MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

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

Thursday, June 10, 2010

1:15 to 2:30 p.m.  TWG Meeting
2:30 to 4 p.m.  Joint Meeting between TWG and Regional Housing Working Group (RHWG)

SANDAG, 7th Floor Conference Room
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101-4231

Staff Contacts:  Carolina Gregor  Susan Baldwin
(619) 699-1989  (619) 699-1943
cgr@sandag.org  sba@sandag.org

AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

• 2009 REGIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN (RCP) PERFORMANCE MONITORING DRAFT REPORT
• 2050 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN (RTP): DEVELOPMENT OF THE INITIAL UNCONSTRAINED TRANSPORTATION NETWORK
• "COMMUNITIES PUTTING PREVENTION TO WORK" GRANTS

A PORTION OF THIS MEETING WILL BE HELD JOINTLY WITH THE RHWG.

AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS FROM JOINT MEETING INCLUDE:

• REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT

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

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), SANDAG will accommodate persons who require assistance in order to participate in SANDAG meetings.  If such assistance is required, please contact SANDAG at (619) 699-1900 at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting.

To request this document or related reports in an alternative format, please call (619) 699-1900, (619) 699-1904 (TTY), or fax (619) 699-1905.
ITEM #

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS

Members of the public will have the opportunity to address the Technical Working Group on any issue within the jurisdiction of the Working Group that is not on this agenda. Speakers are limited to three minutes each.

CONSENT ITEM (#3)

+3. MEETING SUMMARIES

The Technical Working Group (TWG) should review and approve the following meeting summaries:

   a. April 15, 2010, Joint Meeting with the Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC)

   b. May 13, 2010, Regular TWG Meeting

REPORT ITEMS (#4 through #8)

+4. 2009 REGIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN (RCP) PERFORMANCE MONITORING DRAFT REPORT (Christine Eary)

Monitoring progress in implementing the RCP occurs on an annual basis. On June 4, 2010, the Regional Planning Committee authorized release of the draft 2009 Annual Performance Monitoring Report for a 30-day public review and comment period. The Regional Planning Committee item and the Draft Monitoring Report are attached. The TWG is asked for input on the monitoring report.

+5. 2050 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN (RTP): DEVELOPMENT OF THE INITIAL UNCONSTRANDED TRANSPORTATION NETWORK (Carolina Gregor, Dave Schumacher, and Heather Werdick)

Based on feedback received from SANDAG working groups, the public, the Peer Review Panel, and the Policy Advisory Committees, staff has assembled initial recommendations for a preferred 2050 transit network building upon the initial transit alternatives evaluated as part of the Urban Area Transit Strategy. This transit network, combined with highway improvements and other management strategies, form the basis for the initial 2050 Unconstrained Transportation Network. TWG members are asked to discuss and provide feedback on the draft Unconstrained Transportation Network. This item will be presented to the SANDAG Board at its June 11, 2010, policy meeting.
+6. "COMMUNITIES PUTTING PREVENTION TO WORK" GRANTS
(Stephan Vance)

SANDAG, in a partnership with the County Health and Human Services Agency, is responsible for implementing a mini-grant program under the Communities Putting Prevention to Work program that is funded through the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. The grants, which will fund public health assessments in local plans, Safe Routes to School plans and programs, and active community transportation studies, must be awarded and completed by March 2012. To facilitate the timely delivery of these grants, SANDAG is proposing to develop an on-call list of consultants to support these planning activities. Feedback on this approach will be requested from the TWG.

7. DATA COLLECTION EFFORT FOR NEW LAND USE MODEL (PECAS)
(Ed Schafer and Liz Doroski)

SANDAG staff members are mid-way through a three-year model development process to improve land use and transportation models. As part of that process, there is an intensive data collection effort underway. SANDAG staff will provide a brief refresher on the new models and will request development impact fee data from the local jurisdictions.

2:30 – 4 p.m.
>>> JOINT MEETING WITH THE REGIONAL HOUSING WORKING GROUP

8. REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT (RHNA)
(Susan Baldwin)

The TWG and RHWG will hold their first joint meeting to begin discussing the RHNA for the fifth housing element cycle (January 1, 2013 to December 31, 2020). The focus of the discussion will be on principles and factors to be used in the RHNA methodology, RHNA objectives from state housing element law, and past RHNA methodologies. TWG and RHWG members will be asked to provide input in the development of the RHNA methodology for the upcoming cycle.

9. ADJOURNMENT AND NEXT MEETINGS

The next TWG meeting will be held on Thursday, July 8, 2010, from 1:15 to 3:15 p.m. The TWG and RHWG should discuss future joint meeting dates and times for additional discussion on RHNA.

+ next to an item indicates an attachment
MEETING SUMMARY OF THE APRIL 15, 2010, JOINT MEETING BETWEEN
THE REGIONAL PLANNING TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP (TWG) AND
THE CITIES/COUNTY TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CTAC)

Please note: Audio file of meeting is available on the SANDAG Web site
(www.sandag.org) on both the TWG and CTAC home pages.

Agenda Item #1: Welcome and Introductions

Vice Chair Bill Chopyk (La Mesa) called the TWG meeting and Chair Maryam Babaki (National City)
called the (CTAC) to order at 9:30 a.m. Self-introductions were conducted.

Agenda Item #2: Public Comments and Communications

There were no public comments.

CONSENT (ITEM #3)

Agenda Item #3: Meeting Summaries (Approve)

The Working Groups were asked to approve the March 4, 2010, meeting summary (CTAC) and the
March 11, 2010, meeting summary (TWG).

Action: Frank Rivera (Chula Vista) motioned and Zoubir Ouadah (Poway) seconded to approve the
CTAC meeting minutes. The meeting minutes were approved unanimously.

Action: Andy Hamilton (Air Pollution Control District) motioned and Ed Batchelder (Chula Vista)
seconded to approve the TWG meeting minutes. The meeting minutes were approved unanimously.

REPORT (ITEMS #4 through #9)

Agenda Item #4: Electric Vehicles in the San Diego Region (Information)

Joel Pointon (SDG&E) provided an overview of electric vehicle (EV) activities in the region and the
utility's role. Keiichi Kitahara (Nissan) provided information about the Leaf, its new all-electric
vehicle that will be available in the San Diego region before 2011. Andy Hoskinson (e-Tec) discussed
"The EV Project," the largest EV undertaking in U.S. history, and the region's role.

Action: This item was presented for information only.
Mr. Kitahara explained that the Leaf is a zero emissions electric vehicle that will be available in eight months (December 2010), it can be reserved online through the Nissan Web site, and the listed price is $32,700, but after rebates and tax credits, it will be available for $20,000.

Jay Petrek (Escondido) asked about the life span of the battery.

Melissa Ayres (El Cajon) asked for an explanation on photovoltaic bumpers.

Mr. Kitahara provided responses to questions regarding estimated battery life and the use of photovoltaic bumpers on the vehicle.

Greg Wade (Imperial Beach) asked about permit fees, timing, and how many electric vehicles can plug into a work place charge device at one time. Responses were provided in the additional presentation provided by SDG&E and e-Tec.

Vice Chair Chopyk asked if there were any limits on the federal tax credit. Mr. Kitahara responded that he was not aware of any limits.

Mr. Pointon provided information regarding permit support for infrastructure, price elasticity, and the challenges for incorporating charging stations in multi-unit dwellings.

Mr. Hoskinson provided information about the overall project in terms of what, where, how, and when the vehicles would be deployed.

**Agenda Item #7: Regional Bike Plan (Information)**

The San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan (Plan) is being developed to support implementation of both the Regional Comprehensive Plan and the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). This report, presented to the Transportation Committee at its March 19, 2010, meeting, presented an overview of the key elements to the Plan. The draft Bike Plan and its Preliminary Draft Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration is out for a 30-day public review and comment period, through April 24, 2010. The revised draft plan will be submitted to the Transportation Committee on May 21, 2010, and then to the SANDAG Board of Directors on May 28, 2010. Chris Kluth (SANDAG) made the presentation on the Plan.

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

TWG Chair Bill Anderson (City of San Diego) asked about including an analysis of the maintenance cost per bike rider versus the maintenance cost per car.
**Agenda Item #5: Planning for Healthy Communities (Information)**

SANDAG has an opportunity to support the County Health and Human Services Agency over the next two years in a region-wide effort to combat obesity under a $16 million economic stimulus grant from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. A portion of this initiative will provide pass-through grants to local agencies for efforts to address public health issues in local plans, for active community transportation plans, and for safe routes to school plans and programs. The scope of work for SANDAG’s component of the grant envisions local agency participation on an ad hoc working group for planning and public health. Stephan Vance (SANDAG) presented the information for this item.

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

Pat Murphy (Encinitas) asked about a timeline for developing health impact assessment tools, and if it was too late for cities that are developing general plan updates to obtain grants for health elements. He suggested that the program focus on cities that are currently working on their general plans.

**Agenda Item #6: Complete Streets/Livable Streets: Rethinking Street Design (Information)**

Fundamental to encouraging more people to walk, bike, and use transit is creating street environments where people feel safe and welcome. Mr. Hamilton presented examples of new approaches to street design, from New York to Seattle. New modal performance criteria coming in the 2010 Highway Capacity Manual were also discussed.

**Agenda Item #8: Urban Area Transit Strategy (UATS): Draft Regional Transit Networks and Revised Performance Measures (Discussion)**

As part of the development of the 2050 RTP, staff has developed initial transit concepts and associated draft transit networks for the UATS. The draft networks and revised performance measures were presented for input and discussion. The draft networks also will be presented at the upcoming RTP workshops in late April and early May, providing additional opportunities for public input. Carolina Gregor (SANDAG) and Dave Schumacher (SANDAG) provided the presentation. Ms. Gregor also thanked TWG and CTAC members for attending the workshop on the UATS co-hosted by the San Diego Council of Design Professionals and SANDAG earlier that week.

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

TWG Chair Anderson asked about comparing cost competitiveness between the three strategies, as well as compared to roads expansions.

Jay Petrek (Escondido) commented on the connection between Riverside and I-15.
Agenda Item #9: 2050 RTP: Transportation Project Evaluation Criteria Weightings and Proposed Plan Performance Measures (Discussion)

Scott Strelecki (SANDAG) provided a report on the transportation project evaluation criteria weightings and proposed plan performance measures. This report includes refinements that have been made by the Transportation Project Evaluation Criteria Ad Hoc Working Group. Due to time constraints, TWG and CTAC members were asked to e-mail any comments on the transportation project evaluation criteria weightings and proposed plan performance measures to Mr. Strelecki by the close of business day.

Agenda Item #10: Adjournment and Next Meetings (Information)

The next CTAC meeting will be held Thursday, May 6, 2010, from 9:30 to 11:00 a.m. The next TWG meeting will be held Thursday, May 13, 2010, from 1:15 to 3:15 p.m.

Action: CTAC Chair Maryam Babaki (Nation City) adjourned the meeting.

Mr. Wade announced that a workshop on climate change coastal adaptation will be held at the Tijuana International Estuary on May 14, 2010, at 8:30 a.m.

Mr. Hamilton announced the Walk San Diego awards banquet gala on April 22, 2010.
MEETING SUMMARY OF THE MAY 13, 2010,
REGIONAL PLANNING TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP (TWG)

Please note: Audio file of meeting is available on the SANDAG Web site (www.sandag.org) on the TWG home page.

