**The Vision for the 2021 Regional Plan**

**MEETING ANNOUNCEMENT AMIDST COVID-19 PANDEMIC:**

The Board of Directors meeting scheduled for Friday, August 14, 2020, will be conducted virtually in accordance with Governor Newsom’s State of Emergency declaration regarding the COVID-19 outbreak, Executive Order N-29-20, and the Guidance for Gatherings issued by the California Department of Public Health. Board Members will primarily participate in the meeting virtually, while practicing social distancing, from individual remote locations.

There are a few options for public participation:

- At the time of the meeting, listen to the audio stream through sandag.org
- Observe the meeting via Zoom
- Submit comments via email to clerk@sandag.org by 4 p.m. on Thursday, August 13
- Observe the meeting streamed live to YouTube at youtube.com/c/SANDAGREGION/videos (please note that any comments received through YouTube are not considered part of the meeting record).
- To participate via Zoom webinar, click the link to join the meeting: https://zoom.us/j/9980211163
- To participate via Telephone, dial a number based on your current location (US: +1 669 900 6833 or +1 253 215 8782 or +1 346 248 7799 or +1 929 205 6099 or +1 301 715 8592 or +1 312 626 6799). The Webinar ID is: 998-0211-1163
- International numbers available: https://zoom.us/u/ac3wo6aRwQ

SANDAG is relying on commercial technology to broadcast the meeting via Zoom. With the recent increase of virtual meetings, platforms such as Microsoft Teams, WebEx, GoToMeeting, and Zoom are working to scale their systems to meet the new demand. If we experience technical difficulty or you are unexpectedly disconnected from the broadcast, please close and re-open your browser and click the link to re-join the meeting. SANDAG staff will take all possible measures to ensure a publicly accessible experience. Please note that the meeting will continue to be broadcast audio-only via the “Listen to the meeting” link on sandag.org.

Public Comments: Persons who wish to address the members on an item to be considered at this meeting, or on non-agendized issues, may email comments to the Clerk at clerk@sandag.org (please reference: “August 14, Board Meeting” in your subject line and identify the item number(s) to which your comments pertain).

Comments received by 4 p.m. on Thursday, August 13, will be provided to members prior to the meeting. If you desire to provide a live verbal comment during the meeting, please join the Zoom meeting either by computer or phone. At the time for public comments, members of the public will be advised to ‘Raise Hand’ if they wish to provide comments. The ‘Raise Hand’ feature can be found on the Zoom toolbar for those who are joining via computer or by entering *9 for those who are joining via telephone only. The Clerk will call on members of the public by name for those joining via a computer and by the last three digits of your telephone number for those joining via telephone. All comments received prior to the close of the meeting will be made part of the meeting record.
Welcome to SANDAG. Members of the public may speak to the Board of Directors on any item at the time the Board is considering the item. Public speakers are limited to three minutes or less per person. The Board may only take action on any item appearing on the agenda.

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 sandag.org/meetings. Additionally, interested persons can sign up for email notifications at sandag.org/subscribe.

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 the SANDAG ADA Coordinator, the Director of Diversity and Equity, 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 at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting.

SANDAG agenda materials can be made available in alternative languages. To make a request, call (619) 699-1900 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.

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。

Closed Captioning is available

To access Closed Captioning: click the closed caption icon on the toolbar at the top of your screen and follow the prompts. The closed captioning will be shown at the bottom of your screen, Or, open your browser and paste the link: https://www.streamtext.net/player?event=SANDAG-BOD.

Message from the Clerk

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

Mission Statement

The 18 cities and county government are SANDAG serving as the forum for regional decision-making. SANDAG builds consensus; makes strategic plans; obtains and allocates resources; plans, engineers, and builds public transit; and provides information on a broad range of topics pertinent to the region’s quality of life.

San Diego Association of Governments · 401 B Street, Suite 800, San Diego, CA 92101-4231
(619) 699-1900 · Fax (619) 699-1905 · sandag.org
### Board of Directors  
**Friday, August 14, 2020**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.       | Public Comments/Communications/Member Comments  
Members of the public shall have the opportunity to address the Board of Directors on any issue within the jurisdiction of SANDAG that is not on this agenda. |
| +2.      | Consent  
**Proposed FY 2021 Program Budget Amendment and Construction Agreement: El Portal Undercrossing**  
*Julie Wiley, SANDAG*  
The Board of Directors is asked to:  
1. approve an amendment to the FY 2021 Program Budget, accepting $12.1 million in funding from the City of Encinitas to construct the El Portal Undercrossing project (Capital Improvement Program Project No. 1146900), and;  
2. authorize the Executive Director to award a contract for the El Portal Undercrossing project. |
| +3.      | Reports  
**The Vision for the 2021 Regional Plan***  
*Krystal Ayala, Coleen Clementson, Alex Estrella, Tuere Fa’aola, Ray Major, Marisa Mangan, and Antoinette Meier, SANDAG*  
An overview of the vision for the 2021 Regional Plan and summary of how the 5 Big Moves address traffic congestion, social equity, and state and federal mandates will be presented. |
| +4.      | Closed Session: Discussion regarding Significant Exposure to Litigation (Government Code Section 54956.9(d)(2) and (e)(1))  
*Sandy McDonough, Paul Plevin Sullivan & Connaughton*  
The Board of Directors will confer with counsel on a matter with significant exposure to litigation. |
| 5.       | Continued Public Comments  
If the five-speaker limit for public comments was exceeded at the beginning of this agenda, other public comments will be taken at this time. Subjects of previous agenda items may not again be addressed under public comment. |
6. **Upcoming Meetings**
   
The next Board Business meeting is scheduled for Friday, August 28, 2020, at 9 a.m.
The next Board Policy meeting is scheduled for Friday, September 11, 2020, at 10 a.m.

7. **Adjournment**

   + next to an agenda item indicates an attachment

   * next to an agenda item indicates that the Board of Directors also is acting as the San Diego County Regional Transportation Commission for that item
Proposed FY 2021 Program Budget Amendment and Construction Agreement: El Portal Undercrossing

Overview

The City of Encinitas designed and obtained the permits for the El Portal Undercrossing project located within the Los Angeles-San Diego-San Luis Obispo (LOSSAN) Rail Corridor in the City of Encinitas. Encinitas asked SANDAG to procure, manage, and administer the construction phase of the project, and the Board of Directors approved that arrangement in a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) at its meeting on July 26, 2019.

