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---

SANDAG offices are accessible by public transit. Phone 511 or see 511sd.com for route information.

Bicycle parking is available in the parking garage of the SANDAG offices.
1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

2. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES
   The Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG) is asked to review and approve the minutes from its June 9, 2016, meeting.

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

REPORTS

4. POTENTIAL COLLABORATION TO REDUCE ORGANIC MATERIALS FROM LANDFILLS (Rob Rundle)
   Assembly Bill 1826 (Chesbro, 2014) requires local jurisdictions to meet requirements for removing organic materials such as yard trimmings, food scraps, and wood from landfills. The Regional Planning Committee received a presentation on food waste and composting issues at its June 3, 2016, meeting and referred this item to the TWG for information and discussion. Today's item will consist of three components:
   A. Colleen Foster, City of Oceanside, representing the organics subcommittee of the Countywide Integrated Waste Management Citizens and Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), will discuss infrastructure needs related to organics and the relationships between reducing organic materials from landfills and implementing local Climate Action Plans.
   B. Elly Brown and Tyla Montgomery from the San Diego Food System Alliance will discuss food waste challenges and solutions.
   C. James Eggart, General Manager and General Counsel of the Regional Solid Waste Association of San Diego County, will provide an overview of ongoing conversations and dialogues on the new organic materials regulatory requirements.

RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE
Over the past months, the SANDAG Board of Directors has been considering a funding measure to implement San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan. Staff will present a status report, including the most recent updates to the proposed expenditure plan discussed by the Board of Directors at its June 24, 2016, meeting, as well as current and next steps for getting the funding measure on the November 2016 ballot. The most recently updated information, including projects proposed in each subregion, is posted in the report for the July 8, 2016, Board meeting and is available at sandag.org/priorities.

A. SANDAG EFFORTS: Staff provided a report to the SANDAG Board of Directors on June 24, 2016, which included feedback received from the TWG, Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee, Regional Planning Committee, and Transportation Committee. As one of the next implementation steps, the TWG is requested to review the performance measures included in the Regional Complete Streets Policy, discuss options for collecting the information for the monitoring report, and discuss the proposed survey on roundabouts and traffic circles.

B. CIRCULATE SAN DIEGO: Kathleen Ferrier of Circulate San Diego will discuss the group’s effort to showcase the economic benefits of complete streets and active transportation in various areas throughout the region.

This report provides an overview of progress made by TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program and Active Transportation Grant Program recipients through March 31, 2016. It is anticipated that the call for projects for the fourth cycle of the Smart Growth Incentive Program and Active Transportation Grant Program will be held in fall/winter of 2017/2018, with grant awards made in summer 2018. Prior to the call for projects, SANDAG will review the grant evaluation criteria, Smart Growth Concept Map, and update the Regional Housing Progress Report associated with Board Policy No. 033: Implementation Guidelines for SANDAG Regional Housing Needs Assessment Funding Incentives.

Staff will update the TWG on the status of the Series 14 Regional Growth Forecast and local jurisdiction inputs.

This item provides an opportunity for TWG members to provide brief updates on the latest planning projects occurring in their jurisdictions.
10. ADJOURNMENT AND NEXT MEETING

The next TWG meeting is scheduled for Thursday, September 8, 2016, at 1:15 p.m.
The August 11, 2016, meeting will be cancelled.

+ next to an agenda item indicates an attachment
JUNE 9, 2016, MEETING MINUTES

Please note: Audio file of the meeting is available on the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) website, sandag.org, on the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG) page.

The meeting of the TWG was called to order by Chair Brad Raulston (National City), at 1:22 p.m.

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Self-introductions were made.

2. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES (APPROVE)

2A – Approval of the April 14, 2016, meeting minutes

Action: Upon a motion by Jeff Hunt (Oceanside), and a second by Bill Chopyk (Solana Beach), the TWG unanimously approved the April 14, 2016, meeting minutes. Yes: Chair Raulston, David De Cordova (Carlsbad), Kelly Broughton (Chula Vista), Tony Shute (El Cajon), Bill Martin (Escondido), Jim Nakagawa (Imperial Beach), Carol Dick (La Mesa), David DeVries (Lemon Grove), Jeff Hunt (Oceanside), Joseph Lim (Poway), Lara Gates (San Diego), Bill Chopyk (Solana Beach), and John Conley (Vista); No: None; Abstain: None; Absent: Coronado, Del Mar, Encinitas, County of San Diego, San Marcos, and Santee.

2B – Approval of May 5, 2016, meeting minutes

Action: Upon a motion by Mr. Hunt (Oceanside), and a second by Kathy Keehan (Air Pollution Control District), the TWG unanimously approved the May 5, 2016, meeting minutes. Yes: Chair Raulston, Mr. De Cordova (Carlsbad), Ms. Broughton (Chula Vista), Mr. Shute (El Cajon), Mr. Martin (Escondido), Mr. Nakagawa (Imperial Beach), Ms. Dick (La Mesa), Mr. DeVries (Lemon Grove), Mr. Hunt (Oceanside), Mr. Lim (Poway), Ms. Gates (San Diego), Mr. Chopyk (Solana Beach), and Mr. Conley (Vista); No: None; Abstain: None; Absent: Coronado, Del Mar, Encinitas, County of San Diego, San Marcos, and Santee.
3. PUBLIC COMMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS

Carolina Illic, Senior Regional Planner, SANDAG, announced that Susan Baldwin, Senior Regional Planner, SANDAG, received the John Craven Memorial Award from the San Diego Housing Federation for her affordable housing efforts and that Kiran Kaur, Regional Planning Intern at SANDAG, received her Masters in Public Policy at San Diego State University. Congratulations to both.

The TWG congratulated Mr. Batchelder on his retirement from the City of Chula Vista. Mr. Batchelder introduced Scott Donaghe from Chula Vista, who will begin attending TWG meetings.

CONSENT

4. STATUS UPDATE ON SANDAG APPLICATIONS TO THE AFFORDABLE HOUSING AND SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES PROGRAM (INFORMATION)

This report included information regarding the two applications SANDAG was invited to submit to the Strategic Growth Council for the Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities Program.

Action: This consent item was provided for information.

CHAIR’S REPORT

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

Chair Raulston shared items discussed at the last Regional Planning Committee meeting with TWG members.

Action: This item was provided for information.

REPORTS

6. SAN DIEGO FORWARD: THE REGIONAL PLAN: PROGRESS ON IMPLEMENTATION (INFORMATION)

Elisa Arias, Principal Regional Planner, SANDAG, presented an overview of progress to date on implementation of the near-term and continuing actions included in San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan (Regional Plan).

Action: This item was presented for information.

7. STATUS REPORT ON FUNDING MEASURE (INFORMATION)

Rob Rundle, Principal Regional Planner, SANDAG, provided TWG members with a status report on the proposed funding measure, including the proposed expenditure plan discussed by the Board of Directors and current and next steps for getting the funding measure on the November 2016 ballot.

Action: This item was presented for information.
8. REGIONAL TRANSIT ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY – UPDATE ON KEY EARLY ACTIONS (INFORMATION)

Ms. Baldwin provided an update on the status of the work to date on the early actions for the Regional Transit Oriented Development Strategy, which is included as part of the Regional Plan.

**Action:** This item was provided for information.

9. UPDATE ON REGIONAL COMPLETE STREETS POLICY IMPLEMENTATION (INFORMATION)

Ms. Ilic and Stephan Vance, Senior Regional Planner, SANDAG, summarized comments from the joint TWG/CTAC Complete Streets workshop held in May and reported feedback from the Regional Planning and Transportation Committees. In addition, staff solicited input from TWG members on prioritizing next steps for implementation.

**Action:** This item was provided for information.

10. MEMBER COMMUNICATIONS (INFORMATION)

TWG members discussed region-wide concerns and provided staff with possible future discussion topics.

11. ADJOURNMENT AND NEXT MEETINGS (INFORMATION)

Chair Raulston adjourned the meeting of the TWG at 2:58 p.m. The next regularly-scheduled TWG meeting is scheduled for Thursday, July 14, 2016, at 1:15 p.m.
## REGIONAL PLANNING TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP
### MEETING ATTENDANCE FOR JUNE 9, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JURISDICTION/ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ATTENDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Carlsbad</td>
<td>Don Neu</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David De Cordova</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Chula Vista</td>
<td>Kelly Broughton</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ed Batchelder</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marilyn Ponseggi</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Coronado</td>
<td>Rachel Hurst</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jesse Brown</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Del Mar</td>
<td>Kathy Garcia</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of El Cajon</td>
<td>Tony Shute</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Majed Al-Ghafry</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Encinitas</td>
<td>Manjeet Ranu</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michael Strong</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Escondido</td>
<td>Jay Petrek</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bill Martin</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Imperial Beach</td>
<td>Steve Dush</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jim Nakagawa</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tyler Foltz</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of La Mesa</td>
<td>Carol Dick</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chris Jacobs</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Lemon Grove</td>
<td>David DeVries</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of National City</td>
<td>Brad Raulston (TWG Chair)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ray Pe</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Oceanside</td>
<td>Jeff Hunt</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Russ Cunningham</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Poway</td>
<td>Robert (Bob) Manis</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joseph Lim</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>Nancy Bragado</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jeff Murphy</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brian Schoenfisch</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lara Gates</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>Noah Alvey</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joe Farace</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bob Citrano</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JURISDICTION/ORGANIZATION</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>ATTENDING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Marcos</td>
<td>Karen Brindley (TWG Vice Chair)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saima Qureshy</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santee</td>
<td>Melanie Kush</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John O'Donnell</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Solana Beach</td>
<td>Bill Chopyk</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cory Andrews</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Vista</td>
<td>John Conley</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Patsy Chow</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ADVISORY MEMBERS LISTED BELOW (ATTENDANCE NOT COUNTED FOR QUORUM PURPOSES)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JURISDICTION/ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ATTENDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Bill Figge, AICP</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chris Schmidt, AICP</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North County Transit District</td>
<td>Dahvia Lynch</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Johnny Dunning</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Transit System</td>
<td>Denis Desmond</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego Unified Port District</td>
<td>Lesley Nishihira</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lucy Contreras</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego County Regional Airport Authority</td>
<td>Keith Wilschetz</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego County Regional Water Authority</td>
<td>Dana Friehauf</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Dept. of Defense</td>
<td>Anna Shepherd</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Pollution Control District</td>
<td>Kathy Kuehan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Andy Hamilton</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Agency Formation Commission</td>
<td>Robert Barry, AICP</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joe Serrano</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OTHER ATTENDEES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cameron Celeste, City of Chula Vista</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SANDAG STAFF MEMBERS LISTED BELOW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charles “Mugs” Stoll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coleen Clementson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolina Illic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Baldwin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elisa Arias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob Rundle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephan Vance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiran Kaur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Hoyos</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
POTENTIAL COLLABORATION TO REDUCE ORGANIC MATERIALS FROM LANDFILLS

Introduction

In October 2014, Assembly Bill 1826 (AB 1826) (Chesbro) was signed into law and requires local jurisdictions to meet requirements for removing organic materials from landfills (Attachment 1). Organic materials such as yard trimmings, food scraps, and wood remain the most prevalent items in the waste stream, representing approximately one-third of materials disposed. This bill follows a history of legislation that has guided the involvement of SANDAG in various levels of solid waste planning over a number of years.

Discussion

In 1989, Assembly Bill 939 (Sher) (Integrated Waste Management Act) was signed into law and required the development of a regional Integrated Waste Management Plan and the formation of a local task force to advise on the development and future updates of the plan. In 1990, SANDAG was designated as the Local Task Force and was responsible for staffing a Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) and a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) to provide input into solid waste planning in the region.

In 2004, the SANDAG Board of Directors requested that staff review all SANDAG assignments and its committee structure to determine whether there were some activities that no longer served SANDAG’s core legislative responsibilities. Through that review process and budget shortfalls, it was determined that SANDAG could no longer staff the CAC and TAC, and those responsibilities were assumed by the County of San Diego. The County of San Diego staffed both committees until the TAC responsibilities were subsequently turned over to the City of Chula Vista.

Since that time, SANDAG has not included solid waste planning of any type in the Program Budget and Overall Work Program and has only provided minimal input to local agencies that were updating or amending waste management plans (i.e., Non-Disposal Facilities Elements), which was the primary purpose of the Local Task Force. In 2012, Assembly Bill 341 (AB 341) (Chesbro) was passed to further increase the goal for diverting waste from landfills. AB 341 eliminated the requirement for Local Task Forces (such as SANDAG) to provide input to local agencies updating or amending their solid waste plans. Since that time, SANDAG has had no role in solid waste planning in the region. In addition, the recently adopted San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan did not include a discussion of landfill capacity or any solid waste issues.
SANDAG has received periodic requests to take a more active role in solid waste issues in the region. So far, the SANDAG Board of Directors has not included funding in the budget for SANDAG to commit staff resources to this issue.

Today’s item is a request by stakeholders to present a proposal for potential collaboration on reducing organic materials from local landfills. Attachment 2 consists of a letter from the TAC to SANDAG, dated August 2015, outlining the proposal. Representatives from the San Diego Food Alliance will make the presentation.

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

Attachments: 1. AB 1826
              2. TAC Letter to SANDAG

Key Staff Contact: Rob Rundle, (619) 699-6949; rob.rundle@sandag.org
Assembly Bill No. 1826

CHAPTER 727

An act to add Chapter 12.9 (commencing with Section 42649.8) to Part 3 of Division 30 of the Public Resources Code, relating to solid waste.

[Approved by Governor September 28, 2014. Filed with Secretary of State September 28, 2014.]

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL’S DIGEST

(1) The California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989, which is administered by the Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery, establishes an integrated waste management program that requires each county and city and county to prepare and submit to the department a countywide integrated waste management plan. The act requires a business, which is defined as a commercial or public entity, that generates more than 4 cubic yards of commercial solid waste per week or is a multifamily residential dwelling of 5 units or more, to arrange for recycling services. Existing law also requires jurisdictions to implement a commercial solid waste recycling program meeting specified elements.

This bill would, commencing April 1, 2016, require a business that generates a specified amount of organic waste per week to arrange for recycling services for that organic waste in a specified manner. The bill would decrease the amount of organic waste under which a business would be subject to those requirements from 8 cubic yards or more to 4 cubic yards or more on January 1, 2017. The bill would also require a business that generates 4 cubic yards or more of commercial solid waste per week, on and after January 1, 2019, to arrange for organic waste recycling services and, if the department makes a specified determination, would decrease that amount to 2 cubic yards, on or after January 1, 2020.

This bill would require the contract or work agreement between a business and a gardening or landscaping service to require the organic waste generated by those services to comply with the requirements of this act.

This bill would require each jurisdiction, on and after January 1, 2016, to implement an organic waste recycling program to divert organic waste from the businesses subject to this act, except as specified with regard to rural jurisdictions, thereby imposing a state-mandated local program by imposing new duties on local governmental agencies. The bill would require each jurisdiction to report to the department on its progress in implementing the organic waste recycling program, and the department would be required to review whether a jurisdiction is in compliance with this act.
This bill would authorize a local governmental agency to charge and collect a fee from an organic waste generator to recover the local governmental agency’s costs incurred in complying with this act.

This bill would require the department to identify and recommend actions to address permitting and siting challenges and to encourage the continued viability of the state’s organic waste processing and recycling infrastructure, in partnership with the California Environmental Protection Agency and other specified state and regional agencies. The bill also would require the department to cooperate with local jurisdictions and industry to provide assistance for increasing the feasibility of organic waste recycling and to identify certain state financing mechanisms and state funding incentives and post this information on its Internet Web site.

(2) The California Constitution requires the state to reimburse local agencies and school districts for certain costs mandated by the state. Statutory provisions establish procedures for making that reimbursement.

This bill would provide that no reimbursement is required by this act for a specified reason.

The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. Chapter 12.9 (commencing with Section 42649.8) is added to Part 3 of Division 30 of the Public Resources Code, to read:

CHAPTER 12.9. RECYCLING OF ORGANIC WASTE

42649.8. For purposes of this chapter, the following terms shall apply:
(a) “Business” means a commercial or public entity, including, but not limited to, a firm, partnership, proprietorship, joint stock company, corporation, or association that is organized as a for-profit or nonprofit entity, or a multifamily residential dwelling.
(b) “Commercial waste generator” means a business subject to subdivision (a) of Section 42649.2.
(c) “Organic waste” means food waste, green waste, landscape and pruning waste, nonhazardous wood waste, and food-soiled paper waste that is mixed in with food waste.
(d) “Organic waste generator” means a business subject to subdivision (a) of Section 42649.81.
(e) “Rural jurisdiction” means a jurisdiction that is located entirely within one or more rural counties, or a regional agency comprised of jurisdictions that are located within one or more rural counties.
(f) “Rural county” means a county that has a total population of less than 70,000 persons.
(g) “Self-hauler” means a business that hauls its own waste rather than contracting for that service and “self-haul” means to act as a self-hauler.

