MEETING NOTICE
AND AGENDA

REGIONAL PLANNING TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP
The Regional Planning Technical Working Group may take action on any item appearing on this agenda.

Thursday, May 9, 2013
3* to 3:15 p.m. (*Starts at 3 p.m. or immediately after TWG/CTAC workshop ends)

SANDAG, Conference Room 7
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101-4231

Staff Contacts: Carolina Gregor
(619) 699-1989
carolina.gregor@sandag.org

Susan Baldwin
(619) 699-1943
susan.baldwin@sandag.org

AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

• SAN DIEGO FORWARD: THE REGIONAL PLAN:
  UPCOMING PUBLIC WORKSHOPS

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

SANDAG offices are accessible by public transit.
Phone 511 or see www.511sd.com for route information.
Secure bicycle parking is available in the building garage off Fourth Avenue.

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.
ITEM # | RECOMMENDATION
--- | ---
1. | WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS
The Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG) members should conduct self-introductions.

2. | PUBLIC COMMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS
Members of the public shall have the opportunity to address TWG 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 staff coordinators prior to speaking. Public speakers should notify the coordinators if they have a handout for distribution to working group members. Public speakers are limited to three minutes or less per person.

3. | MEETING SUMMARY OF APRIL 11, 2013
The TWG should review and approve the meeting summary from its April 11, 2013, meeting.

CHAIR’S REPORTS (4 through 5)

4. | SAN DIEGO FORWARD: THE REGIONAL PLAN: UPCOMING PUBLIC WORKSHOPS (Phil Trom)
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 provides the workshop schedule and content. TWG members are encouraged to attend, to post the invitation on their local websites, and to invite others that might be interested.

5. | 2013 SAN DIEGO AMERICAN PLANNING ASSOCIATION AWARDS (Bill Chopyk)
Last month, the San Diego chapter of the American Planning Association held its 2013 Awards banquet. Two projects were honored under the 2013 Complete Streets Award, and 13 projects were honored as 2013 San Diego American Planning Association Award Winners, as shown in the attached flier. Congratulations to the award winners!

REPORTS (6)

6. | TransNet SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM: GRANT APPLICATION SCORING RESULTS FOR THE FY 2013 CYCLE (Stephan Vance)
SANDAG received 29 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. At the May 5, 2013, Regional Planning and Transportation Committee meetings, staff presented the project rankings that resulted from the scoring process. Staff will request a recommendation from both committees at its June meetings.
7. ADJOURNMENT OF THE TWG AND NEXT MEETING INFORMATION

The next TWG meeting will be held on Thursday, June 13, 2013.

+ next to an agenda item indicates an attachment
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AGENDA ITEM NO.: 3

Action Requested: APPROVE

MEETING SUMMARY OF APRIL 11, 2013

Please note: Audio file of meeting is available on the SANDAG website (www.sandag.org) on the Regional Planning Technical Working Group page.

Agenda Item 1: Welcome and Introductions

The meeting was called to order by Manjeet Ranu (City of El Cajon), Vice Chair of the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG).

Agenda Item 2: Public Comments and Communications

Members of the public had the opportunity to address the TWG on any issue within the jurisdiction of the respective group that was not on the agenda.

Elyse Lowe (Executive Director, MoveSanDiego) communicated that MoveSanDiego has submitted a letter to SANDAG making comments and recommendations on the content to be included in the next regional plan, with an emphasis on strengthening regional infrastructure. Ms. Lowe stated that recommendations include the integration of health as a core value in the policies of the regional plan, linking regional goals back to local land use and local infrastructure funding plans, actions to achieve sustainable urban development, the importance of integrating affordable housing and social equity objectives into Transit-Oriented Development policy discussions, and regulatory streamlining. Ms. Lowe stated that she will contact TWG members to discuss local priorities for inclusion in the regional plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy.

Item 3: Meeting Summary

Action: Upon a motion by Kathy Garcia (City of Del Mar) and a second by Don Neu (City of Carlsbad), the March 14, 2013, Joint TWG/CTAC meeting summary was approved unanimously.

Agenda Item 4: San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan: Upcoming Public Workshops (Information)

Carolina Gregor (SANDAG) informed the TWG that as part of the Regional Plan Public Involvement Plan, a series of seven workshops will be held between May and July 2013. Three workshops are planned at the Caltrans building in Old Town during the day and four subregional workshops are planned during evening hours in Oceanside, Escondido, La Mesa, and San Ysidro. Further details regarding the workshops will follow and TWG members were encouraged to assist in spreading the word as more information becomes available.
Mr. Ranu encouraged TWG members to coordinate with their public information officers to get the word out about the upcoming workshop series.

**Agenda Item 5: 2050 Regional Growth Forecast (Series 13) (Information)**

Kirby Brady (SANDAG) provided a status update on the 2050 Regional Growth Forecast, informing the TWG that the collection of land use inputs from local jurisdictions is in the process of completion. The next step will involve jurisdictional review of capacity data, including numbers representing total capacity as well as capacity by structure type. Ms. Brady requested that TWG members review these numbers for accuracy as they receive them by email and to contact her regarding any questions or modifications.

