REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

Friday, January 21, 2005
11:00 a.m. - 1:00 p.m.*
SANDAG
401 B Street, 7th Floor Board Room*
San Diego, CA

* Please note change of meeting time and conference room.

AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

THE BEGINNING PORTION OF THIS MEETING WILL BE HELD JOINTLY WITH THE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE. HIGHLIGHTS INCLUDE:

- APPOINTMENTS TO NEW STAKEHOLDERS WORKING GROUP
- PILOT SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM
- SMART GROWTH IN LA MESA

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 and Transportation Committees on any item at the time the Committees are 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 Committees on any issue under the agenda item entitled Public Comments/Communications/Members’ Comments. Speakers are limited to three minutes. The Committees 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 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.
REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE  
Friday, January 21, 2005

** 11 A.M. – CONVENE JOINT MEETING WITH TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE **

ITEM #

+A. CREATION OF A NEW REGIONAL PLANNING STAKEHOLDERS WORKING GROUP (Janet Fairbanks)  

At their November meetings, the Regional Planning and Transportation Committees recommended the creation of a new Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group (SWG) to provide interested citizens with a direct mechanism for involvement in RCP implementation and the RTP update. At its November meeting, the SANDAG Board of Directors approved the creation of the SWG. A selection committee consisting of members of the Regional Planning and Transportation Committees, Regional Planning Technical Working Group, and Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee was formed to review the applications. Their recommendations are attached. The Regional Planning and Transportation Committees are requested to recommend the slate for approval by the Board of Directors.

+B. PILOT SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM UPDATE (Stephan Vance)  

This report provides an update on the $17 million Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program. The ad hoc working group, which includes members of the Transportation Committee, Regional Planning Technical Working Group, and Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee, has been meeting to develop program administrative requirements and project selection criteria. The report discusses the draft project selection criteria, and solicits comments from the Regional Planning and Transportation Committees.

C. SHOWCASING LOCAL EXAMPLES OF SMART GROWTH: SMART GROWTH IN LA MESA (Dave Witt, City of La Mesa)  

Dave Witt, City of La Mesa Assistant City Manager, will make a presentation about local smart growth planning and development activities taking place in the City of La Mesa, illustrating how smart growth concepts can be pursued through local infill and redevelopment efforts.

ADJOURN JOINT MEETING WITH TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE
1. **APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES**

   APPROVE

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

   Members of the public will have the opportunity to address the Regional Planning Committee on any issue within the jurisdiction of the Committee. Speakers are limited to three minutes each and shall reserve time by completing a “Request to Speak” form and giving it to the Clerk prior to speaking. Committee members also may provide information and announcements under this agenda item.

   **CONSENT AGENDA**

3. **REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE 2005 MEETING SCHEDULE**

   INFORMATION

4. **STATUS OF THE RCP BASELINE MONITORING REPORT** (Paul Kavanaugh)

   INFORMATION

   This winter, SANDAG will release a Baseline Monitoring Report based on the annual indicators included in the Regional Comprehensive Plan. This item updates the Regional Planning Committee on the status of the Baseline Monitoring Report, which will provide the basis for establishing short- and long-term targets for each performance indicator.

   **REPORTS**

5. **ENERGY UPDATE** (Councilmember Henry Abarbanel, Energy Working Group Co-Chair)

   INFORMATION/POSSIBLE ACTION

   Energy Working Group (EWG) Co-Chair Henry Abarbanel will update the Regional Planning Committee on the progress of the working group, and will discuss the progress being made on identifying a funding source to sustain the work of the EWG.

6. **UPCOMING MEETINGS**

   The next Regional Planning Committee meeting will be held on Friday, February 4, 2005, from 12 noon – 2 p.m.

7. **ADJOURNMENT**

   + next to an agenda item indicates an attachment
CREATION OF A NEW REGIONAL PLANNING STAKEHOLDERS WORKING GROUP

Introduction

At their November 2004 meetings, the Regional Planning and Transportation Committees recommended creation of a new Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group and appointed members to serve on a selection committee to review applications for the working group. At its November 2004 meeting, the SANDAG Board approved the creation of the new working group. The selection committee held two meetings to review approximately 100 applications from citizens interested in serving on the working group.

Recommendation

The Regional Planning and Transportation Committees are asked to recommend to the SANDAG Board of Directors the appointment of a new Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group. The selection committee’s recommended slate of members is attached to this report.

The Committees also are asked to recommend one of their members to serve as Chair of the Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group.

Discussion

The selection committee reviewed the applications against a set of criteria, including skills and abilities, experience with regional planning issues, and a demonstrated commitment to serve. Of the major categories of the Regional Comprehensive Plan, applicants were asked to identify three areas of interest. The selection committee used the interest areas to help them select candidates in order to ensure a balance of interests on the group. The categories and the number of members interested in the category are: urban form (17), housing (6), transportation (16), border issues (5), environment (8), economic prosperity (12), public facilities (5), and social equity (9).

The selection committee also made sure that the slate has balanced representation from the various subregions: North County Coastal - 3, North County Inland - 5, East County - 4, South County - 3, and Central San Diego - 11.

The selection committee was impressed with the number of citizens who wanted to serve, and the breadth of talent, skills, and abilities of the applicants. The committee is grateful to those who took the time to apply.
The working group will begin meeting in early 2005 and will conclude its work with the adoption of the next comprehensive update of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), which is anticipated in early 2007. The working group will act in an advisory capacity to both the Regional Planning and Transportation Committees on specific Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) implementation and RTP preparation activities.

BOB LEITER  
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning  
Attachment  
Key Staff Contact: Janet Fairbanks, (619) 699-6970, jfa@sandag.org
RECOMMENDED SLATE OF MEMBERS TO THE REGIONAL PLANNING STAKEHOLDERS WORKING GROUP

Bill Anderson
Elaine Cooluris
Anne Fege
Jeff Figler
Paul Fiske
Bill Garrett
Larry Glavinic
Cindy Gompper Graves
Rolf Gunnarson
Todd Henderson
William Hinchy
Kathy Keehan
Steve Otto
Ron Pennock
Don Preis
Brad Raulston
Kevin Reese
Clive Richard
Allison Rolfe
Jim Schmidt
Bob Sergeant
Sandor Shapery
Kevin Siva
Sandy Smith
Sandy Smith
Rick Van Schoik
David Weil
PILOT SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM UPDATE

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 of a smart growth incentive program at the regional level. In November 2004, the Transportation and Regional Planning Committees approved the proposed approach for developing the Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program called for in MOBILITY 2030. The use of approximately $17 million of Transportation Enhancements (TE) funds would fund the pilot program.

The Transportation and Regional Planning Committees approved the formation of an ad hoc working group to assist SANDAG staff with the development of the pilot incentive program. The working group includes members of SANDAG’s Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) (public works directors) and Regional Planning Technical Working Group (RPTWG) (planning directors), as well as Coronado Councilmember Phil Monroe, who has participated on behalf of the Transportation Committee.

This report provides an update on progress made to date on developing the evaluation criteria for the Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program (see Attachment 1).

