Regional Comprehensive Plan Update

February 9, 2012

Today’s Report

- Brief summary
- Major accomplishments
- Timeline and key steps
Our Vision for a Better Future

“To preserve and enhance the San Diego region’s unique features – its vibrant and culturally diverse communities, its beaches, deserts, mountains, lagoons, bluffs, and canyons, and its international setting – and promote sustainability, economic prosperity, and an outstanding quality of life for everyone.”

The RCP Approach

- Connect transportation and land use plans
- Guide infrastructure investments
- Provide incentives and collaboration
RCP Chapters
1. Introduction
2. Regional Vision and Core Values
3. Overview of the San Diego Region
4. Regional Planning and Policy Framework
5. Borders
6. Social Equity and Environmental Justice Assessment
7. Integrated Regional Infrastructure Strategy
8. Performance Monitoring
9. Implementation

Chapter 4
4. Regional Planning and Policy Framework
   A. Urban Form – Where and How Should the Region Grow?
   B. Transportation – Moving People and Goods
   C. Housing – Providing Homes for All Residents
   D. Healthy Environment – Enhancing our Natural Habitats, Air, Water, and Beaches
   E. Economic Prosperity – Creating Opportunities for a Rising Standard of Living; and
   F. Public Facilities – Strengthening the Social and Physical Infrastructure of our Communities
RCP Accomplishments

- Smart Growth Concept Map
- Visual Simulations and Photo Library
- Design Guidelines
- Trip Generation Rates and Parking Strategies
- TransNet SGIP and EMP
- Beach Sand Replenishment
- Climate Action Strategy

RCP Accomplishments (Cont.)

- Policy framework for local plan updates and regional growth forecasts
- Guidance for RTP/SCS and QOL work
- Funding from state and federal agencies
- Binational, tribal, and interregional partnerships
- Collaboration with partner agencies
- Strategic Initiatives
- Common goals
Proposed RCP Timeline and Key Steps

2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015
--- | --- | --- | ---
**Forecast**
- Series 13 Forecast

**RCP**
- RCP Scoping
- Public Outreach Strategy
- Update existing RCP policies; work on new/expanded components; and prepare Draft RCP & EIR
- Release Draft RCP & EIR
- Adopt Final RCP & EIR

**Land Use & Transportation Scenarios**
- Develop Scenarios
- Test Scenarios Using New Models
- Select Revenue Constrained Transportation Network
- Release Draft RTP/SCS & EIR
- Adopt Final RTP/SCS & EIR

**RTP/SCS**
- Target Setting with CARB

**Public Outreach**
- Integrated Public Outreach and Education

Summary

- Key Efforts:
  - Series 13 Regional Growth Forecast
  - Land use and transportation scenarios
  - Update of existing RCP policies
  - Development of new/expanded RCP components
  - Coordination with next RTP/SCS
  - Integrated public outreach and education
- Comments from Board Retreat
- Role of the TWG and RPC
Discussion

- How have you used the RCP?
- What aspects have been helpful?
- What areas would you suggest for improvement?
- What issues, if any, should be emphasized in next RCP?
- Are the vision and core values still relevant? Are we missing anything? Do they need to be revisited?
- Other comments

Regional Comprehensive Plan Update

www.sandag.org
Series 13 Forecast: New Model and New Data Needs
Regional Planning Technical Working Group
February 9, 2012

Overview

- Forecast background
  - History
  - Process
- New in Series 13
  - Updated regionwide forecast
  - New model
  - New data needs
- Schedule and next steps
Forecast background

• SANDAG has produced forecasts since the 1970s
  • Used in: RTP, RCP, water planning, traffic impact analysis, etc…
• Updated every 3-4 years
• Denoted by a Series Number
  • 2030 Regional Growth Forecast Update was “Series 11”
  • 2050 Regional Growth Forecast was “Series 12”
  • …Now we’re on lucky 13!