Andy Hamilton (Air Pollution Control District) asked how the development of land use scenarios affects capacity data. Ms. Brady explained that the capacity data is based on current or adopted plans, providing a breakdown of available housing unit capacity for each jurisdiction and that the development of land use scenarios would not necessarily have an effect. Ms. Gregor indicated that she would provide further clarification within the context of the next item.

Mr. Ranu reminded TWG members that when providing SANDAG with local land use assumptions that city councils have not yet adopted, it is important to obtain review by the city manager to ensure an appropriate level of coordination with the larger legislative body.

**Agenda Item 6: San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan: Alternative Land Use and Transportation Scenarios to Further Reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions – Background Information (Discussion)**

Ms. Gregor provided an update on the status of the development of alternative land use and transportation scenarios. She reported feedback from the TWG and Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) as well as the Regional Planning Committee (RPC) and Transportation Committee (TC), including the following:

- TWG members identified land use, parking, and pricing as sensitive issues, but emphasized the benefit of scenario testing from a long-term “big picture” perspective, particularly for greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reductions. This information was relayed to the SANDAG RPC and TC that provided further feedback.

- The TC recommended that a combination of approaches be taken, including an emphasis on emerging technologies, and suggested testing parking pricing on a regional basis. Also stressed, was the importance of continued communication between TWG and CTAC members and their local elected officials that serve on the SANDAG Policy Advisory Committees and Board.

- The RPC emphasized the need to consider emerging technologies and explore the ability to quantify and model innovations that could help further reduce GHG emissions. Ms. Gregor stated that Phil Trom (SANDAG) has begun exploring emerging technologies and encouraged TWG members to share suggestions.
Ms. Gregor distributed a matrix summarizing previous scenario planning exercises at SANDAG and scenario planning exercises from other organizations such as the Southern California Association of Governments, the Denver Regional Council of Governments, and the San Diego Foundation, describing the fixed parameters and potential variables used in other scenario efforts. Most scenarios start with a baseline and then incorporate more aggressive land use and transportation variables. The purpose of the matrix is to provide ideas on the range of potential variables that could be tested in the scenario planning effort.

Chris Schmidt (Caltrans) suggested that it would be useful and important to test the impact of free transit on the region to provide a bookend possibility in the effort to reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT). Mr. Ranu added that two examples of free transit systems exist in Colorado: the 16th Street mall shuttle, which is the most heavily used route in Denver and the “Eco Pass” in Boulder, which provides free transit for employees of downtown and also has high ridership.

Ed Batchelder (City of Chula Vista) expressed agreement with Mr. Schmidt and continued to suggest that financial disincentives to reduce VMT should be bundled with incentive-based models. Mr. Batchelder went on to recommend that the principles or primary objectives of the scenario models must be made clear, and should be focused on addressing the “backsliding issue” to engage elected officials. Mr. Batchelder suggested that the scenario effort explore subregional opportunities to reduce VMT by identifying gaps in infrastructure, capacity, or employment, and then modeling a “complete neighborhoods” alternative. Mr. Batchelder stated that the region lacks a web of interconnected transportation and stressed the need to identify gaps and model “first and last mile” solutions.

In response to a question from Mr. Hamilton, Ms. Gregor clarified that the scenario modeling process will be iterative, establishing an initial broad set of alternatives to test through the UrbanFootprint visioning tool that is currently being developed, then narrowing that set to the top three to four scenarios to run through the SANDAG suite of modeling tools as a point for policy discussion.

Clarifying a question by Mr. Hamilton regarding the relationship between land use and the transportation network and the abilities of the modeling software, Clint Daniels (SANDAG) explained that the model responds depending on the level of constraints the user applies, providing more flexibility for responsiveness when there are fewer constraints on land use, and modeling land uses as they exist today when land uses are fixed and highly constrained.

Mr. Hamilton responded by suggesting that the scenario process include an alternative with no restrictions to observe a “market-driven” scenario in order to establish a baseline for perspectives to inform decision-makers. Mr. Hamilton went on to discuss economic outcomes that should be considered in the scenario effort, citing one study that showed that parking pricing in Pasadena did not deter development into areas where parking was free, but instead displayed a feedback mechanism that attracted development due to the improved quality of the area. Mr. Hamilton concluded by pointing to other research that shows a positive correlation between walkability, bikeability, and good transit access and improved economic performance, emphasizing that these types of relationships need to be illustrated in the scenario process.
Mr. Ranu asked if the PECAS model is capable of suggesting propensities for land use changes in areas, which could help guide the implementation of future land use changes. Mr. Daniels explained that the response of the model depends on the flexibility provided by the land use inputs, stating that the model is more informative in an unconstrained world.

Mr. Schmidt suggested an alternative scenario that models a reduction in “home-to-school” trips, which greatly contribute to congestion and traffic volumes.

Ms. Lowe suggested a social equity/environment scenario that has tested well according to the Bay Area’s Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), and recommended exploring the parameters and details of that specific MTC effort.

Mr. Batchelder emphasized the concept of “complete neighborhoods,” balancing land use patterns on a subregional level to reduce VMT, and recommended the San Diego Foundation as a potential resource for identifying subregional gaps in neighborhoods.

