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AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

• 2050 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN: DRAFT UNCONSTRAINED TRANSPORTATION NETWORK AND CONCEPTUAL OVERVIEW OF REVENUE CONSTRAINED SCENARIOS

• REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT UPDATE

• TransNet SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM (SGIP) PROGRESS REPORT AND TDA/TransNet BICYCLE PEDESTRIAN AND NEIGHBORHOOD SAFETY GRANT PROGRAM

• TransNet ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION PROGRAM (EMP) STATUS REPORT

PLEASE TURN OFF CELL PHONES DURING THE MEETING
YOU CAN LISTEN TO THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING BY VISITING OUR WEB SITE AT WWW.SANDAG.ORG

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.
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 the SANDAG 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. Any handouts, presentations, or other materials from the public intended for distribution at the Regional Planning Committee meeting should be received by the Clerk of the Board no later than 12 noon, two working days prior to the meeting.

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

SANDAG offices are accessible by public transit. Phone 511 or see 511sd.com for route information.
+1. APPROVAL OF JULY 2, 2010, MEETING MINUTES

APPROVE

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

Members of the public shall have the opportunity to address the Regional Planning Committee (RPC) on any issue within the jurisdiction of the Committee that is not on this agenda. Anyone desiring to speak shall reserve time by completing a “Request to Speak” form and giving it to the Clerk prior to speaking. Public speakers should notify the Clerk if they have a handout for distribution to Committee members. Speakers are limited to three minutes. Committee members also may provide information and announcements under this agenda item.

**REPORTS (3 through 6)**

+3. 2050 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN: DRAFT UNCONSTRAINED TRANSPORTATION NETWORK AND CONCEPTUAL OVERVIEW OF REVENUE CONSTRAINED SCENARIOS (Heather Werdick)

**DISCUSSION**

At its July 23, 2010, meeting the SANDAG Board of Directors accepted the Unconstrained Transportation Network for use in developing the 2050 RTP. The Unconstrained Network provides the universe of projects from which transit, highway, freight, and other transportation projects will be ranked and selected for use in the various Revenue Constrained scenarios. The Board report and associated maps are attached. Staff also will provide an overview of the upcoming process to develop various Revenue Constrained scenarios.

+4. REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT (RHNA) UPDATE (Susan Baldwin)

**INFORMATION**

The SANDAG Board discussed the RHNA at its July 9, 2010, policy meeting. In addition, the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG) and the Regional Housing Working Group (RHWG) have held several joint meetings to begin discussing the development of the RHNA methodology for the fifth housing element cycle (January 1, 2013, to December 31, 2020). The discussions focused on principles and factors to be used in the RHNA methodology, RHNA objectives from state housing element law, and past RHNA methodologies. Input received from the Board, TWG, and RHWG will be provided to the RPC.
SANDAG approved the first round of SGIP projects under TransNet in May 2009. This report provides an overview of the implementation phase of the program and on the progress made to date by the grant recipients. Staff anticipates that the next call for projects will be conducted after completion of the 2050 RTP.

Staff will present an update on the implementation of the TransNet EMP. This will include the current status of land acquisition for mitigation, funding for regional land management and monitoring, and future efforts to launch an interactive Web site for tracking and public information.

The next meeting of the RPC is scheduled for October 1, 2010, at 12 noon.
The meeting of the Regional Planning Committee was called to order by Chair Jim Janney (South County) at 12 p.m. See the attached attendance sheet for Regional Planning Committee (RPC) member attendance.

1. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES (APPROVE)

   Action: Upon a motion by Deputy Mayor Lesa Heebner (North County Coastal) and a second by Councilmember Jerry Selby (East County), the RPC unanimously approved the minutes from the June 4, 2010, meeting.

   Deputy Mayor Lesa Heebner commented on the SANDAG online survey and requested that all Board members be informed of this survey and requested that Committee members send the survey to their constituents for their input.

   Gary Gallegos, Executive Director, assured her an e-mail would be sent to all Board members along with a link to the Web page, as it is part of the Regional Transportation Plan.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

   Chair Jim Janney (South County) welcomed Steve Chung from the U.S. Department of Defense.

   Mr. Chung informed he is presently working for the Navy as the Regional Community Plans and Liaison Officer to Admiral French and Intergovernmental Branch Head. His duties include interfacing with other federal, state, and local agencies on the issues of encroachment and improving existing compatibility.

   Chair Janney expressed his appreciation for Mr. Chung’s participation on the Committee.

CONSENT (Item 3)

3. REGIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN (RCP): 2009 ANNUAL PERFORMANCE MONITORING REPORT (RECOMMEND)

   A draft of the 2009 RCP Monitoring Report was released for public comment in June 2010 and comments have been incorporated into the attached revised draft.
Action: Upon a motion by Deputy Mayor Lesa Heebner (North County Coastal) and a second by Councilmember Steve Gronke (North County Inland), the RPC unanimously recommended that the SANDAG Board of Directors accept the “Regional Comprehensive Plan: 2009 Annual Performance Monitoring Report” in substantially the same form as attached, and further recommends that the Board of Directors approve the revised schedule for biennial reporting in future years.

REPORTS (Items 4 through 6)

4. PRESENTATION ON THE PORT OF SAN DIEGO’S MARITIME INDUSTRY AND ROLE IN THE REGION (INFORMATION)

San Diego Unified Port District Commissioner Lou Smith and John Helmer, Director of Land Use and Planning (San Diego Unified Port District), provided an overview of the Port’s current operations and initiatives, which include capital improvement projects such as the North Embarcadero Visionary Plan, the Broadway Cruise Ship Terminal, San Diego Convention Center Expansion, and the Chula Vista Bayfront Masterplan. The presentation also emphasized the regional and global role of the Port.

Action: This item was provided for information only.

5. OVERVIEW OF CLIMATE CHANGE ADAPTATION AND THE 2050 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN (DISCUSSION)

Ron Saenz, Associate Planner, presented an overview of climate change adaptation strategies and their potential role in the 2050 RTP. The discussion also included efforts being made by federal, state, and local governments.

Action: This item was provided for discussion only.

6. 2050 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN (RTP): PREFERRED UNCONSTRAINED TRANSPORTATION NETWORK (DISCUSSION)

In an effort to receive comments and input from Committee members, Carolina Gregor, Committee Coordinator, provided a status report on the Urban Area Transit Strategy; and, Heather Werdick, Senior Planner, updated the Committee on progress made on the 2050 Unconstrained Transportation Network in the areas of highway and transit plans.

Gary Gallegos, Executive Director, summarized that the dramatic difference from the last RTP is the significantly higher level of transit investment that is being suggested.

The SANDAG Board of Directors will be asked to accept the Unconstrained Transportation Network at its July 23, 2010, meeting.

Action: This item was provided for discussion only.
7. UPCOMING MEETINGS

Chair Janney stated the August 6 RPC meeting would be cancelled. He conducted an impromptu poll with Committee members and announced the next RPC meeting would be held on Friday, September 10, 2010, at 12 noon.

8. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Janney adjourned the meeting at 1:34 p.m.

Attachment: Attendance Sheet
## CONFIRMED ATTENDANCE
### SANDAG REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING
#### JULY 2, 2010 — 12 noon to 2 p.m.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBREGIONAL AREA</th>
<th>JURISDICTION</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>MEMBER / ALTERNATE</th>
<th>ATTENDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North County Inland</td>
<td>City of Vista</td>
<td>Steve Gronke</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Don Higginson</td>
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<td>Jim Janney, Chair</td>
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<td>Al Ovrom</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
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<td>City of Imperial Beach</td>
<td>Jim Janney, Chair</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
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<td>City of Solana Beach</td>
<td>Lesa Heebner</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
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<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Encinitas</td>
<td>Teresa Barth</td>
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<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East County</td>
<td>City of Lemon Grove</td>
<td>Jerry Jones, Vice Chair</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Lemon Grove</td>
<td>Jerry Selby</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>City of Lemon Grove</td>
<td>Jerry Sanders</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Solana Beach</td>
<td>Sherri Lightner</td>
<td>1st Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>City of Solana Beach</td>
<td>Pam Slater-Price</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Members</td>
<td>Caltrans, District 11</td>
<td>Laurie Berman</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>San Diego County Water Authority</td>
<td>Elsa Saxod</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>San Diego County Water Authority</td>
<td>Howard Williams</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>Department of Defense</td>
<td>Steve Chung</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>San Diego Unified Port District</td>
<td>Lou Smith</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>San Diego Unified Port District</td>
<td>Steve Padilla</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>Al Ovrom</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>NCTD</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG)</td>
<td>Bill Anderson</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Member</td>
<td>Southern California Tribal Chairmen’s Association</td>
<td>Johnny Hernandez (Iipay Nation of Santa Ysabel)</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Allen Lawson (San Pasqual)</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Denis Turner (SCTCA)</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Mitigation Program Advisory Member</th>
<th>Wildlife Conservation Board</th>
<th>Deborah Townsend</th>
<th>Member</th>
<th>✓</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Mitigation Program Advisory Member</td>
<td>California Department of Fish and Game</td>
<td>Catherine Caldwell</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Mitigation Program Advisory Member</td>
<td>US Army Corps of Engineers</td>
<td>Steve Juarez</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Mitigation Program Advisory Member</td>
<td>US Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
<td>Michelle Matson</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Mitigation Program Advisory Member</td>
<td>US Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
<td>Therese O’Rourke</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Mitigation Program Advisory Member</td>
<td>US Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
<td>David Mayer</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Mitigation Program Advisory Member</td>
<td>US Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Mitigation Program Advisory Member</td>
<td>US Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
<td>Susan Wynn</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introducing the Draft 2050 RTP

The draft 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) presents the region’s vision for transit, highway, and arterial improvements and operations to meet travel demand in 2050. Defining the Unconstrained Transportation Network is an important step in developing an updated RTP because it establishes the broadest multimodal network from which revenue-constrained network scenarios will be developed.

The estimated cost of the draft Unconstrained Transportation Network totals approximately $135 billion to $140 billion through 2050. Costs will continue to be refined during the development of the 2050 RTP.
Initial Revenue Constrained Scenarios

Over the last month, staff prioritized the future projects in all modes included in the Unconstrained Transportation Network using the Board-approved transportation project evaluation criteria. Based on revenue projections to 2050, initial revenue constrained transportation network scenarios with a range of modal emphases will be developed using this prioritized project list and other factors. The revenue constrained scenarios will be evaluated using Board-approved performance measures leading to the eventual selection of a preferred revenue constrained scenario by the Board of Directors.

Revenue Projections, Flexible Funding, and Board Policy

An important step in preparing the 2050 RTP is to determine the likely revenues that will be available to develop Revenue Constrained scenarios. Initial revenue estimates indicate that approximately $100 billion to $110 billion would be available through 2050. The revenue forecasts include projections of anticipated federal, state, local, and private funds from existing and reasonable available future sources. These revenues range from the locally-generated TransNet half-cent sales tax to state and federal formula funds derived from fuel taxes. These revenue projections are based on current sources and levels of funding, with growth assumptions supported by historical trends.

The allowable uses for these funds are governed by a variety of mechanisms, including federal and state statutes, the TransNet ordinance, Board policy, or by other agencies including Caltrans and local agencies. In order to develop different revenue constrained scenarios for evaluation, staff proposes to evaluate those funds that are governed at the discretion of the SANDAG Board and only require a simple majority of the Board to program. This assumption would allow for approximately $3 billion to $3.5 billion in flexible funding through 2050 (or about 3 percent of the total projected revenues). It should be noted, however, that the current use of these funds is primarily to support the implementation of the TransNet program of projects beyond the 50 percent matching funds goal included in the TransNet Ordinance. Additional revenues would need to be identified over the course of the implementation of the TransNet program in order to complete the projects in the ordinance.

Sustainable Community Strategy

The Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) will be an integral part of the 2050 RTP. It will demonstrate how development patterns and the transportation network, policies, and programs can work together to achieve greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reduction targets for cars and light trucks, if there is a feasible way to do so. The SCS will be based upon the four building blocks that have served as the underpinning for transportation planning in the San Diego region for many years. Work has already been completed or is underway on each of the four building blocks as indicated below.

- A land use pattern that accommodates the region’s future employment and housing needs and protects sensitive habitat and resource areas – The 2050 Regional Growth Forecast and San Diego Regional Multiple Species/Habitat Conservation Plans will serve as the basis for the land use pattern. The Regional Housing Needs Assessment also will be an important part of the land use inputs.
• A transportation network of public transit, highways, local streets, bikeways, and sidewalks. The transportation network is currently being developed as described in the discussion of scenarios above.
• Transportation Demand Management (TDM) such as carpool and telecommute programs – TDM measures also are being developed with the transportation network.
• Transportation System Management (TSM) programs such as congestion pricing strategies and freeway ramp metering – TSM measures also are being developed with the transportation network.

