MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

CITIES/COUNTY TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CTAC)
The CTAC may take action on any item appearing on this agenda.

Thursday, March 3, 2005
9:30 a.m. to 11:30 a.m.

SANDAG, Conference Room A
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101-4231

Chair: Fred Luedtke, City of Escondido
Vice Chair: Doug Isbell, County of San Diego

Staff Contact: Richard Chavez
(619) 699-6989
(619) 699-1905 (Fax)
rch@sandag.org

SANDAG offices are accessible by public transit. Phone 1-800-COMMUTE or see www.sdcommute.com for route information.

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.
## CITIES/COUNTY TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CTAC)

**Thursday, March 3, 2005**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM #</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>AGENDA ITEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Introductions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+2.</td>
<td>APPROVE</td>
<td>Meeting Summary (Fred Luedtke)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The meeting summary for the February 3, 2005, meeting is attached. CTAC is asked to review and approve the meeting summary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Public Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+4.</td>
<td>DISCUSSION</td>
<td>TransNet Early Action Program (Craig Scott)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SANDAG staff will present the attached memo on the inclusion of the local street and roads program in the TransNet Early Action Program. Local agencies are asked to submit amendments to the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) and a 10-year Project Detail Form by March 18, 2005.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+5.</td>
<td>RECOMMEND</td>
<td>Noise Barrier Retrofit Program (Richard Chavez/David Stebbins)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SANDAG and Caltrans staffs are recommending a reallocation of funds to accelerate the delivery of the noise barrier projects in Oceanside and La Mesa. Attached is a summary report. CTAC is asked to review the staff recommendation and options and make a recommendation to the Transportation Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+6.</td>
<td>RECOMMEND</td>
<td>CTAC Charter (Fred Luedtke)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In January 2005, CTAC appointed members to an Ad Hoc Working Group to revise the CTAC Charter. A meeting was held on February 1, 2005, and revisions were discussed. Attached is the revised charter. CTAC is asked to recommend approval of the revised charter to the SANDAG Executive Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+7.</td>
<td>DISCUSSION</td>
<td>Smart Growth Incentive Program (Stephan Vance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>At the February CTAC meeting, staff presented the draft project screening criteria for the Smart Growth Incentive Program. Based on comments received, staff will present the revisions that have been made to the screening criteria. The screening criteria will be presented to the Transportation and Regional Planning Committees for approval on April 1, 2005.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+8.</td>
<td>INFORMATION</td>
<td>Grade Separations for Rail Transit Crossings (Richard Chavez)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Attached is information regarding a rail crossing conference to be held in Costa Mesa on May 1-4, 2005.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>INFORMATION</td>
<td>Announcements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CTAC members are encouraged to share items of interest.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next CTAC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, April 7, 2005.

+ next to an agenda item indicates an attachment.
March 3, 2005

TO: Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC)
FROM: SANDAG Staff
SUBJECT: February 3, 2005 Meeting Summary

Results of the meeting are summarized as follows.

Approval of Meeting Summaries

The meeting summary for the January 6, 2005, meeting was approved as presented.

Public Comments

There were no comments from the public.

TransNet Early Action Program

Craig Scott (SANDAG) reviewed the early action projects, ongoing cash-flow analysis, debt financing issues, formation of the Independent Tax Payers Oversight Committee, Environmental Mitigation Program start-up efforts, Nexus Fee study, and Independent Transit Review study. Chandra Collure (Solana Beach) asked if each agency would receive a bonding capacity analysis. Mr. Scott stated that this would be done on a case by case basis as requested. Doug Isbell (County of San Diego) asked that SANDAG staff send each agency a summary letter. Majed Al-Ghafry (Lemon Grove) asked about any new Maintenance of Effort (MOE) requirements. Mr. Scott stated that the new MOE requirement would be based upon the average transportation contributions for fiscal years 01, 02, and 03. Alex Al-Agha (Chula Vista) asked if I-805 was in the early action program. Mr. Scott stated that the North segment (SR 52 to I-5) and South segment (Telegraph Canyon to SR 94) were in the early action program. Staff was currently assessing the cost of including the Middle segment (SR 94 to SR 52). Bob Johnson (Carlsbad) asked that a future agenda item include a status update on the Nexus Study.

Smart Growth Incentive Program

Stephan Vance (SANDAG) thanked those who helped on developing the program including Majed Al-Ghafry (Lemon Grove), Stephan Marks (NCTD), Gena Franco (San Marcos), Siavash Pazarghadi (City of San Diego), and Din Daneshfar (National City). Mr. Vance presented the draft project evaluation criteria. Richard Leja (City of San Diego) thought there was too much weight placed on project readiness. Bob Johnson (Carlsbad) asked if environmental clearance referred to CEQA or NEPA clearance. Mr. Vance stated that because federal funds were being used environmental clearance referred to NEPA. Mr. Johnson asked if a test run of projects had been
done. Mr. Vance replied that this had not been done. Mr. Leja suggested that the definition of the feasibility study and preliminary engineering should be expanded.

Smart Growth Concept Map

Carolina Gregor (SANDAG) presented the process for developing the Smart Growth Concept Map. Bob Johnson (Carlsbad) stated that communities need to be better educated on the meaning of smart growth. Fred Luedtke (Escondido) stated that it is too simplistic to draw a circle one-quarter of a mile around a transit center and define this as a smart growth area.