Agenda Item #1: Welcome and Introductions

Agenda Item #2: Public Comments and Communications

Members of the public had the opportunity to address the TWG on any issue, within the jurisdiction of the Working Group that is not on this agenda. There were no public speakers. However, Andy Hamilton (Air Pollution Control District) asked about the statewide greenhouse gas target setting process related to Senate Bill 375 and the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS). Charles “Muggs” Stoll (Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning, SANDAG) provided information on this topic. Chair Bill Anderson (City of San Diego) requested that the TWG discuss ideas for communicating with community members about the SCS and its requirements at a future meeting.

CONSENT (ITEM #3)

Agenda Item #3: Meeting Summary (Approve)

A quorum of TWG members was not present. As a result, the April 15, 2010, meeting summary of the joint meeting of the TWG and the Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) was tabled until the next meeting.

REPORT (ITEMS #4 through #8)

Agenda Item #4: 2010 National American Planning Association (APA) Planning Awards (Information)

Last month, the APA honored innovative planning efforts, planners, and advocates with the 2010 National Planning Excellence, Achievement, and Leadership Awards in New Orleans. Two awards were awarded to local plans and planners: the City of San Diego’s General Plan received the Daniel Burnham Award for a Comprehensive Plan and Jane Clough-Riquelme of SANDAG received the Advancing Diversity and Social Change Award in Honor of Paul Davidoff. A video of the award winners was shown at the meeting.
Agenda Item #5: Update on the Urban Area Transit Strategy (UATS) (Review/Comment)

Last month, staff unveiled the alternative transit networks being developed for the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) as part of the UATS. The networks were then reviewed by an independent Peer Review Panel in mid-April and were presented at the 2050 RTP public workshops in late-April and early-May for public input. The attached staff report, prepared for the SANDAG Board of Directors for its May 14, 2010, meeting, described the networks, summarized comments received to-date, proposed transit mode share goals, and discussed the process for developing the 2050 Unconstrained Transportation Network. A more detailed overview of the performance of the networks was presented, and a discussion on initial concepts for complementary highway networks was initiated. Recommendations on an initial unconstrained transportation network will be made to the Board at its June 11, 2010, Policy Meeting. The TWG was encouraged to review and comment on the performance of the transit networks and provide input on the complementary highway networks.

Gary Halbert (City of Chula Vista) observed that transportation pricing and transportation demand management programs may have a larger impact on reducing vehicle miles traveled than the expansion of the transit networks. Mr. Stoll indicated that pricing would best be addressed at a state level than a regional level.

Mr. Hamilton pointed out that SANDAG should evaluate off-peak transit mode share as a performance measure since the use of transit in many large cities is a lifestyle choice, and peak-period transit mode share does not capture that choice.

Carolina Gregor (SANDAG) responded that all-day transit mode share will be included in the evaluation.

Agenda Item #6: 2050 Regional Transportation Plan: Proposed Plan Performance Measures (Discussion)

SANDAG staff provided a report on the proposed plan performance measures. This included refinements that have been made by the Transportation Project Evaluation Criteria Ad Hoc Working Group.

Discussion ensued regarding travel speed by mode. Various members expressed concern about higher speeds and their effects on crash rates and walking/biking.

TWG members asked questions about SANDAG’s data sources, and the differences between modeling versus monitoring. Mr. Hamilton suggested several new measures, including propensity to induce travel demand, regular bike counts in specific areas, and lane miles considered substandard. Staff replied that all measures must be able to be projected to 2050.
Agenda Item #7: Communicating the 2050 Regional Growth Forecast: Web Application and Fact Sheet (Discussion)

SANDAG staff is working on a forecast fact sheet and associated online information kiosk to help spotlight local projects that demonstrate implementation of the core principles of the Regional Comprehensive Plan. TWG members suggested incorporating images from the Smart Growth Photo Library and other examples that help educate community members about design and density issues into the fact sheet.

Agenda Item #8: Federal and State Smart Growth Funding Opportunities (Discussion)

The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) will be issuing a Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) for a new grant program – the Sustainable Communities Planning Grant Program. The State of California also has approximately $60 million available for the Sustainable Communities Planning Grant and Incentives Program funded by Proposition 84. Staff provided a brief overview of these grant programs to the TWG.

Agenda Item #9: Highlighting Smart Growth: City of Encinitas General Plan Update (Information)

The TWG periodically hears about general plan and smart growth efforts happening around the region. The City of Encinitas has embarked upon a General Plan Update. Due to time constraints, this presentation was cancelled and will be rescheduled for the July TWG meeting.

Agenda Item #10: Adjournment and Next Meeting (Information)

The next TWG meeting will be held on Thursday, June 10, 2010, from 1:15 to 3:15 p.m.
Introduction

Chapter 8 of the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) describes how SANDAG will use performance indicators as a tool to track the region’s progress in meeting the goals and policy objectives of the plan. In 2006, SANDAG released The Regional Comprehensive Plan: Establishing a Baseline for Performance Monitoring (Baseline Report). The report discusses the significance of each of the 39 indicators that were established in the RCP, provides preliminary findings for each indicator where data were available, and includes a discussion of SANDAG work efforts underway that could influence performance over time. The Baseline Report serves as a reference and benchmark for all future monitoring reports.

Monitoring our progress in implementing the RCP will occur on an annual basis. The attached 2009 Annual Performance Monitoring Report (2009 Monitoring Report) represents the third annual RCP monitoring report since the Baseline Report was accepted by the SANDAG Board of Directors in October 2006.

Discussion

The 2009 Monitoring Report follows the same format as previous years’ annual performance monitoring reports: it sets forth results for the most recent one-year reporting period (which in most cases is calendar year 2009) and describes the data for the most recent year relative to trends observed in previous years.

2009 Report Highlights

There are areas where the region appears to be moving in the right direction and others where improvement is needed.

Recommendation

The Regional Planning Committee is asked to accept and authorize release of the draft 2009 Annual RCP Performance Monitoring Report for a 30-day public review and comment period.
Moving in the Right Direction

- The share of new housing units built in Smart Growth Opportunity Areas (SGOAs) continued to increase; the SGOAs also experienced job growth despite job losses in the region as a whole.
- Transit ridership continued to increase.
- Travel times have decreased.
- The regional crime rate continued to decrease.
- The number of beach mile closure days has decreased.
- Water consumption decreased over the last two years.

Areas for Improvement

- Housing production in the very low-, low-, and moderate-income categories did not keep pace with above-moderate housing production.
- Region-wide, the share of total commutes made by modes other than drive-alone has not increased substantially since 2000.
- Unemployment has been increasing in the last three years and has now hit double digits. San Diego’s unemployment rate is higher than that of the United States as a whole.

Next Steps

This report will be presented to the Regional Planning Technical Working Group in June for review and comment. Once the 30-day public comment period is complete, the final report will be prepared and presented to the Regional Planning Committee for a recommendation to the SANDAG Board of Directors for consideration and acceptance as the 2009 Annual RCP Performance Monitoring Report.

CHARLES “MUGGS” STOLL
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning


Key Staff Contact: Christine Eary, (619) 699-6928, cea@sandag.org
The Regional Comprehensive Plan

2009 Annual Performance Monitoring Report

DRAFT
The 18 cities and county government are SANDAG serving as the forum for regional decision-making. SANDAG builds consensus; plans, engineers, and builds public transit; makes strategic plans; obtains and allocates resources; and provides information on a broad range of topics pertinent to the region’s quality of life.
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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 the region was in 2004, where the region wants to be by 2030, and what the region needs 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 2009 RCP Annual Performance Monitoring Report (2009 Monitoring Report) is the third since the Baseline Report was accepted by the Board in October 2006.

The 2009 Monitoring Report includes the most recent data available for each indicator, typically from 2009. For some indicators, there is a one year delay or longer in reporting; in these cases, data from the most recent year available are included. For all indicators, the most recent data are provided and related to the Baseline Report.

Based on the data collected for the 2009 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 (SGOAs) continued to increase; the SGOAs also experienced job growth despite job losses in the region as a whole.
- Transit ridership continued to increase.
- Travel times have decreased.
- The regional crime rate continued to decrease.
- The number of beach mile closure days has decreased.
- Water consumption decreased over the last two years.

**Areas for Improvement**

- Housing production in the very low, low, and moderate income categories did not keep pace with above-moderate housing production: 145 percent of the above-moderate income housing goal identified in the RHNA has been met, while 16 percent of the very low-, 22 percent of the low-, and 17 percent of the moderate-income housing goal has been met. Overall, 71 percent of the RHNA housing production goal has been met during the housing element cycle.
- Regionwide, the share of commuters who drive alone has not decreased.
- Unemployment has been increasing in the last three years and has now hit double digits. San Diego’s unemployment rate is higher than that of the United States as a whole.

Throughout the 2009 Monitoring Report, indicator data are in certain cases related to growth in population, housing, or jobs, as shown in Table 1. Between 2008 and 2009, the region grew by 41,855 people, and added 5,199 housing units. In the same time period, the region lost 70,000 jobs.
Table 1
Population, Housing Units, and Job Growth in the San Diego Region, 2004 to 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>2,813,833</td>
<td>3,131,552</td>
<td>3,173,407</td>
<td>11% 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Units</td>
<td>1,040,149</td>
<td>1,140,349</td>
<td>1,145,548</td>
<td>10% 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs</td>
<td>1,205,200</td>
<td>1,309,300</td>
<td>1,239,300</td>
<td>9% -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 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% 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 roughly 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 held every ten years.

Annual indicators were selected as part of the RCP, based upon key policy areas and data availability. The list of indicators is revised periodically as new plans are adopted, to reflect indicators included in those plans. The Regional Energy Strategy was adopted in 2009, and the energy indicators in the RCP Monitoring report now match those of the Regional Energy Strategy. Miles of deficient roads on Congestion Management Program network is being eliminated, as the SANDAG Board of Directors opted out of the Congestion Management Program. SANDAG is no longer required to report on this indicator, and this information will be captured in the future through data provided through the travel times and volumes indicator, once data is available from the A-PeMS system. Additionally, there are two indicators for which data has not been available since the Baseline Report. Although attempts have been made over the years to identify data sources, those indicators are now being dropped from the list due to lack of data. Those indicators include Lagoon health and Participation in the Pedestrian Commuter Program and Free and Secure Trade (FAST) program. It should be noted that lagoon water quality is already captured in the Impaired waterbodies indicator.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Annual Indicators for Monitoring the Regional Comprehensive Plan</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>URBAN FORM AND TRANSPORTATION</strong></th>
<th>1. Share of new housing units and jobs located in Smart Growth Opportunity Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Share of new housing units within County Water Authority water service boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Annual transit ridership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Commute mode shares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Travel times and volumes for key transportation corridors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miles of deficient roads on Congestion Management Program network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Annual hours of traffic delay per traveler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Regional crime rate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>HEALTHY ENVIRONMENT</strong></th>
<th>15. Habitat conserved within designated preserve areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16. Percent of preserve areas actively maintained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17. Number of beach mile closure days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18. Impaired waterbodies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19. Beach widths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lagoon health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20. Air Quality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>ECONOMIC PROSPERITY</strong></th>
<th>21. Labor force educational attainment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22. Employment growth in high-wage economic clusters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23. Regional unemployment rate compared to California and the United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24. Real per capita income compared to California and the United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25. Regional poverty rate compared to California and the United States</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>PUBLIC FACILITIES</strong></th>
<th>26. Water consumption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27. Diversity of water supply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28. Recycled water use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Per capita electricity consumption and peak demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Share of energy produced in the region versus imported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29. Regional energy by source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30. Share of energy produced from renewable resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Per capital peak demand for electricity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32. Electricity consumption by sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33. Natural gas consumption by sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34. Percent of solid waste that is recycled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35. Landfill space available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>BORDERS</strong></th>
<th>36. Interregional traffic volumes into San Diego from surrounding counties and Baja California</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37. Border wait times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38. Participation in SENTRI Lanes, Pedestrian Commuter Program and Free and Secure Trade Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**

While the total number of new housing units has decreased since 2006 with the downturn in the economy, the share of new units in Smart Growth Opportunity Areas (SGOAs) continues to increase, as shown in Figure 1. There were 8,600 new units in 2007-8 and 5,109 new units in 2008-9, with 41 percent and 44 percent of those in SGOAs, respectively.