In the coming months, SANDAG will be evaluating the various transportation scenarios based upon a number of performance measures, including GHG emissions.

Next Steps

Based on feedback from Working Groups, Policy Advisory Committees, and the Board of Directors, staff will complete the development and refinement of the revenue constrained scenarios and evaluate them using the Board-approved plan performance measures. The proposed alternative Revenue Constrained scenarios will be presented to Working Groups, Policy Advisory Committees, and the Board of Directors in September and October.

CHARLES “MUGGS” STOLL
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning


Key Staff Contact: Heather Werdick, (619) 699-6967, hwe@sandag.org
2050 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN: DRAFT UNCONSTRAINED TRANSPORTATION NETWORK

Introduction

During the past few months, staff presented the initial 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Unconstrained Highway and Transit Networks to the Board of Directors, Policy Advisory Committees (PACs), various SANDAG working groups, and at other public meetings for input. The basis of the draft 2050 Unconstrained Transportation Network presented in this report includes the “hybrid” transit scenario from the Urban Area Transit Strategy, highway improvements to serve people and goods, local streets and roads improvements, bicycle projects within the regional network, rail grade separations, and other management strategies.

At its July 16, 2010, meeting, the Transportation Committee discussed the draft Unconstrained Transportation Network and recommended its approval for use in the development of the 2050 RTP. The Transportation Committee supported incorporating the additional ideas suggested by the transit operating agencies in the Unconstrained Transportation Network. Based on the Transportation Committee’s discussion, staff has prepared necessary modifications and related cost estimate refinements to the network and incorporated the updated information into this report for the July 23, 2010, Board meeting.

Discussion

Draft Unconstrained Transportation Network

In developing the 2050 RTP, the Unconstrained Transportation Network represents the region’s vision for transit, highway, and arterial improvements and operations to meet travel demand in 2050. Defining the Unconstrained Transportation Network is an important step in developing an updated RTP, because it establishes the broadest multimodal network from which revenue-constrained network scenarios will be developed.

Once the Unconstrained Transportation Network is defined, staff will prioritize all of the future projects in this network using the Board-approved transportation project evaluation criteria. Based on revenue projections to 2050, various revenue-constrained transportation network scenarios will be developed using this prioritized project list and other factors. The revenue-constrained network scenarios would attempt to build and operate as much of the Unconstrained Transportation Network as possible, given revenue availability and flexibility, and project priorities. These scenarios
would be evaluated using performance measures leading to the eventual selection of a preferred revenue-constrained scenario by the Board of Directors.

The draft Unconstrained Transportation Network totals approximately $119 billion to $134 billion through 2050. Costs will continue to be refined during the development of the 2050 RTP.

Transit Network

As described in previous reports, the Urban Area Transit Strategy has served as the basis for development of the regional transit network for the 2050 RTP. Through the planning process, three transit network alternatives with a focus on the urban areas of the San Diego region were developed and tested. The alternatives were based on the following themes: “Transit Propensity” (expanding transit in the most urbanized areas), “Commuter Point-to-Point” (emphasizing quick access to work), and “Many Centers” (connecting local smart growth areas and activity centers). The overarching goal is to create a world-class transit system for the San Diego region in 2050 that significantly increases the use of transit, walking, and biking in the urbanized areas of the region, makes transit more time-competitive with the automobile, maximizes the use of transit during peak periods, and reduces greenhouse gas emissions and vehicle miles traveled in the region.

The best transit system strategies from each of the three alternatives, as well as ideas received from the SANDAG working groups, PACs, and through the public outreach process have been combined into a “Hybrid” 2050 Unconstrained Transit Network. The Unconstrained Transit Network is based on the following strategies and network assumptions:

- **Strengthen the current transit network in communities that already have strong transit/land use integration.** Improvements focus on:
  - Including local transit routes and service frequencies called for in the comprehensive operational analysis of the two transit agencies and further enhancing most local bus frequencies in the urban areas to 10-minute or better all-day frequencies,
  - Developing rapid bus services along major arterial corridors with 10-minute all-day frequencies, and
  - Adding streetcar and/or other shuttle/circulator services with 10-minute all-day frequencies to help improve intra-community circulation within smart growth centers.

- **Interconnect the existing, most highly urbanized areas and future smart growth centers to each other and to major employment areas.** Improvements focus on:
  - Double-tracking the COASTER, completing the Del Mar and University Towne Centre COASTER tunnels to provide 15-minute all-day frequencies, and adding a permanent station at the Del Mar Fairgrounds and a new station at the Convention Center in Downtown San Diego,
  - Extending the SPRINTER to North County Fair and eastern Escondido, and double-tracking the SPRINTER to provide 7.5-minute all day frequencies,
  - Providing “Express” SPRINTER service to the Oceanside, Vista, and Escondido transit centers with 10-minute peak period frequencies and 15-minute off-peak frequencies,
  - Building a Trolley tunnel and supporting bus tunnel in downtown San Diego to support enhanced operations of the Blue and Orange Trolley lines and support capacity needs for the extensive network of BRT/rapid bus routes that serve downtown San Diego,
Increasing frequencies along the Orange, Blue, and Green Trolley lines to 7.5-minute all-day,
Completing the Mid-Coast Light Rail Transit (LRT) extension to University City,
Adding new LRT service with 10-minute or better all-day frequencies to better serve high-demand corridors, such as Mira Mesa, Kearny Mesa, Chula Vista, Pacific Beach, and Mid-City/Southeastern San Diego communities,
Adding Express LRT service along the Blue Line from San Ysidro to UTC and along several other lines to facilitate faster long-distance trips,
Adding a system of high-frequency, high-speed bus rapid transit (BRT) services with 10- to 15-minute peak and off-peak frequencies that will facilitate easy and convenient access across the region along freeway/Managed Lanes corridors and build a dedicated transitway between Kearny Mesa and downtown San Diego to facilitate several high-speed BRT and rapid bus routes that provide access to the job centers in Kearny Mesa, Sharp/Children’s Hospital Complex, Mission Valley, University of California, San Diego (UCSD) Medical Center/Hillcrest, Bankers Hill, and downtown San Diego, and
Adding select peak commuter BRT bus services with 10- or 15-minute peak directional frequencies that offer high-speed, one-seat ride travel to facilitate access to key regional employment centers, also using the Kearny Mesa transitway.

Integrate high-speed rail (HSR) from Riverside County to the U.S./Mexico international border and add a commuter rail overlay service (similar to existing COASTER service) into the transit network. Improvements focus on:
Providing HSR stations in downtown Escondido and at San Diego International Airport, as assumed in the most recent California High-Speed Rail Authority alignment (subject to change) with service frequencies to be determined by the Authority; and
Adding commuter rail overlay stations along the Interstate 15 (I-15) and I-5 corridors at the following locations: Temecula, State Route 76 (SR 76), Escondido Transit Center, Mira Mesa, University City, Destination Lindbergh, 8th Street in National City, H Street in Chula Vista, the San Ysidro border crossing, the proposed cross-border terminal, and the Otay Mesa border crossing with 15-minute peak period services and 60-minute off-peak services.

Emphasize improvements to the pedestrian environment in and around rail and bus station areas to maximize convenient and safe walking access to transit, and create interconnections between transit and the Regional Bike Plan as a means to facilitate access to transit stations from areas outside a walking distance and create new last-mile solutions.

A “subway-style” map illustrating the “Hybrid” draft 2050 Unconstrained Transit Network is included as Attachment 1. Attachment 2 contains the list of transit routes and headways for the draft 2050 Unconstrained Transit Network. The following table summarizes existing miles of transit service by mode, miles of transit service included in the TransNet Early Action Program (EAP), and additional miles of transit service included in the Hybrid Unconstrained Transit Network. The table has been revised for two reasons: first, to reflect corrections to initial numbers that were listed inaccurately (the revised numbers more accurately reflect one-way directional route miles), and second, to capture the modified route mileage resulting from the improvements that were suggested by MTS and NCTD and incorporated into the Unconstrained Transit Network per the Transportation Committee’s recommendation.
Summary of Transit Miles
(One-Way Directional Route Miles by Mode)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Existing Miles</th>
<th>TransNet EAP Miles</th>
<th>Additional Miles*</th>
<th>Total Miles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commuter Rail/HSR</td>
<td>41 (COASTER)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>75 (HSR and commuter rail overlay service)</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRT</td>
<td>82 (Trolley and SPRINTER)</td>
<td>11 (Mid-Coast Extension)</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRT</td>
<td>None today</td>
<td>82 (I-15 BRT to Downtown San Diego, I-15 BRT to UTC, and South Bay BRT)</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid Bus</td>
<td>5 (SuperLoop)</td>
<td>19 (Mid-City Rapid, Escondido Rapid, and additional SuperLoop)</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetcar/Shuttle</td>
<td>None today</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Assumed in Hybrid Unconstrained Transit Network

Initial cost estimates for the Unconstrained Transit Network total approximately $39 billion to $46 billion. This range is based on an estimated range of $33 billion to $38 billion (or approximately 85%) for capital costs (including vehicle replacement) and $6 billion to $8 billion (or approximately 15%) for transit operating subsidy costs (total operating cost minus fare revenues).

Presentations on the Unconstrained Transit Network will be made to the NCTD Board of Directors on July 22, 2010, and to the MTS Board of Directors in August.

Transit Mode-Share Goals

In June the Board of Directors accepted home-to-work, peak-period transit mode share goals for 14 geographic subareas within the urban area. The current transit mode share (2008) for the overall combined urban area is 5 percent. The mode-share goal accepted by the Board of Directors for the urban area in 2050 is a range of 10 percent to 15 percent. Attachment 3 provides a map that illustrates the mode-share goal ranges for each geographic subarea. Attachment 4 provides a table that delineates the mode-share goal ranges for each subarea along with projected mode shares in 2050 under the Transit Propensity, Commuter Point-to-Point, Many Centers, and the Hybrid Unconstrained Transit Network scenarios.¹

¹ Staff is in the process of refining the transportation model to more accurately assign transit trips originating and/or ending at the international U.S./Mexico border, the San Diego/Riverside County border, and the region’s military facilities, which may have an effect on the mode share projections. Any significant differences in mode share projections will be posted to the SANDAG Web site, and will be used to further refine the Unconstrained Transit Network.
Initial analysis of the Hybrid Unconstrained Transit Network shows that the unconstrained network results in a 12 percent home-to-work, peak-period transit mode share in the urban area, coming in at the mid-point of the goal range accepted by the Board of Directors. Other mode-share data of interest include a projected 29 percent transit mode share in downtown San Diego under the Unconstrained Transit Network, compared to the goal of 30+ percent; a 16 percent projected mode share in the University City area compared to the goal range of 15 percent to 20 percent; and a 20 percent projected mode share in the central core area compared to the goal range of 20 percent to 25 percent (see Attachment 3 map for definition of areas).

Initial analysis also indicates that the Hybrid Unconstrained Transit Network more than doubles daily transit trips compared to the existing transit network (+145%) and increases transit trips beyond the Many Centers scenario (overall highest performing scenario of the three initial scenarios). Regional population during the same time period is projected to increase by 40 percent.

The data also indicates that a higher percentage of people would be accessing transit stations by walking/biking than by park and ride.

Over the next several weeks, staff will conduct a series of sensitivity tests to see how various operating plan and policy options could further affect home-to-work, peak-period transit mode share and system performance. These may include options such as increasing transit frequencies, increasing transit travel speeds, decreasing fares, testing a regional parking pricing policy, and adjusting land use assumptions around key transit corridors. Results from the sensitivity tests will help staff refine the transit networks to attempt to meet the mode-share goals by geographic subarea. Indications from other peer cities that were evaluated as part of the Urban Area Transit Strategy show these factors can have a significant impact on transit usage.

Highway Network

Similarly to the process being proposed for the transit network, SANDAG and Caltrans staffs are analyzing potential modifications to the 2030 RTP Unconstrained Highway Network. These modifications are based on supporting proposed transit investments in key corridors and communities, while providing an adequate level of service for the overall transportation system. It is important to note that the 2030 RTP Unconstrained Highway Network includes an extensive Managed Lanes system that provides tremendous flexibility in serving transit and HOVs by maximizing the available rights-of-way in several of the region’s major highway corridors. The goal in reviewing the highway network is to build upon this existing plan by integrating the revised transit network into it, thereby creating the most efficient and balanced transportation system.