Traffic Signal Optimization Program

Richard Chavez (SANDAG) presented the funding recommendation from the San Diego Regional Traffic Engineer’s Council. Due to inconsistencies in the evaluation criteria used to rank these projects, staff recommended referring this prioritized list of projects back to SANTEC for further discussion. Staff also recommended that SANTEC develop new evaluation criteria that are more quantitative in nature. Staff also expressed concern over the apparent lack of support for the Regional Arterial Management System (RAMS) project. Ed Domingue (SANTEC Chair) presented the prioritized list and explained the process SANTEC used to rank the projects. Richard Leja (City of San Diego) asked if new evaluation criteria would change the project ranking. Mr. Domingue stated that he did not believe it would. Mr. Chavez stated that he believed it would. Staff prepared ranking of the projects was significantly different. This ranking was based upon the number of Regional Arterial System signals that would be benefited by each project. Chandra Collure (Solana Beach) asked how a project that was not on the Regional Arterial System and therefore not eligible (City of San Diego PPLT project) was allowed to be ranked. Mr. Chavez stated that this was a staff oversight. Majed Al-Ghafry (Lemon Grove) stated that the Regional Arterial System requirement was not enforced in the past by SANTEC. Mike Robinson (County of San Diego) stated that prioritization process used by SANTEC is sound and hoped that CTAC would support SANTEC’s recommendation. Stephan Marks (NCTD) asked why $400,000 was being held in reserve and not being allocated to other project on the priority list. A motion was made and seconded to refer the prioritized list back to SANTEC for further discussion and for SANTEC to develop more quantitative based evaluation criteria for ranking projects. Yes-8, No-7, the motion carried.

Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP)
Grade Separation for Rail Transit Crossings
CTAC Charter

Fred Luedtke (Chair) stated that these items are presented as information items, members were encouraged to read them, but in the interest of time no presentations were given.

Announcements

Don Pope (Caltrans) provided an update on Caltrans Local Assistance activities.
March 3, 2005

TO: Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC)
FROM: SANDAG Staff
SUBJECT: TransNet Early Action Program – Inclusion of Local Street and Road Projects for Early Implementation

At the last CTAC meeting, the TransNet Early Action Program, as approved by the SANDAG Board of Directors at its January 28, 2005 meeting, was presented. The Early Action Program focuses on the accelerated implementation of some of the major highway and transit projects that were included in the TransNet Extension Ordinance and Expenditure Plan.

The implementation of this Early Action Program will involve the use of debt financing to support the accelerated delivery of these projects. This debt financing process could occur as early as this summer. As discussed at the last CTAC meeting, this debt financing process also affords an opportunity for local jurisdictions to include “early action” local street and road projects.

CTAC requested a memo summarizing the process to be followed and instructions for providing input. Staff envisions the process for handling requests from local jurisdictions for TransNet debt financing to be basically the same as it has been over the last 17 years under the current TransNet program. The specific process over the next few months is described in the following sections.

2005 TransNet Plan of Finance Update

For the next few months, SANDAG will be involved in a major update to the TransNet Plan of Finance to analyze the cash-flow needs of the current TransNet program through FY 2008, as well as the potential cash-flow requirements of the projects in the Early Action Program. SANDAG’s Financial Advisors will be recommending financial strategies to meet the identified cash-flow needs from the Plan of Finance. This will most likely result in the issuance of long-term sales tax revenue bonds, an expansion of the current short-term commercial paper program, or a combination of the two basic approaches.

For the local street and road component of the TransNet program, each jurisdiction’s currently programmed projects will be assumed as the basic input for the cash-flow analysis. We will be conducting the usual annual RTIP amendment process in the near future for minor amendments to your TransNet-funded projects for FY 2006. In late June, you will be receiving the annual monthly cash-flow requests for projects to be built in FY 2006 and FY 2007. If you are not planning any major changes to your projects in the near future, then there is no additional information needed from you at this point in time. We will pick up any minor changes in the normal annual update process.

However, if you have certain key projects that you wish to have considered for debt financing for accelerated implementation as part of this Plan of Finance update for the Early Action Program, we will need information from you as soon as possible—and, no later than March 25, 2005. The
information you provide will provide a key input into SANDAG's upcoming financial planning process.

Early Action Project Cash-Flow Requests

Because any major change to your approved program will most likely require an amendment to the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP), which includes the TransNet Program of Projects, the RTIP amendment form is attached (Attachment 1) as the primary source of information for any requested TransNet Early Action local street and road project.

The information provided in the RTIP amendment form should be sufficient for the initial work on the plan of finance. At a later date, more detailed cash flow estimates may be required. The key assumption made in the use of these forms is that actual expenditures on these projects will not begin until FY 2006. Please indicate if there are cash flow needs during the balances of FY 2005.

In addition, to further refine regional financial strategies, please fill out the attached 10-year Project Detail Form (Attachment 2). This will help us develop a more comprehensive financial strategy for the local street and road program.

