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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM #</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+1.</td>
<td>APPROVE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**APPROVAL OF THE MAY 4, 2012, MEETING MINUTES**

The Regional Planning Committee (RPC) is requested to review and approve the minutes from its meeting on May 4, 2012.

**2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS**

Members of the public shall have the opportunity to address the RPC on any issue within the jurisdiction of the Committee that is not on this agenda. Anyone desiring to speak shall reserve time by completing a “Request to Speak” form and giving it to the Clerk prior to speaking. Public speakers should notify the Clerk if they have a handout for distribution to Committee members. Public speakers are limited to three minutes or less per person. Committee members also may provide information and announcements under this agenda item.

**CHAIR’S REPORTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>+3.</th>
<th>INFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**SANDAG BOARD ACTION ON PROPOSED APPROACH TO UPDATE THE REGIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN (Carolina Gregor)**

At the last Regional Planning Committee meeting, staff presented a proposed approach to integrate the Regional Comprehensive Plan update with the development of the next SANDAG Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy. At its meeting on May 24, 2012, the SANDAG Board of Directors approved this approach. The Board report is attached for information purposes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>+4.</th>
<th>INFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**COORDINATION WITH CALIFORNIA HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT (Coleen Clementson)**

SANDAG was recently invited by the California Department of Housing and Community Development to participate in a Focus Group to provide input on streamlining the Housing Element process. The first meeting was held on May 15, 2012. Staff will report on the meeting and anticipated next steps.
5. **REGIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN: 2010-2011 BIENNIAL PERFORMANCE MONITORING REPORT (Christine Eary)**

Monitoring progress in implementing the Regional Comprehensive Plan occurs on a biennial basis. The Regional Planning Committee is asked to accept and authorize release of the draft “Regional Comprehensive Plan: 2010-2011 Biennial Performance Monitoring Report” for public review and comment. At its next meeting, the Committee will be asked to recommend that the Board accept the report.

6. **PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT METHODS: BEST PRACTICES FROM COMMUNITY-BASED ORGANIZATIONS (Jane Clough and CBO Representatives)**

In preparation for the next round of regional planning programs, SANDAG contracted with five community-based organizations (CBOs) that participated in the preparation of the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS) to share their best practices for public participation and outreach methods to Communities of Concern. Representatives from several of the CBOs will highlight outreach techniques that they have found successful in engaging their communities in various efforts, including in the RTP/SCS. These suggested techniques will be evaluated by SANDAG staff, and in combination with additional sources of information, assembled into a resource guide. The resource guide will be used to support the Public Involvement Program for upcoming regional planning efforts such as the update of the Regional Comprehensive Plan, Regional Transportation Plan, and Sustainable Communities Strategy.

7. **INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION ON 2-1-1 SAN DIEGO (John Ohanian, Chief Executive Officer)**

2-1-1 San Diego is a resource and information hub that connects people with community, health, and disaster services through a free 24/7 stigma-free confidential phone service and searchable on-line database. 2-1-1 serves the entire population of the County. By dialing 2-1-1, clients are linked to a live, highly-trained Client Service Representative who will navigate them through their situations by assessing their needs and then matching them to the best and closest resource in their community. Assistance is confidential and offered in more than 150 languages. 2-1-1 provides a wide range of immediate resources to local individuals and families. A presentation will be made. Here is a link to the annual report which can also be found on the 2-1-1 Web site at www.211sandiego.org.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM #</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>HIGHLIGHTING SMART GROWTH: SAN MARCOS GENERAL PLAN UPDATE (Karen Brindley, Principal Planner, City of San Marcos) INFORMATION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The RPC periodically receives reports about smart growth efforts happening around the region. In February 2012, the City of San Marcos adopted its General Plan update. City staff will make a presentation on the content and process of the General Plan update.

9.    | UPCOMING MEETINGS INFORMATION |

The next meeting of the RPC is scheduled for Friday, July 6, 2012.

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

1. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES (APPROVE)
   Action: Upon a motion by Supervisor Bill Horn (County of San Diego) and a second by Mayor Sam Abed (City of Escondido), the Regional Planning Committee (RPC) approved the minutes from the April 6, 2012, meeting.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS
   There were no public comments.

REPORTS (3 through 6)

3. PROPOSED COMMENTS ON THE SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC GENERAL RATE CASE (RECOMMEND)
   At its February 10, 2012, meeting the RPC asked for the Regional Energy Working Group (EWG) to assess the revised SDG&E application as it pertains to meeting regional solar energy goals and return with recommendations. The EWG recommends that the RPC recommend to the Board of Directors that SANDAG submit a letter to the Public Utilities Commission (PUC), during a public participation hearing in June, regarding the consistency of the SDG&E rate case application with the SANDAG Board-approved Regional Energy Strategy (RES) and Climate Action Strategy.

   Chair Janney introduced the item and speaker.

   Susan Freedman, Senior Regional Planner (SANDAG), provided the staff report, presented the item, and responded to questions.

   Action: Upon a motion by Supervisor Pam Slater-Price (County of San Diego) and a second by Jerry Jones, Mayor Pro Tem, Lemon Grove (East County), the RPC recommended that the SANDAG Board of Directors submit a letter in substantially the same form as Attachment 1, with the addition of a statement regarding SDG&E receiving credit for rooftop solar, to the California Public Utilities Commission, during a public participation hearing in June, regarding the consistency of the SDG&E rate case application with the SANDAG Board-approved RES and Climate Action Strategy. Chair Janney and Mayor Abed abstained.
4. REGIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ITEMS

A. DRAFT 2010-2011 REGIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN BIENNIAL PERFORMANCE MONITORING REPORT (ACCEPT)

Chair Janney announced that Item 4A was deferred.

In response to a question by Mayor Lesa Heebner, City of Solana Beach (North County Coastal), Carolina Gregor, Senior Regional Planner (SANDAG), clarified that the Draft 2010-2011 RCP Biennial Performance Monitoring Report had several errors and would be revised and brought back to the RPC next month.

B. PROPOSED APPROACH TO UPDATE THE REGIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN (DISCUSSION)

Based on input from the SANDAG Board, the RPC, the TWG, and community-based organizations involved in the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS), as well as on staff analysis, staff proposes that the RCP update be integrated with the development of SANDAG’s next RTP/SCS. The Committee’s input, as well as comments from the TWG (to be solicited at its May 10 meeting), will be relayed to the Board later this month for discussion and possible action.

Chair Janney introduced the item and speaker.

Carolina Gregor, Senior Regional Planner (SANDAG), presented the item and responded to questions.

Action: This item was presented for discussion only.

5. INTEGRATING TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT INTO THE PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT PROCESS (INFORMATION)

iCommute is the Transportation Demand Management (TDM) division of SANDAG. iCommute staff presented the draft of “Integrating Transportation Demand Management Into the Planning and Development Process - A Reference for Cities.” This document will serve as a resource for interested jurisdictions to proactively incorporate TDM strategies into local plans and programs, and will become part of the Smart Growth Tool Kit. This was presented to the RPC as an information item; the Transportation Committee is anticipated to take action on this report this spring.

Chair Janney introduced the item and speaker.

Antoinette Meier, Associate Transportation Planner (SANDAG), presented the item and responded to questions.

Action: This item was presented for information only.
6. HIGHLIGHTING SMART GROWTH: VISTA GENERAL PLAN UPDATE (INFORMATION)

The RPC periodically receives reports about smart growth efforts happening around the region. In February 2012, the City of Vista adopted its General Plan update. The Director of Community Development and Engineering from the City of Vista provided a presentation regarding the General Plan update content and process.

Chair Janney introduced item and the speaker.

John Conley, Director of Community Development and Engineering (City of Vista), provided a brief update on the City of Vista adopted General Plan content and process.

Action: This item was presented for information only.

7. UPCOMING MEETINGS

The next meeting of the RPC is scheduled for Friday, June 1, 2012.

8. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Janney adjourned the meeting at 1:29 p.m.
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PROPOSED APPROACH TO UPDATE THE REGIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

Introduction

In 2004, the SANDAG Board of Directors adopted the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) for the San Diego region. Since its adoption, the RCP has been used extensively. Most recently, it has been used to provide policy guidance for the preparation of the last two regional transportation plans and has been instrumental in shaping the region’s first-ever “Sustainable Communities Strategy,” which was adopted by the SANDAG Board in October 2011 as part of the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (2050 RTP/SCS) in accordance with Senate Bill 375 (SB 375) (Steinberg, 2008).

A process to scope the RCP update was initiated late last year. A key question in the scoping process has been whether the update should be more comprehensive or more technical in nature. As part of this process, the SANDAG Board discussed topics related to the RCP update at its Board Retreat and provided input through individual meetings with SANDAG staff; the Regional Planning Committee and the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG) provided initial input at recent meetings; ideas were solicited from several community-based organizations (CBOs) that participated in the development of the 2050 RTP/SCS; and staff exchanged preliminary ideas with the other major metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs) in California to help define the evolving relationship between existing regional blueprint plans (such as the RCP in the San Diego region) and the newly adopted RTP/SCS.

Based on the combined input and on additional staff analysis regarding timelines, staff resources, and additional efficiencies, an approach is presented today for the Board’s discussion and action. This proposed approach, which is to integrate the development of the RCP update and next RTP/SCS, received support from both the Regional Planning Committee and the TWG based on discussion at their May 4 and May 10, 2012, meetings, respectively.

Background

Reasons for Preparing the Original RCP, and Related State Legislation

SANDAG started preparing the RCP in 2002 based upon the desire of the region’s policymakers to define a vision and lay out long-term goals and recommended actions for the region in areas ranging from urban form, housing, and transportation to public facilities, infrastructure.

Recommendation

The Board of Directors is asked to approve the integration of the Regional Comprehensive Plan update with the development of the next SANDAG Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy.
investments, and border issues. In 2003, Assembly Bill 361 (AB 361) (Kehoe, 2003) included language requiring the preparation and adoption of the RCP.\footnote{PUC Section 132360. (a) It is the intent of the Legislature that the consolidated agency [SANDAG] complete a public process by June 30, 2004, to prepare and adopt a regional comprehensive plan based on the local general and regional plans that integrates land uses, transportation systems, infrastructure needs, and public investment strategies, within a regional framework, in cooperation with member agencies and the public.} AB 361 also required the RCP to be updated as necessary and in an iterative manner with the development of SANDAG regional transportation plans, so that evolving RCP policies could inform and influence transportation planning in the region.\footnote{PUC Section 132360.2 The regional transportation plan and the regional comprehensive plan should be compatible. The regional comprehensive plan should set the framework for the type of changes upon which subsequent regional transportation plans should focus.}

RCP Accomplishments

While SB 375 requires the development of an SCS, SANDAG’s work on enhancing the link between land use and transportation issues began years earlier through the RCP, which is based on principles of smart growth and sustainable development. For example, RCP implementation has resulted in the development of the Smart Growth Concept Map, Smart Growth Visual Simulations, TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program, TransNet Environmental Mitigation Program, Smart Growth Design Guidelines, Trip Generation Rates, Parking Strategies, Regional Housing Needs Assessment, Climate Action Strategy, regional growth forecasting process, performance monitoring assessments, and other related programs, which when combined, served as important inputs into the 2050 RTP/SCS.

In addition, the RCP has provided policy guidance for the region’s search for additional stable sources of infrastructure funding (such as a potential “Quality of Life” initiative); funding from state and federal agencies (including the Healthy Works pass-through grants); the framework for collaboration with Tribal Nations, surrounding counties, and Baja California, Mexico; and the context for collaboration with partner agencies, such as the San Diego County Water Authority, the Department of Defense, Caltrans, the transit agencies, the Port District, and others. Attachments 1 and 2 provide additional background on the RCP.

Changes since the Plan’s Adoption

While the RCP’s contributions have been significant, much has changed since the plan’s adoption in 2004. In particular, the data in the RCP is about a decade old; SANDAG has adopted many other regional plans/programs (including the 2050 RTP/SCS, the Climate Action Strategy, the Regional Economic Prosperity Strategy, etc.); and various issues have emerged where policy guidance is needed (including the economic downturn, the loss of redevelopment in California, and a growing emphasis on public health and social equity, among others). In addition, and perhaps most significantly, the RCP was prepared and adopted before the State of California began addressing climate change from a legislative perspective through Assembly Bill 32 (AB 32) (Nunez, 2006) and SB 375. SB 375, in particular, required MPOs in California to meet specific greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reduction targets established by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) as part of the regional transportation planning process. So, while the RCP includes policies and actions related to sustainability, it does not include specific GHG emission reduction targets and analysis, like the 2050 RTP/SCS.
Proposed Work Program to Merge the Two Documents

Integrating the development of the RCP and RTP/SCS would result in one clearly defined, overarching regional planning document for the San Diego region that addresses regional objectives contained in the RCP and meets statewide GHG emission reduction requirements, as well as other state and federal laws. One regional planning document is likely to be more understandable and relevant to the public than trying to understand multiple documents and how they relate to one another. In addition, because the time that the public is willing to participate is limited, consolidating these efforts into one planning process could result in more successful public engagement.

From a logistical and workload point of view, merging the two documents could take place through five general steps, with each step resulting in information or policies that could be considered for incorporation into the combined document. The proposed steps would include:

1. A technical update of the data in the RCP;
2. Work on the 2050 RTP/SCS implementation actions and RCP-related commitments;
3. Policy-level discussions on additional areas that have emerged since 2004 through a “white paper” approach similar to that used during the development of the 2050 RTP/SCS;
4. An extensive public participation and outreach process that clearly defines timeframes and processes by which the general public, local jurisdictions, CBOs, partner agencies, and interested stakeholders can meaningfully participate in the planning process; and
5. Development of a combined plan, which incorporates updates of the RTP/SCS and the RCP.

The resulting new merged plan would serve as the predominant long-term land use and transportation planning document for the region. It would be renamed with a broader title, but would still include subtitles referencing its multiple roles as the Regional Comprehensive Plan, Regional Transportation Plan, and Sustainable Communities Strategy, per legal and statutory requirements (described further below).

