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401 B Street, 7th Floor
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AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

- 2030 REGIONAL GROWTH FORECAST

PLEASE TURN OFF CELL PHONES DURING THE MEETING

YOU CAN LISTEN TO THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING BY VISITING OUR WEB SITE AT WWW.SANDAG.ORG

MISSION STATEMENT
The 18 cities and county government are SANDAG serving as the forum for regional decision-making. SANDAG builds consensus, makes strategic plans, obtains and allocates resources, plans, engineers, and builds public transit, and provides information on a broad range of topics pertinent to the region’s quality of life.

San Diego Association of Governments · 401 B Street, Suite 800, San Diego, CA 92101-4231
(619) 699-1900 · Fax (619) 699-1905 · www.sandag.org
Welcome to SANDAG. Members of the public may speak to the Board of Directors on any item at the time the Board is considering the item. Please complete a Speaker’s Slip, which is located in the rear of the room, and then present the slip to the Clerk of the Board seated at the front table. Also, members of the public are invited to address the Board on any issue under the agenda item entitled Public Comments/Communications/Member Comments. Speakers are limited to three minutes. The Board of Directors may take action on any item appearing on the agenda.

This agenda and related staff reports can be accessed at www.sandag.org under Meetings on SANDAG’s Web site. Public comments regarding the agenda can be forwarded to SANDAG via the e-mail comment form also available on the Web site. E-mail comments should be received no later than 12 noon, two working days prior to the Board of Directors meeting.

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

SANDAG offices are accessible by public transit. Phone 1-800-COMMUTE or see www.sdcommute.com for route information.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM #</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Members of the public shall have the opportunity to address the Board on any issue within the jurisdiction of SANDAG. Anyone desiring to speak shall reserve time by completing a “Request to Speak” form and giving it to the Clerk of the Board prior to speaking. Public speakers should notify the Clerk of the Board if they have a handout for distribution to Board members. Speakers are limited to three minutes. Board members also may provide information and announcements under this agenda item.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**REPORTS (2 through 3)**

| 2.     | LOCAL GENERAL AND COMMUNITY PLANS AND THE REGIONAL GROWTH FORECAST (Niall Fritz, Chair, Regional Planning Technical Working Group) |
|        | The Regional Growth Forecast is tied directly on the current local general and community plans of the 18 cities and County. This item will present an overview of your local general and community plans including their currency, planning horizon, and role in the forecasting and Regional Comprehensive Plan process. |

| 3.     | 2030 REGIONAL GROWTH FORECAST UPDATE (Ed Schafer) |
|        | In December 2003, the Board approved the 2030 Regional Growth Forecast for use in planning and other purposes. At that time, this forecast provided the baseline view of the future for the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP). Staff is updating this forecast as part of the comprehensive 2007 RTP update based on recent local demographic and economic trends, a new forecast of the U.S. economy, and updates to local general and community plans. This item reports on the process used to develop our long-range forecasts, the key factors and assumptions that underly it, and the expected growth in our region to the year 2030. It also discusses key policy challenges, which the RCP is trying to address, including the volume of future interregional and binational commuting, providing an adequate supply and choices of housing for our workforce, and continued upward pressure on home prices. |

4. UPCOMING MEETINGS

The next Business meeting of the SANDAG Board of Directors is scheduled for Friday, May 26, 2006, at 9 a.m. The next Policy meeting of the SANDAG Board of Directors is scheduled for Friday, June 9, 2006, at 10 a.m.

5. ADJOURNMENT

+ next to an agenda item indicates an attachment
2030 REGIONAL GROWTH FORECAST UPDATE

Introduction

The Regional Growth Forecast is a foundation of SANDAG’s Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP). The forecast represents the best assessment of the changes we can anticipate for the region and its communities based on the most current information available and well-proven and verified computer models. It is meant to help policy and decision-makers prepare for the future and is not an expression for or against growth.

The Regional Growth Forecast provides data that gives us a picture of where we are heading under our current plans and policies. It provides insight into what is working, what isn’t, and what we can do to change our future for the better. This forecast update provides the opportunity to discuss strategies and options relevant to the 2007 RTP and future updates to the RCP.

Background

To ensure that the forecast reflects current national, state, and regional trends and recent changes to local plans and policies, it is updated every three to five years. In December 2003, the 2030 Regional Growth Forecast was accepted by the Board for use in planning and other studies. We are updating the 2030 Regional Growth Forecast at this time to coincide with the preparation of the 2007 RTP. This forecast update covers the period from 2005 to 2030.

The forecast is developed through a collaborative effort with experts in demography, housing, the economy and other disciplines, and the close cooperation of local planning directors and their staffs. The forecast process includes two iterative phases. First, a forecast for the entire region is produced, based largely on economic trends and the associated demographic dynamics. The second phase allocates the regional forecast to jurisdictions and smaller geographic areas based on local general and community plans. Our procedures also incorporate the region’s increasing interregional and binational connections with our neighbors to the north, east, and south. At this time, local staffs are

Policy Questions

The Board should discuss the following issues:

- What strategies should be considered to help keep local general and community plans current?
- What strategies should be considered in addressing increasing interregional and binational commuting trends?
- What steps should be taken to minimize the imbalance between the deficit of land planned for housing and the surplus of land planned for employment by 2030?
- To what extent should the 2007 RTP address the transportation needs of the increasing number of older residents?
reviewing the jurisdiction-level forecasts; therefore, this report focuses on updated forecasts for the entire San Diego region to the year 2030.

SANDAG’s forecasts have been very accurate. Analysis of previous forecasts has shown that on average, population forecasts for our region have erred by a scant 0.4 percent per year. For example, 10 years into the future, we would expect the forecasted population to be off by only ± 4 percent. Our most recent forecast (accepted by the Board in 2003) for the year 2005 differs by less than ½ percent from the official population estimate prepared by the State Department of Finance.

