MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

REGIONAL PLANNING TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP

The Regional Planning Technical Working Group (RPTWG) may take action on any item appearing on this agenda.

Thursday, September 13, 2007
1:15 to 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

• RECOGNITION OF NIALL FRITZ, CHAIR OF THE TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP

• REGIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN (RCP): DRAFT 2007 ANNUAL PERFORMANCE MONITORING REPORT

• SMART GROWTH TOOL BOX: OUTREACH PROGRAM, I-PLACE®’S SKETCH MODEL, AND VISUALIZATION TOOLS

• PROPOSITION 1C IMPLEMENTATION UPDATE

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

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS

Members of the public will have the opportunity to address the Technical Working Group on any issue within the jurisdiction of the Working Group. Speakers are limited to three minutes each.

CONSENT

+3. TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP (TWG) MEETING SUMMARIES

The TWG should review and approve the June 14, 2007, TWG meeting summary and the summary of the joint meeting between the TWG and the Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) held on July 12, 2007.

REPORTS

4. RECOGNITION OF NIALL FRITZ, CHAIR OF THE TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP

Niall Fritz, Director of Development Services for the City of Poway, is retiring, culminating a planning career of over 30 years. He has served as the Chair of the TWG for the last several years, representing the TWG on the SANDAG Regional Planning Committee and at other SANDAG meetings. SANDAG sincerely thanks Mr. Fritz for his service to the TWG and for his sustained commitment to local and regional planning in the San Diego region. Congratulations Niall!

5. ELECTION OF NEW TWG CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR (Niall Fritz)

Jim Sandoval, Planning and Building Director for the City of Chula Vista, currently serves as the TWG Vice Chair. Mr. Sandoval has expressed interest in serving as the TWG Chair if the group so wishes. Nominations for Chair and Vice Chair will be conducted. The TWG should elect its new officers.
6. 2007 AWARDS BY THE CALIFORNIA CHAPTER OF THE AMERICAN PLANNING ASSOCIATION (CCAPA) (Chair Fritz)

The CCAPA has announced its award winners for this year. The following individuals, agencies, and jurisdictions from the San Diego region have received statewide awards.

- Betsy McCullough of the City of San Diego: Outstanding Distinguished Leadership Award for a Professional Planner.
- SANDAG: Outstanding Distinguished Leadership Award for an Agency.
- City of La Mesa: Outstanding Planning Project Award for the Grossmont Trolley Station Project, Alterra & Pravada.
- San Diego Chapter of the APA, in conjunction with the North County Transit District (NCTD), League of California Cities, Caltrans, and SANDAG: 2007 CCAPA Section Activity Award for the Local Planning Commissioners Workshop focused on regional planning issues held last January at Caltrans.

7. ANTICIPATED REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE (RPC) ACTIONS AND DISCUSSION ITEMS FOR FY 2008 (Coleen Clementson)

At its August meeting, staff presented the attached report to the Regional Planning Committee (RPC). The report outlines anticipated actions and discussion items for the RPC based upon the SANDAG Board-adopted FY 2008 Overall Work Program and suggests a calendar of meetings with themes that implement the Regional Comprehensive Plan. This schedule will assist in coordinating the work of the TWG. One of the major focus areas this fiscal year will be the development of planning and financing tools as part of the Smart Growth Tool Box. The TWG should discuss this item and provide feedback on the idea of inviting TWG members to speak about local smart growth projects on a rotating basis.

8. REGIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN (RCP): DRAFT 2007 ANNUAL PERFORMANCE MONITORING REPORT (Christine Eary)

Monitoring progress in implementing the RCP will occur on an annual basis. In August, the Regional Planning Committee authorized release of the draft 2007 Annual Performance Monitoring Report for a 60-day public review and comment period. The TWG is asked for input on the attached report. The review period closes on October 2, 2007.

9. LOCAL SMART GROWTH EFFORTS (All)

A number of smart growth planning projects are underway throughout the region or have recently been acted upon by local policymakers. TWG members are invited to describe the status of their efforts and discuss the challenges and opportunities related to these projects.
+10. SMART GROWTH TOOL BOX: OUTREACH PROGRAMS, I-PLACE3S SKETCH MODEL, AND VISUALIZATION TOOLS (Carolina Gregor)

As referenced, SANDAG is developing a Smart Growth Tool Box this fiscal year to help implement key components of the Regional Comprehensive Plan. This item focuses on three planning tools included in the Tool Box. A presentation on these efforts will be made.

11. PROPOSITION 1C IMPLEMENTATION UPDATE (Susan Baldwin)

Staff will update the TWG on implementation of Proposition 1C (The Housing and Emergency Shelter Trust Fund Act of 2006).

+12. WATER CONSERVATION SUMMIT (Toby Roy and Rose Smutko, San Diego County Water Authority)

The San Diego County Water Authority and its member agencies will host the second annual Water Conservation Summit on Friday, October 12, 2007. During the breakout sessions, the Water Authority will put forth a draft model landscape ordinance for the region. This is an important opportunity for stakeholders, especially from local planning agencies, to provide feedback. Water Authority staff will provide an overview of the summit and progress to date from last year’s summit.

13. ADJOURNMENT AND NEXT MEETING

The next TWG meeting will be held on Thursday, October 11, 2007, from 1:15 – 3:15 p.m.

+ next to an item indicates an attachment
SUMMARY OF JUNE 14, 2007, TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP MEETING

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.

CONSENT ITEMS 3 through 7

Agenda Item #3: Summary of the May 10, 2007, Technical Working Group Meeting

This item was not pulled from the Consent Agenda.

Agenda Item #4: North County Transit District (NCTD) Proposed Bus Route Service Changes Related to the Opening of the SPRINT

The TWG was provided information concerning the SPRINT, which is scheduled to open in December 2007. NCTD is proposing a new service plan to implement changes to BREEZE bus routes to coordinate with the SPRINT. Details are posted on the NCTD Web site at www.gonctd.com. NCTD also will be hosting open houses and workshops, and a Public Hearing on Thursday, June 21, 2007. See the information on-line for details. Also, visit the Web site to review the new on-line SPRINT Preview Trip Planner. Contact Stefan Marks at NCTD at (760) 966-6539 for further information.

Agenda Item #5: Upcoming Workshop on Planning and Designing for Pedestrian Safety

Stephen Vance informed the TWG that the San Diego area has been selected for a free, three-day Caltrans/Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) workshop, “Planning and Designing for Pedestrian Safety,” hosted locally by Caltrans District 11 and Walk San Diego. This workshop, funded by FHWA, is being offered in select regions of the state as part of Caltrans’ commitment to making California safer for pedestrians. The workshop will be held from July 11 to July 13, 2007, from 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. A flyer containing additional information was attached to the agenda packet.
Agenda Item #6: Smart Growth Trip Generation and Parking Demand Study

Christine Eary, SANDAG staff, informed the TWG that within the next few months, SANDAG will be hiring a consultant to work on a study evaluating parking and trip generation rates for smart growth areas within the San Diego region for integration into the San Diego Traffic Generators Manual and the Smart Growth Urban Design Guidelines. An attached report provided an overview of the scope of work.

Agenda Item #7: Sustainable Communities Grant and Loan Program

Coleen Clementson, SANDAG staff, explained that the California Pollution Control Financing Authority is conducting a 2007 funding round for the Sustainable Communities Grant and Loan (SCGL) Program to assist cities and counties to develop and implement sustainable development growth policies, programs, and projects. The SCGL program may fund specific plans, portions of specific plans, alternative transportation studies, finance plans, redevelopment plans, engineering studies, public projects, and other projects that promote sustainable development principles. The application deadline is Monday, July 16, 2007. First priority funding will be for applicants that lack resources to develop and implement sustainable development growth policies, programs, and projects. The Program Description and Application Instructions are available via the Internet at: www.treasurer.ca.gov/cpcfa.

A motion and second were made to approve the Consent Agenda. The motion passed unanimously.

REPORT ITEMS 8 through 14

Agenda Item #8: Reports from TWG members

Chair Fritz presented the group with the San Diego Metropolitan Magazine, which featured articles on the Smart Growth Concept Map, SANDAG’s binational planning efforts, and the projects nominated for the Urban Land Institute (ULI) awards. Chair Fritz announced that the Smart Growth Concept Map and SOLARA, an energy-efficient affordable housing project in Poway, won ULI smart growth awards.

Bill Chopyk, City of La Mesa, commented on the recent APA Awards ceremony, and the TWG requested recognition of all the award recipients.

Patrick Murphy, City of Encinitas, announced an APA award for their E-zoning project, and encouraged the group to take a look at this innovative tool.

Bill Anderson, City of San Diego, announced that Betsy McCullough of the City of San Diego was awarded the Distinguished Planner award.

Ed Batchelder, City of Chula Vista, announced that Chula Vista won awards for the Chula Vista Strategic Plan and Work Program and for its public outreach efforts, including its quarterly speakers forum.
Chair Fritz commented he was on the award jury and felt that the Chula Vista projects were excellent, and he passed on the project information to his staff.

Mr. Chopyk announced that La Mesa won an award for its smart growth Grossmont Trolley Station Project. He also recognized the Chula Vista projects, and said La Mesa is looking to do something similar.

Carolina Gregor, SANDAG staff, announced that SANDAG received awards from the APA and the ULI. SANDAG received APA awards for implementation of the RCP; development of the Smart Growth Concept Map; and the Emerging Regional Government-to-Government Framework with our local Tribal nations. SANDAG received a ULI award for the Smart Growth Concept Map. She thanked TWG members for their participation in the development of the map.

**Agenda Item #9: Public Scoping Meeting for Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an Environmental Impact Report for the 2007 Regional Transportation Plan**

Questions and Comments included:

Mr. Chopyk asked what consultant is preparing the EIR. Ms. Tucker responded that it is being prepared by EDAW. Mr. Chopyk requested the name of the EIR project manager. Ms. Tucker responded that his name is Mr. Graham.

Ms. Gregor read comments from Diane Nygaard that were sent via e-mail questioning whether SANDAG had provided sufficient outreach on the NOP. Ms. Tucker responded by stating that a notice was sent to over 700 people and distributed to many of SANDAG’s working groups through e-mail. There have been two public scoping meetings, including this one. Notices have been posted on-line, in The San Diego Union-Tribune, North County Times, San Diego Daily Transcript, La Prensa, Asian Journal, and announced at numerous committee and working group meetings.

Theresa Quiroz, resident of City Heights, agrees with the comments of Ms. Nygaard’s e-mail, and commented that the average person needs help understanding the process of environmental review. She further stated that a Regional Plan makes statements for areas that are very different. For example, in City Heights there is a park on top of the freeway and a school immediately adjacent. She stated that the RTP EIR does not take into account these local issues.

Joyce Brown, City Heights Development Corporation - Resident Services, stated that the park and elementary school just referred to are used by the children of her residents. She referenced a study completed by the children’s hospital that determined that the children in City Heights have the highest rate of asthma than those in any other city. She stated that her group represents stakeholders, and they should be notified about the meetings that directly affect them. She stated that City Heights has one of the highest levels of transit ridership in San Diego.

Chair Fritz requested the sign-in sheet be passed around once again to make sure the public attending the TWG meeting would be notified of future meetings.

Maria Cortez, President of Terra Alta West, spoke as a resident concerning the allergy and asthma issues affecting the residents of City Heights. She stated that the promises made to City Heights, such as the Centerline transit project, have not been realized. She pointed to the experiences of
friends and family who would be taking the Centerline once it is available. She noted that there has been a lot of growth in City Heights, but that the transportation hasn't kept up. She requested that City Heights not be forgotten in the transportation planning process.

Juan Antonio Ramirez, City Heights Community Development Corporation, referenced the Centerline project. Mr. Chopyk requested information concerning this project, and Mr. Ramirez provided a general background of the transit service. He commented that many of the City Heights residents he speaks with are willing to take transit if it is made available. He stated he supports the transit emphasis alternative of the RTP. He added that the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between Caltrans and the City of San Diego states that the section of Interstate I-15 in City Heights is not to handle big truck traffic loads. He requested that the RTP further consider environmental concerns such as air quality, noise, and land use that directly impact City Heights.

