



**BOARD OF DIRECTORS
SEPTEMBER 11, 2009**

**AGENDA ITEM NO. 09-09-3
ACTION REQUESTED - DISCUSSION**

**2050 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN:
VISION AND GOALS**

File Number 3100500

Introduction

Solutions to our region's transportation needs require a comprehensive planning effort that coordinates land use and transportation and develops an integrated, multimodal transportation system. The Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) contains specific public policies and strategies, as well as projects and programs aimed at meeting the diverse mobility needs of our growing and changing region.

Federal and state laws require that SANDAG prepare a long-range transportation plan and make an air quality conformity determination every four years. A work program and schedule to develop the 2050 RTP, which is slated for adoption in 2011, were presented to the Board of Directors in June 2009.

To establish the policy foundation for the 2050 RTP, the Board should provide policy direction regarding the 2050 RTP vision and goals. Interactive technology will be used to pose questions and promote discussion.

Discussion

Emerging Issues

SANDAG is the first major metropolitan planning organization that will prepare an RTP that will include the provisions of Senate Bill (SB) 375 (Steinberg, 2008). One of the first steps in the 2050 RTP development is to review and update the goals and objectives from the 2030 RTP based on emerging issues such as the implementation of SB 375.

The Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) will be a new element of the RTP, as required by SB 375, and will be designed to show how regional greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction targets, to be established by the California Air Resources Board, would be achieved through development patterns, transportation infrastructure investments, and/or transportation measures or policies that are determined to be feasible. Additionally, the SCS must be consistent with the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) and must address protection of sensitive resource areas. If the SCS does not meet regional GHG reduction targets, an Alternative Planning Strategy (APS) must be developed to demonstrate how the targets could be achieved.

The adopted Smart Growth Concept Map, which identifies existing and planned smart growth areas linked to existing and planned public transit, along with habitat conservation areas, will serve as a basis for the SCS. Additionally, the Regional Climate Action Plan (RCAP) will provide options for additional transportation measures that could reduce GHG emissions.

Framework

Staff is proposing a progressive framework of goals, policy objectives, and performance measures to be used to guide the 2050 RTP. Draft policy goals are proposed for the 2050 RTP. Based on direction from the Board of Directors at the September 11 Board Policy meeting, policy objectives will be created to help reach these goals. Finally, performance measures will be established to measure how well the 2050 RTP performs.

The 2050 RTP should start with the core values from previous RTPs, and incorporate them into broader categories to reflect emerging issues such as climate change, aging population, and the economy. In addition to emerging issues, more traditional concepts, such as providing convenient travel options, optimizing the transportation systems' productivity for people and goods, tailoring transportation improvements to serve compatible land uses, and promoting alternative travel modes also are critical to the development of the 2050 RTP.

In addition to policy direction from past RTPs, the Board has adopted goals and provided policy direction in the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP), as the strategic planning framework for the San Diego region, as well as other plans and strategies. The RCP calls for the application of principles of "smart growth" and "sustainability." Smart growth means developing the region in a way that creates livable communities by connecting land use and transportation, improving the quality of travel by focusing on better urban design and walkability. The RCP's principles of sustainability are based on achieving goals and objectives in three broad areas: a prosperous economy, a healthy environment, and social equity. These three Es together provide the foundation for achieving sustainable and livable communities.

Developing the 2050 RTP Vision, Goals, and Policy Objectives

Proposed 2050 RTP Vision

The RCP sets forth a vision for transportation in the San Diego region, as outlined below:

We have many convenient transportation choices. Fast, frequent, and reliable public transit services interconnect our communities, and our major transit centers are integrated with housing, retail shops, food courts, shade-covered benches, and well-maintained restrooms. More of our residents who have cars opt to leave them at home and families need fewer cars per household. Overall, it's easier and more convenient to get around by walking, biking, and using transit. As a result, many children walk or bike to school, as we used to do when we were younger.

Many of our existing regional freeways, highways, and major roadways have been expanded and include an extensive managed lane network for transit and carpools. These systems are linked to the international airport, ensuring effective access to world markets. Roads, rails, and vehicles are better managed with technology, which increases public safety. In-road sensors and cameras help detect traffic incidents and slowing. Automated systems notify traffic-response teams in real-time and electronically adjust ramp meters and traffic signals to moderate traffic flow.

