BOARD OF DIRECTORS

AGENDA

Friday, April 25, 2014
9 a.m. to 12 noon
SANDAG Board Room
401 B Street, 7th Floor
San Diego

AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

• FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION SECTION 5311 PROGRAM OF PROJECTS

• ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM

• BOARD RESOLUTION TO ACCEPT CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION FUNDS FOR REGIONAL ALTERNATIVE FUEL READINESS PLANNING

PLEASE SILENCE ALL ELECTRONIC DEVICES DURING THE MEETING

YOU CAN LISTEN TO THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING BY VISITING OUR WEBSITE AT SANDAG.ORG

MESSAGE FROM THE CLERK

In compliance with Government Code §54952.3, the Clerk hereby announces that the compensation for legislative body members attending the following simultaneous or serial meetings is: Executive Committee (EC) $100, Board of Directors (BOD) $150, and Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) $100. Compensation rates for the EC and BOD are set pursuant to the SANDAG Bylaws and the compensation rate for the RTC is set pursuant to state law.

MISSION STATEMENT

The 18 cities and county government are SANDAG serving as the forum for regional decision-making. SANDAG builds consensus, makes strategic plans, obtains and allocates resources, plans, engineers, and builds public transit, and provides information on a broad range of topics pertinent to the region’s quality of life.
Welcome to SANDAG. Members of the public may speak to the Board of Directors on any item at the time the Board is considering the item. Please complete a Speaker's Slip, which is located in the rear of the room, and then present the slip to the Clerk of the Board seated at the front table. Members of the public may address the Board on any issue under the agenda item entitled Public Comments/Communications/Member Comments. Public speakers are limited to three minutes or less per person. The Board of Directors may take action on any item appearing on the agenda.

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

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

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

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

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

Los materiales de la agenda de SANDAG están disponibles en otros idiomas. Para hacer una solicitud, llame al (619) 699-1900 al menos 72 horas antes de la reunión.

如有需要，我们可以把SANDAG议程材料翻译成其他语言。

请在会议前至少 72 小时打电话 (619) 699-1900 提出请求。

SANDAG offices are accessible by public transit. Phone 511 or see 511sd.com for route information. Bicycle parking is available in the parking garage of the SANDAG offices.
ITEM # | RECOMMENDATION
--- | ---
+1. | APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES
+1A. | March 14, 2014, Board Policy Meeting Minutes
+1B. | March 28, 2014, Board Business Meeting Minutes

2. | PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS
Public comments under this agenda item will be limited to five public speakers. Members of the public shall have the opportunity to address the Board on any issue within the jurisdiction of SANDAG that is not on this agenda. Other public comments will be heard during the items under the heading “Reports.” Anyone desiring to speak shall reserve time by completing a “Request to Speak” form and giving it to the Clerk of the Board prior to speaking. Public speakers should notify the Clerk of the Board if they have a handout for distribution to Board members. Public speakers are limited to three minutes or less per person. Board members also may provide information and announcements under this agenda item.

+3. | ACTIONS FROM POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEES (Victoria Stackwick)
This item summarizes the actions taken by the Policy Advisory Committees since the last Board Business Meeting. The Board of Directors is asked to ratify these actions.

CONSENT (4 through 7)

+4. | FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION SECTION 5311 PROGRAM OF PROJECTS (Sookyung Kim)
The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) provides funding for capital and operating assistance to agencies providing transportation services in the rural areas through the Section 5311 Non-Urbanized Area Formula Program. The Transportation Committee recommends that the Board of Directors approve the apportionment of FTA Section 5311 funds for Federal Fiscal Year 2014 for the San Diego region.

+5. | BOARD RESOLUTION TO ACCEPT CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION FUNDS FOR REGIONAL ALTERNATIVE FUEL READINESS PLANNING (Anna Lowe)
SANDAG received a notice of proposed award of $300,000 from the California Energy Commission (CEC) to conduct readiness planning for alternative transportation fuels in the San Diego region. The Board of Directors is asked to adopt Resolution No. 2014-16, approving the acceptance of Grant Award ARV-13-013 from the CEC and authorizing the Executive Director, on behalf of SANDAG, to enter into an Agreement with the CEC in order to prepare a regional alternative fuels readiness plan supported by the creation of a multi-stakeholder coordinating council named Refuel: San Diego Regional Alternative Fuel Coordinating Council.
+6. REPORT SUMMARIZING DELEGATED ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR (André Douzdjian)*

In accordance with various SANDAG Board Policies, this report summarizes certain delegated actions taken by the Executive Director since the last Board of Directors meeting.

+7. REPORT ON MEETINGS AND EVENTS ATTENDED ON BEHALF OF SANDAG (Victoria Stackwick)

Board members will provide brief reports orally or in writing on external meetings and events attended on behalf of SANDAG since the last Board of Directors meeting.

REPORTS (8 through 9)

+8. ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM (San Diego Council President Todd Gloria, Transportation Committee Chair; Coleen Clementson)*

The Active Transportation Program (ATP) was created by Senate Bill 99 (Chapter 359, Statutes of 2013) and Assembly Bill 101 (Chapter 354, Statutes of 2013) to encourage increased use of active modes of transportation such as biking and walking. The Transportation Committee recommends that the Board of Directors: (1) approve the list of SANDAG projects to submit for ATP statewide competitive funding and adopt Resolution No. 2014-18, approving the SANDAG application for the ATP funds; and (2) approve the submission of the TransNet/Transportation Development Act Active Transportation Project Selection Criteria, with the proposed changes, to the California Transportation Commission for use in the regional ATP competition.

+9. CLOSED SESSION: CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL - EXISTING LITIGATION - PURSUANT TO GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 54956.9(a) - CLEVELAND NATIONAL FOREST FOUNDATION ET AL. V. SANDAG (CASE NO. 37-2011-00101593-CU-TT-CTL), AND CREED-21 ET AL. V. SANDAG (CASE NO. 37-2011-00101660-CU-TT-CTL) (Julie Wiley)*

The Board of Directors will be briefed on the status of the referenced litigation, which concerns California Environmental Quality Act challenges to the Environmental Impact Report for the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan and its Sustainable Communities Strategy.

10. CONTINUED PUBLIC COMMENTS

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

11. UPCOMING MEETINGS

The next Board Policy meeting is scheduled for Friday, May 9, 2014, at 10 a.m. The next Board Business meeting is scheduled for Friday, May 23, 2014, at 9 a.m.

12. ADJOURNMENT

+ next to an agenda item indicates an attachment

* next to an agenda item indicates a San Diego County Regional Transportation Commission item
BOARD OF DIRECTORS DISCUSSION AND ACTIONS
MARCH 14, 2014

First Vice Chair Jim Janney (Imperial Beach) called the meeting of the SANDAG Board of Directors to order at 10 a.m. The attendance sheet for the meeting is attached.

1. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

Jack Shu, Cleveland National Forest Foundation, spoke regarding changes to San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan performance measures.

REPORTS (2)

2. DRAFT FY 2015 PROGRAM BUDGET (DISCUSSION)

SANDAG Bylaws require the Board of Directors to approve a preliminary budget by April 1 of each year. The Board of Directors was asked to discuss the Draft FY 2015 Program Budget.

Second Vice Chair Don Higginson (Poway) introduced the item.

André Douzdjian, Director of Finance, presented an overview of the Draft FY 2015 Program Budget.

Kurt Kroninger, Director of Technical Services, presented highlights of the Technical Services Department budget.

Charles “Muggs” Stoll, Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning, presented highlights of the Planning Department budget and the Transportation Demand Management Department budget.

Jim Linthicum, Director of Mobility Management and Project Implementation, presented highlights of the Capital Program, including the Intelligent Transportation Systems budget.

Jose Nuncio, TransNet Program Director, presented highlights of the TransNet Program budget.

Samuel Johnson, Director of Operations, presented highlights of the Operations Department budget.

Laura Coté, Director of Administration, presented highlights of the Administrative Services Department budget.
Jack Shu, Cleveland National Forest Foundation, spoke in opposition to the proposed Draft FY 2015 Program Budget.

**Action:** This item was presented for discussion.

3. **CONTINUED PUBLIC COMMENTS**

There were no continued public comments.

4. **UPCOMING MEETINGS**

The next Board Business meeting is scheduled for Friday, March 28, 2014, at 9 a.m.

5. **ADJOURNMENT**

First Vice Chair Janney adjourned the meeting at 11:19 a.m.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JURISDICTION/ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ATTENDING OPEN SESSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Carlsbad</td>
<td>Matt Hall (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Chula Vista</td>
<td>Pamela Bensoussan (1st Alt.)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Coronado</td>
<td>Michael Woiwode (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Del Mar</td>
<td>Terry Sinnott (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of El Cajon</td>
<td>Bill Wells (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Encinitas</td>
<td>Lisa Shaffer (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Escondido</td>
<td>Sam Abed (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Imperial Beach</td>
<td>Jim Janney, 1st Vice Chair (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of La Mesa</td>
<td>Kristine Alessio (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Lemon Grove</td>
<td>Mary Sessom (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of National City</td>
<td>Ron Morrison (Primary)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Oceanside</td>
<td>Jack Feller (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Poway</td>
<td>Don Higginson, 2nd Vice Chair (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego – A</td>
<td>Marti Emerald (1st Alt.)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego - B</td>
<td>Todd Gloria (Primary, Seat B)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Marcos</td>
<td>Chris Orlando (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santee</td>
<td>Jack Dale, Chair (Primary)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Solana Beach</td>
<td>Lesa Heebner (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Vista</td>
<td>Judy Ritter (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego - A</td>
<td>Ron Roberts (Primary, Seat A)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego - B</td>
<td>Bill Horn (Alternate)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Laurie Berman (1st. Alt.)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>Harry Mathis (Primary)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTD</td>
<td>Ed Gallo (1st Alt.)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial County</td>
<td>Sup. John Renison (Primary)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Dept. of Defense</td>
<td>CAPT Darius Banaji (Primary)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD Unified Port District</td>
<td>Bob Nelson (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD County Water Authority</td>
<td>Tom Wornham (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Remedios Gómez-Arnau (Primary)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern California Tribal Chairmen's Association</td>
<td>Allen Lawson (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chairman Jack Dale (Santee) called the meeting of the SANDAG Board of Directors to order at 9:00 a.m. The attendance sheet for the meeting is attached.

1. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

Action: Upon a motion by Deputy Mayor Lesa Heebner (Solana Beach) and a second by Councilmember Chris Orlando (San Marcos), the Board of Directors approved the minutes from the February 28, 2014, Board Business Meeting. Yes – 17 (weighted vote, 91%). No – 0 (weighted vote, 0%). Abstain – Chula Vista and Lemon Grove (weighted vote, 8%). Absent – None.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

Councilmember Sherri Lightner, Council District 1, City of San Diego, spoke in opposition to the proposed alignment of the Interstate 5 (I-5) crossing at La Jolla Village Square for the Mid-Coast Trolley Extension and its negative impact to the Cape La Jolla Gardens condominiums.

Julie Hamilton, Cape La Jolla Gardens Homeowners Association, spoke in opposition to the proposed alignment of the I-5 crossing at La Jolla Village Square for the Mid Coast Trolley Extension.

Michael Krupp, Cape La Jolla Gardens Homeowners Association, spoke in opposition to the proposed alignment of the I-5 crossing at La Jolla Village Square for the Mid Coast Trolley Extension.

Elizabeth Eller, Cape La Jolla Gardens Homeowners Association, spoke in opposition to the proposed alignment of the I-5 crossing at La Jolla Village Square for the Mid Coast Trolley Extension.

Will Cooper, Cape La Jolla Gardens Homeowners Association, spoke in opposition to the proposed alignment of the I-5 crossing at La Jolla Village Square for the Mid Coast Trolley Extension.

Mayor Ron Morrison (National City) commented that the City of Seattle is regulating the new entrants in the ride sharing industry, such as Uber and Side Car, by limiting the number of this type of vehicle that is allowed to operate within the city.
3. ACTIONS FROM POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEES (APPROVE)

This item summarized the actions taken by Policy Advisory Committees since the last Board Business Meeting. The Board of Directors was asked to ratify the actions of the Policy Advisory Committees.

Action: Upon a motion by Council President Todd Gloria (City of San Diego) and a second by Councilmember Mike Woiwode (Coronado), the Board of Directors approved Item No. 3. Yes – 19 (weighted vote, 100%). No – 0 (weighted vote, 0%). Abstain – 0 (weighted vote, 0%). Absent – None.

CONSENT (4 through 8)

4. FY 2015 REGIONAL TRANSIT CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (APPROVE)

The Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) and the North County Transit District (NCTD) have developed their Capital Improvement Programs (CIPs) for FY 2015, which are the basis for the various Federal Transit Administration (FTA) formula funding grants and the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) amendment for the related projects. The Transportation Committee recommended that the Board of Directors: (1) approve the FY 2015 CIP for the San Diego region (MTS and NCTD); (2) approve the submittal of FTA Sections 5307, 5337, and 5339 grant applications for the San Diego region (SANDAG, MTS, and NCTD); and (3) adopt Resolution No. 2014-13, approving Amendment No. 14 to the 2012 RTIP.

5. FY 2013 REQUESTS FOR EXCEPTION TO TransNet EXTENSION ORDNANCE REQUIREMENTS (APPROVE)

The NCTD, MTS, and City of Vista did not meet certain eligibility requirements as noted in their draft FY 2013 TransNet annual compliance audits. These agencies are requesting approval of certain exceptions, as permitted by the TransNet Extension Ordinance. The Transportation Committee recommended that the Board of Directors, acting as the San Diego County Regional Transportation Commission, approve the requests of MTS, NCTD, and the City of Vista to grant those exceptions to the TransNet Extension Ordinance, as permitted under the Ordinance.

6. REPORT SUMMARIZING DELEGATED ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR (INFORMATION)

In accordance with various SANDAG Board Policies, this report summarized certain delegated actions taken by the Executive Director since the last Board of Directors meeting.

7. REPORT ON MEETINGS AND EVENTS ATTENDED ON BEHALF OF SANDAG (INFORMATION)

Board members provided brief reports orally or in writing on external meetings and events attended on behalf of SANDAG since the last Board of Directors meeting.

