MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

REGIONAL PLANNING TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP

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

Thursday, June 12, 2014

1:15 to 3:15 p.m.

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

Staff Contacts: Carolina Gregor
(619) 699-1989
carolina.gregor@sandag.org

Susan Baldwin
(619) 699-1943
susan.baldwin@sandag.org

AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

• HEALTHY COMMUNITIES TRANSFORMATION INITIATIVE

• TransNet SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM AND TransNet/TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION GRANT PROGRAM: CALL FOR PROJECTS FOR THIRD CYCLE OF GRANT FUNDING

• REGIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN: DRAFT 2012-2013 PERFORMANCE MONITORING REPORT

SANDAG offices are accessible by public transit.

Phone 511 or see www.511sd.com for route information.
Secure bicycle parking is available in the building garage off Fourth Avenue.

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

To request this document or related reports in an alternative format, please call (619) 699-1900, (619) 699-1904 (TTY), or fax (619) 699-1905.
ITEM NO. | RECOMMENDATION
--- | ---
1. | WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS
2. | PUBLIC COMMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS
   Members of the public will have the opportunity to address the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG) on any issue within the jurisdiction of SANDAG that is not on this agenda. Public speakers are limited to three minutes or less per person.
+3. | APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES
   The TWG is asked to review and approve the minutes from its May 8, 2014, meeting.

CHAIR’S REPORT

+4. | 2014 ANNUAL SAN DIEGO AMERICAN PLANNING ASSOCIATION AWARDS PROGRAM
   In mid-May, the San Diego American Planning Association held its 2014 Awards Banquet at the downtown Central Library. Various jurisdictions won awards for local planning work that has been highlighted at SANDAG, and SANDAG won an award of merit for its Plug-in Electric Vehicle Readiness Report. A list of winners is attached. Congratulations to all award winners!

REPORTS

+5. | HEALTHY COMMUNITIES TRANSFORMATION INITIATIVE (Stephan Vance)
   Under a program called the Healthy Communities Transformation Initiative, the Department of Housing and Urban Development is developing a healthy communities index and accompanying Healthy Communities Assessment Tool that local entities can use to assess how well their community supports public health, broadly defined. The San Diego region has been selected as a pilot site for the program, and volunteer jurisdictions are needed to help test the tool.

+6. | TransNet SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM AND TransNet/TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION GRANT PROGRAM: CALL FOR PROJECTS FOR THIRD CYCLE OF GRANT FUNDING (Carolina Gregor)
   The call for projects for the third cycle of the TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program (SGIP) and the TransNet/Transportation Development Act Active Transportation Grant Program are anticipated for release this fall. Due to the similar timeframes and program elements, the call for projects for these two grant programs is being conducted simultaneously. The TWG is asked to review and discuss the proposed changes to the program guidelines.
+7. REGIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN: DRAFT 2012-2013 PERFORMANCE MONITORING REPORT (Coleen Clementson)

Every two years, SANDAG prepares a report to monitor progress on the implementation of the Regional Comprehensive Plan. The attached report provides information for the 2012-2013 reporting period. Today’s report is for discussion. TWG comments will be forwarded to the Regional Planning Committee.

+8. REGIONAL PROGRESS SINCE 2004: REVIEW OF LOCAL PLANS (Sarah Strand)

Over the last several months, TWG members have been asked to provide input on a spreadsheet being prepared to capture regional progress toward planning for smart growth by identifying local general, community, and specific plans that have been updated since the adoption of the Regional Comprehensive Plan in 2004. The updated spreadsheet is attached and will be posted to the SANDAG website. The spreadsheet will be updated on a periodic basis.

9. STATUS REPORT ON REGIONAL TRANSIT-ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY (Susan Baldwin)

At the March TWG meeting, staff provided an overview of the work program for the Regional Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Strategy, which is currently underway. Staff will provide a status update and will show slides from the TOD network tour undertaken with the consultant team.

10. LEMON GROVE MAIN STREET PROMENADE (Carol Dick)

Earlier this year, the Lemon Grove Main Street Promenade Project was named as a Project of the Year by the local chapter of the American Public Works Association. Lemon Grove staff will provide an overview of the project, which was partially funded with TransNet SGIP funds, and will showcase the affordable and senior housing developments adjacent to the project.

11. ADJOURNMENT AND NEXT MEETING

The next regularly-scheduled TWG meeting will be held on July 11, 2014, from 1:15 to 3:15 p.m.

+ next to an agenda item indicates an attachment
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June 12, 2014

AGENDA ITEM NO.: 3

Action Requested: APPROVE

MAY 8, 2014, MEETING MINUTES

Please note: Audio file of meeting is available on the SANDAG website, www.sandag.org, on the Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG) page.

The meeting of the TWG was called to order by Chair Bill Fulton (San Diego), at 1:15 p.m.

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Self-introductions were made.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS

Chair Fulton announced that Marcus Bush (SANDAG) was accepted to Marine Corps Officer Candidate School and that this would be his last TWG meeting.

Allison Wood (SANDAG) announced the statewide energy efficiency best practices forum in San Diego sponsored by the Local Government Commission that discusses energy efficiency programs and climate action planning implementation.

Ed Batchelder (Chula Vista) announced that Gary Halbert has been appointed the next Chula Vista City Manager effective July 1, 2014. City Manager Jim Sandoval is retiring from that position.

Rich Whipple (Poway) announced that Dan Singer has been appointed the next Poway City Manager.

CONSENT

3. APRIL 10, 2014, MEETING MINUTES (APPROVE)

Action: Upon a motion by Jeff Murphy (Encinitas) and a second by Chair Fulton, the TWG approved the April 10, 2014, meeting minutes. Yes: Mr. Batchelder, Tony Shute (El Cajon), Jeff Murphy (Encinitas), Jay Petrek (Escondido), Chris Jacobs (La Mesa), Brad Raulston (National City), Mr. Whipple, Chair Fulton, Todd Snyder (County of San Diego), and Karen Brindley (San Marcos); No: None; Abstain: None.
4. COMPLETE STREETS AND TRANSIT-ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT WORKSHOPS ON MAY 8 AND 9, 2014, FEATURING CHRIS ZIMMERMAN OF SMART GROWTH AMERICA (INFORMATION)

Chair Fulton introduced Chris Zimmerman, former Arlington County Board Member and current Vice President of Economic Development for Smart Growth America. Mr. Zimmerman provided an overview of the upcoming workshops sponsored by the City of San Diego on Transit-Oriented Development (TOD), and SANDAG on complete streets. Mr. Zimmerman also highlighted the important effect of budgets on infrastructure and, therefore, smart growth, and recommended cities implement a local leaders’ council network in the region to focus on smart growth and exchange ideas.

Stephan Vance (SANDAG) provided more detail about the Complete Streets Workshop and encouraged TWG members to attend one or both of the workshops and invite others that might be interested. The City of San Diego workshop on transitioning toward TOD will be held on Thursday, May 8 at 6 p.m. at the San Diego Concourse, Silver Room. The SANDAG workshop on complete streets will be on Friday, May 9, from 1 to 4:00 p.m. at Caltrans as part of the region’s efforts to develop a complete streets policy.

5. SERIES 13 REGIONAL GROWTH FORECAST - REQUEST FOR UPDATES TO LAND USE INPUTS (INFORMATION)

Kirby Brady (SANDAG) provided an update on draft Series 13 Regional Growth Forecast, and requested any land use input updates from jurisdictions be submitted by May 30, 2014.

6. REGIONAL PROGRESS SINCE 2004: REVIEW OF LOCAL PLANS (INFORMATION)

Sarah Strand (SANDAG) presented the updated spreadsheet that captures regional progress toward planning for smart growth by identifying local general, community, and specific plans that have been updated since the adoption of the Regional Comprehensive Plan in 2004. Revisions were made based on updates from the jurisdictions that included identification of elements of significance such as supplemental planning efforts, climate action plans, energy roadmaps, and active transportation efforts.

Ms. Brindley asked for the deadline for jurisdictions to send their updates to SANDAG.

Ms. Strand responded that the goal is to have them all submitted by the end of May.

7. CLIMATE ACTION PLANNING TOOLS AND RESOURCES (DISCUSSION)

Ms. Wood provided background on SANDAG and local government efforts in the development of Climate Action Plans (CAP) to reduce Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions in the San Diego region. This report describes the tools and resources available to support CAP development and implementation.
Scott Anders (Energy Policy Initiatives Center, UC San Diego) presented the EPIC tool for GHG emissions calculations, and SANDAG staff described other resources available to support local climate action planning. This includes inventories of GHG and mitigation tools that estimate the expected GHG reductions. EPIC proposes making city inventories consistent in formatting so that they can be compared with regional inventories.

Mr. Petrek asked if cities who have already adopted CAPs will have to amend them when SANDAG updates its CAP.

Mr. Anders responded that cities will not have to update their plan, but rather just work towards consistency in future planning efforts.

8. TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT PILOT PROGRAM BETWEEN SANDAG AND THE CITY OF CHULA VISTA (INFORMATION)

Antoinette Meier (SANDAG) presented an overview of the Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Pilot Program that SANDAG and the City of Chula Vista have undertaken. SANDAG and the City of Chula Vista have partnered to develop two workshops for city staff and the development community on best practices for implementing TDM through the development process. The outcomes from the workshops are expected to help the City of Chula Vista with formalizing a TDM program. The first workshop was held in March to educate participants about TDM, and the second workshop was held in April to begin developing potential programs and policies for consideration by the City of Chula Vista. This workshop series is available for other interested jurisdictions in the San Diego region.

Mr. Batchelder described the current TDM Program and efforts in the City of Chula Vista.

Chair Fulton asked if the City of Chula Vista has measured or will measure the potential change in Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT).

Mr. Batchelder responded that the City of Chula Vista does not have a mechanism to measure change in VMT.

9. SAN DIEGO FORWARD: THE REGIONAL PLAN: DISCUSSION OF DRAFT WHITE PAPERS CURRENTLY AVAILABLE FOR PUBLIC REVIEW (DISCUSSION)

Carolina Gregor (SANDAG) introduced the project managers who drafted the white papers on the topics of Economic Prosperity, Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation, and Emerging Technologies. Each provided a brief overview of their white paper, followed by three sets of break-out sessions to facilitate input and discussion by TWG members on the content and feedback from the public workshops. The white papers will support and provide background information for the development of the Regional Plan. Following the public review period, the white papers will be updated and re-posted to the website. Draft white papers are available at www.sdforward.com for a 45-day public review period that closes on Monday, May 19, 2014.
Below is a summary of TWG member input from the table rotations:

**Economic Prosperity Table:**
- Developing walkable/bikeable/transit-friendly town centers is important, even in rural town centers like Fallbrook, Valley Center, Ramona, Alpine; some areas more receptive than others. Road safety for non-auto users a big issue, as is stormwater and infrastructure financing.
- Infrastructure cost constraints are severe. Support for walkable communities is important to local businesses, but traffic is always a main issue.
- Port investment creates jobs. Port lacks jurisdiction over transportation to/from the Port lands. Goods movement impacts surrounding neighborhoods. Need to partner with jurisdictions/military.
- To attract and retain talent and improve our region’s economic competitiveness, San Diego must do better at “placemaking” in residential, mixed use, and commercial areas; we are falling behind competitor cities. Quality of life is critical, and TOD-type development will be heavily in demand; the San Diego region must be more than sunshine and beaches; it must have neighborhood infrastructure.
- Complete Streets help revitalize communities and they tend to be areas where the region wants to focus growth.
- Communities are supportive of Complete Streets and the region should invest in those communities that are most receptive/supportive.
- New storm water regulations are a roadblock to smart growth.
- Infrastructure financing is a huge missing piece in the planning process.
- Many corridors are not walkable or bikeable and need more financial support.
- Need to focus on place-making in neighborhoods around transit stops.
- Difficulty in creating the “urban density” that will sustain redevelopment of urban areas. What are the conditions that are needed to attract that “critical mass?” Surveys or studies could help. Jobs/housing is out of balance; people don’t work near enough to where they live; South Bay needs more jobs. Region needs to think regionally about job creation, not as individual jurisdictions.
- Need to increase densities in centers of cities/communities. New universities are big drivers. Underground infrastructure often poses challenges.
- There need to be better transit connections between communities; ability to easily get from one center hub to another increases labor pool for businesses and opportunity for individuals.
- Tourists – not just low-income residents – rely on transit, and both use transit in off-hours.
- General frustration with transit operators noted; fares too expensive, service insufficient/spotty.
- Recent immigrants find transit system difficult, lack trust in government, and need links to jobs/education. Better educated workforce benefits everyone.
- Workforce development programs are needed.
- Transportation options are important to everyone; people need to be able to use more than one mode of transportation depending on their needs.
Climate Change Table:
- For local governments that have adopted a Climate Action Plan, it would be helpful to have more regional coordination on implementation and monitoring, and demonstrating reductions.
- Air Pollution Control District or SANDAG should take the lead in establishing a regional framework for GHG inventories.
- The region could benefit from a GHG reduction credit banking system where new projects could offset GHG emissions by retrofitting existing buildings, for example.
- SANDAG has a role to play in providing VMT data and technical assistance for local jurisdictions.
- It is important to consider the upstream energy use and GHG emissions of water sources.
- Implementation needs to be brought to the neighborhood level with unique outreach and education for each community.
- We should work to establish consistent baseline years for local GHG inventories.
- For climate adaptation, we need concrete science at the local level to inform planning.
- Measures for addressing climate change should be prioritized so that the biggest pay-off strategies are first.
- In general, we need to have more focus on adaptation strategies as we are already seeing the impacts of climate change.
- We need to better understand the economic development implications of various measures.
- Efforts in our region need to be brought into the context of the rest of the world.
- We need to further develop the general public’s understanding of climate change.
- We need to advocate for regional approach and consistency to climate planning.
- We should start climate education of community at local, neighborhood level.
- National City defines neighborhoods via school district and makes schools center of neighborhoods – opportunity to connect with youth and change long-term behaviors.
- SANDAG should offer VMT analysis for local jurisdictions.

