MEETING NOTICE
AND AGENDA

REGIONAL PLANNING
TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP (TWG)
The Regional Planning TWG may take action on any item appearing on this agenda.

Thursday, September 14, 2006
1:15 – 3:15 p.m.
SANDAG, 7th Floor Conference Room
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA  92101-4231

Staff Contact:  Carolina Gregor
(619) 699-1989
cgr@sandag.org

AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

• SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE INDEPENDENT TRANSIT PLANNING REVIEW PANEL RELATED TO LAND USE AND SMART GROWTH CONCEPT MAP

• ENHANCED SMART GROWTH LAND USE SCENARIO FOR THE 2007 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN (RTP)

• REGIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN (RCP): DRAFT BASELINE REPORT FOR PERFORMANCE MONITORING

SANDAG offices are accessible by public transit.
Phone 1-800-COMMUTE or see www.sdcommute.com for route information.

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.
+1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Several membership changes have occurred. An updated TWG roster is attached.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS

Members of the public will have the opportunity to address the TWG on any issue within the jurisdiction of the working group. Speakers are limited to three minutes each.

CONSENT ITEM (3)

+3. SUMMARIES OF THE JULY 13 AND JULY 21, 2006, TWG MEETINGS

The TWG should review and approve the attached meeting summaries.

REPORTS (4 – 12)

4. REPORTS FROM TWG MEMBERS

Members of the TWG may report on their activities and/or upcoming events.

+5. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE INDEPENDENT TRANSIT PLANNING REVIEW PANEL RELATED TO LAND USE AND SMART GROWTH CONCEPT MAP (Dave Schumacher and Coleen Clementson)

This item is continued from the July 13, 2006, TWG meeting.

A. Initial Transit Scenario Concepts for 2007 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP): At its June 23, 2006, meeting, the SANDAG Board of Directors accepted the draft Independent Transit Planning Review report for planning purposes for the 2007 RTP. Staff has developed several initial transit scenario concepts incorporating input from the report. Attached is the Transportation Committee report on this item.

B. In addition, in an effort to facilitate an understanding of the items related to land use and the Smart Growth Concept Map, staff has organized the report’s recommendations into the attached tables for discussion. These recommendations will be considered as part of the RTP process.

+6. STATUS REPORT ON THE I-15 INTERREGIONAL PARTNERSHIP – PHASE II (Jane Clough-Riquelme, SANDAG)

This item is continued from the July 13, 2006, TWG meeting.

SANDAG and the Western Riverside Council of Governments (WRCOG) received a $240,000 grant from Caltrans to continue the San Diego-Riverside Interregional Partnership (I-15 IRP). Phase II focuses on economic development, transportation, and housing strategies identified in Phase I. The attached report provides a brief update on advances made in all three of these components of the project.
Staff has completed the smart growth land use alternative for the 2007 RTP. This alternative is based upon the Board-accepted Smart Growth Concept Map. Smart growth assumptions were applied to the "Potential" smart growth areas on the Smart Growth Concept Map using the generic overlay assumptions. These assumptions, which are consistent with the smart growth criteria in the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP), were previously reviewed by the TWG during the development of the Smart Growth Concept Map. Staff will present the specific assumptions and methodologies used in applying the generic overlay assumptions and report on the results of this alternative land use scenario.

The Performance Monitoring Chapter of the RCP identifies a set of performance indicators to monitor the region’s progress toward achieving the goals and objectives of the RCP. The enclosed report establishes a baseline for performance monitoring. In August, SANDAG's Regional Planning and Transportation Committees authorized release of the draft Baseline Report for RCP Performance Monitoring for a 60-day review and comment period. The TWG is asked for input on the report. The review period closes on October 3, 2006.

SANDAG is beginning the process of developing regional smart growth urban design guidelines as part of the RCP implementation. Earlier this year, an ad hoc working group was formed to assist with this effort, consisting of members from the TWG, the Stakeholders Working Group (SWG), and the Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC). Linda Niles and Rosemary Rowan (tentative) are representing the TWG on the ad hoc group, with Andy Hamilton serving as an alternate. The ad hoc group met this summer. Attached is a proposed outline of topics to be included in the guidelines. The draft outline will be presented to the Regional Planning Committee in October.

The purpose of this item is to update the TWG on SANDAG’s subregional planning activities included in the 2006-07 Overall Work Program. In addition, several months ago at the March 2006 Regional Planning Committee meeting, Supervisor Pam Slater-Price suggested the formation of a working group with representatives from each jurisdiction along the SPRINTER line and North County Transit District. SANDAG proposes to set up an ad hoc working group with members of the TWG and the CTAC. The first meeting would be held in late September or early October. TWG members should discuss the membership, meeting location, meeting frequency, and potential agenda items for the group. It is anticipated that the group would meet quarterly.
The American Planning Association (APA) is promoting an effort to celebrate the achievements of planning this October during the inaugural “National Community Planning Month.” This annual event will help raise the visibility of planning and recognize the contributions of the planning profession and the individuals who work hard to make our communities enjoyable, endearing, and valuable. This year’s theme is “Making Great Communities Through Planning.” Each week in October will be focused on a specific aspect of planning. Additional information from the APA’s Web site and suggested ideas for celebrating National Planning Month are attached. The TWG should discuss any ideas it would like to propose to the Regional Planning Committee to celebrate National Community Planning month in the San Diego region.

ADJOURNMENT AND NEXT MEETING

The next TWG meeting will be held on Thursday, October 12, 2006, from 1:15 – 3:15 p.m.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction/Agency</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Phone/Fax/Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Carlsbad</td>
<td>Sandra Holder</td>
<td>Community Development Director</td>
<td>760-602-2724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>City of Carlsbad Planning Department</td>
<td>760-602-8560 fax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1635 Faraday Drive</td>
<td><a href="mailto:shold@carlsbad.ca.us">shold@carlsbad.ca.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Chula Vista</td>
<td>Jim Sandoval</td>
<td>City of Chula Vista Planning and Building</td>
<td>619-691-5002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dept.</td>
<td>619-409-5861 fax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>276 Fourth Avenue</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jsandoval@ci.chula-vista.ca.us">jsandoval@ci.chula-vista.ca.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chula Vista, CA 91910-2631</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ed Batchelder</td>
<td>City of Chula Vista Planning and Building</td>
<td>619-691-5005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dept.</td>
<td>619-409-5859 fax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>276 Fourth Avenue</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ebatchelder@ci.chula-vista.ca.us">ebatchelder@ci.chula-vista.ca.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chula Vista, CA 91910-2631</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mark Stephens</td>
<td>City of Chula Vista Planning and Building</td>
<td>619-409-5959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dept.</td>
<td>619-409-5859 fax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>276 Fourth Avenue</td>
<td><a href="mailto:msstephens@ci.chula-vista.ca.us">msstephens@ci.chula-vista.ca.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chula Vista, CA 91910-2631</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Coronado</td>
<td>Ed Kleeman</td>
<td>City of Coronado Planning Department</td>
<td>619-522-7329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1825 Strand Way</td>
<td>619-437-0371 fax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coronado, CA 92118-3005</td>
<td><a href="mailto:edklemen@coronado.ca.us">edklemen@coronado.ca.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Del Mar</td>
<td>Linda Niles</td>
<td>City of Del Mar Planning and Comm. Dev. Dept.</td>
<td>858-755-9337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1050 Camino Del Mar</td>
<td>858-755-2794 fax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Del Mar, CA 92014-2604</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lniles@delmar.ca.us">lniles@delmar.ca.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Encinitas</td>
<td>Jim Griffin</td>
<td>City of El Cajon Community Development Dept.</td>
<td>619-441-1741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>200 E. Main Street</td>
<td>619-441-1743 fax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>El Cajon, CA 92020-3912</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jgriffin@el-cajon.ca.us">jgriffin@el-cajon.ca.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Escondido</td>
<td>Jon Brindle</td>
<td>City of Escondido Planning Department</td>
<td>760-839-4543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>201 N. Broadway</td>
<td>760-839-4313 fax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Escondido, CA 92025-2709</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jbrindle@ci.escondido.ca.us">jbrindle@ci.escondido.ca.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barbara Redlitz</td>
<td>City of Escondido Planning Department</td>
<td>760-839-4546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>201 N. Broadway</td>
<td>760-839-4313 fax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Escondido, CA 92025-2709</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bredlitz@ci.escondido.ca.us">bredlitz@ci.escondido.ca.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Imperial Beach</td>
<td>Greg Wade</td>
<td>City of Imperial Beach Community Dev. Dept.</td>
<td>619-628-1354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>825 Imperial Beach Boulevard</td>
<td>619-429-9770 fax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Imperial Beach, CA 91932-2702</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gwade@cityofib.org">gwade@cityofib.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jim Nakagawa</td>
<td>City of Imperial Beach Community Dev. Dept.</td>
<td>619-628-4355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>825 Imperial Beach Boulevard</td>
<td>619-628-1355 fax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Imperial Beach, CA 91932-2702</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jnakagawa@cityofib.org">jnakagawa@cityofib.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of La Mesa</td>
<td>Dave Witt</td>
<td>City of La Mesa Community Development Dept.</td>
<td>619-667-1195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8130 Allison Avenue</td>
<td>619-667-1380 fax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>La Mesa, CA 91941-5002</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dwitt@ci.la-mesa.ca.us">dwitt@ci.la-mesa.ca.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdiction/Agency</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Phone/Fax/Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Lemon Grove</td>
<td>Robert Larkins</td>
<td>City of Lemon Grove Community Dev. Dept.</td>
<td>619-825-3805 x3806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3232 Main Street, Lemon Grove, CA 91945-170</td>
<td>619-825-3818 fax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:rlarkin@ci.lemon-grove.ca.us">rlarkin@ci.lemon-grove.ca.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of National City</td>
<td>Roger Post</td>
<td>City of National City Planning Department</td>
<td>619-336-4310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1243 National City Boulevard, National City,</td>
<td>619-336-4376 fax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA 91950-4301</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rpost@ci.national-city.ca.us">rpost@ci.national-city.ca.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Oceanside</td>
<td>Jerry Hittleman</td>
<td>City of Oceanside Planning Department</td>
<td>760-435-3535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>300 N. Coast Highway, Oceanside, CA 92054</td>
<td>760-754-2958 fax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:jhittleman@ci.oceanside.ca.us">jhittleman@ci.oceanside.ca.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Poway</td>
<td>Niall Fritz</td>
<td>City of Poway Dept. of Development Services</td>
<td>858-669-4601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P.O. Box 789, Poway, CA 92074-0788</td>
<td>858-669-1212 fax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:nfritz@ci.poway.ca.us">nfritz@ci.poway.ca.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>Bill Anderson</td>
<td>City Planning and Community Investment</td>
<td>619-236-6361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mail Station 4A, San Diego, CA 92101</td>
<td>619-236-6478 fax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:AndersonW@sandiego.gov">AndersonW@sandiego.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nancy Bragado</td>
<td>City of San Diego Planning Department</td>
<td>619-533-4549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mail Station 4A, San Diego, CA 92101</td>
<td>619-236-6478 fax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:nsbragado@sandiego.gov">nsbragado@sandiego.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rosemary Rowan</td>
<td>County Dept. of Planning and Land Use</td>
<td>858-694-2976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mail Station 0650, San Diego, CA 92123</td>
<td>858-694-2555 fax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:rosemary.rowan@sdcounty.ca.gov">rosemary.rowan@sdcounty.ca.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Marcos</td>
<td>Jerry Backoff</td>
<td>City of San Marcos Planning Department</td>
<td>760-744-1050 x3234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Civic Center Drive, San Marcos, CA 92069-2949</td>
<td>760-591-4135 fax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:jbackoff@ci.san-marcos.ca.us">jbackoff@ci.san-marcos.ca.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Karen Brindley</td>
<td>City of San Marcos Planning Department</td>
<td>760-744-1050 x3220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Civic Center Drive, San Marcos, CA 92069-2949</td>
<td>760-591-4135 fax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:kbrindley@ci.san-marcos.ca.us">kbrindley@ci.san-marcos.ca.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santee</td>
<td>Gary Halbert</td>
<td>City of Santee Director/Deputy City Manager</td>
<td>619-258-4100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>City of Santee Development Services</td>
<td>619-562-9376 fax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10601 Magnolia Avenue, Santee, CA 92071-1222</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ghalbert@ci.santee.ca.us">ghalbert@ci.santee.ca.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Melanie Kush</td>
<td>City of Santee Development Services</td>
<td>619-258-4100 x167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10601 Magnolia Avenue, Santee, CA 92071-1222</td>
<td>619-562-9376 fax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:mkush@ci.santee.ca.us">mkush@ci.santee.ca.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Solana Beach</td>
<td>Steven Apple</td>
<td>Solana Beach Community Development</td>
<td>858-720-2440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>635 S. Highway 101, Solana Beach, CA 92075-2215</td>
<td>858-755-1782 fax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:sapple@cosb.org">sapple@cosb.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdiction/Agency</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Phone/Fax/Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Solana Beach</td>
<td>Lori Naylor</td>
<td>Solana Beach Community Development</td>
<td>858-720-2444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(cont’d)</td>
<td></td>
<td>635 S. Highway 101</td>
<td>858-735-1782 fax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Solana Beach, CA 92075-2215</td>
<td><a href="mailto:LNaylor@cosb.org">LNaylor@cosb.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robin Putnam</td>
<td>Vista Community Development Department</td>
<td>760-639-6100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>600 Eucalyptus Ave.</td>
<td>760-639-6101 fax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vista, CA 92084</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rputnam@ci.vista.ca.us">rputnam@ci.vista.ca.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Conley</td>
<td>Vista Community Development Department</td>
<td>760-639-6100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>600 Eucalyptus Ave.</td>
<td>760-639-6101 fax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vista, CA 92084</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jconley@ci.vista.ca.us">jconley@ci.vista.ca.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Bill Figge</td>
<td>Caltrans District 11 - MS 50</td>
<td>619-688-6681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PO Box 85406</td>
<td>691-688-2511 fax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>San Diego, CA 92186-5406</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bill_figge@dot.ca.gov">bill_figge@dot.ca.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kimberly Weinstein</td>
<td>Caltrans District 11</td>
<td>619-688-0134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mail Station 50</td>
<td>619-688-2511 fax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P.O. Box 85406</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Kimberly_Weinstein@dot.ca.gov">Kimberly_Weinstein@dot.ca.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>San Diego, CA 92186-5406</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North County Transit District</td>
<td>Lance Schulte</td>
<td>NCTD Department of Service Development</td>
<td>760-966-6683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>810 Mission Avenue</td>
<td>760-967-2001 fax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oceanside, CA 92054-281</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lschulte@nctd.org">lschulte@nctd.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stefan Marks</td>
<td>NCTD Department of Service Development</td>
<td>760-966-6539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>810 Mission Avenue</td>
<td>760-722-0940 fax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oceanside, CA 92054-281</td>
<td><a href="mailto:smarks@nctd.org">smarks@nctd.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Transit System</td>
<td>Conan Cheung</td>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>619-515-0933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1255 Imperial Avenue, Suite 1000</td>
<td>619-744-5982 - fax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>San Diego, CA 92101</td>
<td><a href="mailto:conan.cheung@sdmts.com">conan.cheung@sdmts.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego Unified Port District</td>
<td>Bill Briggs</td>
<td>S.D. Unified Port District</td>
<td>619-686-6284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P.O. Box 120488</td>
<td>619-686-6508 fax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>San Diego, CA 92112-048</td>
<td><a href="mailto:wbriggs@portofsandiego.org">wbriggs@portofsandiego.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego County Regional Airport Authority</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>San Diego County Regional Airport Authority</td>
<td>619-532-3736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P.O. Box 82776</td>
<td>619-532-2518 fax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>San Diego, CA 92138-2776</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Aguileras5@efdaw.navfac.navy.mil">Aguileras5@efdaw.navfac.navy.mil</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego County Water Authority</td>
<td>Dana Friehauf</td>
<td>San Diego County Water Authority</td>
<td>858-522-6749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4677 Overland Avenue</td>
<td>858-268-7881 fax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>San Diego, CA 92123</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dfriehauf@sdwa.org">dfriehauf@sdwa.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1220 Pacific Highway</td>
<td>619-532-2518 fax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>San Diego, CA 92132-5190</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Aguilera5@efdaw.navfac.navy.mil">Aguilera5@efdaw.navfac.navy.mil</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Pollution Control District</td>
<td>Andy Hamilton</td>
<td>APCD</td>
<td>858-586-2641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10124 Old Grove Rd.</td>
<td>858-586-2801 fax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>San Diego, CA 92131</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ahamilha@co.san-diego.ca.us">ahamilha@co.san-diego.ca.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Agency Formation Commission</td>
<td>Robert Barry</td>
<td>LAFCO</td>
<td>619-531-5409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1600 Pacific Highway, Room 452</td>
<td>619-557-4190 fax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>San Diego, CA 92101</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Robert.Barry@sdcounty.ca.gov">Robert.Barry@sdcounty.ca.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdiction/Agency</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Phone/Fax/Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANDAG</td>
<td>Bob Leiter</td>
<td>San Diego Association of Governments</td>
<td>619-699-6980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department Director</td>
<td>401 B Street, Suite 800</td>
<td>619-699-1905 fax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>San Diego, CA 92101</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ble@sandag.org">ble@sandag.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(or Mail Station 980)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coleen Clementson</td>
<td></td>
<td>619-699-1944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principal Planner</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:cd@sandag.org">cd@sandag.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mike Hix</td>
<td></td>
<td>619-699-1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principal Planner</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:mhi@sandag.org">mhi@sandag.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carolina Gregor</td>
<td></td>
<td>619-699-1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior Planner and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff Contact</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:cgr@sandag.org">cgr@sandag.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Susan Baldwin</td>
<td></td>
<td>619-699-1943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior Planner</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:sba@sandag.org">sba@sandag.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stephan Vance</td>
<td></td>
<td>619-699-1924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior Planner</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:sva@sandag.org">sva@sandag.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ed Schafer</td>
<td></td>
<td>619-699-1967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Head Demographer</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:esc@sandag.org">esc@sandag.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beth Jarosz</td>
<td></td>
<td>619-699-6997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical Services</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:bja@sandag.org">bja@sandag.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amanda Kirkman</td>
<td></td>
<td>619-699-7315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intern</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:aki@sandag.org">aki@sandag.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Agenda Item #1: Welcome and Introductions

Niall Fritz, City of Poway, chaired the meeting. Self-introductions were conducted.

Agenda Item #2: Public Comments and Communications

There were no public comments or communications.

Agenda Item #3: Technical Working Group Meeting Summaries

Linda Niles, City of Del Mar, submitted minor grammatical corrections and noted a date correction for the forum to discuss loans and grants for sustainable communities from the May 11, 2006, meeting summary to SANDAG staff.

Agenda Item #4: SANDAG Board Action on the Smart Growth Concept Map

Carolina Gregor, SANDAG staff, announced that the SANDAG Board of Directors accepted the Smart Growth Concept Map for planning purposes at its June meeting and thanked TWG members for their participation in the development of the map. She also announced that "Smart Growth Resource Binders" have been created and are available to TWG members.

Marcela Escobar-Eck, City of Carlsbad, commented that it would be helpful if SANDAG would define smart growth on the SANDAG Web site. Ms. Escobar-Eck stated that some people are interpreting the Smart Growth Concept Map as general plan amendments and are confused about how the map was developed. She also suggested providing information in laymen’s terms so that the general public can understand smart growth better.

Coleen Clementson, SANDAG staff, replied that SANDAG has developed a Smart Growth Fact Sheet that will help clarify these issues. The fact sheet has been posted to the Web site and is included in the resource binders.
Agenda Item #5: Letter of Comment to the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) regarding the Adoption of Housing Element Annual Progress Report Regulations

This item was not pulled from Consent.

Agenda Item #6: Draft 2006 Congestion Management Program (CMP)

This item was not pulled from Consent.

ACTION: A motion and second were made to approve the Consent Agenda with the noted corrections made by Ms. Niles to the May 11, 2006, meeting summary. The motion passed unanimously.

REPORTS (7 - 14)

Agenda Item #7: Reports from TWG Members

Jim Sandoval, City of Chula Vista, mentioned that Chula Vista will be featured in the July issue of Planning Magazine for its development of higher standards for energy and water supply.

Agenda Item #8: 2030 Regional Growth Forecast and Follow-Up on General Plan Survey Questions

A. Recommendation to the SANDAG Board for Acceptance of the Series 11 2030 Regional Growth Forecast for Use in the 2007 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)

Ed Schafer, SANDAG staff, informed the TWG that the final forecast had not been finalized in time for this meeting, but that it would be finalized over the weekend. Mr. Schafer stated that the forecast needs to be presented to the SANDAG Board of Directors by August 4, 2006, so it can be used in transportation modeling for the 2007 RTP. He noted that all jurisdictions have seen several versions of the forecast over the last year, including the capacity files and the preliminary forecast. He also stated that feedback from jurisdictions has been received and adjustments have been made to the forecast.

Mr. Schafer suggested two alternatives for the TWG’s consideration. The first option was to call a special meeting of the TWG next week to discuss the final numbers and ask for a recommendation to the SANDAG Board at that time. The second option was since the jurisdictions have already seen the draft projections, the TWG could take a preliminary vote to recommend the forecast for acceptance, and Mr. Schafer would e-mail the revised projections to each jurisdiction the following week and work through any remaining issues at that time.

Questions and Comments included:

Patrick Murphy, City of Encinitas, commented that he would prefer the meeting option in order to listen to other jurisdictions’ comments.
Roger Post, City of National City, stated that the feasibility of scheduling a meeting on short notice could be challenging.

Dennis Turner, County of San Diego, noted that the jurisdictions have had a long time to look over the forecast data; however, politically, he would like to talk over the forecast data with other staff members within his jurisdiction before making a recommendation.

Ed Kleeman, City of Coronado, stated that Coronado may have small figures, but large political impacts. He added that the forecast, when applied to Coronado, assumed redevelopment of commercial parking lots into residential land, while Coronado does not encourage this type of change when the area is already being used as parking. Mr. Kleeman stated that the forecast shows that change and that this is the type of problem that would go unnoticed unless there is time to review the figures.

Ms. Escobar-Eck asked what would happen if the forecast was taken to the Board in September. Mr. Schafer replied that because the RTP is a long process, there is a certain shelf life for the forecast in terms of when projects are built. He stated that if the RTP cannot be completed in 2007, it would be pushed to 2008, and therefore the forecast would have to be extended to the year 2035. Ms. Clementson added that the forecast is the key to creating the land use alternatives and if the Board accepts the forecast in August, staff would be able to begin working on those during late summer and into the fall.

Mr. Fritz stated that ideally the group could meet late next week, or questions and issues could be dealt with on an individual basis.

Ed Batchelder, City of Chula Vista, stated that he would like to see Chula Vista's numbers in an e-mail and be able to provide feedback, but that a meeting may be good so members could discuss mixed-use issues and related nuances.

Mr. Turner commented that he would like both an e-mail containing the numbers and a meeting held to discuss any issues. He also asked how the forecast numbers will be shown. Mr. Schafer replied that 2004 was used as the baseline and that housing unit, population, and employment projections for 2010, 2015, 2020, and 2030 will be shown.

Mr. Kleeman asked if it is possible to show what the previous forecast showed along with the changes that were made. Mr. Schafer responded yes.

Ms. Escobar-Eck stated that it would be helpful if maps could be provided along with the e-mail.

Ms. Clementson commented that Mr. Schafer will get the information to the jurisdictions by Monday, July 17, 2006.

Mr. Fritz polled the group and then determined that the special meeting to discuss the forecast would occur on Friday, July 21, 2006, at 10 a.m. at SANDAG.
B. Potential Additional General Plan Survey Questions

Ms. Clementson stated that Jerry Backoff, City of San Marcos, noted that the General Plan Survey that SANDAG conducted earlier this year as part of the forecast process did not address several important topics, such as specific or precise plans. She stated that Mr. Backoff has put forward several comments for consideration through a memo included in the agenda packet. Ms. Clementson asked the TWG if any members would like to form a small group to help refine the next set of General Plan Survey questions.

Questions and Comments included:

Mr. Kleeman suggested that questions be asked in such a way that jurisdictions do not feel as though their General Plan should be updated or changed. He added that, for example, if a jurisdiction does not have vacant land or habitat at risk, there is no need to change the general plan. Questions need to be asked so that jurisdictions can document that type of situation.

Mr. Backoff mentioned that there are different ways to determine whether a jurisdiction’s general plan is current.

Mr. Fritz commented that the first question, “Is your General Plan current?” should allow for a narration to follow.

Mr. Murphy noted that more general questions should be included in the survey. He suggested including a question that asks what steps are taken to keep the general plan current.

Mr. Kleeman mentioned that the questions should also address the status of demographic changes in order to help indicate whether changes need to be made to the general plan.

Mr. Sandoval reminded the group that the discussion began with Gary Gallegos, SANDAG Executive Director, wanting to know the status of general plans in the region for SANDAG to use in regional forecasting and transportation planning and as a way of communicating with state legislators about funding opportunities for general plan updates. He noted that the survey questions need to be kept simple.

Ms. Clementson summarized that what she was hearing from TWG members was that the questions “Is your general plan current?” and, “If so, what steps are being taken to maintain it’s currency?” would be sufficient and that questions should allow for a narrative response.

Mr. Kleeman commented that “current” can be interpreted in many ways. He added that the only specification for currency is the Housing Element and that the rest of the elements are based on the needs of the community.

Ms. Clementson stated that the state of California requires jurisdictions to have general plans based on population trends for a region.

Mr. Fritz stated that the Government Code requires local jurisdictions to look at their general plan every five years to see if it needs to be updated.
Ms. Escobar-Eck stated that she appreciated San Marcos’ questions; however, she would like to see more uniform and detailed questions instead of narrative ones. She mentioned that a question asking if there are other state agencies that are causing difficulty in maintaining the general plan should be included.

Mr. Turner asked what will be done with the survey information. Ms. Clementson answered that there is a lot of discussion at the state level, and Mr. Gallegos is often asked about the status of local general plans. She stated that the information will be helpful to keep him informed and advocate for the region. Mr. Fritz added it is beneficial for jurisdictions to provide this information since the discussions are happening at the state level. Otherwise, the Office of Planning and Research (OPR) will provide the answers.

Mr. Murphy stated that there is some confusion in terms of general plans since the RTP is planned for 2030, while local plans, such as the city of Encinitas’, have a horizon of 2010, creating a 20-year gap.

Jim Griffin, City of El Cajon, mentioned that El Cajon had recently received a letter from OPR stating that the city’s general plan was out of date.

Ms. Clementson asked if there were any members who would like to get together to create a list of questions that are different from those included in the San Marcos memo. Ms. Niles, Mr. Kleeman, and Mr. Backoff volunteered.