The Forecast’s Role in the Planning Process

It has been apparent since the mid-1990s that our local land use plans and policies, in aggregate, cannot support the long-range economic and population growth anticipated for the region. In part, this is because the local plans typically have a shorter horizon year than the forecast does. They are intended to guide development over a certain period and then be updated to reflect changing conditions.

Following the approach identified in the RCP, this forecast update is based on the general and community plans as they stand today. This forecast is not a prescription for the future, it simply portrays the likely outcomes if we continue operating under our current plans and policies. The RCP sets forth a planning and policy framework and implementation strategies for addressing issues related to future growth.

The RCP’s collaborative planning approach builds up from the local level into a regional framework to establish stronger connections between transportation and land use and connect local and regional plans. This collaborative approach is an iterative process as shown in Figure 1. There are strong ties between the jurisdictions’ general and community plans, the regional growth forecast, and our major regional plans. Updates to local plans and policies will feed into the Regional Growth Forecast, the RTP, and the RCP, which in turn will affect the other plans as they, themselves, are updated. The RCP is intended to provide guidance for future plan changes. Basing our forecasts on existing plans and policies provides us with an important tool to help monitor the RCP’s progress in maintaining and improving the region’s quality of life.

Why We Grow

Population change results from two sources: natural increase (births minus deaths) and net migration (people moving into an area minus those who move out). Generally, natural increase is more stable than net migration, while net migration is much more sensitive to economic conditions.

The source of the region’s growth has shifted significantly over the last three decades as shown in Figure 2. During the 1970s and 1980s, the majority of the region’s growth was due to net migration
influenced by significant economic expansion and labor force growth. Since 1990, natural increase has become the major source of the region's growth. Over the decade of the 1990s, virtually all of the region’s growth arose from natural increase due in part to the severe recession in the early 1990s. Over the last 10 years net migration has rebounded and accounted for 42 percent of the region’s growth. While net migration remains positive to the year 2030, its share of our growth declines slightly over the next 25 years. Net migration is expected to account for approximately 40 percent of the region’s future growth.

Regional Forecast Results

We expect the region to grow by almost one million people by 2030. Table 1 shows that between 2005 and 2030 the region also adds 285,700 new homes and 456,200 new jobs. Our population and employment grow by roughly the same percent, while housing growth is at a slower pace, reflecting the relative lack of residential opportunities in current plans.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>Change Numeric</th>
<th>Change Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total population</td>
<td>3,051,280</td>
<td>4,007,753</td>
<td>956,473</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population 65 years or older</td>
<td>332,643</td>
<td>742,842</td>
<td>410,199</td>
<td>123%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing units</td>
<td>1,108,500</td>
<td>1,394,165</td>
<td>285,665</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons per household</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacancy rate</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td>-28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total employment</td>
<td>1,382,671</td>
<td>1,838,899</td>
<td>456,228</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per capita income ($2000)</td>
<td>$32,645</td>
<td>$44,397</td>
<td>11,752</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
By 2030, the region is expected to be home to just over four million people. This forecast is somewhat higher 145,000 (3.8 percent) than our previous population forecast. The higher population in this forecast is a result of more regional employment (6 percent higher than the previous forecast). The higher employment forecast follows from a more robust national forecast.

While the region adds a sizable number of people over the next 25 years, the rate of growth is slowing. By the last five years of the forecasted period, annual population growth is less than 1 percent per year with the growth rate of the region approximating that of the nation as indicated in Figure 3. The slowing regional growth is due to an anticipated decline in birth rates and an aging population. The aging of the population dampens the growth in labor force and migration.

Other notable forecast results include:

- **Interregional and binational commuting increase significantly.** In this forecast, 88,000 households are “exported” to Riverside and Imperial Counties and Baja California. People will seek lower cost housing elsewhere but will continue to work within the region. This level of external commuting represents 24 percent of all housing demand associated with the region’s future job growth and associated demographic shifts. However, it is lower than the interregional number of 93,000 households in the last forecast. This indicates that the region is moving in a direction consistent with the RCP and reflects recent plan changes such as those in the western area of Chula Vista and downtown San Diego.

- **More housing will be built through redevelopment than ever before.** Regionally, 62 percent of the new housing units are forecasted to be built on vacant land, while 38 percent will be built on redeveloped land. In the previous forecast, only 25 percent of new housing was sited in redevelopment areas that were identified in current plans. This shift of residential development from vacant to redevelopment areas also is consistent with the RCP.

- **There is an imbalance in current plans between areas identified for future residential and employment growth.** Over the forecast, the region fully develops all of its residential capacity. In 2030, however, there is still enough land designated for employment (17,000 acres) to locate over 228,000 jobs.
• **There will be a significant aging of the population.** Over the next 25 years, the population 65 years and older grows by 123 percent, which is almost four times faster than the overall population. The aging of our population has widespread implications including the fiscal health of social security, pension plans, and Medicare; the provision of transportation and other public services; and the anticipated rise of public safety concerns such as elder abuse.

• Household size (the number of persons per household) rises by about 6 percent between 2005 and 2030 from 2.77 to 2.94. This slight increase accounts for 93,000 additional residents living in the region.