The SGOAs experienced a net gain of 11,654 jobs, representing a 2 percent increase between 2005 and 2008. In areas of the region outside of the SGOAs, there was a net loss of 9,355 jobs; therefore the region as a whole experienced an increase of 2,299 jobs between 2005 and 2008. As of 2008, 34 percent of the region’s total jobs were located in SGOAs. Data for 2006 and 2007 were unavailable.

With only five years of housing data and three years of jobs data for this indicator, it is unclear how many new housing units and jobs can be anticipated annually in SGOAs 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 SGOAs, 2004 to 2009

![Chart showing the share of new housing units in SGOAs from 2004 to 2009.](source)

**Share of New Housing Units Within County Water Authority Water Service Boundary**

As shown in Figure 2, the number of new housing units in the San Diego County Water Authority (Water Authority) service boundary accounted for more than 100 percent of the change in housing units in the San Diego region between 2007 and 2008. While the number of new units in the Water Authority service boundary was 8,944 during 2008, the net increase in housing units for the region as a whole was 8,600. This was due to the 2007 wildfires that caused a loss of homes in other areas of the region. A smaller share of housing units built in the Water Authority service boundary during 2009 (90%) than previous years also may be due to
rebuilding from the fires in other areas. As in previous years, 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 2009

![Image of bar chart showing new housing units from 2006 to 2009 with percentages and years labeled.]

Source: SANDAG Current Estimates Program

**Annual Transit Ridership**

Regional transit ridership continues to increase, continuing an upward trend since 2003. The number of transit boardings increased by 6 percent between 2007 and 2008, and it began to level off between 2008 and 2009, with a 1 percent increase. The increase in boardings since 2005 indicates a dramatic increase in ridership over the last five years.¹

**Figure 3**
San Diego Regional Annual Transit Boardings, 2000 to 2009

![Image of line chart showing annual transit boardings from 2000 to 2009 with data points and years labeled.]

Source: Annual Boardings Data, Metropolitan Transit System and North County Transit System; SANDAG

¹ The number of boardings is not equal to the number of transit passengers since many passengers make multiple trips via transit.
Commute Mode Shares

As shown in Figures 4 through 6, the regional mode split remains stable. While there appears to have been a slight decrease in the share of workers who drove alone between 2005 and 2006, this segment of commuters has remained stable since 2006; this suggests that the change between those years was likely due to data collection differences starting in 2006. Beginning in 2006, the American Community Survey (ACS) included data on residents of group quarters facilities, whose commute patterns may have differed from those of the household population. Since alternative commute modes also remained stable since 2006, it is likely that the small increase in the portion of workers who walked, biked, and used other modes between 2005 and 2006 was due to the change in data collection methods.

In future years this data will be reported at a corridor level. Corridor-level reporting in future years will likely demonstrate substantial transit mode shares in specific corridors that are well served by transit. For example, as shown in Figure 7, 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, 2008

![Figure 4](source: American Community Survey, U.S. Census Bureau)

Figure 5
Drive Alone Mode Shares, 2000 to 2008

![Figure 5](source: American Community Survey, U.S. Census Bureau)
Figure 6
Alternative Commute Mode Shares, 2005 to 2008

Percent of Commuters by Primary Mode of Commute to Work

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

Figure 7
Transit Use High in Well-Served Areas (2000), San Diego Region

Source: Census Transportation Planning Package, Census 2000, U.S. Census Bureau

Note: Community Planning Areas are approximated using census tracts.

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

It should be noted that 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 the PeMS is an ongoing effort since its initial development and the release of the first PeMS version dating back to the late 1990s. Key PeMS enhancements have generally focused on assessing and improving the quality of the data and performance measures that the PeMS provides. Specific enhancements currently being developed for the San Diego region under the PeMS multimodal project will allow the PeMS to incorporate real-time transit and arterial data. Through this effort, the 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.2

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

Travel times have decreased in most corridors, but most notably for the morning commutes. The corridors with the greatest decreases in travel time include Interstate (I-) 5 southbound from Oceanside to Downtown San Diego, Interstate 805 northbound from Chula Vista to Sorrento Valley, and Interstate 8 north-westbound from El Cajon to Sorrento Valley. Between 2008 and 2009, commute times in most corridors either decreased slightly or remained the same.

### Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Corridor</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>AM Peak</th>
<th>PM Peak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I-5 Oceanside to Downtown SD</td>
<td>SR 76 to Front St</td>
<td>55 54 55 43 36</td>
<td>47 46 44 38 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I-15 Escondido to Downtown SD</td>
<td>SR 78 to A St via SR 163</td>
<td>49 49 42 37 34</td>
<td>37 36 34 32 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SR 78 Escondido to Carlsbad</td>
<td>I-5 to I-15</td>
<td>16 16 16 16 16</td>
<td>20 25 25 22 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SR 94 El Cajon to Downtown SD</td>
<td>El Cajon Blvd to F St via SR 125/SR 94</td>
<td>16 17 16 15 13</td>
<td>12 12 12 12 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I-8 El Cajon to Downtown SD</td>
<td>El Cajon Blvd to A St via SR 163</td>
<td>19 20 18 16 14</td>
<td>15 15 15 15 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>SR 52 Santee to Kearny Mesa</td>
<td>SR 125 to I-805</td>
<td>11 13 13 12 11</td>
<td>13 14 15 14 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I-805 Mid-City to Sorrento Mesa</td>
<td>I-8 to I-5</td>
<td>15 16 13 12 10</td>
<td>17 19 16 13 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I-805 Chula Vista to Sorrento Mesa</td>
<td>SR 905 to Mira Mesa Blvd</td>
<td>45 45 39 34 30</td>
<td>37 39 32 29 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I-805 Chula Vista to Downtown SD</td>
<td>SR 905 to F St via SR-94</td>
<td>26 24 22 19 18</td>
<td>18 18 17 15 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I-5 San Ysidro to Downtown SD</td>
<td>SR 905 to 6th Ave</td>
<td>14 17 16 14 14</td>
<td>16 18 15 15 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I-8 El Cajon to Sorrento Valley</td>
<td>El Cajon Blvd to Mira Mesa Blvd via I-805</td>
<td>29 31 26 23 19</td>
<td>22 23 22 22 20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Freeway Performance Measurement System (PeMS) Version 9.0, the California Department of Transportation (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.

2 Additionally, travel times and volumes reported for previous years in the 2009 RCP Monitoring Report may differ from those reported in last year’s report as loop detection capability has been enhanced and now more accurately reflects the start and end points of the designated freeway segments.
As shown in Table 3, travel volumes continued to fluctuate in 2009. Observed decreases in travel time despite increases in travel volume can potentially be attributed to a variety of factors, including the completion of high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes on I-5 in the summer of 2008 and decreases in traffic at the border.

Table 3
Travel Volumes in Key Auto Corridors, 2005 to 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Corridor</th>
<th>Average Number of Vehicles Passing Monitoring Stations on a Weekday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average Number of Vehicles Passing Monitoring Stations on a Weekday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Northbound/Eastbound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I-5 Oceanside to Downtown SD</td>
<td>Carmel Valley Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I-15 Escondido to Downtown SD</td>
<td>Poway Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SR 78 Escondido to Carlsbad</td>
<td>Barham Rd/Woodland Pkwy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SR 84 I-805 Mid-City to Sorrento Valley</td>
<td>Euclid Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I-805 Chula Vista to Sorrento Valley</td>
<td>Waring Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>SR 52 I-805 Mid-City to Sorrento Valley</td>
<td>Santo Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I-805 Chula Vista to Sorrento Valley</td>
<td>Governor Dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I-805 Chula Vista to Sorrento Valley</td>
<td>Governor Dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I-805 Chula Vista to Sorrento Valley</td>
<td>N/O SR 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I-5 San Ysidro to Downtown SD</td>
<td>24th St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I-805 Chula Vista to Sorrento Valley</td>
<td>Waring Rd</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 mentioned above, as the PeMS continues to be developed and refined, it will eventually incorporate real-time transit data. In the meantime, the 2009 RCP Monitoring Report includes transit volume information from FY 2005 through FY 2009 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 increased between 2008 and 2009 along most corridors. The largest increase (from 2007 when data was last available, to 2009) in the State Route (SR) 78 Escondido to Carlsbad corridor is associated with the opening of the SPRINTER in 2008. The SPRINTER opening resulted in the addition of more than 1,500 passengers each way along the corridor on an average weekday. Additionally, the Green Line Trolley may have seen increases in conjunction with possible increases in the San Diego State University student population and with the economic downturn, resulting in a greater number of student transit riders.

The COASTER experienced a notable decrease in volume between 2008 and 2009. This could potentially be attributed to fare increases from the second quarter of FY 2009, as well as the economic downturn. Since the COASTER is largely a discretionary service (providing alternative transportation for those who choose not to drive), patronage is sensitive to transit fares.
## Table 4
Transit Passenger Volumes in Key Transit Corridors at Specific Screenline Locations, 2005 to 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitoring Point At Description</th>
<th>Northbound/Eastbound</th>
<th>Southbound/Westbound</th>
<th>Total - Both Directions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1 I-5 Oceanside to Downtown SD</strong></td>
<td>2,852</td>
<td>2,945</td>
<td>2,762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COASTER Sorrento Valley</td>
<td>2,576</td>
<td>2,617</td>
<td>2,486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus 101 Camino Del Mar &amp; Del Mar Heights</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2 I-15 Escondido to Downtown SD - Poway</strong></td>
<td>647</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus 20 Rancho Penasquitos Blvd/Calle</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus 810 Escondido Bl &amp; Felecia</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus 820 Poway Rd &amp; Pomerado</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus 850 Carmel Mtn and Penasquitos**</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus 860 West Bernardo &amp; Poblado Rd</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3 SR 78 Escondido to Carlsbad - Vista</strong></td>
<td>943</td>
<td>958</td>
<td>797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus 320 Vista Transit Center</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPRINTER Vista Transit Center</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4 SR 94 El Cajon to Downtown SD</strong></td>
<td>4,888</td>
<td>4,780</td>
<td>4,703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange Line Euclid</td>
<td>4,888</td>
<td>4,780</td>
<td>4,703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5 I-8 El Cajon to Downtown SD - Fashion Valley</strong></td>
<td>1,224</td>
<td>5,396</td>
<td>6,372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Line Fashion Valley</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>4,027</td>
<td>4,521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus 11 University Ave and 3rd Ave</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus 14 Fashion Valley Transit Center</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus 44 Linda Vista Rd and Ulric St</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6 SR 52 Santee to Kearny Mesa</strong></td>
<td>162</td>
<td>3,043</td>
<td>3,737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus 870 Clairemont Mesa Blvd and Overland</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2,653</td>
<td>3,129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bus 11 Campanile Dr and Montezuma</strong></td>
<td>162</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus 14 Mission Gorge and Fairmount</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*monitoring at two screenlines along corridor   **end of line after 2006, so measure "on board"
### Table 4 (cont’d)