Mr. Fritz stated that jurisdictions have to remember that Sacramento is interested in the process, not the substance. He mentioned that general plan updates cost from $500,000 to $2,000,000.

Mr. Schafer noted that the cost of general plan updates is important for Mr. Gallegos to know while he is in Sacramento.

**Agenda Item #9: 2007 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Draft Revised Transportation Project Evaluation Criteria**

Rachel Kennedy, SANDAG staff, provided a presentation on the revised draft transportation project evaluation criteria. The Transportation Project Evaluation Criteria Ad Hoc Working Group (TPEC) has been meeting since January 2006 and has developed a set of revised transportation project evaluation criteria to be used to prioritize transportation projects in the 2007 RTP. Ms. Kennedy informed the TWG that the TPEC is asking for comments on the set of draft criteria and that the final draft criteria will be brought to the Transportation Committee in September for recommendation to the Board of Directors. Mr. Batchelder and Nancy Bragado are the TWG representatives on the TPEC.

**Questions and Comments included:**

Mr. Turner asked which smart growth place types were included in the highway project criteria. Ms. Kennedy responded that Metropolitan Center, Urban Centers, and Special Use areas were included due to their specific links with highways as specified in the Regional Comprehensive Plan.
(RCP) and that the SANDAG Board of Directors has indicated prioritizing funds toward
Existing/Planned areas.

Mr. Backoff asked how points would be given to areas in flood plains, such as Highway 78 and the
San Marcos Creek. Ms. Kennedy referenced page 52 and stated that areas like those would fall into
the preserves or natural areas criteria.

Mr. Fritz commented on Table 2 and stated that a goal to provide emergency evacuation corridors
should be included.

Ms. Escobar-Eck commented that regional employment centers should be weighted the same as
smart growth areas and stated that in Carlsbad, there are constraints on certain land uses due to
the airport. Ms. Kennedy responded that areas with high concentrations of employment near to
transit stations or highway corridors would receive points in the “serves peak period trips” criteria.
Ms. Escobar-Eck stated that the criteria only address traffic considerations and not the land use
considerations. She added she was concerned about the heavy weighting for the smart growth
areas to the detriment of major employment areas.

Mr. Backoff asked for the reasoning of only including three smart growth areas for the highway
evaluation criteria. She stated the TPEC decided that in some smart growth areas, a highway may
not be ideal and noted that only three listed in the RCP had highway access. Ms. Kennedy also
noted that page 46 lists all of the smart growth place types within the RCP that are desirable for
transit, and will therefore receive points for transit projects.

Andy Hamilton, Air Pollution Control District, asked Mr. Batchelder if transportation projects that
received higher priority through these criteria would be consistent with the RCP.

Mr. Batchelder replied yes, that there is a greater incentive to link transportation funding to the
smart growth areas than under the previous set of criteria. He added that the revised criteria focus
on moving people rather than trips and vehicular capacity.

Mr. Hamilton asked a question regarding why the high occupancy vehicle (HOV) connector criteria
still measures average daily traffic and not average daily person trips. Ms. Kennedy stated that
perhaps the criteria could be revised and a multiplier could be applied to consider multi-passenger
vehicles.

Ms. Kennedy stated that comments made by the TWG would be presented to the TPEC for
consideration at their July 24th meeting and that any additional comments from TWG members
should be e-mailed to her by July 18, 2006.

**Agenda Item #10: Summary of Recommendations of the Independent Transit Planning
Review Panel Related to Land Use and the Smart Growth Concept Map**

This item was deferred to a future TWG meeting.
Agenda Item #11: 2007 Comprehensive Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Draft Issue Paper: Environmental Mitigation Program (EMP)

This item was deferred to a future TWG meeting.

Agenda Item #12: Update on Regional Water Issues

Toby Roy and Rose Smutko, San Diego County Water Authority (CWA), provided information regarding the implementation of three programs: the Landscape Ordinance and Conservation Standards for New Development, the First Annual Water Conservation Summit, which will be held on September 29, 2006, and the Integrated Regional Water Management Plan (IRWMP).

Ms. Roy stated that there is a new policy for the annexation of territory into the CWA service area, and there are two elements where the CWA can work with local planners. The first is requiring water agencies to have regulatory plans for new developments to provide standardization for developers. She stated that a variety of conservation efforts available to developers would be helpful. The second element is conservation focused on outside landscape. Ms. Roy mentioned that on September 29, 2006, there will be a Water Conservation Summit. She stated that one of the workshops will address the enforcement and development of landscape ordinances, and the summit will include participants from the building, manufacturing, and landscape industries.

Keith Greer, City of San Diego, asked a question regarding whether using incentives to increase outdoor conservation as opposed to ordinances and regulations have been considered. Ms. Roy answered that the summit will look at educating customers and the provision of incentives for market transformation. Ms. Smutko added that conservation advocates prefer incentives over enforcement.

Ms. Roy discussed the IRWMP and stated that the CWA has a group of County, city, and CWA representatives putting together a plan that takes a comprehensive approach to combined conservation efforts into one plan. She added that many of these actions are included in the RCP, such as habitat planning and watershed issues. Ms. Roy stated the group would like local planning entities to participate and adopt resolutions on implementing their portions of the plan.

Ms. Escobar-Eck asked for the status of AB 1881. Ms. Roy stated that the bill is currently in one of the Senate committees and is likely to go forward.

Ms. Roy and Ms. Smutko distributed materials and encouraged TWG members to attend the upcoming summit.

Agenda Item #13: Update on I-15 Interregional Partnership (IRP) Phase II

Susan Baldwin, SANDAG staff, provided a brief update on the San Diego-Riverside Interregional Partnership (I-15 IRP) Phase II that focuses on the economic development, transportation, and housing strategies identified in Phase I. Ms. Baldwin stated that the IRP is working with employers, including California State University, San Marcos and Palomar Pomerado Health, located along the SPRINTER lines to promote the construction of workforce housing. She added that the IRP is
planning to hire a consultant to examine the financial feasibility of the project. Ms. Baldwin stated that Jane Clough-Riquelme of SANDAG is serving as one of the primary staff contacts on this project and asked the group if they wanted to receive the extended presentation by Ms. Clough-Riquelme. The group responded affirmatively.

Questions and comments included:

Mr. Turner commented that creating workforce housing is a great idea and asked if there is work being done to create more housing in Riverside. Ms. Baldwin responded yes, that that is part of the larger strategy of the IRP. She stated that most of the funding from Caltrans is being spent on an economic cluster analysis in Riverside. Mr. Turner stated that the general plan for San Diego County is at serious risk of coming to a halt because there is not enough mitigation for north/south traffic in North County and Riverside County. He added that an implication may be a growth moratorium for the County and that more jobs need to be created in Temecula. Ms. Baldwin stated that job creation in Temecula is one of the goals of the IRP.

Agenda Item #14: Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program

Stephan Vance, SANDAG staff, informed the TWG that the California Transportation Commission (CTC) has identified an additional $6 million in Transportation Enhancement (TE) funds for the San Diego region. The Transportation Committee has already approved $2 million to fund the extension of the San Diego bikeway project. The Regional Planning and Transportation Committees will consider allocating the remaining $4 million to the Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program (SGIP). He added that the staff recommendation is to fund two projects that were only partially funded (Palm Avenue in Imperial Beach and Maple Street in Escondido) and two additional projects that were next in line on the project list, the 2nd Street Renaissance project in the City of San Diego and the Grand Avenue/El Mercado project in Escondido. Mr. Vance stated that the SGIP proposal will be considered at a joint meeting on August 4 and added that there will be $942,000 left in reserve.

Agenda Item #15: Adjournment and Next Meeting

Mr. Fritz noted that the August TWG meeting is cancelled and reminded everyone to attend the July 21, 2006 special meeting on the forecast. The next regular TWG meeting will be held on Thursday, September 14, 2006, from 1:15 to 3:15 p.m. in the 7th floor conference room.
SUMMARY OF THE JULY 21, 2006, TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP MEETING – File Number 3000200
SPECIAL MEETING ON THE SERIES 11 2030 REGIONAL GROWTH FORECAST

Agenda Item #1: Welcome and Introductions
Niall Fritz, City of Poway, chaired the meeting. Mr. Fritz welcomed Bill Anderson, the City of San Diego’s new Director of City Planning and Community Investment. Self-introductions were conducted.

Agenda Item #2: Recommendation to the SANDAG Board of Directors for Acceptance of the Series 11 2030 Regional Growth Forecast for use in the 2007 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)

Ed Schafer, SANDAG staff, distributed tables showing the Series 10 and Series 11 forecasts for population, housing, and employment by jurisdiction. Mr. Schafer stated that the purpose of this meeting is to bring closure to the Series 11 forecast. He stated that SANDAG has been working with the local jurisdictions on the forecast for the past 18 months. Mr. Schafer added that most jurisdictions have seen the data at least three times and SANDAG has spent a lot of time trying to incorporate the comments and discussions into the final forecast.

Mr. Schafer stated that the Series 10 and Series 11 forecasts are quite consistent, except for a few exceptions. He noted some differences in the number of housing units between the two forecasts for Chula Vista, where 15,000 units were added due to their general plan update, and for the City of San Diego, where units were also added due to their plan update. He also mentioned population and housing increases related to smart growth in the cities of Solana Beach and Encinitas. Mr. Schafer stated that the Series 11 forecast represents SANDAG’s efforts to model each jurisdiction's general plan and reflect smart growth land uses per jurisdictions' participation in the development of the Smart Growth Concept Map.

Mr. Schafer stated that although both forecasts extend to 2030, the population is projected to be slightly higher in the Series 11 forecast. He stated that increases in persons per household and a decline in vacancy rates are being seen within the region. Mr. Schafer added that although the increase in population is small by jurisdiction, regionally it is significant. He stated that the employment numbers are fairly consistent between forecasts; however, the City of San Diego has more employment in the Series 11 forecast due to the additional employment in the downtown area as does the city of Chula Vista, where more employment is due to higher activity in the Eastern Urban Center and the University area.
Mr. Schafer commented on two additional differences between the two forecasts. He noted that the Series 10 forecast used Master Geographic Reference Areas (MGRA), such as city blocks or small geographical areas in rural areas, and stated that there were about 37,000 MGRA’s. Mr. Schafer stated that the Series 11 forecast uses parcel files from SanGIS and now there are 800,000 parcels. The second difference is that the Series 10 forecast used the 2000 Census as the base, while the Series 11 forecast uses 2004 estimates. He noted that housing was created based on parcel data, aerial photography, and assessor’s data, so refinements had to be made.

Mr. Schafer stated that the two forecasts look fairly consistent in most jurisdictions. In jurisdictions where there are significant numerical differences, it is due to major changes, such as general plan updates, amendments, or smart growth assumptions. Mr. Schafer described the overall forecast process, stating that staff sent the capacity files to the jurisdictions for review, created the forecast, and distributed it again to the jurisdictions for review.

Questions and Comments included:

Dennis Turner, County of San Diego, stated that the County has a model they run apart from the SANDAG model, which found significant differences in the 2030 population and housing numbers. He noted that SANDAG projected 82,000 more people and 75,000 more housing units for the County. Mr. Turner stated that he would like more time to review the forecast, particularly the vacancy rate assumptions. Mr. Schafer stated he understood the County’s concern; however, the focus should not be on population numbers, but on housing numbers.

Tait Galloway, City of San Diego, stated that population is often used to set infrastructure standards in local jurisdictions. He asked how the population of multi-family units was determined and if square footage was used in the calculation. Mr. Schafer stated that at the local level, population was determined by the number of housing units, the vacancy rates and the persons per household. All of these parameters are modeled at the zone of urban modeling (ZUM). Furthermore, at the base year (2004) these parameters are derived from the last census (2000). After that, the trends in these parameters are influenced by regional trends that are forecasted by the Demographic and Economic Forecasting Model (DEFM). Mr. Schafer noted that at times these trends are influenced by professional judgment. Mr. Schafer provided an example using Otay Mesa. He stated for example there are forty units now but four to five thousand in 2030. The existing forty units might have high vacancy rates and high persons per household. However, this trend would not be expected in the future, and SANDAG would make adjustments based on professional judgments.

Mr. Turner asked if the regional population and housing are control totals given to jurisdictions by the state. Mr. Schafer replied no and stated that SANDAG produces those numbers through the Demographic and Economic Forecasting Model (DEFM), with professional courtesies extended to the state and vice versa. He added that SANDAG’s numbers are produced by SANDAG and reviewed by a professional DEFM committee.

Susan Baldwin, SANDAG staff, commented that the total demand for housing units is not being taken care of within the region. Mr. Schafer stated that you have to look at demands and capacities, and then constrain the regional forecast in terms of housing units. He added that once it is constrained, you begin to see an increase in persons per household, and a lower vacancy rate. Mr. Schafer noted that the model determines these numbers based on certain elasticity’s while another
model determines where the other housing units go, for instance out of the region. He stated the overall number of units is determined by the persons per household and vacancy rates.

Mr. Anderson asked if population is derived from housing units. Mr. Schafer stated population is derived from internal equations that take the population, ages it, adds births, and looks at immigration and out-migration.

Mr. Anderson noted that the forecast shows 2.71 persons per household for the City of San Diego. He asked if that number should be lower and asked how that compares to the aging population. Mr. Schafer stated that the region will see doubling up, reflecting some overcrowding, twice as much as the national average. Mr. Anderson asked if a “target” is set for persons per household, could an appropriate housing target then be determined. Mr. Schafer stated that the region does not build enough housing.

Mr. Galloway commented that it is dependent upon household type and income and gave the example of Rancho Pensaquitos versus Southeastern San Diego in terms of doubling up. Mr. Schafer stated that it depends on how you define doubling up. He noted that a child staying in their parents’ home longer is a form of doubling up, as is when young people have two or three roommates in order to afford their apartment. Mr. Schafer mentioned that the forecast starts with 127 average household sizes, from Census data and then benchmark with DOF estimates. He added that it is very difficult to estimate household size and vacancy rates in small geographic areas.

Marcela Escobar-Eck, City of Carlsbad, stated that in Carlsbad the forecast projects 2.55 persons per household. Mr. Schafer noted that the vacancy rate needs to be added in, therefore making the persons per household higher.

Dave de Cordova, City of Encinitas, commented that the between the Series 10 and 11 forecasts, the persons per household for the City of Encinitas increased from 2.61 to 2.72, but the number of units did not change. Mr. de Cordova stated that there appears to have been a significant revision to the population between the two forecasts. Mr. Schafer stated that this change is due to a decrease in the vacancy rate, therefore increasing the persons per household. Mr. de Cordova stated that North County cities are losing enrollment in schools and asked if that influences the numbers. Mr. Schafer responded that SANDAG does not use school enrollment as a factor and that the racial and ethnic make-up in North County is fairly homogeneous and fertility rates are low. He added that birth rates are going down in North County, although the region’s birth rate is fairly flat.

Mr. Anderson commented that the jurisdictions are hearing that they need to increase housing unit capacity county-wide. He asked whether the notion that the whole region is short of units imply that jurisdictions’ household sizes are too high. Mr. Anderson also stated that 2.68 persons per household does not sound like a bad number, and asked if that meant additional housing capacity is not needed. Mr. Schafer answered when SANDAG runs the baseline model, the forecast model states that the whole county needs 400,000 units between now and 2030. He stated the assumptions come out of the model, not based on a certain person per household number, and
when you tell the model you won’t have the 400,000 units, it calculates household size and vacancy rates.

Mr. Anderson asked how household size is calculated. Mr. Schafer responded that population and household size are calculated econometrically, with no policy at all. Ms. Baldwin asked where the vacancy rate is factored in. Mr. Schafer stated household size is calculated for housing units, vacancy rates, and population. He added that the DEFM baseline is only region wide and the results are then distributed to each city based on plans and the Urban Development Model. Mr. Anderson stated he would be interested in the average household size for San Diego. Beth Jarosz, SANDAG staff, noted that the model project housing unit demand is largely based on jobs. She added that the model starts with historical trends in household size and household size is then calculated after the fact. Ms. Jarosz continued that in Poway and San Marcos the household size is closer to three persons per household due to nuclear families, while San Diego generally tends to be lower because of the higher number of singles living in studios.

Mr. Anderson asked how household size is calculated. Mr. Schafer responded that population and household size are calculated econometrically, with no policy at all. Ms. Baldwin asked where the vacancy rate is factored in. Mr. Schafer stated household size is calculated for housing units, vacancy rates, and population. He added that the DEFM baseline is only region wide and the results are then distributed to each city based on plans and the Urban Development Model. Mr. Anderson stated he would be interested in the average household size for San Diego. Beth Jarosz, SANDAG staff, noted that the model project housing unit demand is largely based on jobs. She added that the model starts with historical trends in household size and household size is then calculated after the fact. Ms. Jarosz continued that in Poway and San Marcos the household size is closer to three persons per household due to nuclear families, while San Diego generally tends to be lower because of the higher number of singles living in studios.

Aaron Barling, County of San Diego, commented that it seems like population is known before knowing what the persons per household figure is. Mr. Schafer responded that at the regional level, population is computed demographically, calculated by birth rates, death rates, and amount of people moving in and out of the region. He then stated that housing units is determined using an econometric model that tells you how many more units will be built. Mr. Schafer noted that persons per household are calculated by comparing the forecasted size of the population to the forecasted number of households. He continued that at the local level vacancy rates and persons per household are calculated by singles, multiples, and mobile homes. Mr. Barling asked if redevelopment was included, and Mr. Schafer responded that redevelopment is considered only if the jurisdiction specified it or if it is included in the plans.

Karen Brindley, City of San Marcos, commented on the housing unit change table and stated that the units under construction for San Marcos are 400 units. Mr. Schafer noted that this was created two years ago, and that SANDAG updates data based on aerial photos, GIS, or information from the jurisdictions. He added that if aerial photos show what looks like units under construction, we will specify “under construction” and count it as additional capacity.

Mr. Anderson asked what is the vacancy rate derived in the housing unit count. Mr. Schafer stated that many are done by zone. He noted that the vacancy rate starts at about four percent and by 2030 it gets to about three percent overall, which is extremely low. Mr. Schafer stated, for example, on the coast it is about ten percent, on Coronado Shores it is about twenty-five percent, and in some areas of the county fifty percent. Ms. Baldwin stated the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) numbers were linked to the vacancy rates, and that the state wanted SANDAG to use a five percent vacancy rate.

Mr. Anderson asked what by variable the region is low, and if the region is low by about 85,000 units, is that because the forecast is based on lower vacancy rates and higher persons per household. Mr. Schafer answered that the question is how to explain the housing shortage, and the answer is that numbers come from an econometric forecast. He added that the region is producing workers with not enough places to house them in the region, and then the task becomes figuring out how to get them into the region every day.
Mr. Anderson stated that a rate of 2.68 persons per household seems too high for San Diego and that very low vacancy rates assume that the people that are leaving, negatively impacting the regional transportation system. Mr. Fritz commented that at least 100,000 trips are coming into the region for work purposes. Mr. Schafer stated that SANDAG’s model forecasts jobs based on the U.S. economy and how San Diego’s economy connects to the national economy. Mr. Fritz stated that despite that model, if the region restrained economic land that would affect the projections.

Mr. Galloway asked how accurate the employment forecast is. Mr. Schafer stated that the forecast is within four percent.

Mr. Turner asked if there are enough TWG members present for a quorum and stated that the County would like to wait on recommending the forecast to the SANDAG Board of Directors.

Mr. Schafer suggested polling the members that are present at the meeting.

Ms. Escobar-Eck stated that she was comfortable with the numbers forecasted for Carlsbad and that she would want a strategy for outreach to accommodate growth.

Mr. Anderson stated that the City of San Diego would need clear explanations of the forecast numbers. Mr. Galloway added that in general, the forecast numbers for San Diego are okay, although he would like to see tweaks made to some planning areas between 2020 and 2030. Mr. Schafer stated that that would be difficult, and that this forecast, like the last forecast, tried not to let the cities fill up so quickly so that the County’s numbers were not so high and unrealistic. Mr. Galloway noted however, that it is a realistic factor.

Ms. Brindley commented that a few minor refinements were necessary to the San Marcos numbers, but overall she was fairly comfortable with the forecast. She added that an additional look at the maps and inputs would be beneficial.

Mr. de Cordova mentioned that the focus of the meeting has been on housing numbers and stated that he was comfortable with Encinitas’ numbers.

Linda Niles stated she was comfortable with the City of Del Mar’s forecast numbers.

Mr. Fritz stated that a resolution to Poway’s numbers will be reached soon and asked where the 7,000 additional jobs in Poway came from. Mr. Schafer answered that in general the region is running out of land for housing, but not for jobs. He continued that most jurisdictions have more land for jobs than needed. Mr. Schafer noted that SANDAG will forecast an additional 250,000 people that will not be able to live here.

Mr. Fritz stated that he suspected that the jurisdictions that are not present are comfortable with the forecast and suggested that SANDAG staff contact those jurisdictions that are not here to be sure. Mr. Schafer stated that he received an okay from the City of Chula Vista via e-mail and a noncommittal from the City of Imperial Beach. Mr. Fritz stated the other jurisdictions should be contacted to see if they are comfortable with going to the Board of Directors in two weeks with the provision that the remaining issues are resolved.
Mr. Turner stated that he was okay with recommending the forecast with the understanding that if the issues are not resolved, a discussion will take place at the Board meeting. Mr. Turner asked what the voting procedure was at SANDAG and whether a one hundred percent consensus or formal weighted vote was used. Mr. Schafer stated that consensus is preferred, but the forecast needs to move ahead. He stated that the concern is whether or not the changes made will make a substantive difference. Mr. Turner noted that he was not asking for changes, but that he would like to have another meeting to discuss the forecast. He added that he does not want to create delays, but that the County needs to understand the differences between their forecast and SANDAG’s. Mr. Schafer suggested that assuming all other jurisdictions are fairly comfortable with the forecast and SANDAG will work with the County on the remaining issues in the next three to four days, then the forecast be moved to the Board of Directors. If no resolution is reached, the forecast would be moved forward with a minority report.

Mr. Fritz commented that it is a regional forecast and as long as a jurisdiction’s general plan is not affected, the forecast is fine.

Mr. Turner stated it is a regional forecast, but it will affect transportation planning. He stated that he will work with Mr. Schafer and SANDAG on certain issues, but would not agree to unanimously recommending the forecast to the Board.

Ms. Baldwin asked if 20,000 housing units come out of the County, what would happen to them. Mr. Schafer stated that SANDAG does not know at this point. Mr. Fritz noted that something would have to happen to the units and the TWG may need to meet again to discuss the effects of removing the units. Mr. Turner stated that the region is already exporting 89,000 housing units, and asked if it is feasible to add to that number as well as the impacts on vacancy rates or household size.

Mr. Schafer noted that the County of San Diego and the Cities of Poway, San Diego, and San Marcos would like further review of the forecast.

**Agenda Item #8: Adjournment and Next Meeting**

The next regular TWG Meeting will be held on Thursday, September 14, 2006 from 1:15 to 3:15 p.m. in the 7th Floor Conference Room.
SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE INDEPENDENT TRANSIT PLANNING REVIEW PANEL RELATED TO LAND USE AND THE SMART GROWTH CONCEPT MAP

Introduction

At its June 23, 2006, meeting, the SANDAG Board of Directors voted to accept the draft Independent Transit Planning Review Services report for planning purposes for the 2007 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Staff has developed several initial transit scenario concepts incorporating input from the report. Attached is the Transportation Committee report on this item.

In addition, in an effort to facilitate an understanding of the Transit Review Panel's recommendations related to land use and the Smart Growth Concept Map, staff has organized those recommendations into the attached tables for the TWG's information/discussion. These recommendations will be considered as part of the RTP process.

   2. Recommendations Related to Land Use  
   3. Recommendations Related to the Smart Growth Place Types

Key Staff Contacts:  Coleen Clementson, (619) 699-1944, ccl@sandag.org  
Dave Schumacher, (619) 699-6906, dsc@sandag.org
COMPREHENSIVE 2007 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN: INITIAL TRANSIT SCENARIO CONCEPTS

Introduction

On June 23, 2006, Board of Directors accepted the recently completed Independent Transit Planning Review (ITPR) report for planning purposes for preparing the 2007 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The ITPR includes recommendations on possible strategies for improving the role of public transportation in addressing regional mobility needs. As part of the process in developing the comprehensive 2007 RTP, a number of alternative transit scenarios are being developed that will explore how best to maximize the effectiveness and efficiency of the regional transit system. Staff will present a set of initial scenario concepts, highlighting how input from the ITPR has been factored into them. The Transportation Committee is asked to provide comment on these scenario concepts as they relate to the development of the 2007 RTP transit network.

Discussion

The regional transit system is an integral part of the multimodal approach of the current 2030 RTP. Having an effective system of commuter rail, light rail, bus rapid transit (BRT), local bus, and shuttle services that complements the local road and freeway system is critical to the goal of maximizing the person-carrying capacity of the overall transportation network. Achieving an effective and efficient transit system means focusing transit infrastructure and services in areas with transit-supportive land uses, and having a system plan designed to attract new markets to transit by making it time competitive with the automobile. The benefits gained are not just to transit users, but to auto users as well. An improved transit system provides more travel choices for everyone, and the resulting increase in transit usage in key travel corridors translates into less demand on the highway network.

RTP Process Overview

In developing the 2007 RTP, it is important to consider how best to focus our transit investments given the region’s commitment to the TransNet Early Action Program and a network of Managed Lanes/BRT facilities. The recommendations from the ITPR regarding system design and performance suggested several themes to improve transit service in the region. A preliminary evaluation of these ITPR recommendations, along with other ideas suggested by local community groups, will allow us to evaluate their effects on the overall transportation network using the regional transportation
model. As such, this effort can be seen as a “sketch planning exercise.” The results from this evaluation will provide useful input on potential revisions to the transit network for the 2007 RTP to maximize its effectiveness in addressing regional mobility needs.

The smart growth opportunity areas provide a second key input into the development of the 2007 RTP related to transit. The SANDAG Board of Directors has accepted for planning purposes the Smart Growth Concept Map, which indicates different types of existing, planned, and potential smart growth areas in the region. Serving these smart growth areas is a key tenet to coordinating land use and transportation decisions when evaluating revisions to the planned transit network.

**ITPR Recommendations**

The ITPR recommendations relating to the system design and performance can be grouped into two categories: (1) overarching recommendations that staff feels should be incorporated into all the RTP scenarios; and (2) recommendations that suggest different strategies for how the regional transit system might be designed. It is the latter recommendations that helped us formulate the various initial transit scenario concepts outlined in the next section.

