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MISSION STATEMENT

The Regional Planning Committee provides oversight for the preparation and implementation of the Regional Comprehensive Plan that is based on the local general plans and regional plans and addresses interregional issues with surrounding counties and Mexico. The components of the plan include: transportation, housing, environment (shoreline, air quality, water quality, habitat), economy, borders, regional infrastructure needs and financing, and land use and design.
Welcome to SANDAG. Members of the public may speak to the Regional Planning Committee on any item at the time the Committee is considering the item. Please complete a Speaker’s Slip, which is located in the rear of the room, and then present the slip to Committee staff. Also, members of the public are invited to address the Committee on any issue under the agenda item entitled Public Comments/Communications/Member Comments. Speakers are limited to three minutes. The Regional Planning Committee may take action on any item appearing on the agenda.
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# REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE  
**December 5, 2008**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM #</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+1.</td>
<td><strong>APPROVAL OF THE NOVEMBER 7, 2008, MEETING MINUTES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td><strong>PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Members of the public will have the opportunity to address the Regional Planning Committee on any issue within the jurisdiction of the Committee. Speakers are limited to three minutes each and shall reserve time by completing a “Request to Speak” form and giving it to the Clerk prior to speaking. Committee members also may provide information and announcements under this agenda item.

**CONSENT**

+3. **SAN DIEGO REGIONAL BICYCLE PLAN PROGRESS REPORT** (Chris Kluth)  
INFORMATION

The San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan (Plan) is being developed to support implementation of the both the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) and Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). This report presents an introduction to what the Plan will accomplish, an outline of the planning process and a summary of the work completed to date. This report also summarizes the public involvement component of the planning process which illustrates the diversity of bicycle riders in the region and has generated data to refine both the regional bicycle network and facility options. The Transportation Committee is the Policy Advisory Committee for this project. This report is presented for RPC information.

**REPORT**

+4. **2008 REGIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN (RCP) MONITORING REPORT**  
(Christine Eary)  
RECOMMEND

Last October the RPC reviewed and authorized release of the draft 2008 RCP Monitoring Report for a 30-day public comment period. The public comments received during the comment period have been incorporated into the attached revised draft. The RPC is asked to recommend that the Board of Directors accept the 2008 RCP Monitoring Report.

5. **UPCOMING MEETINGS**  
INFORMATION

The next meeting of the Regional Planning Committee is scheduled for February 6, 2009, at 12 noon

6. **ADJOURNMENT**

+ next to an agenda item indicates an attachment
The meeting of the Regional Planning Committee was called to order by Chair Jerry Jones (East County) at 12:01 p.m. See the attached attendance sheet for Regional Planning Committee member attendance.

1. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

Action: Upon a motion by Chair Pro Tem Pam Slater-Price (County of San Diego) and a second by Councilmember Toni Atkins (City of San Diego), the Regional Planning Committee unanimously approved the minutes from the October 3, 2008, meeting.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

Action: There were no public comments/communications/member comments.

CONSENT ITEM (#3)

3. AFFORDABLE HOMES IN OUR NEIGHBORHOOD PUBLICATION (INFORMATION)

Doris Payne-Camp, Director of Policy and Communications for the San Diego Housing Federation, informed that the brochure that was produced jointly by the San Diego Housing Federation and SANDAG, calls attention to existing affordable housing located throughout the County. The publication shows there are about 35,000 rent-restricted or income-restricted housing units in the County and illustrates the many sources of funding necessary to put the housing together.

Mayor Lori Holt Pfeiler (City of Escondido) asked how many publications were produced and where they would be distributed.

Ms. Payne-Camp responded there were approximately 2,500 produced and they will be sent to all jurisdiction officials, various entities, and SANDAG.

Action: This item was presented for information only.
Chair Jones announced that Item No. 6 would be introduced first.

6. NATIONAL CITY STREETSCAPE ENHANCEMENTS: A PILOT SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM PROJECT (INFORMATION)

Stephan Vance, Senior Planner (SANDAG), introduced Mr. Brad Raulston from the City of National City Redevelopment Agency to speak about the National City Streetscape Enhancement Program, which received a grant from the Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program in the amount of $2 million.

Mr. Raulston, Community Development Director of the City of National City, presented a PowerPoint showing improvements included in the Downtown Specific Plan. The improvements associated with this grant connected the Southwestern College facility to the new library, and the police department. Improved medians, sidewalks, pedestrian crossings and active anchor tenants have created a vibrant corridor that is walkable, liveable, and SMART. Two projects currently underway and designed to create more density are a 60-unit mid-rise condominium project and an 80-unit condominium project on 8th Street.

Chair Pro Tem Slater-Price congratulated Mr. Raulston on his efforts with the Birdrock Traffic Taskforce project in La Jolla and National City.

Chair Jones added they are great looking projects and definitely something of which to be proud.

Mr. Vance said reports on other Pilot Program-funded projects would be presented in the future. He stated the Birdrock project received countywide recognition as an innovative traffic management plan using modern roundabouts, and a workshop on modern roundabouts would take place on December 10.

Chair Jones stated that Mr. Raulston’s comments on minimum densities were valid and it’s something to keep in mind when moving forward with Smart Growth.

Mr. Raulston commented on the challenges the Birdrock project presented and how it differed from National City.

Action: This item was presented for information only.

4. ANNUAL REVIEW OF AND PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO BOARD POLICY NO. 033: GUIDELINES FOR SANDAG REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT MEMORANDUM (RECOMMEND)

Susan Baldwin, Senior Planner (SANDAG), presented a PowerPoint on the implementation guidelines for the SANDAG Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) Memorandum. She reviewed six major issues and the changes which have been made to them.
Dave Druker, representing the North County Transit District, commented that it is not possible to get 100% of the points in some categories.

Ms. Baldwin agreed that in both Nos. 5 and 3 that it is not possible to get 100% of the points.

Bill Anderson, representing the Regional Planning Technical Working Group, commented that it was one of the concerns that the TWG and other jurisdictions expressed. The TWG agrees with criterion but would like to review the actual formulas for the measures next week.

Howard Williams, representing the San Diego County Water Authority, commented on the water shortages and asked whether the green factors had been entered into the discussions, particularly the conservation of grey water in construction.

Ms. Baldwin responded this particular policy does not address specifically that issue, but the overall criteria for the Smart Growth Incentive Program does address sustainability and green building issues.

Chair Pro Tem Slater-Price stated the County has concerns that some of the policies either ignore or penalize jurisdictions that have been top producers of low-income housing and precludes jurisdictions from being able to compete for TransNet dollars based upon current formulas. She supported sending it back to the TWG to be reworked and thought it was a good idea to eliminate the requirement of having an approved housing element from the state.

Councilmember Atkins seconded the motion.

Mayor Holt Pfeiler asked if Chair Pro Tem Slater-Price was supporting the five.

Chair Pro Tem Slater-Price stated that she was.

Chair Jones asked if the motion was to accept staff’s recommendation to accept the concept of the five and send it back to the TWG for some tweaking on the numbers.

Chair Pro Tem Slater-Price said exactly.

Chair Jones said the motion was by Chair Pro Tem Slater-Price and seconded by Councilmember Atkins.

Mayor Holt Pfeiler requested clarification regarding the TWG’s suggestions and asked if they would change it completely or would a “band” type of method be applied to reward jurisdictions that have done something.

Coleen Clementson, Committee Coordinator (SANDAG), said regarding the adjustments to how the points might be calculated, there have been suggestions from TWG members to “band” some of these together so there would be a possibility of getting all of the points in
some of the categories. She praised Mr. Anderson for his leadership and guidance in the process of how items are calculated.

Executive Director Gary Gallegos (SANDAG) commented that history will be remembered by the Board and suggested crafting something within the parameters of the reward system for those jurisdictions that are attempting to do more.

Mayor Holt Pfeiler added that when this policy was put into place it was not known what cities were going to do, or how well it would play out. This is the driver of recognizing that some cities produce more, and that needs to be accommodated; this is the math problem that could not be foreseen three years ago.

Sandy Smith, representing the Heart of Valley Center, urged the Committee to allow those jurisdictions without current housing elements to apply for Smart Growth Incentive funds. She was a member of the Stakeholders Working Group on the Smart Growth Incentive Pilot group. Her community is looking forward to applying for funds to develop two empty fields near Harrah’s, which have been designated as her community’s future Smart Growth areas.

Councilmember Atkins remarked this has been a complex and complicated process to work through. She acknowledged and thanked Mayor Holt Pfeiler for her efforts. She said it is important to continue to monitor the policy which is put into place to make sure it incentivizes all jurisdictions to do more production, hold ourselves accountable to the original intent of this, and reward the behavior of building affordable units.

Chair Jones stated the motion was to accept the concept of the five categories and send it back to the TWG for some math tweaking.

Mayor Holt Pfeiler commented for some bands of points rather than percentages of points.

