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REGIONAL PLANNING TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP

The Regional Planning Technical Working Group may take action on any item appearing on this agenda.
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401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101
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AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

- TransNet SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM AND ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION GRANT PROGRAM: STATUS REPORT AND INFORMATION SHARING
- AIRPORT PLANNING ISSUES
- PUBLIC HEALTH AND THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT

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

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), SANDAG will accommodate persons who require assistance in order to participate in SANDAG meetings. If such assistance is required, please contact SANDAG at (619) 699-1900 at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting.

To request this document or related reports in an alternative format, please call (619) 699-1900, (619) 699-1904 (TTY), or fax (619) 699-1905.
# REGIONAL PLANNING TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP

**Thursday, November 13, 2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM NO.</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>PUBLIC COMMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Members of the public will have the opportunity to address the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG) on any issue within the jurisdiction of SANDAG that is not on this agenda. Public speakers are limited to three minutes or less per person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+3.</td>
<td>APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The TWG is asked to review and approve the minutes from its October 9, 2014, meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>SUMMARY OF ACTIONS FROM LAST REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE (TWG Chair)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In an effort to strengthen information sharing between the TWG and the Regional Planning Committee (RPC), the Chair will report on items discussed at the last RPC meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>MEMBER COMMUNICATIONS (TWG Members)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This item allows for an opportunity for TWG members to provide brief updates on the latest planning projects occurring in their jurisdictions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>2014 SMART GROWTH CONCEPT MAP RESOURCE BINDER (Sarah Strand, SANDAG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The 2014 Technical Update of the Smart Growth Concept Map was accepted by the SANDAG Board of Directors on Friday, October 24, 2014, for planning purposes and for use in SANDAG grant programs. Staff has prepared resource binders for each jurisdiction for ongoing reference. The resource binders will be distributed at the meeting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
 TransNet SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM AND ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION GRANT PROGRAM: STATUS REPORT AND INFORMATION SHARING (Carolina Gregor, SANDAG)

A. Status Report on Call for Projects: The Regional Planning and Transportation Committees will be considering the scoring criteria and program guidelines for the third cycles of the TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program (SGIP) and Active Transportation Grant Program (ATGP) at their November and December meetings. The TWG is asked to discuss a proposal to raise the funding cap on the SGIP from $2 million to $3 or $4 million. Attached as background information is the Regional Planning Committee report.

B. Information Sharing by TWG Members: TWG members are asked to share experiences and progress on their SGIP and ATGP grants. This information-sharing session could be used to help inform the TWG's discussion on the funding-cap issue for the SGIP as well as to make minor refinements or clarifications to the application process for both grant programs as staff prepares to finalize the Call for Projects.

PUBLIC HEALTH AND THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT (Dan Gallagher, SANDAG)

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 the work funded by the grant program.

AIRPORT PLANNING ISSUES (Keith Wilschetz/ Brett Caldwell, San Diego County Regional Airport Authority)

At the September TWG meeting, the TWG expressed interest in receiving information about current airport planning issues in the San Diego region. San Diego County Regional Airport Authority staff will make a presentation on this item.

FUTURE MEETING TOPICS (TWG Members)

TWG members are encouraged to suggest possible topics for future meetings.

ADJOURNMENT AND CANCELLATION OF NEXT MEETING

The next TWG meeting, which would have been held on December 11, 2014, is cancelled. TWG members should remove this meeting from their calendars. The next meeting will be held on January 8, 2015, from 1:15 to 3:15 p.m.
The meeting of the TWG was called to order by Chair Brad Raulston (National City), at 1:15 p.m.

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Self-introductions were made.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS

Coleen Clementson (SANDAG) briefly discussed the Strategic Growth Council Guidelines for the Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities (AHSC) Program and stated that a webcast about the draft program guidelines will take place on October 27, 2014, at the Caltrans offices.

Robyn Wapner (SANDAG) mentioned that SANDAG will be submitting comments on the AHSC draft Program Guidelines. One hundred-thirty million dollars ($130 million) in competitive funds is available. Comments on the draft guidelines are due October 31, 2014. SANDAG would like to hear from local jurisdictions as regional comments are prepared.

Dahvia Lynch (North County Transit District) asked if the SANDAG Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Strategy could be supported by the AHSC Program. Susan Baldwin (SANDAG) responded that the AHSC could serve as a new funding source to help fund TOD projects, in addition to funds from the SANDAG TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program (SGIP) and Active Transportation Grant Program (ATGP).