Recommendation

The Transportation and Regional Planning Committees are asked to discuss and comment on the Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program draft project evaluation criteria.

Discussion

The primary goal of the Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program is to implement a set of demonstration projects that, when complete, will serve as examples for smart growth development consistent with the RCP. The pilot program will provide valuable experience in selecting and implementing capital improvement projects that are intended to have an impact on land development and transportation choices in the project area. Lessons learned from the pilot program will be used to help develop the longer-term Smart Growth Incentive Program funded through the TransNet Extension.
The ad hoc working group that is assisting staff in the development of program administrative requirements and evaluation criteria has met several times. The group’s initial work has focused on developing the project evaluation criteria. The group also will be addressing matters related to program administration, which will include making recommendations regarding the project selection process.

Project Evaluation Criteria

The ad hoc working group began the process of developing project evaluation criteria by reviewing information from similar incentive programs in California, in particular, the Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) program developed by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission in Northern California. The TLC is a 9-county, $18 million per year, program that has been underway for 5 years. It includes funding for capital improvements, community planning efforts, and funding for capital projects directly related to increases in housing. The other incentive program that was reviewed was the Community Design program in the Sacramento area, which the Sacramento Area Council of Governments initiated last year. It provided $9 million for capital improvement projects.

Taking the experience of similar programs into account along with the specific TE program requirements (the funding source), the working group agreed on a draft list of evaluation criteria (Attachment 1). The criteria are divided into two categories:

1) screening criteria that determine basic program eligibility, and
2) project evaluation criteria that determine funding priority.

The purpose of the criteria is to ensure that candidate projects meet the TE funding requirements and can be implemented in a short-time frame (i.e., are “ready to go” projects). The specific criteria also are intended to help select projects that are well-designed, encourage multiple transportation modes, and otherwise support the smart growth development goals of the RCP. The proposed criteria are described in more detail below.

- **Project Screening Criteria** are primarily used to determine basic program eligibility and must be met before a project can be reviewed further. The proposed screening criteria include: (1) demonstration of local commitment/authorization (a resolution from a authorizing the application and committing staff resources and funding to the project); (2) local funding commitment; and (3) eligibility under TE program.

- **Project Evaluation Criteria** are grouped into three primary categories: Project Readiness, Smart Growth Area Land Use Characteristics, and Quality of Proposed Project.

  - Project Readiness Criteria ensure that projects are ready to go and can be delivered consistent with the requirements imposed by the TE program rules. Projects that are further along the development process (i.e., that are closer to being constructed) would receive higher priority.

  - Smart Growth Land Use Characteristics Criteria encourage projects that are located in areas that are consistent with the seven smart growth place types identified in the RCP (see Attachment 2). The criteria evaluate the intensity of surrounding development, land use and transportation system characteristics, and urban design characteristics. The working group
also is considering a criterion that would give priority to projects that help increase the intensity of existing development.

- Quality of Proposed Project Criteria evaluate the specific features of the candidate projects and give priority to projects that improve the transit environment, improve pedestrian and bicycle access, and incorporate streetscape enhancements, traffic calming features, and parking. These criteria are based on a survey of member agencies that identified the range of potential features/improvements for candidate smart growth projects. Projects that included more than one type of feature/improvement would receive higher priority.

It is important to note that some of these project features (parking and traffic calming in particular) may not be eligible for funding under the TE program. Staff will be working with Caltrans staff, who administer the TE program, to determine if some of these components could qualify for funding under the TE program. Another alternative that staff is exploring is whether a portion of the TE funds could be exchanged with another project(s) for other more flexible funding (e.g., Congestion Mitigation & Air Quality (CMAQ) or TransNet).

- Matching Funds Bonus gives priority to projects that have a higher commitment of matching funds. The TE program requires a minimum 11.47 percent local match. Encouraging local agencies to providing matching funds over the minimum requirement helps fund larger types of projects within the limited TE funding available. The ad hoc working group felt that the larger the project, the greater the potential impact the pilot program could have.

As proposed, each criterion would be ranked on a scale from one to five. The criterion could be given more or less importance by multiplying the evaluation score by a weighting factor. As of the writing of this report, the working group has developed a consensus on the evaluation criteria. The group is scheduled to meet again on January 13, 2005, to discuss the weighting factors. Information about the proposed weighting factors will be discussed at the January 21 joint meeting of the Transportation and Regional Planning Committees.

The working group also discussed other aspects of smart growth that SANDAG might want to encourage in the Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program. Affordable housing and environmentally sustainable project design are two examples. However, the group felt that the pilot program should focus on accomplishing a few clearly defined objectives. As we gain experience with this pilot program, we should be able to incorporate other regional objectives in the development of the longer-term smart growth incentive program.

Next Steps

Once a consensus has been developed on the criteria and their relative weighting, the ad hoc working group will develop recommendations regarding the project selection process. Projects from the previous TE cycle were evaluated by an independent group of citizens with knowledge about the different project types. A potential source of such persons could be members of the new Stakeholders Working Group (see Agenda Item A).
Based on progress made to date, a recommendation for approval of the pilot program is expected in February/March 2005 with a call for projects anticipated in March/April 2005.

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachments

Key Staff Contact: Stephan Vance, (619) 699-1924, sva@sandag.org
Project Screening Criteria

Project screening criteria are meant to ensure the applicant is committed to the project, the community supports it, and it can be constructed within the schedule proposed. These criteria must be met in order for the project to be evaluated further.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Commitment/Authorization</th>
<th>The application must include a resolution or minute order from City Council, County Board of Supervisors, or Board of Directors authorizing the application, and committing to allocate the staff resources and matching funds necessary to complete the project as proposed.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding Commitment</td>
<td>The applicant must certify that funding for related improvements are in place to ensure the proposed project can be completed within the schedule proposed in the project application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Eligibility</td>
<td>The project must be eligible under the federal funding program guidelines.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Evaluation Criteria

Project evaluation criteria are used to score and rank projects. These criteria are based on the require source, and the goals of the Smart Growth Incentive Program.

Project Readiness
To ensure the proposed projects can comply with the state's timely use of funds requirements, projects will be scored based on the how close they are to beginning construction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Project Development (Projects receive 1 point for each completed phase up to a maximum of 5 points.)</th>
<th>Feasibility Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preliminary Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental Clearance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Right-of-way Acquisition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Final Design</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Smart Growth Area Land Use Characteristics
To encourage projects in smart growth development areas, and to evaluate how well they support smart growth development, the proposed projects are scored based on the intensity of development, the diversity of land uses, and the quality of urban design in the project area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intensity of Development (0-5 points)</th>
<th>To what extent does the existing or planned project area meet the residential density levels identified in the RCP for its smart growth place type. Project areas at the minimum dwelling units per acre receive 1 point, and areas at the recommended upper end of the range receive 5 points.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Use and Transportation Characteristics of Project Area (0-5 points)</td>
<td>How well does the existing or planned urban form in the project area meet the smart growth objectives of the RCP? Maximum points are given for areas that have, or are planned to have, a mix of residential and commercial uses appropriate to its smart growth place type, and have the appropriate transportation system characteristics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Design Characteristics of Project Area (0-5 points)</td>
<td>How well does the existing or planned urban design in the project area conform to the smart growth design principles in the RCP? Maximum points are given for areas where the existing built environment or the design standards for new construction provides a human-scale built environment. The street network and trail system should provide direct access to commercial and civic services, recreational opportunities, and transportation services. Building construction should be oriented to the pedestrian. Street design should fully accommodate bicyclists and pedestrians.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Quality of Proposed Project.**

