REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

Friday, April 1, 2005
9:30 a.m. to noon
SANDAG Board Room
401 B Street, 7th Floor
San Diego

A PORTION OF THIS MEETING WILL BE HELD JOINTLY WITH THE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

- SCHEDULE AND WORK PROGRAM FOR REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN (RTP) UPDATE
- PILOT SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM
- SMART GROWTH IN SOLANA BEACH
- BUS RAPID TRANSIT OVERVIEW

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.

San Diego Association of Governments · 401 B Street, Suite 800, San Diego, CA 92101-4231 · (619) 699-1900 · Fax (619) 699-1905 · www.sandag.org
Welcome to SANDAG. Members of the public may speak to the Regional Planning Committee on any item at the time the Committee is considering the item. Please complete a Speaker's Slip, which is located in the rear of the room, and then present the slip to Committee staff. Also, members of the public are invited to address the Committee on any issue under the agenda item entitled Public Comments/Communications/Member Comments. Speakers are limited to three minutes. The Regional Planning Committee may take action on any item appearing on the agenda.

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

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

SANDAG offices are accessible by public transit. Phone 1-800-COMMUTE or see www.sdcommute.com for route information.
**REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE**  
Friday, April 1, 2005

**9:30 A.M. - CONVENE JOINT MEETING WITH TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM #</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PUBLIC COMMENTS (A)</strong></td>
<td>INFORMATION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**A. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS**

Members of the public will have the opportunity to address the Regional Planning Committee and/or the Transportation Committee on any issue within the jurisdiction of the Committees. 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 ITEM (B)**

**+ B. STATUS REPORT ON THE NEW REGIONAL PLANNING STAKEHOLDERS WORKING GROUP (Hon. Jack Dale, SWG Chair; Carolina Gregor, Staff)**

The new Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group (SWG) has held their first two meetings. This item provides a status report on the group’s work to date, including the upcoming election of two Vice Chairs, who will represent the SWG on the Regional Planning and Transportation Committees.

**REPORTS (C-F)**

**+ C. WORK PROGRAM FOR THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN (RTP) UPDATE (Michael Hix)**

This report provides an overview of the work program and schedule for updating the RTP. A technical RTP update is expected in 2006 to meet the requirements of the normal three-year update cycle. A more comprehensive RTP update is anticipated in 2007; this 2007 update, which will be based on an updated 2030 Regional Growth Forecast, will incorporate the results of the Independent Transit Planning Review and the strategic initiatives from the adopted Regional Comprehensive Plan. The Regional Planning and Transportation Committees are asked to accept the proposed work program and schedule.
+D. PROGRESS REPORT ON PILOT SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM (Stephan Vance)  

Project selection criteria and program guidelines for the Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program are presented for comment by the Regional Planning and Transportation Committees. This program has been spearheaded by an ad hoc working group that includes local agency planning and public work staff members, and Councilmember Phil Monroe from the Transportation Committee. The Regional Planning Technical Working Group, City/County Transportation Advisory Committee, and the Stakeholders Working Group have all provided input on the program.

E. SHOWCASING LOCAL SMART GROWTH PROJECTS: SMART GROWTH IN SOLANA BEACH  (Greg Shannon, Representative for Shedonna / NCTD Solana Beach Mixed Use Project)

The Regional Planning and Transportation Committees have received periodic presentations featuring local smart growth efforts throughout the region. A presentation will be made on the mixed use project currently proposed at the North San Diego County Transit Development Board (NCTD) COASTER station in Solana Beach.

+F. BUS RAPID TRANSIT OVERVIEW (Bill Lieberman)

The definition and application of bus rapid transit is unique to each city and situation. Mr. Bill Lieberman, Transportation Planning and Operations Consultant, will present his research on bus rapid transit systems around the world and provide conclusions on his assessment of their characteristics and applicability to the San Diego experience and environment.

**ADJOURN JOINT MEETING WITH TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE**

+ 1. APPROVAL OF FEBRUARY 4, 2005, MEETING MINUTES  

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. ENERGY WORKING GROUP MEMBERSHIP (Rob Rundle)  APPROVE

The Energy Working Group has been meeting since March 2004 and is represented by elected officials and a cross-section of other interests. The Energy Working Group recommends that the membership be expanded to include additional representation from the Industrial Environmental Association and the University of California, San Diego.

4. UPCOMING MEETINGS  INFORMATION

The next Regional Planning Committee meeting will be held on Friday, May 6, 2005, from noon to 2 p.m.

5. ADJOURNMENT

+ next to an agenda item indicates an attachment
STATUS REPORT ON THE NEW REGIONAL PLANNING STAKEHOLDERS WORKING GROUP

Introduction

The SANDAG Board of Directors approved the creation of the new Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group (SWG) on November 19, 2004, to review and provide input into key activities associated with the implementation of the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) and the update of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The SANDAG Board approved the membership of the SWG on January 28, 2005.

The SWG will act in an advisory capacity to both the Regional Planning and Transportation Committees on specific RCP and RTP activities, including the development of the smart growth concept map, the smart growth incentive program, land use and transportation performance indicators and targets, and the RTP update.

To date, the SWG has met twice. This report provides information on the group's work to date, including the upcoming election of two vice chairs, who will represent the SWG on the Regional Planning and Transportation Committees.

Discussion

Topics Discussed to Date

At its first two meetings in February and March, the SWG received background presentations on SANDAG, the Regional Comprehensive Plan, the current RTP (MOBILITY 2030), the integration of the RCP implementation and the RTP update, and the Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program. Additionally, the SWG approved a Charter describing its purpose, responsibilities, and membership. Finally, the Working Group provided comments on the Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program, which will be relayed to the Committees as part of Agenda Item D.

Vice Chairs

Upon creating the SWG, the SANDAG Board of Directors appointed Councilmember Jack Dale of Santee as the Chair of the group. At its next meeting, the SWG members will elect two vice chairs.
The vice chairs will represent the SWG in an advisory capacity at future Regional Planning Committee and Transportation Committee meetings. A representative from the previous SWG, which was created to advise the Regional Planning Committee on the development of the RCP, served in an advisory capacity on the Regional Planning Committee, creating a direct link between the SWG and the RPC. The direct representation was helpful in relaying the SWG’s perspectives, and complemented the direct representation from the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG).

The SWG is scheduled to elect a first and second vice chair at its April 19, 2005, meeting, and those individuals will begin representing the SWG at the Regional Planning and Transportation Committee meetings in May 2005.

BOB LEITER
Director of land Use and Transportation Planning

Key Staff Contact: Carolina Gregor, (619) 699-1989; cgr@sandag.org
WORK PROGRAM FOR THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN (RTP) UPDATE

Introduction

SANDAG staff has prepared a draft work program and schedule for updating the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), MOBILITY 2030. The last update was completed in March 2003, and the next regularly scheduled update would occur in March 2006. Existing federal legislation requires SANDAG to make an air quality conformity determination of the long-range transportation plan every three years.

However, pending language in the federal transportation reauthorization legislation would change the normal update cycle to four years. This bill was passed by the House and sent to the Senate in mid-March. In addition, with an extended four-year cycle, staff proposes to develop a more comprehensive update of the RTP in 2007, incorporating a new regional growth forecast, strategic initiatives from the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP), the results of the Independent Transit Planning Review, and the funding impact of the TransNet extension. As a result, staff has developed a work program to produce both a technical RTP update in 2006 and a comprehensive RTP update in 2007. The Stakeholders Working Group provided initial feedback to the RTP Work Program on March 15, 2005.

Recommendation

This report provides the draft work program to update the Regional Transportation Plan in 2006 and again in 2007. The Regional Planning and Transportation Committees are asked to provide any additional comments and accept the draft RTP work program, schedule, and issue papers.

Discussion

Overall Work Program

Staff will provide an overview of the preliminary elements and schedules for the concurrent RTP updates. If the federal transportation legislation is reauthorized in the near future, the need for a 2006 RTP update could be eliminated. In that case, staff would focus its efforts on the issues and products necessary for the comprehensive 2007 RTP update.

Included with this item are five attachments. Attachment 1 is the 2006 RTP Schedule, and Attachment 2 is the 2007 RTP Schedule. Attachment 3, “2007 RTP Issue Papers,” provides more
detail and the envisioned schedule for the various special analyses that would feed into the 2007 RTP. As they are developed over the course of the next year, these issues will be brought for discussion to the various working groups and the Regional Planning and Transportation Committees.

Attachment 4, “RTP Work Program – 2006 and 2007 Updates,” outlines the major tasks and time frames associated with both the 2006 and 2007 RTP updates. Finally, Attachment 5, “2006 and 2007 RTP Milestones,” depicts the projected dates when milestone products or issues would be available for final review or action.

2007 RTP Issue Papers

SANDAG staff intends to produce several issue papers related to the development of the 2007 RTP. These papers highlight several of the unique inputs and analyses that will enhance the development of the RTP. A brief description of each issue paper and anticipated production schedule is shown on Attachment 3.

For example, two efforts are beginning that are independent of the RTP, but whose results will be incorporated into the 2007 RTP update. The first is the Independent Transit Planning Review, already scheduled to be conducted in 2005; this review is a follow-up action to the TransNet extension that was approved in November 2004. The results of this review will affect the transit network and service assumptions in the 2007 RTP. The second effort—Habitat Planning Issues—also is a result of the extension of TransNet, as work begins to set up habitat mitigation banks related to the development of transportation projects and identified funding.

