AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

- **DRAFT REGIONAL COMPLETE STREETS POLICY**

- **TransNet SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM AND ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION GRANT PROGRAM: CALL FOR PROJECTS FOR THIRD CYCLE OF GRANT FUNDING**

- **PUBLIC HEALTH AND THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT**

**PLEASE SILENCE ALL ELECTRONIC DEVICES DURING THE MEETING**

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

**MISSION STATEMENT**

The Regional Planning Committee provides oversight for the preparation and implementation of the Regional Comprehensive Plan that is based on the local general plans and regional plans and addresses interregional issues with surrounding counties and Mexico. The components of the plan include: transportation, housing, environment (shoreline, air quality, water quality, habitat), economy, borders, regional infrastructure needs and financing, and land use and design.
Welcome to SANDAG. Members of the public may speak to the Regional Planning Committee on any item at the time the Committee is considering the item. Please complete a Speaker’s Slip, which is located in the rear of the room, and then present the slip to Committee staff. Members of the public may address the Committee on any issue under the agenda item entitled Public Comments/Communications/Member Comments. Public speakers are limited to three minutes or less per person. The Regional Planning Committee may take action on any item appearing on the agenda.

Public comments regarding the agenda can be sent to SANDAG via comment@sandag.org. Please include the agenda item, your name, and your organization. Email comments should be received no later than 12 noon, two working days prior to the Regional Planning Committee meeting. Any handouts, presentations, or other materials from the public intended for distribution at the Regional Planning Committee meeting should be received by the Clerk of the Committee no later than 12 noon, two working days prior to the meeting.

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

SANDAG operates its programs without regard to race, color, and national origin in compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act. SANDAG has developed procedures for investigating and tracking Title VI complaints and the procedures for filing a complaint are available to the public upon request. Questions concerning SANDAG nondiscrimination obligations or complaint procedures should be directed to SANDAG General Counsel, John Kirk, at (619) 699-1997 or john.kirk@sandag.org. Any person who believes himself or herself or any specific class of persons to be subjected to discrimination prohibited by Title VI also may file a written complaint with the Federal Transit Administration.

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

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

SANDAG offices are accessible by public transit. Phone 511 or see 511sd.com for route information. Bicycle parking is available in the parking garage of the SANDAG offices.
+1. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

The Regional Planning Committee is asked to review and approve the minutes from its October 3, 2014, meeting.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

Members of the public shall have the opportunity to address the Regional Planning Committee on any issue within the jurisdiction of the Committee that is not on this agenda. Anyone desiring to speak shall reserve time by completing a “Request to Speak” form and giving it to the Clerk prior to speaking. Public speakers should notify the Clerk if they have a handout for distribution to Committee members. Public speakers are limited to three minutes or less per person. Committee members also may provide information and announcements under this agenda item.

CHAIR’S REPORT

3. STATUS UPDATE ON MILITARY WORKING GROUP EFFORTS

(Coronado Councilmember Michael Woiwode, Regional Planning Committee Vice Chair and Military Working Group Chair)

On October 27, 2014, a Military Working Group workshop was held to discuss military issues in relation to the development of San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan. Regional Planning Committee Vice Chair Woiwode will summarize progress made to date.

REPORTS

+4. DRAFT REGIONAL COMPLETE STREETS POLICY (Stephan Vance)

With the approval of the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy in 2011, SANDAG committed to develop a Regional Complete Streets Policy. A draft policy was developed after a review of existing local complete streets policies, best practices from regional agencies around the country, and input from member agencies and stakeholders. The Regional Planning Committee is asked to recommend that the SANDAG Board of Directors accept the Regional Complete Streets Policy for planning purposes.

+5. TransNet SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM AND ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION GRANT PROGRAM: STATUS UPDATE AND PROPOSED AMENDMENT (Suchi Mukherjee)

This report provides an overview of the progress made by TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program and Active Transportation Grant Program recipients through June 30, 2014. The Regional Planning Committee is asked to approve a no-cost, time-only schedule extension for the SGIP for the City of National City’s Eighth Street Smart Growth Revitalization Project.
6. **TransNet SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM AND ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION GRANT PROGRAM: CALL FOR PROJECTS FOR THIRD CYCLE OF GRANT FUNDING** (Carolina Gregor)

The call for projects for the third cycles of the TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program and Active Transportation Grant Program are anticipated for release next month. The Regional Planning Committee is asked to discuss the proposed criteria and program guidelines.

7. **PUBLIC HEALTH AND THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT** (Dan Gallagher)

Working with partners at the County of San Diego Health and Human Services Agency, SANDAG has concluded work on the Community Transformation Grant program funded by the United States Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Staff will provide a status report on work completed through the grant program.

8. **ENCINITAS HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE** (Jeff Murphy, City of Encinitas)

The City of Encinitas is updating its housing element for the sixth cycle. As part of this process, it has developed a new mapping strategy, approved by City Council, which includes a new public participation tool to encourage participation by people not previously engaged in the housing element update process. Jeff Murphy, Director of Planning and Building for the City of Encinitas and Vice-Chair of the Regional Planning Technical Working Group, will provide an overview.

9. **CONTINUED PUBLIC COMMENTS**

If the five speaker limit for public comments was exceeded at the beginning of this agenda, other public comments will be taken at this time. Subjects of previous agenda items may not again be addressed under public comment.

10. **UPCOMING MEETING**

The next Regional Planning Committee meeting is scheduled on Friday, December 5, 2014. Please note that the meeting time will be shifted to accommodate the Board of Directors meeting, which is being held in San Ysidro. The Regional Planning Committee meeting will be held from 1 to 2:30 p.m., instead of 12 noon to 2 p.m.

11. **ADJOURNMENT**

+ next to an agenda item indicates an attachment
The meeting of the Regional Planning Committee was called to order by Chair Lesa Heebner (North County Coastal) at 12:00 p.m. See the attached attendance sheet for the Regional Planning Committee member attendance.

1. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

   Action: Upon a motion by Supervisor Dave Roberts (County of San Diego), and a second by Councilmember Jerry Jones (East County), the Regional Planning Committee approved the meeting minutes of September 5, 2014. Yes – 6. No – None. Abstain – None.Absent – None.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

   There were no public comments.

REPORTS

3. TransNet ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION PROGRAM: LAND MANAGEMENT GRANT PROGRAM QUARTERLY STATUS UPDATE AND PROPOSED GRANT AMENDMENT (APPROVAL)

   Keith Greer, Senior Regional Planner, presented the item.

   Action: Upon a motion by Supervisor Roberts (County of San Diego), and a second by Councilmember Jerry Jones (East County), the Regional Planning Committee approved a schedule extension of 12 months requested by the US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) for its TransNet Environmental Mitigation Program-funded Shinohara Vernal Pool Invasive Weed Treatment grant project No. 5001761. Yes – 6. No – None. Abstain – None. Absent – None.

4. 2014 TECHNICAL UPDATE OF THE SMART GROWTH CONCEPT MAP (RECOMMEND)

   Sarah Strand, Regional Planner, presented the item.

   Action: Upon a motion by Supervisor Dave Roberts (County of San Diego), and a second by Mayor Sam Abed (North County Inland), the Regional Planning Committee recommended that the Board of Directors accept the 2014 Smart Growth Concept Map for planning purposes and for use in the next cycle of the TransNet Smart Growth Incentive and Active Transportation Grant Programs. Yes – 6. No – None. Abstain – None. Absent – None.
5. REGIONAL ENERGY NETWORK UPDATE (RECOMMEND)

San Marcos Councilmember Chris Orlando, Energy Working Group Chair, introduced the item; Anna Lowe, Associate Regional Energy/Climate Planner, presented the item and responded to questions.

Lisa Davidson, Director of Customer Programs for San Diego Gas and Electric (SDG&E), thanked SANDAG staff and the Energy Working Group for working with SDG&E to strengthen the region’s energy partnerships and expressed concerns about potential rate increases that could occur if a Regional Energy Network (REN) is formed in the San Diego region.

Mike Evans, San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce, stated that energy efficiency is a great option for businesses in San Diego and supported the formation of a REN.

Dave Roberts, Supervisor (County of San Diego), commented on this item and requested additional information on the funding of RENs and the California Public Utility Commission’s evaluation of existing RENs when available.

Jerry Jones, Councilmember (East County), expressed support for moving forward with the staff recommendation and suggested adding the word “draft” in front of the words “Memorandum of Understanding,” and directing staff to return to the Regional Planning Committee and the SANDAG Board of Directors to report on key milestones.

Pamela Bensoussan, Deputy Mayor, City of Chula Vista (South County), spoke in support of staff’s recommendation and briefly described her understanding of recommendation.

Action: Upon a motion by Supervisor Dave Roberts (County of San Diego), and a second by Councilmember Jerry Jones (East County), the Regional Planning Committee recommended that the Board of Directors approve: (1) becoming a party to the California Public Utilities Commission Energy Efficiency Proceeding; (2) developing a draft Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with member agencies; (3) authorizing staff to begin the development of a Regional Energy Network application and draft MOU with identified agencies; and (4) directing staff to return to the Regional Planning Committee and SANDAG Board of Directors to report on key milestones. Yes – 6. No – None. Abstain – None. Absent – None.

6. HIGHLIGHTING LOCAL SMART GROWTH PLANNING EFFORTS: SAN DIEGO STATE UNIVERSITY SAGE PROJECT AND PARTNERSHIP WITH CITY OF NATIONAL CITY (INFORMATION)

San Diego State University (SDSU) has launched the Sage Project in partnership with the City of National City. The Sage Project model provides opportunities for partnerships within the San Diego region that focus on smart growth, quality of life, and sustainability goals. An overview of the Sage Project and examples of the work that SDSU students are undertaking to help implement the City of National City's general plan as a result of this partnership was provided.

Dr. Jessica Barlow, San Diego State University, and Brad Raulston, City of National City, presented the item.

Action: This item was presented for information only.
7. CONTINUED PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no continued public comments.

8. UPCOMING MEETINGS (INFORMATION)

The next meeting of the Regional Planning Committee is scheduled for Friday, November 7, 2014, at 12 noon.

9. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Heebner adjourned the meeting at 1:28 p.m.
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DRAFT REGIONAL COMPLETE STREETS POLICY

Introduction

The 2050 Regional Transportation Plan and its Sustainable Communities Strategy, adopted by the SANDAG Board of Directors in October 2011, calls for the development of a comprehensive Regional Complete Streets Policy. Over the past two years, staff has been working with the relevant SANDAG working groups to develop an understanding of what role SANDAG can play in supporting Complete Streets in the San Diego region. As part of that process, SANDAG developed a Complete Streets discussion paper that was used to engage stakeholders at local agencies and the public on the topic. The paper also was presented to the SANDAG Board of Directors in June 2014.

Based on the feedback received from stakeholders, and on the direction provided by the Board of Directors, staff drafted a Regional Complete Streets Policy (Attachment 1). The draft policy defines what Complete Streets means to SANDAG in its role as an implementer of transportation projects in the region, and as the regional planning agency that programs transportation funds, sets long-range regional transportation policy, and provides technical assistance and support to local agencies. The draft policy has been reviewed by, and reflects the comments of, the SANDAG Active Transportation Working Group and San Diego Regional Traffic Engineers Council. It has been reviewed and recommended by the Regional Planning Technical Working Group.

Discussion

The draft Regional Complete Streets Policy includes a purpose statement and seven sections, each briefly described below.

Introduction. The policy recognizes the importance of supporting the regional policy framework for smart growth and sustainability and applies to all users and uses of the transportation system as is appropriate in each context.

Policy Statement. This statement establishes the goal of a safe and balanced multimodal system that SANDAG will achieve through its project development process and through incentives and assistance to local agencies.

Applicability. The policy applies to all phases of all projects developed by SANDAG, and to the administration of the TransNet Ordinance routine accommodation provision. Implementing the policy also means supporting and encouraging local General Plans that commit to Complete Streets principles or the adoption of stand-alone polices.

Recommendation

The Regional Planning Committee is asked to recommend that the SANDAG Board of Directors accept the Regional Complete Streets Policy included as Attachment 1 to this report, for planning purposes.
Design Practices and Context Sensitivity. This section encourages a flexible approach to street design that responds to its context and utilizes innovative design solutions when necessary to meet everyone’s needs.

Regional Network Principles. Effective Complete Streets policies provide an interconnected network of travel options that enables people traveling by all modes to comfortably and conveniently reach their destinations. The draft policy establishes a commitment by SANDAG to achieve this objective, taking into account both current and projected demand.

Performance Measures. Measuring outcomes is an important step in any process to determine its effectiveness. The draft policy proposes performance measures and objectives that will enable the periodic evaluation of the policy’s results.

Exceptions. The policy recognizes that there are circumstances where accommodating all modes of travel is prohibited, unjustifiably expensive, or unwarranted. The draft policy describes those circumstances in general terms and establishes a process for approving exceptions.

Implementation. The draft policy includes eight implementation items that will guide the actions of SANDAG staff, ensure coordination with local and state agency Complete Streets efforts, provide training in Complete Streets practices, and establish a monitoring process.

Next Steps

In addition to today’s presentation to the Regional Planning Committee, the draft Regional Complete Streets Policy will be presented to the Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee on November 6, 2014, and the SANDAG Transportation Committee on November 14, 2014. Recommendations from the Transportation and Regional Planning Committees will be presented to the Board of Directors for consideration on December 19, 2014. Once accepted, the policy will be incorporated into San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan as an appendix, and staff will begin work on the implementation items identified in the policy. Implementation will include collaboration with local agency staff where the policy directs development of tools to assist local agencies. Many of the implementation items could be completed within nine to 12 months (Items 7.1 – 7.4 in the Implementation section of the draft Regional Complete Streets Policy, Attachment 1), but some, such as staff training would be on-going as needed to ensure that staff is trained in the state of the practice.
DRAFT REGIONAL COMPLETE STREETS POLICY

Introduction

SANDAG guides regional planning via a policy framework based on smart growth and sustainability. Under this framework, much of the region’s future development will occur within the existing urbanized area and in compact, mixed-use neighborhoods that provide a variety of housing and transportation choices and help create healthier communities. Complete Streets is an important planning concept in this policy framework because it is a process for ensuring the transportation system is safe, useful, and attractive for all users of the transportation network – motorists, pedestrians, bicyclists, transit users, and freight carriers alike. Complete Streets provides valuable flexibility in street design so that the transportation system is appropriate for the current and planned built environment context.

1. Policy Statement

SANDAG seeks to fulfill the regional goal of a safe, balanced, multimodal transportation system that supports compact and sustainable development by adopting a Complete Streets approach in its project development and implementation processes, and by assisting and encouraging local jurisdictions to follow Complete Streets policies and practices. In this way, everyone will be able to safely travel along and across streets and railways to reach destinations within the region, regardless of age, ability, or mode of travel.

2. Applicability

Applicable principles in this Complete Streets Policy should be incorporated into the development of all SANDAG transportation infrastructure projects across the region at all phases of development, including planning and land use decisions, scoping, design, implementation, and performance monitoring. SANDAG will incorporate Complete Streets principles into the development process for all projects in its Capital Improvement Program as appropriate for the project type.

All state, regional, and local agency projects included in the SANDAG programming document known as the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) should be subject to applicable Complete Streets principles. RTIP projects submitted by SANDAG will incorporate Complete Streets principles and SANDAG encourages each entity submitting projects to the RTIP to implement a process that allows for public participation and comment on whether those projects follow Complete Streets principles.

In addition to applying this policy to projects in the RTIP, SANDAG supports and encourages Complete Streets implementation on other projects throughout the region. Local jurisdictions, as required by the California Complete Streets Act of 2008, will incorporate Complete Streets into their general plans as they revise their circulation elements. SANDAG encourages local agencies to implement Complete Streets principles if a circulation element revision is not planned in the near future. Adopting a Complete Streets approach provides an opportunity to establish more detailed direction on Complete Streets implementation than would be provided in the context of a general purpose plan.

---

1 The policy will apply to all new projects and projects still in the planning phase at the time the policy is adopted.
plan. SANDAG also encourages and supports Complete Streets methodologies in the design and construction of all projects in the region developed by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) as appropriate consistent with Deputy Directive 64-R1, and in the maintenance and operation of all state highway and public transit facilities.

Section 4(E)(3) of the TransNet Extension Ordinance requires all projects constructed under the Ordinance to routinely accommodate pedestrian and bicyclists and is therefore connected to Complete Streets planning. Rule #21 of SANDAG Board Policy No. 031 provides guidance for the implementation of that requirement. SANDAG will periodically evaluate the effectiveness of Rule #21 to ensure compliance with this provision and to ensure that the rule reflects current best practices in Complete Streets implementation.

3. Design Practices and Context Sensitivity

While every street should be planned, designed, built, operated, and maintained for all foreseeable users, there is no singular design standard for Complete Streets and few streets will have separate accommodations for every mode. Projects should be planned and designed to consider current and planned adjacent land uses and local transportation needs, and to incorporate the latest and best practice design guidance. Each project must be considered both separately and as part of a connected network to determine the level and type of treatment necessary for all foreseeable users.

In order to provide context sensitive solutions that respond to public input and the need to serve a variety of users, a flexible, balanced approach to project design that utilizes innovative design solutions may be considered provided that an adequate level of safety for all users is ensured. SANDAG will compile a library of best practice design guidance to facilitate this and make it available on its website.

SANDAG encourages local governments and Caltrans to coordinate Complete Streets implementation with broader livable communities planning and integration of land use with transportation. SANDAG will coordinate educational opportunities for jurisdictional technical staff on current design standards and will encourage and support the use of modern best practices in Complete Streets design.

4. Regional Network Principles

A well-connected network provides safe and convenient transitions from one mode of transportation to another, from one jurisdiction to another, and from one type of infrastructure to another. A well-connected network also provides more route choices that can disperse traffic across the network, provides alternatives when priority is given to a particular mode along one route, and provides route alternatives when a link in the network is obstructed. SANDAG will endeavor to provide a continuous, uninterrupted regional network accessible to all users and modes. A well-connected network considers connectivity throughout the lifespan of a transportation project and takes into account the needs of both current and projected users.

5. Exceptions

All transportation projects constructed or reconstructed should be planned, designed, and constructed for all foreseeable users. For some projects, however, an exception to this standard may be warranted. For projects developed by SANDAG, project managers may propose an exception with supporting data to indicate the basis for the request. The request for an exception will be
reviewed by the project manager’s department director before inclusion and/or the next update of the project in the RTIP. Exceptions may be appropriate in the following cases:

- Where specific modes of travel are prohibited by law. In such cases, efforts should be made to accommodate travel by prohibited modes elsewhere, as appropriate for each mode, to ensure network connectivity. Where a proposed project for a limited access facility would cross a major barrier (such as a river, railroad, or highway), consideration should be given to the opportunity to include access across the barrier for otherwise limited modes.

- Where the cost of providing facilities for all travelers, especially pedestrians and bicyclists, would be excessively disproportionate to the need or likely use. Federal guidance defines this as exceeding 20 percent of the total project costs; however, this exception should also be context-sensitive. Where demand is high or a barrier is significant, a cost in excess of 20 percent may be warranted, but where demand is low, 20 percent may not. This exception must consider probable use through the life of the project, a minimum of 20 years.

- Where approved or adopted plans or policies (such as local land use, zoning, or mobility planning) or present and anticipated market conditions indicate an absence of need for both current and future conditions of the anticipated project’s life (a minimum of 20 years for roadways and 50 years for bridges).

- Where unmitigable detrimental environmental impacts outweigh the need for full accommodation of all travel modes. In making this determination, the needs of all modes will be considered, with priorities determined based on the project context.

Exceptions that are recommended for approval on SANDAG projects will be reported to the Transportation Committee through the RTIP process where a member of the public may either present opposition to that recommendation during public comment or in writing in advance of the meeting at which the exception recommendation is to be considered. Exceptions should not be common.

6. Performance Measures

SANDAG will evaluate the outcomes of this Complete Streets Policy in concert with regional performance measures, such as those developed for the Regional Plan and future long-range transportation plans. The policy will be subject to a biennial review of objective measures presented to the Transportation Committee for the committee to use in evaluating the effectiveness of the policy. These measures and their objectives include:

6.1 An increase in the number of projects that include multimodal connections to destinations by providing bicycle and pedestrian facilities, crossing improvements, traffic calming measures, wayfinding signs or other measures;

6.2 An increase in the miles of new and upgraded bikeways and walkways in the region, and other improvements that improve access for biking, walking, and transit or improve monitoring of those modes;

6.3 An increase in member jurisdictions that have adopted policies incorporating Complete Streets principles, or that have revised the circulation element of their general plans in compliance with the California Complete Streets Act;
6.4 The number of staff members from SANDAG and local jurisdictions and other transportation agencies participating in training and events that reflect best practices in Complete Streets planning and design; and

6.5 Progress in accomplishing activities identified in the “Implementation” section below.

7. Implementation

In addition to the measures described above in this policy, SANDAG will take the following actions in collaboration with member agencies and other affected agencies:

7.1 All projects developed by SANDAG are opportunities to improve access and mobility for all modes. Toward that end, SANDAG will create a project development checklist to ensure all projects implemented by SANDAG consider local mobility plans and accommodate the needs of all travel modes and the movement of goods to the extent appropriate. Use of the checklist will include coordination between departments and consultation with staff for all modes through participation on the project development team.