Modifications to the 2030 RTP Unconstrained Highway Network include:

- Removal of the SR 54 outer loop extension from SR 125 to I-8 (I-8)²
- Removal of two HOV lanes on SR 52 from I-5 to I-805 and on SR 94 from SR 125 to Avocado Boulevard
- Additional operational improvements to I-5 from SR 15 to I-8 and to I-8 from I-5 to SR 67 and removal of two HOV lanes on I-5 and I-8 from I-5 to Los Coches³

² The City of El Cajon and County of San Diego concur with SANDAG and Caltrans' findings that the expansion of the SR 54 freeway between SR 125 and I-8 is not needed.
³ In the central I-5 and I-8 corridors, SANDAG and Caltrans' staffs believe that operational improvements will work as well or better than HOV lane improvements. The overall HOV system will still operate satisfactorily without these segments.
• Removal of general purpose lane-widening (two lanes) on I-5 from I-8 to La Jolla Village Drive, I-805 from Telegraph Canyon Road to I-8, and SR 52 to La Jolla Village Drive, and SR 125 from I-8 to SR 52
• Additional operational improvements on SR 76 east of I-15

Remaining congested corridors that are proposed for further study include:
• SR 78 from I-5 to I-15\(^4\)
• I-8 from I-5 to College Avenue

Initial cost estimates for the draft 2050 RTP Unconstrained Highway network total approximately $26 billion to $30 billion. A map of the draft 2050 Unconstrained Highway Network is included as Attachment 5.

\(^4\) The SR 78 Corridor Study will be initiated in late July 2010.
Goods Movement

The draft unconstrained goods movement system consists primarily of road and truckway projects (accommodating over 90 percent of freight by volume) that comprise the backbone of the freight distribution network. The unconstrained system outlined in the draft 2050 Goods Movement Strategy (GMS) also includes several maritime, rail, border, air cargo, and pipeline related projects. The cost to implement the unconstrained goods movement project list is estimated at $28 billion, including approximately $22 billion in highway projects already identified in the draft Unconstrained Highway Network. Projects included in the GMS will be evaluated using updated evaluation criteria approved by the Board of Directors in June 2010.

Local Streets and Roads

The draft Unconstrained Transportation Network also includes improvements to the local streets and roads. The cost estimates for improvements to local streets and roads are currently being developed to incorporate into the 2050 RTP.

San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan

The San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan proposes a vision for a diverse regional bicycle system of interconnected bicycle corridors, support facilities, and programs to make bicycling more practical and desirable to a broader range of people in our region. The Board of Directors approved the San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan in May 2010. The cost to implement the Regional Bicycle Network is estimated at $419 million. The projects will be prioritized, using previously approved evaluation criteria, for inclusion in the 2050 RTP. The San Diego Regional Bicycle Network is included as Attachment 6.

Intermodal Transportation Center

The draft Unconstrained Transportation Network also includes improvements to intermodal transportation centers, such as Destination Lindbergh and San Ysidro. The cost estimates are currently being developed to incorporate into the 2050 RTP.

Rail Grade Separations

The Transportation Committee approved the rail grade separation evaluation criteria in October 2009. These criteria will be used to create a prioritized list of potential grade-separation projects for the COASTER, SPRINTER, and Trolley corridors within the San Diego region for incorporation into the 2050 RTP. The cost estimates for the rail-grade separations are currently being developed.

Transportation Demand Management

The Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program at SANDAG, known as iCommute, provides sustainable and flexible transportation options to reduce peak-period traffic congestion. These programs include: vanpool, carpool, buspool, SchoolPool, Guaranteed Ride Home, telework, and bike programs, in addition to employer outreach, public education, and marketing. While transportation infrastructure, land use, and smart growth development patterns can take many years and resources to implement, TDM strategies are cost-effective, proven methods for reducing environmental pollutants and alleviating congestion more immediately. Consequently, TDM
programs are likely to play a larger role in achieving the near-term goals of the 2050 RTP. The cost of the TDM program is estimated at approximately $730 million through 2050. The iCommute Strategic Plan currently under development will refine and prioritize the implementation of the various TDM programs.

Transportation System Management

Our existing transportation system represents a major investment of resources over the past several decades. While the RTP identifies additional infrastructure investments needed to meet future transportation needs, it is critical that the region place an increased focus on maximizing the efficiency of the facilities already in place. SANDAG is developing a multimodal and integrated strategy for the comprehensive management of the transit, arterial, and highway networks serving both people and goods. Through a combination of programs, such as signal- and ramp-metering coordination and optimization; improved performance monitoring and microsimulation; and advanced vehicle/roadside communication platforms, the delivered tools and services will increase monitoring capabilities, enhance management, and improve system efficiency. The initial estimate for the programs totals approximately $700 million through 2050 and will be further refined and prioritized through the Intelligent Transportation Systems Strategic Plan currently under development.

Next Steps

Staff would prioritize all of the future projects in the Unconstrained Transportation Network, using Board-approved evaluation criteria. Based on revenue projections, various revenue-constrained transportation scenarios would be developed using this prioritized project list and other factors. The revenue-constrained transportation scenarios would attempt to build and operate as much of the Unconstrained Transportation Network as possible, given revenue availability and flexibility and project priorities. Alternative revenue-constrained transportation scenarios would be brought back in the fall for discussion and would be evaluated using the network performance measures that the Board of Directors approves (see Agenda Item No. 13).

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Attachments: 1. Draft 2050 Unconstrained Transit Network (Revised)
2. Draft 2050 Unconstrained Transit Routes and Headways (Revised)
3. 2050 Transit Mode-Share Goal Ranges
4. Transit Mode-Share Goal Ranges and Projected Transit Mode Shares for Initial Transit Network Alternatives and Draft 2050 Unconstrained Transit Network (Revised)
5. Draft 2050 Unconstrained Highway Network
6. Regional Bicycle Plan Network

Key Staff Contacts: Heather Werdick, (619) 699-6967, hwe@sandag.org
Carolina Gregor, (619) 699-1989, cgr@sandag.org
Dave Schumacher, (619) 699-6906, dsc@sandag.org
# Draft 2050 Unconstrained Transit Routes and Headways

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Peak Frequencies</th>
<th>Off-Peak Frequencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>398</td>
<td>Commuter Rail</td>
<td>COASTER with Del Mar and University Town Center (UTC) Tunnels, Permanent Station at Del Mar Fairgrounds, and New Station at Convention Center in downtown San Diego</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>598</td>
<td>Commuter Rail</td>
<td>High Speed Rail - Commuter Rail Service from Riverside to int'l border</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>399</td>
<td>Light Rail</td>
<td>SPRINT (with branch extensions to North County Fair, East Escondido)</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>510</td>
<td>Light Rail</td>
<td>Blue Line w/ Mid-Coast Extension and downtown tunnel</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>520</td>
<td>Light Rail</td>
<td>Orange Line with Extension to Airport and downtown tunnel</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>530</td>
<td>Light Rail</td>
<td>Green Line with Extension to 12th/Imperial</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550</td>
<td>Light Rail</td>
<td>SDSL to San Ysidro via East San Diego, SE San Diego, National City</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>560</td>
<td>Light Rail</td>
<td>SDSL to Downtown via El Cajon Blvd/Mid-City</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>561</td>
<td>Light Rail</td>
<td>UTC to Mira Mesa via Sorrento Mesa</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>562</td>
<td>Light Rail</td>
<td>UTC to Chula Vista via Kearny Mesa, Mission Vly, Mid-City, Nat'l City</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>563</td>
<td>Light Rail</td>
<td>Pacific Beach to El Cajon via Kearny Mesa, Mission Valley, SDSL</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>564</td>
<td>Light Rail</td>
<td>Otay Mesa to Chula Vista via Otay Ranch/Millenia</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>588</td>
<td>Express Light Rail</td>
<td>SPRINT ( - Stops only at Oceanside, Vista, Escondido Transit Centers)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>540</td>
<td>Express Light Rail</td>
<td>UTC to San Ysidro via Downtown San Diego</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>522</td>
<td>Express Light Rail</td>
<td>El Cajon to Downtown San Diego via Euclid</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>566</td>
<td>Express Light Rail</td>
<td>Otay Ranch to UTC via Mid-City, Kearny Mesa</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>610</td>
<td>BRT</td>
<td>Temecula/Escondido to Downtown via I-15, Kearny Mesa Guideway</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>692</td>
<td>BRT</td>
<td>El Cajon to Otay Mesa via Spring Valley, SR125, Millenia</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>652</td>
<td>BRT</td>
<td>Downtown to UTC via Hillcrest, Mission Valley, Kearny Mesa Guideway</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>430</td>
<td>BRT</td>
<td>Oceanside to Escondido via SR 78 HOV Lanes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>607</td>
<td>Peak BRT</td>
<td>Rancho Bernardo to Downtown San Diego via Sabre Springs/Kearny Mesa</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>608</td>
<td>Peak BRT</td>
<td>Escondido to Downtown San Diego via South Escondido, Kearny Mesa</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>650</td>
<td>Peak BRT</td>
<td>Otay Ranch/Chula Vista to Palomar Airport Bus. Park via I-805/I-5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>653</td>
<td>Peak BRT</td>
<td>SE San Diego/Mid-City to Palomar Airport Road Bus. Park via I-805/I-5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>870</td>
<td>Peak BRT</td>
<td>El Cajon to UTC via Santee, SR 52, Kearny Mesa</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>890</td>
<td>Peak BRT</td>
<td>El Cajon to Sorrento Mesa via Santee, SR 52</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>940</td>
<td>Peak BRT</td>
<td>Oceanside to Sorrento Mesa via I-5, Carlsbad, Encinitas</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Draft 2050 Unconstrained Transit Routes and Headways

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Peak Frequencies</th>
<th>Off-Peak Frequencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rapid Bus</td>
<td>30th Ave to Downtown San Diego via North Park</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Rapid Bus</td>
<td>La Mesa to Ocean Beach via Mid-City, Hillcrest, Old Town</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Rapid Bus</td>
<td>Spring Valley to SDSU via SE San Diego, Downtown, Hillcrest, Mid-City</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Rapid Bus</td>
<td>Point Loma to Kearny Mesa via Old Town, Linda Vista</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Rapid Bus</td>
<td>Old Town to Sorrento Mesa via Pacific Beach, La Jolla, UTC</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Rapid Bus</td>
<td>Old Town to UTC via Linda Vista, Clairemont</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>Rapid Bus</td>
<td>Kearny Mesa to Downtown via Sharp Hospital, Mission Valley, Hillcrest</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350</td>
<td>Rapid Bus</td>
<td>Escondido to North County Fair via South Escondido</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>440</td>
<td>Rapid Bus</td>
<td>Carlsbad to San Marcos via Palomar Airport Rd Corridor</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>471</td>
<td>Rapid Bus</td>
<td>Downtown Escondido to East Escondido</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>473</td>
<td>Rapid Bus</td>
<td>Oceanside to UTC via Hwy 101 coastal communities, Carmel Valley</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>474</td>
<td>Rapid Bus</td>
<td>Oceanside to Vista via Mission Ave/Santa Fe Rd corridor</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>477</td>
<td>Rapid Bus</td>
<td>Camp Pendleton to Carlsbad Village via College Blvd, Plaza Camino Real</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>635</td>
<td>Rapid Bus</td>
<td>Millenia to Palomar Trolley via Main St corridor</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>636</td>
<td>Rapid Bus</td>
<td>SDSU to Spring Valley via East San Diego, Lemon Grove, Skyline</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>637</td>
<td>Rapid Bus</td>
<td>North Park to 32nd St Trolley via Golden Hill, SE San Diego</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>638</td>
<td>Rapid Bus</td>
<td>San Ysidro to Otay Mesa via Otay, SR 905 corridor</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>639</td>
<td>Rapid Bus</td>
<td>Otay to North Island via Imperial Beach, Silver Strand, Coronado</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>709</td>
<td>Rapid Bus</td>
<td>H St Trolley to Millenia via H St corridor, Southwestern College</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>910</td>
<td>Rapid Bus</td>
<td>Coronado to Downtown via Coronado Bridge</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>448/449</td>
<td>Streetcar/Shuttle</td>
<td>San Marcos Downtown</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>551</td>
<td>Streetcar/Shuttle</td>
<td>Chula Vista Downtown</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>552</td>
<td>Streetcar/Shuttle</td>
<td>National City Downtown</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>553</td>
<td>Streetcar/Shuttle</td>
<td>San Diego Downtown - Little Italy to East Village</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>554</td>
<td>Streetcar/Shuttle</td>
<td>Hillcrest/Balboa Park/ Downtown San Diego Loop</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>555</td>
<td>Streetcar/Shuttle</td>
<td>30th Ave to Downtown San Diego via North Park/Golden Hill</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>557</td>
<td>Streetcar/Shuttle</td>
<td>El Cajon Downtown</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>558</td>
<td>Streetcar/Shuttle</td>
<td>Escondido Downtown</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>559</td>
<td>Streetcar/Shuttle</td>
<td>Oceanside Downtown</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>565</td>
<td>Streetcar/Shuttle</td>
<td>Mission Beach to La Jolla via Pacific Beach</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Values represent peak period home-to-work transit mode share for destination districts.
### Urban Area Transit Strategy