Emerging Technologies Table:
- Need options for mobility, other methods to reduce congestion.
- Technology will reduce emissions.
- We need to address congestion with new technologies.
- We are not taking advantage of true highway capacity.
- We need all highways to have transit-only lanes.
- Car2Go has potential to reduce congestion.
- Current SANDAG projects with Metropolitan Transit System are not accommodating these new technologies and concepts (Bike Share, electric vehicle, Car2Go). We can do these right now, but we are missing opportunities.
• We need to combine shared-use vehicles with public transit investments, station areas.
• Mobility hubs are important but we need multiple transportation options throughout the region in many locations.
• Land use is critical to make technology, mobility hubs, and car-share work.
• We need to be mindful of technologies’ effects on brick-and-mortar retail.

10. ADJOURNMENT AND NEXT MEETING (INFORMATION)

Chair Fulton adjourned the TWG meeting at 3:15 p.m.

The next TWG meeting is scheduled for June 12, 2014, from 1:15 to 3:15 p.m.
2014 APA San Diego Award Winners:

**Comprehensive Plan: Large Jurisdiction**
City of San Diego, San Diego River Park Master Plan

**Comprehensive Plan: Small Jurisdiction**
City of El Cajon 2013-2021 Housing Element

**Economic Planning and Development Award**
The Green Build at San Diego International Airport
San Diego County Regional Airport Authority

**Transportation Planning Award of Merit**
San Diego Regional PEV Readiness Plan
San Diego Association of Governments

**Best Practices Award of Merit**
County of San Diego Community Design Review Streamline Procedure and Community Design Guideline Checklists
County of San Diego Planning & Development Services

**Public Outreach Award**
Pop-Up Outreach for the Southeastern & Encanto Community Plan Updates, City of San Diego, M.W. Steele Group

**Urban Design Award**
Third Avenue Streetscape Implementation Project
Phase 1, City of Chula Vista

**Planning Advocate Award**
Honorable Greg Cox, San Diego County Supervisor

**Planning Agency Award**
City of La Mesa, Community Development Department

**Communication Initiative Award**
Voice of San Diego, Andrew Keatts and the Land Use Section
HEALTHY COMMUNITIES TRANSFORMATION INITIATIVE

Introduction

Under a program called the Healthy Communities Transformation Initiative (HCTI), the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) is developing a Healthy Communities Index (HCI) and accompanying Healthy Communities Assessment Tool (HCAT). Attachment 1 provides a summary of the HCTI program. The HCI and HCAT are tools that local entities can use to assess how well their community supports public health, broadly defined. The San Diego region has been selected as a pilot site for the program, and this provides an opportunity for local jurisdictions to utilize the tool as a planning aid to assess the wide variety of factors that can have an impact on community health. SANDAG is managing this project at the regional level, and is requesting volunteers from local jurisdictions or community groups to use the tool at the neighborhood level in a planning exercise.

Discussion

Because the San Diego region has been so engaged in the subject on the public health impacts of planning and the built environment, SANDAG was invited in 2012 by HUD to participate on a national advisory panel for the development of a HCI and the HCAT. The region also was chosen as a pilot site along with Minneapolis, Minnesota; Albuquerque, New Mexico; and Charleston, South Carolina to test the tool.

Over the past two years, HUD, through its consultant, Healthy Housing Solutions, Inc., has been working with the national advisory panel and a team of experts to develop the HCI and HCAT. Both are based on the definition of health provided by the World Health Organization as a state of complete physical, mental, and social well-being and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity. With this broad definition, the indicators in the index and tool utilize a comprehensive list of indicators as shown in Attachment 2. The 42 indicators are separated into 10 domains.

HUD is providing data for a portion of the indicators, and SANDAG, in cooperation with the County Health and Human Services Agency, will be collecting the remainder of the data. A beta version the HCI and HCAT has just recently been released using data from the Baltimore, Maryland area.

The San Diego version of the HCI and HCAT will include data for the entire region, but the tools are designed to be used at the neighborhood level. For this reason, SANDAG is requesting local volunteers to help with the testing by identifying communities where the tools could be applied, preferably in an active planning exercise. The local partners would help SANDAG by defining the
test neighborhoods or communities, incorporating the use of the tools into the planning process, and by providing feedback on the how the tools performed to SANDAG and HUD.

If successful, HUD hopes to see the tools used for a variety of purposes including strategic planning and policy development, land use regulation, public infrastructure and program investments, business and residential site selection, plan and program performance monitoring, civic engagement, education, research and evaluation, and philanthropy.

**Project Schedule**

Data collection for the San Diego region will take place over the summer, making the tools available for use beginning in the fall. The consultants will provide training on the use of the tools to all the participants and the pilot testing will run through May 2015. The program assessments will evaluate:

- Challenges related to indicator data collection and population of the HCAT
- Overall relevance and effectiveness of HCI indicators
- Functionality of the HCAT to help assess community (i.e., neighborhood) health
- Ability to engage stakeholders from diverse fields in community health efforts; capacity for a range of public and private sector users (i.e., stakeholders) to utilize the HCI and HCAT in different ways
- Tool documentation, training, and technical support
- Ability to utilize the tools to help inform program, planning, and policy decisions
- Potential opportunities and challenges associated with using the HCI and HCAT at the local level

Those interested in participating in this process should contact SANDAG to participate in the upcoming training.

**Attachments:**  
1. HUD Healthy Communities Transformation Initiative  
2. Healthy Communities Index

**Key Staff Contact:** Stephan Vance, (619) 699-1924, stephan.vance@sandag.org
Defining Healthy Communities

What makes a community healthy? Is it the number of people with disease? Or is community health a product of neighborhood factors, including quality parks and schools, good housing, accessible shops and services, efficient transportation, and safe, clean environments? Across the country, many communities are taking action to improve the health and well-being of their residents by promoting sustainable and healthy neighborhoods. Identifying the right indicators to track and evaluate neighborhood determinants of health can be challenging because there are very few reliable and standardized measures designed to address the range of physical and social determinants of health at the neighborhood level. As more communities take on the challenge of integrating health into community planning and development, there is an increasing need for a comprehensive, standard set of neighborhood-level indicators of health and well-being to help communities establish baseline conditions, prioritize investments, and evaluate progress towards community health goals.

The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) is a leader in promoting community health by using housing as a platform for improving quality of life. HUD’s mission is “to create strong, sustainable, inclusive communities and affordable homes for all.” The Healthy Communities Transformation Initiative (HCTI) supports and advances this holistic vision of community health.

Healthy Communities Transformation Initiative (HCTI)

The Healthy Communities Transformation Initiative (HCTI), funded by HUD’s Office of Lead Hazard Control and Healthy Homes (OLHCHH), is designed to help improve the health systems and the physical, social, and economic service structures that support healthy living and healthy behaviors in our communities. Healthy Housing Solutions, Inc. (Solutions) is leading the team developing this initiative. Two key elements of the HCTI are development of the Healthy Communities Index (HCI) and Healthy Communities Assessment Tool (HCAT).

HUD launched the HCTI with the goal of developing a systematic, evidence-based approach to assist local jurisdictions assess the physical, social, and economic roots of community health, and identify actionable policy and program activities to improve residents’ health and quality of life. Many communities have started to integrate health into community development and planning, but until the HCTI, have lacked access to standardized, comprehensive and practical tools available to help them measure the most important community determinants of health. The HCI and HCAT provide standardized, evidence-based tools that communities can use as a starting point to identify and prioritize issues of greatest concern.

The main objective of the HCTI is to create a unified national effort that:
- Defines criteria and metrics for community health;
- Supports healthy communities research; and
- Showcases best and most promising practices for healthy communities.
The HCTI supports community efforts to improve neighborhood conditions and transform community health through the development and application of standardized healthy community indicators. Indicators were selected based upon their measurability, nexus to health, and relationship to established national public health objectives. All indicators were evaluated for their ability to be easily interpreted, scalability for a range of communities, and capacity to motivate and create actionable policy and program change.

The HCI indicators form the foundation of the HCAT, which is designed to be easily used so the HCI can be broadly applied in any community. In addition to facilitating use of the HCI to evaluate community health, the HCAT also features resources and tools to help communities set and achieve goals. These may include a Healthy Development Checklist of suggested health or development targets and a menu of policies strategies to advance community health objectives.

The HCI and HCAT are being piloted in four cities that have demonstrated an interest in and commitment to measuring and improving community health. The HCTI project team will provide technical assistance to organizations in the pilot cities as well as provide access to national experts and opportunities to help integrate healthy community criteria into local policies and programs. Additionally, the HCTI helps promote interagency collaboration and opportunities to define and expand a national commitment to creating healthy communities.

Solutions is leading a team of uniquely qualified partners (ICF International, the International City/County Management Association, the National Center for Healthy Housing, and the Urban Institute) and being guided by a panel of national experts in the development of these innovative tools to support a common vision of healthy communities. We encourage you to contact us for more information.

Contact us for more information:

HUD OLHCHH
Peter Ashley
Peter.J.Ashley@hud.gov
Chris Trent
Chris.B.Trent@hud.gov

HEALTHY HOUSING SOLUTIONS
Noreen Beatley
nbeatley@healthyhousingsolutions.com

“The HCTI supports community efforts to improve neighborhood conditions and transform community health through the development and application of standardized healthy community indicators.”
## Healthy Communities Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOMAIN</th>
<th>Priority Indicators</th>
<th>Neighborhood Indicator Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Access to parks and open space</td>
<td>Average number of parks within 1/2 mile of the neighborhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED</td>
<td>Adult educational attainment</td>
<td>Percent of adults, aged 25 or older, with a high school diploma.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Age of housing</td>
<td>Percent of homes constructed prior to 1980.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>Business retention</td>
<td>Rate of increase/decrease in the number of businesses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>Chronic school absence</td>
<td>Percent of students chronically absent from school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Commute mode share</td>
<td>Percent of workers commuting by transit, bicycle, foot, or carpool.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Excessive housing cost burden</td>
<td>Proportion of households whose gross housing costs are 35 percent or more of their household income.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Food desert</td>
<td>Share of neighborhood with access to affordable or good-quality fresh food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED</td>
<td>HS Graduation rate</td>
<td>Rate of high school graduation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Household transportation costs</td>
<td>Percent of household budget allocated to transportation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>Local business vitality</td>
<td>Number of small, locally owned businesses per capita.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EO</td>
<td>Long-term unemployment</td>
<td>Percent of individuals out of work for more than 12 months.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>Low birth weight</td>
<td>Percent of live births with low birth weight (&lt;2500 grams).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>Motor vehicle collisions</td>
<td>Annual incidence of motor vehicle collision injuries and fatalities per capita for all modes of transportation on public roadways and right-of-ways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Offsite alcohol outlets</td>
<td>Density of liquor stores for “off-site” alcohol consumption per capita (10,000 people)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Pedestrian connectivity</td>
<td>Density of miles of pedestrian-oriented links per square mile.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED</td>
<td>Preschool enrollment</td>
<td>Percent of three and four year-olds enrolled in preschool.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>Preventable hospitalizations</td>
<td>Age-standardized acute care hospitalization rate for conditions where appropriate ambulatory care prevents or reduces the need for admission to the hospital per 100,000 population under age 75 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED</td>
<td>Reading proficiency</td>
<td>Percent of third or fourth grade students meeting or exceeding “proficient” reading levels on standardized assessment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Healthy Communities Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOMAIN</th>
<th>Priority Indicators</th>
<th>Neighborhood Indicator Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Residential mobility</td>
<td>Percent of population age one year and older living the same house as one year ago.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EH</td>
<td>Residential proximity to traffic</td>
<td>Share of neighborhood with close proximity to heavy road traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EH</td>
<td>School proximity to traffic</td>
<td>Share of neighborhood schools with close proximity to heavy road traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EO</td>
<td>Self-Sufficiency Standard (Formerly Wage Level Indicator)</td>
<td>Proportion of employed workers earning a self-sufficiency wage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EH</td>
<td>Toxic releases from facilities</td>
<td>Share of neighborhood in proximity to significant reportable toxic air emissions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Transit accessibility</td>
<td>Aggregate frequency of transit service within 0.25 miles of block group boundary per hour during evening peak period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EO</td>
<td>Travel time to work</td>
<td>Mean (average) travel time to work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Tree cover</td>
<td>Percent of tree cover within the neighborhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Vacancy rate</td>
<td>Proportion of vacant residential properties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>Violent crime</td>
<td>Annual rate of reported violent incidents per capita (1000 population)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Voter participation</td>
<td>Proportion of voting eligible population who voted in last election.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Walkability</td>
<td>Share of the neighborhood that is pedestrian friendly, i.e., close to amenities and services with good street and sidewalk connections.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Optional Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOMAIN</th>
<th>Priority Indicators</th>
<th>Neighborhood Indicator Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>Access to mainstream financial services</td>
<td>Percent of un- and underbanked households.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Blood lead levels in children</td>
<td>Percent of tested children with a blood lead level over 5ug/dL.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EO</td>
<td>Employment rate</td>
<td>Percentage of employed working age population (15- 64 years).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EH</td>
<td>Proximity to Brownfields site</td>
<td>Share of neighborhood (blocks) within 1km of a brownfields site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EH</td>
<td>Proximity to Superfund sites</td>
<td>Share of neighborhood (blocks) within 1km of an active Superfund site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED</td>
<td>School readiness scores</td>
<td>Percent of kindergarteners ready for first grade.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Demographic and Contextual Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concentrated Poverty</td>
<td>Proportion of households earning 50 percent or less of the area median income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income inequality</td>
<td>Measure of inequality based on the dispersion of household income within the community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Healthy Communities Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain Code</th>
<th>Priority Indicators</th>
<th>Neighborhood Indicator Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Life expectancy</strong></td>
<td>Count of years of potential life lost per capita.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Park Quality</strong></td>
<td>Proprietary city park score that integrates and evaluates park acreage, land share, spending per resident, playgrounds, and park proximity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Racial/Ethnic diversity</strong></td>
<td>Measure of the extent to which several racial/ethnic groups are present in the community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Domain Code