These criteria rate the proposed project based on the variety and quality of features proposed to be constructed. Points are accumulated for each type of improvement included in the project based on the quality of that improvement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedestrian Access Improvements (0-5 points)</th>
<th>To what extent does the project improve pedestrian access to a regional transit station, transit corridor, or rural village center? Maximum points should be awarded to projects that connect people to activity centers (especially transit) following the design principles in SANDAG's Planning and Designing for Pedestrians guidelines.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Access Improvements (0-5 points)</td>
<td>To what extent does the project improve bicycle access to, and secure parking at a regional transit station, transit corridor, or rural village center? Maximum points should be awarded to projects that provide seamless bicycle access to the area’s activity centers, and include secure bicycle parking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Facility Improvements (0-5 points)</td>
<td>To what extent does the project improve the transit patron environment at transit stations, along transit corridors, or at access points immediately adjacent to the transit facility?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetscape Enhancements (0-5 points)</td>
<td>How well does the project include public art elements, public seating, pedestrian-scale lighting, enhanced paving or wayfinding signage?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Calming Features (0-5 points)</td>
<td>How well does the project include one or more of the traffic calming devices recommended in Planning and Designing for Pedestrians?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Improvements (0-5 points)</td>
<td>How well does the project provide appropriate levels of auto access to regional transit and the related project area without detracting from the quality of public spaces, and without detracting from transit, bicycle, and pedestrian circulation?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROJECT EVALUATION SCORE**

**Matching Funds Bonus**

| Matching Funds (0-15 points) | The higher the percentage of matching funds, the greater the number of bonus points the project will receive. |

**TOTAL PROJECT SCORE**
### TABLE 4A.2—SMART GROWTH AREA CLASSIFICATIONS

#### SMART GROWTH DESIGN PRINCIPLES

The following design principles apply to all categories and are critical to the success of smart growth.