7.2 Develop a process for coordinating the development of regional projects with local agency Complete Streets initiatives and include in that process a protocol for evaluating cost sharing opportunities.

7.3 Develop a project development checklist template that local agencies can use to ensure local projects result in Complete Streets.

7.4 Collaborate with local jurisdictions, Caltrans, and transit operators to develop a regional database and mapping tool to facilitate coordinated development of local and regional Complete Streets plans.

7.5 Provide opportunities for SANDAG staff and staff from member agencies, Caltrans, and transit operators to participate in trainings, workshops, and other educational events related to Complete Streets procedures and practices, including but not limited to transportation safety, multimodal network planning, context-sensitive design, connecting transportation and land use decisions, and evaluating projects and the impact of transportation investments. This will be an ongoing activity to ensure practitioners are well informed about state of the art practices.

7.6 Develop tools and reference materials as needed, such as guidance on best practices and innovation in street design, parking management strategies, storm water best practices, incorporating bicycle and pedestrian access to transit stops and stations, traffic impact studies, and public engagement tools. SANDAG will make these tools available to other entities on its website.

7.7 Continue work on related initiatives that support multimodal connections, including the Safe Routes to School and Safe Routes to Transit programs.

7.8 Develop a benchmarking process for SANDAG project managers to use as a tool for monitoring implementation of this policy.
TransNet SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM
AND ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION GRANT PROGRAM:
STATUS UPDATE AND PROPOSED AMENDMENT

Introduction

This report provides an update through June 30, 2014, on projects funded by two grant programs included in the TransNet Extension Ordinance and Expenditure Plan: (1) the Smart Growth Incentive Program (SGIP) and (2) the Active Transportation Grant Program (ATGP). This report also provides information regarding ongoing oversight efforts and one proposed no-cost, time-only SGIP schedule amendment and two no-cost, time-only ATGP schedule amendments.

The Regional Planning Committee, given its role in regional planning policy issues, reviews the progress of and considers amendments to SGIP projects. The Transportation Committee, given its role in transportation policy issues, reviews the progress of and considers amendments to ATGP projects. Because both programs encourage biking, walking, and transit usage and are funded by TransNet, progress on the ATGP also is shared for the Regional Planning Committee's information.

On October 8, 2014, the TransNet Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee (ITOC) reviewed the status report and proposed amendments.

Discussion

This report includes an update on the progress of both grant programs through June 30, 2014 (Attachments 1 – 4), including three amendment requests.

Smart Growth Incentive Program

The SGIP was established through the TransNet Extension Ordinance “to provide funding for a broad array of transportation-related infrastructure improvements that will assist local agencies in better integrating transportation and land use.”
In May 2009, SANDAG awarded $9.4 million in funding to 14 projects (six planning grants and eight capital grants) for the first cycle of the SGIP. Of the 13 projects that went forward (one project was withdrawn at the grantee’s request), eight have been completed, two have been transferred to SANDAG for consolidated implementation with the Regional Bicycle Plan Early Action Program, and the remaining three projects are scheduled to be completed by the end of FY 2015 (June 2015). Of the projects in progress, one is requesting a no-cost, time-only schedule amendment as described below.

In June 2013, SANDAG awarded $9.6 million in funding to 13 projects (seven planning grants and six capital grants) for the second cycle of the SGIP. Grant agreements for all projects have been executed and work is under way. Currently, the 13 projects are scheduled to be completed by the end of FY 2017 (June 2017).

Proposed Smart Growth Incentive Program Amendment

The City of National City is requesting a no-cost, time-only schedule amendment of six months for the Eighth Street Smart Growth Revitalization Project (Attachment 5). This is the fourth amendment request for this project. Approval of this request would extend the grantee’s agreement from December 31, 2014, to June 30, 2015. The grantee has continued to experience various construction issues, including utility undergrounding issues. The time extension will allow the grantee to complete the project.

Prior amendment requests are summarized below:

• The first project extension was approved by staff to amend the agreement expiration date from February 29, 2012, to February 28, 2013 (12 months)

• The second project extension was approved by the Regional Planning Committee to amend the agreement expiration date from February 28, 2013, to June 30, 2014 (16 months)

• The third project extension was approved by the Regional Planning Committee to amend the agreement expiration date from June 30, 2014, to December 30, 2014 (6 months)

Per Section 3 of SANDAG Board Policy No. 035 (Attachment 6), the Regional Planning Committee reviews SGIP extension requests and grant amendments for extenuating circumstances that the grantee could not have reasonably foreseen.

On October 8, 2014, the ITOC recommended that the Regional Planning Committee approve the SGIP amendment request.

Active Transportation Grant Program

The TransNet Extension Ordinance specifies that ATGP funds be used “for bikeway facilities and connectivity improvements, pedestrian and walkable community projects, bicycle and pedestrian safety projects and programs, and traffic calming projects.”

In June 2009, SANDAG awarded $7.8 million in Transportation Development Act (TDA) and TransNet funding to 31 projects (12 planning, parking, and education program grants; and 19 capital grants) for the first cycle of this program. Of the 31 projects, 28 have been completed,
one has been transferred to SANDAG for consolidated implementation with the Regional Bicycle Plan Early Action Program, and one was withdrawn at the grantee's request. The one remaining project from this cycle is scheduled for completion by the end of FY 2015 (June 2015).

In September 2012, SANDAG awarded $8.8 million in TDA and TransNet funding to 25 projects (14 planning, parking, and education program grants; and 11 capital grants) for the second cycle of this program. Of the 25 projects, 4 have been completed. The remaining 21 projects are scheduled to be completed toward the beginning of FY 2017 (July 2017). At this time, two projects are requesting no-cost, time-only schedule amendments as described below.

Proposed Active Transportation Grant Program Amendments

The City of Oceanside is requesting a no-cost, time-only schedule amendment of 12 months for the North Coast Transit Station Bike Station Project (Attachment 7). This is the first amendment request for this project. Approval of this request would extend the grantee's agreement expiration date from October 31, 2015, to October 31, 2016. The project schedule was delayed due to the process to award a Professional Services Agreement with the selected bike station vendor. The time extension will allow the grantee to install the bike station and commence its operation.

The City of Oceanside also is requesting a no-cost, time-only schedule amendment of 12 months for the 2 Year Education, Encouragement, and Awareness Project (Attachment 8). This is the first amendment request for this project. Approval of this request would extend the grantee's agreement expiration date from July 31, 2015, to July 31, 2016. The project schedule was delayed due to difficulties scheduling outreach activities with partnering schools and class cancellations resulting from wildfires earlier this year. The time extension will allow the grantee to complete the number of outreach activities specified in the grantee's proposal.

Per Section 3 of SANDAG Board Policy No. 035: Competitive Grant Program Procedures, the Transportation Committee reviews ATGP extension requests and grant amendments for extenuating circumstances that the grantee could not have reasonably foreseen.

On October 8, 2014, the ITOC recommended that the Transportation Committee approve the two ATGP amendment requests. On October 17, 2014, the Transportation Committee approved both amendment requests.

Grant Monitoring and Oversight

Staff reviews quarterly reports to ensure that grantees are making timely progress with respect to the key milestones identified in Board Policy No. 035: Competitive Grant Program Procedures governing the timely use of grant funds, and their respective grant agreements. The “Watch List” column in Attachments 1 – 4 is used to identify those grantees in danger of missing their scheduled milestone dates and that have not yet worked with SANDAG staff to take corrective action. Delays in tasks leading up to either the award of a contract or project completion also may result in placement of grantees on the watch list. Five staff-level amendments for the ATGP and two for the SGIP are being processed per Board Policy No. 035, as noted in Attachments 1 – 4.

In addition, staff reviews project deliverables for consistency with the agreed upon scopes of work. Status updates are presented to ITOC and the Transportation and Regional Planning Committees on a quarterly basis.
During the past several grants status reports, Regional Planning Committee, Transportation Committee, and ITOC members directed staff to consider process improvements to better ensure that projects are delivered in a timely manner. In response to Recommendation No. 15 included in the FY 2012 TransNet Triennial Performance Audit conducted by the ITOC, staff is establishing a formalized process for site visits with grantees to improve performance over the course of grant implementation.

**Next Steps**

Pending approval by the Regional Planning Committee, staff will execute the proposed SGIP amendment. The next status update on the ATGP and SGIP will be provided in the February 2015 timeframe.

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

Attachments:  
2. Status of FY 2011–FY 2012 (Cycle 2) TransNet SGIP Projects  
5. City of National City Amendment Request for Eighth Street Corridor Smart Growth Revitalization  
6. Board Policy No. 035: Competitive Grant Program Procedures  
7. City of Oceanside Amendment Request for North Coast Transit Station Bike Station  
8. City of Oceanside Amendment Request for 2 Year Education, Encouragement, and Awareness Project

Key Staff Contact: Suchi Mukherjee, (619) 699-7315, suchi.mukherjee@sandag.org
### FY 2009 - FY 2010 Smart Growth Incentive Program Projects (In Progress)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grantee</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Contract Execution Date</th>
<th>Grant Amount</th>
<th>ORIGINAL Contract Expiration Date</th>
<th>REVISED Contract Expiration Date*</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National City</td>
<td>8th Street Corridor</td>
<td>01/26/10</td>
<td>2,000,000.00</td>
<td>02/28/12</td>
<td>12/31/14</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Smart Growth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grantee is requesting a no-cost, time-only schedule extension of six months to 06/30/15 for approval by the Regional Planning Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Chollas Triangle</td>
<td>02/04/10</td>
<td>275,000.00</td>
<td>09/30/12</td>
<td>12/31/14</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward its revised milestones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Park Boulevard/City</td>
<td>05/23/11</td>
<td>300,000.00</td>
<td>02/29/12</td>
<td>02/28/15</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College/San Diego</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward its revised milestones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Pedestrian &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transit Access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>Industrial Boulevard</td>
<td></td>
<td>283,900.00</td>
<td>PROJECT COMPLETE - JULY 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bike Lane &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>Streetscape</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,000,000.00</td>
<td>PROJECT COMPLETE - MARCH 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>Palomar Gateway</td>
<td></td>
<td>399,632.00</td>
<td>PROJECT COMPLETE - JUNE 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>District Specific</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plan &amp; EIR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemon Grove</td>
<td>Lemon Grove Trolley</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,895,000.00</td>
<td>PROJECT COMPLETE - FEBRUARY 2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plaza</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Mid-City SR 15 BRT</td>
<td></td>
<td>225,000.00</td>
<td>PROJECT COMPLETE - FEBRUARY 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Station Area Planning Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Euclid &amp; Market</td>
<td></td>
<td>400,000.00</td>
<td>PROJECT COMPLETE - MARCH 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Village Master Plan</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Imperial Avenue &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td>400,000.00</td>
<td>PROJECT COMPLETE - MARCH 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commercial Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corridor Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9th &amp; 15th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Avenue/Rutledge</td>
<td></td>
<td>577,000.00</td>
<td>PROJECT COMPLETE - MARCH 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pedestrian Crossing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&amp; Traffic Calming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>6th Avenue/Crossing</td>
<td></td>
<td>231,000.00</td>
<td>PROJECT COMPLETE - MARCH 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pedestrian Crossing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&amp; Traffic Calming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Park Boulevard/Essen</td>
<td></td>
<td>224,000.00</td>
<td>PROJECT COMPLETE - MARCH 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>street Pedestrian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crossing &amp; Traffic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Calming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Contract Expiration Date = Project Completion Date

**Watch List Projects are those grantees not making timely progress toward their milestones (which are defined in Policy No. 35 and Use-It-or-Lose-It) and not yet sought corrective action. Delays in tasks leading up to either the award of a contract or project completion may place grantees on the watch list.
### Status of FY 2011 - FY 2012 (Cycle 2) TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program Projects

**Reporting period through June 30, 2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grantee</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Original Contract Completion Date</th>
<th>CURRENT Contract Completion Date</th>
<th>Grant Amount</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>Healthy Communities Program</td>
<td>01/15/16</td>
<td>01/15/16</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td>No Project IS making timely progress toward its milestones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>Third Avenue Streetscape Implementation Project Phase 2</td>
<td>09/24/15</td>
<td>09/24/15</td>
<td>$1,344,671.00</td>
<td>No Project IS making timely progress toward its milestones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Beach</td>
<td>Palm Avenue Mixed- Use &amp; Commercial Corridor Master Plan</td>
<td>07/24/15</td>
<td>07/24/15</td>
<td>$400,000.00</td>
<td>No Project IS making timely progress toward its milestones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Mesa</td>
<td>Oceanside Village Streetscape Improvement Project</td>
<td>12/11/15</td>
<td>12/11/15</td>
<td>$2,000,000.00</td>
<td>No Project IS making timely progress toward its milestones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemon Grove</td>
<td>Main Street Promenade Extension Planning Project</td>
<td>08/15/15</td>
<td>08/15/15</td>
<td>$400,000.00</td>
<td>No Project IS making timely progress toward its milestones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National City</td>
<td>Oceanside-Westside Community Connections</td>
<td>01/11/16</td>
<td>01/11/16</td>
<td>$300,000.00</td>
<td>No Project IS making timely progress toward its milestones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Island Avenue Green Street Mobility Improvements</td>
<td>12/11/14</td>
<td>12/11/14</td>
<td>$1,000,000.00</td>
<td>Board Policy No. 035 allows for staff-approved time extensions of up to six months. Staff is processing a six-month extension for this project to 6/11/2015 to allow the grantee additional time to obtain the necessary permit and proceed with construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Morena Boulevard Station Area Study Phase 2</td>
<td>01/21/16</td>
<td>01/21/16</td>
<td>$400,000.00</td>
<td>No Project IS making timely progress toward its milestones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>The Complete Boulevard Planning Study</td>
<td>01/21/17</td>
<td>01/21/17</td>
<td>$171,617.00</td>
<td>No Project IS making timely progress toward its milestones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Wayfinding Signage</td>
<td>03/11/15</td>
<td>03/11/15</td>
<td>$335,329.00</td>
<td>Board Policy No. 035 allows for staff-approved time extensions of up to six months. Staff is processing a six-month extension for this project to 6/11/15 to allow the grantee additional time to bid the project according to amended Construction Contracting Policies between the City of San Diego and Civic San Diego.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>Armolite Complete Street Corridor</td>
<td>08/30/15</td>
<td>08/30/15</td>
<td>$1,000,000.00</td>
<td>No Project IS making timely progress toward its milestones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista</td>
<td>Vista Downtown Specific Plan Update</td>
<td>04/24/15</td>
<td>04/24/15</td>
<td>$148,383.00</td>
<td>No Project IS making timely progress toward its milestones.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Contract Expiration Date = Project Completion Date

**Watch List Projects are those grantees not making timely progress toward their milestones (which are defined in Policy No. 35 and Use-It-or-Lose-It) and not yet sought corrective action. Delays in tasks leading up to either the award of a contract or project completion may place grantees on the watch list.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grantee</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Grant Amount</th>
<th>Contract Execution Date</th>
<th>ORIGINAL Contract Expiration Date</th>
<th>CURRENT Contract Expiration Date*</th>
<th>Watch List**</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 San Diego</td>
<td>Commercial Street Streetscape Project CAPITAL: Provides new sidewalks, curbs, trees, light, furniture, traffic calming devices, a gateway element, and public plazas around the perimeter of a proposed mixed use/mixed income development in Logan Heights.</td>
<td>$893,000.00</td>
<td>12/12/12</td>
<td>06/01/14</td>
<td>06/01/15</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project is making timely progress toward its revised milestones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Carlsbad</td>
<td>Installation of Audible Pedestrian Signals &amp; Countdown Pedestrian Signals CAPITAL: Installs audible pedestrian signals &amp; countdown pedestrian signals at twenty-one signalized intersections in the City of Carlsbad.</td>
<td>$150,660.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PROJECT COMPLETE - FEBRUARY 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Chula Vista</td>
<td>Chula Vista Bikeway Master Plan Update PLANNING: Updates the City of Chula Vista's existing bikeway network.</td>
<td>$150,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PROJECT COMPLETE - FEBRUARY 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Chula Vista</td>
<td>Sidewalk Safety Program - I Street Sidewalk Improvements CAPITAL: Installs ADA sidewalks and pedestrian ramps.</td>
<td>$115,220.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PROJECT COMPLETE - SEPTEMBER 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Coronado</td>
<td>Coronado Bicycle Master Plan PLANNING: Plans for existing and future bicycle facilities within the City of Coronado.</td>
<td>$75,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PROJECT COMPLETE - MARCH 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Escondido</td>
<td>Downtown Escondido Bike Racks BIKE PARKING: Installs bike lockers and decorative bike racks at Escondido City Hall and various locations throughout the downtown business and retail core.</td>
<td>$14,378.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PROJECT COMPLETE - OCTOBER 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Escondido</td>
<td>Ash Street Undercrossing CAPITAL: Constructs an undercrossing at Ash Street/SR 78 for the Escondido Creek Channel Bike Path.</td>
<td>$457,357.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PROJECT COMPLETE - MARCH 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Escondido</td>
<td>Escondido Creek Bike Path CAPITAL: Installs a Class I bike path from Escondido Transit Center to Centre City Parkway.</td>
<td>$524,100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project withdrawn in July 2012 based on the request of the City of Escondido.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Escondido</td>
<td>Escondido Creek Bike Path Lighting and Restrriping CAPITAL: Installs lighting and restriping for the existing Class I bike path along Escondido Creek Channel from Broadway to Ash Street.</td>
<td>$157,500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PROJECT COMPLETE - MARCH 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Escondido</td>
<td>West Bernardo Bike Path &amp; Cantilever CAPITAL: Installs a Class I bike path and trail connection as the second phase of the Lake Hodges Bikeway Access Project.</td>
<td>$1,425,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PROJECT COMPLETE - MARCH 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 La Mesa</td>
<td>La Mesa Bicycle Facilities Master Plan PLANNING: Plans for existing and future bicycle facilities within the City of La Mesa.</td>
<td>$75,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PROJECT COMPLETE - FEBRUARY 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 La Mesa</td>
<td>Spring Street Trolley Station Pedestrian Access Improvements CAPITAL: Provides pedestrian improvements to reduce conflicts between pedestrians entering and exiting the Spring Street Trolley Station and motor vehicles.</td>
<td>$88,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PROJECT COMPLETE - SEPTEMBER 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 La Mesa</td>
<td>La Mesa/Cajon Boulevards Intersection Improvements &amp; Pedestrian Infrastructure CAPITAL: Reconfigures the intersection between La Mesa Boulevard and El Cajon Boulevard to reduce pedestrian crossing distances and incorporates additional streetscape enhancements.</td>
<td>$361,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PROJECT COMPLETE - SEPTEMBER 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grantee</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Description of Project Activities</td>
<td>Grant Amount</td>
<td>Contract Execution Date</td>
<td>ORIGINAL Contract Expiration Date</td>
<td>CURRENT Contract Expiration Date*</td>
<td>Watch List**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National City</td>
<td>National City Bicycle Master Plan</td>
<td>PLANNING: Plans for existing and future bicycle facilities within the City of National City.</td>
<td>$ 50,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National City</td>
<td>Sweetwater River Bike Path Gap Closure Design - Plaza Bonita Road</td>
<td>CAPITAL: Prepares the Environmental Document and Final Design Plans for a Class I bike path on Plaza Bonita Road.</td>
<td>$ 130,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>UCSD Bicycle/Pedestrian Master Plan</td>
<td>PLANNING: Creates a comprehensive bicycle and pedestrian plan to link campus commuters to the City of San Diego's bicycle and pedestrian paths, local transit stops, and regional transit stations.</td>
<td>$ 75,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Bicycle Detection at Signalized Intersections</td>
<td>CAPITAL: Installs bicycle detection systems and pavement markings at 20 signalized locations in the City of San Diego.</td>
<td>$ 73,500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Pedestrian &amp; Bicycle Safety Education Program</td>
<td>SUPPORT: Provides pedestrian and bicycle safety classes at elementary and middle schools citywide.</td>
<td>$ 290,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>San Diego Pedestrian Master Plan Phase 4</td>
<td>PLANNING: Develops a pedestrian master plan for several communities in the City of San Diego, including San Ysidro, Midway, Old Town, Ocean Beach, College, Pacific Beach, and Kensington.</td>
<td>$ 150,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>EIR &amp; Feasibility Study for Bike Master Plan Update</td>
<td>PLANNING: Provides the EIR for the City of San Diego's Bicycle Master Plan Update.</td>
<td>$ 150,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Kelton Road Midblock Pedestrian Improvements Project</td>
<td>CAPITAL: Installs bulbouts and in-pavement lighted crosswalk on Kelton Road between Zircon Street and Luber Street, at the entrance of Johnson Elementary School</td>
<td>$ 248,400.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego/Caltrans</td>
<td>SR 15 Bike Path Final Design &amp; Environmental Document</td>
<td>CAPITAL: Provides the final design and environmental documentation for a Class I bikeway along the east side of SR 15 between Camino Del Rio South and Adams Avenue.</td>
<td>$ 350,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>Barham Drive Urban Trail Improvement Project</td>
<td>CAPITAL: Designs and constructs an urban trail on the south side of Barham Drive from Twin Oaks Valley Road to the CSUSM SPRINTER Station and provides pedestrian enhancements.</td>
<td>$ 700,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANDAG</td>
<td>Bicycle Locker Wireless Communication</td>
<td>SUPPORT: Establishes a wireless connection at transit centers that have electronic bicycle lockers.</td>
<td>$ 50,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANDAG</td>
<td>Bicycle Locker Retrofits &amp; Upgrades</td>
<td>SUPPORT: Installs electronic lockers at various station locations along the Blue Line Trolley.</td>
<td>$ 50,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANDAG</td>
<td>Bicycle Map Printing &amp; Distribution</td>
<td>PLANNING: Funds the printing and distribution of the San Diego Regional Bike Map.</td>
<td>$ 25,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANDAG</td>
<td>Bayshore Bikeway Segments 7 &amp; 8</td>
<td>CAPITAL: Constructs 1.78 miles of a Class I regional bike facility.</td>
<td>$ 1,078,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grantee</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Description of Project Activities</td>
<td>Grant Amount</td>
<td>Contract Execution Date</td>
<td>ORIGINAL Contract Expiration Date</td>
<td>CURRENT Contract Expiration Date*</td>
<td>Watch List**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santee</td>
<td>Carlton Oaks Drive Class II Bike Lanes</td>
<td>CAPITAL: Modifies the existing striping on Carlton Oaks Drive to install new Class II bike lanes.</td>
<td>$30,200.00</td>
<td>PROJECT COMPLETE - MARCH 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista</td>
<td>Inland Rail Trail Phase IIIB - Right-of-Way Engineering</td>
<td>CAPITAL: Provides the right-of-way engineering for a multi-use facility along the SPRINT TER line.</td>
<td>$500,000.00</td>
<td>Project transferred April 2013 to SANDAG for implementation through the Regional Bicycle Plan Early Action Program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista</td>
<td>Safe Pedestrian Crossing at Longhorn Drive</td>
<td>CAPITAL: Builds an enhanced pedestrian crossing in front of Rancho Buena Vista High School.</td>
<td>$50,649.00</td>
<td>PROJECT COMPLETE - JUNE 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista</td>
<td>Boys &amp; Girls Club Sidewalk Improvements</td>
<td>CAPITAL: Builds new sidewalk and a pedestrian crossing to the Vista Boys and Girls Club and Vista Academy of the Performing Arts.</td>
<td>$146,844.00</td>
<td>PROJECT COMPLETE - JUNE 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Contract Expiration Date = Project Completion Date