- **EC** Economic Health
- **ED** Educational Opportunities
- **EH** Environmental Hazards
- **EO** Employment Opportunities
- **H** Housing
- **HS** Health Systems and Public Safety
- **NA** Natural Areas
- **NC** Neighborhood Characteristics
- **SC** Social Cohesion
- **T** Transportation

1. Requires pilot city to request data from another source (e.g., state agency) or to collect or compile data from local sources.
2. Indicator is a number that can be summed across tracts/ZIP codes.
3. Indicator is a number that should be averaged across tracts/ZIP codes. Note that it will may be appropriate to do a weighted average in cases where it is not methodologically sound to treat all tracts/ZIP codes equally.
4. Indicator will be reported as a percentage or proportion. This will typically require the input of both a numerator and a denominator. The HCAT will sum the numerator across tracts, sum the denominator across tracts and then divide to get the neighborhood proportion. In cases where a tract or ZIP code is only partially allocated to a neighborhood, a weighting of tracts/ZIPs would allow that tract/ZIP to contribute proportionally to the numerator and denominator.
5. This indicator will be reported as a number per specified unit (e.g., per 10,000 residents or per square mile). This will require
6. More than one data source is needed to calculate this indicator. Many indicators need more than one field from a single data source, but these indicators require data from multiple sources (in many cases, the second data source is population from the census).
7. These data sources do not require data requests, local data collection or geospatial analysis using city-defined neighborhoods and are candidates for Solutions/ICF to consider for pre-populating the tool with data.
TransNet SMART GROWTH INCENTIVE PROGRAM AND TransNet/TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION GRANT PROGRAM: CALL FOR PROJECTS FOR THIRD CYCLE OF GRANT FUNDING

Introduction

The TransNet Extension ordinance provides funding for two of the SANDAG land use and transportation competitive grant programs – the Smart Growth Incentive Program (SGIP) and the Active Transportation Grant Program (ATGP). To date, SANDAG has issued two cycles of funding for each of these programs, and traditionally, the call for projects for the two programs have been issued individually. Due to the similar timeframes and program elements, staff is conducting the third cycle of call for projects for these two grant programs simultaneously.

The criteria for both programs underwent significant updates during the last cycle to ensure consistency with the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (2050 RTP/SCS) and Riding to 2050: The San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan. As a result, no changes are proposed to the criteria, and only minor changes are proposed to the program guidelines for both programs for this next cycle. As a point of clarification, it should be noted that the State of California is currently conducting a statewide Active Transportation Program (ATP) consisting of both statewide and regional competitions, being administered by the California Transportation Commission (CTC). In an effort to facilitate the application process for the TransNet/Transportation Development Act (TDA) ATGP, staff is proposing accepting the submission of unfunded regional ATP applications, described in more detail below.

Funding from FY 2014, FY 2015, and FY 2016 is anticipated, for an approximate total of $12 million for the SGIP and $3 million for the ATGP. (When the SANDAG Board of Directors approved the Regional Bike Early Action Program [EAP] in September 2013, it limited the TransNet/TDA ATGP to $1 million per year.) Funding amounts for both programs will be finalized this fall. The SANDAG Board of Directors will be asked to issue the call for projects for both programs this October, and approve the project awards next summer. Work to fulfill the grant agreements would begin in fall 2015.

The Regional Planning Technical Working Group (TWG) is asked to review and discuss the proposed changes to the program guidelines in anticipation of the call for projects.
Background Information

Funding and Eligibility

The SGIP and ATGP were established through the half-cent sales tax TransNet Extension Ordinance, approved by the region's voters in 2004. The ordinance sets aside two percent of the measure’s annual sales tax revenues for smart growth incentives and two percent for active transportation projects, and the ATGP is supplemented with TDA revenues. Only local cities and the County of San Diego are eligible recipients of the grant funds. Nonprofit and community-based organizations may collaborate with the cities or the County, but cannot directly apply for the funds.

Goals, Program Objectives, and Grant Types

The following table provides a summary of goals, program objectives, and grant types for each program, from the last cycle of funding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>SGIP</th>
<th>ATGP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Encourage comprehensive public infrastructure projects and planning activities that facilitate compact, mixed-use development focused around public transit, and that aim to increase housing and transportation choices.</td>
<td>• Encourage the planning and development of Complete Streets, and provide multiple travel choices for the region's residents.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fund projects that can serve as models around the region and attract private development.</td>
<td>• Fund bicycle and pedestrian-oriented transportation facility improvements, planning efforts, encouragement and education programs, and bicycle parking.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Create great places in the San Diego region.</td>
<td>• Support the goals and objectives of Riding to 2050: The San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Objectives</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Serve as catalysts for further smart growth development.</td>
<td>• Encourage a cohesive network of complete streets, improve bike/pedestrian neighborhood connectivity to transit and destinations such as schools, retail, places of work, parks, and other gathering places, and support smart growth place-making.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Influence land development by improving the public realm and encouraging private projects that create great places.</td>
<td>• Improve safety for bicyclists and pedestrians.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Serve as model examples for smart growth in a variety of settings.</td>
<td>• Serve as models for the region by featuring innovative solutions that prioritize access for bicyclists and pedestrians.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Contribute to the reduction of Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions by encouraging travel means other than single-occupant vehicle.</td>
<td>• Ensure access to jobs, services, and recreation for populations with fewer transportation choices, and create equitable transportation opportunities for all users, regardless of age, ability, race, ethnicity, or income.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Support future housing development.</td>
<td>• Increase community support for bicycling and walking and promote active transportation as a means of improving health outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Support reductions in GHG emissions and facilitate an increase in levels of walking and bicycling in the region by providing supportive facilities, amenities, and programs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Types and Percentage Allocations</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Capital (80%) ($2 million cap)</td>
<td>• Capital (75%) ($500,000 threshold for large projects; 60% maximum toward large projects; $1.5 million cap)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Planning (20% plus any rollover from Capital)</td>
<td>• Non-Capital (25%, plus any rollover from Capital)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Planning (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Education/Encouragement/Awareness (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Bicycle parking (5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Summary of Previous Funding Cycles**

The following table provides information for the first two funding cycles of both grant programs, and provides estimated dates and funding amounts for the third funding cycle.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SGIP</th>
<th>Release of Call for Projects:</th>
<th>Projects Awarded:</th>
<th>Funding From:</th>
<th>Available Funding:</th>
<th>Number of Projects Funded:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATGP</th>
<th>Release of Call for Projects:</th>
<th>Projects Awarded:</th>
<th>Funding From:</th>
<th>Available Funding:</th>
<th>Number of Projects Funded:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Cycle</td>
<td>April 2009</td>
<td>June 2009</td>
<td>FY 2010</td>
<td>$7.8 million</td>
<td>29 projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Cycle</td>
<td>April 2012</td>
<td>Sept 2012</td>
<td>FY 2011, FY 2012</td>
<td>$8.8 million</td>
<td>26 projects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposed Changes to Program Guidelines**

Staff is proposing only one modification to the program guidelines for both the SGIP and ATGP, and one modification to the ATGP, as described below. Information related to eligible projects and scoring criteria for both programs is provided in Attachments 1 and 2. In addition, while not a specific change to the criteria or the criteria weighting, the references to reductions of GHG emissions and Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) in the program objectives and other sections of the program guidelines will be strengthened in an effort to continue to incentivize local jurisdictions to plan or build projects that reduce VMT and GHG emissions, implement local and regional climate action plans, and continue to promote active transportation projects that enhance public health, as consistent with the 2050 RTP/SCS.

**Proposed Modifications to Both Programs – Requirement of Matching Funds**

Currently, neither program requires matching funds, but both programs provide points for matching funds. Projects that provide higher matching proportions receive a higher number of points. The original intent of the TransNet extension ordinance was to leverage TransNet funds to the fullest extent possible. With this in mind, it was anticipated that projects that received TransNet funding would bring an approximate match of 50 percent. Over the years, the matching percentage

---

1. In the ATGP (both the capital and non-capital grant programs), projects are scored relative to each other by ranking the matching funds amounts from highest to lowest. The projects with the most matching funds receive the highest points (10 for the capital and 20 for non-capital), and projects with the lowest receive the fewest points. Projects without secured matching funds receive no points. In the SGIP planning grant program, points are awarded in proportion to the percentage of proposed matching funds to the total project cost. In the SGIP capital grant program, projects receive points based on a curve from most to least matching funds.
has come in considerably lower. In an attempt to leverage TransNet funds to a greater degree, it is proposed that both programs institute a new requirement for a minimum local match of 20 to 30 percent of the total cost of the project. This scenario would not change the matching funds scoring criterion. Projects that provide higher matching proportions would still receive a higher number of points. Projects failing to provide the required local match would be ineligible for funding.

Proposed Modifications to the ATGP Capital Grants Program – Removal of Over/Under $500,000 Category Distinction

The second cycle of the ATGP Capital Grants program contained a provision that of the $6.6 million available during that cycle, a maximum of $4 million (or approximately 60% of capital funds) would be available to fund projects over $500,000, and that grant requests could not exceed $1.5 million. This $500,000 threshold established two categories of projects: projects over $500,000, and projects of $500,000 or less. Staff is proposing eliminating these category distinctions as part of Cycle 3 for two reasons: (1) a smaller volume of grant applications is expected for the ATGP resulting from a redirection of funds toward the Bike EAP approved last year; and (2) the category distinction did not result in the expected outcome of evening the playing field between smaller and larger jurisdictions, as was originally anticipated. Given the smaller amount of funding available (approximately $3 million for the third cycle versus almost $9 million for the second cycle), dropping the distinction could help streamline and facilitate the application and review process.

Proposed Considerations for the TransNet/TDA ATGP in Relation to the Statewide ATP

As mentioned previously, the State of California is currently conducting a statewide ATP consisting of both statewide and regional competitions. Program funding will be awarded in two stages, beginning with a statewide competition with applications due in May 2014, followed by a regional competition with applications due in June 2014. The ATP is being administered by the CTC. SANDAG, as the region’s Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), will act as the administrator for the regional competition. More information is available at www.sandag.org/atpfunding.

Proposal Regarding Regional ATP Applications Not Selected for Funding

In an effort to facilitate the application process for the ATGP, staff is proposing that applications submitted by jurisdictions that are not awarded funding as part of the regional MPO-selection process be granted the ability to submit their regional ATP program application, along with the supplemental questions approved by the SANDAG Board and the CTC in May 2014. The supplemental questions address topics such as innovation; project readiness; linkages to bike, pedestrian, and transit networks; effectiveness and comprehensiveness of proposed project; and complementary programs. The TransNet eligibility criteria would be enforced, meaning that only local cities and the County could re-submit their applications for the ATGP. In addition, the Regional Housing Needs Assessment portion of the application, which has been eliminated from the regional portion of the statewide ATP application, would be reinstated for the ATGP.

The ATGP proposals will be due on February 3, 2015. Since the CTC will adopt the SANDAG recommended regional projects in November 2014, sufficient time would be available for jurisdictions to decide whether to resubmit unfunded regional applications to the local ATGP.
**SGIP and ATGP Schedule and Next Steps**

The following schedule is proposed for the third cycle of the SGIP and ATGP process, and is illustrated below in conjunction with the statewide Active Transportation Grant (ATG) program for reference purposes.

- **Summer 2014** – Prepare Call for Projects (criteria, technical update of the Smart Growth Concept Map, Regional Housing Needs Assessment Progress Report)

- **October 2014** – SANDAG Board releases Call for Projects for both programs

- **February 3, 2015** – Applications due

- **Spring 2015** – Evaluations and project rankings

- **June 2015** – SANDAG Board approves projects

- **October 2015** – Grant agreements executed and jurisdictions begin work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>Jul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGIP and ATGP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare Call for Projects</td>
<td>Release Call for Projects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>Jul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State and Federal MAP-21 Active Transportation Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 13: Reg apps due</td>
<td>Aug 20: CTC adopts Statewide Projects for funding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Staff is proposing that applications submitted by local jurisdictions that are not awarded funding as part of the regional MPO-selection process be granted the ability to submit their regional ATP program application, along with the supplemental questions approved by the SANDAG Board and the CTC in May 2014.
Roles and Responsibilities

The TWG, Cities/County Transportation CTAC, and Active Transportation Working Group (ATWG) will serve as the three primary working groups providing input on the program guidelines and project rankings. The Independent Taxpayers Oversight Committee (ITOC) will be asked to review the program guidelines and project rankings for consistency with the TransNet Program eligibility. The Regional Planning Committee will provide policy guidance and recommendations to the SANDAG Board on the program guidelines, criteria, and project selection for the SGIP, and the Transportation Committee will provide policy guidance and recommendations to the Board on the program guidelines, criteria, and project selection for both the SGIP and ATGP. The SANDAG Board will release the call for projects and approve the final project awards for both programs. Under the proposed schedule, the Board would release the call for projects for both programs in October 2014, and approve the selected projects in June 2015. Grants would be executed and work would begin by October 2015.

