REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

Friday, November 5, 2004
12 noon – 2:00 p.m.
SANDAG
401 B Street, Conference Room A*
San Diego, CA

* Please note change of meeting room.

AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

- APPROACH FOR INTEGRATING REGIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN
- NEW STAKEHOLDERS WORKING GROUP
- PILOT SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM

PLEASE TURN OFF CELL PHONES DURING THE MEETING.

MISSION STATEMENT

The Regional Planning Committee provides oversight for the preparation and implementation of the Regional Comprehensive Plan that is based on the local general plans and regional plans and addresses interregional issues with surrounding counties and Mexico. The components of the plan include: transportation, housing, environment (shoreline, air quality, water quality, habitat), economy, borders, regional infrastructure needs and financing, and land use and design components of the regional growth management strategy.
Welcome to SANDAG! Members of the public may speak to the Regional Planning Committee on any item at the time the Committee is considering the item. Please complete a Speaker’s Slip, which is located in the rear of the room, and then present the slip to Committee staff. Also, members of the public are invited to address the Committee on any issue under the agenda item entitled Public Comments/Communications/Members' Comments. Speakers are limited to three minutes. The Regional Planning Committee may take action on any item appearing on the agenda.

This agenda and related staff reports can be accessed at www.sandag.org/rcp under Regional Planning Committee on SANDAG’s website. Public comments regarding the agenda can be forwarded to SANDAG via the e-mail comment form also available on the website. E-mail comments should be received no later than Noon, two days prior to the Regional Planning Committee meeting.

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

SANDAG offices are accessible by public transit.
Phone 1-800-COMMUTE or see www.sdcommute.com for route information.
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<tr>
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**+1. OCTOBER 1, 2004 MEETING MINUTES (pp. 5-11)**

**+2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS**

**+3. PROPOSED APPROACH FOR INTEGRATING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE REGIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN (RCP) AND THE UPDATE OF THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN (RTP) (Bob Leiter) (pp. 12-19)**

The RCP identifies a number of strategic initiatives that are critical to achieving the plan's goals and policy objectives. These include a smart growth incentive program, an updated Regional Housing Needs Assessment, land use and transportation performance indicators and targets, a smart growth concept map, an updated regional growth forecast, and an update to the RTP. This item summarizes the proposed approach for implementing core RCP strategic initiatives and integrating them with the upcoming RTP update. The Regional Planning Committee is asked to accept the proposed approach. The Transportation Committee also will discuss the proposed approach at its November 12, 2004, meeting.

**+4. CREATION OF A NEW REGIONAL PLANNING STAKEHOLDERS WORKING GROUP (Janet Fairbanks) (pp. 20-24)**

Staff recommends that SANDAG establish a new Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group (SWG) to provide interested residents with a direct mechanism for involvement in RCP implementation and the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) update. The attached report describes the proposed SWG’s roles and responsibilities, and the process for selecting and appointing members. The Transportation Committee also will be discussing the creation of the Stakeholders Working Group at its November 12, 2004, meeting. The Regional Planning Committee and Transportation Committee are requested to recommend approval of the creation of the new Stakeholders Working Group to the SANDAG Board of Directors.

**+5. PILOT SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM (Stephan Vance) (pp. 25-31)**

The RCP recognizes that providing incentives is key to implementing smart growth. The current Regional Transportation Plan, MOBILITY 2030, calls for a five-year, $25 million Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program to foster the integration of smart growth land uses and transportation facilities in our communities. This report outlines the proposed approach and schedule for developing the pilot program. The Regional Planning Committee is asked to review and approve the proposed approach. The Transportation Committee also will be discussing the Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program at its November 12, 2004, meeting.
-6. **HOUSING UPDATE** (Susan Baldwin) (pp.32-35)  

A memorandum mailed out to local jurisdictions and other interested parties regarding the Draft Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) numbers is attached. Two workshops will be held to discuss the Draft RHNA and other housing element-related issues. The first will be a joint meeting of the City/County Managers and Planning Directors Associations on December 2 from 11 a.m. - 2 p.m.; the second will be a SANDAG Policy Development Board meeting on January 14, 2005, from 9 a.m. - 12 noon. The SANDAG Board of Directors will be asked to approve the RHNA numbers on January 28, 2005. The Committee should provide staff with ideas for the Policy Development Board meeting in January 2005.

7. **PROPOSAL FOR SHOWCASING LOCAL SMART GROWTH EFFORTS**  
(Kim Kawada)  

Many jurisdictions in the region are pursuing or implementing smart growth projects. In order to generate more awareness about these efforts, it is proposed that periodic presentations highlighting local efforts be made to the Regional Planning Committee. Regional Planning Committee members are asked to discuss this proposal and suggest areas of interest.

8. **UPCOMING MEETING**  

The next Regional Planning Committee meeting will be held on Friday, December 3, 2004, from 12 noon – 2 p.m.

9. **ADJOURNMENT**
November 5, 2004

San Diego Association of Governments
REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

AGENDA ITEM NO.: 1

Action Requested: APPROVE

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION AND ACTIONS
Meeting of October 1, 2004

The Regional Planning Committee meeting was called to order by Committee Chair Lori Holt Pfeiler (North County Inland) at 12:09 p.m. The attendance sheet for the meeting is attached.

Chair Holt Pfeiler thanked all for attending the meeting after having a long summer off. Self introductions were made.

1. APPROVAL OF JULY 2, 2004 MEETING MINUTES

   Action: Mayor Houlihan (Encinitas) moved and Councilmember Jones (East County) seconded to approve the minutes of the September 3, 2004 meeting. The vote was unanimously in favor.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBERS COMMENTS

   None.

CONSENT (Item 3)

3. HOUSING UPDATE – BOARD ACTION ON REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT (INFORMATION)

   Staff reported that the SANDAG Board accepted the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) numbers for distribution at its September 23, 2004 meeting. At that meeting, concerns regarding the numbers were expressed by several Board members. Staff will mail out the three income alternatives to local jurisdictions, and as part of the public review process, will be available to make presentations to the local elected bodies. In addition, staff will discuss the Board’s action on the RHNA with the planning directors at their next meeting. Also, the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) will host a Housing Element workshop in San Diego on October 28, 2004, to discuss requirements needed to meet housing element law and any legislative changes relating to Housing Elements. Finally, staff will host a housing workshop with the SANDAG Board in January 2005. Staff will come back to the Regional Planning Committee in January 2005 with comments on the RHNA numbers resulting from the review period.
Committee Member Comments:

- Mayor Houlihan gave kudos to SANDAG staff on accurately reporting the Regional Planning Committee member comments to the Board.

REPORTS

4. PRESENTATION ON DOWNTOWN SAN DIEGO PLANNING ACTIVITIES (INFORMATION)

Peter Hall, Executive Director of the Centre City Development Corporation (CCDC), provided the Committee with an overview of its Downtown Community Plan Update. Currently, 40% of all new housing in the City of San Diego is being built in downtown San Diego. The Community Plan Update is focusing on quality of life issues such as mixed-use, transit-oriented development, infrastructure enhancements, and other smart growth concepts, that also can be applied in other areas of the region. The plan update is currently being reviewed, and approval is expected early next year.

Gary Papers, Manager of Planning and Architecture for CCDC, provided the Committee with details of CCDC’s Downtown Community Plan Update, which will implement many of the principles advocated in the RCP. He highlighted key projects currently being developed and proposed to be developed, and noted that downtown’s planned build-out is higher than that included in the 1992 community plan with regard to population; residential units; office, retail, and hotel square footage; and parks and open spaces. The plan envisions 75,000 - 80,000 residents in downtown, helping to meet the region’s housing demand, and most of the new growth will be centered around the trolley.

