



***TransNet* SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM:
PROJECT FUNDING RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE
FY 2013 CYCLE**

File Number 3300100

Introduction

Under the *TransNet* Extension Ordinance, 2 percent of annual *TransNet* revenues are allocated for the Smart Growth Incentive Program (SGIP). The SGIP provides funding for local transportation-related infrastructure and planning efforts that support smart growth development in the region. Applicants may submit requests for funding for two types of projects: capital and planning. All funding is awarded through a competitive process as required by the Ordinance.

Recommendation

The Regional Planning and Transportation Committees recommend that the Board of Directors approve for funding the list of recommended projects for the *TransNet* Smart Growth Incentive Program FY 2013 cycle as shown in Attachment 2.

SANDAG issued a call for projects for the second cycle of this program last fall, and a project review and ranking process for those projects has been completed. SANDAG staff presented the SGIP FY 2013 cycle final project rankings to the Regional Planning and Transportation Committees, the Regional Planning Technical Working Group, the *TransNet* Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee (ITOC), and the Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee for information in May and June. The ITOC supported the eligibility of the projects recommended for funding. At their June 7 meetings, the Regional Planning and Transportation Committees recommended that the Board of Directors approve for funding the list of recommended projects for the SGIP FY 2013 cycle (Attachment 2).

Discussion

FY 2013 Call for Projects and Funding Availability

On September 28, 2012, the Board of Directors approved the eligibility and scoring criteria (Attachment 1), and authorized the release of the SGIP FY 2013 call for projects. SANDAG conducted an applicant workshop for local jurisdictions on October 29, 2012, and held roughly a dozen preliminary application review meetings with prospective applicants. In total, SANDAG received 32 applications, 16 for capital and 16 for planning projects. A scoring panel was assembled in January 2013 consisting of three SANDAG staff members, one Caltrans staff member, and three local agency staff members from jurisdictions that did not apply for SGIP funding. All applicants presented their project proposals to the scoring panel at a workshop held on February 5, 2013.

For this funding cycle, \$9.6 million is available to award for projects. As approved by the Board of Directors in the program guidelines, at least 80 percent of the available funding (\$7.68 million) should be awarded for capital projects and up to 20 percent of available funding (\$1.92 million) for

planning projects. Of the 32 applications received, three were deemed ineligible because they were not focused on a Smart Growth Opportunity Area as required by the program guidelines. The remaining 29 applications (15 capital projects and 14 planning projects) were scored and ranked according to the approved scoring guidelines.

Project Ranking Process

The application evaluation process was based on a combination of objective criteria calculated by SANDAG staff and subjective criteria that was scored by the scoring panel. Objective criteria included such items as the land use and transportation characteristics of the project area, the project’s relationship to regional transit, project readiness, and matching funds. Subjective criteria evaluate the quality of the proposed projects, and how well the proposals would meet the program objectives. The subjective criteria were scored by a panel of seven that included three SANDAG staff, staff from three local jurisdictions that had not submitted applications in this cycle, and one staff person from Caltrans. To develop the final project rankings, the objective criteria scores were added to each panel member’s scores for each project to produce a total score. A project ranking was then derived for each panel member from 1 to 15 for capital projects and 1 to 14 for planning projects. Those rankings were then added to develop a sum of project ranks with the lowest sums representing the highest-ranked projects.

The SANDAG Technical Services Department performed an independent review of the scores shown in Attachment 3 to ensure the technical criteria were properly scored, that the evaluation panel’s scores were properly recorded, and that the individual criteria scores were properly summed to obtain the rankings shown in Attachment 2. Descriptions of all project applications are included in Attachment 4.

Final Project Rankings

In total, six capital projects and seven planning projects are recommended to receive funding.

Capital Projects

Local jurisdictions submitted 15 eligible capital grant project applications requesting approximately \$17.3 million in SGIP funding, with a minimum of \$7.68 million available to fund capital projects for the FY 2013 cycle. According to the final project rankings and available funding, four capital projects are recommended to receive full funding. Two projects tied at the funding cut line and are recommended to receive partial funding, awarded proportionately.

Capital Projects Recommended for Full Funding

1.	San Marcos	Armorlite Complete Street Corridor	\$1,000,000
2.	National City	Downtown-Westside Community Connections	2,000,000
3.	La Mesa	Downtown Village Streetscape Improvement Project	2,000,000
4.	San Diego	Island Avenue Green Street Mobility Improvements	1,000,000

Capital Projects Recommended for Partial Funding

5.	San Diego	Wayfinding Signage	\$335,329
6.	Chula Vista	Third Avenue Streetscape Implementation Project	<u>1,344,671</u>

Total Funding Recommended for Award: \$7,680,000

Discussions have been held with the cities of San Diego and Chula Vista regarding the projects recommended for partial funding. The San Diego Wayfinding Signage project can be completed as proposed by providing additional local funds. The Chula Vista Third Avenue Streetscape Implementation project can be completed by scaling back the improvements proposed for one of the three blocks in the project area.

Planning Projects

Local jurisdictions submitted 14 eligible planning grant applications requesting approximately \$3.5 million in SGIP funding, with up to \$1.92 million available to fund planning projects for the FY 2013 cycle. According to the final project rankings and available funding, six planning grants are recommended to receive full funding. A seventh project is identified to receive partial funding.

Planning Projects Recommended for Full Funding

1. San Diego	East Village Green/14th Street Promenade Master Plan	\$300,000
2. San Diego	Morena Boulevard Station Area Study Phase 2	400,000
3. Vista	Vista Downtown Specific Plan Update	148,383
4. Lemon Grove	Main Street Promenade Extension Planning Project	400,000
5. Chula Vista	Healthy Communities Program	100,000
6. Imperial Beach	Palm Avenue Mixed-Use & Commercial Corridor Master Plan	400,000

Planning Project Recommended for Partial Funding

7. San Diego	The Complete Boulevard Planning Study	<u>\$171,617</u>
Total Funding Recommended for Award:		\$1,920,000

The San Diego Complete Boulevard project proposed planning and preliminary engineering in two distinct areas along El Cajon Boulevard. With reduced funding the City of San Diego can fully complete the project in one of those areas.

Next Steps

Upon approval of the recommended projects by the Board of Directors, the selected grantees will be issued a Notice to Award and will be invited to participate in a kick-off meeting with SANDAG staff to initiate the process of executing grant agreements. It is anticipated that grant agreements will be executed in late summer or early fall 2013.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

- Attachments: 1. SGIP Project Criteria and Scoring Guidelines
2. SGIP Project Ranking Summary
3. SGIP Project Criteria Scores
4. SGIP Project Descriptions

Key Staff Contact: Stephan Vance, (619) 699-1924, stephan.vance@sandag.org

SCORING AND SELECTION PROCESS

After applications have been received and reviewed for eligibility by SANDAG staff, proposed projects will be scored and selected according to the processes outlined below.

SCORING

The proposed projects will be scored by a scoring panel consisting of SANDAG staff, Caltrans, and a member(s) of the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG) and/or the Cities/ County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) from jurisdictions that have not submitted applications for funding under the current grant cycle. Panel members may not have had prior involvement in any of the submitted projects, nor may they (nor the jurisdictions they represent) receive compensation for work on any of the funded projects in the future. The scoring criteria are specified in the Project Scoring Criteria Guidance and Scoring Matrix in the next section.

Applicants will be asked to prepare and deliver presentations regarding their proposed projects at a public workshop consisting of the scoring panel and members of the Regional Planning Technical Working Group and the Cities/ County Transportation Advisory Committee. Applicants will be notified of the presentation date.