Several other topics are routinely updated along with any RTP, but have a new focus with the adoption of the Regional Comprehensive Plan in 2004. They include land use forecasts, which include the Smart Growth Concept Map currently under development, a review of the Transportation Project Evaluation Criteria, and an update of the Regional Arterial System. However, the preparation of a Regional Freight Strategy is a new component under development specifically for the 2007 RTP.

Five other issue papers cover new areas or expansion of recent studies. They are Cross-Border Travel, Interregional Travel, Energy Demand and Infrastructure, Tribal Development Issues, and Public Safety/Homeland Security.

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachments

Key Staff Contact: Michael Hix (619) 699-1977; mhi@sandag.org
## 2006 Regional Transportation Plan Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR TASKS</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Update Revenue Scenarios</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update Project Costs &amp; Phasing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create Scenarios and EIR Alternatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare Draft RTP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare Draft EIR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Hearing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Final RTP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopt Final RTP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2007 Regional Transportation Plan Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR TASKS</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Issue Papers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP/Alternate Land Use Forecasts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update Project Evaluation Criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update Performance Indicators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Revenues and Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create Scenarios and EIR Alternatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare Draft RTP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare Draft EIR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Hearing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Final RTP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopt Final RTP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(See detailed breakout - Attachment 3)
## 2007 RTP - Issue Papers Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPICS</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independent Transit Planning Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Freight Strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Arterial System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smart Growth Concept Map</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Project Evaluation Criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross - Border Travel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interregional Travel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Demand and Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribal Development Issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat Planning Issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety &amp; Homeland Security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **2005**
  - Independent Transit Planning Review
  - Regional Freight Strategy
  - Regional Arterial System
  - Smart Growth Concept Map
  - Transportation Project Evaluation Criteria
  - Cross - Border Travel
  - Interregional Travel
  - Energy Demand and Infrastructure
  - Tribal Development Issues
  - Habitat Planning Issues
  - Public Safety & Homeland Security

- **2006**
  - Independent Transit Planning Review
  - Regional Freight Strategy
  - Regional Arterial System
  - Smart Growth Concept Map
  - Transportation Project Evaluation Criteria
  - Cross - Border Travel
  - Interregional Travel
  - Energy Demand and Infrastructure
  - Tribal Development Issues
  - Habitat Planning Issues
  - Public Safety & Homeland Security

- **2007**
  - Independent Transit Planning Review
  - Regional Freight Strategy
  - Regional Arterial System
  - Smart Growth Concept Map
  - Transportation Project Evaluation Criteria
  - Cross - Border Travel
  - Interregional Travel
  - Energy Demand and Infrastructure
  - Tribal Development Issues
  - Habitat Planning Issues
  - Public Safety & Homeland Security
2007 RTP Issue Papers

Brief descriptions of topics to be covered in each issue paper are listed below. They have been grouped into the four major components of mobility from the 2030 MOBILITY RTP. Feedback from a March 15, 2005 meeting with the Stakeholders Working Group has been incorporated.

SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT ISSUE PAPERS

- **Independent Transit Planning Review.** The reassessment of the MOBILITY 2030 Transit Network would be completed by December 2005. The study involves a consultant and peer review group. At its completion, alternative networks may be recommended for analysis. This work should be done by March 2006 so that the entire transit/highway/arterial networks can be reviewed and go to the Board for inclusion in the draft RTP. In relation to the Independent Transit Review, members of the Stakeholders WG want the evaluation to include an evaluation of how well local service will connect with new regional services.

- **Regional Freight Strategy.** Staff will coordinate with rail, truck, ship, air, and pipeline infrastructure providers and users to develop a long-range and integrated freight strategy for the region. The individual modal assessment will be completed for the 2006 RTP Update. The intermodal strategy will be completed for the 2007 RTP.

- **Regional Arterial System.** The definition of a regional arterial and the selection of the Regionally Significant Arterial System should be reviewed and updated for the 2007 RTP. This should be done in context of the future TransNet development fee for regional facilities.

- **Transportation Project Evaluation Criteria.** This task is two-fold. First, SANDAG should develop a process to prioritize regional corridors for future improvements. Second, the existing project evaluation criteria in the RTP should be updated, giving more consideration to transportation projects that are tied to and promote smart growth development. Another category of projects that will have specialized evaluation criteria are Rail Grade Separation projects. The development of this issue paper also should consider whether intermodal projects from the regional freight strategy can be prioritized with other regional projects or should be considered separately. The criteria would be used to develop the networks for the 2007 RTP funding scenarios.

LAND USE/TRANSPORTATION CONNECTION ISSUE PAPERS

- **Smart Growth Concept Map.** A preliminary Smart Growth Concept Map, which illustrates locations where smart growth land uses are already planned or should be considered by local jurisdictions as they update their general plans, is expected to be completed by June 2005, with a final map to be completed by September 2005. This time frame would give staff the opportunity to create and discuss smart growth land use alternatives for analysis in the 2007 RTP.
• **Cross-Border Transportation Issues.** Given increasing development across the border in Baja California, this issue paper would assess the transportation impacts of cross-border travel. It would include the impacts of the new East Otay Mesa POE on the location of planned BRT routes and commercial inspection facilities.

• **Interregional Transportation Issues.** SANDAG staff is currently working with staff of the Western Riverside County Council of Governments (WRCOG) and Caltrans on Phase II studies of the I-15 corridor. These studies will include an evaluation of potential for increasing job opportunities in Riverside County, increased housing opportunities in San Diego County, and specific transportation facility and service improvements that should be planned to serve existing and future commuting patterns on the I-15 corridor. The outcomes of these studies would be presented. In addition, this issue paper will address the growing stock of housing in Imperial County and the travel to and from the San Diego region. What impacts does this recent trend have on the regional transportation system?

• **Habitat Planning Issues.** The new TransNet-funded Environmental Mitigation Program is intended to improve the preservation of habitat areas associated with regional transportation projects. How will the new program be implemented related to identified Early-Action TransNet Projects and other projects in the 2007 RTP identified for early development?

• **Tribal Reservation Development Issues.** New development on tribal reservations has caused traffic impacts in rural areas. How can the region better assess the potential impacts on regional facilities from reservation development and plan for the transportation facilities needed to avoid related congestion? The analysis would be done in collaboration with the individual tribes to assess the existing and planned land uses on tribal lands, and incorporate to the greatest degree possible the travel generated from these sources along with the rest of the regional inputs.

**DEMAND MANAGEMENT ISSUE PAPERS**

• **Energy Demand and Infrastructure.** What types of Transportation Demand Strategies can affect the energy demands of the region for the movement of people and goods? As the cost of energy goes up, how can the region reduce its demand for transportation-related energy and the resulting pollutants? Can transportation corridors also serve as energy/utility corridors?

**SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT ISSUE PAPERS**

• **Public Safety and Homeland Security.** This issue paper will evaluate the impacts of Homeland Security directives on the regional transportation system, as well as looking at issues related to improving safety on the highways and transit system. One issue of public safety brought up at the Stakeholders’ WG meeting was developing a regional strategy to deal with planned or unplanned events which shut down a major transportation corridor or facility.
RTP Work Program - 2006 and 2007 Updates

1. **Establish Work Program** (March 2005)
   - 2006 RTP based on federal 3-year cycle; includes only updated funding scenarios based on revised revenue projections and project cost estimates; 2007 RTP intended to be comprehensive and incorporate better land use and transportation coordination, as outlined in the RCP.
   - Review work program with SWG, RPTWG, CTAC (March 2005).
   - Take to the Transportation Committee / Regional Planning Committee (April 1, 2005).

2. **Review RTP Goals and Policy Objectives** (June 2005)
   - Incorporate RCP directives and Strategic Initiatives.
   - Incorporate Caltrans RTP Supplement guidelines.
   - Obtain direction from the Board for 2007 RTP (June 2005).

3. **Develop and Review Issue Papers** (March 2005–June 2006). These reports will be reviewed by the advisory and policy committees. Attachment 3 discusses these topics and their content in more detail.

4. **Public Outreach and Involvement**
   - Subregional workshops for the 2006 and 2007 RTP.
   - Mini-grants for outreach to minority/low income groups.
   - Work with communications staff to schedule events and outreach products; bring results to TC/RPC.

5. **Update Revenue and Project Cost Projections, with improved operating forecasts**
   - Incorporate improved operating costs in the projections, as directed by Federal Highways and Federal Transit Administration after the 2003 RTP.
   - For 2006 RTP, select new base year to be used for both the 2006 and 2007 RTPs. Update project costs and revenue forecasts for the Revenue Constrained and Reasonably Expected funding scenarios, incorporating the TransNet extension (May 2005).
   - For 2007 RTP, review project costs and revenue forecasts for the Revenue Constrained and Reasonably Expected funding scenarios, incorporating TransNet II and TEA-LU, if new legislation is passed (June 2006).
6. **Incorporate recommendations from Corridor/Subarea Studies/Deficiency Plans for 2007 RTP** (June 2006). These studies could possibly be summarized as an issue paper(s) and brought to the Working Groups for review.

- I-805 Corridor and Direct Access Ramp (DAR) study
- I-5 North Coast
- Central I-5 HOV analysis
- North South Transportation Corridor Analysis


   - Create Capacity File for Existing Plans and Policies (July 2005).
   - Generate New Existing Policies Forecast (December 2005).
   - Use Smart Growth Land Use Concept Map from September 2005 to generate land use alternative(s) for 2007 RTP analysis (March 2006).