Overarching Recommendations - The overarching recommendations are summarized below, along with comments on how each is proposed to be incorporated into the initial RTP transit scenario concepts:

- Better linking transportation and land use planning - This recommendation is at the heart of our Smart Growth strategy and, as noted above, will be a key tenet when evaluating revisions to the transit network.

- Start with a good system plan, then focus on corridor-level planning – The RTP is designed to outline the system plan for transit; testing alternative corridor-level scenarios will help identify the best system plan for our region.

- Focus on corridor-specific transit mode share goals rather than one regional goal – The current 2030 RTP has a regional goal of achieving a 10 percent peak hour transit mode share. Corridor-specific mode share goals focuses attention on those corridors where transit investments are made. It also would provide us a better tool for measuring the success of our Smart Growth strategy to link transit investment with Smart Growth opportunity areas.

Strategy Recommendations - The ITPR recommendations that were used in developing the initial transit scenario concepts are outlined below:

- Focus attention on developing a good underlying system of local bus services – These services provide important connections to and from regional rail and BRT services; in addition to increased service frequencies, infrastructure improvements such a signal priority treatments would help increase transit travel speeds, and improved station waiting environments and real-time passenger information would provide the kind of amenities that will attract new riders.

- Place more emphasis on dedicated transit guideways – Dedicated transit facilities would create the ability to maximize transit operating speeds and reliability, offer opportunities to provide high quality passenger amenities that can attract choice riders, and provide the identity and permanence that promote user and developer confidence in the commitment to the system.
Consider alternative strategies for managing the Managed Lanes facilities - Evaluating differing strategies for managing the various users of Managed Lanes facilities (BRT, carpools/vanpools, and FasTrak™ users) would help determine the right mix of users that can maximize the person-carrying capacity of these facilities.

Evaluate the I-15 Managed Lanes BRT station access design - The current “off-line” station design increases transit travel times since BRT vehicles must exit the Managed Lanes facility to access station sites adjacent to the freeway corridor. Alternative facility designs could help create an “on-line” station that minimizes BRT travel times. Such designs could be used in other corridors where Managed Lanes/BRT facilities are planned.

Minimize transit facility investment in nonurban core areas - Transit investments should be focused in urban core, transit-supportive areas where the investment would be most cost-effective in terms of increased ridership and transit mode share. Areas outside the urban core area also would be served by transit, albeit at a lower level of investment that directly reflects the ability to attract a high transit mode share and coordinate with smart growth land uses.

Retain downtown San Diego as a key transit focus - With the recent and planned residential and employment growth, combined with downtown San Diego’s transit-oriented urban design, downtown should continue to be a key focus area for transit investment.

The next section outlines the initial transit scenario concepts that were developed using these recommendations.

**Initial Transit Scenario Concepts**

Staff has developed a set of initial transit scenario concepts to test how different strategic approaches to the design and operation of the transit network compare with one another. While the focus of these scenario concepts is on the regional transit network, it is important to note that each scenario assumes a concurrent investment in roadway improvements, most notably in the current Managed Lanes/High-Occupancy-Vehicle (HOV) Lanes strategy. Thus, we are recommending that the multimodal strategy of the current RTP be carried forth into the 2007 RTP. These initial scenario concepts also will incorporate the existing/planned and potential smart growth areas included in the Smart Growth Concept Map.

The current 2030 RTP unconstrained revenue scenario along with four initial unconstrained transit scenario concepts would be tested. These are outlined below:

**Scenario #1 - Unconstrained Scenario Revisited**

This alternative represents an updated version of the current 2030 RTP unconstrained revenue scenario that would serve as a benchmark for comparing how well the current unconstrained scenario compares with the alternative scenarios outlined below. This alternative would include both the highway and transit networks in the 2030 RTP unconstrained revenue scenario, updated to reflect changes in the transit systems of the two transit agencies, including the Metropolitan Transit System’s (MTS) Comprehensive Operational Analysis (COA) that is now being implemented and the Fast Forward plan implemented by the North County Transit District (NCTD).
Scenario Concept #2 – Alternative Managed Lanes Strategy: Very High-Occupancy Vehicles

The current Managed Lanes strategy is based on a multimodal approach to maximize person throughput by giving priority to higher-occupancy carpool/vanpool (2+ person requirement), and BRT vehicles. Any excess capacity is assumed available to solo drivers for a fee through the FasTrak program. Using the above unconstrained highway and transit network plan above, this alternative scenario would test a strategy that emphasizes very high-occupancy vehicles (3+ person carpools/vanpools, and BRT) to determine if it offers the potential to achieve a higher person-throughput. This scenario also would include an in-line station design to minimize transit travel times. Arterial priority measures also would be included to facilitate both BRT and local bus operation.

Scenario Concept #3 – Alternative Managed Lanes Strategy: Freeway Transitways

This scenario is similar to Scenario Concept #2 in terms of testing an alternative strategy for the Managed Lanes facilities to maximize person-throughput; however, in this case, the strategy tested would involve dedicating two of the four Managed Lanes to transit. A dedicated transitway would allow for a facility design that maximizes transit speeds and access. The remaining lanes would be priority access for 2+ carpools/vanpools.

Scenario Concept #4 – Transit Corridor Guideways

This alternative would build off the approach in Scenario Concept #3 regarding freeways transitways, expanding the concept of dedicated transit facilities to areas outside the freeway corridors where warranted based on travel demand and opportunities for land use integration. Transit investment would be focused in development of guideways that can best connect major demand origins and destinations in a way that maximizes transit system connectivity, community access to the system, and transit travel speeds. Transit guideways, either fully grade-separated or with at-grade crossings, offer the flexibility to operate an array of BRT services to facilitate operation of Local Bus “Blue Car” service (local tripmaking), Corridor “Red Car” service (medium-distance corridor tripmaking), and Regional “Yellow Car” service (longer-distance regional tripmaking).

Scenario Concept #5 – Downtown/Urban Core Focus

This alternative would build off the approach in Scenario Concept #4 above, but focuses particular attention on the urban core areas in and around the various downtowns in the region (e.g., downtown San Diego, Escondido, Oceanside, and Chula Vista). These areas already have the most dense and transit-supportive land uses in the region today. Combined with dramatic increases in residential and employment growth forecast with the recently adopted Downtown San Diego Community Plan Update, the downtown San Diego area has one of the highest potentials for transit ridership and to achieve transit mode shares in line with those seen in cities with “world-class transit systems.” This alternative would allow us to test the potential of creating such a transit system for this area.

This Scenario Concept #5 also may address concerns raised by Save Our Forests and Ranchlands (SOFAR). With the adoption of MOBILITY 2030, SOFAR challenged the adequacy of the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) that was certified by the SANDAG Board. SANDAG entered into a settlement agreement with SOFAR which stipulated that SANDAG, during the next full update of the RTP, would analyze an alternative network scenario that eliminated three highway segments (State Routes 76, 67, and 94) and shifted funds from those projects to additional transit services. While SANDAG has committed to analyzing this agreed-upon alternative in the EIR for 2007 RTP,
SOFAR has requested that SANDAG analyze a different alternative that focuses additional transit in the downtown San Diego core. If the Transportation Committee concurs with including Scenario Concept #5 in the analysis, and SANDAG and SOFAR can agree on the details of the scenario, staff would amend the settlement agreement to reflect these changes subject to the Board’s approval.

The matrix below shows how each of the ITPR recommendations was factored into the development of each of the initial scenario concepts #2 through #5. (Scenario #1 is the existing unconstrained plan that serves as a benchmark for evaluation of the other four alternative scenarios.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITPR Recommendation</th>
<th>RTP Initial Transit Scenario Concepts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#2 - ML: Very High HOV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Good local bus system</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Dedicated transit guideways</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Alternative Managed Lanes</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. I-15 ML station access</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Minimize noncore transit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Downtown focus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Next Steps**

Staff feels these five initial scenario concepts will provide us with a sketch planning exercise to test and evaluate an array of differing strategies on how we might approach the overall transit system design. This sketch planning exercise will enable us to test the performance of each approach in terms of ridership, transit mode shares, and cost-effectiveness both in terms of capital costs and operating costs. This exercise also will allow us to compare the performance of each alternative by key travel corridor. Since travel demand and land use characteristics vary greatly throughout the region, we may discover that one scenario concept performs well in one corridor, while a different scenario concept works well in another corridor.

We have consulted with MTS and NCTD staff on the development of these initial scenario concepts, and will work closely with each transit agency over the coming months to further develop and evaluate each scenario. Staff plans to present the results of the analysis to the Board of Directors at its October Board Policy meeting. Review by the boards of the two transit agencies would also be undertaken and used as input to a recommendation to the SANDAG Board on a revised transit planning approach for the 2007 RTP update. Direction by the Board at its October meeting will keep the RTP on schedule for identification of final alternatives by January 2007, a draft RTP in May 2007, and adoption of the final RTP by the Board in November 2007.

**BOB LEITER**
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Key Staff Contact: Dave Schumacher, (619) 699-6906, dsc@sandag.org
# Recommendations Related to Land Use
## Independent Transit Planning Review (ITPR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use/Housing</strong></td>
<td>1. Managing non-smart growth is as important as managing smart growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Parking policy and pedestrian oriented site designs are very important to transit patronage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Smart Growth definitions lack spatial factors (linear and network distribution) that are very important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Encourage mixed use density clusters that will facilitate efficient and convenient public transit service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Except for small neighborhood serving uses; other larger retail employment, medical, educational and government land uses should be located near arterial and major collector streets served by public transit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Five to ten urban centers located at the junction of principal transit corridors where major development projects would be encouraged to cluster.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. New auto-oriented land uses should be prohibited by zoning codes to be built along principal transit corridors; and the conversion of existing auto-oriented development to transit oriented land uses should be encouraged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Desirability destination land uses (employment, retail and education) should be sited along corridors to directionally balance peak period travel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Approval of specific plans subdivision of PUD projects should require transit-efficient and pedestrian friendly arterial and collector street patterns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. Discourage leapfrog development in outlying areas and encourage in-fill development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. Use transit patronage potential and VMT as tools to coordinate development approvals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. Promote Smart Growth areas along the Coaster, Sprinter and Trolley stations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. 20-30 du/net acre minimum in transit corridors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14. Integrate supporting retail into residential and employment developments to help minimize dependence on automobile use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transit</strong></td>
<td>1. Take a top-down transit planning approach – network first followed by corridor level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Transit investments should consider best potentials for new ridership and should not ignore current high usage markets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Highway investments as well as transit investments should support livability objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Identify principal transit corridors and station areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Transit level of service investments should be coordinated with the RCP and the Smart Growth Concept Map.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Managed lanes are effective but will likely promote decentralized auto oriented growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Operating speeds, headways, reliability, stop spacing, technology, and customer amenities can all attract ridership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. GPS real time passenger information and real time service monitoring should be a high priority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Design</td>
<td>1. Pedestrian access to transit is as important as development density.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Consider pedestrian circulation, site access, and transit access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Consider pedestrian and transit overlay plans for large employment and special use areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Park-and-rides need to be designed so that they are pedestrian friendly and in turn allow the pedestrian to access transit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. The use of ( \frac{1}{4} ) or ( \frac{1}{2} ) mile radius coverage station areas should be adjusted where topography and natural barriers reduce the effective walk-shed area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>1. Parking can play a significant role in influencing transit ridership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Charging for parking is used to manage demand and encourage rideshare to transit stations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Revise off-street parking requirements so that they are consistent with trip reduction objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Tools</td>
<td>1. Achieving Smart Growth requires three major stakeholders; local governments, developers, and community stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Policies should streamline and simplify project approvals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Local jurisdictions should define infill and priority growth areas for five year periods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Planned land uses must be adopted through General Plans and implemented through zoning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Developers should be offered incentives/ disincentives to encourage investment in redevelopment projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Distribute General Plans, smart growth, transit/pedestrian design guidelines to major developers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Recommendations Related to the Smart Growth Place Types

## Independent Transit Planning Review (ITPR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Metropolitan Center</th>
<th>Urban Center</th>
<th>Town Center</th>
<th>Community Center</th>
<th>Mixed-Use Transit Corridor</th>
<th>Special Use Center</th>
<th>Rural Village</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use/Housing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Quantitative measure of retail uses.</td>
<td>1. 50+ density requirement is too low for an urban center.</td>
<td>1. Separate the retail out of employment and set a retail threshold.</td>
<td>1. Retail measure should be included.</td>
<td>1. Adopt guidelines for promoting “places” within the transit corridors.</td>
<td>1. Recognize size of areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Increase station area densities to ½ mile station area instead of ¼ mile radius.</td>
<td>2. Mixed-use should be a requirement to draw in medical facilities, civic and cultural facilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Add minimum population / employment threshold in addition to density criteria.</td>
<td>3. Mixed-use hubs should be created around transit stations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transit</strong></td>
<td>1. Multi-modal “centroid” to serve as primary transit center.</td>
<td>1. Multi-modal station with a variety of amenities should be stipulated.</td>
<td>1. Designations should include centrally located, multi-modal transit center.</td>
<td>1. There should be a transit mode split.</td>
<td>1. Support efficient movement of transit vehicles through traffic engineering; Ex. Short signal cycles, left turn prohibitions, and transit signal priority</td>
<td>1. Areas will be difficult to serve with transit if they are located more than three miles from a major development area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Metropolitan Center</td>
<td>Urban Center</td>
<td>Town Center</td>
<td>Community Center</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Transit Corridor</td>
<td>Special Use Center</td>
<td>Rural Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parking</strong></td>
<td>1. Add parking program such as paid parking ration, parking maximums, rate surcharges for long term commuter parking, requirements for shared parking.</td>
<td>1. Should have density bonuses for structured parking. 2. Policies should promote “unbundled” parking and have the parking user pay the full cost of parking.</td>
<td>1. Parking guidelines should include paid parking schemes, possible shared parking, and parking design standards. 2. There should be opportunities to integrate park-and-ride facilities.</td>
<td>1. Include parking guidelines.</td>
<td>1. Include parking guidelines.</td>
<td>1. There should be a provision for shared use park-and-ride lots.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specific Recommendations</strong></td>
<td>1. Escondido or Oceanside should be considered for Urban Center designation.</td>
<td>1. Add Town Center to:  - I-15 between Kearny Mesa and Escondido;  - Between La Mesa and Downtown San Diego, near Sabre Springs and Euclid Avenue Station.</td>
<td>1. Should proposed community centers be consolidated into fewer larger centers?</td>
<td>1. Addition of the airport (Lindbergh Field) and the Navy Station as a special use center.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Introduction

In 2001 SANDAG and the Western Riverside Council of Governments (WRCOG) formed an interregional partnership (I-15 IRP), with funding from the California Department of Housing and Community Development to study the job/housing imbalance between Riverside - specifically southwestern Riverside - and San Diego Counties in the I-15 corridor bisecting the two counties. The two agencies focused on examining transportation, housing, and employment characteristics between the two regions and developed strategies that would address ways to reduce the job/housing imbalance that has increased over the past two decades. These strategies were separated into short-, medium-, and long-term objectives. In 2004 Caltrans provided funding to the I-15 IRP to continue to pursue medium-term strategies identified in Phase I of the project, which was completed in 2004. The emphasis for this phase is on implementing specific economic development, transportation, and housing and land use strategies that were identified in the first phase of the project. This report provides a brief update on Phase II for the Regional Planning Technical Working Group’s information, including background on the IRP Joint Policy Committee, the Economic Development Working Group, and updates on the three components of Phase II.

Discussion

I-15 IRP Joint Policy Committee

To monitor Phase II of the I-15 IRP, a Joint Policy Committee was formed between elected officials from Riverside and San Diego. The membership includes representatives from SANDAG’s Borders Committee and representatives from the Boards of WRCOG, the Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC), and the Riverside Transit Agency (RTA) (Attachment 1). The I-15 IRP Joint Policy Committee held its first meeting in Temecula at Temecula City Hall on May 26, 2006. The I-15 IRP Joint Policy Committee met to receive status reports on all of the components at its May 26, 2006, meeting.

An integrated work plan was developed that includes tasks and timelines for the three components of the project: an economic development strategy; a transportation strategy; and a housing strategy. The following is a brief description of each component, current status, and a discussion of policy input.
Economic Development Strategy

Through the I-15 IRP, opportunities exist to improve the economy of both the western Riverside and San Diego regions. An economic development working group was formed and is being staffed by WRCOG. This working group serves as the advisory group for this component.

The core activity of this component is the implementation of an Employment Cluster Analysis. Employment clusters are groups of complementary, competing, and interdependent industries that drive wealth creation in a region. By focusing on “employment” clusters, the two regions can identify and create a foundation for assessing opportunities to improve their local economies. The work program will identify clusters for Riverside County and develop information critical for identifying implementation strategies beneficial to both regions.

Economic Development Working Group (Working Group)

Beginning early this year, the IRP Economic Development Working Group, organized jointly by WRCOG and SANDAG, has been meeting monthly to discuss the progress of the employment cluster analysis of Riverside County. Members of the Working Group include the cities of Canyon Lake, Hemet, Lake Elsinore, Murrieta, Perris, San Jacinto, and Temecula, Riverside County, and economic development organizations of southwest Riverside County, in addition to WRCOG and SANDAG (Attachment 2).

SANDAG is currently preparing the technical work of the cluster analysis as a first step toward the two-county analysis. WRCOG cooperated in obtaining the quarterly employment survey data for Riverside County in 2005, compiled by the California Employment Development Department. The Working Group reviewed the methodology of the cluster analysis and the preliminary candidates for driver industries, which would be the primary members of employment clusters.

Preliminary Analysis

Preliminary analysis of employment concentration and recent growth indicate that industries which rely on an educated workforce are beginning to play an important role in the local economy. Industries with large concentrations or recent growth in employment include medical instruments, electronic components, and telecommunications. These are some of the potential driver industries, which could, over time, generate substantial revenues to the region’s economy. In cooperation with the Working Group, the study is also examining other driver industries which capitalize on unique resources available in Riverside County, such as wine production and logistics, centered on warehousing and transportation.

After identifying the driver industries, the next step in the study is to identify industry clusters which are closely related through business-to-business sales and/or purchases. Identification of those clusters would clarify their market specialization, relative scale (employment), and compensation (payroll). In the coming months, the study also will examine the geographic distribution of cluster industries, with a focus on southwestern Riverside County. Similar analysis would then be performed for the joint economies of Riverside-San Diego Counties. This technical analysis is scheduled to be completed by September and to be reviewed by the Working Group prior to preparation of a final report later this year.
It is expected that findings from the cluster analysis would assist local economic development corporations (EDCs) and others to identify goals and strategies for economic cooperation for Riverside and San Diego counties, with a view toward creating "win-win" situations for both counties and action items that can improve the functional relationship between the San Diego and western Riverside economies. Results of this work should lead to future initiatives in economic cooperation and development, such as:

- identifying key public policy and labor force and physical infrastructure investments;
- identifying needs of the primary occupations for each cluster, with implications for workforce training and other programs; and
- reviewing consistency between occupational needs of cluster industries currently located in Riverside and the graduates produced from area colleges and universities.

**Transportation Strategy**

In this phase of the I-15 IRP, a three-pronged approach is being pursued to improve conditions on the I-15 in the San Diego-southwestern Riverside corridor, especially at the county line. Staff from Caltrans, RCTC, and SANDAG provided updates on each of these activities at the I-15 IRP Policy Committee meeting.

Caltrans District 8 in Riverside/San Bernardino Counties and District 11 in San Diego/Imperial Counties are developing a coordinated plan to identify and assess transportation issues in the I-15 corridor connecting southwestern Riverside and San Diego counties. The report is a joint effort to provide a staging of needs based on traffic projections, programmed and measure-funded projects, and modal options. This approach will examine a number of multi-modal solutions to address the I-15 issues at this location.

Caltrans has developed a list of joint project proposals based on future traffic projections along I-15, projects funded by either Riverside or San Diego County sales tax measures or transportation mitigation fees, local circulation plans, identified RTIP-funded projects, and Regional Transportation Plans (RTPs). An attempt was made to include all projects that were identified in the Southern California Council of Governments (SCAG) and SANDAG RTPs within the lists of projects. The four broad areas of project proposals are Capacity Enhancing, Transit, Operational Improvements, and Intelligent Transportation System (ITS)/Transportation Demand Management (TDM). Upcoming work activities include incorporating District 8's project study reports and preparing the draft report. The draft report will be presented at the next I-15 IRP Policy Committee meeting in September.

RCTC provided an update on passenger rail planning activities on I-15. In May 2005 RCTC directed staff to evaluate a new commuter rail line from Temecula to San Diego to accommodate the large number of Riverside County residents who commute south along I-15. The proposed I-15 Commuter Rail Feasibility study will examine this segment and build upon the work completed by the California High-Speed Rail Authority on the stations and alignments. The purpose of this study is to perform an objective evaluation of the potential for commuter rail extensions along the I-15 corridor from Temecula to Corona and Temecula to San Diego. In addition, RCTC will create a technical advisory committee that will include SANDAG and local governments to provide input into this process. A request for proposals was released in May, and the study is expected to kick off in July for approximately six months.
Finally, SANDAG reported on recent activities related to transit service coordination on the I-15 corridor. SANDAG, the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS), and North County Transit District (NCTD) have developed a draft I-15 Bus Rapid Transit Operations Plan that identified a fairly significant transit demand between Riverside and San Diego Counties. SANDAG will be working with the RTA and RCTC staff to further analyze these travel forecasts and develop operational strategies to service the commuter travel demand between southern Riverside County and high demand destinations within San Diego County. At the meeting it was suggested that SANDAG and RCTC discuss ways in which to collaborate on funding vanpools as a significant number of San Diego’s vanpools originate in Riverside.

**Housing Strategy**

The Phase I report of the I-15 IRP concluded that many of the people moving to southwestern Riverside County were workers in the San Diego region who moved there in search of more affordable housing. It also identified strategies that would assist in the provision of more moderate income housing in the San Diego region and would address the jobs/housing imbalance between the two regions.

During Phase II of the I-15 IRP, SANDAG proposes to undertake a pilot project/feasibility analysis with the assistance of a consultant that would focus on the production of workforce (or moderate income) housing in North County along the Sprinter rail line in collaboration with one or two major employers, many of which have employees who are having difficulty finding affordable housing in proximity to their jobs. The goal of the project is to work with North County local jurisdictions, NCTD, housing developers, and one or two employers to identify the resources, incentives, and strategies needed to construct moderate income workforce housing. SANDAG staff has met with potential partners in this pilot project who have expressed interest in participating, including California State University, San Marcos and Palomar Pomerado Health.

Phase II work on the I-15 housing strategy will assist in the implementation of the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP). The housing chapter of the RCP identifies the need for affordable housing for moderate-income households and more housing choices, and SANDAG’s draft Smart Growth Concept Map provides potential locations for this type of housing to be built. The importance of San Diego and Riverside having an interregional housing strategy established by November in light of the pending statewide bond measure on the ballot was highlighted at the meeting.

**Next Steps**

Draft reports on each of the strategies will be presented to the I-15 IRP Joint Policy Committee on September 29, 2006, at Escondido City Hall.

Attachments:  
1. I-15 IRP Joint Policy Committee Membership Roster  
2. I-15 IRP Economic Development Working Group Membership Roster

Key Staff Contact: Jane Clough-Riquelme, (619) 699-1909, jcl@sandag.org
The primary goal of the I-15 Interregional Partnership (IRP) Joint Policy Committee is to review and provide policy input on Phase II of the I-15 IRP Project. The two regions seek to collaborate on mutually beneficial housing, transportation, and economic planning to improve the quality of life for the region’s residents through the identification and implementation of short-, medium-, and long-range policy strategies.

The Committee will meet three times during the duration of Phase II at dates and times to be mutually determined.
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ENHANCED SMART GROWTH LAND USE SCENARIO
FOR THE 2007 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN (RTP)

Introduction

On June 23, 2006, the SANDAG Board of Directors accepted the Smart Growth Concept Map for planning purposes for the 2007 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). As discussed at previous Technical Working Group (TWG) meetings, the Smart Growth Concept Map will assist in generating alternative land use and transportation scenarios that will be considered as part of the environmental assessment for the comprehensive 2007 RTP update.

Discussion

Land Use Scenarios

1. Existing Plans and Policies Land Use Scenario: This scenario would reflect local inputs into the regional growth forecast, including local inputs on the Existing/Planned smart growth areas.

2. Enhanced Smart Growth Land Use Scenario: This scenario would build upon the Existing Plans and Policies Land Use Scenario described above, and in addition, would incorporate certain land assumptions for the Potential smart growth areas.

As part of the Enhanced Smart Growth Land Use Scenario, certain land use assumptions, or “generic overlays,” have been prepared for each Potential smart growth area place type. The TWG has discussed the generic overlay assumptions at several meetings over the past two years, with the most recent review of the assumptions in March 2006. As discussed at previous meetings, the generic overlays will serve as “placeholders” for transportation modeling purposes until the potential smart growth areas transition into planned smart growth areas. With the exception of Special Use Centers, the generic overlay assumptions, listed in Attachment 1, are based on the most recent information generated from all of the areas that currently qualify as Existing/Planned smart growth areas.

Special Use Centers

Because Special Use centers are so diverse, staff was unable to develop a "generic" set of assumptions for these areas. In general, Special Use Centers consist of the following uses: universities, community colleges, hospitals, and the race track.
As a result, for universities and community colleges, staff applied employment growth trend estimates based on a ratio of employment to student enrollment. For hospitals, staff applied employment growth trend estimates based on a ratio of employment to hospital beds. Finally, because the race track in the City of Del Mar has so many diverse uses over the course of each year and staff was unable to obtain information on its long-term planned land uses, staff did not model any assumptions for this area. As a result, the race track land uses remain constant between the existing plans and policies scenario and the enhanced smart growth land use scenario.

Addition of Two Smart Growth Areas

In addition, the City of San Diego has requested the addition of two potential smart growth areas in the Otay Mesa community: a potential Urban Center in the core of the community and a potential Special Use Center where a Southwestern College satellite campus is planned. These areas were not included in the Smart Growth Concept Map that was presented to the SANDAG Board in June because of the timing and status of the community planning process at that time. However, now that the planning process is further along, the City has requested, and SANDAG staff has expressed support for, the inclusion of these potential smart growth areas in the smart growth land use scenario for analysis in the 2007 RTP. These proposed revisions to the Smart Growth Concept Map will be presented to the SANDAG Board at its September 22, 2006, meeting.

Preliminary Results of Enhanced Smart Growth Land Use Scenario

Using (1) the Board-accepted Smart Growth Concept Map; (2) the most recent set of generic overlay assumptions; (3) the revised assumptions for the Potential Special Use Centers as described above; and (4) the two additional Potential smart growth areas proposed by the City of San Diego in Otay Mesa, staff has now completed the enhanced smart growth land use alternative for the 2007 RTP.