3. JUNE 12 AND SEPTEMBER 11, 2014, MEETING MINUTES (APPROVE)

Action: Upon a motion by Vice Chair Jeff Murphy (Encinitas) and a second by Jim Nakagawa (Imperial Beach), the TWG unanimously approved the June 12, 2014, meeting minutes. Yes: Marilyn Poneggi (Chula Vista), Tony Shute (El Cajon), Vice Chair Murphy, Jay Petrek (Escondido), Bill Chopyk (La Mesa), Dave Devries (Lemon Grove), Chair Raulston, Russ Cunningham (Oceanside), Noah Alvey (County of San Diego), Karen Brindley (San Marcos), John Conley (Vista). No: None; Abstain: None.
**Action:** Upon a motion by Vice Chair Murphy and a second by Mr. Nakagawa, the TWG unanimously approved the September 11, 2014, meeting minutes. Yes: Ms. Ponseggi, Mr. Shute, Vice Chair Murphy, Mr. Petrek, Mr. Chopyk, Mr. Devries, Chair Raulston, Mr. Cunningham, Mr. Alvey, Ms. Brindley, Mr. Conley. No: None; Abstain: None.

**CONSENT**

4. **ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM REGIONAL COMPETITION (INFORMATION)**

The attached report included information on the statewide Active Transportation Program. In addition, Carolina Gregor (SANDAG) reported that the Call for Projects for the TransNet SGIP and ATGP has been delayed. No specific schedule has been set and a specific date for the Calls for Projects will be discussed in the near future.

**CHAIR’S REPORT**

5. **SUMMARY OF ACTION FROM LAST REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE (INFORMATION)**

Chair Raulston reported that the Regional Planning Committee (RPC) recommended the 2014 Technical Update of the Smart Growth Concept Map to the Board of Directors. The Board is expected to take action at its October meeting.

6. **MEMBER COMMUNICATIONS (INFORMATION)**

TWG members provided updates on current and future projects taking place in their respective jurisdictions.

7. **DRAFT REGIONAL COMPLETE STREETS POLICY (RECOMMEND)**

Stephan Vance (SANDAG) provided an update on the draft Regional Complete Streets Policy. The goal of the Complete Streets Policy is to ensure safe, useful, and attractive transportation for everyone in the San Diego region regardless of ability, age, and mode of travel. The draft policy reflects direction provided by the Board of Directors and feedback from regional stakeholders. Mr. Vance asked TWG members to recommend the draft Regional Complete Streets Policy to the RPC.

Mr. Chopyk inquired about the performance measures utilized for Complete Streets, and whether multi-modal Level of Service (LOS) performance measures should be incorporated into the draft Policy.

Mr. Conley mentioned that many Complete Streets result in failing or less than desirable levels of service.

Mr. Vance responded that multi-modal LOS has been around for some time, but it remains a difficult tool to use.

Ms. Lynch expressed appreciation for the clause about coordinating with transit operators. She stated that narrower roads can present challenges for buses, but that collaboration is important.
because sometimes a few key collaborative actions between the jurisdiction and the transit service provider can help maintain mobility.

Kathleen Ferrier (Circulate San Diego and Chair of the SANDAG Active Transportation Working Group [ATWG]) reported that the ATWG requested that bike and pedestrian counts be incorporated into the policy, and that SANDAG add the update of the Regional Traffic Impact Study Guidelines as an action in the policy.

Andy Hamilton (Air Pollution Control District) commented that the San Diego section of the American Planning Association has developed guidance on complete streets, and that people adapt to the network that is provided, so the question really needs to focus more on what people want the community to look like and feel like.

Chair Raulston discussed the expansion of pedestrian sidewalks and the various classes of bikeways, and proposed the use of a matrix that can aid in understanding the trade-offs associated with widening biking and pedestrian infrastructure within the different contexts of urban development. Infrastructure for the automobile has tended to dominate because historically, they’ve had the best data counts.

Action: Upon a motion by Mr. Conley and a second by Mr. Chopyk, the TWG unanimously recommended approval of the draft Regional Complete Streets Policy to the RPC. Yes: Ms. Ponseggi, Mr. Shute, Vice Chair Murphy, Mr. Petrek, Mr. Chopyk, Mr. Devries, Chair Raulston, Mr. Cunningham, Mr. Schoenfisch, Mr. Alvey, Ms. Brindley, Mr. Conley. No: None; Abstain: None.

8. PUBLIC HEALTH AND THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT (INFORMATION)

Due to time constraints, the update on the Community Transformation Grant Program funded by the United States Centers for Disease Control and Prevention was postponed to a future TWG meeting.