**Watch List Projects are those grantees not making timely progress toward their milestones (which are defined in Policy No. 35 and Use-It-or-Lose-It) and not yet sought corrective action. Delays in tasks leading up to either the award of a contract or project completion may place grantees on the watch list.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grantee</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description of Project Activities</th>
<th>Grant Amount</th>
<th>Contract Execution Date</th>
<th>ORIGINAL Contract Expiration Date</th>
<th>CURRENT Contract Expiration Date*</th>
<th>Watch List**</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Carlsbad</td>
<td>Active Village Campaign</td>
<td>SUPPORT: Develops a multi-media campaign to promote the benefits of walking and biking in Carlsbad and Carlsbad Village, and aims to increase bicycling and walking for everyday trips, improve connectivity and create a pilot program that is scalable for other cities in the region.</td>
<td>$271,211.00</td>
<td>02/14/13</td>
<td>04/30/14</td>
<td>04/30/16</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward its revised milestones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Carlsbad</td>
<td>Carlsbad CATS</td>
<td>PLANNING: Develops a comprehensive active transportation implementation strategy (CATS) for livable streets. The plan will be tested by implementing up to five pilot projects.</td>
<td>$150,000.00</td>
<td>02/22/13</td>
<td>12/31/14</td>
<td>12/31/14</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Board Policy No. 035 allows for staff-approved time extensions up to six months. Staff is processing a six month extension for this project to 06/30/15 to allow additional time for the grantee to complete the city-wide implementation strategy for the plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Carlsbad</td>
<td>Coastal Rail Trail - Reach 1</td>
<td>CAPITAL: Enhances safety and improves circulation and access for all modes of transportation between Carlsbad and Oceanside across a natural barrier and completes the northern sections of the Coastal Rail Trail into Oceanside.</td>
<td>$800,000.00</td>
<td>02/14/13</td>
<td>07/31/14</td>
<td>01/31/15</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward its revised milestones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Chula Vista</td>
<td>Main Street Streetscape Master Plan</td>
<td>PLANNING: Provides a plan using Complete Street principles, and improves access to nearby recreational facilities, and promotes water conservation through improved landscaping features.</td>
<td>$299,981.00</td>
<td>03/28/13</td>
<td>09/30/14</td>
<td>03/31/15</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward its revised milestones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 National City</td>
<td>4th Street Community Corridor</td>
<td>CAPITAL: Provides roughly 2.0 miles of Class II bicycle facilities, including bicycle detector loops and bicycle boxes. The project includes installation of high-visibility crosswalks, and traffic calming elements.</td>
<td>$450,000.00</td>
<td>03/05/13</td>
<td>07/31/16</td>
<td>07/31/16</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward its milestones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 National City</td>
<td>Bicycle Parking Enhancements</td>
<td>BIKE PARKING: Installs bicycle racks throughout National City’s bicycle network, providing cyclists with secure and convenient parking for end-of-trip storage.</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td>03/05/13</td>
<td>07/31/16</td>
<td>07/31/16</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward its milestones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 National City</td>
<td>D Avenue Corridor</td>
<td>CAPITAL: Provides approximately 2.5 miles of Class II and III bicycle facilities, including bicycle detector loops and bicycle boxes at all signalized intersections. The project also includes installation of high-visibility crosswalks and traffic calming elements.</td>
<td>$600,000.00</td>
<td>03/05/13</td>
<td>07/31/16</td>
<td>07/31/16</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward its milestones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Oceanside</td>
<td>2 Year Education, Encouragement, and Awareness Project</td>
<td>SUPPORT: Provides adult and student education for active transportation skills and concepts, bilingual Public Service Announcements, and bike route maps of Oceanside bike facilities.</td>
<td>$180,808.00</td>
<td>03/13/13</td>
<td>07/31/15</td>
<td>07/31/15</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Grantee requested a no-cost, time-only schedule extension of twelve months to 07/31/16 - the Transportation Committee approved the extension on October 17, 2014.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Oceanside</td>
<td>Mission Avenue Improvements</td>
<td>CAPITAL: Provides a mix of bicycle, pedestrian, and roadway improvements including: increased sidewalk width with curb bulb-outs, streetscape improvements, and Class III bicycle improvements.</td>
<td>$1,500,000.00</td>
<td>03/22/13</td>
<td>05/31/14</td>
<td>11/30/14</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward its revised milestones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grantee</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Description of Project Activities</td>
<td>Grant Amount</td>
<td>Contract Execution Date</td>
<td>ORIGINAL Contract Expiration Date</td>
<td>CURRENT Contract Expiration Date</td>
<td>Watch List**</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside</td>
<td>North Coast Transit Station Bike Station</td>
<td>BIKE PARKING: Provides a 200 sq. ft. bike station for 30 bicycles to provide secure, indoor bike parking, which bicyclists can access 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.</td>
<td>$ 100,000.00</td>
<td>03/13/13</td>
<td>10/31/15</td>
<td>10/31/15</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Grantee requested a no-cost, time-only schedule extension of twelve months to 10/31/16 - the Transportation Committee approved the extension on October 17, 2014.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside</td>
<td>Oceanside Boulevard Transit Access &amp; Beautification</td>
<td>CAPITAL: Improves the sidewalk and landscaping along Oceanside Boulevard, facilitating pedestrian access to transit stations and destinations.</td>
<td>$ 400,000.00</td>
<td>03/11/13</td>
<td>09/30/14</td>
<td>09/30/14</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward its milestones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Chollas Creek to Bayshore Bikeway - Multi-Use Path Design</td>
<td>CAPITAL: Provides environmental review and design for an envisioned Class I Multi-Use Path to connect between Southeastern San Diego, Barrio Logan, the San Diego Bay and Downtown San Diego for everyday non-motorized travel.</td>
<td>$ 441,250.00</td>
<td>02/21/13</td>
<td>12/31/14</td>
<td>12/31/14</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Board Policy No. 035 allows for staff-approved time extensions of up to six months. Staff is processing a six month extension for this project to 06/30/15 to allow additional time for the grantee to complete the technical studies for the environmental document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Linda Vista CATS</td>
<td>PLANNING: Develops a Comprehensive Active Transportation Strategy (CATS) for the Linda Vista Community Planning Area, providing direct and convenient connections to various destinations, while increasing bicyclist and pedestrian safety.</td>
<td>$ 300,000.00</td>
<td>02/21/13</td>
<td>03/31/16</td>
<td>03/31/16</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward its milestones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Microwave Bicycle Detection (The Intersector)</td>
<td>CAPITAL: Installs microwave based bicycle detection devices at 17 intersections that distinguish between bicycles and vehicles and adjusts signal timing to better accommodate cyclists.</td>
<td>$ 200,000.00</td>
<td>06/11/13</td>
<td>04/30/14</td>
<td>10/31/14</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward its revised milestones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>San Diego River Bike Path &amp; Mission Center Boulevard Improvement:</td>
<td>CAPITAL: Improves pedestrian safety with the installation of the Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon using the 'Hawk Signal' at the project intersection.</td>
<td>$ 293,000.00</td>
<td>06/11/13</td>
<td>12/31/14</td>
<td>12/31/14</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Board Policy No. 035 allows for staff-approved time extensions of up to six months. Staff is processing a six month extension for this project to 06/30/15 due to sensitive habitat issues associated with construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Downtown Complete Streets Mobility Plan</td>
<td>PLANNING: Establishes a comprehensive Complete Streets approach for downtown San Diego.</td>
<td>$ 300,000.00</td>
<td>04/11/13</td>
<td>11/30/14</td>
<td>11/30/14</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Board Policy No. 035 allows for staff-approved time extensions of up to six months. Staff is processing a six month extension for this project to 5/31/15 to allow additional time for the planning process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan</td>
<td>PLANNING: Identifies needed improvements to the existing network and new routes to provide bicycle and pedestrian connectivity.</td>
<td>$ 80,000.00</td>
<td>02/21/13</td>
<td>12/31/14</td>
<td>12/31/14</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward its milestones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>San Marcos Boulevard Complete Street Multi-Way Boulevard</td>
<td>PLANNING: Project creates a multi-modal transportation corridor and prepares a set of Complete Street concepts for the future re-development of San Marcos Boulevard.</td>
<td>$ 124,000.00</td>
<td>03/01/13</td>
<td>02/28/15</td>
<td>02/28/15</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward its milestones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santee</td>
<td>San Diego River Trail - South Side of the San Diego River</td>
<td>CAPITAL: Improves trail by installing a Class I bike path with decomposed granite shoulders for pedestrians.</td>
<td>$ 281,750.00</td>
<td>02/14/13</td>
<td>11/30/14</td>
<td>11/30/14</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Board Policy No. 035 allows for staff-approved time extensions of up to six months. Staff is processing a four month extension for this project to 03/31/15 due to sensitive habitat issues associated with construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solana Beach</td>
<td>Comprehensive Active Transportation Strategy (CATS)</td>
<td>PLANNING: Comprehensive update of the bicycle master plan, and consideration of pedestrian facilities and traffic calming needs, especially around schools, transit and commercial neighborhoods.</td>
<td>$ 136,000.00</td>
<td>02/20/13</td>
<td>06/30/14</td>
<td>12/31/14</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward its revised milestones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista</td>
<td>Bicycle Master Plan</td>
<td>PLANNING: Updates the City of Vista's 2002 Bicycle Master Plan. Provides connections to neighboring bikeways in adjacent communities of Oceanside, Carlsbad, San Marcos, and unincorporated parts of the County.</td>
<td>$ 150,000.00</td>
<td>03/28/13</td>
<td>07/31/14</td>
<td>01/31/15</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward its revised milestones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grantee</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Description of Project Activities</td>
<td>Grant Amount</td>
<td>Contract Execution Date</td>
<td>ORIGINAL Contract Expiration Date</td>
<td>CURRENT Contract Expiration Date*</td>
<td>Watch List**</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlsbad</td>
<td>Bike the Village: 100 Racks</td>
<td>BIKE PARKING: Builds upon the Carlsbad Village’s Bike Rack Pilot Program and other related capital improvement projects in the vicinity and installs 80 additional custom racks and 6 bike corrals.</td>
<td>$33,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PROJECT COMPLETE - JULY 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Mar</td>
<td>Bike Parking Facilities</td>
<td>BIKE PARKING: Planning and implementation of bike parking facilities, including bike racks and lockers, throughout the city.</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PROJECT COMPLETE - JUNE 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial</td>
<td>Eco-Bikeway 7th &amp; Seacoast</td>
<td>CAPITAL: Provides construction of Class II and Class III bikeways, and expands the local pedestrian network along Palm Avenue. Provides an important connection from the Bayshore Bikeway to Seacoast Drive.</td>
<td>$1,500,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PROJECT COMPLETE - NOVEMBER 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santee</td>
<td>Town Center Parkway/ Olive Lane/ Prospect Avenue Bike Project</td>
<td>CAPITAL: Improves safety for bicyclists by installing Class II bike lanes, narrowing vehicle lanes, adding bike lanes at intersections and adjusting video detection to detect bicycles.</td>
<td>$134,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PROJECT COMPLETE - MARCH 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Contract Expiration Date = Project Completion Date

**Watch List Projects are those grantees not making timely progress toward their milestones (which are defined in Policy No. 35 and Use-It-or-Lose-It) and not yet sought corrective action. Delays in tasks leading up to either the award of a contract or project completion may place grantees on the watch list.
September 30, 2014

Susan Baldwin
Senior Regional Planner
SANDAG
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101

RE: Request for Amendment to TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program (SGIP) Grant Agreement No. 5001347 for the National City 8th Street Corridor Smart Growth Revitalization Project

National City’s 8th Street Corridor Smart Growth Revitalization Project is approximately 70% complete with construction. However, based on continued delays by several of the utility companies and issues with our prime construction contractor, we will need additional time to complete the project. Therefore, National City respectfully requests a project schedule extension to June 30, 2015. See attached revision to the project summary table. We appreciate your consideration and look forward to providing a formal presentation of our request to the Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee on October 8th and the Regional Planning Committee on November 7th.

Sincerely,

Stephen Manganiello
Director of Public Works / City Engineer

Attachment:
Revised Summary Table

cc. Suchitra Mukherjee, SANDAG Regional Planner
Leslie Deese, City Manager
Brad Raulston, Executive Director
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Deliverables</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
<th>SANDAG Funds</th>
<th>Matching Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Execute grant agreement</td>
<td>Grant agreement</td>
<td>July 2009</td>
<td>January 2010</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a.</td>
<td>Prepare construction plans for utility undergrounding (SDG&amp;E)</td>
<td>100% plans</td>
<td>January 2010</td>
<td>August 2011</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b.</td>
<td>Prepare construction plans for sewer replacement / upsizing</td>
<td>100% plans</td>
<td>July 2011</td>
<td>February 2012</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 65,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Prepare construction plans for remaining project improvements (50%)</td>
<td>50% plans</td>
<td>March 2010</td>
<td>July 2010</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Conduct public workshop</td>
<td>Meeting notification &amp; summaries</td>
<td>October 2010</td>
<td>October 2010</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a.</td>
<td>Award construct contract for Phase 1</td>
<td>City Council resolution</td>
<td>February 2012</td>
<td>March 2012</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b.</td>
<td>Utility undergrounding construction</td>
<td>Notice of completion</td>
<td>July 2010</td>
<td>May 2011</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c.</td>
<td>Sewer replacement / upsizing</td>
<td>Notice of completion</td>
<td>April 2012</td>
<td>June 2013</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Public presentation (Phases 1 &amp; 2)</td>
<td>Meeting notification &amp; summaries</td>
<td>August 2010</td>
<td>September 2011</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Prepare construction plans &amp; specs for remaining project improvements (90%)</td>
<td>90% plans &amp; specs</td>
<td>August 2010</td>
<td>March 2012</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Prepare construction plans &amp; specs for remaining project improvements (100%)</td>
<td>100% plans &amp; specs</td>
<td>January 2011</td>
<td>February 2011</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Award construction contract for Phase 2</td>
<td>City Council resolution</td>
<td>February 2013</td>
<td>March 2013</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Construction for remaining project improvements</td>
<td>Notice of completion</td>
<td>February 2012</td>
<td>June 2014</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 1,500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total (original) $ 2,000,000 $ 1,500,000 $ 3,500,000

Total (new) $ 2,000,000 $ 6,000,000 $ 8,000,000
COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM PROCEDURES

Applicability and Purpose of Policy

This Policy applies to the following grant programs administered through SANDAG, whether from TransNet or another source: Smart Growth Incentive Program, Environmental Mitigation Program, Bike and Pedestrian Program, Senior Mini Grant Program, Job Access Reverse Commute, New Freedom, and Section 5310 Elderly & Persons with Disabilities Transportation Program.

Nothing in this Policy is intended to supersede federal or state grant rules, regulations, statutes, or contract documents that conflict with the requirements in this Policy. There are never enough government grant funds to pay for all of the projects worthy of funding in the San Diego region. For this reason, SANDAG awards grant funds on a competitive basis that takes the grantees' ability to perform their proposed project on a timely basis into account. SANDAG intends to hold grantees accountable to the project schedules they have proposed in order to ensure fairness in the competitive process and encourage grantees to get their projects implemented quickly so that the public can benefit from the project deliverables as soon as possible.

Procedures

1. Project Milestone and Completion Deadlines

   1.1. When signing a grant agreement for a competitive program funded and/or administered by SANDAG, grant recipients must agree to the project delivery objectives and schedules in the agreement. In addition, a grantee’s proposal must contain a schedule that falls within the following deadlines. Failure to meet the deadlines below may result in revocation of all grant funds not already expended. The final invoice for capital, planning, or operations grants must be submitted prior to the applicable deadline.

      1.1.1. Funding for Capital Projects. If the grant will fund a capital project, the project must be completed according to the schedule provided in the grant agreement, but at the latest, any necessary construction contract must be awarded within two years following execution of the grant agreement, and construction must be completed within eighteen months following award of the construction contract. Completion of construction for purposes of this policy shall be when the prime construction contractor is relieved from its maintenance responsibilities. If no construction contract award is necessary, the construction project must be complete within eighteen months following execution of the grant agreement.

      1.1.2. Funding for Planning Grants. If the grant will fund planning, the project must be completed according to the schedule provided in the grant agreement, but at the latest, any necessary consultant contract must be awarded within one year following execution of the grant agreement, and the planning project must be complete within two years following award of the consultant contract. Completion of planning for purposes of this policy shall be when grantee approves the final planning project deliverable. If no consultant contract award is necessary, the
planning project must be complete within two years of execution of the grant agreement.

1.1.3 Funding for Operations Grants. If the grant will fund operations, the project must be completed according to the schedule provided in the grant agreement, but at the latest, any necessary services contract for operations must be awarded within one year following execution of the grant agreement, and the operations must commence within six months following award of the operations contract. If no services contract for operations is necessary, the operations project must commence within one year of execution of the grant agreement.

1.1.4 Funding for Equipment or Vehicles Grants. If the grant will fund equipment or vehicles, the project must be completed according to the schedule provided in the grant agreement, but at the latest, any necessary purchase contracts for equipment or vehicles must be awarded within one year following execution of the grant agreement, and use of the equipment or vehicles for the benefit of the public must commence within six months following award of the purchase contract.

2. Project Milestone and Completion Deadline Extensions

2.1. Schedules within grant agreements may include project scopes and schedules that will identify interim milestones in addition to those described in Section 1 of this Policy. Grant recipients may receive extensions on their project schedules of up to six months for good cause. Extensions of up to six months aggregate that would not cause the project to miss a completion deadline in Section 1 may be approved by the SANDAG Executive Director. Extensions beyond six months aggregate or that would cause the project to miss a completion deadline in Section 1 must be approved by the Policy Advisory Committee that has been delegated the necessary authority by the Board. For an extension to be granted under this Section 2, the following conditions must be met:

2.1.1. For extension requests of up to six months, the grantee must request the extension in writing to the SANDAG Program Manager at least two weeks prior to the earliest project schedule milestone deadline for which an extension is being requested. The Executive Director or designee will determine whether the extension should be granted. The Executive Director’s action will be reported out to the Board in following month’s report of delegated actions.

2.1.2. A grantee seeking an extension must document previous efforts undertaken to maintain the project schedule, explain the reasons for the delay, explain why the delay is unavoidable, and demonstrate an ability to succeed in the extended time frame the grantee proposes.

2.1.3. If the Executive Director denies an extension request under this Section 2, the grantee may appeal within ten business days of receiving the Executive Director’s response to the responsible Policy Advisory Committee by sending the appeal to the SANDAG Program Manager.

2.1.4. Extension requests that are rejected by the Policy Advisory Committee will result in termination of the grant agreement and obligation by the grantee to return to SANDAG any unexpended funds within 30 days. Unexpended funds are funds for project costs not incurred prior to rejection of the extension request by the Policy Advisory Committee.
3. Project Delays and Extensions in Excess of Six Months

3.1. Requests for extensions in excess of six months, or that will cause a project to miss a completion deadline in Section 1 (including those projects that were already granted extensions by the Executive Director and are again falling behind schedule), will be considered by the Policy Advisory Committee upon request to the SANDAG Program Manager.