Preliminary results indicate that the region increases its housing unit capacity (the number of additional units that can be built) by 88,000 units and its employment capacity (the number of additional jobs that could be accommodated) by 198,000. The additional housing unit capacity reduces the number of units located outside the region that house San Diego workers from nearly 100,000 to 35,000 in the year 2030. This is a decline of nearly 65 percent.

Next Steps

The enhanced smart growth land use scenario will now be used for transportation modeling purposes in the environmental document for the 2007 RTP. Staff will develop a series of transportation and transit alternatives to test under the two land use scenarios. The TWG, along with the CTAC and other working groups, will continue to receive status reports on these efforts and will be requested to provide input at key points in the process.

Attachment: 1. Assumptions Used to Create Model Potential Smart Growth Areas for the Enhanced Smart Growth Land Use Scenario for the 2007 RTP

Key Staff Contact: Ed Schafer, (619) 699-1967, esc@sandag.org
### Assumptions Used to Create Model Potential Smart Growth Areas
for Enhanced Smart Growth Land Use Scenario
for the 2007 Regional Transportation Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Smart Growth Place Type</th>
<th>Density Assumptions</th>
<th>Land Use Distribution Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Center</td>
<td>60 units/acre</td>
<td>60 emps./acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Center</td>
<td>40 units/acre</td>
<td>50 emps./acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Center</td>
<td>30 units/acre</td>
<td>50 emps./acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Village</td>
<td>11 units/acre</td>
<td>25 emps./acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Corridor</td>
<td>40 units/acre</td>
<td>40 emps./acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Use</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Individually Tailored</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

09.07.06
Introduction

The Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP), adopted by the SANDAG Board of Directors in July 2004, is now moving into the implementation phase. Chapter 8 of the RCP describes using performance indicators as a tool to track our progress in implementing the plan. Many of the strategies and actions recommended in the Plan will take years to develop and fund. Therefore, it is important to have a consistent and valid set of indicators that can reflect the sometimes subtle changes that occur over the long run. Future performance monitoring reports on these indicators will be used to assess the degree to which RCP implementation is influencing the quality of life in the region.

Monitoring our progress in implementing the RCP is both a recommendation of the Plan and a legal requirement. Assembly Bill 361 included the specific requirement that SANDAG monitor progress through “realistic measurable standards and criteria, which must be included in the RCP itself and made available to the public.” The list of indicators was published as part of the RCP.

The attached RCP Baseline Report for Performance Monitoring (Baseline Report) establishes a benchmark for future monitoring. The Baseline Report discusses the significance of each indicator and identifies targets for certain indicators. Initial analysis of the data collected and a discussion of SANDAG’s work efforts underway that may influence performance over time also is included in the Baseline Report. On August 4, 2006, the Regional Planning Committee and Transportation Committee authorized release of the draft Baseline Report for a 60-day public review and comment period. The review period closes on October 3, 2006.

Discussion

When preparing the RCP, SANDAG’s Regional Planning Committee, the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG), and the previous Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group (SWG) developed a set of performance indicators to monitor the region’s progress toward achieving the goals and objectives of the RCP. The indicators are organized into the following six categories that relate back to the RCP:

1. Urban Form/Transportation
2. Housing
3. Healthy Environment – Natural Habitats, Water Quality, Shoreline Preservation, Air Quality
4. Economic Prosperity
6. Borders
The complete set of indicators is included in the attached Baseline Report.

Data are available for most but not all of the indicators. Where data were not available, the report explains when data are expected for future reports and identifies the source.

**Initial Targets**

In addition to the indicators, staff recommended and reviewed a set of targets with the Regional Planning Committee in December 2005 that were based upon existing laws or adopted policy. As a result, four targets have been incorporated into the Baseline Report and address the areas of:

- Beach Widths
- Kilowatt Hours of Electricity Used Per Capita at Peak Hours
- Share of Energy Produced In the Region vs. Imported
- Share of Energy Produced from Renewable Resources

Setting targets for other indicators will be done with the Regional Planning Committee, the Transportation Committee, the Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group, and the Regional Planning Technical Working Group over the next year.

**Report Highlights**

While the focus of this report is on establishing a baseline for future annual performance monitoring, the report highlights certain areas where the region appears to be moving in the right direction and others where improvement is needed.

**Moving in the Right Direction**

- Nearly one-third of new housing units built in 2005 were in Smart Growth Opportunity Areas
- Ninety-nine percent of the region’s housing stock is located within the San Diego County Water Authority’s service area
- Transit ridership has trended upward with population growth
- Crime has decreased
- Beach closures have declined
- Air quality has improved
- The workforce in San Diego is increasingly well educated
- The share of the region’s energy produced from renewable resources has increased significantly
Areas for Improvement

- The region continues to experience a serious housing affordability problem
- Congestion on most roads and freeways has increased over the last ten years as have total hours of delay per traveler
- Many waterbodies have some degree of impairment
- Several beaches are losing sand
- Job growth in the region has been concentrated in low-wage industries

Next Steps

This report is being provided to the Regional Planning Stakeholders and Technical Working Groups in September for review and comment. Once the 60-day public comment period is complete, the final report will be prepared and forwarded to the Board of Directors for consideration and acceptance as the Baseline Report for RCP Monitoring.

Over the next year, staff will work with the working groups and the Regional Planning Committee to establish targets for other indicators and will seek input on future reporting formats. The approach to target-setting in the next year will be based on updates of existing and future plans and policies as they are adopted.

Conclusion

Many of the actions and paradigm shifts discussed in the RCP may take years to develop, fund, and implement. Some short-term impacts are likely to be subtle, though some will be more noticeable. This Baseline Report will serve as a benchmark for monitoring progress. If progress is not made over time, SANDAG, through its Policy Advisory Committees and the Board, may wish to re-evaluate the strategies and actions recommended in the RCP.
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

BACKGROUND

Over the next 30 years, San Diego County is expected to grow by more than one million people, bringing the total population to almost four million. Many of these people will be our children and grandchildren. Where will they live? Where will they work? And what will the region around them be like?

The region’s 19 local governments, working under the umbrella of the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG), have developed a plan to address our region’s projected population growth. The goal is to ensure a high quality of life for ourselves and our future generations — to work toward a society that has resolved its housing shortage, transportation problems, and energy issues, and provides healthy, desirable environments for people and nature.

MANDATE ON MONITORING RCP PERFORMANCE

Thousands of people collaborated to produce the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) over a nearly two-year period. Individuals, stakeholders, planning directors, public works directors, city managers, community-based organizations, elected officials, and representatives from tribal governments, state and federal agencies, neighboring counties, and the Republic of Mexico all contributed to the plan’s formation. The RCP was adopted by the SANDAG Board in July of 2004.

The result is a consensus statement of the region’s vision, core values, key issues, goals, objectives, and needed actions. It is a comprehensive summary of where we are today, where we want to be tomorrow, and what we need to do to get there.

But how will we track our progress? In many cases, we are talking about making major changes in our current ways of doing business, looking out 30 years and beyond. Many of the actions and paradigm shifts discussed in the plan may take years to develop, fund, and implement. Some short-term impacts are likely to be subtle. Some will be more noticeable. Over time, however, smart decisions and the cumulative effects of our actions will result in the future that the plan envisions.
Monitoring our progress is not just a good idea, it’s a legal requirement. Assembly Bill 361 (Kehoe) was signed into law in September 2003. It declares that the intent of the legislature is that SANDAG shall “complete the public process of preparing and adopting a regional comprehensive plan…by June 30, 2004.” And it contains specific language regarding monitoring:

“To ensure that the vision and goals of the regional comprehensive plan are implemented, the consolidated agency [SANDAG] must monitor its progress through realistic measurable standards and criteria, which must be included in the regional comprehensive plan itself and made available to the public.”

**STRATEGIC INITIATIVES**

Because of the wide range of actions included in the RCP, participants developed a list of “Strategic Initiatives,” that is, sets of priority actions to be undertaken by various groups to implement the recommended actions and concepts in the adopted plan. The Strategic Initiatives allow for the recommended actions to be organized into manageable units of work and prioritized by timeframe, helping ensure implementation.

Several “Early Actions” were included in the list. These are actions that were underway prior to adoption of the RCP in July 2004, or were expected to be initiated immediately after adoption. All of the “Early Actions” identified have been initiated and include:

- Preparation of a Smart Growth Concept Map
- Development of a regional funding program for MOBILITY 2030 (TransNet)
- Evaluation of the use of transportation impact funding
- Adoption of updated Regional Housing Needs Assessment
- Development of a regional habitat funding program

Many other Strategic Initiatives are underway or are planned to be undertaken in this fiscal year. Further discussion on efforts underway is included in the conclusion of the various sections of this report.

**WHERE WE NEED TO IMPROVE**

As a region, we should provide enough homes to meet the demand created by projected job and population growth. The RCP recognizes that local land use plans, if left unchanged, do not provide enough capacity to meet the region’s projected housing needs over time. If housing capacities in key locations of our more urbanized areas are not increased, more San Diego workers will live in surrounding areas including Riverside and Imperial Counties and Baja California. The result for our region will be a continued housing crisis and worsening traffic. Furthermore, the RCP calls for the San Diego region to take more responsibility for its own housing needs and create additional housing and mixed use capacity in appropriate locations.

The major challenges before us are how to intelligently use the small amount of remaining undeveloped land designated for residential development, how to protect our natural
environment, how to maximize urban redevelopment and infill opportunities, and how to coordinate these revitalization efforts with our current and future transportation networks, maximizing mobility within our region.

From an economic perspective, the RCP calls for creating opportunities for an improving standard of living. This report indicates that while our workforce is increasingly well-educated, job growth in the region has been concentrated in low wage industries. And, overall, our region’s standard of living is growing very slowly and we have not made progress on reducing poverty.

REPORT HIGHLIGHTS

Based on the data collected for this Baseline Report, some highlights become apparent both positive and in areas where improvement is needed.

Moving in the right direction

- Nearly one-third of new housing units built in 2005 were in Smart Growth Opportunity Areas
- Ninety nine percent of the region’s housing stock is located within the San Diego County Water Authority service area.
- Transit ridership has fluctuated upward with population growth
- Crime has decreased
- Beach closures have declined
- Air quality has improved
- The work force in San Diego is increasingly well-educated
- The share of the region’s energy produced from renewable resources has increased significantly

Areas for improvement

- The region continues to experience a serious housing affordability problem
- Congestion on most roads and freeways has increased over the last ten years as have total hours of delay per traveler
- Many waterbodies have some degree of impairment
- Several beaches are losing sand
- Job growth in the region has been concentrated in low-wage industries

Many of the actions and paradigm shifts discussed in the Regional Comprehensive Plan may take years to develop, fund, and implement. Some short-term impacts are likely to be subtle, though some will be more noticeable. This baseline report will serve as the benchmark for monitoring progress. If progress is not made over time, SANDAG, through its policy committees or the Board may wish to re-evaluate the strategies and actions recommended in the RCP.
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DEVELOPING INDICATORS

The set of performance indicators included in the RCP were discussed and developed by The SANDAG Regional Planning Committee and the Regional Planning Technical and Stakeholders Working Groups to monitor the region’s progress toward achieving the goals and objectives of the RCP. A primary prerequisite for all of the annual indicators was that they must be based on data that is available, consistent, and reliable. In addition, the groups clarified other characteristics for the indicators:

- **Regional**: The indicators are intended to focus on the region as a whole, not on individual jurisdictions or subregions.

- **Quality of Life**: The indicators are to be used for monitoring the region’s quality of life and are not intended to be used as the criteria for distributing incentives. Overall, the indicators are intended to answer the questions: “Is the RCP being implemented?” and “Is RCP implementation having a positive impact on the region?”

- **Flexibility**: Some of the indicators may evolve. As new technologies and data resources become available, the list of indicators could be updated and indicators that were once the best available could be replaced by better, more representative, or more informative indicators.

- **Annual and Periodic Indicators**: While it is the intent to update the indicators on an annual basis, the final project monitoring could include both a core group of annually-updated indicators and a set of periodic, more comprehensive indicators updated every three to five years. For example, specific habitat monitoring projects may only be feasible every few years, but would yield valuable information.

When the SANDAG Board of Directors adopted the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) in July 2004, a commitment was made to monitor our progress toward implementing the plan.

In addition to monitoring the RCP, SANDAG undertakes three other performance monitoring programs on a regular basis:

- The Regional Transportation Plan
- The State of the Commute
- The Sustainable Competitiveness Index
These programs are currently maintained independently, but work is underway to coordinate and integrate the four performance monitoring programs. Integration of the programs will result in greater consistency at a policy level, and improved efficiency of data collection at an administrative level.

In integrating the programs, the RCP will provide the overarching framework for all performance monitoring at SANDAG. All monitoring efforts would use RCP monitoring indicators to the extent possible.

Staff responsible for each monitoring program is currently working to refine and integrate the programs, streamline the indicators required by each program, and perhaps even collapse or combine some of the reports or the indicators included therein.

Table 1 presents the final set of annual indicators developed by the three groups and includes the addition of one new indicator (Balanced Job Growth). The indicators are grouped by RCP subject and goal category:

- Urban Form and Transportation
- Housing
- Healthy Environments – Natural Habitats, Water Quality, Shoreline Preservation, Air Quality
- Economic Prosperity
- Borders

**ESTABLISHING A BASELINE**

This report provides a baseline by which to measure future performance. The report features a discussion of the significance and initial findings from the data collected for each indicator. Data were not available for five indicators at the time this report was prepared: Travel Times and Volumes for Key Auto and Transit Corridors; Habitat Conserved Within Designated Preserve Areas; Percent of Habitat Preserve Area Actively Maintained; Lagoon Health; and Participation in SENTRI Lanes, Pedestrian Commuter Program, Free and Secure Trade Program. However, data for these indicators is expected to be available in the next one to two years. Additionally, since the initial list of indicators was prepared, the SANDAG Board of Directors approved the Regional Housing Needs Assessment which will be part of future reporting for the Share of New Units by Structure Type and Income Category.

At the conclusion of each section of this report, there is a discussion of work efforts underway that may, over time, influence the outcome of the various indicators. For example, the Smart Growth Incentive Program is intended to increase the region’s share of housing and jobs in Smart Growth Opportunity Areas and to reduce pressure for development outside the San Diego County Water Authority Boundary.
Table 1
ANNUAL INDICATORS FOR MONITORING THE REGIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

1. URBAN FORM / TRANSPORTATION
   1. Share of new units and jobs located in Smart Growth Opportunity Areas
   2. Share of new housing units within County Water Authority water service boundary
   3. Annual transit ridership
   4. Commute mode shares (single occupancy vehicles, carpool, transit, walking, biking, etc.)
   5. Travel times and volumes for key auto corridors and key transit corridors
   6. Miles of deficient roads on Congestion Management Program network
   7. Annual hours of delay per capita
   8. Regional crime rates

2. HOUSING
   1. Housing Affordability Index (compares median home ownership costs to median income)
   2. Percent of households with housing costs greater than 35 percent of income
   3. Ratio of new jobs to new housing units
   4. Share of new and existing units by structure type (single family, multifamily) and income category
   5. Vacancy rates
   6. Percent of households living in overcrowded conditions
   7. Number of households on the waiting list for Section 8 (housing assistance) Vouchers

3. HEALTHY ENVIRONMENT
   **Natural Habitats**
   1. Habitat conserved within designated preserve areas (acres and percent of preserve area)
   2. Percent of preserve area actively maintained (removal of invasive species, trash removal, fence repairs)
   **Water Quality**
   3. Number of beach closures and advisories per rainfall inch measured at Lindbergh Field
   4. Impaired waterbodies (miles or acres) based on Federal Clean Water Act 303(d) criteria
   **Shoreline Preservation**
   5. Beach widths
   6. Lagoon health (salinity, dissolved oxygen levels)
   **Air Quality**
   7. Air Quality Index (number of days "unhealthy for sensitive groups" with AQI > 100)

4. ECONOMIC PROSPERITY
   1. Labor Force Educational attainment (Share of adult population with high school, college, and graduate education)
   2. Balanced Job Growth
   3. Employment growth in high-wage economic clusters
   4. Regional unemployment rate compared to state and nation
   5. Real per capita income
   6. Regional poverty rate Compared to state and nation
### 5. PUBLIC FACILITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water Supply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Water consumption per capita and total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Diversity of water supply (share of regional water supply, by source)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Amount of reclaimed water used</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Energy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Kilowatt-hours of electricity used per capita at peak hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Share of energy produced in the region vs. imported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Share of energy produced from renewable resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Waste Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Percent of waste that is recycled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Landfill space available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6. BORDERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BORDERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Interregional traffic volumes into San Diego from surrounding counties and Baja California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Border wait times for personal trips and goods movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Participation in SENTRI Lanes, pedestrian commuter program, Free and Secure Trade (FAST) program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SETTING TARGETS

Specific targets to be used as part of the performance measures have been identified for four indicators: Beach Widths, Kilowatt Hours of Electricity Used Per Capita at Peak Hours, Share of Energy Produced In-County vs. Imported, and Share of Energy Produced from Renewable Resources. All four of these targets are either included in existing legislation or adopted SANDAG policies and were reviewed with the Regional Planning Committee in December 2005.

Setting targets for the other indicators will be done with the Regional Planning Committee, the Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group and the Regional Planning Technical Working Group over the next year. Where possible, both a short-range target—possibly five years—and a year 2030 target will be developed for each indicator.

By establishing a comprehensive set of performance indicators, we can begin to measure our success as we realize the goals of the Regional Comprehensive Plan.
URBAN FORM AND TRANSPORTATION
INTRODUCTION

The form of future development is a critical component of the Regional Comprehensive Plan. Central among the plan’s core values is creating attractive, sustainable communities within the region’s existing urbanized areas. Urban design matters at a regional scale and at a personal scale. Our land use and design decisions determine how well our communities serve us in our daily lives, including the quality of our travel choices and our personal safety. That’s why the RCP encourages urban development with an appropriate mix of uses designed to create safe and healthy communities. In addition, the relationship between regional transportation plans and local land use plans and policies is crucial in ensuring that the region’s transportation system efficiently connects our communities.

The indicator data included in this chapter establish a baseline for tracking progress toward the following goals included in the RCP:

- Focus future population and job growth away from rural areas and closer to existing and planned job centers and public facilities to preserve open space and to make more efficient use of existing urban infrastructure
- Create safe, healthy, walkable, and vibrant communities that are designed and built accessible to people of all abilities
- Integrate the development of land use and transportation, recognizing their interdependence
- Develop a flexible, sustainable, and well-integrated transportation system that focuses on moving people and goods – not just vehicles

The indicators designated for tracking progress toward the above urban form and transportation goals are as follows:

1. Share of New Housing Units and Jobs Located in Smart Growth Opportunity Areas
2. Share of New Housing Units Within County Water Authority Water Service Boundary
3. Annual Transit Ridership
4. Commute Mode Shares
5. Travel Times and Volumes for Key Auto and Key Transit Corridors (future indicator)
6. Miles of Deficient Roads on Congestion Management Program Network
7. Annual Hours of Traffic Delay Per Traveler
8. Regional Crime Rate
1. Share of New Housing Units and Jobs Located in Smart Growth Opportunity Areas

Significance

A primary goal of the RCP is to balance regional population, housing, and employment growth with habitat preservation, agriculture, open space, and infrastructure needs. The RCP further calls for improving connections between land use and transportation plans through incentives and collaboration. The identification of Smart Growth Opportunity Areas – places that accommodate, or have the potential to accommodate, higher residential and/or employment densities near public transit – will provide a basis for directing transportation improvements, other public facility investments, and incentives through the TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program.

In collaboration with all member agencies, a Draft Smart Growth Concept Map has been prepared and was accepted by the Board of Directors for planning purposes in June 2006. The Concept Map includes nearly 200 existing, planned, or potential smart growth areas that have been recommended by each of the region’s 18 cities and the County.

Over time, the number of new housing units and jobs located in Smart Growth Opportunity Areas will serve as an indicator of the region’s success in collaborating with and creating incentives for development in smart growth areas and reducing pressure to develop in the region’s backcountry. The data below represent new units in those Smart Growth Opportunity Areas that have been identified as “Existing/Planned.”

Findings

The smart growth areas identified on the Draft Smart Growth Concept Map currently include 162,132 housing units and 368,162 jobs. In total nearly 15 percent of all the housing units in the region and 25 percent of all the jobs are located within the “Existing/Planned” areas. In 2005, new housing units in Smart Growth Opportunity Areas comprised nearly 33 percent of all new housing units in the region. This represents a increase over the previous year (14.9%).

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Housing Units</th>
<th>Housing Units in Smart Growth Areas</th>
<th>Total Jobs</th>
<th>Jobs in Smart Growth Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1,095,077</td>
<td>157,725</td>
<td>1,449,349</td>
<td>368,162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1,108,500</td>
<td>162,132</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SANDAG Annual Population and Housing Estimates.
Figure 1
NEW HOUSING UNITS IN SMART GROWTH OPPORTUNITY AREAS COMPARED TO NEW HOUSING UNITS IN THE SAN DIEGO REGION (2005)

Source: SANDAG Annual Population and Housing Estimates.

Figure 2
JOBS IN SMART GROWTH OPPORTUNITY AREAS COMPARED TO JOBS IN THE SAN DIEGO REGION (2004)

Source: SANDAG Current Estimates Program.
2. **Share of New Housing Units within County Water Authority Service Boundary**

**Significance**

A primary goal of the RCP is to limit sprawl, especially into the backcountry. Specifically, the RCP recommends that the region focus future population and job growth away from rural areas and closer to existing and planned job centers and public facilities. The San Diego County Water Authority (Water Authority) service boundary serves as a useful distinction between existing urban/suburban areas and the backcountry.

**Findings**

Since the year 2000, about 99 percent of the region’s new housing units were constructed within the Water Authority service boundary.

![Figure 3](image)

**Figure 3**

SAN DIEGO REGION NEW UNITS IN COUNTY WATER AUTHORITY SERVICE AREA COMPARED TO TOTAL NEW UNITS (2005)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Units</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13,277</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SANDAG Current Estimates Program

3. **Annual Transit Ridership**

**Significance**

The RCP sets out an objective of developing a network of fast, convenient, high-quality transit services that is competitive with the cost and time of driving alone, especially during peak periods. Annual transit ridership will increase if this goal is met, and transit should, over time, play an
increased role in addressing regional mobility needs. Increases in transit opportunities and transit use provide citizens with more transportation choices and greater mobility. The following data examine annual ridership trends between 1996 and 2005 as compared with growth rates in population and vehicle miles traveled (VMT).

Findings

The trend in annual transit ridership since 1968 has been increasing. Between 1996 and 2005, annual transit ridership in the San Diego region increased from 62 million riders to nearly 88 million riders, representing an increase of more than 41 percent. While ridership declined somewhat between 2001 and 2004, the year 2005 reflects the first increase in ridership since 2001, suggesting that this trend may be reversing itself.

The growth in transit ridership outpaced growth in population and vehicle miles traveled; demonstrating that the role of transit in serving regional mobility needs has increased. This role may increase further in the future for several reasons:

- The recent opening of the new Green Line trolley
- The future opening of the SPRINTER rail line
- System structural changes being made by both the Metropolitan Transit System and North County Transit District
- The increased attractiveness of transit in light of higher fuel prices
- The increased funding for transit over the long-term given the recent extension of the TransNet program, which will allow for significant capital infrastructure improvements for rail and bus services, and operating funds for new and expanded services, including Bus Rapid Transit

Figure 4
SAN DIEGO REGION ANNUAL TRANSIT BOARDINGS (1968-2004)

Source: Annual Boarding’s Data, Metropolitan Transit System and North County Transit District.
Figure 5
GROWTH IN TRANSIT RIDERSHIP COMPARED TO VEHICLE MILES TRAVELED AND POPULATION IN THE SAN DIEGO REGION (1996-2003)

Table 3
GROWTH IN TRANSIT RIDERSHIP COMPARED TO GROWTH IN POPULATION AND VEHICLE MILES TRAVELED IN THE SAN DIEGO REGION (1996-2005)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Annual Transit Ridership</th>
<th>Annual Vehicle Miles Traveled</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>62,080,336</td>
<td>65,532,000</td>
<td>2,621,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>78,047,377</td>
<td>67,354,000</td>
<td>2,653,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>86,446,912</td>
<td>69,665,000</td>
<td>2,702,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>90,582,180</td>
<td>71,984,000</td>
<td>2,751,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>96,024,045</td>
<td>73,632,000</td>
<td>2,813,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>95,128,745</td>
<td>75,795,000</td>
<td>2,863,657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>89,953,608</td>
<td>78,117,000</td>
<td>2,920,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>87,224,915</td>
<td>79,442,000</td>
<td>2,971,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>85,902,494</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3,013,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>87,770,419</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3,051,280</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+25,144,579</td>
<td>+41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+13,910,000</td>
<td>+21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+350,705</td>
<td>+13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Metropolitan Transit System, North County Transit District, SANDAG.
4. Commute Mode Shares

Significance

Transportation goals in the RCP include providing a wide range of convenient, efficient, and safe travel choices, and reducing traffic congestion on freeways and arterials. Commute modes other than single-occupant private vehicles help reduce traffic congestion and air pollution and improve the efficiency of the transportation system by maximizing the person carrying capacity. Thus, commute mode shares are used as an indicator of success in providing a wide range of travel choices and reducing congestion.

Commute mode share data are currently unavailable at the corridor level on an annual basis, although this is expected to change. (See SANDAG Role discussion at the end of this Section.) However, regional data on mode share is available each year from the Census Bureau’s American Community Survey (ACS).

Findings

In terms of the commute to work, recent Census data for the 2004-2005 period\(^1\) shows that the automobile continues to be the primary mode of travel in the region for about 81 percent of the home-to-work trips being made. It should be noted that this figure represents a typical means of travel to work and does not reflect activities such as carpooling or riding transit only once a week or occasionally. Such populations are presumably more likely to use transit or modes other than driving alone, so their exclusion from the survey may mean the commute mode shares for transit (about 4%) may be understated.

The other consideration is that these figures only provide a general indication of how people are getting to work on a region-wide basis and do not reflect the effect transit has on commute travel in specific corridors where transit investments have been focused. There are significant differences in commute behavior between communities within the San Diego region. The role of transit is maximized in areas that have transit-supportive land use densities and urban design. Thus, in transit supportive areas like downtown San Diego and City Heights in the Mid-City area are two areas that are well-served by transit. Accordingly, the 2000 Census found that they have transit commute mode shares of 20 percent and 11 percent, respectively. Conversely, in areas that are not transit-supportive from a land use standpoint, such as Spring Valley or San Marcos, generate just a two percent transit commute mode share.