Mr. Ranu commented that transit makes the most impact on VMT reductions for routine trips to schools and work, but not for regular errands on the weekend. Mr. Ranu emphasized the need to make employment centers more transit-friendly. Mr. Ranu continued to discuss the challenges of streamlining and infrastructure development related to regulations, NIMBYism, and pre-existing infill deficits in urban infill areas that place burdens on both developers and existing residents.

Mr. Ranu suggested a strategy that considers investment in infrastructure and amenities in areas targeted for growth might allow those places to accommodate growth more efficiently, reduce VMT, as well as streamline the permitting process.

Ms. Gregor suggested that the TWG hold a “break-out” brainstorming session, possibly with the CTAC, on May 9 right before the next regularly scheduled TWG meeting, to begin to identify potential assumptions for the alternative scenarios.

Mr. Ranu concluded the item by stressing the importance of a clear message. He stated that the scenarios may need to be exaggerated at the start, but that as the scenario planning effort evolves, there will be great value in highlighting what can potentially be done to further reduce GHG emissions in the region.

**Agenda Item 7: San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan: Public Health White Paper (Discussion)**

Dan Gallagher (SANDAG) distributed the draft Public Health white paper and discussed public health’s history, why it matters, how the built environment affects health, and existing regional/local efforts. Mr. Gallagher requested that the TWG review and comment on the draft, specifically regarding the policy questions and health topics to be focused on in the regional plan, asking members to provide feedback as to what may be missing. Specifically, Mr. Gallagher asked TWG members what project criteria and transportation network performance metrics could help improve public health.
Mr. Batchelder commented that public health is an indicator-outcome of how well planning efforts such as walkability or zoning are done and asked whether enough empirical data exists between health and land use/transportation choices to use public health as an indicator. Mr. Gallagher explained that SANDAG is currently looking at health outcome indicators with partners at Health and Human Services to develop those metrics on criteria such as childhood obesity, for example, but emphasized the need to collect annual data to facilitate the monitoring of public health.

Mr. Batchelder continued by discussing the costs of public health, emphasizing the lack of funding to address inadequate infrastructure on the “front end,” while accumulating even larger costs at the “back end” in an effort to support healthcare. Mr. Batchelder concluded that if someone could explore the financial bookends of not investing on the “front end” and the ultimate “back end” costs/findings could potentially shift perspectives on public health.

Stephan Vance (SANDAG) explained that SANDAG has been exploring ways to accomplish this, specifically through “Healthy Works 1” grant, which developed some health outcomes using the “CommunityViz” tool that will be released following refinement as well as an activity-based model called Integrated Transportation Health Impact Model, which examines the effect of active transportation on physical activity levels. Mr. Vance emphasized that the larger policy question is that while health outcomes and costs are spread broadly throughout society, transportation investment decisions are more focused, asking to what extent policy makers can produce an efficient transportation system with broader societal costs included.

Mr. Hamilton commented that studies have shown that the negative effects of short-term exposure to pollution is far outweighed by the positive benefits of physical activity and that this should be reflected in the white paper. Mr. Hamilton continued by emphasizing the need for a “big picture” perspective and the need to consider the negative health outcomes of policy objectives that invest in road capacity and reward sprawl.

Mr. Batchelder expressed appreciation of the “why public health matters” section of the white paper and discussion of the relationship between public health and local land use planning, commenting that converting public health issues into more practical anecdotal responses will help people understand how planning affects public health.

Ms. Lowe asked if the white paper included recommendations for daily physical activity levels and a connection to what that looks like in relation to transit. Mr. Vance and Mr. Gallagher confirmed that it does, citing research that shows the implementation of public transit correlated with a measurable relationship to body mass index and reminding the TWG that most transit trips involve a walking or biking component to reach transit. Ms. Lowe suggested that the paper connect back to the concept of “complete neighborhoods” and make the case for public health as a core value in the regional plan. Ms. Lowe recommended that a recent study performed by the Department of Public Health regarding GHG emissions and climate change as they relate to health outcomes be incorporated into the white paper.

Mr. Ranu requested that TWG members review the white paper and forward comments to Ms. Gregor.
Mr. Hamilton commented that it would be helpful to address the obstacles that exist to implementing the necessary infrastructure for improving public health and to establish strategies that would facilitate the development of “complete neighborhoods.”

Chris Jacobs (La Mesa) suggested that the white paper address not only the history and current status of public health in planning, but discuss the next steps and potential solutions to public health issues.

Mr. Gallagher responded that in “Healthy Works,” a draft health and wellness policy framework was developed that looked at topics and developed goals, objectives, recommended actions, and possible indicators/performance measures, explaining that this work will be considered in the policy development for San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan, and reiterating the need for feedback from TWG members.

Ms. Lowe suggested that the paper incorporate a discussion of access to affordable housing and the need to focus on communities of concern.

**Agenda Item 8: San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan: Engaging Community-Based Organizations in the Planning Process (Information)**

Jane Clough (SANDAG) informed the TWG that as part of the Public Involvement Plan for San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan, SANDAG has entered into contracts with 11 community-based organizations (CBOs) throughout the region. These community partners will facilitate the development of an “outreach network” to help broaden the participation of vulnerable populations throughout the development of the regional plan. Some workshops have been held with the CBOs to discuss the definition of “communities of concern.” Ms. Clough requested that TWG members support CBOs in their local jurisdictions.