8. ANNUAL UPDATE ON THE ACTIVITIES OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE RESEARCH AND CLEARINGHOUSE (INFORMATION)

As part of the SANDAG Criminal Justice Clearinghouse, regional crime and arrest statistics as well as statistics related to drug use among the offender population are tracked on a regular basis.
SANDAG has maintained these statistics since the late 1980s and remains the only regional source for up-to-date, historical information. An overview and update of the activities and accomplishments of the Criminal Justice Research Unit and the Clearinghouse was provided.

**Action:** Upon a motion by Council President Gloria and a second by Supervisor Ron Roberts (County of San Diego), the Board of Directors approved Consent Items No. 4 through 8. Yes – 19. No – 0. Abstain – 0. Absent – None.

**CHAIRS REPORT (9)**

9. **2014 iCOMMUTE DIAMOND AWARD WINNERS (INFORMATION)**

The SANDAG Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Program, iCommute, manages the region’s approximately 748 vanpools, coordinates with employers to offer transportation benefits programs, and implements a variety of other ridesharing efforts. SANDAG recognizes local employers and organizations for their exemplary TDM efforts.

Chairman Dale introduced the item.

Joshua Eliano, Marketing Analyst, recognized selected local employers and organizations as Diamond Award recipients.

**REPORTS (10 through 16)**

10. **REQUEST BY THE CITY OF DEL MAR TO EXECUTE A MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT FOR USE OF SANDAG COMMERCIAL PAPER PROGRAM (APPROVE)**

The Transportation Committee recommended that the Board of Directors: (1) authorize the Executive Director to execute a Memorandum of Agreement with the City of Del Mar to issue $1.2 million in commercial paper through the TransNet Debt Financing Program; and (2) approve an exception to Rule No. 16 of SANDAG Board Policy No. 031 to increase the repayment period on such transactions from five to ten years.

Council President Gloria, Transportation Committee Chair, introduced the item.

Lisa Kondrat-Dauphin, Senior Accountant, presented the item.

**Action:** Upon a motion by Councilmember Lisa Shaffer (Encinitas) and a second by Councilmember Terry Sinnott (Del Mar), the Board of Directors authorized the Executive Director to execute a Memorandum of Agreement with the City of Del Mar to issue $1.2 million in commercial paper through the TransNet Debt Financing Program, and approved an exception to Rule No. 16 of SANDAG Board Policy No. 031 to increase the repayment period on such transactions from five to ten years. Yes – 18 (weighted vote, 100%). No – 0 (weighted vote, 0%). Abstain – 0 (weighted vote, 0%). Absent – National City.
12. RESOLUTION OF NECESSITY: ACQUISITION OF PROPERTY INTERESTS FOR THE INLAND RAIL TRAIL PROJECT (ADOPT)

The Board of Directors was asked to: (1) receive public testimony; (2) adopt Resolution No. 2014-14 by a two-thirds vote pertaining to acquisition of interests in the portions of properties referenced in the report; and (3) authorize staff to proceed with all condemnation filings and proceedings necessary to acquire the partial interests in the subject parcels for the Inland Rail Trail Project.

Chairman Dale introduced the item.

John Kirk, General Counsel; Jim Linthicum, Director of Mobility Management and Project Implementation; and Emilio Rodriguez, Senior Engineer, presented the item.

Brad Kuhn, Nossaman, presented the findings required for the resolution of necessity and stated that the findings are valid.

Chairman Dale opened the public hearing at 10:01 a.m.

William Smith, a member of the public, spoke in opposition to the taking of his property.

Art Silva, a member of the public, spoke in opposition to the taking of his father’s property.

Chairman Dale closed the public hearing at 10:12 a.m.

Gurley Sellers, a member of the public, spoke in opposition to the taking of his client’s property.

Action: Upon a motion by Council President Gloria and a second by Councilmember Woiwode, the Board of Directors adopted Resolution No. 2014-14 by a two-thirds vote pertaining to acquisition of interests in the portions of properties referenced in the report, and authorized staff to proceed with all condemnation filings and proceedings necessary to acquire the partial interests in the subject parcels for the Inland Rail Trail Project. Yes – 19 (weighted vote, 100%). No – 0 (weighted vote, 0%). Abstain – 0 (weighted vote, 0%). Absent – None.

13. SAN DIEGO FORWARD: THE REGIONAL PLAN: DRAFT PERFORMANCE MEASURES (APPROVE)

Performance measures are used to compare different multimodal transportation network scenarios and help the Board of Directors select a preferred network for the Regional Plan. The Transportation and Regional Planning Committees recommended that the Board of Directors approve the draft performance measures for use in the development of San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan.

Deputy Mayor Heebner, Regional Planning Committee Chair; and Council President Gloria, Transportation Committee Chair, introduced the item.

Rachel Kennedy, Senior Regional Planner, presented the item.

Maya Coutts and Aideen Cox, members of the public, spoke in support of this item.

Monique Lopez, Environmental Health Coalition, spoke in support of this item.
Trent Burgess and Tameron Richards, members of the public, spoke in support of this item.

Randy Van Vleck, City Heights Community Development District, spoke in support of this item.

**Action:** Upon a substitute motion by Mayor Sam Abed (Escondido) and a second by Mayor Matt Hall (Carlsbad), the Board of Directors voted whether to direct staff to review the draft performance measures in order to address the concerns expressed by the Board members regarding measures 7E, 7F, 9A, and 9B, and the impact of the draft performance measures on projects’ funding and priorities. Yes – 9 (weighted vote, 66.67%). No – 9 (weighted vote, 50%). Abstain – 0 (weighted vote, 0%). Absent – San Diego. This motion failed by tally vote.

**Action:** Upon a motion by Deputy Mayor Heebner and a second by Councilmember Shaffer, the Board of Directors approved the draft performance measures for use in the development of San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan. Yes – 12 (weighted vote, 51.67%). No – Carlsbad, Escondido, La Mesa, Oceanside, San Marcos, and Vista (weighted vote, 48.33%). Abstain – 0 (weighted vote, 0%). Absent – San Diego.

11. **DRAFT FY 2015 PROGRAM BUDGET (APPROVE)**

SANDAG Bylaws require the Board of Directors to approve a preliminary budget by April 1 of each year. The Executive Committee reviewed this item and recommended that the Board of Directors approve the Draft FY 2015 Program Budget (including the Overall Work Program), and authorize distribution of the document to member agencies and other interested parties for review.

First Vice Chair Jim Janney (Imperial Beach) introduced the item.

André Douzdjian, Finance Director, presented the item.

**Action:** Upon a motion by Councilmember Jack Feller (Oceanside) and a second by Mayor Morrison, the Board of Directors approved the Draft FY 2015 Program Budget (including the Overall Work Program) and authorized distribution of the document to member agencies and other interested parties for review. Yes – 14 (weighted vote, 100%). No – 0 (weighted vote, 0%). Abstain – 0 (weighted vote, 0%). Absent – El Cajon, Lemon Grove, Poway, San Diego, and San Marcos.

14. **REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO BYLAWS AND POLICIES (APPROVE)**

The Executive Committee recommends that the Board of Directors approve the proposed amendments to the SANDAG Bylaws and Board Policies related to elimination of the Second Vice Chair position effective for the calendar year 2015 leadership selection process.

First Vice Chair Janney introduced the item.

Mr. Kirk presented the item.

**Action:** Upon a motion by Councilmember Feller and a second by Mayor Morrison, the Board of Directors approved the proposed amendments to the SANDAG Bylaws and Board Policies related to elimination of the Second Vice Chair position effective for the calendar year 2015 leadership selection process. Yes – 11 (weighted vote, 100%). No – 0 (weighted vote, 0%). Abstain – 0
(weighted vote, 0%). Absent – El Cajon, Encinitas, Escondido, Lemon Grove, Poway, San Diego, San Marcos, and Solana Beach.

Chairman Dale adjourned to closed session at 11:39 a.m.

15. CLOSED SESSION: CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL - ANTICIPATED LITIGATION PURSUANT TO GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 54956.9(e)(3) – ONE POTENTIAL CASE

The Board of Directors was briefed on a Government Code Claim that has been filed against SANDAG by Wier Construction Corporation.

16. CLOSED SESSION: CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL - EXISTING LITIGATION - PURSUANT TO GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 54956.9(a) - CLEVELAND NATIONAL FOREST FOUNDATION ET AL. V. SANDAG (CASE NO. 37-2011-00101593-CU-TT-CTL), AND CREED-21 ET AL. V. SANDAG (CASE NO. 37-2011-00101660-CU-TT-CTL)

This item was continued.

Chairman Dale reconvened to open session at 11:57 a.m.

John Kirk, General Counsel, reported the following out of closed session: On Item 15, upon a motion by Mayor Abed and a second by Councilmember Feller, the Board of Directors voted to reject the claim by Wier Construction Corporation. Yes – Chairman Dale, First Vice Chair Janney, Mayor Hall, Councilmember Pamela Bensoussan (Chula Vista), Councilmember Woiwode, Councilmember Sinnott, Councilmember Shaffer, Mayor Abed, Vice Mayor Kristine Alessio (La Mesa), Councilmember Jerry Jones (Lemon Grove), Mayor Morrison, Councilmember Feller, Interim Mayor Gloria, Councilmember Heebner, Mayor Judy Ritter (Vista), and Chairwoman Dianne Jacob (County of San Diego). No – Supervisor Roberts. Abstain – None. Absent – City of El Cajon, City of Poway, City of San Diego, and City of San Marcos.

17. CONTINUED PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no continued public comments.

18. UPCOMING MEETINGS

The San Diego Regional Tribal Summit, which will serve as the next Board Policy meeting, is scheduled for Friday, April 11, 2014, starting at 10 a.m.

Please note, the meeting will be held at the following location:

Barona Resort - Golf Events Center, 1932 Wildcat Canyon Road, Lakeside, California, 92040. The next Board Business meeting is scheduled for Friday, April 25, 2014, at 9 a.m. at the SANDAG offices.

19. ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Dale adjourned the meeting at 11:58 a.m.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JURISDICTION/ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ATTEND OPEN SESSION</th>
<th>ATTENDING CLOSED SESSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Carlsbad</td>
<td>Matt Hall (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Chula Vista</td>
<td>Pamela Bensoussan (1st Alt.)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Coronado</td>
<td>Michael Woiwode (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Del Mar</td>
<td>Terry Sinnott (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of El Cajon</td>
<td>Bill Wells (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Encinitas</td>
<td>Lisa Shaffer (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Escondido</td>
<td>Sam Abed (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Imperial Beach</td>
<td>Jim Janney, 1st Vice Chair (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of La Mesa</td>
<td>Kristine Alessio (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Lemon Grove</td>
<td>Jerry Jones (1st Alt.)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of National City</td>
<td>Ron Morrison (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Oceanside</td>
<td>Jack Feller (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Poway</td>
<td>Don Higginson, 2nd Vice Chair (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego – A</td>
<td>Todd Gloria (Primary, Seat A)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego – B</td>
<td>Marti Emerald (1st Alt.)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Marcos</td>
<td>Chris Orlando (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santee</td>
<td>Jack Dale, Chair (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Solana Beach</td>
<td>Lesa Heebner (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Vista</td>
<td>Judy Ritter (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego - A</td>
<td>Ron Roberts (Primary, Seat A)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego - B</td>
<td>Dianne Jacob (Primary, Seat B)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Laurie Berman (1st. Alt.)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>Harry Mathis (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTD</td>
<td>Bill Horn (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial County</td>
<td>Sup. John Renison (Primary)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Dept. of Defense</td>
<td>CAPT. Marko Medved</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD Unified Port District</td>
<td>Bob Nelson (Primary)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD County Water Authority</td>
<td>David Barnum (Alt.)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Remedios Gómez-Arnau (Primary)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern California Tribal Chairmen’s Association</td>
<td>Allen Lawson (Primary)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AGENDA ITEM NO. 14-04-3

APRIL 25, 2014

ACTION REQUESTED – APPROVE

ACTIONS FROM POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEES

File Number 8000100

Introduction

The following actions were taken by the Policy Advisory Committees since the last Board of Directors meeting.

BORDERS COMMITTEE MEETING (March 28, 2014)

The Borders Committee met jointly with the Committee on Binational Regional Opportunities; the Municipalities of Tijuana, Tecate, and Playas de Rosarito; and the State of Baja California, and did not take any actions at this meeting.

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MEETING (April 4, 2014)

The Transportation Committee did not take any actions at this meeting.

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING (April 4, 2014)

The Regional Planning Committee was cancelled.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING (April 11, 2014)

The Executive Committee took the following actions or recommended the following approvals:

- Approved the submittal of the Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery (or TIGER) Grant Program and the Advancing Transportation Planning Through Innovation and Research Broad Agency Announcement grant applications to the U.S. Department of Transportation for funding consideration.

- Approved the draft agenda for the April 25, 2014, Board Business meeting, as amended, and the May 9, 2014, Board Policy meeting, as amended.

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MEETING (April 18, 2014)

The Transportation Committee is scheduled to take the following actions or recommend the following approvals:

Recommendation

The Board of Directors is asked to ratify the actions of the Policy Advisory Committees.
• Recommend that the Board of Directors approve the apportionment of Federal Transportation Administration Section 5311 funds for Federal Fiscal Year 2014 for the San Diego region.

• Recommend that the Board of Directors approve the list of SANDAG projects to submit for Active Transportation Program (ATP) statewide competitive funding and adopt Resolution No. 2014-18, approving the SANDAG application for the ATP funds; and approve the submission of the TransNet/Transportation Development Act Active Transportation Project Selection Criteria, with proposed changes, to the California Transportation Commission for use in the regional ATP competition.

• Approve a no-cost, time-only schedule amendment for the City of San Diego’s Commercial Street Streetscape Project.

• Adopt Resolution 2014-17, approving Amendment No. 15 to the 2012 RTIP.

PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE MEETING (April 18, 2014)

The Public Safety Committee is scheduled to take the following actions or recommend the following approvals:

• Recommend that the Board of Directors accept the Public Safety Work Program and Budget as part of the final FY 2015 Program Budget.

• Approve the inclusion of projects proposed by the Chiefs’/Sheriff’s Management Committee for funding consideration by the San Diego Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI), and include these projects in the FY 2014 San Diego UASI grant submission by the Regional Technology Partnership and Urban Area Working Group.