42649.81. (a) (1) On and after April 1, 2016, a business that generates eight cubic yards or more of organic waste per week shall arrange for
recycling services specifically for organic waste in the manner specified in subdivision (b).

(2) On and after January 1, 2017, a business that generates four cubic yards or more of organic waste per week shall arrange for recycling services specifically for organic waste in the manner specified in subdivision (b).

(3) On and after January 1, 2019, a business that generates four cubic yards or more of commercial solid waste, as defined in Section 42649.1, per week, shall arrange for recycling services specifically for organic waste in the manner specified in subdivision (b).

(4) On or after January 1, 2020, if the department determines that statewide disposal of organic waste has not been reduced to 50 percent of the level of disposal during 2014, a business that generates two cubic yards or more per week of commercial solid waste shall arrange for the organic waste recycling services specified in paragraph (3), unless the department determines that this requirement will not result in significant additional reductions of organics disposal.

(5) A business located in a rural jurisdiction that is exempted pursuant to paragraph (2) of subdivision (a) of Section 42649.82 is not subject to this chapter.

(b) A business subject to subdivision (a) shall take at least one of the following actions:

(1) Source separate organic waste from other waste and subscribe to a basic level of organic waste recycling service that includes collection and recycling of organic waste.

(2) Recycle its organic waste onsite or self-haul its own organic waste for recycling.

(3) Subscribe to an organic waste recycling service that may include mixed waste processing that specifically recycles organic waste.

(4) Make other arrangements consistent with paragraph (3) of subdivision (b) of Section 42649.84.

(c) A business that is a property owner may require a lessee or tenant of that property to source separate their organic waste to aid in compliance with this section.

(d) A business generating organic waste shall arrange for the recycling services required by this section in a manner that is consistent with state and local laws and requirements, including a local ordinance or local jurisdiction’s franchise agreement, applicable to the collection, handling, or recycling of solid and organic waste.

(e) When arranging for gardening or landscaping services, the contract or work agreement between a business subject to this section and a gardening or landscaping service shall require that the organic waste generated by those services be managed in compliance with this chapter.

(f) (1) A multifamily residential dwelling that consists of fewer than five units is not a business for purposes of this chapter.

(2) A business that is a multifamily dwelling is not required to arrange for the organic waste recycling services specified in subdivision (b) for food waste that is generated by the business.
(g) If separate organic waste collection and recycling services are not offered through a local ordinance or local jurisdiction’s franchise agreement, a business generating organic waste may arrange for separate organic waste collection and recycling services, until the local ordinance or local jurisdiction’s franchise agreement includes organic waste recycling services.

42649.82. (a) (1) In addition to the requirements of Section 42649.3, on and after January 1, 2016, each jurisdiction shall implement an organic waste recycling program that is appropriate for that jurisdiction and designed specifically to divert organic waste generated by businesses subject to Section 42649.81, whether or not the jurisdiction has met the requirements of Section 41780.

(2) (A) A county board of supervisors of a rural county may adopt a resolution, as prescribed in this paragraph, to make the rural county exempt from the requirements of this section. If a rural jurisdiction is a city, the city council may adopt a resolution, as prescribed in this paragraph, to make the rural jurisdiction exempt from this section. If a rural jurisdiction is a regional agency comprised of jurisdictions that are located entirely within one or more rural counties, the board of the regional agency may adopt a resolution, as prescribed in this paragraph, to make the rural jurisdiction exempt from the requirements of this section.

(B) A resolution adopted pursuant to subparagraph (A) shall include findings as to the purpose of and need for the exemption.

(C) A resolution to exempt a rural jurisdiction pursuant to subparagraph (A) shall be submitted to the department at least six months before the operative date of the exemption.

(D) On or after January 1, 2020, if the department determines that statewide disposal of organic waste has not been reduced to 50 percent of the level of disposal during the 2014 calendar year, all exemptions authorized by this paragraph shall terminate unless the department determines that applying this chapter to rural jurisdictions will not result in significant additional reductions of disposal of organic waste.

(b) If a jurisdiction, as of January 1, 2016, has in place an organic waste recycling program that meets the requirements of this section, it is not required to implement a new or expanded organic waste recycling program.

(c) The organic waste recycling program required by this section shall be directed at organic waste generators and may include, but is not limited to, one or more of the following:

(1) Implementing a mandatory commercial organic waste recycling policy or ordinance that addresses organic waste recycling.

(2) Requiring a mandatory commercial organic waste recycling program through a franchise contract or agreement.

(3) Requiring organic waste to go through a source separated or mixed processing system that diverts material from disposal.

(d) (1) The organic waste recycling program shall do all of the following:

(A) Identify all of the following:

(i) Existing organic waste recycling facilities within a reasonable vicinity and the capacities available for materials to be accepted at each facility.
(ii) Existing solid waste and organic waste recycling facilities within the
jurisdiction that may be suitable for potential expansion or colocation of
organic waste processing or recycling facilities.

(iii) Efforts of which the jurisdiction is aware that are underway to
develop new private or public regional organic waste recycling facilities
that may serve some or all of the organic waste recycling needs of the
commercial waste generators within the jurisdiction subject to this chapter,
and the anticipated timeframe for completion of those facilities.

(iv) Closed or abandoned sites that might be available for new organic
waste recycling facilities.

(v) Other nondisposal opportunities and markets.

(vi) Appropriate zoning and permit requirements for the location of new
organic waste recycling facilities.

(vii) Incentives available, if any, for developing new organic waste
recycling facilities within the jurisdiction.

(B) Identify barriers to siting new or expanded compostable materials
handling operations, as defined in paragraph (12) of subdivision (a) of
Section 17852 of the Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations, and
specify a plan to remedy those barriers that are within the control of the
local jurisdiction.

(C) Provide for the education of, outreach to, and monitoring of,
businesses. The program shall require the jurisdiction to notify a business
if the business is not in compliance with Section 42649.81.

(2) For purposes of subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1), an “organic waste
recycling facility” shall include compostable materials handling operations,
as defined in paragraph (12) of subdivision (a) of Section 17852 of Title 14
of the California Code of Regulations, and may include other facilities that
recycle organic waste.

(e) The organic waste recycling program may include any one or more
of the following:

(1) Enforcement provisions that are consistent with the jurisdiction’s
authority, including a structure for fines and penalties.

(2) Certification requirements for self-haulers.

(3) Exemptions, on a case-by-case basis, from the requirements of Section
42649.81 that are deemed appropriate by the jurisdiction for any of the
following reasons:

(A) Lack of sufficient space in multifamily complexes or businesses to
provide additional organic material recycling bins.

(B) The current implementation by a business of actions that result in
the recycling of a significant portion of its organic waste.

(C) The business or group of businesses does not generate at least one-half
of a cubic yard of organic waste per week.

(D) Limited-term exemptions for extraordinary and unforeseen events.

(E) (i) The business or group of businesses does not generate at least
one cubic yard of organic waste per week, if the local jurisdiction provides
the department with information that explains the need for this higher
exemption than that authorized by subparagraph (C).
(ii) The information described in clause (i) shall be provided to the department with the information provided pursuant to subdivision (f).

(iii) This subparagraph shall not be operative on or after January 1, 2020, if the department, pursuant to paragraph (4) of subdivision (a) of Section 42649.81, determines that statewide disposal of organic waste has not been reduced to 50 percent of the level of disposal during the 2014 calendar year.

(f) (1) Each jurisdiction shall provide the department with information on the number of regulated businesses that generate organic waste and, if available, the number that are recycling organic waste. The jurisdiction shall include this information as part of the annual report required pursuant to Section 41821.

(2) On and after August 1, 2017, in addition to the information required by paragraph (1), each jurisdiction shall report to the department on the progress achieved in implementing its organic waste recycling program, including education, outreach, identification, and monitoring, on its rationale for allowing exemptions, and, if applicable, on enforcement efforts. The jurisdiction shall include this information as part of the annual report required pursuant to Section 41821.

(g) (1) The department shall review a jurisdiction’s compliance with this section as part of the department’s review required by Section 41825.

(2) The department also may review whether a jurisdiction is in compliance with this section at any time that the department receives information that a jurisdiction has not implemented, or is not making a good faith effort to implement, an organic waste recycling program.

(h) During a review pursuant to subdivision (g), the department shall determine whether the jurisdiction has made a good faith effort to implement its selected organic waste recycling program. For purposes of this section, “good faith effort” means all reasonable and feasible efforts by a jurisdiction to implement its organic waste recycling program. During its review, the department may include, but is not limited to, consideration of the following factors in its evaluation of a jurisdiction’s good faith effort:

(1) The extent to which businesses have complied with Section 42649.81, including information on the amount of disposal that is being diverted from the businesses, if available, and on the number of businesses that are complying with Section 42649.81.

(2) The recovery rate of the organic waste from the material recovery facilities that are utilized by the businesses, all information, methods, and calculations, and any additional performance data, as requested by the department from the material recovery facilities pursuant to Section 18809.4 of Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations.

(3) The extent to which the jurisdiction is conducting education and outreach to businesses.

(4) The extent to which the jurisdiction is monitoring businesses and notifying those businesses that are not in compliance.

(5) The appropriateness of exemptions allowed by the jurisdiction.

(6) The availability of markets for collected organic waste recyclables.

(7) Budgetary constraints.
In the case of a rural jurisdiction, the effects of small geographic size, low population density, or distance to markets.

The availability, or lack thereof, of sufficient organic waste processing infrastructure, organic waste recycling facilities, and other nondisposal opportunities and markets.

The extent to which the jurisdiction has taken steps that are under its control to remove barriers to siting and expanding organic waste recycling facilities.

42649.83. (a) If a jurisdiction adds or expands an organic waste recycling program to meet the requirements of Section 42649.82, the jurisdiction shall not be required to revise its source reduction and recycling element or obtain the department’s approval pursuant to Article 1 (commencing with Section 41800) of Chapter 7 of Part 2.

(b) If an addition or expansion of a jurisdiction’s organic waste recycling program is necessary, the jurisdiction shall include this information in the annual report required pursuant to Section 41821.

42649.84. (a) This chapter does not limit the authority of a local governmental agency to adopt, implement, or enforce a local organic waste recycling requirement, or a condition imposed upon a self-hauler, that is more stringent or comprehensive than the requirements of this chapter.

(b) This chapter does not modify, limit, or abrogate in any manner any of the following:

(1) A franchise granted or extended by a city, county, city and county, or other local governmental agency.

(2) A contract, license, or permit to collect solid waste previously granted or extended by a city, county, city or county, or other local governmental agency.

(3) The existing right of a business to sell or donate its recyclable organic waste materials.

(c) Notwithstanding any other requirement of this chapter, nothing in this chapter modifies, limits, or abrogates the authority of a local jurisdiction with respect to land use, zoning, or facility siting decisions by or within that local jurisdiction.

42649.85. A local governmental agency may charge and collect a fee from an organic waste generator to recover the local governmental agency’s costs incurred in complying with this chapter.

42649.86. (a) The department shall identify and recommend actions to address, with regard to both state agencies and the federal government, the permitting and siting challenges associated with composting and anaerobic digestion, and to encourage the continued viability of the state’s organic waste processing and recycling infrastructure, in partnership with the California Environmental Protection Agency and other state and regional agencies. These other state and regional agencies shall include, but are not limited to, the State Air Resources Board, the State Energy Resources Conservation and Development Commission, the Public Utilities Commission, the Department of Food and Agriculture, the State Water
Resources Control Board, California regional water quality control boards, and air pollution control and air quality management districts.

(b) The department shall cooperate with local governmental agencies and industry to provide assistance for increasing the feasibility of organic recycling by promoting processing opportunities and the development of new infrastructure of sufficient capacity to meet the needs of generators, and developing sufficient end-use markets throughout the state for the quantity of organic waste required to be diverted.

(c) The department shall identify and post on its Internet Web site state financing mechanisms and state funding incentives that are available for in-state development of organic waste infrastructure to help the state achieve its greenhouse gas reduction goals and waste reduction goals.

SEC. 2. No reimbursement is required by this act pursuant to Section 6 of Article XIII B of the California Constitution because a local agency or school district has the authority to levy service charges, fees, or assessments sufficient to pay for the program or level of service mandated by this act, within the meaning of Section 17556 of the Government Code.
TO: SANDAG Regional Planning – Solid Waste Taskforce

FROM: SANDAG Solid Waste Taskforce – Integrated Waste Management Technical Advisory Committee

SUBJECT: REGIONAL DISCUSSION AND PLANNING FOR ORGANIC MATERIALS MANAGEMENT

The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) for the SANDAG Solid Waste Taskforce seeks guidance from the Solid Waste Taskforce on how best to achieve a regional solution to AB 1826 implementation using the many resources of SANDAG. The TAC has recently been working on ways to address the implementation of new legislation related to organic materials, specifically AB 1826, which will phase-in requirements to divert organic materials from the landfill starting in 2016 and AB 1594, which will no longer provide diversion credit for organic materials used as landfill cover starting in 2020. TAC recognizes the need for a discussion and investigation into organic materials management in the San Diego Region including siting new facilities, alternative options to landfilling, regulations, and benefits. With this information, the region can develop policies and programs toward better management of its organic resources. As most organic processing facilities serve multiple jurisdictions, discussion and planning for these requirements are needed on a regional level.

TAC plans to submit a request to the SANDAG Board of Directors to work with TAC and the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) to hold a regional discussion on improving organic materials management and to develop a regional plan to address identified concerns, barriers, needs, and benefits. TAC requests instruction from SANDAG staff on how to proceed in this request.

The overlapping mandates of AB 32, recently enacted legislation and state regulations requiring measurement, evaluation, and reductions of greenhouse gases and those relating to climate change, materials management, composting facilities, water quality and supply, land use designations, and landfill operation technologies make this a pressing concern. This request comes at a critical time for our state and region, considering the current drought and the impending implementation of AB 1826 and AB 1594.

Considering the aggressive goals and timelines of AB 1826 and AB 1594, the issue of planning for processing organic materials must be addressed at a regional level to ensure the necessary zoning revisions and siting of facilities occur to divert organic materials from the landfill.

Three cities in the region have adopted zero waste goals, including the cities of El Cajon, Oceanside, and San Diego. Other jurisdictions are also currently considering adopting similar goals. To most effectively disseminate information and to ensure a coordinated approach throughout the region, the TAC requests that regional leadership be provided by SANDAG.

Despite our robust recycling infrastructure for traditional recyclables, organic materials such as yard trimmings, food scraps, and wood remain the most prevalent items in our waste stream, representing over one third of materials disposed. Decomposition of organic materials in landfills creates one of the primary
sources of methane gas. According to the latest IPCC study, methane is 34 times more potent than CO₂ in causing the greenhouse gas effect that leads to climate change. In an ARB analysis, even with landfill gas capture systems, over 6.7 million metric tons of CO₂ equivalent fugitive emissions were released from state landfills in 2009. Processing organics will reduce these emissions and conserve landfill space. By creating compost and applying it to the soil, nutrients removed from the soil by agricultural production can be returned. Compost prevents soil erosion and reduces water and chemical fertilizer use, which will improve water supply and quality in the surrounding watershed. ARB has estimated that the application of compost will save 0.42 net tons of CO₂ per ton composted through soil carbon storage, decreased water and fertilizer use, and soil erosion. Value-added materials such as mulch and compost can be used in landscaping applications for residences, commercial properties, and public facilities to achieve the same benefits, while creating jobs and revenue from discarded materials.

As with construction and demolition materials, organic materials require an infrastructure to process currently wasted materials into useful resources such as mulch and compost. It has been estimated that the County of San Diego would need eight additional large composting facilities to process organic materials in order to meet State goals. Because the current regional infrastructure for processing organic materials is limited, siting of facilities can take years. Consequently, a regional plan to process and use these materials is warranted. This infrastructure will result in a reduction of pollution and greenhouse gases, create jobs, and further support a burgeoning industry.

Given the complexity of these regional planning issues, the study would include all potentially-impacted parties including TAC, CAC, waste haulers, composting operators, farmers, landscape and city planners, landscaping companies, land developers, business stakeholder groups, and other regulatory agencies (air, water, etc.).

The California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle) has offered to provide presentations to local governments on AB 1826 to give details on requirements and to share the requirements on planning for new organic material processing facilities.