Transit Mode Share Goals and Projected Transit Mode Shares for Initial Transit Network Alternatives and Draft 2050 Unconstrained Transit Network

**Peak-Period, Home-to-Work Trips**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identified Corridors/Areas</th>
<th>Baseline Data</th>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Projected Performance of Initial Transit Network Alternatives</th>
<th>Projected Performance of Unconstrained Network</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2008 Existing Transit</td>
<td>2050 Peak-Period Transit Mode Share Goal Ranges</td>
<td>Transit Propensity</td>
<td>Commuter Point-to-Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major Employment Areas</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown San Diego</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>30% +</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University City</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>15%-20%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorrento Mesa</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>10%-15%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kearny Mesa</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%-15%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otay Mesa/ Otay Ranch</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%-10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palomar Airport</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%-10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Activity Areas</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Core</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>20%-25%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside/Escondido Corridor</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%-15%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Urbanized Areas</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North I-15 Corridor</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%-10%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central Coastal Area</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>10%-15%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Coastal Area</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%-15%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal South Bay</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%-15%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East County/El Cajon</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%-15%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East County/Santee</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%-10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urban Area Transit Strategy Study Area</strong></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%-15%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Values represent peak period home-to-work trip transit mode-share for destination districts.
FIGURE 3-3
UPDATED REGIONAL BICYCLE NETWORK

NOTE:
Colors do not represent facility type. The color variations are intended to differentiate start and end of all corridors.
REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT (RHNA) UPDATE

The report regarding the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) prepared for the SANDAG Board of Directors Policy Meeting of July 9, 2010, is attached. This report provides an overview of the RHNA process and the discussions held to date with the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG) and Regional Housing Working Group (RHWG). The TWG and RHWG will meet jointly on September 9, 2010, to continue their work on preparing a draft RHNA methodology. Staff will report on that meeting at the Regional Planning Committee meeting today.

SANDAG staff is still in consultation with the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) regarding the regional housing needs determination for the 2013-2020 housing element cycle.

Staff will provide a presentation that will cover key points in the attached Board report, including the objectives, process, and schedule for the RHNA.

CHARLES “MUGGS” STOLL
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

2. Building Blocks for Effective Housing Elements, California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) Web site

Key Staff Contact: Susan Baldwin, (619) 699-1943, sba@sandag.org
SANDAG is beginning the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) for the next (fifth) housing element cycle. This responsibility is assigned to SANDAG by state housing element law, and SANDAG undertakes this process prior to each housing element cycle as described in the statutory excerpts in Attachment 1.

Recent legislation, Senate Bill 375 (SB 375) (Steinberg, 2008) and SB 575 (Steinberg, 2009), affect the RHNA and fifth housing element cycle in several ways. The main differences for this cycle include the timing of the RHNA process, required coordination/consistency with the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and its Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) per SB 375, and the length of the housing element cycle. The fifth cycle for the San Diego region will cover an eight-year time period from January 1, 2013, to December 31, 2020. Past housing elements covered a five-year cycle.

Attachment 2 of this report is a timeline for the RHNA process as it relates to the development of the 2050 RTP and its SCS. Staff will give a presentation regarding the history of housing element law, related statewide housing issues, the relationship of the RHNA to the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP), and challenges and opportunities presented by the RHNA process.

Discussion

State Housing Element Law and Regional Comprehensive Plan Objectives

State housing element law (Government Code Section 65584 (d)) states that the RHNA shall be consistent with the four following objectives. These objectives are consistent with the SANDAG RCP and Smart Growth Concept Map and include:

1. Increasing the housing supply and the mix of housing types, tenure, and affordability in all cities and counties within the region in an equitable manner, which shall result in all jurisdictions receiving an allocation of units for low- and very low-income households.

2. Promoting infill development and socioeconomic equity, the protection of environmental and agricultural resources, and the encouragement of efficient development patterns.

3. Promoting an improved intraregional relationship between jobs and housing.

4. Allocating a lower proportion of housing need to an income category when a jurisdiction already has a disproportionately high share of households in that income category, as compared to the countywide distribution of households in that category from the most recent decennial United States census.
SB 375 requires that the RHNA be consistent with the development pattern of the SCS, that the SCS show that it accommodates the RHNA, and that the SCS land use pattern, and therefore the RHNA, assist the region in meeting the greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction targets that will be set by the California Air Resources Board (CARB). The CARB established draft GHG targets on June 24, 2010, and plans to issue final GHG targets by September 30, 2010. SANDAG will need to develop the RHNA and the SCS in such a way that they assist the region in meeting these GHG targets.

Role of SANDAG Working Groups in RHNA Process

In its charter, the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG) - composed of the planning directors of the 18 cities and County of San Diego - is given the responsibility of reporting to the Regional Planning Committee on the RHNA. The Regional Housing Working Group (RHWG) advises the Regional Planning Committee on regional housing-related issues. Because of their common responsibilities, the TWG and RHWG will meet jointly to discuss and formulate recommendations to the Regional Planning Committee on the RHNA process, allocation methodology, and allocations. The first joint meeting of the two working groups occurred on June 8, 2010.

At that meeting, comments from working group members were focused on factors to be used in developing the RHNA. Interest was expressed in considering the following factors as the RHNA is developed:

- Subregional allocations
- Rural vs. urban areas
- Jobs/housing fit (as discussed in the Regional Targets Advisory Committee (RTAC) report)
- Transportation and housing costs
- Reducing GHG emissions
- Social equity and environmental justice
- Employment capacity
- Constraints to development such as airport influence areas, habitat, etc.
- Fair housing

The two working groups will meet again on Thursday, July 8, to further discuss the factors to be used in the development of the RHNA methodology.

Regional Planning Committee

The Regional Planning Committee discussed the RHNA schedule and RHNA objectives contained in state housing element law on April 2, 2010. Comments from members of the Committee included:

- Expression of interest in providing for socio-economically balanced communities that include housing for households in all four income categories (very low-, low-, moderate-, and above moderate-income);

- Expression of interest in considering state legislation that would allow counting (to a greater degree than currently allowed) affordable units that have been acquired, rehabilitated, and rent restricted (often referred to as “acq/rehab” units) in the identification of adequate sites section of the housing element and that would reflect the SANDAG RCP;
A question regarding whether granny flats/second units can be used in the identification of adequate sites (state law allows such units to be counted); and

A question regarding what affect the Palmer v. City of Los Angeles (2009 California Court of Appeals) decision will have on inclusionary housing. Based on this court decision, local jurisdiction inclusionary housing requirements may not be able to be applied to rental units unless the units are subsidized through a direct financial contribution or receive a density bonus incentive, because of preemption by a state law known as the Costa-Hawkins Rental Housing Act. This case is causing jurisdictions to consider changes to their inclusionary housing ordinances and could result in the construction of fewer affordable units.

Consultation with California Department of Housing and Community Development

Prior to the determination by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) of the region’s housing needs by income category for the next housing element cycle, SANDAG and HCD staff are required to consult with each other to exchange information about the assumptions and methodology (population projections, vacancy rates, household formation rates, etc.) used in the determination. HCD staff met with SANDAG staff on June 21, 2010, to continue the consultation that started during the formulation of the 2050 Regional Growth Forecast. Linda Wheaton from HCD and Mary Heim from the California Department of Finance both participated in the expert review meetings that took place during the development of the SANDAG 2050 forecast. SANDAG expects to receive its regional housing determination from HCD by the end of July.

Another issue that HCD and SANDAG staff discussed at the June 21 meeting was the requirement in SB 575 that SANDAG inform HCD of the adoption date for the 2050 RTP. Per SB 375, local jurisdiction housing elements are due within 18 months of adoption of the RTP. SANDAG staff is planning to inform HCD that the 2050 RTP is scheduled to be adopted on July 22, 2011 (at the regular Board of Directors meeting scheduled in July 2011). Based on that adoption date, local housing elements would be due no later than January 21, 2013. (If the RTP is adopted later than July 22, 2011, the due date for local housing elements also would be later.)

Next Steps

SANDAG staff will be keeping the Board of Directors informed and seeking its direction regularly during the RHNA process regarding the development of the RHNA methodology, the regional housing need determination from HCD, and the draft allocation numbers.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Attachments: 1. Excerpts from Housing Element Law (65584 and 65584.04) – Regional Housing Needs Assessment Objectives, Methodology, and Factors
    2. Key Dates for Regional Housing Needs Assessment Fifth Housing Element Update

Key Staff Contact: Susan Baldwin, (619) 699-1943, sba@sandag.org
Excerpts from Housing Element Law (65584 and 65584.04)
Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA)
Objectives, Methodology, and Factors

65584.

(a) (1) For the fourth and subsequent revisions of the housing element pursuant to Section 65588, the department shall determine the existing and projected need for housing for each region pursuant to this article. For purposes of subdivision (a) of Section 65583, the share of a city or county of the regional housing need shall include that share of the housing need of persons at all income levels within the area significantly affected by the general plan of the city or county.

(2) While it is the intent of the Legislature that cities, counties, and cities and counties should undertake all necessary actions to encourage, promote, and facilitate the development of housing to accommodate the entire regional housing need, it is recognized, however, that future housing production may not equal the regional housing need established for planning purposes.

(b) The department, in consultation with each council of governments, shall determine each region’s existing and projected housing need pursuant to Section 65584.01 at least two years prior to the scheduled revision required pursuant to Section 65588. The appropriate council of governments, or for cities and counties without a council of governments, the department, shall adopt a final regional housing need plan that allocates a share of the regional housing need to each city, county, or city and county at least one year prior to the scheduled revision for the region required by Section 65588. The allocation plan prepared by a council of governments shall be prepared pursuant to Sections 65584.04 and 65584.05 with the advice of the department.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the due dates for the determinations of the department or for the councils of governments, respectively, regarding the regional housing need may be extended by the department by not more than 60 days if the extension will enable access to more recent critical population or housing data from a pending or recent release of the United States Census Bureau or the Department of Finance. If the due date for the determination of the department or the council of governments is extended for this reason, the department shall extend the corresponding housing element revision deadline pursuant to Section 65588 by not more than 60 days.
(d) The regional housing needs allocation plan shall be consistent with all of the following objectives:

(1) Increasing the housing supply and the mix of housing types, tenure, and affordability in all cities and counties within the region in an equitable manner, which shall result in each jurisdiction receiving an allocation of units for low and very low income households.

(2) Promoting infill development and socioeconomic equity, the protection of environmental and agricultural resources, and the encouragement of efficient development patterns.

(3) Promoting an improved intraregional relationship between jobs and housing.

(4) Allocating a lower proportion of housing need to an income category when a jurisdiction already has a disproportionately high share of households in that income category, as compared to the countywide distribution of households in that category from the most recent decennial United States census.

(e) For purposes of this section, “household income levels” are as determined by the department as of the most recent decennial census pursuant to the following code sections:

(1) Very low incomes as defined by Section 50105 of the Health and Safety Code.

(2) Lower incomes, as defined by Section 50079.5 of the Health and Safety Code.

(3) Moderate incomes, as defined by Section 50093 of the Health and Safety Code.

(4) Above moderate incomes are those exceeding the moderate income level of Section 50093 of the Health and Safety Code.

(f) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, determinations made by the department, a council of governments, or a city or county pursuant to this section or Section 65584.01, 65584.02, 65584.03, 65584.04, 65584.05, 65584.06, or 65584.07 are exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (Division 13 (commencing with Section 21000) of the Public Resources Code).
methodology shall be consistent with the objectives listed in subdivision (d) of Section 65584.

(b) (1) No more than six months prior to the development of a proposed methodology for distributing the existing and projected housing need, each council of governments shall survey each of its member jurisdictions to request, at a minimum, information regarding the factors listed in subdivision (d) that will allow the development of a methodology based upon the factors established in subdivision (d).

(2) The council of governments shall seek to obtain the information in a manner and format that is comparable throughout the region and utilize readily available data to the extent possible.

(3) The information provided by a local government pursuant to this section shall be used, to the extent possible, by the council of governments, or delegate subregion as applicable, as source information for the methodology developed pursuant to this section. The survey shall state that none of the information received may be used as a basis for reducing the total housing need established for the region pursuant to Section 65584.01.