Staff will update the Board of Directors if the actual actions taken by the Transportation and Public Safety Committees on April 18, 2014, differ from those described in this report.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Key Staff Contact: Victoria Stackwick, (619) 699-6926, victoria.stackwick@sandag.org
FEDERAL TRANIST ADMINISTRATION
SECTION 5311 PROGRAM OF PROJECTS

Introduction

The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) provides funding for capital and operating assistance to agencies providing transportation services in the rural areas through the Section 5311 Non-Urbanized Area Formula Program. Caltrans has published the estimated apportionment for the Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2014 Section 5311 Program. For the San Diego area, this program is divided between the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) and the North County Transit District (NCTD) by a formula based on the rural population served by each agency.

Discussion

FTA Section 5311 funds do not come directly to the region, but instead are initially apportioned to the states. The state, in turn, reapportions the funds to the regions based solely on the regional rural population as a share of the total state rural population. Beginning in FY 2007, based on an agreement with the transit agencies, the Board of Directors allocates these federal funds based on service area rural population – 59 percent to NCTD and 41 percent to MTS. The applications from the transit agencies as well as the SANDAG-approved Section 5311 Program of Projects (POP) are due to the state by May 9, 2014.

Based on the Caltrans estimate, there is $949,605 available for San Diego County ($876,692 for FFY 2014 and $72,913 in carryover). Of this amount, NCTD would receive $517,248 and MTS would receive $432,357. The carryover is from last year’s MTS share; therefore, the entire $72,913 is attributable to MTS. NCTD plans to use the entire amount for operations while MTS plans to use $145,357 to support a capital project (improvements to the bus yard located in Campo) and $287,000 for operating assistance. The Board of Directors of both MTS and NCTD approved their respective POPs at their March 2014 meetings. In addition to the POP, the projects must be included in an approved Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP). The NCTD project was included in Amendment No. 14 to the 2012 RTIP approved by the SANDAG Board at its meeting on March 28, 2014, while the MTS projects are scheduled to be included in Amendment No. 16 scheduled for the May 2, 2014, Transportation Committee meeting.

Recommendation

The Transportation Committee recommends that the Board of Directors approve the apportionment of Federal Transit Administration Section 5311 funds for Federal Fiscal Year 2014 for the San Diego region.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Key Staff Contact: Sookyung Kim, (619) 699-6909, sookyung.kim@sandag.org
BOARD RESOLUTION TO ACCEPT CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION FUNDS FOR REGIONAL ALTERNATIVE FUEL READINESS PLANNING

Introduction

The 2050 Regional Transportation Plan and its Sustainable Communities Strategy recommend that SANDAG support the increased use of clean, alternative fuels (AF) in SANDAG and local jurisdiction-owned vehicle fleets (Action No. 20), support planning and infrastructure development for alternative fueling stations and plug-in electric vehicle (PEV) chargers (Action No. 21), and develop or facilitate a regional approach to long-term planning for AF infrastructure that includes the continued development of public-private strategic alliances (Action No. 22). As such, SANDAG secured grant funding to address regional PEV planning in 2012, and received a Notice of Proposed Award (NOPA) this year to undertake regional planning for all alternative fuels.

Discussion

SANDAG received a grant from the California Energy Commission (CEC) to lead the San Diego Regional Plug-in Electric Vehicle Working Group (REVI) in addressing barriers to regional PEV deployment and in the development of the San Diego Regional PEV Readiness Plan (PEV Readiness Plan). On January 24, 2014, the SANDAG Board of Directors accepted the PEV Readiness Plan as a regional guide for use by local governments, public agencies, and others to support PEV adoption and electric vehicle charging station deployment.

The CEC issued a solicitation under the Alternative and Renewable Fuel and Vehicle Technology Program for regions to prepare AF readiness plans and form AF coordinating councils composed of local governments, regional agencies, and other stakeholders. The AF grant is meant to build upon existing regional PEV planning efforts. SANDAG applied for the CEC grant in partnership with the San Diego Regional Clean Cities Coalition (SDRCCC) and the San Diego Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD). The application included letters of support from the following member agencies: cities of Carlsbad, Chula Vista, Encinitas, Oceanside, and San Diego; and from regional stakeholders

Recommendation

The Board of Directors is asked to adopt Resolution No. 2014-16, approving the acceptance of Grant Award ARV-13-013 from the California Energy Commission (CEC) and authorizing the Executive Director, on behalf of SANDAG, to enter into an Agreement with the CEC in order to prepare a regional alternative fuels readiness plan supported by the creation of a multi-stakeholder coordinating council named Refuel: San Diego Regional Alternative Fuel Coordinating Council.
including the San Diego County Regional Airport Authority, SDAPCD, Unified Port District of San Diego, SDRCCC, and – Caltrans District 11.

On April 22, 2014, the CEC is expected to approve a two-year San Diego regional AF readiness award for $300,000. SANDAG and SDRCCC are able to each contribute $30,000 of in-kind match, for a total project budget of $360,000. The CEC is accepting as SANDAG in-kind match related AF planning tasks already included in the FY 2014 Program Budget for the Energy and Climate Change Planning Program (Overall Work Program Element 3200300). The match is for AF planning work undertaken since the CEC issued its NOPA to SANDAG on January 14, 2014 (Attachment 1). The CEC requires a Board resolution from SANDAG (Attachment 2) before it enters into an Agreement to execute the project. The draft FY 2015 Program Budget includes this grant funding as part of the CEC Alternative Fuels Grant project (Overall Work Program Element 3200900) (Attachment 3).

San Diego Regional Alternative Fuel Coordinating Council

As part of the CEC contract, a multi-stakeholder group must be formed to advise on the development of a regional AF strategic readiness plan. Refuel: San Diego Regional Alternative Fuel Coordinating Council (Refuel San Diego) would serve as this group and hold bimonthly meetings. Refuel San Diego is staffed by the SDRCCC. The stakeholder list developed for the San Diego REVI would serve as a starting point for Refuel San Diego. SANDAG staff would participate as a member of this technical council. The Refuel San Diego meetings would be open to the public and agenda materials would be made available on both the SANDAG and SDRCCC websites.

Over the course of the project, Refuel San Diego would provide periodic updates to the Regional Energy Working Group, and SANDAG staff would provide progress reports to the Regional Planning Committee and Board of Directors, as appropriate.

Next Steps

Upon adoption of the resolution, SANDAG, SDRCCC, and SDAPCD would begin contacting regional stakeholders in preparation for the Refuel San Diego kickoff meeting, tentatively scheduled for this summer. All member agencies would be invited to participate as advisory members and meetings would be held at the San Diego Gas & Electric Energy Innovation Center.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Attachments: 1. CEC Notice of Proposed Award January 14, 2014
2. Resolution No. 2014-16
3. Proposed FY 2015 Work Program Element 3200900

Key Staff Contact: Anna Lowe, (619) 595-5603, anna.lowe@sandag.org
REVISED NOTICE OF PROPOSED AWARDS

Alternative and Renewable Fuel and Vehicle Technology Program
Grant Solicitation PON-13-603
Alternative Fuel Readiness Plans

January 31, 2014

On August 12, 2013, the California Energy Commission (Energy Commission) released a Grant Solicitation and Application Package entitled “Alternative Fuel Readiness Plans” under the Alternative and Renewable Fuel and Vehicle Technology Program (ARFVTP). This first-come, first-served grant solicitation was an offer to fund projects that develop Alternative Fuel Readiness Plans that provide strategies for the deployment of alternative fuel infrastructure and encourage the adoption of alternative fuel vehicles.

The attached table, “Revised Notice of Proposed Awards”, identifies each applicant selected and recommended for funding by Energy Commission staff and includes the amount of recommended funding and score. This notice is being mailed to all parties who submitted an application to this solicitation and is also posted on the Energy Commission's website at: http://www.energy.ca.gov/contracts/index.html.

Funding of proposed projects resulting from this solicitation is contingent upon the approval of these projects at a publicly noticed Energy Commission Business Meeting and execution of a grant agreement. If the Energy Commission is unable to timely negotiate and execute a funding agreement with an Applicant, the Energy Commission, at its sole discretion, reserves the right to cancel the pending award.

Applicants who did not pass can correct their applications and resubmit them for reconsideration if funds are available. Resubmitted applications will be processed as a new application on a first-come, first-served basis.

Questions should be directed to: Sandra Raymos
Contracts, Grants and Loans Officer
California Energy Commission
1516 Ninth Street, MS-18
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 654-4584
Sandra.Raymos@energy.ca.gov
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal Number</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Funds Requested</th>
<th>Proposed Award</th>
<th>Match Amount</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Redwood Coast Energy Authority</td>
<td>Northwest California Alternative Fuels Readiness Project</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>Awardee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District</td>
<td>Monterey Bay Alternative Fuel Ecosystem</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>Awardee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>County of Santa Barbara</td>
<td>Central Coast Alternative Fuel Ecosystem</td>
<td>$299,910</td>
<td>$299,910</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>Awardee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>San Diego Association of Governments</td>
<td>San Diego Regional Alternative Fuel Readiness Project</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>Awardee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>City of Davis</td>
<td>Davis Alternative Fuel Readiness Plan</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>Awardee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>South Coast Air Quality Management District</td>
<td>Hydrogen Readiness in Early Market Communities</td>
<td>$299,360</td>
<td>$299,360</td>
<td>$104,120</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>Awardee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$1,699,270</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,699,270</strong></td>
<td><strong>$384,120</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposed Awards**

**Did Not Pass**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal Number</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Funds Requested</th>
<th>Proposed Award</th>
<th>Match Amount</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2*</td>
<td>County of Santa Barbara</td>
<td>Central Coast Alternative Fuel Ecosystem</td>
<td>$299,910</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Did Not Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3**</td>
<td>Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution District</td>
<td>Monterey Bay Alternative Fuel Ecosystem</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Did Not Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5***</td>
<td>Redwood Coast Energy Authority</td>
<td>Northwest California Alternative Fuels Readiness Project</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Did Not Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County</td>
<td>Alternative Fuel Readiness Plan for San Mateo County</td>
<td>$275,810</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$73,554</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Did Not Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal Number</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>Funds Requested</td>
<td>Proposed Award</td>
<td>Match Amount</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Neatfuel, Inc.</td>
<td>Neatfuel Optimization Works</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$138,000</td>
<td>DQ</td>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Neatfuel, Inc.</td>
<td>Neatfuel Optimization Works</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$138,000</td>
<td>DQ</td>
<td>Disqualified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL PROPOSALS RECEIVED</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,674,990</td>
<td>$1,699,270</td>
<td>$953,674</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* County of Santa Barbara's original application (#2) did not pass. County of Santa Barbara submitted a new application (#8) which is proposed for an award.

** Monterey Bay Air Pollution District's original application (#3) did not pass. Monterey Bay Air Pollution District submitted a new application (#7) which is proposed for an award.

*** Redwood Coast Energy Authority's original application (#5) did not pass. Redwood Coast Energy Authority submitted a new application (#6) which is proposed for an award.

**** City of Davis's original application (#9) did not pass. City of Davis submitted a new application (#11) which is proposed for an award.
RESOLUTION OF THE SAN DIEGO ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
APPROVING THE ACCEPTANCE OF GRANT AWARD ARV-13-013 FROM THE
CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION TO PRODUCE A
REGIONAL READINESS PLAN FOR ALTERNATIVE FUEL VEHICLES

WHEREAS, the San Diego region’s public agencies, local businesses, and educational institutions are integrating alternative fuels (AF) into their vehicle fleets and barriers to AF adoption have been identified; and

WHEREAS, the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan and its Sustainable Communities Strategy actions for implementation recommend that SANDAG support the increased use of clean, alternative fuels in SANDAG and local jurisdiction-owned vehicle fleets (Action 20), support planning and infrastructure development for all alternative fueling stations and plug-in electric vehicle (PEV) chargers (Action 21), and develop or facilitate a regional approach to long-term planning for AF infrastructure that includes the continued development of public-private strategic alliances (Action 22); and

WHEREAS, SANDAG established the San Diego Regional Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Working Group to facilitate strategic and coordinated efforts to address barriers to widespread PEV adoption and to develop a regional readiness plan; and

WHEREAS, the SANDAG Board of Directors accepted the San Diego Regional Plug-in Electric Vehicle Readiness Plan as a regional guide for use by local governments, public agencies, and others to support PEV adoption and electric vehicle charging station deployment throughout the region during its meeting on January 24, 2014; and

WHEREAS, the SANDAG Board of Directors was informed of a potential grant opportunity from the California Energy Commission (CEC) that would expand regional PEV readiness planning to address all alternative fuels under the San Diego Regional AF Readiness Project during its meeting on January 24, 2014; and

WHEREAS, SANDAG applied for this grant in partnership with the U.S. Department of Energy designated San Diego Regional Clean Cities Coalition (SDRCCC) and the San Diego Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD); and

WHEREAS, SANDAG submitted with its CEC application letters of support from member agencies: cities of Carlsbad, Chula Vista, Encinitas, Oceanside, and San Diego; and from regional stakeholders including the San Diego County Regional Airport Authority, SDAPCD, Unified Port District of San Diego, SDRCCC, and California Department of Transportation - District 11; and

WHEREAS, the CEC approved this project, led by SANDAG, with its partner SDRCCC, at its Business Meeting on April 22, 2014; and
WHEREAS, the CEC requires that public agencies provide an authorizing resolution approved by their governing authority to enter into an Agreement with the CEC, and that the AF Readiness Plan be supported by the creation of a multi-stakeholder AF Coordinating Council; and

WHEREAS, SANDAG will assist in the establishment of, in partnership with the SDRCCC, a San Diego Regional AF Coordinating Council and the council will be referred to as Refuel: San Diego Regional Alternative Fuels Coordinating Council or “Refuel San Diego;” and

WHEREAS, SANDAG is to be awarded $300,000 by the CEC and has provided an in-kind match of $30,000 from its FY 2014 Budget and Overall Work Program (OWP) for Energy and Climate Change Planning, and SDRCCC has provided an additional in-kind match of $30,000.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Directors:

1. Approves the acceptance of Grant Award ARV-13-013 from the California Energy Commission to produce a regional readiness plan for alternative fuel vehicles; and

2. Authorizes the Executive Director, or designee, to enter into an Agreement with the CEC, to accept and administer the CEC funds of up to $300,000 in the SANDAG FY 2015 Budget and OWP and subsequent budgets and OWPs to complete the proposed project.

3. Supports the formation of Refuel San Diego and the development of a regional AF readiness plan.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 25th day of April, 2014.
OBJECTIVE
The objective is for SANDAG and its project partner, the San Diego Regional Clean Cities Coalition (CCC), to establish a working group and develop a regionally-accepted Alternative Fuels Readiness plan. The plan is to build upon SANDAGs EV Readiness Plan to address barriers and complexities of other clean fuels, including natural gas and propane. Emphasis in FY 2015 will be to establish the working group and address impediments to alternative fuel infrastructure and vehicles. The CCC is staffed by the California Center for Sustainable Energy (CCSE).