If desired, we would be pleased to coordinate an AB 1826 presentation by CalRecycle staff for the SANDAG Board of Directors. We stand ready to begin the work and await your response.

Best regards,

Colleen Foster
On Behalf of TAC
City of Oceanside

9/14/15
Regional Complete Streets Implementation: SANDAG Efforts

Introduction

The SANDAG Board of Directors adopted the Regional Complete Streets Policy (Policy) in December 2014. The Policy directs how SANDAG will support Complete Streets development in its role as implementer of regional transportation projects. The Policy includes implementation actions directing SANDAG to provide tools, training, and procedures to ensure regional transportation projects consider Complete Streets and assist local jurisdictions in implementing Complete Streets with local transportation plans and projects. Resource materials are available at sandag.org/CompleteStreets.

Staff provided a status report on implementation efforts to the SANDAG Board of Directors on June 24, 2016 (Attachment 1). The report included feedback received from the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG), Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC), Regional Planning Committee (RPC), and Transportation Committee. As one of the next implementation steps, the TWG is requested to review the performance measures included in the Regional Complete Streets Policy, discuss options for collecting the information for the monitoring report, and discuss the proposed survey on roundabouts and traffic circles. The TWG also is requested to discuss additional items raised at the meetings, as described below.

Performance Measures and Data Collection Processes

Section 6 of the Policy (as shown in Attachment 1 of the Board report) states that SANDAG will evaluate the outcomes of the Complete Streets Policy in concert with regional performance measures, such as those developed for future long-range transportation plans. The Policy calls for presenting objective measures to the Transportation Committee biennially to evaluate the Policy’s effectiveness. As a result, staff will prepare a progress report for the Transportation Committee around January 2017. The progress report will supplement and expand upon the annual status report presented to the SANDAG Board of Directors last month.

The performance measures included in the Policy are listed below:

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

2. An increase in the miles of new and upgraded bikeways and walkways in the region, and other improvements that improve access for biking, walking, and transit or improve monitoring of those modes.
3. An **increase in member jurisdictions** that have adopted this Complete Streets Policy, or their own separate policies incorporating Complete Streets principles, or that have revised the circulation element of their general plans in compliance with the California Complete Streets Act.

4. The **number of staff members** from SANDAG and local jurisdictions and other transportation agencies participating in training and events that reflect best practices in Complete Streets planning and design.

5. **Progress** in accomplishing activities identified in the “Implementation” section.

**Discussion**

Performance Measures Nos. 1-3 request the collection of quantitative information that reflects increases in the number of projects, miles, and member jurisdictions. Because the Policy was adopted in December 2014, staff proposes that this information be collected for the calendar years of 2015 and 2016 – either individually for each year or together for the combined two-year period. These performance measures do not necessarily require the establishment of a base year against which to measure progress, but the TWG should discuss whether collecting data for each of the performance measures cumulatively up to the end of 2014 would be a useful point of comparison. As this information is collected, thought should be given to how these projects could potentially be mapped, per the following implementation action included in the Policy:

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

Performance Measure No. 4 consists of a head count of staff members from member agencies that have participated in complete streets training efforts organized or hosted by SANDAG. Staff proposes collecting this information for calendar years 2015 and 2016, again, either individually for each year or together for the combined two-year period, and thereafter on an annual or biennial basis.

Performance Measure No. 5 consists of a status report on implementation efforts similar to the status report presented to the SANDAG Board of Directors last month. Staff proposes to update the implementation report concurrently with the performance monitoring report, and present the information together to the Transportation Committee on a two-year cycle to ensure that the Transportation Committee can properly evaluate the effectiveness of the Policy.

Staff proposes to collect the quantitative measures through a survey that would be sent to both TWG and CTAC members this fall, with the request that TWG and CTAC members coordinate their responses internally so as to avoid any double-counting or duplication of responses.

The TWG is asked to discuss the proposed process and mechanisms for collecting the quantitative data. Staff will solicit input from the CTAC at its August or September meeting, and will report feedback from today’s TWG meeting to help inform the discussion.
**Proposed Survey on Roundabouts and Traffic Circles in the Region**

As summarized in the attached Board report, the RPC requested that SANDAG survey local jurisdictions about roundabouts in the San Diego region. As roundabouts and traffic circles become more common, the RPC saw an opportunity for local jurisdictions to learn from one another how roundabouts perform in different settings, and how to make future investments more functional, attractive, and resource-efficient.

**Discussion**

SANDAG is aware of various roundabouts around the region. Staff recommends conducting a survey asking TWG and CTAC members for information about the location of local roundabouts and traffic circles (intersections and zip codes), pictures (if available), and a staff contact. The information would be compiled as a resource for working groups, policy makers, and community stakeholders. The TWG is asked to provide input on whether the roundabout survey should be conducted with the performance measure survey.

**Other Topics: Funding Landscaping Maintenance and Best Practices during Project Construction**

Other topics that came up at the Regional Planning and Transportation Committee meetings included providing guidance and/or seeking legislative options on how to manage maintenance costs for landscaping (such as tree-trimming, watering, etc.) and the need for a tool kit of best practices for how to minimize the impacts of project construction on local businesses. The TWG is asked to weigh in on how to address these issues.

In addition, SANDAG has continued to refine the regional project development checklist that was posted to the complete streets website earlier this year by incorporating additional questions related to transit, as suggested by the City of San Diego at previous meetings, and by converting the checklist into a format that more closely resembles a checklist (versus a questionnaire). The form is being reformatted into a fillable PDF for greater ease of use. The updated/reformatted checklist will be added to the website before the TWG meeting. Staff will demonstrate the use of the fillable PDF at the meeting, and based on level of interest, SANDAG can convert the local checklist into a fillable format, as well.

**Attachment:** 1. June 24, 2016, Board of Directors Report: Regional Complete Streets Policy Implementation: Status Report

**Key Staff Contacts:** Carolina Ilic, (619) 699-1989, carolina.ilic@sandag.org
Stephan Vance, (619) 699-1924, stephan.vance@sandag.org
REGIONAL COMPLETE STREETS POLICY
IMPLEMENTATION: STATUS REPORT

Introduction

In December 2014, the Board of Directors adopted a Regional Complete Streets Policy (Policy). The Policy was incorporated into San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan upon adoption in October 2015.

The Policy (Attachment 1) recognizes that the SANDAG planning framework is based on smart growth and sustainability. Under this framework, much of the region’s future development will occur within the existing urbanized area and in compact, mixed-use neighborhoods that provide a variety of housing and transportation choices, and help create healthier communities. Complete Streets is an important planning concept within this framework because it provides a process to ensure the transportation system is safe, useful, and attractive for all users of the transportation network – motorists, pedestrians, bicyclists, transit users, and the movement of freight.

The Policy includes seven components, including a policy statement, a description of the applicability of the principles, a section on context sensitivity, emphasis on a well-connected transportation network, a list of situations where exceptions to implementation of the policy might be appropriate, a commitment to measuring performance, and a list of actions to be undertaken in collaboration with member agencies and other affected agencies. This report describes the progress made toward implementing the actions included in the Policy.

Discussion

The following matrix lists each action included in the Policy and summarizes the status of implementation efforts. The matrix was presented to the Regional Planning Committee, the Transportation Committee, and at a joint workshop of the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG) and the Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) in May 2016. Comments from each of the committees and from the two working groups are summarized further below.

---

1 The Regional Complete Streets Policy was one of the five commitments made by the SANDAG Board of Directors from the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan and its Sustainable Communities Strategy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Implementation Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Regional Project Development Checklist:</strong> All projects developed by SANDAG are opportunities to improve access and mobility for all modes. Toward that end, SANDAG will create a project development checklist to ensure all projects implemented by SANDAG consider local mobility plans and accommodate the needs of all travel modes and the movement of goods to the extent appropriate. Use of the checklist will include coordination between departments and consultation with staff for all modes through participation on the project development team.</td>
<td>This action has been completed. A “Regional Complete Streets Project Development Checklist” has been developed. This checklist, included as Attachment 2, is intended for use by SANDAG staff to coordinate across various departments on addressing complete streets elements when designing regional transportation projects. Developing the checklist involved examining complete streets checklists from around the country. The checklist has three sections, including Existing Conditions, Planning Context, and Project Proposal, that SANDAG project managers are required to complete at the start of the project in the scoping document/feasibility study. The checklist requires review and approval from the SANDAG Department Director.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Regional and Local Coordination and Cost-Sharing Protocol:</strong> Develop a process for coordinating the development of regional projects with local agency Complete Streets initiatives and include in that process a protocol for evaluating cost-sharing opportunities.</td>
<td>This action is underway and is expected to be completed in fall/winter 2016/2017. SANDAG staff has been working with the region’s planning and community development directors and public works directors (through the TWG and the CTAC) on enhancing awareness of the Complete Streets Policy and exploring mechanisms to further the implementation of complete streets at the regional and local levels. SANDAG has established a Complete Streets web page at sandag.org/CompleteStreets, discussed these concepts at recent TWG and CTAC meetings, and most recently, held a joint TWG/CTAC workshop focused on highlighting best practices and identifying barriers and solutions regarding implementation. With this foundational work in place, next steps include developing a protocol for evaluating cost-sharing opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions</td>
<td>Implementation Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **3. Local Project Development Checklist**  
*Template:* Develop a project development checklist template that local agencies can use to ensure local projects result in Complete Streets.  
This action has been completed. A document entitled, “Local Complete Streets Sample Checklist: A Tool for Local Agencies” has been developed and posted to the SANDAG Complete Streets web page. The local sample checklist, included as Attachment 3, can be adapted to meet local planning goals and used on a voluntary basis for local jurisdictions and others to consider complete streets in the development of local transportation projects. Use of the sample checklist is optional, can be adapted to meet specific local agency goals, and is not a requirement for receiving transportation funds administered by SANDAG. |
| **4. Regional Database and Mapping Tool:**  
Collaborate with local jurisdictions, Caltrans, and transit operators to develop a regional database and mapping tool to facilitate coordinated development of local and regional Complete Streets plans.  
This action will be started fall/winter 2016/2017. Staff will begin working with local jurisdictions, Caltrans, and transit operators to develop a scope for this effort. |
| **5. Trainings, Workshops, and Educational Events:**  
Provide opportunities for SANDAG staff, and staff from member agencies, Caltrans, and transit operators to participate in trainings, workshops, and other educational events related to Complete Streets procedures and practices including, but not limited to, transportation safety, multimodal network planning, context-sensitive design, connecting transportation and land use decisions, and evaluating projects and the impact of transportation investments. This will be an ongoing activity to ensure practitioners are well informed about state-of-the-art practices.  
This action has begun, and will be an ongoing activity. SANDAG staff has created a Complete Streets web page at sandag.org/Complete Streets, which contains the Policy, the regional checklist, the local sample checklist, upcoming training workshops, and other resources, including guidance on best practices and innovation in street design. SANDAG also hosts monthly webinars provided by the Association of Pedestrian and Bicycle Professionals, and notifies local agencies through the Active Transportation Working Group. In addition, internal interdepartmental training workshops will be held on an ongoing basis to support enhanced understanding of the Policy and sustain continued commitment to implementation. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Implementation Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. Tools and Reference Materials:</strong> Develop tools and reference materials as needed, such as guidance on best practices and innovation in street design, parking management strategies, storm water best practices, incorporating bike and pedestrian access to transit stops and stations, traffic impact studies, and public engagement tools. SANDAG will make these tools available to other entities on its website.</td>
<td>This action has begun, and will be an ongoing activity. In conjunction with CTAC, TWG, and the transit operators, SANDAG continues to identify best practices and innovative resources, which have been added to the Complete Streets web page. As more resources are identified, they will be posted to the web page. Local jurisdictions in the region are pursuing innovative approaches to implement complete streets. SANDAG will continue to highlight these local efforts as examples of best practices that can help inform other local efforts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. Related Initiatives:</strong> Continue work on related initiatives that support multimodal connections, including the Safe Routes to School (SR2S) and Safe Routes to Transit programs.</td>
<td>This action has begun, and will be an ongoing activity. SANDAG staff continues work on related initiatives that support multimodal connections. A SR2S strategic plan and corresponding implementation plan have been developed, and representation from the SR2S Coalition currently exists on the SANDAG Active Transportation Working Group. Safe Routes to Transit programs also have moved forward with the completion of Safe Routes to Transit typology prototypes for San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan. In addition, the Regional Plan incorporates a number of other SANDAG strategies and programs that focus on sustainability, including the Smart Growth Concept Map, the Smart Growth Incentive Program, the Active Transportation Grant Program, the Regional Transit Oriented Development Strategy, the Regional Bike Plan, and the Regional Mobility Hub Implementation Strategy. Implementation of the Regional Bike Plan is underway through the Regional Bike Early Action Program. These efforts serve as the interconnected building blocks for implementing the regional vision and providing more transportation choices.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. **Monitoring**: Develop a benchmarking process for SANDAG project managers to use as a tool for monitoring implementation of this policy.  

   This action will be started fall/winter 2016/2017. SANDAG will evaluate the outcomes of the Complete Streets Policy in concert with regional performance measures, such as those developed for the Regional Plan and future long-range transportation plans. According to the Policy, a biennial review of objective measures will be presented to the Transportation Committee for use in evaluating the effectiveness of the Policy. The performance measures are outlined in the Policy.

9. **Report to Board of Directors**: Provide a report to the Board of Directors on the implementation of this policy within one year of its adoption.  

   This action has begun, and will be an ongoing activity. The June 24, 2016, report to the Board of Directors fulfills this action, and implementation reports will continue to be presented as needed.

---

**Discussion at the Regional Planning Committee**

At its meeting on May 6, 2016, the Regional Planning Committee discussed the implementation of the Regional Complete Streets Policy and suggested that SANDAG consider the following in addition to the implementation actions included in the Policy:

- Provide guidance on how to manage maintenance costs for landscaping (such as tree-trimming, watering, etc.), including how design and recycled water can help minimize these costs.

- Provide guidance or examples of best practices for how to minimize the impacts of project construction on local businesses.

- Consider how landscaping that enhances the pedestrian realm can also serve as a strategy for implementing local climate action plans.

- Survey local jurisdictions about roundabouts in the region.

**Discussion at the Transportation Committee**

At its meeting on May 20, 2016, the Transportation Committee provided the following observations and potential future actions for consideration:

- Preserving the ability of transit vehicles to move around effectively on local streets is critical to the operation of the transit system.

- Pedestrian and bike conflicts with transit vehicles are a concern.

- Local jurisdictions are asked to consult the transit operators when planning modifications to local streets and roads to find solutions that work for all users of the streets.
• Transit operators expressed concern with local jurisdictions painting sharrows in transit lanes.

• Local jurisdictions are seeing signs of economic gains on local streets where Complete Streets projects have been implemented, including new and expanding businesses, businesses improving storefronts, more activity on local streets, and visual improvements.

• Landscape maintenance costs are a concern for local jurisdictions. Although many areas handle these costs through maintenance assessment districts, there are limitations. SANDAG may be able to assist through its Legislative Program to seek greater flexibility in program requirements.

• It remains important to keep traffic moving along major travel corridors.

**Feedback from the Joint TWG/CTAC Workshop**

At the joint workshop held on May 5, TWG and CTAC members made the following observations:

• Complete Streets is not a “one-size-fits-all” endeavor. Designs can look different in different communities and can even vary along a single corridor.

• Early and frequent community involvement and City Council support is important when significant changes are being considered.

• The implementation of Complete Streets can be advanced through pilot projects using paint, which is inexpensive and does not require environmental review.

• A suggested strategy is to start in areas where communities want the improvements, and then use the completed examples to build support for additional projects in different areas.

• Communities and decision-makers need to have information regarding the economic benefits of Complete Streets. SANDAG could assist by developing case studies on the financial benefits.

• Experience with Complete Streets projects suggests that there is often roadway capacity that can be repurposed to support a variety of modes. That means that Complete Streets projects do not necessarily have to restrict car traffic.

• The response to Complete Streets projects in the region seems to be positive, though it is reasonable to anticipate that some people will not like that their community has changed.

• To maximize effectiveness, promotion of Complete Streets and technical training efforts should be on-going.

• Complete Streets can benefit communities in a variety of ways, such as attracting private investment and commercial activity, improving storm water systems, improving safety, etc.

• Project involvement should be extended to early and frequent consultation with key stakeholders to identify and understand possible constraints and develop areas of opportunities from planning through implementation.
In June, staff provided additional status reports to the TWG and CTAC, summarizing the input received from both of the policy committees, and solicited feedback to help determine additional priorities given limited resources.