Chair Jones said it would go to the Executive Committee and then to the Board on the dates indicated.

**Action:** Upon a motion by Chair Pro Tem Slater-Price and a second by Councilmember Atkins, the Regional Planning Committee unanimously accepted the amendments and the five factors from a general perspective as a way to calculate the Policy 033 points and returned the item to the TWG for adjustments to the actual formulas regarding the allocation and calculation of points before presenting it to the Executive Committee on November 14, 2008, and Board of Directors on November 21, 2008.

5. **HOUSING AND SMART GROWTH FUNDING UPDATE (INFORMATION)**

Susan Baldwin, Senior Planner, presented an overview of some of the housing and Smart Growth funding available to local jurisdictions and non-profit and for-profit developers. She briefed the Committee on state funds, which are available, including Prop. 1C, the Governor’s initiative on Permanent Funding Source for Affordable Housing; and Prop. 63.

Mr. Anderson asked if she knew the exact application deadline and what is meant by “project readiness.”
Ms. Baldwin responded that Notices of Funding Availability will be sent either in November or December.

Mr. Anderson asked if “project readiness” was expected to be full entitlements or possibly in process for entitlements.

Ms. Baldwin said she did not recall what the specifics were with respect to project readiness.

Jonathan Hunter, Managing Director, Western Region of the Corporation for Supportive Housing (CSH), commented the way it was handled in the past was that they looked at it as a continuum, so the further along you were in the process, the more points you received.

Ms. Baldwin introduced Mr. Hunter to brief the Committee on supportive housing in the San Diego region.

Mr. Hunter informed that CSH is a national non-profit and community development financing institution, which works with local communities to build permanent housing with services to prevent and end homelessness. The County of San Diego Department of Mental Health engaged CSH to be a technical assistance advisor and capacity-building provider to assist in the development of a plan for utilizing Mental Health Services Act (MHSA) housing program funds to end homelessness, particularly for those with chronic mental health issues. He said $190 million of the Prop. 1C funds are specifically designated for the development of supportive housing, and the County of San Diego Department of Mental Health has developed a plan for the resources and begun work with developers on how to access the resources. The San Diego MHSA Plan projects a goal of developing 323 new units of permanent supportive housing for people with mental illness. They need support in sighting projects and convincing communities that these projects actually build value in communities, solve critical community problems, and create vital and healthy housing that helps people live healthy lives.

Councilmember Atkins complimented Mr. Hunter on the work in San Diego and expressed appreciation to the County for its role in providing services critical to helping communities support these programs. She relayed her experience at a community meeting regarding supportive housing and said better information needs to be developed to help communities understand how effective supportive housing is.

Mr. Hunter responded the development of better interpretive materials is needed for communities to understand that housing is a part of recovery and wellness is a priority.

Councilmember Atkins said she thought there was a disconnect in that communities were feeling as though they had a problem now that needed to be addressed, and asked Mr. Hunter to relay information regarding model programs for addressing the needs of individuals with mental illness in other cities and how communities in San Diego might get something underway.

Mr. Hunter said the Boston Medical Center developed a vulnerability index as a way of assessing the most vulnerable people living on the streets. An organization in New York called Common Ground used the vulnerability index to train interviewers interviewing
people on the streets to determine those people that are the most vulnerable. The important part of the intervention is figuring out what the housing resource is. Communities trying to use this index have to first identify how they're going to provide housing and then put together comprehensive service teams, etc.

**Action:** This item was presented for information only.

6. **UPCOMING MEETINGS**

Ms. Clementson stated the Committee will be noticed once the agenda has been finalized; however, the next Regional Planning Committee scheduled for December 5, 2008, may be a Joint Workshop with the Board of Directors, Regional Planning Committee, and the Transportation Committee to discuss the process to develop the next Growth Forecast. The Board meeting is scheduled to occur between 10 a.m. and 12 noon, and it is possible that the Committee would be asked to attend at that time and then stay to take an action on the RCP Monitoring Report.

Mr. Gallegos added that the venue may be changed to Caltrans in order to accommodate such a large group.

7. **ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Jerry Jones adjourned the meeting at 1:24 p.m.
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Introduction

The San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan (Plan) is being developed to support implementation of both the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) and Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The RCP calls for more transportation options and a balanced regional transportation system to support smart growth and a more sustainable region. The RTP calls for a multimodal regional transportation network that includes a regional bicycle network. In addition, bicycle transportation plays a role in public health, reducing vehicle miles traveled (VMT), improving air quality, and lessening the dependence on motor vehicle travel.

Last fiscal year, SANDAG was awarded a Caltrans planning grant to prepare a regional bicycle plan. In April 2008, Alta Planning and Design was selected as the consultant to assist SANDAG with the planning project. The Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Working Group (BPWG) has been identified as the technical advisory committee for the project and the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG) along with the Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) have been asked to provide input.

This report provides an overview of the purpose of the Plan, the public involvement process, issues related to the proposed network, and next steps. On November 7, 2008, this report was presented as information to the Transportation Committee.

Discussion

The main purpose of the Plan is to develop a unified bicycle system throughout the San Diego region that serves a wide variety of bicycle trips with connections to pedestrian paths, trails, and transit. The Plan will accomplish the following:

- Define a network of regionally significant bicycle routes, facilities, and necessary support programs and facilities;
- Identify gaps in the network and recommend specific improvements needed to fill these gaps in the system;
- Develop cost estimates for build-out of the entire regional network;
- Develop a funding strategy to implement the regional bike network;
- Identify programs to help local jurisdictions to become more bicycle-friendly; and
• Recommend a series of policies and actions to encourage and increase bicycling at the local and regional level.

**The Process**

The planning process includes an important public involvement component as well as strong technical elements and has been organized into four phases. The first three phases have focused on the network development and are summarized below. The fourth and final phase will focus on the development of bicycle supportive programs and a funding strategy to implement the Plan.

**Phase One**

This initial work on the Plan began in April 2008 and included the following:

• Gathered existing data from SANDAG, local circulation elements, and local bicycle master plans;

• Conducted first set of public workshops to discuss:
  - Preliminary plan goals and objectives,
  - Existing Regional Bikeway Corridors Map (Attachment 1),
  - Detailed corridor maps, and
  - Bicycle crash data;

• Launched project Web site (www.sandag.org/bicycleplan); and

• Collected data from 1,577 rider preference questionnaires regarding riding behavior, facility preferences, facility deficiencies, and awareness of bicycle supportive programs.

**Phase Two**

The second phase of the Plan focused on data collection and analysis to draft the existing conditions report. The full Draft Existing Conditions Report has been posted to the project Web site and presents a summary of existing bicycling conditions, facilities, programs, and policies in the San Diego region, as well as a preliminary assessment of the region in terms of relative priority for bicycle improvements.

**Phase Three**

This phase of the Plan is currently underway and focuses on identifying options toward meeting the diverse needs of existing and future bicyclists. The Proposed Corridor Alignments and Classifications & Regional Bicycle-Related Programs Report has been drafted for public review and provides a summary of further refinement to the regional network, facility types, facility classifications, and bicycle programs. This document has been posted to the project Web site and was presented to the public in a second set of workshops in October 2008.

**Phase Four**

The final phase of the Plan will include development of goals and objectives, development of bicycle design guidelines and standards for regional facilities, further refinement of the regional...
network and facility types, preliminary analysis and cost estimates for the priority projects, and development of short-term and long-term funding strategy.

**Issues Under Discussion**

In order to develop the existing conditions report and refined regional network, rider preference questionnaires completed in Phase One provided extensive data regarding riding behavior, facility preferences, facility deficiencies, and awareness of bicycle support programs. The data was collected through a questionnaire that was distributed to participants at the public workshops and posted on the project Web site. Between the workshops and the project Web site, 1,577 surveys were completed. The data in the following three tables (Tables 1, 2, and 3) illustrates that riding behaviors and facility preferences vary broadly. (Additional data from the rider preference survey can be found in Attachment 2.)