Debt Financing Options

As mentioned above, it is likely that the basic short-term and long-term financing options that have been used to implement the current TransNet program will be used to implement the extension as well. The existing commercial paper program is a short-term, floating-rate program that can be borrowed and paid back over a period of a few months or years depending on your estimated revenue and cash-flow needs. The existing TransNet commercial program expires in April 2008. Part of the financial strategy related to the upcoming Plan of Finance update will most likely involve an extension and expansion of this commercial paper option into the future.

It also is expected that long-term, fixed-rate debt will be part of the financial strategy. This long-term debt is typically structured with level debt service payments over a 20- to 30-year time period. Whether a local jurisdiction elects to utilize short- or long-term debt, the prorated issuance costs and debt service costs will be deducted from the local jurisdiction’s formula share of future TransNet funds. The use of debt financing results in the establishment of the required repayment of the debt as the top priority use of your TransNet annual street and road formula funds.

In addition to filling out the forms described above to formally request commercial paper or bond proceeds, you will need to have your City Council or Board of Supervisors approve the use of debt financing for specific project(s). A sample resolution is included as Attachment 3. This action can come later, but will be needed prior to the actual debt issuance. Keep in mind that this is the first, not the only, opportunity for debt financing for local street and road projects. If you have projects that are not far enough along in the development process to know if you will need debt financing or not at this point in time, there will be numerous opportunities in the future as well.

If there are any questions on the cash-flow forms or the debt financing programs, please contact Craig Scott at (619) 699-1926 (csc@sandag.org) or Sookyung Kim at (619) 699-6909 (ski@sandag.org).

Attachments
Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP)
New or Amendment Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEAD AGENCY:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Manager:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre pared by:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>email:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Title:**

**Project Location:**

**Project Limit:**

**City street name or area illustrated on state highway maps - e.g., in Oceanside on El Camino Real (TB map 1086/grid E-7)**

**Project Limit:**

**Total:**

**Project Description:**

(Describe the work to be done. Include significant components of the improvement - in particular those that relate to air quality conformity. Example: rehabilitate roadway; convert 4-lane expressway to 6-lane freeway with 2 HOV lanes; construct left turn lane.)

**Post Mile:**

(length of project)

**TOTAL:**

For Fund Type, see 'RTIP Fund Type' table

PE=Preliminary Engineering, includes environmental & design; RW=Right-of-Way; CON=Construction, includes vehicles (for transit)

*For all CI projects, Project Information Form (Table 2) must accompany this table.
## 10-Year Project Detail Form

Please provide the following information for major arterial and freeway interchange projects for your agency over the next 10 years (2005-2015).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arterial Limits</th>
<th>Existing Number of Lanes</th>
<th>Number of Lanes After Project</th>
<th>Community Opposition (yes/no)</th>
<th>Environmental Mitigation Requirements (yes/no)</th>
<th>Begin PE (month &amp; year)</th>
<th>Begin Construction (month &amp; year)</th>
<th>End Construction (month &amp; year)</th>
<th>PE Cost</th>
<th>R/W Cost</th>
<th>Construction Cost</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
- PE, Preliminary Engineering
- R/W, Right of Way
- Show all costs in 2005 dollars.

Agency:
Preparer:
Telephone:
Date:
TransNet Debt Financing Sample Resolution

RESOLUTION OF __ (Agency Name) __ REQUESTING SANDAG TO PROVIDE ADVANCED FUNDING THROUGH DEBT FINANCING FOR IMPROVEMENTS ON __ (Name of Projects) __

WHEREAS, SANDAG, acting as the San Diego County Regional Transportation Commission, is responsible for the administration of the TransNet program (Proposition A, November 1987 and November 2004); and

WHEREAS, to accelerate the implementation of sales tax-funded projects, SANDAG has established debt financing programs to provide advanced funding for eligible projects under the TransNet program; and

WHEREAS, the following project(s) being implemented by __ (Agency Name) __ have been approved by SANDAG through the 20__ TransNet Program of Projects and would benefit from the availability of advance funding:

(List projects and amount of debt financing required)

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by __ (Agency Name) __ as follows:

1. That the City Manager/Executive Director/Chief Administrative Officer is hereby authorized to request advance funding from SANDAG through its debt financing program in an amount not to exceed $________________.

2. That the City Manager/Executive Director/Chief Administrative Officer is hereby authorized to execute any necessary documents relating to the receipt of said funds from SANDAG.

3. [For long-term debt] That __ (Agency Name) __ will be responsible for paying its proportionate share of the total issuance costs and annual debt service costs based on the ratio of the amount of proceeds provided to __ (Agency Name) __ to the total proceeds of the debt issuance.

4. [For commercial paper] That __ (Agency Name) __ will be responsible for paying its proportionate share of the annual interest and administrative costs of the commercial paper program based on the ratio of the amount of financing provided to __ (Agency Name) __ to the total commercial paper outstanding for each fiscal year.

5. [For commercial paper] That SANDAG will deduct said interest and administrative costs from the __ (Agency Name)'s _ monthly TransNet sales tax allocations prior to making any other sales tax payments for other __ (Agency Name)'s _ projects.

6. [For commercial paper] That __ (Agency Name) __ will repay to SANDAG the principal amount borrowed according to the schedule below. If paid from future sales tax revenues, these principal payments will be deducted by SANDAG from __ (Agency Name)'s _ monthly TransNet sales tax allocations prior to making any other sales tax payments for other __ (Agency Name)'s _ projects.