- Human-scale built environment that creates uniqueness and identity
- Vertically and horizontally mixed use development, with vertical mixed use located near transit stations
- Robust transportation choices that compliment the intensity of development within the Smart Growth Opportunity Area (SGOA)
  - Strong pedestrian orientation: network of streets & pedestrian paths, narrower street scales, special designs to facilitate pedestrian crossings at intersections, and the walker having precedence
  - Bike access/locker facilities and park-n-ride facilities woven in the human-scale design
  - Transit station(s) located centrally within main activity area(s); transit user amenities located adjacent to stations (e.g. child care facilities, coffee bars, dry cleaning drop-off)
- Nearby recreational facilities and public plazas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY/ LAND USE TYPE CHARACTERISTICS</th>
<th>LAND USE INTENSITY TARGETS</th>
<th>TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM CHARACTERISTICS</th>
<th>PUBLIC TRANSIT SERVICE CHARACTERISTICS</th>
<th>EXAMPLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Center</td>
<td>Desired Building Types: Mid- to high-rise residential and office/ commercial 75+ dwelling unit/ average net residential acre within ¼ mile radius of transit station 80+ employees/average net acre within ¼ mile of transit station</td>
<td>Access from several freeways with multiple access points Hub transit system Regional hub for numerous local, corridor, regional transit lines Shuttle services and pedestrian orientation for internal trips</td>
<td>Served by numerous corridor/ regional/local services Very high frequency service (less than 15 minute) throughout the day on all corridor/ regional services High frequency service (15 minute) all day on most local services Multiple station locations, with several key transfer points Internal shuttle system</td>
<td>Downtown San Diego</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Downtown San Diego*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY / LAND USE TYPE CHARACTERISTICS</th>
<th>LAND USE INTENSITY TARGETS</th>
<th>TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM CHARACTERISTICS</th>
<th>PUBLIC TRANSIT SERVICE CHARACTERISTICS</th>
<th>EXAMPLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban Center</td>
<td>▪ Desired Building Types: Mid-to high-rise residential and office/commercial</td>
<td>▪ Freeway connections with multiple access points</td>
<td>▪ Served by several corridor/regional lines and several local services</td>
<td>Existing and Planned:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ 40-75+ dwelling unit/average net acre residential within ¼ mile radius of transit station</td>
<td>▪ Served by several corridor/regional transit lines and several local services</td>
<td>▪ High to very high frequency service (less than 15 minute peak) on all corridor/regional services</td>
<td>▪ Rio Vista (Mission Valley) (San Diego)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ 25+ dwelling unit/acre for mixed use sites within ¼ mile radius of transit station</td>
<td>▪ Possible shuttle routes for internal trips</td>
<td>▪ High frequency throughout the day on all lines</td>
<td>▪ Little Italy (San Diego)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ 50+ employees per net acre within ¼ mile of transit station</td>
<td>▪ Minimal park-and-ride facilities; access should be handled by internal shuttle system</td>
<td>▪ Key transit center, along with multiple smaller station locations</td>
<td>▪ Costa Verde (University City) (San Diego)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Possible internal shuttle system</td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ The Boulevard Marketplace Pilot Village (San Diego)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Morena Linda Vista (San Diego)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ East Urban Center (Chula Vista)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATEGORY/ LAND USE TYPE CHARACTERISTICS</td>
<td>LAND USE INTENSITY TARGETS</td>
<td>TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM CHARACTERISTICS</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSIT SERVICE CHARACTERISTICS</td>
<td>EXAMPLES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Center</td>
<td>Desired Building Types: Low- to mid-rise • 20-45+ dwelling unit/average net acre within ¼ mile radius of transit station or connecting transit service • 30-50 employees/ average net acre within ¼ mile of transit station or connecting transit service</td>
<td>Served by one or more corridor/ regional transit line and several local services • May also be served by regional arterials</td>
<td>Served by 1 to 2 corridor or regional lines, or less than 5 minute shuttle distance from corridor/regional station, and multiple local services • Very high frequency service (less than 15 minute peak) on corridor/regional service or connecting shuttle • High frequency throughout the day on most lines • Multiple station locations, some with central access/transfer point • Shared-use parking or dedicated park-and-ride facilities for regional transit services</td>
<td>Existing and Planned: • Downtown Oceanside • Downtown Escondido • Downtown La Mesa • Downtown El Cajon • Downtown Chula Vista • La Jolla (San Diego) • Village Center Pilot Village (Euclid/Market, San Diego) • Hillcrest (San Diego) • Heart of the City (San Marcos) • Vista Village Transit Center • Santee Town Center Potential SGOA: • Grantville Trolley Station (SD) • San Marcos Creek Specific Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillcrest</td>
<td>Desired Building Types: Low- to mid-rise • 20-45+ dwelling unit/average net acre within ¼ mile radius of transit station or connecting transit service • 30-50 employees/ average net acre within ¼ mile of transit station or connecting transit service</td>
<td>Served by one or more corridor/ regional transit line and several local services • May also be served by regional arterials</td>
<td>Served by 1 to 2 corridor or regional lines, or less than 5 minute shuttle distance from corridor/regional station, and multiple local services • Very high frequency service (less than 15 minute peak) on corridor/regional service or connecting shuttle • High frequency throughout the day on most lines • Multiple station locations, some with central access/transfer point • Shared-use parking or dedicated park-and-ride facilities for regional transit services</td>
<td>Hillcrest (San Diego)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples: Downtown Oceanside, Downtown Escondido, Downtown La Mesa, Downtown El Cajon, Downtown Chula Vista, La Jolla (San Diego), Village Center Pilot Village (Euclid/Market, San Diego), Hillcrest (San Diego), Heart of the City (San Marcos), Vista Village Transit Center, Santee Town Center.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY/LAND USE TYPE CHARACTERISTICS</th>
<th>LAND USE INTENSITY TARGETS</th>
<th>TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM CHARACTERISTICS</th>
<th>PUBLIC TRANSIT SERVICE CHARACTERISTICS</th>
<th>EXAMPLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Center</td>
<td>Desired Building Types: Low- to mid-rise&lt;br&gt;20-45+ dwelling unit/average net acre within ¼ mile of transit station</td>
<td>Served by at least one corridor or regional transit line&lt;br&gt;Served by arterials and/or collector streets</td>
<td>Served by at least one corridor/regional service&lt;br&gt;High frequency service (15 minute in peak hours) on corridor/regional services&lt;br&gt;Moderate to high frequency throughout the day&lt;br&gt;One or more on-street stations</td>
<td>Existing and Planned:&lt;br&gt; Otay Ranch Villages (Chula Vista)&lt;br&gt;Mercado (Barrio Logan, San Diego)&lt;br&gt;Mira Mesa Market Center (San Diego)&lt;br&gt;Pacific Highlands Ranch (San Diego)&lt;br&gt;Downtown Lemon Grove&lt;br&gt;Downtown Coronado&lt;br&gt;San Elijo/La Costa Meadows Community Center (San Marcos)&lt;br&gt;Palm Avenue (Imperial Beach)&lt;br&gt;Potential SGOAs:&lt;br&gt; Solana Beach/NCTD Mixed Use Site&lt;br&gt;North County Metro (Buena Creek Sprinter Station Area, County of San Diego)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Otay Ranch Heritage Village*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY / LAND USE TYPE CHARACTERISTICS</th>
<th>LAND USE INTENSITY TARGETS</th>
<th>TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM CHARACTERISTICS</th>
<th>PUBLIC TRANSIT SERVICE CHARACTERISTICS</th>
<th>EXAMPLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transit Corridor</td>
<td>Desired Building Types: Variety of low-, mid-, and high-rise</td>
<td>Located along a major arterial</td>
<td>Generally served by a corridor/ regional line and local services</td>
<td>Existing and Planned:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25-75+ dwelling unit/ average net acre along transit corridor and within ¼ mile of transit stations</td>
<td>Served by a corridor or regional service, or local services with less than 10 minutes travel time to corridor/ regional line station</td>
<td>High frequency service (15 minute in peak hours) on corridor/ regional and/or local services</td>
<td>El Cajon Blvd and University Avenue (Mid-City) (San Diego)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employment: Commercial and retail supportive uses</td>
<td>Multiple station locations, with one or more on-street transfer locations with intersecting services.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Washington Ave (Mission Hills)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linear size with length extending from less than one mile long, and width extending 1 to 2 blocks outward from corridor</td>
<td>Small shared-use park-and-ride facilities possible</td>
<td></td>
<td>University Avenue (La Mesa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residential and office/ commercial, including mixed use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>South Santa Fe Transit Corridor (Vista)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Located along a major arterial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Potential SGOA:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Served by a corridor or regional service, or local services with less than 10 minutes travel time to corridor/ regional line station</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>El Camino Real (Encinitas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATEGORY/ LAND USE TYPE CHARACTERISTICS</td>
<td>LAND USE INTENSITY TARGETS</td>
<td>TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM CHARACTERISTICS</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSIT SERVICE CHARACTERISTICS</td>
<td>EXAMPLES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Use Center</td>
<td>Desired Building Types: Variety of low-, mid-, and high-rise</td>
<td>Nearby freeway access</td>
<td>Generally served by one or more corridor/ regional line and local services</td>
<td>Existing and Planned: Grossmont Center/ Hospital/ Trolley Station (La Mesa) The Paseo at SDSU (San Diego) Chula Vista Bayfront Palomar College (San Marcos) Cal State San Marcos Potential SGOAs: Ocean Ranch / Rancho Del Oro Industrial Complex (Oceanside) Vista County Courthouse Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment draws from throughout region, with other uses being community serving</td>
<td>45+ employees/ average net acre within ¼ mile of transit station</td>
<td>Served by one or more corridor/ regional lines and local services</td>
<td>High to very high frequency service (15 minute or better in peak) on corridor/ regional services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special use centers may be located within larger area that has several SGOA designations</td>
<td>Optional residential: 50+ dwelling units/ average net residential acre</td>
<td>May be served by shuttle service for internal trips</td>
<td>Moderate to high frequency throughout the day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominated by one non-residential land use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Multiple station locations, with possible central access/transfer point</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail support services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential residential element</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposed Paseo at San Diego State
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>CATEGORY/ LAND USE TYPE CHARACTERISTICS</strong></th>
<th><strong>LAND USE INTENSITY TARGETS</strong></th>
<th><strong>TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM CHARACTERISTICS</strong></th>
<th><strong>PUBLIC TRANSIT SERVICE CHARACTERISTICS</strong></th>
<th><strong>EXAMPLES</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural Community</td>
<td>Within Village Cores, 10.9-24+ dwelling units/acre (higher densities permitted for senior housing)</td>
<td>Concentrated local road network within village, with regional connection to urban areas</td>
<td>Village Cores should include or allow for bus stops and an expansion of bus service in higher density areas</td>
<td>Existing, Planned, and Potential SGOAs: Ramona, Fallbrook, Alpine, Lakeside, Valley Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Distinct communities that include Rural Villages defined by a village limit line with concentrated areas of residential and commercial development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Draws from nearby rural areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Includes semi-rural and rural areas outside the village limit line</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Desired Building Types: Low-rise employment and residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Could include park-n-ride facilities near major road or transit corridors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Possible local transit service or central access point for possible corridor/ regional peak transit line</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES:**

Potential Smart Growth Opportunity Areas (SGOAs):
- Areas discussed at local and regional meetings with local planning directors that are not currently included in existing plans and policies, but may offer the potential for additional smart growth

Computing Land Use Intensity Measurements per Net Acre:
- Residential: Total dwelling units divided by built or planned residential acreage net of public right-of-way
- Employment: Total employees divided by built or planned office, commercial, and retail acreage net of public right-of-way
- Mixed Use: Total dwelling units divided by built or planned residential acreage net of public right-of-way and any other non-residential uses (e.g., commercial, retail, etc.)