SELECTION

Once all submitted projects have been scored, SANDAG staff will present a list of proposed projects to the SANDAG Regional Planning Committee for recommendation to the SANDAG Board of Directors.

SCORING CRITERIA GUIDANCE

HOW WILL PROJECTS BE SCORED?

Once a project has been deemed eligible, it will be scored based on the criteria for its project type. Because the planning activities and capital improvements are very different, each will be scored under its own set of criteria. The project scoring criteria for capital projects are discussed in detail below.

LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION CHARACTERISTICS

The following criteria will determine competitiveness of the location of the proposed grant project, in terms of the project area's land use and transportation characteristics at present, and in the near-term future.

Land use and transportation characteristics will be scored by SANDAG staff using current SANDAG land use and transportation data. Planned densities and land uses must be in adopted general plans and/or community plans. Pending amendments will not be considered. It is the responsibility of local jurisdictions to ensure that SANDAG has current land use data, and to submit information regarding entitled development within the project area.

A. Intensity of Planned Development in Project's Smart Growth Opportunity Area

A1. Planned Densities Relative to Smart Growth Opportunity Area Place Type Thresholds

Up to 6 points are available. This criterion will be scored by SANDAG, comparing PLANNED land use densities for the project area to the density thresholds prescribed for the project's smart growth opportunity area place type. Densities will be based on the land use designations in SANDAG's currently adopted regional growth forecast.

Projects in areas with planned residential and/or employment densities that exceed the minimum density threshold for its smart growth place type will score highest in this category.

A2. Expedited Approval Process

A total of 4 points are available, if an applicant can demonstrate that a specific plan, master Environmental Impact Report, or other mechanism is in place to allow for administrative approval of development projects. This criterion will be scored by SANDAG.

B. EXISTINGS AND ENTITLED LAND DEVELOPMENT IN THE PROPOSED CAPITAL PROJECT AREA

B1. EXISTING Development Density

Up to 6 points are available. EXISTING development density around the proposed capital project will be calculated by SANDAG, comparing EXISTING densities within ¼-mile of the project to the density thresholds prescribed for the project's smart growth opportunity area place type. The ¼-mile area around a project will extend for the full length of linear projects. Project areas where residential and/or employment development exceeds the minimum density threshold for its smart growth place type will score the highest in this category.

B2. ENTITLED Development Density

Up to 6 points are available. ENTITLED development projects within a ¼-mile radius of the proposed capital project will qualify if any portion of the development project boundary is within the ¼-mile area surrounding the proposed capital project. Densities will be scored relative to minimum threshold for the area's smart growth place type. To receive points, applicant must describe entitled developments in the application. This criterion will be scored by SANDAG.

B3. Mix of Uses

Up to 3 points are available. Mix of Uses will be calculated by SANDAG by counting the number of current uses in the project area. Multi-family residential does not count toward these points; it must exist within the project area in addition to the other uses in order to earn points (i.e. projects without multi-family residential within ¼ mile of the

project area will not receive any points). The categories of land uses counted include single-family residential, retail, office, civic, parks, and visitor-serving.

B4. New Uses

A total of 2 points are available. The applicant must provide evidence of any new uses that would be added to the project area as a result of land development that the proposed capital project would support.

C. NEW AFFORDABLE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT

C1. New Affordable Housing Development

Up to 3 points are available. The applicant will identify new affordable housing that will be produced in conjunction with the entitled land development within ¼-mile of the project. "Affordable housing" means housing that serves extremely low, very low, or low income households (between zero to 80 percent of area median income adjusted for household size). Affordable housing costs are defined in Section 6918 for renters and Section 6920 for purchasers of Title 25 of the California Code of Regulations, and in Sections 50052.5 and 50053 of the Health and Safety Code, or by the applicable funding source or program. Acquired and rehabilitated affordable housing qualifies under this criterion. This criterion will be scored by SANDAG.

C2. Low to Very-Low Income Affordable Units

A total of 2 points are available, if 50-100% of units in the development are restricted to low to very-low income residents.

D. TRANSPORTATION CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PROJECT AREA

SANDAG staff will score these criteria based on the transportation facilities within ¼-mile walking distance of the project boundary. Walking distance will be determined through GIS transit and bicycle networks, and network of actual available walking paths.

D1. Relation to Transit

Up to 12 points are available. Transit facilities must be either existing or funded for construction to qualify.

D2. Bicycle Facilities

Up to 2 points are available. Bicycle facilities will be identified by the current San Diego Regional Bike Map unless the applicant provides additional information about existing or planned bike facilities not on the current map.

Only bicycle facilities built consistent with California Highway Design, Chapter 1000 standards will qualify. One point will be awarded where bicycle facilities exist within a 1/4 mile of the proposed project, and 2 points when those facilities connect directly to the project.

D3. Walkability

Up to 4 points are available. Walkability will be determined by the intersection density of the street network in the project area based on the following scale:

Intersection Density (<i>per Square Mile</i>)	Points
290 or greater	4
225-290	3
100-224	2
Less than 100	1

D4. Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Strategies

Up to 2 points are available. Transportation Demand Management strategies within the project area must be described in the project application.

Existing TDM programs within the project area, such as requiring TDM plans as part of the development review process, or parking management strategies such as shared parking or allowing reductions in parking requirements receive two points, and proposed programs or policies receive one point.

Examples of TDM policies and programs that can be considered for this points category are included in (but not limited to those found in) *Integrating Transportation Demand Management into the Planning and Development Process*, which can be found at www.sandag.org/smartgrowth.

E. COMMUNITY DESIGN FEATURES AND CONTEXT OF THE PROJECT AREA**E1. Urban Design Characteristics and Community Context**

Up to 6 points are available. This criterion will be scored by the panel, using aerial imagery, Google Street View and/or site visits, and guidance from the following sections in *Designing for Smart Growth: Creating Great Places in the San Diego Region*:

- Smart Growth Scorecard 3 – Consistent Street Edge (for large developments)
- Smart Growth Scorecard 4 – Street Frontages
- Connectivity (3.4 in Chapter 3 Site Design)
- Site Access (3.3 in Chapter 3 Site Design)
- Building Frontage (4.1 in Chapter 4 Building Design)
- Parking (Chapter 9 Parking)

The highest scoring projects will be located in project areas that exemplify the principles in all or a majority of the above sections. Lower scoring projects will be located in project areas that minimally exemplify principles in only one or a few of the above sections. Panel members will be provided with the above sections from *Designing for Smart Growth*.

Points are also available under this criterion if the local jurisdiction has developed design guidance for the project area that is in line with the above principles, such as:

- Design guidelines
- Form-based codes
- Renderings of proposed development

QUALITY OF PROPOSED CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT

The following criteria will determine competitiveness of the actual proposed grant project, in terms of how well the project meets the objectives of this grant program.

A. SUPPORT FOR PUBLIC TRANSIT

Up to 5 points are available. This criterion will be scored by the panel, using guidance from the following sections in *Designing for Smart Growth: Creating Great Places in the San Diego Region*:

- Smart Growth Scorecard 10 – Transit Access (for streetscapes)
- Chapter 5 – Multimodal Streets – in terms of guidance for stops and stations, as well as bicycle and pedestrian access to transit
- Chapter 6 – Transit Stations

The highest scoring projects will propose elements that exemplify the principles in all or a majority of the above sections. Lower scoring projects will include minimal elements that exemplify principles in only one or a few of the above sections. Panel members will be provided with the above sections from *Designing for Smart Growth*.