PREVIOUS ACCOMPLISHMENTS
This is a new project that will expand on an earlier CEC EV readiness project that ran from FY 2012-FY 2014.

JUSTIFICATION
The 2050 Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) includes actions to (1) support planning and infrastructure development for alternative fueling stations and plug-in EV chargers; and (2) develop or facilitate a regional approach to long-term planning for alternative fuel infrastructure that includes the continued development of public-private strategic alliances. This project helps implement the SCS and the Regional Energy Strategy.

PROJECT MANAGER: Susan Freedman, Land Use / Transportation Planning Department
COMMITTEE(S): Regional Planning Committee
WORKING GROUPS(S): Regional Energy Working Group

PRODUCTS, TASKS, AND SCHEDULES FOR FY 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task No.</th>
<th>% of Effort</th>
<th>Task Description / Product / Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Establish alternative fuels working group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Product: Member list, mission, goals, and electronic distribution list.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Completion Date: 9/30/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Manage alternative fuels working group meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Product: Agendas, powerpoints, attendance sheets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Completion Date: 6/30/2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## PRODUCTS, TASKS, AND SCHEDULES FOR FY 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task No.</th>
<th>% of Effort</th>
<th>Task Description / Product / Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3        | 30          | Task Description: Perform regional assessment of alternative fuels, vehicles and infrastructure.  
Product: Staff report(s).  
Completion Date: 6/30/2015 |
| 4        | 20          | Task Description: Begin preparation of sector-specific alternative fuel toolkits  
Product: Sector list, toolkit outlines, draft materials.  
Completion Date: 6/30/2015 |

## FUTURE ACTIVITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task No.</th>
<th>% of Effort</th>
<th>Task Description / Product / Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1        | 35          | Task Description: Prepare sector-specific alternative fuel toolkits  
Product: Toolkits for local governments, car dealerships, fleet operators and others.  
Completion Date: 3/30/2016 |
| 2        | 25          | Task Description: Manage alternative fuels working group meetings  
Product: Agendas, powerpoints, attendance sheets.  
Completion Date: 6/30/2016 |
| 3        | 40          | Task Description: Develop draft and final regional readiness plan for alternative fuels.  
Product: San Diego Regional Alternative Fuels Readiness Plan  
Completion Date: 6/30/2016 |
REPORT SUMMARIZING DELEGATED ACTIONS
TAKEN BY THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

File Number 8000100

Introduction

Various Board Policies require the Executive Director to report certain actions to the Board of Directors on a monthly basis or upon taking specified actions.

Discussion

Board Policy No. 003

Board Policy No. 003: Investment Policy, states that a monthly report of all investment transactions shall be submitted to the Board of Directors. Attachment 1 contains the reportable investment transactions for February 2014.

Board Policy No. 008

Section 1.7.4 of Board Policy No. 008: Legal Matters, authorizes the Executive Director to take action on claims under $100,000 on behalf of SANDAG.

- On March 18, 2014, the Executive Director rejected a claim for $17,063 related to construction of the Mid-City Rapid Bus Project.
- On March 18, 2014, the Executive Director rejected a claim for $51,088 related to construction of the Mid-City Rapid Bus Project.

Section 6 of the Policy authorizes the Office of General Counsel or outside counsel to file documents on behalf of SANDAG in court proceedings. On April 7, 2014, Complaints for Eminent Domain related to acquisition of temporary and permanent easements for the Inland Rail Trail Project were filed in the San Diego Superior Court, North County Division, related to the following properties:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>San Diego County Assessor Parcel No.</th>
<th>Property Address</th>
<th>Property Owner Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>184-162-03</td>
<td>1971 Buena Creek Road, Vista, CA 92084</td>
<td>Schutten, Ljubinka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184-040-34 &amp; 37</td>
<td>1868 Devon Place, Vista, CA 92084</td>
<td>Neumann, Fritz &amp; Betty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183-060-06</td>
<td>145 Hannalei Drive, Vista, CA 92083</td>
<td>Buena Vista Baptist Church of Vista</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego County Assessor Parcel No.</td>
<td>Property Address</td>
<td>Property Owner Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183-060-78</td>
<td>157 Hannalei Drive, Vista, CA 92083</td>
<td>Meier, Edna T.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183-290-08</td>
<td>145 Mar Vista Drive, Vista, CA 92083</td>
<td>Reid, Dewitt &amp; Sharon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183-290-27</td>
<td>1430 Phillips Street, Vista, CA 92084</td>
<td>Balderrama, John &amp; Coro A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180-173-58</td>
<td>1354 Kilby Lane, Vista, CA 92083</td>
<td>Lopez, Adaitam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180-173-50</td>
<td>125 Kilby Lane, Vista, CA 92083</td>
<td>Wilborn, Luke A. &amp; Shawnee M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180-141-69</td>
<td>1258 Jessie Lane, Vista, CA 92083</td>
<td>Moorehoward Investments, LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180-141-46</td>
<td>1158 Nancy Way, Vista, CA 92083</td>
<td>Lauber Trust 01-11-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180-141-48</td>
<td>1146 Nancy Way, Vista, CA 92083</td>
<td>Stinson, Blaine V. &amp; Judy L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180-141-50</td>
<td>Phillips Street, Vista, CA 92083</td>
<td>Colucci, Armando</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179-185-16</td>
<td>208 Valley View Place, Vista, CA 92083</td>
<td>COLCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179-185-04</td>
<td>924 Phillips Street, Vista, CA 92083</td>
<td>Silva Family Living Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163-333-18</td>
<td>230 N. Santa Fe Avenue, Vista, CA 92083</td>
<td>SDG&amp;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163-321-17</td>
<td>348 N. Santa Fe Avenue, Vista, CA 92083</td>
<td>Pauley Family Ltd Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163-321-24 &amp; 27</td>
<td>352 No. Santa Fe Avenue, Vista, CA 92083</td>
<td>Toma, Michael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163-410-01</td>
<td>498 W. Los Angeles Drive, Vista, CA 92083</td>
<td>Smith, William D.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Board Policy No. 017**

Board Policy No. 017: Delegation of Authority, authorizes the Executive Director to take specified actions and requires those actions to be reported to the Board at the next regular meeting.

Section 4.1 of the Policy authorizes the Executive Director to enter into agreements not currently incorporated in the budget and to make other modifications to the budget in an amount up to $100,000 per transaction, so long as the overall budget remains in balance. Attachment 2 contains the actions for March 2014.

Section 4.2 of the Policy authorizes the Executive Director to approve design plans, specifications, and estimates (PS&E) for capital improvement projects. The PS&Es for the following capital improvement projects were approved:

- CIP 1144400, Orange Line Fiber Optic Cabling Installation Project – Phase 4
- CIP 1145000, Los Peñasquitos Lagoon Bridges Replacement Project

Section 4.4 of the Policy authorizes the Executive Director to approve of the establishment of an offer of just compensation based upon specified conditions. Consistent with Board Policy, the following offers were made:

- Inland Rail Trail Project (CIP 1223023): the following temporary construction easement offers were made:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Offer (appraised value)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Off Cherimoya Drive, Vista, CA 92084</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1863 Devon Place, Vista, CA 92084</td>
<td>$14,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850 and 1864 York Drive, Vista, CA 92084</td>
<td>$9,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1332 Kilby Lane, Vista, CA 92083</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1217 Sandra Circle, Vista, CA 92083</td>
<td>$1,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1264 Jessie Lane, Vista, CA 92083</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off Phillips Street, Vista, CA 92083</td>
<td>$37,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>528 W. California Avenue, Vista, CA 92083</td>
<td>$3,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1262 Waxwing Drive, Vista, CA 92083</td>
<td>$4,060</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Board Policy No. 035**

Board Policy No. 035: Competitive Grant Program Procedures, authorizes the Executive Director to approve request by grantees for project schedule extensions of up to six months. The policy requires the Executive Director to report to the Board actions taken at the next regular meeting. There are two delegated actions to report to the Board:

**Active Transportation Program:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract</th>
<th>Grantee</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Extension (in Months)</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5001735</td>
<td>City of Santee</td>
<td>Town Center Parkway/Olive Lane/Prospect Avenue Bike Lane</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10/31/2013</td>
<td>03/31/2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TransNet Senior Mini Grant Program:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract</th>
<th>Grantee</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Extension (in Months)</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5001700</td>
<td>Traveler’s Aid Society</td>
<td>SenioRide</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>03/30/2014</td>
<td>09/30/2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

2. March 2014 Budget Transfers and Amendments

Key Staff Contact: André Douzdjian, (619) 699-6931, andre.douzdjian@sandag.org
MONTHLY ACTIVITY FOR INVESTMENT SECURITIES TRANSACTIONS FOR FEBRUARY 1 THROUGH FEBRUARY 28, 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transaction</th>
<th>Maturity Date</th>
<th>Security</th>
<th>Par Value</th>
<th>Original Cost</th>
<th>Cost at Maturity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BOUGHT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/03/2014</td>
<td>09/14/2017</td>
<td>IBM CORPORATION</td>
<td>$2,700,000.00</td>
<td>$3,107,673.00</td>
<td>1.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/04/2014</td>
<td>05/02/2014</td>
<td>SOCIETE GENERALE NA COMM PAPER</td>
<td>$2,800,000.00</td>
<td>$2,798,530.00</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/04/2014</td>
<td>07/31/2015</td>
<td>US TREASURY NOTES</td>
<td>$4,100,000.00</td>
<td>$4,194,011.72</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/04/2014</td>
<td>02/19/2016</td>
<td>FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK GLOBAL NOTES</td>
<td>$4,100,000.00</td>
<td>$4,100,246.00</td>
<td>0.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/04/2014</td>
<td>07/31/2016</td>
<td>US TREASURY NOTES</td>
<td>$4,100,000.00</td>
<td>$4,203,300.78</td>
<td>0.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/06/2014</td>
<td>11/03/2014</td>
<td>BNP PARIBAS FINANCE INC COMM PAPER</td>
<td>$2,800,000.00</td>
<td>$2,790,585.00</td>
<td>0.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/25/2014</td>
<td>02/22/2017</td>
<td>PEPFISCO CORP NOTES</td>
<td>$1,495,000.00</td>
<td>$1,493,295.70</td>
<td>0.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/27/2014</td>
<td>09/30/2016</td>
<td>US TREASURY NOTES</td>
<td>$5,600,000.00</td>
<td>$5,954,812.50</td>
<td>0.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL BOUGHT:</strong></td>
<td><strong>27,695,000.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>28,642,454.70</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATURED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/03/2014</td>
<td>02/03/2014</td>
<td>WAL-MART</td>
<td>$3,000,000.00</td>
<td>$3,109,437.00</td>
<td>1.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/28/2014</td>
<td>02/28/2014</td>
<td>FHLB</td>
<td>$2,000,000.00</td>
<td>$2,021,220.00</td>
<td>0.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL MATURED:</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,000,000.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,130,657.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOLD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/04/2014</td>
<td>10/31/2014</td>
<td>US TREASURY NOTES</td>
<td>$2,760,000.00</td>
<td>$2,903,299.69</td>
<td>0.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/04/2014</td>
<td>11/15/2014</td>
<td>US TREASURY NOTES</td>
<td>$2,200,000.00</td>
<td>$2,410,117.19</td>
<td>0.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/04/2014</td>
<td>01/31/2015</td>
<td>US TREASURY NOTES</td>
<td>$595,000.00</td>
<td>$623,656.22</td>
<td>0.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/04/2014</td>
<td>01/31/2015</td>
<td>US TREASURY NOTES</td>
<td>$4,685,000.00</td>
<td>$4,944,322.07</td>
<td>0.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/04/2014</td>
<td>01/31/2015</td>
<td>US TREASURY NOTES</td>
<td>$4,720,000.00</td>
<td>$4,994,165.63</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/06/2014</td>
<td>03/17/2014</td>
<td>BNP PARIBAS FINANCE INC COMM PAPER</td>
<td>$2,800,000.00</td>
<td>$2,795,660.00</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/25/2014</td>
<td>08/28/2015</td>
<td>FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK GLOBAL NOTES</td>
<td>$1,500,000.00</td>
<td>$1,499,940.00</td>
<td>0.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/27/2014</td>
<td>01/31/2015</td>
<td>US TREASURY NOTES</td>
<td>$5,890,000.00</td>
<td>$6,173,886.33</td>
<td>0.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/28/2014</td>
<td>11/28/2016</td>
<td>FNMA</td>
<td>$4,400,000.00</td>
<td>$4,402,750.00</td>
<td>0.88% **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/28/2014</td>
<td>02/28/2017</td>
<td>FHLMC</td>
<td>$4,000,000.00</td>
<td>$4,002,000.00</td>
<td>1.00% **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL SOLD:</strong></td>
<td><strong>33,550,000.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>34,748,228.53</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Proceeds from this sale were used to purchase new securities that would provide higher returns over the holding period.
** This security was called by the issuer.
# MARCH 2014 BUDGET TRANSFERS AND AMENDMENTS

## in '000s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT NUMBER</th>
<th>PROJECT NAME</th>
<th>CURRENT BUDGET</th>
<th>NEW BUDGET</th>
<th>CHANGE</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7500000</td>
<td>Service Bureau - Main Project FY 2014</td>
<td>$21.7</td>
<td>$13.3</td>
<td>($8.4)</td>
<td>Transferred funds from the Main Service Bureau project (7500000) to establish new projects and increase budgets for additional work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7512200</td>
<td>Economic Analysis of the Life Sciences Industry</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$8.4</td>
<td>$8.4</td>
<td>Establish new Service Bureau project 7512200 for Economic Analysis of the Life Sciences Industry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3300800</td>
<td>Community Transformation Grant</td>
<td>$1,797.6</td>
<td>$1,862.4</td>
<td>$64.8</td>
<td>Received additional funding to develop health related assessment tools and performance goals for inclusion in San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3400600</td>
<td>LOSSAN Rail Corridor Planning</td>
<td>$155.1</td>
<td>$191.8</td>
<td>$36.7</td>
<td>Additional start-up costs assessed by Orange County Transportation Authority to make transition as the new LOSSAN managing agency. Funding acquired from remaining LOSSAN member agency assessments from prior year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7351300</td>
<td>ARJIS: Tactical Automated Response Using GPS Enabled Technology</td>
<td>$289.5</td>
<td>$220.0</td>
<td>($69.5)</td>
<td>Adjustments made to UASI grant funding allocations resulted in reduced staffing needs for this project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7351700</td>
<td>ARJIS: Regional Data Sharing II</td>
<td>$945.2</td>
<td>$883.1</td>
<td>($62.1)</td>
<td>Adjustments made to UASI grant funding allocations resulted in reduced staffing needs for this project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BOARD OF DIRECTORS
APRIL 25, 2014

REPORT ON MEETINGS AND EVENTS ATTENDED
ON BEHALF OF SANDAG

Since the last Board of Directors meeting, Board members participated in the following meetings and events on behalf of SANDAG. Key topics of discussion also are summarized.

