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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM #</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Introductions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2.    | APPROVE | Meeting Summary (Fred Luedtke)  
        The meeting summary for the January 6, 2005 meeting is attached. CTAC is asked to review and approve the meeting summary. |
| 3.    |        | Public Comments |
| 4.    | DISCUSSION | TransNet Early Action Program (Craig Scott)  
        SANDAG staff will present the attached TransNet Early Action Program for discussion purposes. This report was presented to the Board of Directors January 28, 2005. The early action projects will be discussed along with issues related to bonding for the Local Street and Road Program and audit requirements for the Maintenance of Effort ordinance provisions. |
| 5.    | DISCUSSION | Smart Growth Incentive Program (Stephan Vance)  
        In November 2004, CTAC appointed members to an Ad Hoc Working Group to establish details of a Smart Growth Incentive Program. Staff will present a summary of working group activities. Attached is a summary report that was presented at a joint meeting of the Regional Planning and Transportation Committees. The draft project screening criteria is included in the report. |
| 6.    | DISCUSSION | Smart Growth Concept Map (Carolina Gregor)  
        Attached is a summary report and schedule for developing a Smart Growth Concept Map. The map could be used to direct future transportation facility improvements. Staff will present the approach that will be used to develop the map. |
| 7.    | REFER | Traffic Signal Optimization Program (Richard Chavez)  
        Attached is a summary report including a list of traffic signal optimization projects recommended for funding by the San Diego Traffic Engineer’s Council (SANTEC). Due to inconsistencies in the evaluation criteria used to rank these projects, staff recommends referring this prioritized list of projects back to SANTEC for further discussion. Staff also recommends that SANTEC develop new evaluation criteria that are more quantitative in nature. |
| 8.    | INFORMATION | Regional Transportation Improvement Program - RTIP (Sookyung Kim)  
        At the January 2005 meeting, CTAC requested additional information regarding RTIP requirements for locally funded projects. Attached is a summary report that includes this information. |
9. Grade Separations for Rail Transit Crossings (José Nuncio)  
   In November 2004, CTAC appointed members to an Ad Hoc Working Group to establish evaluation criteria for prioritizing regional grade separations for rail transit crossings. To date, the working group has defined the scope of this effort and has begun to identify the elements that will be included in the criteria.

10. CTAC Charter (Richard Chavez)  
    In January 2005, CTAC appointed members to an Ad Hoc Working Group to revise the CTAC Charter. A meeting has been scheduled on February 1, 2005 to discuss possible revisions.

11. Announcements  
    CTAC members are encouraged to share items of interest.

The next CTAC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, March 3, 2005.  
+next to an agenda item indicates an attachment.
February 3, 2005

TO: Cities / County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC)
FROM: SANDAG staff
SUBJECT: January 6, 2005 Meeting Summary

Results of the meeting are summarized as follows.

Introductions
Doug Isbell (Vice-Chair) acted as meeting chair in the absence of Fred Luedtke (Chair).

Approval of Meeting Summaries
The meeting summary for the November 4, 2004 meeting was approved as presented.

Public Comments
There were no comments from the public.

Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP)
Sookyung Kim (SANDAG) presented the procedures and requirements for updating the RTIP. There was a discussion on the requirements for putting locally funded projects in the RTIP. Staff stated that it would research the issue and report back to CTAC.

Regional Arterial System Program
José Nuncio (SANDAG) presented a schedule extension recommendation for two projects including Plaza Boulevard widening in National City and Carroll Canyon Road extension in the City of San Diego. The action is a requirement of the Regional Arterial System Use-it-or-Lose-it policy. CTAC unanimously approved recommending the schedule extensions to the Transportation Committee.

CTAC Charter
Richard Chavez (SANDAG) presented the existing CTAC charter developed in 1993 and asked CTAC to appoint members to an Ad-Hoc Working Group to update the charter. The SANDAG Executive Committee has asked all committees to update their charters. CTAC appointed Fred Luedtke (Chair), Richard Leja (City of San Diego), Doug Isbell (County of San Diego), and Chandra Collure (Solana Beach) to the working group.
Caltrans New Director

Staff presented a press release announcing the appointment of Will Kempton as Director of Caltrans.