Land Use Building Type Definitions:
- Low Rise = 2-3 stories
- Mid-Rise = 4-6 stories
- High Rise = 7+ stories
Public Transit Service Characteristics:
  Public transit service characteristics for Smart Growth Opportunity Areas apply to both existing and planned regional transit services as described in the Regional Transportation Plan.
  Shuttle services (Green Car) – Designed for short-distance trips in neighborhood/employment areas, and feeder access to/from corridor and regional services
  Local services (Blue Car) – Designed for shorter-distance trips with frequent stops (e.g. current local bus services)
  Corridor services (Red Car) – Designed for medium distance trips with station spacing about every mile on average (e.g. trolley services, future arterial based bus rapid transit (BRT) routes)
  Regional services (Yellow Car) – Designed for longer distance trips with stations spacing every 4-5 miles on average (e.g. Coaster, future freeway-based BRT routes)

Examples of Smart Growth Opportunity Areas:
  Examples of existing, planned, or potential Smart Growth Opportunity Areas are provided to illustrate the scale and character of the different smart growth area types.
  Actual Smart Growth Opportunity Areas will be identified in the first implementation phase of the RCP when the Smart Growth Area Concept Map is developed in consultation with local jurisdictions.

Rural Communities
  For additional detail, see the County of San Diego’s General Plan 2020.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board of Directors – Policy or Business Meeting (Normally second Friday, 9 a.m. – Noon)</th>
<th>Board of Directors – Business Meeting (Normally first and third Fridays, 9 a.m. – Noon)</th>
<th>Transportation Committee (Normally first Friday, Noon – 2 p.m.)</th>
<th>Regional Planning Committee (Normally second Friday, 8 a.m. – 9 a.m.)</th>
<th>Executive Committee (Normally second Friday, 1:30 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.)</th>
<th>Public Safety Committee (Normally third Friday, 12:30 p.m. – 2:30 p.m.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 14, 2005</td>
<td>January 28, 2005</td>
<td>January 7, 2005</td>
<td>January 21, 2005 11 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. Joint Meeting with Transportation Committee</td>
<td>January 14, 2005</td>
<td>January 14, 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2005 (To be scheduled if needed)</td>
<td>February 25, 2005</td>
<td>February 4, 2005</td>
<td>February 4, 2005 (Moved to First Friday due to SANDAG Retreat)</td>
<td>February 18, 2005 (2 p.m. to 3:30 p.m. Moved to Third Friday due to SANDAG Retreat)</td>
<td>February 18, 2005 (12:30 p.m. to 2 p.m.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 8, 2005</td>
<td>April 22, 2005</td>
<td>April 1, 2005</td>
<td>April 1, 2005</td>
<td>April 8, 2005</td>
<td>April 8, 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 8, 2005</td>
<td>July 22, 2005</td>
<td>July 1, 2005</td>
<td>July 1, 2005</td>
<td>July 8, 2005</td>
<td>July 8, 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 12, 2005</td>
<td>August 26, 2005</td>
<td>August 5, 2005</td>
<td>August 5, 2005</td>
<td>August 12, 2005</td>
<td>August 12, 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 9, 2005</td>
<td>September 23, 2005</td>
<td>September 2, 2005</td>
<td>September 2, 2005</td>
<td>September 9, 2005</td>
<td>September 9, 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 14, 2005</td>
<td>October 28, 2005</td>
<td>October 7, 2005</td>
<td>October 7, 2005</td>
<td>October 14, 2005</td>
<td>October 14, 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*November 2005 (To be scheduled if needed)</td>
<td>*November 18, 2005 (Third Friday)</td>
<td>*November 4, 2005 (First Friday, Committee only meets once due to Thanksgiving Holiday)</td>
<td>November 4, 2005</td>
<td>*November 4, 2005 (First Friday)</td>
<td>*November 18, 2005 (12:30 – 2 p.m., Following Board Meeting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*December 2, 2005 (Third Friday)</td>
<td>*December 16, 2005 (Third Friday)</td>
<td>*December 9, 2005 (Second Friday, Committee only meets once due to Christmas Holiday)</td>
<td>December 2, 2005 (Following Board Policy Meeting)</td>
<td>*December 2, 2005 (First Friday)</td>
<td>December 9, 2004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Changes to normal schedule due to holidays shown in bold
- Board Meetings on the second Friday of each month will take place as needed based on the schedule
- August meetings will be held if needed

Last Updated: 12/21/2004 3:05 PM
approval of october 1, 2004 meeting minutes

action: upon a motion by councilmember jim madaffer (city of san diego) and a second by mayor maggie houlihan (north county coastal), the minutes of the october 1, 2004, meeting were unanimously approved.

2. public comments/communications/member comments

there were no public comments, communications, or member comments.

reports

3. proposed approach for integrating the implementation of the regional comprehensive plan (rcp) and the update of the regional transportation plan (rtp)

bob leiter, director of land use and transportation planning, provided a presentation with an overview of the rcp vision and policy framework, discussion of some of the key strategies in the rcp dealing with transportation and land use coordination, and next steps in implementing the plan. the rcp began with a vision for our region in the year 2030. based on this vision, the rcp set forth a policy framework based on three themes: (1) better connecting land use and transportation plans both at the local and regional level, (2) using those coordinated plans to guide our other plans and investments, and (3) making it happen through incentives and collaboration. the rcp includes strategic initiatives in each of the following areas: land use/transportation, housing, economic development, healthy environment, public facilities, borders, and performance monitoring and analytical tools, and identifies priorities and time frames for completion of those initiatives. the core initiatives that connect land use and transportation include the smart growth incentive program, the regional housing needs assessment (rhna), performance indicators and targets, a smart growth concept map, an updated regional growth forecast, and an updated regional transportation plan (rtp). the overall goal of these initiatives is to
further integrate our land use and transportation plans and policies, and provide incentives that promote the implementation of those plans and policies.

He then explained the goals and steps necessary for implementing each of these core initiatives.

The goals of the Smart Growth incentive Program are to support smart growth with regional transportation investments, provide regional funding for infrastructure and planning, provide local incentives, and acquire funding for activities from outside agencies. The steps to implement this program are developing pilot program guidelines, implementing the pilot program, evaluating the pilot program results, and developing and implementing the long-term program (beyond FY 05).

The goals for the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) are to set five-year targets for housing capacity at the regional level, and by jurisdiction and income category, and provide assistance to communities in meeting these targets. The steps to meet these goals are to prepare the draft Needs Assessment, conduct a public review, and adopt the final Needs Assessment. The SANDAG Board is scheduled to adopt the RHNA in January 2005.

The steps for implementing the performance indicators and targets are to prepare a baseline monitoring report, develop the performance targets, and adopt the Performance Indicators and Targets (by June 2005).

The goals for the Smart Growth Concept Map are to identify areas in the region that currently exhibit smart growth features or could be planned to promote smart growth principles, which aim to provide more compact land uses and good urban design, provide travel choices, provide employment opportunities near housing, provide more housing choices, increase infrastructure capacity in smart growth areas, and protect open space and habitat areas. Mr. Leiter said that from a geographic perspective the focus is in the western part of the region. The Concept Map will try to identify areas where smart growth makes sense and will connect well with the regional transportation system. From a transportation perspective the Concept Map would lay out a future network of transit facilities and show the potential locations of over 140 regional transit stations. The main focus of the Smart Growth Concept Map will be to connect transit station locations and adjacent land uses.