**Next Steps**

SANDAG will continue to work with member agencies, the transit operators, and Caltrans to implement the Regional Complete Streets Policy. Work this year will focus on identifying additional training opportunities for SANDAG and member agency staff, developing a protocol for evaluating cost sharing of regional projects with local agency Complete Streets efforts, developing a scope for a regional database and mapping tool to facilitate coordinated development of local and regional Complete Streets plans, and monitoring and reporting implementation of this Policy. Staff also will work with the TWG and CTAC to address comments raised at the Regional Planning and Transportation Committees, including conducting a survey of roundabouts and traffic circles in the region, pursuing strategies to minimize conflicts between transit and bicyclists, and seeking opportunities to gather information on the economic impacts of street design decisions.

GARY L. GALLEGOS  
Executive Director

Attachments: 1. Regional Complete Streets Policy  
2. Regional Complete Streets Project Development Checklist  
3. Local Complete Streets Sample Checklist: A Tool for Local Agencies

Key Staff Contacts: Carolina Illic, (619) 699-1989, carolina.illic@sandag.org  
Stephan Vance, (619) 699-1924, stephan.vance@sandag.org
REGIONAL COMPLETE STREETS POLICY

Purpose

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

1. Policy Statement

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

2. Applicability

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

In addition, SANDAG supports and encourages Complete Streets implementation by other entities throughout the region. Local jurisdictions, as required by the California Complete Streets Act of 2008, will incorporate Complete Streets into their general plans as they revise their circulation elements. SANDAG encourages local agencies to implement Complete Streets principles if a circulation element revision is not planned in the near future. Adopting a Complete Streets approach provides an opportunity to establish more detailed direction on Complete Streets implementation than would be provided in the context of a general plan. SANDAG also encourages and supports Complete Streets methodologies in the design and construction of all projects in the region developed by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) as appropriate, consistent with Deputy Directive 64-R1, and in the maintenance and operation of all state highway and public transit facilities.

---

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

3. **Design Practices and Context Sensitivity**

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

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

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

4. **Regional Network Principles**

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

5. **Exceptions**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

6. Performance Measures

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

6.1 An increase in the number of projects that include multimodal connections to destinations by providing bicycle and pedestrian facilities, crossing improvements, traffic calming measures, wayfinding signs or other measures.
6.2 An increase in the miles of new and upgraded bikeways and walkways in the region, and other improvements that improve access for biking, walking, and transit or improve monitoring of those modes.

6.3 An increase in member jurisdictions that have adopted this Complete Streets Policy, or their own separate policies, incorporating Complete Streets principles or that have revised the circulation element of their general plans in compliance with the California Complete Streets Act.

6.4 The number of staff members from SANDAG and local jurisdictions and other transportation agencies participating in training and events that reflect best practices in Complete Streets planning and design.

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

7. Implementation

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

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

7.2 Develop a process for coordinating the development of regional projects with local agency Complete Streets initiatives and include in that process a protocol for evaluating cost sharing opportunities. (Estimated time to complete: one year.)

7.3 Develop a project development checklist template that local agencies can use to ensure local projects result in Complete Streets. (Estimated time to complete: nine months.)

7.4 Collaborate with local jurisdiction, Caltrans, and transit operators to develop a regional database and mapping tool to facilitate coordinated development of local and regional Complete Streets plans. (Estimated time to complete: one year.)

7.5 Provide opportunities for SANDAG staff, and staff from member agencies, Caltrans, and transit operators to participate in trainings, workshops, and other educational events related to Complete Streets procedures and practices including, but not limited to, transportation safety, multimodal network planning, context-sensitive design, connecting transportation and land use decisions, and evaluating projects and the impact of transportation investments. This will be an ongoing activity to ensure practitioners are well informed about state-of-the-art practices.
7.6 Develop tools and reference materials as needed, such as guidance on best practices and innovation in street design, parking management strategies, storm water best practices, incorporating bicycle and pedestrian access to transit stops and stations, traffic impact studies, and public engagement tools. SANDAG will make these tools available to other entities on its website.

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

7.8 Develop a benchmarking process for SANDAG project managers to use as a tool for monitoring implementation of this Policy. (Estimated time to complete: 9 months.)

7.9 Provide a report to the Board of Directors on the implementation of this policy within one year of its adoption.
Regional Complete Streets Project Development Checklist

Introduction

On December 19, 2014, the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) Board of Directors adopted a Regional Complete Streets Policy (Policy). The Policy defines Complete Streets as it will be used to guide SANDAG in its role as an implementer of regional transportation projects and as the regional planning agency that programs transportation funds, sets long-range regional transportation policy, and provides technical assistance and support to local agencies. The Board action directed implementation action items such as this project development checklist and others to ensure all projects implemented by SANDAG consider local complete streets initiatives and accommodate the needs of all travel modes. The Policy document is available at:


Background and Resources

In 2004, the SANDAG Board of Directors established a Smart Growth Strategy for the region’s future growth and development. The strategy is illustrated on the Smart Growth Concept Map (SGCM), which was first adopted by the Board of Directors in 2006. The SGCM shows the location of existing, planned, and potential smart growth areas as well as planned habitat and open space. Projects located in a smart growth area must support walking and biking access, especially as it relates to transit. The Smart Growth in the San Diego Region (sandag.org/uploads/projectid/projectid_296_13993.pdf) brochure provides descriptions of the seven smart growth place types. More details about the SGCM are available at:

sandag.org/resources/smartgrowth/index_gmap.asp

Guidance on applying smart growth principles to transportation projects can be found in Designing for Smart Growth, Creating Great Places in the San Diego Region (sandag.org/index.asp?projectid=344&fuseaction=projects.detail).

Transportation design guidance for Complete Streets is available from a variety of sources including, but not limited to, those listed below:

- **Riding to 2050 (see Chapter 7, Bicycle Design Guidelines)**
  sandag.org/uploads/projectid/projectid_353_10862.pdf

- **Planning and Designing for Pedestrians**
  sandag.org/uploads/publicationid/publicationid_713_3269.pdf

- **Caltrans Highway Design Manual Chapter 1000**

- **NACTO Urban Street Design Guide**
  nacto.org/usdg
Local bicycle and pedestrian plans, safe routes to school plans, and Community Active Transportation strategies should all be consulted where they exist. Contact local jurisdiction planning and engineering departments in the project area to identify local plans.

**Using the Checklist**

There are two occasions for employing the Complete Streets checklists.

1. The Project Initiation Complete Streets Checklist is completed and approved at the start of the project initiation process in the scoping document/feasibility study before the project is added to the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP).

2. If changing project scope, the Project Amendment Complete Streets Checklist must be completed and approved prior to amending the project in the RTIP. This is necessary because any exceptions to complying with this policy must be reported to the Transportation Committee as part of the RTIP approval process.

If all modes of travel cannot be accommodated in the project consistent with local and regional plans, the checklist requires an explanation of the circumstances that justify that decision. Discuss the issue with your Director to determine if the project should be submitted for review by the SANDAG Active Transportation Working Group. Be sure the project does not preclude design features that could be added in the future if funds become available.

Project Managers preparing the Checklist should consult with planners in the Land Use Coordination section to assist with the planning context and answer any specific questions for clarification.
Project Initiation Complete Streets Checklist

Project Title: 

Project Location: 

Contact Name, Phone, and Email: 

Existing Conditions (To be completed by SANDAG Planning Staff working with Project Manager)

1. What accommodations for people walking or riding bikes exist in the project area? Include accommodations on any existing transportation facility, and any facilities that the project will intersect or cross. See GIS Senior Analyst for any questions.

   SANDAG Regional Bike Map: gis1.sandag.org/BikeMap2015/index.html
   SANDAG Sidewalk Map: M:\RES\GIS\Sidewalks\SanDiegoSidewalkNetwork_6_17
   City of San Diego Sidewalk Inventory: (website available in 2016)
   Google Maps: www.google.com/maps

2. If there are no existing pedestrian or bicycle facilities, how far from the proposed project are the closest parallel bikeways and walkways?

3. Describe the existing level of pedestrian or bicycle activity along the project corridor based on available data from the Regional Bike Counter Network and/or baseline data collection. See Bike Program Manager for baseline data collection.

   Regional Bike Counter Network webpage:
   sandag.org/index.asp?classid=34&projectid=496&fuseaction=projects.detail

4. What trip generators (existing and planned) are in the vicinity of the proposed project that might attract walking or bicycling customers, employees, students, visitors or others? See GIS Senior Analyst for any questions.

   Land Use Database Connections: \dc.pila.LIS.ago.sde\lis.GIS.Land\lis.GIS.ludu2014

5. What existing challenges or barriers could the proposed project address for people walking or bicycling in the vicinity of the proposed project?

6. What is the crash history in the project area? If the crash history of the site is high, what proposed project strategies will address public safety?

   Transportation Injury Mapping System: tims.berkeley.edu/page.php?page=tools
Planning Context (To be completed by Planning Staff working with Project Manager)

1. Is the project in a Smart Growth Area as defined by the Smart Growth Concept Map? See Land Use Principal Planner for any questions.


2. What local or regional plans will be consulted in the development of the project? (Include bicycle and pedestrian plans, safe routes to school and safe routes to transit plans, community active transportation strategies, streetscape enhancement plans, community plan mobility elements, and other relevant plans provided by local agencies).

   SANDAG Intergovernmental Review Resource List:
   sandag.org/index.asp?classid=12&projectid=379&fuseaction=projects.detail

3. Where the project can contribute to the implementation of local plans, has a local jurisdiction contribution been identified and included in the project budget?

Proposed Project (To be completed by Project Manager)

1. How will the project development process respond to the mobility plans of local agencies?

2. Briefly describe the existing and future travel demand for all modes and how the proposed project will serve that demand.

3. Will the project sever existing access for any modes? If so, describe the circumstances and how the project will mitigate that loss of access. If the lost access cannot be mitigated, explain why not.

4. What accommodations are proposed for people walking or riding bikes in the project design?

5. Will the proposed project remove an existing bicycle or pedestrian facility or block access? If yes, how will that access be restored?

6. If the proposed project would not provide both bicycle and pedestrian accommodation, or if the proposed project would hinder non-motorized access, describe the circumstances that create this constraint.

7. If cost is assumed to be a factor in limiting access for people walking or riding a bike, explain how costs for the walking and biking improvements were allocated, and describe the key cost elements and their costs in relation to the overall project cost.

8. If existing right-of-way is a constraint, has acquisition of additional right-of-way been considered?

9. How will the project development process ensure access for people walking or riding bikes is maintained during project construction?

10. Have all parties responsible for ongoing maintenance of the facility been identified?

December 2015
Complete Streets Certification

This project does/does not accommodate all users as requested by Complete Streets policy.

Completed by: ____________________________________________

Name                                      Title                                      Date

Reviewed and approved by: ____________________________ Department Director

Name                                      Title                                      Date

If this project will not meet the needs of all modes of travel that are not prohibited access by law, report this outcome to the Transportation Committee as part of the RTIP approval process with an explanation of the factors that led to that decision.
Project Amendment Complete Streets Checklist

Project Title: ____________________________________________________________

Project Location: _________________________________________________________

Contact Name, Phone, and Email: _____________________________________________

Existing Conditions (To be completed by SANDAG Planning Staff working with Project Manager)

1. If the land use or transportation context for the project changed since project initiation, explain how, and how those changes are affecting the plan, design, and estimated cost. Has observed pedestrian or bicycle activity along in the project area changed since the project was initiated, and if so, by how much? Has the project plan or design been modified to reflect that change? See Bike Program Manager for baseline data collection

   Regional Bike Counter Network webpage: sandag.org/index.asp?classid=34&projectid=496&fuseaction=projects.detail

2. Has the crash history in the project area changed since the initial assessment? If so, how? Does the current project design respond to any changes in the crash history?

   Transportation Injury Mapping System: tims.berkeley.edu/page.php?page=tools

Planning Context (To be completed by Planning Staff working with Project Manager)

1. Have any new local or regional plans been completed, or have any existing plans been updated since the project was initiated? (Include bicycle and pedestrian plans, safe routes to school and safe routes to transit plans, community active transportation strategies, streetscape enhancement plans)

2. How does the current proposed project respond to these new plans?

Current Project Proposal (To be completed by Project Manager)

1. Have there been any changes in how the proposed project will accommodate people walking or biking, the movement of private vehicles, transit, or freight? Address access along the project corridor and across it.

2. Has the cost of accommodating any mode changed significantly? (If so, by how much? Dollar amount or percent change.) Will the completed project, as currently proposed, fully accommodate all modes? If not, why not?

3. What is the current estimated cost of including full accommodation for all modes?

4. If the proposed project would not provide both bicycle and pedestrian accommodation, or if the proposed project would hinder non-motorized access, describe the circumstances that cause this.
5. If cost is assumed to be a factor in limiting access for people walking or riding a bike, explain the factors that impact the cost, and how those costs were allocated.

6. If existing right-of-way is a constraint, has acquisition of additional right-of-way been considered? If so, what is the estimated cost of that right-of-way?
Complete Streets Certification

This project does/does not accommodate all users as requested by Complete Streets policy.

Completed by: ____________________________________________________________
Name                Title                Date

Reviewed and approved by: ____________________________________________
Department Director
Name                Title                Date

If this project will not meet the needs of all modes of travel that are not prohibited access by law, report this outcome to the Transportation Committee as part of the RTIP approval process with an explanation of the factors that led to that decision.
Local Complete Streets Sample Checklist:  
A Tool for Local Agencies

Introduction

This Complete Streets Sample Checklist is designed as a tool for local agencies to use in developing their own internal process for evaluating whether new transportation projects plan for and accommodate all modes of travel to the extent warranted. Use of the local sample checklist is optional, can be adapted to meet specific local agency goals, and is not a requirement for receiving any transportation funds administered by SANDAG.

Using the Checklist

The Complete Streets Sample Checklist is a tool that can be used when a transportation project is initiated to ensure that all modes are considered in the initial scoping and budgeting of the project. When evaluating existing and potential facilities for each mode, it is often useful for the project to take a holistic approach and consider the corridor context or surrounding transportation network. Because it may not be necessary or feasible to accommodate all modes in every project, the sample checklist provides a mechanism for exploring the application of complete streets solutions in the broader project area and documenting the circumstances that explain the decision.

Project Initiation Complete Streets Checklist

Project Title: __________________________________________________________

Project Location: ______________________________________________________

Project Manager, Phone, and Email: ________________________________________

Existing Conditions

What infrastructure currently exists to support each mode of travel?

- [ ] Auto  Total number of travel lanes _______
- [ ] Transit  Route numbers/headways _______
- [ ] Transit stops/amenities _______
- [ ] Transit priority measures _______
- [ ] Pedestrian facilities  Sidewalk - width and condition _______
- [ ] Sidewalk - both sides of street? _______
- [ ] Adequate street crossings _______
- [ ] Sidewalk shading / street trees _______
- [ ] ADA compliant?  Deficiencies __________________________
- [ ] Bike facility/facilities  Type(s) __________________________
- [ ] Lighting  Street lighting? ____  Pedestrian lighting? ____
- [ ] Storm water  __________________________
- [ ] Auto parking  Number of spaces _______
- [ ] Bike parking  Number of spaces _______

Add details as necessary to describe any infrastructure deficiencies, walking and biking conditions, and/or challenges for transit performance.
**What is the existing level of demand to the extent data are available?**

□ Auto ADT
□ Transit Passengers per day by route
□ Passengers per day by stop
□ Pedestrians*
□ Bikes*

* In the absence of existing demand data for bike and pedestrian traffic, document the surrounding land uses that are likely to attract significant traffic by these modes.