Potential Benefits and Challenges of Integrating the RCP Update with the Next RTP/SCS

Consolidating SANDAG’s major regional planning efforts into one comprehensive document would provide an opportunity for the agency to better communicate to the public the regional vision, and how transportation and land use planning are key elements to implementing that vision. This approach could be thought of as an “SCS Plus” type of methodology, as it would expand the topics in the current SCS chapter of the 2050 RTP/SCS to reflect the broader array of topics contained in the RCP. For reference purposes, Attachment 3 provides a content comparison of the topics included in the RCP and the SCS chapter. Potential benefits and challenges include:

Consistent Data

The data included in the RCP was collected in the early 2000s timeframe, and the projections used in the RCP were based on the 2030 Regional Growth Forecast. The data included in the 2050 RTP/SCS was collected in the 2008-2010 timeframe, and the projections were based on the 2050 Regional Growth Forecast. Potential benefits of merging the two planning efforts would be a consistent set
of data and projections, with no timeframe differences, and more time to coordinate the preparation and adoption of the combined plan.

2050 RTP/SCS Implementation Activities and RCP-Related Commitments

The 2050 RTP/SCS contains a number of implementation actions and commitments, many of which also would be relevant to the RCP update. If prepared as separate stand-alone documents, many of these work elements would have required duplicative processes to incorporate the work into both documents. Potential benefits of merging the two planning efforts would be additional time, where necessary, to complete these actions for incorporation into the combined document, and avoidance of duplication in the planning process. The following is a list of the various implementation actions that would be common to both the RCP update and the next RTP/SCS:

- Comprehensive Public Outreach and Involvement
- Social Equity and Environmental Justice Analysis and Outreach
- Model Enhancements to Support Regional Planning Activities
- Series 13 2050 Regional Growth Forecast Update
- Alternative Land Use and Transportation Scenarios that could further Reduce GHG Emissions, including Potential Parking Strategies
- Regional Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Strategy, including Comprehensive Update to Smart Growth Concept Map
- Regional Complete Streets Policy
- Advance Planning for the 2050 Transit Plan
- Safe Routes to Transit Strategy
- Active Transportation Early Action Program (EAP)
- Bicycle Plan EAP
- Transportation Demand and System Management Initiatives
- Public Health Policy Framework and Analysis
- Performance Monitoring for the RCP and the 2050 RTP/SCS

Additional Emerging Areas

A number of additional areas have emerged since 2004 that were not addressed in the original RCP. These emerging areas also are relevant to the next RTP/SCS because of the growing connections between land use and transportation in our region and throughout the state and the nation. Discussions with the Board, RPC, TWG, and CBOs have yielded the following emerging topics for possible consideration.
• Economic strategies for the San Diego region
• Infrastructure and affordable housing financing in urban areas without redevelopment tools in California
• Expanded social equity and environmental justice analysis and outreach
• Public health planning strategies
• Coordination of transportation infrastructure related to colleges and universities
• Coordination of military issues
• Emerging energy technologies
• Technological advances that support transportation choices
• Effects of changing demographics on transportation needs
• Water and wastewater issues
• Interjurisdictional / subregional planning and coordination issues

Potential benefits of merging the two documents would be an integrated scoping process to refine the list of emerging areas that should be addressed in SANDAG regional plans, reduced duplication/processing of the white papers, and more efficient use of time by the SANDAG Board, Policy Advisory Committees, working groups, staff, and interested stakeholders.

Public Participation and Outreach Strategy

Other potential benefits of merging the two planning processes would be efficiencies gained in public participation and outreach. Because the subject areas of both plans are interrelated, it is likely that there would be significant overlap of participants in workshops or other outreach activities for the two separate planning processes. In addition, all fact sheets, Web site updates, visualization tools, interactive participation mechanisms, translations, marketing tools, or other public engagement tools could be made consistent and more comprehensive by the integration of the two planning efforts.

Potential challenges include fatigue and/or confusion by stakeholders due to the lengthened planning timeframe, and the possibility that stakeholders or members of the public that gain interest in the middle or toward the end of the process might feel like they have been excluded from participating in earlier phases of the plan’s development. Ways of addressing these challenges would be to provide a well-organized public participation and outreach process that clearly defines timeframes and processes by which the general public, local jurisdictions, CBOs, partner agencies, and interested stakeholders can meaningfully participate in the process, and build specific “feedback loops” into the planning process to ensure that topics are revisited at key milestones to provide additional opportunities for public input.
Loss of the “Stand-Alone” RCP, which is Highly Referenced throughout SANDAG Documents and Codified into Sections of the Public Utilities Code

The RCP is a well-established and highly referenced document not only at SANDAG but also in the TransNet Extension Ordinance, the Public Utilities Code (PUC), and in various RCP-related grants. For example, with regard to SANDAG documents, the RCP is repeatedly referenced in SANDAG Bylaws, Ordinances, and Board Policies, in the SANDAG Budget and Overall Work Program, in numerous planning and program-related documents that implement the RCP, on the SANDAG Web site, in the 2050 RTP/SCS, in documents that resulted from the RCP (such as the Smart Growth Design Guidelines, the Smart Growth Trip Generation Rates, the RCP Performance Monitoring Report, etc.), and in SANDAG fact sheets. The TransNet Extension Ordinance references the RCP in multiple locations, including text regarding funding of infrastructure to support development in smart growth opportunity areas consistent with the RCP. With regard to state law, AB 361 (Kehoe, 2003) requires SANDAG to prepare the RCP, conduct performance monitoring for the plan, and periodically update the plan, and such language is codified into PUC sections (for example, PUC Section 132360, stating that the RCP “should be updated as necessary for the consolidated agency to comply with Section 132360.2”). The RCP also is referenced in numerous grants, including some that are still in effect.

One potential challenge of integrating the RCP update with the next RTP/SCS is the possibility of rendering these RCP references as outdated, and/or raising the question of the validity of these provisions if SANDAG no longer has a stand-alone RCP. To address this issue, the agency would need to provide a clear understanding of how the RCP has evolved from a stand-alone document into a merged document. The RTP/SCS/RCP combined document should include an explicit reference to the RCP, in the form of a subtitle, or other obvious mechanism related to the title, to support this transition to a new merged document.

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)

From the standpoint of producing and certifying an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) based on CEQA requirements, there are several benefits and challenges. It is, in fact, possible to produce a programmatic EIR that could collectively cover the topics of a combined RTP/SCS/RCP. It is important to note that all environmental documents are subject to potential litigation, and it is not possible to foresee all of the potential issues that may arise in the future with regard to choosing to produce a separate EIR for a stand-alone RCP or a combined EIR for the next RTP/SCS/RCP. It is clear, however, that the scope of an EIR for a combined RTP/SCS/RCP would take additional time, effort, and cost. This has the potential to result in an increased risk of litigation based upon the fact that the EIR would include more substance for any potential litigant to consider. However, any added risk would not be expected to exceed the risk of producing a separate EIR for a stand-alone RCP.

In looking at the potential benefits of a combined EIR for the next RTP/SCS/RCP, the combined EIR would provide the public with one comprehensive document that analyzes potential impacts associated with all of SANDAG’s major long-range planning efforts. Additionally, SANDAG anticipates the combined effort should provide some cost-savings based upon efficiencies associated with not having to duplicate efforts by preparing two separate EIRs.
Length of Document and Consistent Level of Detail among the Chapters

Currently, the RCP includes detailed information on a variety of topics. One potential challenge is that the combined document could be fairly lengthy. SANDAG will be challenged to ensure that a consistent level of detail is reflected throughout the document, among the various topics. Possible ways of addressing this issue would include the use of white papers, which could include more detail than the level of detail ultimately incorporated into the final combined plan, or through a series of technical appendices, similar to those included as part of the 2050 RTP/SCS.

Next Steps

If the SANDAG Board approves of the proposed approach of merging the RCP update with the next RTP/SCS, staff would draft a comprehensive scope of work and public participation strategy for the combined plan. The updated scope and public participation strategy would be presented for additional input to the Regional Planning and Transportation Committees, the TWG, the Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC), and the CBOs, and ultimately to the SANDAG Board for approval. The following is a proposed timeline by fiscal year to be accompanied by comprehensive public involvement throughout the planning process should the proposal move forward:

- Remainder of FY 2012 and FY 2013: Develop scope of work and public involvement program for combined plan; conduct work on emerging areas; and initiate work on alternative land use and transportation scenarios, regional complete streets strategy, and regional TOD strategy

- FY 2014: Complete model updates; finalize Series 13 2050 Regional Growth Forecast Update; and complete alternative land use and transportation scenarios, regional complete streets strategy, and regional TOD strategy for incorporation into combined plan

- FY 2015: Develop combined plan and EIR; solicit public comments on combined plan and EIR

- FY 2016: Finalize/approve combined plan and adopt/certify final EIR (target adoption date per federal RTP requirements: July 2015)

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Attachments: 1. RCP Fact Sheet
               2. RCP Vision, Core Values, Chapters, and Framework for Action
               3. Content Comparison RCP and Sustainable Communities Strategy Chapter

Key Staff Contact: Carolina Gregor, (619) 699-1989, Carolina.Gregor@sandag.org
Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) Fact Sheet

Our Vision. Our Future.
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 through 2030. It defines a vision and lays out goals, key issues, and needed actions in areas ranging from urban form (where and how the region should grow) 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. It is based on principles of smart growth and sustainable development.

Each jurisdiction makes its own decisions regarding land use. The RCP looks at these individual decisions; assesses their collective impacts; examines cumulative development trends; and provides a blueprint for where and how we want to grow. The plan emphasizes the critical link between land use planning, which tends to happen locally, and transportation planning, which often happens regionally. It calls for focusing transportation and other infrastructure investments in “smart growth opportunity areas,” introducing an incentive-based approach to meeting our goals and infrastructure needs.

While the plan focuses mostly on geographic areas inside our region, it also looks beyond our borders to neighboring areas, such as Imperial, Orange, and Riverside Counties, Baja California, Mexico, and local Native American tribal land. In addition, the RCP addresses equity in our planning processes: do all communities have access to the region’s resources? And do all residents have an equal opportunity to participate in the process? In addition, the RCP calls for monitoring the region’s progress.

Changes Since 2004
Citizens, elected officials, regional infrastructure providers, and other stakeholders worked with SANDAG to prepare the RCP from 2002 to 2004. Much has happened since the plan’s adoption, including:

- The passage of new statewide regulations on greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reductions;
- An economic recession;
- The preparation of a new regional growth forecast through 2050, incorporating updated local land use plans that include more smart growth than previous forecasts;
- Adoption of the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS);
- An emerging focus on public health; and
- An evolving emphasis on social equity.

All of this, as well as commitments made by the SANDAG Board upon adoption of the 2050 RTP/SCS, has resulted in the need to update key components of the RCP in preparation for the next RTP/SCS.

(Continued on reverse)
RCP Accomplishments
Since adopting the RCP in 2004, SANDAG has worked hard to implement the plan. Major accomplishments include:

» The Smart Growth Concept Map (based on input from the 18 cities and county), which serves as the land use element of the RCP and shows over 200 existing, planned, and potential areas eligible to compete for smart growth incentive funds in the region;

» The Smart Growth Toolbox, which includes 11 visual simulations around the region, the Smart Growth Photo Library, Smart Growth Trip Generation Rates, Smart Growth Parking Study, and Smart Growth Design Guidelines;

» The TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program, which, when combined with previous funding, has provided almost $35 million for capital improvements and planning grants for projects to date, and is estimated to provide $4 million to $5 million per year between now and 2048;

» The TransNet/Transportation Development Act (TDA) Active Transportation Program, which has provided almost $25 million to 109 bike, pedestrian, and traffic calming projects and plans to date, and is estimated to provide $8 million to $10 million per year between now and 2048;

» The TransNet Environmental Mitigation Program, which has resulted in the acquisition of 20 properties totaling over 2,300 acres of habitat to date that help implement the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) and the Multiple Habitat Conservation Program (MHCP). About $850 million are set aside for environmental mitigation through 2048 as part of the TransNet program;

» Leveraged funding for SANDAG and local jurisdiction planning efforts from state and federal agencies, including Proposition 1C and Proposition 84 funds;

» The smart growth policy framework for local general and specific plan updates and their incorporation into SANDAG regional growth forecasts;

» Important policy guidance for the development of the 2050 RTP/SCS;

» The adoption of the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) allocations for local jurisdictions, which balance affordable housing throughout the region; and

» The release of the RCP Baseline Monitoring Report in 2006 and subsequent monitoring reports to track RCP implementation.

These accomplishments show that having a RCP in place has helped our region work together toward common goals and successfully compete for state and federal dollars.

For More Information
To learn more about the RCP, visit www.sandag.org/rcp.
Regional Comprehensive Plan
Vision, Core Values, Chapters, and Framework for Action

In 2004, the SANDAG Board of Directors unanimously adopted the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) for the San Diego region. The RCP serves as the strategic planning framework for the region and sets forth a shared vision and core values for a healthy environment, a vibrant economy, and a high quality of life for all residents. The following sections summarize the RCP’s regional vision, core values, chapters, and framework for action.

Regional Vision:

“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.”

Core Values:

1. Urban Form
   - Livable, walkable, safe, and healthy neighborhoods that include a mix of housing, parks, schools, jobs, health care facilities, child care facilities, and shopping;
   - Redevelopment and infill in urban areas along transit corridors to promote sustainable growth;
   - A variety of housing and transportation choices at various price ranges;
   - Preserved and maintained open spaces, rural communities, and agricultural areas; and
   - Accessibility and a barrier-free physical environment for all.

2. Transportation
   - A transportation system that better links jobs, homes, and major activity centers; enables more people to walk, bike, and use transit; efficiently transports goods; and provides effective transportation options for people of all ages and abilities.

3. Housing
   - More apartments, condominiums, mixed-use housing, and single-family homes in all price ranges; and closer to jobs, transit, shopping, and recreation centers.

4. Environment
   - A sustainable region with healthy ecosystems and environmentally friendly development;
   - Clean water, air, soils, water bodies, and coastlines; and healthy beaches; and
   - Protected open space and habitat conservation systems; and preserved natural topography.
5. **Economic Prosperity**

- A balanced variety of jobs with competitive wages; and
- Education and training opportunities for the local workforce to meet the demand for these jobs, helping to ensure a rising standard of living.