March 27, 2014: Facilitating Access to Coordinated Transportation Board of Directors Meeting
San Diego, CA

As the SANDAG representative and 2014 Chair of the Facilitating Access to Coordinated Transportation (FACT) Board of Directors, Third District County Supervisor Dave Roberts attended the FACT Board of Directors meeting. The FACT Board discussed newly implemented services and new service options; voted unanimously to update the FACT five-year service projections; discussed outreach to key regional stakeholders to ensure all segments of San Diego County are represented at FACT; voted unanimously to approve the five-year Mobility Management expense and revenue projections report; and discussed FY 2014-15 goals and the FACT 2015-20 Business Plan update.

March 30 – April 2, 2014: San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce California-Mexico Trade Initiative
Mexico City, MX

SANDAG Vice Chair Jim Janney attended the San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce California-Mexico Trade Initiative as the SANDAG representative. Vice Chair Janney participated in meetings and tours to include the Bombardier Aerospace Manufacturing Plant in Queretaro, the Office of Secretary of Energy, the Mexican Stock Exchange, the Office of Secretary of Economy, the Senate of Mexico, the Office of Secretary of Foreign Relations, the Office of Secretary of Communications, and Transportation Office of Secretary of Energy to discuss regional and cross border issues and collaborative trade opportunities.

April 7, 2014: Oceanside Coastal Rail Trail Ribbon Cutting
Oceanside, CA

SANDAG Vice Chair Janney attended as the SANDAG representative and spoke at the Oceanside Coastal Rail Trail Ribbon Cutting ceremony. The Oceanside segment of the Coastal Rail Trail is the first project completed under the Regional Bike Plan Early Action Program (EAP), a $200 million initiative adopted by the SANDAG Board in September 2013. The EAP comprises 42 projects, totaling 77 miles of bikeways. The bike project was funded by a mix of federal and local sources. About $1.52 million came from the federal Transportation Enhancements program. Another
$931,000 comes from TransNet, the regional half-cent sales tax for transportation administered by SANDAG.

April 10, 2014: Construction Management Association of America Awards Dinner
San Diego, CA

SANDAG Chairman Jack Dale attended the San Diego Chapter of Construction Management Association of America (CMAA) Awards dinner as the SANDAG representative to accept the Client of the Year Award on behalf of SANDAG. The Client of the Year Award recognized SANDAG for the agency's consistent support of the CMAA San Diego Chapter through the agency's capital program updates presented regularly to their membership.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Key Staff Contact: Victoria Stackwick, (619) 699-6926, victoria.stackwick@sandag.org
ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM

Introduction

On September 26, 2013, the Governor signed legislation creating the Active Transportation Program (Senate Bill 99, Chapter 359 and Assembly Bill 101, Chapter 354) to encourage increased use of active modes of transportation such as bicycling and walking. As a requirement of the new legislation, the California Transportation Commission (CTC) recently adopted guidelines and project selection criteria for its use in administering the program.

The Active Transportation Program (ATP) consolidates existing federal and state transportation programs, including the Transportation Alternatives Program, Bicycle Transportation Account, and State Safe Routes to School (SR2S), into a single program and is funded from various federal and state funds appropriated in the annual Budget Act. The program is being administered by the CTC. Funding will be awarded in two stages, beginning with a statewide competition in March 2014, followed by a regional competition in August 2014.

This report provides an overview of the ATP, including the anticipated role for SANDAG and next steps in the process. The complete ATP Guidelines are available at: www.dot.ca.gov/LocalPrograms.

Discussion

Purpose of the Program

The stated purpose of the program is to fund projects that encourage increased use of active modes of transportation by achieving the following goals:

- Increase the proportion of trips accomplished by biking and walking
- Increase safety and mobility for non-motorized users
- Advance the active transportation efforts of regional agencies to achieve greenhouse gas reduction goals
• Enhance public health

• Ensure that disadvantaged communities fully share in the benefits of the program

• Provide a broad spectrum of projects to benefit many types of active transportation users

**Available Funding**

Approximately $360 million statewide has been budgeted for the program over three years, beginning with FY 2014. Fifty percent of the funding ($180 million total, or $60 million per year) will be competitively awarded for projects selected by the CTC on a statewide basis. From this portion of the program, a minimum of $24 million per year is available for SR2S projects, with at least $7.2 million for non-infrastructure grants, including funding for a state technical assistance resource center.

Forty percent of the funding ($144 million total, or $48 million per year) will be allocated for projects selected through a competitive regional process by large urban Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs). The funding distribution to MPOs is based on assumptions included in the approved CTC 2014 ATP Fund Estimate. The estimated funding available for the San Diego region is about $8.7 million in the first year of the program, and $4.3 million for the second year of the program. The remaining 10 percent of funds will be distributed competitively to small urban and rural regions.

In addition, a minimum of 25 percent of the funds in both the statewide and MPO competitive programs must benefit disadvantaged communities. Attachment 2 shows the funding estimates for the overall program and the large urban MPO portion.

**Eligible Applicants**

Local, regional, and state agencies are eligible to apply for both the statewide and MPO competitive programs. Eligible agencies include but are not limited to cities, counties, and MPOs as well as transit agencies, tribal governments, private nonprofit organizations, and school districts. (A complete list of eligible applicants is provided in the ATP Guidelines).

**Timeline**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CTC issues statewide call for projects</td>
<td>March 21, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide project applications due</td>
<td>May 21, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTC adopts statewide projects for funding</td>
<td>August 20, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPO (SANDAG) recommends regional projects for funding</td>
<td>September 30, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTC adopts regional projects for funding</td>
<td>November 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Considerations for SANDAG

SANDAG is both an eligible applicant under the statewide competition as a Regional Transportation Planning Agency and has a role as an MPO to administer the regional program.

Statewide Competition

Consistent with SANDAG Board of Directors action in September 2013, which called for seeking additional funding to support implementation of the Regional Bike Plan Early Action Program, SANDAG staff proposes consideration of the following capital projects for submittal in the statewide competition due to project readiness and the incorporation of all federal requirements likely to be required by the statewide funding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-15 Commuter Bikeway – Adams Avenue to Camino Del Rio South</td>
<td>$9.3 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayshore Bikeway – Barrio Logan</td>
<td>$13.6 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Rail Trail San Diego – Rose Creek</td>
<td>$17.2 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Rail Trail Encinitas – Chesterfield to G Street</td>
<td>$5.1 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Board of Directors is being asked to approve a resolution (Attachment 3) of support with the list of SANDAG projects (above) to submit for ATP statewide competitive funding.

Regional Competition

As the administrator of the regional competition, staff presented the following two options for Transportation Committee consideration:

- SANDAG has the option of choosing to use the guidelines and project selection criteria used by the CTC in administering the statewide competition, thereby deferring project selection to the CTC.

- Alternatively, with CTC approval, SANDAG may use different guidelines and project selection criteria (such as Board’s previously approved criteria for the TransNet/Transportation Development Act [TDA] Active Transportation Program).

Based upon input from the Transportation Committee, SANDAG staff adjusted the adopted TransNet/TDA Active Transportation Project Selection Criteria (Attachments 1 and 2) to reflect aspects of the statewide guidelines. The changes are shown in the attachments and include: the ATP requirement to benefit disadvantaged communities; the types of projects considered to be eligible; a modification of minimum project size; an inclusion of a minimum 11.47 percent match; the public health scoring criteria; and the exclusion of SANDAG Board Policy No. 033 (Implementation Guidelines for Regional Housing Needs) requirement.

The projects from the San Diego region submitted to the CTC but not selected through the statewide competition must be considered along with projects submitted as part of the regional competition.
The timeline associated with the option of submitting SANDAG guidelines and project selection criteria is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Large MPOs submit optional guidelines to Caltrans</td>
<td>May 21, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission approves or rejects MPO guidelines to Caltrans</td>
<td>June 25, 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Next Steps**

Based upon the approval of the SANDAG Board of Directors, SANDAG will submit an application to the CTC for funding of the list of projects for the statewide competition and project selection criteria for the regional competition, as detailed in this staff report. If funding is awarded, staff will seek approval from the Board of Directors for any necessary budget amendments. In addition, staff will return to the Transportation Committee and the Board of Directors with plans for conducting the regional competition early this summer as the process will need to be under way prior to the conclusion of the statewide competition in order to comply with CTC deadlines.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Attachments: 1. Draft TransNet/TDA Active Transportation Project Selection Criteria – Planning Grants with Proposed Changes
2. Draft TransNet/TDA Active Transportation Project Selection Criteria – Capital Grants with Proposed Changes
3. Draft Resolution No. 2014-18

Key Staff Contact: Coleen Clementson, (619) 699-1944, coleen.clementson@sandag.org
ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND PROJECT CATEGORIES

ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS

Applicants must meet the following eligibility criterion. Applications not meeting the following criterion will be deemed ineligible for funding and will not be scored. Please contact Christine Eary at (619) 699-6928 or Christine.Eary@sandag.org if you have any questions about eligibility.

The applicant for Active Transportation Program funds assumes responsibility and accountability for the use and expenditure of program funds. Applicants must be able to comply with all the federal and state laws, regulations, policies and procedures required to enter into a Local Administering Agency-State Master Agreement (Master Agreement). Refer to Chapter 4, Agreements, of the Local Assistance Procedures Manual for guidance and procedures on Master Agreements. The following entities, within the State of California, are eligible to apply for Active Transportation Program funds:

- Local, Regional or State Agencies – examples include city, county, MPO, and Regional Transportation Planning Agency
- Caltrans
- Transit Agencies – Any agency responsible for public transportation that is eligible for funds under the Federal Transit Administration
- Natural Resource of Public Land Agencies – Federal, Tribal, State, or local agency responsible for natural resources or public land administration. Examples include:
  - State or local park or forest agencies
  - State or local fish and game or wildlife agencies
  - Department of the Interior Land Management Agencies
  - U.S. Forest Service
- Public schools or school districts
- Tribal Governments – Federally-recognized Native American Tribes
- Private nonprofit tax-exempt organizations may apply for recreational trails and trailheads, park projects that facilitate trail linkages or connectivity to nonmotorized corridors, and conversion of abandoned railroad corridors to trails. Projects must benefit the general public, and not only a private entity.
- Any other entity with responsibility for oversight of transportation or recreational trails that the California Transportation Commission determines to be eligible

For funding awarded to a tribal government, a fund transfer to the Bureau of Indian Affairs may be necessary. A tribal government may also partner with another eligible entity to apply if desired.

PARTNERING WITH IMPLEMENTING AGENCIES

Entities that are unable to apply for Active Transportation Program funds or that are unable to enter into a Master Agreement with the State must partner with an eligible applicant that can implement the project. Entities that are unfamiliar with the requirements to administer a Federal-Aid Highway Program project may partner with an eligible applicant that can implement the project. If another entity agrees to assume responsibility for the ongoing operations and maintenances of the facility, documentation of the agreement must be submitted with the project application, and a copy of the Memorandum of Understanding or Interagency Agreement between the parties must be submitted with the request for allocation.

The implementing agency will be responsible and accountable for the use and expenditure of program funds.
ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA

In addition to the above, applicants must meet all of the following eligibility criteria to be considered for funding:

Community Support
Resolution or minutes from City Council, County Board of Supervisors, local planning group, or Planning Commission that indicates community support for the project.

1. Consistency with Regional Transportation Plan
All projects submitted must be consistent the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy.

2. Program Evaluation
The Active Transportation Program will be evaluated for its effectiveness in increasing the use of active modes of transportation in California. Applicants that receive funding for a project must collect and submit data to Caltrans as described in the “Project Reporting” section of the statewide Active Transportation Program Guidelines.

3. Fully Funded Projects
A project that is already fully funded will not be considered for funding in the Active Transportation Program. The Commission will make an exception to this policy by allowing the supplanting of federal funds on a project for the 2014 Active Transportation Program.

4. Federal Requirements
Unless programmed for state-only funding, project applicants must comply with the provisions of Title 23 of the U.S. Code of Federal Regulations and with the processes and procedures contained in the Caltrans Local Assistance Procedures Manual and the Master Agreement with Caltrans. Failure to comply with federal requirements may result in the repayment to the State of Active Transportation Program funds.

5. Funding Limits
The total amount of funding requested by each applicant cannot exceed the total amount available ($8.7 million in the first cycle and $4.3 million in the following cycle). There is no minimum grant request for non-capital projects.

6. Disadvantaged Communities
For a project to contribute toward the Disadvantaged Communities funding requirement, the project must clearly demonstrate a benefit to a community that meets any of the following criteria:

- The median household income is less than 80% of the statewide median based on the most current census tract level data from the American Community Survey. Data is available at http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/index.xhtml

- An area identified as among the most disadvantaged 10% in the state according to latest versions of the California Communities Environmental Health Screening Tool (CalEnviroScreen) scores. Scores are available at http://oehha.ca.gov/ej/ces11.html

- At least 75% of public school students in the project area are eligible to receive free or reduced-price meals under the National School Lunch Program. Data is available at http://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/sd/filessp.asp. Applicants using this measure must indicate how the project benefits the school students in the project area or, for projects not directly benefitting school students, explain why this measure is representative of the larger community.

