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AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

• SAN DIEGO FORWARD: THE REGIONAL PLAN: ALTERNATIVE LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION SCENARIOS TO FURTHER REDUCE GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS - STATUS REPORT

• SAN DIEGO FORWARD: THE REGIONAL PLAN: TRANSPORTATION PROJECT EVALUATION CRITERIA

• SERIES 13 DRAFT SUB-REGIONAL GROWTH FORECAST

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.
REGIONAL PLANNING TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP
Thursday, June 13, 2013

ITEM #  RECOMMENDATION
1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS INFORMATION
2. PUBLIC COMMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS

Members of the public will have the opportunity to address the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG) on any issue within the jurisdiction of SANDAG that is not on this agenda. Public speakers are limited to three minutes or less per person.

+3. MEETING SUMMARY – MAY 9, 2013 APPROVE

The TWG should review and approve the meeting summary from its May 9, 2013, meeting and joint workshop with the Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee.

CONSENT

4. TransNet SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM: GRANT APPLICATION INFORMATION
   RECOMMENDATION FOR FISCAL YEAR 2013 CYCLE (Susan Baldwin)

At their June 7, 2013, meetings, the Regional Planning and Transportation Committees are being asked to make a recommendation to the SANDAG Board of Directors to approve funding for the Smart Growth Incentive Program Fiscal Year (FY) 2013 cycle list of recommended projects, as included in the May 9, 2013, TWG agenda package. Pending the Committees’ recommendations, the SANDAG Board of Directors will be asked to approve the list of recommended projects at its June 28, 2013, meeting.

+5. 2050 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN/SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES STRATEGY COMMITMENTS PROGRESS REPORT (Coleen Clementson)

In its final action on the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (2050 RTP/SCS), the SANDAG Board of Directors committed to undertaking six additional actions in response to public comment at the meeting. These six commitments are an integral part of the work program for San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan. The six actions and progress made on them to date are described in the attached report and links are provided to some of the key reports associated with these actions.

REPORTS (6 through 12)

+6. FIFTH CYCLE HOUSING ELEMENT STATUS REPORT (Susan Baldwin) INFORMATION

A report presented to the Regional Planning Committee on June 7, 2013, on the status of local housing element adoptions and findings of compliance by the California Department of Housing and Community Development is attached for information. The housing element due date for local jurisdictions in the San Diego region was April 30, 2013; local jurisdictions that do not adopt a housing element within 120 calendar days of the due date will be required to revise their housing element every four instead of every eight years.
The regional plan workshops are currently underway, with five workshops being held throughout the region in June. TWG members are encouraged to attend and to invite others that might be interested. The workshop flyer is attached.

On May 9, 2013, SANDAG held a joint workshop between the TWG and the Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee to begin brainstorming on the land use component of the alternative land use and transportation scenarios. Staff will provide a brief overview of the workshop results and discuss next steps. TWG members are encouraged to attend the June 21, 2013, regional plan workshop at Caltrans, which will focus on land use and transportation issues, and will solicit public feedback on the scenarios. (See Item #7 for the workshop flyer.)

The SANDAG Board of Directors accepted the San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan vision and goals on May 10, 2013. In past Regional Transportation Plans SANDAG has utilized project evaluation criteria and performance measures informed by these goals as elements of a multi-step process to develop the revenue constrained multimodal transportation network. SANDAG will be updating the criteria from the previously adopted regional plan, the 2050 RTP/SCS, to be used for developing a prioritized list of transportation projects for San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan. The TWG will be asked to provide input on items to be considered in the update of the transportation project evaluation criteria.

The draft results of the sub-regional forecast will be presented to the TWG for discussion.

This study is conducting advanced planning on the four new rail lines outlined in the 2050 RTP/SCS, providing a detailed analysis of ridership potential, capital and operating costs, system infrastructure needs, and potential alignments and station locations. The study began in FY 2013 and will be completed by the end of FY 2014.

After 23 City Council meetings to discuss the Del Mar Village Specific Plan, Council unanimously approved the specific plan and placed it on the November 2012, ballot in order to fulfill the requirements of the city’s voter initiative. Since its November defeat, staff and City Council have been looking at ways to bring forward elements of the plan that the community favors.
13. ADJOURNMENT AND NEXT MEETING INFORMATION

The next TWG meeting will be held on July 11, 2013 from 1:15 to 3:15 p.m.

+ next to an agenda item indicates an attachment
MEETING SUMMARY FOR THE MAY 9, 2013, JOINT MEETING OF THE REGIONAL PLANNING TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP AND THE CITIES/COUNTY TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE

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

Agenda Item A: Welcome and Introductions

The meeting was called to order by Bill Chopyk (City of La Mesa), Chair of the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG).

Agenda Item B: Public Comments and Communications

Members of the public had the opportunity to address the TWG and/or Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) on any issue within the jurisdiction of the respective group that was not on the agenda. Mike Bullock, Chair of the Transportation Committee of the local Sierra Club, made a five-minute presentation about climate change mandates and strategies for reducing vehicle miles traveled.

Agenda Item C: Brainstorming Session on Alternative Land Use and Transportation Scenarios to Further Reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions (Information/Discussion)

1. Project Background and Performance Indicators

As part of the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy (2050 RTP/SCS) adopted in 2011, the SANDAG Board of Directors committed to preparing alternative land use and transportation scenarios to explore a range of options that could further reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. The scenarios will help inform various components of San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan. The TWG and CTAC serve as the primary working groups providing input to the Regional Planning and Transportation Committees on this effort.

Ms. Carolina Gregor, SANDAG, provided background information on the scenario planning effort, described the UrbanFootprint performance indicators, and described how the workshop would be conducted.

2. Break-out Discussion Sessions

TWG and CTAC members broke out into small groups to begin brainstorming on the range of land use and transportation scenarios that could help further reduce GHG emissions. Initial scenario planning efforts will focus primarily on land use assumptions; and input on transportation, parking,
pricing, and emerging technologies was sought. A draft “menu of ideas” was provided at the workshop to help guide the break-out discussions.

3. Tables Report Back to the Group

A facilitator from each table reported their table’s results back to the larger group, as follows:

Table 1

**Crystal Ball Vision/Krystallian Plan:** Focus on complete communities, similar to smart growth place types, accessible to everyone within a hierarchy of (1) walking distance, (2) bike shed distance, (3) transit travel, and (4) vehicular traffic. Identify land use gaps, and gaps in mobility infrastructure; such as bike lanes, sidewalks, roadway, and transit needs. Identified “diamond” area extending from Sorrento Valley to Downtown to La Mesa to San Ysidro as an area of severe congestion, where transportation connectivity improvements to major employment areas are needed. Suggested adding housing to “housing desert” areas, such as Sorrento Valley, Gillespie Field, Carlsbad, Encinitas, and Lemon Grove. Suggested adding employment to “employment desert” areas, such as National City, Imperial Beach, Chula Vista, Spring Valley, La Mesa, and Aerotropolis (Gillespie Field). Increase dwelling units per acre (du/ac) and floor area ratio in these areas. Stay out of Rancho Santa Fe area. Recognize need for connections among communities in the region. Update Smart Growth Concept Map with additional place types and connectivity links focused on complete neighborhoods.

Table 2

**PAUL (Peace = Available Urban Land):** Recognize that the defense industry is changing through the use of drones, more work performed in office buildings versus on the bases, etc. This frees up military bases as available urban land. Redevelop Miramar, Coronado, and Camp Pendleton.

**JOSE (Just Otay Serves Employment):** Develop a new regional center with a binational cross-border focus and high levels of housing and employment density in the Otay Mesa border area.

**TED (Transit Emphasis Development):** Rather than encourage growth around freeways, only cluster growth along Bus Rapid Transit and Trolley routes, and add more transit stations and connectors along those routes.

**SUE (Second Units Everywhere):** Toss out restrictive second unit ordinances and add second units/accessory units everywhere to double residential density in existing areas.

**CARL (Commercial Areas Recycled Land):** Similar to the changes in the defense industry, commercial and retail land patterns are shifting as well, toward “social retail” with web-based shopping. Intensify and redevelop all strip malls and shopping malls with housing and mixed use.