Forecast process

Regionwide Forecast (DEFM)

Subregional Forecast (PECAS)

Detailed Demographic Forecast (PASEF/PopSyn)

Transportation Model (ABM)

Current housing, population, jobs
Local land use plans & policies,
Market conditions, Local review

Historical data, Current demographics, National forecast, Demographic trends, Peer review
Why a new model?

- Existing model successful at predicting greenfield, but not as sensitive to redevelopment
- New model allows more robust alternatives analysis that takes land value into account

Background on PECAS

- Production Exchange Consumption Allocation System
- Used in several other metropolitan regions, California statewide model, Oregon, Ohio
- What PECAS is…
  - Microsimulation model
  - Based on input/output and return on investment
  - Will project square feet of built space, in addition to housing units, jobs, acres
- Key differences:
  - Focus on buildings (sq. ft.) rather than acres
  - Redevelopment based on return on investment
How will PECAS predict future development?

- Input-output model of economic activity
  - Determines supply and demand for goods and services by zone ("neighborhood")
- Return on investment calculations used for development, redevelopment, infill
  - Existing conditions
  - Construction costs
  - Zoning
  - Rents
- Caution: Data collected at parcel-level, modeled at zone-level

Comparing the existing and new models

- Existing model:
  - Existing land use
  - General plans
  - Redevelopment/infill determined by
    - Development trends
    - Local input
    - Constraints

- New model:
  - Existing land use
  - General plans
  - Zoning
  - Redevelopment/infill determined by
    - Economic trends
    - Return on investment
      - Valuation (Assessor and other sources)
      - Costs
    - Constraints
SANDAG will continue to collect land use information

Series 13: Zoning will inform redevelopment and infill
New data needs

- SANDAG inventory:
  - Building square footage
  - Assessed valuation and rents
  - Construction costs
- Next data collection effort: **Zoning**
  - PECAS works in “space types”
  - Zoning will be **generalized** to those space types
  - Local specifics on:
    - Floor Area Ratio (FAR)
    - Permitted or “by right” uses
    - Conditional uses
- General plan will continue to guide what can get built
- Zoning will be used to guide
  - How much?
  - How likely?
  - Possibility of conditional uses?

Translating from zoning ordinance to PECAS for each jurisdiction…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone Codes</th>
<th>Permitted &amp; Conditional Uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zone</td>
<td>Desc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-1</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS</td>
<td>Open Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-M</td>
<td>Hotel/Motel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Floor Area Ratio, lot size, setback, and building height will be used to guide “how much” can be developed.

Permitted and Conditional Uses will be used to guide predicted development patterns.
Benefits

• Comprehensive, electronic database of zoning information may be useful for local planning efforts

• What would be of most use to your jurisdiction?
  • Online tool?
  • Shapefiles?

Conclusion

• Next forecast “Series 13” underway
• Changes will reflect:
  • Benchmarking to Census 2010
  • New models
• Need local assistance with collecting and interpreting zoning
  • Which local staff person should be primary point of contact?
• SANDAG will make resulting zoning files available to jurisdictions for their use in local planning
Schedule and next steps

This month
- Roll out of online zoning data tool
- Request 2-4 jurisdictions to assist with initial testing of zoning review tool

June 2012
- Preliminary zoning data collected
- Review by SANDAG and land use authorities (data available for local use in other projects)

Summer/Fall 2012
- Preliminary regionwide forecast (DEFM)