Mr. Hall commented that what is being done in downtown San Diego is critical not only to downtown but also to the region. The projects serve as a good model of what can be done throughout the region. Downtown does need infrastructure, however, that won’t happen without the Regional Planning Committee’s leadership and support. He urged the Committee, as it does its strategic planning, to keep that in mind.

Committee Member Comments/Questions:

Supervisor Slater-Price stated that it is exciting to see the growth in downtown particularly along the transit corridors. She expressed concern regarding what will happen when people want to move beyond the areas served by the trolley and how transportation will be coordinated. Mr. Hall replied that MTDB’s Transit First Project proposes the linkage between the East Village in downtown San Diego and Hillcrest, which is an important part of the local mobility. In addition, many mixed-use projects will be built close to existing/proposed trolley/transit stations in the downtown area, and bike lanes are being incorporated into many of the new roadway plans.

Supervisor Slater-Price added that active use parks should not be overlooked as families will begin to move downtown; fire fighters and police stations should also be increased. Mr. Hall responded that two new fire stations will be placed downtown: one on the
waterfront and the other in East Village. He pointed out that the vast majority of emergency responses are medical. Regarding schools, there are numerous schools in downtown and CCDC is hoping to include a vertical elementary school in the downtown area in the future.

Mr. Papers added that many of the future housing units that will be built in downtown within the next few years will provide a more diverse range of product types and price ranges. CCDC is doing its best to provide more affordable housing.

Mayor Houlihan stated that she attended a Healthy Transportation Alternatives seminar regarding smart growth and smart code issues and new urbanism principles. She asked whether the downtown developments are including smart code and asked what is considered as affordable housing. Mr. Papers commented that everything that CCDC is working on follows smart growth principles, and that they subscribe to about 80 percent of the smart code. New urbanism promotes walkable communities and good design, but restricts high-rise buildings, so it is something that CCDC shouldn’t be constrained by.

Mr. Hall mentioned that state law mandates that 15% of new housing units within redevelopment areas need to be affordable. CCDC meets and exceeds that number with 29% of its current and future units being considered as affordable housing. We have a lot of “naturally affordable” housing in downtown. The median housing price in the region is $470,000 – more than half of the units in downtown are less than the regional median price. In the suburbs, housing cost is land driven; in downtown, housing cost is construction driven. The only way to stay competitive is to build smaller units. Therefore, the open space elements of the plan become more critical.

Councilmember Madaffer complimented the CCDC staff and is proud of their hard work. Their work is a good example of what redevelopment can do within an area. Because of their success, other smart growth projects are taking place throughout the city. He added that had it not been for Ernie Hahn’s foresight, San Diego would not have what it currently has.

Mr. Hall complimented the “City of Villages” effort and stated that the goals for the City are bright.

Chair Pfeiler thanked CCDC for the presentation noting that many of their projects are good examples of how the Regional Comprehensive Plan can be implemented.

5. STATUS REPORT ON ENERGY WORKING GROUP (INFORMATION)

Dr. Henry Ababarnel, Co-Chair of SANDAG’s Energy Working Group (EWG), announced that the EWG met twice in the month of September, with Councilmember Jones in attendance. The first item Dr. Ababarnel discussed was in response to the Committee’s comments from its July 2, 2004 meeting where comments were made about the absence of an effective way of contributing ideas to SDG&E on its energy efficiency programs. SDG&E brought its action plan to the September 9, 2004 EWG meeting. In response to the comments, SDG&E proposed program advisory groups (PAG) and recommended that the EWG supply and demand working group sit on the PAG. The EWG could assist SDG&E in disseminating
information to residents within the San Diego region. SDG&E recognized its absence of public involvement in the past and agreed that they will gain an enormous amount by involving of local policymakers, residents, and stakeholders.

The second item Dr. Abarbanel discussed was the first major product of the EWG. The EWG will focus its efforts on developing a Long Term Resource Plan to be submitted to the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC), spelling out required regional energy resources and their distribution. The EWG will work closely with SDG&E to develop this plan. The California Energy Commission (CEC) has recognized this region as the only region in California that is working with its public utilities company to shape its energy plans. The CEC will send a representative to the EWG monthly meetings. The EWG has urged the CPUC to do the same.

The EWG has an approved work plan which includes the execution of the Long Term Resource Plan and fundraising. The EWG’s policy subcommittee has asked what the EWG will be when it evolves. It isn’t sure what the outcome will be, but the EWG will be looking at various mechanisms to make important decisions that will be binding. The possibility of creating a Joint Powers Authority (JPA) was discussed. SDG&E was originally resistant to the suggestion but is now thinking in the longer term than in the past, and will assist the EWG to develop such a mechanism.

SDG&E is formally, by law, held accountable by the CPUC for delivering power. The EWG is investigating how local jurisdictions and stakeholders can get together, plan for creating a solution, and address issues of accountability. Dr. Abarbanel welcomed advice from the Committee and will report back in the future.

Staff and Committee Comments:

Staff commented that looking at the Regional Energy Strategy, what is being proposed may require legislative changes. Staff added that the effort to get the CEC to participate with the EWG is a good thing. Dr. Abarbanel noted that the EWG wants to tackle something tangible regarding energy in the region.

Chair Pfeiler stated that if the San Diego region could work together to share the decision making responsibilities, it would be great. Dr. Abarbanel commented that would involve a change in the view of the public utility companies, including SDG&E. The EWG is not in a position to discuss the issues with them at this time.

Chair Pfeiler noted that the decision-making process would be evolutionary. Dr. Abarbanel added that neither SANDAG nor the local jurisdictions are capable to take over the job of SDG&E. But there could be some means to sharing the policy making and responsibility.

Mayor Houlihan commented that she is glad to have the right people on the EWG and asked what EM&V means. Staff replied that EM&V stands for: Evaluation, Measurement and Validation.

Chair Pfeiler thanked Dr. Abarbanel for attending.
**Action:** The Committee received this item for information.

6. **UPDATE ON REGIONAL WATER SUPPLY ISSUES FROM THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY WATER AUTHORITY (INFORMATION)**

Councilmember Jim Bond, representative from the San Diego County Water Authority, provided the Committee with a detailed presentation on water supply issues in the San Diego region, noting that the San Diego region needs to use all of its available water, as many times as possible, prior to discarding it into the ocean.

**Action:** The Committee received this item for information.

7. **RCP IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITIES (DISCUSSION/POSSIBLE ACTION)**

Staff noted that since the SANDAG Board approved the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) in July, the focus of the RCP has now shifted to implementation. Staff provided an overview of implementation activities, and briefed the Committee on what to expect over the next few months, pointing out that the key driver to the RCP implementation schedule is the Regional Transportation Plan update. Under current law, the next RTP update is due in early 2006. Staff listed key land use/transportation issues of focus, including the Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program; Urban Design Manual; Subregional Transportation/Land Use Plans; and Smart Growth Concept Map.

In addition, staff highlighted two other major RCP work elements: the RHNA process and the RCP Performance Measures. The baseline monitoring report will be brought to the Committee in December 2004 or January 2005 and targets will then be developed. A proposal for creating a new Stakeholders Working Group will also be presented.

In closing at its July Board meeting, SANDAG Board members and several public speakers raised concerns about the pressure to convert industrial lands to other uses, and problems with co-locating industrial and residential uses. Staff will try to focus on environmental compatibility related to these issues, although work on this topic is not currently included in the OWP.