Ms. Brown provided a quote from the MOU between Caltrans and the City of San Diego. She pointed to comments on the district requirement to mitigate noise, and assign truck traffic to I-805 from the I-15. She stated the MOU is supposed to stand for memorandum of understanding, but it really stands for method of usurping.

Mr. Chopyk asked about the parties involved in the MOU. Ms. Tucker requested that a copy of this memorandum be provided, and if comments could additionally be submitted in writing. Ms. Brown asked if the dates of the public workshops have been determined. Heather Werdick, SANDAG staff, responded that information regarding the public workshops will be distributed upon the release of the draft RTP, and the SANDAG Board will be discussing that on June 22. She stated that the workshops will most likely be held in the last two weeks of July, and discussions have been underway to further discuss the draft RTP at City Council and Planning Commission meetings.

Chair Fritz inquired about the inclusion of the Centerline project in the RTP. Ms. Werdick said the I-15 managed lanes project is included with the BRT and highway improvements in the Revenue Constrained and the Reasonably Expected Revenue Scenarios of the draft RTP. There are ongoing discussions concerning the status of the additional lanes and, once a determination is made, it will be finalized in the plan. Chair Fritz stated that the project is “sort of” included in the plan. Ms. Werdick responded that the final determination has not yet been included.

Ms. Cortez commented that at a past meeting, City Heights residents were told that the northbound lanes on the I-15 would be high-occupancy-vehicle (HOV) lanes, but that at another meeting they were told that they would be BRT. Mr. Anderson from the City of San Diego said there have been meetings concerning this issue because it is important to have north/south public transit opportunities, but that the needs for goods movement complicate that.

Mr. Anderson further commented that environmental justice concerns regarding issues such as housing and school facilities are surfacing issues that have been seen through projects in Otay Mesa and Barrio Logan. He said the EIR should make sure to address the environmental justice issues, especially due to recent research done in Los Angeles. He stated that the upcoming workshops are to help the communities understand the draft RTP, and requested a presentation for the Planning Commission of the City of San Diego. Mr. Batchelder commented that the freeway and freight movement issues will confront us all.
Ms. Quiroz asked if the decision concerning the Centerline project will be made before the EIR is completed. Ms. Werdick answered that SANDAG must first determine the project list for the environmental review. Then, input and comments from the public and from public agencies can be included in the final RTP. Chair Fritz stated that if the Centerline project was not included in the proposed project, it could be analyzed as an alternative. Ms. Werdick responded that this would be the case except in the no-build scenario.

Mr. Ramirez asked if the managed lanes on I-15 would only be north of SR 163. Ms. Werdick responded that they are north of SR 163 with one lane in each direction south of 163 that can be called a carpool lane or a BRT lane, but a final determination has not been made. Mr. Ramirez said that the SANDAG Transportation Committee defined it as a BRT. Ms. Werdick referenced page 21 in the provided packet that outlines this in further detail. She stated that plans are not changed until there is a final determination made. Mr. Ramirez questioned the technical analysis on the Goods Movement Action Plan. He stated that the environmental issues should be more important than goods movement.

Paul Lare, resident of City Heights, stated that he rides the bus every day and solicits input regarding transit operations. He stated that City Heights residents cannot get to doctor appointments. Some of them are schizophrenic and have serious ailments that rely on medical care. He addressed the elementary school adjacent to I-15 and stated that the school children are greatly affected by asthma. He stated that this subject revolves around three facets: money, politics, and the human interest. He stated that this is a golden opportunity for San Diego to move forward. We are looking at a city with the second-largest population in California, and we need to promote change. The residents of City Heights need to be able to get to work, and take care of their health.

Ms. Brown added that Paul is a City Heights resident that is an example of the ability to mobilize the community. She stated that many residents are very interested in the community, and want to help.

Jon Brindle, City of Escondido, commented that one of the City of Escondido’s concerns is to ensure that the designs provide for an efficient transition from the HOV lanes at SR 78 and I-15. He understands that the transit alternative has an alternate design which will not be as efficient, and he would like to document his concern regarding that particular issue.

Mr. Anderson asked if all scenarios are being evaluated equally in terms of CEQA analysis. Rob Rundle, SANDAG staff, responded that they are not being evaluated equally. The split between highways and managed lanes will be more closely analyzed. The other alternatives will be evaluated, but with less detail. Mr. Anderson further questioned if global warming impacts will be addressed. Mr. Rundle answered that this will be analyzed in the RTP and the program EIR. Mr. Anderson asked if a less detailed analysis of the transit first scenario would provide adequate information to analyze global warming impacts. Mr. Rundle answered that SANDAG has the outputs for that part of the analysis, but that we will not be going into detail concerning issues such as habitat impacts and soil impacts. There will be a CO2 and NOX comparison between alternatives. Mr. Anderson asked why the transit option is not being further analyzed. Mr. Rundle stated that this is based on the direction of the SANDAG Board, and, if they choose to move forward with the transit alternative, there would be a more detailed analysis.
Mr. Chopyk asked if there are any federal funds involved in the project to determine if there is a need for National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) review. Mr. Rundle responded that the RTP is not subject to NEPA, but that the specific projects would be. Chair Fritz asked if this is set up for a two-tier EIR process. Mr. Rundle said that that would be ideal, but that that was not the direction of the Board.

Mr. Lare asked if the BRT utilizes federal funding because he would like to influence our congressional representatives. Ms. Werdick answered that most bus routes do receive federal funds.

**Agenda Item #10: Update on Housing Items**

Susan Baldwin, SANDAG staff, provided the TWG with updates on current housing issues. Discussion ensued as follows.

A. Board Policy #033, Implementation Guidelines for the SANDAG Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) Memorandum

Chair Fritz commented that the RHNA process is a difficult issue and suggested that next time SANDAG develop a methodology that generates more consensus than the methodology used during the last RHNA cycle.

Mr. Murphy stated the current policy is a very poor policy because transit availability and housing do not necessarily equate to affordable housing. He referenced the Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program and said that only six jurisdictions were able to compete for those funds. He stated that this is a divisive policy, and the way it was developed does not reflect a bottom-up approach. He feels we should scrap the current policy and start anew to avoid potential problems in years to come.

Ms. Baldwin asked Mr. Murphy if he is more concerned about identifying sites for housing or about housing production. He stated that he is concerned with both siting and production because he does not see the correlation between the allocation of points so heavily weighted towards affordability and actual need around the region. Ms. Baldwin commented that there are many housing funding programs at the State level, and that SANDAG Policy #033 is reflective of the SANDAG Board’s desire to link housing policy with regional incentives. Mr. Murphy said this makes it more controversial locally because the policy will further limit the availability of funds for housing in many areas of the region.

Mr. Anderson commented that the premise behind the regional smart growth strategy reflects the need to provide incentives for the construction of additional affordable housing with regional funds. He added that when cities do not take on their share of affordable housing, there is less capacity for financing the regional need. A large problem is the ability to find locations for denser development and more affordable housing.

Mr. Batchelder stated that during the last housing element cycle, the jurisdictions tried to move toward a more balanced smart growth approach, but the RHNA allocation process was based on housing capacity in general plans. He added that Chula Vista was left with a large allocation because of its vacant land capacity. The RHNA process should consider jobs, housing, commuting patterns, and other growth-based indicators. Ms. Baldwin responded that the RHNA allocation
process was largely based on the regional growth forecast, which takes numerous indicators such as the ones noted by Mr. Batchelder into consideration.

Chair Fritz commented that site availability was not taken into consideration. Ms. Baldwin said that only 18,000 units were not located by the forecast process; these units were located based on share of employment growth between 2000 and 2010.

Greg Wade, City of Imperial Beach, commented that there still is no incentive given to communities that have historically provided affordable housing. He asked if we could better define production in order to better coordinate with redevelopment law.

Mr. Batchelder said that the pressure will continue on housing element reform. The focus should be not only on new production, but also on providing credit for non-restricted stock in a redevelopment condition for renovation of existing units.

Rick Brady, City of Santee, commented that the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) will allow you to count redevelopment units, but it is extremely difficult because those units basically need to be “ready to collapse.” Also, you would need to reevaluate your projects to see if they meet the requirements for housing credit.

B. State Density Bonus Issues

Mr. Batchelder said that density bonus projects sometimes conflict with height requirements in coastal communities. State housing laws need reform because there are too many conflicts between housing and environmental regulations.

Mr. Chopyk agreed that the State density bonus law needs to be reformed, and the City of La Mesa has never used it due to provisions such as the 30-year affordable housing requirement. He said the law is very complicated, and it is not financially feasible. He said low-income housing needs to be subsidized.

Mr. Murphy said one of the big problems is that HCD does not provide guidelines for development. Concessions in specific plans create a disincentive for cities to incorporate affordable housing. The policy does not work well for infill projects, and Senate Bill 1818 accomplishes less affordable housing and increases the market rates for housing. Density bonus and inclusionary units are two different covenants, and HCD is now requiring density bonus to accomplish inclusionary housing goals, which results in the production of less affordable housing units. He would like HCD to come up with guidelines to assist cities with the implementation of SB 1818.

Chair Fritz expressed concern that the current legislative program might translate into lower-quality housing projects.

Vicki Parker, City of Vista, stated that HCD feels that densities in Vista are not high enough. A recent study that Vista did showed that the required levels of density are not consistent with the market demand. The density requirements should be translated into the development community through such organizations as the Building Industry Association (BIA). Once densities are assumed, the developer has to chase increases in the market value. She also noted that past production of units is affecting the chances to get funding for smart growth projects.
Karen Brindley, City of San Marcos, said that the current bill does not differentiate between multi-family and single-family units. HCD needs to come up with guidelines for implementation, and developers are having difficulty getting feedback from HCD. There are many incentives for the developer, but not for the communities. She expressed interest in participating in a forum to discuss these housing issues.

Roger Post, City of National City, commented that they received an application for their first density bonus project last week. The project already seems to have too many concessions. Ms. Brindley said that often developers request many concessions that create concerns.

Mr. Brady asked if National City or San Marcos has a post-SB 1818 ordinance. Don Neu answered that the City of Carlsbad has a post-SB 1818 ordinance, but that the California Coastal Commission has not given its approval.

Ms. Baldwin stated that this seems like an important and complex issue. She asked the group if they would be interested in assembling with other groups such as the BIA to talk this issue through.

Chair Fritz mentioned his experiences with inclusionary housing and said it is interesting to see the ramifications when you actually get less affordable housing.

Mr. Anderson said that he is worried that this is going to give smart growth a bad name. As density bonus projects obtain exceptions to regulations, residents become concerned that the quality of the housing may be compromised, and perspectives about smart growth may be jeopardized. Ms. Baldwin said that there is more potential for greater housing capacity in smart growth areas because of density bonus law.

Mr. Post asked if density bonus projects are affected differently when you have a form-based code. Mr. Batchelder asked if we now have good intentions running into each other.

Lance Schulte, NCTD, said there has been a lot of tweaking of the underlying economic impacts of affordable housing. It may be productive to look back at this issue and strip away past ideas in order to produce a more streamlined economic approach.

Mr. Brady stated that Chula Vista, Escondido, and San Marcos have certified housing elements, and asked if HCD has requested updates to the density bonus ordinance as part of its compliance reviews. He added that the City of Santee is currently working on an updated ordinance. Melanie Kush, City of Santee, added that HCD gave Santee instructions to proceed without any guidance.

Mr. Murphy voiced a desire to participate in a discussion group because density bonus requests are coming in for all subdivisions in Encinitas. Chair Fritz said that the City of Poway has only had one proposed density bonus project, but it could not meet the lot standards.

Mr. Brady said that with a change in the housing market, the rents for many new apartments are close to moderate-income housing. He suggested that the density bonus ordinance might follow a shift in the rental market prices.
Ms. Baldwin offered to set up a meeting in July to discuss these issues with the TWG and Regional Housing Working Group members. Chair Fritz said that it is a good idea to include the Regional Housing Working Group.