Despite continued population and employment growth, the average commute time is less than 30 minutes, and traffic congestion in key corridors has improved. By better linking transportation and land use decisions in the past, more people now live close to their jobs and leave their cars at home. As a result, more people have additional leisure time and less travel-related stress.

Draft 2050 RTP Goals

Staff has drafted proposed goals for the 2050 RTP which expand upon goals from the 2030 RTP and incorporate recent Board policy discussions on smart growth, energy, economic, and quality of life issues. Once finalized, policy objectives and performance measures will be developed for each of the goals. The Board also should provide direction on other goals that staff should consider for the 2050 RTP.

The proposed 2050 RTP goals are structured into two overarching themes: Quality of Travel & Livability, and Sustainability. Quality of Travel & Livability relates to how the transportation system functions from the customers' perspective, while Sustainability relates to making progress simultaneously in each of the Three "Es" (Healthy Environment, Prosperous Economy, and Social Equity).

In addition to the discussion below, to help clarify the relationship between past RTP policy goals and those proposed for the 2050 RTP, staff created a matrix showing their intersections. The matrix, shown in Attachment 1, provides a comparison of the proposed 2050 RTP goals to the current 2030 RTP goals. The matrix depicts how the existing goals have many linkages to the proposed 2050 RTP goals and also highlights some of the new concepts given other emerging issues.

Quality of Travel & Livability

Mobility – The transportation system should provide for convenient travel options for people and goods and maximize its productivity. The system should optimize both the time it takes to travel as well as the total costs of travel.

Reliability – The transportation system should be reliable so that travelers can expect relatively consistent travel times from day-to-day for the same trip by mode(s).

System Preservation & Safety – The public's investment in transportation should be protected by maintaining the transportation system and keeping it in a good state of repair. It is critical to preserve and ensure a safe regional transportation system through engineering, education, enforcement, and emergency medical services.

Sustainability

Healthy Environment – The transportation system should focus on transportation investments that avoid and mitigate adverse environmental impacts and should promote environmental sustainability by reducing greenhouse gas and smog forming emissions from vehicles. Transportation investments should foster efficient development patterns that optimize travel, housing, and employment choices and encourage future growth away from rural areas and closer to existing and planned development.

Prosperous Economy – Investments to the transportation system should provide cost-effective solutions that maximize public benefits so that the region gets the most out of its investment and that encourage economic growth. The RTP should play a significant role in raising the region's standard of living.

Social Equity – The transportation system should be designed to provide an equitable level of transportation services for low-income, minority, seniors, and youth populations.

Next Steps

The proposed 2050 RTP goals will be discussed with the Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group (SWG). Based on Board direction and input from the SWG, staff will develop policy objectives and performance measures for each of the goals and bring these back to a future Board meeting.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Attachment: 1. Proposed 2050 RTP Goals Compared to Existing 2030 RTP Goals

Key Staff Contact: Heather Werdick, (619) 699-6967, hwe@sandag.org

Funds are budgeted in Work Element #3100500

Proposed 2050 RTP Goals Compared to Existing 2030 RTP Goals

	EXISTING 2030 RTP GOALS							
PROPOSED 2050 RTP GOALS	LIVABILITY	MOBILITY	EFFICIENCY	ACCESSIBILITY	RELIABILITY	SUSTAINABILITY	EQUITY	COMMENTS
QUALITY OF TRAVEL & LIVABILITY								
MOBILITY		■	■	■		■		Features concepts of existing of Mobility, Efficiency, Accessibility, and Sustainability goals
RELIABILITY		■	■		■			Features concepts of existing Mobility, Efficiency, and Reliability goals
SYSTEM PRESERVATION & SAFETY					■			Features concepts of Reliability goal
SUSTAINABILITY								
HEALTHY ENVIRONMENT	■					■		In addition to concepts included in Livability and Sustainability goals, new focus on greenhouse gas emissions reductions
PROSPEROUS ECONOMY								Features some concepts of Livability and Equity goals. However, it is a proposed <u>new</u> goal based on emerging issues
SOCIAL EQUITY				■			■	Features concepts of Accessibility and Equity goals

ACCELERATOR COLLIDER ENERGY

1.7 Mev. H₂⁺ Ion Collisions For Electric Power Generation

Average of 7 grams per hour of H₂⁺ ions collided on carbon crystal foils could replace S. Bay Power Plant. Key work outlined in "*Forward electron ejection in ion collisions*", by Dehaes, Neek, & Sommerville; Aarhus Denmark 1984.