**Agenda Item 9: Freight Stakeholders Working Group Update (Information)**

Christina Casgar (SANDAG) reported on the first kick-off meeting of the recently established Freight Stakeholders Working Group held on January 30, 2013. Ms. Casgar reported that three planning studies are underway: the Goods Movement section of the regional plan, a Freight Gateway Study, and an analysis of freeway operational strategies related to the use of Express Lanes by trucks. Ms. Casgar informed the TWG that the goods movement section of the regional plan will look at various components including truck, roadway, port, rail projects, air cargo, intermodal transfer centers, and even pipelines. Goods movement will nest into the larger context of the regional plan, fitting in at different points and providing specific information about goods movement projects, evaluation criteria, and cost estimates, and will become part of the overall transportation chapter. Ms. Casgar also provided an update of the Freight Gateway Study, which was completed as the first version in 2010 together with Imperial County to understand how traffic circulates between the two counties. The study is currently being updated as the second version, and will release a Request for Proposals by late 2013.

Andrea Hoff (SANDAG) presented an analysis of freeway operational strategies related to the use of Express Lanes by trucks. Ms. Hoff explained that, as the region plans freeway improvements for increases in vehicles, Express Lanes is one concept discussed as a way to address the need for capacity on freeways as well as the concept of Express Lanes used by trucks. Ms. Hoff informed the
TWG on various issues related to intermingling trucks with personal vehicles on Express Lanes, including regulatory challenges and safety concerns. Ms. Hoff stated that the overall objectives are to conduct a broad feasibility study, summarize truck data and data gaps, and look at goods movement throughout the region to develop recommendations for strategies for future research. Ms. Hoff presented three main “deliverables” available for review: a literature review of existing regulations; national and international case studies of truck management strategies; an Issue Identification Memo that identified issues of accommodating and managing trucks on the freeways, ranging from safety to cost/funding, to engineering concerns; and a list of seven broad truck management strategies.

Mr. Ranu asked if global positioning systems are being used to gather data on trucks and goods movement. Ms. Hoff explained that while this is occurring and SANDAG is currently writing a grant to purchase this type of data, it will not be a part of this study. Ms. Casgar added that the data is proprietary, requiring an aggregated form to mask privileged information.

**Agenda Item 10: Adjournment and Next Meeting (Information)**

The next TWG meeting will be held on May 9, 2013, from 1:15 to 3:15 p.m.

**Action:** The TWG meeting was adjourned by Mr. Ranu.
Help Shape Our Region’s Future

Workshops Tackle Important Issues Facing the Region

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

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
2013 Complete Streets Awards:
Maple Avenue Pedestrian Plaza
Carlsbad Livable Streets Assessment

2013 SDAPA Award Winners:
Comprehensive Planning Large Jurisdiction
City of San Diego – General Plan Housing Element 2013-2020
Planning Project
Mercado del Barrio

Planning Project Honorable Mention
Lincoln Acres Library & Community Room

Innovation in Green Community Planning
Holtville Golf Cart/NEV Circulation Master Plan

Innovation in Green Community Planning Honorable Mention
Energy Roadmap Program for Local Governments

Focused Issue Planning
UC San Diego Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Planning Study

Focused Issue Planning Honorable Mention
Regional Housing Needs Assessment Plan/SANDAG Board Policy No. 33/Regional Housing Progress Report 2003-2011

Best Practices
Military Installation Airfield Waiver Study and Project Siting Tool

Grassroots Initiative
Swan Canyon Community-Based Environmental Initiative

Education Project
New and Emerging Tools for Urban Reinvestment Education Program

Neighborhood Planning
North Park Mini-Park and Associated Streetscape Improvements

Distinguished Leadership
Elected Official - Elwood J. “Pete” Mellinger

Hard Won Victories
Chula Vista Bayfront Master Plan
2013 SDAPA Awards Ceremony

Jury:
Patsy Chow
Brian Fish
Rameeta Garewal, AICP
Rob Hutsel
Chris Schmidt, AICP

Awards Committee:
Theresa Millette, AICP
Betsy McCullough, AICP
Mirle Bussell, Ph.D.
Susan Baldwin, AICP
Alex Hempton, AICP
Nick Oliver
Kim Sheredy, AICP
Mary Wright, AICP, Jury Liaison

2013 San Diego Section Scholarship Recipients
Marina Espinoza – UCSD Urban Studies & Planning Program
Debbie Leung – UCSD Urban Studies & Planning Program
Caleb Schroeder – SDSU Master of City Planning Program

Generous donations for the Scholarship Fund were made by the following companies, organizations, and individuals:

Roundtable Pizza
Amanda and Shawn Lee
Comedy Palace
Landini's Pizzeria
San Diego Housing Federation
Car2Go
North Coast Repertory Theatre
 Padres Tickets
Carey and Chris Fernandes
Cygnet Theatre
Bill Anderson
Cosmopolitan Hotel
The Haven Pizzeria
Flemings Prime Steakhouse and Wine Bar
The Pearl Hotel and Restaurant
Harrah's Rincon Casino and Resort
Valley View Casino and Hotel
San Diego Public Market
Chargers Tickets
Betsy McCullough & Jim Hare
Landmark Theater/Susan Baldwin
TransNet SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM: File Number 3300100
GRANT APPLICATION SCORING RESULTS FOR THE FY 2013 CYCLE

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 process.

