MEETING NOTICE
AND AGENDA

ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION WORKING GROUP
The Active Transportation Working Group may take action on any item appearing on this agenda.

Thursday, September 13, 2018
10 a.m. to 12 noon

SANDAG, Board Room
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101

Please take the elevator to the 8th floor to access the meeting room.

Staff Contact: Chris Kluth
(619) 699-1952
chris.kluth@sandag.org

AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

• 2019 ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM: REQUEST FOR VOLUNTEERS

• TransNet ROUTINE ACCOMMODATION REQUIREMENT EVALUATION

• ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION WORKING GROUP ROLE IN REGION

PLEASE SILENCE ALL ELECTRONIC DEVICES DURING THE MEETING

MISSION STATEMENT
The 18 cities and county government are SANDAG serving as the forum for regional decision-making. SANDAG builds consensus; makes strategic plans; obtains and allocates resources; plans, engineers, and builds public transit; and provides information on a broad range of topics pertinent to the region’s quality of life.
Welcome to SANDAG. Members of the public may speak to the Working Group on any item at the time the Working Group is considering the item. Please complete a Request to Comment form and then present the form to the Working Group coordinator. Members of the public may address the Working Group on any issue under the agenda item entitled Public Comments/Communications/Member Comments. Public speakers are limited to three minutes or less per person unless otherwise directed by the Chair. The Working Group may take action on any item appearing on the agenda.

Both agenda and non-agenda comments should be sent to SANDAG via comment@sandag.org. Please include the Working Group name and meeting date, agenda item, your name, and your organization. Any comments, handouts, presentations, or other materials from the public intended for distribution at the Working Group meeting should be received by the Working Group coordinator no later than 12 noon, two working days prior to the meeting. All public comments and materials received by the deadline become part of the official project record, will be provided to the members for their review at the meeting, and will be posted to the agenda file as a part of the handouts following each meeting.

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

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

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

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

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

如有需要，我们可以把SANDAG议程材料翻译成其他语言。

请在会议前至少 72 小时打电话 (619) 699-1900 提出请求.
ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION WORKING GROUP
Thursday, September 13, 2018

ITEM NO. RECOMMENDATION

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS
Members of the public shall have the opportunity to address the Active Transportation Working Group (ATWG) 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 ATWG members. Public speakers are limited to three minutes or less per person. ATWG members also may provide information and announcements under this agenda item.

+3. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES APPROVE
The ATWG is asked to review and approve the minutes from its June 14, 2018, meeting.

REPORTS

4. 2019 ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM: REQUEST FOR VOLUNTEERS (Jenny Russo)
In June 2018, the Board of Directors authorized the regional call for projects for the 2019 Active Transportation Program (ATP). The application period will close on September 28, 2018. The ATP Guidelines require the assembly of a multidisciplinary advisory group to assist in reviewing project applications. ATWG members who did not submit applications for the 2019 ATP will be asked to participate in the evaluation committee.

+5. TransNet ROUTINE ACCOMMODATION REQUIREMENT EVALUATION (Chris Kluth)
Section 4(E)(3) of the TransNet Ordinance requires all new congestion relief projects to accommodate the needs of people walking and biking where it is needed and feasible to do so. Rule 21 of Policy 31 describes how this provision will be implemented. The recent 10-year review of the TransNet program recommended a reevaluation of this process in light of current Complete Streets requirements and best practices. The ATWG is asked to discuss how the process has worked in its jurisdiction and continue the discussion for potential improvements.
6. **ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION WORKING GROUP ROLE IN REGION**
(Chair Everett Hauser and Chris Kluth)

The ATWG is asked to discuss the role their participation provides to local jurisdictions and discuss ideas to promote engagement for best practices for local and regional active transportation plans, projects, and programs.

7. **COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PLAN SUMMARY**
(Chair Everett Hauser)

Chair Everett Hauser will provide an overview of County of San Diego’s recently completed Active Transportation Plan (Plan) that was funded by TransNet through the SANDAG Active Transportation Grant Program. The Plan will be presented to the County of San Diego Planning Commission on September 21, 2018.

8. **REGIONAL ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION NETWORK DATA COLLECTION**
(Josh Clark)

SANDAG is compiling data on local bike and pedestrian projects that connect to the Regional Bicycle Network. The ATWG is asked to provide updates regarding local projects that have been completed recently or are in the planning phases. Staff will provide an update on efforts to collect Geographic Information System data on local bike projects.

9. **ADJOURNMENT AND NEXT MEETING**

The next ATWG meeting is scheduled for Thursday, December 13, 2018, at 10 a.m.

+ next to an item indicates an attachment
JUNE 14, 2018, MEETING MINUTES

Chair Everett Hauser, County of San Diego, called the meeting of the Active Transportation Working Group (ATWG) to order at 10:05 a.m.

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Self-introductions were made.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS

There were no public comments or communications.

3. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES (APPROVE)

Action: Upon a motion by Kathy Keehan (Air Pollution Control District) and a second by Howard LaGrange (City of Oceanside), the ATWG approved the minutes from its December 14, 2017, meeting. Yes: Chair Hauser, Ms. Keehan, Brandon Tobias (Caltrans), Allie Scrivener (City of Coronado), Misty Thompson (City of La Mesa), Mr. LaGrange, Esmeralda White (City of San Diego), Maya Rosas (Pedestrian Advocate), and Andy Hanshaw (San Diego County Bicycle Coalition). No: None. Abstain: Patrick Moneda (City of Chula Vista), Jeff Morgan (City of Santee), Dan Goldberg (City of Solana Beach), and Sam Hasenin (City of Vista). Absent: City of Carlsbad, City of Del Mar, City of El Cajon, City of Encinitas, City of Escondido, City of Imperial Beach, City of Lemon Grove, City of National City, City of Poway, City of San Marcos, Civic San Diego, Economic Development, Metropolitan Transit System, North County Transit District, and Safe Routes to School.

REPORTS

4. SANDAG 2018 TITLE VI PROGRAM WORKING GROUPS SURVEY

Sam Sanford, Associate Regional Planner, distributed a short demographic survey to the members of the ATWG to support the development of the 2018 Title VI Program. As the region's Metropolitan Transit Organization, SANDAG is required to update the Title VI Program every three years per Federal Transit Administration Circular 4702.1B. One component of the program is a table summarizing demographic information of working groups that helps inform transportation-related decisions. Members of the ATWG were asked to complete the voluntary survey to capture this information.
5. **2019 ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM CALL FOR PROJECTS (INFORMATION)**

The Active Transportation Program (ATP) provides state and federal funding for active transportation projects. The 2019 ATP will distribute more than $890 million in funding over four years through the statewide and regional components of the program. Jenny Russo, Senior Contracts and Procurement Analyst, provided a summary of the 2019 ATP, including the schedule and available funding.

6. **CALTRANS DISTRICT 11 UPDATE (INFORMATION)**

Mr. Cutter provided an update on active transportation projects Caltrans District 11 is developing and reported on other Caltrans matters of interest.

7. **REGIONAL BIKESHARE COORDINATION (DISCUSSION)**

Marisa Mangan, Associate Regional Planner, discussed opportunities for regional coordination around bikeshare planning, implementation, and monitoring.

8. **TransNet ROUTINE ACCOMMODATION REQUIREMENT EVALUATION (DISCUSSION)**

Section 4(E)(3) of the TransNet Ordinance requires all new congestion-relief projects to accommodate the needs of people walking and biking where it is needed and feasible. Rule No. 21 of SANDAG Board Policy No. 031, TransNet Ordinance and Expenditure Plan Rules, describes how this provision will be implemented. The recent triennial audit of the TransNet program recommended a reevaluation of this process in light of current Complete Streets requirements and best practices. Stephan Vance, Senior Regional Planner, discussed audit recommendations and solicited feedback about how the process has worked in local jurisdictions and about potential improvements.

9. **REGIONAL ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION NETWORK DATA COLLECTION (DISCUSSION)**

Josh Clark, Regional Planner II, discussed how SANDAG is compiling data on local bike and pedestrian projects that connect to the Regional Bicycle Network. The ATWG provided updates regarding local projects that have been completed recently or are in the planning phases. Mr. Clark provided an update on efforts to collect Geographic Information System data on local bike projects.

10. **ADJOURNMENT AND NEXT MEETING**

The next ATWG meeting is scheduled for Thursday, September 13, 2018, at 10 a.m.

Chair Hauser adjourned the meeting at 11:46 a.m.
ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION WORKING GROUP  
MEETING ATTENDANCE FOR JUNE 14, 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JURISDICTION/ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ATTENDING</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Carlsbad</td>
<td>Craig Williams</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Chula Vista</td>
<td>Patrick Moneda</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Coronado</td>
<td>Allie Scrivener</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Del Mar</td>
<td>Kathy Garcia</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of El Cajon</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Encinitas</td>
<td>Ed Deane</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Escondido</td>
<td>Ali Shahzad</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Imperial Beach</td>
<td>Juan Larios</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of La Mesa</td>
<td>Misty Thompson</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Lemon Grove</td>
<td>Dave DeVries</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of National City</td>
<td>Steve Manganiello</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Oceanside</td>
<td>Howard LaGrange</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Poway</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>Esmeralda White</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>Everett Hauser, Chair</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Marcos</td>
<td>Mike Rafael</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santee</td>
<td>Jeff Morgan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Solana Beach</td>
<td>Dan Goldberg</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Vista</td>
<td>Husam Hasenin</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic San Diego</td>
<td>Brad Richter</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Pollution Control District</td>
<td>Kathy Keehan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Brandon Tobias</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Transit System</td>
<td>Denis Desmond</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North County Transit District</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego County Bicycle Coalition</td>
<td>Andy Hanshaw</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Advocate</td>
<td>Maya Rosas</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Circulate San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Routes to School</td>
<td>Kristin Haukom</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego County Department of Education</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER ATTENDEES</td>
<td>SANDAG STAFF MEMBERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary McGrirk, Alta Planning and Design</td>
<td>Eric Sindel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seth Cutter, Caltrans</td>
<td>Jenny Russo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathan Schmidt, Fehr and Peers</td>
<td>Josh Clark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Baross, member of the public</td>
<td>Stephan Vance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Hunt, San Diego Bike Coalition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtney Armusewicz, STC Traffic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Proulx, Toole Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TransNet ROUTINE ACCOMMODATION REQUIREMENT EVALUATION File Number 1500200