   [Insert a repayment schedule that fully repays the principal amount]

7. That the first priority use of the __ (Agency Name)'s _ annual allocation of TransNet revenues shall be payment of any required costs of debt financing.

   PASSED AND ADOPTED this ___ day of _________________. 20__.
March 3, 2005

TO: Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC)

FROM: Caltrans and SANDAG Staffs

SUBJECT: Highway Noise Barrier Retrofit Program

Introduction

Noise levels exceed state and federal criteria at numerous residential locations adjacent to existing highways in the San Diego region. Passage of Senate Bill 45 (Kopp) in 1997 delegated the responsibility of addressing existing highway noise impacts on residential areas from the state to the regions. In 1998, the SANDAG Board of Directors adopted a policy for addressing existing highway noise issues and later amended this policy in 2001 (see Attachment 1). In June 2002, the SANDAG Board of Directors programmed $1,982,000 toward the construction of three noise barriers—two in the City of Oceanside adjacent to Interstate 5 (I-5), and one in the City of La Mesa adjacent to State Route 94 (SR 94).

In June 2002, the SANDAG Board of Directors also approved a Use-it-or-Lose-it policy requiring the award of a construction contract for the three noise barriers within two years of the programming of the funding. Due to State transportation budget shortfalls, these funds were not programmed until November 2002. Also due to the State transportation budget shortfall, Caltrans has been unable to provide the staff resources needed to advance the projects.

The costs to construct the noise barriers have increased. The cost increases exceed the available programmed funds, and additional funds would be required to complete these noise barrier projects.

Recommendation

Staff recommends that CTAC recommend to the Transportation Committee to: (1) waive the Use-it-or-Lose-it clause for the three noise barriers due to impacts caused by the State transportation budget shortfall; (2) reallocate $1,481,000 of the original $1,982,000 to fully fund the La Mesa noise barrier; (3) reallocate the remaining $501,000 from the original $1,982,000, plus $1,476,000 from the I-5 North Coast TransNet Early Action Project, for a total of $1,977,000 to fully fund the Oceanside noise barriers.
Discussion

The I-5 North Coast project will widen 26 miles of I-5 from Genesee Avenue in the City of San Diego to Vandegrift Boulevard in the City of Oceanside. This project represents an opportunity to construct the Oceanside noise barriers as noise barriers will be constructed as part of this project. Caltrans expects to receive environmental clearance for this project in 2007, with freeway widening beginning in 2009. As part of the stage construction strategy and when feasible, Caltrans plans to build the required noise barriers ahead of the freeway widening. This will provide the noise protection benefits of the noise barriers through the freeway widening construction period. Caltrans plans to start building the Oceanside noise barriers beginning in 2007.

The I-5 noise barriers in Oceanside will be addressed as a mitigation measure for the I-5 North Coast project. It is therefore appropriate to program TransNet Early Action Program funds for this purpose. All appropriate state and federal noise abatement protocol will be followed.

Cost Increases

The costs of the Oceanside and La Mesa noise barriers have increased since 2002 due to increases in construction costs and right-of-way costs. The original costs and the revised costs of these noise barriers are shown below. The revised costs are shown in 2007 dollars, the expected year of construction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>La Mesa Noise Barrier</th>
<th>Original Costs</th>
<th>Revised Costs</th>
<th>Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>$487,000</td>
<td>$487,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way</td>
<td>$133,000</td>
<td>$133,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$861,000</td>
<td>$861,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$738,000</td>
<td>$1,481,000</td>
<td>200%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oceanside Noise Barrier</th>
<th>Original Costs</th>
<th>Revised Costs</th>
<th>Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>$608,000</td>
<td>$608,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$1,351,000</td>
<td>$1,351,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$1,275,000</td>
<td>$1,977,000</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Options

Option 1

Enforce the Use-it-or-Lose-it policy and reallocate the funds to the next project on the 2002 priority list (see Attachment 2). This would be the National City noise barrier project along I-805 at Plaza Boulevard. Caltrans estimates the revised cost of this noise barrier is $1,370,000. The remaining funds are not enough to fund the next project on the list, which is the El Cajon noise barrier along I-8 at Mollison Avenue. The remaining funds could be held in reserve until the next noise barrier funding cycle.

Option 2

Funding shortfalls exist on a number of high-priority transportation projects. The noise barrier funds could be reallocated to a high-priority project like the ongoing construction on I-15.

Attachment/Enclosure
1. **Fund Allocation:** SANDAG will allocate up to one percent (1%) of the funds available through the State Transportation Improvement Program – Regional Improvement Program (STIP-RIP) each cycle to fund eligible retrofit noise barriers. Each STIP-RIP cycle, the local jurisdictions are required to submit a request for their candidate retrofit noise barriers to SANDAG for funding consideration. The request must document that at least two-thirds of the residences immediately adjacent to the freeway desire installation of the noise barrier. The local jurisdictions are required to provide all engineering and right-of-way services, including construction contract administration, unless arrangements are made with Caltrans. The local jurisdictions are required to address long-term noise barrier maintenance issues to the satisfaction of Caltrans prior to funding allocation by SANDAG.