9. ENCINITAS HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE (INFORMATION)

Vice Chair Murphy presented an update on the City of Encinitas’s process to update the housing element of its general plan. The last time the housing element was updated was in the 1990s. Vice Chair Murphy’s presentation focused on the public engagement process, including advisory group workshops, public meetings, methodology, urban design, mapping, financing, scoring criteria, and legal constraints. The completion of the housing element update is a priority for the City of Encinitas.

10. TRI-JURISDICTIONAL SMART GROWTH OPPORTUNITY AREA (INFORMATION)

Mr. Shute provided a brief overview of the new special use center tri-jurisdictional Smart Growth Opportunity Area at Gillespie Field, which serves as the first multi-jurisdictional Smart Growth Opportunity Area on the Smart Growth Concept Map. Mr. Shute described issues such as multi-modal connectivity, TOD, industry clusters, employment hubs, and transit priorities for the Gillespie Field Airport and surrounding area.
Ms. Gregor mentioned that during the RPC meeting on October 3, 2014, Sarah Strand highlighted the multi-jurisdictional planning efforts in this area as an example of collaborative planning, and the Committee expressed support.

11. REMINDER: UPCOMING WORKSHOP ON REGIONAL TOD STRATEGY (INFORMATION)

Ms. Baldwin made an announcement reminding TWG members about the SANDAG Regional TOD Strategy Workshop taking place at SANDAG on October 20, 2014.

12. ADJOURNMENT AND NEXT MEETING (INFORMATION)

Chair Raulston adjourned the TWG meeting at 3:15 p.m.

The next TWG meeting is scheduled for November 13, 2014, from 1:15 to 3:15 p.m.
**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\(^2\) 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>SGIP</th>
<th>ATGP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goals</strong></td>
<td>Encourage the planning and development of Complete Streets, and provide multiple travel choices for the region’s residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fund bicycle and pedestrian-oriented transportation facility improvements, planning efforts, encouragement and education programs, and bicycle parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support the goals and objectives of Riding to 2050: The San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 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</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fund projects that can serve as models and attract private development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Create great places in the San Diego region</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^2\) 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

SGIP

- Capital (80 percent; $2 million cap)
- Planning (20 percent plus any rollover from Capital; $400,000 cap)

ATGP

- 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)
  - Planning (15 percent)
  - Education/Encouragement/Awareness (5 percent)
  - 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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATGP</td>
<td>Release of Call for Projects</td>
<td>Projects Awarded</td>
<td>Fiscal Years</td>
<td>Available Funding</td>
<td>Number of Projects Funded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Cycle</td>
<td>April 2009</td>
<td>June 2009</td>
<td>FY 2010(^3)</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(^4)</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.

\(^3\) No TransNet funds from FY 2009 were used in the first ATGP cycle. The first cycle was supplemented by TDA funds.

\(^4\) 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

**Attachments:**  
   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.
TransNet SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM (SGIP)  
CAPITAL GRANTS 

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.
SGIP SCORING CRITERIA GUIDANCE (Capital 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 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. EXISTINGS 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 Access
- Universal Design (6.2 in Chapter 6 Transit Stations)

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

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

For more information and resources on universal design principles, please visit:

- http://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.
## SGIP SCORING CRITERIA MATRIX (Capital Grants)

<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>A. 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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>Up to 6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2%</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>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>Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 100 percent or more</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>Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 25-49 percent</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>Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 50-99 percent</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>OR</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>Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 50-99 percent</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>B. 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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>Up to 6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2%</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>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>Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 100 percent or more</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>Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 25-49 percent</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>Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 50-99 percent</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>B2. EXISTING Development Density within 1/4 mile radius of proposed capital project site- IN THE PIPELINE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>Up to 6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2%</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>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>Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 100 percent or more</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>Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 25-49 percent</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>Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 50-99 percent</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>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</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>project site - IN THE PIPELINE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 50-99 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 (Single-family residential, retail, office, civic, parks, visitor within 1/4 mile of project site)</td>
<td></td>
<td></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 New use will be added to the project area</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></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></td>
<td>C1. New Affordable Housing Percent of income-restricted affordable housing provided in proposed new development (within 1/4 mile of project site)</td>
<td></td>
<td></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></td>
<td>C2. Low to very-low income affordable units 50-100 percent of units in the development are restricted to low to very-low income residents</td>
<td></td>
<td></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></td>
<td>D1. Relation to Transit Scale of actual walking distance to existing or programmed station or transit hub: Regional or Corridor station or a Transit Center- Project abuts or is onsite Project is within 1/2 mile Transit hub- Project is within 1/4 mile Stop with high frequency local bus service (15 minutes All day)- Project is within 1/4 mile</td>
<td>Up to 12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D2. Bicycle Facilities EXISTING bicycle lanes, bike boulevards, cycle tracks, or separated bike paths (Class I), or PLANNED bicycle lanes, bike boulevards, cycle tracks, or separated bike paths (Class I) (as identified in San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan or local bicycle master plan)</td>
<td>Up to 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1%</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></td>
<td>D3. Walkability Intersection Density per square mile: 290 or greater 225-289 100-224 Less than 100</td>
<td>Up to 4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D4. TDM Strategies EXISTING TDM programs or policies in place PROPOSED TDM programs or policies, including implementation strategy</td>
<td>Up to 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1%</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>
| E1. | Urban Design Characteristics and Community Context | 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  
- Right-of-way Acquisition  
- Final Design  
- 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.
## SGIP SCORING CRITERIA MATRIX (Planning Grants)