If a project applicant believes a project benefits a disadvantaged community but the project does not meet the aforementioned criteria, the applicant must submit for consideration a quantitative assessment of why the community should be considered disadvantaged.
PROJECT CATEGORIES AND ELIGIBLE PROJECT ACTIVITIES

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, Lemon Grove
  - Cities with population 50,000 to 150,000 – $150,000 ($125,000 + $25,000 for environmental) – Carlsbad, El Cajon, Encinitas, Escondido, La Mesa, National City, Poway, San Marcos, Santee, Vista
  - Cities with population greater than 150,000 – $200,000 ($150,000 + $50,000 for environmental) – Chula Vista, Oceanside, County of San Diego
  - City of San Diego – $250,000 ($200,000 + $50,000 for environmental)

A city, county, county transportation commission, regional transportation planning agency, MPO, school district, or transit district may prepare an active transportation plan. An active transportation plan prepared by a city or county may be integrated into the circulation element of its general plan or a separate plan which is compliant or will be brought into compliance with the Complete Streets Act, Assembly Bill 1358 (Chapter 657, Statutes of 2008). An active transportation plan must include, but not be limited to, the following components or explain why the component is not applicable:

a. The estimated number of existing bicycle trips and pedestrian trips in the plan area, both in absolute numbers and as a percentage of all trips, and the estimated increase in the number of bicycle trips and pedestrian trips resulting from implementation of the plan.

b. The number and location of collisions, serious injuries, and fatalities suffered by bicyclists and pedestrians in the plan area, both in absolute numbers and as a percentage of all collisions and injuries, and a goal for collision, serious injury, and fatality reduction after implementation of the plan.

c. A map and description of existing and proposed land use and settlement patterns which must include, but not be limited to, locations of residential neighborhoods, schools, shopping centers, public buildings, major employment centers, and other destinations.

d. A map and description of existing and proposed bicycle transportation facilities.

e. A map and description of existing and proposed end-of-trip bicycle parking facilities.

f. A description of existing and proposed policies related to bicycle parking in public locations, private parking garages and parking lots and in new commercial and residential developments.

g. A map and description of existing and proposed bicycle transport and parking facilities for connections with and use of other transportation modes. These must include, but not be limited to, parking facilities at transit stops, rail and transit terminals, ferry docks and landings, park and ride lots, and provisions for transporting bicyclists and bicycles on transit or rail vehicles or ferry vessels.

h. A map and description of existing and proposed pedestrian facilities at major transit hubs. These must include, but are not limited to, rail and transit terminals, and ferry docks and landings.

i. A description of proposed signage providing wayfinding along bicycle and pedestrian networks to designated destinations.
A description of the policies and procedures for maintaining existing and proposed bicycle and pedestrian facilities, including, but not limited to, the maintenance of smooth pavement, freedom from encroaching vegetation, maintenance of traffic control devices including striping and other pavement markings, and lighting.

A description of bicycle and pedestrian safety, education, and encouragement programs conducted in the area included within the plan, efforts by the law enforcement agency having primary traffic law enforcement responsibility in the area to enforce provisions of the law impacting bicycle and pedestrian safety, and the resulting effect on accidents involving bicyclists and pedestrians.

A description of the extent of community involvement in development of the plan, including disadvantaged and underserved communities.

A description of how the active transportation plan has been coordinated with neighboring jurisdictions, including school districts within the plan area, and is consistent with other local or regional transportation, air quality, or energy conservation plans, including, but not limited to, general plans and a Sustainable Community Strategy in a Regional Transportation Plan.

A description of the projects and programs proposed in the plan and a listing of their priorities for implementation, including the methodology for project prioritization and a proposed timeline for implementation.

A description of past expenditures for bicycle and pedestrian facilities and programs, and future financial needs for projects and programs that improve safety and convenience for bicyclists and pedestrians in the plan area. Include anticipated revenue sources and potential grant funding for bicycle and pedestrian uses.

A description of steps necessary to implement the plan and the reporting process that will be used to keep the adopting agency and community informed of the progress being made in implementing the plan.

A resolution showing adoption of the plan by the city, county or district. If the active transportation plan was prepared by a county transportation commission, regional transportation planning agency, MPO, school district or transit district, the plan should indicate the support via resolution of the city(s) or county(s) in which the proposed facilities would be located.

A city, county, school district, or transit district that has prepared an active transportation plan may submit the plan to the county transportation commission or transportation planning agency for approval. The city, county, school district, or transit district may submit an approved plan to Caltrans in connection with an application for funding active transportation facilities which will implement the plan.

2. Education/Awareness/Encouragement/Enforcement

Education/Awareness/Encouragement/Enforcement 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. Non-infrastructure Safe Routes to Schools projects are also eligible.

- **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.

- **Enforcement** – Targeted enforcement activities around high pedestrian and/or bicycle injury and/or fatality locations (intersections or corridors). These activities cannot be general traffic enforcement but must be tied to improving pedestrian and bicyclist safety.

- Other non-infrastructure investments that demonstrate effectiveness in increasing active transportation such as:
  - Development and implementation of bike-to-work or walk-to-work school day/month programs.
Conducting bicycle and/or pedestrian counts, walkability and/or bikeability assessments or audits, or pedestrian and/or bicycle safety analysis to inform plans and projects.

Conducting pedestrian and bicycle safety education programs.

Development and publishing of community walking and biking maps, including school route/travel plans.

Development and implementation of walking school bus or bike train programs.

Components of open streets events directly linked to the promotion of a new infrastructure project.

School crossing guard training.

School bicycle clinics.

Components of open streets events directly linked to the promotion of a new infrastructure project.

School crossing guard training.

School bicycle clinics.

Development and implementation of programs and tools that maximize use of available and emerging technologies to implement the goals of the Active Transportation Program.

3. Bicycle Parking/Carrying Facilities/Bike Share

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.
- Secure bicycle parking at employment centers, park and ride lots, rail and transit stations, and ferry docks and landings for the benefit of the public.
- Bicycle-carrying facilities on public transit, including rail and ferries.
- Establishment or expansion of a bike share program.

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.

SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOLS PROJECTS

For a project to contribute toward the Safe Routes to School funding requirement, the project must directly increase safety and convenience for public school students to walk and/or bike to school. Other than traffic education and enforcement activities, non-infrastructure projects do not have a location restriction.
How Will Projects Be Scored?

1. **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, carrying facilities, bike share)

- Potential to support smart growth places (ALL)

- Improved safety (planning, education, awareness, encouragement, enforcement)

- Innovation and ability to serve as a model in the region (ALL)

- Prioritization of bicycle and pedestrian access (planning, awareness, encouragement, parking, carrying facilities, bike share)

- Social equity (ALL)

- Potential to increase bicycling and walking for everyday trips (ALL)

- Potential to improve health outcomes over time (planning, education, awareness, encouragement, bike share)

- 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/enforcement, and bicycle parking/carrying facilities/bike share grants. The highest scoring projects will demonstrate the potential for measurable impact across multiple objectives.
2. **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/enforcement:**

Up to 16 points are available. Points will be awarded according to the comprehensiveness of the proposed education, awareness, or encouragement, or enforcement 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/carrying facilities/bike share:**

Up to 12 points are available. Points will be awarded according to the comprehensiveness of the proposed 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.

3. **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/enforcement, and parking/carrying facilities/bike share:**

Up to 30 points are available for education/awareness/encouragement/enforcement, and up to 10 points are available for parking/carrying facilities/bike share. 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/or 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, carrying facilities, and bike share projects must demonstrate that they meet guidelines outlined in *Riding to 2050: The San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan*. Innovations that deviate from the guidelines may be considered. The highest scoring 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.
4. **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,
- fail to involve underserved and limited English proficiency populations (when appropriate in the plan area).

**Education/awareness/encouragement/enforcement, and Bicycle Parking/carrying facilities/bike share:**

Up to 16 points are available for education/awareness/encouragement/enforcement, and up to 10 points are available for parking/carrying facilities/bike share. 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/enforcement 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,
- fail to account for limited English proficiency populations in program delivery (when appropriate in the plan area).

5. **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.
6. **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.

7. **POLICY NO. 033 (REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT INCENTIVE)**

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.

7. **PUBLIC HEALTH**

Up to 10 points will be awarded for improving public health through the targeting of populations with high risk factors for obesity, physical inactivity, asthma, or other health issues. Points will be awarded to applicants that conduct the following:

- Coordinate with the local health department to identify data and risk factors for the community (2 points)
- Describe the targeted populations and the health issues that the project will address (2 points)
- Assess health data using the online California Health Interview Survey (CHIS) tool available at http://healthpolicy.ucla.edu/chis/Pages/default.aspx (3 points)
- Assess the project’s health benefits using the online Health Economic Assessment Tool (HEAT) available at http://www.heatwalkingcycling.org (3 points)

8. **EVALUATION – EDUCATION/AWARENESS/ENCOURAGEMENT/ENFORCEMENT AND PARKING/CARRYING FACILITIES/BIKE SHARE GRANTS ONLY**

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.

9. **INNOVATION – EDUCATION/AWARENESS/ENCOURAGEMENT/ENFORCEMENT AND PARKING/CARRYING FACILITIES/BIKE SHARE GRANTS ONLY**

Up to 10 points are available for education/awareness/encouragement/enforcement grants, and up to 30 points are available for bicycle parking/carrying facilities/bike share 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.
10. **DEMAND (GIS ANALYSIS) – PLANNING AND PARKING/CARRYING FACILITIES/BIKE SHARE GRANTS ONLY**

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

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

**FY11-12 PROPOSED PLANNING, EDUCATION/AWARENESS/ENCOURAGEMENT, AND PARKING PROJECT SCORING CRITERIA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>POINTS POSSIBLE</th>
<th>POINTS POSSIBLE</th>
<th>POINTS POSSIBLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALL GRANTS</td>
<td></td>
<td>PLANNING</td>
<td>E/A/E</td>
<td>PARKING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</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>2.</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/enforcement: Does this effort accompany an existing or proposed capital improvement project? Scale also Parking/carrying facilities/bike share: Does this effort accompany an existing or proposed capital improvement project?</td>
<td>46 15</td>
<td>46 15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</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/enforcement, parking/carrying facilities/bike share: 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>4.</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>20 15</td>
<td>46 15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Matching Funds</td>
<td>Matching funds can be from any of the</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cost/Benefit</th>
<th>Subtotal Score (not counting RHNA points, not counting match points)/Grant Application Amount</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. 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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Public Health</td>
<td>Does the project improve public health by targeting populations with high risk factors for obesity, physical inactivity, asthma, or other health issues?</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EDUCATION, AWARENESS, ENCOURAGEMENT, AND PARKING GRANTS ONLY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>How will the project evaluate its effectiveness?</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. 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>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PLANNING AND PARKING GRANTS ONLY

|   | Demand (GIS analysis) | Factors contributing to score: population and employment, population and employment densities, intersection density, vehicle ownership, and activity centers. | 20 | 20 |

**TOTAL POINTS**

|   | 200160 | 200160 | 200160 |
ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA

ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS

Applicants must meet all of the following eligibility criteria. Applications not meeting all of the following criteria will be deemed ineligible for funding and will not be scored. Please contact Christine Eary at (619) 699-6928 or Christine.Eary@sandag.org if you have any questions about eligibility.

The applicant for Active Transportation Program funds assumes responsibility and accountability for the use and expenditure of program funds. Applicants must be able to comply with all the federal and state laws, regulations, policies and procedures required to enter into a Local Administering Agency-State Master Agreement (Master Agreement). Refer to Chapter 4, Agreements, of the Local Assistance Procedures Manual for guidance and procedures on Master Agreements. The following entities, within the State of California, are eligible to apply for Active Transportation Program funds:

- Local, Regional or State Agencies – examples include city, county, MPO, and Regional Transportation Planning Agency
- Caltrans
- Transit Agencies – Any agency responsible for public transportation that is eligible for funds under the Federal Transit Administration
- Natural Resource of Public Land Agencies – Federal, Tribal, State, or local agency responsible for natural resources or public land administration. Examples include:
  - State or local park or forest agencies
  - State or local fish and game or wildlife agencies
  - Department of the Interior Land Management Agencies
  - U.S. Forest Service
- Public schools or school districts
- Tribal Governments – Federally-recognized Native American Tribes
- Private nonprofit tax-exempt organizations may apply for recreational trails and trailheads, park projects that facilitate trail linkages or connectivity to nonmotorized corridors, and conversion of abandoned railroad corridors to trails. Projects must benefit the general public, and not only a private entity.
- Any other entity with responsibility for oversight of transportation or recreational trails that the California Transportation Commission determines to be eligible

For funding awarded to a tribal government, a fund transfer to the Bureau of Indian Affairs may be necessary. A tribal government may also partner with another eligible entity to apply if desired.

PARTNERING WITH IMPLEMENTING AGENCIES

Entities that are unable to apply for Active Transportation Program funds or that are unable to enter into a Master Agreement with the State must partner with an eligible applicant that can implement the project. Entities that are unfamiliar with the requirements to administer a Federal-Aid Highway Program project may partner with an eligible applicant that can implement the project. If another entity agrees to assume responsibility for the ongoing operations and maintenance of the facility, documentation of the agreement must be submitted with the project application, and a copy of the Memorandum of Understanding or Interagency Agreement between the parties must be submitted with the request for allocation.

The implementing agency will be responsible and accountable for the use and expenditure of program funds.

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA

In addition to the above, applicants must meet all of the following eligibility criteria to be considered for funding:
1. **Community Support/Consistency with Community Plan/Consistency with Regional Transportation Plan**
   Resolution or minutes from City Council, County Board of Supervisors, local planning group, or Planning Commission that indicates community support for the project. OR
   Project is part of a currently adopted Bicycle Plan, Community Plan, Specific Plan, or other planning document that has been approved at the community level.
   All projects submitted must be consistent the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy.

2. **Minimum Design Standards and Guidelines**
   Proposed bicycle and pedestrian elements must meet the minimum geometric standards set forth in the Caltrans Highway Design Manual (Chapter 10), the California MUTCD, and the ADA. Projects may also use AASHTO standards. Must also be consistent with the guidelines outlined in the *San Diego Regional Bike Plan* and *Planning and Designing for Pedestrians*.

3. **Project Readiness**
   Applicant must have completed a feasibility study or an equivalent evaluation of project feasibility. For smaller-scale projects, an equivalent evaluation of project feasibility must have included the following:
   - Agency staff field evaluation
   - Concept drawings
   - Horizontal alignment
   - Identification of potential challenges
   - Identification of right-of-way
   - Identification of environmental requirements
   - Cost estimate
   - Preliminary community input

4. **SANDAG Board Policy No. 031, Rule 21**
   Projects already funded by TransNet are not eligible, and are governed by the Routine Accommodation Provisions outlined in SANDAG Board Policy No. 031, Rule 21.