Funds will be allocated to the noise barrier(s) with the highest Priority Index number as determined by the Noise Barrier Scope Summary Report (NBSSR). Caltrans will maintain a two-tiered Retrofit Noise Barrier Needs List. Funds will only be allocated to Tier 1 noise barriers.

STIP-RIP funds are programmed by SANDAG and administered by Caltrans. STIP-RIP funds are transferred by Caltrans to the local jurisdiction on a reimbursement basis. Strict Use-it-or-Lose-it rules apply to STIP-RIP funds, as defined in the STIP Guidelines adopted by the California Transportation Commission (CTC).

2. **Eligibility:** Qualifying conditions are limited to residential areas with outdoor areas of frequent use immediately adjacent to existing interstate freeways or state highways where noise levels exceed 67 decibels (measured as the energy-average of the A-weighted sound levels occurring during a one hour period, dBA, Leq(h)). A retrofit noise barrier must meet minimum state and federal standards to be added to the Caltrans maintained Retrofit Noise Barrier Needs List.

Barriers on the Retrofit Noise Barrier Needs List must be cost-effective. The cost-effectiveness criterion is established as $45,000 per benefited living unit for the 2002 STIP-RIP funding cycle. This criterion will be adjusted for future STIP-RIP cycles by using the California Construction Cost Index as a guide. The noise barrier’s cost-effectiveness calculation should include all living units (i.e., houses, apartments, and condominiums) that will benefit by a reduction of 5 dBA or more as a result of the noise barrier construction. The noise barrier cost used in making the cost-effectiveness calculation should be the same as that used for calculating the Priority Index.

Noise barriers identified as part of an environmental document for noise abatement purposes for highway improvement or residential development projects will not be eligible for STIP-RIP funding as a retrofit noise barrier. All new highway projects will include noise barriers in accordance with state and federal policy. All new residential developments adjacent to highways will include noise barriers in accordance with state and local policy.
3. **Retrofit Noise Barrier Needs List:** Caltrans will develop and maintain a comprehensive list of noise barrier needs in the region. Caltrans will perform field noise measurements as needed. Caltrans will maintain a two-tiered list: Tier 1 will consist of proposed noise barriers that have a completed Noise Barrier Scope Summary Report (NBSSR). Tier 2 will consist of proposed noise barriers that have no NBSSR. Noise barriers in Tier 1 will be listed in order, based upon their Priority Index numbers. Noise barriers in Tier 2 will be listed in order, based upon measured noise levels.

4. **Noise Barrier Scope and Summary Report (NBSSR):** The local jurisdictions are responsible for funding and completing the NBSSR. Caltrans is responsible for reviewing and approving the NBSSR. The noise barrier will be advanced from Tier 2 to Tier 1 once the NBSSR is approved by Caltrans. Proposed noise barriers must not conflict with projects currently programmed in the RTIP. Long-term maintenance strategies must be included in the NBSSR. NBSSR guidelines can be found in the Caltrans Design Program Web site at www.dot.ca.gov/hq/oppd. The guidelines are in Appendix F of the Project Development Procedures Manual (PDPM) that is listed under the Manuals/Guidance/Design Topics heading on the Web site.

5. **Noise Barrier Requests:** Caltrans will investigate all noise barrier requests and maintain a log. The log will be shared with the local jurisdictions and SANDAG on a quarterly basis. The local jurisdictions are responsible to update their contact person information with Caltrans. Caltrans will develop and maintain an educational pamphlet about noise barriers for distribution purposes. If a requested noise barrier does not meet the minimum standards, Caltrans will send the educational pamphlet to the requester.

6. **Priority Index (PI) Calculation:** The PI is used for ranking Tier 1 noise barriers on the Retrofit Noise Barrier Needs List.

\[
PI = (NL - 67)^2 \times AR \times LU / \text{Cost (in $1,000)}
\]

- **NL:** Is the average of the field-measured noise levels, dBA, Leq(h).
- **AR:** Is the average reduction in noise levels that the proposed noise barrier will achieve. The NAC of 67dBA, Leq(h), is a goal for achievement, but is not mandatory. However, any noise barrier considered under this program must provide a minimum of 5 dBa noise reduction.
- **LU:** Is the number of living units immediately adjacent to the freeway (i.e., first line receivers). Residences located above the first floor in multistory units are included in the living unit count only if the proposed barrier will provide a 5dBa reduction for these units.
- **Cost:** The noise barrier cost in $1,000's includes all costs directly related to the proposed noise barriers. This includes items for engineering, right-of-way, earthwork, drainage, traffic control, structure work, planting, and other specialty work, as well as the noise barrier itself.

For projects that include noise barriers at multiple locations, the overall project’s PI is calculated independently for each location. The PI for the combined project is calculated using a weighted average method, with the weighting based on the number of living units at each location.
7. **Priority Index (PI) Adjustment**: A major factor for determining priority is the percentage of living units immediately adjacent to the freeway where occupants have resided there since the time the highway opened. The local jurisdiction in which the residential area is located is responsible for providing documentation on percentage of living units with original occupants still residing immediately adjacent to the highway.

PI calculated by the above formula is enhanced by an amount equal to the actual percentage of living units with occupants currently still residing there. For example, if the PI for a noise barrier is calculated to be 10.00 and the documentation furnished by the local agency indicates that the current qualifying living unit percentage is 52.5 percent, then the priority index is adjusted to 62.5.