**OTIS (Outside the Infrastructure System):** Areas such as Fallbrook, Valley Center, Lakeside, Ramona, and Alpine are no longer low-density areas. Intensify one or more of them as full cities through a “satellite” city approach. This would require water, sewer, and transit infrastructure investments outside the urban areas, yet respectful of the habitat conservation areas.
Table 3

**Transit Triggered Plan**: Allow transit ridership levels to drive density and development, and create development/zoning flexibility in the areas with the highest ridership. Define the Urban Core as the Trolley Ring. Invest in the Urban Core trolley ring transit network as key to getting people out of their cars. Require minimum densities at 80 percent of the allowed density per local general or specific plans in Existing/Planned Smart Growth Opportunity Areas to realize the potential of the Smart Growth Concept Map. Find ways to add housing within or near employment areas; address environmental and co-location challenges of adding housing to industrial zones. Use new incentives from cap-and-trade to promote market for smart growth. Recognize parking costs/requirements as a huge impediment to building smart growth. (Banks/lenders often require more parking than the local jurisdiction.)

Table 4

**“UATS Plus” or “Better-Off TED”**: Focus growth along transit corridors and at key transit nodes within the Urban Area Transit Strategy (UATS) boundary area based on significant planned transit investments in the 2050 RTP/SCS. Focus on a transit lifestyle and car-less lifestyle, with intensification within ½ mile of fixed rail and ¼ mile of bus stations. Develop in the 3 to 5 story range (aim for 45-75 du/ac or higher) and concentrate on mixing uses that integrate well with housing. Integrate jobs with housing and correct jobs/housing imbalances: if 70 percent of land use is housing, add 10 percent more employment capacity and vice-versa. Recognize that 75 percent of our housing already exists and that the increment of new growth is only 25 percent. Put this new growth in the transit corridors with a “Don’t Tread on Me” open space core value approach by holding back any intensification in the back country and building all new development within the UATS and County Water Authority boundary line. Recognize that future growth should not just be about individual smart growth areas, but rather how the smart growth areas work together and connect with one another and how they relate to the region.

Tools: CEQA thresholds, modeling reforms, “off-model” adjustments, zoning innovations, parking and pricing policies, protect employment lands, direct funding to support the higher densities.

4. **Brief Comparison of Ideas Generated from Each Table to Lessons Learned from Other Regions**

Mr. Jamey Dempster, Cambridge Systematics (consultant to SANDAG), listened to the ideas generated from each table and commented on the proposed concepts in comparison to efforts undertaken in other regions across the state and the nation. Mr. Dempster made the following observations:

- Several of these scenarios include looking at industry trends, and where certain industry types might locate in the region. This was done for the RTP/SCS in the Bay Area. The Bay Area also has several concurrent studies looking at expected employment trends. These studies will also examine the types of housing needed to accommodate people working in those jobs.

- Addressing jobs/housing balance can be difficult, as there are several issues that are difficult to unbundle. Understanding how jobs and housing relate in the region is worthwhile and can help inform how we examine the scenarios.
The region needs radically different scenarios in order to “move the needle.” Otherwise, there won’t be enough of a difference in performance among the scenarios. The Washington DC region had one approach to analyze very different scenarios, but in a qualitative way. They described what types of jobs and development patterns that might accompany broad industry changes (e.g., new “green” technology, reduced federal government jobs, etc.). Then planners and the public discussed strategies needed to meet a range of possible outcomes. The Washington DC region also completed a quantitative evaluation of transportation strategies to reduce GHG emissions. The scenario evaluation results clearly indicated how different results performed, by starting with very distinct bundles of strategies that illustrated the tradeoffs of different approaches.

The group may want to consider a scenario building upon multimodal accessibility to important amenities and resources (cultural, recreation, housing, etc.).

Encouraged the group to think about assigning quantitative aspects to the scenarios, such as minimums or maximums.

5. Group Discussion

TWG and CTAC members participated in a group discussion. The following general ideas were suggested/discussed.

- Propose placing Manhattan-footprint and average intensity overlay over downtown San Diego clustered around Balboa Park and increase transit service levels to New York City levels.
- Consider Boston densities vs. Manhattan densities.
- Add another major center in addition to Downtown San Diego in either North County or South County (e.g., at the border).
- Explore a subregional employment cluster strategy – biotech, medical, etc. concentrated in different places in the region (examine growth forecast for industry trends).
- Draft a “Gen Y” scenario with a focus on working from home, walking, biking, and micro-units as housing types.
- Maximize development within the trolley ring.
- Remove all zoning limits within walking distance of transit stations (and assume what would happen if gas went up to $8/gallon).
- Apply existing and emerging technologies, such as expansion of golf carts (such as those found in senior communities), electric bikes, smart cars or Car2Go services, to bridge the gap between transit stations and homes/jobs and provide short distance, last-mile transportation options.
- Explore more radical investments in transit systems and networks, as the land use variations may not be enough to reach the GHG emission reductions.
- Provide greater transit information, such as “next bus” signs in LED lights, such as in Chicago.
- Understand the role of current development in reducing GHG. Noted the issue of relying on future growth to fix today’s problems may be problematic.
- Explore concept of NADA – No Auto Development Alternative.
5. Next Steps

Ms. Gregor (SANDAG) reported that next steps include writing a report summarizing the TWG and CTAC’s initial scenario ideas, presenting the ideas to the SANDAG policy advisory committees and Board of Directors, soliciting input from stakeholders, and asking the public for their thoughts at the San Diego Forward workshops. Refined concepts would then be presented in July to the SANDAG Policy Committees and Board of Directors for guidance on which land use scenarios should be tested in Urban Footprint over the summer and into the fall. In the fall, TWG and CTAC will be asked to provide additional input on transportation, parking and pricing assumptions, and emerging technologies. The highest-performing land use scenarios would then be tested using the full suite of SANDAG modeling tools with variations to the transportation network, parking and pricing assumptions, and emerging technologies.

Mr. Charles “Muggs” Stoll (SANDAG) closed the workshop with the following comments:

- Our region has matured and we need to take credit for how much has been done over the last decade.
- San Diego will not grow in the same ways during the next 40 years as it did in the past 40 years.
- Three million people already live in this region and one million more people will be added.
- Elected officials are excited about emerging technologies.
- TWG and CTAC members are asked to relay this information and discussion to their decision-makers, preferably those that participate on the SANDAG Board and on the SANDAG Policy Advisory Committees.

Agenda Item D: Adjournment of the Joint CTAC/TWG and Next Meetings (Information)

The next CTAC meeting will be held on Thursday, June 6, 2013. The next TWG meeting will be held on Thursday, June 13, 2013.

Action: The joint TWG/CTAC meeting was adjourned by Bill Chopyk (City of La Mesa), Chair TWG.
***CONVENE TWG MEETING***

**Agenda Item 1: Welcome and Introductions**

The meeting was called to order by Bill Chopyk (City of La Mesa), Chair of the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG).

**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. There were no public comments.

Barb Redlitz (Escondido) invited TWG members to attend the Amgen Bicycle Race on May 12, 2013, in Escondido.

Bill Chopyk reminded the TWG that Bike to Work Day is on May 17, 2013, and encouraged members to participate in the event.

**Item 3: Meeting Summary**

TWG members were asked to review and approve the summary for the April 11, 2013, TWG meeting.

**Action:** Upon a motion by Barb Redlitz (Escondido) and a second by Kathy Garcia (Del Mar), the April 11, 2013, TWG meeting summary was approved unanimously.

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

Phillip Trom (SANDAG) announced that SANDAG will be hosting a series of upcoming workshops. Workshops will occur every third Friday in May, June and July during the day, and every Thursday in the month of June in San Ysidro, Escondido, Oceanside, and La Mesa. Complimentary meals will be provided at all of the workshops. Mr. Trom encouraged TWG members to attend the workshops and spread the word to their cities and partner agencies. Members should RSVP to Sarah Strand at SANDAG.