Next Steps

The TWG, CTAC, and the ATWG will provide input on the proposed changes to the program guidelines during June. The ITOC will receive a report on these two grant programs in July 2014, and the policy advisory committees will be asked to make recommendations on the proposed program guidelines in September 2014, for a call for projects to be released by the SANDAG Board in October 2014.

Attachments:
1. TransNet SGIP
   a. Eligible Projects, Scoring Criteria Guidance, and Scoring Criteria Matrix for Capital Grants
   b. Eligible Projects, Scoring Criteria Guidance, and Scoring Criteria Matrix for Planning Grants
2. TransNet/TDA ATGP
   a. Eligible Projects, Scoring Criteria Guidance, and Scoring Criteria Matrix for Capital Grants
   b. Eligible Projects, Scoring Criteria Guidance, and Scoring Criteria Matrix for non-Capital Grants

Key Staff Contact: Carolina Gregor, (619) 699-1989, carolina.gregor@sandag.org
SGIP ELIGIBLE PROJECTS (Capital Grants)

Eligible capital grant projects include pedestrian improvements, bicycle facilities, transit access improvements, and other innovative smart growth-supporting infrastructure. Proposed capital SGIP projects may include, but are not limited to, the following eligible elements.

- Public Plazas
- Pedestrian Street Crossings
- Streetscape Improvements (such as, median landscaping, street trees, lighting, and street furniture)
- Parklets
- Traffic Calming Features (such as, pedestrian bulb-outs or traffic circles)
- Access Improvements to Transit Stations/Routes
- Wayfinding Signage
- Community Gateway Features
- Pedestrian and Bicycle Paths and Bridges
- On Street Bike Lines
- Bicycle Parking
- Low Impact Development Elements Included as Part of the Above

Applicants are encouraged to utilize innovative solutions that are new to the region, and that are comprehensive in scope.
SGIP SCORING CRITERIA GUIDANCE (Capital Grants)

HOW WILL PROJECTS BE SCORED?

Once a project has been deemed eligible, it will be scored based on the criteria for its project type. Because the planning activities and capital improvements are very different, each will be scored under its own set of criteria. The project scoring criteria for capital projects are discussed in detail below.

1. LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION CHARACTERISTICS

The following criteria will determine competitiveness of the location of the proposed grant project, in terms of the project area’s land use and transportation characteristics at present, and in the near-term future.

Land use and transportation characteristics will be scored by SANDAG staff using current SANDAG land use and transportation data. Planned densities and land uses must be in adopted general plans and/or community plans. Pending amendments will not be considered. It is the responsibility of local jurisdictions to ensure that SANDAG has current land use data, and to submit information regarding entitled development within the project area.

A. Intensity of Planned Development in Project’s SGOA

A1. Planned Densities Relative to SGOA Place Type Thresholds

Up to six points are available. This criterion will be scored by SANDAG, comparing PLANNED land use densities for the project area to the density thresholds prescribed for the project’s smart growth opportunity area place type. Densities will be based on the land use designations in SANDAG’s currently adopted regional growth forecast.

Projects in areas with planned residential and/or employment densities that exceed the minimum density threshold for its smart growth place type will score highest in this category.

A2. Expedited Approval Process

A total of four points are available, if an applicant can demonstrate that a specific plan, master Environmental Impact Report, or other mechanism is in place to allow for administrative approval of development projects. This criterion will be scored by SANDAG.

B. EXISTINGS AND ENTITLED LAND DEVELOPMENT IN THE PROPOSED CAPITAL PROJECT AREA

B1. EXISTING Development Density

Up to six points are available. EXISTING development density around the proposed capital project will be calculated by SANDAG, comparing EXISTING densities within 1/4-mile of the project to the density thresholds prescribed for the project’s smart growth opportunity area place type. The 1/4-mile area around a project will extend for the full length of linear projects. Project areas where residential and/or employment development exceeds the minimum density threshold for its smart growth place type will score the highest in this category.

B2. ENTITLED Development Density

Up to six points are available. ENTITLED development projects within a 1/4-mile radius of the proposed capital project will qualify if any portion of the development project boundary is within the 1/4-mile area surrounding the proposed capital project. Densities will be scored relative to minimum threshold for the area’s smart growth place type. To receive points, applicant must describe entitled developments in the application. This criterion will be scored by SANDAG.

B3. Mix of Uses

Up to three points are available. Mix of Uses will be calculated by SANDAG by counting the number of current uses in the project area. Multi-family residential does not count toward these points; it must exist within the project area in addition to the other uses in order to earn points (i.e. projects without multi-family residential within 1/4 mile of the project area will not receive any points). The categories of land uses counted include single-family residential, retail, office, civic, parks, and visitor-serving.
B4. New Uses

A total of two points are available. The applicant must provide evidence of any new uses that would be added to the project area as a result of land development that the proposed capital project would support.

C. NEW AFFORDABLE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT

C1. New Affordable Housing Development

Up to 3 points are available. The applicant will identify new affordable housing that will be produced in conjunction with the entitled land development within 1/4-mile of the project. “Affordable housing” means housing that serves extremely low, very low, or low income households (between zero to 80 percent of area median income adjusted for household size). Affordable housing costs are defined in Section 6918 for renters and Section 6920 for purchasers of Title 25 of the California Code of Regulations, and in Sections 50052.5 and 50053 of the Health and Safety Code, or by the applicable funding source or program. Acquired and rehabilitated affordable housing qualifies under this criterion. This criterion will be scored by SANDAG.

C2. Low to Very-Low Income Affordable Units

A total of two points are available, if 50-100 percent of units in the development are restricted to low to very-low income residents.

D. TRANSPORTATION CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PROJECT AREA

SANDAG staff will score these criteria based on the transportation facilities within 1/4-mile walking distance of the project boundary. Walking distance will be determined through geographic system information transit and bicycle networks, and network of actual available walking paths.

D1. Relation to Transit

Up to 12 points are available. Transit facilities must be either existing or funded for construction to qualify.

D2. Bicycle Facilities

Up to two points are available. Bicycle facilities will be identified by the current San Diego Regional Bike Map unless the applicant provides additional information about existing or planned bike facilities not on the current map.

Only bicycle facilities built consistent with California Highway Design, Chapter 1000 standards will qualify. One point will be awarded where bicycle facilities exist within a 1/4 mile of the proposed project, and two points when those facilities connect directly to the project.

D3. Walkability

Up to four points are available. Walkability will be determined by the intersection density of the street network in the project area based on the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection Density (per Square Mile)</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>290 or greater</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225-290</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-224</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 100</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D4. Transportation Demand Management Strategies

Up to two points are available. Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategies within the project area must be described in the project application.

Existing TDM programs within the project area, such as requiring TDM plans as part of the development review process, or parking management strategies such as shared parking or allowing reductions in parking requirements receive two points, and proposed programs or policies receive one point.

Examples of TDM policies and programs that can be considered for this points category are included in (but not limited to those found in) *Integrating TDM into the Planning and Development Process*, which can be found at www.sandag.org/smartgrowth.

E. COMMUNITY DESIGN FEATURES AND CONTEXT OF THE PROJECT AREA

E1. Urban Design Characteristics and Community Context

Up to six points are available. This criterion will be scored by the panel, using aerial imagery, Google Street View and/or site visits, and guidance from the following sections in *Designing for Smart Growth: Creating Great Places in the San Diego Region*:

- Smart Growth Scorecard 3 – Consistent Street Edge (for large developments)
- Smart Growth Scorecard 4 – Street Frontages
- Connectivity (3.4 in Chapter 3 Site Design)
- Site Access (3.3 in Chapter 3 Site Design)
- Building Frontage (4.1 in Chapter 4 Building Design)
- Parking (Chapter 9 Parking)

The highest scoring projects will be located in project areas that exemplify the principles in all or a majority of the above sections. Lower scoring projects will be located in project areas that minimally exemplify principles in only one or a few of the above sections. Panel members will be provided with the above sections from *Designing for Smart Growth*.

Points are also available under this criterion if the local jurisdiction has developed design guidance for the project area that is in line with the above principles, such as:

- Design guidelines
- Form-based codes
- Renderings of proposed development

2. QUALITY OF PROPOSED CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT

The following criteria will determine competitiveness of the actual proposed grant project, in terms of how well the project meets the objectives of this grant program.

A. Support for Public Transit

Up to five points are available. This criterion will be scored by the panel, using guidance from the following sections in *Designing for Smart Growth: Creating Great Places in the San Diego Region*:

- Smart Growth Scorecard 10 – Transit Access (for streetscapes)
- Chapter 5 – Multimodal Streets – in terms of guidance for stops and stations, as well as bicycle and pedestrian access to transit
- Chapter 6 – Transit Stations

The highest scoring projects will propose elements that exemplify the principles in all or a majority of the above sections. Lower scoring projects will include minimal elements that exemplify principles in only one or a few of the above sections. Panel members will be provided with the above sections from *Designing for Smart Growth*. 
B. Providing Transportation Choices

Up to five points are available. This criterion will be scored by the panel, using guidance from the following sections in Designing for Smart Growth: Creating Great Places in the San Diego Region:

- Smart Growth Scorecard 8 – Street Connectivity (for streetscapes)
- Smart Growth Scorecard 9 – Pedestrian Realm
- Smart Growth Scorecard 13 – Vehicle and Bicycle Parking (for streetscapes)
- Smart Growth Scorecard 14 – Parking Demand Management (for streetscapes)
- Chapter 5 – Multimodal Streets

The highest scoring projects will propose elements that exemplify the principles in all or a majority of the above sections. Lower scoring projects will include minimal elements that exemplify principles in only one or a few of the above sections. Panel members will be provided with the above sections from Designing for Smart Growth.

Additionally:

- Pedestrian facility design must be consistent with the recommendations in the SANDAG Planning and Designing for Pedestrians, should improve street crossings where necessary, and/or connect the community and its activity centers.
- Bicycle facilities should be designed consistent with the requirements of Chapter 1000 of the California Highway Design manual, or the California MUTCD. Projects may also use AASHTO standards. Bicycle parking should be designed consistent with the bicycle parking guidelines in the San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan. Highest scoring projects will provide continuity with bike routes beyond the immediate project area and connect to important community destinations, especially public transit.
- Projects that do not directly facilitate travel, such as public gathering areas should contribute to reducing vehicle travel by bringing needed public places into walking or bicycling range of community members.
- Changes to vehicle parking should significantly reduce the role of the automobile for travel in the area as well as the impact of parking on the community design of the area.

C. Community Enhancement

Up to five points are available. This criterion will be scored by the panel, using guidance from the following sections in Designing for Smart Growth: Creating Great Places in the San Diego Region:

- Smart Growth Scorecard 12 – Plazas and Seating
- Neighborhood Context (3.2 in Chapter 3 Site Design)
- Chapter 8 – Parks and Civic Space

The highest scoring projects will propose elements that exemplify the principles in all or a majority of the above sections, and contribute toward a setting that is more likely to attract private investment. Lower scoring projects will include minimal elements that exemplify principles in only one or a few of the above sections, and lack features that would help to accomplish the goal of placemaking. Panel members will be provided with the above sections from Designing for Smart Growth.

D. Addressing Project Area Issues

Up to five points are available. This criterion will assess how well the project addresses issues specific to the community, which will be unique in each location, depending on demographics and specific needs; and how well the project preserves and integrates existing cultural and natural resources in the project area.

Specific issues to be addressed may pertain to specific populations such as the elderly or disabled or other low-mobility populations, or may address area issues such as crime, or work toward a goal of economic revitalization for existing businesses.
In the example of specific populations, the proposed project could reduce roadway speeds and employ other traffic calming improvements that will ensure safer access for elderly residents from a residential street to a senior center or retail district around the corner.

In the example of crime, the proposed project could seek to improve public safety by employing crime prevention through environmental design strategies, cleaning up an eyesore, or removing a nuisance that attracts crime.

The applicant should demonstrate how the project will effectively integrate and preserve existing cultural and natural resources in the area that help shape the identity of that community. Natural resources could include (but are not limited to) creeks and open space.

Cultural resources could range from (but are not limited to) locally owned small businesses, murals, memorials and monuments, and historical buildings, bridges, or other infrastructure that represent landmarks in the community.

Highest scoring projects will address area issues comprehensively and effectively, and with design features that artfully integrate community resources into the project. Capital projects should preserve and protect important cultural and natural resources in the project area, and when appropriate, integrate such resources into the project design.

Smart Growth Scorecard 5 – Historic and Natural Features from *Designing for Smart Growth* will also be used to score this criterion.

E. **Sustainability**

Up to two points are available. This criterion will be scored by the panel, using guidance from the following sections in *Designing for Smart Growth: Creating Great Places in the San Diego Region*:

- Smart Growth Scorecard 6 – Sustainable Design (for streetscapes)
- Energy Conservation and Landscaping (3.5 in Chapter 3 Site Design)
- Stormwater Runoff (5.5 in Chapter 5 Multimodal Streets)

The highest scoring projects will propose elements that exemplify the principles in all or a majority of the above sections. Lower scoring projects will include minimal elements that exemplify principles in only one or a few of the above sections. Panel members will be provided with the above sections from *Designing for Smart Growth*.