3.2 A grantee seeking an extension must document previous efforts undertaken to maintain the project schedule, explain the reasons for the delay, explain why the delay is unavoidable, and demonstrate an ability to succeed in the extended time frame the grantee proposes. The grantee must provide the necessary information to SANDAG staff to place in a report to the Policy Advisory Committee. If sufficient time is available, and the grant utilized TransNet funds, the request will first be taken to the Independent Taxpayer Advisory Committee (ITOC) for a recommendation. The grantee should make a representative available at the meeting to present the information to, and/or answer questions from, the ITOC and Policy Advisory Committee.

3.3 The Policy Advisory Committee will only grant an extension under this Section 3 for extenuating circumstances that the grantee could not have reasonably foreseen.

4. Resolution and Execution of the Grant Agreement

4.1 Two weeks prior to the review by the Policy Advisory Committee of the proposed grants, prospective grantees must submit a resolution from their authorized governing body that includes the provisions in this Subsection 4.1. Failure to provide a resolution that meets the requirements in this Subsection 4.1 will result in rejection of the application and the application will be dropped from consideration with funding going to the next project as scored by the evaluation committee. In order to assist grantees in meeting this resolution deadline, when SANDAG issues the call for projects it will allow at least 90 days for grant application submission.

4.1.1 Grantee governing body commits to providing the amount of matching funds set forth in the grant application.

4.1.2 Grantee governing body authorizes staff to accept the grant funding and execute a grant agreement if an award is made by SANDAG.

4.2 Grantee’s authorized representative must execute the grant agreement within 45 days from the date SANDAG presents the grant agreement to the prospective grantee for execution. Failure to meet the requirements in this Subsection 4.2 may result in revocation of the grant award.

5. Increased Availability of Funding Under this Policy

5.1. Grant funds made available as a result of the procedures in this Policy may be awarded to the next project on the recommended project priority list from the most recent project selection process, or may be added to the funds available for the next project funding cycle, at the responsible Policy Advisory Committee’s discretion. Any project that loses funding due to failure to meet the deadlines specified in this Policy may be resubmitted to compete for funding in a future call for grant applications.

Adopted: January 2010
October 1, 2014

Ms. Susan Baldwin  
Senior Regional Planner  
401 B Street, Suite 800  
San Diego, CA 92101

Subject: Request for Amendment to TDA/ TransNet Active Transportation Grant (ATG) Program Agreement No. 5001750 for the North Coast Transit Station Bike Station Project

Dear Ms. Baldwin:

The City of Oceanside requests that you amend our project schedule, Attachment “A”, in our ATG Program Agreement for the North Coast Transit Station Bike Station Project by approving our project extension request. The North Coast Transit Station Bikestation Project is a low-cost, secure, indoor bike parking facility for commuter and recreational bicyclists. This facility will be the first of its kind in the City of Oceanside and will help encourage bicycling throughout the City by providing useful and practical parking amenities.

Due to following extenuating circumstances, the City of Oceanside formally requests a one year project extension in order to meet the grant requirements and complete the project:

- A delay in our project occurred due to issues that arose during the procurement of this project/ facility
  - The City’s procurement policy does not adequately address this type of project/ facility. This project does not explicitly adhere to any of the categories listed in the City Council approved policy as the project includes both material purchases and consultant services
    - As such, a new type of contract/ agreement had to be generated and approved by City Council, therefore resulting in delays in the advertisement and award of this project

Based on these circumstances, and the City of Oceanside request for project extension, the North Coast Transit Station Bikestation Project will be completed in October 2016. The City of Oceanside does not anticipate any additional project delays.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Darra Woods  
Assistant Traffic Engineer

cc: David DiPierro, City Traffic Engineer
October 1, 2014

Susan Baldwin  
Senior Regional Planner  
SANDAG  
401 B Street, Suite 800  
San Diego, CA 92101

RE: Request for Amendment to the Transportation Development Act/Transnet Active Transportation Grant Program Grant Agreement No. 5001749 for City of Oceanside 2 Year Education/Encouragement/Awareness Project

The City of Oceanside requests a one year extension to July 2016 to complete the requirements detailed in the grant schedule. There are three main projects within the grant: 1) Elementary School Education, 2) Adult Education and 3) Public Service Announcements promoting biking. The project also provides funding to promote the City of Oceanside Bike Station that will provide bike parking at the North County Transit Center.

**Elementary School Education**: The program consists of twenty school safety assemblies and weekend bike rodeos. Six of the twenty scheduled bike education projects have been completed. The program requires coordination with elementary schools to arrange for school class time to conduct the safety assemblies that precedes the weekend bike rodeos. The scheduling of the assemblies and rodeos has been difficult due to other competing school activities and priorities. Additionally, the North County brush fires in May forced the cancellation of two bike rodeos due to air quality. Seven school rodeos are scheduled for the period from October 2014 to June 2015 for a total of thirteen to be completed. A one-year extension will allow the completion of the seven additional rodeos.

**Adult Education**: The grant calls for twenty-four monthly adult education classes to be conducted. To date we have held thirteen classes. The program consists of three hours in the classroom and six hours on the road. If our one-year extension to complete our elementary school education is granted, we have sufficient funds in the grant to continue the adult education for an additional year.

**Public Service Announcements**: The grant included five public service announcements to promote safe bike riding. Two of the five PSA’s have been completed and are airing on KOCT-TV. The other three PSA’s have been scripted, videoed and are in editing. Completion is scheduled in November of 2014.
**Oceanside Bike Station Promotion:** The grant also includes funding to promote the City of Oceanside Bike Station. Thirty one-year memberships were to be provided to promote the station beginning in September 2014. Due to the unanticipated delay in the completion the bike station, we expect the memberships to begin in November/December of this year.

The elementary and adult education programs have been well received by the community and the League of American Bicyclists has recognized Oceanside on having one of the best bike education programs in the nation. While the grant greatly benefits our local schools, the adult education program draws participants throughout San Diego County. We urge your approval to provide the one year extension to allow us to complete the elementary school education and continue the adult education through July 2016.

Please let us know if any additional information is needed to support our request.

Respectfully,

Howard LaGrange  
Bicycle and Pedestrian Coordinator

cc: Suchitra Mukherjee, SANDAG Regional Planner  
    David DiPerro, City of Oceanside Traffic Engineer
TransNet SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM AND ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION GRANT PROGRAM: CALL FOR PROJECTS FOR THIRD CYCLE OF GRANT FUNDING

Introduction

The TransNet Extension Ordinance provides funding for two SANDAG land use and transportation competitive grant programs – the Smart Growth Incentive Program (SGIP) and the Active Transportation Grant Program (ATGP). To date, SANDAG has issued two cycles of funding for each program, and traditionally the calls for projects for the programs have been issued independently. Due to the similar program elements, staff is conducting the third call for projects for the two grant programs simultaneously.

The criteria for both programs underwent significant updates during the last grant cycle to ensure consistency with the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (2050 RTP/SCS) and Riding to 2050: The San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan. Information related to program guidelines, eligible projects, and scoring criteria for both programs (from the second cycle) is provided in Attachments 1 and 2.

No changes to the scoring criteria or program guidelines are recommended for the third cycle. Several changes were initially considered, but based on discussion with the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG), Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC), Active Transportation Working Group (ATWG), and Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee (ITOC) at their June and July 2014 meetings (summarized in Attachment 3), changes to the scoring criteria are not recommended. However, since initial discussions with the working groups and ITOC last summer, staff has begun to consider whether there may be an opportunity to raise the cap on the SGIP capital grants from the current cap of $2 million to $3 million or $4 million given the proposed three-year funding cycle, the higher amount of TransNet funds estimated to be available during this funding cycle ($12 million versus $9.6 million), and the continued impacts on local jurisdictions from the loss of redevelopment funds. (Given the smaller amount of funding available for the ATGP, no changes are proposed to the ATGP funding cap.)

1The ATGP is referred to as the “Bicycle, Pedestrian and Neighborhood Safety Program” in the TransNet Extension Ordinance.
The Committee is asked to discuss any potential additional modifications, including whether to raise the funding cap on the SGIP. Pending the Committee’s direction, staff also will solicit input from the TWG and CTAC on this concept at their November meetings and report back to the Committee next month.

This item will be presented to the Transportation Committee on November 14, 2014, for additional input, and brought back to both the Regional Planning and Transportation Committees for recommendation to the SANDAG Board next month.

Discussion

Eligibility, Available Funding, and Program Objectives

The TransNet Extension Ordinance sets aside 2 percent of annual TransNet sales tax revenues each for the SGIP and for the ATGP. The ATGP is supplemented with Transportation Development Act (TDA) revenues. Only local cities and the County of San Diego can apply for grant funds. Nonprofit and community-based organizations may collaborate to apply for funding in conjunction with the cities or the County, but cannot apply directly for the funds.

Approximately $12 million for the SGIP and $3 million$ for the ATGP will be available for this grant cycle (reflecting anticipated funding for FY 2014 through FY 2016), pending Board of Directors’ approval of the SANDAG FY 2016 Program Budget in May 2015. The SANDAG Board is anticipated to issue the call for projects for both programs in December 2014 and approve the project awards in summer 2015.

The following table provides a summary of goals, program objectives, and grant types from the most recent grant cycle for each program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SGIP</th>
<th>ATGP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Goals                | • Encourage comprehensive public infrastructure projects and planning activities that facilitate compact, mixed-use development focused around public transit, and that aim to increase housing and transportation choices.  
• Fund projects that can serve as models and attract private development.  
• Create great places in the San Diego region.   | • Encourage the planning and development of Complete Streets, and provide multiple travel choices for the region’s residents.  
• Fund bicycle and pedestrian-oriented transportation facility improvements, planning efforts, encouragement and education programs, and bicycle parking.  
• Support the goals and objectives of Riding to 2050: The San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan. |

$2$When the SANDAG Board approved the Regional Bike Early Action Program (EAP) in September 2013, it limited the ATGP to $1 million per year.
Program Objectives
• Serve as catalysts for further smart growth development
• Influence land development by improving the public realm and encouraging private projects that create great places
• Serve as model examples for smart growth in a variety of settings
• Contribute to the reduction of Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions by encouraging travel means other than single-occupant vehicle
• Support future housing development

• Encourage a cohesive network of complete streets, improve bike/pedestrian neighborhood connectivity to transit and destinations such as schools, retail, places of work, parks, and other gathering places, and support smart growth place-making
• Improve safety for bicyclists and pedestrians
• Serve as models for the region by featuring innovative solutions that prioritize access for bicyclists and pedestrians
• Ensure access to jobs, services, and recreation for populations with fewer transportation choices, and create equitable transportation opportunities for all users, regardless of age, ability, race, ethnicity, or income
• Increase community support for bicycling and walking and promote active transportation as a means of improving health outcomes
• Support reductions in GHG emissions and facilitate an increase in levels of walking and bicycling in the region by providing supportive facilities, amenities, and programs

Grant Types and Percentage Allocations
• Capital (80 percent; $2 million cap)
• Planning (20 percent plus any rollover from Capital; $400,000 cap)

• Capital (75 percent with $500,000 threshold for large projects; 60 percent maximum toward large projects; $1.5 million cap)
• Non-Capital (25 percent plus any rollover from Capital; varying funding caps)
  o Planning (15 percent)
  o Education/Encouragement/Awareness (5 percent)
  o Bicycle parking (5 percent)

Summary of Previous Funding Cycles

The following table provides information for the first two cycles of both grant programs, and provides estimated dates and funding amounts for the third cycle.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SGIP</th>
<th>Release of Call for Projects</th>
<th>Projects Awarded</th>
<th>Fiscal Years</th>
<th>Available Funding</th>
<th>Number of Projects Funded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### ATGP Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATGP</th>
<th>Release of Call for Projects</th>
<th>Projects Awarded</th>
<th>Fiscal Years</th>
<th>Available Funding</th>
<th>Number of Projects Funded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Cycle</td>
<td>April 2009</td>
<td>June 2009</td>
<td>FY 2010&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>$7.8 million</td>
<td>31 projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Cycle</td>
<td>April 2012</td>
<td>Sept 2012</td>
<td>FY 2011, FY 2012&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>$8.8 million</td>
<td>25 projects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other Considerations

#### Project Readiness and Past Performance

At previous meetings, the Policy Advisory Committees and ITOC have expressed concern over the number of grant amendments being requested by grantees and have suggested that future SGIP and ATGP calls for projects should consider strengthening the criteria related to project readiness and/or adding criteria regarding past performance.

Regarding project readiness, staff conducted an internal analysis of project readiness scores in relation to requests for amendments during the first cycle to assist in determining whether project readiness was a factor in project delays and/or amendment requests. The analysis found no correlation, with some projects that received high project readiness scores having one or more amendment requests, and some projects that received low project readiness scores requesting no amendments. As such, staff is not proposing any changes to the current criteria related to project readiness.

Regarding past performance, staff is establishing a more formalized process for site visits with grantees to improve performance over the course of grant implementation. Successful grant implementation is a collaborative effort between SANDAG and the local jurisdictions. Many of the projects funded under the grant programs are new and innovative, and inherently include a certain amount of unknowns, such as the elimination of redevelopment agencies and issues related to utility easements and facilities, over which local jurisdictions have little control. Within this context, improvements in project implementation to avoid project delays and reduce the number of amendments can be achieved by working more closely with the grantees and undertaking site visits when certain milestones are not being met.

---

<sup>3</sup> No TransNet funds from FY 2009 were used in the first ATGP cycle. The first cycle was supplemented by TDA funds.

<sup>4</sup> No TransNet funds from FY 2013 were used in the second ATGP cycle. FY 2013 and a portion of FY 2014 TransNet funds were used to fund the Inland Rail Trail as part of the Regional Bike EAP.
**Schedule and Next Steps**

The following schedule is anticipated for the third grant cycle.

- **Summer/Fall 2014:** Prepare call for projects (and update Smart Growth Concept Map\(^5\))
- **December 2014:** Regional Planning and Transportation Committees recommend release of the call for projects; SANDAG Board releases call for projects for both programs
- **March 20, 2015:** Applications due
- **Spring/Summer 2015:** Evaluations, project rankings, and review/recommendations by Regional Planning and Transportation Committees
- **Summer 2015:** SANDAG Board approves projects
- **December 2015:** Grant agreements executed and jurisdictions begin work

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

   a. Capital Grants
   b. Planning Grants
2. *TransNet* Active Transportation Grant Program (ATGP): Eligible Projects, Scoring Criteria Guidance, and Scoring Criteria Matrix
   a. Capital Grants
   b. Non-Capital Grants
3. Initially-Proposed Changes to SGIP and ATGP Program Guidelines

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

---

\(^5\) The SANDAG Board accepted the 2014 Technical Update of the Smart Growth Concept Map on October 24, 2014.
SGIP ELIGIBLE PROJECTS (Capital Grants)

Eligible capital grant projects include pedestrian improvements, bicycle facilities, transit access improvements, and other innovative smart growth-supporting infrastructure. Proposed capital SGIP projects may include, but are not limited to, the following eligible elements.

- Public Plazas
- Pedestrian Street Crossings
- Streetscape Improvements (such as, median landscaping, street trees, lighting, and street furniture)
- Parklets
- Traffic Calming Features (such as, pedestrian bulb-outs or traffic circles)
- Access Improvements to Transit Stations/ Routes
- Wayfinding Signage
- Community Gateway Features
- Pedestrian and Bicycle Paths and Bridges
- On Street Bike Lines
- Bicycle Parking
- Low Impact Development Elements Included as Part of the Above

Applicants are encouraged to utilize innovative solutions that are new to the region, and that are comprehensive in scope.
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.

1. 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 SGOA

A1. Planned Densities Relative to SGOA Place Type Thresholds

Up to six 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 four 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. EXISTING AND ENTITLED LAND DEVELOPMENT IN THE PROPOSED CAPITAL PROJECT AREA

B1. EXISTING Development Density

Up to six points are available. EXISTING development density around the proposed capital project will be calculated by SANDAG, comparing EXISTING densities within 1/4-mile of the project to the density thresholds prescribed for the project’s smart growth opportunity area place type. The 1/4-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 six points are available. ENTITLED development projects within a 1/4-mile radius of the proposed capital project will qualify if any portion of the development project boundary is within the 1/4-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 three 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 1/4 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 two 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 1/4-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 two points are available, if 50-100 percent 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 1/4-mile walking distance of the project boundary. Walking distance will be determined through geographic system information 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 two 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 two points when those facilities connect directly to the project.

D3. Walkability
Up to four 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 Strategies

Up to two points are available. Transportation Demand Management (TDM) 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 TDM 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 six 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

2. 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 five 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 five 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 the SANDAG *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 five 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 five 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 two 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 two 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 Design
- 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://design.ncsu.edu/cud/
- http://www.access-board.gov/prowac/
3. PROJECT READINESS

A. Major Milestones Completed

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

- Environmental clearance under California Environmental Quality Act and the National Environmental Policy Act 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 two 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 two 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.

4. 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.

5. Matching Funds

Up to ten 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 ten points distributed proportionately. The project(s) with the highest ratio receives ten points, and those with the lowest receive one point.

6. SANDAG Board Policy No 033 Points for Affordable Housing Production

Up to 75 points are available. See Board Policy No.033 for detailed methodology.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>PTS POSSIBLE</th>
<th>WEIGHT</th>
<th>SCORE POSSIBLE</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION CHARACTERISTICS OF THE AREA AROUND THE PROPOSED CAPITAL PROJECT IMPROVEMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>A.</strong> Intensity of Planned Development in the Project’s SGOA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A1. Planned Densities Relative to SGOA Place Type Thresholds</td>
<td>Up to 6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For Metropolitan Center/Urban Centers/Town Centers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 100 percent or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 50-99 percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 25-49 percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 100 percent or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 50-99 percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 25-49 percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 100 percent or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 50-99 percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 25-49 percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></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>Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 100 percent or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 50-99 percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 25-49 percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A2. Expedited Approval Process</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specific plan, master EIR, or other mechanism allows for administrative approval of development projects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>B.</strong> EXISTING and ENTITLED Land Development Around the Proposed Capital Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B1. EXISTING Development Density within 1/4 mile radius of proposed capital project site- ON THE GROUND</td>
<td>Up to 6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For Metropolitan Center/Urban Centers/Town Centers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 100 percent or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 50-99 percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 25-49 percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 100 percent or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 50-99 percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 25-49 percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></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>Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 100 percent or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 50-99 percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 25-49 percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B2. EXISTING Development Density within 1/4 mile radius of proposed capital project site- IN THE PIPELINE</td>
<td>Up to 6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For Metropolitan Center/Urban Centers/Town Centers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 100 percent or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 50-99 percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 25-49 percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 100 percent or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 50-99 percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 25-49 percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></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>Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 100 percent or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 50-99 percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 25-49 percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>CATEGORY</td>
<td>PTS</td>
<td>CRITERIA</td>
<td>PTS POSSIBLE</td>
<td>WEIGHT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2.</td>
<td>EXISTING Development Density within 1/4 mile radius of proposed capital project site - IN THE PIPELINE</td>
<td></td>
<td>more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 50-99 percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 25-49 percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3.</td>
<td>Mix of Uses</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Single-family residential, retail, office, civic, parks, visitor within 1/4 mile of project site)</td>
<td>Up to 3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Multi-family residential + 6 other uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Multi-family residential + 4-5 other uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Multi-family residential + 2-3 other uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4.</td>
<td>New Use</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>New use will be added to the project area</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>New Affordable Housing Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1.</td>
<td>New Affordable Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td>Percent of income-restricted affordable housing provided in proposed new development (within 1/4 mile of project site)</td>
<td>Up to 3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100 percent of units affordable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>99-75 percent of units affordable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>74-25 percent of units affordable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2.</td>
<td>Low to very-low income affordable units</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50-100 percent of units in the development are restricted to low to very-low income residents</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>Transportation Characteristics (Within walking and biking distance of proposed capital project)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1.</td>
<td>Relation to Transit</td>
<td></td>
<td>Scale of actual walking distance to existing or programmed station or transit hub:</td>
<td>Up to 12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Regional or Corridor station or a Transit Center-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Project abuts or is onsite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Project is within 1/2 mile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Stop with high frequency local bus service (15 minutes All day)-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project is within 1/4 mile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2.</td>
<td>Bicycle Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td>EXISTING bicycle lanes, bike boulevards, cycle tracks, or separated bike paths (Class I), or PLANNED bicycle lanes, bike boulevards, cycle tracks, or separated bike paths (Class I) (as identified in San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan or local bicycle master plan)</td>
<td>Up to 2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Direct connection to proposed project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Facilities within 1/4 mile radius of project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3.</td>
<td>Walkability</td>
<td></td>
<td>Intersection Density per square mile:</td>
<td>Up to 4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>290 or greater</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>225-289</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100-224</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Less than 100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4.</td>
<td>TDM Strategies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>EXISTING TDM programs or policies in place</td>
<td>Up to 2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PROPOSED TDM programs or policies, including implementation strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>CATEGORY</td>
<td>POINTS</td>
<td>CRITERIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| E.  | Community Design Features | 6 | 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 Design 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) |
| 2.  | QUALITY OF PROPOSED CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT 30% | A. Support for Public Transit | 5 | How well does the project support use of regional public transit service in the project area? |
|     | B. Providing Transportation Choices | 5 | How well does the project support transportation choices that would reduce vehicle miles traveled, specifically walking and bicycling? |
|     | 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? |
|     | 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, low-mobility populations, or increasing public safety? How well does the project preserve and appropriately integrate cultural and natural resources in the project area? |
|     | E. Sustainability | 2 | How well does the proposed project incorporate Green Stress/Low-Impact Development principles, to address stormwater runoff, energy conservation, and landscaping/street trees? |
|     | F. Universal Design | 2 | How well does the project incorporate Universal Design principles, to ensure access for users of all ages and abilities? |
| 3.  | PROJECT READINESS 11% | A. Major Milestones Completed | 1 | Environmental Clearance  
1 | Right-of-way Acquisition  
1 | Final Design  
1 | Project Full 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 |
| 4.  | COST EFFECTIVENESS 5% | A. Ratio of grant request to project score | Project grant request, divided by score up to this point; ranked relative to each other |
| 5.  | MATCHING FUNDS 3% | All Projects scored on a curve, from most to least matching funds |
| 6.  | POLICY NO. 033 POINTS | 75 | 25% |
| TOTAL PROJECT SCORE | 300 | 100% |
TransNet SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM (SGIP)
PLANNING GRANTS

SGIP ELIGIBLE PROJECTS (Planning Grants)

Eligible planning projects include planning activities that facilitate smart growth in either “Potential” or “Existing/Planned” Smart Growth Opportunity Areas (SGOAs) on the SANDAG Smart Growth Concept Map. Proposed planning projects must:

- Encourage transit, pedestrian, and bicycle trips
- Support a community’s larger infill development or revitalization effort
- Improve internal mobility
- Enhance sense of place

Project activities eligible for planning grant funding include but are not limited to:

Comprehensive planning efforts such as:

- Specific area plans or community plans
- Amendments to general plans or specific plans

OR

Smaller scale neighborhood planning activities such as:

- Traffic calming or mobility plans
- Feasibility studies for future capital improvements
- Parking management plans
- Form-based codes or design guidelines
- Planning efforts required to make smart growth zoning changes

Applicants may conduct a Health Benefit and Impact Assessment (HIA) to inform development of local planning efforts funded by the SGIP, such as specific plans, area plans, general plans, or specific plan amendments. HIA uses evidence-based analysis to inform decision-makers of potential health outcomes and health co-benefits of a proposed project, policy, or plan. Often, health outcomes of a proposed project are hidden or unintended and would not otherwise be considered if a HIA were not completed.