(4) If the council of governments fails to conduct a survey pursuant to this subdivision, a city, county, or city and county may submit information related to the items listed in subdivision (d) prior to the public comment period provided for in subdivision (c).

(c) Public participation and access shall be required in the development of the methodology and in the process of drafting and adoption of the allocation of the regional housing needs. Participation by organizations other than local jurisdictions and councils of governments shall be solicited in a diligent effort to achieve public participation of all economic segments of the community. The proposed methodology, along with any relevant underlying data and assumptions, and an explanation of how information about local government conditions gathered pursuant to subdivision (b) has been used to develop the proposed methodology, and how each of the factors listed in subdivision (d) is incorporated into the methodology, shall be distributed to all cities, counties, any subregions, and members of the public who have made a written request for the proposed methodology. The council of governments, or delegate subregion, as applicable, shall conduct at least one public hearing to receive oral and written comments on the proposed methodology.

(d) To the extent that sufficient data is available from local governments pursuant to subdivision (b) or other sources, each council of governments, or delegate subregion as applicable, shall include the following factors to develop the methodology that allocates regional housing needs:

(1) Each member jurisdiction’s existing and projected jobs and housing relationship.
(2) The opportunities and constraints to development of additional housing in each member jurisdiction, including all of the following:

(A) Lack of capacity for sewer or water service due to federal or state laws, regulations or regulatory actions, or supply and distribution decisions made by a sewer or water service provider other than the local jurisdiction that preclude the jurisdiction from providing necessary infrastructure for additional development during the planning period.

(B) The availability of land suitable for urban development or for conversion to residential use, the availability of underutilized land, and opportunities for infill development and increased residential densities. The council of governments may not limit its consideration of suitable housing sites or land suitable for urban development to existing zoning ordinances and land use restrictions of a locality, but shall consider the potential for increased residential development under alternative zoning ordinances and land use restrictions. The determination of available land suitable for urban development may exclude lands where the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) or the Department of Water Resources has determined that the flood management infrastructure designed to protect that land is not adequate to avoid the risk of flooding.

(C) Lands preserved or protected from urban development under existing federal or state programs, or both, designed to protect open space, farmland, environmental habitats, and natural resources on a long-term basis.

(D) County policies to preserve prime agricultural land, as defined pursuant to Section 56064, within an unincorporated area.

(3) The distribution of household growth assumed for purposes of a comparable period of regional transportation plans and opportunities to maximize the use of public transportation and existing transportation infrastructure.

(4) The market demand for housing.

(5) Agreements between a county and cities in a county to direct growth toward incorporated areas of the county.

(6) The loss of units contained in assisted housing developments, as defined in paragraph (9) of subdivision (a) of Section 65583, that changed to non-low-income use through mortgage prepayment, subsidy contract expirations, or termination of use restrictions.

(7) High-housing cost burdens.

(8) The housing needs of farmworkers.

(9) The housing needs generated by the presence of a private university or a campus of the California State University or the University of California within any member jurisdiction.
Any other factors adopted by the council of governments.

The council of governments, or delegate subregion, as applicable, shall explain in writing how each of the factors described in subdivision (d) was incorporated into the methodology and how the methodology is consistent with subdivision (d) of Section 65584. The methodology may include numerical weighting.

Any ordinance, policy, voter-approved measure, or standard of a city or county that directly or indirectly limits the number of residential building permits issued by a city or county shall not be a justification for a determination or a reduction in the share of a city or county of the regional housing need.

In addition to the factors identified pursuant to subdivision (d), the council of governments, or delegate subregion, as applicable, shall identify any existing local, regional, or state incentives, such as a priority for funding or other incentives available to those local governments that are willing to accept a higher share than proposed in the draft allocation to those local governments by the council of governments or delegate subregion pursuant to Section 65584.05.

Following the conclusion of the 60-day public comment period described in subdivision (c) on the proposed allocation methodology, and after making any revisions deemed appropriate by the council of governments, or delegate subregion, as applicable, as a result of comments received during the public comment period, each council of governments, or delegate subregion, as applicable, shall adopt a final regional, or subregional, housing need allocation methodology and provide notice of the adoption of the methodology to the jurisdictions within the region, or delegate subregion as applicable, and to the department.

(1) It is the intent of the Legislature that housing planning be coordinated and integrated with the regional transportation plan. To achieve this goal, the allocation plan shall allocate housing units within the region consistent with the development pattern included in the sustainable communities strategy.

(2) The final allocation plan shall ensure that the total regional housing need, by income category, as determined under Section 65584, is maintained, and that each jurisdiction in the region receive an allocation of units for low- and very low income households.

(3) The resolution approving the final housing need allocation plan shall demonstrate that the plan is consistent with the sustainable communities strategy in the regional transportation plan.
### Key Dates for Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA)

**Fifth Housing Element Update**

**July 9, 2010**

*(Revised August 27, 2010)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February 2010</td>
<td>SANDAG Board accepts 2050 Regional Growth Forecast for planning purposes for use in preparing the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS), and RHNA. (The California Department of Finance (DOF) and Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) staff participated in SANDAG’s forecast advisory group.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 1, 2010</td>
<td>Eleven-year RHNA projection period for fifth housing element cycle starts (January 1, 2010 – December 31, 2020)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1, 2010</td>
<td>DOF issues 2010 E-5 estimates used in RHNA consultation process; SANDAG and HCD continue consultation started during development of 2050 Regional Growth Forecast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June – Dec. 2010</td>
<td>Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG) and Regional Housing Working Group (RHWG) develop draft RHNA methodology and prepare draft jurisdiction/income RHNA allocations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 10, 2010</td>
<td>Joint TWG/RHWG meeting to kick off RHNA methodology discussion: RHNA background, schedule, and principles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 9, 2010</td>
<td>SANDAG Board of Directors holds policy meeting to discuss RHNA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 23, 2010</td>
<td>SANDAG provides HCD and Caltrans date of expected adoption of 2050 RTP in writing as required by SB 575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2010</td>
<td>Following HCD/SANDAG RHNA consultation, HCD provides SANDAG with regional housing need determination for RHNA projection period: January 1, 2010 – December 31, 2020 (11 years) (The SANDAG 2050 Regional Growth Forecast projects an additional 127,000 housing units during the 11-year RHNA projection period.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2011</td>
<td>Draft of RTP/SCS/RHNA accepted for distribution/public review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 22, 2011</td>
<td>Final RTP/SCS/RHNA adopted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 21, 2013</td>
<td>Due date for January 1, 2013 – December 31, 2020 (8 year) housing elements due within 18 months after RTP is adopted)*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Housing elements are due every four years for:

1. Jurisdictions that did not adopt their fourth housing element revisions by January 1, 2009, and did not adopt the fourth revision by March 31, 2010, and complete any rezoning contained in the housing element program by June 30, 2010; and
2. Jurisdictions that do not adopt their housing element within 120 days from next housing element due date.
Building Blocks for Effective Housing Elements
http://www.hcd.ca.gov/hpd/housing_element2/index.php

Welcome to the Department’s newest technical assistance resource to assist local governments in adopting housing elements that effectively address housing needs, the specific requirements of State law and in furtherance of local goals and objectives. The Department is committed to working in partnership with local governments and the public and private sectors in addressing California’s continuing housing crisis.

NEW! For examples of complete housing elements in compliance with housing element law click here.
Regional Housing Needs Allocations

The Regional Housing Needs Allocation Program (RHNA) was established in state law following comprehensive amendments to the State Housing Element Law around 1980.

The history of the housing element and the regional housing needs process goes back to 1971 when the state general plan law passed, including a housing element that consisted of a single sentence.

A housing element shall make adequate provisions for the housing needs of all economic segments of the community. In about 1975, the New Jersey Supreme Court in a case known as *Mt. Laurel* ruled that large lot zoning by a suburban community that appeared to be designed to keep low income and presumably nonwhite people from being able to live in the community was illegal.

That was interpreted as justification for a conclusion that all economic segments of the community not only were those which a community had already living there but all those who could or would live there in the absence of unlawful discriminatory zoning.

The State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) proposed a set of regulations on housing elements that included extensive details on what a housing element had to include (generally following federal requirements for those seeking HUD funds) as well as a regional process and a requirement that each housing element had to achieve its share of the regional housing need. The proposed regulations also included a requirement that each housing element had to be approved by HCD. The content of the housing elements portion and the regional concept were in principle acceptable to the League of California Cities.

The part that was completely unacceptable was the requirement for state approval of the housing element and any language that suggested a city was actually responsible for meeting the housing needs as opposed to simply planning for a way to meet them. As a result of that conceptual agreement, legislation was approved that contained most of the content of the HCD regulations eliminating only the requirement of HCD approval.

The regional housing allocation process was recognized as a new mandate and Councils of Governments (COG) were entitled to reimbursement through the State Mandate process. After two cycles of housing element and regional housing needs allocations several conclusions emerged. One was that with the rise in housing prices in California, even with the smallest lot sizes in the country, there were few cities that could provide housing for all economic segments without considerable financial assistance so that affordable housing became much more of a financial issue than a zoning issue.
At the same time both low income and for-profit developers complained that in many communities it was still difficult to find multifamily zoning which was the only type of development that could meet the needs of low income families. There emerged tensions between the four primary interest groups - the cities, HCD, for-profit housing developers, and the low income housing developers. Numerous efforts to reform the regional housing needs allocation process and housing element were proposed virtually every year in the Legislature. Only a few reforms have been adopted and none of which have changed the fundamental principles of the law.

The funding for the regional housing needs allocation process and for the housing elements was suspended in a budget action of the Legislature in the early 1990s. After it was reinstated there was a decision by the Commission on State Mandates that COGs were not eligible for reimbursement and the Legislature adopted a provision through the Budget deciding that COGs could impose fees on local governments who could then, in turn, pass those fees onto builders. No COG has done so since both the League of Cities and the California Building Industry Association provided legal opinions that such a fee would be invalid.

While the controversy over the regional housing needs allocation and the housing element in general continues there is also a question as to what if anything has it accomplished.

Builders and low income housing advocates argue that even though most affordable housing needs financing, and not just zoning by cities, they believe that the law creates pressure on reluctant communities to zone more land for multifamily purposes. That in turn expands the market beyond what would otherwise be there, keeps land prices down, and creates greater availability.

They continue to complain that in many cities there is no land appropriately zoned even though there are many sites that with the proper zoning they believe could be good locations for their projects. Cities argue equally that while there may not be as many sites as the builders want, there are more sites than there are successful projects. Most projects fail not because of lack of zoning approval but because of lack of financial ability. We would be better served to focus on financing issues and accept the fact that cities have zoned more than enough land to meet the actual demand of builders for projects.

The builders argue that some entity other than individual local governments must set forth a need requirement to create the pressure on local governments. From a CALCOG or regional agency perspective this is a no win situation as cities are also evaluated as to the adequacy of the housing elements. They are also judged generally in relationship to the regional housing needs portion assigned to their jurisdiction.
Accordingly, regardless of whether a city considers itself one that already has done more than its share of providing low, moderate income housing; one that considers itself built out and thus has no place to put it; or one that considers itself so expensive that it is ridiculous to even suggest that it is a relevant issue, all cities benefit by having a low number assigned by the region and no one benefits by having a higher number assigned.

This has led to primary objections to decisions particularly by Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) and Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) which have the largest regions, and where it is much more difficult to negotiate these numbers among jurisdictions.

In fact, since ABAG and SCAG do not directly provide transportation funds their identity in the minds of most local governments consists only of doing the regional housing needs allocation process and contributes to a generally negative image of these organizations, notwithstanding whatever else they may be successful at.

**Prospects for Reform**

Politically any RHNA reform is extremely difficult as it seems that whenever three of the four interest groups come together on a reform proposal the fourth (no matter which it is) seems to block it.

SB 375 and Regional Blueprints and the linkage of funding to local planning that promotes growth, reduces vehicle trips, creates a framework to rethink regional housing need reform. It is certainly possible to structure state grant programs for housing support and possibly new Federal programs that could emerge should housing remerge as a Federal priority or for economic development assistance to communities based upon their actions in providing land and other support for promotion of affordable housing.

In addition, several CALCOG member agencies have already made land use planning and provision of housing a factor in allocation of transportation funds. Some have said that give a community sufficient transportation funds, particularly a transit station, and the zoning for housing and the economic viability of housing will be naturally addressed. This suggests that more financial support for transportation and economic development as well as housing could reduce the negative association with taking on significant responsibility for more affordable housing.