If the current occupant or occupants are the owners, then the date of purchase is used as documentation. For rental and leased properties, a statement is obtained from the landlord of the date occupancy commenced.

Another factor for determining priority is the level of contribution from the local jurisdiction. The PI is enhanced by half the percentage of local jurisdiction contribution towards the noise barrier cost up to a maximum of 33 percent (i.e., a maximum of 16.5 points). For example, if the PI for a noise barrier is calculated to be 10.0 and the local jurisdiction contributes 30 percent of the cost, then the priority index is adjusted to 25.0. A noise barrier may qualify for both an enhancement for residents that predate the highway and for a local jurisdiction contribution.

The cost used for determining the level of contribution is the same as for determining the PI, minus the cost of the NBSSR. No PI adjustment is given for local jurisdiction costs associated with completion of the NBSSR, as this is a basic program requirement. Resolution of the city council or Board of Supervisors demonstrates a contribution.

8. **Eligible Expenditures**: Only project features directly attributable to a retrofit noise barrier incurred after the noise barrier has been programmed in the RTIP are eligible for funding. Acceptable project features include drainage modification, earthwork, safety treatments, miscellaneous asphalt paving, landscaping, traffic control and right-of-way acquisition that is directly related to and needed for proper installation of the noise barrier. Support costs (development of final engineering plans, environmental clearance, right-of-way appraisal, construction management) are eligible for funding. Inappropriate project features include maintenance, upgrades, or enhancements to the adjacent residence or roadway, roadway slopes, or roadway features.
## Noise Barrier Project Proposals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Route</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Noise Level</th>
<th>Average Reduction</th>
<th>Living Units</th>
<th>Total Cost (thousands)</th>
<th>Cumulative Cost (thousands)</th>
<th>PI</th>
<th>Percent Residents Predate Freeway</th>
<th>Percent Local Contribution</th>
<th>Adjusted PI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Oceanside</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>Whaley St</td>
<td>California St</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$558</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>La Mesa</td>
<td>SR-94</td>
<td>Waite Dr</td>
<td>Massachusetts Ave</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$738</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Oceanside</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>Hillside Ln</td>
<td>California St</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$717</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>National City</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>Plaza Blvd</td>
<td>4th Street</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>$886</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>El Cajon</td>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>SR-67</td>
<td>Mollison Ave</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>$1,709</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>La Mesa</td>
<td>SR-94</td>
<td>69th St</td>
<td>King St</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$305</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>La Mesa</td>
<td>SR-94</td>
<td>Jill Lane</td>
<td>Massachusetts Ave</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$259</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>Boundary St</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>$765</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes:

PI, Priority Index = ("Noise Level" minus 67) squared times "Average Reduction" times "Living Units" divided by "Total Cost"

Adjusted PI = PI plus "Percent Residents that Predate the Freeway" plus "Percent Local Contribution"

The SANDAG Board of Directors has made $1,982,000 of 2002 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds available for freeway noise barriers. Projects #1 through #3 would receive funding from the 2002 STIP funding cycle.

Project #3 (Oceanside: Hillside Ln to California St) would be funded in the amount of $686,000 due to funding constraints.

---

**June 13, 2002**
Committee Charter

Committee Name:

Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC)

Purpose:

To provide recommendations to the SANDAG Transportation Committee in regards to the planning, funding, and implementation of all ground transportation modes including roads and highways, transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities. Primary areas of concern are the Regional Transportation Improvement Program, Regional Transportation Plan, Congestion Mitigation Program, Regional Arterial System, Regionally Significant Transportation Network, and other transportation programs and issues.

Membership:

Voting membership of CTAC will consist of one representative from each city, the County, Metropolitan Transit System, and North County Transit District. Caltrans, Air Pollution Control District, and the Port District shall be non-voting resource members. Each voting member agency shall have one vote.

Discussion:

Each member agency of CTAC will be requested to designate one member and one or two alternate members. A committee chair and vice chair will be elected and will serve for a period of two years. The CTAC will meet every month or as needed.
March 3, 2005

TO: Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC)
FROM: SANDAG Staff
SUBJECT: Draft Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program Criteria and Guidelines
ACTION: RECOMMEND

Introduction

The Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program is a program proposed in the Regional Transportation Plan, MOBILITY 2030. It also is a precursor to the smart growth incentive program called for in the Regional Comprehensive Plan that will be funded in the ordinance that extended the TransNet program to 2048. At the last CTAC meeting, SANDAG staff presented the draft project evaluation criteria for this program and responded to questions and comments from CTAC members. The draft criteria also were discussed at a joint meeting of the Regional Planning Committee and the Transportation Committee, and with the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (RPTWG).

The ad hoc working group collaborating with SANDAG staff to develop the Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program (SGIP) has recommended changes to the project evaluation criteria in response to these comments, including recommended weighting factors for each criterion. Staff has also prepared draft program guidelines and is in the process of developing the program’s application form. The revised project evaluation criteria and program guidelines are attached to this report. CTAC is asked to recommend that the Transportation Committee adopt these criteria and guidelines for implementing the pilot SGIP.