**Agenda Item 5: 2013 San Diego American Planning Association Awards (Information)**

Bill Chopyk (La Mesa, Chair TWG) recognized awardees of the recent APA awards event which included a Comprehensive Planning Large Jurisdiction award for the City of San Diego’s General Plan Housing Element 2013-2020; honorable mentions for the Regional Housing Needs Assessment/SANDAG Board Policy No. 033/Regional Housing Progress Report 2003-2011 and the SANDAG Energy Roadmap for Local Governments; and Complete Streets Awards for both the Maple Avenue Pedestrian Plaza in Escondido and the Carlsbad Livable Streets Assessment.
Agenda Item 6: TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program: Grant Application Scoring
Results for the FY 2013 Cycle (Information)

Stephan Vance (SANDAG) reported that SANDAG has completed the project selection process for the FY 2013 cycle of the Smart Growth Incentive Program (SGIP). Mr. Vance reminded TWG members that this process began last fall, with direction from the TWG, CTAC, Transportation Committee, and Regional Planning Committee by determining the goals and objectives and the project selection criteria for the program. Mr. Vance thanked the jurisdictions that submitted applications for grants, and emphasized his appreciation of the project selection team that assisted in the review and recommendation of the submittals, including Manjeet Ranu, Wende Protzman, Chris Schmidt, and Mike Strong.

Mr. Vance stated that the program will fund six capital improvement projects and seven planning projects. The list of awardees will be taken to the Regional Planning and Transportation Committees for a final recommendation on June 7, and the approval of the Board of Directors will be sought on June 28, 2013.

In response to a question by Mike Bullock (Sierra Club), Mr. Vance clarified that the SGIP does not estimate or quantify reductions in VMT of projects, however the program does require before and after monitoring of transportation activity on the sites by the grantees.

Chris Schmidt (Caltrans), who staffed the project selection team, commented that the projects that were selected are excellent examples of projects that get people out of their cars, but that the program would benefit from increased funding.

Elyse Lowe (Move San Diego) agreed that funding should be increased for the SGIP and encouraged SANDAG to include financial incentives for Smart Growth in the next Regional Plan. Ms. Lowe thanked SANDAG for their “good work.”

Stephan Vance (SANDAG) concluded by reminding TWG members that local share of TransNet dollars also may be used to fund these types of smart growth projects, citing the Solana Beach 101 Streetscape project.

Agenda Item 7: Adjournment and Next Meeting (Information)

The next TWG meeting will be held on June 13, 2013, from 1:15 to 3:15 p.m.

Action: The TWG meeting was adjourned by Bill Chopyk (City of La Mesa), Chair TWG.
On October 28, 2011, the SANDAG Board of Directors approved the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan and its Sustainable Communities Strategy (2050 RTP/SCS) for the San Diego region, becoming the first large region in California to prepare an RTP under California climate change legislation (SB 375). In accordance with SB 375, the 2050 RTP/SCS demonstrates how development patterns and the transportation network, policies, and programs will work together to achieve the greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reduction targets set by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) for cars and light trucks, and provide a more sustainable future for the region.

The strategy set forth in the 2050 RTP/SCS is to: focus housing and job growth in the urbanized areas where there is existing and planned infrastructure; protect sensitive habitat and open space; invest in a network that gives residents and workers transportation options that reduce GHG emissions; promote equity for all; and implement the plan through incentives and collaboration.

In its final action on the 2050 RTP/SCS, the SANDAG Board of Directors committed to undertaking six additional actions in response to public comment at the meeting. These six commitments are an integral part of the work program for San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan, and will assist in SANDAG’s implementation of SB 375 and its 2050 RTP/SCS consistent with California’s state planning priorities (AB 857 adopted in 2002), the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, and regional GHG targets. San Diego Forward unites two of SANDAG’s major planning efforts into one: the next update of the RTP/SCS and an update of the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) that was adopted in 2004. San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan is scheduled to be adopted in July 2015.

The six actions and progress made on them to date are described below. Links are provided to some of the key reports associated with these actions; all reports and other materials listed can be found on the SANDAG Web site.

1. Develop Alternative Land Use/Transportation Scenarios (OWP 31000.00)

   “Evaluating alternative land use scenarios as part of the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) update to attempt to address the so-called “backsliding” of greenhouse gas levels between years 2035-2050.” (2050 RTP/SCS Resolution)

   The objectives of this project are: 1) to test a range of alternative land use, transportation, pricing, and parking scenarios to further reduce GHG emissions beyond those in the 2050 RTP/SCS; and 2) to incorporate emerging technologies/travel behavior trends into the scenario
process and determine the extent to which the model can capture the GHG reductions of the individual technologies and trends. The results of this work will inform the preparation of San Diego Forward.

Milestones:

- Implementing Commitments from the 2050 RTP/SCS – Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) Meeting, October 4, 2012 and Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG) Meeting, October 11, 2012
- Initiating the Development of Alternative Land Use and Transportation Scenarios – Joint Meeting of CTAC and TWG, March 14, 2013; RPC and TC, April 5, 2013 (Item #5)
- Project Background Information – TWG, April 11, 2013
- Brainstorming Session on Alternative Land Use and Transportation Scenarios – Joint Workshop of CTAC and TWG, May 9, 2013
- Upcoming report – Joint TC/RPC meeting, July 19, 2013

2. Develop Regional Bicycle Plan Early Action Program (OWP 33002.00)

“Developing an early action program for projects included in the Regional Bicycle Plan.” (2050 RTP/SCS Resolution)

SANDAG is working on an early action program for the projects included in the Board-approved Regional Bike Plan. The overall goal is to implement Bike Plan Network High Priority Projects within 10 years, and execute programs to support the network investments.

Milestones:

- Approval of Riding to 2050: San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan (Bike Plan) – SANDAG Board of Directors (BOD), May 28, 2010
- Approval of funding for initial implementation of regional bicycle projects ($6.56 M) and related programs ($1.05 M); SANDAG identified to assume a lead role in the planning, design, and construction of regional bicycle projects - BOD, April 22, 2011
- Acceptance of goals for Bike Plan Early Action Program and initiation of preliminary engineering to refine cost estimates/phasing of projects and prepare funding scenarios ($350,000 TransNet funds) – TC, April 6, 2012 (Item #6)
- Regional Bicycle Plan Fact Sheet – July 2012
- North Park - Mid-City Regional Bike Corridors Project Fact Sheet – March 2013
- Uptown Regional Bike Corridors Project Fact Sheet – March 2013
- Upcoming report – Review/consider funding scenarios and implementation options – TC, July 19, 2013
### 3. Prepare an Active Transportation Implementation Strategy (OWP 33007.00)

“Planning for the broader Active Transportation program, including Safe Routes to School and Safe Routes to Transit, within the next two years.” (2050 RTP/SCS Resolution)

SANDAG is developing an Active Transportation Implementation Strategy will further define the agency’s active transportation planning and implementation work, building on the Regional Bicycle Plan, San Diego Regional Safe Routes to School Strategic Plan, and Safe Routes to Transit Regional Plan. The Safe Routes to Transit Program (33002.00) (Strategic Growth Council Grant – Round Two) currently underway will prioritize projects and develop programs that provide bicycle and pedestrian access around existing and planned transit stops and stations.

**Milestones:**
- Approval of initial funding for Safe Routes to Transit analysis – BOD, April 22, 2011
- Established Active Transportation Working Group (ATWG) – TC, February 15, 2013
- Active Transportation Implementation Strategy Framework report, CTAC/TWG Joint Meeting, March 14, 2013; **TC, April 19, 2013** (Item #10); and ATWG, May 2, 2013
- First meeting of ATWG - May 2, 2013
- Safe Routes to Transit presentation - ATWG May 2, 2013

### 4. Develop a Regional Transit Oriented Development Strategy/Policy (OWP 33004.00)

“Implementing an action to develop a regional transit-oriented development policy in the 2050 RTP Sustainable Communities Strategy to promote and incentivize sustainable development.” (2050 RTP/SCS Resolution)

SANDAG is preparing a Regional Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Strategy to assist the region in creating TOD projects and neighborhoods that will reduce GHG emissions; increase transit ridership, walking and biking; and housing and employment opportunities for all residents of the region. This project will include a review and update of the RCP Smart Growth Place Types associated with the Smart Growth Concept Map (SGCM) and used in the award of Smart Growth Incentive Program (SGIP) grants and other strategies/policies to facilitate development.