Mr. Leiter commented that one size does not fit all in Smart Growth place types. The RCP defines seven different smart growth “place types” ranging from the metropolitan center to rural communities. The steps to implement the Smart Growth Concept Map are to work with local planners to prepare a draft Concept Map, hold public workshops and meetings to gather input, refine the Concept Map as a result of that input, and adopt the Concept Map by September 2005.

Mayor Houlihan (North County Coastal) asked if local planners will be communicating with their various city councils. Mr. Leiter replied that SANDAG staff will be available to make presentations to city councils and to work with city staffs to keep the communication flowing. Mr. Gallegos noted that he meets with city managers on a monthly basis.
Mr. Leiter continued his report with the goals of the Updated Regional Growth Forecast, which are to incorporate the “Regional Housing Needs” targets, reflect new land use inputs from local general plan updates and the Smart Growth Concept Map, and update interregional modeling. The steps to implement the Updated Regional Growth Forecast are to perform a technical analysis, release the draft forecast, conduct a public input process, and adopt the final forecast by February 2007. This work will be conducted in connection with the RTP.

Mr. Leiter said that the goals for updating the RTP are to update the 2030 regional transportation network with the updated growth forecast and the smart growth land use concepts using the best available service concepts and technologies, and update the network phasing, policies, and project evaluation criteria.

Mr. Leiter said that depending upon the outcome of the pending federal transportation reauthorization legislation, we will need to complete the next RTP update within either a three-year or four-year cycle. Under the four-year cycle we would incorporate the technical analysis and work products of the other core RCP initiatives in a comprehensive RTP update. However, the time constraints of the three-year cycle would limit what could reasonably be accomplished, and would rely on the currently adopted 2030 growth forecast and primarily incorporate technical updates to cost estimates, financial forecasts, etc.

Mr. Leiter reported that there would be a series of technical reports that would be developed for the following areas and incorporated into the RTP: the effects of smart growth plans on transportation needs and plans; independent review of the Regional Transit Vision; the effects of interregional commuting from Mexico, and Riverside and Imperial Counties; the effects of tribal reservation development; intermodal connections and freight needs, the effects of public safety and homeland security; a transportation systems management update; a transportation demand management update; the relationship between transportation and energy needs; and the relationship of the RTP with regional plans for air quality, natural habitats, and water quality. Mr. Leiter asked Committee members if there were other topics that have not been mentioned.

Mayor Houlihan asked if these reports would be geared to work with habitat plans. Janet Fairbanks, Senior Regional Planner, answered affirmatively.

Jim Bond, representing the San Diego County Water Authority, asked if alternative arterial street routes would be evaluated to avoid the congestion on Interstate 5 (I-5). He also wanted to know what kind of incentives or work will be done to improve other routes besides I-5. Mr. Leiter responded that staff will look at the overall network, which includes the arterials. Work similar to the North County Parkway Plan and other studies of arterial needs will be done and alternatives modeled. Mr. Gallegos said that how much will be done will depend upon available resources.

Mr. Bond stated that the Governor and the Legislature have allowed hybrids into the high-occupancy-vehicle (HOV) lanes. He said that sales of hybrid cars are high and wondered if that will congest the HOV lanes.
Pedro Orso-Delgado, Caltrans, said that the number of hybrid vehicles at this point is not a significant impact on the HOV lanes. He also said that we need to coordinate local development and arterial planning.

Supervisor Pam Slater (County of San Diego) stated that some of the arterial roads would have been expensive and not feasible to build. We need to look at the overall topography adjacent to housing developments to make a determination about what roads would be needed by the housing development. Mr. Gallegos pointed out that it is a Catch-22 situation because you can’t get the densities you need if you don’t have the infrastructure to support them.

Chair Pfeiler commented this is why the RCP and RTP need to be married.

Mr. Madaffer asked what happens to the incentive program in Proposition A if the measure doesn’t pass. Mr. Gallegos replied that it will be a struggle to come up with funding for that program if it doesn’t pass. The State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) does not have any new money in it. An alternate funding source would be the next federal transportation bill.

Councilmember Madaffer stated that the technical working group will need to be sensitive to that. Mr. Leiter agreed that the Technical Working Group will be looking to ensure funding sources and to size the pilot program to fit available funds.

Mayor Pfeiler said that less funding will result in the program criteria becoming more restrictive.

Kim Kawada, Principal Planner, said that $17 million in TEA funds have been identified to fund the incentive program called for in MOBILITY 2030; however, the funding sources of the other $8 million have not yet been identified.

Councilmember Madaffer cautioned the Committee that there may be opposition to the development of smart growth opportunity areas. He expressed his desire to make certain that we are tying in existing or planned preserves, open space, or habitat areas. He noted that if the federal law remains unchanged and we have to adopt the RTP in 2006, we may not be able to implement the core initiatives. Mr. Leiter said that if a federal reauthorization bill is not approved, we will not be able to provide a full-blown update of the growth forecast and we would not be able to fold the smart growth information into that forecast and the RTP. If that happens we would meet the federal requirements but we would continue to work on a more refined plan that would include those initiatives. We could then go back and amend the RTP a year later.

Mr. Bond said that the $25 million is not much of an incentive when you divide it up between 18 cities and the County.

David Druker, representing the North San Diego County Transit Development Board (NCTD), asked if the Concept Map will include the Del Mar fairgrounds, parks, and the new airport. Mr. Leiter said that was a good point and those areas could be included as special use centers.
Mr. Leiter stated that the six initiatives are interrelated to make a connection between land use and transportation. Once the RTP update is complete, we will have a functional plan that implements the goals and policies of the RCP related to land use and transportation coordination. The next steps are to prepare work programs for each core initiative, establish the stakeholders working group, organize subregional staff teams at SANDAG to collaborate with local agencies, and implement the work program.

**Action:** The report was accepted by the Regional Planning Committee.

4. **CREATION OF A NEW REGIONAL PLANNING STAKEHOLDERS WORKING GROUP**

Ms. Fairbanks reported that this item relates to the creation of a new stakeholders working group. The original stakeholders working group completed its work on the RCP in June, and it was deemed a success. Staff would have this group work on RCP implementation and the RTP update. She explained that the Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group would work in an advisory capacity to the Regional Planning (RPC) and Transportation Committees (TC) on specific RCP implementation and RTP preparation activities. SANDAG staff would take draft reports and recommendations to the Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group, the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (RPTWG), and the City/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) for advice and input. Then, their recommendations would be presented to the RPC and the TC for recommendation to the SANDAG Board.

Ms. Fairbanks explained that staff would follow the same format in terms of recruiting and appointing members as for the initial working group. There would be about 22-25 members recruited from all over the region representing various interests. Staff would prepare a membership application and solicit groups through the SANDAG Web site, our internal mailing lists, and in newspapers.