6. **Public Facilities**

- Infrastructure systems that work for all residents in the region;
- Energy self-sufficiency;
- A diverse water supply that meets the region’s needs, respects the environment, and emphasizes conservation and efficiency;
- Access to healthcare and social services; and
- Good, safe schools for our children that provide a quality education and serve as focal points for our neighborhoods.

7. **Binational and Interregional Coordination**

- A region that recognizes its unique status as an international border community, embraces ethnic and cultural diversity, and promotes a wide variety of cultural resources; and
- Cooperative planning and coordination among local jurisdictions within the region, and with our local school districts, our Native American tribal governments, our neighboring counties, Mexico, and our military communities.

8. **Effective and Responsible Planning and Implementation**

- Broader public participation in the planning process and allocation of resources; and
- A fiscal structure that provides an equitable distribution of burdens and benefits, promotes efficient resource use, and provides clear incentives for achieving plan goals.

**RCP Chapters:**

1. Introduction: What is the Regional Comprehensive Plan?
2. Our Regional Vision and Core Values – Defining Where We Want to Go
3. Overview of the San Diego Region – Current Conditions and Future Trends
4. Regional Planning and Policy Framework – A Preferred Approach for our Regional Growth
   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
   f) Public Facilities – Strengthening the Social and Physical Infrastructure of our Communities
5. Borders – Forging a Better Future with our Neighbors

6. Social Equity and Environmental Justice Assessment – Fair Planning and Development for All Communities

7. Integrated Regional Infrastructure Strategy (IRIS) – Ensuring the Foundation of our Vision for the Future

8. Performance Monitoring – Measuring our Progress

9. Implementation – Translating the Vision into Action

A Regional Framework for Local Action:

Recognizing that each jurisdiction in the region makes its own decisions regarding land use, the RCP sets forth a preferred planning concept and action framework that emphasizes:

1. Improving connections between land use and transportation plans using smart growth principles;

2. Using land use and transportation plans to guide decisions regarding environmental and public facility investments; and

3. Focusing on collaboration and incentives to achieve regional goals and objectives.

The plan provides a broad context in which local and regional decisions can be made that move the region toward a sustainable future. The RCP is available on the SANDAG Web site at www.sandag.org/rcp.
Content Comparison of the Regional Comprehensive Plan and the Sustainable Communities Strategy Chapter

This table compares the content of the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) (adopted by SANDAG in 2004), and the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) chapter of the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (2050 RTP/SCS) (adopted by SANDAG in 2011). The SCS was required per Senate Bill SB 375 (Steinberg, 2008) as an element of the RTP. The SCS chapter was based in large part on policies contained in the RCP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RCP</th>
<th>SCS Chapter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Regional Vision and Core Values</td>
<td>• Land Use/Transportation Connection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Current Conditions and Future Trends</td>
<td>• Land Use Patterns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Regional Planning and Policy Framework and Preferred Planning Concept</td>
<td>• Resource Areas and Farmland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Urban Form</td>
<td>• Transportation Network that Provides Transportation Options and Reduces GHG Emissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Transportation</td>
<td>• TDM Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Housing</td>
<td>• TSM Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Healthy Environment</td>
<td>• Pricing Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Habitat</td>
<td>• Meeting GHG Targets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Air Quality</td>
<td>• Social Equity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Water Quality</td>
<td>• Energy Consumption and GHG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Beaches</td>
<td>• Air Quality (Federal Requirements)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Economic Prosperity*</td>
<td>• Climate Change Impacts and Adaptation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Public Facilities</td>
<td>• Public Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Water Supply</td>
<td>• Promoting Sustainability through Incentives and Collaboration (SANDAG Policies and Programs that support the SCS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Energy</td>
<td>• LAFCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Waste Management</td>
<td>• CEQA Streamlining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Parks, Libraries, Police, Fire, Hospitals</td>
<td>• Parks and Open Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Borders</td>
<td>• Performance Monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Access to Jobs and Housing</td>
<td>• Implementation - Collaboration, Incentives, Strategic Initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Transportation</td>
<td>• Social Equity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Energy and Water Supply</td>
<td>• Energy Consumption and GHG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Environment</td>
<td>• Air Quality (Federal Requirements)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Economic Development*</td>
<td>• Climate Change Impacts and Adaptation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Homeland Security*</td>
<td>• Public Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Social Equity and Environmental Justice Assessment</td>
<td>• Promoting Sustainability through Incentives and Collaboration (SANDAG Policies and Programs that support the SCS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Integrated Regional Infrastructure Strategy (IRIS)</td>
<td>• LAFCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Transportation</td>
<td>• CEQA Streamlining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Water Supply</td>
<td>• Parks and Open Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Wastewater</td>
<td>• Performance Monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Stormwater</td>
<td>• Implementation - Collaboration, Incentives, Strategic Initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Solid Waste</td>
<td>• Social Equity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Energy</td>
<td>• Energy Consumption and GHG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Education</td>
<td>• Air Quality (Federal Requirements)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Borders</td>
<td>• Climate Change Impacts and Adaptation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Access to Jobs and Housing</td>
<td>• Public Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Transportation</td>
<td>• Promoting Sustainability through Incentives and Collaboration (SANDAG Policies and Programs that support the SCS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Energy and Water Supply</td>
<td>• LAFCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Environment</td>
<td>• CEQA Streamlining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Economic Development*</td>
<td>• Parks and Open Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Homeland Security*</td>
<td>• Performance Monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Social Equity and Environmental Justice Assessment</td>
<td>• Implementation - Collaboration, Incentives, Strategic Initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Integrated Regional Infrastructure Strategy (IRIS)</td>
<td>• Social Equity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Transportation</td>
<td>• Energy Consumption and GHG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Water Supply</td>
<td>• Air Quality (Federal Requirements)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Wastewater</td>
<td>• Climate Change Impacts and Adaptation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Stormwater</td>
<td>• Public Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Solid Waste</td>
<td>• Promoting Sustainability through Incentives and Collaboration (SANDAG Policies and Programs that support the SCS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Energy</td>
<td>• LAFCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Education</td>
<td>• CEQA Streamlining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Borders</td>
<td>• Parks and Open Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Access to Jobs and Housing</td>
<td>• Performance Monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Transportation</td>
<td>• Implementation - Collaboration, Incentives, Strategic Initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Energy and Water Supply</td>
<td>• Social Equity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Environment</td>
<td>• Energy Consumption and GHG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Economic Development*</td>
<td>• Air Quality (Federal Requirements)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Homeland Security*</td>
<td>• Climate Change Impacts and Adaptation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Social Equity and Environmental Justice Assessment</td>
<td>• Public Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Integrated Regional Infrastructure Strategy (IRIS)</td>
<td>• Promoting Sustainability through Incentives and Collaboration (SANDAG Policies and Programs that support the SCS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Transportation</td>
<td>• LAFCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Water Supply</td>
<td>• CEQA Streamlining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Wastewater</td>
<td>• Parks and Open Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Stormwater</td>
<td>• Performance Monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Solid Waste</td>
<td>• Implementation - Collaboration, Incentives, Strategic Initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Energy</td>
<td>• Social Equity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Education</td>
<td>• Energy Consumption and GHG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Areas highlighted in yellow indicate common content in both the RCP and SCS chapter of the 2050 RTP/SCS. Areas followed by an asterisk (*) indicate topics discussed in other sections of the 2050 RTP/SCS beyond the SCS chapter.
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.

In September of 2010, the Board of Directors approved a new schedule for biennial reporting, and monitoring progress in implementing the RCP now occurs on a biennial basis. The attached 2010-2011 Biennial Performance Monitoring Report (Monitoring Report) represents the fourth RCP monitoring report since the Baseline Report was accepted by the SANDAG Board of Directors in October 2006.

Discussion

The Monitoring Report follows a similar format as previous years’ performance monitoring reports, and is the first report produced on a biennial basis. It sets forth results for the most recent two-year reporting period (which in most cases is calendar year 2011) and describes the data for the most recent years relative to trends observed in previous 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 2050 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy was adopted in October 2011, and work is now underway to identify potential new or revised indicators to monitor implementation. The new indicators could be incorporated into a future monitoring report.
2010-2011 Report Highlights

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

Moving in the Right Direction

- Air quality continues to improve.
- The regional crime rate continues to decrease.
- Water consumption continues to decrease.
- The diversity of our water supply has increased.
- The share of energy produced from renewable resources continues to increase.

Areas for Improvement

- Beach widths continued to decrease since 2008.
- Per capita peak demand for electricity, and electricity consumption has slowly increased.

It should be noted that a number of indicators are likely demonstrating the effects of the economic recession. For example, there appears to be reductions in travel volumes across the board, likely due in part to the recession, and in part due to increased investment in infrastructure and TDM programs. This may have resulted in reduced border wait times, and shorter travel times in some corridors. Additionally, the regional poverty rate has continued to increase.

Next Steps

Upon the Regional Planning Committee’s action today, the public comment period would extend from June 1 to June 22, 2012. The report will be posted on-line at www.sandag.org/rcp and copies will be made available in the SANDAG Public Information Office (PIO). The report will be presented to the Regional Planning Technical Working Group on June 14, 2012, for additional review and comment. Once the public comment period closes, the final report will be prepared and presented to the Regional Planning Committee on July 6, 2012, for a recommendation to the SANDAG Board of Directors for consideration and acceptance as the 2010-2011 Biennial RCP Performance Monitoring Report.

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


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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BOARD OF DIRECTORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF CARLSBAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Matt Hall, Mayor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) Hon. Ann Kulchin, Mayor Pro Tem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) Hon. Farrah Douglas, Councilmember</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY OF CHULA VISTA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Cheryl Cox, Mayor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) Hon. Pamela Benoucousan, Councilmember</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) Hon. Rudy Ramirez, Councilmember</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY OF CORONADO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Carrie Downey, Councilmember</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) Hon. Al Ovrom, Mayor Pro Tem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) Hon. Michael Wolwode, Councilmember</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY OF DEL MAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
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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 2010-2011 RCP Biennial Performance Monitoring Report (2010-2011 Monitoring Report) is the fourth since the Baseline Report was accepted by the Board in October 2006.

The 2010-2011 Monitoring Report includes the most recent data available for each indicator, typically from either 2010 or 2011. 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 2010-2011 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 regional crime rate continues to decrease.
- Air quality continues to improve.
- Water consumption continues to decrease.
- The diversity of our water supply has increased.
- The share of energy produced from renewable resources continues to increase.
- The percent of solid waste that is recycled continues to increase.

**Areas for Improvement**

- Beach widths continued to decrease since 2008.
- Per capita peak demand for electricity, and electricity consumption has slowly increased.

It should be noted that a number of indicators are likely demonstrating the effects of the economic recession. For example, there appear to be reductions in travel volumes across the board. In terms of vehicular traffic, volumes are likely to be down due in part to recession and in part due to increased investment in infrastructure and TDM programs.

In some issue areas, the impact of the economy has largely been negative. For example, the regional poverty rate has continued to increase.

Throughout the 2010-11 Monitoring Report, indicator data are in certain cases related to growth in population, housing, or jobs, as shown in Table 1.
Table 1
Population, Housing Units, and Job Growth in the San Diego Region, 2000 to 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Percent Change 2000-2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>2,813,833</td>
<td>3,095,313</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Units</td>
<td>1,040,149</td>
<td>1,158,076</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wage &amp; Salary Jobs</td>
<td>1,205,700</td>
<td>1,299,800</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Census 2000; Census 2010; SANDAG Annual Population and Housing Estimates; California Employment Development Department. Does not include military and self-employed.

Some of the indicators included in this report use the American Community Survey (ACS) as their data source. The 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 nationally. 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. There are no new indicators for this reporting period.
## Biennial Indicators for Monitoring the Regional Comprehensive Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Share of new housing units and jobs located in Smart Growth Opportunity Areas</td>
<td>URBAN FORM AND TRANSPORTATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of new housing units within County Water Authority water service boundary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual transit ridership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commute mode shares</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel times and volumes for key transportation corridors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual hours of traffic delay per traveler</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional crime rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Opportunity Index</td>
<td>HOUSING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of households with housing costs greater than 35 percent of income</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio of new jobs to new housing units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of new and existing housing units by structure type and income category</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacancy rates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of households living in overcrowded conditions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of households on the waiting list for Section 8 vouchers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat conserved within designated preserve areas</td>
<td>HEALTHY ENVIRONMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of preserve areas actively maintained</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of beach mile closure days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impaired waterbodies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach widths</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor force educational attainment</td>
<td>ECONOMIC PROSPERITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment growth in high-wage economic clusters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional unemployment rate compared to California and the United States</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real per capita income compared to California and the United States</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional poverty rate compared to California and the United States</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water consumption</td>
<td>PUBLIC FACILITIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity of water supply</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycled water use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy supply and use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share and types of energy produced from renewable resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per capital peak demand for electricity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity consumption by sector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural gas consumption by sector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of solid waste that is recycled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landfill space available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interregional traffic volumes into San Diego from surrounding counties and Baja California</td>
<td>BORDERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Border wait times</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in SENTRI Lanes</td>
<td></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

Data is limited for this indicator this year, due to the nature of the data source. Every ten years, SANDAG benchmarks its estimates program to the newly completed Census data, in this case, the 2010 Census. Therefore, reporting for this indicator will begin anew with each ten-year cycle. New housing unit and job data for the Smart Growth Opportunity Areas (SGOAs) are not comparable to data reported in prior reports. As a result, any changes in new housing units and/or jobs could reflect these changes rather than true increases or decreases in SGOAs.

At this time, there are only SGOA total housing unit and job data available for 2010. There were 233,190 housing units in SGOAs. This represents 20 percent of the region’s housing stock. There were 485,239 jobs in SGOAs, representing 35 percent of the region’s jobs. The next RCP Monitoring Report will update the share of new housing units indicator because there will be more than one data point to calculate new units.

The analysis below is from the last report:

While the total number of new housing units has decreased since 2006 with the downturn in the economy, the share of new units in SGOAs continues to increase, as shown in Figure 1. There were 8,600 new units in 2007-2008 and 5,109 new units in 2008-2009, 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.
Share of New Housing Units within County Water Authority Water Service Boundary

Again, due to SANDAG benchmarking its estimate program to the 2010 Census (see the indicator above), previous data are not comparable. As with the previous indicator, reporting for this indicator will refresh with each ten-year cycle. The 2010 estimates show 1,121,276 total housing units in San Diego County Water Authority (Water Authority) service boundaries, reflecting 97 percent of the region’s housing stock. The next report will update this indicator with the number of new units.