Introduction

Section 4(E)(3) of the TransNet Ordinance requires all new congestion relief projects to accommodate the needs of people walking and biking where it is needed and feasible. Rule 21 of Board Policy No. 031 describes how this provision will be implemented. The recent 10-year review of the TransNet program recommended a reevaluation of this process in light of current Complete Streets requirements and best practices. The ATWG is asked to discuss how the process has worked in jurisdictions and discuss potential improvements.

Attachments: 1. Board Policy No. 031 TransNet Ordinance and Expenditure Plan Rules
2. TransNet Triennial Performance Audit – 2018
3. Regional Complete Streets Certification Form

Key Staff Contact: Chris Kluth, (619) 699-1952, chris.kluth@sandag.org
**TransNet ORDINANCE AND EXPENDITURE PLAN RULES**

This except from Board Policy No. 031 been adopted by the SANDAG Board of Directors in its role as the San Diego County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC). The purpose of the rules in Policy No. 031 is to implement the provisions of the original *TransNet* Ordinance (87-1) and the *TransNet* Extension Ordinance (04-01) and amendments thereto.
Rule #21: Accommodation of Bicyclists and Pedestrians

Adoption Date: February 22, 2008

Text: Adequate provisions for bicycle and pedestrian travel is determined within the context of the roadway type, its existing and planned surrounding land uses, existing bicycle and pedestrian plans, and current or planned public transit service. When addressing the access needs dictated by land use, the responsible agency must consider demand created by current and expected land uses (as determined by the local general plan) within the useful life of the TransNet project. The table Appropriate Bicycle and Pedestrian Accommodation Measures provides a guide to appropriate accommodation measures for each transportation facility type and land use context. In the table, “urban” means within the urbanized area as defined by U.S. Census Bureau.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context/Facility Type</th>
<th>Bicycle Measures</th>
<th>Pedestrian Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Urban Highway         | • Required facility type will be based on the recommendations for any regional bikeway corridors in urban highway alignments developed through the 2007 Regional Bicycle Plan. Pending completion of this plan, appropriate bicycle accommodation will be developed on a project by project basis by local and regional authorities in consultation with appropriate stakeholders.  
• Freeways and freeway interchanges may not eliminate existing bikeways or preclude planned bikeways on local streets and roads. | • Continuous sidewalks and marked crosswalks through freeway interchanges where sidewalks exist or are planned on the intersecting roadway.  
• Where new freeway construction severs existing pedestrian access, grade separated pedestrian crossings with no more than 0.3 mile between crossings. |
| Transit Project       | • Bicycle lockers and racks at stations sufficient to meet normal expected demand.  
• Bicycle access to all transit vehicles except those providing exclusive paratransit service to the disabled as required by the Americans with Disabilities Act.  
• Transit priority measures on roadways may not prevent bicycle access. | • Direct sidewalk connections between station platforms and adjacent roadway sidewalks.  
• Pedestrian crossings where a new transit way severs existing pedestrian access with no more than 0.3 miles between crossings. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context/Facility Type</th>
<th>Bicycle Measures</th>
<th>Pedestrian Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Major Urban Street                    | • Class 2 bike lanes                                                               | • Continuous sidewalks or pathways\(^2\), both sides of the street with marked crosswalks at traffic controlled intersections.  
                                       |                                                    | • ADA compliant bus stop landings for existing and planned transit service. |
| Urban Collector Street (design speed >35 mph) | • Shared roadway. Where planned average daily motor vehicle traffic exceeds 6,500, the outside travel lane should be at least 14 feet wide. | • Continuous sidewalks or pathways\(^2\), both sides of the street.  
                                       |                                                    | • ADA compliant bus stop landings for existing and planned transit service. |
| Urban Collector Street (design speed ≤ 35 mph) | • Shared roadway                                                                  | • Continuous sidewalks or pathways\(^2\) both sides of the street.  
                                       |                                                    | • ADA compliant bus stop landings for existing and planned transit service. |
| Urban Local Street                    | • Shared roadway                                                                   | • Continuous sidewalks or pathways\(^2\) both sides of the street.  
                                       |                                                    | • ADA compliant bus stop landings for existing and planned transit service. |
| Rural Highway                         | • Minimum 8-foot paved shoulder                                                    | • ADA compliant bus stop landings for existing bus stops. |
| Rural Collector Road                  | • Minimum 8-foot paved shoulder                                                    | • Not required with no fronting uses.  
                                       |                                                    | • Paved or graded walkway consistent with community character on streets with fronting uses.  
                                       |                                                    | • ADA compliant bus stop landings for existing bus stops. |
## Appropriate Bicycle and Pedestrian Accommodation Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context/Facility Type</th>
<th>Bicycle Measures</th>
<th>Pedestrian Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural Local Road</td>
<td>• Minimum 6-foot paved shoulder</td>
<td>• Not required with 85th percentile speeds ( \leq 25 \text{ mph} ).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Paved or graded walkway consistent with community character on streets with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fronting uses and 85th percentile speeds ( &gt; 25 \text{ mph} ).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• ADA compliant bus stop landings for existing bus stops.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Application of these accommodation measures is subject to sound planning and engineering judgment to ensure the facility is reasonable and appropriate within the land use and transportation context of the overall project.