8. **Update Performance Indicators**

   - The performance indicators used to measure the success of transit and highway networks should be reevaluated and updated to be consistent with the goals and policy objectives of the Board (February 2006).

   - Update base year and projected Levels of Service, travel time, speed and other indicator data for the 2007 RTP (March – August 2006).

9. **Develop Network and/or Land Use Alternatives**

   - 2006 RTP – Develop EIR alternatives to include SOFAR agreement (March – June 2005).
   - 2007 RTP – Land Use and network alternatives need to be developed by March 2006. Recommended changes and analyses from the Independent Transit Planning Review need to be developed in time to meet these deadlines.


    - Perform travel forecasts.
    - Apply updated performance measures, such as overall LOS and average corridor travel times, to provide a grid of overall effectiveness of each alternative.
    - Select Preferred Network; review with WGs, Committees and gain Board approval (June 2006).
11. **Update Network Phasing**
   - Create new Revenue Constrained and Reasonably Expected funding scenarios.
   - Employ revised evaluation criteria to assist in project selection for 2007 RTP scenarios.
   - Review with Working Groups and gain approval from TC and Board.

12. **Perform Air Quality (AQ) forecasts**
   - Address FTA/FHWA requirement for better documentation on SOV alternatives for AQ analysis.
   - Follows the selection of the Revenue Constrained scenario of the preferred network alternative.
   - AQ for 2006 RTP provided along with draft EIR (Nov 2005); revisions for final RTP (March 2006).
   - AQ for 2007 RTP provided along with draft EIR (Nov 2006); revisions for final RTP (March 2007).

13. **Produce Draft RTP**
   - Preliminary drafts sent to Transportation Committee in August.
   - RTP 2006; include updated base-year data as available (October 2005).
   - RTP 2007 (October 2006).

14. **EIR Preparation**
   - EIR for RTP 2006 incorporating agreed-upon SOFAR alternative; draft EIR (Nov 2005); final (March 2006).
   - Updated EIR for RTP 2007, draft EIR (Nov 2006); final (March 2007).

15. **Revised Draft Final RTP**
   - RTP 2006 (February 2006).
   - RTP 2007 (February 2007).

16. **Final RTP/EIR Adoption**
   - RTP 2006 (March 2006).
   - RTP 2007 (March 2007).

17. **Air Quality Conformity**
## 2006 and 2007 RTP Milestones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MILESTONES</th>
<th>CTAC</th>
<th>TWG</th>
<th>SWG</th>
<th>RPC</th>
<th>TC</th>
<th>BOD</th>
<th>Public Workshops</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RTP Work Program</strong></td>
<td>Apr-05</td>
<td>Mar-05</td>
<td>Mar-05</td>
<td>Apr-05</td>
<td>Apr-05</td>
<td>Apr-05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2007 Revised Goals and Policies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jun-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2006 Network/Funding Alts</strong></td>
<td>May-05</td>
<td>May-05</td>
<td>May-05</td>
<td>Jun-05</td>
<td>Jun-05</td>
<td>Jun-05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2006 Prelim Draft RTP</strong></td>
<td>Aug-05</td>
<td>Aug-05</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aug-05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jul-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2006 Draft RTP</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oct-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2006 Draft EIR</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>June-05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Hearing RTP/EIR</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dec-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results of Public Outreach</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jan-06</td>
<td>Jan-06</td>
<td>Jan-06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Draft RTP Changes</strong></td>
<td>Jan-06</td>
<td>Jan-06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2006 Draft Final RTP</strong></td>
<td>Feb-06</td>
<td>Feb-06</td>
<td>Feb-06</td>
<td>May-06</td>
<td>May-06</td>
<td>May-06</td>
<td>Feb-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adopt Final 2006 RTP/EIR</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mar-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Air Quality Conformity Finding</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Apr-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Issue Papers:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Freight Strategy:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Modal Plans</strong></td>
<td>Jun-05</td>
<td>Jun-05</td>
<td>Jun-05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intermodal Strategy</strong></td>
<td>May-06</td>
<td>May-06</td>
<td>May-06</td>
<td>Jun-06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Smart Growth Concept Map</strong></td>
<td>Aug-05</td>
<td>Aug-05</td>
<td>Aug-05</td>
<td>Sep-05</td>
<td>Sep-05</td>
<td>Sep-05</td>
<td>Sep-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cross-Border Travel</strong></td>
<td>Nov-05</td>
<td>Nov-05</td>
<td>Nov-05</td>
<td>Dec-05</td>
<td>Dec-05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ind Transit Planning Review</strong></td>
<td>Dec-05</td>
<td>Dec-05</td>
<td>Dec-05</td>
<td>Dec-05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Arterial System</strong></td>
<td>Feb-06</td>
<td>Feb-06</td>
<td>Feb-06</td>
<td>Mar-06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interregional Travel</strong></td>
<td>Feb-06</td>
<td>Feb-06</td>
<td>Feb-06</td>
<td>Mar-06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tribal Development Impacts</strong></td>
<td>Feb-06</td>
<td>Feb-06</td>
<td>Feb-06</td>
<td>May-06</td>
<td>May-06</td>
<td>May-06</td>
<td>May-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Corridor/Project Evaluation Criteria</strong></td>
<td>Feb-06</td>
<td>Feb-06</td>
<td>Feb-06</td>
<td>Mar-06</td>
<td>May-06</td>
<td>May-06</td>
<td>Apr-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Energy Impacts</strong></td>
<td>May-06</td>
<td>May-06</td>
<td>May-06</td>
<td>Jun-06</td>
<td>May-06</td>
<td>May-06</td>
<td>Jun-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Habitat Planning</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Safety/Homeland Sec</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Updated Performance Indicators</strong></td>
<td>Dec-05</td>
<td>Dec-05</td>
<td>Dec-05</td>
<td>Jan-06</td>
<td>Jan-06</td>
<td>Jan-06</td>
<td>Feb-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Updated Land Use Forecasts</strong></td>
<td>Mar-06</td>
<td>Mar-06</td>
<td>Mar-06</td>
<td>Mar-06</td>
<td>May-06</td>
<td></td>
<td>Feb-06*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Evaluation Criteria</strong></td>
<td>Feb-06</td>
<td>Feb-06</td>
<td>Feb-06</td>
<td>Mar-06</td>
<td>May-06</td>
<td>May-06</td>
<td>May-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2007 Network/Funding Alts</strong></td>
<td>May-06</td>
<td>May-06</td>
<td>May-06</td>
<td>Jun-06</td>
<td>May-06</td>
<td>May-06</td>
<td>May-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2007 Prelim Draft RTP</strong></td>
<td>Aug-06</td>
<td>Aug-06</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aug-06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jul-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2007 Draft RTP</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oct-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2007 Draft EIR</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nov-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Hearing RTP/EIR</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dec-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results of Public Outreach</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jan-07</td>
<td>Jan-07</td>
<td>Jan-07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Draft RTP Changes</strong></td>
<td>Jan-07</td>
<td>Jan-07</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jan-07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2007 Draft Final RTP</strong></td>
<td>Feb-07</td>
<td>Feb-07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adopt Final 2007 RTP/EIR</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mar-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Air Quality Conformity Finding</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Apr-07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Public Workshop regarding draft issues papers and performance indicators.
PROGRESS REPORT ON PILOT SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM

Introduction

The Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program (SGIP) was originally proposed in SANDAG’s Regional Transportation Plan, MOBILITY 2030. It is a precursor to the longer term smart growth incentive program called for in the Regional Comprehensive Plan that will be funded by the TransNet extension. An ad hoc working group consisting of members of the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG) (local planning directors) and Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) (local public works directors) has been collaborating with SANDAG staff to develop project evaluation criteria for the Pilot SGIP. Coronado Councilmember Monroe also has participated on the ad hoc working group on behalf of the Transportation Committee.

The Regional Planning and Transportation Committees discussed the draft project evaluation criteria for the pilot program at their joint meeting on January 21, 2005. Since then, the draft evaluation criteria have been further discussed by the TWG, CTAC, and the Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group. At its March 3, 2005, meeting, CTAC recommended approval of the draft evaluation criteria. The TWG did not have time to fully discuss the criteria at its March 10 meeting, and postponed action on the item to its April 14 meeting.

On February 25, 2005, in conjunction with its approval of the final Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) for the 2005-2010 housing element cycle, the Board of Directors directed staff to modify the Pilot SGIP project evaluation criteria to award “bonus points” for certain cities with higher percentages of lower income households. The bonus points are to be awarded to jurisdictions whose 1999 percentage of lower income households is higher than the regional average. The draft project evaluation criteria included in Attachment 1 reflect the Board’s policy directive. Attachment 2 is a copy of the memorandum approved by the Board as part of its February 25 action on the RHNA.

Recommendation

This report provides a progress update on the Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program. The Regional Planning and Transportation Committees are asked to provide any additional comments on the draft project evaluation criteria and program guidelines.
Discussion

Program Guidelines

The draft program guidelines (Attachment 1) were developed to meet the requirements of the federal Transportation Enhancement (TE) program that will be the funding source for the Pilot SGIP. The guidelines also establish the application requirements, the evaluation criteria, and project selection process. In general terms, they also provide guidance on how the evaluation criteria will be applied to score and rank candidate projects. An application form is being developed to ensure that each application includes the information needed for a thorough evaluation of the projects.