This is a low energy 1.7 Mev [million electron volt] phenomenon, which creates a sharp peak in forward ejected electrons [8000 electrons per H₂⁺ breakup H₂⁺ → H⁺ + H⁰] moving at the same velocity as the impacting H₂⁺ ions ~ 54,000,000 ft per sec. Single H⁺ ions could be recycled to each create streams of 1000 electrons upon impact.

Short linear acceleration sections could theoretically step up velocities of H₂⁺ ions by thirteen incremental accelerations, 0 to 13,183.6 ft. per sec. 26367.2, 52734.4, 105468.8, 210937.6, 421875.2, 843750.4, 1687500.8, 3375001.6, 6750003.2, 13500006.4, 27000012.8, **54,000,025.6**. This is a velocity doubler. Stored in a 25 ft radius synchrotron .000002 grams of H₂⁺ ions [2 micrograms] would create a force of 8 tons*. A beam the length of the circumference ~ 157 ft., would create a centrifical force of about 100 pounds per foot. *[Centrifical force = mass, times velocity squared. divided by the radius]

Each packet of 2 micrograms [2 ug.] of H₂⁺ ions collided would create a 400 ampere 'convoy electron' jet, [the electron beams are at 1000 Ev [electron volts]], and the power would be 400 megawatts for 1000 packets per sec. Assuming recycling atomic H⁺ ions, plus lower energy consumption overnight, roughly 7.2 grams times 24 hours as average daily operation ~ 172.8 grams of H₂⁺ ions collided per day, even with 75% conversion of the raw beam power through toroidal power pickup coils into electrical energy, would potentially be able to replace the S. Bay 700 megawatt power plant.

The results for Aarhus Denmark's symposium on forward ejected electrons in ion collisions mentioned supra have established empirical results, and the H₂⁺ ion collisions here being considered measured yields for an angle of 1 degree of convoy electrons ejected in the forward direction. The difficulty involved in establishing sufficiently optimal energy yields vis a vis operating energy requirements is related to the expense of creating an optimal ion accelerator for the very low 1.7 Mev energy level where peak production of "convoy electrons" occurs. High energy collisions are extremely interesting to collision physicists searching for the gravitational coupling, they would prefer money be spent on the high energy facilities. But the energy peaks are where they are, in the low Mev range, and wisdom would put funding into optimal designs for low wattage requirements for this range of acceleration. Thick copper pipes may not be the best design to run the ion beams through because the electric currents have to penetrate all that copper to reach the ion beams traveling inside.

Typically, partial beams are very thin whisps to help isolate single events for clear observation, also the terrific centrifical [centrifugal] acceleration of ~ 9 trillion "G's" for a radius curve of 10 feet, [for velocities of 54 million ft per sec.], establishes limits on mass densities of beams even at low energy. Short linear acceleration sections keep energy requirements low because of the absence of centrifugal force that would otherwise have to be contained by electromagnetic fields when accelerating on a curve.

REMY, THOMAS, MOOSE and MANLEY, LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

MICHAEL H. REMY
1944 – 2003

TINA A. THOMAS
OF COUNSEL

JAMES G. MOOSE
WHITMAN F. MANLEY
ANDREA K. LEISY
TIFFANY K. WRIGHT
SABRINA V. TELLER
ASHLE T. CROCKER

455 CAPITOL MALL, SUITE 210
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95814

Telephone: (916) 443-2745
Facsimile: (916) 443-9017
E-mail: info@rtmmlaw.com
<http://www.rtmmlaw.com>

SENIOR COUNSEL
JENNIFER S. HOLMAN
HOWARD F. WILKINS III

ASSOCIATES
AMY R. HIGUERA
AMANDA R. BERLIN
JASON W. HOLDER
LAURA M. HARRIS
CHRISTOPHER J. BUTCHER
JEANNIE LEE

BRIAN J. PLANT
OF COUNSEL

CONFIDENTIAL – ATTORNEY/CLIENT PRIVILEGED

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: City Council, City of Solana Beach

FROM: James Moose *JGM*

DATE: September 3, 2009

RE: SB 375 CEQA streamlining provisions

This memorandum discusses the provisions of the California's Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act, or SB 375, that streamline environmental review for certain transit priority projects ("TPP") under the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). SB 375 requires each metropolitan planning organization ("MPO") to include a Sustainable Communities Strategy ("SCS") in its regional transportation plan ("RTP") or to adopt an Alternative Planning Strategy ("APS"), for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gas ("GHG") emissions, aligning planning for transportation and housing needs, and creating incentives for the implementation of the strategies, such as CEQA streamlining and transportation funding.