2. Unpaved pathways of decomposed granite or other suitable material that are set back from the roadway where feasible would be considered appropriate only on roads serving areas that are rural in nature.

Where a local jurisdiction has a bicycle or pedestrian master plan adopted by the city council or Board of Supervisors and approved by SANDAG, the local agency may use that plan to determine the appropriate means of accommodating bicyclists and pedestrians in a given project and at a minimum provide the facilities called for in the plan. These plans must be updated and approved no less than every five years to qualify as a means of satisfying this provision.

**Best Available Standards.** All bicycle facilities must be designed to the standards established in the California Highway Design Manual, Chapter 1000. Bicycle parking facilities should conform to the guidelines established in the Regional Bicycle Plan adopted by SANDAG. Shared roadways on collector streets should have a curb lane or curb lane plus shoulder that measures at least 14 feet. Where parallel parking is in place, consideration should be given to installing the shared lane pavement marker. All sidewalks must be designed consistent with the design standards established in the AASHTO Guide for the Planning, Design, and Operation of Pedestrian Facilities, the Department of State Architect’s California Access Compliance Reference Manual, and the U.S. Department of Transportation ADA Accessibility Guidelines for Buildings and Facilities (ADAAG). Consistency with the design recommendations in SANDAG’s *Planning and Designing for Pedestrians* is encouraged.

**Bicycle and Pedestrian Accommodation in Reconstruction Projects.** Street and road reconstruction is the time to re-evaluate the function of a road and its context, and to reallocate the right-of-way if appropriate to meet the needs of bicyclists and pedestrians. An agency is not required to acquire additional right of way to improve bicycle and pedestrian access. However, the agency should consider reduced motor vehicle lanes and lane widths, and reduced median widths as a means of providing the appropriate bicycle or pedestrian facility. While such an evaluation is recommended for reconstruction projects of any size, compliance with these guidelines is required for “major” reconstruction projects meeting the definitions established under Rule 18 of SANDAG Board Policy No. 031 regarding the guidelines for implementing the “70/30” requirement.
When Provisions for Bicyclists and Pedestrians Accommodation May Be Excluded. Section 4(E)(3) is based on the premise that pedestrians and bicyclists need safe and convenient access to the same destinations as other users of the public right of way. Consequently, those portions of the transportation network where pedestrians and bicyclists need not be accommodated are the exception, and the decision not to provide for them in a construction or major reconstruction project must be made by the responsible agency for good cause such as severe topographic or biological constraints. Any impacts on the roadway’s motor vehicle capacity that result from providing for pedestrian and bicycle access would not, in themselves, justify excluding bicycle and pedestrian facilities. However, these impacts and their mitigation costs should be considered in determining if the cost of providing the facilities is disproportionate to the probable use.

This provision only requires an agency to provide appropriate bicycle or pedestrian facilities that are within the construction or reconstruction area of the project. Consideration of the provision of sidewalks as part of major rehabilitation roadway projects involving only new pavement overlays of 1-inch thickness or greater (see Rule 18 under Board Policy 031) on streets where sidewalks do not currently exist would only be required if curb, gutter, and related drainage facilities were already in place.

The cost of providing for bicycle and pedestrian access can vary significantly relative to the overall project cost. For this reason, specifying a proportional or absolute limit on spending for bicycle or pedestrian improvements relative to probable use would not allow the kind of discretion necessary to make a significant investment in facilities when necessary, or to withhold an investment when the benefits are marginal. Therefore, the decision to exclude accommodations for bicyclist and pedestrians must be a policy-level decision made by the Board or city council based on the body of information about context, cost, and probable use available at the time. Such a decision must be made in the public hearing required by Section 5(A) of the Ordinance.

Pedestrian Access. Sidewalks or other walkways may be excluded from a project when it can be demonstrated that there are no uses (including bus stops) that would create demand for pedestrian access. In making this determination, the agency must consider the potential for future demand within the useful life of the project. Access to and from public transit, including crossing improvements, also must be considered and accommodated where there is existing or planned transit service.

Bicycle Access. A new project or major reconstruction project may not include the expected bikeway treatment when a suitable parallel route with the appropriate accommodations exists that would require no more than ¼-mile total out of direction travel.