As currently proposed, the guidelines would limit grant funding to a maximum of $2 million per project. The guidelines also include “Use-it-or-Lose-it” requirements that apply to all grant recipients.

Project Evaluation Criteria

The project evaluation criteria matrix (pages 1-6 to 1-7 of Attachment 1) includes a project-specific criterion for affordable housing (Criterion B5 – Affordable Housing). This criterion was added based on the direction provided by the Regional Planning and Transportation Committees at their joint meeting in January 2005. In addition, the matrix awards additional bonus points for certain cities with higher percentages of low income households. This is consistent with the direction provided by the Board as part of its February 25, 2005, RHNA approval.

The evaluation matrix is divided into the following categories: Project Readiness, Smart Growth and Land Use Characteristics, Quality of Proposed Project, Matching Funds, and Low Income Household Bonus. The weighting factors distribute the points between these categories as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total Points</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Readiness</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smart Growth and Land Use Characteristics</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Proposed Project</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matching Funds</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income Household Bonus</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remaining Issues to be Addressed

Regional Planning Technical Working Group Discussion

Two substantive issues remain under discussion. First, some members of the TWG have recommended that the evaluation criteria place greater emphasis on projects that support higher density land development. Because community acceptance of higher density development is often the biggest impediment to developing a smart growth project, some TWG members felt that the Criterion B1 (Intensity of Development) should receive a higher weight. Intensity of related development currently accounts for 7 percent of the total 135 points.
Second, some TWG members also expressed concern that the mandated Low Income Household Bonus points for lower income households (Criterion E) might result in the selection of projects that are not “ready to go.” As currently proposed, this bonus would award 20 points to certain cities (15 percent of the 135 total points).

Ad Hoc Working Group Discussion

The ad hoc working group that has been helping to develop the Pilot SGIP criteria and guidelines reconvened to address both of these outstanding issues. They agreed that a higher weight factor should be applied to Criterion B1 (Intensity of Development). However, the group did not reach consensus on whether that factor should be increased from a weight factor of two (as currently proposed) to a weight factor of three or four. The ad hoc group referred the matter to the TWG for resolution at its April 14 meeting.

The ad hoc working group discussed the Low Income Household Bonus (Criterion E) and agreed that it would not adversely impact potential “ready to go” candidate projects. As currently proposed, Project Readiness (Criterion A) would be worth 15 of the total of 135 points (11 percent). Prior to the addition of the Low Income Household Bonus, the Project Readiness accounted for 13 percent of the total points available. The proposed project evaluation criteria were developed to select projects that address a variety of regional goals. The projects that address more of these goals, and do it well, will be the ones that rise to the top. If the proposed evaluation criteria function as envisioned, no single criterion will bias the evaluation process.

Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group Discussion

In addition to the comments from the TWG, the Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group (SWG) discussed the draft project evaluation criteria at its March 15, 2005, meeting. Members of the SWG provided the following comments:

- Raise the maximum grant amount beyond the $2 million per project limit currently proposed.
- The requirement for projects to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) may prevent certain “ready to go” candidate projects from competing for the pilot program funding.
- Consider rewarding projects that serve greater numbers of people.
- Consider rewarding projects that support reverse commuting.

The recommended $2 million per project limit was based on a survey of local jurisdiction staff. However, the Regional Planning and Transportation Committees may wish to discuss whether a higher grant limit should be permitted for the pilot program. Because federal Transportation Enhancements (TE) monies would fund the Pilot SGIP, compliance with NEPA is mandatory.

One of the proposed criteria already addresses the number of people served. Criterion B1 (Intensity of Development) awards more points to candidate projects that are support areas with higher residential densities.
A specific criterion for projects that support reverse commuting is not proposed. In November 2004, the Regional Planning and Transportation Committees approved the proposed approach for the pilot program and agreed that it should focus on implementing smart growth land uses in areas that help support the regional transportation investments envisioned in the RTP – particularly the planned transit system. 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.

Federal Transportation Enhancements Program Eligibility

As previously noted, candidate projects for the Pilot SGIP would need to meet the eligibility requirements of the federal TE program. Staff has received inquiries about whether a project that adds parking could be a candidate for the Pilot SGIP. Parking is not an eligible expense under the federal TE program.

As discussed in the draft program guidelines (Attachment 1), project applicants who would like to submit parking improvements for funding should meet with or contact SANDAG staff prior to submitting an application to discuss strategies for how the project might be included in the Pilot SGIP. For instance, it may be possible to swap some of the TE funds with other funding sources that could be applied toward transit-related parking. Or, it may be possible to rearrange the public and private components of a project’s financing. For instance, a local jurisdiction may be asking a private land developer to construct sidewalk or streetscape enhancements in exchange for the jurisdiction contributing toward the construction of a parking structure. Because the pedestrian improvements are eligible under the TE program, the jurisdiction may be able to revise the agreement with the developer to apply the grant funds to the eligible TE uses.

Project Evaluation Panel

As proposed, the projects would be scored by a project evaluation panel. This panel would include SANDAG staff and individuals selected from the Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group. The objective is to establish an evaluation panel with individuals familiar with the urban form and design principles of smart growth. SANDAG will recruit panel members with a background in urban design, land development, engineering, public transit, bicycling, and walking. If all those skills cannot be found on the SWG, staff would seek volunteers from the private sector and non-governmental organizations. The panel members should have no connection to any of the projects being evaluated.

Next Steps

Following action by the TWG (expected in April), the Pilot SGIP would come back to the Regional Planning and Transportation Committees in May. Subject to the approval of these two Committees, the item would be scheduled for the May 27, 2005, Board of Directors meeting agenda.

Once approved, SANDAG would issue a call for projects. Project applicants would have approximately 45 days to submit applications. The project evaluation panel would be formed to review and rank the projects. The panel’s recommendations would likely go to the Regional Planning and Transportation Committees for action during the first week of August.
Following approval, the projects must be submitted as a State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) amendment to the California Transportation Commission. This is typically a 90-day process. Following the STIP amendment, successful applicants would be able to begin working with the Caltrans Office of Local Assistance to receive authorization to begin the project.

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachments

Key Staff Contact: Stephan Vance, (619) 699-1924, sva@sandag.org
Program Description

The Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program (SGIP) funds transportation infrastructure improvements that support smart growth development. Project types could include improvements to pedestrian, bicycle and transit facilities, traffic calming, streetscape enhancements, and other innovative smart growth-supporting infrastructure. These projects should encourage pedestrian, bicycle and transit trips; support a community's larger infill development or revitalization effort; and provide for a wider range of transportation choices, improved internal mobility, and stronger sense of place. Funds can be used for preliminary engineering (design and environmental), right-of-way acquisition, and construction.

These Program Guidelines describe the application and call for projects process.

Who Can Apply?

SGIP grants are awarded on a competitive basis. Local governments, transit operators, and other public agencies are eligible recipients of the federal funds. Nonprofit and community-based organizations may be partners with government agencies, but cannot apply directly for the funds. Grant recipients will be required to take the capital project through the federal-aid process with Caltrans Local Assistance and meet both state and SANDAG “use it or lose it” requirements for the funds. In addition, grant recipients may be required to attend a workshop on project implementation and the federal-aid process.

How Much Funding is Available?

There is approximately $17 million in federal Transportation Enhancement (TE) Funds available for the Pilot SGIP. Requested grants should range between $200,000 to $2 million per project. The TE funds are available for up to 88.53 percent of the total project cost. Applicants must provide a minimum local match of 11.47 percent.

Eligible Activities

Project activities eligible for funding include bicycle and pedestrian paths and bridges; on-street bike lanes; pedestrian plazas; pedestrian street crossings; streetscape enhancements such as median landscaping, street trees, lighting, street furniture; traffic calming design features such as pedestrian bulb-outs or traffic circles; transit stop amenities; way-finding signage; and gateway features. Other project types such as parking also may be eligible provided the TE funds can be swapped for another funding source.

Applicants should check with SANDAG and Caltrans Office of Local Assistance for help determining project eligibility. Regardless of the project type, SANDAG is looking for capital projects that are
well-designed, expand transportation options, result in numerous community benefits, and are part of a community’s broader revitalization and development efforts.

**Smart Growth Areas**

Projects funded by the Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program should be in existing or future smart growth areas. SANDAG has just begun the process of working with local jurisdictions to identify these areas as part of the development of the Smart Growth Concept Map called for in the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP). Until that map is developed, the pilot program will evaluate projects based on criteria that address how well the project area exemplifies the smart growth place type characteristics described in the RCP. These characteristics include mixed use, higher intensity, walkable development that is associated with an existing or planned regional transit facility or transit corridor. Section II-B of the project evaluation criteria addresses these characteristics.

The RCP clearly defines six smart growth place types that require a connection to regional transit service; in addition a rural community smart growth place type also is included. Applicants should be able to classify their project sites within one of these smart growth area types. The selection criteria favor projects in locations where existing or planned development best exemplifies one of those place types.

**How Will Projects Be Evaluated?**

The primary goal of the Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program is to deliver a set of constructible projects that will serve as models for how public infrastructure funding can be used to encourage smart growth development. To achieve that goal, the evaluation criteria focus on constructability, the qualities and characteristics of the existing or planned land uses and transportation facilities in the project area, the qualities of the project itself, and available matching funds.