---

\(^1\) American Community Survey, U.S. Census Bureau
5. Travel Times and Volumes for Key Auto and Key Transit Corridors

Significance and Future Reporting

The RCP includes the goals of reducing traffic congestion on freeways and arterials, and developing a network of fast, convenient, high-quality transit services that are competitive with the time to drive alone during peak periods. Progress toward these goals can be measured by evaluating travel times and volumes for key auto and transit corridors.

Travel time and volume data on freeways will be provided by the Performance Measurement System (PeMS), a Web based system used for reporting and monitoring the performance of the freeway system. Freeway detector stations produce volume and lane occupancy information every 30 seconds. Once data is aggregated for each detector station, PeMS can apply algorithms to estimate a number of performance indicators.

The quality of transit related data for this indicator available at this time is somewhat limited. However, data sources for future monitoring reports are being investigated. Currently, travel time is available from transit schedules. Transit volume data are currently available from the SANDAG Regional Passenger Counting Program where transit ridership volumes are estimated for each transit route once a year. These data sources will likely be used in the near-term until a more sophisticated approach can be implemented.
6. Miles of Deficient Roads on Congestion Management Program Network

Significance

The Congestion Management Program (CMP) network is a subset of the region’s most heavily used arterial roadways and freeways, as shown in Map 1 (2006 CMP Roadway Network map). The roads on the network are regularly monitored and rated to determine their Level of Service (LOS). Roadway LOS is a measure used to evaluate how well a roadway section or intersection operates. LOS is commonly described in letter form, ranging from LOS A (least congested) to LOS F (most congested). Peak hour levels of service in 2005 for all roads on the network are shown on Map 2 (2005 Peak Hour LOS map). Congested roadways and freeways (those designated with LOS F) are considered “deficient.” The number of miles of deficient roads are key indicators to monitor the success of implementing MOBILITY 2030, the transportation component of the RCP. As traffic worsens, the number of deficient miles increases.

Findings

When compared to prior years, congestion has stabilized on the region’s freeways and conventional highways. Congestion fluctuated on the region’s arterials between 2001 and 2005. Between 2001 and 2003, the number of deficient miles on the region’s highways decreased slightly and remained the same in 2005. But the number of deficient miles increased considerably on arterials between 2001 and 2003, then decreased somewhat in 2005. Freeways also showed a slight increase in the number of deficient miles, followed by stabilization in 2005.

---

2 Arterials, Freeways, Highways Defined:
Principal Arterials – Signalized streets that serve primarily through traffic and provide access to abutting properties as a secondary function. For example, Balboa Avenue from I-5 to I-15.
Freeways – Multilane divided roadways grade separated from other roadways, with full control access and egress. For example, Interstate 5.
Highways – State or federally-designated urban or rural routes, designed to accommodate longer trips in the region. For example, State Route 75.
Figure 6

### Table 4

**Percent Deficient Roads**
Percent deficient is calculated from Miles Deficient and Total Miles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Arterials</th>
<th>Highways</th>
<th>Freeways</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2001</strong></td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2003</strong></td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2005</strong></td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Miles of Deficient Roads**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Arterials</th>
<th>Highways</th>
<th>Freeways</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2001</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2003</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2005</strong></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Miles of Total Roads**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Arterials</th>
<th>Highways</th>
<th>Freeways</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2001</strong></td>
<td>98</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2003</strong></td>
<td>98</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2005</strong></td>
<td>102</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ID Values**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Deficient</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>117</strong></td>
<td>117</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>116</strong></td>
<td>116</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>107</strong></td>
<td>107</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Map 2
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7. Annual Hours of Traffic Delay Per Traveler

Significance

Annual hours of traffic delay per traveler is a key indicator for monitoring the success of implementing MOBILITY 2030, the transportation component of the RCP. Whereas average travel time during the peak period is a good measure of performance in individual corridors, annual hours of delay is a better overall regional indicator of the time residents spend in traffic each year - increased time spent in traffic typically corresponds to decreases in residents’ productivity and quality of life, and an increase in air pollution. As traffic worsens, annual hours of delay increases.

Findings

The region’s residents are spending an increasing amount of time in traffic. Annual hours of traffic delay represents the extra travel time it takes travelers to complete a trip during peak periods (6 to 9 a.m. and 4 to 7 p.m.) as a result of congestion. Between 1996 and 2003, the region experienced a 79 percent increase in the average hours of traffic delay per traveler during peak periods.

In Figure 7, delay continues to grow as annual vehicle miles of travel (VMT) outpaces the growth in population, employment, and new highway miles. Major highway improvements that may have contributed to the slower growth of traffic delay in the years 1997 and 1999-2001 include the State Route 76 expressway in Oceanside, portions of State Route 125 north of Interstate 8, and State Route 15 south of Interstate 8. The recent completion of the Green Line trolley extension to San Diego State University, along with projects underway at the I-5/I-805/SR 56 interchange and in the I-15 may help to curb the upward trend in regional traffic delay.3

---

3 Annual Hours of Traffic Delay per Capita: To calculate “Annual Hours of Delay,” Texas Transportation Institute estimates the daily vehicle hours delay per incident (delays that result from accidents or broken down vehicles) and recurring (predictable) conditions for both freeways and principal arterials. This is then multiplied by a factor of 250 (represents working days per year) and 1.25 (represents average persons per vehicle).
Figure 7
ANNUAL HOURS OF TRAFFIC DELAY PER TRAVELER DURING PEAK PERIODS (1996-2003)

![Graph showing annual hours of delay per traveler during peak periods from 1996 to 2003.](image)

Source: Annual Urban Mobility Study, Texas Transportation Institute.

Table 5
ANNUAL HOURS OF TRAFFIC DELAY PER TRAVELER DURING PEAK PERIODS (1996-2003)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Hours of Traffic Delay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Annual Urban Mobility Study, Texas Transportation Institute.

8. Regional Crime Rate

Significance

One goal of the RCP is to create safe, healthy, walkable, and vibrant communities. The regional crime rate, as measured by Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) Index Crimes, is one way to measure safety. FBI Index Crimes include homicide, rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny, and motor vehicle theft.
Findings

Crime in the region decreased significantly between 1995 and 1999, and has remained relatively constant since 1999. Some explanation for this trend can be found in the SANDAG Criminal Justice Research Division April 2006 report entitled Twenty-Five Years of Crime in the San Diego Region: 1981 through 2005:

“A number of theories have been provided regarding possible factors related to this overall drop in crime, including declining numbers of young males in high crime-associated age groups, legislation which increased jail and prison time for violent offenses, economic factors, and the implementation of effective crime prevention programs.”

Figure 8
FBI INDEX CRIMES PER 1,000 POPULATION (1995-2005)

Source: SANDAG Criminal Justice Research Division (data provided by local law enforcement agencies).

URBAN FORM AND TRANSPORTATION SUMMARY

Conclusions

It is promising that one-third of the new housing units built in 2005 were in Smart Growth Opportunity Areas, and that 99 percent of the region’s housing stock is located within the Water Authority service area. Transit ridership has fluctuated, but the general trend over the last decade is upward. In some areas, as much as 20 percent of commute trips are made by transit. However, traffic congestion on most of our roads and freeways has increased over the last 10 years, as have total hours of travel delay. Crime has declined significantly.
Future Target Setting

Currently no targets have been set for this group of indicators. Targets may be developed in the future for some or all of the indicators as a result of discussions among local elected officials, stakeholders, and SANDAG staff. The Independent Transit Planning Review panel has recommended that commute mode share targets be set for defined corridors. SANDAG has identified a preliminary set of key transportation corridors that will be used to monitor mode share and other transportation related performance indicators.

SANDAG Role

As the region’s transportation planning agency, SANDAG plays many roles with regard to the regional transportation goals laid out in the RCP. Here is a list of some of the pertinent programs and projects. More detailed information is available from the SANDAG public information office and Web site.

2007 Regional Transportation Plan

The Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) will next be updated in 2007. One of the purposes of the RTP is to better connect our freeway, transit, and road networks to our homes, schools, work, shopping, and other activities. The 2007 Regional Transportation Plan will build upon MOBILITY 2030, the RTP adopted in 2003, as well as the 2006 RTP Update and Supplemental Environmental Impact Report. The 2007 RTP will continue to strengthen the land use transportation connection and offer regional transportation funding incentives to jurisdictions that support smarter, more sustainable land use.

As an input to the 2007 RTP, an Independent Transit Planning Review (ITPR) was designed to provide an independent assessment of the transit plan contained in the 2030 Mobility Plan. A peer review panel, made up of transit planning, transit operations, and land use experts from around North America, helped guide the study process and work of a technical consultant. In addition to providing recommendations on the transit plan and project corridors, they also discussed the need for increased coordination of SANDAG Smart Growth initiatives and overall RCP goals with transportation planning...Recommendations contained in the final report prepared by the peer review panel and consultant will serve as input into the 2007 comprehensive update of the RTP.

Smart Growth Concept Map

The draft Smart Growth Concept Map lays out almost 200 existing, planned, or potential smart growth locations that have been identified by the 18 cities and the County of San Diego as Smart Growth Opportunity Areas. The Map will provide a framework for such programs as the TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program, and recommendations that will be included in the 2007 RTP. The final map will be approved in 2007.
Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program and the TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program

The Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program awarded $19 million of federal Transportation Enhancement funds to projects throughout the region that integrate smart growth land uses and transportation facilities. Lessons learned from the Pilot Program will guide the design of the TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program, which will fund $7 million in projects each year beginning in 2009.

Urban Design Guidelines

SANDAG is preparing Smart Growth Urban Design Guidelines that will provide guidance to local governments, planners, developers, community members, and others in defining smart growth development principles.

Congestion Management Program

The Congestion Management Program (CMP) provides innovative options for managing our region’s traffic congestion now and into the future. The CMP addresses both current and future congestion, giving jurisdictions options for implementing innovative and preventive congestion management strategies. The CMP addresses congestion through monitoring of our region’s roadway system, evaluation and mitigation of the impacts of new major developments on the CMP system, Deficiency Plans that include recommendations for improving a roadway’s performance, and alternative strategies such as better project design to encourage transit use and walking, or the establishment of carpool or vanpool programs, among others.

Other Projects and Programs

SANDAG also oversees the planning and development of key transportation projects and programs that may impact mode share, travel times, and traffic congestion over time. Some examples are:

- The Interstate15 Managed Lanes/Bus Rapid Transit will create a 20-mile Managed Lanes facility in the median of Interstate 15 between State Route 163 and State Route 78 designed to provide priority access for transit, carpooling, and FasTrak.

- The Mid-Coast Transit Corridor project will connect with trolley service from the Old Town Transit Center to the University of California, San Diego (UCSD) and University Towne Centre areas.

- The 22-mile Sprinter rail project will link the downtown areas of four rapidly growing North County cities: Oceanside, Vista, San Marcos, and Escondido.

- Evaluating the use of freeway shoulder lanes for buses in times of congestion based upon what is learned in the one-year demonstration project that allow buses on MTS Route 960
to use the freeway shoulder from Interstate 805 and Nobel Drive to State Route 52 and Kearny Villa Road during morning and evening rush hours.

- Ridelink which coordinates a number of free commuter services to San Diego region residents to promote alternatives to driving alone to work or school.

- Implementing selected recommendations from the Independent Transit Planning Review including evaluating alternative approaches for monitoring the transit mode share in key transportation corridors to accurately measure return on transit investments.
HOUSING

INTRODUCTION

Affordable housing is typically defined as housing for which the resident pays no more than 30 percent of their income toward housing costs. The lack of affordable housing is one of the major issues facing the San Diego region today. Housing can provide stability to our neighborhoods, communities, and families. It is vital to our economy. It is directly linked to traffic congestion, the length of our commutes, and the quality of our environment. Unfortunately, the costs of renting or owning a home in the San Diego region have risen dramatically over the past ten years. In fact, our region is regularly ranked as one of the top ten areas in the nation with the highest priced and least affordable housing.

A core value of the Regional Comprehensive Plan is to provide more housing choices—more apartments, condominiums, and single family homes in all price ranges. How much housing we build, what type of housing we build, and where we build it are some of the most important decisions we can make in shaping our region’s future.

While the types of homes vary, the majority (61 percent) of the housing units in the San Diego region are single family homes. Multifamily homes make up 35 percent of the region’s housing stock, and mobile homes, manufactured homes, and trailers comprise the remaining four percent.

The cost of homes in the region has increased dramatically over the last decade, especially when compared to household income, which has increased only slightly over the past 20 years. As of December 2005, only nine percent of households in the San Diego region could afford a median priced home, compared to 14 percent in California and 49 percent for the nation.4

Rental housing costs also are high. In an annual survey of rental costs entitled “Out of Reach,” the National Low Income Housing Coalition ranked the San Diego region as the 11th costliest rental housing market in the United States—up from 12th the year before. In 1999, the region ranked 40th.

To find affordable housing, many workers are moving far from their jobs, often outside San Diego County or across the international border. A recent survey have that 29,000 south western Riverside County residents commute into San Diego County for work, and workers even move as far away as Imperial County to find homes they can afford. An estimated 40,000 workers cross the border from Mexico each day for jobs in the San Diego region and many are U.S. citizens (Caltrans Traffic Census). This imbalance between jobs and housing is leading to a tremendous strain on our roads, freeways, infrastructure, and environment, as well as a strain on the quality of life for those commuters.

4 Source: California Association of Realtors, Housing Affordability Index, December 2005
The indicator data included in this chapter establish a baseline for tracking progress toward the following goal included in the RCP:

- Provide a variety of affordable and quality housing choices for people of all income levels and abilities throughout the region

The indicators designated for tracking progress toward the above housing goal are as follows:

1. Housing Affordability Index
2. Percent of Households with Housing Costs Greater Than 35 percent of Income
3. Ratio of New Jobs to New Housing Units
4. Share of New and Existing Units by Structure Type and Income Category
5. Vacancy Rates
6. Percent of Households Living in Overcrowded Conditions
7. Number of households on the waiting list for Section 8 (housing assistance) Vouchers

1. **Housing Affordability Index**

**Significance**

A primary goal of the RCP is to provide a variety of affordable housing choices for people of all income levels. The Housing Affordability Index rates the affordability of owner-occupied units currently on the market. The Index compares local median housing prices (including mortgage payments, interest rates, taxes, and insurance) with local household incomes to determine overall affordability. The Index shows the percentage of households that can afford a median priced home in the county. Lower index values represent less housing affordability. The Index ranges from zero (no household can afford a median priced home) to 100 (every household can afford a median priced home).

**Findings**

Housing affordability in the region has decreased significantly since 1995.
Figure 9
HOUSING AFFORDABILITY INDEX (1995-2005)

Source: California Association of Realtors.

Table 6
HOUSING AFFORDABILITY INDEX (1995-2005)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percent of Households that can Afford a Median Priced Home in San Diego</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>38 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>38 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>38 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>38 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>33 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>24 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>26 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>22 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>19 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>11 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>9 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: California Association of Realtors.
2. Percent of Households with Housing Costs Greater Than 35 Percent of Income

Significance

A primary goal of the RCP is to provide a variety of affordable housing choices for people of all income levels. In addition to the Housing Affordability Index, which relates to owner-occupied housing, it is important to look at the full spectrum of housing options. To do this, the federal affordability standard is applied. Federal guidelines suggest that no household should spend more than one-third of its income on housing, for either rental or owner-occupied housing. Households spending more than one-third of their income on housing are considered to be living in unaffordable housing. The values listed below represent the percent of households that are paying 35 percent or more of their income for housing. This includes households with a mortgage, households without a mortgage, and renter-occupied units.

Findings

Housing affordability has declined in the region since 2000, as more households are paying 35 percent or more of their income for housing. While some fluctuations in the reported data are possibly the result of sampling variability, the overall trend between 2000 and 2004 is statistically significant at the 0.10 confidence level, according to the U.S. Census Bureau.
3. Ratio of New Jobs to New Housing Units

Significance

A balance of jobs and housing is fundamental to many of the goals and objectives of the RCP. In particular, the RCP focuses on providing an adequate supply of housing for our region’s workforce and adequate sites to accommodate business expansion and retention. The ratio of new jobs to new housing units provides an indicator of whether or not the region is meeting both goals and is a calculated variable based on housing unit and wage and salary job counts.

Findings

Since 2001, we have seen steady growth in the number of new housing units completed, while job growth has fluctuated as a result of the nationwide recession.

Figure 11
TOTAL NEW JOBS PER NEW HOUSING UNIT RATIO (2001-2004)

Source: SANDAG Annual Population and Housing Estimates, California Employment Development Department.
## Table 7

**TOTAL JOBS PER HOUSING UNIT RATIO (2001-2004)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Housing Unit</th>
<th>Jobs</th>
<th>New Units</th>
<th>New Jobs</th>
<th>New Jobs / New Units</th>
<th>Jobs / Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1,040,149</td>
<td>1,193,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1,048,699</td>
<td>1,218,400</td>
<td>8,550</td>
<td>24,600</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1,063,371</td>
<td>1,230,700</td>
<td>14,672</td>
<td>12,300</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1,078,416</td>
<td>1,240,100</td>
<td>15,045</td>
<td>9,400</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1,095,077</td>
<td>1,258,600</td>
<td>16,661</td>
<td>18,500</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1,108,500</td>
<td>1,281,000</td>
<td>13,423</td>
<td>22,400</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SANDAG Annual Population and Housing Estimates, California Employment Development Department.

## 4. Share of New and Existing Units by Structure Type and Income Category

### Significance

A primary goal of the RCP is to provide a variety of housing choices for people of all ages and income levels. The mix of single family and multifamily units is an indicator of the types of housing choices available to the region’s residents. Single family units may be either detached or attached units. Multifamily units include apartment buildings. Condominiums may fall into either category, depending on the configuration of the building. Note: Data on new and existing units by income category are not currently available, but should be included in future reports. Additionally, as stipulated in the SANDAG Board Policy No.033, jurisdictions are asked to report annually on their progress toward meeting the Regional Housing Needs Assessment for 2005-2010.

### Findings

The mix of single and multifamily units in the region has remained constant over time. New construction may show some variation from year to year, but the overall trend has been a mix of roughly 1/3 multifamily and 2/3 single family units. It is interesting to note that the number of new multifamily units being constructed overall is generally increasing. Each year, except 2005 saw a net decrease in mobile homes.
Figure 12
SHARE OF EXISTING UNITS BY STRUCTURE TYPE (2000-2005)

Source: SANDAG Annual Population and Housing Estimates

Figure 13
NEW MULTIFAMILY AND SINGLE FAMILY UNITS (2001-2005)

Source: SANDAG Annual Population and Housing Estimates
5. Vacancy Rates

Significance

Housing vacancy rates are indicative of the supply of housing in the region. Low vacancy rates suggest a tight housing supply, and can lead to an increase in housing costs.

Findings

The owner-occupied vacancy rate has remained relatively constant since 2000. Rental vacancy rates have increased since 2000. Minor fluctuations in the reported data are likely the result of the survey techniques, and are not statistically significant at the 0.10 confidence level, according to the U.S. Census Bureau. The change between 2000 and 2004 is statistically significant according to the U.S. Census Bureau. These values represent the share of housing units that are not occupied.

Figure 14
VACANCY RATES BY OWNERSHIP (2000-2004)

Source: American Community Survey, U.S. Census Bureau.

6. Percent of Households Living in Overcrowded Conditions

Significance

Overcrowding is an indicator of both the supply and affordability of housing. Overcrowded housing suggests that residents either cannot find, or cannot afford, adequate housing. Federal guidelines
suggest that a household is overcrowded if there is more than one person per room in the housing unit.

Findings

Overcrowding in the region has remained relatively constant since 2000. There is no statistically significant change between 2000 and 2004 at the 0.10 confidence level, according to the U.S. Census Bureau.

Figure 15

Source: American Community Survey, U.S. Census Bureau.

7. Number of Household on the Waiting List for Section 8 (Housing Assistance) Vouchers

Significance

Tens of thousands of families and individuals in San Diego earn less than half of the median area income. They include seniors living on low fixed incomes, veterans who served the country, but cannot afford decent homes, single-parent and even two-parent families in low-wage jobs, and people with disabilities.

To assist with rental costs, various housing authorities manage major programs to help house San Diegans. These programs make housing more affordable by reducing a family's rent amount.
One such program is Section 8 which was enacted as part of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974. The Section 8 rental assistance programs are federally funded and administered through various housing agencies.

**Findings**

There are six housing authorities that administer the Section 8 program in the San Diego region; these agencies include the San Diego Housing Commission, the San Diego County Housing Authority, and the cities of Carlsbad, Encinitas, National City, and Oceanside. According to staff at these agencies, approximately 73,500 households are on Section 8 waiting lists with a wait time that ranges from four to seven years.

**HOUSING SUMMARY**

**Conclusions**

The region continues to experience serious housing affordability problems. The clearest evidence of this is the affordability ranking by the California Association of Realtors (CAR) Housing Affordability Index, which indicates that only 9 percent of the county’s households can afford a median priced home, down from 38 percent in 1995. Further evidence of the region’s growing unaffordability is the rising percentage—from 29 percent in 2000 to 36 percent in 2005—of households that pay more than 35 percent of their income for housing. Contributing to the increase in housing costs is the region’s lack of housing supply and variety of housing types as shown in the ratio of new jobs to housing units and the share of existing units by structure type.

During the 1999-2004 housing element cycle the number of new homes built for very low and low income households in the region was about 5,800 units or about 16 percent of the new housing needed as identified in the Regional Housing Needs Assessment. (See the Regional Housing Needs Assessment discussion below.)

**Future Target Setting**

The initial housing-related targets for the RCP will come from the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) process described below. Over the next year, work will continue on setting targets for the other housing indicators.

**SANDAG Role**

SANDAG has a number of roles in helping the region address its housing needs and the goals laid out in the RCP. These roles include: undertaking the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) process associated with the preparation of local general plan housing elements, staffing the Regional Housing Working Group (RHWG), reviewing state and federal housing-related legislation, and working with local jurisdictions on implementing smart growth.
Regional Housing Needs Assessment

The role of SANDAG in the local general plan housing element process is the preparation of the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA). SANDAG and the California Department of Housing and Community Development determine each region’s share of the state’s housing need for the five-year housing element cycle based on growth projections. This number represents the amount of new housing units for which the region will need to plan during the housing element cycle. Then SANDAG works with the local jurisdictions to allocate overall regional housing needs to each jurisdiction in four required income categories (very low, low, moderate, and above moderate).

The RHNA for the 2005-2010 housing element cycle was adopted by the Board of Directors on February 25, 2005. The goals set as part of this process will help the region plan for more housing and a greater diversity of housing types. Monitoring the region’s actual production of housing against the RHNA goals will help the region determine its success in meeting its housing needs. SANDAG Board Policy No. 33 lays out specific provisions regarding the allocation of certain discretionary funding to local jurisdictions in relation to local jurisdiction housing element compliance.

Regional Housing Working Group

The Regional Housing Working Group is a standing committee that advises SANDAG on housing issues, including housing production, affordable housing, housing elements implementation, and SANDAG R-H-Needs-A (RHNA). The committee is composed of local housing staff and the representatives from the construction, financial, and real estate industries, low-income housing advocacy groups, and nonprofit organizations.
HEALTHY ENVIRONMENT

INTRODUCTION

To ensure a healthy environment, the region must protect key open spaces and sensitive habitat areas, ensure that the air and water are clean, and restore eroding beaches. Also important to our healthy environment is urban ecology: those natural areas that remain in or around urbanized areas.

A number of issues must be addressed in order to implement a comprehensive, regional habitat preservation system to sustain natural features in urbanized areas of the region. While preserve areas provide habitat for threatened and endangered species, urban canyons and natural landscapes outside preserve areas also are important. They provide visual relief from urbanization as well as public access to the region’s natural resources.

Viable natural habitats, water quality, a well-managed shoreline, and air quality are critical components to the overall economic prosperity of our region. Also, there are critical to the health and well being of our residents.

The indicator data included in this chapter establish a baseline for tracking progress toward the following policy objectives included in the RCP:

NATURAL HABITATS
- Preserve and maintain natural biological communities and species native to the region
- Protect agricultural lands for future crop production and for functions described in habitat conservation plans

WATER QUALITY
- Restore, protect, and enhance the water quality and the beneficial uses of local coastal waters, inland surface waters, groundwaters, and wetlands
- Reduce or eliminate pollutants at their source before they enter our region’s water bodies

SHORELINE PRESERVATION
- Preserve and enhance the region’s beaches and nearshore areas as environmental and recreational resources

AIR QUALITY
- Achieve and maintain federal and state clean air standards
The indicators designated for tracking progress toward the above healthy environment policy objectives are as follows:

**NATURAL HABITATS**

1. Habitat Conserved Within Designated Preserve Areas (future indicator)
2. Percent of Habitat Preserve Area Actively Maintained (future indicator)

**WATER QUALITY**

3. Number of Beach Closure Days
4. Impaired Waterbodies (miles or acres) Based on Federal Clean Water Act 303(d) Criteria

**SHORELINE PRESERVATION**

5. Beach Widths
6. Lagoon Health (future indicator)

**AIR QUALITY**

7. Air Quality Index

---

**1. Habitat Conserved Within Designated Preserve Areas**

**Significance and Future Reporting**

The RCP aims to preserve and maintain natural biological communities and species native to the region. The number of acres of sensitive habitat conserved (as denoted by “designated preserve areas”) indicates how well the region is doing at protecting native ecosystems.

There are a total of four habitat conservation planning programs in the San Diego region as shown in Map 3. Of these, plans have been completed for the MSCP South County Subregion and the Multiple Habitat Conservation Program (MHCP). The MSCP for the North County and East County Subareas are underway.

When the plans are completed, local jurisdictions are required to prepare annual habitat tracking reports that show how and where lands are being conserved, how well their conservation goals are being achieved, and how the habitat preserve system is being built out. A Regional Conserved Lands Database is being constructed which will allow the region to have a more complete accounting of conserved lands. The database will not limit itself to only those jurisdictions that prepare annual habitat tracking reports.

**Findings**

Since 1997, when the MHCP and the South County MSCP and were adopted, over 30,000 acres of land have been conserved in the City of San Diego and the unincorporated areas of the South County MSCP.
2. Percent of Habitat Preserve Area Actively Maintained

Significance and Future Reporting

The RCP recognizes that just preserving open space and habitats is not enough to maintain the biological value of the land, particularly in the urbanized western portion of the region where conserved areas are in close proximity to developed/urban areas. Similar to other infrastructure in the region, such as roads, transit systems, and water and sewer conveyance systems, natural habitat areas must be actively maintained to support the species and their habitats in perpetuity. This can be accomplished through adaptive land management activities and ongoing biological monitoring.