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 and 16 for planning projects. 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.

An initial list of project funding recommendations was included in the April 5 agendas for the Regional Planning and Transportation Committees. Those items were deferred to allow time to reevaluate the project ranking process. While the approach used in the initial report was consistent with previous SGIP funding cycles, it was determined that the ranking methodology for this cycle should be consistent with the processes used in other competitive grant programs at SANDAG. The approach described below achieves that objective.

Discussion

FY 2013 Funding Availability

The FY 2013 cycle has $9.6 million 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. 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 1.
**Project Ranking Process**

The application evaluation process was based on a combination of objective criteria calculated by SANDAG staff and subjective criteria that was scored by the scoring panel. Objective criteria included such items as the land use and transportation characteristics of the project area, the project’s relationship to regional transit, project readiness, and matching funds. Subjective criteria evaluate the quality of the proposed projects, and how well the proposals would meet the program objectives. The subjective criteria were scored by a panel of seven that included three SANDAG staff, staff from three local jurisdictions that had not submitted applications in this cycle, and one staff person from Caltrans. To develop the final project rankings, the objective criteria scores were added to each panel member’s scores for each project to produce a total score. A project ranking was then derived for each panel member from one to 15 for capital projects and one to 14 for planning projects. Those rankings were then added to develop a sum of project ranks with the lowest sums representing the highest ranked projects. The final project rankings are now determined based on cumulative ranks rather than an average score as shown in Attachment 2.

The SANDAG Technical Services Department performed an independent review of the scores shown in Attachment 2 to ensure the technical criteria were properly scored, that the evaluation panel’s scores were properly recorded, and that the individual criteria scores were properly summed to obtain the rankings shown in Attachment 3. Descriptions of all project applications are included in Attachment 4.

**Final Project Rankings**

In total, six capital projects and seven planning projects are recommended to receive funding.

**Capital Projects**

Local jurisdictions submitted 15 eligible capital grant project applications requesting approximately $17.3 million in SGIP funding. There is at least $7.68 million available to fund capital projects for the FY 2013 cycle. According to the final project rankings and available funding, four capital projects are recommended to receive full funding. Two projects tied at the funding cut line and are recommended to receive partial funding, awarded proportionately.

**Capital Projects Recommended for Full Funding**

1. San Marcos Armorlite Complete Street Corridor $1,000,000
2. National City Downtown-Westside Community Connections $2,000,000
3. La Mesa Downtown Village Streetscape Improvement Project $2,000,000
4. San Diego Island Avenue Green Street Mobility Improvements $1,000,000

**Capital Project Recommended for Partial Funding**

5. San Diego Wayfinding Signage $335,329
6. Chula Vista Third Avenue Streetscape Implementation Project $1,344,671

**Total Funding Recommended for Award:** $7,680,000
Planning Projects

Local jurisdictions submitted 14 eligible planning grant applications requesting approximately $3.5 million in SGIP funding. There is $1.92 million available to fund planning projects for the FY 2013 cycle. According to the final project rankings and available funding, six planning grants are recommended to receive full funding. A seventh project is identified to receive partial funding.

Planning Projects Recommended for Full Funding

1. San Diego East Village Green/14th Street Promenade Master Plan $300,000
2. San Diego Morena Boulevard Station Area Study Phase 2 $400,000
4. Lemon Grove Main Street Promenade Extension Planning Project $400,000
5. Chula Vista Healthy Communities Program $100,000
6. Imperial Beach Palm Avenue Mixed-Use & Commercial Corridor Master Plan $400,000

Planning Project Recommended for Partial Funding

7. San Diego The Complete Boulevard Planning Study $171,617

Total Funding Recommended for Award: $1,920,000

Based on discussions with the cities of Chula Vista and San Diego, the Wayfinding Signage project can be completed as proposed by providing additional local funds. The Chula Vista Third Avenue Streetscape Implementation project can be completed by scaling back the improvements proposed for one of the three blocks in the project area. The San Diego Complete the Boulevard project proposed planning and preliminary engineering in two distinct areas along El Cajon Boulevard. With reduced funding the City of San Diego can fully complete the project in one of those areas.

Next Steps

Staff will present the FY 2013 SGiP project ranking results to the Regional Planning Committee, TransNet Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee, the Regional Planning Technical Working Group, and the Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee at their May or June meetings and will bring this item back to the Regional Planning and Transportation Committees in June for a recommendation to the Board of Directors, whose final action is scheduled for June.