**Milestones:**
- Implementing Commitments from the 2050 RTP/SCS, CTAC Meeting, October 4, 2012 and TWG Meeting October 11, 2012
- Held two TOD Stakeholder Listening Sessions (see last Handouts document under Bookmarks) to identify TOD-related issues – December 17, 2012
- Scope of work for consultant assistance prepared; Request for Proposals to be advertised June 2013
5. **Make enhancements to the travel demand models (OWPs 23000.00, 23002.00, 23004.00)**

“Continuing to make enhancements to the travel demand models; the activity-based models currently under development will be “open source” and available for the next RTP update.” (2050 RTP/SCS Resolution)

SANDAG is transitioning from an enhanced four-step transportation model to an activity-based model (ABM), which simulates the daily travel itineraries of individuals and households. The ABM attempts to predict whether, where, when, and how peoples' travel from home to work, school, shopping, healthcare, and recreation occurs based on empirical data. The ABM is being used with the Production, Exchange, and Consumption Allocation System (PECAS) an integrated land use-transportation modeling framework that applies economic theory and travel costs in forecasting the spatial distribution of development. These models are being used to prepare the Series 13 Regional Growth Forecast and San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan.

**Milestones:**
- The ABM / PECAS source code currently is available for download from the SANDAG Subversion repository.
- SANDAG will be releasing automated build scripts to compile the source code into a functional application later this year.
- Additional information about the ABM and PECAS is located on the SANDAG Web site.
- Three Transportation Modeling Forums have been held at SANDAG – December 2011, December 2012, June 2012 (see Resources at bottom of page for PowerPoint presentations). A fourth is planned for June 12, 2013.

6. **Develop a regional complete streets policy (OWP 33008.00)**

“Developing a regional complete streets policy within the next two years.” (2050 RTP/SCS Resolution)

SANDAG is undertaking the development of a comprehensive regional Complete Streets Policy. The concept of complete streets is based on the premise that streets are complete when they serve all of the public: motorists, public transit and transit users, pedestrians, bicyclists, the young and old, the able-bodied, and the disabled. Complete streets support the need to provide an array of transportation choices called for by smart growth policies like those that underlie the Regional Comprehensive Plan.

**Milestones:**
- Regional Complete Streets Policy – Bicycle-Pedestrian Working Group, September 19, 2012; RPC, November 2, 2012; TC, November 9, 2012
- Implementing Commitments from the 2050 RTP/SCS, CTAC, October 4, 2012 and TWG, October 11, 2012
FIFTH CYCLE HOUSING ELEMENT STATUS REPORT

Introduction

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

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

Background

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

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

- Twelve jurisdictions have adopted final housing elements that have been found in compliance by HCD (Chula Vista, Coronado, Escondido, Imperial Beach, Lemon Grove, National City, Oceanside1, San Diego, Santee, Solana Beach, Vista, and the County of San Diego).

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

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

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


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

**May 30, 2013**

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

Updated based on California Department of Housing and Community Development website, May 30, 2013 ([http://www.hcd.ca.gov/hpd/hrc/plan/he/status.pdf](http://www.hcd.ca.gov/hpd/hrc/plan/he/status.pdf)) and correspondence with Robin Huntley, HCD Division of Housing Policy Development
Help Shape Our Region’s Future

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

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

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

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

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

Los talleres abordarán cuestiones importantes que enfrenta la región

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

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

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

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

**Talleres comunitarios por la noche**

Cada jueves del mes de junio. En todos los talleres se ofrecerán sándwiches, galletas y bebidas de cortesía

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

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

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

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

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

**Talleres en el centro de San Diego en días de entre semana**

El tercer viernes de mayo, junio y julio. En todos los talleres se ofrecerán sándwiches, galletas y bebidas de cortesía

- **17 de mayo** – Diálogos enfocados en el medio ambiente saludable, energía, cambio climático y salud pública
- **21 de junio** – Diálogos enfocados en el uso de suelo y el transporte
- **19 de julio** – Diálogos enfocados en la prosperidad económica, instalaciones públicas y fronteras

**Caltrans Distrito 11**

Todos los talleres de entre semana se llevarán a cabo de las 11:30 a.m. a la 1:30 p.m. en:

- **Salón García y Salón Gallegos**
  - 4050 Taylor Street, San Diego


**Favor de confirmar asistencia**

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

Para mayor información, visite sandag.org/sandiegoforward
SAN DIEGO FORWARD: THE REGIONAL PLAN:  
TRANSPORTATION PROJECT EVALUATION CRITERIA  

File Number 3100000/3100400

Introduction

The SANDAG Board of Directors accepted the San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan vision and goals on May 10, 2013. In past Regional Transportation Plans (RTPs) SANDAG has utilized project evaluation criteria and performance measures informed by the plan goals as elements of a multistep process to develop the revenue constrained multimodal transportation network. Project rankings; along with other factors such as funding availability, project readiness, and overall network connectivity; will be considered when developing the proposed San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan multimodal transportation network alternatives.

Discussion

As part of the development of the regional plan, SANDAG will be reviewing and updating the current transportation project evaluation criteria and performance measures. The focus of this meeting’s discussion will be to collect input and/or ideas for criteria and methods, for consideration in the comprehensive project evaluation criteria development process. Included as Attachment 1 are the adopted 2050 RTP/Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) Transportation Project Evaluation Criteria for reference. The types of criteria include highway corridors, high occupancy vehicle connectors, freeway-to-freeway connectors, transit services, goods movement, and rail grade separations. Active Transportation criteria will be developed and included with these other criteria types for San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan.

Once the multimodal transportation network alternatives have been developed, performance measures will be applied to evaluate each network alternative and help in the comparison across alternatives. The performance measures organizational structure will be consistent with the Plan’s goals.

Next Steps

At the July 11, 2013, Regional Planning Technical Working Group meeting, staff will present the draft revised project evaluation criteria, for further discussion and input. Input on revisions to the plan performance measures will be sought from TWG in fall 2013.

The transportation project evaluation criteria are expected to be approved by the Board of Directors in October 2013, while the plan performance measures are expected to be approved in December 2013.

Attachment: 1. Technical Appendix 4 – Transportation Project Evaluation Criteria

Key Staff Contact: Rachel Kennedy, (619) 699-1929, Rachel.Kennedy@sandag.org
Introduction

This technical appendix describes the process for developing evaluation criteria for prioritizing highway, high occupancy vehicle (HOV) connectors, freeway connectors, transit, and goods movement projects included in the Unconstrained Transportation Network of the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). This appendix also includes information on the creation of criteria to prioritize regional rail grade separations, and screening criteria for the regional arterial system.

Informed by the 2050 RTP goals set by the Board of Directors, the project evaluation criteria are one element of a multistep process used to develop the revenue constrained multimodal transportation network for the RTP. Project rankings; along with other factors such as funding availability, project readiness, and overall network connectivity; were considered when developing the proposed 2050 RTP network alternatives.

The Board of Directors approved the transportation project evaluation criteria for highway corridors, freeway and HOV connectors, transit services, and freight projects on June 11, 2010.

Transportation Project Evaluation Criteria

SANDAG utilized criteria for evaluating and ranking highway, transit, freeway connector and HOV connectors in the previous 2030 RTP: Pathways for the Future (2030 RTP). As part of the development of the 2050 RTP, the Executive Director and the Chair of the Board of Directors established the Transportation Project Evaluation Criteria Ad Hoc Working Group (TPEC) to review and update the transportation project evaluation criteria. A comprehensive update of the regional arterial screening criteria was done for the 2030 RTP and was not modified for the 2050 RTP.

The TPEC was composed of representatives from a number of standing SANDAG working groups, including the Bicycle-Pedestrian Working Group (BPWG), Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC), Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group (SWG), Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG), Tribal Transportation Technical Working Group, as well as staff from Caltrans, MTS, NCTD, the San Diego County Regional Airport Authority, and Port of San Diego. The TPEC met on a monthly basis beginning in September 2009 and created and updated evaluation criteria to analyze regional transit service, highway, freeway connector, and HOV connector projects.