The analysis below is from the last report:

As shown in Figure 2, the number of new housing units in the 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.
Annual Transit Ridership

Regional transit ridership has fluctuated in recent years. Transit boarding increased dramatically between 2007 and 2009. The number of transit boardings decreased by 11 percent between 2009 and 2010. Boardings began to rise again in 2011. This variation in boardings may be a reflection of gas prices, which peaked in 2008 and began subsiding in 2009. In 2011, gas prices began climbing again, which also may be associated with that year’s boardings increase. Additionally, transit boardings may be down from 2009 because of the continued economic recession.

---

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 for primary mode of commute to work remains stable. While there appears to have been a slight increase in the share of workers who drove alone between 2008 and 2010, this change is not statistically significant. The number of commuters driving alone has remained stable since 2006. Alternative commute modes also remained stable since 2008, with no statistically significant changes.

Figure 4
Regional Commute Mode Shares, 2010

Source: American Community Survey, 1-Year Estimate. U.S. Census Bureau

Figure 5
Drive Alone Commute Mode Shares, 2000 to 2010

Source: American Community Survey, 1-Year Estimate. U.S. Census Bureau
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

2 Additionally, travel times and volumes reported for previous years in the 2008 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.
Travel times shown in Table 2 differ from those presented in the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) for the following reason:

- RTP travel times are model based, whereas the reported travel times represent actual observed data. RTP travel times represent “door-to-door” commute times that take into account road configuration, assigned traffic volume, and any intersection controls, 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.

Between 2006 and 2011, commute times decreased in most corridors.

**Table 2**

**Travel Times in Key Auto Corridors, 2005 to 2011**

<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</td>
<td>Oceanside to Downtown SD</td>
<td>SR 76 to Front St</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>Escondido to Downtown SD</td>
<td>SR 78 to A St via SR 163</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SR 78</td>
<td>Escondido to Carlsbad</td>
<td>I-5 to I-15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SR 94</td>
<td>El Cajon to Downtown SD</td>
<td>El Cajon Blvd to F St via SR 125/5R 94</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>El Cajon to Downtown SD</td>
<td>El Cajon Blvd to A St via SR 163</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>SR 52</td>
<td>Santee to Kearny Mesa</td>
<td>SR 125 to I-805</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>Mid-City to Sorrento Mesa</td>
<td>I-8 to I-5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>Chula Vista to Sorrento Mesa</td>
<td>SR 905 to Mira Mesa Blvd</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>Chula Vista to Downtown SD</td>
<td>SR 905 to F St via SR-94</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>San Ysidro to Downtown SD</td>
<td>SR 905 to 6th Ave</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>El Cajon to Sorrento Valley</td>
<td>El Cajon Blvd to Mira Mesa Blvd via I-80</td>
<td>29</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 8:00 a.m., and the p.m. peak period is based on a departure time of 5:00 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.
Map 1
Key Auto Corridor Travel Times, San Diego County, 2011
As shown in Table 3, travel volumes continued to fluctuate in 2011. Observed decreases in travel time and travel volume can potentially be attributed to a variety of factors, including the downturn of the economy and roadway construction efforts during the last several years focused on infrastructure improvements that address “severe congestion levels” - specific bottlenecks that cause an overall slowing of the system.

### Table 3
Travel Volumes in Key Auto Corridors, 2005 to 2011

<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>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I-5 Oceanside to Downtown SD</td>
<td>Carmel Valley Rd</td>
<td>108,100</td>
<td>98,100</td>
<td>93,100</td>
<td>93,200</td>
<td>96,600</td>
<td>96,200</td>
<td>98,300</td>
<td>84,800</td>
<td>85,600</td>
<td>84,600</td>
<td>83,100</td>
<td>85,300</td>
<td>86,700</td>
<td>86,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I-15 Escondido to Downtown SD</td>
<td>Poway Rd</td>
<td>97,000</td>
<td>99,300</td>
<td>114,100</td>
<td>113,500</td>
<td>115,600</td>
<td>108,300</td>
<td>107,800</td>
<td>113,700</td>
<td>114,300</td>
<td>114,600</td>
<td>95,300</td>
<td>106,500</td>
<td>103,800</td>
<td>101,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SR 78 Escondido to Carlsbad</td>
<td>Barham Rd/Woodland Pkwy</td>
<td>77,300</td>
<td>76,300</td>
<td>75,600</td>
<td>75,700</td>
<td>77,200</td>
<td>76,500</td>
<td>76,400</td>
<td>79,700</td>
<td>79,000</td>
<td>79,200</td>
<td>78,500</td>
<td>79,000</td>
<td>79,600</td>
<td>79,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SR 94 El Cajon to Downtown SD</td>
<td>Euclid Ave</td>
<td>75,500</td>
<td>81,600</td>
<td>81,000</td>
<td>79,500</td>
<td>79,300</td>
<td>79,800</td>
<td>78,800</td>
<td>77,200</td>
<td>77,600</td>
<td>77,000</td>
<td>76,600</td>
<td>77,300</td>
<td>76,100</td>
<td>76,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I-8 El Cajon to Downtown SD</td>
<td>Waring Rd</td>
<td>114,900</td>
<td>115,800</td>
<td>114,700</td>
<td>112,400</td>
<td>112,900</td>
<td>112,800</td>
<td>110,100</td>
<td>117,200</td>
<td>118,000</td>
<td>117,800</td>
<td>114,900</td>
<td>114,400</td>
<td>114,700</td>
<td>110,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>SR 52 Santee to Kearny Mesa</td>
<td>Santo Rd</td>
<td>39,200</td>
<td>39,100</td>
<td>40,600</td>
<td>39,900</td>
<td>38,900</td>
<td>44,800</td>
<td>49,200</td>
<td>39,500</td>
<td>39,300</td>
<td>33,400</td>
<td>33,800</td>
<td>30,700</td>
<td>44,300</td>
<td>48,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I-805 Mid-City to Sorrento Valley</td>
<td>Governor Dr</td>
<td>104,200</td>
<td>106,600</td>
<td>106,200</td>
<td>103,600</td>
<td>103,300</td>
<td>104,500</td>
<td>104,200</td>
<td>105,300</td>
<td>105,600</td>
<td>104,700</td>
<td>102,600</td>
<td>101,200</td>
<td>102,500</td>
<td>101,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I-805 Chula Vista to Sorrento Valley</td>
<td>Governor Dr</td>
<td>104,200</td>
<td>106,600</td>
<td>106,200</td>
<td>103,600</td>
<td>103,300</td>
<td>104,500</td>
<td>104,200</td>
<td>105,300</td>
<td>105,600</td>
<td>104,700</td>
<td>102,600</td>
<td>101,200</td>
<td>102,500</td>
<td>101,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I-805 Chula Vista to Downtown SD</td>
<td>NO SR 54</td>
<td>106,900</td>
<td>107,200</td>
<td>105,400</td>
<td>101,500</td>
<td>102,400</td>
<td>92,900</td>
<td>91,800</td>
<td>103,400</td>
<td>104,100</td>
<td>102,500</td>
<td>101,500</td>
<td>101,700</td>
<td>88,700</td>
<td>88,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I-5 San Ysidro to Downtown SD</td>
<td>24th St</td>
<td>83,200</td>
<td>87,400</td>
<td>79,200</td>
<td>75,800</td>
<td>76,000</td>
<td>77,500</td>
<td>76,200</td>
<td>89,900</td>
<td>93,900</td>
<td>79,700</td>
<td>73,000</td>
<td>73,800</td>
<td>74,800</td>
<td>73,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I-8 El Cajon to Sorrento Valley</td>
<td>Waring Rd</td>
<td>114,900</td>
<td>115,800</td>
<td>114,700</td>
<td>112,400</td>
<td>112,900</td>
<td>110,100</td>
<td>110,100</td>
<td>117,200</td>
<td>118,000</td>
<td>117,800</td>
<td>114,900</td>
<td>114,400</td>
<td>114,700</td>
<td>110,600</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 2011 RCP Monitoring Report includes transit volume information from FY 2005 through FY 2011 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. As with vehicle travel volumes, transit travel volumes continued to fluctuate. This may also be due to the economic recession, as well as cutbacks in State and federal funding.
### Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitoring Point Description</th>
<th>Northbound/Earthbound</th>
<th>Southbound/Weatherbound</th>
<th>Total - Both Directions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2005</strong></td>
<td><strong>2006</strong></td>
<td><strong>2007</strong></td>
<td><strong>2008</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside to Downtown SD</td>
<td>2,352</td>
<td>2,945</td>
<td>2,762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total - Both Directions</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,183</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,276</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,184</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2006</strong></td>
<td>2,121</td>
<td>1,946</td>
<td>1,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total - Both Directions</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,058</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,164</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,184</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2008</strong></td>
<td>5,184</td>
<td>5,164</td>
<td>5,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total - Both Directions</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,418</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,080</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,080</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2009</strong></td>
<td>1,950</td>
<td>1,902</td>
<td>1,902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total - Both Directions</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,190</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,209</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,209</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2010</strong></td>
<td>2,018</td>
<td>2,003</td>
<td>2,003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total - Both Directions</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,190</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,209</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,209</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Monitoring at two locations along corridor**  **1st line of data after 2006, so measure on board**  
Source: SANDAG Passenger Counting Program 2011

**Note:**
- Table 4 presents transit passenger volumes in key transit corridors at specific screenline locations, from 2005 to 2011.
- The data includes passenger counts for various routes and destinations, such as Oceanside to Downtown SD, Poway Rd & Pomerado, and 12th and Imperial.
- The table includes data for both Northbound/Eastbound and Southbound/Westbound directions, as well as Total - Both Directions for the years 2005 to 2011.
- The data is sourced from the SANDAG Passenger Counting Program 2011.
**Annual Hours of Traffic Delay per Traveler**

Annual hours of traffic delay per traveler has decreased since 2005 as shown in Figure 7. However, between 2009 and 2010, it has slightly increased. In the next RCP Monitoring report, we will know if this is a trend or if it stabilized. Delay is defined as the extra travel time it takes travelers to complete a trip during peak periods (6 to 9 a.m. and 4 to 7 p.m.) as a result of congestion.

*Figure 7*

Annual Hours of Traffic Delay Per Traveler During Peak Periods, 2000 to 2010

![Graph of Annual Hours of Traffic Delay Per Traveler](source)

*Source: Annual Urban Mobility Report, Texas Transportation Institute*

**Regional Crime Rate**

As shown in Figure 8, the rate of crime in the region continues to decline, and in 2010 reached a new low of 25 per 1,000 people.

*Figure 8*

FBI Index Crimes Per 1,000 People, 2000 to 2010

![Graph of FBI Index Crimes Per 1,000 People](source)

*Source: SANDAG Criminal Justice Research Division.*
Conclusion

As of 2011 the region continued to make progress toward achieving some of the urban form and transportation goals listed in the RCP, but not others. It is likely that many of these indicators reflect the continued economic recession's impact on travel. 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 2003-2004.
Despite the sharp fall in housing prices associated with the recession, the lack of affordable housing continues to be one of the major issues facing the San Diego region today. Building permit issuance has fallen from nearly 20,000 units in 2003, to just over 5,000 units in 2011. 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 approximately 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 (GHG) emission targets set by the California Air Resources Board (CARB).

In October 2011, SANDAG adopted the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy (2050 RTP/SCS) and the Regional Housing Needs Assessment Plan for the fifth housing element cycle (2013 – 2020). Both documents, which were prepared concurrently, show that the region has made strides toward ensuring sufficient housing capacity for all income levels between now and 2050. Collectively, the 18 cities and County of San Diego have over 200,000 units of multifamily unit housing capacity planned in the 30 dwelling units per acre category. About 80 percent of the new housing units expected to be built between now and 2050 will be multifamily, with most of them located on infill and redevelopment sites near transit. This trend toward more compact, transit-oriented development will help the region achieve both its housing and GHG reduction targets.

A new challenge faced by the region and its local jurisdictions (along with other areas in the state) is the loss of affordable housing funding related to the elimination of redevelopment agencies, and the minimal amount of funding remaining from the housing bonds approved by the state’s voters in 2002 and 2006. In order to continue building affordable housing at the levels seen during the 2000’s, new sources of funding and new approaches to addressing our affordable housing needs for very low, low, and moderate income households need to be found.

**Housing Opportunity Index**

As shown in Figure 9, data from 2011 continues the mostly 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 55 percent in 2011. 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 six 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 at the end of the last decade. Prices went from $495,500 in June 2007 to $370,000 in June 2008 and to $314,250 in June 2009 (DataQuick Information Systems). 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 and bottomed out in January 2009 at $280,000. The current median home price is just over five times the regional median household income of $62,771 (SANDAG Current Estimates Program). Historically the median price of a home has been considered to be
affordable at three to four times the median income. Although home prices began rising again to $331,500 in 2010, they recently dipped to $320,000 in 2011.

Figure 9
Housing Opportunity Index, 2000 to 2011

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 41 percent of households paying more than 35 percent of income for housing costs during 2009 and 2010.

Figure 10
Percent of Households Paying 35 Percent or More of Income for Housing, 2000 to 2010

Source: American Community Survey, 1-Year Estimates. U.S. Census Bureau
Another indicator of lack of housing affordability 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 $1,324 for a two-bedroom unit (a slight decrease from $1,418 in 2009). In 2010 that amount was $52,960 annually or about $25 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 $119 less than for the state ($53,079); the upward trend in annual income needed over the last ten years is fairly consistent for both the state and the region.

In 2010, the minimum wage in California was $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 11**
Annual Income Needed to Afford Fair Market Rent (FMR), 2000 to 2010

![Graph showing annual income needed to afford FMR from 2000 to 2010 for San Diego and California. The graph shows a trend line for each, with San Diego generally lower than California.]

*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 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 is pursuing through implementation of the RCP and 2050 RTP/SCS, and RHNA 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 12 shows the ratio of new jobs created to new housing units built from 2001 to 2010, 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 1.07 based on the total number of jobs and housing units between 2001 and 2010. 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, 2009, and 2010, although in 2010 the loss is not as substantial as in 2009. The loss of 68,400 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 12. As the economy recovers in future years, this indicator (and others because of the complicated nature of this issue) may provide a more useful measure of whether the region is achieving a balance between jobs and housing units.