Procedures for Excluding Accommodations for Pedestrians and Bicyclists from Projects. When an agency determines not to include bicycle or pedestrian accommodations in a project because the cost of doing so would be excessively disproportionate to the need or probable use, the agency must include a notice of that decision in the notice of the public hearing required by Sections 5(A) and Section 6 of the Ordinance. In submitting the project to SANDAG for inclusion in the TransNet Program of Projects as part of the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) process, the agency must notify SANDAG that bicycle and/or pedestrian facilities, as described in Table 1 or in its bicycle or pedestrian master plan, will not be included in the project along with written justification for that decision. The decision and justification is subject to review and comment by SANDAG through the Bicycle-Pedestrian Working Group, which would forward its
comments to the SANDAG Transportation Committee. The Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee also would review and comment on such projects as part of its role in the RTIP process. The Transportation Committee in approving the TransNet Program of Projects must make a finding that the local decision not to provide bicycle or pedestrian facilities is consistent with the provisions of this Ordinance prior to approving the project for funding under the TransNet Program. If this consistency finding is not made, the agency would have the opportunity to revise its fund programming request for consideration in a future RTIP amendment.

**Effective Implementation.** This rule will be effective for projects added to the TransNet Program of Projects subsequent to their adoption by the SANDAG Board of Directors. Within three years of their adoption, the rule will be re-evaluated by SANDAG to ensure they are effectively encouraging provision of a balance transportation network without imposing an excessive cost burden on projects funded under the program.
TransNet Triennial Performance Audit - 2018

Task 6:
Draft Report (Excerpt)


April 2018
Chapter 4: Local Street and Road

The 2004 TransNet Extension Ordinance allocated 29.1 percent of annual sales tax revenues to the 19 local jurisdictions to fund improvements on the local street and road network. With approximately $714 million provided through June 2017, this program is the second largest TransNet Program after major corridor capital construction.

Key Results
Absent standard performance outcome data, improvements to the local street and road network was limited to the reporting of pavement condition as a measure of road quality. Additionally, both the Ordinance and SANDAG Board policy requirements pertaining to local jurisdictions’ compliance with bike and pedestrian accommodations and the applicability of splitting local funding 70/30 for congestion relief and maintenance need to be reevaluated.

- Over the last three years, pavement condition decreased by one percent. This follows the trend since the start of TransNet where pavement condition in the San Diego region declined from a good condition to the current at-risk condition rating.
- 70/30 congestion relief and maintenance project split may not allow local jurisdictions sufficient flexibility in linking TransNet monies to current individual infrastructure needs at the local level.
- While the SANDAG Board Policy No. 031, Rule 21 requires local jurisdictions to provide appropriate accommodations for bicycle and pedestrian travel when building new or reconstructing existing local streets and roads, compliance with the rule is not regularly monitored by SANDAG—except for a review performed in 2014, that identified continued efforts were required to ensure compliance. Yet, in light of SANDAG’s Complete Streets policy emerging at the same time, Rule 21 compliance has since not been further pursued by SANDAG and has been deferred to monitoring efforts as part of the Complete Streets policy implementation.

Recommendation Highlights
- Revisit the TransNet Extension Ordinance congestion relief and maintenance split to be more relevant with local needs as the TransNet lifecycle matures by considering elimination of the 70/30 split, change to the percentage limitations, or modification of the categorical definitions within the TransNet Extension Ordinance limitations.
- Use results from SANDAG Board Policy No. 031, local Rule 21 review to make identified changes to the Ordinance definitions and follow-up on areas of noncompliance noted during the review.
- Work with locals to determine a method to demonstrate compliance with Board Policy No. 031, Rule 21.
- Amend or establish a SANDAG Board Policy to require local jurisdictions to track and report on the number of bike and pedestrian facilities implemented using TransNet funds.
- Conduct another review of local projects and considering whether any adjustments are warranted in light of SANDAG’s Complete Streets Policy.

Pavement in the San Diego region is considered in at-risk condition and has declined over recent years. But recent pavement rehabilitation efforts by the City of San Diego will result in improved conditions over the next few years.

Note: ¹ Refer to Report Exhibit 2 for TransNet allocations of nearly $714 million for Local Street and Road Program.
Chapter Introduction

Local streets and roads feed the highway system, provide paths for transit, and provide neighborhood-level transportation access. As such, TransNet set aside 29.1 percent of sales tax collections to fund improvements on the region’s approximate 7,800 center line miles of local streets and roads. Specifically, TransNet stipulated that local jurisdictions propose a variety of congestion relief and maintenance projects through the biennial Regional Transportation Improvement Program for spending TransNet money and committing other state, federal, and local funds allocated. To deliver these projects, local jurisdictions followed common public construction project delivery and procurement methods and employed a mix of in-house and consultant staff to plan, design, and oversee projects. Capital construction was still typically outsourced, while routine maintenance of assets was generally performed in-house by designated public works crews. Since 2008, nearly $714 million was provided to local jurisdictions for their streets and roads making it the second largest TransNet Program after major corridor capital construction.  