<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

**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**
• Through bike lanes
• Cycle track intersection approach
• 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
## ATGP SCORING CRITERIA MATRIX (Capital Grants)

<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>PROJECT READINESS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>PROJECT CONNECTIONS AND SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>Connection to Transit</td>
<td>Bike improvements proximity: Project is within 1.5 miles of a 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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.</td>
<td>Safety Improvements and Overcoming Barriers</td>
<td>Completions 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? How well will the proposed pedestrian improvements address the identified need in the project area? How well will the proposed bicycle improvements address the identified need in the project area?</td>
<td>Up to 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>B. Relationship to Program Objectives</strong></td>
<td>How well does the project meet the program objectives?</td>
<td>Up to 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>C. Innovation</strong></td>
<td>Is this project an FHWA or state experimentation effort? 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 8</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></td>
<td><strong>B. Supportive Policies and Plans</strong></td>
<td>Demonstrated policy language in approved plan, or a completed community active transportation strategy/plan</td>
<td>Up to 3</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></td>
<td><strong>B. Regional Housing Needs Assessment Incentive</strong></td>
<td>Score is based on the formula provided in Board Policy No. 033</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>C. Matching Funds</strong></td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Up to 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>D. Cost/Benefit</strong></td>
<td>Subtotal Score(not counting RHNA points, not counting match points)/Grant Application Amount</td>
<td>Up to 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>200</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TransNet ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION GRANT PROGRAM (ATGP)**

**NON-CAPITAL GRANTS**

**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, 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
- Population Density
- Intersection Density
- Vehicle Ownership
- Employment
- Employment Density
- Activity Centers
# ATGP EDUCATION/AWARENESS/ENCOURAGEMENT AND PARKING
## SCORING CRITERIA MATRIX (Non-Capital Grants)

<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>1.</td>
<td>ALL GRANTS</td>
<td></td>
<td>PLANNING</td>
<td>E/A/E</td>
<td>PARKING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>Relationship to Program Objectives</td>
<td>How well does the proposed project address program objectives?</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>Comprehensiveness</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>Community Support</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.</td>
<td>Matching Funds</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.</td>
<td>Cost/Benefit</td>
<td>Subtotal Score (not counting RHNA points, not counting match points)/Grant Application Amount</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.</td>
<td>Regional Housing Needs Assessment Incentive/Policy No. 033 Points</td>
<td>Points will be allocated according to methodology described in Policy No. 033</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>CATEGORY</td>
<td>CRITERIA</td>
<td>POINTS POSSIBLE</td>
<td>POINTS POSSIBLE</td>
<td>POINTS POSSIBLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<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>A. Evaluation</td>
<td>How will the project evaluate its effectiveness?</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Innovation</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>10</td>
<td>30</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>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>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL POINTS</td>
<td></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

---

1In 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 United States 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.

Discussion

In March 2010, 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 SRTS 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 the SANDAG policies, projects, programs, and plans as part of the FY 2015 Overall Work Program and SANDAG Budget. This also will allow the PHSG to continue through the San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan update.

Attachments: 1. Healthy Works Fact Sheet 2. CTG Final Report

Key Staff Contact: Dan Gallagher, (619) 595-5354, dan.gallagher@sandag.org
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.
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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 developed a comprehensive policy discussion paper that was used to inform policy makers, 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 them 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 require an increased level of inter-departmental communication and coordination that has already begun to take place in advance of the policy adoption.