**Transit Passenger Volumes in Key Transit Corridors at Specific Screenline Locations, 2005 to 2009**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitoring Point At Description</th>
<th>Northbound/Eastbound</th>
<th>Southbound/Westbound</th>
<th>Total - Both Directions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>7 I-805 Mid-City to Sorrento Valley</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus 50 Genesee Ave / Clairmont Mesa Blvd</td>
<td>663 776 1,318 1,468 1,460</td>
<td>554 552 1,215 1,290 1,344</td>
<td>1,217 1,328 2,533 2,758 2,804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus 105 Clairmont Mesa Blvd / Clairmont Dr</td>
<td>n/a n/a 272 302 257</td>
<td>n/a n/a 323 277 274</td>
<td>n/a n/a 595 579 531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus 150 Gilman Dr and Via La Jolla</td>
<td>284 340 674 818 827</td>
<td>246 218 630 668 726</td>
<td>530 558 1,304 1,486 1,553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus 960 Clairmont Mesa Blvd and Overland</td>
<td>87 73 95 94 114</td>
<td>88 77 70 91 109</td>
<td>175 150 165 185 223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8 I-805 Chula Vista to Sorrento Valley</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus 50 Genesee Ave / Clairmont Mesa Blvd</td>
<td>n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a</td>
<td>n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a</td>
<td>n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9 I-805 Chula Vista to Downtown SD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus 50 Genesee Ave / Clairmont Mesa Blvd</td>
<td>n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a</td>
<td>n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a</td>
<td>n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10 I-5 San Ysidro to Downtown SD - San Ysidro</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Line Iris Ave</td>
<td>13,234 13,835 13,941 14,790 15,471</td>
<td>11,152 10,989 11,095 11,551 12,184</td>
<td>24,386 24,824 25,036 26,341 27,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus 929 Iris Ave</td>
<td>12,008 12,232 12,251 13,082 13,677</td>
<td>9,029 8,729 9,059 8,833 9,731</td>
<td>21,037 20,961 21,310 21,915 23,408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus 932 International Border</td>
<td>756 769 755 924 905</td>
<td>678 752 731 1,532 1,240</td>
<td>1,434 1,521 1,486 2,456 2,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>San Ysidro to Downtown SD - 12th and Imperial</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Line 12th and Imperial</td>
<td>10,904 10,654 10,820 11,940 12,343</td>
<td>11,855 11,289 12,031 12,250 12,675</td>
<td>22,759 21,943 22,851 24,190 25,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus 929 12th and Imperial</td>
<td>10,319 10,343 11,465 11,896</td>
<td>11,228 10,588 11,218 11,364 11,821</td>
<td>21,773 20,907 21,561 22,829 23,717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus 932 12th and Imperial</td>
<td>359 335 477 475 447</td>
<td>627 701 813 886 854</td>
<td>986 1,036 1,290 1,361 1,301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11 I-8 El Cajon to Sorrento Valley</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a</td>
<td>n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a</td>
<td>n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a</td>
<td>n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*monitoring at two screenlines along corridor  **end of line after 2006, so measure “on board”*
Overall as predicted in the 2008 RCP Monitoring Report, systemwide transit travel volumes continued to increase from 2007 to 2008, while freeway travel times and volumes continued to decrease in the same time period. These predictions were made in light of multiple factors such as the economic slowdown, increases in gas prices, as well as infrastructure improvements (such as the opening of the SPRINT light-rail service along the SR 78 corridor).

**Annual Hours of Traffic Delay Per Traveler**

Annual hours of traffic delay per traveler has decreased since 2005, as shown in Figure 8. Delay is defined as the extra travel time it takes travelers to complete a trip during peak periods (6 a.m. to 9 a.m. and 4 p.m. to 7 p.m.) as a result of congestion.

![Figure 8](nancy@nancystern.com)

**Regional Crime Rate**

As shown in Figure 9, the rate of crime in the region continues to decline, and in 2009 it reached a new low.

![Figure 9](nancy@nancystern.com)
Conclusion

As of 2009 the region continued to make 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 are increasingly traveling by public transit. 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 have mostly decreased. Finally, the regional crime rate continues the decrease that started in 2006-2007.
Despite the sharp fall in housing prices during the last several years, the lack of affordable housing continues to be one of the major issues facing the San Diego region today. The RCP calls for more housing choices—more apartments, condominiums, and single family homes in all price ranges. How much, what type, and where housing is built are some of the most important decisions the region can make in shaping its 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 and better connecting transportation and land use. Implementation of smart growth, by creating more compact, walkable, and bicycle-friendly communities that are accessible to public transit, will help the region meet its greenhouse gas reduction targets that will be set by the California Air Resources Board (CARB).

**Housing Opportunity Index**

As shown in Figure 10, data from 2009 continues the upward trend in housing affordability since 2007. The percent of homes sold that are affordable to households earning the regional median income has increased from a low of 5 percent in 2006 to 53 percent in 2009. This change from the first part of the decade is the result of the mortgage lending and foreclosure problems and economic downturn that have affected the region, as well as the nation as a whole.

Despite the increase in affordability during the past four years, housing prices are 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, and by 15 percent to $314,250 in June 2009 (DataQuick Information Systems). The current median home price is just over four times the regional median household income of $72,963, and although historically the median price of a home has been considered to be affordable at three to four times the median income, home prices have begun rising again. According to DataQuick as reported in the San Diego Union-Tribune, the median price of all homes during the current real estate cycle peaked in November 2005 at $517,500, appears to have bottomed out in January 2009 at $280,000 and continues to rise, with the most recent median price reported at $325,250 in April 2010.

**Figure 10**

**Housing Opportunity Index, 2000 to 2009**

![Graph showing Housing Opportunity Index from 2000 to 2009](source: National Association of Home Builders)
Percent of Households With Housing Costs Greater Than 35 Percent of Income

During the first half of last decade, the percentage of households paying more than 35 percent of their income toward housing costs was on an upward trend. While this trend did not reverse, it did stabilize beginning in 2006. It remained constant, with 40 percent of households paying more than 35 percent of income for housing costs during 2006, 2007, and 2008.

Figure 11
Percent of Households Paying 35 Percent or More of Income for Housing, 2000 to 2008

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 $1,418 for a two-bedroom unit. In 2009 that amount was $56,720 annually or $27 per hour (assuming that no more than 30 percent of income is spent on housing). However, the income needed in the San Diego region is roughly $5,000 more than for the state ($51,654); the upward trend over the last ten years is fairly consistent for both areas.

Currently, the minimum wage in California is $8.00 per hour. Therefore, a household must include more than three minimum wage earners working forty hours per week year-round to make a two-bedroom fair market rent affordable in the San Diego region.

Figure 12
Annual Income Needed to Afford Fair Market Rent, 2000 to 2009

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

Source: Out of Reach, National Low-Income Housing Coalition
Ratio of New Jobs to New Housing Units

In 2008 the California Planning Roundtable published a thoughtful informative report entitled, “Deconstructing Jobs-Housing Balance.” This report provides an overview of jobs-housing balance issues for planning practitioners. It outlines the objectives such a policy hopes to achieve (such as reduced driving and congestion, reductions in air pollutants, and lower costs to businesses and commuters, among others) and the strengths and shortcomings of the various ways of measuring this balance. The conclusion of the report is that jobs-housing balance ratios should be used as generalized indicators, and that regional and local policies such as the smart growth, affordable housing, economic prosperity, transit-oriented transportation, congestion pricing, and transportation demand and system management strategies that the region has been pursuing through implementation of the RCP and RTP will assist in meeting the objectives associated with jobs-housing balance. The variables that make assessing jobs-housing balance difficult include the types of jobs available, job skills and education of residents, availability (or lack thereof) of a range of housing choices that are affordable to a variety of income levels, households with multiple workers, job changes, and quality of schools.

With that perspective in mind, Figure 13 shows the ratio of new jobs created to new housing units built from 2001 to 2009, and Table 5 shows the jobs and housing data and ratios for both total jobs and housing units and new jobs and housing units. The ratio fluctuates between 1.17 and 1.09 based on the total number of jobs and housing units between 2001 and 2009. This ratio is similar to most of the other major metropolitan areas of the state (see California Regional Progress Report, 2007).

As shown in Table 5 over the past few years, growth in the number of new housing units has slowed significantly; growth in the number of new jobs began to slow in 2006, the region experienced net job losses in 2008 and 2009. The loss of 59,000 jobs in 2009 caused the significant drop in the ratio of new jobs to new units as well as the drop in the ratio of total jobs to total housing units as shown in Figure 13. As the economy recovers in future years, this indicator (and others because of the complicated nature of this issue) will be a more useful measure of whether the region is achieving a good balance between jobs and housing units. The regional ratio also can be used to determine whether the subregions are providing a balance between jobs and housing.

Table 5
Total Jobs Per Housing Unit Ratio, 2001 to 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Housing Units</th>
<th>Jobs</th>
<th>New Units</th>
<th>New Jobs</th>
<th>New Jobs/New Units</th>
<th>Jobs/Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1,040,149</td>
<td>1,205,200</td>
<td>8,550</td>
<td>24,600</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1,048,699</td>
<td>1,299,800</td>
<td>14,672</td>
<td>11,900</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1,063,371</td>
<td>1,241,700</td>
<td>15,045</td>
<td>9,600</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1,078,416</td>
<td>1,251,300</td>
<td>16,661</td>
<td>20,200</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1,095,077</td>
<td>1,271,500</td>
<td>12,908</td>
<td>21,300</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1,107,985</td>
<td>1,292,800</td>
<td>10,298</td>
<td>19,700</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1,118,283</td>
<td>1,312,500</td>
<td>13,466</td>
<td>7,200</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1,131,749</td>
<td>1,319,700</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>-9,700</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1,140,349</td>
<td>1,310,000</td>
<td>5,199</td>
<td>-59,000</td>
<td>-11.3</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1,145,548</td>
<td>1,251,000</td>
<td>5,199</td>
<td>-59,000</td>
<td>-11.3</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SANDAG Annual Population and Housing Estimates, California Employment Development Department
Share of New Housing Units by Income Category

A total of 76,121 building permits for new housing units were issued in the region between July 1, 2003 and December 31, 2009 (seven years of the 7.5-year planning period for the July 1, 2005-June 30, 2010 housing element cycle), including 3,972 very low-income, 4,021 low-income, 3,512 moderate-income, and 64,616 above moderate-income housing units, as shown in Table 5. Based on the 2003 – 2010 Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) adopted by SANDAG in February 2005, the region has achieved 16 percent of the very low income, 22 percent of the low income, 17 percent of the moderate income, and 145 percent of the above moderate income regional housing needs established in the RHNA. The data show that the above moderate-income housing needs established in the RHNA have been exceeded, while the housing needs for very low-, low-, and moderate-income households are not being met. The subsidies needed to build very low- and low-income housing in the region have proved inadequate to meet the region’s lower-income RHNA goals despite the approval of the statewide affordable housing bonds in 2002 (Proposition 46) and 2006 (Proposition 1C). 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 couple years, so the construction of above moderate-income units may slow over the next two years.

Overall, the region has met 71 percent of its RHNA housing goal of 107,301 units during seven years (only six months shy of the seven and a half years of the housing element planning period).