Generally, under the streamlining provisions, if a project qualifies as a TPP, is consistent with the SCS adopted as part of an RTP for which an environmental impact report ("EIR") was prepared and meets various other criteria discussed below, it shall be exempt from further CEQA review. Public Resources Code section 21155 sets forth the requirements for a project to qualify as a TPP. Along with requirements for project density and location, the TPP must be consistent with the "general use designation, density, building intensity, and applicable policies specified for the project area in either a sustainable communities strategy or an alternative planning strategy," for which the State Air Resources Board "has accepted [an MPO's] determination that the [SCS] or the

alternative planning strategy would, if implemented, achieve the GHG emission reduction targets.”

Public Resources Code section 21155.1 states that, “if the legislative body finds, after conducting a public hearing,” that a TPP, as defined above, meets all of the requirements of section 21155.1, subdivisions (a) and (b), and one of the requirements of subdivision (c), the TPP “is declared to be a sustainable communities project and *shall be exempt* from this division. . . .” Subdivisions (a), (b) and (c) set forth environmental and land use criteria, along with an affordable housing component, that must be met for the exemption to apply.

1. The Plain Language of Public Resources Code Section 21155.1 Requires Application of the Exemption

In our opinion, the language of Public Resources Code section 21155.1 effectively eliminates an agency’s discretion to conduct CEQA review for a project that meets its requirements. We base this conclusion on the plain meaning of the statutory mandate that states the project “shall be exempt.” (*California School Employees Assn. v. Governing Board* (1994) 8 Cal.4th 333, 338; *Janken v. GM Hughes Electronics* (1996) 46 Cal.App.4th 55, 60 [“primary determinant” of legislative intent is words used by the Legislature].) Where the language is clear and unambiguous, the plain meaning must be followed. There is no ambiguity in the legislative language of 21155.1, and if a TPP meets the listed criteria, it “shall be exempt” from CEQA.

We understand that San Diego Association of Governments (“SANDAG”) staff has asserted that the “CEQA streamlining provisions are not mandatory and are intended to be a tool that local jurisdictions may use, if desired.” We disagree with this assertion, particularly in light of our understanding that SANDAG staff based this interpretation not on the plain statutory language, but on communications with members of SB 375 author Darrell Steinberg’s staff. As stated above, the plain meaning of statutory language must be followed. If the statutory language is clear and unambiguous, there is no need for further interpretation. (*California School Employees Assn., supra*, 8 Cal.4th at p. 340; *Halbert’s Lumber, Inc. v. Lucky Stores, Inc.* (1992) 6 Cal.App.4th 1233, 1239.) Only if the plain meaning of the statute’s text does not resolve the interpretive question, would a court look to the legislative history to assist in an interpretation. (*Flannery v. Prentice* (2001) 26 Cal.4th 572, 579; *Dyna-Med, Inc. v. Fair Employment & Housing Com.* (1987) 43 Cal.3d 1379, 1387.) Here, because the language “shall be exempt” is clear and unambiguous, we do not believe a court would consider communications with staff to interpret the plain language in a different manner, particularly if those communications could only be substantiated with hearsay evidence.

We understand that another option presented by SANDAG staff would be to include a site on the RTP/SCS map, but have an asterisk next to it indicating additional

environmental review would be required. Again, it is our opinion that this is contrary to the statutory language of Public Resource Code section 21155.1 and is therefore not in fact a viable option. We also note that, should a city attempt to “volunteer” to be excluded from consideration in the RTP and SCS, this would likely result in a loss of transportation funding, and could make the city vulnerable to a lawsuit to the extent its actions were interpreted as trying to thwart the purposes of SB 375.