B. PROVIDING TRANSPORTATION CHOICES

Up to 5 points are available. This criterion will be scored by the panel, using guidance from the following sections in *Designing for Smart Growth: Creating Great Places in the San Diego Region*:

- Smart Growth Scorecard 8 – Street Connectivity (for streetscapes)
- Smart Growth Scorecard 9 – Pedestrian Realm
- Smart Growth Scorecard 13 – Vehicle and Bicycle Parking (for streetscapes)
- Smart Growth Scorecard 14 – Parking Demand Management (for streetscapes)
- Chapter 5 – Multimodal Streets

The highest scoring projects will propose elements that exemplify the principles in all or a majority of the above sections. Lower scoring projects will include minimal elements that exemplify principles in only one or a few of the above sections. Panel members will be provided with the above sections from *Designing for Smart Growth*.

Additionally:

- Pedestrian facility design must be consistent with the recommendations in SANDAG's *Planning and Designing for Pedestrians*, should improve street crossings where necessary, and/or connect the community and its activity centers.
- Bicycle facilities should be designed consistent with the requirements of Chapter 1000 of the California Highway Design manual, or the California MUTCD. Projects may also use AASHTO standards. Bicycle parking should be designed consistent with the bicycle parking guidelines in the San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan. Highest scoring projects will provide continuity with bike routes beyond the immediate project area and connect to important community destinations, especially public transit.
- Projects that do not directly facilitate travel, such as public gathering areas should contribute to reducing vehicle travel by bringing needed public places into walking or bicycling range of community members.
- Changes to vehicle parking should significantly reduce the role of the automobile for travel in the area as well as the impact of parking on the community design of the area.

C. COMMUNITY ENHANCEMENT

Up to 5 points are available. This criterion will be scored by the panel, using guidance from the following sections in *Designing for Smart Growth: Creating Great Places in the San Diego Region*:

- Smart Growth Scorecard 12 – Plazas and Seating
- Neighborhood Context (3.2 in Chapter 3 Site Design)
- Chapter 8 – Parks and Civic Space

The highest scoring projects will propose elements that exemplify the principles in all or a majority of the above sections, and contribute toward a setting that is more likely to attract private investment. Lower scoring projects will include minimal elements that exemplify principles in only one or a few of the above sections, and lack features that would help to accomplish the goal of placemaking. Panel members will be provided with the above sections from *Designing for Smart Growth*.

D. ADDRESSING PROJECT AREA ISSUES

Up to 5 points are available. This criterion will assess how well the project addresses issues specific to the community, which will be unique in each location, depending on demographics and specific needs; and how well the project preserves and integrates existing cultural and natural resources in the project area.

Specific issues to be addressed may pertain to specific populations such as the elderly or disabled or other low-mobility populations, or may address area issues such as crime, or work toward a goal of economic revitalization for existing businesses.

In the example of specific populations, the proposed project could reduce roadway speeds and employ other traffic calming improvements that will ensure safer access for elderly residents from a residential street to a senior center or retail district around the corner.

In the example of crime, the proposed project could seek to improve public safety by employing crime prevention through environmental design strategies, cleaning up an eyesore, or removing a nuisance that attracts crime.

The applicant should demonstrate how the project will effectively integrate and preserve existing cultural and natural resources in the area that help shape the identity of that community. Natural resources could include (but are not limited to) creeks and open space.

Cultural resources could range from (but are not limited to) locally owned small businesses, murals, memorials and monuments, and historical buildings, bridges, or other infrastructure that represent landmarks in the community.

Highest scoring projects will address area issues comprehensively and effectively, and with design features that artfully integrate community resources into the project. Capital projects should preserve and protect important cultural and natural resources in the project area, and when appropriate, integrate such resources into the project design.

Smart Growth Scorecard 5 – Historic and Natural Features from *Designing for Smart Growth* will also be used to score this criterion.

E. SUSTAINABILITY

Up to 2 points are available. This criterion will be scored by the panel, using guidance from the following sections in *Designing for Smart Growth: Creating Great Places in the San Diego Region*:

- Smart Growth Scorecard 6 – Sustainable Design (for streetscapes)
- Energy Conservation and Landscaping (3.5 in Chapter 3 Site Design)
- Stormwater Runoff (5.5 in Chapter 5 Multimodal Streets)

The highest scoring projects will propose elements that exemplify the principles in all or a majority of the above sections. Lower scoring projects will include minimal elements that exemplify principles in only one or a few of the above sections. Panel members will be provided with the above sections from *Designing for Smart Growth*.

F. UNIVERSAL DESIGN

Up to 2 points are available. This criterion will be scored by the panel, using guidance from the following sections in *Designing for Smart Growth: Creating Great Places in the San Diego Region*:

- Smart Growth Scorecard 7 – Universal Access
- Universal Design (6.2 in Chapter 6 Transit Stations)

Additionally, intersection improvements must include pedestrian signals and detectable warnings designed for pedestrians with visual and hearing impairments.

The highest scoring projects will propose elements that exemplify the principles of universal design. Lower scoring projects will include minimal elements that exemplify principles in only one or a few of the above sections. Projects that only meet Public Rights-of-Way Accessibility Guidelines will not receive points. Panel members will be provided with the above sections from *Designing for Smart Growth*.

For more information and resources on universal design principles, please visit:

- <http://www.design.ncsu.edu/cud/>
- <http://www.icat-ciat.org/guidelines.html>
- <http://www.access-board.gov/prowac/>

PROPOSED CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT READINESS AND GRANT-SCORE RATIO

A. MAJOR MILESTONES COMPLETED

Up to 4 points are available. SANDAG will score projects based on the project development milestones completed.

- Environmental clearance under CEQA and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) if appropriate is worth one point.
- Completion of right-of-way acquisition, all necessary entitlements, or evidence provided by the applicant that no right-of-way acquisition is required, earns one point.
- Completion of final design (plans, specifications, and estimates) also earns one point.
- One point will be awarded if the applicant can provide evidence that the project is fully funded, OR the grant will fully fund the project.

B. EVIDENCE OF LOCAL COMMITMENT

Up to 2 points are available. The applicant should demonstrate that the project is supported by the community, as a result of a comprehensive public participation process that significantly involved a diverse group of stakeholders.

Projects that can provide evidence of a comprehensive, community-based planning process leading to the project and endorsement of community groups will be awarded 2 points.

Projects that cannot demonstrate that their planning process involved a diverse group of community stakeholders and that the project has the support of some, but not most community groups will receive one point.

Evidence of opposition from individuals within the community will not reduce the points awarded unless there is an ad hoc organization of opposition, or the number of individuals in opposition is significant.

C. GRANT-SCORE RATIO

Up to 16 points are available. The grant-score ratio is scored by dividing the sum of the weighted points earned on the criteria in categories I and II by the grant request. The projects will be ranked based on the resulting ratio and the available 16 points will be distributed proportionately. The project(s) with the highest ratio receives 16 points, and the one(s) with the lowest receives one point.

MATCHING FUNDS

Up to 10 points are available. Points for matching funds are awarded by dividing the total project cost as proposed in the application by the grant request. The projects will be ranked based on the resulting ratio and the available 10 points distributed proportionately. The project(s) with the highest ratio receives 10 points, and those with the lowest receive one point.

SANDAG BOARD POLICY NO 033 POINTS FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING PRODUCTION

Up to 75 points are available. See Board Policy No.033 for detailed methodology.

TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program Capital Project Scoring Criteria

#	CATEGORY	Pts.	CRITERIA	POINTS POSSIBLE	WEIGHT	SCORE POSSIBLE	% ¹
I.	LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION CHARACTERISTICS OF THE AREA AROUND THE PROPOSED CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT						26%
A.	Intensity of Planned Development in the Project's Smart Growth Opportunity Area						
A1	Planned Densities Relative To SGOA Place Type Thresholds	<p>3 Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 100% or more</p> <p>2 Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 50-99%</p> <p>1 Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 25-49%</p> <p>AND</p> <p>3 Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 100% or more</p> <p>2 Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 50-99%</p> <p>1 Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 25-49%</p> <p>OR</p> <p><i>For Community Centers/Rural Village/Mixed-Use Transit Corridor</i></p> <p>6 Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 100% or more</p> <p>4 Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 50-99%</p> <p>2 Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 25-49%</p>	Up to 6	1	6	2%	
A2	Expedited Approval Process		Specific plan, master EIR, or other mechanism allows for administrative approval of development projects	4	1	4	1%

¹ Percentages are rounded to the nearest whole number.

TransNet SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM DRAFT CRITERIA – CAPITAL GRANTS

B.	EXISTING and ENTITLED Land Development Around the Proposed Capital Project						
B1	EXISTING Development Density within ¼ mile radius of proposed capital project site – ON THE GROUND	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3 2 1 AND 3 2 1 OR 6 4 2 	<p><i>For Metropolitan Centers/Urban Centers/Town Centers</i></p> <p>Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 100% or more</p> <p>Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 50-99%</p> <p>Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 25-49%</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 100% or more</p> <p>Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 50-99%</p> <p>Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 25-49%</p> <p>OR</p> <p><i>For Community Centers/Rural Village/Mixed-Use Transit Corridor</i></p> <p>Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 100% or more</p> <p>Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 50-99%</p> <p>Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 25-49%</p>	Up to 6	1	6	2%
B2	ENTITLED Development Density within ¼ mile radius of proposed capital project site – IN THE PIPELINE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3 2 1 AND 3 2 1 OR 6 4 2 	<p><i>For Metropolitan Centers/Urban Centers/Town Centers</i></p> <p>Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 100% or more</p> <p>Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 50-99%</p> <p>Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 25-49%</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 100% or more</p> <p>Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 50-99%</p> <p>Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 25-49%</p> <p>OR</p> <p><i>For Community Centers/Rural Village/Mixed-Use Transit Corridor</i></p> <p>Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 100% or more</p> <p>Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 50-99%</p> <p>Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 25-49%</p>	Up to 6	1	6	2%

TransNet SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM DRAFT CRITERIA – CAPITAL GRANTS

B3	Mix of Uses		(Single-family residential, retail, office, civic, parks, visitor w/in ¼ mile of project site)	Up to 3	2	6	2%
		3	Multi-family residential + 6 other uses				
		2	Multi-family residential + 4-5 other uses				
		1	Multi-family residential + 2-3 other uses				
B4	New Use	2	New use will be added to the project area	2	1	2	1%
C.	New Affordable Housing Development						
C1	New Affordable Housing		% of income-restricted affordable housing provided in proposed new development (within ¼ mile of project site)	Up to 3	2	6	2%
		3	100% of units affordable				
		2	99-75% of units affordable				
		1	74-25% of units affordable				
C2	Low to very-low income affordable units	2	50-100% of units in the development are restricted to low to very-low income residents	2	1	2	1%
D.	Transportation Characteristics (within walking and biking distance of proposed capital project)						
D1	Relation to Transit		Scale of actual walking distance to existing or programmed ² station or transit hub ³ :				
		12	Regional ⁴ or Corridor ⁵ station or a Transit Center – Project abuts or is onsite	Up to 12	1	12	4%
		10	Project is within ½ mile				
		8	Transit hub – Project is within ¼ mile				
		6	Stop with high frequency local bus service (15 mins. all day) – Project is within ¼ mile				

² Transit station or hub qualifies if corresponding implementation or construction funding has been programmed in the RTIP.

³ Transit hub will be defined as an intersection of three or more bus routes, where at least one route has a minimum scheduled headway of 15 minutes from 7 a.m. to 7 p.m.

⁴ Regional service is defined as COASTER or freeway-based Bus Rapid Transit.

⁵ Corridor service is defined as SPRINTER, Trolley, and arterial-based Rapid Bus.

TransNet SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM DRAFT CRITERIA – CAPITAL GRANTS

D2	Bicycle Facilities		EXISTING bicycle lanes, bike boulevards, cycle tracks, or separated bike paths (Class I), or PLANNED bicycle lanes, bike boulevards, cycle tracks, or separated bike paths (Class I) (as identified in <i>San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan</i> or local bicycle master plan)	Up to 2	2	4	2%
		2	Direct connection to proposed project				
		1	Facilities within ¼ mile radius of project				
D3	Walkability		Intersection Density per square mile:	Up to 4	2	8	3%
		4	290 or greater				
		3	225-290				
		2	100-224				
		1	Less than 100				
D4	TDM Strategies		EXISTING TDM programs or policies in place	Up to 2	2	4	2%
		1	PROPOSED TDM programs or policies, including implementation strategy				
E.	Community Design Features						
E1	Urban Design Characteristics and Community Context	6	Design characteristics of existing community, AND/OR proposed design characteristics prescribed by documented guidance for the area or jurisdiction through design guidelines, form-based codes, or renderings of proposed development; area will be assessed relative to the following sections in <i>Designing for Smart Growth</i> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent Street Edge (Smart Growth Scorecard) • Street Frontages (Smart Growth Scorecard) • Connectivity (3.4 in Chapter 3 Site Design) • Site Access (3.3 in Chapter 3 Site Design) • Parking (Chapter 9 Parking) • Building Frontage (4.1 in Chapter 4 Building Design) 	Up to 6	2	12	4%

TransNet SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM DRAFT CRITERIA – CAPITAL GRANTS

II.	QUALITY OF PROPOSED CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT						30%
A.	Support for Public Transit	5	How well does the project support use of regional public transit service in the project area?	Up to 5	5	25	8%
B.	Providing Transportation Choices	5	How well does the project support transportation choices that would reduce vehicle miles traveled, specifically walking and bicycling?	Up to 5	5	25	8%
C.	Community Enhancement	5	How well does the proposed project enhance the public realm in the project area, to engender support for smart growth, through place making and creating regional destinations?	Up to 5	4	20	7%
D.	Addressing Project Area Issues	5	How well does the project address identified special needs and concerns of the community, such a improving access for elderly, disabled, or low-mobility populations or increasing public safety? How well does the project preserve and appropriately integrate cultural and natural resources in the project area?	Up to 5	3	15	5%
E.	Sustainability	2	How well does the proposed project incorporate Green Streets/Low-Impact Development principles, to address stormwater runoff, energy conservation, and landscaping/street trees?	Up to 2	1	2	1%
F.	Universal Design	2	How well does the project incorporate Universal Design principles, to ensure access for users of all ages and abilities?	Up to 2	1	2	1%
III.	PROJECT READINESS						11%
A.	Major Milestones Completed	1 1 1 1	Environmental Clearance Right-of-way Acquisition Final Design Project Fully Funded (matching funds secured OR grant will fully fund project)	Up to 4	5	20	7%
B.	Evidence of Local Commitment	2	Project is supported by the community, and is the result of a comprehensive public participation process that significantly involved a diverse group of stakeholders	Up to 2	6	12	4%
					Subtotal		
IV.	COST EFFECTIVENESS						5%
	Ratio of grant request to project score		Project grant request, divided by score up to this point; ranked relative to each other	0.00		16	5%
V.	MATCHING FUNDS						3%
	Relative amount of match		All projects scored on a curve, from most to least matching funds			10	3%
VI.	POLICY NO. 033 POINTS					75	25%
	TOTAL PROJECT SCORE					300	100%

SCORING AND SELECTION PROCESS

After applications have been received and reviewed for eligibility by SANDAG staff, proposed projects will be scored and selected according to the processes outlined below.