Pavement Condition Declined, but Recent Efforts may Reverse Trend

Given the lack of local street and road performance outcome data to demonstrate congestion relief improvements and greater mobility, local street and road performance outcome communication was limited to the reporting of road quality. A typical measure of road quality is the pavement condition index (PCI) initially developed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. This measure rates of pavement distress with scores ranging from 0 (failed) to 100 (perfect). Points are deducted from 100 for distress such as cracking, rutting, and other distortions. Thus, the higher a PCI score, the better average road condition. Typically, an index of 70 to 100 indicates good or excellent condition, 50 to 69 is at-risk condition, and 49 and below is poor to failed condition.

While this data was not tracked or analyzed by SANDAG at the regional level, external reports indicated the average PCI for roads in cities within San Diego County dropped from a PCI rating of 66 to 65 between 2014 and 2016 as shown in Exhibit 33. This is part of an overall declining trend where San Diego pavement condition dropped from a PCI of 74 in 2008, indicating a good condition, when TransNet started.


Source: League of California Cities Biennial California Statewide Local Street and Road Needs Assessment reports.

34 Refer to Report Exhibit 2 for TransNet allocations of nearly $714 million for Local Street and Road Program.

35 Based on the League of California Cities biennial California Statewide Local Street and Road Needs Assessment Report showing PCI ratings for all California counties.
Individual local jurisdiction pavement survey results showed improving conditions

To capture most current pavement condition at the local jurisdictional level, we surveyed the 19 local jurisdictions. While not all jurisdictions used TransNet funds to maintain their roadways, survey responses from 14 local jurisdictions showed the average current PCI for the San Diego region was 71, which is considered a “good” condition. This number differed from the results presented by the California Statewide Local Street and Road Assessment in its 2016 report perhaps due to timing of the City of San Diego reported data. Recently, the City of San Diego invested significant TransNet resources and other funding sources to improve its roadways and reported an increased PCI of 71 in 2017 based on road condition survey results conducted in 2016. Given that streets and roads in the City of San Diego account for approximately 38 percent of the roadways in San Diego County, an increase in PCI for the City of San Diego will likely positively reflect on the overall PCI for San Diego County in future League of California Cities’ reports.

Congestion Relief and Maintenance Split May Need to Be Revisited

The TransNet Extension Ordinance requires that at least 70 percent of the revenues provided for the Local Street and Road Program be spent on congestion relief projects and no more than 30 percent spent on maintenance projects—commonly known as the “70/30 Split Rule.” Examples of each category are shown in Exhibit 34. While SANDAG Board Policy No. 031: TransNet Ordinance and Expenditure Plan Rules provided a mechanism for local agencies to request an exemption to the 30 percent maintenance limitation with justification, some local jurisdictions expressed that the process was cumbersome.

**EXHIBIT 34. EXAMPLES OF LOCAL STREET AND ROAD 70/30 SPLIT RULE DEFINITIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Congestion Relief (70%)</th>
<th>Maintenance (30%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New or widened roads and bridges</td>
<td>Lane removal for bikes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavement overlay 1-inch thick or greater</td>
<td>Pavement overlay less than 1-inch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge retrofit</td>
<td>Bridge replacement for aesthetic purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New traffic signals or upgrades</td>
<td>Traffic signal replacement or software</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian crossings and lighting</td>
<td>Light bulb replacement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In the past, local jurisdictions conveyed that these definitions established in 2006 have restricted their use of TransNet funds because the 70/30 Split Rule did not adequately reflect their needs, particularly for pavement rehabilitation projects. Some jurisdictions felt they must wait until a roadway deteriorated to meet eligibility definitions as a 70 percent congestion relief project. Based on interviews conducted during the current and prior performance audits, local jurisdictions have voiced preferences for a more flexible approach on how TransNet monies can be spent for local projects. Some jurisdictions were fairly built-out and felt that the 70/30 split prohibits them from using TransNet monies on other needed maintenance projects. Even jurisdictions with space for congestion relief projects may welcome a different split allowing

---

36 The following local jurisdictions did not respond to the survey—Del Mar, Imperial Beach, National City, and Solana Beach.
for larger allocations towards maintenance as maintenance will become a more significant issue for locals over the next decade as congestion relief improvements begin to deteriorate as well.

Recently passed California Senate Bill 1 legislation is likely to help in this area by providing nearly $1.5 billion statewide to local jurisdictions for maintenance needs. This influx of funds will certainly help rebuild the region’s roadway infrastructure, but there could still be areas that have greater maintenance needs while having fewer capital projects that meet the current TransNet congestion relief definitions. While there is a mechanism to get approval for changes to the 70/30 split, it appears to be cumbersome and time-consuming. To allow local jurisdictions more flexibility on how to best spend TransNet monies on local project needs, the SANDAG Board may want to consider modifying the rule’s definitions or changing the 1-inch or thicker requirement for congestion relief-type pavement overlays.