5. **Baseline Data Collection**
   - Applicants must include baseline data collection within its scope of work, budget, and schedule. Prior to project construction, grantee must collect data on (at minimum) observed bicycle and pedestrian demand and safety in the project area, and submit results to SANDAG. A subset of grantees may be selected for in-depth evaluation by SANDAG, in which case, SANDAG will conduct the data collection effort with required participation from grantee staff. Such in-depth evaluation conducted by SANDAG will take place solely for the purpose of SANDAG Active Transportation data collection and monitoring efforts, and will not impact grantees’ budgets.
   - Bicycle and pedestrian observed demand data must be collected prior to project construction, through counts, observations of bicyclist/pedestrian/driver behavior, and intercept surveys using the National Bicycle and Pedestrian Documentation Project methodology:
     - Counts must be conducted prior to project construction, during National Documentation Days in the second week of September. Supplementary counts and surveys can be conducted during January, May, and July to provide seasonal data if desired.
     - Counts should be conducted for two hours, at peak times relative to the facility. For example, facilities attracting utilitarian trips should be counted on a Tuesday, Wednesday, or Thursday from 5 to 7 p.m., whereas facilities attracting recreational trips should be counted on a Saturday, from 9 to 11 a.m.
     - Counts must be conducted using standard forms, to be provided by SANDAG. The Count Form is provided below as an example. Completed forms must be submitted to SANDAG as a project deliverable.
   - Bicycle and pedestrian safety data must be submitted as part of the project application.
   - Plan to budget up to $5,000 for data collection, depending on the size of the project.
   - For assistance with data collection, contact Christine Eary at Christine.Eary@sandag.org, or (619) 699-6928.

6. **Program Evaluation**
   The Active Transportation Program will be evaluated for its effectiveness in increasing the use of active modes of transportation in California. Applicants that receive funding for a project must collect and submit data to Caltrans as described in the “Project Reporting” section of the statewide Active Transportation Program Guidelines.
6-7. Fully Funded Projects

A project that is already fully funded will not be considered for funding in the Active Transportation Program. The Commission will make an exception to this policy by allowing the supplanting of federal funds on a project for the 2014 Active Transportation Program.

8. Federal Requirements

Unless programmed for state-only funding, project applicants must comply with the provisions of Title 23 of the U.S. Code of Federal Regulations and with the processes and procedures contained in the Caltrans Local Assistance Procedures Manual and the Master Agreement with Caltrans. Below are examples of federal requirements that must be met when administering Active Transportation Program projects.

- National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) compliance and documentation is required on all projects. Refer to Chapter 6, Environmental Procedures, of the Local Assistance Procedures Manual for guidance and procedures on complying with NEPA and other federal environmentally related laws.
- Project applicants may not proceed with the final design of a project or request "Authorization to proceed with Right-of-Way" or "Authorization to proceed with Construction" until Caltrans has signed a Categorical Exclusion, a Finding of No Significant Impact, or a Record of Decision. Failure to follow this requirement will make the project ineligible for federal reimbursement.
- If the project requires the purchase of right of way (the acquisition of real property), the provisions of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 apply. For more information, refer to Chapter 13, Right of Way, of the Local Assistance Procedures Manual.
- If the project applicant requires the consultation services of architects, landscape architects, land surveyors, or engineers, the procedures in the Chapter 10, Consultant Selection, of the Local Assistance Procedures Manual must be followed.
- Contract documents are required to incorporate applicable federal requirements such as Davis Bacon wage rates, competitive bidding, Disadvantaged Business Enterprises/Equal Employment Opportunity provisions, etc. For more information, refer to Chapter 9, Civil Rights and Disadvantaged Business Enterprises, and Chapter 12, Plans, Specifications & Estimate, of the Local Assistance Procedures Manual.

Failure to comply with federal requirements may result in the repayment to the State of Active Transportation Program funds.

9. Funding Limits

The total amount of funding requested by each applicant cannot exceed the total amount available ($8.7 million). The minimum grant request for capital projects is $250,000.

10. Disadvantaged Communities

For a project to contribute toward the Disadvantaged Communities funding requirement, the project must clearly demonstrate a benefit to a community that meets any of the following criteria:

- The median household income is less than 80% of the statewide median based on the most current census tract level data from the American Community Survey. Data is available at http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/nave/jsf/pages/index.xhtml
- An area identified as among the most disadvantaged 10% in the state according to latest versions of the California Communities Environmental Health Screening Tool (CalEnviroScreen) scores. Scores are available at http://oehha.ca.gov/ej/ces11.html
- At least 75% of public school students in the project area are eligible to receive free or reduced-price meals under the National School Lunch Program. Data is available at http://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/sd/filessp.asp. Applicants using this measure must indicate how the project benefits the school students in the project area or, for projects not directly benefitting school students, explain why this measure is representative of the larger community.

If a project applicant believes a project benefits a disadvantaged community but the project does not meet the aforementioned criteria, the applicant must submit for consideration a quantitative assessment of why the community should be considered disadvantaged.
ELIGIBLE PROJECTS

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. Capital projects include both infrastructure projects and infrastructure projects with non-infrastructure components.

Eligible capital grant projects may include but are not limited to:

- Development of new bikeways and walkways that improve mobility, access, or safety for non-motorized users:
  - New bicycle facilities including paths and bicycle boulevards
  - New sidewalks
  - New pedestrian facilities

- Improvements to existing bikeways and walkways, which improve mobility, access, or safety for non-motorized users:
  - Elimination of hazardous conditions on existing bikeways and walkways
  - Preventative maintenance of bikeways and walkways with the primary goal of extending the service life of the facility
  - Bicycle lane striping and widening
  - Widening of sidewalks and sidewalk gap closures
  - Pedestrian over and under crossings
  - Shortcuts to shorten bike/walk travel time and provide for safer connections
  - Bulb outs and intersection treatments
  - Road diets
  - Pedestrian-scale lighting
  - Median refuges
  - Signage and wayfinding

- Installation of traffic control devices to improve the safety of pedestrians and bicyclists:
  - Pedestrian and bicycle-related traffic control devices and pavement markings
  - High visibility crosswalks (ladder/zebra/continental style)
  - Roundabouts and traffic circles
  - Speed humps and speed tables
  - Raised intersections
  - Full or half street closures

- Safe Routes to School projects that improve the safety of children walking and bicycling to school, in accordance with Section 1404 of Public Law 109-59.

- Safe routes to transit projects, which will encourage transit by improving biking and walking routes to mass transportation facilities and school bus stops

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.

SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOLS PROJECTS

For a project to contribute toward the Safe Routes to School funding requirement, the project must directly increase safety and convenience for public school students to walk and/or bike to school. Safe Routes to School infrastructure projects must be located within two miles of a public school or within the vicinity of a public school bus stop.

RECREATIONAL TRAILS

For trail projects that are primarily recreational to be eligible for Active Transportation Program funding, the projects must meet the federal requirements of the Recreational Trails Program as such projects may not be eligible for funding from other sources (http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/recreational_trails/). Multi-purpose trails and paths that serve both
recreational and transportation purposes are generally eligible in the Active Transportation Program, so long as they are consistent with one or more goals of the program.
How Will Projects Be Scored?

**PROJECT READINESS**

1. 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: 2 points
- Environmental clearance (CEQA and/or NEPA; or evidence that environmental clearance is not required) – 4 points
- Right-of-way acquisition (must be complete, including all necessary entitlements, or evidence that no right-of-way acquisition is required) – 4 points
- Final design (plans, specifications, and estimates) – 10 points

**PROJECT CONNECTIONS AND SAFETY**

2. Connection to Regional Bicycle Network

Up to 8 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) – 6 points
- Project will build part of the network, consistent with facility classification proposed in *Riding to 2050* – 8 points

3. Completes Connection/Linkage in Local Bicycle Network

8 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).

4. Completes Connection/Linkage in Existing Pedestrian Network

8 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.

5. 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 – 6 points
- Pedestrian improvements: Score will be based on actual available walking paths, as mapped in GIS.
  - Project is within ¼ mile of a local transit stop – 2 points
  - Project directly connects to a local transit stop (proposed improvements must directly connect to transit stop) – 4 points
  - Project is within ½ mile of a regional transit station – 4 points
  - Project directly connects to a regional transit station (proposed improvements must directly connect to the station) – 6 points
6. 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 7 years:

A. 1 – 2 correctable collisions – 2 points
B. 3 – 4 correctable collisions – 4 points
C. 5 or more correctable collisions – 6 points

and/or

Creates access or overcomes barriers in area where hazardous conditions prohibited safe access for bicyclists and pedestrians – up to 6 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:

1. 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
2. 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.

**QUALITY OF PROJECT**

7. 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 5 points
- Bicycle priority measures – up to 5 points
- Pedestrian priority measures – up to 5 points

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

- Residential Street – 20 mph = Devices every 250 feet, so 1 device would be effective 250 ft. on either side
- Collector or Main Street – 25 mph = 400 feet
- Arterial street (traffic taming) – 35 mph = 800 feet
8. **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

9. **Innovation**

Up to 8 points will be awarded. 4 points will be awarded if the applicant provides evidence of the project being an FHWA or State experimentation effort.

Up to 4 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

**Intersections (cont’d)**

- Median refuge island
- Through bike lanes
- Cycle track intersection approach

**Bicycle Signals**

- Bicycle signal heads
- Signal detection and actuation
- Active warning beacon for bike facility crossing at unsignalized intersection

**Bicycle Signals (cont’d)**
Hybrid signal for bike route crossing of major street

**Bikeway Signing & Marking**

- Colored bike facilities
- Shared lane markings
- Bike route wayfinding signage and markings system
- Innovative pedestrian/traffic calming solutions could include:

**Crossings**

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

**Supportive Programs & Policies**

10. Complementary Programs

Up to 3 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.

11. Supportive Policies and Plans

Up to 3 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.
FORMULA SCORES

12. 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

13. Board Policy No. 033 (Regional Housing Needs Assessment Incentive)

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.

14.13. 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 10 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.

15.14. 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 10 points, and the projects with the lowest cost benefit ratio will receive 1 point.

For projects that only include phases prior to construction:

1. Project will be scored and ranked together with construction projects
2. Score will be reduced according to ultimate phase proposed in project, as follows:
   - Environmental clearance – subtract 75%
   - Right-of-way acquisition – subtract 50%
   - Final design – subtract 25%

15. Public Health

Up to 10 points will be awarded for improving public health through the targeting of populations with high risk factors for obesity, physical inactivity, asthma, or other health issues. Points will be awarded to applicants that conduct the following:

- Coordinate with the local health department to identify data and risk factors for the community (2 points)
- Describe the targeted populations and the health issues that the project will address (2 points)
- Assess health data using the online California Health Interview Survey (CHIS) tool available at http://healthpolicy.ucla.edu/chis/Pages/default.aspx (3 points)
• Assess the project’s health benefits using the online Health Economic Assessment Tool (HEAT) available at http://www.heatwalkingcycling.org (3 points)

17. Use of California Conservation Corps (CCC) or a Qualified Community Conservation Corps

Projects should seek to use the California Conservation Corps or a qualified community conservation corps, as defined in Section 14507.5 of the Public Resources Code, as partners to undertake or construct applicable projects in accordance with Section 1524 of Public Law 112-141. Up to 5 points will be deducted if an applicant does not seek corps participation or if an applicant intends not to utilize a corps in a project in which the corps can participate. Applicants will not be penalized if either corps determines that they cannot participate in a project.

The California Conservation Corps can be contacted at ccc.ca.gov. Community conservation corps can be contacted at californialocalconservationcorps.org.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>POTENTIAL POINTS</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>PROJECT READINESS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Completion of Major Milestones</td>
<td>Projects are eligible for points following completion of each phase:</td>
<td>Up to 20</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community active transportation strategy/neighborhood-level plan/corridor study</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental Clearance</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Right-of-way Acquisition</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Final Design</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>PROJECT CONNECTIONS AND SAFETY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Connection to Regional Bicycle Network</td>
<td>Project directly connects to the Regional Bikeway Network</td>
<td>Up to 8</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project is a part of the Regional Bikeway Network</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</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>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</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>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Connection to Transit</td>
<td>Bike improvements proximity:</td>
<td>Up to 12</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project is within 1.5 mi of regional transit station</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pedestrian improvements proximity:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project is within ¼ mile of a local transit stop</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project directly connects to a local transit stop</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project is within ½ mile of a regional transit station</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project directly connects to a regional transit station</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Safety Improvements and Overcoming Barriers</td>
<td>Completes connection in existing network at location with documented safety hazard or accident history.</td>
<td>Up to 12</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A. 1 – 2 correctable crashes involving nonmotorized users within the last 7 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B. 3 – 4 correctable crashes involving nonmotorized users within the last 7 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C. 5 or more correctable crashes involving nonmotorized users within the last 7 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and/or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Creates access or overcomes barriers in area where hazardous conditions prohibited safe access for bicyclists and pedestrians.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>QUALITY OF PROJECT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Effectiveness and Comprehensiveness of Proposed Bicycle, Pedestrian, and/or Traffic Calming Measures</td>
<td>How well will the proposed traffic calming address the identified need in the project area? Are the proposed solutions appropriate for the situation?</td>
<td>Up to 15 total</td>
<td>7.5% 9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How well will the proposed pedestrian improvements address the identified need in the project area?</td>
<td>Up to 5</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How well will the proposed bicycle improvements address the identified need in the project area?</td>
<td>Up to 5</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Relationship to Program Objectives</td>
<td>How well does the project meet the program objectives?</td>
<td>Up to 18</td>
<td>9% 11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Innovation</td>
<td>Is this project an FHWA or state experimentation effort?</td>
<td>Up to 8 4</td>
<td>4% 5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the project propose solutions that are new to the region, and have the potential to serve as a replicable model for other cities in the region? Does the project utilize innovative solutions such as those listed in the NACTO Urban Bikeway Guide?</td>
<td>Up to 4</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUPPORTIVE POLICIES &amp; PROGRAMS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. 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>
<td>1.5% 2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Supportive Policies and Plans</td>
<td>Demonstrated policy language in approved plan, or a completed community active transportation strategy/plan</td>
<td>Up to 3</td>
<td>1.5% 2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FORMULA SCORES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. 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>
<td>7.5% 9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Regional Housing Needs Assessment Incentive</td>
<td>Score is based on the formula provided in Board Policy No. 033</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. 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>Up to 10</td>
<td>5% 6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Cost/Benefit</td>
<td>Subtotal Score (not counting RHNA points, not counting match points)/Grant Application Amount</td>
<td>Up to 10</td>
<td>5% 6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Public Health</td>
<td>Does the project improve public health by targeting populations with high risk factors for obesity, physical inactivity, asthma, or other health issues?</td>
<td>Up to 10</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. California Conservation</td>
<td>Has the applicant sought California Conservation Corps</td>
<td>0 to -5</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corps</td>
<td>or a qualified Community Conservation Corps participation on the project?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPROVING THE APPLICATION FOR ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM FUNDS
(SENATE BILL 99, CHAPTER 359, AND ASSEMBLY BILL 101, CHAPTER 354)
TO THE CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

WHEREAS, the Legislature and Governor of the State of California have provided funds for the program shown above; and

WHEREAS, the California Transportation Commission (CTC) has been delegated the responsibility for the administration of this grant program, establishing necessary procedures; and

WHEREAS, the San Diego Association on Governments (SANDAG), if selected, will enter into an agreement with the State of California to carry out the development of the proposal.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the SANDAG Board of Directors, acting as its Governing Body:

1. Approves the filing of an application to fund the following capital projects:
   a. Interstate 15 Commuter Bikeway from Adams Avenue to Camino Del Rio South;
   b. Bayshore Bikeway in Barrio Logan;
   c. Coastal Rail Trail in San Diego at Rose Creek; and
   d. Coastal Rail Trail in Encinitas from Chesterfield to G Street; and

2. Certifies that SANDAG, as the applicant, will assume responsibility and accountability for the use and expenditure of program funds; and

3. Certifies that SANDAG is able to comply with all the federal and state laws, regulations, policies and procedures required to enter into a Local Administering Agency-State Master Agreement (Master Agreement); and

4. Appoints the Executive Director, or designee, as agent to conduct all negotiations, and execute and submit all documents including but not limited to applications, agreements, payment requests, and so on, which may be necessary for the completion of the aforementioned project(s).
PASSED AND ADOPTED this 25th day of April 2014.