The evaluation criteria have two main components: eligibility screening criteria, and project evaluation criteria. Once a project has passed the eligibility screening, it will be scored based on the project evaluation criteria. Each project evaluation criterion is ranked on a scale from 0 to 5. Each criterion is then weighted by a factor from 1 to 3 depending on its relative importance.

The “project,” is the capital improvement that would be supported by the Pilot SGIP grant. It could include any number of project types eligible under the federal TE program, including bicycle and pedestrian improvements, streetscape enhancements, enhancements to transit facilities, and other types. A candidate project could include one or more of these types of improvements, and would be evaluated based on how well it proposes to execute each type of improvement.

The eligibility screening and project evaluation criteria are discussed in more detail below.

**Section 1: Project Screening Criteria**

Project Screening Criteria are primarily used to determine basic program eligibility and ensure that the applicant is committed to the project. Three criteria must be met before a project can be evaluated further: (1) Applicants must provide a resolution authorizing the application and
committing matching funds and staff resources to the project from a local Board or Council; (2)
applicants must certify that other necessary funding is committed to the project; and (3) eligibility
under the federal funding program guidelines must be met.

Applicants with questions about project eligibility should contact SANDAG (619-699-1924) or
Caltrans Office of Local Assistance (858-616-6525). The resolution from the Board or Council may be
submitted after the application deadline, provided it is received before the project evaluation panel
makes its recommendation on project priorities.

Section 2: Project Evaluation Criteria

PART A. The Project Readiness criterion is used to evaluate whether the capital project will be able
to meet its schedule as stated in the application. The further along the project is in the project
development process, the more points the project would earn. Project Readiness has been weighted
so as to reflect the relative importance of this evaluation criterion. Only projects that are ready for
construction will score the highest in this category and achieve the full 15 points allotted.

PART B. Smart Growth Area Land Use Characteristics are used to evaluate how well the existing or
planned land uses and transportation system characteristics in the project area reflect its smart
growth place type. Projects supporting residential development that exceeds minimum density
levels for its smart growth place type will score the highest in the Intensity of Development
category.

In order to achieve the highest score in the Land Use and Transportation Characteristics of Project
Area category, the project must be in an area that provides, or is planned to provide, a mix of uses
combined with the appropriate transportation system characteristics. Special emphasis is placed on
areas focused around regional transit facilities.

The Urban Design Characteristics of the project will be evaluated to determine how well the area
reflects the smart growth design principles in the RCP. For additional guidance, refer to SANDAG’s
Planning and Designing for Pedestrians.

The criterion Related Land Development evaluates how well new land development or
redevelopment directly related to the proposed project reflects smart growth development
principles, particularly in terms of providing for additional housing. To be directly related, the
project must abut or directly serve the new land development.

Finally, proposed projects directly related to land development that includes Affordable Housing
will be scored based on the quantity of affordable housing provided. “Affordable housing” means
housing that serves extremely low, very low, or low income households (between 0 – 80 percent of
area median income adjusted for household size). Affordable housing costs are defined in Section
6918 for renters and Section 6920 for purchasers of Title 25 of the California Code of Regulations,
and in Sections 50052.5 and 50053 of the Health and Safety Code, or by the applicable funding
source or program.

PART C. Quality of Proposed Project scoring is based on an evaluation of the quality of the various
kinds of improvements that may be included in project. Pedestrian Access Improvements are key
components of quality smart growth areas and have been weighted accordingly. Maximum points
in these categories are awarded based on the quality of the project design, and how well the project connects the community and its activity centers to public transit. Bicycle Access Improvements will be evaluated similarly.

Transit Facility Improvements will be scored according to how well the candidate project improves the environment for patrons at transit stations, along transit corridors, or at other access points in the immediate vicinity of a transit facility.

Streetscape Enhancements and Traffic Calming Features also impact the quality of the project. Streetscape Enhancements will be scored according to the quality of the proposed design, and the benefit to the pedestrian environment. Traffic Calming Features should effectively reduce vehicle speeds while also enhancing the street environment for pedestrians and bicyclists.

Finally, Parking Improvements ensure that there is an appropriate level of auto access to regional transit and the immediate project area. Projects that include parking will be evaluated on how well the parking is integrated into the community. It should provide enough parking to meet expected demand, taking into account the potential for increases in transit and walking trips. Because parking is not an eligible expense under the TE program, applicants submitting parking improvements for funding should meet with or contact SANDAG staff prior to submitting an application to discuss strategies for how the project might be included in the Pilot SGIP. For instance, it may be possible to swap some of the TE funds with other funding sources (e.g., federal Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funds) that could be applied toward transit-related parking. Or, it may be possible to rearrange the public and private components of a project’s financing. For instance, a local jurisdiction may be asking a private land developer to construct sidewalk or streetscape enhancements in exchange for the jurisdiction contributng toward the construction of a parking structure. Because the pedestrian improvements are eligible under the TE program, the jurisdiction may wish to revise the agreement with the developer to apply the grant funds to the eligible TE uses.

PART D. Matching Funds points are awarded to projects based on the amount of matching funds provided by the local jurisdiction from either public or private sources. Private sources of matching funds must be committed through an approved assessment or development impact fee, developer agreement, or other appropriate sources, and must be available at the time the project will be constructed. Points are awarded by multiplying the percentage of matching funds times a weighting factor of 20, up to a maximum of 15 points. The percentage of matching funds is the ratio of the matching funds to the total SGIP project cost.

**Who Will Score The Projects?**

A panel that includes SANDAG staff and people chosen from SANDAG’s Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group will rank the projects. This evaluation panel will include people with knowledge of smart growth design principles and its components. SANDAG will recruit panel members with a background in urban design, land development, engineering, public transit, bicycling, and walking. To the extent possible, the panel also should represent the diverse subareas of the region.
Smart Growth Incentive Program Application Process

**Step 1:** SANDAG issues a call for projects. Applications will be due within approximately 45 days.

**Step 2:** Applicants submit a project proposal to SANDAG for funding consideration. The application must be completed in full for the project to be considered for funding.

**Step 3:** SANDAG staff, with the assistance of Caltrans Office of Local Assistance, will evaluate the projects for funding eligibility. Next, SANDAG will evaluate project proposals with the assistance of the project evaluation panel. The evaluation panel will score each project based on its merits relative to the other projects submitted. Once all the projects have been scored, they will be ranked based on their score. The evaluation panel will then review the project rankings with respect to the following program goals:

- How well do the top-ranked projects represent the various smart growth place types identified in the RCP?
- Do the top-ranked projects demonstrate the viability of smart growth development throughout the San Diego region?

In addition, the panel will recommend a prioritized list of projects for a waiting list. In the event that one or more of the recommended projects loses its funding for failure to meet its delivery schedule or other reason, a project from the waiting list could be funded based on its priority and the amount of funding available.

**Step 4:** Based on the recommendations of the evaluation panel, and funding availability of the overall program, SANDAG staff will make a funding recommendation to the SANDAG Regional Planning and Transportation Committees.

**Step 5:** Following approval of the list of Pilot SGIP projects, SANDAG will submit the projects to the California Transportation Commission (CTC) as an amendment to the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). This process requires a Caltrans review of the projects, and a 60-day public notice period prior to CTC action.

**Step 6:** Following the CTC’s approval of the STIP amendment, grant recipients will attend a workshop on project implementation and the federal-aid process where SANDAG and Caltrans Office of Local Assistance will discuss their respective roles for the Pilot SGIP. Grantees must comply with SANDAG’s Use-It-or-Lose-It Policy for the TE program (attached), and the Federal Highway Administration’s federal-aid process.
Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program
Draft Project Evaluation Criteria

I. Project Screening Criteria

Project screening criteria are meant to ensure the applicant is committed to the project, that the community supports it, and that 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>A. 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>B. 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>C. Funding Eligibility</td>
<td>The project must be eligible under the federal funding program guidelines.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. Project Evaluation Criteria

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Project Readiness</th>
<th>To ensure the proposed projects can comply with the state’s timely use of funds requirements, projects will be scored based on the degree they are to beginning construction.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Project Development (Projects receive 1 point for each completed phase to a maximum of 5 points)</td>
<td>Feasibility Study</td>
</tr>
<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>
<tr>
<td>Max. Points</td>
<td>Weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. Smart Growth Area Land Use Characteristics</th>
<th>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, the quality of urban design in the project area, the provision of additional housing in general and affordable housing in particular.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Intensity of Development (0-5 points)</td>
<td>To what extent does the existing or planned project area meet the residential density levels identified in the RCP for its smart growth area 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 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 area type, and have the appropriate transportation system characteristics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 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 accommodate bicyclists and pedestrians, including transit passengers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Related Land Development Projects (0-5 points)</td>
<td>Is there a current land development project associated with the proposed capital improvements? How well does it contribute to smart growth development by providing additional housing in the area?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Affordable Housing² (0-5 points)</td>
<td>Does the project serve affordable (subsidized) housing? How much additional affordable housing is provided?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Max. Points | Weight | Max. Score |
| 5 | 1 | 5 |
| 5 | 2 | 10 |
C. 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></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Max. Points</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Max. Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pedestrian Access Improvements (0-5 points)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bicycle Access Improvements² (0-5 points)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></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 areas activity centers, and include secure bicycle parking.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Transit Facility Improvements (0-5 points)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Streetscape Enhancements (0-5 points)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How well does the project include public art elements, public seating, pedestrian-scale lighting, enhanced paving or wayfinding signage?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Traffic Calming Features (0-5 points)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How well does the project include one or more of the traffic calming features recommended in Planning and Designing for Pedestrians?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Parking Improvements (0-5 points)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Matching Funds

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

E. Low Income Household Bonus Points³  20

TOTAL SCORE  135

Notes
³Affordable housing is defined as income- or price-controlled housing. See the program guidelines for details.
²All bicycle facility improvements must comply with the requirements of the California Highway Design Manual, Chapter 1000.
³Low income household bonus points awarded per SANDAG Board policy (2/25/05).
Transportation Enhancement (TE) Program
(Use-It-Or-Lose-It Policy)

1. **Quarterly Progress Report**: Each project sponsor shall submit a quarterly progress report consisting of the following:
   a. Accomplishments in the current quarter;
   b. Anticipated progress next quarter;
   c. Pending issues and recommended resolutions;
   d. Current schedule adhering to the two major milestones and nine intermediate milestones; and
   e. Status of budget, including any updates on project cost estimate.