**Continued Effort is Needed to Ensure Compliance with Bike and Pedestrian Accommodations**

In February 2008, the SANDAG Board added Rule 21 to its Board Policy No. 031: TransNet Ordinance and Expenditure Plan Rules requiring local jurisdictions to provide appropriate accommodations for bicycle and pedestrian travel during street and road reconstruction for new projects or major reconstruction projects.37 The rule also allowed for exceptions where bike and pedestrians are prohibited by law from using the facility or where the costs of including bikeways and walkways would be excessively disproportionate to the need or probable use. Compliance and requested exceptions were tracked through self-certifications made during biennial Regional Transportation Improvement Program updates by selecting a check-box in the electronic ProjectTrak system and written requested exceptions presented to SANDAG’s Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee. SANDAG performed a detailed evaluation of bike and pedestrian accommodations in 2014; yet, continued efforts are needed to ensure compliance with this policy.

Specifically, to determine whether the rule was effectively encouraging a balanced transportation network, SANDAG staff conducted a three-part evaluation in 2014 consisting of surveying local public works staff to collect data on how they implement the requirement, determining which projects included the accommodations, and conducting a field review of those projects to determine compliance with the requirement. Those efforts found that not all street maintenance overlay projects included the minimum bicycle and pedestrian accommodations or project accommodations did not cover the entire length of the projects. However, it was difficult to evaluate the impact of the rule on the bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure since only six local agencies tracked bike facilities funded with TransNet and only three agencies tracked pedestrian facilities. From this review, SANDAG identified that additional types of projects should be subject to Rule 21 and should be added to the policy such as median landscape projects and traffic signal installation projects. Additionally, the review determined that a checklist to evaluate projects was needed and learned that local agencies had compliance questions.

While the compliance review was a sound practice employed, it was only completed once in 2014 and has not been regularly performed on an ongoing basis. Moreover, SANDAG did not follow-up on the evaluation’s results to revise the Rule 21 definitions, develop the evaluation checklist, or work with the local

---

jurisdictions to solve perceived compliance issues. According to SANDAG, it did not make changes because the SANDAG Board approved the Complete Streets Policy at the same time that committed to a process that ensures the needs of people using all modes of travel are considered on every street or network of streets. However, SANDAG’s Complete Streets Policy is applicable only to SANDAG infrastructure projects whereas locals are required by the California Complete Streets Act of 2008 to incorporate a balanced, multimodal transportation network that meets the needs of all users of streets, roads, and highway elements into their general plans. Further, SANDAG’s Complete Streets Policy stated that SANDAG would periodically evaluate the effectiveness of Rule 21 to ensure compliance with the provision and that the rule reflects current best practices in Complete Streets implementation.

Thus, SANDAG should follow through with the results from the Rule 21 evaluation conducted in 2014 and continue to monitor compliance with the rule, until otherwise amended. Further, SANDAG should require local agencies to track and report on the number of bike and pedestrian facilities implemented using TransNet funds.

**Recommendations**

To better understand whether Local Street and Road Program spending is delivering projects that result in the best performance outcomes and value for taxpayer investment, the ITOC should request the SANDAG Board to direct staff to perform the following:

11. Revisit the Ordinance congestion relief and maintenance split to be more relevant with local needs as the TransNet lifecycle matures by considering elimination of the 70/30 split, change to the percentage limitations, or modification of the categorical definitions within Ordinance limitations.

12. Continue to monitor compliance with SANDAG Board Policy No. 031, Rule 21, until otherwise amended, by implementing the following:

   a. Following-up on the results from the SANDAG Board Policy No. 031, Rule 21 evaluation conducted by SANDAG in 2014.

      1. Use results from SANDAG Board Policy No. 031, local Rule 21 review to make identified changes to the Ordinance definitions and follow-up on areas of noncompliance noted during the review.

      2. Work with locals to determine a method to demonstrate compliance with SANDAG Board Policy No. 031, Rule 21.

      3. Amend or establish a SANDAG Board Policy to require local jurisdictions to track and report on the number of bike and pedestrian facilities implemented using TransNet funds.

   b. Conducting another review of local projects and considering whether any adjustments are warranted in light of SANDAG’s Complete Streets Policy.
# REGIONAL COMPLETE STREETS CERTIFICATION FORM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title:</th>
<th>Click or tap here to enter text.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Location:</td>
<td>Click or tap here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of Complete Streets Analysis Area:</td>
<td>Click or tap here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Name, Phone, and Email:</td>
<td>Click or tap here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If this project will not meet the needs of all modes of travel, report this outcome to the Transportation Committee as part of the environmental clearance process with an explanation of the factors that led to that decision.

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

1. Describe project area used for the Complete Streets analysis. Is this a corridor, site, or project segment? Please attach a conceptual layout of the project.

   Click or tap here to enter text.

2. What infrastructure currently exists to support each mode of travel? Consider the following when describing existing conditions of the project area:
   - Auto (number of travel lanes, parking, designated passenger loading/unloading)
   - Transit (type, stops, amenities, transit priority measures)
   - Pedestrian (existence of sidewalk, width and condition, street crossings, ADA compliance, shade)
   - Bike (types of facilities, bike parking)

   Click or tap here to enter text.

3. Describe any challenges or infrastructure deficiencies affecting the experience of people walking, biking, taking transit, driving, or using shared mobility services (e.g. Uber or Lyft).

   Click or tap here to enter text.
4. If there are no existing transit, bike, or pedestrian facilities, identify the closest parallel facilities.