C. Potential housing bill proposed by Mayor Mickey Cafagna of Poway that would allow local jurisdictions within the region to transfer a percentage of their regional housing need goals to other jurisdictions in exchange for redevelopment and other funds.

Chair Fritz commented that many jurisdictions, especially the smaller ones, will be built out, so this could be a good way to address affordable housing needs. Receiving jurisdictions would be amenable because of the additional funding.

Mr. Anderson said that the City of San Diego would take on moderate income housing if infrastructure funding is provided.

Mr. Schulte said that transit agencies should be included in the discussions.

Mr. Chopyk commented that jurisdictions should not be able to “buy” their way out of affordable housing. All jurisdictions are struggling to achieve their RHNA goals.

Ms. Parker added that the proposal seems inconsistent with environmental justice goals.

Mr. Batchelder said that the regional share process already talks about jurisdictions working together on a sub-regional basis to address affordable housing needs, but this needs further discussion.

Ms. Parker agreed that there are provisions for such collaborations, but she does not want the TWG to lose sight of the fact that infrastructure is not the only cost burden borne by the jurisdiction over the life of a housing unit.

Based on discussions between Poway and National City on this issue over the past two years, Mr. Post recognized the long-term commitment needed for something like this to happen. In this situation, the geographical distance between the two jurisdictions could also generate some criticism.

Mr. Wade said a sub-regional distribution would be the key to making this work.

Ms. Baldwin referred to the handout with a proposed schedule for addressing this issue. A meeting will be held with TWG members, Regional Housing Task Force members and redevelopment staff to discuss this proposal further.

D. Smart Growth and Housing Legislative Report presented to the Executive Committee on May 11, 2007, and to the Regional Planning Committee (RPC) on June 1, 2007.

Agenda Item #11: Follow-up on I-PLACE3S Training Workshops

Ms. Gregor reported that on May 22 and 23, 2007, SANDAG held training workshops on the I-PLACE3S sketch modeling tool for local planning staffs and transit planners. She briefly reported on the workshop outcomes and stated that staff will return with possible next steps in the deployment of the tool at a future meeting.

Agenda Item #12: Recent Awards and Activities Associated with the Smart Growth Concept Map

Ms. Gregor reported that staff recently made presentations to the SANDAG RPC and to the ULI on the Smart Growth Concept Map. These presentations were very well received, and resulted in suggestions for local jurisdictions to post information regarding their smart growth areas on their Web sites and advertise projects within these areas more visibly within their communities. Ms. Gregor reported that along these lines, SANDAG has updated its smart growth Web site, which now includes an "interactive" Smart Growth Concept Map with Google site and satellite maps, allowing users to more easily access information on each area. Staff will showcase the updated Web site at a future meeting. The interactive map can be accessed at www.sandag.org/rcp.

Ms. Gregor also reported that San Diego State University (SDSU) recently invited planners from the City of Santee and SANDAG to participate in a project where graduate students developed and presented smart growth site plans for two of Santee's potential smart growth areas on the Smart Growth Concept Map. In mid-May, Santee and SANDAG staff served as jurors for the student proposals, which linked regional smart growth planning criteria to the local application of these principles. Ms. Kush stated that it was a very interesting project because the students' work allowed her to focus in on the true constraints on transitioning their Potential smart growth areas to Existing/Planned areas based on environmental and land ownership issues. She complimented Professor Nico Calavita’s class on their work.

Agenda Item #13: Transit Development Review Report

This item was tabled to the next TWG meeting.

Agenda Item #14: Adjournment and Next Meeting

The next TWG meeting will be held on Thursday, July 12, 2007, from 1:15 to 3:15 p.m. A joint meeting with the Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee is being considered.
SUMMARY OF JULY 12, 2007, JOINT MEETING OF THE REGIONAL PLANNING
TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP AND THE CITIES/COUNTY TRANSPORTATION
ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

Agenda Item #1: Welcome and Introductions

Jim Sandoval, City of Chula Vista, and Greg Humora, City of La Mesa, co-chaired the meeting. Self-introductions were conducted. Muggs Stoll, SANDAG staff, conducted a "pop quiz," testing the working group’s familiarity of their civic counterparts.

Agenda Item #2: Public Comments and Communications

Jay Powell, City Heights Development Corporation, commented on the Mid-City rapid transit project along the I-15 referred to as the “Centerline.” He distributed a summary of key issues surrounding this project. He felt the key issues are that the draft 2007 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) identifies the I-15 as a future high-occupancy-vehicle (HOV) corridor and a key freight corridor, which would prevent the Centerline stations at University Avenue and El Cajon Boulevard from being constructed as transit-oriented development projects, and would contribute to air quality and noise pollution, especially as related to a local elementary school immediately adjacent to the I-15. He spoke against the inclusion of a goods movement route within the I-15 corridor, and urged that the median in the center of the freeway be dedicated for use of the rapid transit stations on the plazas where University Avenue and El Cajon Boulevard cross the freeway. He added that the transit stations are already constructed, and would contribute to the advancement of smart growth.

Agenda Item #3: Draft 2007 Regional Transportation Plan

Heather Werdick, SANDAG staff, stated that on June 22, 2007, the SANDAG Board released the draft 2007 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) for review and comment. Ms. Werdick presented an overview of Reasonably Expected Revenue Scenario and a schedule of the RTP public outreach workshops. Working Group members were invited to discuss and comment on the draft plan, and were encouraged to attend the workshops in their sub-regions.

Jerry Backoff, City of San Marcos, asked which scenario the Palomar Airport Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) service is included in. Ms. Werdick responded that it is included in the Revenue Constrained Scenario, not the Reasonably Expected Scenario.

Ed Kleeman, City of Coronado, asked about the structure of the public workshops, and asked if they will be the same at each location. Ms. Werdick answered that the workshops will begin with an informational presentation on the draft RTP followed by an open house and discussion.
Lance Schulte, North County Transit District (NCTD), asked if the RTP Environmental Impact Report (EIR) will address parking and related land costs. Rob Rundle, SANDAG staff, responded that the EIR will not get into that type of specificity. He added that the draft EIR will likely be available by August 15 instead of the projected August 3 time line.

There was an inquiry regarding how long it will be before the next update of the RTP. Ms. Werdick responded that the RTP is a long-range document that is updated every four years. Since the plan assumes an additional $17 billion, many of the revenues will not start until after 2015 because a funding source needs to be identified. Mr. Stoll added that the phasing of transportation projects is included in Appendix A.

Mr. Sandoval stated that the Chula Vista General Plan update results in an additional 15,000 housing units over the previous general plan, and this may include another 7,000 units due to the future university in the Otay Ranch area. He commented that there should be more East/West transit routes in South County, and that there is a need to take a closer look at the transportation demands of development projects that serve as regional attractors. While local developments should be able to pay their own way, it might be worthwhile to consider sub-regional funding approaches for the necessary transportation improvements of regional attractors. He added that it is valuable to look at goods movement because there are many economic impacts generated from travel to Mexico and back. He added that we also need to look at how corridors are accessed. He hopes that people in South County will rely on SR 125, but they will also use SR 94 heavily.

**Agenda Item #4: Response to Questions on Regional Transportation Congestion Improvement Program (RTCIP)**

Marney Cox, SANDAG staff, stated that the TransNet Extension Ordinance includes a Regional Transportation Congestion Improvement Program (RTCIP) that requires developers of new residential units to help pay for impacts on regional arterials. A workshop was held in April to discuss how the money should be spent on the regional arterials. Mr. Cox addressed the following unresolved questions that came out of those meetings and discussions.

- For multi-family units, should the average fee amount from the nexus study be used or should a specific amount based on trips per unit be used? Mr. Cox responded that the average amount was greater than $2,000 and the specific amount was less than $2,000, which was the threshold in the TransNet ordinance. He presented a way to estimate fees through 2006 even though the fees will not take effect until 2008. The Caltrans cost index has increased more than the Bureau of Labor statistics, and we are not locked into a particular cost index. He foresees the fee per unit will be above the $2,000 threshold.

- Guidelines to match up with the mitigation fee impact. Mr. Cox commented that the guidelines in the ordinance will need to match up with the Mitigation Fee Act, and the consultants will help provide continuity between those two requirements. He addressed two written comments from CTAC members related to this item. First, if jurisdictions would like to collect impact fees for non-residential units, they can use information from the Nexus study to determine the amount of the fees. Second, he pointed out that changes to the Regional Arterial System (RAS) definition have resulted in the addition of 100 more regional arterial lane miles. He commented that this does not change the Nexus study even though the system has grown. The amount of the fee will not be recalculated. The expansion of the RAS simply allows jurisdictions to spend
the collected funds on an expanded set of roads, and the question then becomes one of allocation. He added that jurisdictions can conduct their own Nexus study to recalculate fee amounts, as long as the fees collected for residential units are higher than those specified by the Nexus study per the TransNet ordinance.

- Variations in costs per trip. Mr. Cox addressed the reasoning behind the variations in costs per trip. In typical nexus studies, no trip is different from another, but since this one only looked at impact fees on residential units, the consultants looked at the proportion of trips that should be allocated to commercial uses. The assumptions used for the different trip allocations resulted in three different costs per trip. This is because some trips originally allocated to commercial uses have been allocated to residential.

- Future fee adjustments. Mr. Cox explained that the impact fee amount in 2008 and beyond will be adjusted annually based on the construction cost index. The ordinance specifies the Engineering News Record (ENR) index or a similar index for determining fee increases. There is a big difference between the Caltrans cost increases and ENR, but SANDAG is leaning towards the Caltrans cost increases.

- Fee waivers. Mr. Cox stated that there are two ways for jurisdictions to receive fee waivers. One is for the provision of very low-, low-, and moderate-income households. The other is through redevelopment projects that do not result in overall trip increases.

- Fee credits. Mr. Cox stated that jurisdictions can receive fee credits if they have a fee program in place that is collecting and spending an amount that will satisfy the requirements of the ordinance. This money must be spent on the RAS system and reflect complete compliance. Jurisdictions that do not have a fee program today must adopt one, and he recommended cooperation between cities to help guide the formation of fee programs. Mr. Cox encouraged members to e-mail him additional comments or questions.

Mr. Humora asked when the consultant will complete the remaining work and get back to the working group. Mr. Cox answered that they will start in August and information will be available by mid-September.

Mr. Backoff requested a summary of the RAS. Mr. Cox said it is defined by the most recent RTP in 2003, and is being updated through the 2007 RTP. Mr. Backoff asked if SANDAG will build the regional connecting roads. Mr. Cox said that the strategy is for jurisdictions to collect the funds and pool their resources to be spent on the arterial system.

Mr. Humora commented that his city’s attorney interpreted the Nexus study literally, and will apply the fee based on the single and multi-family home figures in the Nexus study. Mr. Cox responded that that is a correct way to do it, and that he will come back with a fee amount for both single and multi-family homes above the threshold.

Zoubir Ouadah, City of Poway, asked whether a jurisdiction could meet its $2,000 requirement if it applied impact fees to both residential and commercial developments. Mr. Cox responded no, that the ordinance does not allow that.
Bill Chopyk, City of La Mesa, commented that there should be consideration given to the jobs/housing balance. He thinks the addition of commercial to residential should create an offset because it can reduce the overall impacts to the transportation system. Mr. Cox answered that the ordinance cannot be changed, but the RTP has strategies to encourage the proximity of housing to jobs outside of the RTCIP.

Mr. Ouadah, asked how the original ordinance calculated trips costs. Mr. Cox responded that the total incremental cost was divided by the costs per lane mile to determine the overall cost. Mr. Ouadah asked if an overall deficiency in the system was assumed upon the adoption of the ordinance. Mr. Cox said that the Mitigation Fee Act states that a jurisdiction can only charge new growth for its impact. It can also charge for non-residential impacts, but that is not required.

