Staff will work with local agency staff on programming funds (Option #2) or developing interagency MOUs (Option #3) to transfer funds in future years as needed.

RAMS Users Group

Complementary to the first year of RAMS operations was a need to create a formal RAMS Users Group (RUG) to allow Caltrans and participating local agencies a forum to discuss arterial management and traffic signal issues within the framework of the regional QuicNet4+ platform. The RUG is modeled after a small, informal group that participated in a forum during development of the RAMS. The intent of this RUG model is to leverage the collective knowledge and experience amongst local agencies in using the RAMS platform. The RUG is intended to be run by local agency staff, with SANDAG staff providing staff support. With evolving technologies (i.e., webinars, remote networking, etc.), RAMS users have the ability to share information and learn from one another without formal in-person meetings.

After the May 2012 SANTEC meeting, members identified user needs to be covered by the Users Group in FY 2013, ranging from basic, introductory topics (e.g., managing controller inventory, setting controller permissions, GIS, etc.) to advanced RAMS functionalities (e.g., Active Directory management, adaptive signal control). Due to staff turnover and time lapse between active uses of the RAMS platform, many agencies expressed a need for additional formal training. In response, McCain provided training to all local agencies to give new and existing RAMS users the opportunity to maintain a basic proficiency in operating within the RAMS environment. Two training sessions were conducted by McCain in December 2012 and provided at no cost to local agencies.

In early January 2013, staff members from Carlsbad and Caltrans have volunteered to lead future RUG endeavors. Staff continues to work with these local agency members to develop upcoming RUG meeting items and discussion topics.

Performance Measures for On-Going RAMS Operations

Staff will provide a more detailed report of key quantitative and qualitative measures documenting the performance of the on-going RAMS maintenance and support activities.
Next Steps

This report provided updated information to CTAC members for future discussion and consideration. Staff plans to provide an project update at the April 17 SANTEC meeting to further develop recommendations for future RAMS support and maintenance efforts.

Attachment: 1. Regional Arterial Management System (RAMS) Operations - Fiscal Year 2013 Regional Support Model Cost Sharing Breakdown

Key Staff Contacts: Stan Glowacki, (619) 699-1913, Stan.Glowacki@sandag.org
Ellison Alegre, (619) 699-0729, Ellison.Alegre@sandag.org
### Regional Arterial Management System (RAMS) Operations
### Fiscal Year 2013 Regional Support Model Cost Sharing Breakdown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Option #</th>
<th>Funding Option</th>
<th>Signal Count</th>
<th>Signal %</th>
<th>Total Annual Costs</th>
<th>Cost Share %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Local TNet Withheld</td>
<td>1,520</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>$67,600</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Local TNet Withheld</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>$12,500</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Carlsbad</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Local TNet Withheld</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>$11,700</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Oceanside</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Local TNet Withheld</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>$11,200</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Marcos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Local TNet Withheld</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>$10,800</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Vista</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Local TNet Withheld</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>$8,800</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Local TNet Withheld</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>$7,400</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Poway</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Local TNet Withheld</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>$7,300</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Chula Vista</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Local TNet Reprogram</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>$15,500</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of El Cajon</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Local TNet Reprogram</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>$9,700</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of National City</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Local TNet Reprogram</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Encinitas</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Local TNet Reprogram</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>$7,400</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of La Mesa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Local TNet Reprogram</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>$7,400</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans District 11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Local Non-TNet Payment</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>$24,400</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Escondido</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Local Non-TNet Payment</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>$11,300</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANDAG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3,534</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>$236,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>