Discussion

Program Guidelines. The draft program guidelines were developed to meet the federal state and local requirements of the federal Transportation Enhancement (TE) funds that will be the funding source for the program. They also establish the application requirements and, in general terms, provide guidance on how the evaluation criteria will be applied to score and rank projects. The application form is being designed to ensure that each application includes the information needed for a thorough evaluation of the projects. The guidelines also explain the application requirements and evaluation criteria, and describe the project selection process.

Project Evaluation Panel. As proposed in the draft guidelines, the projects will be scored by a project evaluation panel. This panel would include SANDAG staff and individuals selected from SANDAG’s newly formed 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 Stakeholders Working Group, 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.

Revised Evaluation Criteria. There are two major differences between the evaluation criteria matrix presented to CTAC at the February meeting and the attached matrix. First, the matrix now includes weighting factors for each criterion. The matrix divides the evaluation criteria into four sections: Project Readiness, Smart Growth and Land Use Characteristics, Quality of Proposed Project, and Matching Funds. The weighting factors distribute the points between these sections as follows:

- A. Project Readiness 13%
- B. Smart Growth and Land Use Characteristics 39%
- C. Quality of Proposed Project 35%
- D. Matching Fund 13%

Total 100%

The second major change is that affordable housing has been added as a criterion to Section B, Smart Growth and Land Use Characteristics. This category was requested at the joint meeting of the Regional Planning and Transportation Committees in response to a letter from the San Diego Housing Federation. With SANDAG in the process of adopting a formula for allocating affordable housing throughout the region, this issue has taken on added significance.

Program Application Forms. Staff is still in the process of developing the program application forms. They will be designed to relate directly to the evaluation criteria to ensure the evaluation panel has all the information it needs to score the projects. Once a draft form has been completed, it will be reviewed by the pilot program’s ad hoc working group. CTAC members not on the ad hoc working group who would like to review the application form before it goes to the Transportation and Regional Planning Committees should notify SANDAG staff.

Next Steps

The final draft evaluation criteria and program guidelines will be presented to the RPTWG on March 10, and to the Stakeholders Working Group on March 15. Assuming the program receives a recommendation for approval from these two groups and CTAC, the program would go to a joint meeting of the Regional Planning and Transportation Committees on April 1, and to the SANDAG Board of Directors on April 22. Once the program has been approved, SANDAG will issue a call for projects, and receive applications 45 days later. A project evaluation panel will be formed that will review and rank the projects approximately three weeks after the application deadline. The panel’s recommendations would then go to the Transportation and Regional Planning Committees for approval the first week of July. After the SANDAG Board endorses the action of these committees, 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.
SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM  
DRAFT APPLICATION AND CALL FOR PROJECTS PROCESS

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.

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 receive the funds. Grant recipients will be required to take the capital project through the federal aid process with Caltrans Local Assistance and meet both the state and SANDAG’s “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?
SANDAG will allocate $17 million in federal Transportation Enhancement (TE) funds toward the Pilot SGIP. Grant amounts will range from $200,000 to $2 million per project. A minimum local match of 11.47 percent of the total SGIP project cost is required.

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, and 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 may also be eligible. 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 SGIP should be in existing or future smart growth areas. SANDAG has just begun the process of working with local jurisdictions to identify these areas for the Regional Comprehensive Plan’s (RCP) Smart Growth Concept Map. 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.

The RCP clearly defines six smart growth place types that require a connection to regional transit service, and a rural smart growth place type (see Attachment 1). 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 SGIP 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, and on the qualities of the project itself.

The evaluation criteria have two main components: eligibility screening criteria, and project evaluation criteria that refer to the quality of the project and its surrounding area. Once a project has passed the eligibility screening, it will be scored on the project evaluation criteria. These criteria are included in the Pilot SGIP scoring matrix attached to the application materials.

The project evaluation criteria in the SGIP scoring matrix was designed to rank the capital improvement project and its surrounding land uses on a scale from 0 to 5. Each criterion is then weighted by a factor from one to three depending on its relative importance. The weight factors put a premium on projects that are “ready to go,” increase density, and meet the Smart Growth land use and urban design characteristics of the project area type, as defined in the RCP, and provide for affordable housing.

The “project” is the capital improvement that would be supported by the 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 others. Because the project could include one or more of these improvement types, each grant will be evaluated based on how well it proposes to execute each type. Proposals that include more than one type of improvement will be scored on each element, and so could earn points for each.

The screening and evaluation criteria in the scoring matrix 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. These three criteria must be met before a project can be evaluated further: (1) A resolution authorizing the application and committing matching funds and staff resources to the project from a local Board or Council; (2) certification that other necessary funding is committed to the project; and (3) eligibility under the federal funding program guidelines. Applicants with questions about project eligibility should contact SANDAG (619 600-1924) or the 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. PROJECT READINESS CRITERIA are 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 Area 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 described in Attachment 1. 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 SGIP project reflects Smart Growth development principles, especially 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) at affordable housing costs. 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 and Transit Facility 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. Streetscape Enhancements and Traffic Calming Features also impact the quality of the SGIP 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 fund swaps and other strategies for how the project might be included in the program.

Section 3: Matching Funds Bonus

MATCHING FUNDS BONUS 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 impact fee, 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 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. As much as possible, the panel 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 45 days.