Priority will be given to those planning efforts that will result in or allow administrative or expedited approval of smart growth development projects. Planning projects must start within one year of grant award and must be complete within two years of grant award.
SGIP SCORING CRITERIA GUIDANCE (Planning Grants)

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 five (5) points are available. Transit Infrastructure and Service within the SGOA will be scored as indicated below.

- SGOAs with existing regional or corridor transit infrastructure (five points)
- SGOAs with programmed regional or corridor transit infrastructure or existing high frequency local transit infrastructure and service (three points)
- SGOAs with planned regional or corridor transit infrastructure, or programmed or planned high frequency local transit infrastructure and service (one 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 five (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 six (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 seven (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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>PTS POSSIBLE</th>
<th>WEIGHT MULTIPLIER</th>
<th>TOTAL PTS 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>20</td>
<td>1</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>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL POINTS POSSIBLE** 200
TransNet ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION GRANT PROGRAM (ATGP)¹
CAPITAL GRANTS

ATGP ELIGIBLE PROJECTS (Capital Grants)

Eligible capital grant projects will result in construction of facilities intended for use by bicyclists and pedestrians, or will provide safer roadway access for bicyclists and pedestrians through traffic calming. Eligible activities include design, right-of-way acquisition, construction, and installation of traffic control devices. Eligible capital grant projects may include but are not limited to:

- New bicycle facilities including paths and bicycle boulevards
- Bicycle lane striping and widening
- New sidewalks, widening of sidewalks, sidewalk gap closures
- New pedestrian facilities
- Pedestrian over and under crossings
- Shortcuts to shorten bike/walk travel time and provide for safer connections
- High visibility crosswalks (ladder/zebra/continental style)
- Bulb outs and intersection treatments
- Roundabouts and traffic circles
- Speed humps and speed tables
- Raised intersections
- Median refuges
- Road diets
- Full or half street closures
- Pedestrian and bicycle-related traffic control devices and pavement markings
- Pedestrian-scale lighting
- Signage and wayfinding

Applicants are encouraged to utilize innovative solutions that are new to the region, and to focus efforts in project areas that (1) lend themselves to development of neighborhood-level bicycle and pedestrian networks, (2) connect residential areas to activity centers such as schools, transit centers, commercial districts, and parks, and (3) are comprehensive and include all of the following: bicycle, pedestrian, and traffic calming improvements.

¹ The ATGP is supplemented with Transportation Development Act (TDA) revenues.
How Will Projects Be Scored?

1. **PROJECT READINESS**
   
   **A. Completion of Major Milestones**
   
   Projects will be scored based on the number of milestones completed. Up to 20 points are available. The scores will be assigned for either completion of each milestone, or proof that it is not required (environmental and right-of-way below) as follows:
   
   - Neighborhood-level plan, corridor study, or Community Active Transportation Strategy: Two points
   - Environmental clearance (CEQA and/or NEPA; or evidence that environmental clearance is not required) – Four points
   - Right-of-way acquisition (must be complete, including all necessary entitlements, or evidence that no right-of-way acquisition is required) – Four points
   - Final design (plans, specifications, and estimates) – Ten points

2. **PROJECT CONNECTIONS AND SAFETY**
   
   **A. Connection to Regional Bicycle Network**
   
   Up to eight points are available. Regional Bicycle Network is defined in Riding to 2050: The San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan.
   
   - Project will build direct connection to the network (project must directly connect to an existing or proposed segment of the network) – Six points
   - Project will build part of the network, consistent with facility classification proposed in Riding to 2050 – Eight points

   **B. Completes Connection/Linkage in Local Bicycle Network**
   
   Eight points will be awarded if the project proposes to close a gap between existing bicycle facilities. A gap is defined as a lack of facilities between two existing facilities, or a situation where there is an undesirable change in facility type (e.g., a project proposing to change a segment of class III between two class II segments into class II).

   **C. Completes Connection/Linkage in Existing Pedestrian Network**
   
   Eight points will be awarded if the project proposes to close a gap in the existing pedestrian network. Applicant must demonstrate evidence of an existing gap. Examples include missing sidewalk segments, or enhancement of one or more blocks in between blocks that have previously been upgraded.

   **D. Connection to Transit**
   
   Up to 12 points are available; projects that include both bicycle and pedestrian improvements are eligible for points for both modes. SANDAG staff will analyze project area via GIS to determine score. Regional transit station is defined as any station served by COASTER, SPRINTER, San Diego Trolley, Bus Rapid Transit, or Rapid Bus. Distance is defined as walkable distance (accounting for barriers such as canyons)
   
   - Bike improvements
     - Project is within 1.5 miles of regional transit station – Six points
   
   - Pedestrian improvements: Score will be based on actual available walking paths, as mapped in GIS.
     - Project is within 1/4 mile of a local transit stop – Two points
     - Project directly connects to a local transit stop (proposed improvements must directly connect to transit stop) – Four points
     - Project is within 1/2 mile of a regional transit station – Four points
     - Project directly connects to a regional transit station (proposed improvements must directly connect to the station) – Six points
E. Safety Improvements and Overcoming Barriers

Points will be awarded based on applicant description of safety hazard or collision history. Collision data must be highlighted to point out which collisions are applicable to the project area and why they are relevant. Up to 12 points are available.

Completes connection in existing network at location with documented safety hazard or collision history, specifically, correctable crashes involving bicyclists or pedestrians within the last seven years:

A. One to two correctable collisions – Two points
B. Three to four correctable collisions – Four points
C. Five or more correctable collisions – Six points

and/or

Creates access or overcomes barriers in area where hazardous conditions prohibited safe access for bicyclists and pedestrians – up to six points.

To gain points for creating access or overcoming barriers, applicant must describe detractors in the project area that prohibited safe access, such as a lack of facilities, high traffic volumes and speeds in an area with origins and destinations that would warrant bicycle or pedestrian trips if access were safe, freeway on/off ramps, blind curves, steep slopes, etc.

Points will be awarded based on degree of hazard and potential for increased bicycle or pedestrian trips.

Points will be awarded for both collision history and hazardous conditions lacking collision history in two ways:

- Project area with multiple hazardous locations - A project area encompasses two hazardous locations, one with collision data and one that is so unsafe that it prohibits safe access; or
- Project area with an intersection or roadway segment that has both barriers and crash data - A location within a project area has crash data, but also has been identified as a high barrier roadway in The San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan Bicycle Barriers Model.

3. QUALITY OF PROJECT

A. Effectiveness of Proposed Traffic Calming, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Priority Measures

Points will be awarded based on the quality of traffic calming and bicycle and pedestrian priority measures proposed, and the potential for the proposed measures to address the area need as stated by the applicant. Design guidelines such as those outlined in Planning and Designing for Pedestrians, Riding to 2050: The San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan, and the National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO) Urban Bikeway Design Guide will be used as a guide to inform scoring.

The highest scoring projects will make significant changes to the area’s transportation infrastructure in a way that results in an environment where reduced vehicular speeds provide for safer access for bicyclists and pedestrians, and definitively prioritizes bicycle and pedestrian access. Examples of highest scoring projects include road diets that reallocate right-of-way and/or reconfigure the roadway to balance access for all modes, and projects that include a broad array of context-appropriate traffic calming devices and bicycle/pedestrian priority measures.

Lower-scoring projects will have fewer features and make only minimal improvements for bicycle and pedestrian access.

Up to 15 points are available.

- Traffic calming measures – up to five points
- Bicycle priority measures – up to five points
- Pedestrian priority measures – up to five points

Traffic calming measures will be analyzed for frequency, relative to the following guidelines:

- Residential Street – 20 mph = Devices every 250 feet, so one device would be effective 250 feet on either side
- Collector or Main Street – 25 mph = 400 feet
• Arterial street (traffic taming) – 35 mph = 800 feet

B. Relationship to Program Objectives

Up to 18 points will be awarded based on how well the proposed project meets the Active Transportation Grant Program objectives:

• Encourage the development of a cohesive network of complete streets and improve bicycle/pedestrian neighborhood connectivity to transit and destinations such as schools, retail, places of work, parks, and other community gathering places, and support smart growth placemaking.
• Improve safety for bicyclists and pedestrians through traffic calming and complete streets design principles.
• Serve as models for the region by featuring innovative solutions that comprehensively prioritize access for bicyclists and pedestrians.
• Ensure access to jobs, services, and recreation for populations with fewer transportation choices, and create equitable transportation opportunities for all users, regardless of age, ability, race, ethnicity, or income.
• Increase community support for bicycling and walking as a viable transportation choice for all trip purposes, and promote active transportation as a means of improving health outcomes.
• Support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and facilitate an increase in levels of bicycling and walking in the region, by providing supportive facilities, amenities and programs for bicyclists and pedestrians.

Consideration will be given to both the number of objectives that the project addresses, and how well the project meets the program objectives, particularly with respect to the following:

• Complete streets
• Improved bicycle/pedestrian connectivity to destinations
• Potential to support smart growth places
• Improved safety
• Innovation and ability to serve as a model in the region
• Prioritization of bicycle and pedestrian access
• Social equity
• Potential to increase bicycling and walking for everyday trips
• Potential to improve health outcomes over time
• Reduction of greenhouse gas emissions

C. Innovation

Up to eight points will be awarded. Four points will be awarded if the applicant provides evidence of the project being an FHWA or state experimentation effort.

Up to four points will be awarded if the project proposes solutions that are relatively new to the region, such as colored bike lanes or shared access lanes, sharrows, cycletracks, reverse angled parking, and other examples. The highest scoring projects will utilize the following innovations such as, but not limited to, those found in the NACTO Urban Bikeway Design Guide, specifically:

Bike Lanes and Cycle tracks

• Buffered bike lanes
• Left-side bike lanes
• Cycle tracks (one-way protected, raised, two-way)

Intersections

• Bike boxes
• Intersection crossing markings
• Two-stage turn queue boxes
• Median refuge island

• Through bike lanes
• Cycle track intersection approach

Bicycle Signals

• Bicycle signal heads
• Signal detection and actuation
• Active warning beacon for bike facility crossing at unsignalized intersection
• Hybrid signal for bike route crossing of major street

Bikeway Signing and Marking

• Colored bike facilities
• Shared lane markings
• Bike route wayfinding signage and markings system

Innovative pedestrian/traffic calming solutions could include:

Crossings
• Automated pedestrian detection devices at signalized crossings, including infrared, microwave, and video detectors
• Pre-crossing safety information such as illuminated push buttons and safety advisories to pedestrians and drivers
• Automated “WALK” clearance phase extension for slower crossings such as those made by elderly and disabled pedestrians
• “Animated eyes” and/or pavement markings to remind pedestrians to look for turning vehicles
• HAWK signals
• Rectangular Rapid flash beacons (must include ADA accommodation: a locator note and audible speech to convey that warning lights have been activated, not just that a signal has been activated); in-street lighting is discouraged
• Mid-block chokers
• Mid-block crossings with accompanying signage and enhanced area lighting
• Dynamic lighting at marked crosswalks: focused on the crosswalk and activates when a pedestrian crosses
• High visibility crossings (ladder/zebra/continental style)
• Advance yield bars

Intersections
• Right-turn slip lane and crosswalk, with geometry designed to slow turning vehicles
• Right-turn slip lane with raised crosswalk
• Raised crosswalks
• Raised intersections
• Median refuge island with corral
• Median refuge island with pedestrian activation button
• Pedestrian scramble
• Freestanding crosswalk yielding signs
• Traffic circles and roundabouts
• Semi- and Partial Diverters
• Forced Turn Channelization
• Advance stop bars
• Stencils and signage
• Prohibited right turns on red

Access for Elderly and Disabled Persons
• Use of rapid ticks and slow chirps instead of speech to indicate when to cross and when to wait (where it is technically feasible to have two poles at least 10 feet apart on a corner)
• Vibro-tactile walk indicators
• Push button locator tone
• Locator tone and walk indication ticks/tones that adjust in response to ambient noise levels
• On traffic pole, tactile arrow running parallel to associated crosswalk

4. SUPPORTIVE PROGRAMS AND POLICIES

A. Complementary Programs

Up to three points will be awarded if the project includes program activities that complement the capital improvements, such as an awareness program, education or encouragement efforts, and enforcement activities. Consideration will be given to both the breadth and depth of programs proposed.

B. Supportive Policies and Plans

Up to three points will be awarded if the project is preceded by a complete streets policy included in a community or specific plan, or a community active transportation strategy. The highest scoring projects will have completed a community active transportation strategy specific to the project area.
5. **FORMULA SCORES.**

A. **Demand (GIS Analysis)**

This criterion includes seven factors, listed below. SANDAG will analyze the area relative to the factors below, using GIS. A buffer of a half-mile will be created around the project area for projects with pedestrian improvements, and one mile for projects with bicycle improvements. Results for each factor will be ranked from highest to lowest (with the exception of vehicle ownership, which will be ranked from lowest to highest), in quintiles, for all projects. Projects will then be scored relative to each other, by ranking the raw scores from highest (15 points) to lowest (1 point).

- Population
- Employment
- Population Density
- Employment Density
- Intersection Density
- Activity Centers
- Vehicle Ownership

D. **Regional Housing Needs Assessment Incentive- Board Policy No. 033**

Points will be awarded based on the “SCORING CRITERIA Concerning Calculation of Board Policy No. 033 Incentive Points” detailed in Exhibit 3 of Board Policy No. 033. Up to 50 points will be awarded.

E. **Matching Funds**

Other sources of funding for cooperative projects must be explicitly identified. The application must include supporting documentation that shows matching funds have been secured. Matching funds that have not been secured will not count toward this score.

Projects will be scored relative to each other, by ranking the matching funds amounts from highest to lowest. Points will be distributed from highest to lowest. The projects with the most matching funds will receive ten points, and the projects with the least matching funds will receive one point. Projects without secured matching funds will not receive any points for this category.

F. **Cost/Benefit**

Score will be determined by taking the subtotal score of Criteria 1 through 12 and dividing that subtotal by the grant application amount. Projects will be scored relative to each other by taking the raw scores and distributing them from highest to lowest. The projects with the highest cost benefit ratio will receive ten points, and the projects with the lowest cost benefit ratio will receive one point.

For projects that only include phases prior to construction:

- Project will be scored and ranked together with construction projects
- Score will be reduced according to ultimate phase proposed in project, as follows:
  - Environmental clearance – subtract 75 percent
  - Right-of-way acquisition – subtract 50 percent
  - Final design – subtract 25 percent
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>POTENTIAL PTS</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td><strong>PROJECT READINESS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. Completion of Major Milestones</td>
<td>Projects are eligible for points following completion of each phase: Community active transportation strategy/neighborhood-level plan/corridor study Environmental Clearance Right-of-way Acquisition Final Design</td>
<td>Up to 20</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. <strong>PROJECT CONNECTIONS AND SAFETY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. Connection to Regional Bicycle Network</td>
<td>Project directly connects to the Regional Bikeway Network or Project is a part of the Regional Bikeway Network</td>
<td>Up to 8</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Completes Connection/Linkage in Local Bicycle Network</td>
<td>Closes a gap between existing bicycle facilities (guidance will include definition of gap, and will include situations where there exists an undesirable change in facility type)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Completes Connection/Linkage in Existing Pedestrian Network</td>
<td>Closes a gap in the existing network</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D. Connection to Transit</td>
<td>Bike improvements proximity: Project is within 1.5 miles of regional transit station Pedestrian improvements proximity: Project is within 1/4 mile of a local transit stop Project directly connects to a local transit stop Project is within 1/2 mile of a regional transit station Project directly connects to a regional transit station</td>
<td>Up to 12</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E. Safety Improvements and Overcoming Barriers</td>
<td>Completes connection in existing network at location with documented safety hazard or accident history. A. One to two correctable crashes involving nonmotorized users within the last seven years B. Three to four correctable crashes involving nonmotorized users within the last seven years C. Five or more correctable crashes involving nonmotorized users within the last seven years and/or Creates access or overcomes barriers in area where hazardous conditions prohibited safe access for bicyclists and pedestrians.</td>
<td>Up to 12</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>CATEGORY</td>
<td>CRITERIA</td>
<td>POTENTIAL PTS</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>QUALITY OF PROJECT</td>
<td>A. Effectiveness and Comprehensiveness of Proposed Bicycle, Pedestrian, and/or Traffic Calming Measures</td>
<td>How well will the proposed traffic calming address the identified need in the project area? Are the proposed solutions appropriate for the situation?</td>
<td>Up to 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>How well will the proposed pedestrian improvements address the identified need in the project area?</td>
<td>Up to 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>How well will the proposed bicycle improvements address the identified need in the project area?</td>
<td>Up to 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.</td>
<td>Relationship to Program Objectives</td>
<td>How well does the project meet the program objectives?</td>
<td>Up to 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C.</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>Is this project an FHWA or state experimentation effort?</td>
<td>Up to 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Does the project propose solutions that are new to the region, and have the potential to serve as a replicable model for other cities in the region? Does the project utilize innovative solutions such as those listed in the NACTO Urban Bikeway Guide?</td>
<td>Up to 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>SUPPORTIVE POLICIES AND PROGRAMS</td>
<td>A. Complementary Programs</td>
<td>Is this project accompanied by programs that complement the capital improvements, such as an awareness campaign, education efforts, and increased enforcement?</td>
<td>Up to 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Supportive Policies and Plans</td>
<td>Demonstrated policy language in approved plan, or a completed community active transportation strategy/plan</td>
<td>Up to 3</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>FORMULA SCORES</td>
<td>A. Demand (GIS analysis)</td>
<td>Factors contributing to score: population and employment, population and employment densities, intersection density, vehicle ownership, and activity centers.</td>
<td>Up to 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Regional Housing Needs Assessment Incentive</td>
<td>Score is based on the formula provided in Board Policy No. 033</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Matching Funds</td>
<td>Matching funds can be from any of the following sources:</td>
<td>Up to 10</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Identified and approved capital funding from identified source. Please provide proof in the form of a resolution or letter of approval.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Approved match grant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. In-kind services. Please provide adequate support documentation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D. Cost/Benefit</td>
<td>Subtotal Score(not counting RHNA points, not counting match points)/Grant Application Amount</td>
<td>Up to 10</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ATGP ELIGIBLE PROJECTS (Non-Capital Grants)

Active Transportation Non-Capital Grants can be classified into three categories:

1. Planning

Planning efforts intended to address bicycle and/or pedestrian access at a neighborhood or citywide level, primarily to accommodate non-recreational bicycle and walking trips

Eligible planning projects include:

- Comprehensive Active Transportation Strategies – maximum funding amount of $300,000
- Bicycle master plans – maximum funding amounts are as follows:
  - Cities with population up to 50,000 - $100,000 ($75,000 + $25,000 for environmental) – Coronado, Del Mar, Imperial Beach, Solana Beach, and Lemon Grove
  - Cities with population 50,000 to 150,000 - $150,000 ($125,000 + $25,000 for environmental) – Carlsbad, El Cajon, Encinitas, Escondido, La Mesa, National City, Poway, San Marcos, Santee, and Vista
  - Cities with population greater than 150,000 - $200,000 ($150,000 + $50,000 for environmental) – Chula Vista, Oceanside, and the County of San Diego
  - City of San Diego - $250,000 ($200,000 + $50,000 for environmental)

2. Education/Awareness/Encouragement

Education/Awareness/Encouragement projects include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Education – Programs to teach walking and bicycling safety skills to children and adults.
- Eligible education projects can take place at schools, places of employment, community centers, or other venues.
- Awareness – Multimedia campaigns to impact the attitudes and behavior of the general public, generally to improve safety for all roadway users but bicyclists and pedestrians in particular.
- Encouragement – Targeted outreach and events designed to encourage walking and bicycling as a viable mode of transportation for everyday/utilitarian trips.