The MOU calls for Encinitas to have liability for all project costs, including change orders, litigation, and SANDAG staff time. This arrangement worked well in 2013, when SANDAG successfully constructed the Santa Fe Drive Undercrossing on behalf of the City of Encinitas.

Key Considerations

In May 2020, SANDAG conducted an invitation for bids (IFB) to seek qualified contractors that could construct the El Portal Undercrossing project. The project consists of constructing a new railroad bridge, a new pedestrian underpass, retaining wall construction, and landscaping at Mile Post 237.1 on a portion of the LOSSAN Rail Corridor located in the City of Encinitas (City), within the County of San Diego.

Five bids were received in response to the IFB, ranging from $6.69 million to $9.21 million. SANDAG staff proposes to award Granite Construction Company, the lowest responsive and responsible bidder, a construction agreement for the El Portal Undercrossing project in the amount of $6,693,693.

As required by SANDAG Board Policy No. 024, SANDAG prepared an independent cost estimate of $5,259,490 for this project. The low bid is $1,434,203 (24%) higher than the engineer’s estimate. The difference between the low bid and the engineer’s estimate is largely due to the retaining wall, traffic control, and precast girder bid items. The increase in these costs is reasonable due to the potential for shoring needed during retaining wall construction, difficulty of traffic control on a main arterial road with an ongoing adjacent construction project, and limited availability of precast concrete manufacturers.

Award of the contract is contingent upon Board approval and a commitment from the City to provide the additional funds to cover the difference between the estimate and the bid amount. The request for the approval of additional funds is scheduled for approval at the City’s council meeting on August 12, 2020. The current project budget committed from the City is $8,937,000. The City Council is expected to commit to an additional $3,163,000 at its council meeting. If approved by the City Council, funds will be transferred to SANDAG in two installments: one in August 2020 in the amount of $2,200,000 and another in July 2021 in

Recommendation:

The Board of Directors is asked to:

1. approve an amendment to the FY 2021 Program Budget, accepting $12.1 million in funding from the City of Encinitas to construct the El Portal Undercrossing project (Capital Improvement Program Project No. 1146900), and;
2. authorize the Executive Director to award a contract for the El Portal Undercrossing project.

Fiscal Impact:

All costs associated with the construction of this project, including SANDAG staff time, design support, and construction management will be funded by the City of Encinitas.

Schedule/Scope Impact:

The El Portal Undercrossing project will take approximately 378 working days to complete and is anticipated to commence in fall 2020, with the facility scheduled to open to the public in spring 2022.
the amount of $963,000. Staff will report to the Board during its meeting on August 14 if the anticipated approval by the City Council does not occur prior to the August 14 meeting.

Next Steps
Following approval by the Board and receipt of the first installment of $2,200,000 from the City, the contract award will be sent to Granite Construction for its signature.

Hasan Ikhrata, Executive Director
Key Staff Contacts: Julie Wiley, (619) 699-6966, julie.wiley@sandag.org
Alexandra DeVaux (619) 595-5613, alexandra.devaux@sandag.org

Attachment 1. Proposed budget for El Portal Undercrossing
## FY 2020 CAPITAL BUDGET AMENDMENT IN ‘000’S

**Project Number:** 1146900  
**RTIP Number:** ENC46  
**Project Name:** El Portal Undercrossing

### Project Scope

Complete final design and construct pedestrian undercrossing underneath the existing NCTD operated railroad at the El Portal location described in the Project Limits below.

### Project Limits

The project is located at MP 237.1 on the LOSAN Rail Corridor. The undercrossing will connect a highway 101 to Vulcan Ave, within the City of Encinitas and is located East of El Portal street.

### Major Milestones

- Draft Environmental Document: Mar-20  
- Final Environmental Document: May-20  
- Ready to Advertise: Mar-20  
- Begin Construction: Apr-21  
- Open to Public: Apr-22  
- Close-Out: Oct-22

### SANDAG Expenditure Plan ($000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK</th>
<th>PRIOR YEARS</th>
<th>FY 20</th>
<th>FY 21</th>
<th>FY 22</th>
<th>FY 23</th>
<th>FY 24</th>
<th>FY 25</th>
<th>FY 26</th>
<th>FY 27</th>
<th>FY 28</th>
<th>FY 29</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$125</td>
<td>$130</td>
<td>$115</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$115</td>
<td>$160</td>
<td>$160</td>
<td>$28</td>
<td>$80</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Support</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Capital</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Support</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Capital</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,600</td>
<td>4,600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Services</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Contingency</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total SANDAG</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$640</td>
<td>$640</td>
<td>$640</td>
<td>$640</td>
<td>$640</td>
<td>$640</td>
<td>$640</td>
<td>$640</td>
<td>$640</td>
<td>$640</td>
<td>$640</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OUTSIDE AGENCY Expenditure Plan ($000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK</th>
<th>PRIOR YEARS</th>
<th>FY 20</th>
<th>FY 21</th>
<th>FY 22</th>
<th>FY 23</th>
<th>FY 24</th>
<th>FY 25</th>
<th>FY 26</th>
<th>FY 27</th>
<th>FY 28</th>
<th>FY 29</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Document</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Support</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Capital</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Support</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Capital</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Caltrans</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total SANDAG &amp; Caltrans</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$640</td>
<td>$640</td>
<td>$640</td>
<td>$640</td>
<td>$640</td>
<td>$640</td>
<td>$640</td>
<td>$640</td>
<td>$640</td>
<td>$640</td>
<td>$12,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Funding Plan ($000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIOR YEARS</th>
<th>FY 20</th>
<th>FY 21</th>
<th>FY 22</th>
<th>FY 23</th>
<th>FY 24</th>
<th>FY 25</th>
<th>FY 26</th>
<th>FY 27</th>
<th>FY 28</th>
<th>FY 29</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$640</td>
<td>$640</td>
<td>$640</td>
<td>$640</td>
<td>$640</td>
<td>$640</td>
<td>$640</td>
<td>$640</td>
<td>$640</td>
<td>$640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$640</td>
<td>$640</td>
<td>$640</td>
<td>$640</td>
<td>$640</td>
<td>$640</td>
<td>$640</td>
<td>$640</td>
<td>$640</td>
<td>$640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$640</td>
<td>$640</td>
<td>$640</td>
<td>$640</td>
<td>$640</td>
<td>$640</td>
<td>$640</td>
<td>$640</td>
<td>$640</td>
<td>$12,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Funding Source**

- **FEDERAL:**
  - 74000203 ATP - FHWA 54460321: $0 | $0 | $97 | $1,800 | $1,800 | $1,600 | $1,600 | $205 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $3,802
- **LOCAL:**
  - 91008151 City of Encinitas: $0 | $0 | $247 | $1,487 | $2,390 | $2,390 | $2,375 | $275 | $196 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $8,298

**Total:** $0 | $0 | $344 | $4,011 | $6,180 | $6,180 | $6,180 | $3,802 | $275 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $12,100
The Vision for the 2021 Regional Plan

Overview

On August 7, 2020, staff presented the data-driven approach used to develop the vision for the 2021 Regional Plan to a joint meeting of the Transportation, Regional Planning, and Borders Committees. This process was led by teams of experts who used rigorous and innovative methods not seen before at SANDAG and applied key strategies known as the 5 Big Moves. Attachment 1 provides the Joint Transportation, Regional Planning, and Borders Committees August 7, 2020, meeting staff presentation and the recording is available on the SANDAG YouTube channel.