The revisions to the RTP criteria were intended to support the vision of the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) and address the updated goals of the 2050 RTP. Where appropriate, efforts also were taken to simplify and standardize the criteria across different modal categories. New criteria were also added to address emerging issues such as greenhouse gas (GHG) and to enhance social equity analysis. The criteria are structured with a standard 100-point scoring system.

The TPEC organized the updated criteria into three major categories: Serves Travel Needs, Develops Network Integration, and Addresses Sustainability. The Serves Travel Needs category contains criteria that focus on the movement of people and goods and awards points for projects that serve peak-period trips, goods movement, or congested corridors. The Network Integration criteria give credit for projects that provide connectivity between surrounding land uses and the transportation network. Criteria in this category include measures such as serving...
RCP Smart Growth Areas, incorporation of transit and/or Managed or HOV lanes, and linking high frequency transit. The Addresses Sustainability category focuses on criteria that fall within the “3 Es” of healthy environment, economic prosperity and social equity. These criteria provide for a comprehensive assessment of the annual capital, operation, and maintenance costs of the project in relation to the number of people moved or person hours saved.

The same three criteria categories are used for transit services, highway, freeway connector, and HOV connector criteria, with variations in the individual criteria. Within each of the three categories, weighting for each of the individual criteria also was determined. The individual criteria descriptions, weighting, and score details are listed in Tables TA 4.1 to TA 4.16.

Highway Corridors

SANDAG has used criteria for evaluating and ranking highway corridor projects since 1997. Using the 2030 RTP criteria as a starting point, the TPEC created a set of revised highway corridor evaluation criteria which reflect SANDAG Board-adopted principles on smart growth, social equity, GHG reductions, and the Urban Area Transit Study.

The fifteen highway evaluation criteria presented in Tables TA 4.1 and TA 4.2 quantify project traffic usage, evacuation route access, travel time savings, cost, critical linkages, safety, goods movement, access to employment, smart growth, carpool lane integration, transit integration, greenhouse gas emissions, social equity, habitat preservation, and residential impacts. SANDAG staff has worked with Caltrans, MTS, NCTD, the TPEC members and their respective working groups to revise and update the criteria. Table TA 4.3 describes the highway evaluation criteria weighting.

The highway network corridor evaluation was used to develop the Revenue Constrained Network alternatives and project phasing included in the 2050 RTP. The 46 unconstrained highway corridors originally evaluated for the 2050 RTP are listed in priority order in Table TA 4.4.

The prioritized list of highway projects was used as a tool in assembling logical transportation networks of highway projects that complement transit and arterial projects. Priority order is not necessarily strictly followed. Rather, emphasis is placed upon developing meaningful networks in accordance with the 2050 RTP goals and objectives.

High Occupancy Vehicle Connectors

HOV connectors will facilitate direct HOV to HOV access and allow for continuous movement on the HOV or Managed Lanes network from freeway to freeway. The HOV connector criteria and weighting are shown in Tables TA 4.5 through 4.7. The HOV Connectors are ranked by pair and shown in Table TA 4.8. Nine HOV connectors are included in the Revenue Constrained Scenario.

Freeway-to-Freeway Connectors

The TPEC also updated the Freeway-to-Freeway Connector criteria. The TPEC provided input that resulted in the use a number of the same criteria that were used to evaluate highway projects. The nine criteria shown in Tables TA 4.9 though 4.11 quantify project area accident rates, goods movement, mobility, congestion relief, transit integration, and cost effectiveness. The ranked projects are shown in Table TA 4.12.
Transit Services

The TPEC, with key input from MTS and NCTD staff, updated the Transit Services Evaluation criteria in order to prioritize new transit services. Building on the criteria developed for use in the 2030 RTP, the TPEC recommended a number of modifications which integrate the Regional Comprehensive Plan and transit connectivity. The evaluation of the 53 regional transit services was used to develop the Revenue Constrained Network alternatives and project phasing included in the 2050 RTP.

Tables TA 4.13 and 4.14 describe the transit services evaluation criteria and detailed scoring. Table TA 4.15 describes the transit services criteria weighting. All transit routes evaluated for the 2050 RTP are listed in priority order in Table TA 4.16.

Goods Movement

The 2050 Goods Movement Strategy (GMS) considers the growing importance of freight and goods movement to the region’s economic prosperity and seeks to balance regional and national freight priorities. The unconstrained goods movement network consists primarily of road and truckway projects (accommodating more than 90 percent of freight by volume) that comprise the backbone of the freight distribution network. The unconstrained network outlined in the 2050 GMS also includes several maritime, rail, border, air cargo, intermodal, and pipeline related projects. Projects included in the GMS were evaluated using evaluation criteria approved by the Board of Directors on June 11, 2010, and a prioritized GMS list of projects was developed.

An Ad Hoc Freight Stakeholders Group was formed to provide input on the development of the 2050 GMS to include feedback on evaluation criteria, and related goods movement planning activities. The Ad Hoc Freight Stakeholders Group was comprised of members representing the Port of San Diego and Port users; San Diego County Regional Airport Authority, and shippers and carriers using the airport; San Diego and Arizona Eastern Railway; BNSF Railway; regional truckers; warehouse operators; San Diego Regional and Otay Mesa Chambers of Commerce; San Diego World Trade Center; Caltrans; and others interested in efficient goods movement in the San Diego region. Additionally, two members from the Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC), representing the Public Works Directors in the San Diego region, were appointed to participate on the Ad Hoc Freight Stakeholders Group.

The evaluation criteria for the 2050 GMS follow the policy goals established by the Board of Directors for the 2050 RTP. The evaluation criteria also consider the two overarching themes for the 2050 RTP: Quality of Travel & Livability, and Sustainability. The goods movement project evaluation criteria are grouped into three focus areas, as follows:

- Serves Freight System Needs
- Develops Freight Network Integration
- Addresses Sustainability

The “Serves Freight System Needs” and “Develops Network Integration” focus areas generally correspond to the Quality of Travel & Livability theme while “Addresses Sustainability” is linked to the Three “Es” (Social Equity, Healthy Environment, and Prosperous Economy).

Staff worked with the Ad Hoc Freight Stakeholder Group to develop scores and weights for the individual criteria included under each of the three focus areas.
Tables TA 4.17 through 4.21 provide a list of the evaluation criteria focus areas and descriptions for each criterion.

Changes to the evaluation criteria weightings from the 2030 Goods Movement Action Plan (GMAP) were driven by the addition of the Sustainability focus area. Additionally, the evaluation criteria weightings were adapted for each individual mode to account for significant differences in scale among modes. The final project list ranked by mode is included in Table 4.22.

Evaluation criteria developed for goods movement projects were used to rank freight projects by mode, including Maritime (seaport related), Rail and Intermodal Facilities, Truck/Roadway, and Airport projects that facilitate goods movement and integrate the region’s freight network. The ranked projects were used to develop the prioritized lists of goods movement projects by mode to be incorporated into the 2050 RTP. In addition to the ranked projects, pipeline projects and goods movements projects located on the Mexican side of the border were listed as “projects of interest” but not evaluated nor ranked for funding.

Rail Grade Separation Criteria

The Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) developed regional rail grade separation prioritization criteria that stress congestion relief, safety, and funding needs as the primary elements with additional consideration of other factors, including effects on pedestrian traffic, bus transit operations, emergency services, truck freight operations, and noise.

In preparation for the development of the criteria, staff conducted a literature search of other rail grade separation prioritization criteria. These included the California Public Utilities Commission criteria, other states’ criteria, the federal government, as well as articles published in research journals. The findings formed the basis for the initial discussions within CTAC.

The intent of the implementation of a regional rail grade separation program is to provide funding for construction of significant traffic congestion relief projects through the implementation of rail grade separations where other more economical alternatives are demonstrably not feasible or practical. Elimination of crossings is considered a potentially practical alternative. Program allocations will need to be considered in conjunction with other regional transportation funding priorities and needs, and will be dependent on the availability of funding from federal, state, and local sources.