**Committee Comments**

- Mayor Houlihan stated that she found it useful that at the Healthy Transportation Alternatives Workshop, traditional zoning and form based zoning were pictured with what needs to be and what our communities end up looking like. She suggested that the RPC begin to visualize how future zoning and development can be approached differently. Form based zoning could be more effective than traditional zoning in implementing the RCP.

- Supervisor Slater-Price supported efforts to examine the industrial / residential lands relationship, and stated that this would be a good area for staff to focus on. Staff responded that it will develop a work program identifying how much staff time and costs would be involved, will look at other issues that can be deferred, and will bring a summary back to the Committee for review.
• Gail Goldberg stated that she is happy to see SANDAG moving forward on the industrial/residential lands issue.

• Councilmember Bond emphasized that smart growth incentives are good, and reminded the Committee that we should remember scales and flexibility when applying smart growth concepts and incentives.

Action: The Committee received this item for discussion.

7. UPCOMING MEETINGS

The next meeting of the Regional Planning Committee is scheduled for 12 to 2 p.m. on Friday, November 5, 2004.

8. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Pfeiler adjourned the meeting at 2:01 p.m.

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Key Staff Contact: Carolina Gregor, (619) 699-1989, cgr@sandag.org
## CONFIRMED ATTENDANCE
### SANDAG REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING
#### OCTOBER 1, 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GEOGRAPHICAL AREA</th>
<th>JURISDICTION</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>MEMBER/ALTERNATE</th>
<th>ATTENDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North County Inland</td>
<td>City of Escondido</td>
<td>Lori Holt-Pfeiler, Chair</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Vista</td>
<td>Judy Ritter</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South County</td>
<td>City of Chula Vista</td>
<td>Patty Davis, Vice Chair</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Imperial Beach</td>
<td>Patricia McCoy</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North County Coastal</td>
<td>City of Encinitas</td>
<td>Maggie Houlihan</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Carlsbad</td>
<td>Matt Hall</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East County</td>
<td>City of Lemon Grove</td>
<td>Jerry Jones</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of La Mesa</td>
<td>Barry Jantz</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Jim Madaffer</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Scott Peters</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Bill Horn</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Pam Slater-Price</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>Caltrans, District 11</td>
<td>Pedro Orso-Delgado</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bill Figge</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>San Diego County Water Authority</td>
<td>James Bond (Vice Chairman)</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>Department of Defense</td>
<td>Susannah Aguilera</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>San Diego Unified Port District</td>
<td>Jess Van Deventer</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bill Briggs</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>MTDB</td>
<td>Leon Williams (Chairman)</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bob Emery</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>NCTD</td>
<td>Dave Drucker</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tom Golich</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>Regional Planning Technical Working Group</td>
<td>Gail Goldberg</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group</td>
<td>Lynne Baker for Carol Bonomo</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROPOSED APPROACH FOR INTEGRATING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE REGIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND THE UPDATE OF THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Introduction

The Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) identifies several strategic initiatives that are critical to achieving key goals and policy objectives of the Plan related to land use and transportation. These core initiatives include:

- A smart growth incentive program
- An updated Regional Housing Needs Assessment
- Performance indicators and targets related to land use and transportation
- A smart growth concept map
- An updated regional growth forecast
- An updated Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) that contains:
  - An updated long-range regional transportation network plan
  - Updated short-range and mid-range plans
  - Supporting policies and transportation project evaluation criteria

The purpose of this report is to provide a summary of issues related to the implementation of these initiatives and to lay out an overall approach for implementing them, ensuring effective coordination between the implementation of the RCP and the next update of the RTP. The Regional Planning Technical Working Group has discussed the proposed approach and its input has been integrated into this report. The Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) also will review this report at its November 4, 2004, meeting, and comments received from CTAC will be provided to the Regional Planning Committee at the November 5, 2004, meeting.

Recommendation

The Regional Planning Committee is requested to accept the proposed approach for integrating the RCP and RTP activities outlined in this report. This report will be presented to the Transportation Committee at its November 12, 2004, meeting and to the SANDAG Board of Directors on November 19, 2004.

Discussion

The RCP establishes a policy framework to better connect land use and transportation plans within our region. The following section provides an overview of the core RCP land use and transportation-related initiatives, their interrelationships, and issues to be resolved. Attachment 1 provides a draft
flow chart and timeline for these efforts. The flow chart and timeline will be refined based on comments from the SANDAG Board of Directors and Policy Advisory Committees and further staff work.

Smart Growth Incentive Program

Successful implementation of the RCP will require incentives for smart growth development. Policies included in the RCP and in the current RTP, MOBILITY 2030, call for the development and implementation of a smart growth incentive program at the regional level. Combined with other federal, state, and local incentives, a regional program would encourage local jurisdictions to plan for and implement smart growth land uses in areas that help support regional transportation investments envisioned in the RTP.

MOBILITY 2030 calls for an initial five-year, $25 million pilot smart growth incentive program. The approach for developing this initial pilot program is described more fully in Agenda Item #5. The use of approximately $17 million of Transportation Enhancement Activities (TE) funds available during FY 2005–FY 2009 to fund the Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program is proposed. Under the expected schedule, a call for projects for the full $17 million would be completed by the end of FY 2005. (Identifying a specific funding source for the remaining $8 million would occur after the adoption of a new federal transportation reauthorization act.)

The pilot program would be a precursor to the anticipated longer-term $280 million funding program proposed in the extension of the TransNet local transportation sales tax (Proposition A). Proposition A includes a two percent set-aside that would provide an average of $7 million per year over the 40-year measure (2008-2048). Lessons learned from the pilot program would be used to develop the longer-term incentive program.

Regional Housing Needs Assessment

The RCP recognizes the importance of providing adequate housing to the region in the future, and identifies the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) process as an opportunity to help meet this goal. In September 2004, the SANDAG Board of Directors accepted for distribution the draft RHNA for the years 2005–2010. The draft RHNA sets forth an overall estimate of housing units that should be produced within the region during this period, an allocation of those housing units to the 19 local jurisdictions, and a proposed distribution of housing units in each jurisdiction by income category.

The 2005–2010 RHNA is an important first step because, once adopted, it will be used by local jurisdictions as a basis for updating the housing elements of their general plans. These housing element updates are likely to lead to amendments to the land use elements of local general plans to provide additional housing capacity through means such as re-designating non-residential lands to residential, increasing the densities of existing residential land, and/or modifying development regulations (e.g., density bonus ordinances, accessory unit ordinances, mixed use development ordinances).

In updating their housing elements, local jurisdictions ideally should locate additional housing units in smart growth opportunity areas close to public transit and other infrastructure and services. These areas could be illustrated on the Smart Growth Concept Map discussed below. In particular,
locating multifamily housing in these areas will help support regional transportation investments. Providing additional housing opportunities and product types in the San Diego region also would likely reduce projected levels of interregional commuting from adjacent regions, such as Riverside County and Baja California, Mexico.

Performance Indicators and Targets

The RCP calls for annual monitoring of performance indicators that will allow us to measure our progress toward meeting our regional quality of life goals. Several specific performance indicators related to transportation and land use are identified in the RCP:

- Share of new housing units and jobs located in “smart growth opportunity areas”
- Share of new housing units located within County Water Authority water service boundary
- Annual weekday transit ridership
- Commute mode shares (single-occupancy vehicles, carpools, transit, walking, biking, etc.)
- Travel times and volumes for key auto corridors and transit corridors
- Miles of deficient roads on Congestion Management Program network
- Annual hours of delay per capita

The first step in implementing a performance monitoring program is preparing a Baseline Monitoring Report that provides information about existing performance levels for each of the annual indicators identified in the RCP (Chapter 8). Where possible, historical information for these indicators, along with comparisons with other regions, would be provided in order to help benchmark our region’s performance.