SCORING

The proposed projects will be scored by a scoring panel consisting of SANDAG staff, Caltrans, and a member(s) of the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG) and/or the Cities/ County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) from jurisdictions that have not submitted applications for funding under the current grant cycle. Panel members may not have had prior involvement in any of the submitted projects, nor may they (nor the jurisdictions they represent) receive compensation for work on any of the funded projects in the future. The scoring criteria are specified in the Project Scoring Criteria Guidance and Scoring Matrix in the next section.

Applicants will be asked to prepare and deliver presentations regarding their proposed projects at a public workshop consisting of the scoring panel and members of the Regional Planning Technical Working Group and the Cities/ County Transportation Advisory. Applicants will be notified of the presentation date.

SELECTION

Once all submitted projects have been scored, SANDAG staff will present a list of proposed projects to the SANDAG Regional Planning Committee for recommendation to the SANDAG Board of Directors.

SCORING CRITERIA GUIDANCE

HOW WILL PROJECTS BE SCORED?

Once a project has been deemed eligible, it will be scored based on the criteria for its project type. Because the planning activities and capital improvements are very different, each will be scored under its own set of criteria. The project scoring criteria for planning projects are discussed in detail below.

1. RELATIONSHIP TO REGIONAL TRANSIT

Up to 5 points are available. Transit Infrastructure and Service within the Smart Growth Opportunity Area will be scored as indicated below.

- SGOAs with existing regional or corridor transit infrastructure (5 points)
- SGOAs with programmed regional or corridor transit infrastructure or existing high frequency local transit infrastructure and service (3 points)
- SGOAs with planned regional or corridor transit infrastructure, or programmed or planned high frequency local transit infrastructure and service (1 point)

Note: Rural Villages are not scored on this criterion because the place type does not require transit service. Consequently, Rural Village scores will be normalized to the total 200 points available to other place types.

2. SMART GROWTH DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL

Up to 5 points are available. Evidence of opportunities to develop smart growth plans or projects in the proposed planning area: Can the area appropriately accommodate smart growth? Is there land available for redevelopment or rezoning? Would the existing urban form support smart growth development? How well does the proposed planning effort support development at or above the intensity of use targets for the area's smart growth place type?

3. PLANNING PROJECT GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Up to 6.67 points are available. How well do the proposed project objectives support smart growth development in the project area? Would the plan result in development that increases transportation and housing choices?

4. METHOD TO ACCOMPLISH THE SGIP PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

Up to 6 points are available. How does the proposed project plan to accomplish stated objectives? How well does the proposed project scope of work facilitate meeting project objectives? Does the scope of work include significant public outreach?

5. IMPLEMENTATION

Up to 7 points are available. Will the proposed planning process lead to timely change in the project area? Is the planning process ready to go? Will it result in regulatory mechanisms that facilitate smart growth or lead directly to an implementable development or capital project? In particular, is a plan in place, or will the project develop a plan that will facilitate smart growth development through a master EIR or other mechanism that allows for administrative approval of development projects? Does the plan area include significant environmental concerns that may delay or prevent successful implementation of the plan? How will the public participation process significantly involve a diverse group of stakeholders and help develop consensus for smart growth?

6. EVIDENCE OF LOCAL COMMITMENT AND COMMUNITY SUPPORT

Up to 2.5 points are available. How has the jurisdiction or agency demonstrated a commitment to implement smart growth? This commitment may be demonstrated through existing ordinances, policies, or incentives. Is the proposed planning project supported by the community?

7. MATCHING FUNDS

Points for matching funds are awarded by dividing the total project cost as proposed in the application by the grant request. The projects will be ranked based on the resulting ratio and the available 20 points will be distributed proportionately. The project(s) with the highest ratio will receive 20 points, and the project(s) with the lowest ratio will receive one point.

8. POLICY NO.033 POINTS

Up to 50 points are available. See Board Policy No.033 for detailed methodology.

FY 11-12-13 PLANNING GRANTS PROJECT SCORING CRITERIA MATRIX

#	CATEGORY	CRITERIA	POINTS POSSIBLE	WEIGHT MULTIPLIER	TOTAL POINTS POSSIBLE
1.	Relationship to Regional Transit	Is the transit infrastructure and service within the SGOA existing, programmed or planned?	5	3	15
2.	Smart Growth Development Potential	Evidence of opportunities to develop smart growth plans or projects in the proposed planning area	5	4	20
3.	Proposed Project Goals and Objectives	How well do the proposed project objectives support smart growth development in the project area? Would the plan result in development that increases transportation and housing choices?	6.67	3	20
4.	Method to Accomplish Program Objectives	How does the proposed project plan to accomplish stated objectives? How well does the scope of work facilitate meeting project objectives and include public outreach?	6	5	30
5.	Implementation	Is the project ready to go, will it result in specific implementation actions such as zoning changes or a master EIR?	7	5	35
6.	Evidence of Local Commitment/ Community Support	How has the applicant demonstrated a commitment to implement smart growth? (ordinances, policies, incentives)? How will the plan process engage the community?	2.5	4	10
7.	Matching Funds	Points awarded in proportion to the percentage of proposed matching funds to total project cost.			20
8.	Policy No.033 Points	Points are awarded per jurisdiction based upon the methodology adopted in Policy No.033			50
TOTAL POINTS POSSIBLE					200

SGIP CAPITAL GRANTS PROJECT RANKING SUMMARY

Attachment 2

Capital SGIP Grant Proposals

Agency	Project	Sum of Ranks	Overall Rank	SGIP Funds Requested	Cumulative Funds Requested	Recommended Project Funding
San Marcos	Armorlite Complete Street Corridor	14	1	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000
National City	Downtown-Westside Community Connections Project	15	2	\$2,000,000	\$3,000,000	\$2,000,000
La Mesa	Downtown Village Streetscape Improvement Project	26	3	\$2,000,000	\$5,000,000	\$2,000,000
San Diego	Island Avenue Green Street Mobility Improvements	35	4	\$1,000,000	\$6,000,000	\$1,000,000
San Diego	Wayfinding Signage	40	5	\$500,000	\$6,500,000	\$335,329
Chula Vista	Third Avenue Streetscape Implementation Project, Phase 2	40	5	\$2,005,000	\$8,505,000	\$1,344,671
Oceanside	Mission Avenue Improvement Project, Phase 2	51	7	\$1,930,000	\$10,435,000	\$0
Vista	Paseo Sante Fe Streetscape & Infrastructure Project Catalyst, Section A	53	8	\$1,000,000	\$11,435,000	\$0
National City	Highland Avenue Smart Growth Corridor	60	9	\$1,300,000	\$12,735,000	\$0
San Diego	Five Points Neighborhood/ Washington Street Pedestrian & Median Improvements	61	10	\$360,000	\$13,095,000	\$0
Lemon Grove	Lemon Grove Avenue Realignment	63	11	\$950,000	\$14,045,000	\$0
Carlsbad	Connect the Village: Wayfinding & Traffic Calming	87	12	\$470,000	\$14,515,000	\$0
Escondido	Bicycle Path - Missing Link	93	13	\$340,500	\$14,855,500	\$0
San Marcos	Creekside Drive Multi-Modal Corridor Enrichment Project	95	14	\$1,000,000	\$15,855,500	\$0
San Diego	University Avenue & 54th Street Roadway Improvements	96	15	\$1,440,000	\$17,295,500	\$0
Total Available Funding					\$7,680,000	Total Recommended Funding
Total Funding Requested					\$17,295,500	\$7,680,000
Total Requested Funding Over Available					(\$9,615,500)	