The rail grade separation prioritization criteria were accepted by the SANDAG Board of Directors for inclusion in the 2030 RTP on October 13, 2006. For the 2050 RTP minor revisions were made to the criteria after a review was conducted by a working group formed by the San Diego Regional Traffic Engineers Council.

Projects were prioritized based on two criteria categories: project-specific criteria and Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) housing production. The project-specific criteria are worth 75 percent, and the RHNA housing production criteria comprises 25 percent of the total project score. The criteria are shown in Table TA 4.23. The final rankings are included in Table TA 4.24.

Regional Arterial System

The Regional Arterial System constitutes that part of the local street and road network which, in conjunction with the system of highways and transit services, provides for a significant amount of mobility throughout the region. The Regional Arterial System defines...
Table TA 4.3 – Highway Corridor Project Evaluation Criteria Weighting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Areas</th>
<th>2050 RTP Goals</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Max. Score</th>
<th>Total Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Serves Travel Needs</td>
<td>System Preservation &amp; Safety Reliability</td>
<td>Located in a High Accident Rate Area</td>
<td>Is the project located in an area with a high vehicular crash rate?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Preservation &amp; Safety</td>
<td>Provides Access to Evacuation Routes</td>
<td>Does the project provide evacuation access for regional hazard areas including federally recognized Indian reservations?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility, Prosperous Economy</td>
<td>Serves Goods Movement</td>
<td>Does the project accommodate goods movement and provide for congestion relief?</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>Serves Daily Person Trips</td>
<td>What is the number of potential daily person trips located within one mile of the highway corridor?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>Provides Mobility and Congestion Relief</td>
<td>What is the increase in person capacity resulting from the project?</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility, Healthy Environment</td>
<td>Provides Congestion Relief</td>
<td>What is the number of daily person-hours saved?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develops Network Integration</td>
<td>Mobility, Healthy Environment</td>
<td>Serves RCP Smart Growth Areas</td>
<td>Does the project serve RCP Smart Growth Areas?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>Facilitates Carpool and Transit Mobility</td>
<td>Does the project contain carpool/Managed Lane facilities and/or regional or corridor transit service within a congested corridor?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Environment</td>
<td>Minimizes Habitat and Residential Impacts</td>
<td>Does the project minimize negative habitat and residential impacts?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility, Reliability</td>
<td>Critical Linkage</td>
<td>Is the project located in a high volume freeway corridor and/or lacking a continuous parallel arterial listed in the Regional Arterial System to provide congestion relief?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Areas</td>
<td>2050 RTP Goals</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Max. Score</td>
<td>Total Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addresses Sustainability</td>
<td>Prosperous Economy</td>
<td>Cost-Effectiveness of Congestion Relief</td>
<td>What is the annual public capital and operating project cost divided by person-hours saved?</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Healthy Environment</td>
<td>GHG Emissions</td>
<td>What is the change in regional CO$_2$ emissions from implementing the project?</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Equity, Mobility</td>
<td></td>
<td>Provides Accessibility to Low-Income/Minority/Senior (75+) Areas Including Federally Recognized Indian Reservations</td>
<td>Does the highway corridor serve low-income/minority/senior (75+) areas including federally recognized Indian reservations within one mile of the project?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Equity, Mobility</td>
<td></td>
<td>Provides Accessibility to Federally Recognized Indian Reservations</td>
<td>Does the highway corridor serve federally recognized Indian reservations within one mile of the project?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosperous Economy, Social Equity, Mobility</td>
<td></td>
<td>Access to Jobs</td>
<td>What is the number of projected 2050 jobs served within one mile of the project?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Areas</td>
<td>2050 RTP Goals</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Max. Score</td>
<td>Total Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serves Travel Needs</td>
<td>Reliability, Healthy Environment</td>
<td>Serves Congested Areas</td>
<td>Does the route serve the more congested highway corridors or arterials in the region?</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>Serves Peak Period Trips</td>
<td></td>
<td>What are the number of potential transit trips within the capture areas of the transit stations/stops and park-and-ride facilities?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility, Reliability</td>
<td>Provides Time Competitive/Reliable Transit</td>
<td></td>
<td>What is the percentage of the route located in priority treatment?</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>Peak Transit Ridership</td>
<td></td>
<td>What is the morning and afternoon peak-period transit utilization?</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>Off-Peak Transit Ridership</td>
<td></td>
<td>What is the midday off-peak transit utilization?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develops Network Integration</td>
<td>Mobility, Reliability, Healthy Environment</td>
<td>Links High-Frequency Transit Services</td>
<td>How many other high-frequency (timed transfer service or at least 15 minute service) transit routes does the route connect to?</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Environment</td>
<td>Serves RCP Smart Growth Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td>Does the route serve existing/planned/pending and/or potential RCP Smart Growth areas?</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Areas</td>
<td>2050 RTP Goals</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Max. Score</td>
<td>Total Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addresses</td>
<td>Prosperous Economy</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>What is the annual public project capital and operating cost divided by passenger miles?</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Healthy Environment</td>
<td>GHG Emissions</td>
<td>What is the change in regional CO2 emissions from implementing the project?</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Equity, Mobility</td>
<td>Provides Accessibility to Low-Income/Minority/Senior (75+) Areas Including Federally Recognized Indian Reservations</td>
<td>Does the transit service serve low-income/minority areas including federally recognized Indian reservations within ½ mile and senior (75+) areas including federally recognized Indian reservations within ¼ mile of the transit route’s stations/stops?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Equity, Mobility</td>
<td>Provides Accessibility to Federally Recognized Indian Reservations</td>
<td>Does the transit service serve federally recognized Indian reservations within ½ mile of the transit route’s stations/stops</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prosperous Economy, Social Equity, Mobility</td>
<td>Access to Jobs</td>
<td>What is the total number of projected 2050 jobs served within ½ mile of the transit route’s stations/stops?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table TA 4.21 – Freight Project Evaluation Criteria and Weighting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Area</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Max. Score</th>
<th>Total Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Serves Freight System Needs</td>
<td>Throughput</td>
<td>How much additional freight can be accommodated by the project?</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relieves Freight System Bottlenecks/Capacity Constraints and Reduces Delay</td>
<td>Does the project improve average travel time for freight?</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improves freight system and/or modal safety</td>
<td>Does the project accommodate features that enhance safety and/or enhance national security?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develops Freight Network Integration</td>
<td>Improves Freight System Management/Efficiency</td>
<td>Does the project include freight management systems, strategies, and/or technologies to improve efficiency, velocity?</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provides Critical Modal/Intermodal Link/Connectivity</td>
<td>Does the project integrate the local freight system?</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addresses Sustainability</td>
<td>Cost-Effectiveness (Project Lifecycle)</td>
<td>How does the project rank against others with respect to project cost/capacity? Does project have outside funding sources to leverage public funds?</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimizes Community Impacts; Improves Safety, Reduces Hazards</td>
<td>Does the project minimize/address community impacts?</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimizes Environmental/Habitat Impacts</td>
<td>Does the project minimize/address environmental/habitat impacts?</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rail Grade Separation Criteria

Project-Specific Criteria

These criteria take into account existing vehicular and train traffic, accident history, cost, noise, access to emergency services, and other factors.