This baseline and historical information would lead to a second step – setting future performance “targets” for each indicator. These performance targets would quantify specific short-term and long-term objectives, and help measure the progress we are making toward achieving our RCP goals, and readjust our directions, if needed.

Smart Growth Concept Map

The RCP recommends that smart growth development be planned in locations near existing and future transit stations along regional transit corridors identified in the adopted RTP, as well as other appropriate locations, such as rural community village cores that can provide a focal point for commercial and civic uses that serve surrounding rural areas. The RCP defines seven categories of smart growth “place types,” ranging from “metropolitan center” to “rural community.”

The RCP calls for preparation of a Smart Growth Concept Map to identify specific locations where smart growth development exists, is planned, or has the potential to exist in the future. Areas with potential will be designated as “smart growth opportunity areas.” SANDAG will work with city and county planning and public works staffs, stakeholders, and the policy advisory committees to identify specific locations of smart growth place types throughout the region.

To better connect land use and transportation, local plans for smart growth should be coordinated with regional plans, such as the RTP. An initial step in developing the Smart Growth Concept Map would be to illustrate existing and planned land uses around the regional transit networks in MOBILITY 2030 (both the Reasonably Expected Revenue and Unconstrained Revenue scenarios).
While the focus of the Smart Growth Concept Map will be on identifying and illustrating the location of existing, planned, and potential compact urban development near regional transit, the map also should include other land uses, such as the locations of key open space preserve areas that are planned for acquisition through the various habitat conservation plans. Incorporating preserve areas into the concept map will help identify areas of the region where urban development should not occur, as well as appropriate locations for the rural community smart growth place type.

The Smart Growth Concept Map would be used in the update of the regional growth forecast and the development of RTP land use alternatives described below. It is anticipated that the map would be updated regularly to reflect general plan amendments and updates in a timely manner. A more detailed report on the approach and schedule for preparing the Smart Growth Concept Map will be presented in December.

Regional Growth Forecast Update

The RCP calls for preparation of an updated regional growth and development forecast, which is based on transportation and land use priorities as reflected in local general plans. The updated growth forecast would incorporate the amendments to housing and land use elements resulting from the RHNA process, other major general plan updates from local jurisdictions (e.g., County of San Diego, City of San Diego, City of Chula Vista), and inputs from the Smart Growth Concept Map that are acceptable for inclusion by the local jurisdictions. Ideally, the updated forecast also should include the location of existing and planned land uses on tribal reservations.

The updated regional growth forecast would be prepared in conjunction with the 2007 or 2008 comprehensive update of the RTP (discussed below). It would include both an updated 2030 regionwide forecast and an updated 2030 cities/county forecast.

Regional Transportation Plan Update

As the primary vehicle for integrating land use and transportation consistent with the RCP, the next update of the RTP will be one of the most important strategic initiatives. The ultimate objective is to develop a comprehensive update to the RTP that incorporates the policies from the RCP and makes progress in achieving the plan’s vision and goals. However, several factors (described below) complicate the development of the next RTP update, and affect the schedule for implementing the other core initiatives described in this report.

Federal RTP Requirements

Under existing law, an RTP update is required every three years, and the next RTP update for this region would need to be adopted in early 2006 (3-year cycle). Pending federal legislation could extend that deadline to 2007 or 2008 (4- or 5-year cycle). The deadline for the RTP update establishes the critical path for the various initiatives described in this report.

Since the adoption of MOBILITY 2030 in March 2003, SANDAG’s regional planning efforts have focused on the development of the San Diego region’s first RCP (adopted in July 2004) and the extension of the TransNet program. As specified in the current Overall Work Program and Budget, staff will begin preparing the next update of the RTP in early 2005, regardless of the due date.
If current federal law remains unchanged and SANDAG must adopt an RTP by early 2006, the tight schedule would not allow staff to incorporate many of the core initiatives described above. The 2006 update would be based on the currently adopted 2030 Regional Forecast, and would primarily incorporate updates to revenue forecasts and transportation project/program cost estimates. This approach affords the opportunity to satisfy existing law and adopt an RTP in 2006, while at the same time laying the groundwork for completion of a comprehensive update in 2007.

The more comprehensive RTP update would include inputs from the Smart Growth Concept Map, an updated regional growth forecast, and updated inputs from the various technical reports summarized below.

Figure 1 illustrates the major RTP deadlines under the current 3-year cycle and under the 4-year update cycle (which is the most likely of the current legislative proposals). The next update of the RCP would occur sometime after the first comprehensive RTP update in 2007.

Elements of a Comprehensive RTP Update

As identified in the RCP, the next comprehensive RTP update (under the 4- or 5-year cycle) should:

- Integrate the smart growth goals and policy objectives contained in the RCP, and incorporate local commitments for smart growth opportunity areas into the updated regional growth forecast
- Identify transportation improvement needs at intermodal connection points at key locations, such as transit centers, airports, rail stations, and major employment centers
- Address upcoming plans for new regional airport facilities
- Address multimodal access to other goods movement centers, such as intermodal rail yards, sea ports, and ports of entry
- Address the relationship of intercity conventional rail and interregional high-speed rail service to RTP objectives
Other key issues that should be addressed in the comprehensive RTP update include:

- How well does the “Regional Transit Vision” contained in the adopted 2030 RTP meet the future needs of the region, taking into account the smart growth concepts contained in the RCP and the Smart Growth Concept Map?
- How well does the plan address existing and future freight movement within and through the region?
- What are the implications of existing and future development on tribal reservations on the regional transportation system?
- What are the implications of existing and future development in Mexico, as well as existing border crossing inspection programs, on our regional transportation system?
- What are the implications of existing and future development in Southwestern Riverside County and Imperial County on the regional transportation system?
- How does transportation affect energy demands and needs in our region, and what types of transportation strategies can reduce energy consumption and air pollution?
- How do public safety and homeland security issues affect transportation in our region?

In order to address these issues, a number of specific technical reports would be completed in conjunction with the overall preparation of the comprehensive RTP update. These reports would be reviewed by the various working groups (both technical and stakeholders) with recommendations brought to SANDAG’s Policy Advisory Committees.

The technical reports would be used in the development of transportation network alternatives for the RTP update. In addition, the technical reports could be used in the preparation of supporting policies, actions, and updated performance measures and targets to be included in the draft RTP.

Once a draft RTP has been prepared, an environmental impact report (EIR) also would be prepared to analyze the environmental impacts of the proposed plan, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act.

Integration of Key Elements

The RCP provides an overall vision and a policy framework for better connecting transportation and land use plans. Coordinating the implementation of the core initiatives outlined above will result in an integrated regional transportation and land use “functional plan,” comprised of the following elements:

- Updated regional and “cities/county” growth forecast
- Smart Growth Concept Map
- Regional Transportation Plan
- Performance indicators and targets
- Smart Growth Incentive Program

Once these work elements are completed, a summary document should be prepared which includes key provisions of each of the elements, and describes their interrelationships.
Next Steps

This report will be presented to the Transportation Committee at its November 12, 2004, meeting and to the SANDAG Board of Directors on November 19, 2004. Following acceptance of the proposed approach for integrating the implementation of RCP and RTP update, staff will prepare work programs for each of the core initiatives described in this report and will begin implementing these work programs.