FULLY FUNDED
PARTIALLY FUNDED
NOT FUNDED

SGIP PLANNING GRANTS PROJECT RANKING SUMMARY

Planning SGIP Grant Proposals

Agency	Project	Sum of Ranks	Overall Rank	SGIP Funds Requested	Cumulative Funds Requested	Recommended Project Funding
San Diego	East Village Green/ 14th Street Promenade Master Plan	17	1	\$300,000	\$300,000	\$300,000
San Diego	Morena Boulevard Station Area Study Phase 2	18	2	\$400,000	\$700,000	\$400,000
Vista	Vista Downtown Specific Plan Update	36	3	\$148,383	\$848,383	\$148,383
Lemon Grove	Main Street Promenade Extension Planning Project	40	4	\$400,000	\$1,248,383	\$400,000
Chula Vista	Healthy Communities Program	43	5	\$100,000	\$1,348,383	\$100,000
Imperial Beach	Palm Avenue Mixed-use & Commercial Corridor Master Plan	44	6	\$400,000	\$1,748,383	\$400,000
San Diego	The Complete Boulevard Planning Study	45	7	\$400,000	\$2,148,383	\$171,617
Carlsbad	Plan the Village: A New Master Plan for Carlsbad Village	47	8	\$230,000	\$2,378,383	\$0
San Diego	Sixth Avenue Bridge Promenade Feasibility Study	54	9	\$175,000	\$2,553,383	\$0
San Diego	Pacific Beach Boardwalk & Parks Neighborhood District	56	10	\$400,000	\$2,953,383	\$0
Escondido	Grape Day Park Master Plan	59	11	\$80,000	\$3,033,383	\$0
Oceanside	Oceanside Mixed-use Public Parking Structure	81	12	\$400,000	\$3,433,383	\$0
Santee	Town Center Pedestrian Connection Feasibility Study	89	13	\$35,000	\$3,468,383	\$0
Del Mar	Parking Management Plan	96	14	\$45,000	\$3,513,383	\$0
Total Available Funding					\$1,920,000	Total Recommended Funding
Total Funding Requested					\$3,513,383	\$1,920,000
Total Requested Funding Over Available					(\$1,593,383)	

FULLY FUNDED
PARTIALLY FUNDED
NOT FUNDED

Smart Growth Incentive Program Project Criteria Scores

Capital SGIP Grant Proposals

AGENCY	Carlsbad	Chula Vista	Escondido	La Mesa	Lemon Grove	National City	National City
PROJECT	Connect the Village: Wayfinding & Traffic Calming	Third Avenue Streetscape Implementation Project Phase 2	Bicycle Path - Missing Link	Downtown Village Streetscape Improvement Project	Lemon Grove Avenue Realignment	Highland Avenue Smart Growth Corridor	Downtown - Westside Community Connections Project
CRITERIA							
Land Use and Transportation Characteristics							
A. Intensity of Planned Development in the Project's SGOA							
A1. Planned Densities Relative to SGOA Place Type Thresholds	3	5	2	3	4	0	5
A2. Expedited Approval Process	3	2	0	4	0	0	4
B. Existing and Entitled Land Development							
B1. Existing Development Density within 1/4 mile of project area	2	2	1	2	0	0	0
B2. Entitled Development Density within 1/4 of project area (proposed)	0	3	0	0	3	0	0
B3. Mix of Uses	4	4	0	2	4	4	4
B4. New Use	0	0	0	0	2	0	0
C. New Affordable Housing Development							
C1. New Affordable Housing	2	0	0	0	2	0	0
C2. Low to Very-low Income Affordable Housing	2	0	0	0	2	0	0
D. Transportation Characteristics							
D1. Relation to Transit	12	8	10	10	10	8	10
D2. Bicycle Facilities	4	0	4	2	4	0	4
D3. Walkability	4	6	4	8	4	8	8
D4. TDM Strategies	0	4	0	4	2	4	4
E. Community Design Features							
E1. Urban Design Characteristics and Community Context	5	10	5	9	5	7	9
Quality of Proposed Capital Improvement Project							
A. Support for Public Transit	11	20	13	21	13	17	20
B. Providing Transportation Choices	15	21	15	22	9	15	19
C. Community Enhancements	6	10	5	9	6	7	8
D. Addressing Project Area Issues	9	12	8	12	8	11	11
E. Sustainability	1	2	1	2	2	2	2
F. Universal Design	1	2	2	2	1	2	2
POINTS SUB-TOTAL	84	111	70	112	81	85	110
Project Readiness							
A. Major Milestones Completed	15	15	15	20	15	15	15
B. Evidence of Local Commitment	11	12	9	12	8	8	10
Grant Score Ratio	14	3	15	4	9	8	2
Grant Fund Request Amount	\$ 470,000.00	\$ 2,005,000.00	\$ 340,500.00	\$ 2,000,000.00	\$ 950,000.00	\$ 1,300,000.00	\$ 2,000,000.00
Ratio (sub-total of points/ grant request amount)	0.00017872	0.00005536	0.00020558	0.00005600	0.00008528	0.00006538	0.00005500
Rank	13	3	14	4	8	7	2
Grant Score Ratio Points	14	3	15	4	9	8	2
Matching Funds	3	2	1	8	10	5	6
Match Fund Amount	\$ 95,000.00	\$ 350,000.00	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 3,371,000.00	\$ 3,500,000.00	\$ 900,000.00	\$ 2,000,000.00
Total Project Cost	\$ 565,000.00	\$ 2,355,000.00	\$ 350,500.00	\$ 5,371,000.00	\$ 4,450,000.00	\$ 2,200,000.00	\$ 4,000,000.00
Match Ratio	0.17	0.15	0.03	0.63	0.79	0.41	0.50
Rank	4	3	1	12	15	8	9
Match Fund Ratio Score	3	2	1	8	10	5	6
Policy 033 Points	15	31	31	24	35	42	42
Total Project Score	142	174	141	180	158	163	185