Table 5
Total Jobs Per Housing Unit Ratio, 2001 to 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Housing Units</th>
<th>Wage &amp; Salary 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>2001</td>
<td>1,051,142</td>
<td>1,230,000</td>
<td>10,993</td>
<td>24,300</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1,065,802</td>
<td>1,241,800</td>
<td>14,660</td>
<td>11,800</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1,080,204</td>
<td>1,251,300</td>
<td>14,402</td>
<td>9,500</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1,093,198</td>
<td>1,271,500</td>
<td>12,994</td>
<td>20,200</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1,107,985</td>
<td>1,292,800</td>
<td>14,787</td>
<td>21,300</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1,118,283</td>
<td>1,312,500</td>
<td>10,298</td>
<td>19,700</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1,131,749</td>
<td>1,319,700</td>
<td>13,466</td>
<td>7,200</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1,140,654</td>
<td>1,309,300</td>
<td>8,905</td>
<td>-10,400</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1,145,548</td>
<td>1,240,900</td>
<td>4,894</td>
<td>-68,400</td>
<td>-14.0</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1,149,426</td>
<td>1,229,800</td>
<td>3,878</td>
<td>-11,100</td>
<td>-2.9</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SANDAG Current Estimates Program, California Employment Development Department.

Note: The 2010 Housing Unit estimate in Table 5 was not benchmarked to the 2010 Census. Since this table reflects a series benchmarked from the Census 2000, it is appropriate to use this figure. It does not match the estimate in Table 1.

1 Does not include military and self-employed

Figure 12
Total New Jobs Per New Housing Unit Ratio, 2001 to 2010

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

Fourth Housing Element Cycle (July 1, 2005 – June 30, 2010)

A total of 80,734 building permits for new housing units were issued in the region between January 1, 2003 and December 31, 2010 (six months beyond the 7.5-year Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) projection period for the fourth housing element cycle), including 4,563 very low income, 4,747 low income, 3,652 moderate income, and 67,772 above moderate income housing units, as shown in Table 6B. Based on the 2003–2010 RHNA adopted by SANDAG in February 2005, building permits have been issued for 19 percent of the very low income, 26 percent of the low income, 18 percent of the moderate income, and 152 percent of the above moderate income regional housing needs established for the RHNA projection period.

The data show that the above moderate income housing needs established in the fourth RHNA cycle have been exceeded, while the housing needs for very low, low, and moderate income households fell short of their respective goals. 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) and availability of tax increment housing set-aside funds from redevelopment agencies (which will no longer be available in the future). Few moderate income units were built because of the high costs associated with land and construction materials and the requirement that most of the available financial resources be used to build lower income units. As shown in Figure 13, total building permit issuance dropped off during 2006, 2007, 2008, and 2009, before increasing slightly in 2010, the final year of the fourth housing element cycle. Likewise, construction of above moderate income units slowed during 2007, 2008, and 2009, and increased in 2010. Lower income units (very low and low) had the most variable changes in new building permit issuance, experiencing a decline in one year and an increase the following year. However, as Figure 13 illustrates, more housing units were permitted for lower income households (very low and low) than for moderate income households from 2003-2011.

Overall, the region met 75 percent of its RHNA housing goal of 107,301 units during the eight year period (six months beyond the seven and a half years of the RHNA projection period).

Figure 13
Total Housing Units Permitted in the San Diego Region by Income Category, 2003-2011

Source: Data compiled from building permits issued by the local jurisdictions in the San Diego region based on Annual Housing Element Progress Reports submitted to the California Department of Housing and Community Development and information provided to SANDAG by individual jurisdictions.
Table 6A
Share of New Housing Units by Income Category, January 1, 2003 through December 31, 2010

<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 Permitted</td>
<td>4,563</td>
<td>4,747</td>
<td>3,652</td>
<td>67,772</td>
<td>80,734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHNA Goal (4th Cycle)</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>19%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>152%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units Left to Permit</td>
<td>19,580</td>
<td>13,601</td>
<td>16,628</td>
<td>-23,242</td>
<td>26,567</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data compiled from building permits issued by the local jurisdictions in the San Diego region. Permitted units include deed-restricted and non-deed-restricted units as reported by each jurisdiction.

Fifth Housing Element Cycle (January 1, 2013 – December 31, 2020)

A total of 9,810 building permits for new housing units were issued in the region between January 1, 2010 – December 31, 2011 (two years out of the 11-year RHNA projection period for the fifth housing element cycle), including 1,036 very low income, 971 low income, 478 moderate income, and 7,325 above moderate income housing units, as shown in Table 6B.

Based on the 2010 – 2020 Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) Plan adopted by the SANDAG Board of Directors in October 2011, the region has achieved 3 percent of the very low income, 4 percent of the low income, 2 percent of the moderate income, and 11 percent of the above moderate income regional housing needs established for the RHNA projection period. Because the data collected through December 31, 2011 reflects the first two years of an 11-year RHNA cycle, the percentages of the units produced for very low, low, moderate, and above moderate income households are fairly low. The data show that satisfactory progress is being made in the above moderate income housing category, while nominal progress has been made in meeting the housing needs for very low, low, and moderate income households within the first two years of the 11-year RHNA projection period.

As shown in Figure 13, total building permit issuance increased from 2010 to 2011, but dropped slightly for very low income households, dropped significantly for low income households, and increased for moderate and above moderate income households. (Note: The data in Tables 6A and 6B overlap by one year – from January 1, 2010, to December 31, 2010).

Table 6B
Share of New Housing Units by Income Category, January 1, 2010 through December 31, 2011

<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 Permitted</td>
<td>1,036</td>
<td>971</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>7,325</td>
<td>9,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHNA Goal (5th Cycle)</td>
<td>36,450</td>
<td>27,700</td>
<td>30,610</td>
<td>67,220</td>
<td>161,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Goal Produced</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units Left to Permit</td>
<td>35,414</td>
<td>26,729</td>
<td>30,132</td>
<td>59,895</td>
<td>152,170</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data compiled from building permits issued by the local jurisdictions in the San Diego region. Permitted units include deed-restricted and non-deed-restricted units as reported by each jurisdiction.
**Vacancy Rates**

Vacancy rates remained stable between 2000 and 2008, but increased between 2008 (4.5%) and 2010 (6.7%), as shown in Figure 14. This increase is likely related to the increase in foreclosures in recent years.

**Figure 14**
**Vacancy Rates, 2000 to 2010**

![Vacancy Rate Graph]

*Source: American Community Survey, 1-Year Estimates. 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 remained relatively stable between 2005 and 2010. The Census definition of overcrowded is more than one person per room.

**Figure 15**
**Overcrowding in the Region, 2000 to 2010**

![Overcrowding Graph]

*Source: American Community Survey, 1-Year Estimates., U.S. Census Bureau*
Number of Households on the Waiting List for Section 8 Vouchers

In 2011, collectively the region had approximately 92,615 households on Section 8 waiting lists. Although in 2007 and 2008 the waiting lists included 65,600 and 49,700 households respectively, the shorter waiting list in 2008 was likely the result of the periodic purging of the lists undertaken by the Section 8 jurisdictions. Only six jurisdictions in the San Diego region issue Section 8 vouchers: Carlsbad, Encinitas, National City, Oceanside, the City of San Diego, and the County of San Diego.

Conclusion

Housing affordability continues to be a significant issue in the San Diego region, although the above data indicate that the rapid decline in affordability (i.e., increase in housing costs) has 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, the region’s ability to produce housing for very low, low, and moderate income households is and will likely continue to be challenging. With the expenditure of state housing bond money (Propositions 46 and 1C) almost complete, and the generally accepted need for financial subsidies and/or regulatory measures to construct very low and low income unit, 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 increase the construction of moderate income housing also needs to 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) Plan South, finalized in 1998; the Multiple Habitat Conservation Program (MHCP), finalized in 2003; the North County Plan, with public review anticipated in Spring 2013 and completion in 2014; and the East County Plan, delayed until further notice as a result of budget and staffing constraints. 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 percent of the region). Seven jurisdictions are working on approval of their implementing agreements (covering 73 percent of the region), and seven jurisdictions are not pursuing implementing agreements due to limited habitat in their jurisdictions (covering 1 percent of the region). The remaining area (covering 6 percent of the region) consists of military lands which have their own integrated natural resource management plans.

As part of SANDAG participation in regional habitat conservation planning, a conserved lands database was 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 2011 with 2020 and 2030 Targets

The SANDAG Environmental Mitigation Program (EMP), funded through TransNet, aims to protect, preserve and restore native habitats as offsets to disturbance caused by construction of regional and local transportation projects. Since 2008, more than 2,376 acres of open space, much of it previously slated for development, have been acquired under the EMP. In 2010 and 2011, SANDAG acquired eight habitat conservation properties totaling 1,289 acres through the TransNet EMP. These projects include Tabata (23.7 acres acquired in 2010), Zamudio (32.5 acres acquired in 2010), Mendocino (19.7 acres acquired in 2010), Vessels (162 acres acquired in 2010), Jeffries Ranch (80.3 acres acquired in 2011), Rincon (37.3 acres acquired in 2011), Deer Canyon (31.4 acres acquired in 2011), and Rancho Lilac (902 acres acquired in 2011).

One successful project example of the TransNet EMP is the Rancho Lilac property acquired in October 2011, as part of the expansion of State Route 76. SANDAG authorized the purchase of the 902-acre Rancho Lilac property in Valley Center for $16.5 million, the largest single property acquired through the TransNet EMP (the property is almost nine times the size of the San Diego Zoo). The Rancho Lilac property is considered both culturally and biologically unique and is home to multiple rare and endangered species. It is also the last component to completing the environmental mitigation for the expansion of SR 76. In addition, acquisitions and regional coordination through the EMP have successfully fulfilled the regional vision of creating extensive wildlife corridors in and around the San Luis Rey River. The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) negotiated the purchase and is responsible for building on SR 76.
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 1.26 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, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ownership Type</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>477,515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>613,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>107,702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>37,439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonprofit</td>
<td>27,213</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SANDAG Conserved Land Database 2011

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 was to assist the database managers to make these independent databases be able to share data and collaborate of future data gathering efforts. This centralize database will be completed in September 2012.
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 un-urbanized 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. SANDAG is working with San Diego State University to develop standard guidelines for all land managers to follow in the creation of their natural resource management plans.

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 multi-stakeholder effort to identify critical linkages for the connectivity of wildlife linkages and to initiate regional monitoring of these areas.

Number of Beach-Mile Day Closures

Beginning with the 2011 report, Beach-Mile Days (BMDs) is the new way to measure beach closures. This measure was changed from the previous “weather-adjusted beach mile closure days” because the San Diego County Annual Beach Closure and Advisory Report is no longer available.

BMD is a standardized measure indicating the scale of a beach closure. The California Environmental Protection Agency reports this measure through their Beach Watch Database. It is the product of the number of days a beach was closed and the length of impacted coastline (in miles). For example, if a particular beach was closed for three days and for a distance of 150 yards, the number of BMDs for this incident would be 0.26 (150 yards/1 mile X 3 days). BMD is a useful measure for annual comparisons of beach health. The Beach closures shown in Figure 18 are caused by water contamination by pathogens. Pathogens can potentially endanger beachgoers when they are exposed to the contaminated water through skin contact (swimming or surfing) or ingestion. Runoff during storms can contribute to contamination; thus, years with a lot of rain may have a higher BMD.

As shown in Figure 18, the BMD has steadily decreased since 2006 when it was 398 for the County. The BMD was 313 in 2007, 288 in 2008, 211 in 2009, and 208 in 2010.

Figure 18
Beach Mile Closure Days, 2001 to 2010

Source: California Environmental Protection Agency: Beach Watch Database.
Beach Widths

Between 2009 and 2010, shoreline retreat and shorezone volume losses occurred at most of the beaches in the Oceanside and Silver Strand Littoral Cells. These losses likely are due to the relatively severe wave conditions that prevailed during the 2009-2010 winter season. However, substantial shoreline advance and shorezone volume gains predominated in the Mission Beach Littoral Cell. These gains appear to be attributable to the 450,000 cy of nourishment material placed at Mission Beach by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. These changes produced beach widths that exceeded the 2010 target widths by a large margin in the Mission Beach Littoral Cell. In contrast, beach widths at the Oceanside Littoral Cell sites remained below their 2010 target widths (Table 7). Building upon the success of the Regional Beach Sand Project (RBSP) in 2001, SANDAG is embarking on a second RBSP, scheduled for summer 2012. Through this project, SANDAG will continue the process of restoring the region’s eroded beaches by implementing proactive measures to protect and enhance the quality of our coastline.