Public Participation

Effective public participation is a critical component to the success of the implementation of RCP and the RTP update. As discussed more fully in Agenda Item #4, the creation of a Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group is proposed to assist in the specific RCP implementation and RTP preparation activities.

In addition to the new Stakeholders Working Group, the integrated RCP/RTP public participation program would include activities such as subregional workshops, open houses, public meetings, survey research, websites, and other public involvement methods.

Subregional Teams

SANDAG would organize “subregional staff teams” to collaborate with local jurisdictions on many of the core initiatives described in this report. Staff from SANDAG and local jurisdictions would work together to develop the Smart Growth Concept Map, update the regional growth forecast, and review and update transportation networks for the RTP update. Four subregional teams would be organized focused on the following geographic areas: North County (Coastal and Inland), South County, Central, and East County.

BOB LEITER
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RCP/RTP Integration – Draft Flow Chart and Timeline

**Smart Growth Incentive Program**
- Jul-Dec 2004: Initiate Pilot Program
- Jan-Jun 2005: Implement Pilot Program
- Jul-Dec 2005: Develop Incentive Program
- Jan-Jun 2006: Adopt Incentive Program
- Jul-Dec 2006: Smart Growth

**Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA)**
- Jul-Dec 2004: Draft RHNA
  - Public Review
- Jan-Jun 2005: Approve Final RHNA
  - Public Review
- Jul-Dec 2005: Draft RHNA
- Jan-Jun 2006: Adopt RHNA

**RCP Performance Indicators/Targets**
- Jul-Dec 2004: Prepare Baseline Monitoring Report
- Jan-Jun 2005: Develop and Adopt Performance Indicators and Targets
- Jul-Dec 2005: Adopt Concept Map
- Jan-Jun 2006: Accept Draft RTP
  - Accept Draft EIR
  - Adopt Final RTP
  - Certify Final EIR

**Smart Growth Concept Map**
- Jul-Dec 2004: Initiate Process
- Jan-Jun 2005: Develop Draft Concept Map
- Jul-Dec 2005: Adopt Concept Map
- Jan-Jun 2006: Update Forecast Models
  - Conduct Technical Analysis
  - Develop Draft 2030 Forecast
- Jan-Jun 2007: Accept Draft RTP
  - Accept Draft EIR
  - Adopt Final RTP
  - Certify Final EIR

**Regional Growth Forecast Update**
- Jul-Dec 2004: Update Forecast Models
- Jan-Jun 2005: Conduct Technical Analysis
- Jul-Dec 2005: Develop Draft 2030 Forecast
- Jan-Jun 2006: Accept Draft RTP
  - Accept Draft EIR
  - Adopt Final RTP
  - Certify Final EIR

**RTP Update (4-year cycle)**
- Jul-Dec 2004: Update Transportation Model
- Jan-Jun 2005: Prepare Technical Reports
  - Conduct Alternatives Analysis
  - Accept Draft RTP
  - Accept Draft EIR

**RTP Update (3-year cycle)**
- Jul-Dec 2004: Update Transportation Model
- Jan-Jun 2005: Prepare Technical Updates
  - Accept Draft RTP
  - Accept Draft EIR
  - Adopt Final RTP
  - Certify Final EIR
CREATION OF A NEW REGIONAL PLANNING STAKEHOLDERS WORKING GROUP

Introduction

The Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) identifies a number of land use and transportation-related strategic initiatives that are critical to achieving the plan’s goals and policy objectives. Agenda Item #3 describes these key RCP initiatives and summarizes the proposed approach for integrating them with the upcoming Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) update.

To provide a direct mechanism for stakeholder involvement in RCP implementation and the RTP update, staff recommends that SANDAG establish a new Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group. This report describes the proposed working group’s roles and responsibilities, and the general process for selecting and appointing members. The Transportation Committee will be considering the same recommendations at its November 12, 2004, meeting. Both the Regional Planning and Transportation Committees are requested to recommend approval of the creation of the new working group to the SANDAG Board of Directors.

Recommendation

The Regional Planning Committee is asked to recommend to the SANDAG Board of Directors the creation of a new Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group to provide interested citizens with a direct mechanism for early and continuous involvement in RCP implementation and the RTP update. The working group would begin meeting in early 2005 and would conclude its work with the adoption of the next comprehensive update of the RTP, which is anticipated in early 2007.

In addition, the Regional Planning Committee should appoint two of its members to serve on the proposed selection team. (The Transportation Committee also will be asked to appoint two of its members to serve on the selection team.)

Discussion

Consistent with our adopted policies, SANDAG promotes active public participation in the development and implementation of our regional plans and programs. Typical public participation tools used include open houses, community workshops, websites, and public meetings. SANDAG also has routinely used working groups as one of the components of an effective public participation program.

In December 2002, the Regional Planning Committee appointed a working group to directly involve regional stakeholders interested in contributing to the preparation of the RCP; that group
completed its work with the adoption of the RCP in July 2004. In 2001, SANDAG appointed a 2030 RTP Working Group to assist in the development of MOBILITY 2030; that group began meeting in late 2001 and concluded its work with the adoption of the MOBILITY 2030 in March 2003.

Relationship among SANDAG Board, Policy Advisory Committees, and Working Groups

According to adopted SANDAG policies, the Board of Directors has the responsibility for approving the RCP and its components and for approving the RTP and its related corridor and system studies. The SANDAG Board has delegated certain responsibilities to its Policy Advisory Committees (PACs). Among other responsibilities, the Regional Planning Committee provides oversight for the preparation and implementation of the RCP and its components, and the Transportation Committee provides policy oversight for transportation plans such as the RTP.

SANDAG also has a variety of working groups that act in an advisory role to the PACs. The Regional Planning Technical Working Group (RPTWG), made up of the region’s planning directors, advises the Regional Planning Committee on land use planning issues. The Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC), which includes the region’s public works directors and transit agencies, advises the Transportation Committee on transportation-related issues.

The proposed Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group (SWG) would act in an advisory capacity to both the Regional Planning and Transportation Committees on specific RCP implementation and RTP preparation activities described below. The following figure illustrates the relationships among the Board, Committees, and working groups, and their primary responsibilities regarding the RCP and RTP.

Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group Role

The role of the proposed SWG would be to review and provide input into key RCP implementation and RTP update activities. These include the development of a smart growth concept map, a smart
growth incentive program, land use and transportation performance indicators and targets, and the RTP update. (See Attachment 1 for a more detailed description.) The SWG would provide comments and feedback to the Regional Planning Committee and Transportation Committee.

The SWG also would assist with associated RCP/RTP public outreach, and help inform and encourage active public participation by outside groups. The previous stakeholders working group created for the RCP preparation reviewed various components of the RCP with other groups with which they were affiliated. In some cases this review generated new ideas that were incorporated into the RCP, making the document stronger, more comprehensive, and reflective of various ideas and points of view. The result was a plan that was supported and endorsed by many organizations and agencies in the San Diego region.

To help develop specific work products for the integrated RCP/RCP work plan, we also may form smaller ad hoc working groups that draw from the stakeholders and the technical working groups (RPTWG and CTAC). A good example may be the development of updated transportation evaluation criteria, which would include both transportation and land use objectives.

Relationship of Regional Planning Stakeholder Working Group to other SANDAG Working Groups

In general, the SWG’s focus would be on regionwide planning activities. It would not focus on specific subregionally based planning efforts or on individual transit project development activities. Other separate working groups would continue to advise either the Regional Planning or Transportation Committees on these more specific planning and project development activities.

However, SANDAG has several existing single-purpose working groups and task forces whose interests and responsibilities may overlap the proposed stakeholders working group. Two examples of these are the Walkable Communities Advisory Committee and the Regional Housing Task Force. With the creation of the SWG, staff will identify opportunities to eliminate or consolidate duplicative working groups and task forces.