**What is the safety record over the last five years for the project area?**

□ Auto-involved crashes
□ Pedestrian-involved crashes
□ Bicycle-involved crashes
□ Pedestrian and bicycle-involved crashes within ¼ mile of transit stops

**Coordination with transit agencies**

□ What existing challenges could the proposed project address for transit routes in the vicinity of the proposed project? What transit priority measures could improve transit performance? (Recommendation: Coordinate with the Metropolitan Transit System [MTS] or North County Transit District [NCTD])

Recommendations:

□ Test existing and potential future bus turn movements using “auto-turn” software to accommodate 45-foot coach buses
□ Minimize corner bulb-outs that conflict with bus movements; avoid installing bulb-outs on corners with bus stops or with bus turns; consider creating in-lane bus stops as an alternative
□ Work with transit operators to assess impacts of roadway capacity reductions to buses
□ Work with transit operators to assess impacts of traffic calming measures to buses
□ Provide separate travel ways for bike and bus traffic whenever possible
□ Ensure 11-foot minimum lane widths for travel lanes used by buses
□ Avoid traffic calming measures on bus travel lanes that are incompatible with buses (e.g., speed bumps, speed tables, etc.)
□ Coordinate proposed bus stop relocations with MTS/NCTD
□ Provide safe path of travel to/from bus stops (adequate sidewalks, crosswalks)
□ Ensure vertical/horizontal clearances for buses
□ Coordinate with transit operators on need for existing or future transit priority measures such as transit signal priority in future transit-only lanes
**Planning Context**

*Have the following documents been checked for planned facilities?*

- Pedestrian Master Plan
- Bicycle Master Plan
- Community Active Transportation Strategy
- Community Plans and Facility Financing Plans
- Climate Action Plan
- SANDAG Regional Plan (highway, transit, rail, transportation demand management)
- SANDAG Regional Transportation Improvement Program
- SANDAG Regional Bike Plan
- SANDAG Smart Growth Concept Map (to help determine context)
- Pending local development proposals

Briefly describe relevant planned facilities and development proposals. Is there an opportunity to enhance this transportation project beyond existing plans to provide an enhanced walking, biking, or transit experience for future users of this corridor?

**Forecasted travel demand**

- Auto ADT _____ Forecast year ____
- Transit _____ Forecast year ____
- Pedestrian* _____ Forecast Year ____
- Bike* _____ Forecast Year ____

*If forecasts do not exist for future bike and pedestrian traffic, identify significant future land uses or other conditions that would influence demand.

**Proposed Project**

*Will the proposed transportation project adequately and safely accommodate all modes, or are there opportunities to adequately and safely accommodate all modes through the larger project area?*

- Auto
- Auto parking
- Transit
- Pedestrian
- Bike
- Bike parking
- ADA Compliant

For the proposed transportation project: Briefly describe the proposed accommodations or traffic calming measures for each mode and the features that will make the accommodations more friendly to people walking, biking, and using transit including urban greenery such as street trees, buffers from high speed traffic, street lighting, transit stop amenities, transit priority measures, etc.
For any mode not adequately accommodated through the proposed transportation project, describe the constraints or justify the lack of demand. Describe any relevant alternative access.

**Complete Streets Certification**

This project does/does not accommodate all modes of travel as outlined in the [local guiding policy].

Completed by

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Reviewed and approved by:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Resources

The following documents are useful resources for how to plan and design Complete Streets:

*Smart Growth in the San Diego Region*, a brochure that provides descriptions of the seven smart growth place types and the Smart Growth Concept Map.

*Designing for Smart Growth, Creating Great Places in the San Diego Region*, provides guidance on applying smart growth principles to transportation projects in smart growth areas.

Transportation design guidance for Complete Streets is available from a variety of sources including, but not limited to, those listed below:

- Riding to 2050 (see Chapter 7, Bicycle Design Guidelines)
- Planning and Designing for Pedestrians
- Caltrans Highway Design Manual Chapter 1000
- NACTO Urban Street Design Guide
- NACTO Urban Bikeway Design Guide
- NACTO Transit Street Design Guide
- NCTD Bus Stop Development Handbook
- SANDAG LRT Design Criteria
- Active Transportation Implementation Strategy & Safe Routes to School Typologies

Local bicycle and pedestrian plans, safe routes to school plans, and Community Active Transportation strategies should be consulted where they exist. Contact local jurisdiction planning and engineering departments in the project area to identify local plans, and local transit agencies to identify and collaborate on potential transit priority measures and transit stop amenities.
San Diego Association of Governments – TransNet Program

INDEPENDENT TAXPAYER OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

July 13, 2016

AGENDA ITEM NO.: 3

Action Requested: RECOMMEND

TransNet SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM AND ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION GRANT PROGRAM: QUARTERLY PROGRESS REPORT AND PROPOSED GRANT AMENDMENT

File Number 3300100

Introduction

The San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) staff provides a quarterly progress report for the TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program (SGIP) and TransNet Active Transportation Grant Program (ATGP) projects to the Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee (ITOC), Transportation Committee, and Regional Planning Committee. The TransNet SGIP and ATGP Quarterly Progress Report (Attachment 1) shows progress made on each grant project through March 31, 2016. Attachment 2 includes a SGIP amendment request from Civic San Diego that relates to the location of the project.

Recommendation

The ITOC is asked to recommend that the Regional Planning Committee approve a project location amendment for Civic San Diego’s 14th Street Pedestrian Promenade Demonstration Block from between Broadway and E Street to between G and Market Streets (two blocks to the south).

Discussion

As of March 31, 2016, all ATGP and SGIP projects are on schedule. Although no schedule amendments have been requested, Civic San Diego is requesting a project location amendment for the 14th Street Promenade Demonstration Block from between Broadway and E Street to between G and Market Streets (two blocks to the south). The project site identified in the grant application is the property adjacent to the Police Department Headquarters. The Police Department has expressed concerns regarding the construction of the demonstration block along its frontage at this time, but fully supports the implementation of the 14th Street Promenade Master Plan. In reviewing this request, staff applied the grant evaluation criteria used in the competitive selection process to the proposed location and determined that the project score and ranking would be the same. The amendment will not result in a change to the completion date (July 8, 2018) for this project.
Next Steps

The TransNet SGIP and ATGP Quarterly Progress Report will be provided to the Transportation Committee for information on July 15, 2016. The Regional Planning Committee will receive the report and consider the proposed SGIP project location amendment on August 5, 2016. The ITOC amendment recommendation and comments will be reported to both committees. The next quarterly progress report is scheduled for the October 12, 2016, ITOC meeting.

Attachments: 1. Quarterly Progress Report TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program and Active Transportation Grant Program with Exhibits A-F
2. SGIP Project Location Amendment Request, Civic San Diego

Key Staff Contact: Susan Baldwin, (619) 699-1943, susan.baldwin@sandag.org
Quarterly Progress Report

TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program and Active Transportation Grant Program

March 31, 2016

Introduction

This report shows progress made by each grant recipient through March 31, 2016, on projects funded by two grant programs included in the TransNet Extension Ordinance and Expenditure Plan: (1) the Smart Growth Incentive Program (SGIP); and (2) the Active Transportation Grant Program (ATGP). It also indicates any schedule amendments being processed.

Smart Growth Incentive Program

The SGIP was established through the TransNet Extension Ordinance “to provide funding for a broad array of transportation-related infrastructure improvements that will assist local agencies in better integrating transportation and land use.” Since the program was launched in 2009, the SGIP has awarded more than $30 million in funds (as of March 31, 2016) to a total of 43 projects, including 23 capital grants and 20 planning grants. Of the 43 SGIP funded projects, 18 have been completed. An overview of SGIP funding cycles 1, 2, and 3 is provided below.

Cycle 1 SGIP

In May 2009, the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) awarded $9.2 million in funding to 13 projects (five planning grants and eight capital grants) for the first cycle of the SGIP. Eleven of the projects have been completed and two were transferred to SANDAG (July 2013) for implementation through the Regional Bike Plan Early Action Program (EAP). (Progress on the transferred projects is reported through SANDAG’s annual budget for the Regional Bike Program.) Information on Cycle 1 SGIP projects can be found at: http://www.sandag.org/grantsummary.pdf.

Cycle 2 SGIP (Exhibit A)

In June 2013, SANDAG awarded $9.6 million in funding to 13 projects (seven planning grants and six capital grants) for the second cycle of the SGIP. Seven of the projects have been completed. The remaining six projects are scheduled to be completed by the end of 2017.
**Cycle 3 SGIP (Exhibit B)**

In July 2015, SANDAG awarded $12 million in funding to 17 projects (eight planning grants and nine capital grants); the projects are underway and making timely progress. At this time, Civic San Diego is requesting a project location amendment for the 14th Street Pedestrian Promenade Demonstration Block from between Broadway and E Street to between G and Market Streets (two blocks to the south).

**Active Transportation Grant Program**

The *TransNet* Extension Ordinance specifies that ATGP funds be used “for bikeway facilities and connectivity improvements, pedestrian and walkable community projects, bicycle and pedestrian safety projects and programs, and traffic calming projects.” Since the program was launched in 2009, the ATGP has awarded nearly $24.4 million in funds to a total of 70 projects, including 34 planning, parking, and education program grants; and 36 capital grants. Of the 70 ATGP funded projects 44 have been completed. An overview of ATGP funding cycles 1, 2, and 3, and the *TransNet* ATGP-Active Transportation Program (ATP) Funding Exchange Projects is provided below. This program is funded by *TransNet* and Transportation Development Act (TDA) funds.

**Cycle 1 ATGP**

In June 2009, SANDAG awarded $7.8 million in *TransNet* and TDA to 26 projects (eight planning, parking, and education program grants; and 18 capital grants). Twenty-five have been completed and one was transferred to SANDAG (April 2013) for implementation through the Regional Bike Plan EAP. (Progress on the transferred project is reported through SANDAG’s annual budget for the Regional Bike Program.) Information on Cycle 1 ATGP projects can be found at: [http://www.sandag.org/grantsummary.pdf](http://www.sandag.org/grantsummary.pdf).

**Cycle 2 ATGP (Exhibit C)**

In September 2012, SANDAG awarded $8.8 million in *TransNet* and TDA to 25 projects (14 planning, parking, and education program grants; and 11 capital grants) for the second cycle of this program. Of the 25 projects, 19 have been completed. The remaining six projects are making timely progress toward completion and are scheduled to be completed by the end of calendar year 2016.

**Cycle 3 ATGP (Exhibit D)**

In July 2015, SANDAG awarded $3 million in TDA funding to 12 projects (six planning, parking, and education program grants; six capital grants). Eleven grant agreements have been executed and these projects are underway. One project (National City’s Sweetwater River Bikeway/30th Street Bicycle Facility Improvements) was withdrawn due to the award of statewide ATP funding for the same project. The funding awarded to that project is being reallocated to the next highest ranking project(s) from the competitive process. Funding from this project has been reallocated to fully fund two ATGP projects (Carlsbad and Solana Beach) that had received partial funding and one ATGP project (National City Midblock Crossing) was added. The grant agreements for these projects are in process.
TransNet ATGP-ATP Funds Exchange Projects (Exhibit E)

On September 26, 2013, the Governor signed legislation creating the California ATP to encourage increased use of active modes of transportation such as bicycling and walking. The program is administered by the California Transportation Commission (CTC). Funding for each cycle (generally held annually) is competitively awarded in two stages, beginning with a statewide competition led by the CTC, followed by a regional competition conducted by SANDAG. Following the regional project evaluation process for Cycles 1 and 2 of the ATP, a funding exchange was implemented to reduce the administrative burden associated with federal funding requirements for nine local projects. The funding exchange resulted in the transfer of ATP funds for TransNet funds; SANDAG will use the ATP funds exchanged to construct regional bike projects that have already received federal/state funding approval.

SANDAG has approved the exchange of $10.7 million in TransNet funds since the ATP was launched. In November 2014, $6 million in TransNet ATGP funds were approved for seven projects (two planning grants, and five capital grants) selected through the regional Cycle 1 ATP process. In October 2015, $4.7 million in TransNet ATGP funds were approved for two capital projects selected through the regional Cycle 2 ATP process. Projects receiving TransNet funds as a result of the funding exchange are being administered by SANDAG through the ATGP. Grant agreements have been executed for the nine projects, which are now underway.

Grant Monitoring and Oversight

Staff reviews quarterly reports to ensure that grantees are making timely progress with respect to the key milestones identified in SANDAG Board Policy No. 035: Competitive Grant Program Procedures (Exhibit F), governing the timely use of grant funds and their respective grant agreements. The “Watch List” column in the status summaries (Exhibits A – E) is used to identify those grantees in danger of missing their scheduled milestone dates and that have not yet worked with SANDAG staff to take corrective action. Delays in tasks leading up to either the award of a contract or project completion milestones also may result in placement of grantees on the watch list.

In addition, staff reviews project deliverables for consistency with the agreed-upon scopes of work. Progress reports (including schedule amendments) for the two grant programs are presented to the Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee (ITOC) and the Transportation and Regional Planning Committees on a quarterly basis.

Per Section 3 of SANDAG Board Policy No. 035 (Exhibit F), the appropriate Policy Advisory Committee (the Regional Planning Committee for SGIP grants and the Transportation Committee for ATGP grants) reviews and considers SGIP and ATGP schedule amendments for approval based upon extenuating circumstances that the grantee could not have reasonably foreseen.

During past quarterly progress reports, Regional Planning Committee, Transportation Committee, and ITOC members directed staff to consider process improvements to better ensure that projects are delivered in a timely manner. In response to Recommendation No. 15 included in the FY 2012 TransNet Triennial Performance Audit conducted by the ITOC, staff has established a formalized process for site visits with grantees to improve performance over the course of grant implementation. In addition, staff has developed an interactive map on KeepSanDiegoMoving.com that provides more information on the ATGP and SGIP grant-funded projects. This map is available to the public and will be updated on a quarterly basis.
Exhibits

A. Status of Cycle 2 (FY 2011 – 2013) TransNet SGIP Projects
B. Status of Cycle 3 (FY 2014 – 2016) TransNet SGIP Projects
D. Status of Cycle 3 (FY 2014 – 2016) TransNet/TDA ATGP Projects
E. Status of TransNet ATGP-ATP Funds Exchange Projects
F. SANDAG Board Policy No. 035: Competitive Grant Program Procedures
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grantee</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description of Project Activities</th>
<th>Grant Amount</th>
<th>Contract Execution Date</th>
<th>ORIGINAL Contract Expiration Date</th>
<th>CURRENT Contract Expiration Date*</th>
<th>Watch List**</th>
<th>Status and Amendment History</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1 Lemon Grove    | Main Street Promenade Extension Planning Project | PLANNING: Proposes multi-modal enhancements to the Main Street Promenade Extension corridor and creates opportunities for recreation and social gathering. Includes the preparation of preliminary designs and environmental documentation. | $400,000     | 01/08/14                | 01/08/16                         | 01/08/2017 (RPC approved 5/6/2016) | No           | Project IS making timely progress toward its revised milestones.  
Am1 (staff) – 6 month  
Am2 (RPC) – 6 month |
| 2 National City  | Downtown-Westside Community Connections | CAPITAL: Enhances National City's right-of-way by providing streetscape improvements and incorporating placemaking features such as public art. | $2,000,000   | 08/15/13                | 08/15/15                         | 12/31/16                        | No           | Project IS making timely progress toward its revised milestones.  
Am1 (staff) – 6 month  
Am2 (RPC) – 6 month |
| 3 San Diego      | East Village Green/14th Street Promenade Master Plan | PLANNING: Develops a master plan for East Village Green, Downtown San Diego's largest proposed open space, and the 14th Street Promenade, a proposed linear park, to provide a safe pedestrian and bicycle connection between City College and Barrio Logan. | $300,000     | 02/11/14                | 01/11/16                         | 07/11/16                        | No           | Project IS making timely progress toward its revised milestones.  
Am1 (staff) – 6 month |
| 4 San Diego      | Morena Boulevard Station Area Study Phase 2 | PLANNING: Supports mixed-use, transit-oriented development in the Mid-Coast Trolley Line station areas by preparing amendments to Linda Vista and Clairmont Mesa planning documents, processing rezones, and developing a programmatic environmental document. | $400,000     | 01/21/2014              | 01/21/2016                       | 07/21/17                        | No           | Project IS making timely progress toward its revised milestones.  
Am1 (RPC) – 18 month |
| 5 San Diego      | The Complete Boulevard Planning Study   | PLANNING: Studies two primary areas along the Boulevard Rapid Bus line and proposes improvements that can contribute to the sustainability, economic vitality, and well-being of the surrounding communities. | $171,617     | 01/21/14                | 01/21/17                         |                                  | No           | Project IS making timely progress toward its milestones.  
No Amendments |

RPC = Regional Planning Committee
### Status of Cycle 2 (FY 2011 - 2013) TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Grant Program Projects