2. The City Cannot Avoid Application of an Exemption by Not Holding a Public Hearing

We also understand that staff from the League of California Cities has pointed to the language in Public Resources Code section 21155.1, which states that “if the legislative body finds, *after a conducting a public hearing. . .*,” to conclude that a city does not actually have to make such a determination. The argument appears to be that if a city never holds a public hearing to make the determination, then the TPP is not exempt and presumably would have to be subject to independent CEQA review. League of Cities staff opined that SB 375 “invites, but does not require, a lead agency to hold a public hearing to determine whether the TPP meets the requirements for a statutory exemption” and further concludes that a writ of mandate could not be brought because the determination of whether to hold a public hearing is within the discretion of the local agency.

We disagree with this interpretation. Under the general provisions of CEQA, if an agency proposes to “approve” a “project,” then the agency must consider whether the project is covered by an exemption. Where the project involves the issuance of a lease, permit, license, certificate, or other entitlement for use, the agency must determine whether the proposed activity is exempt from CEQA during the 30-day “preliminary review” period after the agency has received a project application and accepted it as complete. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21080.2; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15102, 15061, 15062.17.) If the agency finds that the project is subject to a statutory exemption, then no further analysis is required. (CEQA Guidelines, § 15061, subd. (b)(2).)

While these provisions require that an agency take some action to determine whether a proposal is exempt from CEQA, the agency typically need not follow any particular procedure to make such a determination. In other words, the provisions requiring preliminary review do not require that an agency provide the public or other agencies with an opportunity to review, or hold a public hearing on, its exemption determination. (See CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15060 [preliminary review], 15061 [review for exemption]; see also *Magan v. County of Kings* (2002)105 Cal. App. 4th 468, 477 [even where an exemption is contested, an agency need not provide a hearing on the record for such contest].) We therefore conclude that the public hearing requirement exists in Public Resources Code section 21155.1 to ensure that a public hearing will be held as part of the

process for determining whether a TPP is exempt from CEQA review. We do not believe it absolves an agency from making the determination.

Further, we disagree with the notion that a writ of mandate could not be brought because the determination of whether to hold a public hearing is within the discretion of the local agency. An applicant (or other interested party) could indeed seek a writ compelling the agency to make a determination, and could also seek a writ compelling the agency to exempt the project from CEQA.

In one case, the Court of Appeal determined that a project was exempt from CEQA even though the agency's record made no mention of an exemption. (*Erven v. Board of Supervisors* (1975) 53 Cal. App. 3d 1004, 1013–1014.) The decision suggests that whether a project qualifies for an exemption is a question of law, and a reviewing court can consider whether a project qualifies for an exemption even where the agency did not first consider the issue. (Cf. *Elk County Water District v. Department of Forestry and Fire Protection* (1997) 53 Cal. App. 4th 1, 10 [question of whether exemption falls with certified regulatory program involves purely legal questions that are “unaffected by any fact-finding below”].) For that reason, it is reasonable to conclude that a court reviewing such a decision would hold that the determination of whether a project is a TPP and statutorily exempt under 21155.1 is a question of law, and not subject to the “abuse of discretion” standard.

3. The City May Exercise its Land Use Authority to Ensure That a TPP Otherwise Exempt from CEQA Review is Consistent with the City's General Plan

Under State Planning and Zoning Law, the general plan is a city's basic planning document and provides the blueprint for development throughout the community. Since the general plan is the guide for all future development, any decision by a city affecting land use and development must be consistent with the general plan. (See *Citizens of Goleta Valley v. Board of Supervisors* (1990) 52 Cal.3d 553, 570.) A determination regarding consistency is a legislative decision, and will not be set aside by a court unless the city has acted arbitrarily, capriciously, or without evidentiary notice as required by law. (See *San Franciscans Upholding the Downtown Plan v. City and County of San Francisco* (2002) 102 Cal.App.4th 656, 668.) While the decision is legislative, it does necessitate some level of factual determination. (*Building Industry Ass'n v. City of Oceanside* (1994) 27 Cal.App.4th 744, 761.)

Pursuant to these general principles, a city may require that certain studies be conducted in order to ensure that enough information has been provided to determine whether a proposal is in fact consistent with the general plan. The city may also impose conditions on development to ensure that general plan policies and principles will be met. For example, we understand that the Circulation Element of the City's General Plan includes

LOS policies that the City is required to impose. The City could therefore require a traffic study to ensure that a proposed project would be consistent with these General Plan policies, and impose conditions that require compliance with the policies.