Table 6
Share of New Housing Units by Income Category, January 1, 2003 through December 31, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Above Moderate</th>
<th>Total for all Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Housing Units Produced</td>
<td>3,972</td>
<td>4,021</td>
<td>3,512</td>
<td>64,616</td>
<td>76,121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHNA Goal</td>
<td>24,143</td>
<td>18,348</td>
<td>20,280</td>
<td>44,530</td>
<td>107,301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Goal Produced</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>145%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units Left to Permit</td>
<td>20,171</td>
<td>14,327</td>
<td>16,768</td>
<td>-20,086</td>
<td>31,180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Vacancy rates remained stable between 2000 and 2008, but increased between 2008 (4.5%) and 2009 (5.9%), as shown in Figure 14.

Figure 14
Vacancy Rates, 2000 to 2009

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

Percent of Households Living in Overcrowded Conditions

As shown in Figure 15, the percentage of households living in overcrowded conditions in the region has remained stable since 2005 at 6 percent.

Figure 15
Overcrowding in the Region, 2000 to 2008

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

Number of Households on the Waiting List for Section 8 Vouchers

In 2009 there were approximately 83,420 households on the Section 8 waiting list. While this appears to be a dramatic increase since 2008 when there were 49,700 households, the smaller waiting list in 2008 was likely the result of the periodic purging of the lists undertaken by the Section 8 jurisdictions. There were 73,500 and 65,600 households on the waiting list in 2006 and 2007, respectively. The jurisdictions that issue Section 8 vouchers include 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 and the economic downturn experienced both in the region and nationwide. Although building permits for above moderate-income (market rate) homes has exceeded the RHNA goals, progress continues to be slow toward meeting the RHNA goals for the lower- and moderate-income categories. With the expenditure of the state's housing bond money (Propositions 46 and 1C) almost complete and because the construction of very low- and low-income units requires some type of financial subsidy or regulatory assistance, the region will need to consider new ways to provide housing for families and individuals whose incomes fall into these categories. The need to look at ways to build more moderate-income housing also should be explored.
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**

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 2010 (the revised draft North County Plan will be released for public review mid-2010); and the East County MSCP, originally anticipated for completion in 2010. Work on the East County MSCP has slowed significantly due to budget and staffing constraints at the County. Map 2 shows the location and boundaries of these plans.

Map 2
San Diego Region Habitat Conservation Planning Areas

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 military lands which have their own integrated natural resource management plans.

During this last year, the City of Oceanside has received comments during their public review of their draft subarea plan. Oceanside staff will be responding to these comments with the intent of bringing the draft plan to their City Council in the fall of 2010.

As part of SANDAG participation in regional habitat conservation planning, a conserved lands database has been developed in 2010 to track the conservation and management of land in San Diego County. This database,
available to the public, will be maintained and serve as the basis for RCP monitoring for habitat conservation. Of the total land in jurisdictions that have approved conservation plans and signed implementing agreements, 81 percent of land has been conserved within the habitat preserve system, as shown in Figure 16. This includes lands preserved to date within the MSCP South and the MHCP.

Additional acreage has been obligated by the City and County of San Diego under approved discretionary development entitlements or conservation banks, but has not yet been conserved through formal legal mechanisms (e.g., easement, dedication in fee title to jurisdictions). This acreage will be added to the conserved lands database when they are legally conserved.

Figure 16
MSCP South County and MHCP Land Conservation by Year, 1997 to 2010 with 2020 and 2030 Targets

Percent of Preserve Area Actively Maintained

Once conserved, the owner of the property is responsible for the maintenance of the area to retain its habitat conservation values. Based upon the estimates of land conserved in the region described in the previous section, over 1.25 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 (e.g. State Parks, U.S. Forest Service Lands, Bureau of Land Management areas).

Figure 17
Land Management by Source, 2010

Source: 2007 Annual Monitoring Reports, Local Jurisdictions

Source: SANDAG Conserved Land Database 2010
Implementation of RCP Strategic Initiatives

A number of strategic initiatives relating to regional habitat management were identified in chapter 9 of the RCP. The following provides information on the progress to date.

- **Develop regional habitat funding program**
  The SANDAG Board of Directors established The Quality of Life Ad Hoc Steering Committee in June 2008 to provide policy direction and guide collaborative efforts to collaborate with regional stakeholders on possible approaches to a regional Quality of Life Funding Strategy. A regional funding program for habitat conservation is one of the funding elements being discussed.

- **Develop and implement regional habitat management and monitoring plan**
  The SANDAG Board of Directors approved funding for the coordination of regional management and monitoring efforts. A group of contractors was hired to assist the local jurisdictions, land managers, and wildlife agencies with the development of standardized habitat management and monitoring plans that are efficient and cost-effective.

- **Coordinate regional habitat monitoring databases**
  Currently there are four regional databases for management and monitoring efforts located at the federal, state, and local levels. The focus of the regional management and monitoring team for FY 2011 will be to assist the database managers to make these independent databases be able to share data and collaborate of future data gathering efforts.

- **Prepare guidelines for protecting natural habitats in urbanized areas, and for use of native vegetation in urban landscapes**
  The various jurisdictions are working on implementing or adopting habitat conservation plans for the natural habitats in urbanized and nonurbanized areas. The various subregional habitat conservation plans illustrated in Map 2 provide the umbrella guidelines for conservation. Included in these jurisdictional plans are provisions for use of native and prohibition of invasive species in urban areas adjacent to open space areas.

- **Coordinate the planning of future transportation and wildlife corridors**
  Caltrans has been partnering with SANDAG, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the California Department of Fish and Game on the development of wildlife movement structures under new transportation infrastructure projects, such as SR 76. In addition, SANDAG is engaged in a multistakeholder effort to identify critical linkages for the connectivity of wildlife linkages and to initiate regional monitoring of these areas.

**Number of Beach Mile Closure Days**

The number of beach mile closure days reached a new low in 2009. The number of beach mile closure days fluctuated between 2000 and 2007, but has been decreasing since 2007, as shown in Figure 18.

**Figure 18**

Weather-Adjusted Beach Mile Closure Days, 2000 to 2009

Source: 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

Most beaches experienced an increase in sand between 2007 and 2008. Many beaches, particularly in Mission Beach and Silver Strand, remained in excess of their target widths, as shown in Table 7. The areawide shoreline advance that occurred in 2006 was sufficient to restore the beach widths to levels not observed since the first two years following the Regional Beach Sand Project. In 2007 some beaches exceeded their target widths. It is expected that the 2009 beach widths will remain constant, but a significant drop in widths is anticipated in 2010 due to severe wave conditions.

Table 7
Beach Widths and Targets of Shoreline Segments San Diego Region (in feet), 2000 to 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Silver Strand Littoral Cell</td>
<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>242.0</td>
<td>238.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Silver Strand State Beach</td>
<td>427.0</td>
<td>461.0</td>
<td>448.0</td>
<td>451.5</td>
<td>451.0</td>
<td>449.0</td>
<td>434.5</td>
<td>438.5</td>
<td>486.0</td>
<td>453.5</td>
<td>458.5</td>
<td>210.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<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>790.0</td>
<td>784.0</td>
<td>767.0</td>
<td>232.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Beach Littoral Cell</td>
<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>270.0</td>
<td>220.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pacific/Mission Beaches</td>
<td>238.5</td>
<td>273.0</td>
<td>286.0</td>
<td>277.7</td>
<td>279.3</td>
<td>282.3</td>
<td>283.7</td>
<td>268.3</td>
<td>301.7</td>
<td>254.0</td>
<td>275.3</td>
<td>200.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<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>201.0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside Littoral Cell</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>194.3</td>
<td>192.0</td>
<td>226.0</td>
<td>265.5</td>
<td>250.5</td>
<td>209.3</td>
<td>217.8</td>
<td>216.0</td>
<td>236.0</td>
<td>182.5</td>
<td>212.5</td>
<td>228.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<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>125.5</td>
<td>232.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Solana Beach</td>
<td>134.0</td>
<td>123.0</td>
<td>108.0</td>
<td>171.0</td>
<td>141.0</td>
<td>138.0</td>
<td>133.0</td>
<td>130.0</td>
<td>157.0</td>
<td>116.0</td>
<td>155.0</td>
<td>232.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<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>167.2</td>
<td>240.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<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>193.2</td>
<td>216.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<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>230.0</td>
<td>232.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SANDAG Regional Beach Monitoring Program, Annual Report 2009
Note: The SANDAG Regional Beach Sand Project nourished 12 of the region’s beaches in 2001.

Impaired Waterbodies

There are no new data for this indicator as this data is published every four years. Between 2002 and 2006, impaired waterbodies in the region increased. Impaired waterbodies are those that do not meet Clean Water Act standards. This list is prepared every four years by the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board.

As noted in last year’s report, the region as a whole greatly enhanced its monitoring efforts in recent years; as such, a greater percentage of waterbodies were found to be impaired in 2006 than in 2002. Therefore, the extent to which the region’s impaired waterbodies has increased cannot be conclusively determined, as data from 2002 and 2006 are not comparable. Data collected in future years should indicate whether the dramatic increase in impaired waterbodies between 2002 and 2006 signifies a valid trend.
Air Quality

The Air Quality Index (AQI) data suggest that air quality largely continues to improve in the San Diego region as compared to 1999. Air quality appeared to have been at its cleanest in 2009, with the lowest number of days during which air quality was considered unhealthy since 1999. The increases in 2006 and 2008 were likely due to a number of days during which the region experienced record-high temperatures.

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

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

The AQI data presented in this report reflect EPA revised standards for PM$_{2.5}$ (fine particles). The EPA enacted a stricter standard for PM$_{2.5}$ in 2006. The data shown report on performance relative to the revised standard from 1999 to 2009. It also should be noted that the data exclude days during the 2003 and 2007 wildfires when PM$_{2.5}$ and carbon monoxide exceeded their respective standards.
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 continued to decrease and is at its lowest since 2005. Beach widths have increased at most beaches but are not at 2001 replenishment levels. With respect to air quality, the AQI reached its lowest since 1999, but the region remains in non-attainment for the 8-hour ozone standard. In FY 2011 SANDAG continues to evaluate strategies to fund improvements to water quality, habitat preservation, and beach nourishment.
The Regional Economic Prosperity Strategy (REPS), originally developed in 1998, was updated in 2008. The REPS identifies strategic goals and recommends actions that call for infrastructure investment and public policy support in order to strengthen the region’s economic foundation. The REPS is based on 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 remained stable, as shown in Figure 21. Between 2007 and 2008, there was a slight decrease in the percentage of the labor force with a high school degree only, from 19 percent to 17 percent, and there was a slight increase in those with some college or an associate’s degree, from 32 percent to 33 percent.

**Figure 21**

**Labor Force Educational Attainment, 2000 to 2008**

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 22.

Figure 22

![Graph showing employment growth in high-wage clusters from 2002 to 2005.](source: SANDAG Cluster Inventory)

Regional Unemployment Rate Compared to California and the United States

The unemployment rate in the San Diego region, California, and the United States has increased dramatically over the last two years with the economic downturn, as shown in Figure 19. The region’s unemployment rate is currently 10.3 percent; it is lower than the state’s rate (12.3%), but greater than the country’s (9.4%) for the first time in years. This could mainly be attributed to the fact that the recession affected the San Diego region earlier than the rest of the nation. The San Diego economy, and specifically the local construction industry, were possibly also hit harder than the nation as a whole because of the recession’s impact on our local building boom.