Smart Growth Incentive Program Project Criteria Scores

Capital SGIP Grant Proposals

AGENCY	Oceanside	San Diego	San Diego	San Diego	San Diego	San Marcos	San Marcos	Vista
PROJECT	Mission Avenue Improvement Project Phase 2	Island Avenue Green Street Mobility Improvements	Five Points Neighborhood/ Washington Street Pedestrian & Median Improvements	University Avenue & 54th Street Roadway Improvements	Wayfinding Signage	Armorlite Complete Street Corridor	Creekside Drive Multi-modal Corridor Enrichment Project	Paseo Sante Fe Streetscape & Infrastructure Project Catalyst Section A
CRITERIA								
Land Use and Transportation Characteristics								
A. Intensity of Planned Development in the Project's SGOA								
A1. Planned Densities Relative to SGOA Place Type Thresholds	6	6	4	4	6	4	0	5
A2. Expedited Approval Process	0	4	3	0	4	0	0	4
B. Existing and Entitled Land Development								
B1. Existing Development Density within 1/4 mile of project area	4	6	2	0	5	6	0	0
B2. Entitled Development Density within 1/4 of project area (proposed)	6	3	0	0	3	0	0	0
B3. Mix of Uses	4	6	2	2	6	2	0	6
B4. New Use	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0
C. New Affordable Housing Development								
C1. New Affordable Housing	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
C2. Low to Very-low Income Affordable Housing	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0
D. Transportation Characteristics								
D1. Relation to Transit	10	12	10	8	12	10	0	10
D2. Bicycle Facilities	2	4	4	0	4	4	4	2
D3. Walkability	8	6	6	4	4	2	2	4
D4. TDM Strategies	4	0	0	4	4	4	0	0
E. Community Design Features								
E1. Urban Design Characteristics and Community Context	7	7	7	5	6	10	9	8
Quality of Proposed Capital Improvement Project								
A. Support for Public Transit	15	11	17	13	8	19	11	16
B. Providing Transportation Choices	21	13	14	15	7	21	15	17
C. Community Enhancements	8	7	8	5	6	10	8	8
D. Addressing Project Area Issues	10	7	7	11	6	11	8	12
E. Sustainability	2	1	1	1	1	2	2	2
F. Universal Design	2	1	2	2	1	2	2	2
POINTS SUB-TOTAL	109	96	87	74	85	111	63	96
Project Readiness								
A. Major Milestones Completed	15	20	10	10	20	15	15	15
B. Evidence of Local Commitment	11	8	10	10	11	9	9	12
Grant Score Ratio	5	10	16	1	13	12	6	10
Grant Fund Request Amount	\$ 1,930,000.00	\$ 1,000,000.00	\$ 360,000.00	\$ 1,440,000.00	\$ 500,000.00	\$ 1,000,000.00	\$ 1,000,000.00	\$ 1,000,000.00
Ratio (sub-total of points/ grant request amount)	0.00005648	0.00009600	0.00024167	0.00005139	0.00017000	0.00011100	0.00006300	0.00009600
Rank	5	9	15	1	12	11	6	9
Grant Score Ratio Points	5	10	16	1	13	12	6	10
Matching Funds	3	4	5	1	9	6	7	9
Match Fund Amount	\$ 500,000.00	\$ 300,000.00	\$ 145,753.00	\$ 160,000.00	\$ 1,000,000.00	\$ 1,000,000.00	\$ 1,445,000.00	\$ 2,000,000.00
Total Project Cost	\$ 2,430,000.00	\$ 1,300,000.00	\$ 505,753.00	\$ 1,600,000.00	\$ 1,500,000.00	\$ 2,000,000.00	\$ 2,445,000.00	\$ 3,000,000.00
Match Ratio	0.21	0.23	0.29	0.10	0.67	0.50	0.59	0.67
Rank	5	6	7	2	13	9	11	13
Match Fund Ratio Score	3	4	5	1	9	6	7	9
Policy 033 Points	28	40	40	40	40	38	38	24
Total Project Score	171	178	168	136	178	191	138	166

**Smart Growth Incentive
Program Project Criteria
Scores**

Planning SGIP Grant Proposals

AGENCY	Carlsbad	Chula Vista	Del Mar	Escondido	Imperial Beach	Lemon Grove	Oceanside	San Diego	San Diego
PROJECT	Plan the Village: A New Master Plan for Carlsbad Village	Healthy Communities Program	Parking Management Plan	Grape Day Park Master Plan	Palm Avenue Mixed-use & Commercial Corridor Master Plan	Main Street Promenade Extension Planning Project	Oceanside Mixed-use Public Parking Structure	The Complete Boulevard Planning Study	East Village Green/ 14th Street Promenade Master Plan
CRITERIA									
Relationship to Regional Transit	15	15	3	15	9	15	15	9	15
Smart Growth Development Potential	16	14	7	13	14	14	12	15	16
Planning Project Goals and Objectives	13	14	8	10	13	13	9	12	12
Method to Accomplish the SGIP Program Objectives	20	20	19	18	22	22	15	17	23
Implementation	23	26	15	17	23	23	20	15	20
Evidence of Local Commitment and Community Support	8	9	4	6	8	7	3	7	9
Match Funds Score	19	4	20	16	13	4	1	13	17
Match Amount	\$ 80,000.00	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 45,000.00	\$ 20,000.00	\$ 95,000.00	\$ 40,000.00	\$ -	\$ 95,000.00	\$ 100,000.00
Total Project Cost	\$ 310,000.00	\$ 110,000.00	\$ 90,000.00	\$ 100,000.00	\$ 495,000.00	\$ 440,000.00	\$ 400,000.00	\$ 495,000.00	\$ 400,000.00
Match Proportion	0.26	0.09	0.50	0.20	0.19	0.09	0.00	0.19	0.25
Match Rank	13	3	14	11	9	3	1	9	12
Matching Funds Ratio Calculation	19	4	20	16	13	4	1	13	17
Policy No. 033 Points	15	31	0	31	28	35	28	40	40
Final Score	129	133	76	126	130	133	103	128	152

**Smart Growth Incentive
Program Project Criteria
Scores**

Planning SGIP Grant Proposals

AGENCY	San Diego	San Diego	San Diego	Santee	Vista
PROJECT	Morena Boulevard Station Area Study Phase 2	Pacific Beach Boardwalk & Parks Neighborhood District	Sixth Avenue Bridge Promenade Feasibility Study	Town Center Pedestrian Connection Feasibility Study	Vista Downtown Specific Plan Update
CRITERIA					
Relationship to Regional Transit	15	9	15	15	15
Smart Growth Development Potential	18	10	14	10	16
Planning Project Goals and Objectives	17	8	11	7	15
Method to Accomplish the SGIP Program Objectives	22	24	19	10	23
Implementation	24	17	19	15	27
Evidence of Local Commitment and Community Support	8	8	7	4	8
Match Funds Score	4	11	1	4	10
Match Amount	\$ 40,000.00	\$ 70,000.00	\$ -	\$ 3,500.00	\$ 20,000.00
Total Project Cost	\$ 440,000.00	\$ 470,000.00	\$ 175,000.00	\$ 38,500.00	\$ 168,383.00
Match Proportion	0.09	0.15	0.00	0.09	0.12
Match Rank	3	8	1	3	7
Matching Funds Ratio Calculation	4	11	1	4	10
Policy No. 033 Points	40	40	40	27	24
Final Score	148	127	126	92	138