4. CEQA Review for the RTP/SCS

We understand that SANDAG is currently at work on the 2050 RTP work program, which will be based on the 2050 Regional Growth Forecast, will incorporate the results of the many regional and corridor studies currently underway, and will include the SCS as a new element of the RTP. The SCS will be designed to show how regional GHG reduction targets, to be established by the California Air Resources Board (“CARB”), would be achieved through development patterns, infrastructure investments, and/or transportation measures or policies that are determined to be feasible. Additionally, the SCS must be consistent with the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (“RHNA”) and must address protection of sensitive resource areas. If the SCS does not meet regional GHG reduction targets, an APS must be developed to demonstrate how the targets can be achieved.

An EIR will be prepared for the 2050 RTP, and will include GHG emissions baseline measurements and projections, as well as potential mitigation measures to reduce emissions. The EIR also will include analysis of the SCS. We understand that the adopted Smart Growth Concept Map, which identifies existing and planned smart growth areas linked to existing and planned public transit, along with the identified habitat conservation areas, will serve as a basis for the SCS.

While we do not know how SANDAG plans to analyze the impacts associated with areas identified as “mixed use” on the Smart Growth Concept Map, we understand that the City is concerned that SANDAG might analyze those areas as if they contained only residential uses, without any commercial use component. While we do not know how SANDAG intends to proceed, generally, if an agency is approving a project with a land plan component, then it should analyze the impacts in a way that is consistent with the land plan. Analysis of environmental effects need not rely on speculative assumptions, but will be judged in light of what was reasonably feasible, and the document should provide a sufficient degree of analysis to allow decision-makers to make intelligent judgments. (CEQA Guidelines, § 15151.) “[T]he adequacy of an EIR is determined in terms of what is reasonably feasible, in light of factors such as the magnitude of the project at issue, the severity of its likely environmental impacts, and the geographic scope of the project.” (CEQA Guidelines, § 15204, subd. (a).)

Given that mixed use zoning designations include both residential and commercial use components, we believe that a reasonable approach would be to include both residential and commercial uses where mixed use designations are analyzed for the RTP EIR. A reasonable assumption about the amounts of each type of development that could be

allowed could be made based on review of the zoning codes of each city in the region. Such an approach seems feasible, since the maximum number of each component of mixed uses can be determined based on a review of city zoning codes, and would give a reasonably accurate depiction of the impacts associated with the RTP. A more conservative approach would err on the side of maximizing commercial uses.

We note that the City will have opportunity during the EIR process to make comments and offer input on the scope of the RTP EIR's analysis. (See Pub. Resources Code, § 21080.4; CEQA Guidelines, § 15082 [scoping requirements]; Pub. Resources Code, §§ 21104, 21153; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15086, 15087.) Further, a CEQA challenge could be brought by any affected city or interested citizen who has exhausted its administrative remedies by raising objections during the administrative process. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21177.)

In the event that SANDAG approves the RTP and certifies an EIR and no lawsuit is brought during the statute of limitations period, the RTP will thereafter be presumed adequate. Public Resources Code section 21167.2 creates a conclusive presumption that the EIR is legally adequate for purposes of its use by responsible agencies. "This presumption acts to preclude reopening of the CEQA process even if the initial EIR is discovered to have been fundamentally inaccurate and misleading in the description of a significant effect or the severity of its consequences." (*Laurel Heights Improvement Association v. Regents of the University of California* (1993) 6 Cal.4th 1112, 1130.) Therefore, for purposes of determining whether a TPP qualifies for an exemption from further CEQA review under Public Resources Code section 21155.1, the City would be required to rely on the conclusions of the RTP EIR.

* * * * *

Please feel free to contact me should you have additional questions.

----- Original Message -----

From: [George Crissman](mailto:George.Crissman@cox.net)
To: webmaster@sandag.org
Cc: unclog@cox.net
Sent: Monday, September 07, 2009 11:09 PM
Subject: [2050 RTP Vision] [Public Comment] Friday Board Meeting 9/11/2009

September 7, 2009

Dear SANDAG Webmaster:

Please forward this message regarding Friday's meeting of the SANDAG Board of Directors to the Directors, in accordance with the policy on your website at <http://www.sandag.org/index.asp?committeeid=31&fuseaction=committees.detail>

Thank you for your assistance.