When asked why they ride (Table 1), the majority of respondents (90.0%) are motivated to bike due to the health benefits associated with biking. The pleasure of riding a bicycle also is an incentive for 81.3 percent of respondents. Transportation-related purposes were cited less frequently by survey respondents with 58.2 percent biking to get to work, 36.6 percent for shopping or running errands, 15.2 percent to connect to transit, and 9 percent to travel to school. Response frequencies do not sum to 100 percent because survey respondents were allowed to select multiple responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For exercise/health reasons</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For pleasure</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To get to work</td>
<td>58.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For shopping/errands</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To get to transit</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To get to school</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't bike</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 shows that the greatest number of respondents are most interested in riding on separated bike paths (71%); then on on-street bike lanes (42.6%); and thirdly, on bicycle boulevards (41.9%), which are shared roadway facilities on local and neighborhood streets that favor through bicycle travel. Fewer respondents favor bike routes, which are defined as shared roadway facilities that are delineated only with signage and no pavement markings. The highest percent (34.6%) of respondents ranked bike routes second on a scale from one to four, with one being the most preferred. Trails or dirt paths are least preferred, with 36.9 percent responding that they are not at all interested in riding on this type of facility. Overall, these results indicate a preference for urban facilities that provide for separate bicycling rights-of-way, or secondarily, on-street lanes.
Please Rate Your Level of Preference for each of the Following Bicycle Facilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bicycle Facility Type</th>
<th>1 Highly Interested</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4 Not at all Interested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Off-Street Paved Bike Paths</td>
<td>71.0%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Street Bike Lanes</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Boulevards</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Routes</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpaved Trails or Dirt Paths</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The survey asked community members about those improvements that most likely would influence increased riding. More bike lanes (Class II) and more multi-use paths (Class I) were mentioned as being very likely to encourage increased riding by over 60 percent of the respondents. Maintenance and wider shoulders were mentioned as being very likely to increase riding by approximately 50 percent of respondents. Bicycle boulevards were mentioned by about 43 percent of the respondent as being very likely to increase riding. These results are summarized in Table 3. Response frequencies do not sum to 100 percent because survey respondents were allowed to select multiple responses.

Would the Following Improvements Influence You to Bike More Often?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Very Likely</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Somewhat Likely</th>
<th>Somewhat Unlikely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Very Unlikely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More Bike Lanes on Major Streets</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Paved (off-street) Bike Paths</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased Maintenance</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widen Outside/Curb Lanes on Major Streets</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Boulevards</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Bike Routes</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More On-Road Bike Signage</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Bicycle Parking</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposed Regional Network and Facility Types

One of the big challenges in refining the regional network for a region the size of San Diego is determining how to address the vast diversity in the area—including topographical challenges, right-of-way constraints, and the many different types of riders and rider preferences. The solution will be found with a comprehensive approach that uses a variety of strategies and facility types depending on the context of the situation.
In an effort to address this diversity an intercommunity bikeway network is under development that will combine standard facility types as identified by the California Highway Design Manual (Table 4), as well as consideration of two emerging facility types that may be used in corridors where a standard facility will not meet the needs of a wide variety of cyclists. Additional information about the use and implementation of two such facilities, cycle tracks and bicycle boulevards, is contained in Attachment 3. The application of a corridor classification system upon the Regional Network using these five classification types will take place in Phase Four of the Plan. It also is important to recognize that all roadways are open to bicycle travel, unless it is specifically prohibited, and should be considered as part of the greater regional and local bicycle network that serves to supplement streets and roadways that include Class I, II, and III facilities.

**Table 4**

**Bicycle Facility Types**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bike Path (Multi-Use Trail), Class I</td>
<td>An 8- to 12-foot paved path within its own right-of-way to provide a non-motorized connection or access where it cannot be provided on the roadway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Lanes, Class II</td>
<td>Five-foot lanes striped on the outside of the roadway and identified with signs and pavement markings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Route, Class III</td>
<td>Roads designated by signs as preferred routes for bicycle travel.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposed changes to the existing Regional Bikeway Corridors consist of five new corridors as shown in Attachment 4, while Attachment 5 shows the location of four corridors that are proposed for realignment to serve higher density areas. In addition, given previous direction from the Transportation Committee and the nature of the citizen input generated from the public outreach efforts, a sub-network showing a “spine” of potential Class I facility locations is shown in Attachment 6.

**Next Steps**

A draft of the Plan is expected to be complete in early 2009 followed by a 30-day public review period. Necessary revisions to the Plan will follow public review The Final Report is expected in the spring of 2009. Updates on the progress of the Plan will be presented to the Regional Planning Committee on a regular basis.

BOB LEITER  
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachments:  
1. Overview of the San Diego Regional Bikeway Corridors  
2. Summary of Public Input  
3. Cycle Tracks and Bicycle Boulevards  
4. New Proposed Regional Corridors  
5. Proposed Regional Corridors with Adjusted Realignments  
6. Regionwide Proposed Class I Facilities

Key Staff Contact: Chris Kluth, (619) 699-1952, ckl@sandag.org
Figure 3-4: Overview of San Diego Regional Bicycle Corridors
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Riding Behavior

Table 1 reports bicycling frequency during the typical week. Responses are fairly evenly distributed across the week, with the most common response being three days per week (21.3%). This pattern suggests that the community members surveyed represent a broad cross-section of bicyclists in terms of riding frequency and also shows consistency with other regions across the United States.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Days per Week</th>
<th>Percent of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When asked why they do not ride more often (Table 2), survey respondents cited lack of bicycle facilities (53.9%), excessive traffic (50%), and motorists not providing room for bicycles on roadways (47.3%) as the strongest factors. However, several other deterrents, such as poorly maintained roads or bike facilities (43.5%) also were indicated. Response frequencies do not sum to 100 percent because survey respondents were allowed to select multiple responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Percent of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No bike paths, lanes, or bike routes</td>
<td>53.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too many cars / cars drive too fast</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drivers don’t share the road</td>
<td>47.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bikeways / roads in poor condition</td>
<td>43.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough time</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destinations are too far away</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have to carry things</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient lighting</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weather</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I travel with small children</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 displays a summary of the top five locations where survey respondents referenced a gap that fell within the currently adopted regional bicycle network. A total of 583 comments were made about gap locations that correspond to locations along the currently adopted regional bicycle corridors. References to gaps along the Coastal Rail Trail were by far the most frequently cited, with almost 30 percent of the gap references related to this facility. The next most common gap reference was made in relation to areas along the San Diego River Bikeway, the Central Coast Corridor, and the Bayshore Bikeway.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Corridor</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Rail Trail</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego River Bikeway</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Coast Corridor</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayshore Bikeway</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Route 56 Bike Path</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bicycle Supportive Programs

Table 4 summarizes respondents’ interest in developing education and encouragement program types. The table suggests that individuals are highly interested in expanding most program types. Responses indicate that public awareness campaigns and user-friendly bicycle maps and guides are the most desired program types, with only a few respondents not at all interested in program development. Interest in maps and guides is consistent with the results presented in Table 4-4. Approximately 95 percent of respondents use the San Diego Region Bicycle Map and 90 percent are interested or highly interested in additional maps and guides. Public awareness campaigns focused on bicyclists’ rights, responsibilities, and the health and environmental benefits of bicycling are deficient regionally compared to education- and enforcement-related programs. Respondents’ strong interest in this program type makes a case for increasing awareness-related programs. Respondents were permitted to select multiple answers. As a result, the number of responses does not equal 100 percent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Type</th>
<th>1: Highly Interested</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4: Not at all Interested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>User-friendly Bicycle Maps and Guides</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Awareness Campaign Focused on Bicyclists Rights, Responsibilities, and the Health and Environmental Benefits of Bicycling</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-stop Bicycle Information Website</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route Planning for Bicyclists (511 service)</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Programs for Motorists</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Type</td>
<td>1 Highly Interested</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4 Not at all Interested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Programs for Elementary, Middle/Junior, and High School Students</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Programs for Law Enforcement Personnel</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Programs for Adult Cyclists</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Support Encouragement Programs, such as the Diamond Awards Program</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan

**Cycle Tracks**

- Bicycle facilities that combine the experience of separated bike paths with the infrastructure of bike lanes.
- Provide space in the roadway right-of-way that is exclusively for bicycle travel.
- Typically one-way on both sides of a street.
- Separated from pedestrian and vehicles by on-street parking or a barrier, such as pavement markings or coloring, bollards, curbs/medians or a combination of these elements.
- Recommended width is 7 feet minimum.
- Visual and physical queues are included to understand where bicyclists and pedestrians should be moving.

**Placement:**
- Along urban or suburban arterials with longer blocks and with few driveway or midblock access points for vehicles
- Along corridors with adequate right-of-way

**Intersection Treatments:**
- Protected bicycle phases at signals
- Signal phases in advance of vehicle phases
- Warning signs, special markings and on-street parking removal (if present) prior to the intersection at non-signalized intersections

**Access Management:**
- Reduce potential conflict points with medians, driveway consolidations, or restricted movements.
- Signed shared roadways with additional treatments.
- Extent of treatments depend on roadway conditions, street and land use characteristics.
- Bikeways developed on existing low-traffic neighborhood streets where speeds and traffic volumes are kept low enough so it is comfortable for cyclists to share the lane with motorists.
- Bikeways where the movement of bicycles is given priority over through motor vehicle traffic movement.
- Intersection treatments to help cyclists safely cross major streets.
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REGIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN: 2008 ANNUAL PERFORMANCE MONITORING REPORT

File Number 3000200

Introduction

SANDAG presented the Regional Comprehensive Plan 2008 Performance Monitoring Report (2008 Monitoring Report) to the Regional Planning Committee (RPC) on October 3, 2008, for review and comment. The RPC provided comments and authorized release of the 2008 Monitoring Report for a 30-day public review period. SANDAG staff incorporated RPC comments as well as those received during the public review period into the 2008 Monitoring Report. The revised 2008 Monitoring Report is attached.