Figure 23
Unemployment in San Diego, California and the United States, 2000 to 2009

![Graph showing unemployment rates from 2000 to 2009.](source: California Employment Development Department, Labor Market Information; U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics)
Real Per Capita Income Compared to California and the United States

San Diego’s real per capita income has remained stable since 2006. It increased slightly in 2007, but it declined slightly in 2008. As shown in Figure 24, it remains above that of California and the United States, which also follow a similar increase/decrease trend since 2006.

![Figure 24: Real Per Capita Income in San Diego, California and the United States in Inflation-Adjusted 2008 Dollars, 2000 to 2008](source)

Regional Poverty Rate Compared to California and the United States

The San Diego region’s poverty rate increased slightly in 2008. It is approximately 13 percent and is now even with that of California and the United States. Again, as with other indicators, this increase may partly be attributable to the current economic recession.

![Figure 25: Percent of Residents Living in Poverty in San Diego, California and the United States, 2000 to 2008](source)
Conclusion

Unemployment increased in 2008 and 2009 in the San Diego region. It is lower than the California rate, but higher than the United States rate for the first time in years. The region had been experiencing a rising standard of living between 2004 and 2007, as measured by an increase in real per capita income. Other indicators of economic prosperity in the region appear to be relatively stable. The 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 help to ensure that the region reinforces its status as one of the most desirable places to work and live. Above all, the strategic goals and recommended actions are designed to expand and create high- and middle-income jobs, which will ensure a rising standard of living for the region's residents. Future monitoring reports will measure the success of these strategies.
Public Facilities

Our region requires reliable supplies of water and energy, opportunities to reuse and recycle materials, and sufficient disposal options for waste. The region also needs to make more efficient use of its resources. The Regional Energy Strategy (RES), originally adopted in 1994 and updated in 2003, was again updated in 2009. It serves as an energy policy guide to support decisionmaking by SANDAG and its member agencies. The RES identifies region-specific energy issues such as increasing the diversity of energy supply in the region. The 2009 RCP Monitoring Report reflects new indicators and targets included in the updated RES.

Water Consumption

As shown in Figure 26, water consumption fluctuated over the last decade, but has declined over the last two years. The continued decline in water consumption could potentially be attributed to efforts by the San Diego County Water Authority (Water Authority) and local jurisdictions to increase public awareness regarding water issues and the need for water conservation in light of the ongoing drought.

Figure 26
Water Consumption, 2000 to 2009

Diversity of Water Supply

The diversity of the region’s water supply has been increasing. Reliance on the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California as a source has decreased from 85% in 2003 to 63% in 2009. Efforts undertaken by the Water Authority several years ago have begun to yield benefits in terms of diversity in the region’s water supply. The shares of conserved water, recycled water, and local surface water supply sources increased and are close to meeting their 2020 targets.
Recycled Water Use

As indicated in previous reports, the amount of recycled water use continues to increase as the region continues to invest in infrastructure and consumer awareness, as shown in Figure 28. Recycled water use has steadily increased since 2006. In 2009 the region reached a new high of 26,323 acre-feet of recycled water used. These increases may be due to larger recycled water facilities that have begun serving 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.

Share of Energy Produced from Renewable Resources

More than half (56%) of the region’s energy resources come from natural gas. Figure 28 shows the region’s projected overall breakdown of energy resources used in 2009. It should be noted that the percentages below are not comparable to last year’s report because purchase power is not included this year. Purchase power refers to power that is sold to San Diego Gas & Electric (SDG&E), but the energy is source is unknown. This unknown percentage should decrease over time as the California Department of Water Resources contracts entered into during the energy crisis are phased out. Additionally, the estimates for coal and large hydroelectric are based on state-prescribed averages - the percentages for the San Diego region are likely much lower.
As of 2009, 9 percent of the region’s electricity comes from renewable resources. The renewable resources percentage must increase significantly to meet state minimum requirements. In 2009, the SANDAG Board of Directors approved the RES, which updated the region’s energy goals and targets. One of the RES goals is to support development of renewable energy resources to meet or exceed a 33 percent renewable portfolio standard by 2020. The region’s most used renewable resource was wind (46%). Figure 29 shows the different types of renewable energy resources that were used in the San Diego region in 2009.

**Figure 29**
San Diego Annual Per Capita Electricity Consumption, 2000 to 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kilowatt Hours</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural Gas</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewable Energy</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coal</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Hydroelectric</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: San Diego Gas & Electric

**Per Capita Peak Demand for Electricity**

The region’s annual per capita electricity peak demand has slowly increased since 2001 and slightly decreased since 2007.

**Figure 30**
San Diego Annual Per Capita Electricity Peak Demand, 2000 to 2009

Source: San Diego Gas & Electric
Electricity Consumption by Sector

Additionally, another update to the RES included the replacement of the “per capita electricity consumption and peak demand” with “electricity consumption by sector” in order to track and identify total electricity consumption by residential and commercial sectors. The change in this indicator will assist in meeting the RES goals of reaching energy efficiency and conservation, implementing cost-effective steps to reduce peak demand, and increasing the total amount of renewable and nonrenewable energy resources to diversify electricity resources in the region. Residential and commercial sectors used the most electricity in the region. Figure 31 shows their consumption per capita.

Figure 31
Per Capita Electricity Consumption by Sector, San Diego Region, 2003, 2008, and 2020 Target

Source: Energy Policy Initiatives Center, University of San Diego, 2008

Natural Gas Consumption by Sector

Natural gas is the most environmentally benign fossil fuel and the only fossil fuel that the state permits to power electricity. In 2007, the San Diego region consumed approximately 581 million therms of natural gas (this number does not include gas used for electricity production). Similar to electricity consumption, the majority of natural gas consumption is from both the residential and commercial sectors. Figure 32 shows their consumption.

Figure 32
Per Capita Natural Gas Consumption by Sector, San Diego Region, 2003, 2008 and 2020 Target

Source: Energy Policy Initiatives Center, University of San Diego, 2008
Percent of Solid Waste that is Recycled

Local jurisdictions are no longer required by the state to report on this indicator. SANDAG staff is currently working to determine if a new data source will be available for future reporting. The following data and analysis are from the 2008 RCP Monitoring Report.

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 33. The target calls for a 50 percent solid waste diversion rate; in 2006 48 percent of solid waste was diverted from landfills.¹

Figure 33
Percent of Solid Waste Diverted From Landfills, 2000 to 2006

Landfill Space Available

There are no new data for this indicator in 2009. The following data and analysis are from the 2008 RCP Monitoring Report. 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 will actually reach capacity in terms of permitted daily tonnage between 2010 and 2011 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 was also 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 County Integrated Waste Management Board preliminary estimates, the region reached a 55 percent solid waste diversion rate in 2006, and progress continues to be made.

The County and City of San Diego are actively working on a number of options to expand capacity. The above estimate does not include current expansion efforts underway at Sycamore Canyon and Miramar landfills, nor the proposed but not completely permitted new landfill at Gregory Canyon.

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.

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 was originally estimated and will show that the region has actually achieved or exceeded the state-mandated target.
Conclusion
Regional water consumption has been declining as public awareness increases about water issues. There continues to be an increase in the amount of recycled water used. New indicators from the recently updated RES provide a new illustration of energy usage in the region; the share of energy produced from renewable resources has increased slightly.
The region’s distinct characteristics present a variety of opportunities and challenges for planning and coordinating along our interregional and binational borders. Access to jobs and housing continues to be an important issue. As people move farther away from their places of employment, increased pressure is placed upon our interregional transportation systems.

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

The number of interregional trips into San Diego from Orange County, Riverside County, and Imperial County appears to be stabilizing; however, there has been a decline (from 174,500 in 2007 to 152,100 in 2008) in the number of vehicles traveling between the region and Northern Baja. The number of trips between San Diego and Riverside County slightly increased in 2008, 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 from 9,714,786 in 2007 to 9,538,352 as shown in Figure 34.

Figure 34
San Diego Region Average Weekday Traffic Volumes to and From Orange, Imperial, and Riverside Counties and Tijuana, Baja California, Mexico, 2000 to 2009

Figure 35
Pedestrian Border Crossings from Tijuana Into San Diego, 1997 to 2008

Source: Caltrans Traffic Census

Source: SANDAG
Border Wait Times

There are no new data for this indicator in 2009. SANDAG is currently pursuing a new data source. SANDAG 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 36.

Figure 36
Average Border Wait Times - Northbound Into San Diego From Tijuana, Mexico, 2004 to 2007

![Figure 36](source: U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Border Wait Times: Southern Border Ports of Entry, 2004-2006)

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

There are a total of 110,000 Secure Electronic Network for Travelers Rapid Inspection (SENTRI) participants in 2009, which represents 5,000 fewer participants than were reported in the last year’s report, as shown in Figure 37. There are no new data for the Pedestrian Commuter Program and the Free and Secure Trade Program, but it is anticipated that new data will be available in the 2010 report.

Figure 37
SENTRI Participants, 2006 to 2009

![Figure 37](source: SANDAG Border Crossing Data)

Conclusion

The volume of commutes into San Diego from Baja California has decreased, as have the number of new participants in the SENTRI program.
2050 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN: 
DEVELOPMENT OF THE INITIAL UNCONSTRAINED TRANSPORTATION NETWORK

Introduction

During April and May, staff presented the Urban Area Transit Strategy alternative transit networks to the Transportation and Regional Planning Committees, various SANDAG working groups, and at the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) public workshops for public input. The networks also were reviewed by an outside Peer Review Panel. Based on feedback received so far, staff has assembled initial recommendations for a preferred 2050 transit network based on the initial three alternatives evaluated as part of the Urban Area Transit Strategy. This transit network, highway improvements, and other management strategies form the basis for the initial 2050 Unconstrained Transportation Network.

Board members are asked to discuss and provide feedback on the initial Unconstrained Transportation Network. Recommendations for a preferred Unconstrained Transportation Network will be presented at the July 2010 Board meeting for further discussion and use in the development of the Draft 2050 RTP.

2050 RTP Transportation Network Scenarios

In developing the 2050 RTP, the Unconstrained Transportation Network represents the region’s vision for reasonable transit, highway, and arterial improvements and operations to meet travel demand in 2050. Defining the Unconstrained Network is an important step in developing an updated RTP, because it establishes the broadest multimodal network from which revenue constrained network scenarios will be developed.

Once the Unconstrained Network is defined, staff will prioritize all of the future projects in this network, using the updated transportation project evaluation criteria (see Agenda Item No. 4). Based on revenue projections, various Revenue Constrained transportation network scenarios will be developed using this prioritized project list and other factors. The Revenue Constrained network scenarios will attempt to build and operate as much of the Unconstrained Network as possible, given revenue availability and flexibility, and project priorities. These scenarios will be evaluated using performance measures leading to the eventual selection of a preferred Revenue Constrained Network by the Board of Directors.

As previously discussed with the Board, Senate Bill 375 (Steinberg, 2008) (SB 375) requires that the 2050 RTP include a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) as a new element, in addition to the traditional policy, action, and financial elements. The 2010 Regional Transportation Plan Guidelines adopted by the California Transportation Commission on April 7, 2010, establish that the RTP must...
be an “internally consistent” document (i.e., all four elements of the RTP must be consistent with one another). As a result, transportation investments and the forecasted development pattern in the SCS should be complementary and not contradictory.