**Next Steps**

The following are key next steps in the process to complete the 2030 Regional Growth Forecast and forecast alternatives for use in the preparation of the comprehensive 2007 RTP update:

• Board is asked to accept (1) the Smart Growth Concept Map and (2) the 2030 Regional Growth Forecast Update (Existing Policies) for use in the comprehensive 2007 RTP and other planning studies (June/July 2006)

• Staff develops a forecast alternative based on the Smart Growth Concept Map (September 2006)

• Board discusses the Smart Growth and Existing Policies Forecast Alternatives (October/November 2006)

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Key Staff Contact: Edward Schafer, (619) 699-1967, esc@sandag.org
Forecast Implications

- The forecast is widely used by the jurisdictions in the development of plans.
- Jurisdictions work closely with SANDAG to ensure forecast is consistent with adopted local plans.
- General plans affect the quality of regional transportation planning.
Forecast Implications

- Potential Smart Growth Areas and infill housing may require comprehensive general plan updates.
- The more the general plan represents the current policies of the jurisdiction, the more accurate the forecast.

The State of the General Plans

- Some jurisdictions are satisfied with their older plans.
- Other jurisdictions cited a lack of staff and financial resources for not updating their comprehensive plans.
Consequences of Updating General Plans

- During their last comprehensive plan update:
  - Six jurisdictions increased the number of allowable housing units
  - Three jurisdictions decreased the number of allowable housing units
  - Two jurisdictions did not change the allowable housing units
The 2030 Regional Growth Forecast Update
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The Forecast Is:

• Based on adopted local plans and policies
• A policy tool to help guide plans and policies
• Updated every 3-5 years
• Not an expression for or against growth
**Why Conduct the Forecast?**

- Update Regional Transportation Plan
- Update Regional Comprehensive Plan
- Central to much of SANDAG’s work program
- Provides a common authoritative data source for the region

**Many Agencies Use Our Forecast**

- Jurisdictions
- Air Quality Control Board
- County Water Authority
- Metropolitan Water District
- Local water districts
- Fire districts
- School districts
- Developers
- Utility companies
Iterative Planning Process

- Regional Comprehensive Plan
- Local General Plans and Policies
- Regional Transportation Plan
- Regional Growth Forecast

Forecast Accuracy

- SANDAG’s regional forecasts average +/-0.4 percent error per year
- Extensive testing and refinement of methods
- Collaborative effort of regional experts
## Population Forecasts

### Actual Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>3,051,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>4,007,753</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Forecast Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>Numeric Change</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>3,051,280</td>
<td>4,007,753</td>
<td>956,473</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>1,108,500</td>
<td>1,394,165</td>
<td>285,665</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>1,382,671</td>
<td>1,838,899</td>
<td>456,228</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Why Do We Grow?

- Two sources of growth
  - \textit{Natural increase} – births minus deaths
  - \textit{Migration} – people who move in minus those who move out

Natural Increase Drives Future Growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Migration</th>
<th>Natural Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970-2005</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Annual Population Change = 48,100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Migration</th>
<th>Natural Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-2030</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Annual Population Change = 32,300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Growth Is Slowing**

Annual Population Growth Rate

- San Diego
- US


**Population Is Aging**

- Age Group
  - Under 5
  - 15 - 19
  - 30 - 34
  - 45 - 49
  - 60 - 64
  - 75 - 79
  - 85 +

- 2005 vs 2030

- Males
- Females

- Baby Boom - 45 to 60
**Population Is Aging**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 - 64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 - 49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85 +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2005 vs 2030**

**Region Becoming More Diverse**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of Population</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Asian and Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Housing Units Drop Off as Land Is Built Out**

- **Graph**: Housing Unit Change
  - **Y-axis**: 0 to 100,000
  - **X-axis**: 2004-10 to 2025-30
  - **Legend**:
    - In Region
    - Out-of-Region

**Smart Growth Concept Map**

- **Existing or Planned Smart Growth Areas**
  - 80 areas
  - Meet RCP minimum criteria
- **Potential Smart Growth Areas**
  - 120 areas
  - Do not currently meet RCP minimum criteria
Housing Built under Smart Growth Plans

Potential Change with Smart Growth

In Region vs. Out-of-Region

Implications

2005 vs. 2030

Persons per Household: 2.77 vs. 2.94
Vacancy Rate: 4.3% vs. 3.1%
The Consumption of Land in the Forecast

• In 2030 nearly all land planned for residential use is consumed
• In 2030 17,000 acres of land planned for employment remain undeveloped
  – Potential for 228,000 additional jobs after 2030
  – Approximately 10 years of additional employment growth

Next Steps:

• June/July 2006: Board considers the Smart Growth Concept Map for use in the 2007 RTP and other planning studies
  Board considers the 2030 Regional Growth Forecast Update (Existing Policies) for use in the 2007 RTP and in other studies
• September 2006: Staff develops a forecast alternative based on the Smart Growth Concept Map
• October/November 2006: Board discusses Smart Growth and Existing Policies Forecast Alternatives
Policy Questions

• What strategies should be considered to help keep local general and community plans current?
  – Development impact fees at regional or statewide level to fund plan updates
  – Seek funding from the State for plan updates, such as planning grants
**Policy Questions**

• What strategies should be considered in addressing increasing interregional and binational commuting trends?
  – Promote infill housing development close to jobs per the draft Smart Growth Concept Map
  – Develop coordinated transportation/land use strategies with our external neighbors, including the potential use of toll facilities
  – Develop transportation choices and policies that reduce the impact of interregional commuting

**Policy Questions**

• What steps should be taken to minimize the imbalance between the deficit of land planned for housing and the surplus of land planned for employment by 2030?
  – Promote infill housing development close to jobs per the draft Smart Growth Concept Map
  – Convert land zoned for employment to mixed-use or housing
  – Consider the co-location of compatible residential and non-residential uses
  – Lobby the State to enact fiscal reform
Policy Questions

• How should the 2007 RTP address the transportation needs of the increasing number of older residents?
  • Implement transit and BRT services to give people more transportation options
  • Implement innovative transportation programs and coordinate transportation resources for seniors
  • Develop retirement-focused housing close to transit and services
  • Implement design guidelines that facilitate the mobility of elderly pedestrians