3. Bicycle Parking

Planning and implementation of bicycle parking facilities.

Eligible projects include bicycle racks, lockers, bike corrals, and/or other bike storage facilities such as bike stations. The maximum funding amounts for bicycle parking facilities is $50,000, and for bike stations, $100,000. Facilities must be designed for general public access, i.e. not serving any single place of employment or single activity center.

---

1 The ATGP is supplemented with Transportation Development Act (TDA) revenues.
ATGP SCORING CRITERIA GUIDANCE (Non-Capital Grants)

How Will Projects Be Scored?

1. **ALL GRANTS**

   **A. Relationship to Program Objectives**

   Points will be awarded based on how well the proposed project meets the Active Transportation Grant Program objectives:

   - Encourage the development of a cohesive network of complete streets and improve bicycle/pedestrian neighborhood connectivity to transit and destinations such as schools, retail, places of work, parks, and other community gathering places, and support smart growth placemaking.
   - Improve safety for bicyclists and pedestrians through traffic calming and complete streets design principles.
   - Serve as models for the region by featuring innovative solutions that comprehensively prioritize access for bicyclists and pedestrians.
   - Ensure access to jobs, services, and recreation for populations with fewer transportation choices, and create equitable transportation opportunities for all users, regardless of age, ability, race, ethnicity, or income.
   - Increase community support for bicycling and walking as a viable transportation choice for all trip purposes, and promote active transportation as a means of improving health outcomes.
   - Support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and facilitate an increase in levels of bicycling and walking in the region, by providing supportive facilities, amenities and programs for bicyclists and pedestrians.

   Consideration will be given to both the number of objectives that the project addresses, and how well the project meets the program objectives, particularly with respect to the following:

   - Complete streets (planning, encouragement, parking)
   - Improved bicycle/pedestrian connectivity to destinations (planning, encouragement, parking)
   - Potential to support smart growth places (ALL)
   - Improved safety (planning, education, awareness, encouragement)
   - Innovation and ability to serve as a model in the region (ALL)
   - Prioritization of bicycle and pedestrian access (planning, awareness, encouragement, parking)
   - Social equity (ALL)
   - Potential to increase bicycling and walking for everyday trips (ALL)
   - Potential to improve health outcomes over time (planning, education, awareness, encouragement)
   - Potential to reduce greenhouse gas emissions (ALL)

   Up to 30 points are available for planning grants, and up to 20 each for education/awareness/encouragement, and bicycle parking grants. The highest scoring projects will demonstrate the potential for measurable impact across multiple objectives.

   **B. Comprehensiveness**

   **Planning:**

   Up to 16 points are available. Points will be awarded according to the comprehensiveness of the proposed planning effort, in terms of both scope and scale. The highest scoring projects will address Complete Streets principles (addressing and prioritizing access for both bicyclists and pedestrians, and traffic calming), or could be considered a Community Active Transportation Strategy (CATS).

   The highest scoring planning efforts will aim for significant changes to the area’s transportation infrastructure, resulting in an environment where street design and vehicular speeds provide for safer access for bicyclists and pedestrians, and definitively prioritizes bicycle and pedestrian access.
Lower-scoring projects will plan for only minimal improvements for bicycle or pedestrian access.

**Education/awareness/encouragement:**

Up to 16 points are available. Points will be awarded according to the comprehensiveness of the proposed education, awareness, or encouragement effort, in terms of scope and potential impact.

The highest scoring projects will reach more of the region’s residents, or a specific underserved or vulnerable population such as low-income populations who rely more on walking or biking because they lack access to a car, elderly, or Limited English Proficiency populations. The highest scoring projects will also take place over a longer period of time, and complement a capital improvement project. Higher scoring projects could also be part of a larger transportation demand management effort.

Lower-scoring projects will be smaller in scope, scale, or duration, and will be independent of any capital improvement projects.

**Bicycle Parking:**

Up to 12 points are available. Points will be awarded according to the comprehensiveness of the proposed parking project, in terms of scope and scale. The highest scoring projects will cover a larger geographic area and complement a capital improvement project. Higher scoring projects could also be part of a larger transportation demand management effort.

Lower-scoring projects will be smaller in scope and scale, and will be independent of any capital improvement projects.

### C. Methodology

**Planning:**

Up to 30 points are available. Points will be awarded according to how well the planning process or proposed effort will meet the demonstrated need and project goals. Highest scoring projects will include a comprehensive planning process in their scopes of work that address the goals of Complete Streets, prioritize bicyclist and pedestrian access, plan for traffic calming, and tie into Safe Routes to School efforts in the project area.

**Education/awareness/encouragement, and parking:**

Up to 30 points are available for education/awareness/encouragement, and up to 10 points are available for parking. Points will be awarded according to how well the proposed effort will meet the demonstrated need and project goals. Highest scoring projects will include a succinct explanation of the need for the project, clearly articulated project goals, and a Scope of Work that directly addresses those goals and lists measurable objectives and deliverables.

Lower scoring projects will have stated a generic need, broad goals, and/or a scope of work that fails to clearly articulate how the project goals will be met.

Bicycle parking projects must demonstrate that they meet guidelines outlined in *Riding to 2050: The San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan*. Innovations that deviate from the guidelines will be may be considered. The highest scoring bicycle parking projects will be placed appropriately, in appropriate locations, with design that is both attractive and functional, and can demonstrate that they serve the goals as stated by the applicant.

**D. Community Support**

**Planning:**

Up to 16 points are available. Points will be awarded according to the inclusiveness of the planning process, and evidence that key stakeholders will be active participants in the process. The highest scoring projects will demonstrate that:

- the effort is strongly supported by the community,
- community input is a substantive component in the planning process, and
- that key stakeholders, including underserved and limited English proficiency populations, have been identified and will have a meaningful role in the planning effort.
Lower scoring projects will:
- have a Scope of Work that includes minimal opportunities for community input,
- include generic letters of support that fail to show substantive involvement from key stakeholders, and
- fail to involve underserved and limited English proficiency populations (when appropriate in the plan area).

**Education/Awareness/Encouragement and Bicycle Parking:**

Up to 16 points are available for education/awareness/encouragement, and up to 10 points are available for parking. Points will be awarded according to the quantity and quality of the role of community involvement in the project. The highest scoring projects will demonstrate that:
- the effort is strongly supported by the community,
- relevant stakeholders representing the community had input into the methodology,
- community organizations have a substantive role in project implementation, and
- the Scope of Work includes language-appropriate program delivery for non-English speaking populations (for education/awareness/encouragement projects, if appropriate for the plan area).

Lower scoring projects will:
- fail to show meaningful community support,
- include generic letters of support that fail to show substantive involvement from key stakeholders,
- fail to involve community organizations in project implementation, and
- fail to account for limited English proficiency populations in program delivery (when appropriate in the plan area).

**E. Matching Funds**

Other sources of funding for cooperative projects must be explicitly identified. The application must include supporting documentation that shows matching funds have been secured. Matching funds that have not been secured will not count toward this score.

Projects will be scored relative to each other, by ranking the matching funds amounts from highest to lowest. Points will be distributed from highest to lowest. The projects with the most matching funds will receive 20 points, and the projects with the least matching funds will receive 1 point. Projects without secured matching funds will not receive any points for this category.

**F. Cost/Benefit**

Score will be determined by taking the subtotal score of Criteria 1 through 12 and dividing that subtotal by the grant application amount. Projects will be scored relative to each other by taking the raw scores and distributing them from highest to lowest. The projects with the highest cost benefit ratio will receive 18 points, and the projects with the lowest cost benefit ratio will receive 1 point.

**G. Regional Housing Needs Assessment Incentive/Policy No. 033**

Points will be awarded based on the “SCORING CRITERIA Concerning Calculation of Board Policy No. 033 Incentive Points” detailed in Exhibit 3, of Board Policy No. 033. Up to 50 points will be awarded.
2. EDUCATION/AWARENESS/ENCOURAGEMENT AND PARKING GRANTS ONLY

A. Evaluation

Up to 20 points are available. Points will be awarded according to the quality of the evaluation proposed for the project. Highest scoring projects will:

- Have identified performance measures in the application, or will include a task for identification of performance measures in the Scope of Work;
- Include specific pre- and post-data collection efforts as part of the project scope, budget, and schedule in support of evaluating the project’s effectiveness.

Lower scoring projects will lack meaningful evaluation methods or data collection as part of the project.

B. INNOVATION

Up to 10 points are available for education/awareness/encouragement grants, and up to 30 points are available for bicycle parking grants. Points will be awarded for innovative projects that show potential to serve as a replicable model for the region. Highest scoring projects will include innovative methods of accomplishing project goals that have not yet been tried in the San Diego region to date. Lesser points will be awarded to project activities that are relatively new to the region. No points will be awarded if the project proposes activities that are already in practice in the region.

If the proposed practice has been tried in other regions, the applicant must make the case that it has proven to be successful in those regions.

Examples of innovative encouragement projects could include but are not limited to ciclovia or Sunday Streets programs, and bikesharing. Innovative bicycle parking projects include but are not limited to bike corrals, and development of bicycle parking ordinances.

3. PLANNING AND PARKING GRANTS ONLY

A. Demand (GIS Analysis)

This criterion includes seven factors, listed below. SANDAG will analyze the area relative to the factors below, using GIS. A buffer of a half-mile will be created around the project area for projects with pedestrian improvements, and one mile for projects with bicycle improvements. Results for each factor will be ranked from highest to lowest (with the exception of vehicle ownership, which will be ranked from lowest to highest), in quintiles, for all projects. Projects will then be scored relative to each other, by ranking the raw scores from highest (20 points) to lowest (1 point).

- Population
- Employment
- Population Density
- Employment Density
- Intersection Density
- Activity Centers
- Vehicle Ownership
<p>| NO. | CATEGORY | CRITERIA | POINTS POSSIBLE | POINTS POSSIBLE | POINTS POSSIBLE |
|-----|----------|----------|----------------|----------------|
| 1.  | ALL GRANTS |          | PLANNING       | E/A/E          | PARKING        |
| A.  | Relationship to Program Objectives | How well does the proposed project address program objectives? | 30 | 20 | 20 |
| B.  | Comprehensiveness | Planning: How comprehensive is the proposed plan? (geographic area and emphasis on bike/ped/traffic calming, CATS) Education/awareness/encouragement: Does this effort accompany an existing or proposed capital improvement project? Scale also Parking: Does this effort accompany an existing or proposed capital improvement project? | 16 | 16 | 12 |
| C.  | Methodology | Planning: How well will the planning process or proposed effort meet the demonstrated need and project goals? Education/awareness/encouragement, parking: How effective will the proposed effort be in meeting the demonstrated need and project goals? | 30 | 30 | 10 |
| D.  | Community Support | Planning: Does the planning project include an inclusive process? Other: Does the project involve broad segments of the community and does it have broad and meaningful community support? | 16 | 16 | 10 |
| E.  | Matching Funds | Matching funds can be from any of the following sources: 1. Identified and approved capital funding from identified source. Please provide proof in the form of a resolution or letter of approval. 2. Approved match grant 3. In-kind services. Please provide adequate support documentation. | 20 | 20 | 20 |
| F.  | Cost/Benefit | Subtotal Score (not counting RHNA points, not counting match points)/Grant Application Amount | 18 | 18 | 18 |
| G.  | Regional Housing Needs Assessment Incentive/Policy No. 033 Points | Points will be allocated according to methodology described in Policy No. 033 | 50 | 50 | 50 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>POINTS POSSIBLE</th>
<th>POINTS POSSIBLE</th>
<th>POINTS POSSIBLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>EDUCATION, AWARENESS, ENCOURAGEMENT, AND PARKING GRANTS ONLY</td>
<td></td>
<td>PLANNING</td>
<td>E/A/E</td>
<td>PARKING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A. Evaluation</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>How will the project evaluate its effectiveness?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B. Innovation</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Is this project new to the region and does it have the potential to serve as a replicable model for other cities in the region?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>PLANNING AND PARKING GRANTS ONLY</td>
<td></td>
<td>PLANNING</td>
<td>E/A/E</td>
<td>PARKING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A. Demand (GIS analysis)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Factors contributing to score: population and employment, population and employment densities, intersection density, vehicle ownership, and activity centers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL POINTS</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Initially-Proposed Changes to the SGIP and ATGP Program Guidelines

In total, two modifications to the program guidelines were originally proposed. Neither one of the proposed changes would have changed the scoring criteria or any associated weighting. One modification for both the Smart Growth Incentive Program (SGIP) and Active Transportation Grant Program (ATGP) was initially proposed, and one modification for only the ATGP was originally proposed. Both are described below.

Information related to program guidelines, eligible projects, and scoring criteria for both programs (from the second cycle) is provided in Attachments 1 and 2.

Initially-Proposed Modifications to Both Programs – Requirement of Matching Funds

Currently, neither grant program requires matching funds, but both programs provide points for matching funds. Projects that provide a higher percentage of matching funds receive a higher number of points. In accordance with TransNet Extension Ordinance provisions to maximize funding, TransNet funding is leveraged with other fund sources. Over the years, the average matching percentage has been about 20 percent for both programs, ranging from 0 to 50 percent. In an attempt to leverage funds to a greater degree, staff initially proposed instituting a minimum local match requirement of 20 to 30 percent of the total cost of the project. This proposal would not have changed the scoring criteria for matching funds. Projects that provide a higher match than the minimum would still have received a higher number of points. Projects failing to provide the required local match would have been ineligible for funding.

The following comments were received from working group members:

- Members of the Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) expressed concern over requiring a minimum local match.
- Members of the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG) and Active Transportation Working Group (ATWG) were split on this issue. Some members expressed concern over requiring a minimum local match, especially for smaller jurisdictions that might have a harder time coming up with a match. Others suggested that if a minimum match were to be required, a lower threshold, such as 10 percent of the total cost of the project, should be considered, similar to minimum match requirement thresholds of state and federal programs.
- Members of the Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee (ITOC) were also split on this issue. While ITOC members agreed with TWG and ATWG members that requiring 20 to 30 percent of the total project cost would be too high, some ITOC members supported requiring at least 10 percent of the total project cost in order to leverage additional

---

1 In the ATGP (both the capital and non-capital grant programs), projects are scored relative to each other by ranking the matching funds amounts from highest to lowest. The projects with the most matching funds receive the highest points (10 for the capital and 20 for non-capital), and projects with the lowest receive the fewest points. Projects without secured matching funds receive no points. In the SGIP planning grant program, points are awarded in proportion to the percentage of proposed matching funds to the total project cost. In the SGIP capital grant program, projects receive points based on a curve from most to least matching funds.

2 “These funds shall be allocated on a regional competitive grant basis. It is intended that these funds be used to match federal, state, local, and private funding to maximize the number of improvements to be implemented.” (Page 8, TransNet Extension and Ordinance, 2004)
TransNet funding. Other ITOC members expressed concern over requiring a minimum match, asking why jurisdictions should be penalized if they have good projects but can’t afford a minimum required match, especially since most applications in the first and second cycles included at least some voluntary match funding.

Based on the comments from the working groups and ITOC, staff is no longer proposing instituting a minimum local match requirement for either program for the third cycle.

Initially-Proposed Modifications to the ATGP Capital Grants Program – Removal of Over/Under $500,000 Category Distinction

The ATGP Capital Grants program contains a provision that approximately 60 percent of capital funds be available to fund projects over $500,000, with a cap of $1.5 million. This $500,000 threshold establishes two categories of projects: projects over $500,000, and projects of $500,000 or less. This category threshold was instituted with the idea that a distinction between large and small projects would allow smaller jurisdictions to compete more successfully for grant funding from this program. Staff originally proposed eliminating these categories as part of the third cycle for two reasons: (1) a smaller volume of grant applications is expected for the ATGP because of the redirection of funds to the Bike Early Action Program approved by the SANDAG Board last year; and (2) the category distinction did not seem to result in the expected outcome of “evening the playing field” between smaller and larger jurisdictions, as was originally anticipated. Staff’s perspective was that given the smaller amount of funding available (approximately $3 million for the third cycle versus almost $9 million for the second cycle), dropping the distinction would help streamline and facilitate the application and review process.

The following comments were received from working group members and ITOC:

- TWG and ATWG members expressed support for maintaining the over/under $500,000 category distinction.
- CTAC members did not comment on this proposed modification.
- ITOC members did not object to eliminating the category distinction.

Given the lack of consensus, staff is no longer proposing removing the category distinction.
PUBLIC HEALTH AND THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT

Introduction

According to the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), three risk behaviors — lack of physical activity, poor nutrition, and tobacco use — are responsible for much of the early death related to chronic disease in the United States. Effectively addressing these three behaviors through policy, systems, and environmental change to make healthy options the easier choices can have a significant impact on preventing negative health consequences, such as heart disease, stroke, Type 2 diabetes, and cancer.

Discussion

In March 2010, the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) and the San Diego County Health and Human Services Agency (HHSA) partnered on projects related to regional planning, active transportation, and Safe Routes to School to increase levels of physical activity and access to healthy food and nutrition. These projects, which made up Phase I of the Healthy Works program at SANDAG, were supported by a $3 million contract with HHSA that was funded through the CDC’s Communities Putting Prevention to Work program.

In September 2011, HHSA received another CDC grant, the Community Transformation Grant (CTG), and chose to partner with SANDAG again to build on the successes of the Healthy Works Phase I projects. SANDAG and HHSA initiated the Healthy Works Phase II projects in July 2012. The projects included: Regional Safe Routes to School Strategic Plan Implementation, Public Health and Wellness Policies for Regional Plans, Regional Monitoring and Evaluation for Physical Activity and Public Health, Regional Complete Streets Policy and Implementation, Health Benefits and Impacts Analysis Program and the continuation of the Public Health Stakeholder Group (PHSG).

The CTG program finished at the Federal Fiscal Year (September 29, 2014). Attached is the CTG Final Report which provides a summary and status of SANDAG-CTG projects to date along with program accomplishments and lessons learned. There is also a section on how CTG projects will be sustained within the agency moving forward.
Next Steps

In May 2014, the SANDAG Board of Directors approved funding to continue health considerations in SANDAG’s policies, projects, programs, and plans as part of the Fiscal Year 2015 Overall Work Plan and Program Budget. This will also allow the PHSG to continue through the development of San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan.

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

Attachments: 1. Healthy Works - Phase II Fact Sheet
2. Community Transformation Grant Final Report, September 22, 2014

Key Staff Contact: Dan Gallagher, (619) 595-5354, dan.gallagher@sandag.org
HEALTHY WORKS - PHASE II
FACT SHEET

The Community Transformation Grant program is a $132 million nationwide initiative sponsored by the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). The program supports local communities in implementing evidence-based strategies to reduce chronic diseases such as heart disease, stroke, and diabetes, which are the leading causes of death in the United States. Community Transformation Grant funds are authorized under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act of 2010 to improve community health through prevention, while reducing health disparities and lowering health care costs.

In October 2011, the County of San Diego Health and Human Services Agency (HHSA) received a potentially five-year, $15 million Community Transformation Grant. The grant will support the County’s Live Well! San Diego initiative and strengthen its strategic partnership with SANDAG on health-related activities in the San Diego region. SANDAG and the county will build on what was accomplished under Healthy Works, the CDC-funded Communities Putting Prevention to Work program. In July 2012, HHSA contracted with SANDAG for $2.5 million in Community Transformation Grant funds to continue implementing a range of projects that increase physical activity and access to healthy food and nutrition throughout the region.

Program Schedule
The SANDAG Community Transformation Grant activities will be implemented from July 2012 through September 2016. Funds are anticipated to be allocated annually by the CDC.

Public Participation
Members of the public will have ample opportunities to participate in the Community Transformation Grant program. SANDAG will form a Public Health Stakeholder Group to develop recommendations for Community Transformation Grant activities and provide feedback and input. The group will include key stakeholders from across the region. All meetings will be open to the public. It is anticipated that the group will convene quarterly starting Thursday, October 25, 2012.

SANDAG also will participate in the Safe Routes to School Coalition which will meet bi-monthly. The role of the coalition is to identify strategies to address infrastructure, program, and policy-related barriers to walking and biking to school.