Process for Selecting the Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group

The following section sets forth a proposed process for selecting the SWG. The same basic process was used to establish the stakeholders working group for the development of the RCP, which was viewed as successful:

Membership – Staff recommends selecting 22 to 25 SWG members. The working group should have balanced representation from the various subregions (i.e., North County Coastal, North County Inland, East County, South County, and City of San Diego and County). The working group also should be balanced among urban design/development, housing, transportation, environmental, social equity, and infrastructure interest groups, consistent with the major elements of the RCP.

Selection Process

- **Recruitment.** Staff recommends that membership applications and credentials be solicited from groups who have shown an interest in the RCP, the RTP, and other related projects; groups identified by the Regional Planning and Transportation Committees; and from the
general public through advertisements in community newspapers, postings at local jurisdictions, and Internet postings.

• **Applications.** An application form will be developed whereby interested parties can provide information on their qualifications.

• **Selection Criteria.** Criteria should include balancing the group by geography and interests, maximizing the number of groups the member is associated with, skills and abilities, experience with regional planning issues, and a demonstrated commitment to serve.

• **Selection Committee.** The Regional Planning and the Transportation Committees would appoint two of its members to review applications. In addition, two members each from RPTWG, CTAC, and SANDAG staff would review applications. The Regional Planning and Transportation Committee would be asked to recommend the SWG slate to the SANDAG Board of Directors.

• **Reappointment Process.** Establishing a process for reappointments will help ensure active membership at all times. If an SWG member misses three meetings, he/she would be replaced. The Regional Planning and Transportation Committees would recommend that the SANDAG Board appoint a new member in the category in need of representation from the original candidate list.

• **Termination of Working Group.** The group would complete its work with the adoption of the comprehensive RTP update (anticipated in early 2007).

Chair – The Chair of the Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group should be an elected official appointed by the SANDAG Board of Directors.

BOB LEITER  
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Proposed RCP/RTP Activities for the
Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group (SWG)

**Smart Growth Incentive Program.** Successful implementation of the RCP will require incentives for smart growth development. The adopted RTP, MOBILITY 2030, and the RCP call for the development and implementation of a smart growth incentive program, as funding becomes available. The SWG would provide input into program development activities, such as the specific types of projects that are eligible, the project selection criteria, and program requirements.

**RCP Performance Monitoring and Targets.** The RCP calls for annual monitoring of performance indicators to measure progress meeting regional quality of life goals. The first step is to prepare a baseline report that provides information regarding existing performance levels for each of the annual indicators identified in the RCP. The baseline report would lead to a discussion regarding setting future targets for each performance indicator. The SWG would provide input regarding these targets, which quantify short-term and long-term objectives.

**Smart Growth Concept Map.** The RCP calls for preparation of a “smart growth concept map” that illustrates locations where smart growth development exists, is planned, or could occur. Developing the map would include evaluating and identifying potential locations for smart growth place types throughout the region, and connections to existing and future regional and corridor transit services and stations. The SWG would provide input into potential locations and types of smart growth opportunity areas.

**RTP Update.** The SWG would review and provide input into RTP activities, including:

- **Vision, Goals, and Objectives.** The vision, goals, and policy objectives of the RTP should be revisited to be consistent with the overall vision and goal of the RCP.

- **Transportation Project Evaluation Criteria.** The SWG can provide input as the project evaluation criteria are revised to reflect a transportation project’s relationship to smart growth development. This is a major effort over the course of the next year as we research new criteria to emphasize the land use-transportation connection.

- **Preferred Alternative.** The SWG can provide input into the preferred alternative for the RTP, including measures of performance that should be considered. While various transportation-related performance measures are typically used in evaluating alternatives, the SWG can provide input into other potential factors.
PILOT SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM

Introduction

Successful implementation of the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) will require incentives for smart growth development. Policies included in the RCP as well as in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) call for the development and implementation of a smart growth incentive program at the regional level. Combined with other federal, state, and local incentives, a regional program would encourage local jurisdictions to plan for and implement smart growth land uses in areas that help support regional transportation investments envisioned in the RTP.

MOBILITY 2030 calls for the development of an initial five-year, $25 million pilot smart growth incentive program. The use of approximately $17 million of Transportation Enhancement Activities (TE) funds is proposed to fund the Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program. Ultimately, SANDAG envisions that a longer-term smart growth incentive program would be funded through the extension of the TransNet program (Proposition A). This report outlines the proposed approach and schedule for implementing the initial pilot program.

Recommendation

The Regional Planning Committee is asked to review and approve the proposed approach for the Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program. The Transportation Committee also will be considering this item at its November 12, 2004 meeting.

Discussion

The five-year, $25 million pilot smart growth incentive program called for in MOBILITY 2030 was intended to “foster the integration of smart growth land uses and transportation facilities in our communities.” Implementing smart growth land use is one of the four key components of MOBILITY 2030; the other three components are continued development of our transportation system, better system management, and strategies to reduce demand on the transportation system. “Smart growth” refers to a more compact, efficient, and environmentally-sensitive pattern of development that focuses future growth away from rural areas, and better connects housing with jobs, services, and transportation facilities.

Under the pilot program, grant funds would be made available to local jurisdictions for projects that help integrate transportation and land use, such as transit-oriented developments and other smart growth projects that make areas more conducive to mixed land uses, walking, and biking. Broad principles for developing smart growth incentives were included in the Regional
Comprehensive Plan (see Attachment 1). One of those principles is that implementing ready-to-go demonstration projects should be the focus of the pilot program.

The pilot program would be a precursor to the anticipated longer-term $280 million funding program proposed in the extension of the TransNet local transportation sales tax, known as Proposition A (discussed below). Lessons learned from the pilot program would be used to develop the longer-term incentive program.

Proposed Funding Source

Staff proposes to use the Transportation Enhancement Activities (TE) program as a funding source for the initial $25 million pilot program. The California Transportation Commission (CTC) has produced an estimate of federal TE funds available to regional agencies. Approximately $17 million\(^1\) is available to the San Diego region for the period covering FY 2005 to FY 2009. Identifying a specific funding source for the remaining $8 million would occur after the adoption of a new federal transportation reauthorization act.

Prior Uses of TE Funds

The TE program was implemented by the federal government to support enhancements to the transportation system that were not normally funded under traditional funding programs. There are a variety of eligible uses for TE funds, but in the last funding cycle in the region, SANDAG focused the use of these funds on four project types that supported key regional priorities:

- Projects supporting transit-oriented development
- Regional corridor and feeder bikeways
- Scenic viewshed or wildlife corridor acquisitions
- Corridor or gateway enhancements

Attachment 2 summarizes the projects funded in the four previous cycles of the TE program (FY 1993 to FY 2004) as well as the eligible uses of TE funds. Several of these projects are examples of the kinds of projects that could be funded under a smart growth incentive program. For example, the San Diego Mid-City Gateway Project, the East Village Transit Station improvements, and the San Ysidro station improvements all enhanced the pedestrian environment in the immediate vicinity of existing or future transit station areas. The La Mesa El Cajon Boulevard enhancements resulted in an improved streetscape that, along with La Mesa’s Mixed-Use Strategic Implementation Plan, has generated private sector interest in redevelopment projects within the corridor.

Adapting the TE Program to a Smart Growth Incentive Program

Staff proposes to adapt the existing structure of SANDAG’s TE program to function as a Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program. Key recommendations are as follows:

- The $17 million in TE funding should be allocated in a single call for projects.