Stephan Marks, NCTD, asked if there is a mechanism in the ordinance to allow money to be spent on mitigating transportation impact through transportation demand management measures or transit. Mr. Cox replied yes, that the drafters of the ordinance anticipated that jurisdictions may want to spend the funds on transit, and there are provisions allowing this to occur for BRT and other projects.

Jim Griffin, City of El Cajon, asked if there is a reporting mechanism to show how many dwelling units were developed, and the funds that were collected. Mr. Cox stated that SANDAG is hoping to wrap this information into the TransNet expenditure audits on a fiscal year basis.

**Agenda Item #5: TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program Ad Hoc Working Group**

Stephan Vance, SANDAG staff, stated that building upon the "Lessons Learned" from the Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program (SGIP), SANDAG staff is preparing to develop the long-term TransNet-funded SGIP at approximately $6 million per year. He reported on the implementation time line and requested TWG/CTAC participation in an ad hoc working group to guide program development.

Mr. Vance stated that one of the best lessons learned is that it is valuable to take the time to develop the selection criteria with the participation of those most directly involved in applying for these funds. He added that this will come before the Regional Planning Committee in November, and would like to have draft guidelines by March. There will be a call for projects in June, and SANDAG is looking at different ways to increase the availability and flexibility of the incentive funds.

Mr. Chopyk asked whether jurisdictions interested in volunteering their time to help define the criteria will be limited from competing for funds. Mr. Vance answered no, and that it would provide those jurisdictions a comprehensive understanding of the process. He said that in the Pilot program, criteria members were drawn from the Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group (SWG), but that that group will sunset once the RTP is adopted. The following TWG/CTAC members volunteered for the Smart Growth Incentive Program Ad Hoc Working Group:

- Paul Vo, San Marcos
- Linda Niles, City of Del Mar
- Patrick Murphy, City of Encinitas
- Lance Schulte, NCTD
Agenda Item #6: Funding Options: Public/Private Partnerships and Joint Development

Jane Signaigo-Cox, SANDAG staff, stated that SANDAG is exploring ways to fund transportation and transit projects and to implement smart growth in areas identified on the Smart Growth Concept Map through public/private partnerships (PPP) and joint development, particularly at transit stations. An attached report provided information on the work done to date in this area and on anticipated work for FY 2008.

Ms. Signaigo-Cox presented the group with information on ways to bridge the $17 billion gap between the Reasonably Expected and Revenue Constrained RTP scenarios. She informed the group that a Request for Proposals (RFP) is being assembled for three funding options, and for the development of guidelines for PPP in San Diego. One option aims at evaluating joint TOD in existing or potential areas on the Smart Growth Concept Map. Another option seeks to evaluate the I-15 BRT sites at Rancho Bernardo and Sabre Springs. The RFP also will identify other PPPs to offset the public sector costs in the Reasonably Expected Revenue Scenario. Ms. Signaigo-Cox added that a scope of work is being put together, and a short-list for all three components should be expected by the fall.

Mr. Kleeman commented that these partnerships seem to have the ability to eliminate smart growth areas through the prioritization of certain smart growth areas as deemed by the consultants. Ms. Signaigo-Cox responded that the RTP has ranked certain projects, but the PPP is set to look at the projects that are in the Reasonably Expected scenario and can be realized through this funding mechanism. Coleen Clementson, SANDAG staff, added that SANDAG is looking for the best opportunities for joint development to occur and this does not affect the priority when allocating smart growth incentive funds.

Mr. Sandoval asked if there is a way to evaluate the projects that are actually ready to go instead of only looking at possible projects. Ms. Clementson said there is not a lot of money for funding right now, so SANDAG wants to make sure that the funds that are allocated make positive and significant contributions. Ms. Clementson also solicited comments of this nature to be forwarded to staff to better develop this option. Mr. Stoll added that the consultants should be looking at these issues, and if there a few potential deals out there that need a little extra funding, SANDAG would like to be made aware.

Mr. Schulte commented that NCTD is in the process of one TOD PPP development, is halfway through three more, and would be happy to share lessons learned up to this point.

Mr. Stoll commented on the potential for high-occupancy-toll (HOT) PPPs, and recent state legislation has only allowed for four toll schemes. He projected the desire to be open to those ideas, but the current legislative process may affect any toll-related proposals.
Agenda Item #7: Biannual Transit Development Review Report

Ms. Clementson introduced SANDAG's intergovernmental review work element. There are four components of this element, one of which is transit review. She added that SANDAG serves as the regional clearinghouse for environmental documents. In that role, staff reviews developments and plans, and evaluates how they impact our congestion management program and how they relate to the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP). SANDAG evaluates the need for fair share contributions from future development, and proposals that are adjacent to or near smart growth areas. This is done to maintain eligibility for such funds as the Smart Growth Incentive Program.

Chris Kluth, SANDAG staff, said that the goal of intergovernmental review is to strengthen the link between transit and land use. He added that this process was started at MTDB, and work has been done with the cities to formalize that process. Now that this is at SANDAG, it is important to remind everyone of what SANDAG can offer. The attached report to the Transportation Committee summarized the results of SANDAG's efforts to coordinate transit and land use through the project development review process during July to December 2006. SANDAG staff works closely with local jurisdictions to ensure the integration of transit facilities into development projects and to improve the pedestrian environment wherever possible. During the aforementioned reporting period, these efforts resulted in the inclusion of $873,450 worth of privately funded transit and pedestrian facilities. This report will be provided to the Regional Planning Committee later this year.

Mr. Chopyk asked at what point the improvements appear on the program list. Mr. Kluth said that the project is put on the list once it has gone through permitting, but over the years projects have been changed after permitting. The table just gives an overview of the potential improvements that have been realized through the program. Mr. Chopyk asked how the values of these improvements were generated. Mr. Kluth said that the figures came from consulting with planners at MTS, and the figures they use to develop a budget.

Mr. Schulte thanked SANDAG staff for helping integrate transit and land use, providing mobility options. He commented that it is important that cities send SANDAG projects that are appropriate for review. He added that it may be useful to develop some regional standards to streamline the process, and incorporate them with general plans and zoning ordinances.

Mr. Kluth stated that the City of San Diego and the former Metropolitan Transit Development Board (MTDB) went into great detail with checklists and participation in their general plan update.

Mr. Ouadah commented that the City of Poway is struggling with infrastructure improvements to the roadway for transit. The city often makes improvements, but decreases in ridership sometimes results in the discontinuation of the transit service. Mr. Marks stated that where housing and sewers go, transit eventually follows. In smaller areas where a route gets discontinued, there still may be the possibility to add that route back later on. The improvements have to be made to have access to travel from bus stops and sidewalks. This should be done when planning for infrastructure, even if it may one day lose service. Mr. Marks added that one challenge with bus stops is that there is not a specific funding source to maintain them. The depletion of capital funding makes it harder to continue services. MTS allows advertising on their shelter and benches; whereas NCTD does not want to go that route to compensate for funding shortfalls.
Agenda Item #8: Adjournment and Next Meetings

The next CTAC meeting is scheduled on Thursday, September 6, 2007, from 9:30 - 11:30 a.m. The next TWG meeting is scheduled on Thursday, September 13, 2007, from 1:15 - 3:15 p.m. (The August CTAC and TWG meetings are cancelled.)
ANTICIPATED REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE (RPC)
ACTIONS AND DISCUSSION ITEMS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008

Introduction

This report outlines anticipated actions and discussion items for the Regional Planning Committee (RPC) in Fiscal Year 2008 based upon the Overall Work Program (OWP) that was adopted by the SANDAG Board of Directors in June 2007. Staff is also proposing a calendar of meetings based upon themes that implement the Regional Comprehensive Plan.

Discussion

The Regional Planning Committee is responsible for guiding several work elements in the FY 2008 OWP that implement the Regional Comprehensive Plan. The attached table lists the anticipated actions and discussion items for the RPC by work element and is being provided for RPC information and discussion. The table also includes suggested dates for each of the six working groups that advise the Regional Planning Committee to report on their activities.

In addition, attached for RPC discussion is a proposed calendar of meetings with general themes that implement the Regional Comprehensive Plan. The goal is to group similar action and discussion items together when possible to provide context, and to cancel meetings when specific actions are not required. Other relevant informational presentations including reports on local smart growth planning efforts and tribal planning initiatives will be added over the course of the fiscal year.

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachments: 1. Table of RPC Anticipated Actions and Discussion Items for FY 2008
2. Proposed FY 2008 RPC Meeting Calendar and General Themes

Key Staff Contact: Coleen Clementson, (619) 699-1944, ccl@sandag.org
### ANTICIPATED ACTIONS AND DISCUSSION ITEMS FOR THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE IN FY 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Anticipated Action</th>
<th>Tentative Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REGIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN (RCP) PLANNING &amp; IMPLEMENTATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Smart Growth Concept Map Technical Update</td>
<td>Recommend</td>
<td>Feb 08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Smart Growth Design Guidelines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project Overview &amp; Schedule</td>
<td>Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Draft Guidelines – Part I</td>
<td>Recommend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Smart Growth Trip/Parking Study</td>
<td>Recommend</td>
<td>Jun 08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Report on computer simulation and visualization tools</td>
<td>Information/Possible Action</td>
<td>Oct 07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Report on outreach program to local planning staffs and commissions</td>
<td>Information/Possible Action</td>
<td>Oct 07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. RCP Monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2007 Draft Report</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2008 Draft Report</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Blueprint Planning Grant Implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Final Report on Integrated Regional Infrastructure Strategy (IRIS) funding strategy</td>
<td>Information/Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blueprint Learning Network Status Report</td>
<td>Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Report on Regional Planning Technical Working Group Activities</td>
<td>Discussion/Possible Action</td>
<td>Feb 08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REGIONAL HOUSING AND SMART GROWTH DEVELOPMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Smart Growth Incentive Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Establish Review Committee</td>
<td>Approve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program Criteria</td>
<td>Recommend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Award Projects</td>
<td>Recommend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Background Report on RHNA policies and issues</td>
<td>Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preliminary Timeline &amp; Process for next RHNA update</td>
<td>Recommend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Report on Smart Growth Financing Tools</td>
<td>Information/Possible Action</td>
<td>Jun 08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Housing Legislative Program Report</td>
<td>Discussion/Possible Action</td>
<td>Nov 07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Transit Station Area Joint Development Study</td>
<td>Information</td>
<td>Feb 08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Report on SPRINT Working Group Activities</td>
<td>Information</td>
<td>April 08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Report on Regional Housing Working Group Activities</td>
<td>Information</td>
<td>April 08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ANTICIPATED ACTIONS AND DISCUSSION ITEMS FOR THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE IN FY 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Anticipated Action</th>
<th>Tentative Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REGIONAL ENERGY STRATEGY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Report on Sunrise Powerlink Project</td>
<td>Discussion/Possible Recommendation</td>
<td>Nov 07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Draft Regional Climate Change Action Plan</td>
<td>Recommend</td>
<td>May 08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Progress Report on Sustainable Region Program</td>
<td>Recommend</td>
<td>May 08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Draft Regional Energy Strategy</td>
<td>Recommend</td>
<td>Jun 08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NATURAL RESOURCE PLANNING AND COORDINATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Habitat &amp; Environmental Mitigation Program (EMP) Overview &amp; Status Report</td>
<td>Information</td>
<td>Aug 07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Memorandum of Agreement for TransNet EMP</td>
<td>Recommend</td>
<td>Oct 07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. EMP Management &amp; Monitoring FY 08 Funding Allocation</td>
<td>Recommend</td>
<td>Nov 07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Report on EMP Working Group Activities</td>
<td>Information</td>
<td>May 08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REGIONAL SHORELINE MANAGEMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Regional Beach Sand Cost Allocation Methodology</td>
<td>Recommend</td>
<td>Aug 07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Regional Beach Sand Replenishment Feasibility Study</td>
<td>Information</td>
<td>May 08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Report on Shoreline Working Group Activities</td>
<td>Information</td>
<td>May 08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RELATED RCP WORK ELEMENTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Regional Economic Prosperity</td>
<td>Discussion/Possible Action</td>
<td>Aug 07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Report on Intergovernmental Review Program</td>
<td>Discussion/Possible Action</td>
<td>Nov 07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Report on Regional Bicycle Plan</td>
<td>Discussion/Possible Action</td>
<td>Feb 08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Proposed FY 2008 RPC Meeting Calendar and General Themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Meeting Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>July 2007</strong></td>
<td>Meeting Cancelled</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **August 2007** | General Theme: **RCP Elements and Monitoring**  
  - Regional Habitat Preservation Planning  
  - Regional Economic Prosperity Strategy  
  - SDG&E Energy Planning  
  - RCP 2007 Monitoring Report |
| **September 2007** | Cancel Meeting                                                                 |
| **October 2007** | General Theme: **Smart Growth Planning Tools**  
  - Smart Growth Design Guidelines  
  - I-PLACE3S Planning Tool and 3-D Visualization  
  - Smart Growth Concept Map Website  
  - TransNet EMP Memorandum of Agreement  
  - Regional Planning Stakeholder Working Group Activities Report |
| **November 2007** | General Theme: **Smart Growth Financing Tools**  
  - Smart Growth Incentive Program  
  - Joint Development at Transit Stations  
  - Intergovernmental Review Program  
  - Housing Legislative Update  
  - TransNet EMP Funding Allocation  
  - Sunrise Powerlink |
| **December 2007** | General Theme: **Energy and Climate Change**  
  - Regional Energy Strategy Technical Update  
  - Climate Change and Energy Legislative Update  
  - Energy Working Group Activities Report |
| **January 2008** | Cancel Meeting                                                                  |
| **February 2008** | General Theme: **RCP Elements and Blueprint Planning**  
  - Smart Growth Concept Map Update  
  - Blueprint Planning Grant Wrap-Up  
  - Regional Public Facilities Planning  
  - Joint Development at Transit Stations  
  - Regional Bicycle Plan  
  - Regional Planning Technical Working Group Activities Report |
Proposed FY 2008 RPC Meeting Calendar and Themes (cont’d)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>General Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 2008</td>
<td>Cancel Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2008</td>
<td><strong>Smart Growth and Regional Housing</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Smart Growth Incentive Program Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Regional Housing Needs Assessment Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Housing Legislation Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Regional Housing Working Group Activities Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• SPRINT Working Group Activities Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2008</td>
<td><strong>Energy, Water Quality and the Environment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Climate Change Action Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sustainable Region Progress Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• EMP Working Group Activities Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Regional Beach Sand Replenishment Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Shoreline Working Group Activities Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2008</td>
<td><strong>Smart Growth Planning and Financing</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Smart Growth Design Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Smart Growth Trip/Parking Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Status Report on I-PLACE3S and 3-D Visualization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Status Report on Regional Smart Growth Financing Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Regional Energy Strategy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The 18 cities and county government are SANDAG serving as the forum for regional decision-making. SANDAG builds consensus; plans, engineers, and builds public transit; makes strategic plans; obtains and allocates resources; and provides information on a broad range of topics pertinent to the region’s quality of life.
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**INTRODUCTION**