In addition, SANDAG will schedule public events, training workshops, and presentations, as needed, for specific projects throughout the grant period. For more information on meeting dates, agendas, and opportunities to provide input, visit the project website at sandag.org/healthyworks.

Grant-Funded Programs
SANDAG will implement the following four activities as part of the Community Transformation Grant program:

(Continued on reverse)
1. Public Health and Wellness Policies for Regional Land Use and Transportation Planning
   » Develop a regional public health and wellness policy framework and performance metrics
   » Develop guidance for incorporating health considerations into local and regional planning
   » Conduct health analysis on appropriate components of the next regional plan
   » Develop recommendations for implementing a regional monitoring and evaluation program for physical activity and public health indicators
   » Conduct outreach to promote active design guidelines in the region

2. Health Benefits and Impacts Analysis Program
   » Build capacity throughout the region to conduct health assessments on proposed projects, policies, and plans at the regional and local level
   » Develop a technical assistance program to support local agencies in implementing health assessments
   » Develop protocols for future institutionalization of the health benefit and impact analysis tool for assessing health and social equity benefits and impacts of proposed transportation plans and projects

3. Regional Complete Streets Policy and Implementation
   » Build capacity in the region to comply with the Complete Streets Act of 2008 and support projects that balance all modes of travel on public rights of way
   » Support the update of the Traffic Impact Study guidelines for the San Diego region
   » Support the development of a Regional Complete Streets Policy

4. Regional Safe Routes to School Strategic Plan Implementation
   » Conduct a needs analysis and prioritize the recommendations identified in the Regional Safe Routes to School (SRTS) Strategic Plan
   » Develop a phasing and funding strategy to implement the Regional SRTS Strategic Plan
   » Identify and implement up to three high-priority actions in high-need areas

For More Information
Visit sandag.org/healthyworks or contact Stephan Vance, SANDAG community transformation grant program manager, at stephan.vance@sandag.org or (619) 699-1924.
COMMUNITY TRANSFORMATION GRANT

FINAL REPORT

September 22, 2014

Prepared for: County of San Diego, Health and Human Services Agency

Prepared by: SANDAG Staff

Dan Gallagher
Sarah Strand
Stephan Vance
Bridget Enderle
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

According to the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), three risk behaviors — lack of physical activity, poor nutrition, and tobacco use — are responsible for much of the early death related to chronic disease in the United States. Effectively addressing these three behaviors through policy, systems, and environmental change to make healthy choices the easier choices can have a significant impact on preventing negative health consequences, such as heart disease, stroke, Type 2 diabetes, and cancer.

In March 2010, the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) and the San Diego County Health and Human Services Agency (HHSA) partnered on projects related to regional planning, active transportation, and Safe Routes to School (SRTS) to increase levels of physical activity and access to healthy food and nutrition. These projects, which made up Phase I of the Healthy Works program at SANDAG, were supported by a $3 million contract with HHSA that was funded through the CDC’s Communities Putting Prevention to Work program.

In September 2011, HHSA received another CDC grant, the Community Transformation Grant (CTG), and chose to partner with SANDAG again to build on the successes of the Healthy Works Phase I projects. SANDAG and HHSA initiated the Healthy Works Phase II projects in July 2012. The projects included: Regional Safe Routes to School Strategic Plan Implementation, Public Health and Wellness Policies for Regional Plans, Regional Monitoring and Evaluation for Physical Activity and Public Health, Regional Complete Streets Policy and Implementation, Health Benefits and Impacts Analysis Program and the continuation of the Public Health Stakeholder Group (PHSG).

With early termination of CTG funding, the following report provides a summary and status of SANDAG-CTG projects to date along with program accomplishments and lessons learned. There is also a section on how CTG projects will be sustained within the agency moving forward.

STATUS OF AGREEMENT/PROJECT OBJECTIVES

Public Health and Wellness Policies for Regional Land Use and Transportation Planning

Contractor shall develop and present to the SANDAG Board of Directors for adoption a Public Health and Wellness Policy Framework for regional land use and transportation plans such as the Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy.

Final Status: Public Health White Paper complete. Public Health White Paper will become an appendix and policy considerations will be included in the Regional Plan update. Health Indicators for the Biennial Regional Comprehensive Plan Monitoring Report will also be considered.

Regional Monitoring and Evaluation for Physical Activity and Public Health

Contractor shall develop/integrate comprehensive set of active transportation measures for the next Regional Transportation Plan update.
Final Status: CTG Year 2 carryover funds in the amount of $124,146 will be used to help bring the current Bike Counter Network Program started under Communities Putting Prevention to Work to be fully operational by paying for data transmission fees for three years, perform battery replacement and address outstanding maintenance issues of bike counters in the field. A user friendly public interface will also be developed to better inform the public on the counter network. This will assist SANDAG to incorporate the system into our transportation data monitoring system.

**Health Benefits and Impacts Analysis Program**

Contractor shall develop recommendations for institutionalizing health benefits and impacts analysis (HIA) methodologies and protocols into the planning and project development process within SANDAG, and implement a technical assistance program to build capacity within the region to conduct HIAs.

Final Status: The recommendations for institutionalizing HIA methodologies and protocols are complete. The recommendations were presented to the SANDAG Executive Team for consideration, and a number of recommendations have been or are in the process of being implemented, including the incorporation of health into performance measure and evaluation criteria, enhanced communication around health both internally and externally at the agency, streamlining data-sharing processes, sustaining public health through the development of the regional plan, and continuing to collaborate with the HHSA. Technical assistance has been provided to the City of Vista to perform a HIA on the Downtown Vista Specific Plan. The technical assistance program will be complete on September 30, 2014, and the City of Vista will complete the HIA independently by the end of the year.

**Regional Complete Streets Policy and Implementation**

Contractor shall develop a Regional Complete Streets Policy, and establish a technical assistance program to support complete streets policy implementation at the local level.

Final Status: With input from all the key SANDAG stakeholders, SANDAG staff develop a comprehensive policy discussion paper that was used to inform policy maker, local agency staff and the public about Complete Streets policy and implementation options. To get broader public input, SANDAG conducted a public workshop that was attended by approximately 100 people. Then the paper was presented to the Board of Directors to inform the about the principles of Complete Streets and its implementation, and to stimulate a discussion with the Board that would inform the development of the policy.

Based on the direction provided by the Board, and on feedback from the public and the working groups, a draft regional Complete Streets policy has been developed. After an internal review by stakeholder departments and management, the draft policy will be presented to the working groups for discussion and feedback, and to the Transportation and Regional Planning Policy Committees for a recommendation to the Board of Directors. Adoption of a policy is anticipated sometime in the fall 2014.

Implementation of a technical assistance program for local agencies is an anticipated implementation strategy that would be required by the regional policy when it is adopted. Initial technical assistance would have been supported by CTG funding, so with no CTG program after the end of this federal fiscal year, other funding sources will have to be identified to support this effort.
Regional Safe Routes to School Strategic Plan Implementation

Contractor shall conduct an SRTS analysis to identify SRTS infrastructure and non-infrastructure needs and develop a phasing and funding strategy to implement highest priority projects and programs.

Final Status: SANDAG surpassed the outcome objective for this program component by conducting a regional needs analysis, identifying priority projects/programs, creating four potential implementation scenarios, and strategies for funding implementation.

PROGRAM ACCOMPLISHMENTS

- Describe accomplishments and outcomes of all major activities
- Include a description of the specific policy, systems and environmental changes that were achieved
- Describe any unanticipated or additional accomplishments
- Public Health White Paper was first in a series of white papers to be complete with substantial input from the PHSG, Working Groups, and Policy Committees. The Public Health White Paper was then finalized and put online under Environment/Communities on the San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan webpage. Broad ranging support for Public Health policy objectives from SANDAG Committee Members.

- Regional Monitoring and Evaluation for Physical Activity and Public Health:

  The Regional Bike Counter Network managed by San Diego State University contains 54 units strategically located in 37 sites in 15 jurisdictions. Site selection was based on regional bikeway corridors, urban place types and socio-economic factors. Data is collected continuously at 15 minute increments and uploaded daily allowing for analysis of bicycling and walking behavior. SANDAG is currently considering how to eventually integrate the network into our transportation data collection system and incorporate the data into the State of the Commute Report. The Bike Counter Network was part of several information announcements sent out by iCommute staff for May Bike to Work Month.

- HIA: The recommendations to incorporate health into the planning and project development process developed the awareness and education of agency staff about the public health connection to planning, and helped elevate public health as a priority within the agency. Public health was added into the budget for the regional plan, and health considerations were incorporated into performance measures, evaluation criteria, vision, goals and objectives for the plan. Additionally, public health staff was added into the intergovernmental project development review process. The PHSG was sustained at least through the development of the regional plan, and staff implanted changes to PHSG membership to include medical doctors, school representatives, and others that can help broaden health perspectives and build consensus. Staff will explore potential health indicators for addition to the Regional Comprehensive Plan Monitoring Report and will consider ways to strengthen health-related factors in grant program evaluation criteria during future policy updates. SANDAG will continue to pursue grants and other sources of
funding to sustain public health planning efforts, will continue to prioritize health in the annual Overall Work Program, and will continue providing support and resources to local jurisdictions, for example through grant funding or technical assistance, as available. The Scoping for a Health Assessment Tool assisted the agency in determining the cost, feasibility, and uses of a variety of tools. Staff is currently facilitating a pilot of the HUD HCTI assessment tool, which was included in the scoping report. SANDAG will continue to support local jurisdictions through the pilot of the HCTI tool.

The technical assistance program enabled HIA expert consultants Human Impact Partners to provide assistance and resources to the City of Vista in the development of an HIA for the Downtown Specific Plan. HIP provided scoping assistance, draft pathway diagrams, scoping worksheets (including research questions), an example of a document to use in HIA subgroup meeting, and examples of a completed HIA. The City of Vista will complete the HIA independent of HIP using a separate consultant.

- Development of the Complete Streets discussion paper provided a focus for identifying the key issues that need to be addressed in formulating a regional complete streets policy, and it was an effective vehicle for informing policy-makers about the options available to them when establishing a regional policy and implementation strategy.

- The public workshop that was held on Complete Streets also provided an opportunity to discuss issues related to Complete Streets with stakeholders and community members, but it also turned out to be an excellent opportunity to demonstrate the significant level of public interest in Complete Streets.

While a final policy was not developed and adopted before the termination of the CTG contract, the project resulted in a significant amount of discussion about Complete Streets among SANDAG staff that will facilitate systems changes once a policy is adopted. Issues were aired and potential solutions were identified. Once a Complete Streets policy is adopted, environmental change will occur over time through the capital project development process.

- Regional SRTS Strategic Plan Implementation: The four implementation framework scenarios developed through this project provide options for establishing an effective and comprehensive regional SRTS program that reflects the region’s goals and national best practices. Whereas the required deliverables were intended to identify priorities for implementing programs with CTG funding, the final outcomes provide a strong basis for establishing a far more comprehensive and sustainable program. This information can be used by SANDAG and policymakers to determine the most appropriate long-term approach to regional SRTS assistance.

Additionally, the detailed cost estimates developed as a part of this project can be incorporated into San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan, as an initial step to seeking future funding for regional SRTS implementation.
LESSONS LEARNED

- Depending on how Public Health and the Built Environment are presented, broad support among diverse coalitions can be built with the unifying message of Public Health.

- The Bike Counter Network existed with little visibility both within SANDAG and with the bicycling and walking public. Raising the visibility of the benefits of the network through better coordination among all the involved agencies will help the network become better integrated into regional data collection.

- There is a need to continue bridging the “language gap” between planning and public health. It will be important to develop a consistent message about health and planning that is sensitive to diverse stakeholders and can help build consensus. Focusing on health as a unifying effort can diffuse opposition.

- Support for public health planning emphasized the need for a “health in all policies” approach within the agency. This has been most effective by incorporating health into existing work and conversations, for example by emphasizing the health co-benefits of lowering vehicles-miles-traveled, and encouraging active transportation, smart growth, energy efficiency, and climate change mitigation/adaptation.

- There is a need to further identify and fill data gaps and develop a streamlined process for inter-agency data sharing. HIA methodology is most effective during the planning process, well in advance of the project development phase. Health must be considered early on for the best chance at implementation.

- In the process of engaging local agency stakeholders in the development of the Complete Streets Discussion Paper, we learned that interest in Complete Streets is widespread throughout the region, but there is little interest in having the regional agency (SANDAG) dictate policy on Complete Streets to those agencies. Instead, technical and financial support can be used as incentives to encourage local action.

- Within the San Diego region SRTS programs and projects are unevenly dispersed and absent in many areas where need is most pronounced. Also, reporting and evaluating SRTS effectiveness is inconsistent throughout the region. Despite an incomplete picture of the current status and need for SRTS, there is high demand for local SRTS funding. More work with local agencies and policymakers is needed to determine the best approach to strengthening SRTS within the region.

SUSTAINABILITY PLAN

What is your plan for sustaining the project or elements of the project?

- Public Health Policies for Regional Plans: In May 2014, the SANDAG Board of Directors approved funding in the amount of $108,000 to continue health considerations in SANDAG’s policies, projects, programs, and plans. This will also allow the PHSG to continue through the Regional Plan update.
• Regional Monitoring and Evaluation for Physical Activity and Public Health: The long term objective is to eventually integrate the Bike Counter Network data into the transportation monitoring system at SANDAG.

• HIA: From the recommendations to institutionalize HIA methods and protocols, the SANDAG Executive Team directed staff to consolidate the recommendations into overall goals accompanied by a menu of implementation options to help achieve those goals. This document will serve as a guiding resource to assist staff in continuing to make progress on incorporating health across the agency, and can help monitor this progress.

• Complete Streets: The draft Complete Streets policy will include recommendations for an implementation program that will institutionalize Complete Streets practices at SANDAG. In addition, the policy will likely direct SANDAG to provide training to local agency staff and others on Complete Streets, and to provide incentives for local agencies to adopt local Complete Streets policies and practices.

• Regional SRTS Strategic Plan Implementation: Due to early termination of CTG funding, implementation would require establishing an alternative funding source. Toward the end of 2015, SANDAG leadership will review the project recommendations and provide guidance on next steps.

Describe any efforts or systems changes that are already or will be sustained and describe the factors or circumstances that allowed you to sustain these elements.

• Public Health White Paper and policy considerations will be incorporated into the Regional Plan update known as San Diego Forward. Health Indicators for the Biennial Regional Comprehensive Plan Monitoring Report will also be considered.

• Regional Monitoring and Evaluation for Physical Activity and Public Health: Strategic use of CTG Year 2 Carryover funds will help ensure that the current Bike Counter Network becomes fully functional to assist SANDAG with a longer term objective to eventually integrate the data into our transportation monitoring system. The Federal Highway Administration is also very interested and impressed with the San Diego Regional Bike Counter Network. They want to help fill the gap in active transportation data collection by identifying best practices, encouraging data collection with standards for quality control, and by-building a national database of bike and pedestrian counts.

• HIA:
  ➢ Increased staff awareness of the public health and planning connection.
  ➢ Public health has been elevated within the agency as a priority.
  ➢ Incorporation of health throughout the regional plan update, and moving forward with possible incorporation of health indicators into the Regional Comprehensive Plan Monitoring Report.
Identified the need to improve communication around health to develop a consistent message that is coordinated with existing San Diego County efforts and can increase public awareness of the nexus between transportation and health, including improvements to the public health webpage.

- Added public health staff to the intergovernmental review process and checklist.
- Fostered and further developed new inter-departmental relationships around health including with Human Resources and the Criminal Justice research division.

- Complete Streets: Previous efforts to provide design guidance for walkable and smart growth communities provide ready-made tools for supporting Complete Streets implementation across the region.

Describe the impact of implementing this project on your organization, partners and/or community (i.e., how are these different as a result of this work and experience).

- Public health was elevated as a priority within the agency.
- Agency staff became more aware and educated about the connections between agency work and public health outcomes.
- Agency staff became more aware of public health resources available for them to apply to agency work.
- PHSG stakeholders provided valuable perspectives on regional plan efforts and learned about SANDAG planning efforts. This has helped to build partnerships and collaborations across industries, and has helped shrink the gap between planning and public health professionals by fostering working relationships.
- The adopted Complete Streets policy will put systems in place to ensure all the infrastructure work that takes place at SANDAG will accommodate to the maximum extent the needs of people on foot, riding a bike, or taking transit. Within the organization, this will required an increased level of inter-departmental communication and coordination that has already begun to take place in advance of the policy adoption.
National City 8th Street Corridor
Smart Growth Revitalization Project

(TransNet SGIP Grant Agreement No. 5001347)

Request for Amendment
Regional Planning Committee Meeting
November 7, 2014

Project Overview

• Executed Grant Agreement No. 5001347 with SANDAG in January 2010

• Awarded Construction Contract for Phase I in March 2012
  ➢ Phase I – Utility Undergrounding & Sewer Replacement / Upsizing (Complete)

• Awarded Construction Contract for Phase II in June 2013
  ➢ Phase II – Smart Growth Streetscape Enhancements (70% Complete)

• Requesting Amendment to Project Schedule
  ➢ Delays with Utility Companies
  ➢ Issues with Contractor’s Performance – Staffing, Safety, Traffic Control, Pedestrian/ADA Access
  ➢ Extend Project Completion from December 2014 to June 2015
### Project Benefits

- Strengthen the physical and visual link between the 8th Street Trolley Station and Downtown National City to encourage walking, bicycling, and transit use
- Enhance pedestrian safety, access, and mobility
- Reduce vehicle speeds through traffic calming
- Improve parking and access to local businesses
- Enhance the public realm through creation and activation of public open spaces
- Invigorate “Smart Growth” redevelopment and revitalize a critical transit and pedestrian corridor for the benefit of local businesses, residents, visitors, and the region as a whole

### Project Improvements

- Road Diet w/ left-turn pockets
- Wider sidewalks
- Bike lanes
- Corner bulb-outs
- Enhanced parking
- New street lights
- Landscaping
- Storm water treatment
- Utility undergrounding
- Sewer upsizing
- Enhanced signing and striping
- Benches and bike racks
Project Improvements

Questions?
TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program and Active Transportation Grant Program: Call for Projects for Third Cycle of Grant Funding

Regional Planning Committee
November 7, 2014

Smart Growth Concept Map

2014 Technical Update approved on October 24, 2014
Smart Growth Incentive Program

Active Transportation Grant Program
All Projects Awarded

North County
OCEANSIDE
Mission Avenue Improvements

ESCONDIDO
Maple Street Promenade
CITY OF SAN DIEGO
Market and Euclid Land Use and Mobility Plan

CHULA VISTA
Third Avenue Streetscape Implementation Project, Phase 1
**Timeline**

- **December 2014**
  - Recommendation by Regional Planning and Transportation Committees and Board action to release call for projects
- **March 2015**
  - Applications due
- **Spring/Summer 2015**
  - Evaluations, project rankings, and recommendations by Regional Planning and Transportation Committees
- **Summer 2015**
  - SANDAG Board approves projects
- **December 2015**
  - Grant agreements executed and jurisdictions begin work

---

**TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program and Active Transportation Grant Program: Call for Projects for Third Cycle of Grant Funding**

Regional Planning Committee
November 7, 2014
PUBLIC HEALTH AND THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT

Regional Planning Committee
November 7, 2014

Partnership
Transportation-Health Relationships

Transportation systems affect our health in many ways.

Community Transformation Grant

• US Center for Disease Control $500,000 grant
• Completed September 2014

Five focus areas:
• Health Benefits and Impacts Assessment
• Regional Complete Streets Policy and Implementation
• Regional Safe Routes to School Implementation Strategy
• Public Health and Wellness Policies for Regional Plans
• Regional Monitoring for Physical Activity and Public Health
Tools: Healthy Communities Atlas

Maps existing conditions for social and physical factors that affect health outcomes in the region

- Four categories:
  - Active transportation
  - Injury prevention
  - Nutrition
  - Air quality

Households in Walking Distance of Healthy Food
Levels of Youth Physical Activity Support

**Tools: Regional Bicycle/Pedestrian Counter Network**

- 37 locations
- Provide data for:
  - local and regional monitoring
  - grant funding opportunities
Bicycle Counter

![Image of a bicycle counter on a road]

Bicycle and Pedestrian Counters

![Image of bicycle counter on a road]
![Image of a pedestrian counter on a crosswalk]
Public Health Stakeholder Group

Tools: Border Health Equity Transportation Study

- Caltrans Planning Grant
- Study mobility and health-related challenges facing a border community (San Ysidro)
- Model document for other communities
Tools: Forecasting Health Outcomes

Physical Activity
- Travel Survey
- Health Survey

Air Pollution
- Vehicle Emissions Model
- Air Shed Model
- U.S. Census

Traffic Injuries
- Travel Demand Model
- Traffic Collisions

Healthy Communities Assessment Tool
Baltimore, Maryland

The Healthy Communities Assessment Tool (HCAT) rates each city neighborhood on more than 40 social, economic, and physical factors important to community health. Users can examine how their own neighborhood performs on each factor and compare neighborhoods on their overall ranking of core indicators from the Healthy Communities Index (HCI).

- Get info about the Healthy Communities Transformation Initiative (HCTI) and community indicators.
- Learn more about the HCI, HCI indicators, and the ranking system.
- Download data used in the HCAT.