______________________________           ATTEST: ________________________________
CHAIRPERSON                   SECRETARY

MEMBER AGENCIES: Cities of Carlsbad, Chula Vista, Coronado, Del Mar, El Cajon, Encinitas, Escondido, Imperial Beach, La Mesa, Lemon Grove, National City, Oceanside, Poway, San Diego, San Marcos, Santee, Solana Beach, Vista, and County of San Diego.

ADVISORY MEMBERS: California Department of Transportation, Metropolitan Transit System, North County Transit District, Imperial County, U.S. Department of Defense, San Diego Unified Port District, San Diego County Water Authority, Southern California Tribal Chairmen's Association, and Mexico.
April 18, 2014

Board of Directors
SANDAG
401 B Street, #800
San Diego, CA 92101

Re: Mid City Rapid Bus Project Bus Stop at 5425 El Cajon Blvd

Dear Members of the Board of Directors:

We are the owners of a small shopping center located at 5425-5439 El Cajon Boulevard, San Diego – at the SE corner of 54th Street and El Cajon Boulevard. SANDAG has proposed a new bus stop at that location. Let me first state that we are not necessarily opposed to the bus stop but the process was flawed and we have a proposed alternative superior siting of the bus stop. Our objections are as follows:

Improper Notification:

Public hearings were held on this project late 2012 or early 2013. SANDAG has represented they made several attempts but were “unable to contact” the property owner to participate in the Public hearings. Numerous signs at the Center indicate the name and phone numbers of the Property Manager and the Leasing Agent for the Center. It would appear that SANDAG was either negligent or intentionally made only token attempts to notify the owner. Thus, the property owner was not notified of SANDAG plans until August 23, 2013, after the plans for the bus stop were well developed.

Misrepresentation of Impact:

SANDAG has misrepresented the impact that this bus stop will have on the parking and traffic flow within the Center after completion. Our architect has reviewed the impact of the SANDAG plans and states that after the construction of the bus stop the Center will lose parking spaces, accessibility, convenience, and circulation.

Business Interruption:

The actual construction of the proposed bus stop by SANDAG will necessitate closing one of only two entrances to the Center for an undisclosed period of time,
greatly reducing the ingress/egress and parking within the Center. The SANDAG plan will necessitate a “detour” of 1/2 mile just to access the Center from El Cajon Blvd from all directions and 54th Street from the southerly direction see attached “Detour” diagram. The only access/egress will be from 54th Street northerly direction. Since this is a “convenience center” the resultant lost business will cause substantial loss of goodwill and income and may force several stores to close within the Center. The property owners and business owners will have resulting inverse condemnation claims for loss of goodwill, diminution in value and loss of income and or rents.

Right to Take Issues:

SANDAG wrongfully asserts a right to take our property for the bus stop based upon a 1986 deed describing much more limited rights. The deed reserves to us the right to use the property for the purposes to which it is presently devoted. These uses are parking, access, and landscaping. The bus stop takes our right to continue our present uses without payment of just compensation. Moreover, the bus stop structure is not within the scope of the limited rights described in the deed. Therefore SANDAG is taking our private property for a public use without payment of just compensation as required by the Constitution.

Alternative Proposal:

We delivered to SANDAG (Eric Adams, Senior Project Manager), an alternative proposal for the bus stop on February 24, 2014. Our proposal solves the important issues above and appears to be an actual improvement over the SANDAG site. The alternative site is (1) more level and thus more ADA/handicap friendly and (2) is further from the 54th St/El Cajon Boulevard intersection resulting in better traffic flow through that intersection. SANDAG has not had the courtesy to respond to our alternative proposal.

We respectfully request an opportunity to present our Alternative proposal to you and the reasons for which it is a much better solution to what will certainly become a major problem to the business owners in our Center both during and subsequent to construction of the SANDAG proposal.

Thank you,

Charles Miller
Manager
Mitre Financial, LLC

Encl: Alternative proposal for bus stop location
Report on “How”, for LDVs

The Development of California Light-Duty Vehicle (LDV) Requirements to Support Climate Stabilization: Fleet-Emission Rates & Per-Capita Driving

Paper 2014-A-30793-AWMA*

Mike R. Bullock
Retired Satellite Engineer (36 years), 1800 Bayberry Drive, Oceanside, CA 92054

*Report approved by The Air and Waste Management Association for publication in their Conference Proceedings and a June, 2014 Panel Presentation

“Heroic Measures” Assumptions & Mileage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>ICE Parameters and Calculations</th>
<th>ZEVs</th>
<th>Yearly Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CAFÉ MPG</td>
<td>LCFS</td>
<td>Eq. MPG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>.9267</td>
<td>37.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>.9200</td>
<td>38.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>.9133</td>
<td>39.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>.9000</td>
<td>40.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>.8500</td>
<td>42.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>.8000</td>
<td>47.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>.8000</td>
<td>52.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>.8000</td>
<td>55.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>.8000</td>
<td>58.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>.8000</td>
<td>60.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>.8000</td>
<td>64.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2027</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>.8000</td>
<td>67.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2028</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>.8000</td>
<td>70.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2029</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>.8000</td>
<td>73.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>.8000</td>
<td>76.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Sum of Miles and then Gallons of Equivalent Fuel: | 1247.5 | 11.23 |

Equivalent MPG of LDV Fleet in 2030: 111.12

Sum of ZEV Miles = 860. Fraction of Miles Driven by ZEVs = 68.9%
Fractions of Fleets Sold in California that are Zero Emission Vehicles AND Required Driving Reduction, For 2 Different Cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zero Emission Vehicle (ZEV) Fleet Per-Cent</th>
<th>&amp; Required Driving Reduction, Per-Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Heroic Measures&quot; Case Versus the &quot;Extra Heroic Measures&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heroic Measures</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra Heroic Measures</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heroic Measures</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra Heroic Measures</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% Reduction in Per-Capita Driving, with Respect to 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heroic Measures</th>
<th>-32%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extra Heroic Measures</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Calculation of Net Driving Decrease with Respect to 2005 Driving

\[(\text{Per-Capita Driving Factor}) \times (\text{Population Factor}) = \text{Net Driving Factor}\]

\[(.68) \times (1.23) = .84\]

Even though the population will grow 23%, net driving must decrease by 16%.
To Get the HM* Reductions

GHG Reductions from Cars & Light-Duty Trucks to Support Climate Stabilization

*HM = Heroic Measures Case

In San Diego County, 41% of GHG emissions come from cars and light-duty trucks.

Three Solution Categories

Required Amount of Driving Reduction (32%)

Great Transit

Great Land Use (Complete Streets)

Pricing & Payout

Government (Until transit is profitable)

Developers & Government

More general funds for education and other benefits; because less general funds for roads

Parking-lot earnings go to those for whom the parking is built

Less parking and road expansions are needed, saving $$$$
### Remedies to Ensure 32%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Remedies</th>
<th>Estimated Reduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current predictions of the state’s “SANDAG’s”</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stop expanding freeways</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– No need, Eliminate congestion with less driving</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reallocate freeway-expansion funds to transit</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pricing, to increase fairness &amp; choice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Demonstration projects: unbundle the cost of parking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Legislation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Unbundle the cost of all “free” or underpriced parking</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Equitable and environmentally-sound road-use fees</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Smarter growth, complete streets, bike classes</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pricing, to increase fairness &amp; choice</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**An Important Pricing Strategy**

*A Privacy-Protecting, Road-Use-Fee Pricing & Payout System to Help Solve Climate, Congestion, Deferred Road Maintenance, and the Social Inequity of Using General Funds to Maintain Roads, Since that Money is Needed for Such Things as Transit, Food Stamps, and Education*

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED,** that DEMCCO supports a road-use fee pricing and payout system that (1) would cover all road-use costs, including the environmental and health costs caused by driving; (2) could still include a fuel tax or fee; (3) would mitigate impacts on low-income users; (4) would protect privacy; (5) would include congestion pricing when that technology becomes feasible; (6) would keep the per-mile price incentive to drive energy-efficient cars at least as large as it is with today’s fuel excise tax; and (7) would send its earnings to all citizens and institutions that are losing money under the current system, with the goal being to achieve a full and just compensation.
Another Important Pricing Strategy

Funding for a Demonstration Project of an Equitable and Environmentally-Sound Car-Parking Policy

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that DEMCCO supports funding the development and prototype installation of car-parking systems with at least the last two features (numbered 7 and 8), so as to demonstrate useful feasibility, with the full set of features as follows: (1) have full-cost base pricing; (2) have congestion pricing; (3) have charge and payout policies that will minimize money lost by non-drivers, due to parking facilities; (4) will support sharing of parking facilities; (5) will provide retrievable knowledge of the use of each parking space; (6) have a data interface that will support on-demand predictions of parking-space price and availability; (7) have automatic car detection; and (8) will do efficient mailing of invoices, containing both parking charges and parking earnings.
Climate & Light-Duty Vehicle Requirements

Cause, Required Actions, and LDV Transportation Solutions in Environmental Planning

Mike Bullock
mike_bullock@earthlink.net
Sierra Club, San Diego Chapter

The Climate Problem

Any Earth Science text book* contains the following facts:

• Atmospheric CO2 traps heat
  – CO2 Molecules absorb and then emit, in a random direction, infrared radiation, heat given off by the Earth’s surface
  – This effect is significant
• Combustion of fossil fuels greatly increases our Earth’s levels of atmospheric CO2
  – The amount of CO2 in the atmosphere is well known
  – Our yearly emissions are well known

How Bad Could It Get?

- *Scientific American* June 2008 issue
  - 550 PPM CO2 possible in several decades
  - This could (5% probability) lead to 8 Deg. Celsius of warming
  - 8 Deg. Celsius could lead to “a devastating collapse of the human population, perhaps even to extinction”

- December 24/31 2012 Issue of Nation magazine:

> A recent string of reports from impeccable mainstream institutions—the International Energy Agency, the World Bank, the accounting firm of PricewaterhouseCoopers—have warned that the Earth is on a trajectory to warm by at least 4 Degrees Celsius

> [4 Degrees Celsius] would be incompatible with continued human survival.

> Winter, *UU World* magazine (p. 57)  “Lags in the replacement of fossil-fuel use by clean energy use have put the world on a pace for 6 degree Celsius by the end of this century. Such a large temperature rise occurred 250 million years ago and extinguished 90 percent of the life on Earth. The current rise is of the same magnitude but is occurring faster. We must reduce or eliminate all uses of fossil fuels.

Governor’s Executive Order S-3-05

California's S-3-05 CO2_e Emissions, MMT Per Year

The world is currently above its trajectory. The world will need to get emissions below the trajectory to make up for this.
Our Climate Crisis

- Earth & Space Research (ESR) website: http://www.esr.org/outreach/climate_change/mans_impact/man1.html

  Current level = 400 PPM

  S-3-05’s Goal is to cap CO2 at 450 PPM, which is off this chart.

Our Climate Crisis

- From: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/An_Inconvenient_Truth#Scientific_basis

  Current Level of CO2 is 400 PPM

  S-3-05’s goal is to cap CO2 at 450 PPM

  S-3-05 Achievement Outcomes

  - X% chance > 4 (Extinction?)
  - 30% chance > 3 (very bad)
  - 50% chance > 2 (bad)
BRIEF OF SCIENTISTS AMICUS GROUP AS AMICI CURIAE IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS-APPELLANTS SEEKING REVERSAL

DANIEL M. GALPERN
Law Offices of Charles M. Tebbutt, P.C.
941 Lawrence St. Eugene, OR 97401-2815
USCA Case #13-5192 Document #1465822 Filed: 11/12/2013

A. Parties and Amici. Except for the following, all parties, intervenors, and amici appearing before the district court and in this Court are listed in the Brief for Plaintiffs-Appellants. James Hansen, David Beerling, Paul J. Hearty, Ove Hoegh-Guldberg, Pushker Kharecha, Valérie Masson-Delmotte, Camille Parmesan, Eelco Rohling, Makiko Sato, Pete Smith, and Lise Van Susteren are amici curiae in this appeal (referred to hereinafter as “Amici Scientists.”).

From the Climate Scientists
From Page 21: . . . the required rate of emissions reduction would have been about 3.5% per year if reductions had started in 2005, while the required rate of reduction, if commenced in 2020, will be approximately 15% per year.

• My math:
  – 15% means a factor of 0.85, year after year
  – Consider the 10 years from 2020 to 2030
  – (.85)\(^{10}\) = .20, which is 80% down
  – Other articles, describing Hansen’s work: “decarbonization by 2030”
New **Prescription for Climate Stabilization**

California's S-3-05 C02_e Emissions, MMT Per Year

**GHG Emissions, SD County**

Source: Energy Policy Initiatives Center (EPIC, USD)
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