Discussion

SANDAG presented the 2008 Monitoring Report to the RPC on October 3, 2008. At the October meeting, the RPC provided one comment regarding the Commute Mode Share indicator. SANDAG also received one public comment. Actions taken and responses to comments are listed below.

RPC Comment

Commute Mode Share

- The mode share for transit seems low, relative to walk/bike/other. This data does not reflect the fact the transit mode share is much higher in specific commute corridors.

Response: Staff is currently developing the T-PeMS application, which will provide mode share data along specific corridors, and will be able to report this information in future years. Text regarding the increased transit mode share in communities such as downtown was added to the report.

Public Comment

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

- Please report the number and percentage of households paying more than 50 percent of income on housing, by income band, to show the real need for homes for affordable to low-income households.
Response: Unless data is unavailable for an indicator, all requests for changing or adding to indicators will be addressed when the Regional Comprehensive Plan is next updated.

Data Updates

Additionally, SANDAG has received updated data for two indicators since the draft was released in October. Those indicators are listed below. The updated data have been incorporated into the text.

Share of New Housing Units by Income Category

- Several jurisdictions have provided SANDAG with updated data regarding Regional Housing Needs Assessment performance. This data may be updated further based on additional information local jurisdictions are providing to SANDAG in association with the annual review of Board Policy No. 033.

Air Quality Index

- San Diego Air Pollution Control District revised its Air Quality Index reporting to reflect new federal standards for ozone and particulate matter. Data for previous years has also been revised to reflect the new standards.

Upon release of the draft report for public review, staff updated the report in response to the RPC comment regarding the Commute Mode Share indicator. The draft report was also presented to the Regional Planning Technical Working Group for input. Revisions to the report were made where appropriate in the attached version (Attachment 1).

Next Steps

The 2008 Monitoring Report will be presented to the Board of Directors for acceptance in December. The Regional Comprehensive Plan Performance Monitoring Report will continue to be produced on an annual basis.

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning


Key Staff Contact: Christine Eary, (619) 699-6928, cea@sandag.org
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Introduction

The Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP), 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. The 2008 Regional Comprehensive Plan Annual Performance Monitoring Report (2008 Monitoring Report) is the second since the Baseline Report was accepted by the Board in October 2006.

The 2008 Monitoring Report includes the most recent data available for each indicator, typically from 2007. For some indicators, there is a one year delay in reporting; in these cases, data from 2006 are included. For all indicators, the most recent data are provided and related to the Baseline Report.

Based on the data collected for the 2008 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

- The share of new housing units built in Smart Growth Opportunity Areas increased.
- Annual hours of traffic delay per traveler have decreased.
- Transit ridership continued to increase.
- The regional crime rate continued to decrease.
- The percent of solid waste that was recycled was close to achieving the state-mandated target.\(^1\)
- Recycled water use continued to increase substantially.

Areas for Improvement

- Housing production in the very low, low, and moderate income categories did not keep pace with above-moderate housing production: 58 percent of the above-moderate income housing goal identified in the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) has been met, while less than 10 percent of the very low-, low-, and moderate-income housing goal has been met. Overall, only 27 percent of the RHNA housing production goal has been met during the first half of the housing element cycle.
- Regionwide, the share of commutes made by transit, walking, bicycling, and carpool/vanpool have not increased substantially.
- Following beach width increases at all beaches in 2006, beach widths declined in 2007; for multiple beaches, widths are even smaller in 2007 than they were in 2005.
- Unemployment increased for the first time in three years.

\(^1\) The percent of solid waste that was recycled in 2006 is based on a preliminary estimate; it is anticipated that when this estimate is revised, it will be higher than originally estimated and show that the region actually has achieved or exceeded the state-mandated target.
• Per capita energy usage in the region continued to increase, moving further away from the target established in the Regional Energy Strategy.

• Plans estimate that the region will reach physical landfill capacity in 2016, but unless proposed permit changes are implemented, permitted capacity could be reached prior to 2016.

Throughout the 2008 Monitoring Report, indicator data are in certain cases related to growth in population, housing, or jobs, as shown in Table 1. Between 2006 and 2007, the region grew by 34,156 people, and added 13,466 housing units, and 6,500 jobs.

Table 1
Population, Housing Units, and Job Growth in the San Diego Region, 2000 to 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>2,813,833</td>
<td>3,064,113</td>
<td>3,098,269</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Units</td>
<td>1,040,149</td>
<td>1,118,283</td>
<td>1,131,749</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs</td>
<td>1,205,200</td>
<td>1,312,500</td>
<td>1,319,000</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: SANDAG Annual Population and Housing Estimates; California Department of Finance; California Employment Development Department; Bureau of Labor Statistics

Many of the indicators included in this report use the American Community Survey (ACS) as their data source. ACS is the United States (U.S.) Census Bureau’s new program for collecting and disseminating demographic, socio-economic, and housing data on an annual basis. Approximately one out of 40 addresses (2.5 percent of the population) is surveyed each year, which equals about three million addresses a year. In San Diego County, one out of 40 equates to about 28,800 addresses each year.

Please note that ACS is not designed to count the population, but rather to collect person and household characteristic information. The official Census (short form), which counts the entire population, still will be conducted every ten years, with the next Census taking place in 2010.
### 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 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 |
| **Economic Prosperity** | 23. Labor force educational attainment |
| | 24. Employment growth in high-wage economic clusters |
| | 25. Regional unemployment rate compared to California and the United States |
| | 26. Real per capita income compared to California and the United States |
| | 27. Regional poverty rate compared to California and the United States |
| **Public Facilities** | 28. Water consumption |
| | 29. Diversity of water supply |
| | 30. Recycled water use |
| | 31. Per capita electricity consumption and peak demand |
| | 32. Share of energy produced in the region versus imported |
| | 33. Share of energy produced from renewable resources |
| | 34. Percent of solid waste that is recycled |
| | 35. Landfill space available |
| **Borders** | 36. Interregional traffic volumes into San Diego from surrounding counties and Baja California |
| | 37. Border wait times |
| | 38. Participation in SENTRI Lanes, Pedestrian Commuter Program, Free and Secure Trade (FAST) Program |
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 Regional Comprehensive Plan (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 Within Smart Growth Opportunity Areas

In 2006, 19,000 new housing units were built in the region. Of these, almost 6,000, or 31 percent, were built in Smart Growth Opportunity Areas, as shown in Figure 1. This represents an increase in the share of new housing units built in Smart Growth Opportunity Areas, from 13 percent in 2005.

At the time of publication, new data regarding job growth in Smart Growth Opportunity Areas are unavailable. 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 21,500 jobs during the same time period. As of 2005, 33 percent of the region’s jobs were located in Smart Growth Opportunity Areas.

With only three 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, and which factors may be influencing growth in these areas. Continued monitoring is required to identify trends.

Figure 1
Share of New Housing Units in Smart Growth Opportunity Areas, 2004 to 2006

Source: SANDAG Current Estimates Program

---

2 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 was used in the development of the 2007 Regional Transportation Plan, and to determine eligibility for participation in the TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program.
Share of New Housing Units Within County Water Authority Water Service Boundary

In 2007, the share of new housing units built within the San Diego County Water Authority service boundary increased slightly, to 97.3 percent, as shown in Figure 2. These data signify progress toward the RCP goal of focusing population and job growth away from rural areas and closer to existing and planned job centers and public facilities.

Figure 2
New Housing Units in the County Water Authority Service Area, 2006 to 2007

Annual Transit Ridership

Regional transit ridership continued to increase, continuing an upward trend since 2003; ridership grew 2 percent between 2006 and 2007. There were 97 million transit riders in the San Diego region in 2007, as shown in Figure 3.

This upward trend over the past three years is expected to continue in the near future with the opening of the SPRINTER rail line this year and increasing gas prices.

Figure 3
San Diego Regional Annual Transit Boardings, 2000 to 2007

Commute 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.
The data suggest that the proportion of workers driving alone has dropped, and that working at home and bicycle or walk commutes have increased. However, these trends may be as much a result of new data collection methods in the American Community Survey (ACS) as they are of actual trends. Beginning in 2006, the ACS includes data on residents of group quarters facilities, whose commute patterns may differ from those of the household population. Therefore, data from prior years are not directly comparable. Trends may be better analyzed in next year’s report.

In future years, this data will be reported at a corridor level. Corridor-level reporting in future years will likely demonstrate substantial transit mode share in specific corridors that are well-served by transit. For example, the 2000 Census found that Downtown San Diego and City Heights had transit commute mode shares of 20 percent and 11 percent, respectively.