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

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

Key Staff Contact: Stephan Vance, (619) 699-1924, stephan.vance@sandag.org
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
project area will not receive any points). 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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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</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></td>
<td><strong>AND</strong></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></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></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></td>
<td><strong>OR</strong></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</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 100% or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>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.
## B. EXISTING and ENTITLED Land Development Around the Proposed Capital Project

| B1 | EXISTING Development Density within ¼ mile radius of proposed capital project site – ON THE GROUND | For Metropolitan Centers/Urban Centers/Town Centers | Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 100% or more | Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 50-99% | Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 25-49% | AND | 3 | Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 100% or more | 2 | Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 50-99% | 1 | Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 25-49% | OR | For Community Centers/Rural Village/Mixed-Use Transit Corridor | 6 | Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 100% or more | 4 | Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 50-99% | 2 | Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 25-49% |
|----|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|----|----|---------------------------------------------------|----|-------------------------------------------------|----|-------------------------------------------------|----|-------------------------------------------------|----|-------------------------------------------------|----|-------------------------------------------------|----|-------------------------------------------------|----|
| 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 | Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 50-99% | Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 25-49% | AND | 3 | Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 100% or more | 2 | Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 50-99% | 1 | Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 25-49% | OR | For Community Centers/Rural Village/Mixed-Use Transit Corridor | 6 | Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 100% or more | 4 | Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 50-99% | 2 | Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 25-49% |

| Up to 6 | 1 | 6 | 2% |
### B3 Mix of Uses
- **(Single-family residential, retail, office, civic, parks, visitor within ¼ mile of project site)**
  - 3 Multi-family residential + 6 other uses
  - 2 Multi-family residential + 4-5 other uses
  - 1 Multi-family residential + 2-3 other uses

| Up to 3 | 2 | 6 | 2% |

### B4 New Use
- 2 New use will be added to the project area

| 2 | 1 | 2 | 1% |

### C New Affordable Housing Development

#### C1 New Affordable Housing
- % of income-restricted affordable housing provided in proposed new development (within ¼ mile of project site)
  - 3 100% of units affordable
  - 2 99-75% of units affordable
  - 1 74-25% of units affordable

| Up to 3 | 2 | 6 | 2% |

#### 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)

#### D1 Relation to Transit
- Scale of actual walking distance to existing or programmed station or transit hub:
  - Regional or Corridor station or a Transit Center - Project abuts or is onsite
  - Project is within ½ mile
  - Transit hub - Project is within ¼ mile
  - Stop with high frequency local bus service (15 mins. all day) - Project is within ¼ mile

| Up to 12 | 1 | 12 | 4% |

---

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.
### D2 Bicycle Facilities

- **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 the San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan or local bicycle master plan)
  - Direct connection to proposed project facilities within ¼ mile radius of project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### D3 Walkability

- **Intersection Density per square mile:**
  - 290 or greater
  - 225-290
  - 100-224
  - Less than 100

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### D4 TDM Strategies

- **EXISTING** TDM programs or policies in place
- **PROPOSED** TDM programs or policies, including implementation strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### E. Community Design Features

**E1 Urban Design Characteristics and Community Context**

- 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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## II. QUALITY OF PROPOSED CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT

| A. Support for Public Transit | 5 | How well does the project support use of regional public transit service in the project area? | Up to 5 | 5 | 25 | 8% |
| B. Providing Transportation Choices | 5 | How well does the project support transportation choices that would reduce vehicle miles traveled, specifically walking and bicycling? | Up to 5 | 5 | 25 | 8% |
| C. Community Enhancement | 5 | 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? | Up to 5 | 4 | 20 | 7% |
| D. Addressing Project Area Issues | 5 | 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? | Up to 5 | 3 | 15 | 5% |
| E. Sustainability | 2 | How well does the proposed project incorporate Green Streets/Low-Impact Development principles, to address stormwater runoff, energy conservation, and landscaping/street trees? | Up to 2 | 1 | 2 | 1% |
| F. Universal Design | 2 | How well does the project incorporate Universal Design principles, to ensure access for users of all ages and abilities? | Up to 2 | 1 | 2 | 1% |

## III. PROJECT READINESS

| A. Major Milestones Completed | 1 | Environmental Clearance | Up to 4 | 5 | 20 | 7% |
| 1 | Right-of-way Acquisition | |
| 1 | Final Design | |
| 1 | Project Fully Funded (matching funds secured OR grant will fully fund project) | |
| B. Evidence of Local Commitment | 2 | Project is supported by the community, and is the result of a comprehensive public participation process that significantly involved a diverse group of stakeholders | Up to 2 | 6 | 12 | 4% |

| Subtotal | |

## IV. COST EFFECTIVENESS

| Ratio of grant request to project score | Project grant request, divided by score up to this point; ranked relative to each other | 0.00 | 16 | 5% |

## V. MATCHING FUNDS

| Relative amount of match | All projects scored on a curve, from most to least matching funds | 10 | 3% |

## VI. POLICY NO. 033 POINTS

| TOTAL PROJECT SCORE | 300 | 100% |

**CAPITAL GRANTS FY 2011 – FY 2013 SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM CALL FOR PROJECTS**
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
### Smart Growth Incentive Program Project Criteria Scores

**AGENCY**  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Carlsbad</th>
<th>Chula Vista</th>
<th>Escondido</th>
<th>La Mesa</th>
<th>Lemon Grove</th>
<th>National City</th>
<th>National City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**PROJECT**  
- Connect the Village: Wayfinding & Traffic Calming  
- Third Avenue Streetscape Implementation Project Phase  
- Bicycle Path - Missing Link  
- Downtown Village Streetscape Improvement Project  
- Lemon Grove Avenue Realignment  
- Highland Avenue Smart Growth Corridor  
- Downtown - Westside Community Connections Project