Announcements

Gary Vettese (Caltrans) stated that there is a statewide shortfall in the Highway Bridge Restoration and Reconstruction (HBRR) program and that some projects may need to be delayed. Caltrans is providing an advanced construction option to local agencies to help keep projects on schedule. Richard Leja (City of San Diego) stated that Dave Zamoras has replaced Patti Boekamp as director of capital improvements. Doug Isbell (County of San Diego) stated that the County Board of Supervisors would be considering developer impact fees at its upcoming meeting. Mr. Isbell requested that TransNet advanced bonding and a report from the ad-hoc working groups be placed on the next CTAC agenda. Carmen Kasner (City of Del Mar) requested that TransNet Maintenance of Effort issues be placed on the next CTAC agenda.
**DRAFT TRANSNET EARLY ACTION PROGRAM**

**Introduction**

In November 2004, San Diego County voters approved Proposition A extending the TransNet ½ cent sales tax for transportation through 2048. At the December meeting, the Board approved a work program outlining a set of tasks related to the implementation of the TransNet Extension. Some of these tasks began immediately following the passage of the ballot measure and others will continue over the next three fiscal years until the new program is fully phased in by FY 2009. This report provides an update on several of the major tasks currently underway, with a focus on tasks related to the identification of priority projects for early implementation – referred to as the draft TransNet Early Action Program.

Proposition A included a total of 47 major transportation infrastructure improvement projects and several transportation programs. The revenues from the sales tax extension will become available in FY 2009 (July 2008); however, the Board has the ability to issue bonds backed by the sales tax revenue stream to fund the implementation of an early action program, if the Board so chooses. Staff has prepared a Draft TransNet Early Action Program for the Board to review and discuss. Based on the direction provide to the staff at today’s meeting, as well as at the upcoming 2005 Board retreat, the program will be revised, funding needs will be identified, and a specific list of early action projects will be submitted as an amendment to the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) for the Board’s consideration at the February 25, 2005 Board meeting.

**Recommendation**

It is recommended that the Board review and discuss the Draft TransNet Early Action Program and authorize staff to proceed on the identified early action projects. The ongoing refinement of this Early Action Program and the overall implementation of the TransNet Extension will be a major topic of discussion at the 2005 Board Retreat.

**Discussion**

Staff has developed an early action program that will jump-start several of the key projects and programs contained in Proposition A. Once this Early Action Program is approved, staff can begin developing detailed financial strategies and schedules for advancing the early action projects and programs.
Proposed Early Action Projects

“Tier 1 Projects”: The first priority TransNet projects include those projects that remain uncompleted from the original 1987 TransNet Ordinance and Expenditure Plan. These projects include the widening of SR 76 between Melrose Drive and I-15, the extension of SR 52 from SR 125 to SR 67, and the Mid-Coast light rail extension from Old Town to University City (see attached map). Proposition A specified that these projects should receive priority treatment for implementation.

“Tier 2 Projects”: The second priority TransNet projects include projects on corridors already under construction or construction ready including the I-15 Managed Lanes Corridor from SR 78 to SR 163 and the SR 52 Managed Lane/HOV project from I-15 to SR 125. Efforts on these projects include advancing the design and construction work on the I-15 project and the environmental, design, and construction phases of the SR 52 project within a 5 to 7 year completion period. This proposed “get in and get out” strategy will minimize the disruption to the traveling public and give full utility to the corridor within a single condensed time frame, as opposed to phasing the improvements in smaller stages over a greater number of years. An additional set of projects will focus on completing environmental documents on the I-5 North Coast Corridor and segments of the I-805 Corridor in order to accelerate the future construction of these projects (see attached map).