Best regards,

George Crissman
unclog@cox.net

=====
Board Item: SANDAG Board of Directors Meeting for Friday, September 11, 2009
2050 Regional Transportation Plan: Vision and Goals
Agenda Item No. 09-09-3
File Number 3100500
Submitter: George Crissman
Organization: (Not Applicable)

Dear Board Member:

During the session regarding the vision and goals for the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan, would you please ask SANDAG staff to perform the necessary research and report back with answers to these questions:

1. In the agenda, the paragraph entitled "Mobility" (under the "Quality of Travel & Livability" headline) says "the system should optimize both the time it takes to travel as well as the total costs of travel". Why doesn't it say "the system should REDUCE both the time it takes to travel as well as the total costs of travel"?

Note: The agenda for Friday's meeting is online at http://www.sandag.org/uploads/meetingid/meetingid_2226_9991.pdf

2. Also in the agenda, the paragraph titled "Prosperous Economy" under the headline "Sustainability" says "investments to the transportation system should provide cost-effective solutions that maximize public benefits...". How will cost-effectiveness be determined? What methodology will be used, what is the source and accuracy of the data, and what calculations will be performed?

3. When "maximizing public benefits", will you give any weight to the results of SANDAG's "Transit Public Opinion Study" (December, 2008: http://www.sandag.org/uploads/publicationid/publicationid_1428_9419.pdf page 14) showing that 64% of travellers choose to drive alone and 20% choose to carpool, a ridership total of 84% that prefer cars and roads?

4. The agenda contains a comment that "... the transportation system should be designed to provide an equitable level of transportation services for ... seniors ..." (see: "Social Equity" paragraph under the "Sustainability" headline). A previous SANDAG study (December, 2006:

http://www.sandag.org/uploads/meetingid/meetingid_1442_6208.pdf page 169, figure 28) revealed that mass transit ridership decreases as travelers get older.

a) What non-transit modes of travel will be proposed or enhanced for senior citizens?

b) Will "Neighborhood Electric Vehicles" be considered (proposed in http://www.nctimes.com/news/opinion/commentary/article_11d7daac-22f3-593c-b0fc-2ff5fa627b66.html)?

c) Will scooters, mopeds, segways, and other powered vehicles be considered?

5. The "Healthy Environment" paragraph under the "Sustainability" headline in the agenda says "... the transportation system should focus on transportation investments that avoid and mitigate adverse environmental impacts...". What are the current vehicle emission levels on our freeways? What would the vehicle emissions be if the freeways were expanded with regular lanes to completely eliminate congestion?

a) A line chart with "hour of the day" on the X-axis and "total emissions" on the Y-axis would satisfy this request.

b) Plotting "before expansion" and "after expansion" lines on the chart would clearly show the difference.

6. Under the "Emerging Issues" headline in the agenda, it is stated "The adopted Smart Growth Concept Map, which identifies existing and planned smart growth areas linked to existing and planned public transit, along with habitat conservation areas, will serve as a basis for the SCS (Sustainable Communities Strategy)". Have the concepts of "smart growth" been previously implemented anywhere in the United States in the last hundred years? If the answer is "yes", please answer part a). If the answer is "no", please answer part b).

a) If they have been tried: where were they tried, when were they tried, and what were the results?

b) If they have not been tried: what is the evidence "smart growth" will provide an affordable, high quality of life to residents?

Note: Questions 7, 8, and 9 ask about the cost of construction (7), cost of operation (8), and cost of maintenance (9) of the various modes of travel. These questions are prompted by the reference to "... the public's investment in transportation ..." in the paragraph titled "System Preservation and Safety" under the "Quality of Travel and Livability" headline in the agenda and by the need for cost-effective transportation projects.

7. What are the costs to construct a freeway lane, a managed lane, light rail, heavy rail, and transit bus guideways on a passenger-mile basis? Two answers for each mode are desired:

a) Use "full seated capacity" for each mode of travel (for the car, assume a vehicle capacity of 4 passengers). Omit standee capacity and "crush capacity" from the calculations.

b) Use "one-quarter seated capacity" (for the car, assume 1 passenger -- the driver -- is in the car).