The outcome—based on years of feedback from the Board of Directors, public input, research, data analysis, and coordination with experts—is a bold new transportation vision that directly addresses traffic congestion, social equity, and state and federal mandates, and could serve the transportation needs of the San Diego region for generations to come.

Key Considerations

The 2021 Regional Plan must comply with specific state and federal mandates, including a Sustainable Communities Strategy (per Senate Bill 375) that achieves greenhouse gas emission reduction targets set by the California Air Resources Board; compliance with federal civil rights requirements (Title VI); and environmental justice considerations, air quality conformity, and public participation. More information about the requirements for the Regional Plan are provided as Attachment 2.

Capital investments alone are not likely to achieve desired congestion relief or meet greenhouse gas emission reduction mandates. As such, a package of innovative policies, programs, and technologies will be a necessary component of the 2021 Regional Plan. A discussion of those components will be brought forward this fall.

Based on previous Board direction, data analysis combined with stakeholder input has guided the development of a comprehensive vision for a transportation ecosystem that leverages technology to create a safe, adaptable, and equitable transportation network with fast, fair, and clean choices to move around the region seamlessly. Staff will present a transportation network that integrates the 5 Big Moves to provide a regional system of Complete Corridors that are managed in real time by the Next Operating System (Next OS) to create capacity and keep the transportation system operating smoothly and safely for all modes. Transit

Action: Discussion

An overview of the vision for the 2021 Regional Plan and summary of how the 5 Big Moves address traffic congestion, social equity, and state and federal mandates will be presented.

Fiscal Impact:

Funding for development of the 2021 Regional Plan is included in Overall Work Program Element No. 3102000 in the FY 2021 Program Budget.

Schedule/Scope Impact:

The environmental impact report (EIR) will be initiated this fall. The draft EIR and draft 2021 Regional Plan are expected to be released for Board of Directors review and public comment in spring 2021.
Leap and Flexible Fleet services connect a network of Mobility Hubs that cover the region’s population centers, major employment centers, and other key activity centers across the region.

The level of investment is an important consideration in development of the 2021 Regional Plan. Staff has developed an overall cost estimate of about $177 billion over a 30-year period. Staff developed the cost estimates in concert with national experts from a consultant team and in coordination with the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans, District 11), Metropolitan Transit System, North County Transit District, and the local jurisdictions and County of San Diego. As a comparison, the current Board-adopted 2019 Federal Regional Transportation Plan included a $128 billion investment over 30 years. Staff will prepare more detailed documentation on the approach to developing the cost estimates that will be shared with the SANDAG Working Groups, Policy Advisory Committees, and Board of Directors in fall 2020.

**Next Steps**

Key policies and programs that are being considered as part of the vision, as well as modeling results, more detailed cost estimates, revenue assumptions, and other critical aspects will be presented to the SANDAG Working Groups, Policy Advisory Committees, and Board of Directors in fall 2020.

The Board will be asked to consider adoption of the 2021 Regional Plan in fall 2021.

**Hasan Ikhrata, Executive Director**

Key Staff Contacts: Coleen Clementson, (619) 699-1944, Coleen.Clementson@sandag.org
Ray Major, (619) 595-5668, Ray.Major@sandag.org

Attachments:
1. Joint Transportation, Regional Planning, Borders Committees August 7, 2020 Meeting Presentation
2. Regional Plan: Federal and State Requirements
A bold new approach to planning for the future

Embracing data-driven planning, incorporating emerging technologies, and incorporating resident input
5 Big Moves

Key strategies to envision our future transportation ecosystem

- Next OS: Enabling technology
- Complete Corridors: Backbone of a multimodal system
- Transit Leap: Quality transit alternatives to automobiles
- Mobility Hubs: Connection and transfer points
- Flexible Fleets: First and Last mile options

Putting people first
Part I
  • Overview of the data-driven planning process
  • Complete Corridors
  • Transit Leap

10-minute break

Part II
  • Mobility Hubs and Flexible Fleets
  • Next Operating System
  • Conclusion

10-minute break

Committee discussion and public comment
Today’s Presenters

Antoinette Meier  
Director of Mobility and Innovation

Tuere Fa’aola  
Senior Regional Planner

Alex Estrella  
Senior Regional Planner

Jennifer Williamson  
Principal Regional Planner

Marisa Mangan  
Senior Regional Planner

Krystal Ayala  
Associate Regional Planner
Sprint Planning

This iterative process brought in data and feedback from residents at each phase.
Getting input from communities

By listening to residents throughout the region, we can plan for improvements that address their unique needs.
Insights: Transit doesn’t work for many people today

safety and security

I wouldn’t let my kids take public transit here because of safety and security concerns.

Safety is a huge factor in riding public transit for me and as a woman I don’t feel safe riding alone.

The bus is not reliable and takes planning. Before I had a car, I would take the bus – I had to leave super early and really plan ahead.

I wish I could take public transit, but it takes a long time and there is a lack of frequency options, and a last mile issue.

reliability and speed

The network is too linear. If you go to any major city, public transit is just as easy and just as fast as driving.

I’m surprised there’s no transit to the airport… We need airport connectivity.

I don’t have a car, so I take the bus and COASTER to get to Encinitas for work. I leave Chula Vista at 6 a.m. for my 10 a.m. shift.

I have to walk home from work at 11 p.m. because it’s too late for the buses.

incomplete transit network

inadequate service for transit dependent
**Insights: People want safe, fast, and convenient choices**

- **no school bus service**
  - We used to have buses in middle school, but not anymore. People getting to school creates most of the traffic.
  - Trying to get across Mira Mesa Blvd. after picking up my daughter from school can take up to 20 minutes.