Step 1: Warrants

The following criteria and point system is implemented with a potential maximum of 100 points. The total project-specific criteria score is multiplied by 0.75 to produce a scaled, 75-point score for the total regional rail grade separation project score.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Max Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peak-Period Exposure Index (PPEI) Factor</td>
<td>Measured as the product of the existing high directional traffic and the total measured blocking delay during the same three hours of the day experiencing the highest congestion at the crossing</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak-Day Total Delay Exposure Index (PDEI) Factor</td>
<td>Measured as the product of the existing average daily traffic (ADT), the total number of trains, and an average train crossing delay time factor</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accident History</td>
<td>Accident history in the past five years involving vehicles, pedestrians, and bicycles with trains, not including accidents involved in attempted suicides</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Request</td>
<td>The funding request criterion awards points for the percentage of total project costs contributed by the local agency including funds already committed from state, federal, or other sources</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Benefits</td>
<td>Number of pedestrians served by grade separation during top four hours</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Operations Effects</td>
<td>Number of buses served an hour by grade separation and access to a transit center</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise Reduction</td>
<td>Distance of rail crossing area to sensitive receptors</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit to Emergency Services</td>
<td>Distance of rail crossing area to emergency service provider</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact to Truck Freight Operations</td>
<td>Percentage of trucks</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Step 2: Once the projects have been prioritized according to the criteria above, consideration for funding would include the following project readiness elements.
a. Project feasibility (e.g., physical constraints and reliability of cost estimate)
b. Environmental document status
c. Right of Way acquisition status
d. Permits (e.g., Public Utilities Commission, Coastal Commission, or the Department of Fish and Game)

**RHNA Criteria**
Please refer to SANDAG Board Policy No. 033. Regional rail grade separation projects must include incentive points (a minimum of 25 points out of 100 possible) based on the number of lower income housing units produced in accordance with RHNA Alternative 3. SANDAG staff will calculate the incentive points for each jurisdiction on an annual basis in accordance with the Board Policy.
Regional Plan Workshops
Pictures from Central and San Ysidro Workshops

Healthy Environment, Energy, Climate Change, and Public Health - Caltrans
Healthy Environment, Energy, Climate Change, and Public Health - Caltrans
Public Health Stakeholders Working Group Comments on Transportation Evaluation Criteria
6-13-13 TWG Meeting-Handout Item #9

April 2013

1. **LARGER PLANNING CONTEXT:** Go beyond “congestion relief, to more fully include health, fiscal efficiency, equity, economic development and environmental goals.

2. **PUBLIC HEALTH CORE VALUE:** Public Health should be adopted as a core value of the Regional Plan (the board did so in May).

3. **PUBLIC HEALTH EMPHASIS AREAS:** For considering public health in funding decisions and performance metrics, SANDAG should consider the four areas identified in the December 2012 U.S. Department of Transportation report, *Metropolitan Area Transportation Planning for Healthy Communities*: active transportation, safety, air pollution, and access to opportunities for healthy lifestyles.

4. **LOCAL ACCESS:** Account for the indirect consequences on local land use decisions of regional transportation investments.

5. **MODE NEUTRALITY:** Devise some mode-neutral criteria, rather than only evaluating projects within separate categories.

6. **ACCESSIBILITY FOCUS:** The evaluation criteria should focus on *access (ease of obtaining goods)*, rather than *mobility (ease of movement to obtain goods)*. Exclusive focus on mobility inherently emphasizes travel speed (road capacity) at the expense of proximity (compact neighborhoods).

7. **SMART GROWTH PLACE TYPES:** The definitions of Smart Growth Place Types should be reconsidered where the definition includes roadway corridor access. By definition, smart growth areas should only have the minimum necessary roadway access, but should have superior transit, walking, and biking opportunities.

8. **PER CAPITA COSTS AND BENEFITS:** To account for hidden costs to non-drivers and others, the criteria should evaluate projects on a *per capita* basis rather than on *per person-mile travelled* in a particular corridor.

9. **INDUCED DEMAND AND GENERATED TRAFFIC:** Project modeling should account for induced traffic (short-term increase in traffic once a new facility opens) and generated traffic (long-term increase from new auto-oriented development).

10. **FOCUS ON GOOD URBAN DESIGN:** Include consideration of Complete and green streets, “pedestrian-seductive” streetscapes, the transit first mile/last mile experience, and other urban design considerations to the extent possible.
The Regional Plan
Regional Planning Technical Working Group June 13, 2013

San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan
Vision & Goals

To provide innovative mobility choices and planning to support a sustainable and healthy region, a vibrant economy and an outstanding quality of life for all.
2050 RTP/SCS Project Evaluation Criteria

Process

• Transportation Project Evaluation Criteria Ad Hoc Working Group (TPEC) assisted in development and refinement of project evaluation criteria
  – SANDAG Working Group members
  – Partner agency staff
  – Regular monthly meetings
• SANDAG Working Groups input and feedback
• Transportation Committee recommendation
• SANDAG Board acceptance of criteria for use in 2050 RTP/SCS

2050 RTP/SCS Project Evaluation Criteria

Categories

• Transit services
• Highway corridors
• High occupancy vehicle (HOV) connectors and freeway connectors
• Goods movement
• Rail grade separations
2050 RTP/SCS Focus Areas & Weighting

• Serves travel needs
• Develops network integration
• Addresses sustainability
• Weighed scores based on a 100 point scale

San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan Process

• Consultant assistance with draft criteria refinement and development
• SANDAG Working Group and partner agency input and feedback
• Public outreach
• Expert panel review
• Policy Committees recommendation
• SANDAG Board accept criteria for use in San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan
San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan
Strategies & Focus

• Revise and develop project evaluation criteria
  – Public Health
  – Active Transportation
  – Social equity

• Integrate enhanced modeling tools and criteria
  – Activity-based model (ABM)
  – Production, Exchange and Consumption Allocation System (PECAS)

San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan
Strategies & Focus Continued

• Public outreach feedback
  – SANDAG working group meetings
  – San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan workshops
  – Project evaluation criteria workshop

• Expert panel review
Schedule & Next Steps

• May-June 2013: Review of existing criteria and development of initial draft criteria
• June-August 2013: SANDAG Working Group input, public outreach, expert review panel
• September 2013: Draft criteria to Policy Committees
• October 2013: Draft criteria to Policy Committees and Board for approval

sandag.org/SanDiegoForward
# Draft Series 13 Subregional Growth Forecast

**Disclaimer:** This forecast represents one possibility for future growth in the San Diego region. It is intended to represent a likely prediction of future growth, but it is not intended to be a prescription for growth. The Series 13 Regional Growth Forecast represents a combination of economic and demographic projections and existing plans and polices.

## POPULATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>City</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Cajon</td>
<td>105,185</td>
<td>117,216</td>
<td>123,070</td>
<td>123,417</td>
<td>12,031</td>
<td>5,854</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>18,232</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>243,916</td>
<td>312,374</td>
<td>336,544</td>
<td>345,973</td>
<td>68,458</td>
<td>24,170</td>
<td>9,429</td>
<td>102,057</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronado</td>
<td>24,697</td>
<td>33,265</td>
<td>37,763</td>
<td>42,040</td>
<td>(1,371)</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>42,040</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Mar</td>
<td>1,411</td>
<td>4,174</td>
<td>4,428</td>
<td>4,670</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Cajon</td>
<td>99,478</td>
<td>103,716</td>
<td>110,229</td>
<td>116,772</td>
<td>4,238</td>
<td>6,513</td>
<td>6,543</td>
<td>17,294</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encinitas</td>
<td>59,518</td>
<td>62,511</td>
<td>65,087</td>
<td>67,053</td>
<td>2,993</td>
<td>2,576</td>
<td>1,966</td>
<td>7,535</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>143,951</td>
<td>166,204</td>
<td>174,589</td>
<td>175,413</td>
<td>22,253</td>
<td>8,385</td>
<td>834</td>
<td>31,472</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Beach</td>
<td>26,324</td>
<td>26,085</td>
<td>30,852</td>
<td>31,456</td>
<td>(239)</td>
<td>4,767</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>5,132</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Mesa</td>
<td>57,065</td>
<td>60,936</td>
<td>70,804</td>
<td>77,706</td>
<td>3,871</td>
<td>9,686</td>
<td>6,902</td>
<td>20,641</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemon Grove</td>
<td>25,320</td>
<td>26,646</td>
<td>29,260</td>
<td>31,543</td>
<td>1,326</td>
<td>2,614</td>
<td>2,283</td>
<td>6,223</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National City</td>
<td>58,582</td>
<td>61,790</td>
<td>85,597</td>
<td>95,244</td>
<td>3,208</td>
<td>23,789</td>
<td>9,665</td>
<td>36,662</td>
<td>66.2%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside</td>
<td>167,344</td>
<td>177,416</td>
<td>188,576</td>
<td>188,911</td>
<td>10,072</td>
<td>11,162</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>21,597</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poway</td>
<td>47,811</td>
<td>50,875</td>
<td>53,952</td>
<td>54,282</td>
<td>3,064</td>
<td>3,077</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>6,471</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>1,301,617</td>
<td>1,427,572</td>
<td>1,633,540</td>
<td>1,750,090</td>
<td>125,955</td>
<td>205,968</td>
<td>116,550</td>
<td>448,473</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>83,781</td>
<td>110,487</td>
<td>112,363</td>
<td>112,898</td>
<td>26,706</td>
<td>1,876</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>29,177</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santee</td>
<td>53,413</td>
<td>59,043</td>
<td>62,411</td>
<td>66,022</td>
<td>5,630</td>
<td>3,368</td>
<td>3,611</td>
<td>12,609</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solana Beach</td>
<td>12,679</td>
<td>13,624</td>
<td>14,556</td>
<td>14,574</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>1,027</td>
<td>1,028</td>
<td>2,007</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista</td>
<td>93,719</td>
<td>97,730</td>
<td>114,131</td>
<td>128,951</td>
<td>4,011</td>
<td>16,401</td>
<td>14,820</td>
<td>35,232</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated</td>
<td>486,564</td>
<td>534,412</td>
<td>620,064</td>
<td>659,564</td>
<td>47,848</td>
<td>85,652</td>
<td>39,500</td>
<td>173,000</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Regional Total**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region Total</strong></td>
<td>3,095,313</td>
<td>3,435,713</td>
<td>3,853,698</td>
<td>4,068,759</td>
<td>340,400</td>
<td>417,985</td>
<td>215,061</td>
<td>973,446</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## HOUSING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region Total</strong></td>
<td>1,421,941</td>
<td>1,624,124</td>
<td>1,769,938</td>
<td>1,911,405</td>
<td>202,183</td>
<td>145,814</td>
<td>141,467</td>
<td>489,464</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## JOBS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region Total</strong></td>
<td>1,158,076</td>
<td>1,243,981</td>
<td>1,394,526</td>
<td>1,491,189</td>
<td>91,905</td>
<td>144,545</td>
<td>96,703</td>
<td>335,153</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overview