### CRITERIA

#### Land Use and Transportation Characteristics

**A. Intensity of Planned Development in the Project’s SGSA**
- A1. Planned Densities Relative to SGSA Place Type Thresholds
  - Scores: 3 5 2 3 4 0 5
- A2. Expedited Approval Process
  - Scores: 3 2 0 4 0 0 4

**B. Existing and Entitled Land Development**
- B1. Existing Development Density within 1/4 mile of project area
  - Scores: 2 2 1 2 0 0 0
- B2. Entitled Development Density within 1/4 of project area (proposed)
  - Scores: 0 3 0 0 3 0 0
- B3. Mix of Uses
  - Scores: 4 4 0 2 4 4 4
- B4. New Use
  - Scores: 0 0 0 0 2 0 0

**C. New Affordable Housing Development**
- C1. New Affordable Housing
  - Scores: 2 0 0 0 0 0 0
- C2. Low to Very low Income Affordable Housing
  - Scores: 2 0 0 0 0 0 0

#### Transportation Characteristics

**D1. Relation to Transit**
- Scores: 12 8 10 10 10 8 10
- **D2. Bicycle Facilities**
  - Scores: 4 0 4 2 4 0 4
- **D3. Walkability**
  - Scores: 4 6 4 8 4 8 8
- **D4. TDM Strategies**
  - Scores: 0 4 0 4 2 4 4

#### Community Design Features

**E1. Urban Design Characteristics and Community Context**
- Scores: 5 10 5 9 5 7 9

#### Quality of Proposed Capital Improvement Project

**A. Support for Public Transit**
- Scores: 11 20 13 21 13 17 20

**B. Providing Transportation Choices**
- Scores: 15 21 15 22 9 15 19

**C. Community Enhancements**
- Scores: 6 10 5 9 6 7 8

**D. Addressing Project Area Issues**
- Scores: 9 12 8 12 8 11 11

**E. Sustainability**
- Scores: 1 2 1 2 2 2 2

**F. Universal Design**
- Scores: 1 2 2 2 1 2 2

#### Project Readiness

**A. Major Milestones Completed**
- Scores: 15 15 15 20 15 15 15

**B. Evidence of Local Commitment**
- Scores: 11 12 9 12 8 8 10

#### Grant Score Ratio

**Grant Fund Request Amount**
- $3,500,000.00  $1,000,000.00  $0.000000  $0.000000  $0.000000  $0.000000  $0.000000

**Ratio (sub-total of points/grant request amount)**
- 0.00001782  0.00005536  0.00020558  0.00005600  0.00008526  0.00006538  0.00005500

**Rank**
- 13 3 14 4 8 7 2

#### Matching Funds

**Grant Score Ratio Points**
- 14 3 15 4 9 8 2

**Ratio (sub-total of points/match fund amount)**
- 0.00001782  0.00005536  0.00020558  0.00005600  0.00008526  0.00006538  0.00005500

**Rank**
- 14 3 15 4 8 7 2

**Policy 033 Points**
- 0.00001782  0.00005536  0.00020558  0.00005600  0.00008526  0.00006538  0.00005500

**Policy 033 Points**
- 14 3 15 4 8 7 2

**Total Project Score**
- 142 174 141 180 158 163 185
### Smart Growth Incentive Program Project Criteria Scores

**Capital SGIP Grant Proposals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>Oceanside</th>
<th>San Diego</th>
<th>San Diego</th>
<th>San Diego</th>
<th>San Diego</th>
<th>San Marcos</th>
<th>San Marcos</th>
<th>Vista</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT</td>
<td>Mission Avenue Improvement Project Phase 2</td>
<td>Island Avenue Green Street Mobility Improvements</td>
<td>Five Points Neighborhood/ Washington Street Pedestrian &amp; Median Improvements</td>
<td>University Avenue &amp; 54th Street Roadway Improvements</td>
<td>Wayfinding Signage</td>
<td>Amorilte Complete Street Corridor</td>
<td>Creekside Drive Multi-modal Corridor Enrichment Project</td>
<td>Paseo Santa Fe Streetscape &amp; Infrastructure Project Catalyst Section A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CRITERIA**

### Land Use and Transportation Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Intensity of Planned Development in the Project’s SGOA</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1. Planned Densities Relative to SGOA Place Type Thresholds</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2. Expedited Approval Process</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. Existing and Entitled Land Development</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1. Existing Development Density within 1/4 mile of project area</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2. Entitled Development Density within 1/4 of project area (proposed)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B3. Mix of Uses</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B4. New Use</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C. New Affordable Housing Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C1. New Affordable Housing</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C2. Low to Very Low Income Affordable Housing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### D. Transportation Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D1. Relation to Transit</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D2. Bicycle Facilities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3. Walkability</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4. TDM Strategies</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### E. Community Design Features

| E1. Urban Design Characteristics and Community Context | 7 | 7 | 7 | 5 | 6 | 10 | 9 | 8 |