The 2030 Regional Growth Forecast Update
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PRESS RELEASE — May 12, 2006
FROM PETRA E. BARATAS C.V.
MAYOR CANDIDATE
TO SANDAG MEMBERSHIP @ 911,
C.V. THE BEAUTIFUL CITY BY THE SEA
NEEDS THE LEADERSHIP OF A MAYOR WHO
UNDERSTANDS THE PEOPLE’S NEEDS, HAS SENSE
AND SKILLS OF FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY
THE DEBT LIABILITIES OF THE CITY
THAT’S WHY I’M RUNNING FOR MAYOR TO PROMOTE GOOD
BUSINESS, JOBS, TRANSPORTATION NEEDS, EDUCATION
PROPOSALS.
C.V. CITY OWNED PROFESSIONAL SOCCER STADIUM
OWNED REVENUES TO THE CITIZENS OF C.V.
THE WEALTHY OWNERS OF THE STADIUM ARE NOT
NEEDED, SOCCER SPORTS POPULAR WORLD
SERVICE. A CHARGER STADIUM IN C.V. THAT JOHN MOURRIS PADRES
OWNERS PROPOSING TO TEAM UP WITH SPANOS, ACCORDING TO
PAYERS MONEY TO SUBSIDIZE THIS WEALTHY MILLIONAIRE.
SD CITY ATTY MIKE AQUINN’T RECALL MOURRIS PADRES OWNER
DEBT, SHE HAS ALREADY RIPPED OFF THE PEREGRINE INVESTORS
RESPECTFULLY PETRA E. BARATAS
CANDIDATE FOR CHULA VISTA MAYOR.
A Quote—“THE PERFORMANCE OF A CHURCH IS BASED ON THE CHARACTER OF THE BUILDER”

I am Petra E. Barajas a running candidate for Mayor of Chula Vista. To move the City business forward to the 21st Century because things are done like the times of Colonization—(Wink & Nod). When minute man militia would run on horse in the middle of the night alerting the colonies THE RED COATS ARE COMING!

We can read in the newspapers the 21st Century Paul Reveres like Peter and Susan Watry, Wona Franklin, Judy Cascales, Lupita Jimenez, Earl and Kip Jentz, and others.

Now on my personal data you can click in the Internet on the Smart Voter’s guide on my Biography and other issues when I ran for S.W.S.B. and as a Write-In Candidate for the 79th District Election of 2004.

1. Further personal information, such as my age is not required to the Mayor’s Office.
2. Further my Ethnicity, of my Mexican origin, is not a requirement to the Mayor’s office, since I am a U.S. Citizen.
3. Cultural relevance to my roots is that I lived in Chula Vista, Zip Code 91913, (a suburb in the Southwestern College area) where I raised my family in an American Dream Home. A two story, six bedroom, four bath, fireplace, with mini Olympic size swimming pool and Jacuzzi. The only home with intercom next to the Bonita Vista High School.

Petra Barajas para Alcalde

Chula Vista tiene una contendiente de origen hispano para las elecciones locales de junio próximo

Antonio Sánchez
Elmer

Chula Vista—En su cuarto intento por regar la ciudad, Petra Barajas se postuló de manera clara y directa con el afán de transformar la ciudad y hacerla una mejor y más segura para las generaciones futuras. A pesar de que no ha sido la única candidata en las últimas elecciones, la mayor parte del voto por sus propuestas. No obstante, la experiencia y el conocimiento que ha acumulado a lo largo de los años, la han preparado para enfrentar las demandas y desafíos de la alcaldía. Con un plan de gobierno que busca la mejora de los servicios y la atención a los problemas más urgentes de la ciudad, Petra Barajas ha logrado el apoyo de muchas personas que quieren ver un cambio real en Chula Vista. Será una candidata fuerte y decidida en las próximas elecciones, con una agenda clara y concisa que busca el bienestar de todos los vecinos de la ciudad. La experiencia, la educación y los conocimientos de Petra Barajas la colocan como una candidata muy interesante para las elecciones locales de junio próximo.

El Latino Page 6
March 3, 2006
Peta E. Barajas
Vote “The American Dream”
P.O. Box122123
Chula Vista, CA 91912
(619) 498-1723

Republican, es un cadáver de seis hijos, y como mucha una de las prioridades es proteger a la comunidad. No sabía nada del este aspecto de la vida de vivir en una ciudad como Chula Vista. En el periodo de su administración, las cosas se han mejorado notablemente en temas como la seguridad, la economía y el desarrollo de la ciudad. En el periodo de su administración, las cosas se han mejorado notablemente en temas como la seguridad, la economía y el desarrollo de la ciudad. En el periodo de su administración, las cosas se han mejorado notablemente en temas como la seguridad, la economía y el desarrollo de la ciudad.
A 1976 Consensus Of The "2nd To None Winners" of BONITA VISTA HIGH SCHOOL SOCCER SPIRIT

We want a city owned professional soccer stadium

Vote!! "The American Dream"
JUNE 6, 2006
For Mayor of Chula Vista
PETRA E. BARAJAS

P.O. Box 122123 * Chula Vista, CA * 91912* (619) 498-1723

Petra Petra Petra
Build us a Soccer Stadium Now!
We want professional soccer stadium
We want professional soccer stadium
We want professional soccer stadium.
(Mayor Petra June 7, 2006)
(Rendition of macho man song)
May 12, 2006 SANDAG  
Good morning, Ladies and Gentlemen. My subject: Will You Help Prevent a Disaster at Kaiser Hospital? I am using this means to bring to your attention a very dangerous situation concerning buses that I believe is a recipe for disaster.