Figure 4
Regional Commute Mode Shares, 2000 to 2006

Travel Times and Volumes for Key Transportation Corridors

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 tool used for reporting and monitoring the performance of the freeway system. Freeway detector stations collect volume and lane occupancy information every 30 seconds.

The data presented in Map 1 and Table 2 do not represent “door-to-door” commute times, but rather, trip time once on the freeway. Travel times are representative only of a freeway trip; average travel times are computed from an aggregation of freeway loop detector data. Accordingly, travel time monitoring currently is limited to freeway segments and the availability of freeway loop detector stations; thus, all segments shown in Map 1 and Table 2 are confined to each respective freeway.

Improvement of PeMS has been ongoing since its initial development and the release of the first PeMS system version in the late 1990s. Key PeMS enhancements generally have focused on assessing and improving the quality of the data and performance measures that PeMS provides. Specific enhancements
currently being developed for the San Diego region under the PeMS multimodal project will allow PeMS to incorporate real-time transit and arterial data. Through this effort, PeMS will have the ability to measure usage and travel time data for both transit and arterials, including the estimation of on-ramp wait times. This additional data will better approximate “door-to-door” travel times. PeMS analysis of key performance measures also will be enhanced by reporting an estimated travel time reliability factor. Once these PeMS enhancements are completed, they will be incorporated in future monitoring reports.3

Travel times shown in Table 2 differ from those presented in the 2007 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) for two reasons:

- RTP travel times are model-based, whereas the reported travel times 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.

- 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. However, as indicated above, PeMS will have the ability to measure arterial travel times, to approximate RTP door-to-door travel times for future reports.

Travel times have not increased nor decreased substantially in most corridors. The Interstate 15 (I-15) southbound a.m. and I-805 southbound p.m. commutes experienced the greatest decrease in travel time, dropping seven minutes, respectively from 2006 to 2007. Between 2006 and 2007, commute times in most corridors either decreased slightly or remained the same.

Table 2
Travel Times in Key Auto Corridors, 2005 to 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Corridor</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Average Trip Time (minutes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A.M. Peak Period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>Oceanside to Downtown San Diego (SD)</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>Escondido to Downtown SD</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SR 78</td>
<td>Escondido to Carlsbad</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SR 94</td>
<td>El Cajon to Downtown SD</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>El Cajon to Downtown SD</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>SR 52</td>
<td>Santee to Sorrento Valley</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>Mid-City to Sorrento Valley</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>Chula Vista to Sorrento Valley</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>Chula Vista to Downtown SD</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>San Ysidro to Downtown SD</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>El Cajon to Sorrento Valley</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Freeway Performance Measurement System (PeMS Version 9.0), Caltrans

Notes: (a) 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 4:00 p.m. (b) The a.m. direction is listed; the p.m. is the reverse direction of travel. (c) Corridor limits are listed for the a.m. direction and are approximately the same for the p.m. direction. (d) Data are reported for commutes on Tuesdays, Wednesdays, and Thursdays.

3 Additionally, travel times and volumes reported for previous years in the 2008 Monitoring Report may differ from those reported in last year’s report, as recent enhancements to PeMS include improved travel time calculations that more accurately reflect the start and end points of the designated freeway segments. Travel volumes for specific corridors may reflect different monitoring stations from previous reports in order to better reflect the travel characteristics or modal services within that corridor. Also, a different monitoring station may be used for a given report if a station is unavailable or unreliable due to highway construction, maintenance, or roadway incidents that might otherwise skew the data.
Map 1
Key Auto Corridor Travel Times, San Diego County, 2007

1 I-5 Oceanside to Downtown SD
   North Bound: 44 minutes
   South Bound: 55 minutes

2 I-15 Escondido to Downtown SD
   North Bound: 34 minutes
   South Bound: 42 minutes

3 I-58 Escondido to Carlsbad
   East Bound: 25 minutes
   West Bound: 16 minutes

4 SR 94 El Cajon to Downtown SD
   East Bound: 12 minutes
   West Bound: 16 minutes

5 I-8 El Cajon to Downtown SD
   East Bound: 15 minutes
   West Bound: 18 minutes

6 SR 52 Santee to Kearny Mesa
   East Bound: 15 minutes
   West Bound: 13 minutes

7 I-8 Mid-City to Sorrento Valley
   North Bound: 13 minutes
   South Bound: 16 minutes

8 I-805 Chula Vista to Sorrento Valley
   North Bound: 30 minutes
   South Bound: 32 minutes

9 I-805 Chula Vista to Downtown SD
   North Bound: 22 minutes
   South Bound: 17 minutes

10 I-5 San Ysidro to Downtown SD
    North Bound: 15 minutes
    South Bound: 15 minutes
As shown in Table 3, travel volumes decreased slightly in most corridors in 2007. Observed decreases in travel times, and travel volumes in particular in 2007, may likely be attributed to the increase in gas prices and the state of the economy. However, a number of freeway improvements have been completed since 2005, which also may account for subsequent increases in mobility. For example, declining traffic on northbound I-5 may be the result of the opening of the northbound I-5/I-805 bypass lanes in spring 2005. These new bypass lanes divert traffic from the general purpose lanes, decreasing delay, and improving overall corridor travel times. It is anticipated that southbound traffic on I-5 also will decrease with the opening of the southbound bypass lanes in summer 2007; this anticipated decrease may be reflected in next year’s monitoring report. More detailed analysis relative to these improvements and specific corridor monitoring will be provided in the SANDAG State of the Commute Report, to be published in spring 2009.

Table 3
Travel Volumes in Key Auto Corridors, 2005 to 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Corridor</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Northbound/Eastbound</th>
<th>Southbound/Westbound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>Oceanside to Downtown SD</td>
<td>108,000</td>
<td>98,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>Escondido to Downtown SD</td>
<td>97,000</td>
<td>99,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SR 78</td>
<td>Escondido to Carlsbad</td>
<td>77,300</td>
<td>76,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SR 94</td>
<td>El Cajon to Downtown SD</td>
<td>75,500</td>
<td>81,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>El Cajon to Downtown SD</td>
<td>114,900</td>
<td>115,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>SR 52</td>
<td>Santee to Kearny Mesa</td>
<td>39,200</td>
<td>39,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>Mid-City to Sorrento Valley</td>
<td>104,200</td>
<td>106,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>Chula Vista to Sorrento Valley</td>
<td>104,200</td>
<td>106,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>Chula Vista to Downtown SD</td>
<td>108,200</td>
<td>107,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>San Ysidro to Downtown SD</td>
<td>83,200</td>
<td>87,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>El Cajon to Sorrento Valley</td>
<td>114,900</td>
<td>115,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Freeway Performance Measurement System (PeMS Version 9.0), Caltrans

Notes: (a) Data are reported for commutes on Tuesdays, Wednesdays, and Thursdays. (b) Traffic data obtained from monitoring stations may be subject to atypical operating conditions due to active highway construction. Volumes for I-805 Mid-City to Sorrento Valley and I-805 Chula Vista to Sorrento Valley are the same as those for Chula Vista to Downtown San Diego because they share the same screenline.

As PeMS continues to be developed and refined, it will eventually incorporate real-time transit data. In the meantime, the 2008 Monitoring Report includes transit volume information from FY 2005 through FY 2007 based on SANDAG Passenger Counting Program data. Transit passenger volumes are measured at key locations (screenlines) selected within each corridor. For each corridor, transit passenger volumes are listed by screenline in Table 4.