- **commutes are stressful and long**
  - The traffic in Sorrento Valley is so bad, I would never take a job there.
  - More time on my commute means less time with my family.
  - At this point in my life, I am willing to pay a little more to gain some time back.
  - I plan my day around traffic patterns.
  - I plan my commute around when the red lines on Google Maps disappear.

- **unsafe conditions and not enough infrastructure for bikes and micromobility**
  - I like the scooters and bikes, especially around colleges and schools. If I had some dedicated lanes to take a scooter to school, I wouldn’t be driving.
  - Biking outside of the neighborhood is unsafe. People text and drive and go into the bike lanes a lot.
  - Scooters should have their own lanes and be regulated, or they should go altogether.

- **drivers need flexibility, control, and privacy**
  - I like riding my bike at the beach, but I don’t feel safe on the roads.
  - I’m all about the privacy and flexibility I have in my chariot. I like doing what I know.
  - Nothing beats the privacy and control of taking my own car.
  - My car is really my only option when I have my kids with me.

**Vision Advisory Panel**

- adaptable systems // resiliency // safety // power of data // public private partnerships //
Identifying Critical Connections
Data-Driven Planning

Where people live and work

Census data helped make connections between where people live and work
Trips to and from employment centers are the most predictable.

Other regional trips, including trips from the border and to recreation in Balboa Park and Mission Bay.
Other work trips including military bases

7% low-income residents have access to fast and frequent transit service
The median transit travel time is **51 minutes** – double the travel time for people who drive to work

10% of the region’s population has a disability
13% of our population will be age 75 or older in 2050

42% of greenhouse gas emissions come from transportation/passenger vehicles
Network Development and Refinement

Complete Corridors
### Interregional Corridors

**Trip Distance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt;20 miles</td>
<td>(60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-20 miles</td>
<td>(30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;5 miles</td>
<td>(10%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Peak Period Performance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Approx.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Miles Traveled (Freeway)</td>
<td>2/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delay (Freeway)</td>
<td>2/3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Urban Corridors

**Trip Distance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt;20 miles</td>
<td>(10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-20 miles</td>
<td>(80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;5 miles</td>
<td>(10%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Peak Period Performance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Approx.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Miles Traveled (Freeway)</td>
<td>1/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delay (Freeway)</td>
<td>1/3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rural Corridors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trip Distance</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt;20 miles</td>
<td>(10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-20 miles</td>
<td>(80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;5 miles</td>
<td>(10%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Peak Period Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vehicle Miles Traveled (Freeway)</th>
<th>Approx.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delay (Freeway)</td>
<td>&lt;5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposed Complete Corridor Network

A system of managed lanes in the most traveled corridors in the western part of our region
**Corridor Capacity Opportunities**

Sample highway corridor

Current highway corridor

Future highway corridor with proposed improvements

---

**Corridor Capacity Opportunities with 5 Big Moves**

**West Chula Vista/I-5**

Current capacity

Future capacity with 5 Big Moves concepts

220% increase in person trips

1,000 person trips
SR 78 today

SR 78 could be reimagined using the Complete Corridors concept
SR 78 could have technology to manage lanes

Proposed Regional Arterial Network
Provide access to freeways, major employment centers, and transit
Regional Bike Network

As part of a Complete Corridor, the bike network creates a safe place for people who walk and bike.
Main and Magnolia in the heart of El Cajon

How technology can make intersections smarter and safer in El Cajon
Transit Leap Service Types

- **Commuter rail**
  Fully grade separated, higher speed, longer distance
- **Light rail**
  Fully/partially grade separated, medium speed, shorter distance
- **Next Gen Rapid**
  Rapid and Express (with transit priority)
- **Local bus** and **Flexible Fleets**
Data connects employment centers with areas that have the highest concentration of commute origins, revealing potential connections.
Refining proposed Commuter Rail Routes

Proposed Transit Leap Network

This network aligns with Complete Corridors and has three primary services
San Ysidro Transit Center and pick-up/drop-off areas today

Envision San Ysidro Transit Center with managed curbs, Flexible Fleets, and bike lanes
San Ysidro Transit Center Trolley platform and curb today

San Ysidro Transit Center could connect light rail with commuter rail using Transit Leap
Improved and more equitable transit access

Transit Leap could create faster, more frequent, and longer service hours

- People and jobs within 10 minutes of fast and frequent transit
  - Today: 5%
  - VISION: 55%
- Population with access to longer transit service hours
  - Today: 8%
  - VISION: 60%
- Low-income residents with access to fast and frequent transit service
  - Today: 7%
  - VISION: 59%

1 Fast and Frequent: service every 10 minutes
2 Longer Transit Service Hours: 20 hours of continuous service

We’ve paused for a short break

The August 7 joint meeting of the SANDAG Transportation, Regional Planning, and Borders Committees will resume in…
Mobility Hubs

Developing the Mobility Hub Network

Potential Mobility Hub Locations
- Major Employment Centers (K)
- Major Commute Origins (40 in total)
- Major Employment Center Boundaries

Initial Mobility Hub Propensity
- Propensity Score
  - Strong
  - Medium
  - Weak

---

San Diego
FORWARD
Proposed Regional Mobility Hub Network

Mobility Hubs and Communities of Concern
Proposed Central Mobility Hub

An area where people could connect to transit options throughout the region

A Central Mobility Hub could connect people to the airport
A Central Mobility Hub could connect people to Flexible Fleets, micromobility, and ridehailing

A Central Mobility Hub could be a central connection for light rail, commuter rail, and interregional rail
Oceanside Transit Center platform today

Oceanside Transit Center platform with Mobility Hub
Oceanside Transit Center (S. Tremont) today

Oceanside Transit Center (S. Tremont) with Mobility Hub
Mission at Nevada is a 5-minute bike ride or 10-minute walk to the Oceanside Transit Center

Mission at Nevada with Mobility Hub
Flexible Fleet Services

- **Micromobility**: Low-speed devices
- **Ridehail & Carshare**: On-demand vehicles
- **Rideshare**: Shared rides
- **Microtransit**: On-demand shuttles
- **Last Mile Delivery**: Ground and aerial package delivery
What we heard…
- Supportive infrastructure
- Operating incentives
- Complement transit
- Affordable and accessible choices

Flexible Fleet Outreach
Flexible Fleets work in partnership with the private sector and communities

Flexible Fleets operate everywhere
Services could thrive in urban, suburban, and rural settings
Driverless vehicles link for added capacity

Privacy screens offer a comfortable experience

Cleaning bot

WiFi and mobile device charging

Accessible boarding

Space for personal belongings

Folding rack for bikes

El Cajon Boulevard in North Park today
El Cajon Boulevard could be transformed into a Complete Corridor

Flexible Fleets could connect to Transit Leap services and serve short trips within the community
Proposed Sorrento Valley Transit Station

New and enhanced services could improve access to opportunities at our largest employment center.