Winter/Spring 2013
- Preliminary subregional forecast results for TWG review

Summer/Fall 2013
- Draft forecast

Differences between 2010 predicted and 2010 benchmark

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Series 12 Forecast</th>
<th>Numeric Difference</th>
<th>Percent Difference</th>
<th>Source for Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>3,095,313</td>
<td>3,181,349</td>
<td>86,036</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>Census 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Units</td>
<td>1,164,786</td>
<td>1,147,167</td>
<td>-17,619</td>
<td>-1.5%</td>
<td>Census 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td>1,086,865</td>
<td>1,053,982</td>
<td>-32,883</td>
<td>-3.0%</td>
<td>Census 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilian Wage &amp; Salary Jobs</td>
<td>1,229,800</td>
<td>1,250,703</td>
<td>20,903</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>California Employment Development Dept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Rate</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>California Employment Development Dept.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First step in Series 13 forecast: Update Regionwide (DEFM) model to reflect Census 2010, most current economic, demographic, and housing trends.
Jurisdiction-level differences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Final 2008 Estimate</th>
<th>2008 Forecast Base</th>
<th>Numeric Difference</th>
<th>Percent Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carlsbad</td>
<td>102,452</td>
<td>103,406</td>
<td>954</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>235,767</td>
<td>230,397</td>
<td>-5,370</td>
<td>-2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronado</td>
<td>21,063</td>
<td>23,030</td>
<td>1,967</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Mar</td>
<td>4,186</td>
<td>4,561</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Cajon</td>
<td>97,684</td>
<td>97,555</td>
<td>-129</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encinitas</td>
<td>59,411</td>
<td>63,615</td>
<td>4,204</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>140,785</td>
<td>143,259</td>
<td>2,474</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Beach</td>
<td>26,335</td>
<td>28,092</td>
<td>1,757</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Mesa</td>
<td>55,753</td>
<td>56,445</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemon Grove</td>
<td>24,949</td>
<td>25,511</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National City</td>
<td>56,889</td>
<td>56,144</td>
<td>-745</td>
<td>-1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside</td>
<td>166,064</td>
<td>178,102</td>
<td>12,038</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poway</td>
<td>47,596</td>
<td>50,744</td>
<td>3,148</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>1,279,505</td>
<td>1,333,617</td>
<td>54,112</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>82,116</td>
<td>82,419</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santee</td>
<td>52,367</td>
<td>55,850</td>
<td>3,483</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solana Beach</td>
<td>12,780</td>
<td>13,447</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista</td>
<td>92,793</td>
<td>95,400</td>
<td>2,607</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated</td>
<td>474,194</td>
<td>489,958</td>
<td>15,764</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Addressing the differences

- Regionwide 3.3% DOF population over-estimate
  - For many jurisdictions, the differences are minor
  - For some, differences are larger
- Housing, jobs, land use do not have revision “issues”
- Recommendation:
  - Use growth rates calculated from forecast base (2008) to forecast year
  - Do not mix-and-match data sources (e.g. compare Census 2010 to forecast years)
- Series 13 forecast will use Census 2010 as benchmark
  - Anticipated draft forecast mid-year 2013.
COMPLETE STREET POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

1. Review top ten elements of an Ideal Complete Streets Policy

2. Emphasize goals for multi-modal options and safety pursuant to California’s Complete Street bill
   - In addition to citing AB 1358, use specific language to support multi-modal goals, even among chapters dedicated to vehicular circulation.
   - Exemplary language can be found in the City of Sacramento’s 2009 Mobility Element: http://www.sacgp.org/documents/04_Part2.04_Mobility.pdf
   - Provide language supportive of multi-modal LOS analyses

3. Allow for flexible vehicular Level of Service thresholds to encourage the evaluation of tradeoffs between modes
   - Particularly in certain zones such as the Village where all-day benefits for bicycling and pedestrian safety outweigh benefits gained from peak-hour throughput.
   - Consistent with modified CEQA Environmental Checklist which now asks whether an improvement for one mode compromises safety or accessibility for other modes
   - Sample language: Maintain operations on all roadways and intersections at LOS A-D at all times, including peak travel times, unless maintaining this LOS would, in the City’s judgment, be infeasible and/or conflict with the achievement of other goals. (City of Sacramento)
   - Sample language: When a traffic analysis indicates that the Level of Service (LOS) for a street reaches D or below, the city will determine what improvements or changes in operations are needed to maintain or improve the LOS, and identify potential funding and prioritization for the necessary improvements through the Capital Improvement Program. (City of La Mesa)