F. **Universal Design**

Up to two points are available. This criterion will be scored by the panel, using guidance from the following sections in *Designing for Smart Growth: Creating Great Places in the San Diego Region*:

- Smart Growth Scorecard 7 – Universal Access
- Universal Design (6.2 in Chapter 6 Transit Stations)

Additionally, intersection improvements must include pedestrian signals and detectable warnings designed for pedestrians with visual and hearing impairments.

The highest scoring projects will propose elements that exemplify the principles of universal design. Lower scoring projects will include minimal elements that exemplify principles in only one or a few of the above sections. Projects that only meet Public Rights-of-Way Accessibility Guidelines will not receive points. Panel members will be provided with the above sections from *Designing for Smart Growth*.

For more information and resources on universal design principles, please visit:

- [http://design.ncsu.edu/cud/](http://design.ncsu.edu/cud/)
- [http://www.access-board.gov/prowac/](http://www.access-board.gov/prowac/)
3. PROJECT READINESS

A. Major Milestones Completed

Up to four points are available. SANDAG will score projects based on the project development milestones completed.

- Environmental clearance under California Environmental Quality Act and the National Environmental Policy Act if appropriate is worth one point.
- Completion of right-of-way acquisition, all necessary entitlements, or evidence provided by the applicant that no right-of-way acquisition is required, earns one point.
- Completion of final design (plans, specifications, and estimates) also earns one point.
- One point will be awarded if the applicant can provide evidence that the project is fully funded, OR the grant will fully fund the project.

B. Evidence of Local Commitment

Up to two points are available. The applicant should demonstrate that the project is supported by the community, as a result of a comprehensive public participation process that significantly involved a diverse group of stakeholders.

Projects that can provide evidence of a comprehensive, community-based planning process leading to the project and endorsement of community groups will be awarded two points.

Projects that cannot demonstrate that their planning process involved a diverse group of community stakeholders and that the project has the support of some, but not most community groups will receive one point.

Evidence of opposition from individuals within the community will not reduce the points awarded unless there is an ad hoc organization of opposition, or the number of individuals in opposition is significant.

4. Grant-Score Ratio

Up to 16 points are available. The grant-score ratio is scored by dividing the sum of the weighted points earned on the criteria in categories I and II by the grant request. The projects will be ranked based on the resulting ratio and the available 16 points will be distributed proportionately. The project(s) with the highest ratio receives 16 points, and the one(s) with the lowest receives one point.

5. Matching Funds

Up to ten points are available. Points for matching funds are awarded by dividing the total project cost as proposed in the application by the grant request. The projects will be ranked based on the resulting ratio and the available ten points distributed proportionately. The project(s) with the highest ratio receives ten points, and those with the lowest receive one point.

6. SANDAG Board Policy No 033 Points for Affordable Housing Production

Up to 75 points are available. See Board Policy No.033 for detailed methodology.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>PTS POSSIBLE</th>
<th>WEIGHT</th>
<th>SCORE POSSIBLE</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION CHARACTERISTICS OF THE AREA AROUND THE PROPOSED CAPITAL PROJECT IMPROVEMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>Intensity of Planned Development in the Project’s SGOA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1.</td>
<td>Planned Densities Relative to SGOA Place Type Thresholds</td>
<td>For Metropolitan Center/Urban Centers/Town Centers</td>
<td>Up to 6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 100 percent or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 50-99 percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 25-49 percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 100 percent or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 50-99 percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 25-49 percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>For community Centers/Rural Village/Mixed-Use Transit Corridor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 100 percent or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 50-99 percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 25-49 percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.</td>
<td>Expedited Approval Process</td>
<td>Specific plan, master EIR, or other mechanism allows for administrative approval of development projects.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>EXISTING and ENTITLED Land Development Around the Proposed Capital Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1.</td>
<td>EXISTING Development Density within 1/4 mile radius</td>
<td>For Metropolitan Center/Urban Centers/Town Centers</td>
<td>Up to 6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of proposed capital project site- ON THE GROUND</td>
<td>Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 100 percent or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 50-99 percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 25-49 percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 100 percent or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 50-99 percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 25-49 percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>For community Centers/Rural Village/Mixed-Use Transit Corridor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 100 percent or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 50-99 percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 25-49 percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2.</td>
<td>EXISTING Development Density within 1/4 mile radius</td>
<td>For Metropolitan Center/Urban Centers/Town Centers</td>
<td>Up to 6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of proposed capital project site- IN THE PIPELINE</td>
<td>Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 100 percent or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 50-99 percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 25-49 percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 100 percent or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 50-99 percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Exceeds minimum employment requirements by 25-49 percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>For community Centers/Rural Village/Mixed-Use Transit Corridor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 100 percent or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>CATEGORY</td>
<td>PTS</td>
<td>CRITERIA</td>
<td>PTS POSSIBLE</td>
<td>WEIGHT</td>
<td>SCORE POSSIBLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2.</td>
<td>EXISTING Development Density within 1/4 mile radius of proposed capital project site - IN THE PIPELINE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 50-99 percent</td>
<td>Up to 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Exceeds minimum residential requirements by 25-49 percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3.</td>
<td>Mix of Uses</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Single-family residential, retail, office, civic, parks, visitor within 1/4 mile of project site)</td>
<td>Up to 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Multi-family residential + 6 other uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Multi-family residential + 4-5 other uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Multi-family residential + 2-3 other uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4.</td>
<td>New Use</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>New use will be added to the project area</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>New Affordable Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td>Percent of income-restricted affordable housing provided in proposed new development (within 1/4 mile of project site)</td>
<td>Up to 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100 percent of units affordable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>99-75 percent of units affordable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>74-25 percent of units affordable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2.</td>
<td>Low to very-low income affordable units</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50-100 percent of units in the development are restricted to low to very-low income residents</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>Transportation Characteristics (Within walking and biking distance of proposed capital project)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Scale of actual walking distance to existing or programmed station or transit hub:</td>
<td>Up to 12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Regional or Corridor station or a Transit Center-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Project abuts or is onsite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Project is within 1/2 mile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Transit hub-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project is within 1/4 mile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stop with high frequency local bus service (15 minutes All day)-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project is within 1/4 mile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2.</td>
<td>Bicycle Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td>EXISTING bicycle lanes, bike boulevards, cycle tracks, or separated bike paths (Class I), or PLANNED bicycle lanes, bike boulevards, cycle tracks, or separated bike paths (Class I) (as identified in San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan or local bicycle master plan)</td>
<td>Up to 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Direct connection to proposed project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Facilities within 1/4 mile radius of project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3.</td>
<td>Walkability</td>
<td></td>
<td>Intersection Density per square mile:</td>
<td>Up to 4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>290 or greater</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>225-289</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100-224</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Less than 100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4.</td>
<td>TDM Strategies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>EXISTING TDM programs or policies in place</td>
<td>Up to 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PROPOSED TDM programs or policies, including implementation strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>CATEGORY</td>
<td>POINTS</td>
<td>CRITERIA</td>
<td>POINTS POSSIBLE</td>
<td>WEIGHT</td>
<td>SCORE POSSIBLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| E.  | Community Design Features | 6      | Design Characteristics of existing community, AND/OR proposed design characteristics prescribed by documented guidance for the area or jurisdiction through design guidelines, form-based codes, or renderings of proposed development; area will be assessed relative to the following sections in Design for Smart Growth:  
- Consistent Street Edge (Smart Growth Scorecard)  
- Street Frontages (Smart Growth Scorecard)  
- Connectivity (3.4 in Chapter 3 Site Design)  
- Site Access (3.3 in Chapter 3 Site Design)  
- Parking (Chapter 9 Parking)  
- Building Frontage (4.1 in Chapter 4 Building Design) | Up to 6 | 2 | 12 | 4% |
| 2.  | QUALITY OF PROPOSED CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT | 30% | | | | | |
| A.  | Support for Public Transit | 5 | How well does the project support use of regional public transit service in the project area? | Up to 5 | 5 | 25 | 8% |
| B.  | Providing Transportation Choices | 5 | How well does the project support transportation choices that would reduce vehicle miles traveled, specifically walking and bicycling? | Up to 5 | 5 | 25 | 8% |
| C.  | Community Enhancement | 5 | How well does the proposed project enhance the public realm in the project area, to engender support for smart growth, through place making and creating regional destinations? | Up to 5 | 4 | 20 | 7% |
| D.  | Addressing Project Area Issues | 5 | How well does the project address identified special needs and concerns of the community, such as improving access for elderly, disabled, low-mobility populations, or increasing public safety? How well does the project preserve and appropriately integrate cultural and natural resources in the project area? | Up to 5 | 3 | 15 | 5% |
| E.  | Sustainability | 2 | How well does the proposed project incorporate Green Stress/Low-Impact Development principles, to address stormwater runoff, energy conservation, and landscaping/street trees? | Up to 2 | 1 | 2 | 1% |
| F.  | Universal Design | 2 | How well does the project incorporate Universal Design principles, to ensure access for users of all ages and abilities? | Up to 2 | 1 | 2 | 1% |
| 3.  | PROJECT READINESS | 11% | | | | | |
| A.  | Major Milestones Completed | 1 | Environmental Clearance  
1 | Right-of-way Acquisition  
1 | Final Design  
1 | Project Full Funded (matching funds secured OR grant will fully fund project) | Up to 4 | 5 | 20 | 7% |
| B.  | Evidence of Local Commitment | 2 | Project is supported by the community, and is the result of a comprehensive, public participation process that significantly involved a diverse group of stakeholders | Up to 2 | 6 | 12 | 4% |
| 4.  | COST EFFECTIVENESS | 5% | | | | | |
| A.  | Ratio of grant request to project score | Project grant request, divided by score up to this point; ranked relative to each other | 0 | 16 | 5% |
| 5.  | MATCHING FUNDS | 3% | | | | | |
| | | All Projects scored on a curve, from most to least matching funds | 10 | 3% |
| 6.  | POLICY NO. 033 POINTS | 75 | 25% | | | | |
| TOTAL PROJECT SCORE | | 300 | 100% | | | |
SGIP ELIGIBLE PROJECTS (Planning Grants)

Eligible planning projects include updates to land use plans to qualify “Potential” SGOA as “Existing/Planned,” and other planning activities that facilitate smart growth. Proposed planning projects must:

- Encourage transit, pedestrian, and bicycle trips
- Support a community’s larger infill development or revitalization effort
- Improve internal mobility
- Enhance sense of place

Project activities eligible for planning grant funding include but are not limited to:

Comprehensive planning efforts such as:

- Specific area plans or community plans
- Amendments to general plans or specific plans

OR

Smaller scale neighborhood planning activities such as:

- Traffic calming or mobility plans
- Feasibility studies for future capital improvements
- Parking management plans
- Form-based codes or design guidelines
- Planning efforts required to make smart growth zoning changes

Applicants may conduct a Health Benefit and Impact Assessment (HIA) to inform development of local planning efforts funded by the SGIP, such as specific plans, area plans, general plans, or specific plan amendments. HIA uses evidence-based analysis to inform decision-makers of potential health outcomes and health co-benefits of a proposed project, policy, or plan. Often, health outcomes of a proposed project are hidden or unintended and would not otherwise be considered if a HIA were not completed.

SANDAG is in the process of developing a technical assistance program to support local agencies in conducting HIAs. The technical assistance program is intended to provide technical expertise through an on-call consultant at no additional cost to eligible agencies. Additional information regarding the process of receiving technical assistance for HIA related work will be provided at a later date.

Priority will be given to those planning efforts that will result in or allow administrative or expedited approval of smart growth development projects. Planning projects must start within one year of grant award and must be complete within two years of grant award.
SGIP SCORING CRITERIA GUIDANCE (Planning Grants)

HOW WILL PROJECTS BE SCORED?

Once a project has been deemed eligible, it will be scored based on the criteria for its project type. Because the planning activities and capital improvements are very different, each will be scored under its own set of criteria. The project scoring criteria for planning projects are discussed in detail below.

1. RELATIONSHIP TO REGIONAL TRANSIT

Up to five (5) points are available. Transit Infrastructure and Service within the SGOA will be scored as indicated below.

- SGOAs with existing regional or corridor transit infrastructure (five points)
- SGOAs with programmed regional or corridor transit infrastructure or existing high frequency local transit infrastructure and service (three points)
- SGOAs with planned regional or corridor transit infrastructure, or programmed or planned high frequency local transit infrastructure and service (one point)

Note: Rural Villages are not scored on this criterion because the place type does not require transit service. Consequently, Rural Village scores will be normalized to the total 200 points available to other place types.

2. SMART GROWTH DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL

Up to five (5) points are available. Evidence of opportunities to develop smart growth plans or projects in the proposed planning area: Can the area appropriately accommodate smart growth? Is there land available for redevelopment or rezoning? Would the existing urban form support smart growth development? How well does the proposed planning effort support development at or above the intensity of use targets for the area’s smart growth place type?

3. PLANNING PROJECT GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Up to 6.67 points are available. How well do the proposed project objectives support smart growth development in the project area? Would the plan result in development that increases transportation and housing choices?