2. **Milestones and Budget**: SANDAG staff will monitor the budget and all eleven (11) milestones shown below.
   - Start Environmental Studies
   - Draft Environmental Document
   - Final Environmental Document*
   - Obtain Required Permits
   - Begin Design Engineering
   - Complete Plans, Specifications, and Cost Estimates
   - Start Right-of-Way Acquisition
   - Right-of-Way Certification
   - Ready to Advertise
   - Award Construction*
   - Project Completion (project open for use)

*major milestones
3. **Project Delays and Extensions up to One Year**
   - Should any of the intermediate milestones fall behind schedule, the project sponsor shall demonstrate to SANDAG staff that the major milestone schedules will still be met.
   - Should any of the major milestones fall behind schedule, the project sponsor can request an extension of up to one year.
   - An extension request of up to six months can be approved administratively by SANDAG staff. Requests for extensions of more than six months but less than one year in total shall be determined by the Transportation Committee.
   - The project sponsor seeking the extension must demonstrate an ability to succeed in the extended time frame.
   - If the project sponsor cannot demonstrate that the project can be delivered with the additional time extension, then SANDAG staff shall recommend a fund reallocation to the Transportation Committee in accordance with Section 5 below.

4. **Extensions Beyond One Year**

Requests totaling more than one year will be considered only for those projects showing extenuating conditions out of the control of the project sponsor, defined as follows:

- **Environmental**: During the environmental review process, the project sponsor discovers heretofore unknown sites (e.g., archeological, endangered species) that require additional investigation and mitigation efforts. The project sponsor must demonstrate that the discovery is new and unforeseen;
- **Permitting**: Difficulty in obtaining permits from various agencies. The project sponsor must demonstrate that every effort has been made to obtain the necessary permits and that the delay is wholly due to the permitting agency;
- **Construction Schedule**: Applies to projects restricted to certain construction dates during the year (i.e., to avoid nesting season for certain species); and
- **Other**: Changes in federal/state policies or laws

The project sponsor shall appeal directly to the Transportation Committee providing a detailed justification for the requested extension including a revised project schedule. The Transportation Committee shall grant the additional extension only by a vote of two-thirds majority of eligible voting members in attendance.

5. **AB 1012 Use-It-or-Lose-It Requirements/Fund Reallocation**

Each year, Caltrans distributes a memorandum that indicates the amount of TE funds each region must obligate or risk losing the funds. Based on the schedules submitted for each of the funded projects, staff monitors the TE program’s obligation commitments for the San Diego region. This policy seeks to ensure project delivery to both meet the State requirements and promote quality projects in the region.
Any reallocation decision should be made with consideration given to the overall TE program's obligation commitment. In the event the project funds are reallocated, staff will recommend to the Transportation Committee to either move the funds to the existing TE reserve account (for TE projects experiencing cost increases) or to notify the next project applicant on the ranking list of the amount of funds available, and request a project schedule and related budget information. If a new project cannot be delivered on a schedule that would avoid a loss of funds to the region, then the funding will be offered to the next project on the priority list. This process will be repeated until a satisfactory project is found.
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February 25, 2005

TO: SANDAG Board of Directors

FROM: Mayor Lonnie B. Pfeifer, Mayor Steve Padilla, and Councilmember Jim Madaffer

SUBJECT: Agenda Item No. 12 – Final Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA)

Our regional housing needs are significant — both now and in the future. Addressing these needs is often a complex process when dealing with the varied interests of the cities in our region. We are committed to doing everything we can to address our regional housing needs. Recognizing the differences between the cities, we are proposing an incentive-based compromise to the RHNA Modified Alternative 1. Simply put, for those cities that are willing and able to accommodate additional housing, those cities should be compensated through incentives that would help improve existing as well as future infrastructure.

We recommend the Board approve Modified Alternative 1, with the following provisions:

1. Jurisdictions whose 1999 lower income households as a percentage of total households is estimated to be greater than the regional average (Attachment 2, Column 1) shall receive 15 bonus points (out of 100 possible) for projects requesting funding through the Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program. (This would include National City, El Cajon, Imperial Beach, Lemon Grove, La Mesa, Escondido, Vista, Chula Vista, San Diego, and San Marcos.)

2. In addition to the current Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program, for all future discretionary funding allocated to local agency projects by SANDAG (following the adoption by jurisdictions of housing elements for 2005-2010), the following criteria shall apply:

   a. In order to qualify for such funding, a jurisdiction will be required to demonstrate that they are in compliance with provisions of their adopted housing element which set forth their commitment to providing adequate multi-family zoned land or other actions necessary to accommodate their share of lower income housing under the adopted RHNA.

   b. Incentive points (a minimum of 25 points out of 100 possible) will be given to projects in jurisdictions in which lower income housing units are being produced in accordance with the housing unit figures contained in Alternative 3 (Attachment 2, Column 13).

   c. In order to verify compliance with these provisions, each jurisdiction shall annually submit a report to SANDAG indicating their progress in complying with requirements of their housing element, as well as actual production of housing units within their jurisdiction by income category, during the preceding year.
BUS RAPID TRANSIT OVERVIEW

Introduction

Last year, SANDAG contracted with William Lieberman, AICP, to research bus rapid transit systems around the world to assess their characteristics and applicability to the San Diego experience and environment. Mr. Lieberman conducted a case study review of several cities’ bus rapid transit (BRT) systems and evaluated the components that lead to success, the trade-offs among various applications of BRT, and the lessons learned.

Mr. Lieberman will present his research and conclusions at the Joint Meeting of the Regional Planning and Transportation Committees on April 1.

Recommendation

The Transportation Committee and Regional Planning Committee are asked to receive this report for information.

BOB LEITER
Director of land Use and Transportation Planning

Key Staff Contact: Toni Bates, (619) 699-6950, tba@sandag.org
The Regional Planning Committee meeting was called to order by Committee Chair Lori Holt-Pfeiler (North County Inland) at 12:02 p.m. The attendance sheet for the meeting is attached.

Chair Holt-Pfeiler thanked all for attending the meeting. Self introductions were made.

1. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

   1a. Joint Meeting of Transportation and Regional Planning Committees – January 21, 2005
   1b. Regional Planning Committee – January 21, 2005

   Action: Councilmember Hall (North County Coastal) made the motion and Supervisor Horn (County of San Diego) seconded the motion to approve the meeting minutes. The vote was unanimously in favor.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBERS COMMENTS

   None.

REPRESENTATIONS

3. SHOWCASING LOCAL EXAMPLES OF SMART GROWTH: SMART GROWTH IN OTAY RANCH (INFORMATION)

   Kim Kilkenny, representing the Otay Ranch Company, and Rick Rosaler, a principal planner for the City of Chula Vista, provided the Committee with an overview of smart growth development efforts in Otay Ranch, a community within the City of Chula Vista.

   Mr. Kilkenny explained that Otay Ranch has been and continues to be an extraordinary planning opportunity in the San Diego region. Otay Ranch is a large piece of property—approximately 23,000 acres—and is divided into 12 villages, including the Village of Heritage. The Village of Heritage, which is built out, serves as a model for the development of the next villages. The Otay Ranch property is only 12.9 miles from downtown San Diego, and, once the bus rapid transit (BRT) line is completed, the trip between Otay Ranch and downtown will take approximately 20 minutes.
From the outset, the Otay Ranch Company was challenged with finding a way to improve upon conventional development. Three goals were developed for the Otay Ranch Villages: (1) environmental stewardship; (2) provide facilities concurrent with need; and (3) create a sense of place.

Meeting the goal of environmental stewardship consisted of establishing a 17 square-mile managed preserve system, which later became part of the Multiple Species Conservation Program. Careful planning and location of parks, schools, pedestrian bridges, fire stations, and other infrastructure have ensured that facilities are concurrent with need. In order to create a sense of place, the Otay Ranch was divided into 12 villages, each approximately one mile square. At the heart of each village are transit stations, mixed use retail centers, activity centers, and approximately half the residential population of that village. The proximity of transit, activity centers, and residences combined with narrow, pedestrian-friendly streets creates the community's sense of place. Heritage Village, the first of the 12 villages, has been completely built out today. A key goal in creating a sense of place was to locate half of the village's population within ¼-mile of the transit station in the center of the village.