 Reporting period through March 31, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grantee</th>
<th>Project Description of Project Activities</th>
<th>Grant Amount</th>
<th>Contract Execution Date</th>
<th>ORIGINAL Contract Expiration Date</th>
<th>CURRENT Contract Expiration Date*</th>
<th>Watch List**</th>
<th>Status and Amendment History</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>San Marcos Armorlite Complete Street Corridor CAPITAL: Constructs multi-modal improvements along Armorlite Drive, a Class I bike path on the North side of the street, and the extension of Class II or III bike facilities to the Mission Sports Park.</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>12/30/13</td>
<td>08/30/15</td>
<td>08/31/16</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward its revised milestones. Am1 (staff) – 6 month Am2 (RPC) – 6 month</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Cycle 2 Smart Growth Incentive Grant Program Projects (Completed)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grantee</th>
<th>Project Description of Project Activities</th>
<th>Grant Amount</th>
<th>Status and Amendment History</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Chula Vista Healthy Communities Program PLANNING: Develops a city-wide Healthy Communities Program to inform amendments to the General Plan and other key implementation documents. Also includes the preparation of design concepts for a Healthy Corridors Pilot Project.</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>PROJECT COMPLETE – JANUARY 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Chula Vista Third Avenue Streetscape Implementation Project Phase 2 CAPITAL: Implements streetscape enhancements, traffic calming, and improved pedestrian crossings in Chula Vista's Third Avenue Village.</td>
<td>$1,344,671</td>
<td>PROJECT COMPLETE – MARCH 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Imperial Beach Palm Avenue Mixed-Use &amp; Commercial Corridor Master Plan PLANNING: Proposes the transformation of the Palm Avenue/State Route 75 corridor into a &quot;Main Street&quot; through public right-of-way improvements, traffic calming, and pedestrian, bicycle, and transit enhancements. Involves the preparation of preliminary designs and environmental documentation.</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>PROJECT COMPLETE – JANUARY 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>La Mesa Downtown Village Streetscape Improvement Project CAPITAL: Enhances the La Mesa Downtown Village area by constructing a variety of streetscape improvements and a new public plaza.</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>PROJECT COMPLETE - DECEMBER 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RPC = Regional Planning Committee
### Status of Cycle 2 (FY 2011 - 2013) TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Grant Program Projects

Reporting period through March 31, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grantee</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description of Project Activities</th>
<th>Grant Amount</th>
<th>Contract Execution Date</th>
<th>ORIGINAL Contract Expiration Date</th>
<th>CURRENT Contract Expiration Date*</th>
<th>Watch List**</th>
<th>Status and Amendment History</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Island Avenue Green Street Mobility Improvements</td>
<td>CAPITAL: Constructs a series of widened sidewalks and corner bulb-outs along Island Avenue.</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PROJECT COMPLETE – FEBRUARY 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Wayfinding Signage</td>
<td>CAPITAL: Installs approximately 300 new wayfinding signs throughout Downtown San Diego to direct residents, visitors and workers to popular destinations.</td>
<td>$335,329</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PROJECT COMPLETE – SEPTEMBER 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Contract Expiration Date = Project Completion Date

**Watch List Projects are projects not making timely progress toward their milestones (as defined in Board Policy No. 035) and that have not yet sought corrective action. Delays in tasks leading up to either the award of a contract or project completion may cause a project to be placed on the watch list.**
### Status of Cycle 3 (FY 2014 - 2016) TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Grant Program Projects

**Reporting period through March 31, 2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grantee</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description of Project Activities</th>
<th>Grant Amount</th>
<th>Contract Execution Date</th>
<th>ORIGINAL Contract Expiration Date</th>
<th>CURRENT Contract Expiration Date*</th>
<th>Watch List**</th>
<th>Status and Amendment History</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 El Cajon</td>
<td>El Cajon Transit Center Transit-Supportive Land Use and Mobility Plan</td>
<td>PLANNING: The project would comprehensively analyze the study area surrounding the El Cajon Transit Center to plan a new vision for the area to include transit-supportive land use, improved mobility options, and an enhanced public realm.</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>12/14/15</td>
<td>12/14/17</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward its milestones. No Amendments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Escondido</td>
<td>Transit Center Active Transportation Connections</td>
<td>CAPITAL: The project fills important gaps in the Active Transportation network immediately adjacent to the Escondido Transit Center (ETC) where active transportation demand is the highest. The project connects the ETC to grocery, commercial, residential and office centers to the west by constructing a bridge for pedestrians and by providing bike lanes between Tulip and Quince Street.</td>
<td>$1,270,000</td>
<td>12/03/15</td>
<td>06/03/19</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward its milestones. No Amendments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Imperial Beach</td>
<td>Palm Avenue Mixed Use and Commercial Corridor Plan West End Sector</td>
<td>PLANNING: This project builds upon the 2009 Master Plan taking the plans from a 30 percent level to 100 percent construction drawings for the project area (West End Sector). Project details include public right of way improvements, traffic calming measures, and significant pedestrian, bicycle, and transit improvements.</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>01/11/16</td>
<td>05/26/18</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward its milestones. No Amendments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 La Mesa</td>
<td>North Spring Street Smart Growth Corridor</td>
<td>CAPITAL: The project will enhance public infrastructure, encourage/support future private development, contribute to the reduction of greenhouse gases, and serve as a model smart growth project for the region. Enhancements include ADA ramps, high visibility cross walks, lighting, &amp; safety fencing, class III bicycle route with sharrow markings along the corridor and a pedestrian railroad crossing and sidewalk improvements.</td>
<td>$992,503</td>
<td>11/12/15</td>
<td>07/12/18</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward its milestones. No Amendments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grantee</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Description of Project Activities</td>
<td>Grant Amount</td>
<td>Contract Execution Date</td>
<td>ORIGINAL Contract Expiration Date</td>
<td>CURRENT Contract Expiration Date*</td>
<td>Watch List**</td>
<td>Status and Amendment History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemon Grove</td>
<td>Lemon Grove Avenue Realignment</td>
<td>CAPITAL: The project realigns and reconstructs segments of Lemon Grove (LGA) and North Avenues, trolley/railroad crossing and the LGA State Route 94 entrance/exit and upgrades existing substandard improvements at the trolley/railroad crossing; water and storm drains; and underground SDG&amp;E, Cox and AT&amp;T transmission and/or distribution overhead lines.</td>
<td>$805,000</td>
<td>11/20/15</td>
<td>05/20/17</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward its milestones. No Amendments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemon Grove</td>
<td>Broadway Downtown Village Specific (DVSP) Expansion</td>
<td>PLANNING: The expansion would consider promoting mixed-use with increased residential densities and commercial intensities within the proposed boundaries consistent with the adopted Downtown Village Specific Plan. However, the proposed project will also consider a form-based code for the expansion as well as areas of the existing DVSP. This area falls within a walkable distance to the Lemon Grove Trolley Depot and several bus stops.</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td>11/20/15</td>
<td>11/20/17</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward its milestones. No Amendments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National City</td>
<td>Downtown Westside Wayfinding and Community Gateways</td>
<td>CAPITAL: The project includes the installation of new wayfinding/gateway signs throughout the Downtown and Westside Communities. The visually unified street space will attract and support future development and serve as a model example for smart growth in the region.</td>
<td>$825,000</td>
<td>12/08/15</td>
<td>09/08/17</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward its milestones. No Amendments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grantee</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Description of Project Activities</td>
<td>Grant Amount</td>
<td>Contract Execution Date</td>
<td>Original Contract Expiration Date</td>
<td>Current Contract Expiration Date</td>
<td>Watch List**</td>
<td>Status and Amendment History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National City</td>
<td>Westside Mobility Improvements</td>
<td>CAPITAL: This project enhances bicycling and pedestrian connections in the Downtown and Westside Specific Plan areas and encourages smart growth development. The project includes the installation of Class II bicycle facilities, intersection curb bulb-outs at key intersections, and ADA-compliant curb ramps at intersections with improved crosswalks.</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>12/08/15</td>
<td>12/08/17</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward its milestones. No Amendments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National City</td>
<td>Downtown Specific Plan Update</td>
<td>PLANNING: The Downtown Specific Plan Update will provide an overall update to the original plan adopted in 2005. The plan will incorporate new elements related to Smart Growth, specifically Transportation Demand Management and parking policies. The Specific Plan Update will revise land use zones, urban design standards and recommend future implementation programs/projects in a manner that will provide direction for development that will create a unique sense of place in National City's vibrant Downtown core.</td>
<td>$320,000</td>
<td>12/09/15</td>
<td>06/09/17</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward its milestones. No Amendments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside</td>
<td>Seagaze Drive Downtown Mobility Project</td>
<td>CAPITAL: This project will enhance the quality of Seagaze Drive and provide much needed continuity with Mission Avenue through innovative smart growth supporting infrastructure including: pedestrian bulb-outs, ADA ramps with truncated domes, rectangular rapid flashing beacons, enhanced crosswalks, and a raised pork-chop median.</td>
<td>$357,497</td>
<td>12/02/15</td>
<td>06/02/17</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward its milestones. No Amendments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Status of Cycle 3 (FY 2014 - 2016) TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Grant Program Projects

**Reporting period through March 31, 2016**

#### Exhibit B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grantee</th>
<th>Project Description of Project Activities</th>
<th>Grant Amount</th>
<th>Contract Execution Date</th>
<th>ORIGINAL Contract Expiration Date</th>
<th>CURRENT Contract Expiration Date*</th>
<th>Watch List**</th>
<th>Status and Amendment History</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 11 San Diego (Civic San Diego) | 14th Street Pedestrian Promenade Demonstration Block. CAPITAL: The promenade would create an approximately 30-foot wide pedestrian promenade/linear park. It will link City College to Barrio Logan through East Village, including connecting several existing and future park sites. It will serve to connect Downtown's densely populated neighborhoods with enhanced landscaped corridors focused on improving pedestrian and other non-vehicular circulation. | $1,000,000   | 12/08/15                | 07/08/18                         | No                               | Project IS making timely progress toward its milestones.  
Grantee IS requesting a project location amendment. |
| 12 San Diego             | San Ysidro Wayfinding Signs. CAPITAL: The project includes the design and installation of wayfinding signs in the San Ysidro Port of Entry District to improve the area’s mobility and respond to changes in the configuration of the Port of Entry. Signs will help visitors easily locate public services, popular destinations, and transportation options. | $350,000     | 12/04/15                | 06/04/17                         | No                               | Project IS making timely progress toward its milestones.  
No Amendments |
| 13 San Diego             | Grantville Trolley Station/Alvarado Creek Enhancement Project. PLANNING: This project restores the Alvarado Creek channel to a naturalized creek with bridges and walking/cycling trails, the pedestrian and bicycle experience between future TODs and the transit stop will be greatly enhanced. The station’s full potential cannot be fully realized without supporting amenities such as a restored creek. | $400,000     | 12/04/15                | 08/04/17                         | No                               | Project IS making timely progress toward its milestones.  
No Amendments |
### Status of Cycle 3 (FY 2014 - 2016) TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Grant Program Projects

**Exhibit B**

**Reporting period through March 31, 2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grantee (City)</th>
<th>Project Description of Project Activities</th>
<th>Grant Amount</th>
<th>Contract Execution Date</th>
<th>ORIGINAL Contract Expiration Date</th>
<th>CURRENT Contract Expiration Date*</th>
<th>Watch List**</th>
<th>Status and Amendment History</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Diego (Civic San Diego)</td>
<td>Sixth Avenue Bridge Promenade Feasibility and Conceptual Design</td>
<td>PLANNING: The project will complete a Feasibility and Conceptual Design study for an enhanced pedestrian connection between Downtown and Bankers Hill/Balboa Park. The preliminary concept for this project includes an enhanced pedestrian pathway or promenade from Downtown to Balboa Park with treatments such as widened sidewalks, landscaping, benches, and trellises.</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>12/08/15</td>
<td>12/04/17</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward its milestones. No Amendments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Pacific Beach Greenways, Parks and Transit Plan</td>
<td>PLANNING: The Pacific Beach Greenways, Parks and Transit Plan expands community open space and improve multi-modal circulation by identifying new public spaces, improve mobility, supports transit and foster development in an existing smart growth area. The study effort will include the creation of public open spaces, multi-modal infrastructure improvements that improve safety for all modes of travel and expand beach access, improvements to the beach boardwalk, and integration of arts and culture in urban design.</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>12/04/15</td>
<td>12/04/17</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward its milestones. No Amendments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Kearny Mesa Smart Growth Employment Area Plan</td>
<td>PLANNING: The Kearny Mesa Smart Growth Employment Area Plan will produce an updated land use and zoning strategy to expand employment potential of the Project Area and allow complementary residential uses in a mixed-use context.</td>
<td>$105,000</td>
<td>12/04/15</td>
<td>06/04/17</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward its milestones. No Amendments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Status of Cycle 3 (FY 2014 - 2016) TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Grant Program Projects

*Reporting period through March 31, 2016*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grantee</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description of Project Activities</th>
<th>Grant Amount</th>
<th>Contract Execution Date</th>
<th>ORIGINAL Contract Expiration Date</th>
<th>CURRENT Contract Expiration Date*</th>
<th>Watch List**</th>
<th>Status and Amendment History</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17 Vista</td>
<td>Paseo Santa Fe Phase II</td>
<td>CAPITAL: Paseo Santa Fe Phase II is an infrastructure and street scape project located in Vista's Town Center on South Santa Fe Avenue. It is a complete and livable streets revitalization project that includes a road diet that will reduce the street width from five lanes to two lanes; install new curbs, gutters, and enhanced sidewalks; construction of roundabouts at key intersections; and, install decorative elements such as landscaping, street lights, street signs, and pedestrian furniture.</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>11/9/15</td>
<td>05/19/19</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward its milestones. No Amendments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Contract Expiration Date = Project Completion Date*

**Watch List Projects are projects not making timely progress toward their milestones (as defined in Board Policy No. 035) and that have not yet sought corrective action. Delays in tasks leading up to either the award of a contract or project completion may cause a project to be placed on the watch list.*
### Status of Cycle 2 (FY 2011 - 2013) TransNet/TDA Active Transportation Grant Program Projects

Reporting period through March 31, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grantee</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description of Project Activities</th>
<th>Grant Amount</th>
<th>Contract Execution Date</th>
<th>ORIGINAL Contract Expiration Date</th>
<th>CURRENT Contract Expiration Date*</th>
<th>Watch List**</th>
<th>Status and Amendment History</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong> National City</td>
<td>Bicycle Parking Enhancements</td>
<td>BIKE PARKING: Installs bicycle racks throughout National City’s bicycle network, providing cyclists with secure and convenient parking for end-of-trip storage.</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>03/05/13</td>
<td>07/31/16</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward its milestones. No Amendments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong> National City</td>
<td>D Avenue Corridor</td>
<td>CAPITAL: Provides approximately 2.5 miles of Class II and III bicycle facilities, including bicycle detector loops and bicycle boxes at all signalized intersections. The project also includes installation of high-visibility crosswalks and traffic calming elements.</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>03/05/13</td>
<td>07/31/16</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward its milestones. No Amendments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong> Oceanside</td>
<td>2 Year Education, Encouragement, and Awareness Project</td>
<td>SUPPORT: Provides adult and student education for active transportation skills and concepts, bilingual Public Service Announcements, and bike route maps of Oceanside bike facilities.</td>
<td>$180,808</td>
<td>03/13/13</td>
<td>07/31/15</td>
<td>07/31/16</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward its revised milestones. Am1 (TC) – 12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4</strong> Oceanside</td>
<td>North Coast Transit Station Bike Station</td>
<td>BIKE PARKING: Provides a 200 sq. ft. bike station for 30 bicycles to provide secure, indoor bike parking, which bicyclists can access 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>03/13/13</td>
<td>10/31/15</td>
<td>10/31/16</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward its revised milestones. Am1 (TC) – 12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5</strong> San Diego</td>
<td>Linda Vista CATS</td>
<td>PLANNING: Develops a Comprehensive Active Transportation Strategy (CATS) for the Linda Vista Community Planning Area, providing direct and convenient connections to various destinations, while increasing bicyclist and pedestrian safety.</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>02/21/13</td>
<td>03/31/16</td>
<td>09/30/16</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward its revised milestones. Am1 (TC) – 6 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TC** = Transportation Committee
### Status of Cycle 2 (FY 2011 - 2013) TransNet/TDA Active Transportation Grant Program Projects