How to take these concepts and put them into a legislative approach, and whether it should be done at the regional, state or national level, is a conversation that still needs to take place. It does not lend itself to a specific proposal at this time.
Redevelopment, Housing Finance and Regional Housing Needs

The primary financing that cities had at the time RHNA was first proposed were HUD grants and tax increment financing through redevelopment. However, three actions reduced this support:

- In 1978 with the passage of Proposition 13 that limited property taxes and, thereby, the revenues from tax increments,
- In 1980 with the election of President Reagan and a shift to a reduced Federal role and the gradual elimination over the next several years of 75 percent of the housing assistance that cities were receiving annually from HUD, and
- In 1986 a change to multifamily housing finance that eliminated most of the tax benefits available to multifamily housing construction and investment.

As a result there is far less funding for housing for multifamily than there used to be. In recent years the most significant financing has come from two statewide bond measures which provided significant funding for housing. There is also talk of coming up with a set of fees that could provide a permanent funding source for affordable housing at the state level. Redevelopment continues to require that 20 percent of tax increment funds be set aside for affordable housing but the value and amount of that is presently very limited.

If there is another housing bond measure or, even better, if there is a permanent housing funding source proposed, this may provide an opportunity to revisit the regional housing needs allocation process. There also could be opportunities in new Federal financing programs and other incentives that can change the way the regional housing needs allocation process works in California.

On the other hand, getting rid of it, or significantly altering the concept of it, is probably not ever going to be easy because of the strong resistance from both the for-profit and non-profit housing advocacy groups.
TransNet SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM PROGRESS
REPORT AND TDA/TransNet BICYCLE PEDESTRIAN AND
NEIGHBORHOOD SAFETY GRANT PROGRAM

Introduction

In May 2009, SANDAG awarded $9.4 million in funding to 14 projects (six planning grants and eight capital grants) for the first two-year cycle of the TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program (SGIP). The program was established through the TransNet Extension Ordinance “to provide funding for a broad array of transportation-related infrastructure improvements that will assist local agencies in better integrating transportation and land use, such as enhancements to streets and public places, funding of infrastructure needed to support development in smart growth opportunity areas consistent with the Regional Comprehensive Plan, and community planning efforts related to smart growth and improved land use/transportation coordination.”

In June 2009, SANDAG also awarded $7.8 million in Transportation Development Act (TDA) and TransNet funding to 30 projects (12 planning, parking, and program grants and 18 capital grants) under the Active Transportation program. This was the first annual cycle of the TransNet Bicycle Pedestrian and Neighborhood Safety/Traffic Calming Program, but SANDAG has been funding bicycle and pedestrian projects with TDA funds since 1972, and bicycle projects under the original TransNet Ordinance since FY 1989. The TransNet Extension Ordinance specifies that the funds be used “for bikeway facilities and connectivity improvements, pedestrian and walkable community projects, bicycle and pedestrian safety projects and programs, and traffic calming projects.” The Active Transportation program is the responsibility of the Transportation Committee. Both programs are included in this report so the Regional Planning Committee can see how these related programs are working together.

Both programs include funding of 2 percent of the annual TransNet revenues each. This report provides an update on grant progress to date, discusses ongoing oversight efforts and the next call for projects.

Discussion

FY 2009-FY 2010 Grants and Progress to Date

Shortly after the first cycles of TransNet SGIP and TDA/TransNet Bicycle Pedestrian Neighborhood Safety/Traffic Calming grants were awarded in May and June 2009, SANDAG staff began establishing grant agreements with the local jurisdictions that received grants. Largely because this is the first TransNet grant cycle, establishing grant agreements has taken longer than anticipated.
Staff has therefore spent a significant amount of time working with grantees to establish scopes of work, budgets, and schedules that will provide enough information to adequately monitor each grantee’s progress with respect to the programs’ Use-It-or-Lose-It policy (Attachment 1). At the time of this report, grant agreements have been executed with all grantees, with the exception of five that are still pending.

The process of developing grant agreements has proven to be a valuable learning experience. For instance, future program guidelines should require sufficient detail for project scopes, schedules, and budgets to enable this information to be incorporated directly into the grant agreement. These are important in establishing consistent quarterly reporting, project oversight, and invoicing processes. Grants awarded in future calls for projects will be governed by Board Policy No. 35, adopted by the Board of Directors in January 2010, which outlines the Use-It-or-Lose-It policy and other administration procedures that will apply to all SANDAG grant programs.

Where grant agreements have been established, grantee performance has been timely in most cases. Grantees have been making significant progress according to their milestones as laid out in their scopes of work. For the SGIP, it should be noted that a grant agreement has not been established for the Oceanside Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan and EIR project because the project could not be fully funded by the City of Oceanside. For the Bicycle Pedestrian and Neighborhood Safety/Traffic Calming Program, two projects have already been completed. Grantee progress is described in Attachment 2. The attachment includes a “watch list” that will also appear in subsequent staff reports to denote those grantees that appear in danger of missing their use-it-or-lose-it milestone deadlines. This quarter there are no grants on the watch list, but there are three grantees currently requesting schedule extensions in accordance with the Use-It-or-Lose-It policy. The City of Escondido has four grants that are not on the watch list, but execution is still pending for these agreements. The City of Escondido has experienced delays in executing their grant agreements due to unexpected staffing issues. SANDAG is working with City of Escondido staff to obtain information necessary for grant agreement execution by October. Staff anticipates that this will be resolved by the next status report to the RPC.

When the SGIP grant awards were made in May 2009, revenues were estimated at $9.4 million. Based on actual revenues through June 2010, there currently are $8.7 million in TransNet revenues available for the FY 2009-FY 2010 cycle. This results in a shortfall in projected versus actual program revenues of $700,000. Not funding the $160,000 awarded to the Oceanside project leaves a shortfall of $540,000. For the Bicycle Pedestrian and Neighborhood Safety/Traffic Calming Program, revenues were estimated at $7.8 million when grant awards were made in June 2009; there currently are $7 million available for the FY 2010 cycle, resulting in a shortfall of $800,000. These funding shortfalls should not present a cash flow problem for existing grantees as revenues are being received significantly faster than invoices for grant expenditures. The funding amounts available for future calls for projects can be reduced by $540,000 and $800,000, respectively, to fully fund the grants from the FY 2009-FY 2010 and FY2010 cycles.

Program Oversight

Grantees are required to submit quarterly status reports for the purpose of monitoring timely progress toward completion of the grant. Additionally, invoices are submitted on a quarterly basis, but must be accompanied by a quarterly status report in order for payment to be approved. SANDAG staff will monitor grantee progress through quarterly reports, but also through review of
plans for capital projects, involvement in consultant selection, and project team and community meetings for planning projects. Staff will continue to provide regular status reports to the Regional Planning Committee (RPC) regarding grant progress. Oversight requirements for both programs are outlined in Attachment 3.

**Next Calls for Projects**

According to the biennial funding cycle that has been established for the SGIP, and the annual funding cycle for the Bicycle Pedestrian Neighborhood Safety/Traffic Calming Program, the next calls for projects for both programs would be expected in 2010. However, potential changes to program eligibility and criteria are anticipated in response to the development of the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), Urban Area Transit Strategy (UATS), the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS), and the Regional Bicycle Plan. The new RTP could impact funding priorities within both programs by establishing a significantly expanded planned transit network in the UATS, a new policy framework in the SCS, and a financing strategy for Regional Bicycle Plan projects. Therefore, it is proposed that the next Bicycle Pedestrian Neighborhood Safety/Traffic Calming Program call for projects be issued in spring 2011, and for the SGIP after completion of the 2050 RTP, near the end of 2011.

**Next Steps**

Staff will continue to monitor grantee progress and will provide regular status reports to the RPC. Prior to the next call for projects, staff will conduct an analysis of the current selection criteria and funded projects in light of program objectives and the policy framework to be outlined in the 2050 RTP. The application and grant agreement process will also be examined in an effort to identify areas for improvement. Staff will present the results of this analysis and propose an updated set of selection criteria to the RPC prior to the next call for projects for both grant programs.

CHARLES “MUGGS” STOLL  
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachments: 1. TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program and Bicycle Pedestrian Neighborhood Safety/Traffic Calming Program Use-It-or-Lose-It Requirements  
2. FY 2009-2010 TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program Grants and FY 2010 TDA/TransNet Bicycle Pedestrian Neighborhood Safety/Traffic Calming Program Grants  
3. TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program and Bicycle Pedestrian Neighborhood Safety/Traffic Calming Program Oversight Requirements

Key Staff Contact: Christine Eary, (619) 699-6928, cea@sandag.org
TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program and Bicycle Pedestrian Neighborhood Safety/Traffic Calming Program Use-It-or-Lose-It Requirements

1. Project Milestone and Completion Deadlines

1.1. This policy applies to all Smart Growth Incentive Program grant funds, whether from TransNet or another source. By signing a grant agreement for the Smart Growth Incentive Program, grant recipients agree to the following project delivery objectives.

1.1.1. Capital Grants. The project must be completed according to the schedule provided in the grant agreement, but at the latest, a construction contract must be awarded within two years following execution of the grant agreement, and construction must be completed within eighteen months following award of the construction contract.

1.1.2. Planning Grants. The project must be completed according to the schedule provided in the grant agreement, but at the latest, a consultant contract must be awarded within one year following execution of the grant agreement, and the planning project must be complete within two years following award of the consultant contract.

Failure to meet the above deadlines may result in revocation of all grant funds not already expended.

1.2. Grant funds made available as a result of this process may be awarded to the next project on the recommended project priority list from the most recent project selection process, or they may be added to the funds available for the next project funding cycle, at SANDAG’s discretion. Any project that loses funding due to failure to meet the deadlines specified in this policy may be resubmitted to compete for funding in a future call for projects.

2. Project Milestone and Completion Deadlines

2.1. Grant recipients may receive extensions on their project schedules of up to one year for good cause. Extensions of up to twelve months aggregate that would not cause the project to miss a deadline in Sections 1.1.1 or 1.1.2 may be approved by the SANDAG Program Manager for the Smart Growth Incentive Program. Extensions beyond twelve months aggregate or that would cause the project to miss a deadline in Sections 1.1.1 or 1.1.2 must be approved by the Regional Planning Committee. For an extension to be granted under this Section 2, the following conditions must be met:

2.1.1. For extension requests of up to six months, the grant recipient must request the extension in writing to the SANDAG Program Manager at least two weeks prior to the earliest project schedule milestone deadline for which an extension is being requested.

2.1.2. For extension requests that will cause one or more project milestones to be delayed more than six months, but less than twelve months aggregate, the grant recipient must request an extension in writing to the SANDAG Program Manager at least six weeks prior to the earliest project schedule milestone deadline for which an extension is being requested.

2.1.3. The project sponsor seeking the extension must document previous efforts undertaken to maintain the project schedule, the reasons for the delay, and why they were unavoidable, and demonstrate an ability to succeed in the extended time frame.

2.1.4. If the Program Manager denies an extension request under this Section 2, the project sponsor may appeal within ten business days of receiving the Program Manager’s response to the Regional Planning Committee.

2.1.5. Extension requests that are rejected by the Regional Planning Committee will result in termination of the grant agreement and obligation by the project sponsor to return to SANDAG any unexpended funds. Unexpended funds are funds for project costs not incurred prior to rejection of the extension request by the Regional Planning Committee.

3. Project Delays and Extensions of up to One Year

3.1. Requests for extensions beyond one year or that will cause a project to miss a deadline in Sections 1.1.1 or 1.1.2 (including those projects that were already granted extensions by the SANDAG Program Manager and are again falling behind schedule) will be considered by the Regional Planning Committee. The Regional Planning Committee will only grant an extension under this Section 3 for extenuating conditions beyond the control of the project sponsor, defined as follows:
3.1.1. Capital Grants

3.1.1.1. Environmental. An extension may be granted when, 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.

3.1.1.2. Right-of-Way. Extensions for delays necessary to complete right-of-way acquisition may be granted only when right-of-way needs are identified that could not have been foreseen at the time the grant agreement was signed.

3.1.1.3. Permitting. Delays associated with obtaining permits from external agencies may justify an extension when the project sponsor can demonstrate that every effort has been made to obtain the necessary permits and that the delay is wholly due to the permitting agency.

3.1.1.4. Construction Schedule. Extensions may be granted when unavoidable construction delays create a conflict with restrictions on construction during certain times of the year (for instance, to avoid nesting season for endangered species).

3.1.1.5. Litigation. Extensions may be granted when a lawsuit has been filed concerning the project being funded.

3.1.1.6. Other. Extensions may be granted due to changes in federal/state policies or laws that can be shown to directly affect the project schedule.

3.1.2. Planning Grants

3.1.2.1. Changed Circumstances. An extension may be granted for a planning project when circumstances not within the control of the grant recipient, such as an action by an outside agency, require a change in the scope of work for the project.