### Quality of Proposed Capital Improvement Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Support for Public Transit</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Providing Transportation Choices</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Community Enhancements</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Addressing Project Area Issues</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Sustainability</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Universal Design</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**POINTS SUB-TOTAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Support for Public Transit</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Providing Transportation Choices</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Community Enhancements</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Addressing Project Area Issues</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Sustainability</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Universal Design</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Project Readiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Major Milestones Completed</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Evidence of Local Commitment</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grant Score Ratio**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Fund Request Amount</th>
<th>$1,200,000.00</th>
<th>$1,000,000.00</th>
<th>$200,000.00</th>
<th>$1,400,000.00</th>
<th>$1,000,000.00</th>
<th>$200,000.00</th>
<th>$1,400,000.00</th>
<th>$1,000,000.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ratio (sub-total of points / grant request amount)</td>
<td>0.00005648</td>
<td>0.00009600</td>
<td>0.00024167</td>
<td>0.00025139</td>
<td>0.00011000</td>
<td>0.00011000</td>
<td>0.00011000</td>
<td>0.00009600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio of SGIP Grant Score Points</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Matching Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matching Fund Amount</th>
<th>$250,000.00</th>
<th>$250,000.00</th>
<th>$150,000.00</th>
<th>$150,000.00</th>
<th>$150,000.00</th>
<th>$150,000.00</th>
<th>$150,000.00</th>
<th>$150,000.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Match Ratio</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Policy 033 Points**

| Policy 033 Points | 38 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 38 | 38 | 34 |

**Total Project Score**

| 171 | 178 | 168 | 136 | 136 | 178 | 191 | 138 | 166 |
### Smart Growth Incentive Program Project Criteria

**Agency**
- Carlsbad
- Chula Vista
- Del Mar
- Encinitas
- Imperial Beach
- Lemon Grove
- Oceanside
- San Diego
- San Diego

**Project**
- Plan the Village: A New Master Plan for Carlsbad Village
- Healthy Communities Program
- Parking Management Plan
- Grape Day Park Master Plan
- Palm Avenue Mixed-use & Commercial Corridor Master Plan
- Main Street Promenade Extension Planning Project
- Oceanside Mixed-use Public Parking Structure
- The Complete Boulevard Planning Study
- East Village Green: 14th Street Promenade Master Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>PROJECT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relationship to Regional Transit</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smart Growth Development Potential</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Project Goals and Objectives</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method to Accomplish the SGIP Program Objectives</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of Local Commitment and Community Support</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Match Funds Score</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Final Score**
- 129
- 133
- 76
- 126
- 130
- 133
- 103
- 128
- 152
### Smart Growth Incentive
#### Program Project Criteria

**Scores**

Planning SGIP Grant Proposals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>San Diego</th>
<th>San Diego</th>
<th>San Diego</th>
<th>Santee</th>
<th>Vista</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morena Boulevard Station Area Study Phase 2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pacific Beach Boardwalk &amp; Parks Neighborhood District</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sixth Avenue Bridge Promenade Feasibility Study</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Town Center Pedestrian Connection Feasibility Study</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vista Downtown Specific Plan Update</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Final Score</strong></td>
<td><strong>148</strong></td>
<td><strong>127</strong></td>
<td><strong>126</strong></td>
<td><strong>92</strong></td>
<td><strong>138</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>San Diego</th>
<th>San Diego</th>
<th>San Diego</th>
<th>Santee</th>
<th>Vista</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relationship to Regional Transit</td>
<td>40,000.00</td>
<td>30,000.00</td>
<td>15,000.00</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
<td>3,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smart Growth Development Potential</td>
<td>39,000.00</td>
<td>30,000.00</td>
<td>15,000.00</td>
<td>6,000.00</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Project Goals and Objectives</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of Local Commitment and Community Support</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Match Funds Score</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Match Amount</th>
<th>Match Proportion</th>
<th>Match Rank</th>
<th>Policy No. 533 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40,000.00</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000.00</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,000.00</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Matching Funds Ratio Calculation*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Final Score</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>191</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>185</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>180</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>178</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>178</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>174</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>171</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 Catalyst, Section A</td>
<td>166</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>163</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>168</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>158</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>142</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>141</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>138</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>136</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** $17,295,500

**Total Funding Requested** $17,295,500

**Total Requested Funding Over Available** ($9,615,500)
## SGIP PLANNING GRANTS PROJECT RANKING SUMMARY
Planning SGIP Grant Proposals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Final Score</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>152</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>148</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemon Grove</td>
<td>Main Street Promenade Extension Planning Project</td>
<td>133</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>133</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>130</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>128</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>129</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>126</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>127</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>126</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>103</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>92</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>76</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

- **FULLY FUNDED**
- **PARTIALLY FUNDED**
- **NOT FUNDED**

**Total Funding Requested**: $3,513,383
**Total Requested Funding Over Available**: ($1,593,383)
<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 Refuge, 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 Refuge, 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 multi-modal 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 Multi-modal 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
## Planning Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carlsbad 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* 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 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 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* 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* Main Street Promenade Extension Planning Project</td>
<td>Enliven the Main Street Promenade corridor through public right-of-way enhancements for pedestrians and cyclists, 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 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** 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* 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* 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 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 multi-modal 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 Sixth Avenue Bridge 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 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 trolley station and commercial area to the south to promote safe walking and bicycling trips.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista* 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 multi-modal connections.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Indicates projects recommended for full funding  
** Indicates projects recommended for partial funding