On August 3, 2007, the SANDAG Regional Planning Committee provided several comments and recommended changes before taking action to accept this report for a 60-day public review period. This report has been modified where possible as requested by the RPC. Other RPC comments are noted within the text of this report and will be researched for potential inclusion in the final report that will be presented to the SANDAG Board of Directors in October 2007. The public is invited to e-mail comments on this report in writing by October 5, 2007, to rcpmonitoring@sandag.org.

The Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP or the “Plan”), adopted by the SANDAG Board of Directors in 2004, is the long term planning framework for the San Diego region. It defines a vision and lays out goals, key issues, and needed actions in areas ranging from urban form and transportation to public facilities and borders. It summarizes where we were in 2004, where we want to be by 2030, and what we need to do to get there. The RCP also calls for ongoing monitoring to track progress toward meeting the goals outlined in the Plan.

In 2006, SANDAG released The Regional Comprehensive Plan: Establishing a Baseline for Monitoring Performance (Baseline Report), to be used to benchmark progress on an annual basis. This 2007 RCP Annual Performance Monitoring Report (2007 Monitoring Report) is the first since the Baseline Report was accepted by the SANDAG Board of Directors in October 2006.

This 2007 Monitoring Report includes the most recent data available for each indicator, typically from 2006. For some indicators, there is a one year delay in reporting; in these cases, data from 2005 are included. For all indicators, the most recent data are provided and related to the Baseline Report.

New this year, the California Center for Regional Leadership released the California Regional Progress Report, a report that compares regions throughout California across a variety of indicators. The report included a few indicators that are similar to those featured in the RCP Performance Monitoring Report. For these indicators, the California Regional Progress Report is referenced for comparison.

Based on the data collected for the 2007 Monitoring Report, the indicators illustrate those areas in which the region appears to be moving in the right direction and those in which improvement is needed.

**Moving in the Right Direction**
- Ninety-nine percent of new housing units built in the region in 2005 and 2006 were located within the San Diego County Water Authority water service boundary.
- Transit ridership is increasing.
- The region’s reliance on imported water continues to decrease as the water supply diversifies.
- The share of energy produced from renewable resources continues to increase.

**Areas for Improvement**
- The share of new housing units built in Smart Growth Opportunity Areas declined in 2006.
- The region continues to experience a serious housing affordability problem.
- Many waterbodies in the region are impaired.
- Energy usage in the region continues to increase, moving further away from the target established in the Regional Energy Strategy.
- Wait times continue to lengthen at the U.S.-Mexico border, particularly for commercial vehicles.

At the request of the RPC, the decline in the share of new housing units built in Smart Growth Opportunity Areas has been added to the Areas for Improvement section.
Throughout the report, indicator data are, in certain cases, related to growth in population, housing, or jobs. The following table is provided for reference.

### Table 1
**Population, Housing Units, and Job Growth in the San Diego Region (2000-2006)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>2,813,833</td>
<td>3,039,277</td>
<td>3,066,820</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Units</td>
<td>1,040,149</td>
<td>1,108,500</td>
<td>1,118,410</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs</td>
<td>1,193,800</td>
<td>1,281,800</td>
<td>1,297,100</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SANDAG Annual Population and Housing Estimates, California Department of Finance, California Employment Development Department, Bureau of Labor Statistics; numbers subject to revision by state agencies.

### Annual Indicators for Monitoring the Regional Comprehensive Plan

**URBAN FORM AND TRANSPORTATION**

1. Share of new housing units and jobs located in Smart Growth Opportunity Areas
2. Share of new housing units within the San Diego County Water Authority water service boundary
3. Annual transit ridership
4. Commute mode shares
5. Travel times and volumes for key transportation corridors
6. Miles of deficient roads on Congestion Management Program network
7. Annual hours of traffic delay per traveler
8. Regional crime rate

**HOUSING**

9. Housing Opportunity Index
10. Percent of households with housing costs greater than 35 percent of income
11. Ratio of new jobs to new housing units
12. Share of new and existing housing units by structure type and income category
13. Vacancy rates
14. Percent of households living in overcrowded conditions
15. Number of households on the waiting list for Section 8 vouchers

**HEALTHY ENVIRONMENT**

16. Habitat conserved within designated preserve areas
17. Percent of preserve areas actively maintained
18. Number of beach mile closure days
19. Impaired waterbodies
20. Beach widths
21. Lagoon health
22. Air Quality Index
### Annual Indicators for Monitoring the Regional Comprehensive Plan (cont’d)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Prosperity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23. Labor force educational attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Balanced job growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Employment growth in high-wage economic clusters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Regional unemployment rate compared to California and the United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Real per capita income compared to California and the United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Regional poverty rate compared to California and the United States</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29. Water consumption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Diversity of water supply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Recycled water use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Per capita electricity consumption and peak demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Share of energy produced in the region vs. imported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Share of energy produced from renewable resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Percent of solid waste that is recycled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Landfill space available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Borders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37. Interregional traffic volumes into San Diego from surrounding counties and Baja California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Border wait times for personal trips and goods movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Participation in SENTRI Lanes, Pedestrian Commuter Program, Free and Secure Trade (FAST) Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### URBAN FORM AND TRANSPORTATION

Our land use and urban design decisions determine how well our communities serve us in our daily lives, including the quality of our travel choices and our personal safety. 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 to ensuring that the region’s transportation system efficiently connects our communities. The Urban Form and Transportation indicators track progress toward achieving these goals.

**Share of New Housing Units and Jobs Located in Smart Growth Opportunity Areas**

In 2006, almost 10,000 new housing units were built in the region. Of these, 1,400 (or 14 percent) were built in Smart Growth Opportunity Areas,¹ as seen in Figure 1. This represents a decline in the share of new housing units built in Smart Growth Opportunity Areas, from 34 percent in 2005.

The Smart Growth Opportunity Areas experienced a net loss of 2,394 jobs, representing a 5 percent decrease between 2004 and 2005, while the region as a whole experienced an increase of

---

¹ SANDAG, working closely with the local jurisdictions, developed a Smart Growth Concept Map in 2006 that includes approximately 200 existing, planned, and potential locations for smart growth development based upon land use density and associated transportation service targets in the RCP. The Smart Growth Concept Map is being used in the development of the 2007 Regional Transportation Plan and to determine eligibility for participation in the TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program.
21,500 jobs in the same time period. As of 2005, 33 percent of the region’s jobs were located in Smart Growth Opportunity Areas.

With only two years of data for this indicator, it is unclear how many new housing units and jobs can be anticipated annually in Smart Growth Opportunity Areas. Continued monitoring is required.

The RPC requested that this indicator be identified as an area for improvement. This change has been made to the report. Also at the request of the RPC, staff will investigate the availability of permit data for future reports.

Annual Transit Ridership

Regional transit ridership continues to increase, reversing a previous downward trend between 2000 and 2004 as shown in Figure 3; ridership grew 7 percent between 2005 and 2006. There were 93,715,313 transit riders in the San Diego region in 2006.

Consistent with SANDAG data, the California Regional Progress Report, measuring a similar indicator, reports that the San Diego region did not make progress between 1999 and 2004 in increasing transit ridership and that the region ranks in the bottom third among California regions. However, as noted above, data for 2005 and 2006 show recent ridership growth in the region. This upward trend over the past two years is expected to continue in the near future with the opening of the SPRINTER rail line, system changes being made by the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) and North County Transit District (NCTD), and increased funding for transit services through the TransNet half-cent sales tax ordinance.

2 Additionally, the region has made significant progress in streamlining and automating data collection, and improving performance monitoring. One major project in the stages of completion is the RTMS (Regional Transportation Management System) project, which implemented a scheduling system, an Automated Vehicle Locator system and fare collection system. Staff is fully trained and utilizing these new technologies, resulting in more efficient planning and monitoring of the public transit system. This effort has further resulted in significant service improvement.
**Travel Times and Volumes for Key Transportation Corridors**

Data were not available for this indicator in the Baseline Report, and therefore, an expanded discussion is provided in this 2007 Monitoring Report.

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 drive-alone travel times 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 are 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 collect volume and lane occupancy information every 30 seconds.

As shown in Figure 4, the regional mode split remains stable. The share of commuters driving alone to work has not significantly changed. Year-to-year fluctuations in the data may be the result of sample differences and may not reflect true year-to-year changes. In future years, this data will be reported at a corridor level.

The California Regional Progress Report reports that the San Diego region did not make significant progress between 2000 and 2005 in shifting from single-occupant vehicle commutes. However, San Diego is one of only three regions in California that experienced a reduction in commuters driving alone to work. It appears that this reduction is likely due to an increase in telecommuting in the region.

Travel times have not increased nor decreased much in most corridors. The I-15 northbound p.m. commute experienced the greatest decrease in travel time, from 43 minutes in 2001 to 36 minutes in 2006. The greatest increase in travel time was experienced in the I-15 southbound a.m. commute, which increased from 41 minutes in 2001 to 48 minutes in 2006.