Step 2: Applicants submit a project proposal to SANDAG for funding consideration. The program application and related instructions are included in Attachment 2. 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 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?

The project evaluation panel may choose to re-order the project ranking from among the highest-rated projects to achieve these program goals. However, they are not obligated to recommend funding a project for every place type or geographic area. 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 another reason, a project or projects from the waiting list could be funded based on its priority the amount funding available.
Step 4: Based on the recommendations of the evaluation panel and funding availability of the overall program, SANDAG’s Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning will make a funding recommendation to the SANDAG Transportation Committee and the Regional Planning Committee, which will select the projects to be funded.

Step 5: Following SANDAG Board approval of the Regional Planning and Transportation Committees’ action, 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 the Caltrans Office of Local Assistance will discuss their respective roles in the program. Grantees must comply with SANDAG’s Use-It-or-Lose-It policy for the TE program (see Attachment 3), and the Federal Highway Administration’s federal aid process.
# Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program

## Draft Project Evaluation Criteria

**February 23, 2005**

## 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.

### A. Local Commitment/Authorization

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.

### B. Funding Commitment

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.

### C. Funding Eligibility

The project must be eligible under the federal funding program guidelines.

## 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.

### A. Project Readiness

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Project Development</th>
<th>Feasibility Study</th>
<th>Preliminary Engineering</th>
<th>Environmental Clearance</th>
<th>Right-of-way Acquisition</th>
<th>Final Design</th>
<th>Max. Points</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Max. Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Projects receive 1 point for each completed phase to a maximum of 5 points.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B. Smart Growth Area Land Use Characteristics

To encourage projects in smart growth development areas, and to evaluate how well they support smart growth development, the proposed projects are scored based on the intensity of development, the diversity of land uses, the quality of urban design in the project area, the provision of additional housing in general and affordable housing in particular.

1. **Intensity of Development (0-5 points)**

   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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Development</th>
<th>Max. Points</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Max. Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(0-5)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **Land use and Transportation Characteristics of Project Area (0-5 points)**

   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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Development</th>
<th>Max. Points</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Max. Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(0-5)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Urban Design Characteristics of Project Area (0-5 points)**

   How well does the existing or planned urban design in the project area conform to the smart growth design principles in the RCP? Maximum points are given for areas where the existing built environment, or the design standards for new construction provides a human-scale built environment. The street network and trail system should provide direct access to commercial and civic services, recreational opportunities, and transportation services. Building construction should be oriented to the pedestrian. Street design should fully accommodate bicyclists and pedestrians, including transit passengers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Development</th>
<th>Max. Points</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Max. Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(0-5)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **Related Land Development Projects (0-5 points)**

   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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Development</th>
<th>Max. Points</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Max. Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(0-5)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. **Affordable Housing (0-5 points)**

   Does the project serve affordable (subsidized) housing? How much additional affordable housing is provided?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Development</th>
<th>Max. Points</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Max. Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(0-5)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program
#### Draft Project Evaluation Criteria
February 23, 2005

**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>Points</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Pedestrian Access Improvements (0-5 points)</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>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bicycle Access Improvements (0-5 points)</td>
<td>To what extent does the project improve bicycle access to, and secure parking at a regional transit station, transit corridor, or rural village center? Maximum points should be awarded to projects that provide seamless bicycle access to the areas activity centers, and include secure bicycle parking.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Transit Facility Improvements (0-5 points)</td>
<td>To what extent does the project improve the transit patron environment at transit stations, along transit corridors, or at access points immediately adjacent to the transit facility?</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Streetscape Enhancements (0-5 points)</td>
<td>How well does the project include public art elements, public seating, pedestrian-scale lighting, enhanced paving or wayfinding signage?</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Traffic Calming Features (0-5 points)</td>
<td>How well does the project include one or more of the traffic calming devices recommended in Planning and Designing for Pedestrians?</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Parking Improvements (0-5 points)</td>
<td>How well does the project provide appropriate levels of auto access to regional transit and the related project area without detracting from the quality of public spaces, and without detracting from transit, bicycle and pedestrian circulation?</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**D. Matching Funds Bonus**

Matching Funds (0-15) The higher the percentage of matching funds, the greater the number of bonus points the project will receive. 20 Maximum of 15 points

**TOTAL PROJECT SCORE** 115

**Notes**

1Affordable 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.
THE CROSSING ZONE: A DECADE OF PROGRESS
The Western Regional Grade Crossing Safety Training Conference
May 1-4, 2005
Costa Mesa, California

Intended for local road and highway agencies, and heavy- and light-rail owners and operators, the conference program will include sessions on timely topics including: trespassing; the new train horn rule; “intelligent” rail systems; homeland security; liability issues; development around existing tracks and crossings; community outreach; important updates on federal legislation and the state of the industry; crossing inventories; the 2003 MUTCD; temporary traffic control; grade separations; crossing closures; signals and preemption; and diagnostic reviews, and three pre-conference tutorials on: crossing design; preemption; and quiet zones.

This conference is sponsored by the Technology Transfer Program and the Federal Railroad Administration and co-sponsored by Union Pacific, Burlington Northern Sante Fe, Metrolink and other railroads, the National Association of County Engineers, government and industry.

Additional information on the event is be posted at http://www.techtransfer.berkeley.edu/railroad/index.html