The responsibility to manage lands conserved to protect biological resources is that of the individual owner of the land – a government agency, a non-profit organization such as a land conservancy, a homeowner association, or an individual. There is currently no centralized strategy for preserve implementation; therefore there is no centralized data source from which to obtain data on land management activities.
Implementing structure to perform the functions of regional coordination. For example, with a coordinating structure in place, preserve data would be available to comprehensively track preserve build-out progress, including the percentage of the preserve being managed.

The first step of regional coordination is underway with the Regional Conserved Lands Database slated for completion in the summer of 2007. This database will provide general information on the status of land management activities for conserved areas. The database may also assist in identifying land areas in need of funds for land management activities. If a regional coordinating structure is developed, then activities pertaining to the preserve – land acquisition, habitat management, and biological monitoring, can be readily determined.

3. Number of Beach Closure Days

Significance

For environmental, economic, and recreational reasons, a goal of the RCP is to reduce or eliminate pollutants in our region’s water bodies. Beach closures pinpoint specific instances in which pollutants affect water quality in our ocean and bays. Fewer beach closures mean less pollution. It is necessary that beach closure days be examined with regard to the amount of rainfall each year, as this amount influences the number of beach closure days. The following data signifies the number of days in the year during which the region experienced at least one beach closure, adjusted by inches of rainfall.

Findings

The number of weather-adjusted beach closure days in the region has been decreasing over time. Beach closures within the region are largely attributed to pollution in urban runoff that is transported to rivers, bays, and ultimately the ocean via the stormwater conveyance system. To reduce pollution in urban runoff, the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) has issued a permit to local jurisdictions requiring them to develop and implement water quality programs that address this issue. The decrease in beach closures may be the result of the region’s jurisdictions working together to address this issue since the issuance of the permit in 2001.

The reduction in the number of weather-adjusted beach closure days also may be attributed to stricter water quality regulations. Over the last several years, the RWQCB has increased its standards and requirements placed on local jurisdictions. Furthermore, over the last several years the RWQCB has been stricter in its enforcement.

Figure 17 and Table 9 show the steady reduction of beach closure days since 2000. Although during 2005 the region had its highest yearly rainfall in the five-year period analyzed for this report, the weather-adjusted closures continued to decrease. Knowing that rainfall events have a large impact

---

5 Rainfall often results in beach closures due to elevated bacteria levels in ocean waters. Levels of bacteria rise significantly in ocean waters especially those adjacent to storm drains, creeks, and rivers during and after rainstorms. Elevated levels of bacteria may continue for a period of up to three days following rainstorms, depending upon the intensity of the rain and the volume of runoff.
on beach closures, progress made by local jurisdictions in implementing stormwater programs now and in the future may lessen the correlation between rainfall and beach closures. Increases in rainfall events may not necessarily mean an increase in beach closure days.

However, as standards set by the RWQCB become stricter over the next several years, the local jurisdictions may find it more difficult to meet these requirements. Funding for local stormwater programs must increase as the demands placed on local jurisdictions increase, in order to meet the ultimate goal of zero weather-adjusted beach closure days per year.

Figure 16
WEATHER-ADJUSTED BEACH CLOSURE DAYS (2000-2005)

Table 8
WEATHER-ADJUSTED BEACH CLOSURE DAYS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weather-Adjusted Closures</th>
<th>Beach Closure Days</th>
<th>Rainfall (inches)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Annual Beach Closure and Advisory Report, County of San Diego Department of Environmental Health; Western U.S. Historical Summaries, Western Regional Climate Center.
4. Impaired Waterbodies (miles or acres) based on Federal Clean Water Act 303(d) Criteria

Significance

The Federal Clean Water Act (Section 303(d)) mandates that states develop a list of segments of water that do not meet water quality standards, even after pollution control technology has been implemented for point sources of pollution. The State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) works with the regional water quality control boards and local jurisdictions to prepare this list. Local jurisdictions are required by law to establish action plans and rank the waters in order to move towards improvement of these segments.

For environmental, economic, and recreational reasons, a goal of the RCP is to reduce or eliminate pollutants in our region’s waterbodies. The list of 303(d) impaired waterbodies pinpoints specific instances in which pollutants affect water quality in our lakes, rivers, and streams. Fewer impairments mean less pollution.

Findings

As of 2002, there are 52 water segments in the San Diego region, such as streams, waterbodies, and the shoreline, that are considered impaired and do not meet water quality standards. As seen below, the data represents the 303(d) list prepared for 2002. Currently, the SWRCB is updating the 303(d) list for 2006 and collecting comments from local jurisdictions. The 303(d) list is usually updated every two years and as information becomes available, the data will be included in future RCP performance monitoring reports.
Map 4
SAN DIEGO REGION 303(d) IMPAIRED WATERS
5. Beach Widths

Significance

The beaches of the San Diego region are an important environmental, economic, and recreational resource. The shoreline is an erosional coast, consisting primarily of narrow beaches backed by steep sea cliffs. The beaches and cliffs have been eroded for thousands of years by ocean waves and rising sea levels. Episodic and site-specific coastal retreat, such as bluff collapse, is inevitable, although some coastal areas have remained stable for many years.

In recent times, this erosion has been accelerated by urban development. The natural supply of sand to the region’s beaches has been significantly diminished by flood control structures, dams, water quality control devices, removal of sand and gravel through extraction operations, and the creation of impervious surfaces. With more development, the region’s beaches will continue to suffer increased erosion, thereby reducing, and possibly eliminating their physical and economic benefits.

Preserving the region’s beaches is a key policy objective of the RCP. The average beach widths representing all segments along the San Diego coastline are in Table 10.

Targets

Targets for individual shoreline segments were set in the SANDAG Shoreline Preservation Strategy in 1993. These targets are listed in Table 10, and are designated as the estimated total need for design property protection in the Strategy. Four shoreline segments (Silver Strand State Beach, Coronado, Ocean Beach, and Pacific/Mission Beaches) exceeded the 2010 target in 2004. The remainders of the shoreline segments are short of their 2010 targets.

Findings

Beach widths in the region have been declining since the Regional Beach Sand Project in 2001.

The SANDAG Regional Shoreline Monitoring Program (Monitoring Program) was initiated in 1996. The Monitoring Program provides physical measurements of the region’s beaches and is essential to the design and evaluation of future efforts to replenish beaches and manage the region’s shoreline. Specifically, the Monitoring Program measures the changes in beach width over time, documents the benefits of sand replenishment projects, and helps to improve the design and effectiveness of beach fills.

Since the Monitoring Program was first implemented, there has been regular nourishment of our beaches through the dredging of harbors and lagoons and the Regional Beach Sand Project (RBSP), which nourished 12 of the region’s beaches in 2001. Since the completion of the RBSP, little to no sand has been placed on area beaches, the impact of which has been the return to pre-RBSP sand levels.
As seen in Table 10, with the exception of a couple of segments, after the RBSP the beach widths slowly declined and the data for 2004 looks very similar to the pre-RBSP beach width data for 1998.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall Averages</th>
<th>1998</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2010 Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Beach</td>
<td>150.0</td>
<td>118.0</td>
<td>109.0</td>
<td>202.7</td>
<td>154.0</td>
<td>145.0</td>
<td>151.3</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver Strand State Beach</td>
<td>427.0</td>
<td>461.0</td>
<td>448.0</td>
<td>451.5</td>
<td>451.0</td>
<td>449.0</td>
<td>434.5</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronado</td>
<td>759.0</td>
<td>758.0</td>
<td>767.0</td>
<td>784.0</td>
<td>767.0</td>
<td>768.0</td>
<td>764.0</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean Beach</td>
<td>278.0</td>
<td>282.0</td>
<td>274.0</td>
<td>283.0</td>
<td>295.0</td>
<td>259.0</td>
<td>264.0</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific/ Mission Beaches</td>
<td>217.3</td>
<td>257.3</td>
<td>265.3</td>
<td>273.3</td>
<td>271.8</td>
<td>272.5</td>
<td>278.3</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Jolla</td>
<td>182.0</td>
<td>141.0</td>
<td>192.0</td>
<td>213.0</td>
<td>183.0</td>
<td>229.0</td>
<td>219.0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>185.0</td>
<td>189.8</td>
<td>219.8</td>
<td>253.2</td>
<td>253.6</td>
<td>213.8</td>
<td>219.4</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Mar</td>
<td>185.5</td>
<td>227.0</td>
<td>166.0</td>
<td>133.3</td>
<td>173.3</td>
<td>161.8</td>
<td>133.3</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solana Beach</td>
<td>134.0</td>
<td>123.0</td>
<td>108.0</td>
<td>171.0</td>
<td>141.0</td>
<td>138.0</td>
<td>133.0</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encinitas</td>
<td>157.5</td>
<td>134.0</td>
<td>152.3</td>
<td>183.0</td>
<td>177.3</td>
<td>181.3</td>
<td>175.0</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlsbad</td>
<td>161.3</td>
<td>171.5</td>
<td>182.8</td>
<td>190.4</td>
<td>210.2</td>
<td>212.8</td>
<td>189.4</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside</td>
<td>227.5</td>
<td>229.8</td>
<td>234.0</td>
<td>262.0</td>
<td>257.3</td>
<td>258.8</td>
<td>225.0</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. **Lagoon Health**

**Significance and Future Indicator**

The RCP sets out the following policy objectives regarding water quality: restoring, protecting, and enhancing the water quality and the beneficial uses of local coastal waters, inland surface waters, groundwater and wetlands; and reducing or eliminating pollutants at their source before they enter our region’s water bodies.

The Lagoon Health indicator tells us about the health of the lagoon itself. The Federal Clean Water Act mandates that local governments develop plans for attaining or maintaining water quality in water bodies, which includes rivers, bays, estuaries, lagoons, and the ocean. The three indicators together (beach closures, impaired water bodies, and lagoon health) provide an overall picture of
the health of the region’s water bodies. Just as beaches and rivers perform an essential function in the region’s ecosystem, lagoons perform a valuable function as well.

Lagoons act as a filter that removes pollution from runoff; they are critical to the survival of various types of birds, fish, and other wildlife through their provision of diverse habitat types, and similar to beaches, lagoons can be used for recreation.

As part of the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) permit issued in 2001, parties to the permit are required to monitor the health of a majority of the region’s lagoons. Starting in 2007, monitoring data collected regarding bacterial levels in the lagoons will be included in this report. Currently, the City of Encinitas is charged with overseeing the collection of this data. They are re-evaluating their methodology over the next year and plan to implement a new program with the issuance of the new San Diego RWQCB permit. Once this methodology is finalized, SANDAG will likely utilize this data for this indicator.

7. Air Quality Index

Significance

Air quality affects public health, productivity, and the environment. Thus, for environmental, economic, and equity reasons, a goal of the RCP is to achieve and maintain federal and state clean air standards. Air quality can be measured by the number of days that the region fails to meet clean air pollution standards.

The Air Quality Index (AQI) can be used for reporting daily air quality. It tells us how clean or polluted the air is, and what associated health effects might be a concern. The AQI focuses on the health effects people may experience within a few hours or days after breathing polluted air. The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) calculates the AQI for five major air pollutants regulated by the Clean Air Act: ground-level ozone, particle pollution (also known as particulate matter), carbon monoxide, sulfur dioxide, and nitrogen dioxide. For each of these pollutants, the EPA has established national air quality standards to protect public health. In the San Diego region, ground-level ozone and particulate matter pollutant levels are responsible for the majority of days during which the region experiences an AQI over 100.

An AQI value of 100 generally corresponds to the national air quality standard for the pollutant, which is the level US EPA, has set to protect public health. AQI values below 100 are generally thought of as satisfactory. When AQI values are above 100, air quality is considered to be unhealthy-first for certain sensitive groups of people, then for everyone as AQI values get higher. Sensitive groups are defined as those “at greater risk than the general population from the toxic effects of a specific air pollutant,” such as older adults, children, or those with heart or lung disease.
Findings

Air quality in the region has improved significantly since the early 1990s, as evidenced by the decrease in the number of days during which air quality was deemed unhealthy for sensitive groups. Effective emission control efforts have resulted in cleaner vehicles, power plants, industries, and consumer products, as well as transportation plans that integrate transit and other alternatives to solo vehicle travel. Air quality improvements are expected to continue despite projected growth in population, employment, industrial activity, and vehicles miles traveled.

Figure 17
NUMBER OF DAYS AIR QUALITY WAS DEEMED UNHEALTHY FOR SENSITIVE GROUPS (1995-2005)


HEALTHY ENVIRONMENT SUMMARY

Conclusions

Some of the indicators for which data is currently available show a relatively positive picture. Beach closures have declined and air quality has improved. On the other hand, many of our waterbodies have some degree of impairment, and many of our beaches are losing sand. We are making progress in habitat conserved with designated preserve areas.

Future Target Setting

At this point only the Beach Widths indicator has official targets. These targets are for the year 2010 and were established in 1993 as a part of the SANDAG Shoreline Preservation Strategy. The
Shoreline Preservation Working Group, which developed the Strategy and targets, is still active and may wish to establish later-year targets.

As the habitat conservation plans are completed, targets will be established by default. For example, the target for the South County MSCP is to conserve a total of 172,000 acres in that planning area.

Another potential target for air quality can be derived from requirements embodied in the federal and state Clean Air Acts. The San Diego air basin is classified as a “serious” non-attainment area for 1-hour ozone under the state Clean Air Act. At the federal level, the San Diego region has been designated as non-attainment for the 8-hour ozone standard. The California Air Resources Board, in cooperation with the San Diego Air Pollution Control District and SANDAG, is developing an attainment plan for 8-hour ozone to demonstrate how the region will attain required 8-hour ozone levels by the June 2009 attainment date.

Targets for the other indicators in this section may be set after discussions among local elected officials, stakeholders, and SANDAG staff.

**SANDAG Role**

**Habitat Conservation Planning**

The largest subregional plan, the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP), spans eleven cities and a portion of unincorporated San Diego County in southwestern San Diego County. Approved in 1997, the plan targets more than 172,000 acres for conservation and protects 85 sensitive plants and animal species.

The Multiple Habitat Conservation Program (MHCP) includes seven incorporated cities in northern San Diego County. This subregional plan, approved by the SANDAG Board of Directors in March 2003, provides the guidelines for the preservation of a 20,000-acre preserve system and the protection of 61 plant and animal species.

**Environmental Mitigation Program**

A component of the TransNet Extension is the creation of an Environmental Mitigation Program (EMP), which goes beyond traditional mitigation for regional and local transportation projects. While the EMP includes an allocation for the estimated direct costs for mitigation of upland and wetland habitat impacts for regional and local transportation projects, it also includes additional funding for habitat acquisition, management, and monitoring activities. The EMP will help implement the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) and the Multiple Habitat Conservation Program (MHCP). Satisfying the mitigation requirements for priority projects will be addressed comprehensively rather than on a project-by-project basis in order to maximize early land acquisition opportunities.
The Environmental Mitigation Program will be a collaborative effort among SANDAG, the cities, the County, the wildlife agencies (California Fish and Game and the U.S Fish and Wildlife Service), and other regulatory agencies (Coastal Commission, U.S Army Corps of Engineers, U.S Environmental Protection Agency, and the Regional Water Quality Control Board) as well as representatives of various stakeholder groups, including the environmental community and the science/technical community.

**Shoreline Preservation Working Group**

The Shoreline Preservation Working Group (Working Group) was formed as a committee in the 1980s and currently advises the Regional Planning Committee on issues related to the implementation of the Shoreline Preservation Strategy (Strategy) adopted in 1993. The Strategy proposes an extensive beach building and maintenance program for the critical shoreline erosion areas in the region. It contains a comprehensive set of recommendations on the beach building program and on financing and implementation. The Working Group has technical expertise and background knowledge of regional shoreline issues, which is useful in applying the principles and goals laid out in the Strategy and The Regional Comprehensive Plan (adopted in 2004). Continuing to support the region’s ongoing and future beach nourishment efforts is a top priority for the Working Group. Additionally, in 1996, SANDAG enacted a shoreline monitoring program and the Working Group will continue to oversee and implement this program.

**MOBILITY 2030/Regional Transportation Improvement Conformity with the State Implementation Plan (Air quality)**

SANDAG and the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) must make a determination that the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) conform to the California State Implementation Plan (SIP) for air quality. Conformity to the SIP means that transportation activities will not create new air quality violations, worsen existing violations, or delay the attainment of the national ambient air quality standards.
ECONOMIC PROSPERITY
ECONOMIC PROSPERITY

INTRODUCTION

The Regional Economic Prosperity Strategy (REPS) was originally developed in 1998 in response to the economic restructuring and recession of the early 1990s. REPS laid out a concise strategy that called for infrastructure investment (both human and physical capital) and public policy support to strengthen the region’s economic foundation. The Prosperity Strategy is based upon the premise that investments in human and physical infrastructure will lead to stronger businesses and a well-trained workforce, ultimately leading to improvements in the regional standard of living.

IMPROVING THE REGION’S STANDARD OF LIVING

As a component of Regional Comprehensive Plan implementation, the Regional Economic Prosperity Strategy is currently being updated to incorporate new data and to reflect economic

Investments in human and physical infrastructure

Businesses that add higher-paying jobs to region stay and expand

Labor force has the incentive to seek training and education

Higher paying jobs improve region’s standard of living
changes since the 1990s. The overall strategy, however, remains the same: invest in infrastructure to improve standard of living.

In light of the update it has become clear that some indicators may be better suited to tracking our progress than others. For instance, former studies have included indicators that focused on job growth in high-wage sectors of the economy. What is becoming apparent through the REPS update is that the balance of job growth is ultimately a more important metric for the region’s economic prosperity. For that reason, a new job-balance indicator is being added to the RCP Monitoring report.

The indicator data included in this chapter establish a baseline for tracking progress toward the following goal included in the RCP:

- Ensure a rising standard of living for all of our residents

The indicators designated for tracking progress toward the above economic prosperity goal are as follows:

HUMAN CAPITAL

1. Labor Force Educational Attainment

JOBS BALANCE

2. Balanced Job Growth
3. Employment in High-Wage Clusters
4. Unemployment Rate

STANDARD OF LIVING

5. Real Per Capita Income
6. Regional Poverty Rate

1. **Labor Force Educational Attainment**

**Significance**

The RCP maintains that the region should offer broad access to education and workforce training opportunities to all residents, with an emphasis on the economically disadvantaged to foster shared economic prosperity. Educational opportunity assists in raising the standard of living for the region’s residents by providing people with the training to move up their career ladders.
Findings

Educational attainment in the region has increased somewhat since 2000. While some fluctuations in the reported may be the result of the survey techniques, the general improvement in educational attainment is statistically significant at the 0.10 confidence level, according to the Census Bureau.

Figure 18
LABOR FORCE EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT (2000-2004)

Source: American Community Survey, U.S. Census Bureau.

2. Balanced Job Growth

Significance

The balance of job growth is important to the long-term economic health of the region. If job growth is concentrated in low-wage jobs, the standard of living will fall. Job growth can occur in those lower-wage industries, but must be balanced by growth in jobs higher on the career ladder to provide upward mobility and a rising standard of living for the region’s residents.

Findings

Since the 1990s employment in low-wage industries has grown faster than in middle- and high-wage industries.
3. **Employment Growth in High-Wage Economic Clusters**

**Significance**

Economic clusters are groups of interrelated, export-oriented industries that are responsible for bringing new money into the region. Industries within a cluster have business transactions with one another, and thus are interdependent. Cluster companies often participate in local industry associations, which foster collaboration and the exchange of knowledge. Companies within a cluster also compete with each other for market share, which drives innovation and productivity.

Companies within clusters tend to be among the region’s leaders in research and development funding, patent awards, and other key indicators of innovation. Many of the clusters also pay high wages, although some do not. All clusters are economic drivers for the region because they are export-oriented. San Diego’s export-oriented clusters include the following:

- Biomedical Products
- Biotechnology and Pharmaceuticals
- Communications
- Financial Services
- Fruit and Vegetables
- Horticulture
Of these clusters, twelve are considered to have high wages. High-wage clusters are clusters in which the average annual salary is above the regional average across all industries. Growth in high-wage economic clusters therefore has a dual benefit for the region: economic growth that brings money into the region and growth of high-paying jobs for local residents. These characteristics fit in with the RCP goals of improving the local business environment, and providing a rising standard of living to the region’s residents.


**Findings**

An economic slowdown at both the local and national levels caused employment in high wage clusters to dip by approximately 1,800 jobs between 2002 and 2003. Slight declines occurred in Biomedical Products, Communications, Computer and Electronics, Defense and Transportation Equipment, Publishing, Recreational Goods, and Software, which lost a combined total of 5,900 jobs. Meanwhile San Diego’s Biotechnology and Pharmaceuticals, Design, Environmental Technology, and Financial Services clusters continued to grow, adding a total of 4,100 jobs to the regional economy.
4. Regional Unemployment Rate

Significance

The unemployment rate is an indicator of economic activity in the region. A low unemployment rate implies that the economy is strong and that most people who want a job can find one. These characteristics fit in with the RCP goals of improving the local business environment, and providing a rising standard of living for the region’s residents.

The unemployment rate is the proportion of persons in the labor force who do not currently have a job. The labor force is defined as persons age 16 and older who are either currently employed or unemployed but looking for a job. Persons who cannot work, or who choose not to work, are not included in the rate.

Findings

While the region’s unemployment rate increased slightly during the national recession at the beginning of the 1990s, San Diego has fared far better than the state or nation as a whole. Moreover, the region’s unemployment rate continues to remain at historically low levels, signifying a strong local economy.
UNEMPLOYMENT IN SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA, AND THE UNITED STATES (1990-2005)


Table 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>San Diego</th>
<th>California</th>
<th>United States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Real Per Capita Income

Significance

The primary, overarching goal of the Economic Prosperity chapter of the RCP is to ensure a rising standard of living for all residents. One common measure of standard of living is per capita income.

Per capita income is determined by dividing a region’s total personal income by the population of the region. Values are listed in inflation-adjusted 2004 dollars.

Findings

The region’s real per capita income rose steadily from 1995 to 2000, but has fallen slightly since. However, it continues to be higher than both the state and the nation.

Figure 22
REAL PER CAPITA INCOME IN SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA, AND THE UNITED STATES (1990-2003) IN INFLATION-ADJUSTED 2004 DOLLARS

Sources: U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis; SANDAG Annual Population & Housing Estimates; U.S. Census Bureau, Annual Population Estimates
Table 11
REAL PER CAPITA INCOME IN SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA, AND THE UNITED STATES (1990-2003) IN INFLATION-ADJUSTED 2004 DOLLARS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>San Diego</th>
<th>California</th>
<th>United States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>$32,061</td>
<td>$30,277</td>
<td>$28,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>$31,412</td>
<td>$29,222</td>
<td>$27,589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>$31,517</td>
<td>$29,181</td>
<td>$28,078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>$31,308</td>
<td>$28,619</td>
<td>$27,905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>$31,248</td>
<td>$28,931</td>
<td>$28,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>$31,938</td>
<td>$29,636</td>
<td>$28,603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>$32,860</td>
<td>$30,436</td>
<td>$29,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>$34,053</td>
<td>$31,177</td>
<td>$29,817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>$36,325</td>
<td>$32,742</td>
<td>$31,155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>$37,235</td>
<td>$33,439</td>
<td>$31,679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>$38,186</td>
<td>$35,612</td>
<td>$32,739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>$37,766</td>
<td>$35,068</td>
<td>$32,612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>$37,544</td>
<td>$34,448</td>
<td>$32,356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>$37,150</td>
<td>$34,278</td>
<td>$32,326</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Regional Poverty Rate

Significance

The primary, overarching goal of the Economic Prosperity chapter of the RCP is to ensure a rising standard of living for all residents. The poverty rate provides one measure to determine whether or not conditions are improving for the region’s lower-income residents.

These values represent the percentage of individuals whose total income falls below the poverty threshold set by the U.S Census Bureau, according to family size and composition.

Findings

Poverty in the region has remained relatively constant since 2000. Minor fluctuations in the reported data are likely the result of the survey techniques, and are not statistically significant at the 0.10 confidence level, according to the U.S Census Bureau.
Table 12
PERCENT OF RESIDENTS LIVING IN POVERTY IN SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA, AND THE UNITED STATES (2000-2004)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>San Diego</th>
<th>California</th>
<th>United States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: American Community Survey, U. S Census Bureau

ECONOMIC PROSPERITY SUMMARY

Conclusions

A few trends can be detected from the above data. The workforce in San Diego is increasingly well-educated, but recent job growth in the region has been concentrated in low wage industries. Overall, our region's standard of living is growing very slowly and we have not made progress in reducing poverty.

Future Target Setting

SANDAG is in the process of updating the Regional Economic Prosperity Strategy (REPS). The updated strategy may result in the refinement of the indicators included in future RCP monitoring reports. In addition, goals developed through the REPS update may serve as future targets for the Economic Prosperity indicators.

SANDAG Role

Regional Economic Prosperity Strategy

Through the update of the Regional Economic Prosperity Strategy, SANDAG will identify the infrastructure investments needed to ensure a rising standard of living for the region’s residents. Implementing the REPS requires a variety of regional organizations and agencies to coordinate their efforts and to promote the creation of middle and higher income jobs. The REPS also recommends that the region focus on targeted workforce development and training for local residents so that they can attain the jobs created. The prosperity strategy is presented within the three “E”s sustainability framework of Environment, Equity, and Economy. Balancing these areas requires a universal and holistic approach to policy making. Making the REPS an element of the RCP has inextricably linked economic growth, opportunity, and prosperity to quality of life.
PUBLIC FACILITIES
PUBLIC FACILITIES

INTRODUCTION

Our region requires reliable supplies of water and energy, opportunities to reuse and recycle materials, and sufficient disposal options for waste. The region also needs to make more efficient use of its resources. We can do this by locating public facilities where they will most effectively provide access and availability of needed services and protect public health and safety.

To address the importance of public facilities to the San Diego region, this chapter focuses on water supply, energy, and waste management. Key issues include meeting our water demand, energy, and waste management infrastructure needs, and providing public facilities that meet our current and future needs in a timely, efficient, and sustainable manner.

The indicator data included in this chapter establish a baseline for tracking progress toward the following policy objectives included in the RCP:

WATER SUPPLY
- Ensure a safe, sufficient, reliable, and cost-efficient water supply for the San Diego region

ENERGY
- Meet the region’s energy needs in a fiscally and environmentally sound manner

WASTE MANAGEMENT
- Minimize the need for additional landfills and provide economically and environmentally sound resource recovery, management, and disposal facilities
- Exceed the state-mandated 50 percent waste stream diversion rate and work toward a 75 percent diversion rate.