**Commuter Mode Shares**

As shown in Figure 4, the regional mode split remains stable. The share of commuters driving alone to work has not significantly changed. Year-to-year fluctuations in the data may be the result of sample differences and may not reflect true year-to-year changes. In future years, this data will be reported at a corridor level.

The California Regional Progress Report reports that the San Diego region did not make significant progress between 2000 and 2005 in shifting from single-occupant vehicle commutes. However, San Diego is one of only three regions in California that experienced a reduction in commuters driving alone to work. It appears that this reduction is likely due to an increase in telecommuting in the region.

**Figure 4**

Regional Commute Mode Shares (2000-2005)

Travel times have not increased nor decreased much in most corridors. The I-15 northbound p.m. commute experienced the greatest decrease in travel time, from 43 minutes in 2001 to 36 minutes in 2006. The greatest increase in travel time was experienced in the I-15 southbound a.m. commute, which increased from 41 minutes in 2001 to 48 minutes in 2006.

**Source:** Annual Boardings Data, MTS, and NCTD
Travel times listed below differ from those presented in the 2007 RTP for two reasons: (1) RTP travel times are model-based, whereas travel times reported below represent actual observed data. The San Diego Regional Transportation Model estimates travel time on each arterial or freeway link, taking into account the configuration of the road, volume of traffic assigned, and any intersection controls. The modeled travel times are not observed data, as they are derived from a series of programs designed to forecast travel demand on the transportation system. Travel times computed from PeMS only include the freeway section being traversed. Speed is computed from a loop in the ground. PeMS travel times are observed data and would include effects of non-recurring congestion (e.g. accidents). (2) RTP travel times represent “door-to-door” commute times that include trip time on arterial streets, whereas the travel times listed below only include trip time once on the freeway.

The RPC commented that the travel times reported for the I-5 Oceanside to Downtown San Diego and SR 52 Santee to Sorrento Valley corridors do not match perceived travel times. Staff will double check the travel times for each corridor and make any necessary revisions. The RPC asked that the difference between travel times listed in this report and those in the RTP be clarified. A corresponding note has been added above. Finally, the RPC requested that a measure of variation from the average travel times be included. This level of detail will be provided in the SANDAG State of the Commute report, but staff will include this for the I-5 corridor in question for the final report, if possible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corridor</th>
<th>A.M. Peak Period</th>
<th>P.M. Peak Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 I-5 Oceanside to Downtown SD</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 I-15 Escondido to Downtown SD</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 SR 78 Escondido to Carlsbad</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 SR 94 El Cajon to Downtown SD</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 I-8 El Cajon to Downtown SD</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 SR 52 Santee to Sorrento Valley</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 I-805 Mid City to Sorrento Valley</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 I-805 Chula Vista to Sorrento Valley</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 I-805 Chula Vista to Downtown SD</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 I-5 San Ysidro to Downtown SD</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 I-8 El Cajon to Sorrento Valley</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Freeway Performance Measurement System (PeMS Version 7.3), Caltrans
Notes: (1) The a.m. peak period is based on a departure time of 7:30 a.m., and the p.m. peak period is based on a departure time of 4 p.m. (2) The a.m. direction is listed; the p.m. is the reverse direction of travel.

As shown in Table 3, travel volumes have not significantly increased or decreased in most corridors. Decreases in travel volumes were seen in the I-5 Oceanside to Downtown San Diego northbound and SR 94 westbound corridors, which decreased by an average of 7,600 and 7,300 vehicles per day between 2001 and 2006, respectively, or 8 percent. The SR 52 eastbound corridor experienced the greatest increase in travel volumes, adding an average of 6,180 vehicles daily between 2001 and 2006, or 19 percent.
Table 3
Travel Volumes in Key Auto Corridors (2001-2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Corridor</th>
<th>Southbound</th>
<th>Northbound</th>
<th>Eastbound</th>
<th>Westbound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I-5 Oceanside to Downtown SD</td>
<td>84,000</td>
<td>84,900</td>
<td>85,600</td>
<td>97,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I-15 Escondido to Downtown SD</td>
<td>106,100</td>
<td>124,600</td>
<td>123,900</td>
<td>75,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SR 78 Escondido to Carlsbad</td>
<td>85,200</td>
<td>75,500</td>
<td>81,600</td>
<td>85,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SR 94 El Cajon to Downtown SD</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>120,600</td>
<td>No data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I-8 El Cajon to Downtown SD</td>
<td>32,900</td>
<td>39,200</td>
<td>39,100</td>
<td>No data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>SR 52 Santee to Sorrento Valley</td>
<td>105,400</td>
<td>105,300</td>
<td>105,100</td>
<td>99,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I-805 Mid City to Sorrento Valley</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>104,800</td>
<td>104,500</td>
<td>No data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I-805 Chula Vista to Sorrento Valley</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I-805 Chula Vista to Downtown SD</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I-5 San Ysidro to Downtown SD</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>91,800</td>
<td>89,000</td>
<td>No data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I-8 El Cajon to Sorrento Valley</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>120,600</td>
<td>No data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Freeway Performance Measurement System (PeMS Version 7.3), Caltrans

Figures 5 and 6 indicate that improvements on I-15, as well as the opening of SR 56, may have helped alleviate congestion in the corridor. For the northbound commute, travel times have been decreasing between 2002 and 2006 even though travel volumes have fluctuated in the same time period.

For the region as a whole, the fact that travel times have increased by an average of only 5 percent is a positive sign, suggesting that mobility has remained manageable. This is particularly relevant when considering that between 2001 and 2006, the region’s population grew by 7 percent, and the number of regional jobs grew by 6 percent. Continued monitoring will be required to assess the impact of regional transportation investments, such as those that are included in the TransNet Early Action Program and the 2007 RTP, on mobility in the region. In addition, more detailed corridor monitoring will be provided in the SANDAG State of the Commute report.
Miles of Deficient Roads on Congestion Management Program Network

Data for this indicator are available bi-annually, and there are no new data at this time. As reported previously, congestion has fluctuated between 2001 and 2005. Improvement has been seen on the region’s freeways and arterials between 2003 and 2005, but congestion increased on the region’s highways.

Figure 7


Annual Hours of Traffic Delay Per Traveler

There are no new data for this indicator at this time.3 The most recent data available are from 2003, which indicates that annual hours of traffic delay per traveler have increased.

The California Regional Progress Report, reporting on a similar indicator, reports that the San Diego region did not make progress between 1998 and 2004 in decreasing daily vehicle hours of delay. It is noteworthy that none of the other regions made progress on this indicator between 1998 and 2004; however, the San Diego region ranks roughly in the middle of California regions in terms of delay.

Regional Crime Rate

As shown in Figure 9, the rate of crime in the region declined 5 percent between 2005 and 2006.

The California Regional Progress Report, measuring a similar indicator, reports that the San Diego region’s violent crime rate has decreased, but the regional property crime rate has not. The San Diego region ranks roughly in the middle among all California regions in terms of violent crime and property crime rates.

3 Data for this indicator is from the Annual Urban Mobility Report, published by the Texas Transportation Institute. The most recent Report, published in 2005, provided data for 2003. The report was not published in 2006 because the study’s authors were refining the report’s research methods. The report is expected to resume publication in 2007.
CONCLUSION

As of 2007, the region made slight progress toward achieving the urban form and transportation goals listed in the RCP. The increase in annual transit ridership is an encouraging sign that the region’s residents are increasingly traveling by public transit. It is anticipated that this trend will likely continue as transit improvements are introduced in the future, such as the opening of the SPRINT rail line. Future monitoring is required to fully understand our progress toward improving mobility. Two indicators, miles of deficient roads on Congestion Management Program network and annual hours of traffic delay per traveler, suggest that congestion is increasing. However, for those indicators, it should be noted that data are only available up to 2005 and 2003 respectively. When examining travel times and volumes in key auto corridors, this indicator suggests that the region is reasonably managing congestion, as travel times and volumes have not increased or decreased significantly between 2001 and 2006 despite the addition of more than 200,000 residents and 78,000 jobs.

HOUSING

The lack of affordable housing continues to be one of the major issues facing the San Diego region today. The RCP calls for 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.

Housing Opportunity Index

Regional housing affordability continues to be at an all-time low, but the decline in affordability appears to have stabilized since 2005. The Housing Opportunity Index measures the percentage of homes sold that are affordable to a household earning the regional median income. In 2006, 5 percent of homes sold in the San Diego region were affordable to a family earning the regional median income.

The California Regional Progress Report, measuring a similar indicator, reports that the San Diego region, along with all other California regions, did not make progress between 2003 and 2006 in improving housing affordability. The San Diego region ranks in the bottom third of California regions in terms of housing affordability.

Figure 10

Housing Opportunity Index (2000-2006)

Source: National Association of Home Builders

Percent of Households with Housing Costs Greater than 35 Percent of Income

Figure 11 shows that since 2000, an increasing percentage of households in the region have been paying more than 35 percent of their income toward housing costs. This trend may be stabilizing because the change between 2004 and 2005 is not statistically significant. Year-to-year fluctuations in the data may be the result of sample differences and may not reflect true year-to-year changes.

4 The Housing Opportunity Index (HOI) replaces the Housing Affordability Index (HAI) used in The Regional Comprehensive Plan: Establishing a Baseline for Monitoring Performance, as the HAI no longer exists.
The California Regional Progress Report, measuring a similar indicator, reports that the San Diego region ranks comparably to other California regions in this area.

Figure 11

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

Ratio of New Jobs to New Housing Units

The ratio of new jobs to new housing units has fluctuated since 2001, but appears to have stabilized between 2005 and 2006. In 2006, there were 1.5 new jobs for every new housing unit in the region.

The California Regional Progress Report, which uses a different data source for this indicator, reports that the San Diego region did not make progress between 2000 and 2005 in improving its jobs to housing ratio; however, the San Diego region is reported to rank comparably with most regions in California.

Figure 12

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

Share of New Housing Units by Income Category

A total of 11,541 new housing units were built in the region between July 2005 and July 2006, including 343 very low-income, 893 low-income, 418 moderate-income, and 9,887 above moderate-income housing units. Based on the 2005–2010 Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) adopted by SANDAG in February 2005, the region achieved 1 percent of the very low-income, 5 percent of the low-income, 2 percent of the moderate-income, and 22 percent of the above moderate-income housing units established in the RHNA. The data show that the above moderate-income housing needs established in the RHNA are being met, while the housing needs for very low-, low-, and moderate-income households are not.

Table 4
Share of New Housing Units by Income Category (July 1, 2005 – June 30, 2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Above Moderate</th>
<th>Total For All Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Housing Units Produced</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>893</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>9,887</td>
<td>11,541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHNA Goal</td>
<td>24,143</td>
<td>18,348</td>
<td>20,280</td>
<td>44,530</td>
<td>107,301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Of Goal Produced</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units Left To Produce</td>
<td>23,800</td>
<td>17,455</td>
<td>19,862</td>
<td>34,643</td>
<td>95,760</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data compiled from local jurisdictions in the San Diego region
Vacancy Rates

Vacancy rates for both owner-occupied and renter-occupied units have remained relatively stable since 2000. Year-to-year fluctuations in the data may be the result of sample differences and may not reflect true year-to-year changes.

Figure 13
Vacancy Rates by Ownership (2000-2005)

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

Percent of Households Living in Overcrowded Conditions

As shown in Figure 14, the percentage of households living in overcrowded conditions in the region continues to decline.

Figure 14
Overcrowding in the Region (2000-2005)

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

Number of Households on the Waiting List for Section 8 Vouchers

In 2007, there are approximately 65,600 households on the Section 8 waiting list, down from the approximately 73,500 households on the Section 8 waiting list reported in the Baseline Report.

CONCLUSION

Housing affordability continues to be a problem for the region; however, the above data indicate that the rapid decline in affordability may have slowed for the time being. Progress toward meeting RHNA goals has been slow, particularly in the lowest income categories.