Table 7
Beach Widths and Targets of Shoreline Segments San Diego Region (in feet), 2000 to 2010

<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>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Beach</td>
<td>300.0</td>
<td>218.0</td>
<td>218.0</td>
<td>308.0</td>
<td>218.0</td>
<td>217.0</td>
<td>221.0</td>
<td>229.0</td>
<td>307.0</td>
<td>234.0</td>
<td>242.0</td>
<td>229.0</td>
<td>217.0</td>
<td>238.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver Strand State Beach</td>
<td>427.0</td>
<td>461.0</td>
<td>448.0</td>
<td>154.5</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>462.0</td>
<td>427.0</td>
<td>210.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean Beach</td>
<td>278.0</td>
<td>282.0</td>
<td>274.0</td>
<td>283.0</td>
<td>295.0</td>
<td>259.0</td>
<td>264.0</td>
<td>260.0</td>
<td>305.0</td>
<td>284.0</td>
<td>270.0</td>
<td>307.0</td>
<td>266.0</td>
<td>232.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solana Beach</td>
<td>134.0</td>
<td>123.0</td>
<td>108.0</td>
<td>171.0</td>
<td>141.0</td>
<td>138.0</td>
<td>133.0</td>
<td>130.0</td>
<td>157.0</td>
<td>113.0</td>
<td>155.0</td>
<td>157.0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>228.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Mar</td>
<td>185.5</td>
<td>227.0</td>
<td>166.0</td>
<td>133.3</td>
<td>167.3</td>
<td>157.3</td>
<td>120.7</td>
<td>102.3</td>
<td>158.0</td>
<td>106.0</td>
<td>125.5</td>
<td>118.5</td>
<td>102.5</td>
<td>232.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Jolla</td>
<td>182.0</td>
<td>141.0</td>
<td>192.0</td>
<td>213.0</td>
<td>183.0</td>
<td>229.0</td>
<td>219.0</td>
<td>224.0</td>
<td>223.0</td>
<td>183.0</td>
<td>201.0</td>
<td>200.0</td>
<td>210.0</td>
<td>200.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>184.3</td>
<td>183.0</td>
<td>215.0</td>
<td>252.5</td>
<td>240.5</td>
<td>212.5</td>
<td>209.0</td>
<td>208.3</td>
<td>224.8</td>
<td>175.0</td>
<td>204.5</td>
<td>202.5</td>
<td>173.3</td>
<td>228.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encinitas</td>
<td>157.5</td>
<td>137.3</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>169.7</td>
<td>157.2</td>
<td>240.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solana Beach</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>191.0</td>
<td>180.6</td>
<td>216.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside</td>
<td>283.0</td>
<td>278.3</td>
<td>287.3</td>
<td>287.0</td>
<td>294.7</td>
<td>302.7</td>
<td>265.0</td>
<td>277.7</td>
<td>300.7</td>
<td>248.0</td>
<td>230.0</td>
<td>249.0</td>
<td>216.7</td>
<td>232.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SANDAG Regional Beach Monitoring Program, Annual Report 2010

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

Impaired Waterbodies

Data for this indicator are published every four years. Between 2006 and 2010, impaired waterbodies in the region decreased. 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 2009, the region as a whole greatly enhanced its monitoring efforts between 2002 and 2006; as such, a greater percentage of waterbodies were found to be impaired in 2006 than in 2002. Thus, the extent to which the region’s impaired waterbodies has increased between 2002 and 2006 cannot be conclusively determined. Similarly, between 2006 and 2010 more information has been made available from the Water Board and outside agencies that makes comparisons among the years difficult due to changing data collection.
The RCP 2010-2011 Biennial Performance Monitoring Report methodologies. Overall, the new policies in place for the listing and de-listing of impaired water bodies reflects an increase in the amount and better organized water quality data available for consideration.

Figure 19
Impaired Waterbodies, 2002, 2006, and 2010

![Graph showing impaired waterbodies](image)

Source: San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board

**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 2011, 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 2010. 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 2008 the region has been experiencing a consistent improvement in its 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 decreased at most beaches, but should increase in the next reporting period with the SANDAG Regional Beach Sand Project. With respect to air quality, 2011 had the fewest number of unhealthy days since 1999. SANDAG continues to evaluate strategies to fund improvements to water quality, habitat preservation, and beach nourishment.
Economic prosperity is an important area of focus for tracking the region’s performance. A well-educated workforce, growth in industry clusters, and high-wage along with balanced-wage jobs are all important indicators to measure the progress of the region’s economy. Additionally, focusing resources on human and physical infrastructure, job growth, and a rising standard of living are important factors that work symbiotically to improve San Diego’s quality of life.

**Economic Prosperity Factors that Improve the Region’s Quality of Life**

Economic prosperity indicators were developed for the RCP Annual Performance Monitoring Report to track past performance and to anticipate future areas of strategic initiatives. These indicators are tracked in the following areas:

- Labor Force Education Attainment
- Employment Growth in High Wage Industry Clusters
- Regional Unemployment Rate Compared to California and the United States
- Real per Capita Income Compared to California and the United States
- Regional Poverty Rate Compared to California and the United States

As a component of the RCP implementation, the Regional Economic Prosperity Strategy (REPS) was originally developed in 1998 in response to the economic restructuring and recession of the early 1990s. The REPS was updated in 2008 and identifies demographic and economic challenges facing the San Diego region, and promotes a strategy to meet these challenges and improve the competitiveness of our local economy. The outcome of the REPS identified strategic goals and recommended actions that call for infrastructure investment and public policy support in order to strengthen the region’s economic foundation.

Another important component of the RCP implementation includes measuring employment growth in the region’s traded industry clusters. The clusters were introduced locally in 1994 as a tool to aid in the economic recovery by identifying several employment clusters that would serve as the foundation for regional recovery and growth. Since 1998, three cluster reports have been completed and SANDAG is currently finalizing its fourth cluster study.
Labor Force Educational Attainment

Labor Force education attainment is an important measure of the region’s educational progress and standard of living. Overall, the San Diego region has a well-educated labor force. As shown in Figure 21, labor force educational attainment remained stable since 2005. The one exception, however, was a slight decrease in the percentage of the labor force with only a high school degree since 2007.

Figure 21
Labor Force Educational Attainment, 2005 to 2010

Employment Growth in High-Wage Economic Clusters

Economic clusters are groups of interrelated, export-oriented industries that are responsible for bringing new money into the region. Industries within a cluster have business transactions with one another, and thus are interdependent. Cluster companies often participate in local industry associations, which foster collaboration and the exchange of knowledge. Companies within a cluster also compete with each other for market share, which drives innovation and productivity. Companies within clusters tend to be among the region’s leaders in research and development funding, patent awards, and other key indicators of innovation. Many of the clusters also pay high wages, although some do not. All clusters are economic drivers for the region because they are export-oriented.

Measuring employment growth in traded industry clusters is an important indicator of economic prosperity because it shows how the region’s economy grows and changes over time. Clusters help drive economic growth because they bring new money into the region by selling their products and services nationally and internationally.

SANDAG is currently updating the traded industry cluster definitions to reflect changes in the economy since the last study was completed in 2006. According to the draft report, Traded Industry Clusters in the San Diego Region, 2011, the following thirteen clusters drive the regional economy:

- Action Sports Manufacturing
- Advanced Precision Manufacturing
- Aerospace, Navigation, and Maritime Technology
- Apparel Manufacturing
- Biomedical Devices and Products
- Biotechnology and Pharmaceuticals
Out of these thirteen traded industry clusters, eight clusters were considered “high wage traded industry clusters” and showed wages that are greater than the region’s annual average wage across all industries. As shown in Figure 22, employment in high-wage economic clusters increased in 2010.

However, it should be noted that the clusters were re-defined in the most recent Traded Industry Clusters in the San Diego Region study. Increases in jobs may be the result of both employment growth in the region’s specialized clusters as well as cluster definition changes. For example, the Biomedical Devices and Products and Biotechnology and Pharmaceuticals clusters have been stable clusters throughout the 2000s, contributing to employment growth in 2002, 2003, 2005, and 2010, as shown below in Table 22. Other clusters have decreased in size and are no longer counted as clusters. For example, Financial Services and Design Services were counted as clusters in 2002, 2003, and 2005, but decreased in employment size over time and were no longer counted in cluster employment in 2010. Similarly, other clusters have evolved over time. With the growth of microbrewing in San Diego, the specialty foods cluster has expanded to become Specialty Foods and Microbreweries. New clusters in 2010 include Advanced Precision Manufacturing and Apparel Manufacturing.

These eight high wage clusters in the San Diego region include:

- Action Sports Manufacturing
- Advanced Precision Manufacturing
- Aerospace, Navigation, and Maritime Technology
- Biomedical Devices and Products
- Biotechnology and Pharmaceuticals
- Cleantech
- ICT
- Publishing and Marketing

Source: SANDAG Cluster Inventory; Traded Industry Clusters in the San Diego Region, 2011 (SANDAG)
Employment growth in high wage clusters therefore has a dual benefit to the region such as economic growth that brings in new money into the region and growth of jobs for local residents. These characteristics fit in with the RCP’s goals of improving local business environment and providing a rising standard of living to the region’s residents.

It should be noted that the revised cluster definitions are currently in draft form, but are anticipated to be finalized by the end of the year.

**Regional Unemployment Rate Compared to California and the United States**

San Diego’s unemployment rate was stable around 5 percent between 2000 and 2007 and was lower than the state and the nation, as shown in Figure 23. Between 2007 and 2009, the region’s unemployment rate began to rise, peaking in 2010. This mirrors state and national trends during the recession. However, the unemployment rate in the San Diego region, California, and the United States has decreased slightly since 2010. This is partially attributed to the recent improvement in the economy. The region’s unemployment rate was 9.9 percent in 2011; it was lower than the state’s rate (11.7%) and greater than the country’s (8.9%) for the third year in a row. The San Diego economy, and specifically the local construction industry, was hit harder than the nation as a whole because of the recession’s impact on our local building industry. Between 2006 and 2010, about 35,000 jobs were lost in the construction industry in the region (California Employment Development Department, QCEW, 2006-2010).

*Figure 23*

Unemployment in San Diego, California and the United States, 2000 to 2011

Source: California Employment Development Department; U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics
Real Per Capita Income Compared to California and the United States

Real per capita income is a good measure of the region’s standard of living. As shown in Figure 24, San Diego’s real per capita income has risen between 2003 and 2007. Since 2007, it dropped slightly. Real per capita income was $45,714 in 2009 and remains above that of California and the United States.

Figure 24
Real Per Capita Income in San Diego, California and the United States in Inflation-Adjusted 2009 Dollars, 2001 to 2009

Source: U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis

Regional Poverty Rate Compared to California and the United States

The San Diego region’s poverty rate has historically been lower than the state and the nation, as shown in Figure 25. However, the region’s poverty rate has increased since 2007, with trends similar to the state and the nation. In 2010, the poverty rate is just under 15 percent, which is slightly lower than California and the United States. Again, as with other indicators, this increase is attributable to the current economic recession.

Figure 25
Percent of Residents Living in Poverty in San Diego, California and the United States, 2000 to 2010

Source: American Community Survey, 1-Year. U.S. Census Bureau
Conclusion

Economic prosperity for the region shows both positive and negative performance. The region continues to have a well-educated labor force. Many of the traded industry clusters in the region continue to grow and provide a variety of balanced and high wage jobs for residents. The region experienced a relatively consistent standard of living between 2003 and 2007, as measured by real per capita income and a drop in the standard of living since 2007. Data from recent indicators, such as poverty and unemployment, show how the economic downturn has affected our region. These indicators show that San Diego is not as bad off economically as the state as a whole. However, the drop in the unemployment rate indicates that the economy may be recovering slightly. 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. Additionally, the Traded Industry Clusters in the San Diego Region, 2011 study is being updated to determine drivers of the regional economy and measure how they are changing. These efforts will help to ensure that the region reinforces its status as one of the most desirable places to work and live. Future monitoring reports will measure the success of these strategies.
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 decision-making 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 2011 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 from 2007 to 2010. 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 2010

Source: San Diego County Water Authority Annual Reports (fiscal year water supply by source)

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 percent in 2003 to 44 percent in 2011. Efforts undertaken by the Water Authority several years ago have begun to yield benefits in terms of diversity in the region’s water resource portfolio. The shares of conserved water, recycled water, and local surface water as components of the Water Authority’s diversification strategy have 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 and stabilized in 2009 and 2010. In 2010 the region had a slight decline to 25,592 acre-feet of recycled water used. The slight decline may be due to the decrease in water consumption overall, see the Water Consumption indicator above. The increase in previous years 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.
Energy Supply and Use

Energy supply describes the resources that make up the total electricity produced for the San Diego Gas & Electric (SDG&E) service area, of which 91 percent is attributed to San Diego County. The energy supply is a mix of both imported and in-region power. Sixty percent of the region’s overall power comes from natural gas. The region’s use of coal continues to decrease, since California no longer permits in-state coal plants and long-term out-of-state contracts continue to expire. Figure 29 shows the breakdown of energy sources used in 2000 and 2010.

Figure 29
Energy Sources for the San Diego Region, 2000 and 2010

| Source: San Diego Gas & Electric Power Content Label |
| Natural Gas  | 48% | 62% | 60% |
| Nuclear      | 22% | 18% | 16% |
| Renewable Energy | 7%  | 10% | 11% |
| Coal         | 15% | 7%  | 4%  |
| Large Hydroelectric | 8%  | 3%  | 0%  |
| Other*       | 0%  | 0%  | 9%  |

* Other refers to power sold to SDG&E, but the energy source is unknown.
Share and Types of Energy produced from Renewable Resources

As of 2010, 11 percent of the region’s electricity came from renewable resources, while state and regional targets called for 20 percent as shown in Figure 30. In 2009, the SANDAG Board of Directors approved the Regional Energy Strategy (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 (RPS) by 2020. Figure 31 shows the different types of renewable energy resources that were used in the San Diego region in 2010.

Figure 30
Share of Energy Produced from Renewable Resources

![Figure 30](image)

Figure 31
Breakdown of Renewable Energy Resources for 2010

![Figure 31](image)

Source: San Diego Gas & Electric Power Content Label.

*Under California law, rooftop solar energy systems are not counted toward the RPS requirements. The RES includes a separate clean distributed generation goal that sets targets for rooftop solar and other kinds of onsite energy systems.
**Per Capita Peak Demand for Electricity**

The region’s annual per capita electricity peak demand has slowly increased since 2001, as shown in Figure 32 below. The RES calls for cost effective steps and incentives to utilize demand response and energy efficiency measures to reduce overall peak demand.

![Graph showing San Diego Annual Per Capita Electricity Peak Demand, 2000 to 2010](Image)

**Source:** California Energy Commission; California Department of Finance Population Estimates

**Electricity Consumption by Sector**

Electricity and natural gas consumption by sector were added as performance measures in the 2009 update of the RES. The change in this indicator assists SANDAG in tracking the RES goals of reaching energy efficiency and conservation targets, implementing cost-effective steps to reduce peak demand, and increasing the total amount of renewable and nonrenewable energy resources to diversify electricity supply. Residential and commercial sectors use the most electricity in the region. Figure 33 shows the total annual consumption of electricity by sector and is used to track the RES energy efficiency goal to reduce per capita electricity consumption in the residential and commercial sectors by 20 percent by 2030, in order to keep total electricity consumption flat between now and 2030.
Figure 33
Existing and Projected Electricity Consumption by Sector, San Diego Region

Natural Gas Consumption by Sector

Natural gas supplies more than half of the fuel to generate electricity for the San Diego region. Natural gas is the most environmentally benign fossil fuel; it is used for cooking, to heat and cool homes, and for industrial applications. In 2010, the San Diego region consumed approximately 505 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 the residential and commercial sectors as shown in Figure 34. The RES calls for increased use of natural gas for certain transportation applications, decreased use of natural gas for end-uses like water heating, and more efficient use of natural gas in electricity generation.