Mira Mesa Boulevard in the Sorrento Valley employment center today
Transit Leap and Flexible Fleets could improve access to Sorrento Valley

Flexible Fleets and Complete Corridors could make traveling to Sorrento Valley easy, convenient, and safe
Commuter rail could connect Sorrento Valley to key destinations, including a Central Mobility Hub.
The technology that makes the transportation ecosystem work

NEXT OS PLATFORM

APPLICATIONS & SERVICES

DATA SOURCES

Residents & Businesses
Transportation Operators
Planners & Policymakers

The technology that makes the transportation ecosystem work

A suite of integrated applications to plan trips and book and pay for services

A suite of dashboards and tools with advanced analytics

A platform with public and private data that better informs decisions

Tools for people who use the system, those who operate it, and the people who plan and set policies

Residents & Businesses
Transportation Operators
Planners & Policymakers
Laura’s Journey

- Lives in southeast San Diego with her family
- Essential worker, commutes to Sorrento Valley
- Transports her son to junior high school and toddler to daycare
Laura’s morning routine gets easier with the 5 Big Moves

5 Big Moves Data Viewer

A Transformative Transportation Vision

For the 2021 Regional Plan
A Bold New Vision
Fast, Fair, Clean

Data Viewer: Commuter Rail
We’ve paused for a short break

The August 7 joint meeting of the SANDAG Transportation, Regional Planning, and Borders Committees will resume in…
Regional Plan: Federal and State Requirements

Introduction

The development of our Regional Plan is governed by several federal and state laws and regulations, as described below. In the San Diego region, the Regional Plan combines the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), its Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS), and the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP).

State Requirements

- **Senate Bill 375 (SB 375):** (Chapter 728, Statutes of 2008) directed the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to set regional targets for cars and light trucks for the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. SB 375 amended state RTP requirements (Government Code Section 65080 et seq.) by requiring that RTPs include a SCS that demonstrates how the regional greenhouse gas reduction targets will be achieved. CARB has adopted guidelines for the evaluation of the SCS.

- **Assembly Bill 805:** (Chapter 658, Statutes of 2017) requires that SANDAG’s Regional Plan include strategies that provide for mode shift to public transportation, identify disadvantaged communities, and include transportation strategies to reduce pollution exposure in disadvantaged communities.

- **Assembly Bill 1730:** (Chapter 634, Statutes of 2019) extended the deadline for SANDAG’s next Regional Plan until December 31, 2021. It also requires that SANDAG submit an implementation report to CARB when it submits a SCS to CARB for review. This report will track the implementation of its most recently adopted 2015 SCS.

- **California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA):** SANDAG, as the Lead Agency under the CEQA, will prepare a Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the 2021 Regional Plan.

- **Other State Requirements:** The Regional Plan also includes the elements required for the RCP (Public Utilities Code Section 132360, et seq.) and the Regional Housing Needs Assessment described in the state’s housing element law (Government Code Section 65580, et seq.).

Federal Requirements

- **Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21)/Fixing America’s Surface Transportation (FAST) Act and Metropolitan Planning Regulations:** The Regional Plan must implement a performance-based approach in its metropolitan transportation planning process and meet other requirements of the U.S. Department of Transportation Metropolitan Planning Regulations (Title 23 CFR Parts 450 and 771 and Title 49 CFR Part 613).

- **Section 176 of the federal Clean Air Act and Transportation Conformity Rule:** Under the Clean Air Act (42 USC Section 7506), as amended, and the Environmental Protection Agency’s (EPA’s) Transportation Conformity Rule (Title 40 CFR Part 93), SANDAG must demonstrate that the Regional Plan conforms to requirements of the State Implementation Plan for attainment of air quality standards, and uses the most recent planning assumptions.
• **Title VI of the federal Civil Rights Act of 1964 and other non-discrimination requirements:** The Regional Plan must comply with Title VI of the federal Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000d), the Americans with Disabilities Act (as defined in Title 49, Part 37, of the United States Code), Executive Order 12898 on Environmental Justice, and Executive Order 13166 on Limited English Proficiency to ensure consideration of social equity, environmental justice, and accessibility.

**Regional Plan Content Requirements**

The California Transportation Commission (CTC) periodically adopts guidelines for the preparation of RTPs that include checklists that must be submitted with the draft and final Regional Plan to the CTC, Caltrans, and federal agencies. Attachments 2A and 2B include the RTP Checklist and the Air Quality Conformity Checklist, respectively. Key requirements are summarized below.

**RTP Checklist**

- **General:** The Regional Plan must cover a period of at least 20 years from the adoption date; include policy, action, financial elements, and SCS addressing 10 specified issues; long- and short-range strategies and actions; and travel demand model methodology.

- **Consultation/Cooperation:** A Public Involvement Program must be developed and implemented. Consultation must be conducted with Tribal Governments; local elected officials; representatives from environmental and economic communities, airport, transit, and freight; with agencies responsible for land use, natural resources, environmental protection, conservation, and historic preservation. The Regional Plan must discuss involvement of private sector, federal land management agencies, and coordination efforts with regional air quality planning authorities (San Diego County Air Pollution Control District).

- **Title VI and Environmental Justice:** The Public Participation Plan must describe strategies to seek out and consider the needs of low-income and minority communities. A Title VI analysis and an Environmental Justice analysis must be prepared.

- **Multimodal Discussion, Programming/Operations:** The Regional Plan must discuss intermodal and connectivity issues, highways, transit, regional airport system, regional pedestrian needs, regional bicycle needs, California Coastal Trail, rail transportation, maritime transportation, and goods movement. It must be consistent with regional ITS architecture. It also must identify objective criteria used for measuring the performance of the transportation system.

- **Financial:** The Regional Plan must include a financial plan that demonstrates how it can be implemented, revenues must reflect fiscal constraint and the Regional Plan must include a list of financially constrained projects.