The disaster is the connection of a 15 minute frequency bus route, #13, to a 30 minute frequency bus route, #14, on a city street, CRAWFORD. Do the math, 15 goes into 30 twice. This means two 15 minute frequency buses will arrive and one will depart BEFORE the connecting 30 minute bus will arrive, with a potential of at least 26 minutes wait for riders needing to continue on their EASTBOUND trip on Zion Avenue. This means two sets of unhappy #13 bus passengers waiting on the narrow sidewalk.

Add a 15 minute rest stop for the #13 bus driver because it is the end of the route. Result: the appearance of a permanently parked bus on CRAWFORD Street.

Now add the WESTBOUND #14 bus and the passengers waiting for it, which include manual wheelchairs, walkers, the blind, and the elderly, on the same sidewalk. It also needs space to park because the #13 bus is still there.

Now jump to September at rush hour, on the first workday of the week the service begins, the #13 driver will leave the Zion Avenue bus stop, make a right turn on Crawford Street and will announce, "This is the end of the line, all passengers continuing east on Zion Avenue must transfer to the #14 bus." The driver then proceeds to take his break.

After at least 9 years of service by the #13 bus EASTBOUND on Zion Avenue to Allied Gardens, this announcement will be a shock, to say the least. People expecting to get to work, home, or school will suddenly be standing on the sidewalk, waiting for the #14 bus EASTBOUND.

I have just spent 5 days checking the ridership of the current #13 bus route which operates on a 30 minute frequency. There are many more riders that continue past the bus stops at Kaiser Hospital than those who get off or get on the buses at those stops. A very disturbing discovery is the number of grade school and high school students using the buses, many of whom go to school in Santee. Without access to the #14 bus at Grantville, these students will be among the passengers standing on Zion or Crawford waiting for transfer from the #13 bus to the #14 bus to get home in Allied Gardens. Is this what you planned?

The solution is simple and it will save money. It is currently being used, and is called Grantville Trolley Station. The #14 bus currently has a bus stop there. KEEP IT THERE. The #13 bus currently has a bus stop there. KEEP IT THERE, and make it the NORTHERN TERMINAL for the #13 bus route.

Reduce the frequency of #13 bus trips to KAISER HOSPITAL bus stops to the SAME FREQUENCY as the #14 bus. With each bus route at a 30 minute frequency, you will have an average 15 minute frequency to KAISER HOSPITAL, which is twice the current frequency, and you will be serving the residents of Allied Gardens, Navajo, Grantville, and Mission Valley, as well, and the conditions for a DISASTER have been eliminated.

Will SANDAG please take a close look at this dangerous situation and help convince MTS to implement my suggestion for eliminating it before it can happen? The Allied Gardens, Navajo, and Mission Valley Community Councils all support my recommendations. Will you?

Thank you, and God bless you.

Don Stillwell, 6308 Rancho Mission Road #173, San Diego, CA 92108 (619) 282-7760
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Bus No.</th>
<th>Z or C</th>
<th>Arrive</th>
<th>Depart</th>
<th>Waiting</th>
<th>On Bus</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>1451</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>8:13A</td>
<td>8:14A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1452</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>7:38A</td>
<td>7:39A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1453</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>7:42A</td>
<td>7:44A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1454</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>6:44A</td>
<td>6:46A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1455</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>8:38A</td>
<td>8:40A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1456</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>8:48A</td>
<td>8:50A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>1457</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>11:13A</td>
<td>11:14A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1458</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>1:16A</td>
<td>1:17A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1459</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>2:16A</td>
<td>2:17A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1460</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>2:24A</td>
<td>2:26A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1461</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>3:14A</td>
<td>3:16A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1462</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>3:24A</td>
<td>3:26A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1463</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>4:14A</td>
<td>4:16A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1464</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>4:24A</td>
<td>4:26A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1465</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>4:34A</td>
<td>4:36A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1466</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>5:24A</td>
<td>5:26A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1467</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>6:14A</td>
<td>6:16A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1468</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>6:24A</td>
<td>6:26A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- No stop before 3:53 PM due to traffic.
- Bus had a broken water hose at 9:13 AM.
- School children plus 7:22 AM fire engine.
COA Change

- Route 13 and 14 connection all along Mission Gorge Rd.
- Provides direct service to Kaiser Hospital from both Routes 13 and 14
- Route 14 Trolley connections at 7 stations, including Mission SD and SDSU

Issues with Truncating Route 13 at Grantville

- 350 Route 13 riders (700 trips) would be forced to transfer from a 15 min. service to a 30 min. service 1 mile away from their destination.
- Route 14 must be routed through Grantville for connection with Route 13, impacting 75% of ridership destined along Mission Gorge Rd.

New Route 13 and 14
Update
INCREASE SUPPLY AND AFFORDABILITY OF HOUSING

Summary

During the 2006 Legislative Session, the League has been involved in various efforts aimed at increasing the supply and affordability of housing. Major activities include:

1. Supporting the inclusion of funding for affordable housing construction, infrastructure funding to assist with the construction of infill housing, and funding for regional and local planning as a component of an infrastructure bond package. In a related effort, the League has actively supported jointly with CSAC, the inclusion of additional funds in the bond to improve local streets and roads, which often relates to a community's willingness to accept additional housing.

2. Sponsoring a series of "carrot" housing bills, based upon concepts adopted at the League's Board Meeting on October 7, 2005, in San Francisco, designed to provide additional financial tools to assist with the development of additional housing, or provide regulatory relief and increased flexibility to "good actor" communities that have taken positive steps to develop housing.

3. Advocating for balanced state policies that highlight the importance of housing while engaging in policy discussions involving issues such as eminent domain, redevelopment, and development in flood plains.