Other Early Action Efforts

Plan of Finance Development: Staff has begun the process of updating the TransNet Plan of Finance to determine detailed cash flow needs related to the completing the current TransNet program through FY 2008 and, at the same time, to develop financing strategies for accelerating the implementation of projects from the new measure. As part of this effort, staff has initiated the process to competitively procure financial advisors, bond counsel, and investment bankers to assist with any debt financings to be approved by the Board. These procurement processes are expected to take 4-5 months. In the meantime, the Board has the ability to expand the current TransNet commercial paper program in less than two months. Staff has begun discussions with SANDAG’s financial advisor on this option. The use of commercial paper could provide a quick and cost-effective way to fund immediate cash flow needs on “Tier 1” and “Tier 2” TransNet projects. The commercial paper for immediate needs could then be rolled into a long-term, fixed rate debt issued at a later date once the new Plan of Finance is completed and approved by the Board and the new financing team is in place by the end of the fiscal year. Staff has also begun discussing Local Street and Road Program bond capacity issues with local agency staff through the Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC).

Environmental Mitigation Program: A critical factor for successful implementation of the early action projects is advancing the development of the TransNet Environmental Mitigation Program (EMP). Advancing the project mitigation packages will facilitate and expedite the delivery of the early action projects. Staff is beginning discussions with the resource agencies and permit holders next month on establishing habitat plan coverage for early action TransNet projects, and we hope to negotiate initial agreements on these projects over the next several months. In addition, staff has drafted options for the establishment of a regional entity to administer the Regional Habitat Conservation Fund contained within the EMP. We will discuss these options with the MSCP and MHCP permit holders and will then bring forward a recommended approach regarding this matter.
Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee (ITOC): Staff has initiated the solicitation process for individuals interested in applying for a position on the ITOC. Newspaper advertisements have been developed and a letter of interest has been distributed. Application forms are being mailed to all interested candidates. Applications are due by February 25, 2005. As described in the TransNet Extension Ordinance and Expenditure Plan, a Technical Screening Committee will be established to review applications and recommend candidates to the Selection Committee. The Selection Committee will make the final selection of the ITOC members. One of the first actions of the ITOC will be to review the financing strategies related to the implementation of the Early Action Program and provide recommendations to the Board.

Independent Transit Plan Review: Staff has begun efforts to competitively procure a consulting firm to conduct an independent review of the region’s long-range transit plan. The firm will focus its review on the transit technology and service concepts for the regional corridors. Parallel to this effort, an independent peer review committee is being established to help hire the consultant, define the scope of work, and review the consultant firm’s findings. Transit professionals from regions with operating bus rapid transit (BRT) services, transit guideways, and light rail services are being targeted to participate on the peer review committee. The first meeting of the Peer Review Panel will be in late March 2005 and the consultant contract is scheduled to be awarded in April 2005. We plan to bring a report to the Transportation Committee in March outlining the study work scope and process.

Maintenance of Effort Requirements: Through the Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC), staff has begun discussing the new Maintenance of Effort (MOE) requirements with local agency staff. These requirements specify that TransNet funds shall be used to augment, not supplant existing local revenues being used for transportation purposes. A special audit will be conducted, most likely in coordination with the FY 2005 fiscal audits, to establish the new MOE base for each jurisdiction. These new requirements and related changes to eligibility requirements for TransNet local street and road expenditures will continue to be discussed with CTAC.

Regional Transportation Congestion Improvement Program (RTCIP): Staff has begun efforts to competitively procure a consulting firm to complete a nexus study related to the $2,000 per dwelling unit private developer funding contribution required by the new TransNet Extension Ordinance. Staff has met with consulting firms experienced in conducting nexus studies. Staff has also conducted benchmarking of other California regions that have previously completed nexus studies. The TransNet Ordinance calls for the draft nexus study to be presented to the SANDAG Board within nine months of the passage of the proposition, or by August 2005. Staff expects to release an RFP to obtain a consultant to carry out the nexus study by early February and begin work related to this study one month later.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Key Staff Contact: Craig Scott (619) 699-1926; csc@sandag.org
Funds are budgeted in Work Element #11102
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 an 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.

  o 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.

  o 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. 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.
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

Attachment

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 requirement 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 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><strong>Urban Design Characteristics of Project Area (0-5 points)</strong></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><strong>Pedestrian Access Improvements (0-5 points)</strong></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><strong>Bicycle Access Improvements (0-5 points)</strong></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><strong>Transit Facility Improvements (0-5 points)</strong></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><strong>Streetscape Enhancements (0-5 points)</strong></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><strong>Traffic Calming Features (0-5 points)</strong></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><strong>Parking Improvements (0-5 points)</strong></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**
February 3, 2005

TO: Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC)

FROM: SANDAG Staff

SUBJECT: Development of the Smart Growth Concept Map

ACTION: INFORMATION

Introduction

The Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) contains policy objectives and actions aimed at improving transportation and land use coordination. A key recommendation is to identify “smart growth opportunity areas” and place a higher priority on directing transportation facility improvements and other infrastructure resources toward those areas.