Special attention also was given to various modes of transportation. Four- to six-lane arterials expedite automobile traffic in and out of the villages, while the promenade streets, pop-through cul-de-sacs, pedestrian bridges, paseos, and regional trails encourage pedestrian activity. A right-of-way for BRT also has been reserved to connect the villages with the region's public transportation system. Another feature of the Otay Ranch Villages is the variety of housing choices. The villages feature affordable housing units reserved for certain income groups, multifamily units, small lot single-family detached homes, as well as traditional single-family detached homes.

Rick Rosaler noted that the land use plan for Otay Ranch was jointly processed by the Chula Vista City Council and the County Board of Supervisors, and that both jurisdictions adopted an identical plan for the 23,000 acres. This is probably the only time a joint venture such as this has ever been implemented, and it will probably not be done again. He added that 1,100 acres within Otay Ranch have been reserved to attract a satellite campus of the University of California.

Mr. Kilkenny concluded that developing this project has not been an easy task. There were tremendous obstacles that needed to be overcome. However, both the City of Chula Vista and the County of San Diego have persevered in the implementation of this project and have taken significant political risks. A television clip from Channel 8 News was shown highlighting the project.

Committee Member Comments and Questions

- It was questioned whether Mello Roos fees are paid and, if so, how much they are per month. Mr. Kilkenny stated that the Community Facilities District (CFD) adds an additional 1 percent property tax, which is used to pay for infrastructure. Mr. Rosaler added that Homeowner's Association fees (about $60/month for a single-family home) pay for private parks, landscape, maintenance, and other needs.
• One member commented that the fees are something that people can consider before they move. Mr. Kilkenny responded that the City of Chula Vista has a long history of using CFDs, especially to help finance the needs of local school districts. Chula Vista is the fastest growing city in the state and the seventh fastest growing city in the nation.

• This project sounds like a great commercial success. Is that understood within the larger development community—can this type of project be considered a business opportunity? Mr. Kilkenny replied that the demand for this type of project is so strong that a lot of developers are coming in to see what has been done and are attempting to duplicate it. However, the development community is not very big on taking risks. It just so happens that the owners of Otay Ranch were very committed to this project.

• It’s interesting to see how the promenade streets, the narrow main streets, and fire districts all tie in together. Does the fact that the City of Chula Vista is a Charter City facilitate that? Mr. Kilkenny replied that it was determined that the streets should be 28 feet in the residential districts to create a sense of place. Mr. Rosaler added that the Fire Department tested the street widths three times with SUVs parked on the streets. The fire chief bought double-articulated fire trucks to allow them access through the streets.

Mr. Kilkenny added that another lesson learned pertained to roundabouts in the village. Construction trucks weren’t very sensitive to the design and continually drove over them. One roundabout had to be rebuilt three times. The lesson was that future roundabouts had to be designed and engineered correctly. Mr. Rosaler added that roundabouts have been used as traffic-calming devices in promenade streets and also have been used as traffic circles.

Mr. Kilkenny provided a special thank you to those people who were instrumental in the passage of the plan for this project: Supervisor Slater-Price, Supervisor Horn, MTS Chairman Williams (who was a County Supervisor at the time), Councilmember Patty Davis, and former Chula Vista Planning Director Bob Leiter.

Chair Pfeiler thanked Mr. Kilkenny and Mr. Rosaler for attending the meeting. She noted that this information will help the Regional Planning Committee (RPC) in implementing its Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) in the region.

4. APPROACH FOR DEVELOPING THE SMART GROWTH CONCEPT MAP (RECOMMEND)

Staff made a presentation on the proposed approach and timeline for developing the Smart Growth Concept Map. The RCP calls for developing the map during FY 2005 for use as a planning tool in updating the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and allocating future incentive funds for smart growth. Staff noted that comments from the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG) had been incorporated into the staff report.

Next steps will be for staff to meet with local planning staffs to identify smart growth place types along existing and planned transit corridors included in MOBILITY 2030. The schedule for the Concept Map is tied to the 2007 RTP update schedule and the update of the Regional Growth Forecast. In order to allow sufficient time to develop the RTP land use
scenarios, the final Smart Growth Concept Map is needed by September 2005. Milestones anticipated within that time frame include: a preliminary draft concept map by March 2005, a public review period over the summer, and a final concept map by September. The Committee was asked for feedback in three areas:

1. How can local elected officials best be involved in the process, and how can SANDAG secure jurisdictional endorsements of the final map?
2. What public involvement mechanisms would the Committee like to see employed during the process?
3. Can the Committee recommend the proposed approach to the Board?

Chair Pfeiler commented that the RPC can use the Otay Ranch project as an example.

Committee Member Comments and Questions

• When will the Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program start? Recommendations of the first phase of the program will be taken to the Board in April. The second phase of the program that passed with Proposition A will begin in 2008.

• The Chula Vista project is a good example of a smart growth development on new land, but much of our future smart growth efforts will take place on land that's already developed and is undergoing redevelopment. It will take a different kind of courage from decision-makers to pursue that kind of smart growth. The decision-makers will need to be able to convince people that change will be better, which will be difficult to do. There needs to be a way to encourage those that own large and small parcels of land to make these kinds of changes on their own.

• Smart growth will be hard for smaller cities to implement. The point is not to reinvent the wheel, but to create a more attractive wheel that can be presented in a way that people can relate to, particularly along our transportation corridors. The proposed approach of working with local staffs and local elected officials is good because it is a bottom-up approach. Staff commented that they would initially be working with the staffs of three "test case" cities that have recently updated their general plans. Those cities—the Cities of San Diego, Chula Vista, and La Mesa—will all have a variety of smart growth place types. Once identified, those place types will provide examples for other jurisdictions. Otay Ranch is a good example of smart growth, but there won’t be many opportunities in other areas of the region to replicate that.

• Each jurisdiction will have its own idea of smart growth concepts.

• From a North County Coastal perspective, the Committee should engage in a relationship with the North San Diego County Transit Development Board (NCTD). They own a lot of land, and local jurisdictions could benefit from partnering with them.

• It is important to have NCTD and the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) on board with this project and encourage them to work with their neighboring communities to develop
projects near existing and/or proposed transit stations. Staff is currently having conversations involving the staffs from the transit agencies and Caltrans in the meetings with the local planning staffs.

- There are opportunities for Vista and Escondido to develop projects along the Sprinter line.

- The ability to double-track around that area would be helpful.

- It would be ideal to move the Sprinter east toward Broadway Street in Escondido.

- The first step is to have consensus. Jurisdictional endorsements are good, but the SANDAG Board representatives should ask their respective jurisdictions what type of action on the map is best for their individual communities.

- These are helpful meetings and discussions. The notion of coordinating the intensity of development and transit services makes sense. There are tremendous opportunities in areas such as University City, and the concept of redeveloping a more affluent neighborhood is an excellent opportunity to bring in private partners. In less affluent communities the land is cheaper, but people have to believe that their quality of life will be better. Positive change takes a lot of work in any community.

- Residents need to believe that the changes will make their communities better.

Chair Pfeiler stated that the Committee is not trying to solve the fiscal aspect in every community. We will have to wrestle with the fiscal pieces at the state level.

**Action:** Councilmember Peters (City of San Diego) made the motion and Councilmember Jones (East County) seconded the motion to recommend the proposed approach for developing the smart growth concept map to the SANDAG Board of Directors.

5. REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT (RHNA) FOR THE 2005-2010 HOUSING ELEMENT CYCLE (RECOMMEND)

Chair Pfeiler indicated that she had requested that this item be brought back before the Committee for discussion. When this item was discussed previously, the Committee could not come to a consensus. She noted that the RPC should determine whether it can make a recommendation to the Board on the RHNA.

Staff indicated that the RPC is being asked to make a recommendation to the SANDAG Board, which will be holding a public hearing on the final RHNA for the 2005-2010 housing element cycle on February 25, 2005. In December 2004, at the request of the City/County Management Association (CCMA), the SANDAG Chairman agreed to a 30-day extension of the RHNA public review period to January 31, 2005.

The discussion and comments received during the public review period have focused on the income allocation methodology for the Draft RHNA. In addition to allocating the region’s overall housing need (107,301 units) by jurisdiction, each jurisdiction’s housing need number
is required to be allocated into four categories: very low, low, moderate, and above moderate.

A number of alternatives for allocating each jurisdiction's regional share have been discussed and considered by the RPC. The Draft RHNA and Alternative 3 were accepted for distribution by the Board for a 90-day public review period in September 2004. Alternatives 1 and 2 also were distributed for information. During the public review period, the lower-income allocation methodologies used by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) and Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), and a sixth alternative suggested by the City of Poway (Modified Alternative 1), were reviewed by the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG) (planning directors). The TWG met twice in January 2005 to discuss the income allocation alternatives with the goal of forwarding a recommendation to the RPC. Although the group was not able to reach a clear consensus on one alternative, they narrowed the focus to two alternatives—Alternative 3 and Modified Alternative 1.

Committee Member Discussion

- Why is the methodology continually changing? What happened to the jobs/housing balance? Staff replied that the jobs/housing balance was a factor used in the methodology for allocating the housing need numbers by jurisdiction. A portion of the RHNA numbers was allocated based on each jurisdiction's share of projected employment growth between 2000 and 2010.