- **Environmental:** The Regional Plan is subject to CEQA and an EIR must be prepared. Clean Air Act State Implementation Plan conformity must be demonstrated (see below).
Air Quality Conformity Checklist

- Under the U.S. Department of Transportation Metropolitan Planning Regulations and EPA’s Transportation Conformity Rule requirements, the Regional Plan needs to meet four requirements: (1) Regional emissions analysis; (2) Timely implementation of Transportation Control Measures; (3) Financial Constraint Analysis; and (4) Interagency consultation and public involvement. In the San Diego region, the air quality conformity analysis is conducted for ozone or smog (2008 and 2015 federal ozone standards).
Regional Transportation Plan Checklist
(Revised December 2016)

(To be completed electronically in Microsoft Word format by the MPO and submitted along with the draft and final RTP to Caltrans)

Name of MPO: ____________________________________________________________

Date Draft RTP Completed: ________________________________________________

RTP Adoption Date: _______________________________________________________

What is the Certification Date of the Environmental Document (ED)? ______

Is the ED located in the RTP or is it a separate document? ______

By completing this checklist, the MPO verifies the RTP addresses all of the following required information within the RTP.

Regional Transportation Plan Contents

General

1. Does the RTP address no less than a 20-year planning horizon? (23 CFR 450.324(a))

2. Does the RTP include both long-range and short-range strategies/actions? (23 CFR 450.324(b))

3. Does the RTP address issues specified in the policy, action and financial elements identified in California Government Code Section 65080?

4. Does the RTP address the 10 issues specified in the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) component as identified in Government Code Sections 65080(b)(2)(B) and 65584.04(i)(1)?
   a. Identify the general location of uses, residential densities, and building intensities within the region?
   b. Identify areas within the region sufficient to house all the population of the region, including all economic segments of the population over the course of the planning period of the regional transportation plan taking into account net migration into the region, population growth, household formation and employment growth?
   c. Identify areas within the region sufficient to house an eight-year projection of the regional housing need for the region pursuant to Government Code Section 65584?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Page #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d. Identify a transportation network to service the transportation needs of the region?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Gather and consider the best practically available scientific information regarding resource areas and farmland in the region as defined in subdivisions (a) and (b) of Government Code Section 65080.01?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Consider the state housing goals specified in Sections 65580 and 65581?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Utilize the most recent planning assumptions, considering local general plans and other factors?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Set forth a forecasted development pattern for the region, which, when integrated with the transportation network, and other transportation measures and policies, will reduce the greenhouse gas emissions from automobiles and light trucks to achieve, if there is a feasible way to do so, the greenhouse gas emission reduction targets approved by the ARB?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Provide consistency between the development pattern and allocation of housing units within the region (Government Code 65584.04(i)(1)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Allow the regional transportation plan to comply with Section 176 of the federal Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. Section 7506)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Does the RTP include Project Intent i.e. Plan Level Purpose and Need Statements?

5. Does the RTP specify how travel demand modeling methodology, results and key assumptions were developed as part of the RTP process? (Government Code 14522.2)

**Consultation/Cooperation**

1. Does the RTP contain a public involvement program that meets the requirements of Title 23, CFR 450.316(a)?
   (i) Providing adequate public notice of public participation activities and time for public review and comment at key decision points, including a reasonable opportunity to comment on the proposed metropolitan transportation plan and the TIP;
   (ii) Providing timely notice and reasonable access to information about transportation issues and processes;
   (iii) Employing visualization techniques to describe metropolitan transportation plans and TIPs;
   (iv) Making public information (technical information and meeting notices) available in electronically accessible formats and means, such as the World Wide Web;
   (v) Holding any public meetings at convenient and accessible locations and times;
   (vi) Demonstrating explicit consideration and response to public input received during the development of the metropolitan transportation plan and the TIP;
(vii) Seeking out and considering the needs of those traditionally underserved by existing transportation systems, such as low-income and minority households, who may face challenges accessing employment and other services;
(viii) Providing an additional opportunity for public comment, if the final metropolitan transportation plan or TIP differs significantly from the version that was made available for public comment by the MPO and raises new material issues that interested parties could not reasonably have foreseen from the public involvement efforts;
(ix) Coordinating with the statewide transportation planning public involvement and consultation processes under subpart B of this part; and
(x) Periodically reviewing the effectiveness of the procedures and strategies contained in the participation plan to ensure a full and open participation process.

2. Does the RTP contain a summary, analysis, and report on the disposition of significant written and oral comments received on the draft metropolitan transportation plan as part of the final metropolitan transportation plan and TIP that meets the requirements of 23 CFR 450.316(a)(2), as applicable?

3. Did the MPO/RTPA consult with the appropriate State and local representatives including representatives from environmental and economic communities; airport; transit; freight during the preparation of the RTP? (23 CFR 450.316(b))

4. Did the MPO/RTPA who has federal lands within its jurisdictional boundary involve the federal land management agencies during the preparation of the RTP? (23 CFR 450.316(d))

5. Where does the RTP specify that the appropriate State and local agencies responsible for land use, natural resources, environmental protection, conservation and historic preservation consulted? (23 CFR 450.324(g))

6. Did the RTP include a comparison with the California State Wildlife Action Plan and (if available) inventories of natural and historic resources? (23 CFR 450.324(g)(1&2))

7. Did the MPO/RTPA who has a federally recognized Native American Tribal Government(s) and/or historical and sacred sites or subsistence resources of these Tribal Governments within its jurisdictional boundary address tribal concerns in the RTP and develop the RTP in consultation with the Tribal Government(s)? (23 CFR 450.316(c))

8. Does the RTP address how the public and various specified groups were given a reasonable opportunity to comment on the plan using the participation plan developed under 23 CFR part 450.316(a)? (23 CFR 450.316(a)(i))

9. Does the RTP contain a discussion describing the private sector involvement efforts that were used during the development of the plan? (23 CFR 450.316(a))

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Page #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. Does the RTP contain a discussion describing the coordination efforts with regional air quality planning authorities? (23 CFR 450.316(a)(2)) \textit{(MPO nonattainment and maintenance areas only)}

11. Is the RTP coordinated and consistent with the Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan? (23 CFR 450.306(h))

12. Were the draft and adopted RTP posted on the Internet? (23 CFR 450.324(k))

13. Did the RTP explain how consultation occurred with locally elected officials? (Government Code 65080(D))

14. Did the RTP outline the public participation process for the sustainable communities strategy? (Government Code 65080(E))

15. Was the RTP adopted on the estimated date provided in writing to State Department of Housing and Community Development to determine the Regional Housing Need Allocation and planning period (start and end date) and align the local government housing element planning period (start and end date) and housing element adoption due date 18 months from RTP adoption date? (Government Code 65588(e)(5))

**Title VI and Environmental Justice**

1. Does the public participation plan describe how the MPO will seek out and consider the needs of those traditionally underserved by existing transportation system, such as low-income and minority households, who may face challenges accessing employment and other services? (23 CFR 450.316 (a)(1)(vii))