The indicators designated for tracking progress toward the above public facilities policy objectives are as follows:

WATER SUPPLY
1. Water Consumption per Capita and Total
2. Diversity of Water Supply
3. Amount of Reclaimed Water Used

ENERGY
4. Kilowatt Hours of Electricity Used Per Capita at Peak Hours
A goal of the RCP is to ensure a safe, sufficient, reliable, and cost efficient water supply for the San Diego region. The San Diego County Water Authority (Water Authority) and local water districts are mandated to supply sufficient water resources to meet the needs of the region. These agencies base their supply needs upon population, demographic, housing, and economic numbers provided to them by SANDAG and the local land use agencies. With current forecasts projecting one million more people in the region by 2030, how the region grows will have a significant impact upon water demand.

The types and design of development as well as the locations where development occurs also can have impacts on consumption of water and water infrastructure, and affect our water agencies’ ability to supply enough water to the region.

Findings

The Water Authority is the wholesale water agency serving 23 retail water agencies in the San Diego region.

As seen in Figures 25 and 26, the amount of water delivered overall and the amount delivered per capita by the Water Authority since 1999 have fluctuated; however, from 2004 to 2005 demand has decreased. Decreases in overall consumption and per capita consumption of water may be caused by several factors. Most notable are the efforts by the Water Authority to diversify their water supply and increase the amount of water conserved. More information on diversification can be found in the next section of this report.

According to the 2000 Water Authority Urban Water Management Plan (see Figure 24), from 2004 through 2020, the demand for water is forecasted to increase. This may be due to projected increases in the region’s population (Table 15). In addition to diversification, conservation measures also can help address future water demands. Local governments can directly affect our overall demand by promoting conservation programs within their jurisdiction and implementing water efficiency standards throughout the planning process. Promotion of water saving measures, such as planting native, drought resistant plants and discouraging over-watering by helping the public calculate how much to water their gardens at varied times of the year can add positively to the region’s overall water savings each year. In
addition, implementation of programs such as the ultra-low-flush toilet incentives program and adopting Best Management Practices such as making irrigation system upgrades that promote efficiency will help to reduce overall water consumption throughout the region.

Figure 23
REGIONAL HISTORIC AND PROJECTED NORMAL WATER DEMAND (1990-2000)

Projected water use now includes demands at Camp Pendleton Marine Corps Base.
Figure 24
AMOUNT OF WATER DELIVERED BY THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY WATER AUTHORITY (1999-2005)

Source: San Diego County Water Authority Annual Reports (Water Use by Member Agency)

Figure 25
AMOUNT OF WATER DELIVERED BY THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY WATER AUTHORITY PER CAPITA (2000-2005)

Source: San Diego County Water Authority Annual Reports (Water Use by Member Agency); SANDAG Annual Population and Housing Estimates.
### Table 13

SAN DIEGO WATER CONSUMPTION (2000-2005)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Water per Capita (acre-feet)</th>
<th>Water Delivered (acre-feet)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>694,995</td>
<td>2,724,561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>646,387</td>
<td>2,813,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>686,530</td>
<td>2,825,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>649,622</td>
<td>2,843,697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>715,763</td>
<td>2,885,713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>644,845</td>
<td>2,922,863</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: San Diego County Water Authority Annual Reports (Water Use by Member Agency); SANDAG Annual Population and Housing Estimates.

---

2. Diversity of Water Supply

**Significance**

Currently, only about 22 percent of the water used within the San Diego County Water Authority service area comes from local sources, primarily from surface water reservoirs. Water demands are met primarily through imported water deliveries from the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (MWD). MWD secures its imported supply from two main sources, the Colorado River and the State Water Project. The reliability of these two supplies has a direct impact upon our region’s availability of water for future growth.

To lessen demands on a single supply source like the MWD, the goal of the Water Authority is to diversify the region’s water supply portfolio. This may be done through a variety of methods, such as the Water Authority-Imperial Irrigation District water transfer, the All American and Coachella Canal Lining Projects, and through the development of local recycling, groundwater, and seawater desalination projects.

Development of a diverse supply provides for flexibility and adaptability in the resource mix to handle potential risks associated with managing and developing supplies. These risks could include environmental constraints, water supply contamination, and/or lack of funding.

**Findings**

As seen in Figures 27 and 28 below, the Water Authority has made progress toward their diversification strategy. In 2005, the amount of water imported was reduced from 84 percent in 2003 to 78 percent. This reduction can be attributed to the Water Authority-Imperial Irrigation District water transfer, which was finalized through the Colorado River Quantification Settlement Agreement in 2003. The annual maximum of the water transfer is 200,000 acre feet, which will be met in 2021.
In 2011, the Water Authority plans to have the regional seawater desalination facility at the Encina Power Station delivering 50 million gallons of desalinated seawater per day to the region. The completion of the regional seawater desalination facility is essential to the Water Authority meeting their goal of providing 40 percent of the region’s water through local sources (seawater desalination, conservation, service water, recycling, and groundwater).

Figure 29 shows the diversification targets for the Water Authority for the year 2020. Increases in water supplied through local sources other than seawater desalination, as well as the concrete lining of the All American and Coachella Canals in Imperial Valley will need to be realized before these goals can be met.

Figure 26
SAN DIEGO WATER SUPPLY BY SOURCE (2000)

Source: San Diego County Water Authority Annual Reports (Fiscal Year Water Supply by Source).
Figure 27
SAN DIEGO WATER SUPPLY BY SOURCE (2005)

Source: San Diego County Water Authority Annual Reports (Fiscal Year Water Supply by Source).

Figure 28
WATER AUTHORITY DIVERSIFICATION TARGETS FOR 2020

Source: San Diego County Water Authority Annual Reports (Fiscal Year Water Supply by Source).
3. Amount of Reclaimed Water Used

Significance

The policy objective of the water supply section of the RCP is to ensure a safe, sufficient, reliable, and cost-efficient water supply for the region. Because water is a limited resource, increasing the amount of water that is reclaimed (or recycled) throughout the region is important in meeting this goal. The reuse of water has not been implemented by many agencies and jurisdictions due to negative public perception and the high cost of these programs. However, there is a large opportunity available to the region to become more diverse in its methods for meeting the region’s water demand if increases in recycled water were to occur.

According to the San Diego County Water Authority (Water Authority), “[a] number of agencies in San Diego continue to implement and expand their water recycling projects. Currently, about 13,000 acre feet of recycled water is reused within the Water Authority service area annually. This number is projected to increase to over 53,000 acre feet per year by 2020. Approximately 69 percent of the recycled water is used for agriculture, landscape irrigation, and other municipal and industrial uses; the remaining 31 percent is recharged into groundwater basins.”

Findings

Over the last several years the amount of reclaimed water has remained steady or declined. As mentioned above, the Water Authority plans to increase the amount of recycled water in the region to 53,000 acre feet per year by 2020. This is a dramatic increase over the amount of water that the region is currently recycling. Because of this aggressive goal, the Water Authority should work to reverse the declining trend seen in Figure 30.

---

4. Kilowatt Hours of Electricity Used Per Capita at Peak Hours

Significance

The amount of electricity used on a per capita basis is an important indicator to assess how well the region is implementing energy conservation and efficiency measures. To accomplish this, the RCP recommends assessing both the amount of electricity needed (in kilowatts or kW) and electricity used (in kilowatt hours or kWh) by San Diegans on a per capita basis.

The Regional Energy Strategy (RES) was approved by SANDAG in 2003. The RES developed policies and provided measurable targets to achieve the region’s sustainable energy vision. Regarding energy conservation and efficiency, the RES called for a reduction in per capita electricity peak demand (i.e., electricity needed in summer at the hottest time of day) and overall per capita electricity consumption back to 1990 levels by 2010 and to 1980 levels by 2030.

Findings

Energy consumption per capita increased 16 percent between 1990 and 2005. Between 1990 and 2005, electricity consumption per capita has increased by less than 1 percent per year. Although this indicates the region is not on track to meet the significant reductions called for in the RES, California has the lowest per capita electricity consumption of any state and consumes almost 50 percent less electricity per capita than the national average. San Diego’s per capita consumption was 23 percent lower than the state level in 2000 and 15 percent lower in 2003. This is
in part due to aggressive statewide energy efficiency and demand reduction goals and due to milder climate of the San Diego region.

Figure 30
SAN DIEGO ANNUAL PER CAPITA ELECTRICITY USE (ANNUAL KILOWATT HOURS) (1990-2005)

Source: San Diego Gas and Electric.
Figure 31
PEAK KILOWATT POWER USAGE PER CAPITA (1990-2005)

Source: San Diego Gas and Electric.
Note: This graph is just a placeholder and is still being revised to include updated data as shown in the table below.

Table 14
ANNUAL KILOWATTHOURS OF ELECTRICITY USED PER CAPITA AND PEAK KILOWATT ENERGY USAGE PER CAPITA (1990-2005)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>San Diego Use-Per-Capita (kWh, Normalized)</th>
<th>San Diego Use-Per-Capita (Watts, Normalized)</th>
<th>California Use-Per-Capita (kWh)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>5,151</td>
<td>1,080</td>
<td>7,653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>5,203</td>
<td>1,085</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>5,238</td>
<td>1,106</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>5,322</td>
<td>1,116</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>5,401</td>
<td>1,106</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>5,441</td>
<td>1,122</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>5,486</td>
<td>1,181</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>5,581</td>
<td>1,212</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>5,763</td>
<td>1,241</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>5,933</td>
<td>1,281</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>5,989</td>
<td>1,181</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>5,555</td>
<td>1,099</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>5,639</td>
<td>1,148</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>5,723</td>
<td>1,194</td>
<td>6,732*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>5,918</td>
<td>1,266</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>5,996</td>
<td>1,292</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: San Diego Gas and Electric and California Energy Commission. 2003 is most recent year of state data available.
5. Share of Energy Produced in the Region vs. Imported

Significance

A recommended action of the RCP is to promote the local production of cost-effective, environmentally sensitive energy to reduce our dependence on imported energy. The proportion of local energy that is supplied from in-region sources directly reflects progress toward this goal.

Target

Table 17 identifies the amount of energy in kilowatt hours (kWh) produced in-region. In terms of capacity, or the amount of electricity that can be produced by a generator provides targets: 65 percent in-county generation by 2010 and 75 percent in county by 2020. The region’s assets currently provide approximately 60 percent of the region’s total capacity needs, and that percentage is steadily increasing.

Findings

The share of energy produced within the region generally remains at roughly one-third, as shown in Table 18. The share peaked at approximately 40 percent in 2000 as a result of the energy crisis because local power plants ran at their maximum capacity. Generally, San Diego’s older in-region
resources run at partial capacity due to the potential environmental impact. In addition, distributed
generators dependent on natural gas shut down as fuel prices steeply increased in the 2000s.

Table 15
SHARE OF ENERGY PRODUCED WITHIN THE REGION (1990-2000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Share of Energy Produced Within the Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 Target</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030 Target</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: San Diego Gas and Electric.

6. **Share of Energy Produced from Renewable Resources**

**Significance**

The development of renewable energy resources such as wind, solar, and geothermal is specifically
calculated in the RCP and targets have been established in the Regional Energy Strategy.

**Target**

The RES, adopted by the SANDAG Board in 2003, includes a goal of increasing the total electricity
supply from renewable resources to 15 percent by 2010, 25 percent by 2020, and 40 percent by
2030. By 2005, the share of energy produced from renewable resources reached 5.25 percent, after
ten years at only 1 percent or less. Since 2003, the California Legislature set more aggressive
renewable goals for the state; the state targets encourage Investor Owned Utilities (IOUs) like
SDG&E to use renewable resources.

In addition, the RES called for an emphasis on in-county renewable installations. For 2010, the RES
called for 740 megawatts of renewables, of which 340 MW (46%) are to be in-county. For 2010, the
SDG&E 2004 Long Term Resource Plan identified 777 MW of renewables, of which 342 MW (44%)
are to be in-county.
Findings

The share of the region’s energy produced from renewable resources increased significantly in recent years. In 2002, Senate Bill 1078 was passed which required IOUs to increase the share of energy generated by renewable resources and established a target of 20 percent of electric generation that should come from renewable resources by 2017. IOUs are encouraged to increase the share of energy produced by renewable resources by 1 percent per year to reach the target of 20 percent by 2017.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>% of Energy Produced from Renewable Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 Target</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020 Target</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030 Target</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: San Diego Gas and Electric.

7 These values are based on the California Public Utility Commission’s Renewable Portfolio Standard Rules and thus do not include Customer Owned Photovoltaic.

7. Percent of Waste that is Recycled

The waste management goals of the RCP are to minimize the need for additional landfills and provide economically and environmentally sound resource recovery, management, and disposal facilities. A second goal is to exceed the state-mandated 50 percent waste stream diversion rate by the year 2005 and work toward a 75 percent diversion rate.

Both goals can be tracked by reviewing the percentage of waste that is diverted from landfills and is instead recycled or put to another use.
Target

Assembly Bill 939 sets forth a target for solid waste diversion. It mandates that 50 percent of solid waste must be diverted from landfills by 2005. As of 2002, the most recent year for which data is available, the region had not yet met the target.

Findings

The waste diversion rate has fluctuated since 1995, but the region has not yet reached the 50 percent diversion rate mandated by the State of California, although there has been a slight upward trend over the last ten years.

![Figure 33: PERCENT OF SOLID WASTE DIVERTED FROM LANDFILLS (1995-2002)](image)

Source: California Integrated Waste Management Board.

8. Landfill Space Available

Significance

The waste management goals of the RCP include minimizing the need for additional landfills and provide economically and environmentally sound resource recovery, management, and disposal facilities. The RCP also aims to exceed the state-mandated 50 percent waste stream diversion rate by the year 2005 and work toward a 75 percent diversion rate.
Findings

Trend data is currently unavailable; the data source for this indicator, the Countywide Siting Element is completed every five years and only 2002 data are available at this time. The current remaining landfill capacity is represented here in cubic yards. This estimate is based upon existing permitted in-county capacity, excluding the San Onofre and Las Pulgas landfills. This estimate also does not include any landfills planned but not permitted. Therefore, the Gregory Canyon landfill and the expansion of the Sycamore Canyon landfill are not included in the capacity figures.

The estimated number of years of remaining capacity is based on assumptions such as reaching a regionwide diversion rate of 50% by 2005, and slight increases in total disposal and exported solid waste. Again, this does not take into account any landfills that are planned but not permitted. The actual year when the county is projected to run out of capacity under this scenario is also listed in parentheses.

Table 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Remaining Capacity (cubic yards)</th>
<th>Estimated Years of Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>89,044,519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 (to 2016)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


PUBLIC FACILITIES SUMMARY

Conclusions

Water consumption per capita has remained fairly steady since 2000, but declined slightly between 2004 and 2005. The amount of reclaimed water used in the region each year has declined. Between 1990 and 2005, electricity consumption per capita has increased by less than 1 percent per year. The share of the region’s energy produced from renewable resources increased significantly in recent years from 0.5 percent in 1990 to 5.3 percent in 2005; and the share of energy produced within the region generally remains at roughly one-third. The waste diversion rate has fluctuated since 1995, but the region has not yet reached the 50 percent diversion rate mandated by the State of California, although there has been a slight upward trend over the last ten years.

Future Target Setting

Three of the eight indicators in this section already have targets. While not impossible, setting targets for things such as landfill space will be challenging. The targets will be set by stakeholders and SANDAG staff.
SANDAG Role

Regional Energy Strategy

SANDAG, with other partners, produced the Regional Energy Strategy (RES), which used the technical information of the Regional Energy Infrastructure Study to develop a vision for how energy will be produced and consumed in the region. The RES proposes eight goals and the implementation steps necessary to achieve them.

Integrated Regional Infrastructure Strategy

The Integrated Regional Infrastructure Strategy (IRIS) was prepared as part of the RCP to provide an investment and financing strategy to help the region meet its combined infrastructure needs. IRIS addresses transportation, water, wastewater, stormwater management, solid waste, energy, education, and parks and open space. The RCP Strategic Initiatives call for further developing guidelines to link annual expenditures of capital improvement programs to the long term goals of facility master plans that incorporate RCP goals.
BORDERS

INTRODUCTION

The San Diego region’s borders have traditionally been thought of as limited to the jurisdictional boundaries of San Diego County. However, over the years, the perceptions of our borders have expanded. San Diego County increasingly has close ties to its neighboring counties and Mexico, which challenge us to think of our region beyond our borders. In addition, San Diego County is home to 17 federally-recognized tribal nations with sovereignty over 18 reservations -- more than any other county in the United States (see Map 5). Our abundant natural resources, as well as our location on the U.S.-Mexico border, make our region an attractive place to live and work. Continued growth here, as well as in the surrounding regions, is evidence of this desirability. The region’s distinct characteristics also present a variety of opportunities and challenges for planning and coordination along our interregional and binational borders.

Map 5

THE SAN DIEGO REGION, SOVEREIGN INDIAN NATIONS, AND NEIGHBORING AREAS

Source: SANDAG
An important issue is access to jobs and housing. The growth projected for the San Diego region over the next 30 years is a function of economic expansion and job creation, a continued influx of people moving to the area, and natural population growth within the area. However, home construction in the San Diego region has not kept pace with population growth. Consequently, housing prices have risen, making home ownership difficult for much of the population. As a result, many people who are employed in the region have started moving to neighboring regions, including southwestern Riverside County, Imperial County, and Baja California, in search of homeownership. As people move further away from their places of employment, increased pressure is placed upon our interregional transportation systems, affecting not only the long-distance commuter but also causing congestion for residents in communities along the transportation route.

The indicator data included in this chapter establish a baseline for tracking progress toward the following goal included in the RCP:

- Provide reliable and efficient transportation systems associated with key trade corridors, interregional commuting corridors, tribal reservations, and ports of entry.

The indicators designated for tracking progress toward the above borders goal are as follows:

1. Interregional Traffic Volumes to and from Surrounding Counties and Baja California
2. Border Wait Times for Personal Trips and Goods Movement
3. Participation in SENTRI Lanes, Pedestrian Commuter Program, FAST Program (future indicator)

### 1. Interregional Traffic Volumes to and from Surrounding Counties and Baja California

**Significance**

A goal of the RCP relating to interregional and binational commuting is to ensure an efficient flow of people and goods across the international ports of entry and along key trade and interregional commuting corridors. A policy objective towards this goal is to reduce future long-distance interregional and binational commuting. Progress towards this goal can be measured by examining the flow of commuters crossing into the region each day. However, the existing data is limited to the Caltrans Traffic Census, which includes all vehicles, not just commuters. Additional data such as level of service or another measure of congestion would be useful in measuring our progress towards this goal.

The following data examines average weekday traffic volumes at the borders between San Diego and Tijuana, Imperial County, Riverside County, and Orange County. Total annual passenger vehicle and pedestrian border crossings are examined as well.
Findings

The largest volume of interregional trips takes place between Tijuana, Baja California and the San Diego region, followed by Orange County, Riverside County, and Imperial County, in that order. Note that these volumes include all vehicles going in both directions, not just commuters. They also include vehicles just passing through the region, for example, those going from Baja to Los Angeles. Between 2000 and 2004, Riverside County became the fastest growing contributor of interregional trips to and from San Diego, with a 37 percent increase in average weekday traffic volumes. Average weekday traffic volumes to and from San Diego from all neighboring regions grew 15 percent between 2000 and 2004.

The growth of interregional commuting between Riverside County and San Diego can be attributed to people seeking a lower cost of housing in Riverside County but continuing to work in San Diego. Long-distance commuting, both interregional and from within the region, puts a tremendous strain on our roads, freeways, infrastructure, and personal lives. While some amount of interregional commuting will always occur, providing additional housing capacity in key locations within the more urbanized areas of the region could assist in reducing the projected increases in interregional commuting and provide more housing and transportation choices to our residents. Additionally, another focus needs to be providing jobs in those communities where employees can afford to live.

Between 1997 and 2004, the increase in the number of pedestrian border crossings outpaced the increase in the number of passenger vehicle border crossings; pedestrian border crossings grew 43 percent, while passenger vehicle border crossings grew 38 percent. As a result of stricter security screenings since the 9/11 events, there have been longer and more unpredictable waits at the border for vehicle crossings, which may have contributed to a shift from vehicle to pedestrian crossings.

2. Border Wait Times for Personal Trips and Goods Movement

Significance

Providing reliable and efficient transportation systems associated with key trade corridors and ports of entry is a goal of the RCP. Wait times at the border provides a way to measure how efficiently people and goods are able to flow across our international ports of entry.

Findings

In 2005, according to U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) Web site data, the combined average weekday wait time at the San Ysidro and Otay Mesa Ports of Entry (POE) was 34.4 minutes in general passenger vehicle lanes, and 4.4 minutes in SENTRI\(^8\) lanes between 5 a.m. and 9 a.m. However, on a typical weekday, observed waits during the morning peak periods appear to be higher than the delays reported on the CBP Border Wait Times Web page.

\(^8\) SENTRI is a management process offered by CBP that expedites border crossings for pre-screened participants.
For commercial vehicles, CBP reported an average weekday wait time at the Otay Mesa POE of 27.5 minutes in general lanes between noon and 6:00 p.m. However, users report they experience longer waits to cross into the San Diego region. No delay data were available for FAST\textsuperscript{9} lanes in 2004 and 2005.

No data on border delays is available prior to 2004. Still, queues at the border have increased and become more unpredictable over time. Border wait times—especially in the northbound direction—are a result of growth in crossborder travel and stricter security screenings coupled with transportation infrastructure constraints.

A recent SANDAG study\textsuperscript{10} quantified economic opportunities lost because of current and projected traffic congestion and delays at the San Diego-Baja California POEs. In particular, current delays for both personal crossborder trips and freight movement cost the San Diego-Baja California region $4.2 billion in lost output and a loss of more than 35,000 jobs in 2005. If steps are not taken to improve border crossing and transportation infrastructure and management, these losses are projected to more than double in the next ten years.

To provide additional crossborder travel capacity, a new POE has been proposed about two miles east of the existing Otay Mesa crossing. State Route 11, an east-west extension of future State Route 905, would connect the future East Otay Mesa-Otay II POE to a roadway in Tijuana, which would link to the Tijuana-Tecate Toll Road and the Tijuana-Rosarito Corridor.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure34.png}
\caption{AVERAGE BORDER WAIT TIMES – NORTHBOUND INTO SAN DIEGO FROM TIJUANA (2004-2005)}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{9} FAST is a commercial process offered by CBP to pre-approved importers, carriers, and registered drivers that results in quicker clearance across the border. FAST is available at the Otay Mesa POE only.

\textsuperscript{10} SANDAG, Estimating Economic Impacts of Wait Times at the San Diego-Baja California Border, 2006.
Table 18
AVERAGE BORDER WAIT TIMES - NORTHBOUND INTO SAN DIEGO
FROM NORTHERN BAJA CALIFORNIA (2004-2005)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SENTRI Lanes Average Wait Time</th>
<th>General Passenger Lanes Average Wait Time</th>
<th>General Cargo Lanes Average Wait Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Figure 35
SAN DIEGO REGION AVERAGE WEEKDAY TRAFFIC VOLUMES TO AND FROM ORANGE, IMPERIAL, AND RIVERSIDE COUNTIES AND TIJUANA, BAJA CALIFORNIA (2000)

Source: Caltrans Traffic Census
Figure 36
SAN DIEGO REGION AVERAGE WEEKDAY TRAFFIC VOLUMES TO AND FROM ORANGE, IMPERIAL, AND RIVERSIDE COUNTIES AND TIJUANA, BAJA CALIFORNIA (2004)

Source: Caltrans Traffic Census
3. Participation in SENTRI Lanes, Pedestrian Commuter Program, Free and Secure Trade (FAST) Program

Significance and Future Indicator

At least 30,000 commuters pass northward through our border ports of entry on a daily basis. Projections indicate that cross-border vehicle traffic will more than double between 2000 and 2020. To accommodate the dynamic border transportation system, MOBILITY 2030 includes projects to improve access to border crossings, expand freight rail service, coordinate commercial vehicle crossings, and implement programs such as the Secure Electronic Network for Travelers Rapid Inspection (SENTRI) and Free and Secure Trade (FAST) that expedite border crossings for pre-screened participants. Currently there are approximately 71,000 vehicle SENTRI participants and 5,500 Pedestrian SENTRI participants. In addition, there are 1588 FAST enrollees.

---

11 Economic Impacts of Border Wait Times at the San Diego- Baja California Border Region, June 2005
BORDERS SUMMARY

Conclusions

Current data suggests that we do not meet our objective of reducing future long-distance interregional and binational commuting. Interregional and binational trips are increasing and are expected to continue to increase as the population grows. Additional data such as level of service or another measure of congestion would be useful in measuring our progress towards this goal. In addition, periodic surveys of interregional and crossborder travelers would be useful to better estimate the volume or share of commute trips from the overall travel volumes.

Future Target Setting

Several work efforts are underway that may begin to establish potential targets for the indicators in this section such as the Otay Mesa-Otay de Mesa Binational Corridor Strategic Plan and the 2007 Regional Transportation Plan. Additionally, indicators measuring cooperation with neighboring jurisdictions, including the region’s Tribal Governments, could be developed as means to measuring inter-regional cooperation.

SANDAG Role

I-15 Interregional Partnership (IRP)

One of the most active interregional programs at SANDAG is the I-15 IRP. The IRP is a voluntary partnership among elected officials representing communities along Interstate 15. As part of Phase One, SANDAG and the Western Riverside Council of Governments (WRCOG) worked to address congestion on the I-15 by looking at jobs-housing imbalance. The result was twenty-three short, medium and long term interregional strategies in transportation, economic development and housing. The focus of Phase Two is analyzing the ways in which the Riverside and San Diego economies are connected through a joint employment cluster study. Additionally, several transportation projects are underway including a Caltrans County Line Study to identify transportation issues facing the I-15 corridor and an interregional Bus Rapid Transit bus operation plan. Work is also being done to encourage workforce housing in north San Diego County.

Tribal Liaison Program

It is through the Borders Committee that SANDAG has been pursuing government-to-government relations with tribal governments in the region. In 2002 SANDAG held a regional Tribal Summit as part of the development of the 2003 RTP. Since that time the agency has incorporated tribal liaison work into its work plan and a “tribal government-to-government” component in its Public Involvement Policy. In 2005, SANDAG built partnerships with two regional intertribal councils – the Reservation Transportation Authority (RTA) and the Southern California Tribal Chairmen’s Association (SCTCA). In that same year, the SCTCA became an advisory member on the SANDAG Borders Committee. SANDAG, together with the RTA and SCTCA co-hosted the 2006 San Diego
Regional Tribal Summit. This second summit was held between elected tribal leaders from the 17 tribes in the San Diego region and the SANDAG Board of Directors which has lead to several follow-up actions to build government-to-government relations including the assembly of an Interagency Tribal Technical Working Group. Additionally, through the Tribal Liaison Program and with assistance from Caltrans, SANDAG will be working with the tribal governments on a Tribal Transit Feasibility Study and the development of a Tribal Transportation Demand Management Plan.