3.2. The grant recipient shall make its request directly to the Regional Planning Committee, providing a detailed justification for the requested extension, including a revised project schedule and work plan, at least six weeks prior to the earliest project schedule milestone deadline, or deadline in Sections 1.1.1 or 1.1.2, for which an extension is being requested.

3.3. Extension requests that are rejected by the Regional Planning Committee will result in termination of the grant agreement and obligation by the project sponsor to return to SANDAG any unexpended funds. Unexpended funds are funds for project costs not incurred prior to rejection of the extension request.
## TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program FY 2009 - FY 2010 Grants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>GRANT TYPE</th>
<th>GRANT AMOUNT</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>WATCH LIST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Mid-City SR-15 BRT Station Area Planning Study</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
<td>Executing consultant contract</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Chollas Triangle Master Plan</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>$275,000</td>
<td>Executing consultant contract</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Palomar Gateway District Specific Plan and EIR</td>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>Scope of work finalized, preparing RFP and public participation strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Euclid and Market Village Master Plan</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>Finalizing consultant selection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Oceanside Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan and EIR</td>
<td>Oceanside</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td>City budget constraints prevented Project funding. $160,000 award will revert to SGIP.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Imperial Avenue and Commercial St. Corridor Plan</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>Finalizing consultant selection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>8th St. Corridor Smart Growth Revitalization</td>
<td>National City</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>Preparing 30% Design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Lemon Grove Trolley Plaza</td>
<td>Lemon Grove</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$1,895,000</td>
<td>Preparing 30% Design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Park Blvd/Essex St. Pedestrian Crossing &amp; Traffic Calming</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$224,000</td>
<td>Preparing 30% Design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Park Blvd./City College/San Diego High Pedestrian and Transit Access Improvements</td>
<td>San Diego /CCDC</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>Grant agreement pending due to changes in schedule and scope</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>4th Ave./Quince Pedestrian Crossing &amp; Traffic Calming</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$233,000</td>
<td>Preparing 30% Design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Industrial Blvd. Bike Lane &amp; Pedestrian Improvements</td>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$283,900</td>
<td>Slightly behind schedule; schedule amendment pending, consistent with Use-it-or-Lose-it Policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Third Ave. Streetscape Implementation Project</td>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>Completed 50% Design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>4th and 5th Ave./Nutmeg Pedestrian Crossing &amp; Traffic Calming</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$619,000</td>
<td>Preparing 30% Design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Watch List projects are those whose Use-It-or-Lose-It milestones appear to be in danger of falling behind schedule and therefore require additional monitoring.
## TDA/TransNet Bicycle Pedestrian Neighborhood Safety/Traffic Calming Program FY 2010 Grants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>GRANT TYPE</th>
<th>GRANT AMOUNT</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Chula Vista Bikeway Master Plan Update</td>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>Agreement recently executed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Coronado Bicycle Master Plan</td>
<td>Coronado</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>Draft plan completed, ad hoc committee is reviewing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Downtown Escondido Bike Racks</td>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>$14,378</td>
<td>SANDAG is working with Escondido to resolve grant agreement execution issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>La Mesa Bicycle Facilities Master Plan</td>
<td>La Mesa</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>Plan is being drafted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>National City Bicycle Master Plan</td>
<td>National City</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>Will present plan draft at public workshop next quarter; existing conditions report complete, comprehensive public outreach nearly complete (including website, online user survey &amp; bike tour event)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>EIR and Feasibility Study for Bike Master Plan Update</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>Project has not started, awaiting completion of Bike Master Plan to include w/RFP; slightly behind schedule, schedule amendment pending in accordance with Use-it-or-Lose-it policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Education Program</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>$290,000</td>
<td>Agreement recently executed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>San Diego Pedestrian Master Plan Phase 4</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>RFP will be issued next quarter; slightly behind schedule, schedule amendment pending in accordance with Use-it-or-Lose-it policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>UCSD Bicycle/Pedestrian Master Plan</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>Agreement recently executed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Bicycle Locker Wireless Communication</td>
<td>SANDAG</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>Finalizing consultant contract</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Watch List projects are those whose Use-It-or-Lose-It milestones appear to be in danger of falling behind schedule and therefore require additional monitoring.
# TDA/TransNet Bicycle Pedestrian Neighborhood Safety/Traffic Calming Program FY 2010 Grants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>GRANT TYPE</th>
<th>GRANT AMOUNT</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Bicycle Locker Retrofits and Upgrades</td>
<td>SANDAG</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>Finalizing consultant contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Bicycle Map Printing and Distribution</td>
<td>SANDAG</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>PROJECT COMPLETE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Spring St. Trolley Station Pedestrian Access Improvements</td>
<td>La Mesa</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$88,000</td>
<td>Project scheduled to begin FY11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Escondido Creek Bike Path</td>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$524,100</td>
<td>SANDAG is working with Escondido to resolve grant agreement execution issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Ash Street Undercrossing</td>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$457,357</td>
<td>SANDAG is working with Escondido to resolve grant agreement execution issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Escondido Creek Bike Path Lighting and Restriping</td>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$157,500</td>
<td>SANDAG is working with Escondido to resolve grant agreement execution issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>La Mesa Blvd./El Cajon Blvd. Intersection Improvements &amp; Pedestrian Infrastructure</td>
<td>La Mesa</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$361,000</td>
<td>Project scheduled to begin FY11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Inland Rail Trail Phase IIIB – Right of Way Engineering</td>
<td>Vista</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>Consultant contract executed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Bicycle Detection at Signalized Intersections</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$73,500</td>
<td>Agreement recently executed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Safe Pedestrian Crossing at Longhorn Dr.</td>
<td>Vista</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$50,649</td>
<td>Advertised for construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Barham Dr. Urban Trail Improvement Project</td>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>Completed 50% Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Sidewalk Safety Program - I Street Sidewalk Improvements</td>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$116,220</td>
<td>Agreement recently executed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Sweetwater River Bike Path Gap Closure - Plaza Bonita Rd.</td>
<td>National City</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$130,000</td>
<td>Design 95% complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Carlton Oaks Dr. Class II Bike Lanes</td>
<td>Santee</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$30,200</td>
<td>PROJECT COMPLETE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>SR-15 Bike Path Final Design and Environmental Document</td>
<td>San Diego/Caltrans</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>Agreement being executed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Installation of Audible Pedestrian Signals and Countdown Pedestrian Signals</td>
<td>Carlsbad</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$150,660</td>
<td>Ready to advertise for construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Kelton Rd. Midblock Pedestrian Improvements</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$248,400</td>
<td>Agreement recently executed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Watch List projects are those whose Use-It-or-Lose-It milestones appear to be in danger of falling behind schedule and therefore require additional monitoring.
Watch List projects are those whose Use-It-or-Lose-It milestones appear to be in danger of falling behind schedule and therefore require additional monitoring.
Planning Grants

1. **Contact Information.** Grantee must provide SANDAG with contact information for the project manager. Grantee must provide SANDAG with updated contact information in a timely manner if there are any changes to staff assigned.

2. **Stakeholder and Community Meetings.** Grantee must provide SANDAG with advance notice (preferably within two weeks) and agendas of all stakeholder and community meetings, and a copy of minutes following the meeting. SANDAG staff may attend any meetings as appropriate.

3. **Request for Proposals.** Grantee must submit consultant Request for Proposals to SANDAG staff for review and comment.

4. **Quarterly Reports.** Grantee must submit quarterly reports to SANDAG, detailing accomplishments in the quarter, anticipated progress next quarter, pending issues and actions toward resolution, and status of budget and schedule.
TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program and Bicycle Pedestrian Neighborhood Safety/Traffic Calming Program Oversight Requirements

**Capital Grants**

1. **Contact Information:** Grantee must provide SANDAG with contact information for the project manager. Grantee must provide SANDAG with updated contact information in a timely manner if there are any changes to staff assigned.

2. **Design Development Meetings:** Grantee must provide SANDAG with advance notice (preferably within two weeks) and agendas of all design development meetings, and a copy of minutes following the meeting. SANDAG staff may attend any meetings as appropriate.

3. **Plan Review:** Grantee must submit project design drawings to SANDAG for review and comment at 30 percent, 60 percent, 90 percent, and 100 percent. SANDAG staff may meet with the grantee to comment on submitted plans and assure substantial conformance. SANDAG may comment on submitted plans regarding:
   - whether they are consistent with the project proposed in the original grant application, and
   - consistency with accepted pedestrian/bicycle facility and smart growth design standards.

4. **Quarterly Reports:** Grantee must submit quarterly reports to SANDAG, detailing accomplishments in the quarter, anticipated progress next quarter, pending issues and actions toward resolution, and status of budget and schedule.

5. **Performance Monitoring:** SANDAG staff may measure performance of the constructed capital improvements against stated project objectives, and evaluate the overall SGIP. Grantee is expected to meet with SANDAG staff to identify relevant performance measures and data sources, and provide available data and feedback regarding the program as appropriate.
Introduction

The TransNet Extension Ordinance and Expenditure Plan, approved countywide by voters in November 2004, includes an Environmental Mitigation Program (EMP), which is a funding allocation category for the cost to “create a reliable approach for funding required mitigation for future transportation improvements thereby reducing costs and accelerating project delivery (TransNet Extension Ordinance Section D).” The EMP established two funds: (1) the Biological Mitigation Fund for direct mitigation, management, and monitoring for transportation-related impacts; and (2) the Regional Habitat Conservation Fund for efforts related to regional land acquisition, management, and monitoring for implementation of the regional habitat conservation plans.

On February 22, 2008, the Board of Directors authorized a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with Caltrans, the California Department of Fish and Game, and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service to establish the process to implement the goals of the TransNet EMP over a ten-year period. The MOA, executed on March 19, 2008, memorialized a Plan of Finance (POF) strategy of $440 million over the 10 years for the Biological Mitigation Fund and $40 million for the Regional Habitat Conservation Fund. The MOA is consistent with the TransNet EMP Implementation Guidelines adopted by the SANDAG Board of Directors on September 24, 2004.

This report provides an annual status update of the implementation of the EMP.

Discussion

Attachment 1 summarizes the progress of the Biological Mitigation Fund. The purpose of the Biological Mitigation Fund is to provide funds for the acquisition, restoration, and management of mitigation for regional transportation projects included in the RTP and local streets and roads. The following are some key achievements:

- Since January 2008, 15 properties totaling 1,241 acres have been acquired at a cost of approximately $60 million.

- Acquisition costs are 20.7 percent lower than the 2002 budget established under TransNet. The EMP program has enabled SANDAG to acquire land at a reduced cost due to the recession.
• One of the properties was acquired jointly with the County of San Diego, and one with both the County and State of California. These partnerships leveraged $5.4 million of non-TransNet acquisition and management funds, allowing more of the regional habitat preserves to be acquired.

• Mitigation has been secured for 16 RTP projects, and 119 acres for local streets and roads projects. The EMP has enabled SANDAG to successfully acquire all of the uplands mitigation for the SANDAG Board-approved Early Action Projects, and the program is currently focusing on the wetlands mitigation.

• Forty-eight percent of all the mitigation needs for the Regional Transportation Plan projects estimated under the TransNet Extension Ordinance has been secured since January 2008.

Attachment 2 summarizes the progress of the Regional Habitat Conservation Fund. The purpose of the Regional Habitat Conservation Fund is to provide funding for regional habitat management and monitoring necessary to implement habitat conservation planning throughout the region. These funds help maintain the current condition of the regional habitat preserve system, thereby reducing the likelihood that this system will degrade and reducing the need for listing of new species as endangered by the federal and state governments. The following are some key achievements:

• $5,285,000 of land management grants have been provided to over 30 applicants through a competitive grant program. Some of the activities have included weed removal in vernal pool habitat resulting in increased populations of endangered species; restoration of cactus wren habitat burned by wildfires; removal of invasive species to promote endangered species habitat throughout the region; and installation of fencing, signage, and controlled recreational access to open space lands. Matching funds from the grant applicants have totaled $3,568,243; a 67 percent match of non-TransNet funds. Ten additional grants totaling $2,085,000 are proposed for approval at the SANDAG Board’s September 24, 2010, meeting.

• Completion of regional population assessment of the California gnatcatcher (one of the flagship species for conservation planning in Southern California) covering the periods pre- and post-2007 wildfires. This assessment will allow the region to track the status and trend of this species over time and determine the success of management actions.

• Completion of a multi-year effort to review the impacts and recovery of habitat and species from the 2003 and 2007 wildfires—this is the largest and most comprehensive study conducted to date in Southern California. This study will allow the region to track recovery from future fires and focus management on those species struggling to come back from past fires.