Mayor Houlihan asked that press releases on this solicitation be transmitted electronically to RPC members.

Ms. Fairbanks said that staff would develop criteria for a selection committee to rank the applications. The selection committee would be made up of two members from the RPC and two from the TC, SANDAG staff, and two members each from the RPTWG and the CTAC. In January 2005, the RPC and the TC would be asked to recommend to the SANDAG Board for approval.

Mayor Houlihan and Supervisor Slater volunteered to be on the selection committee.

Ms. Fairbanks stated that the creation of this new stakeholders working group would be acted on by the SANDAG Board at its November 19 meeting. A notice about the selection of Working Group members would be published the following day, with two weeks provided to accept applications. She suggested that the selection panel meet before the holidays. This will allow staff the time to put together the paperwork for appointing the working group members in January 2005 and would allow the Stakeholders Working Group to hold its first meeting in February 2005.
Mayor Houlihan asked how often this Working Group would meet. Ms. Fairbanks replied that it would likely meet once a month.

Mayor Houlihan noted that the reappointment process described in the staff report states that if a member misses three meetings, he/she would be replaced. She thought that should be reduced to missing two meetings in a row.

Mayor Pfeiler suggested that this section be amended to indicate that if a member misses two meetings in a row or three meetings over the course of one year, that he/she would be replaced.

Councilmember Madaffer said that information ought to be provided up front. Ms. Fairbanks agreed to make that change and to publish the meeting schedule so that members will know ahead of time when the meetings will be held.

Mr. Gallegos suggested that since Councilmember Madaffer sits on both the RPC and the TC, he would be a good candidate for the selection panel.

Ms. Fairbanks suggested that the selection panel meet on either December 15 or 16.

Councilmember Madaffer agreed to participate upon approval of the TC Chair.

Supervisor Slater indicated that December 16 would work best for her calendar.

Action: Upon a motion by Supervisor Slater and a second by Mayor Houlihan, the RPC unanimously recommended creation of a Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group outlined in this report, and approved Mayor Maggie Houlihan and Supervisor Pam Slater-Price as the two representatives from the RPC for the selection panel for the working group.

5. PILOT SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM

Stephan Vance, Senior Regional Planner, reported that MOBILITY 2030 calls for the development of an initial five-year, $25 million pilot smart growth incentive program. 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. This pilot program would be a precursor to the anticipated longer-term, $280 million funding program proposed in the extension of TransNet. Lessons learned from the pilot program would be used to develop the longer-term incentive program.

The California Transportation Commission (CTC) has provided an estimate of Transportation Enhancement (TE) funds available to regional agencies of about $17 million 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.
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 uses for TE funds but, in the last funding cycle, SANDAG focused the use of these funds on four project types that supported the following key regional priorities: projects supporting transit-oriented development, regional corridor and feeder bikeways, scenic viewed or wildlife corridor acquisitions, or corridor or gateway enhancements. For this cycle it is recommended that these funds be refocused exclusively for the Smart Growth Incentive Program.

Mr. Vance stated that this item has been presented to the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG) and CTAC to discuss various approaches to the program. It was the recommendation from those groups that SANDAG should do the program in one call for projects and only fund those projects that are “ready to go” and that showcase the benefits of smart growth.

Mr. Vance reviewed the schedule for implementing this program. Staff is suggesting that a joint ad hoc working group of CTAC and TWG members be formed to determine the administration process and project selection criteria. This would be performed over the next two months, with a report back in January containing the group’s recommendations for the proposed program. Staff will take this item to the Transportation Committee for concurrence and then to the SANDAG Board. A call for projects would be issued in February 2005. The selection process would be worked through the working groups, the RPC, the Transportation Committee in March, and project recommendations would be presented to the SANDAG Board in April 2005.

Mr. Vance noted that this process is a little different this time around because these projects have to go through a Caltrans review process and receive approval by the CTC. He noted that the state has very strict “use it or lose it” funding provisions. The CTC would act on the project recommendations by July 2005 for approval and project development in the next fiscal year.

Mr. Druker asked how the list of projects in Attachment 2 relates to this pilot program. Mr. Vance said the list includes the projects funded in the past with TE funds.

Mr. Gallegos clarified that the list was intended to show the kinds of projects that were previously funded with TE funding. The recommendation now is to focus the funding on smart growth projects.

Chair Pfeiler stated that this is an affirmation that we are changing the focus for the expenditure of these funds.

Mr. Bond clarified that this is not new money, but a new focus on spending TE monies.

Supervisor Slater-Price pointed out that TE requires a local match of about 12 percent.

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Madaffer and a second by Mayor Houlihan, the Committee unanimously approved the proposed approach for the Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program.
Susan Baldwin, Senior Regional Planner, reported that on September 24, 2004, the SANDAG Board accepted the Draft RHNA numbers for the 2005-2010 housing element cycle for a 90-day public review period. SANDAG is seeking comments on the draft RHNA numbers by December 31, 2004. She said that staff is available to make presentations on this matter to city councils and the County Board of Supervisors. Staff also has scheduled a meeting with the City/County Management Association on December 2, 2004, and will be talking to them about the RHNA process, the draft numbers, and other issues. The area Planning Directors are invited to that meeting. A Policy Board meeting will be held on January 14, 2005, to talk about housing issues related to the RHNA. The issues that were previously raised included real ways that the region can provide affordable housing and how best to meet the housing element law, tools for providing affordable housing (federal and state subsidies, etc.), inclusionary housing, second units, and what areas are most appropriate to provide additional multifamily-zoned land.

Mayor Houlihan suggested that we obtain information from areas that have tried inclusionary housing or accessory units and find out the methods used, how it works, what the loopholes are, and whether these approaches pay off.

Mr. Druker agreed with the regional and subregional type of planning and the possibility of partnering with adjacent cities or areas to meet the RHNA numbers.

Mayor Houlihan suggested that staff gather information on the experience in Hermosa Beach on the additional zoning that occurred in that area.

Bob Emery, representing MTS, indicated that Poway has already had a meeting with staff to discuss these items. One of the major issues is the flexibility to put affordable housing where it might feasibly be built. It’s not a matter of not wanting affordable housing; rather, it is a matter of having the land and the zoning for it. He added that a large percentage of the City of Poway is designated for preservation through the Multiple Species Conservation Plan (MSCP). He expressed support for arrangements with other jurisdictions to meet the RHNA numbers.

Mr. Gallegos challenged the RPC members and the planning directors to come up with a way to work together to resolve this issue. He said it is especially challenging when the RHNA number we get from the state exceeds the housing capacities of the local general plans. He was in favor of subregional planning, but said that we have to work with the planning directors on this concept. Meeting the RHNA will continue to get tougher in the future.

Mayor Houlihan stated that even if we increase the zoning, we have to be sure that we can build what needs to be built.

Supervisor Slater stated that there are three things that work against subregional planning: (1) the mandate that we had to have affordable housing in each community; (2) developers were given incentives to build units that would then sunset their affordability status in
20-30 years; and (3) jurisdictions were not given credit for older units that might become more affordable.