5. Describe transportation demand within the project area and surrounding land uses or trip generators that influence demand. Use data available through the mapping tool to support your assessment. Consider the following data:

- Auto: Average Daily Traffic
- Transit: Average Weekday Ridership, Average Weekday Boardings/Alightings
- Bikes/Pedestrian: Regional Bike and Ped Counters and contact Christine Eary

6. Assess the overall safety of the project area. Use vehicular, bike, and pedestrian crash data from the database and mapping tool to support your assessment.

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

7. Have the following documents been checked for planned infrastructure (Choose Yes, No, or N/A)?

| _______ | SANDAG Regional Plan networks (transit, active transportation, and highway) |
| _______ | Local Pedestrian Master Plan |
| _______ | Local Bicycle Master Plan |
| _______ | Local Community Active Transportation Strategy |

8. Have the following documents been reviewed for community context (Choose Yes, No, or N/A)?

| _______ | SANDAG Smart Growth Concept Map (to help determine context) |
| _______ | Local Community Plans and Facility Financing Plans |
| _______ | Local Climate Action Plan |
| _______ | Pending local development proposals |
9. Based on the plan checks, briefly describe relevant planned facilities and development proposals and how they may affect future travel demand as related to this project.

Click or tap here to enter text.

Proposed Transportation Project (To be completed by Project Manager)

10. Describe how the project plans to maintain or enhance the experience for people walking, including people with disabilities (sidewalk width, traffic calming, enhanced paving, street trees, street furniture, audible/high visibility crosswalks, flashing beacons, ramps, crossing distance, bulbouts, pedestrian refuges, streetlights, etc.).

Click or tap here to enter text.

a. If the project will degrade the experience for people walking, including people with disabilities (removal of sidewalk, crosswalks, widening of crossing distance, etc.), describe the impact and how the project will mitigate those impacts.

Click or tap here to enter text.

11. Describe how you have coordinated with MTS and/or NCTD to maintain or enhance bus operations and transit amenities within the project area per local agency standards (bus movement, bus stop location and amenities, lane widths, accessibility of bus stops, Transit Priority Measures, etc.).

Click or tap here to enter text.

a. If the project will negatively impact transit operations (reduce travel speeds/ increase travel times, etc.), describe the impact and how the project will mitigate those impacts. (e.g. transit signal priority, queue jumpers, exclusive transit lanes, dedicated transit lane, use of freeway shoulders, and direct access ramps to freeway high occupancy vehicle [HOV] facilities or Managed/Express Lanes, etc.)

Click or tap here to enter text.
12. Describe how the project plans to maintain or enhance the safety and comfort of people biking (separated bike facilities, traffic calming, intersection bicycle detection, bicycle signal phases, bicycle-specific signal heads, secure bike parking, etc.).

Click or tap here to enter text.

a. If the project will degrade the safety and comfort of people biking (removal of bike facility, etc.), describe the impact and how the project will mitigate those impacts.

Click or tap here to enter text.

13. Describe how the project plans to maintain or enhance the experience of people driving or using shared mobility services (passenger loading zones, idle space for drivers, etc.).

Click or tap here to enter text.

a. If the project will degrade the experience of people driving or using shared mobility services describe the impact and how the project will mitigate those impacts.

Click or tap here to enter text.

14. For any mode not accommodated through the proposed transportation project, describe the constraints or justify the lack of demand. Describe any relevant alternative access.

Click or tap here to enter text.

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

Click or tap here to enter text.
16. Will cost be a factor in limiting access for people walking, riding a bike, or using transit? If yes or maybe provide information on cost estimates for pedestrian, bicycle, and transit infrastructure, including methodology used, additional costs incurred, and percent of overall project cost.

Click or tap here to enter text.

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

Click or tap here to enter text.

18. Have all parties responsible for ongoing maintenance been identified? Please explain.

Click or tap here to enter text.

19. Will the proposed project adequately and safely accommodate all modes and satisfy related parking/accessibility needs or, alternatively, are there opportunities to adequately and safely accommodate all modes within the surrounding area? (Choose Yes, No, or Maybe)

- Pedestrian
- ADA Compliant
- Transit
- Bike
- Bike Parking
- Autos
- Auto parking
- Shared mobility service parking and loading zones

If no or maybe, explain.

Click or tap here to enter text.
Does this project accommodate all users as required by Complete Streets policy? 

Provide an explanation.

As a result of this complete streets analysis, are there any recommended changes that will be considered in future phases of the project?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completed by:</th>
<th>Click or tap here to enter text.</th>
<th>Click or tap here to enter text.</th>
<th>Click or tap to enter a date.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completed by:</th>
<th>Click or tap here to enter text.</th>
<th>Click or tap here to enter text.</th>
<th>Click or tap to enter a date.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended for approval by:</th>
<th>Click or tap here to enter text.</th>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>Click or tap to enter a date.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewed and approved by:</th>
<th>Click or tap here to enter text.</th>
<th>Department Director</th>
<th>Click or tap to enter a date.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>