• Establishment of South and North County land manager’s forums to share best management practices, strategize on key gaps in existing knowledge, leverage funding and resources, and dissolve institutional barriers among land management entities.
• Completion of a regional assessment of the monitoring that has occurred for the endangered species within the region covered by the regional habitat conservation planning efforts. This assessment will be used to focus future monitoring and land management activities, as well as future grant funding.

Challenges

The TransNet EMP is a unique approach that is being discussed as a framework for other parts of California and the United States. The EMP was featured at a recent Transportation Research Board meeting on large-scale solutions for transportation development. Below is a discussion of several challenges that have been identified and current actions to address these challenges:

• Both the public and SANDAG leadership have requested a transparent, up-to-date system to depict the status of the EMP and to be able to track expenditures. Staff has developed a working draft of an EMP Dashboard that will enable online access to the status of efforts under both the Biological Mitigation Fund and the Regional Habitat Conservation Fund. The EMP Dashboard needs to be integrated into SANDAG’s Keep San Diego Moving Web site and then will be open to the public providing real-time, transparent information on the progress of the program.

• Securing opportunities for wetlands remains a challenge due to the arid nature of the San Diego region. SANDAG staff is currently conducting a Request for Proposals process to identify willing participants to enter into public-private and public-public partnerships to secure wetland mitigation lands. These negotiations will be completed this fiscal year.

• Finally, SANDAG staff has identified the need to assist the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACOE) with a dedicated staff position to establish regional wetland mitigation banks for linear transportation projects. Once a bank is established, significant savings in cost and time will be achieved, as well as the potential to reduce mitigation requirements for future impacts. However, the substantial staff resources required to process mitigation banks are difficult to secure for the USACOE, and without outside funding they can take years to complete, with the potential for multiple changes in staff during that time.

Next Steps

This report is intended to be a status update of the program as of September 2010. Staff will return with subsequent reports on the TransNet EMP Dashboard and the progress of wetland mitigation at future RPC meetings.

CHARLES “MUGGS” STOLL
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachments: 1. CIP Project Number: 1200200 Biological Mitigation Fund
              2. CIP Project Number: 1200300 Regional Habitat Conservation Fund

Key Staff Contact: Keith Greer, (619) 699-7390, kgr@sandag.org
**Biological Mitigation Fund (CIP 1200200)**

**Purpose:** Environmental Mitigation Program (EMP), Biological Mitigation Fund. To secure mitigation for projects in the Regional Transportation Plan and local streets and roads pursuant to the TransNet Extension Ordinance and the subsequent TransNet Implementation Memorandum of Agreement (approved February 22, 2008).

**TransNet EMP Acquisitions (acres) by year**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Estimated Remaining Mitigation Needs:**
Regional Transportation Plan Projects as of Sept 2010*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Remaining RTP Mitigation (1196 ac)</th>
<th>Regional Transportation Plan Projects (1122 ac)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>755</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>269</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>172</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Plus 119 acres for local streets and roads

**Status:** As of September 2010, 1241 acres of land have been acquired for mitigation under the TransNet EMP. The focus has been on properties for the TransNet Early Action projects, including State Route 76 expansion and the Interstate 5 corridor. Several properties will require the future restoration of habitat. The identification and acquisition of wetland mitigation opportunities is a significant challenge which staff actively is working to resolve.
Regional Habitat Conservation Fund (CIP 1200300)

**Purpose:** Environmental Mitigation Program, Regional Habitat Conservation Fund. In March 2008, the SANDAG Board of Directors authorized funding pursuant to the TransNet Extension Ordinance to maintain and enhance the habitat values of the regional conservation preserve system pursuant to a five-year funding strategy.

![Conservation Fund Encumbrances by Category as of September 2010](image)

![Encumbrance by Fiscal Year](image)
Status: Currently SANDAG has granted 30 projects for land management activities (an additional 10 are pending Board approval), and has contracts for nine monitoring projects ranging from post wildfire recovery to status monitoring of endangered species. This year concluded a 5-year effort to assess recovery from the past wildfires, a report on the current status of biological monitoring of sensitive species in the region, and initiation of multi-agency forums to develop better coordination among the various land managers.
Our Region. Our Future.

2050 Regional Transportation Plan

2050 RTP Process and Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
<th>Spring 2010</th>
<th>Summer 2010</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th>Early 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goals and Objectives</td>
<td>Network Development All Modes</td>
<td>Project Evaluation Criteria</td>
<td>Ranked Projects by Category</td>
<td>Revenue Projections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2050 Regional Growth Forecast</td>
<td>Plan Performance Measures</td>
<td>Unconstrained Network</td>
<td>Revenue Constrained/SCS Network Scenarios</td>
<td>Revenue Constrained/SCS Preferred Network Scenario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft 2050 RTP and EIR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Draft 2050 Unconstrained Highway Network

- Managed/HOV Lanes
- General Purpose Lanes
- Toll Lanes
- Operational Improvements
- Freeway Connectors
- HOV Connectors
- Freeway & HOV Connectors

C = Conventional Highway
E = Expressway
F = Freeway
HOV = High Occupancy Vehicle
MB = Movable Barrier
ML = Managed Lanes
T = Toll Road
TU = Tunnel

Additional Unconstrained Components
Revenue Projections and Flexible Funding

- Revenue Constrained scenarios/SCS must be based on reasonably available funding
- Initial revenue projections total $100 – $110 billion through 2050
- Funding restricted by allowable uses
- Board policy on flexible funding
Sustainable Communities Strategy

Next Steps

- Refine and evaluate Revenue Constrained scenarios
Regional Housing Needs Assessment

Who’s Involved?

- Board of Directors
- Regional Planning Committee
- Regional Planning Technical Working Group
- Regional Housing Working Group
History of Housing Element Law

- 1965 – General plans required
- 1969 – Housing elements made mandatory
- 1971 – HCD prepared Housing Element Guidelines
- 1977 – Housing Element Guidelines extensively revised to require increased detail
- 1980 – Housing Element Guidelines codified and comprehensive amendments made

More History

- Recognition that multifamily zoning was scarce in many communities
- Recognition that providing for affordable housing was not only a zoning issue but a financial issue
- Over years many changes have been made to housing element law, but the fundamental principles of the law have not changed
SB 375 and Housing Element Law

- Planning for housing and transportation synchronized - RTP and RHNA
- Housing elements due 18 months after RTP adopted
- Eight-year housing element cycle
- Consistency with Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS)

Past Housing Element Cycles

San Diego Region

- 1986 – 1991 (First Cycle)
- 1991 – 1996 (Second Cycle)
- 1999 – 2004 (Third Cycle)
- 2005 – 2010 (Fourth Cycle)
- 2013 – 2020 (Fifth Cycle) (SB 375 and 575)
RHNA Objectives from Housing Element Law (added in 2004)

- Increasing supply and mix of housing types, tenure, and affordability
- Promoting infill development and socio-economic equity, protection of environmental and agricultural resources, and encouragement of efficient development patterns
- Promoting jobs/housing balance
- Alleviating over-concentration households, i.e. promoting balanced communities

RCP Housing Chapter

- **Goal:** Provide a variety of affordable and quality housing choices for people of all income levels...
- **Policy Objective:** Increase the supply of and variety of housing choices, especially higher density multifamily housing...
**RCP Housing Chapter**

- **Recommended Actions:**
  - Identify and rezone appropriate sites for entry-level houses, multifamily and mixed use housing, close to public transportation, employment, and other services
  - Identify and develop appropriate underutilized sites for housing, such as older strip commercial centers

**Housing Element**

**Regional Roles and Responsibilities**

- Consultation with HCD to determine the region’s housing needs
- Allocation of regional share by jurisdiction
- Allocation of jurisdiction share by income category
Allocation by Income Category

- Very low – 23 percent
- Low – 17 percent
- Moderate – 19 percent
- Above moderate – 41 percent

2010 Household Income Limits
Family of Four

- **Very Low Income**
  0-50 percent AMI - $39,250

- **Low Income**
  50-80 percent AMI - $62,800

- **Moderate Income**
  80-120 percent AMI - $90,600

- **Above Moderate**
  120 percent and above area median income

AMI = Area Median Income
Housing Element
Local Roles and Responsibilities

- Update housing element every eight years
- Identify adequate sites to accommodate overall share of the region’s housing needs
- Identify adequate sites at 30 du/ac for lower income housing

Potential Sites for Lower & Moderate Income Housing
2050 Regional Growth Forecast
2010 – 2020 RHNA Planning Period

- 127,000 housing units (11 years)
- Lower income: 40 percent or 50,800 housing units

Employment and Residential Lands Inventory

- 80 percent of new residential development will be multifamily homes
- 80 percent of new residential development will be located in redevelopment/infill areas
Residential Comparison

Comparison of Residential Product by MPO
(Percent Change from 2005-2035)

2050 Regional Growth Forecast
30+ du/ac Housing Capacity
Regional Total: 213,540

North Coastal
Over 30 du/acre: 4,361

North Inland
Over 30 du/acre: 18,337

Unincorporated
Over 30 du/acre: 3,526

City of San Diego
Over 30 du/acre: 144,463

East
Over 30 du/acre: 23,281

South
Over 30 du/acre: 22,358
**RHNA Allocation Factors**

- Jobs and housing relationship
- Opportunities and constraints to developing housing
  - Lack of sewer/water service capacity
  - Vacant/redevelopment/infill land availability
  - Land protected from development
  - County policies to preserve agricultural land
- Distribution of household growth in RTP and maximizing transportation infrastructure

**RHNA Allocation Factors**

- Market demand for housing
- Agreements between county and cities to direct growth toward incorporated areas
- Units “at risk” of converting to market rate units
- High housing cost burdens
- Housing needs of farm workers
- Housing needs generated by CSU or UC campuses
- Other factors adopted by SANDAG
Opportunities

- Smart Growth Concept Map adopted
- 2050 Regional Growth Forecast identifies significant increase in multifamily capacity from local general plan amendments
- Unused residential capacity from last cycle
- Improve links between transportation and land use and make better use of investments in our transit system – SB 375, Urban Area Transit Strategy

RHNA Schedule

- September 2010 – State determines regional housing needs
- June – December 2010 – Develop methodology for distributing regional housing need to local jurisdictions
- February 2011 – Draft RHNA for distribution
- July 2011 – SANDAG Board adoption of final RHNA
- January 2013 – Housing Elements due within 18 months of RTP adoption
## Regional Housing Needs Assessment

### New Housing Units by Income Category

**1/1/03 – 12/31/09**

**2009 RCP Performance Monitoring Report**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Above Moderate</th>
<th>Total for All Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Housing Units Produced</td>
<td>3,972</td>
<td>4,021</td>
<td>3,512</td>
<td>64,616</td>
<td>76,121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHNA Goal</td>
<td>24,143</td>
<td>18,348</td>
<td>20,280</td>
<td>44,530</td>
<td>107,301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Goal Produced</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>145%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units Left To Permit</td>
<td>20,171</td>
<td>14,327</td>
<td>16,768</td>
<td>-20,086</td>
<td>31,180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Large scale acquisition and management

- Reduced cost
- Accelerated delivery
- Implement habitat plans
- Listing of species
TransNet Extension EMP

“The intent is to establish a program to provide for large-scale acquisition and management of critical habitat areas and to create a reliable approach for funding required mitigation for future transportation improvements thereby reducing future costs and accelerating project delivery. This approach would be implemented by obtaining coverage for transportation projects through existing and proposed multiple species conservation plans. (Section D)”

Biological Mitigation Fund

San Luis Rey River Valley – in escrow

Vessels Property
Habitat Conservation Fund
Weed management – Tijuana River Valley

Biological Mitigation Fund
Harmony Grove - acquired 2/13/09

Sage Hill
Biological Mitigation Fund

Habitat Conservation Fund

Regional monitoring and land management
Habitat Conservation Fund

Wildfire recovery

- HERMES COPPER BUTTERFLY

Land management

Weeding and Dethatching

- 150 percent increase in endangered species
- 90-95 percent kill of key weeds
- 27 percent decrease in non-native grasses
- Targeting and timing key to success
- Re-invasion rate unknown
Habitat Conservation Fund

*Land management*

**Signage and Access**

- Simple and pro-active
- Allows access to remain open to public
- Anecdotal success

Cost Effective Methods for Restoration
Habitat Conservation Fund

FYs 2006 - 2010

- Management: $8,935,000
- Monitoring: $5,475,000
- Coordination: $1,590,000

What’s Next?

1) Online system to depict status
2) Wetlands mitigation banks
3) Coordination of land managers
4) Alignment of regional monitoring assessment to land management actions