Transit volumes largely have remained consistent since 2005 along most corridors. The largest increase, in the I-8 El Cajon to Downtown San Diego corridor, is associated with the opening of the Green Line Trolley in 2005. The Green Line Trolley opening resulted in the addition of more than 4,000 passengers each way along the corridor, on an average weekday. A similar increase is expected along the SR 78 Escondido to Carlsbad corridor in FY 2008 due to the SPRINTER line opening in March 2008.
## Table 4
Transit Passenger Volumes in Key Transit Corridors at Specific Screenline Locations, 2005 to 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Corridor</th>
<th>Screenline(s) and Corresponding Transit Service</th>
<th>Northbound/Eastbound</th>
<th>Southbound/Westbound</th>
<th>Total – Both Directions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I-5 (Oceanside to Downtown SD)</td>
<td>Sorrento Valley</td>
<td>2,852 2,945 2,762</td>
<td>2,331 2,331 2,422</td>
<td>3,484 3,601 3,442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>COASTER</td>
<td>Route(s): 101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I-15 (Escondido to Downtown SD)</td>
<td>Poway</td>
<td>647 701 547</td>
<td>771 749 533</td>
<td>1,418 1,450 1,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Route(s): 20, 810, 820, 850, 860</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Miramar</td>
<td>943 958 797</td>
<td>1,139 1,150 839</td>
<td>2,082 2,108 1,636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Route(s): 20, 210, 810, 820, 850, 860</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SR 78 (Escondido to Carlsbad)</td>
<td>Vista</td>
<td>420 460 468</td>
<td>531 477 473</td>
<td>951 937 941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Route(s): 320</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>354 393 377</td>
<td>508 489 502</td>
<td>862 882 879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Route(s): 320</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SR 94 (El Cajon to Downtown SD)</td>
<td>Euclid Trolley Station</td>
<td>4,888 4,780 4,703</td>
<td>5,423 5,544 5,266</td>
<td>10,311 10,324 9,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Orange Line Trolley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I-8 (El Cajon to Downtown SD)</td>
<td>Fashion Valley Trolley Station</td>
<td>1,224 5,396 6,372</td>
<td>1,227 5,394 6,216</td>
<td>2,451 10,790 12,588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Green Line Trolley</td>
<td>Route(s): 11, 14, 44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SDSU</td>
<td>162 3,043 3,737</td>
<td>194 4,037 4,874</td>
<td>356 7,080 8,611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Route(s): 11, 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>SR 52 (Santee to Kearny Mesa)</td>
<td>Santee</td>
<td>6 16 9 18 17 14</td>
<td>24 33 23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Route(s): 870</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I-805 (Mid-City to Sorrento Valley)</td>
<td>University City</td>
<td>663 776 1,318</td>
<td>554 552 1,215</td>
<td>1,217 1,328 2,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Route(s): 50, 105, 150, 960</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I-805 (Chula Vista to Sorrento Valley)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1,191 1,391 1,215</td>
<td>1,217 1,328 2,533</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I-805 (Chula Vista to Downtown SD)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I-5 (San Ysidro to Downtown SD)</td>
<td>San Ysidro/Tijuana Trolley Station</td>
<td>13,234 13,835 13,941</td>
<td>11,152 10,989 11,095</td>
<td>24,386 24,824 25,036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Blue Line Trolley</td>
<td>Route(s): 929 and 932</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12th and Imperial Trolley Station</td>
<td>10,904 10,654 10,820</td>
<td>11,855 11,289 12,031</td>
<td>22,759 21,943 22,851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Blue Line Trolley</td>
<td>Route(s): 929</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I-8 (El Cajon to Sorrento Valley)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SANDAG Passenger Counting Program
It is anticipated that systemwide transit travel volumes likely will continue to increase, while freeway travel times and volumes likely will continue to decrease in 2008. These predictions are made in light of multiple factors, such as the economic slowdown, further increases in gas prices, as well as infrastructure improvements, such as the opening of the SPRINTER light rail service along the SR 78 corridor and freeway improvements that should improve mobility within specific segments.

Miles of Deficient Roads on Congestion Management Program Network

Between 2005 and 2007, the miles of Congestion Management Program (CMP) deficient arterials, highways, and freeways decreased. Improvement was most pronounced among the region’s arterials: only 8 percent of the CMP network arterials were considered deficient in 2007, as compared to 22 percent in 2005. The miles of deficient freeways on the CMP network also decreased, from 36 percent in 2005 to 23 percent in 2007, as shown in Figure 5.

Figure 5

Annual Hours of Traffic Delay per Traveler

Annual hours of traffic delay per traveler increased in 2004, and then decreased slightly in 2005, as shown in Figure 6. Delay is defined as the extra travel time it takes travelers to complete a trip during peak periods (6 to 9 a.m. and 4 to 7 p.m.) as a result of congestion.

Figure 6
Annual Hours of Traffic Delay per Traveler During Peak Periods, 2000 to 2005


Source: Annual Urban Mobility Report, Texas Transportation Institute
Regional Crime Rate

As shown in Figure 7, the rate of crime in the region continues to decline, and in 2007 reached its lowest rate since 2000.

Figure 7
FBI Index Crimes per 1,000 People, 2000 to 2007

Conclusion

As of 2007, the region made progress toward achieving some of the urban form and transportation goals listed in the RCP, but not others. The continued increase in annual transit ridership is an encouraging sign that the region’s residents increasingly are traveling by public transit. It is anticipated that this trend likely will continue in light of increasing gas prices and with the opening of the SPRINT rail line. Future monitoring is required to fully understand our progress toward improving mobility. When examining travel times and volumes in key auto and transit corridors, this indicator suggests that the region is reasonably managing congestion, as freeway travel times and volumes mostly have decreased between 2006 and 2007.
Despite the sharp fall in housing prices during the last year, the lack of affordable housing continues to be one of the major issues facing the San Diego region today. The Regional Comprehensive Plan (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. The Smart Growth Opportunity Areas located on the Smart Growth Concept Map identify 200 sites throughout the region where new housing can be located near jobs and transit—thus providing more housing and transportation choices.

**Housing Opportunity Index**

Data from 2007 indicates that the downward trend in housing affordability since 2000 finally may be reversing. During 2007, there was a doubling (from 5% in 2005 and 2006 to 10% in 2007) in the percentage of homes sold that are affordable to a household earning the regional median income, as shown in Figure 8. This change is likely the result of the mortgage lending crisis and increase in foreclosures that have affected the region, as well as the country as a whole. Housing, however, is still out of reach for many households in the region. The median price of all homes (resale houses, resale condominiums, and new houses/condominiums and condominium conversions) dropped by 25 percent from $495,500 in June 2007, to $370,000 in June 2008 (DataQuick Information Systems). The current median home price is almost six times the regional median household income of $68,388. Historically, the median price of a home has been three to four times the median income.

**Figure 8**

**Housing Opportunity Index, 2000 to 2007**

Source: National Association of Home Builders

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

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 2005 and 2006 is not statistically significant, as shown in Figure 9. Year-to-year fluctuations in the data may be the result of sample differences and may not reflect true year-to-year changes.
Another indicator of affordability problems in the region is the income a household must earn to afford the rent for an apartment at the Department of Housing and Urban Development’s Fair Market Rent of $1,355 for a two-bedroom unit. In 2007/2008 that amount was $54,200 annually or $26 per hour (assuming that no more than 30 percent of its income is spent on housing), as shown in Figure 10.

In California, the minimum wage in 2008 is $8.00 per hour; the average wage earned by renters in the San Diego region is $15.64 per hour. Therefore, a household must include over three minimum wage earners working forty hours per week year-round, to make a two-bedroom fair market rent affordable.

**Ratio of New Jobs to New Housing Units**

The ratio of new jobs to new housing units has fluctuated since 2001, and in 2007 experienced a threefold decline compared to 2006. In 2007, there were 0.5 new jobs for every new housing unit in the region, indicative of the economic slowdown and associated decline in job growth, as shown in Figure 11.
Share of New Housing Units by Income Category

A total of 28,861 building permits for new housing units were issued in the region between July 2005 and December 2007 (2.5 years of the five-year housing element cycle), including 689 very low-income, 1,282 low-income, 1,176 moderate-income, and 25714 above moderate-income housing units, as shown in Table 5. Based on the 2005 – 2010 Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) adopted by SANDAG in February 2005, the region achieved 3 percent of the very low-income, 7 percent of the low-income, 6 percent of the moderate-income, and 58 percent of the above moderate-income housing needs established in the RHNA. The data show that the above moderate-income housing needs established in the RHNA are closer to being met, while the housing needs for very low-, low-, and moderate-income households are not. The subsidies needed to build very low-and low-income housing in the region are inadequate to meet the region’s lower income RHNA goals despite the approval of the statewide affordable housing bonds in 2002 and 2006. Few moderate income units were built because of the high costs associated with land and construction materials and the requirement to use most financial resources to build lower income units. Building permit issuance has dropped off during the past year, so the construction of above moderate-income units may slow over the next two years.

Overall, the region has met only 27 percent of its RHNA housing goal of 107,301 units during the first half of the housing element cycle.

Table 5
Share of New Housing Units by Income Category, July 1, 2005 – December 31, 2007

<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><strong>Total Housing Units Permitted</strong></td>
<td>689</td>
<td>1,282</td>
<td>1,176</td>
<td>25,714</td>
<td>28,861</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 Permitted</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units Left to Permit</td>
<td>23,454</td>
<td>17,066</td>
<td>19,104</td>
<td>18,816</td>
<td>78,440</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data compiled from building permits issued by local jurisdictions in the San Diego region

Vacancy Rates

Vacancy rates have remained relatively stable since 2000, at approximately 4.5 percent as shown in Figure 12. Year-to-year fluctuations in the data may be the result of sample differences and may not reflect true year-to-year changes.
As shown in Figure 13, the percentage of households living in overcrowded conditions in the region continues to decline. Fluctuations in the data between 2005 and 2006 may be the result of sample differences and may not reflect true year-to-year changes.

**Number of Households on the Waiting List for Section 8 Vouchers**

In 2008, there are approximately 49,700 households on the Section 8 waiting list, down from approximately 65,600 households in 2007 and 73,500 households in 2006. The reduction is likely the result of the periodic purging of the lists undertaken by the Section 8 jurisdictions. The jurisdictions that issue Section 8 vouchers are Carlsbad, Encinitas, National City, Oceanside, the City of San Diego, and the County of San Diego.