2. Has the MPO conducted a Title VI analysis that meets the legal requirements described in Section 4.2?

3. Has the MPO conducted an Environmental Justice analysis that meets the legal requirements described in Section 4.2?

**Modal Discussion**

1. Does the RTP discuss intermodal and connectivity issues?

2. Does the RTP include a discussion of highways?

3. Does the RTP include a discussion of mass transportation?

4. Does the RTP include a discussion of the regional airport system?

5. Does the RTP include a discussion of regional pedestrian needs?
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Does the RTP include a discussion of regional bicycle needs?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Does the RTP address the California Coastal Trail? (Government Code 65080.1) (For MPOs and RTPAs located along the coast only)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Does the RTP include a discussion of rail transportation?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Does the RTP include a discussion of maritime transportation (if appropriate)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Does the RTP include a discussion of goods movement?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Programming/Operations**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Is the RTP consistent (to the maximum extent practicable) with the development of the regional ITS architecture? (23 CFR 450.306(g))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Does the RTP identify the objective criteria used for measuring the performance of the transportation system?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Does the RTP contain a list of unconstrained projects?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Financial**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Does the RTP include a financial plan that meets the requirements identified in 23 CFR part 450.324(f)(11)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Does the RTP contain a consistency statement between the first 4 years of the fund estimate and the 4-year STIP fund estimate? (65080(b)(4)(A))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Do the projected revenues in the RTP reflect Fiscal Constraint? (23 CFR part 450.324(f)(11)(ii))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Does the RTP contain a list of financially constrained projects? Any regionally significant projects should be identified. (Government Code 65080(4)(A))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Do the cost estimates for implementing the projects identified in the RTP reflect “year of expenditure dollars” to reflect inflation rates? (23 CFR part 450.324(f)(11)(iv))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>After 12/11/07, does the RTP contain estimates of costs and revenue sources that are reasonably expected to be available to operate and maintain the freeways, highway and transit within the region? (23 CFR 450.324(f)(11)(i))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Does the RTP contain a statement regarding consistency between the projects in the RTP and the ITIP? (2016 STIP Guidelines Section 33)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Does the RTP contain a statement regarding consistency between the projects in the RTP and the RTIP? (2016 STIP Guidelines Section 19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. Does the RTP address the specific financial strategies required to ensure the identified TCMs from the SIP can be implemented? (23 CFR part 450.324(f)(11)(vi) (nonattainment and maintenance MPOs only)

Environmental

1. Did the MPO/RTPA prepare an EIR or a program EIR for the RTP in accordance with CEQA guidelines?

2. Does the RTP contain a list of projects specifically identified as TCMs, if applicable?

3. Does the RTP contain a discussion of SIP conformity, if applicable?

4. Does the RTP specify mitigation activities? (23 CFR part 450.324(f)(10))

5. Where does the EIR address mitigation activities?

6. Did the MPO/RTPA prepare a Negative Declaration or a Mitigated Negative Declaration for the RTP in accordance with CEQA guidelines?

7. Does the RTP specify the TCMs to be implemented in the region? (federal nonattainment and maintenance areas only)

I have reviewed the above information and certify that it is correct and complete.