Federal regulations require that the RTP be financially constrained and include a financial plan that demonstrates how the adopted transportation plan can be implemented [Title 23 CFR Part 450.322(f) (10)]. The financial plan must demonstrate that projects included in the RTP can be implemented using committed, available, or reasonably available revenue sources (Title 23 CFR Part 450.104). Therefore, to achieve consistency among all RTP elements, the SCS must be developed to match the financially (or revenue) constrained plan. The 2050 RTP Environmental Impact Report (EIR) will analyze the Revenue Constrained plan as the Proposed Project. Project alternatives also will be analyzed in the EIR.

Discussion

Initial Recommendations for a 2050 Unconstrained Transit Network

The Urban Area Transit Strategy will serve as the basis for development of the regional transit network to be included in the 2050 RTP. Through the planning process, staff has developed and begun testing three transit network alternatives with a focus on the urban areas of the San Diego region with the ultimate goal of incorporating one of the networks (or a combination or variation of the networks) into the 2050 RTP Unconstrained Network. The Urban Area is illustrated in Attachment 1.

As discussed in Agenda Item No. 3A, the transit alternatives under study were grouped into three themes: Transit Propensity” (expanding transit in the most urbanized areas); “Commuter Point-to-Point” (emphasizing quick access to work); and “Many Centers” (connecting local smart growth areas and activity centers).

Based on feedback from the 2050 RTP public workshops, the Peer Review Panel, the performance analysis, and the public, staff recommends combining the best overall transit system strategies contained in all three alternatives as the focus for developing and testing a preferred RTP unconstrained transit network. This strategy focuses on developing a strong link between transit and transit-supportive land use patterns, a link that will ensure that future investments made in transit are maximized in terms of cost-effectiveness. Based on this approach, staff recommends developing a Hybrid strategy based on the following key points:

- Improve the current transit network in communities that already have strong transit/land use integration (e.g., Mid-City, coastal South Bay communities, etc.). Improvements would focus on establishing 10-minute, all-day frequencies on most local routes, developing Rapid Bus services along major arterial corridors, and adding new light rail service to better serve high-demand corridors. Streetcar and/or other shuttle/circulator services also would help improve intra-community circulation within smart growth centers (e.g., downtown San Diego, downtown Escondido, downtown El Cajon, etc.). This strategy would incorporate much of Transit Propensity alternative.

- Expand high-frequency local and Rapid Bus services into the largest-scale smart-growth areas that are emerging or planned in the near-term as suggested by the Many Centers alternative. These concentrations of future transit-friendly land uses help justify significant investments in transit infrastructure and services.
• Interconnect the existing, most highly-urbanized areas and future smart growth centers to major employment areas with a system of high-speed, high-frequency rail and Bus Rapid Transit lines that will facilitate easy and convenient access across the region. Using findings from the evaluation of the Commuter Point-to-Point alternative, the addition of selected peak commuter bus services that offer one-seat rides/competitive travel would facilitate access to key regional employment centers.

• Emphasize improvements to the pedestrian environment in and around rail and bus station areas to maximize convenient and safe walking access to transit, and also create interconnections between transit and the Regional Bike Plan as a means to facilitate access to transit stations from areas outside a walking distance and create new last-mile solutions.

These actions, taken together, could serve as a good starting point for the overall strategy for developing the long-range vision for the transit plan that will ultimately be incorporated into the 2050 RTP. The Transportation and Regional Planning Committees are discussing the proposed “Hybrid” approach at their joint meeting on June 4, 2010, and any comments made will be provided verbally at the June 11 Board Policy meeting. A draft list of transit projects for the 2050 Hybrid Unconstrained Transit Network is included as Attachment 2a. (Attachment 2b provides definitions of transit services and facilities for the Urban Area Transit Strategy for reference purposes.)

Initial Recommendations for a 2050 Unconstrained Highway Network

Similarly to the process being proposed for the transit network, SANDAG and Caltrans staffs are analyzing potential modifications to the 2030 RTP Unconstrained highway network. These modifications are based on supporting proposed transit investments in key corridors and communities while providing an adequate level of service for the overall transportation system. It is important to note that the 2030 RTP Unconstrained highway network includes an extensive Managed Lanes system that provides tremendous flexibility in serving transit and high occupancy vehicles (HOVs) by maximizing the available rights-of-way in several of the region’s major highway corridors. The goal in reviewing the highway network is to build upon this existing plan by integrating the revised transit network into it, thereby creating the most efficient and balanced transportation system.

Potential modifications include additional operational improvements to relieve bottlenecks, refinements of the HOV and Managed Lane network to support transit services, and adjustments to general purpose lane widening beyond what is included in the 2030 Reasonably Expected RTP for corridors that are projected to operate at acceptable levels of service. A map of the initial 2050 Unconstrained Highway Network is included as Attachment 3.
Next Steps

Based on discussion today, the initial Unconstrained Transportation Network will be presented to the working groups for discussion and feedback. Recommendations for a preferred Unconstrained Transportation Network will be presented at the July 2010 Board meeting for further discussion and use in the development of the Draft 2050 RTP.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Attachments: 1. Study Area for Urban Area Transit Strategy
2a. Initial List of Transit Projects for the 2050 Hybrid Unconstrained Transit Network
2b. Definitions of Transit Services and Facilities for Urban Area Transit Strategy
3. Map of Initial 2050 Unconstrained Highway Network
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Dave Schumacher, (619) 699- 6906, dsc@sandag.org
Heather Werdick, (619) 699-6967, hwe@sandag.org

Funds are budgeted in Work Elements #31003 and 31005
An initial list of transit projects to be included in the 2050 Hybrid Unconstrained Transit Network is proposed below. (Definitions of transit services are included in Attachment 2b as a reference.) This initial list builds upon transit services currently in operation today and on planned transit services currently included in the 2030 Reasonably Expected Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

Based on results of upcoming model runs to test the performance of these transit projects, staff will propose modifications to the mix of projects and adjustments to the levels of service in order to maximize the cost-effectiveness for the unconstrained transit network that will eventually be incorporated into the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan.

Ultimately, the selected transit network will be accompanied by a series of policy recommendations that may enhance the performance of the networks. The policy recommendations may address issues such as urban design, parking, street connectivity, bike and pedestrian access, transit awareness and education, last mile solutions, etc. During the planning process, staff will conduct a series of sensitivity tests that may provide supplemental information on the effectiveness of any potential policies that could be considered in the planning process.

**Local Bus Services**

Within the Urban Area Transit Strategy study area, service frequencies on most existing local bus services would be increased to 10 minutes or better throughout the day to serve short-distance trip-making and provide connections to regional Rapid Bus, Bus Rapid Transit, and Rail services. Additional local bus services within the study area would include:

- Solana Beach-Carmel Valley-University City
- Carmel Valley-Pacific Highlands Ranch-Sabre Springs
- Mira Mesa-Scripps Ranch North-South Poway Industrial Park

Outside the study area, a basic level of local bus service (30-60 minute service throughout most of the day) would be provided to connect key communities to the urban areas, including:

- Fallbrook
- Valley Center
- Ramona
- Alpine
- Tribal nations

**Rapid Bus Services**

A network of limited-stop Rapid Bus services would operate in key travel corridors as overlay services to local bus services to serve medium-distance tripmaking, including:

- Oceanside-University City via Coast Highway corridor
- Oceanside-Vista via Mission Avenue corridor
- Camp Pendleton-Mira Costa College-Plaza Camino Real
• Escondido-South Escondido
• Carlsbad-San Marcos via Palomar Airport Road corridor
• Old Town-Pacific Beach-La Jolla-University City
• Mission Valley-University City via Genesee Avenue corridor
• Ocean Beach-Old Town-Mid-City-La Mesa
• Point Loma-Old Town-Linda Vista-Kearny Mesa
• SDSU-Downtown via Adams Ave/First Avenue corridors
• North Park-South Park-Golden Hill-Downtown
• Downtown-Coronado
• Downtown-Southeastern communities-Spring Valley
• SDSU-Mid-City-Lemon Grove-Spring Valley
• SDSU-Mid-City-Southeastern communities-National City
• Chula Vista-Southwestern College-Otay Ranch
• Imperial Beach-Otay-Otay Mesa

**Bus Rapid Transit Services**

All day bus rapid transit services would operate in key freeway/transit guideway corridors to serve long-distance regional tripmaking, including:

• Escondido-North I-15 communities, Kearny Mesa, Mission Valley, Downtown
• Otay Mesa-Otay Ranch-Chula Vista-National City-Downtown
• San Ysidro-Chula Vista-National City-Downtown-Old Town-University City

Peak-period commuter bus services would operate in key freeway/transitway corridors to provide point-to-point connections/one-seat ride service between key residential areas and regional employment centers, including:

• Escondido and north I-15 communities to Downtown
• Oceanside-Carlsbad-Encinitas to Sorrento Mesa
• Otay Ranch-Chula Vista to University City/Sorrento Mesa
• Southeastern San Diego communities-Mid-City to University City/Sorrento Mesa
• El Cajon-Santee to Kearny Mesa/University City/Sorrento Mesa
• Santee-El Cajon-Spring Valley to Eastern Urban Center/Otay Mesa
• Inland South Bay-Southeastern San Diego communities/Mid-City to Escondido/Palomar Airport Road corridor

**Commuter and Light Rail Services**

Double tracking of the COASTER would allow 15 minute peak/60 minute off-peak bi-directional service, while double tracking the Sprinter corridor would allow 10 minute all day service, along with express/limited stop service between Oceanside and Escondido.

A commuter rail overlay service on the proposed California High Speed Rail system would facilitate commuter travel needs between the Temecula-Escondido I-15 corridor and south county job centers.
Additional light rail services would operate in the following corridors:

- University City-Mira Mesa via Mira Mesa Boulevard
- University City-Kearny Mesa-Mission Valley-Mid-City-Southeastern San Diego communities-National City-Chula Vista via I-805 and I-15
- Downtown-SDSU via Park Blvd/El Cajon Boulevard
- Pacific Beach-Kearny Mesa-Mission Valley-SDSU-El Cajon via Balboa Avenue/Green Line

Streetcar/Shuttle-Circulator Services

Several streetcar and/or bus shuttle/circulator services would operate in key community center areas to facilitate both intra-area tripmaking and first-last mile connections to regional transit services.

- Downtown areas in San Diego, Oceanside, Escondido, El Cajon, National City, Chula Vista
- Community centers in University City/Sorrento Mesa, Kearny Mesa, Mission Valley, Hillcrest/North Park, Eastern Urban Center (Chula Vista)
Definitions of Transit Services and Facilities
For Urban Area Transit Strategy

High-Speed Rail:

- Designed for very high-speed long-distance intercity trips with long station spacing and dedicated grade-separated lines. Examples include the Shinkansen in Japan, the TGV in France, and the AVE in Spain. California High-Speed Rail (HSR) is currently being planned from Sacramento to San Diego.

  - Vehicles are steel wheel on steel track electrically-powered bidirectional train sets.
  - Top Speed: 220 miles per hour (mph), but 150 mph maximum expected from San Diego to Escondido and 200 mph maximum from Escondido to Riverside.
  - Level boarding.
  - Passenger Capacity: Not yet determined in CA. Examples from around the world range from approximately 300 to 1,300 per train but most single level trains have about 400-500.
  - Operates on dedicated high speed track with no at-grade crossings.
  - California HSR system will be over 600 miles.

Commuter Rail:

- Designed for higher-speed, longer-distance regional trips with stations spacing every four to five miles on average. Examples include the San Diego COASTER, Dallas/Fort Worth Trinity Railway Express, and Southern California Metrolink.