**Conclusion**

Housing affordability continues to be a problem for the region; however, the above data indicate that the rapid decline in affordability (i.e., increase in housing costs) may have slowed for the time being. Much of this change has been due to the decline in housing prices, resulting from the large number of foreclosures experienced both in the region and nationwide. Nevertheless, progress toward meeting RHNA goals has been slow, particularly in the lower and moderate income categories.
Healthy Environment

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

Habitat Conserved Within Designated Preserve Areas

Of the jurisdictions with approved conservation plans and signed implementing agreements, 58 percent of land has been conserved within the habitat preserve system, as shown in Figure 14. This includes 6,090 acres preserved to date within the City of Carlsbad.

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).

Figure 14
MSCP South County and MHCP Land Conservation by Year, 1997 to 2031

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 2009; and the East County MSCP, anticipated for completion in 2010. Map 2 shows the location and boundaries of these plans.
Six jurisdictions, including a portion of the unincorporated area of the County, have approved habitat conservation plans and signed implementing agreements (covering 20% of the region). Seven jurisdictions are working on approval of their implementing agreements, (covering 73% of the region), and seven jurisdictions are not pursuing implementing agreements due to limited habitat in their jurisdictions (covering 1% of the region). The remaining area (covering 6% of the region) consists of land owned by the U.S. military.

**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 participation in regional habitat conservation planning, a conserved lands database is being developed to serve as a baseline for tracking this information. SANDAG currently is working to provide the draft data to local jurisdictions and federal and state land managers for verification. Updated data should be available within six to nine months.

**Number of Beach Mile Closure Days**

The number of beach mile closure days fluctuated between 2000 and 2004, but has been relatively stable since 2004, as shown in Figure 15. The number of beach mile closure days increased slightly from 2006 to 2007.

Despite the slight increase, the Beach Report Card 2007-2008, published by Heal the Bay, reported that 96 percent of San Diego county beaches attain grades of “A” or “B” during dry weather, compared to 87 percent of beaches statewide. Heal the Bay’s findings regarding wet weather trends in 2006 and 2007 for San Diego beaches appear consistent with the beach closure data reported above—during wet weather, 70 percent of San Diego beaches received grades of “A” or “B” in 2006, and in 2007 this number dropped to 67 percent.
The RCP: 2008 Annual Performance Monitoring Report

Figure 15
Weather-Adjusted Beach Mile Closure Days, 2000 to 2007

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

Beach Widths

Despite all beaches having more sand in 2006 than they did in 2005, likely due to wave conditions, all beaches lost sand in 2007, as shown in Table 6. Wave conditions in the summer of 2006 were more conducive to the onshore transport of sand than those in the summers of 2005 and 2007. As predicted in last year’s report, the unanticipated increase in beach width that occurred between 2005 and 2006 quickly was reversed by less favorable wave conditions. 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 Project values (prior to 2001). The area-wide 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 (RBSP). In 2007, some beaches exceeded their target widths.

Table 6
Beach Widths and Targets of Shoreline Segments San Diego Region (in feet), 2000 to 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall Averages</th>
<th>1998</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2010 Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Beach</td>
<td>300.0</td>
<td>218.0</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>234.0</td>
<td>238.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronado</td>
<td>759.0</td>
<td>758.0</td>
<td>767.0</td>
<td>784.0</td>
<td>767.0</td>
<td>768.0</td>
<td>764.0</td>
<td>737.0</td>
<td>750.0</td>
<td>784.0</td>
<td>232.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean Beach</td>
<td>278.0</td>
<td>282.0</td>
<td>274.0</td>
<td>283.0</td>
<td>295.0</td>
<td>259.0</td>
<td>264.0</td>
<td>260.0</td>
<td>305.0</td>
<td>284.0</td>
<td>220.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Jolla</td>
<td>182.0</td>
<td>141.0</td>
<td>192.0</td>
<td>213.0</td>
<td>183.0</td>
<td>229.0</td>
<td>219.0</td>
<td>224.0</td>
<td>223.0</td>
<td>183.0</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Mar</td>
<td>185.5</td>
<td>227.0</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>106.0</td>
<td>232.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solana Beach</td>
<td>134.0</td>
<td>123.0</td>
<td>108.0</td>
<td>171.0</td>
<td>141.0</td>
<td>138.0</td>
<td>130.0</td>
<td>157.0</td>
<td>116.0</td>
<td>232.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encinitas</td>
<td>157.5</td>
<td>134.0</td>
<td>152.3</td>
<td>183.0</td>
<td>177.3</td>
<td>181.3</td>
<td>175.0</td>
<td>150.3</td>
<td>201.8</td>
<td>140.8</td>
<td>240.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlsbad</td>
<td>161.3</td>
<td>171.5</td>
<td>182.8</td>
<td>190.4</td>
<td>210.2</td>
<td>212.8</td>
<td>189.4</td>
<td>177.2</td>
<td>205.8</td>
<td>178.4</td>
<td>216.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside</td>
<td>283.0</td>
<td>278.3</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>248.0</td>
<td>232.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Source: SANDAG Regional Beach Monitoring Program, Annual Report 2008

4 In 2001, the RBSP nourished twelve of the region’s beaches. Since the completion of the RBSP, little to no sand has been placed on area beaches.
Lagoon Health

Data are unavailable for this indicator.\(^5\)

Impaired Waterbodies

There are no new data for this indicator. Between 2002 and 2006, impaired waterbodies in the region increased, as shown in Figure 16. 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.

As noted in last year’s report, the region as a whole greatly has enhanced its monitoring efforts in recent years; as a result, 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 conclusively be 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 16
Impaired Waterbodies, 2002 and 2006

![Graph showing the increase in impaired waterbodies between 2002 and 2006.](source: San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board)

Air Quality Index

UPDATED AIR QUALITY INDEX DATA WILL BE PROVIDED AT THE DECEMBER 5 REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE.

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 2007, 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 also are observed with regard to shoreline preservation and air quality. In large part, beach widths have decreased since the region’s beach sand replenishment project in 2001; an increase in 2006 was followed by further decreases in 2007. In FY 2009, SANDAG is evaluating strategies to fund improvements to water quality, habitat preservation, and beach nourishment.

\(^5\) The City of Encinitas is charged with overseeing the collection of data regarding bacterial levels in the region’s lagoons. Its data methodology is being finalized. Once this data is available, SANDAG may utilize it to report on this indicator.
The Regional Economic Prosperity Strategy (REPS), originally developed in 1998, was updated this year. 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. 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, as shown in Figure 17. Year-to-year fluctuations in the data may be the result of sample differences and may not reflect true year-to-year changes.

**Figure 17**

Labor Force Educational Attainment, 2000 to 2006

![Graph showing labor force educational attainment from 2000 to 2006](source: American Community Survey, U.S. Census Bureau)

**Employment Growth in High-Wage Economic Clusters**

There are no new data available for this indicator. In 2005, there was a slight increase in employment in high-wage economic clusters over 2002 and 2003, as shown in Figure 18.

**Figure 18**


![Bar chart showing employment in high-wage clusters from 2002 to 2005](source: SANDAG Cluster Inventory)
Regional Unemployment Rate Compared to California and the United States

After three years of improvement, San Diego’s unemployment rate increased in 2007, and matched that of the United States for the first time in seven years, as shown in Figure 19.

Figure 19
Unemployment in San Diego, California, and the United States, 2000 to 2007

Real Per Capita Income Compared to California and the United States

In 2006, San Diego’s real per capita income increased. It remains above that of California and the United States, though it is not increasing as quickly in San Diego as it is in California and the United States, as shown in Figure 20.

Figure 20
Real Per Capita Income in San Diego, California, and the United States in Inflation-Adjusted 2007 Dollars, 2000 to 2007

Regional Poverty Rate Compared to California and the United States

The San Diego region’s poverty rate remains stable and below that of California and the United States, as shown in Figure 21. Year-to-year fluctuations in the data may be the result of sample differences and may not reflect true year-to-year changes.
Conclusion

Unemployment increased in 2007 in the San Diego region, paralleling California’s increase in unemployment. However, the region continues to experience a rising standard of living, as measured by real per capita income, though it is not keeping pace with California or the United States as a whole. Other indicators of economic prosperity in the region appear to be stable. San Diego’s REPS contains strategic goals and recommended actions to 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 in the nation 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.
Water Consumption

As reported previously, water consumption continues to fluctuate, but increased in 2006, as shown in Figure 22.

Figure 22
Water Consumption, 2000 to 2006

Diversity of Water Supply

The diversity of the region’s water supply has been increasing in recent years, but reliance on the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California as a source increased slightly in 2007. However, the share of water that is recycled has shown a slight increase, as shown in Figure 23.