- Forecast Background
  - History
  - Process
- Regional Forecast Review
  - 2013 California Department of Finance Forecast
  - Series 13 Regional Growth Forecast
- Series 13 Subregional Forecast Inputs
  - Local General Plans
  - Existing Policies
- Results
  - Major Trends
- Schedule & Next Steps
Forecast process and new models

- Regionwide Forecast (DEFM)
- Subregional Forecast (PECAS and UDM)
- Detailed Demographic Forecast (PASEF and PopSyn)
- Transportation Model (ABM)

Current housing, jobs, population, and sq. ft.
Local land plans & policies
Market conditions
Local review

Historical data
Current demographics
National forecast
Demographic trends
Expert review

2050 California Forecast

- Statewide (-15%):
  - 2007 California forecast = 59.5 million
  - 2013 California forecast = 50.4 million

- Imperial: -16%, -12%
- Los Angeles: -17%, -19%
- Orange: -5%
- Riverside: 6%
- Sacramento: -12%
- San Francisco: -19%
- San Diego: -19%

2007 CA DOF forecast
2013 CA DOF forecast
### Population, Jobs, and Housing

- **2010 - 2050**
  - 973,000 more people
  - 489,000 more jobs
  - 333,000 more housing units

### Land Use Inputs

- Existing Plans and Policies
- Reviewed ~350k Parcels
- ~65K Parcel Updates
- Updated Constraints

*Online Comments = 2,322*
Series 13 Subregional Forecast: Land Use Inputs

- Updated General Plans
  - Chula Vista (SP)
  - Escondido
  - Imperial Beach
  - National City
  - San Diego (CP)
  - San Marcos (SP)
  - Vista
  - County

- Site Specific Projects
- Sufficient capacity

Schedule and next steps

June 2013
- DRAFT subregional forecast results for TWG review
- Receive final input and recommendations from TWG

June – July 2013
- New subregional results incorporating TWG input

July 2013
- Subregional forecast to TWG
- Subregional forecast to Board of Directors
- Draft forecast accepted for planning purposes
Plan Area

- Camino del Mar between 9<sup>th</sup> St – north of 15<sup>th</sup> St
- Approx. 32 acres, 68 parcels, 279,000 SF existing development
- 3 Public Facilities: City Hall, Library, Post Office
- Del Mar Plaza & L’Auberge Inn
1940s-1960s
Development Issues

- 60% of the existing buildings exceed currently permitted zoning:
  - Exceed allowed height
  - Exceed allowed FAR
  - Have fewer parking stalls than required
- Have no impetus or incentive to redevelop
- Many spaces not conducive to retail
What development was considered

- Mixed use village, containing residential and including parking structures and boutique hotels
- Development parcels with expanded development capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>2012 Existing</th>
<th>2035 Projected Buildout</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily Residential Units</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boutique Hotel Rooms</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail/Restaurant/Services SF</td>
<td>74,205</td>
<td>139,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>169,646</td>
<td>170,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic</td>
<td>28,466</td>
<td>35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Square Feet:</strong></td>
<td><strong>279,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>500,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Anticipated Mix @ Buildout

- Housing 28%
- Retail, Restaurant & Services 34%
- Office 28%
- Civic 6%
- Hotel 4%
Private Development Incentives

- Increases Floor Area Ratio (FAR) from .45 to 1.0.
- Allows multifamily residential.
- Height increases to 26 feet.
- Additional FAR for housing, affordable housing, open space & view corridors, public parking and LEED Platinum up to 1.5 FAR.
- Implements requirement for Specific Plan and public vote.
Camino del Mar Issues

- Currently exceeding capacity, resulting in congestion
- Speed is increasing based on latest speed survey
- 17% of Village accidents involve cyclists or pedestrians
- 70-80 foot pedestrian street crossing distance (25 seconds)
- 5’-0” sidewalks, inconsistent and interrupted by parking
Mobility Recommendations

- Wider sidewalks for Pedestrians
- Adequate capacity for Vehicles
- Enhanced provisions for Bicycles
- Enhanced provisions for Transit
- Additional on-street parking
“Complete Street” solution

- Pedestrian crossing reduces to 4 seconds per side (60% less time than today)
- Bicycles flow with cars around roundabouts
Parking – Park Once Approach

ISSUES:
- Vacant private parking when public parking is over capacity

SOLUTIONS:
- Encouraging public parking on private properties through alternative ratios
- City Hall parking structure
- Additional parking structures on private property
- Increase on-street parking
Public Finance

- **Revenue Projections**
  - New development could generate $576,000/year in tax revenue at Plan’s eventual buildout.
  - One time fees: In-Lieu, Impact Fees, Exactions, User Fees

- **Public Improvements Finance Strategies**
  - Public Parking Structure: $5 – $7 million
  - Streetscape Improvements: $4.0 - $5.0 million
  - Mix of funding including:
    - Grants/donations
    - Development impact fees and exactions
    - Loans and long-term debt financing
Public Input Shaped the Plan

- Over 90 forums within 18 months
- 23 City Council meetings that focused on the Plan
- A survey conducted at the end of the process found >80% of the residents knew about the Plan
- November 6: Election and public vote
What Transpired

- Polling showed 50% support
  - Concern for roundabouts and 2-lanes of travel
  - Concern for increased development intensity
  - Loss of control – want to keep the ability to vote
  - Too much to comprehend

- November 2012 Voter results (Prop. J)
  - 58% against
  - 42% in favor
Vision from the Community Plan

“Focus major retail and office activity into an economically viable, pedestrian-oriented and attractive area that serves the needs of both residents and visitors and is well integrated into the residential fabric of the community.”

“Development in Del Mar needs to be of human scale, with one story on the west side … Ultimately the amount of development should not be overwhelming. The VSP was too big, too complex and too ambitious.”
Next Steps

- Housing Element
  - Revised to not include commercial core
  - Certified yesterday!

- Parking
  - Parking Management Plan
  - Mixed-Use Parking Standards
  - Parking Signage
  - Employee Parking

- City Hall Redevelopment
  - Facilities Assessment
  - Direction for 1050 Camino del Mar

- Roundabouts
  - Test locations in city

- “Business Friendly” City Hall Review Committee
  - Made up of local businesses
Del Mar Reality?