4. METHOD TO ACCOMPLISH THE SGIP PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

Up to six (6) points are available. How does the proposed project plan to accomplish stated objectives? How well does the proposed project Scope of Work facilitate meeting project objectives? Does the Scope of Work include significant public outreach?

5. IMPLEMENTATION

Up to seven (7) points are available. Will the proposed planning process lead to timely change in the project area? Is the planning process ready to go? Will it result in regulatory mechanisms that facilitate smart growth or lead directly to an implementable development or capital project? In particular, is a plan in place, or will the project develop a plan that will facilitate smart growth development through a master EIR or other mechanism that allows for administrative approval of development projects? Does the plan area include significant environmental concerns that may delay or prevent successful implementation of the plan? How will the public participation process significantly involve a diverse group of stakeholders and help develop consensus for smart growth?

6. EVIDENCE OF LOCAL COMMITMENT AND COMMUNITY SUPPORT

Up to 2.5 points are available. How has the jurisdiction or agency demonstrated a commitment to implement smart growth? This commitment may be demonstrated through existing ordinances, policies, or incentives. Is the proposed planning project supported by the community?
7. **MATCHING FUNDS**

Points for matching funds are awarded by dividing the total project cost as proposed in the application by the grant request. The projects will be ranked based on the resulting ratio and the available 20 points will be distributed proportionately. The project(s) with the highest ratio will receive 20 points, and the project(s) with the lowest ratio will receive one point.

8. **POLICY NO.033 POINTS**

Up to 50 points are available. See Board Policy No.033 for detailed methodology.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>PTS POSSIBLE</th>
<th>WEIGHT MULTIPLIER</th>
<th>TOTAL PTS POSSIBLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Relationship to Regional Transit</td>
<td>Is the transit infrastructure and service within the SGOA existing, programmed or planned?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Smart Growth Development Potential</td>
<td>Evidence of opportunities to develop smart growth plans or projects in the proposed planning area.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Proposed Project Goals and Objectives</td>
<td>How well do the proposed project objectives support smart growth development in the project area? Would the plan result in development that increases transportation and housing choices?</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Method to Accomplish Program Objectives</td>
<td>How does the proposed project plan to accomplish stated objectives? How well does the scope of work facilitate meeting project objectives and include public outreach?</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Is the project ready to go, will it result in specific implementation actions such as zoning changes or a master EIR?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Evidence of Local Commitment/ Community Support</td>
<td>How has the applicant demonstrated a commitment to implement smart growth? (ordinances, policies, incentives)? How will the plan process engage the community?</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Matching Funds</td>
<td>Points awarded in proportion to the percentage of proposed matching funds to total project cost.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Policy No.033 Points</td>
<td>Points are awarded per jurisdiction based upon the methodology adopted in Policy No. 033</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL POINTS POSSIBLE** 200
ATGP ELIGIBLE PROJECTS (Capital Grants)

Eligible capital grant projects will result in construction of facilities intended for use by bicyclists and pedestrians, or will provide safer roadway access for bicyclists and pedestrians through traffic calming. Eligible activities include design, right-of-way acquisition, construction, and installation of traffic control devices. Eligible capital grant projects may include but are not limited to:

- New bicycle facilities including paths and bicycle boulevards
- Bicycle lane striping and widening
- New sidewalks, widening of sidewalks, sidewalk gap closures
- New pedestrian facilities
- Pedestrian over and under crossings
- Shortcuts to shorten bike/walk travel time and provide for safer connections
- High visibility crosswalks (ladder/zebra/continental style)
- Bulb outs and intersection treatments
- Roundabouts and traffic circles
- Speed humps and speed tables
- Raised intersections
- Median refuges
- Road diets
- Full or half street closures
- Pedestrian and bicycle-related traffic control devices and pavement markings
- Pedestrian-scale lighting
- Signage and wayfinding

Applicants are encouraged to utilize innovative solutions that are new to the region, and to focus efforts in project areas that (1) lend themselves to development of neighborhood-level bicycle and pedestrian networks, (2) connect residential areas to activity centers such as schools, transit centers, commercial districts, and parks, and (3) are comprehensive and include all of the following: bicycle, pedestrian, and traffic calming improvements.
ATGP SCORING CRITERIA GUIDANCE (Capital Grants)

How Will Projects Be Scored?

1. PROJECT READINESS

A. Completion of Major Milestones

Projects will be scored based on the number of milestones completed. Up to 20 points are available. The scores will be assigned for either completion of each milestone, or proof that it is not required (environmental and right-of-way below) as follows:

- Neighborhood-level plan, corridor study, or Community Active Transportation Strategy: Two points
- Environmental clearance (CEQA and/or NEPA; or evidence that environmental clearance is not required) – Four points
- Right-of-way acquisition (must be complete, including all necessary entitlements, or evidence that no right-of-way acquisition is required) – Four points
- Final design (plans, specifications, and estimates) – Ten points

2. PROJECT CONNECTIONS AND SAFETY

A. Connection to Regional Bicycle Network

Up to eight points are available. Regional Bicycle Network is defined in *Riding to 2050: The San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan*.

- Project will build direct connection to the network (project must directly connect to an existing or proposed segment of the network) – Six points
- Project will build part of the network, consistent with facility classification proposed in *Riding to 2050* – Eight points

B. Complements Connection/Linkage in Local Bicycle Network

Eight points will be awarded if the project proposes to close a gap between existing bicycle facilities. A gap is defined as a lack of facilities between two existing facilities, or a situation where there is an undesirable change in facility type (e.g., a project proposing to change a segment of class III between two class II segments into class II).

C. Complements Connection/Linkage in Existing Pedestrian Network

Eight points will be awarded if the project proposes to close a gap in the existing pedestrian network. Applicant must demonstrate evidence of an existing gap. Examples include missing sidewalk segments, or enhancement of one or more blocks in between blocks that have previously been upgraded.

D. Connection to Transit

Up to 12 points are available; projects that include both bicycle and pedestrian improvements are eligible for points for both modes. SANDAG staff will analyze project area via GIS to determine score. Regional transit station is defined as any station served by COASTER, SPRINTER, San Diego Trolley, Bus Rapid Transit, or Rapid Bus. Distance is defined as walkable distance (accounting for barriers such as canyons)

- Bike improvements
  - Project is within 1.5 miles of regional transit station – Six points
- Pedestrian improvements: Score will be based on actual available walking paths, as mapped in GIS.
  - Project is within 1/4 mile of a local transit stop – Two points
  - Project directly connects to a local transit stop (proposed improvements must directly connect to transit stop) – Four points
  - Project is within 1/2 mile of a regional transit station – Four points
  - Project directly connects to a regional transit station (proposed improvements must directly connect to the station) – Six points
E. Safety Improvements and Overcoming Barriers

Points will be awarded based on applicant description of safety hazard or collision history. Collision data must be highlighted to point out which collisions are applicable to the project area and why they are relevant. Up to 12 points are available.

Completes connection in existing network at location with documented safety hazard or collision history, specifically, correctable crashes involving bicyclists or pedestrians within the last seven years:

A. One to two correctable collisions – Two points
B. Three to four correctable collisions – Four points
C. Five or more correctable collisions – Six points

and/or

Creates access or overcomes barriers in area where hazardous conditions prohibited safe access for bicyclists and pedestrians – up to six points.

To gain points for creating access or overcoming barriers, applicant must describe detractors in the project area that prohibited safe access, such as a lack of facilities, high traffic volumes and speeds in an area with origins and destinations that would warrant bicycle or pedestrian trips if access were safe, freeway on/off ramps, blind curves, steep slopes, etc.

Points will be awarded based on degree of hazard and potential for increased bicycle or pedestrian trips.

Points will be awarded for both collision history and hazardous conditions lacking collision history in two ways:

- Project area with multiple hazardous locations - A project area encompasses two hazardous locations, one with collision data and one that is so unsafe that it prohibits safe access; or
- Project area with an intersection or roadway segment that has both barriers and crash data - A location within a project area has crash data, but also has been identified as a high barrier roadway in The San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan Bicycle Barriers Model.

3. QUALITY OF PROJECT

A. Effectiveness of Proposed Traffic Calming, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Priority Measures

Points will be awarded based on the quality of traffic calming and bicycle and pedestrian priority measures proposed, and the potential for the proposed measures to address the area need as stated by the applicant. Design guidelines such as those outlined in Planning and Designing for Pedestrians, Riding to 2050: The San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan, and the National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO) Urban Bikeway Design Guide will be used as a guide to inform scoring.

The highest scoring projects will make significant changes to the area’s transportation infrastructure in a way that results in an environment where reduced vehicular speeds provide for safer access for bicyclists and pedestrians, and definitively prioritizes bicycle and pedestrian access. Examples of highest scoring projects include road diets that reallocate right-of-way and/or reconfigure the roadway to balance access for all modes, and projects that include a broad array of context-appropriate traffic calming devices and bicycle/pedestrian priority measures.

Lower-scoring projects will have fewer features and make only minimal improvements for bicycle and pedestrian access. Up to 15 points are available.

- Traffic calming measures – up to five points
- Bicycle priority measures – up to five points
- Pedestrian priority measures – up to five points

Traffic calming measures will be analyzed for frequency, relative to the following guidelines:

- Residential Street – 20 mph = Devices every 250 feet, so one device would be effective 250 feet on either side
- Collector or Main Street – 25 mph = 400 feet
- Arterial street (traffic taming) – 35 mph = 800 feet
B. Relationship to Program Objectives

Up to 18 points will be awarded based on how well the proposed project meets the Active Transportation Grant Program objectives:

- Encourage the development of a cohesive network of complete streets and improve bicycle/pedestrian neighborhood connectivity to transit and destinations such as schools, retail, places of work, parks, and other community gathering places, and support smart growth placemaking.
- Improve safety for bicyclists and pedestrians through traffic calming and complete streets design principles.
- Serve as models for the region by featuring innovative solutions that comprehensively prioritize access for bicyclists and pedestrians.
- Ensure access to jobs, services, and recreation for populations with fewer transportation choices, and create equitable transportation opportunities for all users, regardless of age, ability, race, ethnicity, or income.
- Increase community support for bicycling and walking as a viable transportation choice for all trip purposes, and promote active transportation as a means of improving health outcomes.
- Support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and facilitate an increase in levels of bicycling and walking in the region, by providing supportive facilities, amenities and programs for bicyclists and pedestrians.

Consideration will be given to both the number of objectives that the project addresses, and how well the project meets the program objectives, particularly with respect to the following:

- Complete streets
- Improved bicycle/pedestrian connectivity to destinations
- Potential to support smart growth places
- Improved safety
- Innovation and ability to serve as a model in the region

- Prioritization of bicycle and pedestrian access
- Social equity
- Potential to increase bicycling and walking for everyday trips
- Potential to improve health outcomes over time
- Reduction of greenhouse gas emissions

C. Innovation

Up to eight points will be awarded. Four points will be awarded if the applicant provides evidence of the project being an FHWA or state experimentation effort.

Up to four points will be awarded if the project proposes solutions that are relatively new to the region, such as colored bike lanes or shared access lanes, sharrows, cycletracks, reverse angled parking, and other examples. The highest scoring projects will utilize the following innovations such as, but not limited to, those found in the NACTO Urban Bikeway Design Guide, specifically:

**Bike Lanes and Cycle tracks**
- Buffered bike lanes
- Left-side bike lanes
- Cycle tracks (one-way protected, raised, two-way)

**Intersections**
- Bike boxes
- Intersection crossing markings
- Two-stage turn queue boxes
- Median refuge island
- Through bike lanes
- Cycle track intersection approach

**Bicycle Signals**
- Bicycle signal heads
- Signal detection and actuation
- Active warning beacon for bike facility crossing at unsignalized intersection
- Hybrid signal for bike route crossing of major street

**Bikeway Signing and Marking**
- Colored bike facilities
- Shared lane markings
- Bike route wayfinding signage and markings system
Innovative pedestrian/traffic calming solutions could include:

**Crossings**
- Automated pedestrian detection devices at signalized crossings, including infrared, microwave, and video detectors
- Pre-crossing safety information such as illuminated push buttons and safety advisories to pedestrians and drivers
- Automated “WALK” clearance phase extension for slower crossings such as those made by elderly and disabled pedestrians
- “Animated eyes” and/or pavement markings to remind pedestrians to look for turning vehicles
- HAWK signals
- Rectangular Rapid flash beacons (must include ADA accommodation: a locator note and audible speech to convey that warning lights have been activated, not just that a signal has been activated); in-street lighting is discouraged
- Mid-block chokers
- Mid-block crossings with accompanying signage and enhanced area lighting
- Dynamic lighting at marked crosswalks: focused on the crosswalk and activates when a pedestrian crosses
- High visibility crossings (ladder/zebra/continental style)
- Advance yield bars

**Intersections**
- Right-turn slip lane and crosswalk, with geometry designed to slow turning vehicles
- Right-turn slip lane with raised crosswalk
- Raised crosswalks
- Raised intersections
- Median refuge island with corral
- Median refuge island with pedestrian activation button
- Pedestrian scramble
- Freestanding crosswalk yielding signs
- Traffic circles and roundabouts
- Semi- and Partial Diverters
- Forced Turn Channelization
- Advance stop bars
- Stencils and signage
- Prohibited right turns on red

**Access for Elderly and Disabled Persons**
- Use of rapid ticks and slow chirps instead of speech to indicate when to cross and when to wait (where it is technically feasible to have two poles at least 10 feet apart on a corner)
- Vibro-tactile walk indicators
- Push button locator tone
- Locator tone and walk indication ticks/tones that adjust in response to ambient noise levels
- On traffic pole, tactile arrow running parallel to associated crosswalk

4. SUPPORTIVE PROGRAMS AND POLICIES

**A. Complementary Programs**

Up to three points will be awarded if the project includes program activities that complement the capital improvements, such as an awareness program, education or encouragement efforts, and enforcement activities. Consideration will be given to both the breadth and depth of programs proposed.