4. Continuing to publish our Focus On Housing semi-monthly newsletter, containing interviews with key developers, planners, legislators and others, and includes success stories and emerging issues.

5. Convening and working with a "Coalition for Smarter Growth" that includes key representatives from environmental organizations, CSAC, and councils of governments to explore common ground to develop voluntary regional planning incentives, infill incentives and other mechanisms that lead to improved regional planning for housing and other land uses.

Traditional Land Use Defense

The 2006 Legislative Session has by many accounts been a banner year for legislative proposals related to housing. While the League is sponsoring and supporting many bills, we have also been playing traditional defense. At least four of the bills the League is opposing are co-sponsored by CA Association of Realtors and legal-aid groups. Collectively, these bills seek to limit local discretion over land use, limit opportunities for community input, or increase opportunities for litigation. Efforts to negotiate solutions are underway on some; while on others consensus may not be possible.

Recap of Conclusion of League/Homebuilder Discussions

Over the previous one and one-half years the representatives from the League and homebuilders expended enormous time, effort, and goodwill in attempting to fashion a "big fix" on housing and land use. Neither side felt that the existing process was working
well. There was common ground on the need for change. The builders were looking for more “up front” clarity on where they could build and more certainty in the local land use approval process. Cities were seeking preservation of local control, relief from state micromanaging, and more financing tools for local planning, infrastructure improvements, service delivery, and the construction of affordable housing.

Yet, despite our best efforts to fashion a broad package, disputes emerged at the negotiation table over critical details. This was compounded by the belief of many city officials that the concepts were too cumbersome to be workable, doubts existed about the proposed expanded RHNA process, issues with “built-out” cities, not enough affordable housing, and the ability of the promised financial incentives to be produced. In short, many local officials felt that the risks local governments were being asked to take far outweighed the potential benefits. The League offered a pilot incentive-based approach to the builders to test some of the concepts, but this offer was rejected as insufficient.

Thus, a parting of the ways has occurred. The aftermath has not been pleasant for any of the parties involved. This is especially true given the tremendous good-faith efforts of all parties during the many discussions and negotiations.

Homebuilders Introduce SB 1800:

On February 24th, the homebuilders introduced, as anticipated, SB 1800 (Ducheny and Cedillo). This bill contains many of the concepts explored, but ultimately rejected by the League. In brief, the bill:

**Expanded Land Supply:** Land use element must designate 20-year housing supply. RHNA process determines 10-year housing need. Must plan for at least natural population growth and job growth (might be higher than 10-year housing need). COG determines regional need. Regional housing needs allocation plan must provide that 40% of the sites are zoned at specified “Mullin” densities (by right). COG decides each jurisdiction’s share of the 40% requirement.

**Contents of Housing Plans:** Each local government must adopt a housing opportunity plan in its housing element that identifies sites for a 10-year housing supply. Housing opportunity plan provides for by-right development at Mullin densities for very-low, low, and moderate income households. Includes property development standards, design guidelines, infrastructure plans. Legislative body must find, based on substantial evidence, that each site can accommodate the full density range identified for that site. Projects that are consistent with housing opportunity plan must be approved unless 4/5 vote and health or safety finding. No project-level CEQA review unless new information or changed circumstances. Plan cannot be changed for 5 years except by 4/5 vote and health or safety finding; no net loss. Plan can be changed after 5 years unless complete application or letter of intent from property owner.

**Enforcement and Fines:** Locals Subject to $10,000 daily fines for non compliance.
Housing opportunity plans (10-year supply) are not reviewed by HCD, but HCD still
reviews overall housing element. Substantial evidence standard under Anti-Nimby Law is changed in a way that is detrimental to local authority.

Legislative Status of SB 1800

A hearing was held and testimony taken on the measure on April 4th. The bill remains in Senate Transportation and Housing Committee due to many concerns raised by the Chair, Senator Alan Lowenthal. Both the Senate Environmental Quality Committee and the Local Government Committee have also requested it. The deadline for fiscal bills has passed, meaning that future actions on this bill will require rule waivers. There have been several meetings among legislative staff on this measure, and at least one meeting involving environmental representatives and builders, but no sign yet of any real progress. The League has met with representatives of the homebuilders and the author’s staff and reiterated our commitment to attempt to fashion a more workable proposal. We anticipate that there will be an effort at some point over the next month or so to try to move this bill in some form. Another option would be to insert similar language in another bill in the Assembly. We do not underestimate the builder’s capacity to move a bill like this at some point.

Administration Focused on Infrastructure Bond Package

The Secretaries of Business Transportation and Housing (BT&H); Resources; Food and Agriculture; and State and Consumer Services hosted a series of major meetings over the fall on land use and housing issues. Invited to these meetings were all of the major organizations involved in land use including local government, environmental groups, housing advocates, farmland preservationists and others. At this meeting, the Administration representatives announced that they wanted the assistance of the groups to advise the Administration on what should be included in a housing/planning reform package, and also said that consensus among all the participating groups, although desirable, was not mandatory. Although the League had been participating in similar meetings throughout the year, it had been difficult at times – given the breadth of the issues and the clash of perspectives among the interest groups – to ascertain what might come from these efforts.

A variety of task forces formed within the Resources Agency and BT&H for a number of months on CEQA streamlining, housing, and other planning issues. At the request of BT&H Secretary, Sunne McPeak, that the League led a specified group of stakeholders in the development of a recommended package of financial incentives related to this discussion in mid December. Since then, however, things have been relatively quiet on this issue, given other efforts to develop an infrastructure bond package.

Additional Update Provided At League Board Meeting: League staff will provide additional information, including updates of any further discussions and developments with the League’s bill package, homebuilders, environmental organizations, affordable housing groups, legislators, and the Administration—as this issue continues to develop.
For information purposes. Below is the housing proposal that was approved by the League Board on October 7, 2005.