Explore Domains and Indicators:
- Economic Health
- Educational Opportunities
- Environmental Hazards
- Employment Opportunities
- Housing
- Health Systems and Public Safety
- Natural Areas
- Neighborhood Characteristics
- Social Cohesion
- Transportation
Questions?

Dan Gallagher, AICP
Dan.Gallagher@sandag.org

Public Health and the Built Environment
## RHNA Allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Levels</th>
<th>2010-2020 HE Cycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low / Low</td>
<td>1,283*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Moderate</td>
<td>907</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two Attempts

- **2008 - 2011: Comprehensive Update**
  - ~65% of units on El Camino Real
  - Business owners strongly opposed

- **2012 - 2013: Restart**
  - 1,000 folks participated
  - Split Council on approach to mapping

Proposition A

- Requires public vote for increases in density and intensity
- Reduced height limit from 3 to 2-stories and 30'
- Natural or finished grade, whichever is more restrictive
Community Engagement

- Engage folks who cannot attend workshops
- Maximize transparency
- Provide flexibility in site selection
- Simplify materials
- Keep the subject engaging

Community Engagement

- Main Message Points
  - **Our population is changing**: accommodating housing choices will meet the needs of our community
  - **It protects our quality of life**: Properly planning avoids negative consequences of unplanned growth
  - **Tax dollar saved**: Eligible for regional infrastructure grants
  - **It's the Law**: Significant penalties can be assessed
Community Engagement

COMMUNITY DIALOGUE SESSIONS

- Why should we plan for future housing?
- How will future housing respond to community character?
- What will future housing look like?
- How will future housing fit in my community?
- How are future housing locations identified?
- Where should housing go in our community?

Why should we plan for future housing?

The focus of the October outreach
2 DESIGN CONTEXTS
HOW WILL FUTURE HOUSING RESPOND TO EXISTING CHARACTER?

OLD ENCINITAS

COMMUNITY DIALOGUE SESSIONS [DRAFT]
What will future housing look like?
How will future housing fit in my community?

4 NEIGHBORHOOD PROTOTYPES
HOW WILL FUTURE DEVELOPMENT FIT INTO OUR COMMUNITIES?

MAIN STREET / MIXED USE - SMALL SITE

OPTION 1: 2-3 STORY DEVELOPMENT

How are future housing locations identified?

5 FUTURE HOUSING DISTRIBUTION
HOW WILL FUTURE HOUSING LOCATIONS BE IDENTIFIED?

FUTURE HOUSING DISTRIBUTION

FORECASTED APPROACH TO HOUSING LOCATION

- Community dialogue sessions
- Research and analysis
- Economic development incentives

CHOICE APPROACH TO HOUSING LOCATION

- Market analysis
- Economic growth
- Community input

REAL ESTATE SPECIFIC APPROACH

- Site selection
- Zoning
- Infrastructure

RESIDENTIAL OR COMMERCIAL APPROACH

- Mixed use
- Single use
- Residential

MAJOR APPROACH TO HOUSING LOCATION

- City-wide
- District
- Neighbourhood

COMMUNITY DIALOGUE SESSIONS
(DRAFT)
STATION 6
USING ON-LINE ENGAGEMENT

Where should housing go in our community?

Where should housing go in our community?
Where should housing go in our community?

In 2016, there will be a ballot measure to adopt a plan for future housing in Encinitas... What do you want this plan to look like?

Introduction

Overview

The City has begun the work to update its Housing Plan to ensure that we're prepared to meet the future housing needs of our community. Updating our Housing Plan will allow us to address the housing choices for our changing population and bring us into compliance with state law. An updated Housing Plan will provide a number of benefits to the City, protect our quality of life and save our tax dollars.

What do you want this plan to look like? Tell us in two easy steps where you want future housing and what it should look like:

- Step one: Select your community from the map. As you select the map, a callout box will appear indicating your potential community.
- Step two: Select your favorite housing strategy (ready-made and/or build your own). The target number of housing units for each community is reflected in the map.

Optional: You can also select your favorite housing strategy in the other communities (optional step).

Optional: You can also describe the community characteristics you want your new neighborhood to have.

To learn more on topics such as how the housing numbers were determined, how the housing sites were selected, and what this housing could look like, select the site or visit us at www.CityofEncinitas.info.
Where should housing go in our community?

In 2016, there will be a ballot measure to adopt a plan for future housing in Encinitas... What do you want this plan to look like?

Old Encinitas

Where should approximately 295 new homes be located in Old Encinitas and what characteristics should the housing have in those locations?

Show your sites, depending on how much time you have, feel free to participate in any one, two, or all three exercises.

Select Your Favorite Mixed-Use Housing Strategy

If you've got just a few minutes, check out these three strategies:
- Mixed Use Places
- Mixed Use Corridors
- Highly Connected

These were your favorites. All three meet the peak of approximately 295 units - let's do it in their connected way.

Build Your Own Housing Strategy

If you have a bit more time to predict and design your own strategy, take a look at the sites in Old Encinitas where new housing units could go. Pick your preferred sites and then tell us what housing type you should apply there. Since the choice of housing units for Old Encinitas is approximately 295 units, your strategy must accommodate roughly that many.

Describe Your Favorite Characteristics

What are the community's characteristics that you would like to preserve or introduce in Old Encinitas?

If you want to talk about the unique characteristics found in Old Encinitas, describe them here or share ideas that you consider your views as part of this process. Ultimately, the city will use that information to create design standards for future projects that can communicate the unique local identity of housing units

How would you allocate approximately 295 new housing units among some of these 11 sites in Old Encinitas and what housing type should these sites have?

Click on a site, then see the tabs below. Then under the tab, choose your preferred neighborhood design below and watch your progress toward approximately 295 units.

So far, you selected...

0%

To learn more on topics such as how the housing numbers were determined, how the housing sites were selected, and what this housing could look like, select the logo or visit us at www.encinitashomeinfo.
Where should housing go in our community?

Mixed Use 2 & 3 Stories (141 Units)

Mixed Use 3 Stories (177 Units)

Where should housing go in our community?

Viable Housing Site Summary

Site amenities and proximity:
- Near bus and bike routes
- Access to parks and recreation
- Near schools
- Near shopping centers
- Near employment centers

Location: [Map Image]

Street view images:
- [Image 1]
- [Image 2]
Where should housing go in our community?

Click here for more about these options:

Which is your preferred housing type for Old Castelano site 107?

Mixed Use 2 & 3 Stories (141 Units) [X]

Mixed Use 3 Stories (177 Units) [X]

Where should housing go in our community?

Click here for more about these options:

Which is your preferred housing type for Old Castelano site 107?

Mixed Use 2 & 3 Stories (141 Units) [X]

Mixed Use 3 Stories (177 Units)
Where should housing go in our community?

How would you allocate approximately 295 new housing units among some of these 11 sites in Old Encinitas and what housing type should these sites have?

Click on a site, then see the tabs below

Select a housing site on the map or using the tabs below. Then under the tabs, choose your preferred neighborhood design below and watch your progress toward approximately 295 units.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other ideas about land uses and/or sites in Old Encinitas? Describe them here.

More Options

Congratulations!

Your information has been submitted and will be collectively presented before a joint session of the Encinitas Planning Commission/City Council in December/January. Visit www.HomesinEncinitas.info for details.
Where should housing go in our community?

In 2016, there will be a ballot measure to adopt a plan for future housing in Encinitas...What do you want this plan to look like?

Introduction
Overview | Goals | Locations | New Housing | Old Corridors | Other Options

Old Corridors
Where should approximately 50% be located in Old Encinitas and what characteristics should the housing be in those locations?
Share your ideas. Depending on how much time you have, feel free to participate in any one, two or all three sections.

Select Your Favorite Infill Multi Housing Strategy
If you've got a little more time to plan and design your own strategy, take a look at the sites in Old Encinitas where new housing units could be picked up for your neighborhood. Start with what housing type you think is most appropriate. Once all the sites to be reviewed for Old Encinitas are approximately 50% located, you can accommodate the final housing density.

Build Your Own Housing Strategy
If you've got a little more time to plan and design your own strategy, take a look at the sites in Old Encinitas where new housing units could be picked up for your neighborhood. Start with what housing type you think is most appropriate. Once all the sites to be reviewed for Old Encinitas are approximately 50% located, you can accommodate the final housing density.

Describe Your Favorite Characteristic
What are the community characteristics that you would like to preserve or introduce in Old Encinitas?

If you want to build on the unique characteristics found in Old Encinitas, describe them here! Our design reviewers may consider your views as part of their process. Ultimately, the city's review process will be guided by standards to create design guidelines that further protect what the community holds as important. A list of thoughts and ideas will be reviewed to inform the guidelines.

Where should housing go in our community?

Review the three plans, then select your favorite strategy.

Mixed Use Places
This strategy increases housing primarily in medium- and high-density locations, typically in downtown areas, on linear streets, and at the intersections of arterials and collector streets. Location areas that include a mix of housing and commercial uses. In this scenario, housing is clustered around commercial, retail, and recreation areas. Great variation and large proportions of 3-story mixed-use buildings increase the new place to serve nearby public attractions and local businesses.

Major Corridors
This strategy includes housing primarily in medium- to high-density locations, typically in downtown areas, on linear streets, and at the intersections of arterials and collector streets. Location areas that include a mix of housing and commercial uses. In this scenario, housing is clustered around commercial, retail, and recreation areas. Great variation and large proportions of 3-story mixed-use buildings increase the new place to serve nearby public attractions and local businesses.

Highly Concentrated
This strategy includes housing primarily in medium- to high-density locations, typically in downtown areas, on linear streets, and at the intersections of arterials and collector streets. Location areas that include a mix of housing and commercial uses. In this scenario, housing is clustered around commercial, retail, and recreation areas. Great variation and large proportions of 3-story mixed-use buildings increase the new place to serve nearby public attractions and local businesses.
Where should housing go in our community?

Review the three plans, then select your favorite strategy.

MIXED USE PLACES

This strategy takes advantage of the benefits of mixed housing with retail and commercial uses. It includes low to medium-density housing, commercial areas, and public open spaces. Some sites would be suitable for mixed-use development, while others would be better suited for high-density housing. The strategy is designed to create a vibrant urban center that fosters social interaction and economic growth.

MAJOR CORRIDORS

This strategy focuses on creating walkable streets and mixed-use development along major corridors. It includes sidewalks, bike lanes, and green spaces. The goal is to create a pedestrian-friendly environment that encourages social interaction and economic growth.

HIGHLY CONCENTRATED

This strategy focuses on creating high-density housing in areas that are already developed. The goal is to create a compact, walkable neighborhood that fosters social interaction and economic growth.

Examples

- Mixed-use developments
- Walkable streets
- Bike lanes
- Green spaces
- Compact, walkable neighborhoods

Where should housing go in our community?

Review the three plans, then select your favorite strategy.

MIXED USE PLACES

This strategy takes advantage of the benefits of mixed housing with retail and commercial uses. It includes low to medium-density housing, commercial areas, and public open spaces. Some sites would be suitable for mixed-use development, while others would be better suited for high-density housing. The strategy is designed to create a vibrant urban center that fosters social interaction and economic growth.

MAJOR CORRIDORS

This strategy focuses on creating walkable streets and mixed-use development along major corridors. It includes sidewalks, bike lanes, and green spaces. The goal is to create a pedestrian-friendly environment that encourages social interaction and economic growth.

HIGHLY CONCENTRATED

This strategy focuses on creating high-density housing in areas that are already developed. The goal is to create a compact, walkable neighborhood that fosters social interaction and economic growth.

Examples

- Mixed-use developments
- Walkable streets
- Bike lanes
- Green spaces
- Compact, walkable neighborhoods

Where should housing go in our community?
Where should housing go in our community?

Congratulations!

Your information has been submitted and will be collectively presented before a joint session of the Encinitas Planning Commission/City Council in December/January. Visit www.HomeinEncinitas.info for details.

In 2016, there will be a ballot measure to adopt a plan for future housing in Encinitas... What do you want this plan to look like?

Introduction

Overview, Goals, Locations, New Entrances, Old Entrances, Other Areas

Old Entrances

Where should approximately 8,000 houses be located in Old Encinitas and what characteristics should the housing have at those locations? Share your ideas. Depending on how much time you have, feed into participate in any one, two, or all three sessions.

Select Your Favorite Ready Made Housing Strategy

If you've got just a few minutes, check out these three strategies:
- Mixed Use Places
- Many Cultures
- Highly Connected
Then select your favorite. All three meet the goal of approximately 15 min to walk to a new special place.

Build Your Own Housing Strategy

If you have a lot more time or want to plan and design your own strategy, take a look at the sites in Old Encinitas where new housing units could go. Pick your preferred area and then tell us what housing type should be applied here. Know the shares of housing size in our town. Here is an approximately 300 unit housing strategy. What's your favorite?"
CITY OF ENCINITAS
HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE
Your Voice Counts!

In 2016, there will be a ballot measure to adopt a plan for future housing in Encinitas...

what do you want this plan to look like?
Population Growth Continues

Population growth in Encinitas, and the region as a whole, is projected to continue into the foreseeable future. According to SANDAG’s Regional Growth Forecast, economic and population growth in Encinitas will continue at a steady rate into 2050.

We will lose the organic and eclectic character that is Encinitas without having some housing at attainable prices.

Encinitas is facing a challenge when it comes to our local housing and we need your input to create a plan that includes community-supported solutions. Housing costs in Encinitas continue to climb, while the availability and variety of that housing continues to drop. At the same time, we have a growing population, home prices are rising, and our existing residents have changing needs. Simply put, Encinitas is evolving and we need to create more housing options that meet our community’s growing and changing needs.

To make this happen, we need to update our local plan that addresses future housing opportunities. Called the Housing Element, this plan hasn’t been updated since the 1990s, and a lot has changed since then. It is important that we update our plan to meet our current and future needs.

Why do we need a housing element?

1. **OUR POPULATION IS CHANGING**
   Accommodating housing choices will meet the needs of our community.

2. **IT PROTECTS OUR QUALITY OF LIFE**
   Planning for future housing helps avoid negative consequences of unplanned growth and ensures it will provide community benefits.

**eHousing**

We want to plan wisely for our future, with all age and income groups in mind, and we need the community to be a part of the effort. With your input, we will:

- **Identify**
  the type and location of future housing in Encinitas

- **Determine**
  the community characteristics that you value to ensure that they are preserved

- **Create**
  design standards for future projects so that the community can be confident that they will fit in with existing neighborhoods

The plan that you help us create will be put to a public vote in November 2016. Now is the time to learn how housing affects you, and how you can help guide the future of Encinitas.
Housing Options for Many Encinitans

People live, work and play in different ways than previous generations. The Millennial generation — people born in the 1980s and 1990s — has been slower to buy single-family homes than earlier generations. There are varying reasons for this situation, including rising student debt, cost of housing and new challenges in securing a mortgage for first-time homeowners. They also often want different things in housing and neighborhoods than are available today. They are looking for pedestrian- and bike-friendly communities with services and amenities nearby.

As a result, for this younger generation, multifamily housing near retail locations is in greater demand than single family homes.

At the same time, the Baby Boomer generation is aging and this has impacts on the housing market. The senior citizen population in Encinitas is projected to nearly double by 2035. Many senior citizens will seek to downsize and move into smaller homes in urban areas with easily accessible services, transportation, and amenities.

Did you know...

- **TAX DOLLARS ARE SAVED**
  With an approved housing plan, Encinitas will be eligible for regional and state grants that can help fund infrastructure improvements and public amenities.

- **IT'S THE LAW**
  State law requires that we adopt a plan to accommodate the housing needs of everyone in our community.

By 2035, the population in Encinitas is expected to grow by 7%. That's 4,236 more people who need housing.

The mean annual social security income in Encinitas is $17,962.

Over 25% of the City's extremely low income residents are aged 65+ years or older.

The median priced home in Encinitas is $769,000 (24% higher than the North County Coastal median of $619,000).

The average rent for a two-bedroom apartment in Encinitas is $1,869.

Only 59% of existing households in Encinitas make enough money to rent a two-bedroom apartment in the city. Only 28% can afford to buy a home.

The Encinitas Housing Authority Rental Assistance program has over 600 families on the waitlist, of which over 70% are elderly or disabled.

Currently, there are over 9,000 baby-boomers (65+) in the City. By 2035, that number will increase by roughly 78%.
State Penalties May Be Imposed if We Fail
Adequately planning for all housing needs for everyone in our community — seniors, families, and young professionals at various income levels — is a requirement under state law. A city could face significant repercussions if it fails to comply. These consequences include:

- Potential loss of land use control
- Increasing numbers of housing units that the city will be responsible for in the future
- Ineligibility for a variety of park and infrastructure improvement funds
- Makes entire City General Plan vulnerable to challenge

Grant Money is Available for City Projects
Because our housing policies have not been updated, the City is not eligible to compete for a number of grants that could help fund infrastructure improvements. We are losing out on hundreds of thousands of dollars every year in available grant funding that is going to other local cities. This means that we have to rely on our local tax dollars to pay for some projects that could be funded by regional grants, like bike facility improvements, sidewalks, traffic calming features, parks and rail underpasses.

How does this impact me and how can I get involved?
As part of updating our housing policies, we need to determine where future housing should be located and what it should look like once it is built. Each of the five Encinitas communities has its own identity, so a one-size-fits-all approach to housing will not work. Instead, the plan will need to be tailored to fit the unique character of each community.

In November 2014, the City will be hosting a series of community dialogue sessions and utilizing e-Town Hall, an online engagement tool to solicit input from the community. We want to know how you define community character, what characteristics you want to preserve, and what characteristics you want to introduce. We’ll also ask for your input on locations in your community that would be appropriate for future housing. We hope that you will join in the discussions. Event details will be posted at www.athomeinencinitas.info

When is this all going to happen?
The process to update the housing plan will begin in November 2014 with a concerted effort to gather community input on future housing choices. The process will conclude with a vote of the public on the plan in November 2016. Here are some key milestones along the way:

- **2014**
  - November 2014: Community dialogue sessions in each of Encinitas’ five communities and e-Town Hall online engagement is launched.

- **2015**
  - January 2015: City Council and Planning Commission joint study session to provide direction on a preferred land use and community character plan for future housing.
  - February 2015: City Council and Planning Commission joint study session to review the complete draft housing plan and policies, and submission of the draft plan for State review.
  - March 2015: City Council and Planning Commission joint study session and public review of related draft rezonings and Zoning Code amendments.
  - May 2015: Environmental Impact Report (EIR) scoping meeting
  - May-Dec 2015: City staff prepares Draft EIR

- **2016**
  - January-February 2016: Draft EIR public review and comment period
  - February-March 2016: City staff prepares responses to comments on Draft EIR
  - April 2016: Final EIR published
  - May to June 2016: Planning Commission recommendation and City Council decision to refer final housing plan to voters.
  - November 2016: Public vote on new housing plan.

Call
760-943-2101

Email City staff
athomeinencinitas.info

Visit the website
athomeinencinitas.info
Your Voice Counts!
Come share your thoughts on future housing choices for our community. The City of Encinitas is hosting five Community Dialogue Sessions to get your input on potential locations for new housing in the city, as well as design considerations for these future neighborhoods.

All Community Dialogue Sessions will be held as an open house format. Drop in anytime between 10 a.m. and 8 p.m.

CARDIFF
Seaside Center for Spiritual Living
1613 Lake Drive
November 13, 2014

OLD ENCINITAS
Library
540 Cornish Drive
November 15, 2014

LEUCADIA
Beacon’s Bible Church
367 La Veta Avenue
November 17, 2014

OLIVENHAIN
Ranch View Baptist Church
416 Rancho Santa Fe Road
November 18, 2014

NEW ENCINITAS
Diegueño Middle School
2150 Village Park Way
November 22, 2014

Can’t make your Community Dialogue Session or just rather participate from your home or business? Starting November 10, we will launch an activity on our e-Town Hall, where you will be able to share your input online.

Find out more: www.AtHomeInEncinitas.info
¡Su Voz Cuenta!

Venga a compartir sus ideas sobre futuras opciones de vivienda para nuestra comunidad. La ciudad de Encinitas tendrá cinco Sesiones de Dialogo Comunitarios para conseguir su opinión en la localización de las nuevas casas en la ciudad de Encinitas. Además, se verá el diseño que se considerará para estas futuras casas.

Todas las Sesiones de Comunidad de Dialogo se llevara a cabo como un formato de casa abierta de 10 de la mañana a 8 de la noche. Ven y participa a cualquier momento.

CARDIFF
Seaside Center for Spiritual Living
1613 Lake Drive
13 de Noviembre, 2014

OLD ENCINITAS
Library
540 Cornish Drive
15 de Noviembre, 2014

LEUCADIA
Beacon’s Bible Church
367 La Veta Avenue
17 de Noviembre, 2014

OLIVENHAIN
Ranch View Baptist Church
416 Rancho Santa Fe Road
18 de Noviembre, 2014

NEW ENCINITAS
Diegueño Middle School
2150 Village Park Way
22 de Noviembre, 2014

No puede participar en su Sesión de Dialogo Comunitario? ¿Prefiere mejor participar desde su casa o trabajo? A partir de 10 de Noviembre, lanzaremos una actividad en nuestro e-Town Hall, donde podrá dar su opinión en línea.

Para mas información: www.AtHomeInEncinitas.info