**B. Supportive Policies and Plans**

Up to three points will be awarded if the project is preceded by a complete streets policy included in a community or specific plan, or a community active transportation strategy. The highest scoring projects will have completed a community active transportation strategy specific to the project area.
5. **FORMULA SCORES.**

A. **Demand (GIS Analysis)**

This criterion includes seven factors, listed below. SANDAG will analyze the area relative to the factors below, using GIS. A buffer of a half-mile will be created around the project area for projects with pedestrian improvements, and one mile for projects with bicycle improvements. Results for each factor will be ranked from highest to lowest (with the exception of vehicle ownership, which will be ranked from lowest to highest), in quintiles, for all projects. Projects will then be scored relative to each other, by ranking the raw scores from highest (15 points) to lowest (1 point).

- Population
- Employment
- Population Density
- Employment Density
- Intersection Density
- Activity Centers
- Vehicle Ownership

D. **Regional Housing Needs Assessment Incentive- Board Policy No. 033**

Points will be awarded based on the “SCORING CRITERIA Concerning Calculation of Board Policy No. 033 Incentive Points” detailed in Exhibit 3 of Board Policy No. 033. Up to 50 points will be awarded.

E. **Matching Funds**

Other sources of funding for cooperative projects must be explicitly identified. The application must include supporting documentation that shows matching funds have been secured. Matching funds that have not been secured will not count toward this score.

Projects will be scored relative to each other, by ranking the matching funds amounts from highest to lowest. Points will be distributed from highest to lowest. The projects with the most matching funds will receive ten points, and the projects with the least matching funds will receive one point. Projects without secured matching funds will not receive any points for this category.

F. **Cost/Benefit**

Score will be determined by taking the subtotal score of Criteria 1 through 12 and dividing that subtotal by the grant application amount. Projects will be scored relative to each other by taking the raw scores and distributing them from highest to lowest. The projects with the highest cost benefit ratio will receive ten points, and the projects with the lowest cost benefit ratio will receive one point.

For projects that only include phases prior to construction:

- Project will be scored and ranked together with construction projects
- Score will be reduced according to ultimate phase proposed in project, as follows:
  - Environmental clearance – subtract 75 percent
  - Right-of-way acquisition – subtract 50 percent
  - Final design – subtract 25 percent
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>POTENTIAL PTS</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td><strong>PROJECT READINESS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>Completion of Major Milestones</td>
<td>Projects are eligible for points following completion of each phase: Community active transportation strategy/neighborhood-level plan/corridor study Environmental Clearance Right-of-way Acquisition Final Design</td>
<td>Up to 20</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td><strong>PROJECT CONNECTIONS AND SAFETY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>Connection to Regional Bicycle Network</td>
<td>Project directly connects to the Regional Bikeway Network or Project is a part of the Regional Bikeway Network</td>
<td>Up to 8</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>Completes Connection/Linkage in Local Bicycle Network</td>
<td>Closes a gap between existing bicycle facilities (guidance will include definition of gap, and will include situations where there exists an undesirable change in facility type)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>Completes Connection/Linkage in Existing Pedestrian Network</td>
<td>Closes a gap in the existing network</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>Connection to Transit</td>
<td>Bike improvements proximity: Project is within 1.5 miles of regional transit station Pedestrian improvements proximity: Project is within 1/4 mile of a local transit stop Project directly connects to a local transit stop Project is within 1/2 mile of a regional transit station Project directly connects to a regional transit station</td>
<td>Up to 12</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.</td>
<td>Safety Improvements and Overcoming Barriers</td>
<td>Completes connection in existing network at location with documented safety hazard or accident history. A. One to two correctable crashes involving nonmotorized users within the last seven years B. Three to four correctable crashes involving nonmotorized users within the last seven years C. Five or more correctable crashes involving nonmotorized users within the last seven years and/or Creates access or overcomes barriers in area where hazardous conditions prohibited safe access for bicyclists and pedestrians.</td>
<td>Up to 12</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>CATEGORY</td>
<td>CRITERIA</td>
<td>POTENTIAL PTS</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>QUALITY OF PROJECT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>Effectiveness and Comprehensiveness of Proposed Bicycle, Pedestrian, and/or Traffic Calming Measures</td>
<td>How well will the proposed traffic calming address the identified need in the project area? Are the proposed solutions appropriate for the situation? How well will the proposed pedestrian improvements address the identified need in the project area? How well will the proposed bicycle improvements address the identified need in the project area?</td>
<td>Up to 15 total</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Up to 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>Relationship to Program Objectives</td>
<td>How well does the project meet the program objectives?</td>
<td>Up to 18</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>Is this project an FHWA or state experimentation effort? Does the project propose solutions that are new to the region, and have the potential to serve as a replicable model for other cities in the region? Does the project utilize innovative solutions such as those listed in the NACTO Urban Bikeway Guide?</td>
<td>Up to 8</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Up to 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>SUPPORTIVE POLICIES AND PROGRAMS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>Complementary Programs</td>
<td>Is this project accompanied by programs that complement the capital improvements, such as an awareness campaign, education efforts, and increased enforcement?</td>
<td>Up to 3</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>Supportive Policies and Plans</td>
<td>Demonstrated policy language in approved plan, or a completed community active transportation strategy/plan</td>
<td>Up to 3</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>FORMULA SCORES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>Demand (GIS analysis)</td>
<td>Factors contributing to score: population and employment, population and employment densities, intersection density, vehicle ownership, and activity centers.</td>
<td>Up to 15</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>Regional Housing Needs Assessment Incentive</td>
<td>Score is based on the formula provided in Board Policy No. 033</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>Matching Funds</td>
<td>Matching funds can be from any of the following sources: 1. Identified and approved capital funding from identified source. Please provide proof in the form of a resolution or letter of approval. 2. Approved match grant 3. In-kind services. Please provide adequate support documentation.</td>
<td>Up to 10</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>Cost/Benefit</td>
<td>Subtotal Score (not counting RHNA points, not counting match points)/Grant Application Amount</td>
<td>Up to 10</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ATGP ELIGIBLE PROJECTS (Non-Capital Grants)

Active Transportation Non-Capital Grants can be classified into three categories:

1. **Planning**

Planning efforts intended to address bicycle and/or pedestrian access at a neighborhood or citywide level, primarily to accommodate non-recreational bicycle and walking trips.

Eligible planning projects include:

- Comprehensive Active Transportation Strategies – maximum funding amount of $300,000
- Bicycle master plans – maximum funding amounts are as follows:
  - Cities with population up to 50,000 - $100,000 ($75,000 + $25,000 for environmental) – Coronado, Del Mar, Imperial Beach, Solana Beach, and Lemon Grove
  - Cities with population 50,000 to 150,000 - $150,000 ($125,000 + $25,000 for environmental) – Carlsbad, El Cajon, Encinitas, Escondido, La Mesa, National City, Poway, San Marcos, Santee, and Vista
  - Cities with population greater than 150,000 - $200,000 ($150,000 + $50,000 for environmental) – Chula Vista, Oceanside, and the County of San Diego
  - City of San Diego - $250,000 ($200,000 + $50,000 for environmental)

2. **Education/Awareness/Encouragement**

Education/Awareness/Encouragement projects include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Education – Programs to teach walking and bicycling safety skills to children and adults.
- Eligible education projects can take place at schools, places of employment, community centers, or other venues.
- Awareness – Multimedia campaigns to impact the attitudes and behavior of the general public, generally to improve safety for all roadway users but bicyclists and pedestrians in particular.
- Encouragement – Targeted outreach and events designed to encourage walking and bicycling as a viable mode of transportation for everyday/utilitarian trips.

3. **Bicycle Parking**

Planning and implementation of bicycle parking facilities.

Eligible projects include bicycle racks, lockers, bike corrals, and/or other bike storage facilities such as bike stations. The maximum funding amounts for bicycle parking facilities is $50,000, and for bike stations, $100,000. Facilities must be designed for general public access, i.e. not serving any single place of employment or single activity center.
How Will Projects Be Scored?

1. **ALL GRANTS**

   **A. Relationship to Program Objectives**

   Points will be awarded based on how well the proposed project meets the Active Transportation Grant Program objectives:

   - Encourage the development of a cohesive network of complete streets and improve bicycle/pedestrian neighborhood connectivity to transit and destinations such as schools, retail, places of work, parks, and other community gathering places, and support smart growth placemaking.
   - Improve safety for bicyclists and pedestrians through traffic calming and complete streets design principles.
   - Serve as models for the region by featuring innovative solutions that comprehensively prioritize access for bicyclists and pedestrians.
   - Ensure access to jobs, services, and recreation for populations with fewer transportation choices, and create equitable transportation opportunities for all users, regardless of age, ability, race, ethnicity, or income.
   - Increase community support for bicycling and walking as a viable transportation choice for all trip purposes, and promote active transportation as a means of improving health outcomes.
   - Support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and facilitate an increase in levels of bicycling and walking in the region, by providing supportive facilities, amenities and programs for bicyclists and pedestrians.

   Consideration will be given to both the number of objectives that the project addresses, and how well the project meets the program objectives, particularly with respect to the following:

   - Complete streets (planning, encouragement, parking)
   - Improved bicycle/pedestrian connectivity to destinations (planning, encouragement, parking)
   - Potential to support smart growth places (ALL)
   - Improved safety (planning, education, awareness, encouragement)
   - Innovation and ability to serve as a model in the region (ALL)
   - Prioritization of bicycle and pedestrian access (planning, awareness, encouragement, parking)
   - Social equity (ALL)
   - Potential to increase bicycling and walking for everyday trips (ALL)
   - Potential to improve health outcomes over time (planning, education, awareness, encouragement)
   - Potential to reduce greenhouse gas emissions (ALL)

   Up to 30 points are available for planning grants, and up to 20 each for education/awareness/encouragement, and bicycle parking grants. The highest scoring projects will demonstrate the potential for measurable impact across multiple objectives.

   **B. Comprehensiveness**

   **Planning:**

   Up to 16 points are available. Points will be awarded according to the comprehensiveness of the proposed planning effort, in terms of both scope and scale. The highest scoring projects will address Complete Streets principles (addressing and prioritizing access for both bicyclists and pedestrians, and traffic calming), or could be considered a Community Active Transportation Strategy (CATS).

   The highest scoring planning efforts will aim for significant changes to the area’s transportation infrastructure, resulting in an environment where street design and vehicular speeds provide for safer access for bicyclists and pedestrians, and definitively prioritizes bicycle and pedestrian access.
Lower-scoring projects will plan for only minimal improvements for bicycle or pedestrian access.

**Education/awareness/encouragement:**

Up to 16 points are available. Points will be awarded according to the comprehensiveness of the proposed education, awareness, or encouragement effort, in terms of scope and potential impact.

The highest scoring projects will reach more of the region’s residents, or a specific underserved or vulnerable population such as low-income populations who rely more on walking or biking because they lack access to a car, elderly, or Limited English Proficiency populations. The highest scoring projects will also take place over a longer period of time, and complement a capital improvement project. Higher scoring projects could also be part of a larger transportation demand management effort.

Lower-scoring projects will be smaller in scope, scale, or duration, and will be independent of any capital improvement projects.

**Bicycle Parking:**

Up to 12 points are available. Points will be awarded according to the comprehensiveness of the proposed parking project, in terms of scope and scale. The highest scoring projects will cover a larger geographic area and complement a capital improvement project. Higher scoring projects could also be part of a larger transportation demand management effort.

Lower-scoring projects will be smaller in scope and scale, and will be independent of any capital improvement projects.

**C. Methodology**

**Planning:**

Up to 30 points are available. Points will be awarded according to how well the planning process or proposed effort will meet the demonstrated need and project goals. Highest scoring projects will include a comprehensive planning process in their scopes of work that address the goals of Complete Streets, prioritize bicyclist and pedestrian access, plan for traffic calming, and tie into Safe Routes to School efforts in the project area.

**Education/awareness/encouragement, and parking:**

Up to 30 points are available for education/awareness/encouragement, and up to 10 points are available for parking. Points will be awarded according to how well the proposed effort will meet the demonstrated need and project goals. Highest scoring projects will include a succinct explanation of the need for the project, clearly articulated project goals, and a Scope of Work that directly addresses those goals and lists measurable objectives and/or deliverables.

Lower scoring projects will have stated a generic need, broad goals, and/or a scope of work that fails to clearly articulate how the project goals will be met.

Bicycle parking projects must demonstrate that they meet guidelines outlined in *Riding to 2050: The San Diego Regional Bicycle Plan*. Innovations that deviate from the guidelines will be may be considered. The highest scoring bicycle parking projects will be placed appropriately, in appropriate locations, with design that is both attractive and functional, and can demonstrate that they serve the goals as stated by the applicant.

**D. Community Support**

**Planning:**

Up to 16 points are available. Points will be awarded according to the inclusiveness of the planning process, and evidence that key stakeholders will be active participants in the process. The highest scoring projects will demonstrate that:

- the effort is strongly supported by the community,
- community input is a substantive component in the planning process, and
- that key stakeholders, including underserved and limited English proficiency populations, have been identified and will have a meaningful role in the planning effort.
Lower scoring projects will:

- have a Scope of Work that includes minimal opportunities for community input,
- include generic letters of support that fail to show substantive involvement from key stakeholders, and
- fail to involve underserved and limited English proficiency populations (when appropriate in the plan area).