Outline of Housing Agreement
Housing/General Plan Task Force

**RHNA Process.** Planning for housing needs must start with numbers that are accepted by local planners as credible. Although recent changes enacted in 2004, have improved the process, a number of additional changes are needed.

- **Regional population:** The population forecast is the cornerstone of the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) process. Once population projections are developed by the Department of Finance, then the Department of Housing (HCD) develops "housing needs" and allocates those numbers to councils of governments. This process has been extremely controversial for local governments. Although some reforms are proposed (below) to allow the RHNA to be developed by COGs instead of HCD, there remain some questions about if the initial process of projecting population growth must also be revised. A further discussion is necessary, involving COG’s and local officials, to determine to what extent the population forecast and allocation process must be revised.

- **Regional housing need:** Require COG to develop regional housing need numbers with data it generates as required under existing law including household formation, growth rates, etc. with input from HCD. (HCD can comment upon COG forecasts, but not overrule.)

- **Allocating regional housing need:** Add LAFCO regional growth policies to objectives with which COG housing allocation plan must be consistent. This is to ensure that COG allocation plans recognize LAFCO policies.

- **Allocating regional housing need:** Add information regarding facility within city (such as a university) that draws population or constrains land supply, but over which city does not have land use control, to data that must be included by COG in allocating regional housing need.

- **Allocating Regional housing need:** Require COGs to allocate RHNA numbers in an equitable manner so that cities with average lower density zoning than the average for the COG shall be allocated their fair share of housing units.

- **Transferring allocation of regional housing need:** Cities and counties may enter into agreements to transfer a portion of their RHNA allocation from one jurisdiction to another (after allocation plan is adopted by COG) if receiving jurisdiction demonstrates how those units can be accommodated within their housing element’s land inventory consistent with priority investment zones, socio-economic balance, jobs/housing balance, protection of agricultural land and any other "sustainable development" policy. Report agreement to COG. This provides additional flexibility for local governments to reach agreements on sharing resources and housing needs.
Planning

- **General Plan updates:** Encourage, but not mandate, update of general plan in 10-year intervals. Clarify existing statutory authority to collect fees for this purpose. Encourage local governments to develop an “infill strategy” when updating their plans. The effect of this proposal is to move toward a more predictable update process for local general plans, which will provide more planning certainty for both the community as well as developers.

- **Incentive-based Housing element certification:** This approach relies on the “carrot” approach to reward communities that are willing to take additional steps to address housing needs. Under this proposal, cities and counties would be allowed to select one of three ways to adopt a housing element. Each of the alternatives continues in effect the existing five-year planning period and the existing requirement to identify sites in a community’s land inventory for its entire RHNA allocation. A community need not submit its housing element to HCD if it chooses either the “affordable housing” or “10-year land supply” alternative (Alternatives One and Two). A community may also choose to remain under existing law and submit its housing element to HCD (Alternative Three).

**Alternative 1—10 Year Land Supply:** Adopt “10-year land supply” housing element. The purpose of this alternative is to encourage the production of housing by identifying a long-term land supply for housing at all income levels which may result in the construction of more housing at lower cost. This would be accomplished in two ways: (1) A community must identify sites in its land inventory for “double” its five-year RHNA allocation for all income levels. Sites that are pre-zoned and annexed within 3 years can be included in the inventory.\(^1\) Zoning for sites must include designation of “minimum densities” which allow a housing builder to calculate the minimum number of units that will be allowed on the site. The purpose of this requirement is to prevent density ranges with no minimum, or with a minimum density which will not allow the construction of the number of units attributed to the site in the community’s land inventory.\(^2\) (2) Developer may submit a “letter of intent” to freeze land use classification, zoning regulations and development standards for one year (from the filing of the letter) provided: (i) there is no pending zoning action on the property; (ii) written consent of the property owner is obtained; and (iii) one letter per developer per parcel is allowed over the five-year planning period. In order to maintain the certainty of the 10-year land supply, changes in state law affecting housing supply regulations would not apply until the end of the ten-year land supply period.

**Alternative 2—Affordable Housing:** Adopt an “affordable housing” housing element. The purpose of this alternative is to encourage the production of housing that is affordable to very low and low-income families. This would be

\(^1\) Rather than a requirement that sites be annexed within 3 years, we may wish to consider sites that are pre-zoned and within the sphere of influence.

\(^2\) Changes in land use classifications would continue to be subject to “Dutra” statute (Gov’t Code 65863).
accomplished in two ways: (1) The community must identify sites in its land inventory, for its entire very low and low income RHNA allocation, where housing affordable to very low and low income families could be built “by right” (with only design review) at Mullin densities.² (2) The community must apply the land use classification, zoning regulations and development standards in effect at the time that an application for very low or low income housing is submitted if the applicant (i) files an application that proposes a housing development that is consistent with the density allowed in the land use classification; (ii) demonstrates to the satisfaction of the city that it has secured a financing commitment for the project; and (iii) is deemed complete by the city or county within 180 days of the initial submittal.

Alternative 3—Status Quo: Submit housing element to HCD for review under existing law.

- Exemption from density bonus law. A site that meets one of the following requirements shall be exempt from density bonus law:

  (i) Any site that allows development at a density that is 35% higher than the “Mullin densities”:
  o Unincorporated rural areas: density—10 (Above 15, exempt)
  o Non metro city/county: density—15 (Above 20, exempt)
  o Suburban jurisdictions: density—20 (Above 25, exempt)
  o Metropolitan jurisdiction: density—30 (Above 40, exempt)
  (ii) The site is identified in the “affordable housing” housing element; or
  (iii) The site is identified in the “10-year land supply” housing element.