HEALTHY ENVIRONMENT

To ensure a healthy environment, the region must protect our key open spaces and sensitive habitat areas, ensure that our air and water are clean, and restore our eroding beaches. Viable natural habitats, water quality, a well managed shoreline, and air quality are critical components to the health and well being of our residents, as well as to the overall economic prosperity of our region.

Habitat Conserved Within Designated Preserve Areas

The region is engaging in the implementation or development of four subregional habitat conservation plans: the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) South, finalized in 1998; the Multiple Habitat Conservation Program (MHCP), finalized in 2003; the North County MSCP, anticipated for completion in 2008; and the East County MSCP, anticipated for completion in 2009. Map 2 shows the location and boundaries of these plans.

5 2007 data has been compiled from five out of six housing authorities that administer the Section 8 program in the San Diego region. 2006 data was compiled from all six housing authorities.
Six jurisdictions, including a portion of the unincorporated area of the County, have approved habitat conservation plans and signed implementing agreements (covering 20 percent of the region). Seven jurisdictions are working on approval of their implementing agreements, (covering 73 percent), and seven jurisdictions are not pursuing implementing agreements due to limited habitat in their jurisdiction (covering 1 percent). The remaining area (covering 6 percent) consists of military lands.

Of those jurisdictions with approved conservation plans and signed implementing agreements, 61 percent of land has been conserved within the habitat preserve system (see Figure 15 on page 14). Additionally, the City of San Diego and County of San Diego have indicated that an additional 15,400 acres and 12,200 acres, respectively, have been obligated for habitat conservation under approved discretionary development entitlements or conservation banks, but have not yet been conserved through formal legal mechanisms (e.g., easement, dedication in fee title to jurisdictions).

The California Regional Progress Report, measuring a similar indicator, reports that the San Diego region made progress between 2003 and 2005 in increasing the amount of protected open space.

**Percent of Preserve Area Actively Maintained**

Based upon the estimates of land conserved in the region described in the previous section, over one million acres in the region are managed as open space with dedicated land managers. This includes land in North and East County MSCP that are federal, state, and locally owned and conserved for open space and habitat. There is currently no regional database that tracks the lands under active management or the activities that have been conducted on these lands. As part of SANDAG’s participation in regional habitat conservation planning, a conserved lands database is being developed to serve as a baseline to start to track this information. Updated data should be available within six to nine months.
**Figure 15**
**MSCP South Land Conservation by Year (Pre-1998-2006)**

![Graph showing land conservation by year with data points indicating percentage of target conserved.

Source: 2006 Annual Monitoring Reports

---

**Number of Beach Mile Closure Days**

The number of beach mile closure days fluctuated between 2000 and 2006, but has been relatively stable since 2004.

**Figure 16**
**Weather-Adjusted Beach Mile Closure Days (2000-2006)**

![Graph showing weather-adjusted beach mile closure days]

Source: Annual Beach Closure and Advisory Report, County of San Diego Department of Environmental Health; Western U.S. Historical Summaries, Western Regional Climate Center

---

**Impaired Waterbodies**

Between 2002 and 2006, impaired waterbodies in the region increased. Impaired waterbodies are those that do not meet Clean Water Act standards. This list is prepared every four years by the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board.

In the California Regional Progress Report, the San Diego region was shown to experience the greatest percentage increase in the number of impaired water segments in the state. It is assumed that polluted runoff has been a major factor contributing to increases in impaired water segments regionwide; however, it should be noted that the region as a whole has greatly enhanced its monitoring efforts in recent years. As such, a greater percentage of waterbodies were found to be impaired in 2006 than in 2002. Therefore, the extent to which the region’s impaired waterbodies has increased cannot be conclusively determined as data from 2002 and 2006 are not comparable. Data collected in future years should indicate whether the dramatic increase in impaired waterbodies between 2002 and 2006 signifies a valid trend.
**Figure 17**

Impaired Waterbodies (2002 and 2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Impaired Waterbodies (rivers, streams)</th>
<th>Acres of Impaired Lakes, Bays, &amp; Lagoons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>6,907</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>20,975</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board

**Beach Widths**

A few beaches continue to exceed the target set forth in the SANDAG Regional Shoreline Preservation Strategy, and all beaches had more sand in 2006 than they did in 2005. This is likely due to wave conditions. Wave conditions in the summer of 2006 were more conducive to the onshore transport of sand than those in the summer of 2005. The unanticipated increase in beach width that occurred during the past year could be quickly reversed by less favorable wave conditions in the future. At the time of the 2005 survey, three consecutive years of shoreline retreat had diminished the beach widths at most locations to such an extent that they were equal to or less than pre-Regional Beach Sand Replenishment Project values (prior to 2001). The areawide shoreline advance that occurred in 2006 was sufficient to restore the beach widths to levels not observed since the first two years following the Regional Beach Sand Project. See Table 5 on page 16.

**Lagoon Health**

Data are unavailable for this indicator.6

---

6 The City of Encinitas is charged with overseeing the collection of data regarding bacterial levels in the region’s lagoons. Their data methodology is being finalized. Once this data is available, SANDAG will utilize it to report on this indicator.

**Air Quality Index**

After a few years of improving air quality, the number of days during which air quality was considered unhealthy increased by eight days in 2006. This marks a near return to the number of days air quality was deemed unhealthy for sensitive groups in 2002 and 2003. The increase in 2006 was likely due to a number of days during which the region experienced record-high temperatures. Data in future years should help determine if last year’s increase in unhealthy air quality days represents a weather-related anomaly in the region’s trend toward improving air quality or if the region’s air quality is actually declining.

**Figure 18**

Number of Days Air Quality Was Deemed Unhealthy for Sensitive Groups (2000-2006)

Source: San Diego Air Pollution Control District
**Table 5**

Beach Widths and Targets of Shoreline Segments, San Diego Region (in feet) (2000-2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall Averages</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001*</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2010 Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SILVER STRAND LITTORAL CELL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Beach</td>
<td>218.0</td>
<td>308.0</td>
<td>218.0</td>
<td>217.0</td>
<td>221.0</td>
<td>229.0</td>
<td>307.0</td>
<td>238.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver Strand State Beach</td>
<td>448.0</td>
<td>451.5</td>
<td>451.0</td>
<td>449.0</td>
<td>434.5</td>
<td>438.5</td>
<td>486.0</td>
<td>210.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronado</td>
<td>767.0</td>
<td>784.0</td>
<td>767.0</td>
<td>768.0</td>
<td>764.0</td>
<td>737.0</td>
<td>790.0</td>
<td>232.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISSION BEACH LITTORAL CELL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean Beach</td>
<td>274.0</td>
<td>283.0</td>
<td>295.0</td>
<td>259.0</td>
<td>264.0</td>
<td>260.0</td>
<td>305.0</td>
<td>220.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific/ Mission Beaches</td>
<td>286.0</td>
<td>277.7</td>
<td>279.3</td>
<td>282.3</td>
<td>283.7</td>
<td>268.3</td>
<td>301.7</td>
<td>200.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Jolla</td>
<td>192.0</td>
<td>213.0</td>
<td>183.0</td>
<td>229.0</td>
<td>219.0</td>
<td>224.0</td>
<td>223.0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCEANSIDE LITTORAL CELL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>226.0</td>
<td>265.5</td>
<td>250.5</td>
<td>209.3</td>
<td>217.8</td>
<td>216.0</td>
<td>236.0</td>
<td>228.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Mar</td>
<td>166.0</td>
<td>133.3</td>
<td>167.3</td>
<td>157.3</td>
<td>120.7</td>
<td>102.3</td>
<td>158.0</td>
<td>232.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solana Beach</td>
<td>108.0</td>
<td>171.0</td>
<td>141.0</td>
<td>138.0</td>
<td>133.0</td>
<td>130.0</td>
<td>157.0</td>
<td>232.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encinitas</td>
<td>152.3</td>
<td>183.0</td>
<td>177.3</td>
<td>181.3</td>
<td>175.0</td>
<td>150.3</td>
<td>201.8</td>
<td>240.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlsbad</td>
<td>182.8</td>
<td>190.4</td>
<td>210.2</td>
<td>212.8</td>
<td>189.4</td>
<td>177.2</td>
<td>205.8</td>
<td>216.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside</td>
<td>287.3</td>
<td>287.0</td>
<td>294.7</td>
<td>302.7</td>
<td>265.0</td>
<td>277.7</td>
<td>300.7</td>
<td>232.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The SANDAG Regional Beach Sand Project nourished 12 of the region’s beaches in 2001*

**CONCLUSION**

The region continues to make progress on habitat conservation, and further progress is anticipated as the North and East County MSCPs are adopted. As of 2006, the region has been experiencing mixed results with regard to water quality. The number of beach mile closure days has stabilized in recent years, but has not decreased overall. In addition, pollution in our region’s lakes, streams, rivers, bays, and lagoons has gotten worse. Mixed results are also observed with regard to shoreline preservation and air quality. Beach widths have mostly decreased since the Regional Beach Sand Replenishment Project in 2001, but increased in 2006. This is likely due to changes in wave conditions from the summer of 2005 to the summer of 2006. In terms of air quality, the region appears to be making progress overall; it remains to be seen whether last year’s results were an anomaly due to record-high temperatures.

**ECONOMIC PROSPERITY**

The Regional Economic Prosperity Strategy (REPS), originally developed in 1998, is being updated this year. The REPS identifies strategic goals and recommends actions that call for infrastructure investment and public policy support in order to strengthen the region’s economic foundation. The REPS 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.

**Labor Force Educational Attainment**

Labor force educational attainment remains stable. Year-to-year fluctuations in the data may be the result of sample differences and may not reflect true year-to-year changes.

The California Regional Progress Report, measuring a similar indicator, reports that the San Diego region made progress between 2000 and 2005 in educational attainment. The report found that the region had the second highest percentage of residents with Bachelor’s degrees of all California regions in 2005.
Balanced Job Growth

There are no new data for this indicator at this time. As of 2004, job growth in the region remains unbalanced. Between 2000 and 2004, the proportional share of job growth in each wage level has not changed much.

Employment Growth in High-Wage Economic Clusters

In 2005, there was a slight increase in employment in high-wage economic clusters over 2002 and 2003.

Regional Unemployment Rate Compared to California and the United States

San Diego’s unemployment rate continues to improve, and employment growth is keeping pace with population growth. Generally, San Diego’s unemployment rate tracks that of the state and the nation and is currently lower than both.

Real Per Capita Income Compared to California and the United States

In 2005, San Diego’s real per capita income increased. It remains above that of California and the United States, but has only increased slightly since 2000.
The California Regional Progress Report, measuring a similar indicator, reports that the San Diego region made progress between 2000 and 2004 in increasing real per capita income. The San Diego region experienced the second highest increase in real per capita income of all California regions between 2000 and 2004.

The RPC commented that the above description for this indicator is misleading and that it be revised to state that real per capita income in San Diego is not growing as fast as that of California or the United States. This will be revised in the final report.

**CONCLUSION**

The region is experiencing a rising standard of living, as measured by real per capita income, but it is not keeping pace with California or the United States as a whole. Unemployment continues to decrease, and employment in the region’s high-wage clusters is increasing. Other indicators of economic prosperity in the region appear to be stable. San Diego’s REPS, to be considered by the SANDAG Board of Directors in late 2007, contains strategic goals and recommended actions that will help improve the condition of the local economy. It calls for infrastructure investment and public policy support to strengthen the region’s economic foundation and make it more competitive. These policy efforts and infrastructure investments will ensure that the region reinforces its status as one of the most desirable places to work and live. Above all, the strategic goals and recommended actions are designed to expand and create high- and middle-income jobs, which will ensure a rising standard of living for the region’s residents. Future monitoring reports will measure the success of these strategies.
PUBLIC FACILITIES

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, the RCP 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.

Water Consumption

New data were unavailable at the time of printing for this report, but is expected to be available in next year’s report. As reported previously, water consumption has fluctuated since 1999, but decreased between 2004 and 2005.