  - Commuter rail lines use diesel or electric locomotives (diesel are more common and are used in Southern California).
  - Typical speed: 80 mph.
  - Typically low floor.
  - Supported by Park and Ride lots.
  - Typical passenger capacity: 130 seats per car operating with 3-8 car trains (typically no standees).
  - Operates on a dedicated right-of-way separate from other vehicles.
  - Typical length of line: 25-100 miles.
## Light Rail Transit (LRT):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Image</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="San Diego Trolley" /></td>
<td>Designed for medium-distance trips with station spacing about every mile on average. Examples include the San Diego Trolley, the San Diego SPRINTER, Portland MAX, Minneapolis Hiawatha Line, and Houston MetroRail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="San Diego Sprinter" /></td>
<td>Electric or diesel-powered rail vehicles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Typical speed: corridor speed limit, generally not exceeding 55 mph.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Designed for high-capacity corridors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Integrates well with street traffic, signals, and pedestrians.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operates on a dedicated guideway within separate right-of-way or on-street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Typical passenger capacity: 60-140 seated plus standees (per car), with 1-4 cars.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Typical length of line: 6-25 miles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Typically low floor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Streetcar/Shuttle-Circulator:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Image</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Portland Modern Streetcar" /></td>
<td>Designed for short-distance trips with station spacing every few blocks or every quarter-mile on average. Streetcar examples include Portland Modern Streetcar, Seattle Streetcar, and San Francisco Historic Streetcar. Shuttle-circulators include MTS Shuttle, University City SuperLoop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image4.png" alt="San Francisco Historic Streetcar" /></td>
<td>Typical speed: speeds up to the speed limit of the street they operate on, generally averaging 12 mph (with stops).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image5.png" alt="MTS Shuttle" /></td>
<td>Designed for dense urban areas, such as downtown areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Integrates well with street traffic, signals, and pedestrians.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Streetcars operate either in mixed-traffic with automobiles or on a dedicated right-of-way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Typical passenger capacity for streetcars: up to 100 seated and standees per car (vehicles generally provide few seats due to short distance nature of trips). Operate as single vehicles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Typical passenger capacity for shuttles-circulators: up to 20-25 seated, depending upon vehicle size.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Typical length of line: 2-6 miles.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bus Rapid Transit (BRT): Designed for longer-distance, higher-speed, regional trip-making on a dedicated bus guideway or freeway Managed Lanes/High-Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) facilities. All-day, all-stop trunk BRT services can be complemented with peak-period commuter express services designed to provide very limited stop connections to major employment centers. Examples include San Diego Interstate 15 BRT, Los Angeles Orange Line, Eugene, Oregon EmX, and the Brisbane South-East Busway.

- Diesel or CNG/alternative fuels standard.
- Typical speed: corridor speed limit, typically 40-60 mph on average.
- Supported by Park and Ride lots.
- Designed for high-capacity corridors.
- Low floor design.
- Operates on dedicated guideway and sometimes in mixed-traffic with automobiles.
- Typical passenger capacity: 50-60 seated plus standees on arterial routes, 50-80 seated on freeway routes (per bus).
- Typical length of line: 8-15 miles on arterial segments, 10-30 miles on freeway segments.
- Typical station spacing: 0.5-1 mile on arterial segments, 4-5 miles on freeway segments.

Continued on next page...
Rapid Bus:

Provides higher-speed alternatives to local bus services in high volume arterial corridors and utilizes a range of lower-capital cost signal priority treatments, short segments of transit-only lanes, and limited station stops to achieve faster travel times. Rapid Bus services can be upgraded to BRT over time through implementation of dedicated transit lanes to bypass congested arterial segments. Examples include Los Angeles Metro Rapid and Boston Washington Street Silver Line.

- Diesel or CNG/alternative fuels standard.
- Typical speed: speeds up to the speed limit of the street they operate on, averaging about 25 mph (with stops).
- Low floor design.
- Designed for high-capacity corridors.
- Integrates well with street traffic, signals, and pedestrians.
- Typical passenger capacity: 40 seated plus standees (per bus).
- Typical length of line: 8-15 miles.
- Typical station spacing: 0.5-1 mile.

High-Frequency Local Bus:

Facilitates mid-to-short-distance trip-making within local communities, with closer station spacing. Local bus services serve as the backbone of the transit system and provide the primary access into local communities where fixed-route services are warranted.

- Typically standard and single articulated buses.
- Typical speed: speeds up to the speed limit of the street they operate on, averaging 12 mph (with stops).
- Low-floor design.
- Integrates well with street traffic, signals, and pedestrians.
- Operates in mixed-traffic with automobiles, but can benefit from transit-signal priority and queue jump lanes.
- Typical passenger capacity: 37-57 seated plus standees (per bus).
- Typical length of line: ranges from under 5 miles up to 25 miles.
- Typical station spacing: 1-4 blocks.
COMMUNITIES PUTTING PREVENTION TO WORK GRANT

File Number 3100000

Introduction

Last fall, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) issued a notice of funding availability to state and local public health departments soliciting grant applications to implement comprehensive programs that address either obesity or tobacco use. This grant program, called Communities Putting Prevention to Work (CPPW), provided $372 million nationwide under the federal government’s American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) economic stimulus efforts. The County of San Diego’s Health and Human Services Agency (HHSA) applied for a grant focused on obesity prevention and was awarded $16.1 million. The grant will support the development of public policies and programs that promote physical activity and good nutrition, two of the key determinants of obesity.

Public health research has identified a relationship between the built environment and levels of physical activity. Land use decisions also have an impact on nutrition since they can determine access to healthy foods, and the County’s grant proposes to address these issues in a number of ways discussed below. Because SANDAG brings a regional perspective to issues of transportation, urban design, and land use, the County invited SANDAG to participate in this grant program. As a result, SANDAG will be responsible for the projects developed to promote environmental and systems changes that will promote healthier communities in the San Diego region. SANDAG’s component of the grant award is approximately $3 million.

Discussion

Public and Regional Planning

In recent years, public health officials have become increasingly alarmed by a rising rate of obesity in this country associated with physical inactivity, leading to a parallel increase in health risks such as diabetes and heart disease. The cost impacts of this trend on state and local governments are significant. According to the California Department of Health Services, the costs attributable to physical inactivity and obesity amounted to $28 billion in 2005.

The search for the cause of this increase has pointed in several directions, but two clear causes are a decrease in the level of physical activity in our daily lives and poor nutrition that results in excessive
calorie intake. Public health research has found a relationship between the types of communities in which we live and our level of physical activity—especially physical activity associated with our means of travel—and between nutrition and access to healthy foods. Researchers are finding that people are more physically active when they live in communities that are more compact and have a greater mix of land uses than those who live in single-use, lower-density neighborhoods.

SANDAG’s Regional Comprehensive Plan, smart growth policy framework, and coordination with local land use planning efforts begin to address these public health issues by encouraging compact, mixed-use development and active transportation. Participating in the CPPW grant provides a unique opportunity to more directly address the public health policy issues associated with transportation and land use decisions and to support planning activities and programs that will encourage the development of healthier communities.

**The Communities Putting Prevention to Work Program**

Under the CPPW grant program, SANDAG will be responsible for implementing six “interventions” or projects. These projects, described in more detail in Attachment 1, cover the following areas:

- Development of transportation model enhancements, a health impacts assessment tool, and enhancements to sketch planning tools
- Development of public health-based regional planning policy recommendations, performance measures, and monitoring programs
- Pass-through grants to support local planning efforts addressing healthy communities issues
- Development of a regional safe-routes-to-school strategy and supporting safe-routes-to-school pass-through grants
- Expanded promotion of active transportation through iCommute Bike to Work program
- Implementation and promotion of the Regional Bicycle Plan route signage and wayfinding program

Through this grant program, SANDAG will be taking a significant step into the realm of public health. An ad hoc working group may be formed to provide a forum for stakeholder feedback and to provide a mechanism to receive input from public health professionals on the policy recommendations that the grant program will develop.

Because this is an ARRA grant, the federal government is requiring immediate implementation to help stimulate the economy, so work has already begun through the County Health and Human Services Agency. SANDAG’s work will begin officially with the start of the new fiscal year. All the work under the grant must be completed by March 2012.

CHARLES “MUGGS” STOLL
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachment: 1. Communities Putting Prevention to Work Fact Sheet

Key Staff Contact: Stephan Vance, (619) 699-1924, sva@sandag.org
Communities Putting Prevention to Work
Fact Sheet

OVERVIEW

What is it? A $372 million nationwide grant program for the purpose of combating obesity and tobacco use.

How are funds coming to the San Diego region? The County Health and Human Services Agency (HHSA) applied for a grant under the obesity control component of the program. The CDC awarded $16.1 million to the County, the largest grant in the country for obesity control.

How is SANDAG involved? The County of San Diego HHSA has partnered with SANDAG as a subcontractor under the grant to help implement the components of the project related to regional planning issues, active transportation, and safe routes to school. This work will be supported by approximately $3 million in grant funds.

How will local agencies be involved? There will be several opportunities for local agencies that want to be involved in the project. The CPPW grant will fund pass-through grants to local agencies, and an ad hoc working group with local agency staff participation will be formed to help SANDAG implement its component of the grant program.

PROGRAM SCHEDULE

The grant program is a component of the federal ARRA effort to provide economic stimulus funds. As such, the program must be completed within two years under the following proposed schedule.

- Grant award notification: March 2010
- Executed contract between County and SANDAG: June 2010
- SANDAG work commences: July 2010
- Pass-through grants awarded: Fall/Winter 2010
- Grant funded interventions completed: February 2012
- Grant program completed: March 2012

GRANT FUNDED INTERVENTIONS

Health Impact Assessment and Forecasting. $663,100

Utilizing consultant assistance and SANDAG’s regional modeling staff, this work will:

- develop a GIS-based regional health impact assessment tool to identify key areas where public health disparities can best be addressed with planning and infrastructure investments
- add a health outcomes component to SANDAG’s CommunityViz sketch planning tool
- provide support for the update of SANDAG’s activity-based regional transportation model to better account for and forecast nonmotorized trips
Regional Comprehensive Planning Policies $104,000
With the help of a planning and public health specialist, this work will:
- identify the public health impacts of transportation and land use decisions, provide options for integrating public health consideration into regional planning
- develop recommendations for public health goals and objectives for the RCP and RTP
- develop metrics necessary to monitor progress

Healthy Communities Campaign $1,285,500
This component of the grant will develop, implement, and support two pass-through grant programs:
- $700,000 for grants to local agencies to add public health components to local planning efforts
- $150,000 for Active Community Transportation Studies to develop comprehensive approaches for creating bicycle and pedestrian friendly neighborhoods

Countywide Safe Routes to School Strategic Plan and Implementation Resources $487,000
SANDAG will develop a countywide Safe Routes to School strategic plan, and provide pass-through grants:
- $250,000 capacity building and planning grants
- $50,000 for education, encouragement and enforcement campaigns

Active Commuter Transportation Campaign $238,000
Through iCommute, this project will support efforts in FY 2011 to expand bike to work promotions over the entire month of May, including employer outreach and bike commute training. It also will support development of a “walking school bus” program and bike buddies program that will complement the Safe Routes to School initiative.

Regional Bicycle Plan Implementation $301,300
This effort will begin implementation of the Regional Bicycle Plan, scheduled to be adopted in May 2010. It will develop and produce regional bikeway corridor and wayfinding signs, and, in cooperation with local agencies begin installation of the signs. It also will produce promotional materials about the regional bikeway network.

Total Program Funding $3,078,900