**Economic Impacts of Border Wait Times, Otay Mesa Strategic Plan**

SANDAG, in cooperation with Caltrans, completed an extensive study to gauge the economic impacts of border wait times on the binational economy. This first set of results, released in June 2005, focused on personal travel. The latest study looked at freight movement. Findings show the effects of border crossing delays on productivity, industry competitiveness, and lost business income at the regional, state, and national level for the United States and Mexico.

Also in partnership with Caltrans, SANDAG has developed an economic model to assess the magnitude of regional economic impacts resulting from delays at the ports of entry. This model will serve as an analysis tool that can be used to understand economic impacts as the volume of travel increases and/or as a result of security screenings.

**Otay Mesa-Mesa De Otay Binational Corridor Strategic Plan**

The SANDAG Borders Committee and the Committee on Binational Regional Opportunities (COBRO) identified the Otay Mesa-Mesa de Otay binational corridor as an area of opportunity to create an effective binational planning partnership. Transportation, economic development, housing, and environmental conservation are the four key issue areas that were recognized for evaluation as part of the Otay Mesa-Mesa de Otay Binational Corridor Strategic Plan. The draft Early Action Plan was released in June 2006. The Final Strategic Plan is anticipated to be completed in early 2007.
## APPENDIX

### RCP INDICATOR DATA STATUS AND TARGET SETTING - 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RCP SECTION / Indicator</th>
<th>STATUS OF DATA</th>
<th>HOW OFTEN IS THE DATA SOURCE UPDATED?</th>
<th>INDICATOR TARGET SET?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>URBAN FORM AND TRANSPORTATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Share of New Housing Units and Jobs Located in Smart Growth Opportunity Areas</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Share of New Units Within County Water Authority Boundary</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Annual Transit Ridership</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Commute Mode Shares</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Travel Times and Volumes for Key Auto and Key Transit Corridors</td>
<td>Future (1)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Miles of Deficient Roads on Congestion Management Program Network</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Every 2 Yrs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Annual Hours of Traffic Delay Per Traveler</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HOUSING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Housing Affordability Index</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Percent of Households with Housing Costs Greater Than 35% of Income</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ratio of New Jobs to New Housing Units</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Share of New and Existing Units by Structure Type and Income Category</td>
<td>Partial (2)</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Vacancy Rates</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Percent of Households Living in Overcrowded Conditions</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Number of Households on the Waiting List for Section 8 Vouchers</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HEALTH ENVIRONMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Habitat Preserved Within Designated Preserve Areas</td>
<td>Future (4)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Percent of Habitat Preserve Area Actively Maintained</td>
<td>Future (5)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Number of Beach Closure Days</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Impaired Water Bodies Based on Federal Clean Water Act Criteria</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Every 2-4 Yrs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Beach Widths</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Availability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagoon Health</td>
<td>Future (6)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality Index</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ECONOMIC PROSPERITY

1. Labor Force Educational Attainment          | Current         | Annually  | No           |
2. Balanced Job Growth                         | Current         | Annually  | No           |
3. Employment in High-Wage Clusters           | Current         | Annually  | No           |
4. Unemployment Rate                           | Current         | Annually  | No           |
5. Real Per Capita Income                      | Current         | Annually  | No           |
6. Regional Poverty Rate                       | Current         | Annually  | No           |

### PUBLIC FACILITIES

1. Water Consumption Per Capita and Total     | Current         | Annually  | No           |
2. Diversity of Water Supply                  | Current         | Annually  | No           |
3. Amount of Reclaimed Water Used             | Current         | Annually  | No           |
4. Kilowatt Hours of Electricity Used Per Capita at Peak Hours | Current | Annually | No |
5. Share of Energy Produced In-County vs. Imported | Current | Annually | Yes |
6. Share of Energy Produced from Renewable Resources | Current | Annually | Yes |
7. Percent of Waste That is Recycled          | Current         | Annually  | Yes          |
8. Landfill Space Available                    | Current         | Every 5 Yrs. | No |

### BORDERS

1. Border Wait Times for Personal Trips and Goods Movement | Current | Annually | No |
2. Interregional Traffic Volumes to and from Surrounding Counties and Baja California | Current | Annually | No |
3. Participation in SENTRI Lanes, Pedestrian Commuter Program, FAST Program | Future (7) | --- | --- |

**Notes:**
- A status of "Current" means the indicator reflects the most recent available data.
- (1) New data required.
- (2) Income category not yet available by local jurisdiction.
- (3) Data not available.
- (4) Data to become available as plans are completed.
- (5) No centralized data currently available, but may be in the future.
- (6) Data may be available in 2007.
- (7) Data may be available in 2007.
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Introduction

Earlier this year, SANDAG established an ad hoc working group to assist with the development of the urban design guidelines called for in the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP). Members of the Technical Working Group (TWG) who volunteered for this working group include Linda Niles of Del Mar and Rosemary Rowan from the County. Andy Hamilton from the Air Pollution Control District (APCD) is the alternate. The Working Group has had one meeting and has begun by discussing the content of the guidelines and the project schedule. A summary of their comments and the next steps are discussed below.

Discussion

The initial discussion of the Urban Design Guidelines Ad Hoc Working Group focused on a draft outline of the document, the project schedule, and the project budget. A copy of the draft outline that reflects the initial comments received from the Working Group is attached. The draft outline proposes to organize the document around a general discussion of urban design principles in smart growth areas, followed by detailed technical appendices on specific technical issues. In general, those present at the meeting concurred with this approach and offered suggestions on the order of the subject areas.

The proposed structure of the document is in part a function of limitations imposed by the project budget. The current fiscal year budget provides $75,000 for consultant services, so staff is proposing to begin by developing an overview of urban design principles that relates the subject specifically to the San Diego environment. Potentially, one or two of the technical appendices could also be completed if additional funding could be acquired. Several members of the Working Group expressed concern that $75,000 would not be enough to accomplish this level of work. Staff is trying to identify additional resources that could be applied to the project.

The Working Group has not developed a detailed project schedule as yet, but the general approach is to try to get a consultant team on board by the end of the calendar year and to complete a draft by the next summer. Completing the project will depend on funding that likely will not be available until the FY 2007-2008 fiscal year, however. That would push the completion date back to a year from now at the earliest.

Attachment 1. Urban Design Guidelines – Draft Outline

Key Staff Contact: Stephan Vance, (619) 699-1924, sva@sandag.org
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DRAFT OUTLINE
PLANNING AND DESIGNING FOR SMART GROWTH
URBAN DESIGN GUIDELINES FOR THE SAN DIEGO REGION

1. Introduction
   1.1. Purpose – Why good urban design is important
   1.2. Relationship of the Urban Design Guidelines to Regional Comprehensive Plan, the Smart Growth Concept Map, Planning and Designing for Pedestrians, and other SANDAG documents
   1.3. Relationship of the Urban Design Guidelines to existing design standards
   1.4. Overview of the document: The topics covered, how it was developed, and how to use it.

2. Designing for the San Diego Region
   2.1. The principles of good design and how they are manifest in the San Diego region
   2.2. Good urban design and the smart growth place types
   2.3. Smart growth in a multi-cultural region
   2.4. Realizing smart growth in the San Diego region (photo simulations)

3. Creating Great Public Places – the key to livable communities
   3.1. The importance of foot traffic
   3.2. Plazas
   3.3. Parks
   3.4. Main streets, markets and shopping districts
   3.5. Street furniture and other amenities
   3.6. Public Art

4. Development and Redevelopment
   4.1. Facilitating and encouraging smart growth development
   4.2. Changing places: How conventional developed areas can become smart growth places

Technical Appendices

1. Site Design
   1.1. Residential
   1.2. Commercial
   1.3. Mixed Use

2. Parking
   2.1. Trip generation and parking demand in smart growth areas
   2.2. Siting and design
   2.3. Pricing parking to control demand
Technical Appendices (cont’d)

3. Multimodal Street Design
   3.1. Street networks and connectivity
   3.2. The hierarchy of streets
      3.2.1. Designing streets for their context
      3.2.2. Designing streets to accommodate all users
      3.2.3. Emergency and large vehicle access
   3.3. Multimodal level of service standards
   3.4. Traffic Calming

4. Siting and Designing Civic Uses
   4.1. Schools
      4.1.1. Locating schools to encourage nonmotorized access
      4.1.2. Designing schools as community assets
      4.1.3. Fitting schools into existing communities
   4.2. Government Buildings
      4.2.1. Libraries
      4.2.2. Recreation Centers
      4.2.3. __________

5. Parks
   5.1. Siting community and neighborhood parks
   5.2. Designing parks for active use

6. Designing for Transit
   6.1. Integrating transit into the community
   6.2. Design requirements for conventional bus transit
   6.3. Design requirements for bus rapid transit
   6.4. Design requirements for light rail

7. Sustainable Development
   7.1. Green building technology
   7.2. Designing for storm water and water quality control
   7.3. Urban forests

8. Designing for universal access

9. Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED)

10. Implementing good design through form-based codes
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Suggested Activities

An almost unlimited range of events can be held during National Community Planning Month to highlight the contributions of planning in your community, region, or state.

You can find many potential sponsors for events and activities, from chapters, divisions, and student chapters of APA, to public agencies, planning firms and other businesses, nonprofit groups, and educational institutions ranging from K-12 schools to planning schools.

The following are just a few possibilities to consider. Check back regularly for additional ideas. As you finalize your plans for National Community Planning Month in October 2006, please share so this information may be posted on the website. Click here to submit your information.

State and Local Proclamations

Ask your mayor, city council, or county executive to declare October Community Planning Month in your area. Ask your state legislator to pass a resolution designating it Community Planning Month in your state. Tailor these sample proclamations to suit your purposes.

Click here to download a sample proclamation

Engage Elected Officials

Arrange to meet your congressional representatives while they are back in your state or district during the Columbus Day recess. Offer to show them some planning successes in your community and discuss how they can support planning that creates communities of lasting value for all people.

Hold a legislative breakfast forum on planning for your state legislators, county commissioners, or city council members. Show them how planning addresses issues of economic development, environmental quality, and social equity in your state and community. Ask the governor, county executive, or mayor to present an award to an outstanding “citizen planner” who has made a difference by serving on a planning commission or helping shape the future of your community.

Resources:

- APA’s Growing Smart Legislative Guidebook offers state legislators and staffers model statutory language for improving planning at state and regional levels and for giving cities and counties the tools they need to plan for the future. For information on state tools that your legislators might consider, see the Growing Smart User Guide, which is organized by community and regional needs, in such areas as agriculture, infrastructure, natural resources, housing, etc.
- APA’s Policy Guides offer best practice recommendations for planning that can improve citizen participation, community revitalization, housing, environmental protection, disaster mitigation and recovery, and many

http://www.planning.org/ncpm/activity suggestions.htm 08/30/2006
other topics.
- Check back for additional resource material and suggested talking points.

Find Partners to Celebrate Planning

Everyone has an interest in the outcomes of good planning, so look around your community for partners to co-sponsor events during National Community Planning Month. Some suggested partners include:

- Celebrate planning for agriculture with Cooperative Extension, the Farm Bureau, 4-H, Future Farmers of America, farmers’ markets, and community supported agriculture groups.
- Celebrate planning for affordable housing and better jobs-to-housing balance with major employers, the chamber of commerce, housing and faith-based groups, and home builders.
- Celebrate planning for “complete streets” and transportation access for all with bike and pedestrian advocates, disabilities groups, transit agencies, freight companies, and departments of transportation.
- Celebrate planning for healthy communities and ecosystems with doctors, nurses, health agencies, and environmental groups advocating for clean air and water.
- Celebrate planning for cultural resource preservation with historic preservation agencies and organizations and local historical societies.

Tour Planning Successes

Organize walking, bike, bus, boat, driving or jogging tours. Link the tours to the theme for each week of National Community Planning Month. Some suggestions include:

- Our Legacy of Great Communities — focus on planning accomplishments
- Today’s Great Communities — current development projects
- People Making Great Communities — special tours for different language groups or for young people

Recruit planners from local agencies and firms as guides; team up with other interest groups to sponsor tours; promote tours to visitors staying at local hotels. Offer in-depth mobile workshops or short, one-to-two-hour walking tours. Provide knowledgeable guides or produce self-guided brochures.

Hold an Open House

Local and regional planning agencies, planning firms, and planning schools can invite citizens to get an insider’s view of planning topics, tools, and techniques by holding an open house.

Photographs, maps, and models can be used to highlight past accomplishments and current planning projects. Planning staff or students can demonstrate how planners use GIS, scenario modeling, and other visual simulation techniques to show what the community might look like 10 or 20 years from now. Use a short video, slide show, or PowerPoint presentation to give an overview of the community’s history, pointing out how planning provided a good framework for aspects of the community people still enjoy.
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The presentation might introduce viewers to current planning issues, pose questions about future growth decisions, and emphasize ways to participate in the planning process. Consider providing light refreshments and giving visitors a take-home gift, such as a planning-related T-shirt, mouse pad, or button.

Create an Exhibit

Put together a display of maps, photographs, and drawings that shows how the community (or particular neighborhoods or districts within it) has evolved over time. Highlight ways that good planning has guided its growth, creating assets enjoyed today, while always evaluating future options based on growth projections and community values. Use the display to reveal recurring phases in the planning process, from citizen participation to policy decisions to plan implementation. Point out the roles played by elected officials, professional planners, volunteers serving on planning commissions, and interest groups in the community. Celebrate planning as a fundamental part of the democratic process, enabling communities to embrace new residents and creatively respond to changing conditions.

Such an exhibit might be displayed at the state capitol or city hall for the entire month. Or it could be a traveling exhibit, moving to different locations around the community, such as public libraries, schools, and other venues.

Consider capturing the text and visuals assembled for an on-site exhibit and using them to create a more lasting, digital exhibit placed on the city or county’s website. Such a virtual exhibit could provide newcomers to the community with a quick history of its evolution, as well as a quick lesson in the important role played by planning. The same site could be augmented over time with virtual tours of various neighborhoods and districts in the community, serving to orient residents and visitors alike, while also pointing out the planning decisions that resulted in certain patterns of development or conservation. Local teachers might find this digital display an excellent resource for their students.

For additional suggestions on ways to engage the public through a website devoted to community planning issues and processes, see Section 9 of the Planners’ Communication Guide (E-Communications).

Hold a Public Forum

National Community Planning Month provides a great opportunity to draw attention to planning issues in the community or surrounding region and to place those issues within the context of current innovations in planning across the country. Whether designed as a series of lectures, a symposium, or a hands-on design charrette, such public forums can demonstrate that planning in America is a robust process that welcomes many perspectives to the table and touches upon all aspects of community life, now and well into the future.

Such forums can invite representatives from different “stakeholder” groups in a community to share their insights into current planning issues and their vision of possible solutions. Young people, the elderly, developers, realtors, environmentalists, public health professionals, major employers, union leaders, and many others have legitimate concerns as well as good ideas that the community as a whole needs to consider — and can consider through the
planning process.

Forums can also be used to help community members place their immediate concerns within a larger context. They might look at how other places in their region are grappling with issues that know no jurisdictional boundaries, such as air and water pollution, population and investment flows, transportation demands, and the like. Similarly, forums can be used to illuminate how communities elsewhere in the country are creating effective solutions to commonly held problems through innovative planning: increasing affordable housing, creating mixed-use, mixed-income districts, revitalizing waterfronts and warehouse districts, taming the commercial strip, creating a networks of trails and greenways, and so forth. APA members who work in state or regional planning agencies, those in private practice, and those who teach in planning schools, might be able to address such issues with relevant examples.

Make a Video

National Community Planning Month also offers an ideal occasion to develop and screen a short video about planning’s role in shaping the community and region. The very process of producing such a program can engage many different members of the community as well as attract the attention of local media. Media programs at local colleges, technical schools, and high schools may have faculty and students who could help. Local television stations, cable systems, and the audio-visual departments of major companies might also lend a hand. The final product can be screened at an open house, shown by a local television or cable company, or posted to a community website for viewing and downloading.

APA’s Planning Advisory Service Report 500/501, Lights, Camera, Community Video, is an excellent how-to manual that offers numerous examples of places where this has been done and a DVD with some of the resulting videos. It shows how to use both the process of interviewing residents and the screening of the final program to raise the visibility of planning issues — and the importance of citizen participation — within the community. Footage of planning projects featured in APA’s National Planning Awards videos is also available by contacting APA at publicinfo@planning.org.

Show Up in Unexpected Places

Use National Community Planning Month as an occasion to get planning out of the public hearing room and into the community. Show up at unexpected places by having a display at a local music festival, arts celebration, or county fair. Reach out to other groups in the community to co-sponsor an event in recognition National Community Planning Month, like a fund-raising 10K run or walk, with the proceeds going to a good cause like affordable housing, conservation, or K-12 education. Get pledges from businesses, organizations, and special interest groups as a sign that they recognize, support, and celebrate good planning. Have fun!

World Town Planning Day — A Global Planning Perspective

Each year on November 8, World Town Planning Day is celebrated in more than 30 countries by planning professionals, civic leaders, and young people. This
year, APA will focus its energy and efforts on celebrating National Community Planning Month to highlight the impact and benefits of planning in this country. World Town Planning Day presents an excellent opportunity to look at planning from a global perspective, and APA encourages its members to consider planning challenges and solutions around the globe on that day. Click here for more about World Town Planning Day.

More Ideas to Come ...

Check back in the coming weeks for specific ideas on how to promote National Community Planning Month to the media in your area and how to engage your Senators and Representatives during the congressional Columbus Day recess.
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- APA's Growing Smart Legislative Guidebook offers state legislators and staffers model statutory language for improving planning at state and regional levels and for giving cities and counties the tools they need to plan for the future. For information on state tools that your legislators might consider, see the Growing Smart User Guide, which is organized by community and regional needs, in such areas as agriculture, infrastructure, natural resources, housing, etc.
- APA's Policy Guides offer best practice recommendations for planning that can improve citizen participation, community revitalization, housing, environmental protection, disaster mitigation and recovery, and many other topics.
- Check back for additional resource material and suggested talking points.

Find Partners to Celebrate Planning

Everyone has an interest in the outcomes of good planning, so look around your community for partners to co-sponsor events during National Community Planning Month. Some suggested partners include:

- Celebrate planning for agriculture with Cooperative Extension, the Farm Bureau, 4-H, Future Farmers of America, farmers' markets, and community supported agriculture groups.
- Celebrate planning for affordable housing and better jobs-to-housing balance with major
employers, the chamber of commerce, housing and faith-based groups, and home builders.

- Celebrate planning for "complete streets" and transportation access for all with bike and pedestrian advocates, disabilities groups, transit agencies, freight companies, and departments of transportation.
- Celebrate planning for healthy communities and ecosystems with doctors, nurses, health agencies, and environmental groups advocating for clean air and water.
- Celebrate planning for cultural resource preservation with historic preservation agencies and organizations and local historical societies.

Tour Planning Successes

Organize walking, bike, bus, boat, driving or jogging tours tours. Link the tours to the theme for each week of National Community Planning Month. Some suggestions include:

- *Our Legacy of Great Communities* — focus on planning accomplishments
- *Today's Great Communities* — current development projects
- *People Making Great Communities* — special tours for different language groups or for young people

Recruit planners from local agencies and firms as guides; team up with other interest groups to sponsor tours; promote tours to visitors staying at local hotels. Offer in-depth mobile workshops or short, one- to two-hour walking tours. Provide knowledgeable guides or produce self-guided brochures.

Hold an Open House

Local and regional planning agencies, planning firms, and planning schools can invite citizens to get an insider's view of planning topics, tools, and techniques by holding an open house.

Photographs, maps, and models can be used to highlight past accomplishments and current planning projects. Planning staff or students can demonstrate how planners use GIS, scenario modeling, and other visual simulation techniques to show what the community might look like 10 or 20 years from now. Use a short video, slide show, or PowerPoint presentation to give an overview of the community's history, pointing out how planning provided a good framework for aspects of the community people still enjoy.

The presentation might introduce viewers to current planning issues, pose questions about future growth decisions, and emphasize ways to participate in the planning process. Consider providing light refreshments and giving visitors a take-home gift, such as a planning-related T-shirt, mouse pad, or button.

Create an Exhibit

Put together a display of maps, photographs, and drawings that shows how the community (or particular neighborhoods or districts within it) has evolved over time. Highlight ways that good planning has guided its growth, creating assets enjoyed today, while always evaluating future options based on growth projections and community values. Use the display to reveal recurring phases in the planning process, from citizen participation to policy decisions to plan implementation. Point out the roles played by elected officials, professional planners, volunteers serving on planning commissions, and interest groups in the community. Celebrate planning as a fundamental part of the democratic process, enabling communities to embrace new residents and creatively respond to changing conditions.

Such an exhibit might be displayed at the state capitol or city hall for the entire month. Or it could be a travelling exhibit, moving to different locations around the community, such as public libraries, schools, and other venues.

Consider capturing the text and visuals assembled for an on-site exhibit and using them to create a more lasting, digital exhibit placed on the city or county's website. Such a virtual exhibit could provide newcomers to the community with a quick history of its evolution, as well as a quick lesson in the
important role played by planning. The same site could be augmented over time with virtual tours of various neighborhoods and districts in the community, serving to orient residents and visitors alike, while also pointing out the planning decisions that resulted in certain patterns of development or conservation. Local teachers might find this digital display an excellent resource for their students.

For additional suggestions on ways to engage the public through a website devoted to community planning issues and processes, see Section 9 of the Planners’ Communication Guide (E-Communications).

Hold a Public Forum

National Community Planning Month provides a great opportunity to draw attention to planning issues in the community or surrounding region and to place those issues within the context of current innovations in planning across the country. Whether designed as a series of lectures, a symposium, or a hands-on design charrette, such public forums can demonstrate that planning in America is a robust process that welcomes many perspectives to the table and touches upon all aspects of community life, now and well into the future.

Such forums can invite representatives from different “stakeholder” groups in a community to share their insights into current planning issues and their vision of possible solutions. Young people, the elderly, developers, realtors, environmentalists, public health professionals, major employers, union leaders, and many others have legitimate concerns as well as good ideas that the community as a whole needs to consider — and can consider through the planning process.

Forums can also be used to help community members place their immediate concerns within a larger context. They might look at how other places in their region are grappling with issues that know no jurisdictional boundaries, such as air and water pollution, population and investment flows, transportation demands, and the like. Similarly, forums can be used to illuminate how communities elsewhere in the country are creating effective solutions to commonly held problems through innovative planning: increasing affordable housing, creating mixed-use, mixed-income districts, revitalizing waterfronts and warehouse districts, taming the commercial strip, creating a networks of trails and greenways, and so forth. APA members who work in state or regional planning agencies, those in private practice, and those who teach in planning schools, might be able to address such issues with relevant examples.

Make a Video

National Community Planning Month also offers an ideal occasion to develop and screen a short video about planning’s role in shaping the community and region. The very process of producing such a program can engage many different members of the community as well as attract the attention of local media. Media programs at local colleges, technical schools, and high schools may have faculty and students who could help. Local television stations, cable systems, and the audio-visual departments of major companies might also lend a hand. The final product can be screened at an open house, shown by a local television or cable company, or posted to a community website for viewing and downloading.

APA’s Planning Advisory Service Report 500/501, Lights, Camera, Community Video, is an excellent how-to manual that offers numerous examples of places where this has been done and a DVD with some of the resulting videos. It shows how to use both the process of interviewing residents and the screening of the final program to raise the visibility of planning issues — and the importance of citizen participation — within the community. Footage of planning projects featured in APA’s National Planning Awards videos is also available by contacting APA at publicinfo@planning.org.

Show Up in Unexpected Places

Use National Community Planning Month as an occasion to get planning out of the public hearing room and into the community. Show up at unexpected places by having a display at a local music festival, arts celebration, or county fair. Reach out to other groups in the community to co-sponsor an event in recognition National Community Planning Month, like a fund-raising 10K run or walk, with the proceeds
going to a good cause like affordable housing, conservation, or K-12 education. Get pledges from businesses, organizations, and special interest groups as a sign that they recognize, support, and celebrate good planning. Have fun!

**World Town Planning Day — A Global Planning Perspective**

Each year on November 8, World Town Planning Day is celebrated in more than 30 countries by planning professionals, civic leaders, and young people. This year, APA will focus its energy and efforts on celebrating National Community Planning Month to highlight the impact and benefits of planning in this country. World Town Planning Day presents an excellent opportunity to look at planning from a global perspective, and APA encourages its members to consider planning challenges and solutions around the globe on that day. Click here for more about World Town Planning Day.

**More Ideas to Come ...**

Check back in the coming weeks for specific ideas on how to promote National Community Planning Month to the media in your area and how to engage your Senators and Representatives during the congressional Columbus Day recess.

©Copyright 2006 American Planning Association All Rights Reserved
October 2006

National Community Planning Month

Making Great Communities Though Planning

Celebrate the achievements of planning this October during the inaugural National Community Planning Month.

This annual event will help raise the visibility of planning and APA. It’s time to recognize the contributions of the planning profession and the individuals who work hard to make our communities enjoyable, endearing, and valuable.

This year’s theme is Making Great Communities Through Planning. Communities don’t just happen — they take hard work, foresight, and commitment. Each week in October will be focused on a specific aspect of planning:

Our Legacy of Great Communities
October 1-7
Early visionaries helped create communities that set the foundation for many ideas and theories in planning. Communities that were considered revolutionary when first built continue to thrive and offer residents the same benefits, illustrating the long-lasting benefits of good planning.

Today's Great Communities
October 8-14
Our communities today offer residents numerous choices — where to live, how to commute, and where to recreate. Planners work to ensure that the character of a community is maintained, while addressing the challenges and needs associated with growth and change.

Tomorrow’s Great Communities
October 15-21
Planning today will create the communities of tomorrow. Planning is a visionary process, always looking toward the future. How can we keep residents safe from crime, natural and man-made disasters? How can we help protect the environment through planning so future generations can enjoy green space, clean air, and unpolluted waters? The work in progress today will create communities of lasting value for future generations.

People Making Great Communities
October 22-31
Planning takes hard work and a visionary individual to transfer ideas from paper into actual results within a community. Good planning is best achieved when all community members participate in the planning process and provide input and feedback. Engaging younger community members helps build understanding about the importance of planning and participating in the process — it may even inspire some to become future planners.

Local Celebrations

APA members are encouraged to celebrate the month in their own communities. Keep checking the website for suggested activities and materials to assist in celebrating National Community Planning Month. We are also interested in knowing what you’re planning for your community.

http://www.planning.org/ncpm/index.htm?project=Print
Click here to see suggested community activities
Click here for tips on reaching out to youth
Click here to learn how to share your plans with others
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