Figure 23

1 IID Transfer refers to water conveyed to the region from the Imperial Irrigation District. Canal Lining Transfer refers to water conserved as a result of the concrete lining of the All-American and Coachella canals in the Imperial Valley.

Source: San Diego County Water Authority Annual Reports (fiscal year Water Supply by Source)
Recycled Water Use

As predicted in last year’s report, the amount of recycled water used continues to increase as the region continues to invest in infrastructure and consumer awareness, as shown in Figure 24. Recycled water use has fluctuated since 2000, but increased 29 percent in 2007, following an 18 percent increase in 2006. These increases may be due to a few new larger water recycling 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 24
Amount of Recycled Water Used, 2000 to 2007

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 25. Figure 26 illustrates that peak demand is increasing as well.

Figure 25
San Diego Annual Per Capita Electricity Consumption, 2000 to 2007

Source: San Diego Gas & Electric
Share of Energy Produced in the Region Versus Imported

In 2006, the region reached the target established in the 2003 RES for share of energy produced in the region versus imported, but this share declined slightly in 2007, as shown in Figure 27.

Share of Energy Produced from Renewable Resources

Five percent of the region’s electricity comes from renewable resources. In 2003, the RES called for 15 percent from renewable resources by 2010. Subsequently, state law was enacted requiring 20 percent renewable energy resources by 2010. An Executive Order calls for 33 percent renewable resources by 2020. Thus far, the region’s primary electric utility, San Diego Gas & Electric (SDG&E), has slowly increased the percentage of renewable resources in its overall portfolio. Additional renewable resources will be needed to meet the 20 percent by 2010 requirement, as shown in Figure 28.

---

6 The RES will be updated in FY 2009, and the regional targets will be reevaluated at that time.
As shown in Figure 29, natural gas supplies more than half of the fuel to generate electricity for the San Diego region. Natural gas is the most environmentally benign fossil fuel and the only fossil fuel that the state permits to power electricity. The renewable resources percentage must increase significantly to meet state minimum requirements. Purchased power refers to power that is sold to SDG&E but the energy source is unknown. This unknown percentage should shrink over time as California Department of Water Resources contracts entered into during the energy crisis are phased out.

**Percent of Solid Waste that is Recycled**

The percent of solid waste that is recycled in the region increased in 2006, moving closer to the state-mandated target, as shown in Figure 30. The target calls for a 50 percent solid waste diversion rate; in 2006, 48 percent of solid waste was diverted from landfills.\(^8\)

---

\(^7\) These values are based on the California Public Utility Commission’s Renewable Portfolio Standard Rules, and thus, do not include customer-owned Photovoltaic.

\(^8\) The percent of solid waste that was recycled in 2006 is based on a preliminary estimate; it is anticipated that when this estimate is revised, it will be higher than originally was estimated and will show that the region actually has achieved or exceeded the state-mandated target.
Figure 30
Percent of Solid Waste Diverted from Landfills, 2000 to 2006

Source: California Integrated Waste Management Board

Landfill Space Available

For the regional landfill system as a whole, there appears to be an adequate supply of physical landfill capacity in terms of land area and air space until approximately 2016, but there is a significant limiting factor because present permitted daily tonnages at the landfills will not accommodate projected tonnages in the near future. Permitted daily tonnages for each landfill are determined by environmental concerns such as traffic, noise, water quality, and odors. Based on these limitations, estimates from the San Diego County Integrated Waste Management Plan Countywide Siting Element indicate that the region actually will reach capacity in terms of permitted daily tonnage prior to 2016, unless other changes are made, such as reducing the amount of trash generated in the region, and extending the hours of operation for trash collecting and hauling. This estimate is based on existing permitted regional capacity, excluding the San Onofre and Las Pulgas landfills located in Camp Pendleton.

The estimate also was based on assumptions such as reaching a regionwide solid waste diversion rate of 50 percent by 2005, and slight increases in total disposal and exported solid waste. According to the California Integrated Waste Management Board preliminary estimates, the region reached a 48 percent solid waste diversion rate in 2006, and progress continues to be made.

The County and City of San Diego are working actively on a number of options to expand physical landfill capacity. There are current efforts underway at both Sycamore Canyon and Miramar landfills to expand the landfill area. A new landfill at Gregory Canyon also is proposed but has not received final permits.

Every year there has been some solid waste exported from San Diego County. Export tonnage has fluctuated from year to year. In 1995, the region exported 14 percent of its waste compared to 4 percent in 2001.

According to the 2005 Countywide Siting Element, if the Sycamore Canyon landfill expansion and proposed Gregory Canyon landfill are approved with proposed increases in daily permitted disposal tonnages, the region may need to export 7.2 percent of its waste in 2017 to meet the region’s disposal need of 6.1 million tons. If neither landfill proposal is approved without using other strategies, the region may export significantly more of its waste in 2017.

Conclusion

Regional water consumption continues to fluctuate, as consumption increased slightly in 2007 following declining consumption in 2006. It is particularly important to note that there continues to be a significant increase in the amount of recycled water used. Our per capita usage and the share of energy produced within the region are moving away from the targets set in the RES, and after six years of increasing our share of energy produced from renewable resources, this share declined in 2007.
Regarding solid waste management, the region almost has reached its state-mandated recycling target, but must continue moving in this direction in order to avoid running out of landfill space. Unless proposed permit changes are implemented, the region will reach permitted landfill capacity prior to 2016.
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**

After years of steady increases, the number of interregional trips into San Diego from Baja California, Orange County, Riverside County, and Imperial County appears to be stabilizing. The number of trips into San Diego from Riverside County continued to increase in 2006, but to a lesser extent than in previous years. In addition, the annual number of pedestrian trips into San Diego from Baja California continues to decline, as shown in Figures 31 and 32.

**Figure 31**
San Diego Region Average Weekday Traffic Volumes to and from Orange, Imperial, and Riverside Counties and Tijuana, Baja California, 2000 to 2006

![Figure 31](source: Caltrans Traffic Census)

**Figure 32**
Pedestrian Border Crossings from Tijuana into San Diego, 1997 to 2007

![Figure 32](source: SANDAG)
Border Wait Times

There are no new data for this indicator in 2007, as the data source used in previous years has been eliminated. SANDAG is pursuing a new source of border wait times data and hopes to be able to continue reporting on this indicator in future years. As of 2006, border wait times were increasing, as shown in Figure 33.

Figure 33
Average Border Wait Times – Northbound into San Diego from Tijuana, 2004 to 2006

![Average Border Wait Times - Northbound into San Diego from Tijuana, 2004 to 2006](image)


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

There are a total of 115,000 Secure Electronic Network for Travelers Rapid Inspection (SENTRI) participants as of 2008, which represents 18,000 more participants than were reported in 2007, as shown in Figure 34. There are no new data for the Pedestrian Commuter Program and the Free and Secure Trade Program.

Figure 34
SENTRI Participants, 2006 to 2008

![SENTRI Participants, 2006 to 2008](image)

Source: SANDAG Border Crossing Data

Conclusion

The volume of commutes into San Diego from surrounding counties and Baja California appears to have stabilized. Finally, there are 18,000 new participants in the SENTRI program.
Summary and Conclusions

The results of the 2008 Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) Annual Performance Monitoring Report highlight 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

- The share of new housing units built in Smart Growth Opportunity Areas increased.
- Annual hours of traffic delay per traveler have decreased.
- Transit ridership continued to increase.
- The regional crime rate continued to decrease.
- The percent of solid waste that was recycled was close to achieving the state-mandated target.\(^9\)
- Recycled water use continued to increase substantially.

Areas for Improvement

- Housing production in the very low, low, and moderate income categories did not keep pace with above-moderate housing production: 58 percent of the above moderate-income housing goal identified in the RHNA has been met, while less than 10 percent of the very low-, low-, and moderate-income housing goal has been met. Overall, only 27 percent of the RHNA housing production goal has been met during the first half of the housing element cycle.
- Regionwide, the share of commutes made by transit, walking, bicycling, and carpool/vanpool have not increased substantially.
- Following beach width increases at all beaches in 2006, beach widths declined in 2007; for multiple beaches, widths are even smaller in 2007 than they were in 2005.
- Unemployment increased for the first time in three years.
- Per capita energy usage in the region continued to increase, moving further away from the target established in the Regional Energy Strategy.
- Plans estimate that the region will reach physical landfill capacity in 2016, but unless proposed permit changes are implemented, permitted capacity could be reached prior to 2016.

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 ideally will 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 Bus Rapid Transit on Interstate 15;

\(^9\) The percent of solid waste that was recycled in 2006 is based on a preliminary estimate; it is anticipated that when this estimate is revised, it will be higher than originally estimated and show that the region actually has achieved or exceeded the state-mandated target.
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- Funding for smart growth through the TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program and the Transportation Act/TransNet Bicycle and Pedestrian Funding Program;
- Strategies recommended in the Regional Economic Prosperity Strategy update earlier this year; and