Figure 25
Water Consumption (2000-2005)

Source: San Diego County Water Authority Annual Reports

Diversity of Water Supply

The diversity of the region’s water supply is increasing. Increases in the amount of water brought into the region through the Imperial Irrigation District and surface water supplies have helped to decrease the region’s reliance on the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California as a source.

Recycled Water Use

Recycled water use has fluctuated since 2000, but increased 18 percent between 2005 and 2006. This increase may be due to a few new, larger recycled water facilities that have begun serving new customers in the region. In addition, agencies have been providing recycled water retrofit assistance to existing customers in order to expedite hook ups to their recycled water systems. It is anticipated that the amount of recycled water used will continue to increase as the region continues to invest in infrastructure and consumer awareness.

Figure 26

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

Figure 27
Amount of Recycled Water Used (2000-2006)

Source: San Diego County Water Authority Annual Reports (Fiscal Year Water Supply by Source)
Per Capita Electricity Consumption and Peak Demand

Per capita electricity consumption continues to increase and move further away from the target established in the 2003 Regional Energy Strategy (RES), as shown in Figure 28. Figure 29 shows that peak demand is increasing as well.

Figure 28
San Diego Annual Per Capita Electricity Consumption (2000-2006)

Source: San Diego Gas and Electric

Figure 29
San Diego Annual Per Capita Electricity Peak Demand (2000-2006)

Source: San Diego Gas and Electric

Share of Energy Produced in the Region vs. Imported

The share of energy produced within the region continues to decrease and move further away from the target established in the 2003 Regional Energy Strategy at an increasing rate.

Share of Energy Produced from Renewable Resources

The region continues to make progress toward increasing its share of energy produced from renewable resources and is moving slowly toward the target established for 2010 in the 2003 RES.7

Figure 30
Share of Energy Produced Within the San Diego Region (2000-2006)

Source: San Diego Gas and Electric

Figure 31
SDG&E Share of Energy Produced from Renewable Resources8 (2000-2030)

Source: San Diego Gas & Electric

7 Subsequent to the RES, more stringent state law (SB 107) has been adopted requiring 20 percent renewable energy by 2010. The Governor also has proposed an additional goal of 33 percent by 2020. The RES will be updated in Fiscal Year 2008, and the targets will be reevaluated at that time.

8 These values are based on the California Public Utility Commission’s Renewable Portfolio Standard Rules, and thus, do not include customer-owned photovoltaic.
Percent of Solid Waste that is Recycled

The percent of solid waste that is recycled in the region remains stable, and the region has not yet met its state-mandated target. The target calls for a 50 percent solid waste diversion rate; in 2005, 45 percent of solid waste was diverted from landfills.

Figure 32
Percent of Solid Waste Diverted from Landfills (2000-2002)

Source: California Integrated Waste Management Board

Landfill Space Available

An estimated nine years of landfill capacity currently remain. The County is working on a number of options to expand capacity.

Table 6
Remaining Landfill Space Available

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<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>
<td>9 (to 2016)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: San Diego County Department of Public Works, Integrated Waste Management Plan Countywide Siting Element

CONCLUSION

The region appears to be making progress regarding its water supply as water consumption has decreased since the previous year, and the region is making progress toward its water diversification strategy. It is particularly important to note that there has been a significant increase in the amount of recycled water used. Energy indicators in the region yield mixed results. On the one hand, our usage and the share of energy produced within the region are moving away from the targets set in the RES. On the other hand, the region continues to increase its share of energy produced from renewable resources. Regarding solid waste management, the region needs to increase its recycling and waste diversion efforts in order to meet its state-mandated target and avoid running out of landfill space.

BORDERS

The region’s distinct characteristics present a variety of opportunities and challenges for planning and coordinating along our interregional and binational borders. Access to jobs and housing continues to be an important issue. As people move farther away from their places of employment, increased pressure is placed upon our interregional transportation systems.

Interregional Traffic Volumes into San Diego from Surrounding Counties and Baja California

The number of interregional trips into San Diego from Baja California, Orange County, Riverside County, and Imperial County continues to increase, particularly from Riverside County.

Figure 33
San Diego Region Average Weekday Traffic Volumes to and from Orange, Imperial, and Riverside Counties and Tijuana, Baja California (2000-2005)

Source: Caltrans Traffic Census
Border Wait Times for Personal Trips and Goods Movement

Border wait times continue to increase, particularly for commercial vehicles. Commercial vehicles experienced a 12-minute increase in their average border wait times between 2005 and 2006. This is partly due to increased trade and truck traffic, but may also be due to stricter inspections at the ports of entry. However, wait times for both passenger and commercial lanes tend to be substantially higher than the peak-period delays shown by the above U.S. Customs and Border Protection data.

The RPC noted that border wait times also have doubled for transit. Staff is will note this in the final report if data is available to verify this.

Figure 34
Average Border Wait Times – Northbound into San Diego from Tijuana (2004-2006)


Participation in SENTRI Lanes, Pedestrian Commuter Program, Free and Secure Trade (FAST) Program

There are a total of 97,000 Secure Electronic Network for Travelers Rapid Inspection (SENTRI) participants in 2007, which represents 26,000 more participants than were reported in the Baseline Report. There are no new data for the Pedestrian Commuter Program and the FAST.

CONCLUSION

The region continues to experience increasing interregional commute volumes, particularly from Riverside County. Border wait times are increasing as well; commercial vehicles experienced a significant increase in wait times between 2005 and 2006. Finally, there are 26,000 new participants in the SENTRI program.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The results of this year’s RCP Performance Monitoring Report highlight those areas in which the region appears to be moving in the right direction and those in which improvements are needed:

MOVING IN THE RIGHT DIRECTION

- Ninety-nine percent of new housing units built in the region in 2005 and 2006 were located within the San Diego County Water Authority water service boundary.
- Transit ridership is increasing.
- The region’s reliance on imported water continues to decrease as our water supply diversifies.
- The share of energy produced from renewable resources continues to increase.

AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

- The share of new housing units in Smart Growth Opportunity Areas declined in 2006.
- The region continues to experience a serious housing affordability problem.
- An increasing number of waterbodies is impaired.
- Energy usage in the region continues to increase, moving further away from the target established in the RES.
- Wait times continue to lengthen at the U.S.-Mexico border, particularly for commercial vehicles.

The region would expect to experience improvements in the areas listed above as the initiatives recommended in the RCP are developed and implemented. SANDAG is involved in a number of efforts that will ideally result in improvements to the region’s quality of life and reflect progress in future monitoring reports, such as:

- TransNet Early Action Program projects;
- Transit improvements, such as the opening of the SPRINTER at the end of this year and Bus Rapid Transit on I-15;
- Funding for smart growth through the TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program and the Transportation Development Act/TransNet Bicycle and Pedestrian Funding Program;
- Strategies recommended in the REPS update later this year;
- An updated RES and climate change action plan.
Introduction

In 2004, the SANDAG Board adopted the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) for the San Diego region, setting a framework for long-term planning based on smart growth and sustainability. Last year, the SANDAG Board accepted the Smart Growth Concept Map for planning purposes for the 2007 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The Smart Growth Concept Map is a significant milestone for San Diego, as it identifies 200 locations in the region that can support smart growth land uses and transportation investments.

Implementation Focus

This year, a key goal is to provide incentives and assistance to local member agencies to promote smart growth development in the areas identified on the map. With these goals in mind, and as part of the RCP Implementation work program, SANDAG is developing a “Smart Growth Tool Box.” The Tool Box will include the following planning and financing tools:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• I-PLACE³S Sketch Modeling Tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Visualization Tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Smart Growth Design Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Outreach Program to Local Planning Staffs and Commissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Smart Growth Trip Generation/ Parking Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Interactive Web-Based Smart Growth Concept Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Research on connections between public health, land use, and transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Regional Bike Master Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financing Tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program (SGIP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• TransNet Bicycle/Pedestrian Neighborhood Safety Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Regional Housing and Smart Growth Financing Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Transit Station Area Joint Development Study</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This report focuses on three planning tools included in the Smart Growth Tool Kit: the outreach program, the I-PLACE³S sketch modeling tool, and potential visualization tools that can compliment I-PLACE³S and other planning tools. A presentation demonstrating these tools, as well as the new internet-based Smart Growth Concept Map site, will be made.
Outreach Program

A strategic initiative in the Regional Comprehensive Plan is to develop and initiate a smart growth community education program. During the development of the Smart Growth Concept Map, staff made numerous presentations on the RCP and smart growth to a variety of groups, and has continued to make presentations upon request. More recently, staff has developed a presentation that provides an overview of the tools in the Smart Growth Tool Box, and has requested the opportunity to make this presentation to local planning, redevelopment, and public works departments, and to local planning commissions in order to more closely coordinate efforts with member agencies. SANDAG has received requests and is in the process of making these presentations. A similar presentation will be made today, highlighting the planning tools discussed in this report.

I-PLACE³S Sketch Modeling Tool

I-PLACE³S is an internet-based planning program designed to provide communities with the opportunity to develop and evaluate alternative land use scenarios for selected areas. Last year, SANDAG partnered with the City of Escondido as part of a Pilot program to test the application of I-PLACE³S on Escondido’s Downtown Specific Plan update, which is identified on the Smart Growth Concept Map as an Existing/Planned Town Center.

Through this pilot project and in combination with their existing public participation program, Escondido has been able to refine and narrow down preferred land use alternatives for the area. In addition, based on Escondido’s use of the program, SANDAG has been able to make a number of improvements to the model and better understand the steps involved in the local application of the program.

Additional Pilot Projects

SANDAG is initiating two additional pilot projects this fiscal year to continue to test and refine the model and to better understand the local and regional resources needed to apply the program. In August, the Regional Planning Committee approved criteria for selecting the additional I-PLACE³S Pilot Projects. The criteria included a requirement that areas be identified on the Smart Growth Concept Map. In addition, the criteria called for a good subregional distribution of areas; differing project scales, project readiness; and appropriateness of the application of I-PLACE³S to the project.

At the meeting, staff will report on the number of jurisdictions that submitted applications for this round of pilot projects. A selection committee consisting of SANDAG staff, the I-PLACE³S consultant, and two planners from within the region that did not submit applications will review the applications and recommend jurisdictions for this round of pilot projects. The selections will be announced at the October 5, 2007, Regional Planning Committee meeting. Work on the pilot projects will begin this fall, setting the stage for general use of the tool starting in Fiscal Year 2009.

Staff anticipates that there will be increasing demand for the use of I-PLACE³S at both the local and regional levels. From the local perspective, I-PLACE³S can provide quantitative information about alternative land use scenarios that can assist community members and decision makers in local planning efforts. From the regional perspective, SANDAG is considering the possibility of offering I-PLACE³S as part of the TransNet SGIP as a tool for areas identified on the Smart Growth Concept
Map to undertake local planning efforts that may result in more smart growth. In addition, there is considerable potential for the use of I-PLACE 3S at both the local and regional levels in maintaining and updating the Regional Growth Forecast.

Visualization Tools

During the development of the Smart Growth Concept Map, the need for more sophisticated smart growth visualization tools became evident. While SANDAG provides a regional definition of smart growth in the RCP and provides illustrations of the seven smart growth place types included in the Smart Growth Concept Map in brochures and presentations, SANDAG is moving toward an innovative trend of developing two and three-dimensional images and visualization techniques to demonstrate the application of smart growth. These visualization techniques can help compliment local map-based planning efforts, such as I-PLACE 3S or other planning tools, helping residents to better understand the look, feel, bulk, and scale of various land use alternatives under consideration by local communities.

Staff is preparing a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) for consultants that can assist SANDAG with the development of these tools. It is anticipated that a consultant team will be selected by winter and that a number of localized visualization tools will be available by next summer. These tools will be made available to local jurisdictions, integrated into SANDAG presentations and outreach efforts, and used in the development of the Smart Growth Design Guidelines. A sampling of potential visualization tools will be provided in today’s presentation.

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