



# ***Implementation Strategies***

## ***Project Selection Criteria***

### ***Case Study: San Diego, CA***

GRTA Land Development Committee

June 8, 2005

# Case Study: San Diego, CA

- San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) MPO
  - 18 cities, 1 county
- MOBILITY 2030 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) –  
adopted in 2003
- Regional transportation planning agency controls all  
projects within that region using State or Federal funds  
(per statewide legislation)
- All RTP projects are subject to an evaluation process
  - Regional Arterial System
  - Regionally Significant Network
  - Highway Corridor Project
  - Freeway Connector Study
  - Transit Services Projects

# Regional Arterial System

## Project Evaluation Criteria

### ■ Regional Arterial Network is based on:

- Critical Link (multi-jurisdictional), Population, Employment, Activity Centers, Future Traffic, Regional Transit Vision, Intermodal

### ■ Project types include:

- Traffic signalization, Roadway widening, Roadway extensions, Medians, Grade separation, Access controls, Bikeways, Pedestrian treatments, Transit signaling, lanes or stops

### ■ Land use eligibility criteria:

- “Only projects located in a City/County that has adopted a resolution in support of Smart Growth consistent with the principles outlined in REGION2020 (economic prosperity, transportation choices, increase housing supply, protect environment, fiscal reform) are eligible.” — SANDAG MOBILITY 2030 RTP

# Regional Arterial System Project Evaluation Criteria

**TABLE TA 7.3—REGIONAL ARTERIAL SYSTEM PROJECT EVALUATION CRITERIA**

#	EVALUATION CRITERIA	QUANTITATIVE POINTS	QUALITATIVE POINTS	TOTAL POINTS
1	Traffic Usage	24		24
2	Congestion Relief	24		24
3	Traffic Safety	16		16
4	Cost-Effectiveness	24		24
5	Regional Arterial System Continuity	24		24
6	Regional Transit Vision	24		24
7	Environmental Stewardship	4	4	8
8	Process Complexity	16		16
9	Smart Growth	16	8	24
10	Project Readiness	24		24
11	Past Performance	8		8
12	Local Contribution	24		24
13	Housing Element	16		16
14	Feasibility		8	8
15	Regional Benefit		16	16
16	Bicycle/ Pedestrian		16	16
17	Factors Not Covered by Existing Criteria		4	4
	Totals	244	56	300

Smart Growth  
24 points

Housing Element  
16 points

**Total – Land Use  
40 of 300 points  
or 13%**

# Regional Arterial System Project Evaluation Criteria

- Smart Growth- Qualitative:
  - Ability to encourage compact, efficient, and environmentally sensitive pattern of development that provides people with additional travel, housing, and employment choices
  - Ability to focus future growth away from rural areas and closer to existing and planned job centers, transit areas, and public facilities
  - Project proximity to population, employment and major activity centers
- Smart Growth- Quantitative:
  - a) Mode Connectivity (one point for each mode type)
  - b) Project supports existing or planned intensification or mixed use in RTV station area or major activity center. (supports – full 7 points)
- Housing Element- only Quantitative:
  - City/County has state or self-certified Housing Element? (Yes 16, No 0)
  - State of California has established minimum statewide goals for affordable housing and is updated every two years

# Regionally Significant Transportation Network

- Network provides essential mobility throughout region
- Includes highest priority projects for funding
- Transportation system types include:
  - Regional Arterials
  - Highway Corridors
  - Freeways
  - Transit Services

# Regionally Significant Transportation Network

- Arterial Evaluation Criteria for designation into Network:
    - Critical Link
    - Connector
    - Population
    - Employment
    - Activity Centers
    - Future Traffic
    - Regional Transit Service
    - Intermodal
  - Fewer projects and higher likelihood to get funded
  - Cities and Counties prioritize projects through local transportation planning process
-  Land Use Related Criteria

# Highway Corridors Project Evaluation Criteria

**TABLE TA 7.8**—SUMMARY OF HIGHWAY PROJECT EVALUATION CRITERIA

Quantitative Criteria	Percent of Total Score (Weight Factor)
1. Total Cost Divided By Person-Miles Traveled	35%
2. Total Cost Divided By Travel Time Savings	35%
Qualitative Criteria	Percent of Total Score (Weight Factor)
3. Critical Linkage	3.75%
4. Addresses High Accident Rate	3.75%
5. High Truck Usage	3.75%
6. Serves Employment/Education	3.75%
7. Serves Smart Growth	3.75%
8. Facilitates Carpool and Transit Mobility	3.75%
9. Minimizes Habitat Impacts	3.75%
10. Minimizes Residential Impacts	3.75%

**Total – Land Use  
7.5 of 100 points  
or 7.5%**

Employment/  
Education Centers  
3.75 points

Smart Growth  
3.75 points

# Highway Corridors Project Evaluation Criteria

- “Serving Major Employment/ Education Areas” defined as:
  - “Existing or planned major college or university within one mile of the highway corridor or greater than five employees per acre density within one mile.”
  