The RCP defines seven categories of smart growth “place types,” ranging from “metropolitan center” to “rural community.” In addition, the RCP recommends that smart growth development be planned near existing and future transit stations identified in the adopted Regional Transportation Plan (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.

One of the RCP’s early actions is the development of a Smart Growth Concept Map illustrating the location of existing and planned smart growth areas, and potential smart growth areas. This report describes the overall approach for developing the Smart Growth Concept Map.

Background

The Concept Map will be used in relation to four SANDAG core initiatives (Attachment 1):

- The update of the Regional Growth Forecast;
- The development of land use scenarios for the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) update;
- The development of updated transportation project evaluation criteria as part of the RTP update; and
- Determining eligibility for the TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program.

The uses of the map will influence the production schedule and will determine the level of detail needed for each core initiative. The map will be updated periodically to reflect ongoing general plan amendments and updates. Regular updates to the map will ensure accurate land use inputs into the next growth forecast and RTP update process, and allow active participation by local jurisdictions in the TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program.
General Approach

The seven place types identified in the RCP fall into two distinct categories – “Existing and Planned Smart Growth Areas” and “Potential Smart Growth Areas” (Attachment 1), which will be illustrated on the map. Working with city and county planning staffs, SANDAG staff will evaluate the potential for the appropriate smart growth place types identified in the RCP to be located at transit-oriented locations specified in MOBILITY 2030, as well as opportunities in rural communities. The transit networks in both the Reasonably Expected Revenue scenario and the more robust Unconstrained Revenue scenario are candidate sites for smart growth areas.

The Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG) will serve as the lead advisory group in preparing the Concept Map. Input and direction will be solicited from the Regional Planning and Transportation Committees, the CTAC, the newly-constituted Stakeholders Working Group, the SANDAG Board of Directors, and the public.

Schedule

The schedule for preparing the Concept Map is tied to the 2007 RTP update schedule and the update of the Regional Growth Forecast. The land use assumptions for the “existing and planned” smart growth areas included on the Concept Map will be included in the Regional Growth Forecast, and will serve as the basis for developing the Existing Plans and Policies land use scenario. The land use assumptions for the “potential” smart growth areas will assist in developing the Enhanced Smart Growth land use scenario for the RTP update.

In order to allow sufficient time to develop the RTP land use scenarios, the final Smart Growth Concept Map is needed by September 2005. The following milestones are anticipated within this timeframe:

- TWG and CTAC review Preliminary Draft Concept Map: March 2005
- SANDAG Board accepts Draft Concept Map for public review: June 24, 2005
- Public Review Period: June – August 2005
- SANDAG Board accepts final Smart Growth Concept Map for use in preparing land use alternatives for the RTP update: September 23, 2005

---

1 Transit locations could include existing and future transit stations serving regional and corridor transit services such as the Trolley, Coaster, Sprinter, and bus rapid transit (BRT) corridors, as well as existing and future “urban corridor” service areas along key local transit routes, such as University Avenue and El Cajon Boulevard in San Diego and La Mesa.
Characteristics of Smart Growth Categories
And Uses of Smart Growth Concept Map
January 13, 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SMART GROWTH CATEGORIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing and Planned Smart Growth Areas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CHARACTERISTICS**

Existing and Planned Smart Growth Areas:

Places where existing development and/or planned land uses are consistent with the urban design characteristics and minimum residential and employment land use intensities described in the Smart Growth Matrix.

Potential Smart Growth Areas:

Opportunity areas where there is potential for the application of urban design characteristics and minimum residential and employment land use intensities described in the Smart Growth Matrix if appropriate changes are made to local plans.