4. Integrate land use into functional street classifications
   - ‘Place-based’ street classifications reflect a more context sensitive design solution for different road characteristics depending on surrounding land use.
   - Replace or overlay traditional classifications such as Prime Arterial, Secondary Arterials, Collector Streets, etc. with new street typologies (see National City’s Community Corridors included in recent General Plan update, CCDC Green Streets included in the Downtown

5. Revise the City’s current standard lane width of 12 feet
   - Safety studies indicate that lane widths in excess of 9-11 feet provide little additional capacity, but result in excessive speeds and higher crash rates.

6. Create a Five Year Transportation Plan and combine multiple transportation modes into one strategic planning document
   - Combine goals for active transportation, transit, ADA transition, and vehicular circulation and allows for greater cost efficiencies.
   - Assess corridors where travel speeds exceed 35 mph for potential Complete Street improvements, especially near schools, mixed-use corridors, and transit routes.
   - Conduct a comprehensive assessment of streets with excess capacity where a road diet would make room available within the right of way for bike/pedestrian safety improvements.
   - Establish and report on measurable goals (miles of new sidewalk, bike lanes, number of bike parking spaces, intersections reconfigured for all modes, crosswalks installed, etc.)
   - Exemplary plans can be found in Charlotte (http://www.charmeck.org/city/charlotte/Transportation/PlansProjects/Pages/Transportation%20Action%20Plan.aspx) and Seattle (http://www.seattle.gov/transportation/tsphome.htm).

7. Adopt new administrative tools to ensure Complete Streets policies are implemented
   - Revise traffic impact study guidelines to reflect Complete Street goals and requirements (AB 1358) and the 2010 CEQA Guidelines (SB 97).
   - Implement internal use of a Street Design Checklist filled out for all transportation projects, including major maintenance. (see Seattle’s Complete Street checklist, http://www.seattle.gov/transportation/compSt_how.htm)
Complete Streets Workshops

Co-Sponsored by National Complete Streets Coalition, HHSA, SANDAG, WalkSanDiego

Challenges and Discussion Point Summary

On September 7 and November 17, staff members from Chula Vista, La Mesa, Encinitas and San Diego convened to participate in a 2-part Complete Streets workshop. The workshops focused on Complete Streets policies and implementation and were made possible through a partnership among SANDAG, the San Diego County Health and Human Services Agency (HHSA), the National Complete Streets Coalition, and WalkSanDiego. Funding for the workshops was provided by HHSA’s Healthy Works program. Notes from the workshops regarding barriers and challenges to implementing Complete Streets follow.

Discussion: Barriers and Challenges to Complete Streets

- LOS – current system emphasizes vehicle LOS
  - Challenge not to have regional design guidelines or multi-modal metric system to relate to traffic engineers, CEQA
  - How to obtain multi-modal improvements with development projects. Would like to see regional guidelines on this.
  - Catch 22 of designing good streets and future LOS being negatively impacted
  - How to combine a multi-modal LOS analysis/metrics with existing LOS

- Challenges with Multi-Modal LOS: consistency with regional models, lack of impact fee/metrics to implement, requires culture change, needs tandem viable transportation options, would like more information on CEQA analysis/thresholds.

- Complete Streets concepts are in many policies but difficult to implement with lack of other infrastructure tools such as transit service improvements.

- Difficult to do road diets due to need for GP amendment. This generated discussion of flexible policies/principles in GP that are not so specific.

- CEQA compliance, conducting multi-modal LOS analysis, limited ROW. Suggested new term: Level of Mobility to move away from vehicle dominance.

- Conducting corridor studies to plan for and implement Complete Streets.

- Would like to explore whether new development can ‘bank’ mitigation fees to accumulate $$ to implement Complete Streets.

- Public perception of traffic flow and lack of local examples that prove traffic still flows (even with traffic calming)

- Money