Mr. Gallegos stated that we have some flexibility, though he expected some input from housing advocates about the social equity issue. The state Secretary of Business, Transportation, and Housing is really focused on this and wants to tie investments in transportation with housing. The state will be asking the question, “Are we investing our transportation dollars in the right place?”

Action: The Committee received this item for information.

7. PROPOSAL FOR SHOWCASING LOCAL SMART GROWTH EFFORTS

Ms. Kawada reported that next month the City of Chula Vista will provide information about Otay Ranch as an example of green field smart growth development. In January 2005, the City of La Mesa is scheduled to make a presentation on its redevelopment plans as an example of smart growth in older, built-out communities.

The Committee expressed interest in receiving future presentations on smart growth efforts. Ms. Kawada asked Committee members to notify her of ideas for future presentations.

Action: The Committee received this item for information.

8. UPCOMING MEETINGS

The next meeting of the Regional Planning Committee is scheduled for 12 noon to 2 p.m. on Friday, December 3, 2004.

9. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Pfeiler adjourned the meeting at 1:28 p.m.

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Key Staff Contact: Carolina Gregor, (619) 699-1989, cgr@sandag.org
<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 Druker</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</td>
<td>Gail Goldberg</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Working Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>Regional Planning Stakeholders</td>
<td>Lynne Baker for Carol Bonomo</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Working Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STATUS OF THE RCP BASELINE MONITORING REPORT

Introduction

The Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) talks about using performance indicators as a tool to track our progress in implementing the plan. It makes the point that many of the actions and paradigm shifts discussed in the plan will take years to develop and fund. Therefore, it is important to have a consistent set of indicators that can reflect the sometimes subtle changes that occur over the long run. The indicators listed in Chapter 8 of the RCP were developed to help us measure the plan’s effectiveness as it is implemented over time.

Monitoring our progress in implementing the RCP is both a good idea and a legal requirement. Assembly Bill 361 included the specific condition that SANDAG must monitor the progress through “realistic measurable standards and criteria which must be included in the RCP itself and made available to the public.”

The RCP Baseline Monitoring Report will be presented to the Regional Planning Committee in March 2005. It will describe the status of the various indicators by providing current data—typically calendar year 2003—as well as some historical data for comparison. Then, over the next few months, a task for the Regional Planning Committee, the Regional Planning Technical Working Group, and the Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group will be to develop quantitative short-range and long-range targets for each indicator. In other words, the Baseline Report describes where we are today, and where we have been in the recent past. Now the question is, exactly where do we want to be in 10 years? How about in 30 years?

Discussion

During the development of the RCP in early 2004, SANDAG’s Regional Planning Committee and the Regional Planning Technical and Stakeholders Working Groups discussed and developed a set of performance indicators to monitor the region’s progress toward achieving the goals and objectives of the RCP. A primary prerequisite for all of the annual indicators was that they must be based on data that are available, consistent, and reliable. In addition, the groups clarified other characteristics for the indicators:

- Regional: The indicators are intended to focus on the region as a whole, not on individual jurisdictions or subregions.

- Quality of Life: The indicators are to be used for monitoring the region’s quality of life and are not intended to be used as the criteria for distributing incentives. Overall, the indicators are
intended to answer the question: “Is RCP implementation having a positive impact on the region?”

- **Flexibility:** Some of the indicators may evolve. As new technologies and data resources become available, the list of indicators could be updated, and indicators that were once the best available could be replaced by better, more representative, or more informative indicators.

- **Annual and Periodic Indicators:** While it is the intent to update the indicators on an annual basis, the final project monitoring could include both a core group of annually-updated indicators and a set of periodic, more comprehensive indicators updated every three to five years. For example, specific habitat monitoring projects may only be feasible every few years, but would yield valuable information.

In addition, the indicators must interrelate with the “three Es” of sustainability: the Economy, the Environment, and social Equity. Sustainability is a key theme of the RCP, and is defined as “simultaneously meeting our current economic, environmental, and community needs while also ensuring that we are not jeopardizing the ability of future generations to meet their needs.”

Attachment 1 presents the final list of indicators as developed by the Regional Planning Committee and its working groups and included in Chapter 8 of the RCP. However, in collecting the data for the Baseline Report, it is becoming apparent that for various reasons some of the indicators will need to be delayed, modified, or dropped altogether. The March 2005 report to the Regional Planning Committee will include a full explanation of which indicators are affected and why.

BOB LEITER

Director, Department of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachment

Key Staff Contact: Bob Leiter, (619) 699-6980; ble@sandag.org
### 1. URBAN FORM / TRANSPORTATION

- **A.** Share of new units and jobs located in Smart Growth Opportunity Areas
- **B.** Share of new housing units within County Water Authority water service boundary
- **C.** Annual weekday transit ridership
- **D.** Commute mode shares (single-occupancy vehicles, carpool, transit, walking, biking, etc.)
- **E.** Travel times and volumes for key auto corridors and key transit corridors
- **F.** Miles of deficient roads on Congestion Management Program network
- **G.** Annual hours of delay per capita
- **H.** Regional crime rates

### 2. HOUSING

- **A.** Housing Affordability Index (compares median home ownership costs to median income)
- **B.** Percent of households with housing costs greater than 35 percent of income
- **C.** Ratio of new jobs to new housing units
- **D.** Share of new and existing units by structure type (single family, multifamily) and income category
- **E.** Vacancy rates
- **F.** Percent of households living in overcrowded conditions
- **G.** Number of households on the waiting list for Section 8 (housing assistance) Vouchers

### 3. HEALTHY ENVIRONMENT

**Natural Habitats**
- A. Habitat conserved within designated preserve areas (acres and percent of preserve area)
- B. Percent of preserve area actively maintained (removal of invasive species, trash removal, fence repairs)

**Water Quality**
- A. Number of beach closures and advisories per rainfall inch measured at Lindbergh Field
- B. Impaired waterbodies (miles or acres) based on Federal Clean Water Act 303(d) criteria

**Shoreline Preservation**
- A. Beach widths
- B. Lagoon health (salinity, dissolved oxygen levels)

**Air Quality**
- A. Air Quality Index (number of days "unhealthy for sensitive groups" with AQI > 100)

### 4. ECONOMIC PROSPERITY

- **A.** Regional unemployment rate compared to state and nation
- **B.** Real per capita income
- **C.** Regional poverty rate compared to state and nation
- **D.** Employment growth in high-wage economic clusters
- **E.** Educational attainment (Share of adult population with high school, college, and graduate education)

Continued....
5. PUBLIC FACILITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water Supply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Water consumption per capita and total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Diversity of water supply (share of regional water supply, by source)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Amount of reclaimed water used</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Energy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Kilowatt-hours of electricity used per capita at peak hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Share of energy produced in-county vs. imported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Share of energy produced from renewable resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Waste Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Percent of waste that is recycled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Landfill space available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. BORDERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BORDERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Border wait times for Secure Electronic Network for Travelers Rapid Inspection (SENTRI) lanes, and non-SENTRI lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Interregional commute volumes into San Diego from surrounding counties and Baja California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Participation in SENTRI Lanes, pedestrian commuter program, Free and Secure Trade (FAST) program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>