Source: California Energy Commission
Percent of Solid Waste that is Recycled

The State ceased reporting local jurisdictions’ diversion rates in 2007. With the passage of Senate Bill 1016 (Wiggins, 2008), only per capita disposal rates are reported for each jurisdiction. The rates are not reported for the county as a whole. The County of San Diego reports an average of the region’s local jurisdictions, including the unincorporated area. This average is then calculated into a diversion rate that is shown in Figure 35. It should be noted that the County “average” is not a true average because each jurisdiction’s rate is based on its own population. However, it is the only measure available that gives a sense of the region’s rate of recycling.

The percent of solid waste that is recycled in the region increased since 2006, surpassing the state-mandated target, as shown in Figure 35. The target calls for a 50 percent solid waste diversion rate; in 2009 66 percent of solid waste was diverted from landfills.
Landfill Space Available

The County of San Diego is the designated local enforcement agency (LEA) for all solid waste facilities in the region. The City of San Diego is the LEA for facilities within the City of San Diego. The LEAs with concurrence for the Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle), formerly the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB), issue operating permits to facilities including landfills, transfer stations, material recovery, and composting facilities.

In general terms, solid waste refers to garbage, refuse, and other discarded solid materials generated by residential, commercial, and industrial activities. CalRecycle identifies 10 categories of wastes: paper, glass, metal, electronics, plastic, other organic, construction and demolition (C&D), household hazardous waste, special waste, and mixed residue. Solid waste generation is measured by disposal and diversion. Disposal is defined in PRC Section 40192 as “the final deposition of solid wastes onto land, into the atmosphere, or into the waters of the state.” Solid waste that is disposed in landfills is measured in volume (cubic yards) and weight (tons). Diversion includes programs and practices such as waste prevention and source reduction, recycling, reuse, and composting that reduce the total amount of waste that requires disposal.

The San Diego region is currently served by three privately operated landfills and one operated by the City of San Diego. The four landfills have a total remaining capacity of 97,411,143 cubic yards and have a total daily throughput of 17,845 tons per day. This includes the Sycamore Landfill expansion that was permitted by CIWMB in 2006 (City of San Diego 2006). There also are two landfills operated by Marine Corps Base Camp Pendleton for its exclusive use. A limited amount of solid waste generated in the San Diego region is also disposed of outside of the region. The four landfills have an estimated average of 48.9 percent remaining capacity (CalRecycle 2011a). Table 8 shows the remaining capacity of landfills located in the San Diego region and their estimated date of closure.
Table 8
Landfills Located in the San Diego Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Estimated Closure Date</th>
<th>Throughput (tons/day)</th>
<th>Total Capacity (cubic yards)</th>
<th>Remaining Capacity (cubic yards)</th>
<th>% Remaining Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Borrego Landfill</td>
<td>10/31/2030</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>844,000</td>
<td>478,836</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otay Landfill</td>
<td>4/30/2021</td>
<td>5,830</td>
<td>62,377,974</td>
<td>33,070,879</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Miramar</td>
<td>1/31/2017</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>87,760,000</td>
<td>16,473,000</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sycamore Landfill</td>
<td>12/31/2031</td>
<td>3,965</td>
<td>48,124,462</td>
<td>47,388,428</td>
<td>98.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>17,845</td>
<td>199,106,436</td>
<td>97,411,143</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CalRecycle 2011

There are 145 recycling centers in the San Diego region that collect recyclable materials. In addition, eight composting facilities in the region collect, grind, mix, pile, and add moisture and air to organic materials to speed natural decay and produce a soil amendment. Another five chipping and grinding facilities in the region are designed to reduce the size of compostable material. Recycling, composting, chipping, and grinding all reduce the amount of solid waste that must be disposed of in a landfill.

C&D materials include lumber, drywall, metals, masonry (brick, concrete, etc.), carpet, plastic, pipe, rocks, dirt, paper, cardboard, or green waste related to land development. Metals are the most commonly recycled material while lumber makes up the majority of debris that still goes to a landfill (CalRecycle 2010). There are 19 C&D Recyclers in San Diego, one processing facility, and four inert fill-disposal operations (CalRecycle 2011).

The proposed 1,770-acre Gregory Canyon Landfill site is located in northern San Diego County on SR-76 with a facility area of 308 acres and a disposal footprint of 183 acres. The facility, as currently planned, would have an average daily throughput of 3,200 tons per day and would receive up to 1,000,000 tons of municipal solid waste per year. The total site capacity is 59,000,000 cubic yards and has an estimated closing date of 2040. Gregory Canyon is currently seeking approval of a Solid Waste Facility Permit to operate the landfill, after over 10 years of ballot initiatives, court challenges, and environmental review (Gregory Canyon 2011).

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

While in previous years there was an increase of trips into San Diego County, that number has decreased or remained stable in recent years, as shown in Figure 36. There was a slight decrease (from 152,100 in 2008 to 140,200 in 2010) in the number of vehicles traveling between the region and Northern Baja. The number of trips between San Diego and Riverside County decreased slightly in 2009, but has crept back within the last year. In addition, the annual number of pedestrian trips into San Diego from Baja California also slightly declined from 2008 to 2010 to 9,198,913 as shown in Figure 37.

Figure 36
San Diego Region Average Weekday Traffic Volumes to and from Orange, Imperial, and Riverside Counties and Northern Baja, Mexico, 2000 to 2010

Source: Caltrans Traffic Census
Border Wait Times

Border wait times in 2010 showed a small decrease from 2009 for both passengers and commercial vehicles. Crossborder passenger vehicle volumes declined while truck volumes have grown. The implementation of tandem inspection booths and the use of travel documents with radio frequency technology likely contributed to the decrease in wait times, as well as the overall decline in travel associated with the economic recession.
Participation in SENTRI Lanes

There were a total of 126,685 Secure Electronic Network for Travelers Rapid Inspection (SENTRI) participants in 2011, which represents 16,685 more participants than were reported in the last report, as shown in Figure 39. This includes all SENTRI participants for the entire U.S.-Mexico border; SENTRI participants are able to cross at any U.S.-Mexico border crossing.

Figure 39
SENTRI Participants, 2006 to 2011

Conclusion

The volume of commutes into San Diego from Baja California has slightly decreased, but the numbers of new participants in the SENTRI program have increased. A slight decrease in wait times may be due to operational improvements at the border crossings.
Introduction
In an effort to continue to improve upon the methods SANDAG uses to involve low-income, minority, and other Communities of Concern in the regional planning process, SANDAG contracted with five community-based organizations (CBOs) that participated in the preparation of the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS). The CBOs have been asked to share their best practices for public participation and outreach methods to Communities of Concern. Representatives from each of the CBOs will highlight outreach techniques that they have found successful in engaging their communities in various efforts, including in the RTP/SCS. These suggested techniques will be evaluated by SANDAG staff, and in combination with additional sources of information, assembled into a resource guide. The resource guide will be used to support the Public Involvement Program for upcoming regional planning efforts such as the update of the Regional Comprehensive Plan, Regional Transportation Plan, and Sustainable Communities Strategy.

Discussion
SANDAG Board Policy No. 025 (Public Participation/Involvement Policy) incorporates concepts from federal and state laws, and guidance. The Policy states that social equity and environmental justice are meant to ensure the meaningful involvement of low-income, minority, disabled, senior, those with limited English proficiency, and other traditionally underrepresented communities and it is a key component of SANDAG public participation activities.

Meaningful involvement means that: (1) potentially affected community residents have an appropriate opportunity to participate in decisions about a proposed activity that will affect their environment and/or health; (2) the public’s contribution can influence the regulatory agency’s decision; (3) the concerns of all participants involved will be considered in the decision-making process; and (4) the decision-makers seek out and facilitate the involvement of those who are potentially affected.

Building on the collaborative work conducted in the 2050 RTP, SANDAG extended contracts with the following CBOs for an additional six months to collaborate on the development of a resource guide for outreach on regional issues with Communities of Concern.

- All Congregations Together (ACT) – Southeastern San Diego
- Casa Familiar – San Ysidro
- Chula Vista Community Collaborative
- El Cajon Collaborative (Little House Avocado, Inc.)
- Linda Vista Collaborative (Bayside Community Center)
Initial Findings

Some of the common themes that have arisen from this process include: the need to provide culturally and linguistically appropriate information for communities; building trust necessary to have meaningful involvement is done over time; nurture relationships first; build community capacity to understand the connections between short-range needs and long-range goals; CBOs play a critical role as brokers build on their social capital and long-standing relationships with community members as well as their ability to be information brokers in a two-way communication (interpreting complex information to communities so that it is meaningful and relevant; relaying community needs/concerns back to the agency in a format that will have the most impact).

Challenges being faced include: lack of adequate funding for a sustained effort; disengaging; information that is too technical in nature; funders’ preferences for implementing latest outreach fads over respecting longer-term processes to achieve outcomes; lack of clear and relevant messages; lack of culturally and linguistically relevant material; and rigid, technical timelines that often do not coincide with local, cultural traditions for sharing information and formulating responses.

Three of the five CBOs are the coordinating agencies for community collaboratives. Community collaboratives act as forums for local institutions such as churches, schools, health clinics, ethnic groups, and others to discuss issues of common concern. In terms of regional planning efforts, community collaboratives provide a culturally relevant structure for developing local outreach protocols including crossing language barriers and structuring meetings. If members of a collaborative make connections between their local concerns and regional planning efforts, they can begin to understand regional planning in a way that is relevant and meaningful to their communities. Based upon the information collected to date, it is apparent that community collaboratives can serve as a valuable resource for SANDAG’s public involvement strategy.

Next Steps

The suggested information and outreach techniques gathered through this process, in combination with additional sources of information collected by SANDAG staff, will be assembled into a resource guide that will be used to support the Public Involvement Program for upcoming regional planning efforts such as the update of the Regional Comprehensive Plan, Regional Transportation Plan, and Sustainable Communities Strategy.

CHARLES ‘MUGGS’ STOLL
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Key Staff Contact: Jane Clough, (619) 699-1909, Jane.Clough@sandag.org
Why Monitor Performance?

- Assembly Bill 361 (Kehoe) – mandated RCP preparation and ongoing monitoring
- Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP)
  - Chapter 8: Performance Monitoring – Measuring our Progress
Report Indicators

- Urban Form and Transportation
- Housing
- Healthy Environment
- Economic Prosperity
- Public Facilities
- Borders

Moving in the Right Direction

- Crime
- Air Quality
- Water Consumption
- Diversity of Water Supply
- Share of Energy from Renewable Resources
- Recycling
Areas for Improvement

• Beach Widths
• Electricity

Possible Recession Impacts

• Overall Travel
• Poverty
Opportunities for Review and Comment

• www.sandag.org/rcpmonitoring
• Comments due June 22, 2012
• Regional Planning Committee – July 6
• Board of Directors – July 27

Recommendation

The Regional Planning Committee is asked to accept and authorize release of the draft 2010-2011 Biennial RCP Performance Monitoring Report for public review and comment.
Regional Comprehensive Plan:

2010-11 Biennial Performance Monitoring Report

June 1, 2012
Introduction

- Title VI/Environmental Justice
- Social Equity in Regional Planning
- Partners: Community-based Organizations (CBOs)
Community-based Organizations

- All Congregations Together (ACT)
- Casa Familiar
- Chula Vista Community Collaborative (School District)
- El Cajon Collaborative (Little House)
- Linda Vista Collaborative (Bayside Community Center)

ALL CONGREGATIONS TOGETHER

The ACT VISION is: To provide services that will cause an observable positive change in the health, social, and economic conditions of individuals and communities.
Introduction: All Congregations Together

Service Area:
92102 Zip code and the area formerly known as “Southeast” San Diego

Demographics of Population Served:
• Seniors (over the age of 60)
• Individuals with disabilities
• Individuals with limited means that need Non-Emergency medical transportation

Partners:
• Residents
• Senior Centers
• Faith Communities
• Healthcare Providers
• Non-profits

Theme: All Congregations Together
“Integrated Model”

Upon Entry:
• Everyone is Eligible for Every Service
• What Services are Needed
• Who is Best Able to Provide Service
• ACT is Here to Help
Experiences: All Congregations Together

Use of “Integrated Model” in area formerly known as “Southeast San Diego”:

- “All” services to all who come in our doors
- On-Board Client Survey
- Board of Directors engage Community Stakeholders and Congregational Leaders

The “Integrated Model”: Term that was coined by METRO United Methodist Urban Ministries of San Diego to provide all services available to each client as they enter the organization for services.
INTRODUCTION: CASA FAMILIAR

Service Area:
- San Ysidro community planning area & southern portion of San Diego County’s South Bay

Demographics of Population Served:
- Of a total of a population of 28,481 residents, 95% are minorities (with 89% of Hispanic origin), and 46.6% are foreign-born

Services Provided:
- Offers over fifty programs spanning the program areas of Human Services, Community Development, Recreation Services, Technology, Arts & Culture, and Education
- 40 years of service provision and involvement in land use and transportation

THEME: COMMUNITY ORGANIZING

Trust-building takes time and consistency
- Building rapport/trust
- "dress-down"
- Participate in fairs, block parties, public hearings, etc.

Leaders from within the community
- Hires and trains community members
- Has many successful relationships
‘SIN LIMITES’ WORKSHOPS

- Since 2002
- Vehicle for Community Input
- Creates sense of responsibility

EXPERIENCES: CASA FAMILIAR

Specific tactics and strategies need to be applied according to the target population and program’s objectives
- Young Leaders Program and relationship with SDSU

Test policies and strategies through implementation and development work
- WiFi in affordable housing projects

Conduct community forums after evaluating various policies
- CDBG – Casa Familiar tested and determined CDBG to be inequitable

Cultural and arts events as another venue to bring up issues
- MOMA Exhibit
Introduction: Chula Vista Community Collaborative

Service Area:
Chula Vista and South Bay

Demographics:
- Low income families
- Underserved and vulnerable populations

Partnerships:
- Over 250 partners: Schools, service providers, health agencies, and government
Theme: “Community Capacity Building”

- Promotora Model (Best Practice Model)
  - Education
  - Outreach
  - Linkage
  - Culturally/linguistically appropriate
  - Advocacy

Chula Vista Community Collaborative

Photo taken during an RTP outreach meeting
Experiences:
Chula Vista Community Collaborative

Education
- Safe Routes to School
- Disaster Preparedness
- Es Dificil Ser Mujer

Outreach
- Parenting Classes
- Financial Education

Successes!
- Targeted Outreach
- Leverage Resources and Opportunities
- Participation!!!