**Reporting period through March 31, 2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grantee</th>
<th>Project Description of Project Activities</th>
<th>Grant Amount</th>
<th>Contract Execution Date</th>
<th>ORIGINAL Contract Expiration Date</th>
<th>CURRENT Contract Expiration Date*</th>
<th>Watch List**</th>
<th>Status and Amendment History</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>6</strong> San Diego</td>
<td>Downtown Complete Streets Mobility Plan PLANNING: Establishes a comprehensive Complete Streets approach for downtown San Diego.</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>04/11/13</td>
<td>11/30/14</td>
<td>05/31/16</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress toward its revised milestones. Am1 (staff) – 6 months Am2 (TC) – 12 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Cycle 2 Active Transportation Grant Program Projects (Completed)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grantee</th>
<th>Project Description of Project Activities</th>
<th>Grant Amount</th>
<th>Status and Amendment History</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>7</strong> Carlsbad</td>
<td>Active Village Campaign SUPPORT: Develops a multi-media campaign to promote the benefits of walking and biking in Carlsbad and Carlsbad Village, and aims to increase bicycling and walking for everyday trips, improve connectivity and create a pilot program that is scalable for other cities in the region.</td>
<td>$271,211</td>
<td>PROJECT COMPLETED – JANUARY 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8</strong> Carlsbad</td>
<td>Bike the Village: 100 Racks BIKE PARKING: Builds upon the Carlsbad Village’s Bike Rack Pilot Program and other related capital improvement projects in the vicinity and installs 80 additional custom racks and 6 bike corrals.</td>
<td>$33,000</td>
<td>PROJECT COMPLETE - JULY 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9</strong> Carlsbad</td>
<td>Coastal Rail Trail - Reach 1 CAPITAL: Enhances safety and improves circulation and access for all modes of transportation between Carlsbad and Oceanside across a natural barrier and completes the northern sections of the Coastal Rail Trail into Oceanside.</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>PROJECT COMPLETE - JANUARY 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10</strong> Carlsbad</td>
<td>Carlsbad CATS PLANNING: Develops a comprehensive active transportation implementation strategy (CATS) for livable streets. The plan will be tested by implementing up to five pilot projects.</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>PROJECT COMPLETE - MAY 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*TC = Transportation Committee*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grantee</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description of Project Activities</th>
<th>Grant Amount</th>
<th>Contract Execution Date</th>
<th>ORIGINAL Contract Expiration Date</th>
<th>CURRENT Contract Expiration Date*</th>
<th>Watch List**</th>
<th>Status and Amendment History</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>Main Street Streetscape Master Plan</td>
<td>PLANNING: Provides a plan using Complete Street principles, and improves access to nearby recreational facilities, and promotes water conservation through improved landscaping features.</td>
<td>$299,981</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PROJECT COMPLETE - SEPTEMBER 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Mar</td>
<td>Bike Parking Facilities</td>
<td>BIKE PARKING: Planning and implementation of bike parking facilities, including bike racks and lockers, throughout the city.</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PROJECT COMPLETE - JUNE 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Beach</td>
<td>Eco-Bikeway 7th &amp; Seacoast</td>
<td>CAPITAL: Provides construction of Class II and Class III bikeways, and expands the local pedestrian network along Palm Avenue. Provides an important connection from the Bayshore Bikeway to Seacoast Drive.</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PROJECT COMPLETE - NOVEMBER 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National City</td>
<td>4th Street Community Corridor</td>
<td>CAPITAL: Provides roughly 2.0 miles of Class II bicycle facilities, including bicycle detector loops and bicycle boxes. The project includes installation of high-visibility crosswalks, and traffic calming elements.</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PROJECT COMPLETED – MARCH 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside</td>
<td>Oceanside Boulevard Transit Access &amp; Beautification</td>
<td>CAPITAL: Improves the sidewalk and landscaping along Oceanside Boulevard, facilitating pedestrian access to transit stations and destinations.</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PROJECT COMPLETE - SEPTEMBER 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside</td>
<td>Mission Avenue Improvements</td>
<td>CAPITAL: Provides a mix of bicycle, pedestrian, and roadway improvements including: increased sidewalk width with curb bulb-outs, streetscape improvements, and Class III bicycle improvements.</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PROJECT COMPLETE - JULY 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TC = Transportation Committee
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grantee</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description of Project Activities</th>
<th>Grant Amount</th>
<th>Contract Execution Date</th>
<th>ORIGINAL Contract Expiration Date</th>
<th>CURRENT Contract Expiration Date*</th>
<th>Watch List**</th>
<th>Status and Amendment History</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Chollas Creek to Bayshore Bikeway - Multi-Use Path Design</td>
<td>CAPITAL: Provides environmental review and design for an envisioned Class I Multi-Use Path to connect between Southeastern San Diego, Barrio Logan, the San Diego Bay and Downtown San Diego for everyday non-motorized travel.</td>
<td>$441,250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PROJECT COMPLETE - DECEMBER 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>San Diego River Bike Path &amp; Mission Center Boulevard Improvement: Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon</td>
<td>CAPITAL: Improves pedestrian safety with the installation of the Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon using the ‘Hawk Signal’ at the project intersection.</td>
<td>$293,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PROJECT COMPLETE - JUNE 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Microwave Bicycle Detection (The Intersector)</td>
<td>CAPITAL: Installs microwave-based bicycle detection devices at various intersections that distinguish between bicycles and vehicles and adjusts signal timing to better accommodate cyclists.</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PROJECT COMPLETE - OCTOBER 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan</td>
<td>PLANNING: Identifies needed improvements to the existing network and new routes to provide bicycle and pedestrian connectivity.</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PROJECT IS COMPLETE - JUNE 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>San Marcos Boulevard Complete Street Multi-Way Boulevard</td>
<td>PLANNING: Project creates a multi-modal transportation corridor and prepares a set of Complete Street concepts for the future re-development of San Marcos Boulevard.</td>
<td>$124,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PROJECT COMPLETE - FEBRUARY 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TC = Transportation Committee
### Status of Cycle 2 (FY 2011 - 2013) TransNet/TDA Active Transportation Grant Program Projects

Reporting period through March 31, 2016

#### Exhibit C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grantee</th>
<th>Project Description of Project Activities</th>
<th>Grant Amount</th>
<th>Contract Execution Date</th>
<th>ORIGINAL Contract Expiration Date</th>
<th>CURRENT Contract Expiration Date*</th>
<th>Watch List**</th>
<th>Status and Amendment History</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22 Santee</td>
<td>CAPITAL: Improves trail by installing a Class I bike path with decomposed granite shoulders for pedestrians.</td>
<td>$281,750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PROJECT IS COMPLETE - MAY 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Santee</td>
<td>CAPITAL: Improves safety for bicyclists by installing Class II bike lanes, narrowing vehicle lanes, adding bike lanes at intersections and adjusting video detection to detect bicycles.</td>
<td>$134,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PROJECT COMPLETE - MARCH 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Solana Beach</td>
<td>PLANNING: Comprehensive update of the bicycle master plan, and consideration of pedestrian facilities and traffic calming needs, especially around schools, transit and commercial neighborhoods.</td>
<td>$136,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PROJECT IS COMPLETE - JUNE 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Vista</td>
<td>PLANNING: Updates the City of Vista's 2002 Bicycle Master Plan. Provides connections to neighboring bikeways in adjacent communities of Oceanside, Carlsbad, San Marcos, and unincorporated parts of the County.</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PROJECT COMPLETE - JANUARY 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Contract Expiration Date = Project Completion Date

**Watch List Projects are projects not making timely progress toward their milestones (as defined in Board Policy No. 035) and that have not yet sought corrective action. Delays in tasks leading up to either the award of a contract or project completion may cause a project to be placed on the watch list.

TC = Transportation Committee
### Status of Cycle 3 (FY 2014 - 2016) TransNet/TDA Active Transportation Grant Program Projects

#### Reporting Period through March 31, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grantee</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description of Project Activities</th>
<th>Grant Amount</th>
<th>Contract Execution Date</th>
<th>ORIGINAL Contract Expiration Date</th>
<th>CURRENT Contract Expiration Date*</th>
<th>Watch List**</th>
<th>Status and Amendment History</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Carlsbad</td>
<td>Carlsbad Boulevard and Tamarack Avenue Pedestrian Improvement Project</td>
<td>CAPITAL: Provide enhanced facilities for pedestrians, transit users and bicyclists. The proposed project will establish a new standard for a pedestrian scramble, provide and demand actuated NTOR blank out signs, modify traffic detection to count cyclists and provide unique clearance times. Bicyclists will be provided with northbound and southbound bike boxes.</td>
<td>$270,000</td>
<td>12/08/15</td>
<td>05/08/17</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress towards its milestones. No Amendments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Chula Vista</td>
<td>Walk + Bike Chula Vista Education Encouragement Awareness Campaign</td>
<td>SUPPORT: Creates a positive multimedia campaign, coordinates and promotes new walking and biking infrastructure projects to increase awareness on bicycle and pedestrian access, educate businesses and residents, and promote alternative transportation choices and improved safety in Chula Vista.</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>12/07/15</td>
<td>06/07/17</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress towards its milestones. No Amendments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Coronado</td>
<td>Coronado Comprehensive Active Transportation Strategy</td>
<td>PLANNING: Provides a complete multi-modal transportation network in Coronado that accommodates the needs of all users and modes. Specifically, the CATS will include a pedestrian master plan component, an updated bicycle master plan component, and the development of Safe Routes to School and traffic calming recommendations for the City of Coronado.</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>12/01/15</td>
<td>11/01/18</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress towards its milestones. No Amendments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 El Cajon</td>
<td>Be Safe, El Cajon</td>
<td>SUPPORT: Circulate San Diego and the City of El Cajon will initiate a multi-media, multi-lingual, multi-modal, and multi-faceted education, encouragement and awareness campaign to encourage active transportation and pedestrian safety for residents.</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>12/14/15</td>
<td>12/14/16</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress towards its milestones. No Amendments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grantee</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Description of Project Activities</td>
<td>Grant Amount</td>
<td>Contract Execution Date</td>
<td>ORIGINAL Contract Expiration Date</td>
<td>CURRENT Contract Expiration Date*</td>
<td>Watch List**</td>
<td>Status and Amendment History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Escondido</td>
<td>Escondido Creek Trail Signalized Bike/Pedestrian Crossing at El Norte Parkway Project</td>
<td>CAPITAL: Provides active transportation connectivity for the Escondido Creek Trail. Provides active transportation connectivity for the Escondido Creek Trail in accordance with the Escondido Creek Trail Master Plan. The project also includes a bridge that will provide a sidewalk, decorative fencing, safety barrier, bike lanes and buffers across the Escondido Creek.</td>
<td>$335,000</td>
<td>12/03/15</td>
<td>06/03/19</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress towards its milestones. No Amendments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 National City</td>
<td>Citywide Midblock Crossing Enhancements Project</td>
<td>CAPITAL: Provides additional pedestrian lighting enhancements at 14 existing mid-block pedestrian crossing locations throughout the city and creates a safe environment for pedestrians through complete street design principles and encourages the development for a well-connected pedestrian network. Improvements include new solar-powered lights and curb bulbouts, enhanced crosswalk striping, and upgrades to curb ramp to be ADA-compliant.</td>
<td>$625,000</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Contract execution anticipated in May 2016. No Amendments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 National City</td>
<td>National City Bicycle Parking Enhancements (Bike Parking)</td>
<td>BIKE PARKING: The project will install bicycle racks throughout National City's bicycle network. The bicycle racks will provide cyclists with safe, secure, and convenient parking for end-of-trip storage and enhance regional and local bicycle networks.</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>12/09/15</td>
<td>12/09/16</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress towards its milestones. No Amendments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grantee</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Description of Project Activities</td>
<td>Grant Amount</td>
<td>Contract Execution Date</td>
<td>ORIGINAL Contract Expiration Date</td>
<td>CURRENT Contract Expiration Date*</td>
<td>Watch List**</td>
<td>Status and Amendment History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside</td>
<td>Bike/Bus Safety Public Outreach Project</td>
<td>SUPPORT: Creates public service messages (aka bus wraps) on 15 buses to: (1) educate the public on the meaning of &quot;Sharrows&quot; and (2) alert cyclists to the danger of attempting to pass buses on the right side. Program funding will allow wraps on 15 buses for six months and reach approximately 600,000 people per month.</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>11/30/15</td>
<td>05/30/17</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress towards its milestones. No Amendments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Euclid and Market Complete Streets Master Plan</td>
<td>PLANNING: The plan improves pedestrian and bicycle connectivity and facilities, safety, and equitable access to transit and amenities. The project location on Market and Euclid overlays a planned Community Facilities District (CFD), implementing the Complete Streets Master Plan and transportation infrastructure needed to attract businesses, improve safety, boost economic development and fulfill the smart growth vision for the neighborhood.</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>12/08/15</td>
<td>04/08/17</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress towards its milestones. No Amendments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santee</td>
<td>Riverwalk Drive Crossing Project</td>
<td>CAPITAL: The project will install new concrete bulbouts, pedestrian ramps, pedestrian warning signage, a new ladder crosswalk and enhanced area lighting. It will also add parking lanes to narrow the lanes and add sharrows down the length of the project.</td>
<td>$216,900</td>
<td>12/03/15</td>
<td>07/03/18</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress towards its milestones. No Amendments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Status of Cycle 3 (FY 2014 - 2016) TransNet/TDA Active Transportation Grant Program Projects

Reporting Period through March 31, 2016

### Exhibit D

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grantee</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description of Project Activities</th>
<th>Grant Amount</th>
<th>Contract Execution Date</th>
<th>ORIGINAL Contract Expiration Date</th>
<th>CURRENT Contract Expiration Date*</th>
<th>Watch List**</th>
<th>Status and Amendment History</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11 Santee</td>
<td>Citywide Bike Lanes Project</td>
<td>CAPITAL: Provides for bike lanes along Fanita Parkway from Mast Boulevard to Carlton Oaks Boulevard; Cuyamaca Street from Riverpark Drive to Mast Boulevard; El Nopal from Magnolia Avenue to eastern City limits; Fanita Drive from Prospect Avenue to southern City limits; Riverview Parkway from Mission Gorge Road to Town Center Boulevard; Woodside Avenue North from SR 67 offramp to eastern City limits.</td>
<td>$156,000</td>
<td>12/03/15</td>
<td>04/03/17</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress towards its milestones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Solana Beach</td>
<td>Stevens/Valley Avenue Corridor – Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvement Project</td>
<td>CAPITAL: This project will reduce the number of lanes on Stevens/Valley Avenue in order to provide for bike lanes along all of Stevens/Valley Avenue; to construct sidewalks in missing locations; to provide enhanced crosswalks; to construct curb ramps consistent with current standards; and to provide traffic calming features to slow down traffic.</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>11/12/15</td>
<td>05/12/18</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project IS making timely progress towards its milestones</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Contract Expiration Date = Project Completion Date

**Watch List Projects are projects not making timely progress toward their milestones (as defined in Board Policy No. 035) and that have not yet sought corrective action. Delays in tasks leading up to either the award of a contract or project completion may cause a project to be placed on the watch list.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grantee</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description of Project Activities</th>
<th>Grant Amount</th>
<th>Contract Execution Date</th>
<th>ORIGINAL Contract Expiration Date*</th>
<th>CURRENT Contract Expiration Date*</th>
<th>Watch List**</th>
<th>Status and Amendment History</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Awarded November 2014</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>F Street Promenade Streetscape Master Plan</td>
<td>$491,000</td>
<td>08/14/15</td>
<td>08/14/18</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project is making timely progress toward its milestones. No Amendments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Del Mar</td>
<td>Pedestrian and Bike facilities along Camino del Mar, Jimmy Durante, and Via de la Valle</td>
<td>$812,000</td>
<td>07/14/15</td>
<td>01/14/17</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project is making timely progress toward its milestones. No Amendments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>4th Street Community Corridor</td>
<td>$1,092,000</td>
<td>09/03/15</td>
<td>03/03/19</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project is making timely progress toward its milestones. No Amendments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Imperial Beach</td>
<td>Bicycle Parking Enhancements</td>
<td>$1,800,000</td>
<td>12/01/15</td>
<td>12/01/16</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project is making timely progress toward its milestones. No Amendments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>National City</td>
<td>Division Street Road Diet</td>
<td>$875,000</td>
<td>08/21/15</td>
<td>05/21/17</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project is making timely progress toward its milestones. No Amendments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>National City</td>
<td>Euclid Avenue Bicycle and Pedestrian Enhancements</td>
<td>$425,000</td>
<td>08/21/15</td>
<td>05/21/17</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project is making timely progress toward its milestones. No Amendments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Status of TransNet ATGP-ATP Funds Exchange Projects

Reporting period through March 31, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grantee</th>
<th>Project Description of Project Activities</th>
<th>Grant Amount</th>
<th>Contract Execution Date</th>
<th>ORIGINAL Contract Expiration Date*</th>
<th>CURRENT Contract Expiration Date*</th>
<th>Watch List**</th>
<th>Status and Amendment History</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>PLANNING: Prepare a comprehensive master plan and policy document for the unincorporated area to guide the development and maintenance of active transportation infrastructure and supportive programs.</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>06/12/15</td>
<td>06/12/18</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project is making timely progress toward its milestones. No Amendments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Awarded October 2015</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlsbad</td>
<td>CAPITAL: Provide enhanced facilities for pedestrians, transit users and bicyclists. The proposed project will establish a new standard for a pedestrian scramble, provide and demand actuated NTOR blank out signs, modify traffic detection to count cyclists and provide unique clearance times. Bicyclists will be provided with northbound and southbound bike boxes.</td>
<td>$1,054,000¹</td>
<td>5/9/2016</td>
<td>5/9/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project is making timely progress toward its milestones. No Amendments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista</td>
<td>CAPITAL: Paseo Santa Fe Phase II is an infrastructure and streetscape project located in Vista's Town Center on South Santa Fe Avenue. It is a complete and livable streets revitalization project that includes a road diet that will reduce the street width from five lanes to two lanes; install new curbs, gutters, and enhanced sidewalks; construction of roundabouts at key intersections; and, install decorative elements such as landscaping, street lights, street signs, and pedestrian furniture.</td>
<td>$3,700,000²</td>
<td>4/12/2016</td>
<td>10/12/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project is making timely progress toward its milestones. No Amendments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Contract Expiration Date = Project Completion Date

**Watch List Projects are projects not making timely progress toward their milestones (as defined in Board Policy No. 035) and that have not yet sought corrective action. Delays in tasks leading up to either the award of a contract or project completion may cause a project to be placed on the watch list.