Smart Growth Incentive Program Project Descriptions

Capital Projects

Jurisdiction	Project Title	Description
Carlsbad	Connect the Village: Wayfinding & Traffic Calming	Construct "Livable Streets" through traffic calming measures in the Barrio and innovative pedestrian and bicyclist wayfinding signage to better connect people in surrounding neighborhoods to the Village.
Chula Vista **	Third Avenue Streetscape Implementation Project (TASIP), Phase 2	Construct streetscape and traffic calming improvements such as, medians, bulb-outs, decorative pavers, a road diet, cool paving elements, expanded bike parking, marked bicycle routes, relocated transit stops, landscaping, street trees, pedestrian lighting, wayfinding/ informational signs, and street furnishings.
Escondido	Bicycle Path – Missing Link	Construct a section of the missing Class I Bike Path to provide a direct connection from the existing Regional Class II bike lanes along Centre City Parkway to the Escondido Transit Center, the Inland Rail Trail, and Escondido's Downtown area.
La Mesa *	Downtown Village Streetscape Improvement Project	Enhance the La Mesa Downtown Village sense of place and walkability through construction of new sidewalks, wide curb ramps, bollards, enhanced crosswalks, bulb-outs, pavement, decorative lighting, street trees, street furniture, wayfinding signage, bike parking, and a new public plaza.
Lemon Grove	Lemon Grove Avenue Realignment	Realign/ reconstruct segments of Lemon Grove Ave. and North Ave. including striping, installation of traffic signals, upgrading existing substandard improvements at the trolley/ railroad crossing, relocate and replace sewer, water and storm drains, and underground SDG&E, COX, and AT&T transmission and/ or distribution overhead lines.
National City	Highland Avenue Smart Growth Corridor	Implement corridor enhancements such as new benches, shelters, recycling receptacles, and potentially electronic signs at bus stops, install bike racks, corner bulb-outs, curb ramps, enhanced crosswalks, pedestrian refuges, traffic calming/ road diet, landscaping, ornamental street lighting, public art, and diagonal on-street parking.
National City*	Downtown-Westside Community Connections Project	Enhance the City right-of-way through improvements such as new benches, shelters, recycling receptacles, public art and electronic signs at bus stops, install bike racks, corner bulb-outs, curb ramps, enhance crosswalks, pedestrian refuges, landscaping, street lighting, wayfinding signage, and diagonal on-street parking.
Oceanside	Mission Avenue Improvement Project, Phase 2	Implement pedestrian, bicycle and roadway improvements such as, reduce travel lanes, implement reversed-angled parking, and construct streetscape enhancements such as widened sidewalks, curb bulb-outs, and class III bicycle improvements.
San Diego*	Island Avenue Green Street Mobility Improvements	Construct a series of new/ widened sidewalks and corner bulb-outs along sections of Island Avenue, and include a bike sharrow marking along Island Ave. from Front Street to Interstate 5.
San Diego	Five Points Neighborhood/ Washington Street Pedestrian & Median Improvements	Improve safety, walkability and transit access for pedestrians by constructing curb ramps, popouts, median improvements, landscaping, neighborhood signage, an improved crosswalk landing, and installing visual countdown/ audible signals and directional signage.
San Diego	University Avenue & 54 th Street Roadway Improvements	Implement principles of the Complete Streets Act and Sustainable Communities Strategy by eliminating both free westbound/ southbound right turn lanes, install Class II bike lanes, and improve transit stations with wider waiting areas, shelters, improved street lighting, wider sidewalks, and upgraded signals.
San Diego**	Wayfinding Signage	Install approximately 300 new pedestrian and vehicular oriented signs throughout the Downtown Community Plan Areas to direct downtown residents, visitors and workers to popular destinations.
San Marcos*	Armorlite Complete Street Corridor	Construct multimodal improvements to Armorlite Drive including enhanced walkways, bike racks, street furnishings, pedestrian lighting, mid-block crossings a Class I bike path on the North side of the street, and extension of Class II or III bike facilities to the Mission Sports Park.
San Marcos	Creekside Drive Multimodal Corridor Enrichment Project	Construct two 12' travel lanes, 18' diagonal parking, 8' parallel parking, 15' sidewalks with street furniture/ landscaping, paved crosswalks, and 12' multi-use trail, seat walls, pedestrian bridge and bio swells.
Vista	Paseo Sante Fe Streetscape & Infrastructure Project Catalyst Section A	Implement the first capital improvements for a high priority revitalization project including the construction of wide sidewalks, streetlights, street furniture, a linear park, undergrounding overhead utilities, reconstruction of the roadway, implement a "road diet," traffic calming measures, bulb-outs, and a roundabout.

* Indicates projects recommended for full funding

** Indicates projects recommended for partial funding

Planning Projects

Jurisdiction	Project Title	Description
Carlsbad	Plan the Village: A New Master Plan for Carlsbad Village	Conduct a comprehensive planning process to update the Carlsbad Village Master Plan to include components such as a Health Impact Assessment, encourage compact, mixed-use development around public transit, support the community's revitalization effort, support transit, walking and bicycling trips, and enhance the sense of place in the Village.
Chula Vista*	Healthy Communities Program	Develop a city-wide Healthy Communities Program encompassing all 15 smart growth areas, amend the General Plan Subdivision Manual, Design Standards Manual and other implementing documents, and implement a Healthy Corridors Pilot Project in the smart growth area, CV-1, including the preparation of design concept plans.
Del Mar	Parking Management Plan	Develop a Parking Management Plan to address immediate to long-term management strategies for appropriately managing parking facilities in the Central Commercial District, beach area and seasonal impact areas of Del Mar, engage stakeholders, and create a distinctly urban, compact, walkable mixed-use district.
Escondido	Grape Day Park Master Plan	Create a Park Master Plan for Grape Day Park to plan for recreational opportunities for a growing population through a formal, open process to garner greater community support and foster a shared sense of identity.
Imperial Beach*	Palm Avenue Mixed-use & Commercial Corridor Master Plan	Prepare design and development drawings (30% completeness level) and the associated environmental documents necessary to cover implementation of all proposed elements of transforming the existing six-lane highways (Palm Ave./ SR-75) into a "Main Street" through public right-of-way, traffic calming, pedestrian, bicycle and transit improvements.
Lemon Grove*	Main Street Promenade Extension Planning Project	Enliven the Main Street Promenade Extension corridor through public right-of-way enhancements for pedestrians and bicyclists, create a place for recreational and social activities, design for shared circulation of bicycles, pedestrians and vehicles, improve health, and create an amenity for generations to come.
Oceanside	Oceanside Mixed-use Public Parking Structure	Complete a feasibility study and concept plan for a mixed-use public parking structure on existing City owned public parking lot three blocks from the Oceanside Intermodal Transportation Center to provide much-needed public parking downtown and new office/ retail spaces.
San Diego**	The Complete Boulevard Planning Study	Conduct a study to realize the transformative potential of BRT in Mid-City through the enhancement of two primary areas along the soon-to-be completed Boulevard Rapid Bus line including improvements to connect surrounding residential communities to the new route, and create landmark destinations that contribute to the sustainability, economic vitality, and well-being of communities that the BRT serves.
San Diego*	East Village Green/ 14 th Street Promenade Master Plan	Develop a Master Plan for East Village Green (the proposed largest public open space in downtown San Diego (4.1 acres)) and the 14th Street Promenade (a linear park that will expand much needed open space in the city's densest community) to provide a safe pedestrian and bicycle connection traversing East Village from City College to Barrio Logan.
San Diego*	Morena Boulevard Station Area Study, Phase 2	Prepare amendments to the Linda Vista Community Plan, the Linda Vista Facilities Community Plan, the Clairmont Mesa Facilities Financing Plan, process rezones, and prepare a programmatic environmental document to support mixed-use, transit-oriented development in the Mid-Coast Trolley Line station areas.
San Diego	Pacific Beach Boardwalk & Parks Neighborhood District	Create a Pacific Beach Parks Plan and Action Plan to implement ocean-front pocket parks, traffic calming, and improved multimodal use and beach access, create a Healthy Community/ Eco-District, improve the beach boardwalk, and integrate arts and culture.
San Diego	Sixth Avenue Bridge Promenade Feasibility Study	Complete a Feasibility and Design Study to provide an enhanced pedestrian connection between Downtown and Balboa Park through the elimination of the free right-turn lane off northbound I-5 off-ramp, and the removal of parking and one travel lane to construct an enhanced pedestrian pathway.
Santee	Town Center Pedestrian Connection Feasibility Study	Develop alternatives for implementation with future development to connect the residential area north of Town Center Parkway to the transit/ trolley station and commercial area to the south to promote safe walking and bicycling trips.
Vista*	Vista Downtown Specific Plan Update	Conduct an update to the Vista Downtown Specific Plan to improve parking management, incorporate health policies, evaluate health impacts of the plan, encourage multi-family and mixed-use development, streamline the process for project review, add a new Arts & Culture District, and revise parking and other standards and design guidelines to support smart growth and multimodal connections.

* Indicates projects recommended for full funding

** Indicates projects recommended for partial funding