\(^1\) The use of TE funds requires an 11.88 percent local match from project applicants. With this match, the TE program could fund a total of $19.3 million in projects.
• The pilot program should focus on implementing “ready-to-go” demonstration projects that improve access to transit in areas with high activity levels and on transportation-related improvements that encourage the smart growth development envisioned in the RCP.

• The existing TE program should be tailored to meet the needs of the pilot program. To assist SANDAG staff in program development activities, such as project selection criteria and program requirements, an ad hoc working group made up of members of the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (RPTWG) and Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) should be created. The ad hoc working group recommendations would be brought to the full RPTWG and CTAC for their consideration.

The RPTWG discussed this item at its October 14, 2004, meeting. RPTWG members suggested that funds be made available in a single funding cycle. They also suggested that SANDAG consider funding planning studies with future cycles. (Planning studies are not an eligible use of TE program funds, but would be eligible under other potential funding programs.) RPTWG members also suggested that SANDAG staff provide feedback to local jurisdictions who do not receive funding, so that these jurisdictions could improve their projects for future funding cycles. CTAC is scheduled to discuss the Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program at its November 4, 2004 meeting, and CTAC’s comments will be relayed to the Regional Planning Committee at the November 5th meeting.

Proposed Schedule and Next Steps

The proposed schedule and next steps for developing the Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October/November 2004</td>
<td>RPTWG and CTAC review proposed concept for the pilot program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2004</td>
<td>The Regional Planning and Transportation Committees review and discuss the proposed concept for the pilot program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2004</td>
<td>RPTWG and CTAC review criteria for the pilot program and make recommendations to the Regional Planning and Transportation Committees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2005</td>
<td>Regional Planning Committee and Transportation Committee approve pilot program criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2005</td>
<td>SANDAG issues call for projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2005</td>
<td>Projects applications submitted by local agencies to SANDAG. Proposed projects are evaluated and ranked, and RPTWG and CTAC make recommendations on rankings to Regional Planning and Transportation Committees.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regional Planning and Transportation Committees recommend approval of pilot projects to SANDAG Board. SANDAG Board approves pilot projects.

May 2005 – July 2005 Caltrans review of projects, and CTC approval. Pilot projects are added to the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP).

Longer-Term Smart Growth Incentive Program

SANDAG envisions that a longer-term Smart Growth Incentive Program would be funded through the extension of the TransNet program (Proposition A). Proposition A includes a two percent set-aside that would provide an average of $7 million per year over the 40-year measure (2008-2048). “Lessons learned” from the pilot program would be used to develop the longer-term program.

The longer-term program would provide incentives to facilitate planning and development activities to foster a variety of smart growth “place types,” ranging from the “metropolitan center” to “rural communities.” As described in Agenda Item #3, the Smart Growth Concept Map would identify specific existing and planned smart growth areas eligible for incentives, as well as “opportunity areas” where there is potential for smart growth to exist. The longer-term incentive program could fund capital improvements in existing and planned areas, and studies in “opportunity areas” to foster smart growth planning activities.
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Principles for Developing Criteria for Smart Growth Incentives

The Regional Comprehensive Plan established four principles to guide the development of criteria for smart growth incentives in the San Diego region. Item 2 in the list below pertains directly to the Smart Growth Incentive Program. The pilot program would support development of the demonstration projects called for in the principles.

1. Regional Funding for Transportation Investments that Support Smart Growth. In its development of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and programming of transportation projects, SANDAG should ensure that its decisions regarding key regional transportation corridor investments give a higher priority to the implementation of smart growth by local jurisdictions in "smart growth opportunity areas," with a particular focus on opportunities for housing affordable to all income levels. Additionally, SANDAG should ensure that the design and implementation of its regional transportation facilities supports smart growth development by local jurisdictions.

2. Regional Funding for Smart Growth Infrastructure and Planning.
   a. Infrastructure Improvements. SANDAG should provide direct financial incentives to local communities for needed infrastructure improvements in smart growth opportunity areas. Improvements funded under such a program might include transit access improvements, community parking, bicycle and pedestrian circulation improvements, traffic calming, streetscape improvements, transit-related roadway improvements, and others. The program should use a variety of available funding sources.

   Demonstration Projects. SANDAG should initially focus on public infrastructure improvements for "ready-to-go" projects that will demonstrate smart growth principles and serve as a catalyst for additional smart growth development in key locations.

   b. Planning. SANDAG should provide technical assistance and/or planning grants to local jurisdictions to implement regional smart growth goals and policy objectives through local plans and regulations. Assistance could support preparation of general plan amendments, community plans, specific plans, and development regulations that facilitate smart growth development.

3. Local Incentives for Smart Growth. Local jurisdictions should provide incentives for appropriate development in smart growth opportunity areas, such as priorities for infrastructure improvements, fee reductions, priority processing of development plans, and others. SANDAG should give priority in its funding decisions to jurisdictions that are providing local smart growth incentives.

Funding for Other Smart Growth Activities. SANDAG should work with other agencies (e.g., California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and private foundations) to coordinate the development of programs that provide incentives for other types of smart growth activities, such as affordable housing production, habitat protection, and the like.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Grant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cycle 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National City</td>
<td>Railroad Depot Purchase/Renovation</td>
<td>$1,232,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Transit Development Board (MTDB)</td>
<td>Old Town LRT Landscaping</td>
<td>$528,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego/ Center City Development Corporation (CCDC)</td>
<td>King Promenade Bike Path Landscaping</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlsbad</td>
<td>Jefferson Street Bike Lanes</td>
<td>$163,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>Sweetwater Bike/Jogging Trail</td>
<td>$154,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Dieguito River Valley JPA</td>
<td>Lake Hodges Bike &amp; Hiking Path</td>
<td>$715,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cycle 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Bayshore Bikeway (Sweetwater River Crossing)</td>
<td>$875,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>Inland Rail Trail</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego/CCDC</td>
<td>Santa Fe Depot Forecourt Improvements</td>
<td>$3,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista</td>
<td>Route 78 Corridor Enhancements</td>
<td>$1,013,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronado/Imperial Beach/City of San Diego</td>
<td>Route 75 Beautification</td>
<td>$852,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State Parks</td>
<td>Old Town San Diego Entry Redevelopment</td>
<td>$308,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTDB</td>
<td>South Line LRT Landscaping</td>
<td>$666,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Dieguito River Valley JPA</td>
<td>Rutherford Ranch/San Felipe Viewshed</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santee</td>
<td>Santee Trolley Station/Civic Square Project</td>
<td>$427,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cycle 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlsbad/Oceanside/ Solana Beach/Encinitas</td>
<td>Coastal Rail Trail Project Development</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State Parks</td>
<td>Sentenac Canyon Purchase</td>
<td>$880,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemon Grove</td>
<td>Trolley Corridor Enhancement</td>
<td>$346,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>Mission Beach Board Walk</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>El Cajon Blvd Enhancement</td>
<td>$565,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Fish &amp; Game</td>
<td>Sycuan Peak Viewshed Acquisition</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cycle 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlsbad/Oceanside/ Solana Beach/Encinitas</td>
<td>Coastal Rail Trail Construction</td>
<td>$4,513,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>Mission Beach Board Walk</td>
<td>$1,186,306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>Mid-City Gateway Project</td>
<td>$4,254,874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronado/Imperial Beach</td>
<td>Silver Strand Enhancements</td>
<td>$1,378,561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTDB</td>
<td>San Ysidro Intermodal Transportation Center</td>
<td>$1,895,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encinitas/Escondido</td>
<td>Biological Cove &amp; Habitat Acquisition</td>
<td>$1,880,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>Escondido Creek Acquisition</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTDB</td>
<td>East Village Intermodal Transit Station</td>
<td>$4,584,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Mesa</td>
<td>El Cajon Blvd. Enhancement</td>
<td>$1,565,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$39,661,241</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Federal law identifies a variety of eligible uses of TE funds, including:

1. provisions of facilities for pedestrian and bicycles;
2. provision of safety and educational activities for pedestrians and bicyclists;
3. acquisition of scenic easements and scenic or historic sites;
4. scenic or historic highway programs;
5. landscaping and other scenic beautification;
6. historic preservation;
7. rehabilitation and operation of historic transportation buildings, structures or facilities;
8. preservation of abandoned railway corridors;
9. control and removal of outdoor advertising;
10. archaeological planning and research;
11. environmental mitigation to address water pollution due to highway runoff or reduce vehicle-caused wildlife mortality while maintaining habitat connectivity; and
12. establishment of transportation museums.
October 22, 2004

TO: Mayors/Chair of the Board of Supervisors, City Managers/County Chief Administrative Officer, Planning/Community Development Directors and Other Interested Parties

FROM: Gary L. Gallegos, Executive Director

SUBJECT: Draft Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) for the 2005-2010 Housing Element Cycle

On September 24, 2004, the Board of Directors for the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) accepted the Draft Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) numbers for the 2005-2010 housing element cycle for a 90-day public review period. A table (Attachment 1) with the draft numbers is attached for your review. Also attached at the request of the Board, is a separate table (Attachment 2) with the three income alternatives that were considered during the initial review process. (Alternative 3 was the alternative accepted for distribution.) The full Board report can be obtained by contacting SANDAG at 619/699-1950 or can be downloaded from the Internet by typing: www.sandag.org/draftrhna. SANDAG is seeking comments on the Draft RHNA numbers no later than Friday, December 31, 2004.

The RHNA numbers include a total housing need number for each jurisdiction and a breakdown of the total number into four income categories: very low, low, moderate, and above moderate. State housing element law requires that jurisdictions must identify adequate sites to meet their housing needs. With respect to the very low and low income categories, local jurisdictions must demonstrate that they have an adequate amount of multifamily-zoned land or can otherwise accommodate the housing needs of those income categories.

The SANDAG Board will consider adopting the final RHNA numbers at its January 28, 2005, meeting. Several meetings are scheduled prior to this Board meeting to help educate those who are involved about the Draft RHNA numbers and the housing element process.

These meetings include:

- Thursday, October 28, 2004, 8:30 a.m. - 12:30 p.m. – Housing Element Workshop with the California Housing and Community Development Department (HCD)
• Thursday, December 2, 2004, 11 a.m. – 2 p.m. – RHNA Discussion at the City Managers Association monthly meeting with the planning directors

• Friday, January 14, 2005, 9 a.m. – Noon – SANDAG Policy Board Meeting regarding RHNA numbers and other housing element-related issues

In addition, SANDAG staff is available to make presentations to city councils, the Board of Supervisors, and other organizations regarding the draft RHNA numbers.

If you have questions or written comments regarding the Draft RHNA or would like to schedule a presentation, please contact Susan Baldwin at (619) 699-1943, via e-mail at sba@sandag.org, or at the above address.

GG/sb/ais

Attachments: 1. Draft Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) for the 2005-2010 Housing Element Cycle
2. Draft Regional Housing Needs Assessment - Methodology C and Three Income Allocation Alternatives
### Draft Regional Share Allocation using Methodology C and Alternative 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Regional Share – Methodology C</th>
<th>Regional Share Allocation by Income Category – Alternative 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very Low*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlsbad</td>
<td>8,353</td>
<td>2,499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>17,176</td>
<td>3,731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronado</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Mar</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Cajon</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encinitas</td>
<td>1,707</td>
<td>502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>2,430</td>
<td>485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Beach</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Mesa</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemon Grove</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National City</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside</td>
<td>6,405</td>
<td>1,454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poway</td>
<td>1,239</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego – Original</td>
<td>45,613</td>
<td>9,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units to/from Unincorporated Area</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego – Revised</td>
<td>45,613</td>
<td>9,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>6,236</td>
<td>1,434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santee</td>
<td>1,377</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solana Beach</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista</td>
<td>2,261</td>
<td>509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated Area</td>
<td>12,323</td>
<td>3,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units to/from City of San Diego</td>
<td>(375)</td>
<td>(320)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated Area – Revised</td>
<td>12,323</td>
<td>2,834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego Region</td>
<td>107,000</td>
<td>24,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Revised to equal regional percentages.
### Draft Regional Housing Needs Assessment
#### Methodology C and Three Income Allocation Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Share</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Above Moderate</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Above Moderate</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Above Moderate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carlsbad</td>
<td>8,353</td>
<td>1,226</td>
<td>1,042</td>
<td>1,353</td>
<td>4,732</td>
<td>1,862</td>
<td>1,11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24,99</td>
<td>1,811</td>
<td>1,353</td>
<td>2,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>17,176</td>
<td>4,015</td>
<td>3,295</td>
<td>3,390</td>
<td>6,476</td>
<td>3,873</td>
<td>2,946</td>
<td>3,390</td>
<td>6,967</td>
<td>3,731</td>
<td>2,597</td>
<td>3,907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronado</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Mar</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Cajon</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encinitas</td>
<td>1,707</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>746</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>2,430</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>857</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Beach</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Mesa</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemon Grove</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National City</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside</td>
<td>6,405</td>
<td>1,431</td>
<td>1,155</td>
<td>1,352</td>
<td>2,466</td>
<td>1,442</td>
<td>1,098</td>
<td>1,352</td>
<td>2,513</td>
<td>1,454</td>
<td>1,040</td>
<td>1,352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poway</td>
<td>1,239</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego*</td>
<td>45,613</td>
<td>11,446</td>
<td>7,806</td>
<td>8,331</td>
<td>18,030</td>
<td>10,496</td>
<td>7,974</td>
<td>8,331</td>
<td>18,812</td>
<td>9,546</td>
<td>8,141</td>
<td>8,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>6,236</td>
<td>1,373</td>
<td>1,176</td>
<td>1,273</td>
<td>2,415</td>
<td>1,404</td>
<td>1,070</td>
<td>1,273</td>
<td>2,491</td>
<td>1,434</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>1,273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santee</td>
<td>1,377</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solana Beach</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista</td>
<td>2,261</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated Area*</td>
<td>12,323</td>
<td>2,315</td>
<td>1,967</td>
<td>2,338</td>
<td>5,703</td>
<td>2,575</td>
<td>1,949</td>
<td>2,338</td>
<td>5,461</td>
<td>2,834</td>
<td>1,932</td>
<td>2,338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego Region</td>
<td>107,000</td>
<td>24,100</td>
<td>18,329</td>
<td>20,179</td>
<td>44,392</td>
<td>24,100</td>
<td>18,329</td>
<td>20,179</td>
<td>44,392</td>
<td>24,100</td>
<td>18,329</td>
<td>20,179</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: State law requires that the region's housing needs be allocated by income category as follows: 23 percent very low income, 17 percent low income, 19 percent moderate income, and 41 percent above moderate income. Individual jurisdiction allocations by income category were adjusted slightly to ensure that regional income category requirements were met.

*Adjusted to reflect transfer of 695 lower income units from Unincorporated Area to City of San Diego.

**Alternative 3 was accepted by the SANDAG Board for distribution on September 24, 2004.