**USES OF CONCEPT MAP**

1. Update of the Regional Growth Forecast

   Will be included in the Regional Growth Forecast.¹

   Will not be included in the Regional Growth Forecast.

2. RTP Update – Development of Land Use Scenarios

   a. Existing Plans and Policies Scenario

      Will be included in the Existing Plans and Policies Scenario.²

      Will not be used in the Existing Plans and Policies Scenario.

   b. Enhanced Smart Growth Scenario

      Will be included in the Enhanced Smart Growth Scenario, at same intensities as assumed in (a) above.

      Will be included in the Enhanced Smart Growth Scenario.

3. RTP Update – Update of Transportation Project Evaluation Criteria

   To Be Determined

   To Be Determined

4. TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program

   Eligible for both planning and infrastructure grants.

   Eligible for planning grants only.

¹ Jurisdictions that currently are in the process of updating their local plans may submit written correspondence to SANDAG requesting that particular areas demonstrating planned characteristics be considered as planned smart growth areas for forecasting purposes prior to the completion of their general plan update.

² The Existing Plans and Policies Scenario will include the Existing and Planned Smart Growth Areas, and will therefore contain the same information as the Regional Growth Forecast.
Introduction

The San Diego Traffic Engineer’s Council (SANTEC) is recommending the funding of five Traffic Signal Optimization Program (TSOP) projects. Due to inconsistencies in the ranking of these projects, staff recommends referring this prioritized list of projects back to SANTEC for further discussion. Staff also recommends that SANTEC develop new evaluation criteria that are more quantitative in nature.

Background

SANTEC is responsible for making project funding recommendations for the TSOP. Funding for this program comes from SANDAG’s Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) program. In September 2004, SANDAG issued a call for projects for the Traffic Signal Optimization Program (TSOP). Project applications totaling over $1.4 million were received. At it’s January 13, 2005 meeting, SANTEC developed a project priority ranking list shown in Attachment 1. New SANDAG procedures require that project funding recommendations from SANTEC be forwarded to CTAC and then to the Transportation Committee for final approval.

Discussion

Staff recommends that CTAC refer the project priority ranking list back to SANTEC for further discussion and development. There is a significant disconnect between the evaluation criteria developed by SANTEC, shown in Attachment 2, and the actual SANTEC member voting results, shown in Attachment 3. For example, the SPRINTER Rail Grade Crossing TSOP project received an equal number of high scores (2’s and 3’s) as it did low scores (10’s).

Another inconsistency includes the SANTEC recommendation to fund the City of San Diego’s project to install passive permissive left turn (PPLT) signals at 5 locations. This project is not on the Regional Arterial System. Optimizing arterials identified in SANDAG’s Regional Arterial System is listed as the second most important criteria.

There was also inconsistent representation in the scoring process. Seven of the twenty voting agencies did not participate in the vote. Staff believes this represents an unacceptably high level of non-participation in the process.
Technical working groups like SANTEC must develop and use both qualitative and quantitative evaluation criteria for ranking projects. Procedures must be in place to ensure that scarce regional transportation funds are used for projects that best meet the SANDAG Board of Directors established regional transportation goals and objectives. Staff recommends that SANTEC be directed to develop new, more quantitative, evaluation criteria. This will make the SANTEC TSOP project prioritization process more consistent with the current process that CTAC uses for prioritizing Regional Arterial System projects.
### SANTEC Project Ranking Recommendations
#### Traffic Signal Optimization Program (TSOP)

Available Reserve Funds: $927,847

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Requested Amount</th>
<th>Cumulative Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>City of Escondido</td>
<td>Centre City Parkway Retiming</td>
<td>$41,000</td>
<td>$41,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>Navajo Road Interconnect</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$91,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>Del Mar Heights Interconnect</td>
<td>$183,350</td>
<td>$274,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>City of Chula Vista</td>
<td>Adaptive Traffic Signal System (SCATS) Expansion</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$424,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>Install Passive Permissive Left Turn (PPLT) at 5 Locations*</td>
<td>$99,000</td>
<td>$523,350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cut-off: projects 1-5 recommended for funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Requested Amount</th>
<th>Cumulative Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>MTS, City of San Diego, SANDAG</td>
<td>Downtown Trolley Signal Study</td>
<td>$63,000</td>
<td>$586,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>SANDAG</td>
<td>Regional Arterial Management System (RAMS)</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$786,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>NCTD</td>
<td>SPRINTER/Signal Study</td>
<td>$165,000</td>
<td>$951,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>Balboa Avenue Interconnect</td>
<td>$331,700</td>
<td>$1,283,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>SANDAG</td>
<td>Integrated Workstation (RIWS)</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$1,483,050</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Requested Amount: $1,483,050