1 Project also received $270,000 in Cycle 3 of the ATGP. (See Exhibit D)
2 Project also received $2,000,000 in Cycle 3 of the SGIP (See Exhibit B)
COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM PROCEDURES

Applicability and Purpose of Policy

This Policy applies to all grant programs administered through SANDAG, whether from TransNet or another source, including but not limited to the Smart Growth Incentive Program, Environmental Mitigation Program, Bike and Pedestrian Program, Senior Mini Grant Program, Federal Transit Administration grant programs, and Active Transportation Grant Program.

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

Procedures

1. Project Milestone and Completion Deadlines

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

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

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

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

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

2. Project Milestone and Completion Deadline Extensions

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

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

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

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

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

3. Project Delays and Extensions in Excess of Six Months

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

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

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

4. Resolution and Execution of the Grant Agreement

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

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

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

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

5. Increased Availability of Funding Under this Policy

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

Adopted: January 2010
Amended: November 2014
May 23, 2016

Tracy Ferchaw
Associate Grant Program Analyst
San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG)
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101

RE: 14th Street Pedestrian Promenade Demonstration Block
Grant Agreement No. 5004750

Dear Ms. Ferchaw:

The project site identified in the grant application for the 14th Street Promenade Demonstration Block is the property adjacent to the Police Department Headquarters. The Police Department has various concerns regarding the construction of the demonstration block along their frontage at this time, but fully supports the implementation of the 14th Street Promenade Master Plan. As more blocks are activated along the 14th Street corridor, pedestrian activity will help to facilitate a change in environmental use of the site area.

Therefore, we have chosen to relocate the demonstration project to the block along 14th Street between G and Market streets. We feel this project site is a better location for the demonstration block since it is adjacent to East Village Green and is part of the master plan that will eventually connect East Village Green to Fault Line Park. Albertson’s and Market Street Village Apartments are the adjacent landowners and we have contacted the manager of the grocery store, as well as the on-site manager for the apartment complex to discuss the project scope and schedule. Both entities are excited about the project and are looking forward to working with us to develop the demonstration block.

This new site will contain the same elements identified in the original location, but will be tailored to the existing site and adjacent commercial and residential uses. The uses may include sitting areas, places for neighbors to gather, small recreational facilities, meandering pathways, generous sidewalks, additional plantings and storm water facilities.

No schedule change is requested for this project.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Aaron Hollister
Senior Planner
14th Street Promenade Master Plan

1. Urban Discovery and Play District
   - Encourage creativity, learning and play
   - Urban Discovery Academy
   - City College

2. Park District
   - Green connector between parks
   - Residential blocks
   - East Village Green
   - Fault Line Park

3. Entertainment and Innovation District
   - Celebrate history of innovation and industry
   - Flexible spaces
   - Bob Sinclair legacy
Original Site of Demonstration Block
Cycle 3 SGIP
December 8, 2015 - July 8, 2018

Block 2

No change west side between bulb-outs (typ. for each block)

Bulbouts for safer pedestrian crossing (as per streetscape manual)

Stormwater planters

Landscaped trellis with seating

Stormwater planters

Entrance

Parking

Salvation Army

Parking

Salvation Army

14th Street Concept Plan - 3/24/2016 Update
Scale: 1"=30'

OLD
New Organic Materials Regulatory Requirements
Local and Regional Challenges in San Diego County

AB 1826/Climate Action

Michael Wonsidler, County of San Diego
Ana Carvalho, City of San Diego
Colleen Foster, City of Oceanside

Overview

• Countywide Disposal - 3.1 Million Tons (2014)
• ~310,000 truck loads – Currently
• AB 1826 Adds Organics Stream – 131,250 more trucks daily in San Diego
2012 City of San Diego Waste Composition Study, Miramar Landfill

Organics: 39% (1.2M tons)  
Food: 15%  (465,000 tons)

Organics comprise:
- Food scraps
- Soiled papers and cardboard
- Yard trimmings (e.g. leaves, grass, brush)
- Lumber

Organics Processing Infrastructure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tons Per Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organics Disposed</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.2M disposal + 188K ADC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Processed</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Food Scraps Processed</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Max. Permitted Capacity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lack of Regional Capacity</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regional Organic Processing Facilities

Legend
- Yard Trimmings
- Food Scraps
- Pilot Food Scraps

Case Study

Regional Example - Distance from Encinitas
- Victorville - 130 miles
- Otay Landfill - 42 miles
- Miramar Greenery - 18 miles
- El Corazon - 13 miles
- Local Farm - 1 mile

How can we be efficient without regional planning and oversight?
Hauler Example Case Study

- North County – WM Cities
  ▫ Del Mar
  ▫ Carlsbad
  ▫ Oceanside
- South County WM Cities
  ▫ El Cajon
  ▫ Santee
  ▫ San Diego
- WM Organics Processing
  ▫ Orange County
- Roadways Impacted:
  ▫ I-5
  ▫ 78 Interchange
  ▫ I-15
  ▫ State 163
  ▫ I-8
  ▫ State 52

Potential Transportation Impacts

- Lacking local facilities, traffic and road impacts will increase:
  ▫ 1,050,000 tons/year
  ▫ 131,250 truckloads/year
  ▫ ~200 miles round trip to out-of-county facilities

Pavement damage: 1 collection truck = 9,300 SUVs
 $$$, congestion, potential for accidents, etc.
National Environmental Protection Agency’s Food Recovery Hierarchy


Fat, Oils & Grease

Backyard Composting
Small Scale
Decentralized Composting
Centralizing Composting & Anaerobic Digestion

Solutions & Benefits for the Region

Potential for Additional Food Donation

Total Commercial Food Waste in the City of San Diego
80,000 tons
15% of it could be diverted to feed people
~12,000 tons
Generating
~ 20,000,000 meals/year

Food Waste Composting at San Diego Hotels, by Ana Carvalho, BioCycle January 2014
Solutions & Benefits for the Region

Feeding People

In addition

Reduces 2 MTCO2e per ton
food waste rescued - CARB GHG Inventory

Organics Infrastructure - Compost

- Replenishes soil
  healthier soils & plants

- Reduces landfill leachate
  & GHG emissions

  2009 Landfills emitted ~6.7 MMTCO2e
  CARB GHG Inventory

- Sequesters carbon
  from the atmosphere

  Composting organics reduces
  0.42 MTCO2e per ton
  CARB GHG Inventory

- Retains water
  1% Increase in organic matter = 25,000 gals
  of available soil water/acre
Local Organics Infrastructure = Jobs

San Diego County Agriculture
5th largest industry, $5.1B value

Nationally
- 1st in number of organic farms
- 2nd highest number of farms (6,565)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Facility</th>
<th>Jobs Per 10,000 Tons/Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Composting</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landfill</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Possible Solutions

Anaerobic Digesters (AD)

- Convert food scraps, manures, etc. into renewable energy
- Residual can be composted

Wastewater AD
- Food Waste slurry fed into Wastewater Treatment Plant Digester
- Increases energy production
- Residual contains sewage sludge
Barriers to Organic Materials Processing

- Lack of regional capacity
- Lack of food recovery infrastructure & coordination
- High transportation & land costs
- Land use policies & zoning ordinances
- Inadequately addressed in Climate Action Plans
- Organic materials used as alternate daily cover
- Lack of marketing & procurement policies

Engage and Collaborate Regionally

- Stakeholders: SANDAG; Jurisdictions; Haulers; Processors
  - Regional Land Use and Transportation Planning with a focus on mitigating the impact of solid waste collection and processing
    - Expand local processing infrastructure
    - Develop routing & infrastructure efficiencies
    - Policy and ordinance updates
    - Coordinated regional outreach & education
  - Develop viable rate structures and Multi-party contracts
  - Engage Food Recovery, Farming & Business Communities
Discussion/ Questions?

Thank you!

Colleen Foster
Senior Management Analyst
City of Oceanside
cfoster@ci.oceanside.ca.us
AB1826: Critical Moment for Smarter Regional Organics Planning

SANDAG
Regional Planning
Technical Working Group

July 14, 2016

Collaboration & Policy Change
REGIONAL ISSUES

- Land Use, Regional Growth
- Sustainable Communities
- Strategic Planning
- Public Health (Thriving Communities and Anti-Obesity)
- Economic Development
- Watershed Protection
- Energy
- Climate Change and Adaptation

Active Transportation x Healthy Food Access
40% of food is wasted

1 out of 7 struggle to EAT

5% of wasted food = meals needed

FOOD WASTED BY WEIGHT — 63 MILLION TONS

CONSUMER-FACING BUSINESSES INCLUDE

- Supermarkets, Grocery Stores & Distribution Centers: 8M
- Full Service Restaurants: 7M
- Institutional & Foodservice: 5M
- Limited Service Restaurants: 4M
- Government: 0.5M
Prevention Strategies

Consumer Education Campaign
Waste Tracking & Analytics
Standardized Date Labeling

Prevent Food Waste
Food for People
Food for Animals
Food for Soil
Composting

Unwasted Food
Local Solutions

ABg3g (1989)
5,300 companies
85,000 jobs

Composting
1. residential + on-site
2. community: farms+ gardens
3. centralized + municipal

Food System Alliance

Unwasted Food
Local Solutions
FOOD RECOVERY ECOSYSTEM

**DONORS:** Food Businesses

**RECIPIENTS:** Food Banks, Kitchens, Hunger Agencies

**POLICY**
- Standardized Donation Regulation
- Donation Tax Incentives

**BUSINESS EDUCATION**
- Donation Liability Education

**INFRASTRUCTURE & LOGISTICS**
- Value-Added Processing
- Donation Transportation
- Donation Storage & Handling
- Donation Matching Software

---

- **Jobs:** recovery & processing
- **Food security:** high-nutritional value
- **Landfill diversion:** reduction in GHG emissions
- 1st in number of organic farms
- 2nd highest number of farms (6,565)
- 5th largest industry, $5.1B value

Increasing California’s crop and soil organic matter from 1% to 2% would mitigate ALL of California’s residential, commercial and livestock emissions and increase the land’s water holding capacity by over one million acre feet.

-Marin Carbon Project
AB551 Urban Agriculture Incentive Zones

40,000 privately-owned vacant lots

UCSD Superfund Research Center

200 community compost sites
8-10 mid-scale compost sites
(since 1993)

Requires supportive land use policies
Immediate Opportunities

- **Strategize policy solutions:**
  Participate in our 9/27 Unwasted Food Solution Summit II held at Jacobs Center

- **Roll out education campaign:**
  Transit System rollout of national Ad Council’s Save the Food campaign

---

**Our Goal:**
Make San Diego a **model** food recovery region!
Organics: Our Regional Vision

- Develop a regional plan for organics
- Review and adapt local land use policies and zoning ordinances to facilitate composting
- Create economic incentives to recover food and compost
- Increase capacity for food recovery and composting
- Incorporate food system and healthy soils into Climate Action Plans/Adaptation Strategies
- Support development of local markets for organics end-use products

Regional Organics: Funding Ideas

- Alameda County:
  Referendum D: 10% of tipping fee revenue is required to be spent on source reduction or waste prevention projects; 50% given back to cities with stipulations
- CAC Resolution:
  $1/ton on landfill waste disposal

Areas SDFSA can support SANDAG
1. Identify funding to include organics management in budget
2. Incorporate food systems in regional planning
3. Launch a formal regional Working Group on organics
Case Study: La Jolla Boulevard, Bird Rock Community, San Diego

Prior to 2003, La Jolla Boulevard in the Bird Rock neighborhood of La Jolla, California was a four-lane boulevard moving 20,000 cars per day with average speeds reaching 38-42 mph. The design and width of the roadway and speed of traffic created an environment unsafe for pedestrians and unable to stimulate growth among local businesses.

In response to numerous community members demanding a safer walking environment, the City of San Diego, in partnership with the community, embarked upon a study to improve safety along the boulevard. The result? More narrow travel lanes, five roundabouts, landscaped medians and angled parking. These efforts slowed traffic speeds and improved pedestrian safety, but also helped to revitalize the entire street.

Sales tax receipts from 97 local businesses (2010) in Bird Rock show an upward spike in 2006 and 2007 immediately following the roundabout installation.

Other Project Benefits

- Vehicular speeds decreased from 38-42 mph to 22-25 mph.
- Businesses thrived: Bird Rock Coffee Roasters, a local business located on La Jolla Blvd, went from doing an average of 275 transactions per day to 320-350 per day
- Numerous new businesses opened during construction of the roundabouts, including CVS who signed a 40-year lease, indicating optimism for Bird Rock's long-term economic viability.
- Noise levels dropped from approximately 60-70 dB(A) to 40 dB(A)

Complete Streets Business Survey

Name
First
Last

1. What is the name of your business?

2. Type of business you own. Circle one response.
   - Restaurant/Bar
   - Beauty/Barber
   - Automotive
   - Grocery/Liquor
   - Office
   - Clothing/Design
   - Other:

3. Please choose the title that best applies to you.
   - Owner
   - Manager
   - Employee
   - Other:

4. Have you noticed an increase in sales at your business since the completion of the street improvements in August 2015?
   - Yes
   - No

6. Have you noticed a decrease in sales at your business since the completion of the street improvements in August 2015?
   - Yes
   - No

8. Would you consider providing more detailed information to us?
   - Yes
   - No
9. Have you noticed more people walking and biking since the completion of the project?

☐ Yes
☐ No

10. About how many customers do you serve per day on a typical weekday?

☐ Less than 25 customers
☐ 25-49 customers
☐ 50-99 customers
☐ 100-199 customers
☐ 200 or more customers

11. About how many customers do you serve per day on a typical weekend?

☐ Less than 25 customers
☐ 25-49 customers
☐ 50-99 customers
☐ 100-199 customers
☐ 200 or more customers

12. Please provide any comments you may have regarding the Third Avenue improvements.

Email

For more information please contact Kathleen Ferrier at kferrier@circulatesd.org
Series 14 Regional Growth Forecast

Technical Working Group Meeting
July 14, 2016
Rachel Cortés
rachel.cortes@sandag.org

Status Update and Upcoming Tasks

This year the Regional Models Team has been working on...
- Input data development
- Model development
- Model testing
- Data visualization
- Web-based review tool
Models

**Regional Forecast**
Region-wide population, housing and jobs forecast for 2015-2050

**Sub-regional Forecast**
Population, housing and jobs forecast for 2015-2050 for the local jurisdictions and smaller geographies
Real estate simulation
The regional and subregional models both required maintenance to start Series 14 and a large amount of detailed data

Data

**Regional Forecast**
Births, deaths and migration data applied to a 2015 base population
Jobs and employment data

**Sub-regional Forecast**
Parcels
Buildings
Zoning
Scheduled development
Zoning and Scheduled Development

Update to Series 13 inputs
Review zoning for correctness and feasibility
Review Series 13 Scheduled Development and provide new projects
Both will be layers in a web-based review tool that SANDAG developed

Upcoming...

Test review tool and plan how-to session:

Begin jurisdictional review in September
Coordinate an expert panel:
TWG members and other professionals in the field
By the end of this year:
Draft region-wide results
Draft preliminary results of the sub-regional model by November
Please let me know if you have any questions or comments:

Rachel Cortes  
rachel.cortes@sandag.org  
(619) 699-0726