- “Serving Smart Growth” defined as:
  - “At least two percent of the existing or planned land use within one mile of the highway is designated as smart growth. Smart growth is defined as, within a one-quarter mile radius, there are housing densities greater than 20 dwelling units per acre and employment densities greater than 45 employees per acre.”

# Freeway Connectors Study

## Project Evaluation Criteria

**TABLE TA 7.15—FREEWAY CONNECTORS STUDY  
EVALUATION CRITERIA**

QUANTITATIVE CRITERIA	DESCRIPTION	MAXIMUM POINTS
Cost Effectiveness (Traffic Usage)	2030 Average Daily Traffic/ Cost to Complete	16
Cost Effectiveness (Travel Time Savings)	Travel Time Savings/ Cost to Complete	16
QUANTITATIVE CRITERIA	DESCRIPTION	MAXIMUM POINTS
Serves Goods Movement/Truck Usage	Average Daily Truck Volume	8
Improves Traffic Safety	Historical freeway accident rates in vicinity	8
Minimizes Environmental Impacts	Community, historic, noise, biological impacts	8
Compatibility with Smart Growth	Mode connectivity, transit use, proximity to transit stations and smart growth areas	8
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>64</b>

**Total –  
Land Use  
8 of 64 pts  
or 12.5%**

**Smart Growth  
3.75 points**



# Freeway Connectors Study

## Project Evaluation Criteria

- Segments of Freeway System are ranked in the RTP for each criterion
- “Compatibility with Smart Growth” described as: mode connectivity, transit use, proximity to transit stations and smart growth areas

# Transit Services Project Evaluation Criteria

TABLE TA 7.17—TRANSIT SERVICES EVALUATION CRITERIA

GROUP	CRITERIA	DESCRIPTION
Serves Commute Needs	Serves Congested Areas	Does the route serve the more congested corridors in the region?
	Serves Major Employment/Educational Areas	Does the route serve the major employment/educational areas?
	Provides High Speed Transit	What is the average speed of the route?
	Peak Ridership	What is the morning and afternoon peak period ridership?
	Peak Productivity	What is the morning and afternoon peak period ridership per service mile?
Serves Transit Supportive Corridors	Population Density	What is the average population per square mile within ½ mile of stations?
	Employment Density	What is the average employment per square mile within ¼ mile of stations?
Serves Transit Supportive Corridors (continued)	Serves Variety of Activity Centers	How many non-employment major activity centers are within a ½ mile of stations (hospitals, retail centers, hotels, visitor attractions, government centers including K-12 schools, and colleges and universities)?
	Off-Peak Ridership	What is the midday and evening ridership?
	Off-Peak Productivity	What is the midday and evening ridership per service mile?
Develops Network Integration	Links Yellow and Red Car Services	How many other Yellow and Red Car routes does the route connect to?
	Transfer Patronage	What is the number of passengers who transfer by service mile?
Cost Effectiveness	Subsidy	What is the subsidy per passenger mile required for this route?



Congestion  
5 points



Major Areas  
5 points



Population &  
Employment  
Density



5 points each



Activity Centers  
5 points

**Total points - Land Use  
25 of 65 points or 38%**

# Transit Services Project Evaluation Criteria

## ■ Example of scoring method for each criteria:

### Population Density

**What is the average population per square mile within ½ mile of stations?**

Routes ranked based on 2020 population per square mile within a ½ mile of the stations.

*Score Description*

5	Rank order of 1 through 9
4	Rank order of 10 through 19
3	Rank order of 20 through 28
2	Rank order of 29 through 36
1	Rank order of 37 through 45

Source: SANDAG MOBILITY 2030 RTP

# Case Study – San Diego, CA

- SANDAG has begun next RTP update
- Anticipated changes to criteria:
  - Affordable housing element will be added to the eligibility criteria instead of project evaluation criteria for Regional Arterials
  - “Smart Growth Opportunity Areas” will become future determination in rankings
- Goal is to simplify all project evaluation criteria and make all scoring methods consistent