(Must be signed by MPO Executive Director or designated representative)  Date

Print Name  Title
## Conformity Analysis Documentation
### Checklist for MPO TIPs/RTPs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>40 CFR</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>§93.102</td>
<td>Document the applicable pollutants and precursors for which EPA designates the area as nonattainment or maintenance. Describe the nonattainment or maintenance area and its boundaries.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§93.104 (b, c)</td>
<td>Document the date that the MPO officially adopted, accepted or approved the TIP/RTP and made a conformity determination. Include a copy of the MPO resolution. Include the date of the last prior conformity finding.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§93.104 (e)</td>
<td>If the conformity determination is being made to meet the timelines included in this section, document when the new motor vehicle emissions budget was approved or found adequate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§93.106</td>
<td>If the metropolitan planning area is in a serious, severe, or extreme ozone nonattainment area and/or serious carbon monoxide nonattainment area and contains an urbanized population over 200,000, then RTP must specifically describe the transportation system envisioned for future years called &quot;horizon years.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§93.106 (a)(2)ii</td>
<td>Describe the regionally significant additions or modifications to the existing transportation network that are expected to be open to traffic in each analysis year. Document that the design concept and scope of projects allows adequate model representation to determine intersections with regionally significant facilities, route options, travel times, transit ridership and land use.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§93.108</td>
<td>Document the TIP/RTP is fiscally constrained consistent with DOT's metropolitan planning regulations at (23 CFR 450) in order to be found in conformity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§93.109 (a, b)</td>
<td>Document that the TIP/RTP complies with any applicable conformity requirements of air quality implementation plans (SIPs) and court orders.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§93.109 (c-k)</td>
<td>Provide either a table or text description that details, for each pollutant and precursor, whether the interim emissions tests and/or the budget test apply for conformity. Indicate which emissions budgets have been found adequate by EPA, and which budgets are currently applicable for what analysis years.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§93.110 (a, b)</td>
<td>Document the use of latest planning assumptions (source and year) at the “time the conformity analysis begins,” including current and future population, employment, travel and congestion. Document the use of the most recent available vehicle registration data. Document the date upon which the conformity analysis was begun.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USDOT/EPA guidance</td>
<td>Documents planning assumptions are less than 5 years old at the time the conformity analysis begins. If assumptions are older than 5 years documents justification for not reviewing and updating assumptions at least every 5 years.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§93.110 (c,d,e,f)</td>
<td>Document any changes in transit operating policies and assumed ridership levels since the previous conformity determination. Document the use of the latest transit fares and road and bridge tolls. Document the use of the latest information on the effectiveness of TCMs and other SIP measures that have been implemented. Document the key assumptions and show that they were agreed to through Interagency and public consultation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§93.111</td>
<td>Document the use of the latest emissions model approved by EPA.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>40 CFR</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>§93.112</td>
<td>Document fulfillment of the interagency and public consultation requirements outlined in a specific implementation plan according to §51.390 or, if a SIP revision has not been completed, according to §93.105 and 23 CFR 450. Include documentation of consultation on conformity tests and methodologies as well as responses to written comments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§93.113</td>
<td>Document timely implementation of all TCMs in approved SIPs. Document that implementation is consistent with schedules in the applicable SIP and document whether anything interferes with timely implementation. Document any delayed TCMs in the applicable SIP and describe the measures being taken to overcome obstacles to implementation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§93.114</td>
<td>Document that the conformity analyses performed for the TIP is consistent with the analysis performed for the Plan, in accordance with 23 CFR 450.324(f)(2).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§93.115</td>
<td>Describe how the projects come from a conforming RTP and TIP. If this criterion is not satisfied, the project must satisfy all criteria in Table 1 of §93.109(b) for a project not from a RTP and TIP.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§93.118 (a, c, e)</td>
<td>For areas with SIP budgets: Document that emissions from the transportation network for each applicable pollutant and precursor, including projects in any associated donut area that are in the Statewide TIP and regionally significant non-Federal projects, are consistent with any adequate or approved motor vehicle emissions budget for all pollutants and precursors in applicable SIPs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§93.118 (b)</td>
<td>Document for which years consistency with motor vehicle emissions budgets must be shown.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§93.118 (d)</td>
<td>Document the use of the appropriate analysis years in the regional emissions analysis for areas with SIP budgets, and the analysis results for these years. Document any interpolation performed to meet tests for years in which specific analysis is not required.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§93.119 (a)</td>
<td>For areas without applicable SIP budgets: Document that emissions from the transportation network for each applicable pollutant and precursor, including projects in any associated donut area that are in the Statewide TIP and regionally significant non-Federal projects, are consistent with the requirements of the “Action/Baseline”, “Action/1990” and/or “Action/2002” interim emissions tests as applicable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§93.119 (b)</td>
<td>Document the use of the appropriate analysis years in the regional emissions analysis for areas without applicable SIP budgets. The regional emissions analysis must be performed for analysis years that are no more than ten years apart. The first analysis year must be no more than five years beyond the year in which the conformity determination is being made. The last year of the timeframe of the conformity determination (as described under §93.106(d)) must also be an analysis year.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§93.119 (h, j)</td>
<td>Document how the baseline and action scenarios are defined for each analysis year.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§93.122 (a)(1)</td>
<td>Document that all regionally significant federal and non-Federal projects in the nonattainment/maintenance area are explicitly modeled in the regional emissions analysis. For each project, identify by which analysis it will be open to traffic. Document that VMT for non-regionally significant Federal projects is accounted for in the regional emissions analysis.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 CFR</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§93.122 (a)(2, 3)</td>
<td>Document that only emission reduction credits from TCMs on schedule have been included or that partial credit has been taken for partially implemented TCMs. Document that the regional emissions analysis only includes emissions credit for projects, programs, or activities that require regulatory action if: the regulatory action has been adopted; the project, program, activity or a written commitment is included in the SIP; EPA has approved an opt-in to the program; EPA has promulgated the program, or the Clean Air Act requires the program (indicate applicable date). Discuss the implementation status of these programs and the associated emissions credit for each analysis year.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§93.122 (a)(4,5,6)</td>
<td>For nonregulatory measures that are not included in the STIP, include written commitments from appropriate agencies. Document that assumptions for measures outside the transportation system (e.g. fuels measures) are the same for baseline and action scenarios. Document that factors such as ambient temperature are consistent with those used in the SIP unless modified through interagency consultation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§93.122 (b)(1)(i) 2</td>
<td>Document that a network-based travel model is in use that is validated against observed counts for a base year no more than 10 years before the date of the conformity determination. Document that the model results have been analyzed for reasonableness and compared to historical trends and explain any significant differences between past trends and forecasts (for per capita vehicle-trips, VMT, trip lengths mode shares, time of day, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§93.122 (b)(1)(ii) 2</td>
<td>Document the land use, population, employment, and other network-based travel model assumptions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§93.122 (b)(1)(iii) 2</td>
<td>Document how land use development scenarios are consistent with future transportation system alternatives, and the reasonable distribution of employment and residences for each alternative.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§93.122 (b)(1)(iv) 2</td>
<td>Document use of capacity sensitive assignment methodology and emissions estimates based on a methodology that differentiates between peak and off-peak volumes and speeds, and bases speeds on final assigned volumes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§93.122 (b)(1)(v) 2</td>
<td>Document the use of zone-to-zone travel impedances to distribute trips in reasonable agreement with the travel times estimated from final assigned traffic volumes. Where transit is a significant factor, document that zone-to-zone travel impedances used to distribute trips are used to model mode split.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§93.122 (b)(1)(vi) 2</td>
<td>Document how travel models are reasonably sensitive to changes in time, cost, and other factors affecting travel choices.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§93.122 (b)(2) 2</td>
<td>Document that reasonable methods were used to estimate traffic speeds and delays in a manner sensitive to the estimated volume of travel on each roadway segment represented in the travel model.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§93.122 (b)(3) 2</td>
<td>Document the use of HPMS, or a locally developed count-based program or procedures that have been chosen through the consultation process, to reconcile and calibrate the network-based travel model estimates of VMT.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§93.122 (d)</td>
<td>In areas not subject to §93.122(b), document the continued use of modeling techniques or the use of appropriate alternative techniques to estimate vehicle miles traveled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§93.122 (e, f)</td>
<td>Document, in areas where a SIP identifies construction-related PM10 or PM 2.5 as significant pollutants, the inclusion of PM10 and/or PM 2.5 construction emissions in the conformity analysis.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§93.122 (g)</td>
<td>If appropriate, document that the conformity determination relies on a previous regional emissions analysis and is consistent with that analysis.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 40 CFR

| §93.126, §93.127, §93.128 | Document all projects in the TIP/RTP that are exempt from conformity requirements or exempt from the regional emissions analysis. Indicate the reason for the exemption (Table 2, Table 3, traffic signal synchronization) and that the interagency consultation process found these projects to have no potentially adverse emissions impacts. | Page | Comments |

1. Note that some areas are required to complete both interim emissions tests.
2. 40 CFR §93.122(b) refers only to serious, severe and extreme ozone areas and serious CO areas above 200,000 population.

### Disclaimers

This checklist is intended solely as an informational guideline to be used in reviewing Transportation Plans and Transportation Improvement Programs for adequacy of their conformity documentation. It is in no way intended to replace or supersede the Transportation Conformity regulations of 40 CFR Parts 51 and 93, the Statewide and Metropolitan Planning Regulations of 23 CFR Part 450 or any other EPA, FHWA or FTA guidance pertaining to transportation conformity or statewide and metropolitan planning. This checklist is not intended for use in documenting transportation conformity for individual transportation projects in nonattainment or maintenance areas. 40 CFR Parts 51 and 93 contain additional criteria for project-level conformity determinations.