8. Along the same line of thought, what are the costs to operate a freeway lane, a managed lane, light rail, heavy rail, and transit bus guideways on a passenger-mile basis? Two answers for each mode are desired:

a) Use "full seated capacity" for each mode of travel (for the car, assume a vehicle capacity of 4 passengers). Omit standee capacity and "crush capacity" from the calculations.

b) Use "one-quarter seated capacity" (for the car, assume 1 passenger -- the driver -- is in the car).

9. Also, what are the costs to maintain a freeway lane, a managed lane, light rail, heavy rail, and transit bus guideways on a passenger-mile basis? Two answers for each mode are desired:

a) Use "full seated capacity" for each mode of travel (for the car, assume a vehicle capacity of 4 passengers). Omit standee capacity and "crush capacity" from the calculations.

b) Use "one-quarter seated capacity" (for the car, assume 1 passenger -- the driver -- is in the car).

Under the "Next Steps" headline in the agenda, it is noted that "... based on Board direction and input from the SWG, staff will develop policy objectives and performance measures for each of the goals and bring these back to a future Board meeting." The clear and detailed responses from SANDAG staff to these questions will greatly assist in setting the vision and goals necessary to meet future transportation needs.

Sincerely,

George Crissman

Interactive Question #3 – Rank the proposed 2050 goals in order of importance, with 6 being the most important and 1 the least important.

_____ **Mobility** – The transportation system should provide for convenient travel options for people and goods and maximize its productivity. The system should optimize both the time it takes to travel as well as the total costs of travel.

_____ **Reliability** – The transportation system should be reliable so that travelers can expect relatively consistent travel times from day-to-day for the same trip by mode(s).

_____ **System Preservation & Safety** – The public’s investment in transportation should be protected by maintaining the transportation system and keeping it in a good state of repair. It is critical to preserve and ensure a safe regional transportation system through engineering, education, enforcement, and emergency medical services.

_____ **Healthy Environment** – The transportation system should focus on transportation investments that avoid and mitigate adverse environmental impacts and should promote environmental sustainability by reducing greenhouse gas and smog forming emissions from vehicles. Transportation investments should foster efficient development patterns that optimize travel, housing, and employment choices and encourage future growth away from rural areas and closer to existing and planned development.

_____ **Prosperous Economy** – Investments to the transportation system should provide cost-effective solutions that maximize public benefits so that the region gets the most out of its investment and that encourage economic growth. The RTP should play a significant role in raising the region’s standard of living.

_____ **Social Equity** – The transportation system should be designed to provide an equitable level of transportation services for low-income, minority, seniors, and youth populations.

Interactive Question #12 - Rank the following indicators in order of importance to be used as guidelines in developing alternatives for the 2050, with 5 being the most important and 1 the least important.

_____ **Job creation**

_____ **Median household income**

_____ **Sales/property tax increases**

_____ **Standard of living**

_____ **Unemployment rate**



2050 RTP: Vision and Goals

- Overview
- Interactive technology
- Board discussion

2050 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN **SANDAG** 2



Framework

- Progressive framework to guide development of the 2050 RTP
- Incorporate adopted goals from 2030 RTP and other plans into broader categories to reflect emerging issues



Connecting the Dots





Proposed 2050 RTP Vision

- Convenient and integrated transportation choices
- Fast, frequent, and reliable public transit
- Linking transportation and land use
- Using technology to better manage the transportation system



Draft 2050 RTP Goals

- Goals based upon 2030 RTP
 - Incorporate energy, economic, and quality of life issues
 - Expand smart growth
- Proposed 2050 RTP goals have many linkages to the existing 2030 RTP goals
- Organized into two themes
 - Quality of Travel & Livability
 - Sustainability



Quality of Travel & Livability

- **Mobility** – convenient travel options for people and goods
- **Reliability** – reliable and consistent travel times
- **System Preservation and Safety** – preserve and ensure a safe regional transportation system in a good state of repair



Sustainability

- **Healthy Environment** – avoid and mitigate adverse environmental impacts and promote environmental sustainability by reducing greenhouse gas emissions
- **Prosperous Economy** – provide cost-effective solutions that maximize public benefits and help raise region's standard of living
- **Social Equity** – provide equitable levels of transportation services



Next Steps

- 2050 RTP goals will be discussed with the Stakeholders Working Group
- Develop policy objectives and performance measures for each of the goals

2050 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN  9