LAFCO
- Facilitate annexation to achieve RHNA: Amend LAFCO law to require LAFCO to give “great weight” to annexation proposal that adds land to achieve RHNA if proposal is consistent with infill strategy; logical and orderly development (no leapfrogging); contiguous land, etc. This proposal is intended to improve the coordination between RHNA allocations and LAFCO annexation policies.

Enforcement
- Authorize a court to impose fines on a city or county where the court has ordered the city or county to correct its actions and again finds the housing element in violation and the court determines the city has acted in “bad faith” in its adoption or implementation of its housing element

² Alternative Two also requires the community to include its moderate and high-income sites in its land inventory as required in existing law. The “Mullin densities” refer to the densities set forth in Government Code § 65583.2(c)(3)(B). They are 15 units per acre for incorporated cities within nonmetropolitan counties; 20 units per acre for suburban jurisdictions; and 30 units per acre in metropolitan counties. “Suburban” and “metropolitan” are defined by section 65583.2(d) through (f).
• Fines must be deposited in local affordable housing trust fund and court has continuing jurisdiction to order and ensure that the funds are used to build affordable housing.

**Financial Incentives.** Provide priority eligibility for state housing and infrastructure funds to cities and counties that either:

(i) Allow affordable multifamily units to be constructed “by right;” or
(ii) Zone for 10-year land supplies and offer additional “certainty;” or
(iii) Identify areas for additional housing and higher densities in locations that are consistent with regional housing and transportation objectives adopted by the council of governments for the region.

**Funding Housing and Infrastructure: Options**

• **Local-State Affordable Housing Matching Program:** If either city or county; county and all of its cities; or broader regional coalition of cities and counties through a JPA, establishes an affordable housing trust fund to invest in affordable housing, or to pool resources for infrastructure improvements, then state law would require the county auditor to shift a matching amount of local property taxes (school share) on an ongoing basis up to a defined cap, perhaps a percentage of total property tax growth.

• **Related Incentive Bill: Housing/Infill Infrastructure Investment Districts:** State grants tax increment authority (school’s share) to create 100 housing/infill infrastructure investment districts, that are aimed at building housing with an average net density over 70% of the district of over 20-units per acre (that may also pay for services and environmental mitigation). Cities and counties compete for COG designation “priority investment zones.” Zones are established under the supervision of State Infrastructure Bank. After 20 years authority sunsets, unless INF Bank agrees to extend. Local’s retain 10% of revenue to pay for ongoing services.

• **Affordable Housing Incentives Funding Bill:** After repayment of the state deficit bonds (10 years or less) and ¼ cent sales tax is returned to cities and counties, dedicate ½ of the property tax revenue used for the “triple-flip” ($approx 1 billion, plus growth) in the following way:

  ✓ 30% for high density housing infrastructure allocated by representative city/county JPA pursuant consistent with regional plans.
  ✓ 30% for affordable housing construction funds to local housing trusts allocated by representative city/county JPA, consistent with RHNA allocations.
  ✓ 20% for resource preservation/environmental mitigation consistent with regional plans.
✓ 15% distributed on an ongoing per-unit basis (discretionary funds) directly to communities that build housing at higher density (amount increases with density over 10-units per acre).
✓ 5% for planning: priority for updates and environmental documents related to local infill-related specific plans.
May 17, 2006

TO: Board of Directors

FROM: Edward Schafer, Senior Demographer

SUBJECT: Follow-up Information From the May 12, 2006, Board of Directors Policy Meeting

At the May 12, 2006, Board of Directors Policy meeting, a question was raised concerning the average persons per household (PPH) values used in the 2030 Regional Growth Forecast Update. Staff’s response to the question noted that, while the region’s PPH is 2.77, it varies among the jurisdictions. We have included the most recent data on PPH, vacancy rates, and percent of the population 65 years old and older by jurisdiction (see attached table).

For the year 2006, PPH ranges from a high of 3.43 in National City to a low of 2.04 in Del Mar. Other demographic characteristics also vary among the jurisdictions. For example, 2006 vacancy rates range from a high of 18.5 percent in Coronado to a low of 1.6 percent in Poway. Likewise, the percent of the population 65 years old and older was lowest in Poway (9.5%) and highest in Solana Beach (17.2%).

The data in the attached table portray the uniqueness of each jurisdiction’s population characteristics. In developing the inputs to the regional growth forecasts, staff strives to ensure that the specific nature of each jurisdiction is captured and modeled during the forecasting process. This will become more evident when we bring the results of the jurisdiction-level forecasts to the Board of Directors this summer.

If you have any questions regarding the attached information or our regional growth forecasts, please do not hesitate to contact me at (619) 699-1967 or via e-mail to esc@sandag.org.

ES/cd

Attachment
### Selected Population Characteristics by Jurisdiction

**San Diego Region, 2006**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Persons Per Household</th>
<th>Vacancy Rate</th>
<th>Percent 65 Years Or Older*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carlsbad</td>
<td>98,607</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>223,423</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronado</td>
<td>26,248</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Mar</td>
<td>4,524</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Cajon</td>
<td>96,867</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encinitas</td>
<td>62,815</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>140,766</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Beach</td>
<td>27,563</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Mesa</td>
<td>55,724</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemon Grove</td>
<td>25,363</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National City</td>
<td>63,537</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside</td>
<td>174,925</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poway</td>
<td>50,542</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>1,311,162</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>76,725</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santee</td>
<td>54,709</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solana Beach</td>
<td>13,327</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista</td>
<td>94,440</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated</td>
<td>465,553</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>3,066,820</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Sources: DOF, 2006; SANDAG, 2006*

*2005 Estimate of Population 65 Years Old and Older*