Notes:

* This project is not on the Regional Arterial System.
CMAQ FUND DISTRIBUTION AND PROJECT SELECTION CRITERIA

Approved by San Diego Regional Traffic Engineer’s Council
February 10, 2000

The following fund distribution and project selection criteria are provided for discussion, consideration purposes for new projects, and to ensure that such funding request meet the original CMAQ Traffic Signal Optimization program objectives.

The CMAQ Task Force recommends that SANTEC continue to distribute funds on the basis of project value. All funds will be available for specific projects which will be compete against each other using a priority evaluation system.

Project types will be prioritized in the following order:

Pre-approved projects

- Retime traffic signal – project cost less than $50,000 and $3,500 per intersection
- PPLT installation – project cost less than $12,500 per approach up to a total project cost of $50,000.

Projects submitted for priority selection process

1. Retime traffic signal – project cost over $50,000.
2. PPLT installation – project cost over $12,500 per approach or total project cost over $50,000.
3. Traffic signal central control computer systems and communication links.
4. Replace obsolete equipment/improve vehicle detection-minor signal modifications that can be shown to improve air quality such as overlaps and various left turn phasing.
5. Motorist information and monitoring systems.

Signal retiming and PPLT projects of low costs are pre-approved because they have a proven high air quality benefits-to-cost ration and simple retiming projects are relatively inexpensive.

Installation of new traffic signals, the widening of curb-to-curb or right-of-way dimensions and projects that are essentially maintenance and rehabilitation are not fundable under CMAQ guidelines.

The criteria for judging projects are listed below in priority order.

1. Improvement to air quality.
2. Arterials identified in SANDAG’S Regional Arterial System.
3. Regional implications/inter-jurisdictional coordination.
4. Roadway traffic volumes.
5. Demonstrated intelligent vehicle/highway systems, advanced traffic management systems.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>RIWS</th>
<th>RAMS</th>
<th>Centre City Pkwy</th>
<th>Navajo Road</th>
<th>SPRINTER Signals</th>
<th>Del Mar Heights</th>
<th>SCATS</th>
<th>Balboa Avenue</th>
<th>Trolley Signals</th>
<th>PPLT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Carlsbad</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Chula Vista</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Coronado</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Del Mar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of El Cajon</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Encinitas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Escondido</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Imperial Beach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of La Mesa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Lemon Grove</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of National City</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Oceanside</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Poway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Marcos</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santee</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Vista</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD weighted vote (3X)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Solana Beach</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County weighted vote (2X)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans weighted vote (2X)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranking</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
* Agency did not participate in vote
"1" represents the highest score, "10" the lowest
TO: Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC)

FROM: SANDAG staff

SUBJECT: Regional Transportation Improvement Program

At the January meeting, CTAC members requested documentation that shows the requirement that regionally significant projects funded entirely with local funds must be included in the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP). The following is an excerpt from the federal planning regulation 23 CFR 450.342. Section (f) (3) states that the RTIP shall include:

“All regionally significant transportation projects for which an FHWA or the FTA approval is required whether or not the projects are to be funded with title 23, U.S.C., or Federal Transit Act funds.”

In addition, section (f) (5) states that the RTIP shall include:

“For informational purposes and air quality analysis in nonattainment and maintenance areas, all regionally significant projects to be funded with non-Federal funds.”

As the designated Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), SANDAG is required to adhere to these regulations. During the last update of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), SANDAG staff worked with local agencies to define the Regionally Significant Arterial Network. This network is shown in Figure 6.2 of the 2030 RTP and further defined in Table TA 7.7 of the RTP Technical Appendices. Capacity increasing projects on this network must be included in the RTIP regardless of the funding source.