- It was noted that the gross number of housing units to be distributed throughout the region has now been determined. What is now being debated is how they are distributed. Staff responded that there are three parts to the RHNA: (1) the 107,301 units needed to be distributed throughout the region; (2) each jurisdiction's share of the overall allocation; and (3) what is currently under debate, the allocation of units within each jurisdiction by income category. State law requires that in allocating the regional share numbers by jurisdiction, the distribution must seek to reduce the concentration of lower-income households in areas with a disproportionate share of such households. In other words, the region needs to try to ensure that the location of lower-income households and housing units are distributed throughout the region.

- The location of lower-income housing isn't the only issue. Lower-income housing increases services needed in the community in which they are located.

- We need to provide jurisdictions with incentives to improve neighborhoods through residential development. How do the RHNA allocation numbers relate to the region's transportation system? Also, if a jurisdiction takes a greater responsibility for lower-income housing, what sort of incentives does it get? Staff indicated that the allocation of the RHNA numbers by jurisdiction was largely based on SANDAG's regional growth forecast, which factors in the region's commuting patterns and transportation system.

- The most important point is that all jurisdictions are not going to be happy with the final outcome. We should try to reach some consensus here today, and then the issue should be forwarded to the Board for consideration.
We've divided up the puzzle into 19 parts, but are not looking at the region as a whole or sub-regionally. We need to look at transportation corridors such as the SR 78 corridor as a unit. The region has to consider what is available and what can be done. The unincorporated area has vacant land, and we can build more livable communities like Del Mar Heights and Penasquitos.

Future housing allocations can be distributed that way, but we need to decide on the numbers for the upcoming housing element cycle now based on existing state law.

The region should not let the state dictate what's best for us. This is a local/regional issue, which should be determined regionally. In addition, there should be incentives involved to create density.

This issue is going to be tough to gain consensus on from this point forward. Carlsbad will have difficulty complying with Modified Alternative 1, and even greater difficulty with Alternative 3.

**MOTION**

Councilmember Hall (North County Coastal) made the motion to recommend approval of Modified Alternative 1 to the SANDAG Board of Directors. Supervisor Horn (County of San Diego) seconded the motion for discussion.

**DISCUSSION ON THE MOTION**

Chair Pfeiler stated that she doesn’t feel that a consensus exists for Modified Alternative 1 based on previous discussions.

- The City of Carlsbad is second to the City of Chula Vista when it comes to building homes. There isn’t enough money in the world to build enough affordable housing in Carlsbad, which has a 15 percent inclusionary requirement.

- It is important to remember that density doesn’t equal affordability.

- The City of Chula Vista supports Alternative 3.

- Is there a way to provide jurisdictions with tax credits to help jurisdictions meet the service needs of lower-income households? That would be helpful.

- The City of La Mesa is okay with Modified Alternative 1. Are we doing this because the state mandates that we do it, or because it's the right thing to do? The mandate is to plan for, not build, the housing. Also, does the state enforce housing element law, or do the RHNA numbers just sit on a shelf somewhere? The Committee should try to come to consensus on an alternative to forward to the SANDAG Board for discussion.
Action: The Committee members voted on the motion made by Councilmember Hall (North County Coastal) and seconded by Supervisor Horn (County of San Diego) to recommend Modified Alternative 1 to the Board. The vote was tied: Yes - 3; No - 3.

6. STATUS REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE ENERGY WORKING GROUP (RECOMMEND)

Councilmember Abarbanel, Co-Chair of the Energy Working Group (EWG), reported on the actions of the EWG to date. He also thanked the RPC for allowing Councilmember Jones to participate on the EWG on its behalf.

In December 2004, an Energy Efficiency pilot project for energy in municipal buildings was distributed by SANDAG’s EWG; all 18 local jurisdictions were encouraged to apply. So far, there have been three responses. This pilot project will enable the EWG to go to the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) for potential funding support. SDG&E is required to submit a long-term Resource Plan to the CPUC, and it has been agreed that the EWG will participate in the preparation of the plan that gets submitted to the CPUC. The agreement is to work with SDG&E to develop the Plan that needs to be submitted in July 2006.

Approval of the EWG’s Work Plan would provide the EWG the necessary direction to work with SDG&E to determine what the San Diego region wants regarding its energy needs. The EWG is sponsoring an Energy Transmission Workshop on March 15, 2005, at the SANDAG offices. Councilmember Abarbanel announced that he will attend the Harvard Energy Research Group meeting in Del Mar. He also noted that he participated in composing and sending letters to the CPUC on various regulatory issues that are consistent with SANDAG’s adopted Regional Energy Strategy.

He concluded that he has two action items that require the Committee’s approval: (1) to approve EWG’s request to solicit funding from several sources; and (2) to approve the EWG’s ability to work directly through the Executive Committee on time-sensitive issues.

Committee Member Comments

• It was asked what other members are having discussions with the EWG. Councilmember Abarbanel commented that large businesses, small businesses, the Port of San Diego, the San Diego County Water Authority, the San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce, and the San Diego Regional Energy Office are currently discussing the region’s energy issues.

• It was asked who else would benefit from having these discussions. Councilmember Abarbanel responded that the County of San Diego, University of California, San Diego (UCSD), and San Diego State University (SDSU) have all been asked to join in. He requested that the Committee approve that action.

• The Committee indicated that that sounds like a reasonable request.

• It was noted that the District Attorney’s office just reached a settlement regarding energy issues. Why doesn’t the EWG have any access to that funding—shouldn’t the funds be
given back to the ratepayers? Councilmember Abarbanel indicated that it was unclear how the funds will be distributed, but he will take those concerns to the CPUC.

- If some of those funds could be distributed back to the San Diego ratepayers, then maybe the increases in energy rates could be minimized.

**Action:** Councilmember Jones (East County) made the motion and Councilmember Ritter (North County Inland) seconded the motion to accept the EWG’s proposed work plan and funding recommendation and its request to work directly through the Executive Committee on time-sensitive issues. The Committee voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

7. **UPCOMING MEETINGS**

The next meeting of the RPC is scheduled for 12 p.m. to 2 p.m. on Friday, March 4, 2005.

8. **ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Pfeiler adjourned the meeting at 1:59 p.m.
## CONFIRMED ATTENDANCE
### SANDAG REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING
#### February 4, 2005

<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><strong>North County Inland</strong></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><strong>South County</strong></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><strong>North County Coastal</strong></td>
<td>City of Carlsbad</td>
<td>Matt Hall</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Carlsbad</td>
<td>Bud Lewis</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>East County</strong></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><strong>City of San Diego</strong></td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Scott Peters</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Jim Madaffer</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>County of San Diego</strong></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><strong>Advisory Member</strong></td>
<td>Caltrans, District 11</td>
<td>Pedro Orso-Delgado</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mark Baza</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advisory Member</strong></td>
<td>San Diego County Water Authority</td>
<td>Howard Williams</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advisory Member</strong></td>
<td>Department of Defense</td>
<td>Susannah Aguilera</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advisory Member</strong></td>
<td>San Diego Unified Port District</td>
<td>William Hall</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advisory Member</strong></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><strong>Advisory Member</strong></td>
<td>NCTD</td>
<td>Dave Druker</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advisory Member</strong></td>
<td>Regional Planning Technical Working Group</td>
<td>Niall Fritz</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ENERGY WORKING GROUP MEMBERSHIP

Introduction

The Energy Working Group (EWG) was established in 2004 to advise the Regional Planning Committee and the SANDAG Board of Directors on the implementation of the Regional Energy Strategy. The Board of Directors outlined an initial list of entities that should be represented on the EWG as well as elected officials from four geographic subregions, the City of San Diego, and the County of San Diego. A list of current EWG members is attached.

Recommendation

The Energy Working Group recommends that the Regional Planning Committee approve the addition of two groups to the EWG membership.

• Industrial Environmental Association
• University of California, San Diego

Discussion

The strength of the EWG is in the diversity of the members that discuss energy issues important to the San Diego region. Members of the Regional Planning Committee are able to appoint and recommend members to the EWG. In addition, elected officials already serving on the EWG are able to recommend additional members to the RPC for approval. Energy Working Group Co-Chair Abarbanel is recommending these additions to the working group due to their unique perspectives on energy issues. Both groups have participated in EWG discussions, but are not currently members of the working group.

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachment

Key Staff Contact: Rob Rundle; (619) 699-6949; rru@sandag.org
# Energy Working Group Members

## Elected Officials
- Hon. Henry Abarbanel (Co-chair)
- Hon. Art Madrid (Co-chair)
- Hon. Bob Campbell
- Hon. Steve Casteneda
- Hon. Michael Zucchet
- Vacant

## Stakeholders
- Bud Irvin
- Alan Ball
- Steve Zolezzi
- Albert Huang
- Irene Stillings
- Dr. Alan Sweedler
- Marty Hunter
- Bill Reed
- Bill Hays
- Michael Shames
- Ralph Torres
- Skip Fralick

## Representing
- North County Coastal
- East County
- North County Inland
- South County
- City of San Diego
- County of San Diego

## Representing
- San Diego County Water Authority
- Large Business (Qualcomm)
- Small Business (Food and Beverage Assoc.)
- Environmental Health Coalition
- San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce
- San Diego Regional Energy Office
- San Diego State University Foundation
- San Diego-Imperial Counties Labor Council
- San Diego Gas & Electric
- San Diego Unified Port District
- Utility Consumer’s Action Network
- U.S. Navy
- Sierra Club