EL CAJON COLLABORATIVE

Mission: We build relationships, leverage resources and promote best practices to enhance the quality of life for children, youth and families in our community.
Introduction: El Cajon Collaborative

Service Area:
- East Region - focus on the City of El Cajon

Demographics of Population Served:
- Underserved / Underrepresented residents
  - Persons living in poverty
  - Refugees/Immigrants

Collaborative Partners:
(27 formal Partners, 150+ engaged stakeholders)
- Non-profits
- Health care providers
- Schools, colleges, universities
- Government entities (police, probation, HHSA, libraries)
- Faith communities
- Residents

Mission: We build relationships, leverage resources and promote best practices to enhance the quality of life for children, youth and families in our community.

Theme: El Cajon Collaborative

Partners as Cultural Brokers

First Build Trust Over Time:
- Build Relationships
- Convene
- Bring Something to the Table
- Maintain Relationships
- Act as a Hub of Connectivity

Then Leverage Relationships: Cultural Broker Approach:
- Best Fit
- Natural Motivation
- Develop a Plan
- Implement Plan
Experiences: El Cajon Collaborative

Use of “Cultural Broker Model” in East Region:
• Park Safety Survey
• Regional Transportation Plan

Successful Techniques:
• Existing relationships
• Partners that residents already trust
• Respect and self-determination
• Informal presentations
• Broker information to community

Successful Tools:
• Incentives (gas cards, meals)
• Foreign language interpreters (paid)

ECC facilitated group meetings in local homes for SANDAG’s RTP outreach efforts
LINDA VISTA COLLABORATIVE

Coming together to enhance the quality of life for Linda Vista residents

Our Community Includes:
- Military Housing (Navy)
- USD
- Refugee/immigrant communities
- Low-income

Collaborative Partners Include:
- Non-profits
- Faith Based Community
- K–12 schools
- USD
- Local governing boards
- Reps for elected officials
- City & government agencies
Theme: “Inter-ethnic Steering Committee/Stakeholders”

- Utilize Existing Partnerships
  - Young leaders from each ethnic community
  - Translations
  - Isolated groups
  - Pre-existing relationships/trust
  - Captured audiences

- Establish New Partnerships
  - Seek organizations working with targeted audiences to limit the duplication of services/networks/etc.

2050 RTP Outreach: Convivio Latino
Senior Field Trip Downtown

Experiences:
“Presentation is Crucial”

- Properly translated materials
  - Language
  - Cultural variances
  - Education level

- Find a way to present the material in a way that makes it applicable to the community!

- Incentives for engagement

- Appreciation
Community-based Organizations

- All Congregations Together (ACT)
- Casa Familiar
- Chula Vista Community Collaborative (School District)
- El Cajon Collaborative (Little House)
- Linda Vista Collaborative (Bayside Community Center)
What happened before 9-1-1?
Imagine thousands of times a day...

I need food
I've lost my job
I no longer have healthcare
I'm transitioning from the Navy
I can't pay my mortgage

We can't help with that
I'll try to transfer you to an agency who can help
I'm not sure who you can call.

Why did you call us?
I don't know, please hold.
We only serve Santee

Please call back when We're open

There's a solution...

2-1-1, how can I help you?

Yes, I can connect you with someone who can help...

2-1-1 SAN DIEGO

Suicide Prevention
Catholic Charities
Senior I & A
Crisis Hotline
Volunteer Center
2-1-1 Mission and Vision

**Vision** • 2-1-1 is San Diego’s primary source for community, health and disaster information.

**Mission** • Helping people by connecting them efficiently to the services delivery system, and providing vital trend information for community planning.

2-1-1 History

• 1970 - 1999 - Program of United Way – a partner we still have today
• 2000 - Transitioned to INFO LINE a separate non-profit
  after Atlanta launched the first 2-1-1 in 1997
• 2005 - Launched as 2-1-1, as the region’s only 24/7, free 3-digit dialing code for community, health and disaster services
  First year of operation, 2-1-1 answered 85,000 calls
• 2007 - Major responder to Firestorm – raised awareness by 60%
• 2009 - Upgraded to commercial “cloud based” telephony system
• 2010 - Signed a “sole source” contract with the County of San Diego
• 2011 - Relocated to “State of the Art” Facility
2-1-1’s Contact Center

Every day people dial 2-1-1 for assistance navigating the complex system of community, health and disaster services. Highly trained Client Service Representatives have helped more than 220,000 clients access services such as food assistance, healthcare information and housing and educational services.

Dial 2-1-1 for
- Housing & Shelter Assistance
- Food Assistance
- Utility Assistance
- Military & Veteran Services
- Disaster Response
- Mental Health Resources
- Substance Abuse Services
- Healthcare Services
- Legal Services
- Parenting Services
- Children’s Services
- Physical Activity & Nutrition Resources
- Financial Assistance
- Senior Services
- Volunteer Services
- Education Assistance
- Employment Resources

Why 2-1-1?

• Easy to remember, 3-digit dialing code, especially in disasters
• 24/7 service
• Confidential and stigma-free
• Highly-trained Specialists (70% bi-lingual)
• Offered in more than 205 languages
• Free from all wireless services
• AIRS accredited and Full Quality Assurance
• Pre-screenings for specific services
• Tailored programs take the client beyond just a referral
• Searchable online database with 6,000+ resources
2-1-1’s Technology

- InContact cloud-based telephony solution
  - Robust automated client satisfaction survey system
  - 100% call recording
  - True virtual hold
  - Call back system

- Chat and email

- Searchable online database
  - Multiple search methods
  - Taxonomy based indexing
  - GIS Mapping
  - Real-time data
How 2-1-1 Measures Up • 2011/12

• Connected **320,000** clients to help last year
• Per our Client Satisfaction Surveys, 2-1-1 has a **92% satisfaction rate**
• Through the 2-1-1 follow-up process, **98% of the referrals were accurate**

---

**Healthcare Navigation Program**

More than 20 percent of adult San Diegans struggle to access healthcare. Our Healthcare Navigation program addresses this need by serving as an entry point for clients. Healthcare Navigation provides a wide range of support, including an assessment of need and eligibility, assistance in setting up medical and clinical appointments, and help completing applications for Medi-Cal, Healthy Families and prescription assistance.

**Benefits & Enrollment/CalFresh**

One of every six people in San Diego County experienced hunger this past year. Working with multiple partners and community leaders, 2-1-1’s Benefits & Enrollment program helps people find the assistance they need to put food on their table, most frequently by connecting them to the statewide CalFresh program. Our close partnership with the County allows us to electronically submit applications using an innovative telephonic signature, ensuring seamless delivery of service and shorter processing times.

**Military & Veteran Services**

San Diego County has one of the highest populations of Veterans and Active Duty Military in the nation. In fact, more than 60,000 military personnel have returned to Southern California since March 2010, which is why we launched the Military, Veteran and Family Access Program. The program provides specialized services, tailored information and referrals to help our veterans, active duty military and loved ones access food, housing, utility assistance, and public benefit programs like CalFresh and Medi-Cal.
San Diego County Firestorm 2007

3 simple numbers. 1 helpful voice.
2-1-1’s Disaster Response Function

- Non-emergency disaster information
- Provide Real-time Information to Public Safety (OES)
  - Needs Assessment
  - Rumor Control
  - Status of crisis
- 24/7 public information dissemination to the public
- Ability to handle a large volume of public inquiries
2-1-1’s Disaster Response Resume

- 2007 Firestorm
- 2008 Flooding
- 2009 H1N1
- 2010 Easter Earthquake
- 2010 Northern California (support provided)
- 2011 Region-wide Power Outage
- 2011 San Onofre Nuclear Plant Alert
- Dozens of smaller fires and emergencies

Beyond Disasters...
How 2-1-1’s Public Safety Role Assists Cities

- Reduces nonemergency calls to 9-1-1
- Saves staff time answering phones
- Manageable consistent messaging
- Resource for constituents

3 simple numbers. 1 helpful voice.
Mapping Client Data by Need and Zip Code

Client: 8531362
Need: CalFresh (Food Assistance)
Zip Code: 92115

Mapping Resources Near Clients

Client: 8531362
Resource near 92115

Emergency Food Assistance Program
Address: 4227 52nd Street
San Diego, CA 92115

Mid-City Christian Fellowship
Address: 4100 Fairmont Avenue
San Diego, CA 92105
The “Swiss Army Knife” ...

The “Swiss Army Knife”...

2-1-1

2-1-1s Across California & US

2-1-1 Covers 30 Counties in California
93% Californians can access a 2-1-1

2-1-1 National Update
37 States have 90%+ coverage
87% of US have access

3 simple numbers. 1 helpful voice.
As of October 2011, 2-1-1 serves over 260 million Americans (86.6% of the entire population) covering all 50 states (including 37 states with 90%+ coverage) plus Washington DC and Puerto Rico.
Future Projects and Partnerships

Community Information Exchange

2-1-1 San Diego

Social Service Providers

Homeless Providers

County of San Diego

Beacon HIE

HUD and Others
REPORT GRAFFITI

Reporting Graffiti in Your Neighborhood

Law enforcement agencies throughout San Diego County are working together to combat graffiti by taking part in a program to follow-up with clean-up and investigation of the graffiti.

Click here to report graffiti using our online form

Questions?

Presented by:

John Ohanian
Chief Executive Officer
San Marcos Facts

- Population – 84,391
- One of the fastest growing cities in the region since 1980
- City’s Corporate Limits: 24.30 square miles, 8 communities
- Unincorporated Sphere of Influence: 8.73 square miles
- 27,744 Housing Units
- Home to CSUSM and Palomar College
- Three Sprinter Stations (Civic Center, CSUSM, Palomar College)
Why was the General Plan Updated?

- Last comprehensively updated in 1987
- Issues needed to be addressed, i.e. traffic and growth
- New environmental regulations, i.e. AB 32 and SB 375
- Opportunity to evaluate and strategize on local opportunities, trends, and needs
- New development and design regulations

General Plan Content

Seven Elements:
- Land Use and Community Design
- Mobility
- Conservation and Open Space
- Parks, Recreation and Community Health
- Safety
- Noise
- Housing (to be updated separately per State law SB 375/575)

- Includes an Implementation Plan
SAN MARCOS GENERAL PLAN
Our City, Our Future

General Plan Process

• Initiated update in Fall 2009
• General Plan and EIR adopted by City Council in February 2012
• City’s Consultant was AECOM
• City Council priority to establish a comprehensive public participation program

SAN MARCOS GENERAL PLAN
Our City, Our Future

Public Participation

• General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC) – 24 meetings
• Telephone survey with statistically valid results
• Public workshops (conducted at four off-site neighborhood locations) – total of 12 public workshops
• Newsletters
• Youth program
• General Plan phone line
• Interactive website www.ourcityourfuture.org
• Participate at the 2x yearly street fairs
Nine (9) guiding themes were identified through the comprehensive public participation program to reflect the objectives of the community:

• Creating a Vibrant Destination City
• A Strong Local Economy and Employment Base
• Connecting People to Places
• An Educational and Academic Hub
• A City With Choices
• Sustaining Environmental Quality
• Building a Greener Community
• A Healthy and Safe Community
• Continuing Our Agricultural Heritage
San Marcos embraced Smart Growth and transit oriented developments highlighted in the RCP and RTP/SCS, through the San Marcos Creek and University District Specific Plans, as well as the Palomar Station Specific Plan.

With the update of the General Plan, the City identified additional transportation corridors that could accommodate mixed use.

New Land Use classifications of Mixed Use have been created to allow mixed use developments along Mission Road, Rancho Santa Fe Road, and San Marcos Boulevard (north side).

These three corridors are identified as Smart Growth Areas in the RCP.
Mixed Use Classifications

• Four mixed use classifications were created:
  - **Traditional Mixed Use:** residential, commercial, office (2 intensities)
  - **Non-Residential mixed use including commercial, office, civic uses**
  - **Non-Residential mixed uses including office and business park**

### Highlights of the Land Use & Community Development Element

- **Design / Planning Features**
  - Smart Growth/Mixed Use Development
  - Infill Development
  - Complete Streets
  - Form Base Code
  - Designing for Healthy Communities
  - Green Buildings
  - Sustainable Systems
  - Land Use Density & Intensity
- **Updated General Plan Land Use Designations/Classifications**
- **Updated Land Use Plan**
- **Public Services, Infrastructure, Utilities**
• Provide a comprehensive multimodal system that serves the City
• Increase mobility within the urban core mixed use areas, reducing vehicle miles traveled
• Create connections for multiple modes of travel to activity centers and implement Complete Streets

SAN MARCOS GENERAL PLAN
Our City, Our Future

Mobility Element

Incorporates

– Complete Streets
– Multi-Modal Levels of Service
– San Marcos Blvd. Designated as a Multi-Way Blvd.
– Traffic Calming
– Transportation Demand Management
– Robust Trail/Bicycle Network
– Improved Connections to Transit Facilities (SPRINTER & Bus)
– Intra-City Shuttle

SAN MARCOS GENERAL PLAN
Our City, Our Future

Mobility Element
Conservation & Open Space

- Addresses issues related to air quality, climate change, and energy use; reduction of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions
- Air quality and GHG emission policies include:
  - Participation in regional efforts to reduce GHG
  - Encouraging energy conservation and use of alternative energy sources in the community
  - Development of a Climate Action Plan for reduction of GHG
  - Promoting efficient use of energy in public and private facilities, infrastructure, and equipment

Parks, Recreation & Community Health

- City included a Community Health and Family Enrichment section in the Parks/Recreation Element
- Addresses:
  - Healthy community policies
  - Active communities
  - Safe route to schools
  - Access to nutritious foods
  - Community and social connectivity
  - Preserving the City’s agricultural heritage
  - Provide opportunities to further local food production
  - Support of local farmers markets
  - Access to health care facilities