**Education/Awareness/Encouragement and Bicycle Parking:**

Up to 16 points are available for education/awareness/encouragement, and up to 10 points are available for parking. Points will be awarded according to the quantity and quality of the role of community involvement in the project. The highest scoring projects will demonstrate that:

- the effort is strongly supported by the community,
- relevant stakeholders representing the community had input into the methodology,
- community organizations have a substantive role in project implementation, and
- the Scope of Work includes language-appropriate program delivery for non-English speaking populations (for education/awareness/encouragement projects, if appropriate for the plan area).

Lower scoring projects will:

- fail to show meaningful community support,
- include generic letters of support that fail to show substantive involvement from key stakeholders,
- fail to involve community organizations in project implementation, and
- fail to account for limited English proficiency populations in program delivery (when appropriate in the plan area).

**E. Matching Funds**

Other sources of funding for cooperative projects must be explicitly identified. The application must include supporting documentation that shows matching funds have been secured. Matching funds that have not been secured will not count toward this score.

Projects will be scored relative to each other, by ranking the matching funds amounts from highest to lowest. Points will be distributed from highest to lowest. The projects with the most matching funds will receive 20 points, and the projects with the least matching funds will receive 1 point. Projects without secured matching funds will not receive any points for this category.

**F. Cost/Benefit**

Score will be determined by taking the subtotal score of Criteria 1 through 12 and dividing that subtotal by the grant application amount. Projects will be scored relative to each other by taking the raw scores and distributing them from highest to lowest. The projects with the highest cost benefit ratio will receive 18 points, and the projects with the lowest cost benefit ratio will receive 1 point.

**G. Regional Housing Needs Assessment Incentive/Policy No. 033**

Points will be awarded based on the "SCORING CRITERIA Concerning Calculation of Board Policy No. 033 Incentive Points" detailed in Exhibit 3, of Board Policy No. 033. Up to 50 points will be awarded.
2. EDUCATION/AWARENESS/ENCOURAGEMENT AND PARKING GRANTS ONLY

A. Evaluation

Up to 20 points are available. Points will be awarded according to the quality of the evaluation proposed for the project. Highest scoring projects will:

- Have identified performance measures in the application, or will include a task for identification of performance measures in the Scope of Work;
- Include specific pre- and post-data collection efforts as part of the project scope, budget, and schedule in support of evaluating the project’s effectiveness.

Lower scoring projects will lack meaningful evaluation methods or data collection as part of the project.

B. INNOVATION

Up to 10 points are available for education/awareness/encouragement grants, and up to 30 points are available for bicycle parking grants. Points will be awarded for innovative projects that show potential to serve as a replicable model for the region. Highest scoring projects will include innovative methods of accomplishing project goals that have not yet been tried in the San Diego region to date. Lesser points will be awarded to project activities that are relatively new to the region. No points will be awarded if the project proposes activities that are already in practice in the region.

If the proposed practice has been tried in other regions, the applicant must make the case that it has proven to be successful in those regions.

Examples of innovative encouragement projects could include but are not limited to ciclovia or Sunday Streets programs, and bikesharing. Innovative bicycle parking projects include but are not limited to bike corrals, and development of bicycle parking ordinances.

3. PLANNING AND PARKING GRANTS ONLY

A. Demand (GIS Analysis)

This criterion includes seven factors, listed below. SANDAG will analyze the area relative to the factors below, using GIS. A buffer of a half-mile will be created around the project area for projects with pedestrian improvements, and one mile for projects with bicycle improvements. Results for each factor will be ranked from highest to lowest (with the exception of vehicle ownership, which will be ranked from lowest to highest), in quintiles, for all projects. Projects will then be scored relative to each other, by ranking the raw scores from highest (20 points) to lowest (1 point).

- Population
- Population Density
- Intersection Density
- Vehicle Ownership
- Employment
- Employment Density
- Activity Centers
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>POINTS POSSIBLE</th>
<th>POINTS POSSIBLE</th>
<th>POINTS POSSIBLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>ALL GRANTS</td>
<td></td>
<td>PLANNING</td>
<td>E/A/E</td>
<td>PARKING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>Relationship to Program Objectives</td>
<td>How well does the proposed project address program objectives?</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>Comprehensiveness</td>
<td>Planning: How comprehensive is the proposed plan? (geographic area and emphasis on bike/ped/traffic calming, CATS) Education/awareness/encouragement: Does this effort accompany an existing or proposed capital improvement project? Scale also Parking: Does this effort accompany an existing or proposed capital improvement project?</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Planning: How well will the planning process or proposed effort meet the demonstrated need and project goals? Education/awareness/encouragement, parking: How effective will the proposed effort be in meeting the demonstrated need and project goals?</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>Community Support</td>
<td>Planning: Does the planning project include an inclusive process? Other: Does the project involve broad segments of the community and does it have broad and meaningful community support?</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.</td>
<td>Matching Funds</td>
<td>Matching funds can be from any of the following sources: 1. Identified and approved capital funding from identified source. Please provide proof in the form of a resolution or letter of approval. 2. Approved match grant 3. In-kind services. Please provide adequate support documentation.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.</td>
<td>Cost/Benefit</td>
<td>Subtotal Score (not counting RHNA points, not counting match points)/Grant Application Amount</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.</td>
<td>Regional Housing Needs Assessment Incentive/Policy No. 033 Points</td>
<td>Points will be allocated according to methodology described in Policy No. 033</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>CATEGORY</td>
<td>CRITERIA</td>
<td>POINTS POSSIBLE</td>
<td>POINTS POSSIBLE</td>
<td>POINTS POSSIBLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>EDUCATION, AWARENESS, ENCOURAGEMENT, AND PARKING GRANTS ONLY</td>
<td><strong>PLANNING</strong></td>
<td>E/A/E</td>
<td>PARKING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>How will the project evaluate its effectiveness?</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>Is this project new to the region and does it have the potential to serve as a replicable model for other cities in the region?</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>PLANNING AND PARKING GRANTS ONLY</td>
<td><strong>PLANNING</strong></td>
<td>E/A/E</td>
<td>PARKING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>Demand (GIS analysis)</td>
<td>Factors contributing to score: population and employment, population and employment densities, intersection density, vehicle ownership, and activity centers.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL POINTS**

200 200 200
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 2010, the Board of Directors approved a new schedule for reporting, and monitoring progress in implementing the RCP now occurs on a biennial basis. The attached 2012-2013 Biennial Performance Monitoring Report (Monitoring Report) represents the fifth RCP monitoring report since the Baseline Report was accepted by the SANDAG Board in October 2006.

Discussion

The Monitoring Report follows a similar format as previous years’ performance monitoring reports. It sets forth results for the most recent two-year reporting period (which in most cases is calendar year 2013) and describes the data for the most recent years relative to trends observed in previous years.

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. With the anticipated adoption of San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan in 2015, which will integrate the RCP and the Regional Transportation Plan, work is now under way to identify potential new or revised indicators to monitor implementation of San Diego Forward. In addition, SANDAG staff is coordinating with the U.S. Department of Transportation and Caltrans on transportation related performance measures that will be established as part of the current transportation bill (Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act or MAP-21). New measures or indicators could be incorporated into a future monitoring report.

Recommendation

The Regional Planning Committee is asked to accept the Draft 2012-2013 Biennial Regional Comprehensive Plan Performance Monitoring Report for a three-week public review and comment period.
2012-2013 Monitoring 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

- Beach widths have increased
- Air quality continues to improve
- Water conservation 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

- Growth in transportation modes other than driving alone remains relatively constant
- Travel times and traffic volumes have been increasing since 2009
- Affordable housing for lower and moderate income households continues to be provided at a low-level when compared to housing for above moderate income households
- Border wait times have increased

It should be noted that a number of indicators are likely demonstrating the effects of the economic recovery. For example, this may have contributed to increased border wait times and longer travel times in some corridors.

Next Steps

Upon the Regional Planning Committee’s action, the public comment period would extend from June 6 to June 27, 2014. The draft report will be posted online at www.sandag.org/rcp. The report is scheduled to be presented to the Regional Planning Technical Working Group on June 12, 2014, for additional review and comment. Comments should be emailed to Coleen Clementson at coleen.clementson@sandag.org or mailed to the SANDAG mailing address. Once the public comment period closes, the final report will be prepared for action by the Regional Planning Committee and Board of Directors this summer and fall.

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


Key Staff Contact: Coleen Clementson, (619) 699-1944, coleen.clementson@sandag.org
The Regional Comprehensive Plan
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Executive Summary

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 RCP: Establishing a Baseline for Monitoring Performance (Baseline Report), to be used to benchmark progress on an annual basis. The 2012 to 2013 RCP Biennial Performance Monitoring Report (2012 to 2013 Monitoring Report) is the fifth since the Baseline Report was accepted by the Board of Directors in October 2006.

The 2012 to 2013 Monitoring Report includes the most recent data available for each indicator, typically from either 2012 or 2013. For some indicators, there is a one year delay or longer in reporting; in these cases, data from the most recent available year are included. For all indicators, the most recent data are provided and related to historical observations.

Based on the data collected for the 2012 to 2013 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**
- Beach widths have increased.
- Air quality continues to improve.
- Water conservation 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**
- Share of modes other than driving alone remains relatively stable.
- Travel times and traffic volumes have been increasing since 2009.
- Affordable housing for lower and moderate income households continues to be provided at a low level when compared to housing for above moderate income households.
- Border wait times have increased.
Throughout the 2012 to 2013 Monitoring Report, indicator data are in certain cases related to changes in population, housing, or jobs as shown in Table 1.

### Table 1
**Population, Housing Units, and Job Growth, 2005 and 2012**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>2,966,783</td>
<td>3,128,734</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Units</td>
<td>1,107,985</td>
<td>1,165,970</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Employment</td>
<td>1,498,781</td>
<td>1,450,913</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: State of California, Department of Finance, E-8 Population and Housing Estimates; SANDAG Current Estimates Program.

Some of the indicators included in this report use the American Community Survey (ACS) as their data source. The ACS is the United States Census Bureau's new program for collecting and disseminating demographic, socio-economic, and housing data on an annual basis. Approximately one out of 38 addresses (2.5% of the population) is surveyed each year, which equals about 3.5 million addresses a year nationally. In San Diego County, one out of 38 equates to roughly 31,000 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, will still 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>Category</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **URBAN FORM AND TRANSPORTATION** | 1. Share of new housing units and jobs located in Smart Growth Opportunity Areas  
2. Share of new housing units within County Water Authority water service boundary  
3. Annual transit ridership  
4. Commute mode shares  
5. Travel times and volumes for key transportation corridors  
6. Annual hours of traffic delay per traveler  
7. Regional crime rate |
| **HOUSING**                     | 8. Housing Opportunity Index  
9. Percent of households with housing costs greater than 35% of income  
10. Ratio of new jobs to new housing units  
11. Share of new and existing housing units by structure type and income category  
12. Vacancy rates  
13. Percent of households living in overcrowded conditions  
14. Number of households on the waiting list for Section 8 vouchers |
| **HEALTHY ENVIRONMENT**         | 15. Habitat conserved within designated preserve areas  
16. Percent of preserve areas actively maintained  
17. Number of beach mile closure days  
18. Impaired waterbodies  
19. Beach widths  
20. Air Quality |
| **ECONOMIC PROSPERITY**         | 21. Labor force educational attainment  
22. Employment growth in high-wage economic clusters  
23. Regional unemployment rate compared to California and the United States  
24. Real per capita income compared to California and the United States  
25. Regional poverty rate compared to California and the United States |
| **PUBLIC FACILITIES**           | 26. Water consumption  
27. Diversity of water supply  
28. Recycled water use  
29. Energy supply and use  
30. Share and types of energy produced from renewable resources  
31. Per capital peak demand for electricity  
32. Electricity consumption by sector  
33. Natural gas consumption by sector  
34. Percent of solid waste that is recycled  
35. Landfill space available |
| **BORDERS**                     | 36. Interregional traffic volumes into San Diego from surrounding counties and Baja California  
37. Border wait times  
38. Participation in Secured Electronic Network for Travelers Rapid Inspection Lanes |
Urban Form and Transportation

Our land use and urban design decisions determine how well our communities serve us in our daily lives, including the quality of our travel choices and our personal safety. The Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) encourages urban development with a 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

Although the total number of new housing units built annually has decreased since 2005, the share of total units in Smart Growth Opportunity Areas (SGOAs) has slowly increased from 2005 onward. At present, one-fifth of the region’s total housing stock is in SGOA’s, or approximately 236,000 out of 1.17 million housing units. As shown in Figure 1, 33 percent of the region’s new housing units were built in SGOAs between 2012 and 2013 with the proportion of yearly new units built within Smart Growth Opportunity Areas (SGOAs) fluctuating over time (ranging from a low of 16% in 2005 to 2006 to a high of 47% in 2008 to 2009).

![Figure 1: Share of New Housing Units in SGOAs, 2005 to 2013](chart)

Note: Data from 2010 to the present were benchmarked based on the Census 2010 data, while data for prior years were not revised. Therefore, a bar reflecting the share of new housing units in SGOAs between 2009 and 2010 is excluded due to a break in the series.

Source: SANDAG Current Estimates Program
With respect to jobs, there were 542,138 jobs in SGOAs in 2012, representing 37 percent of the region’s jobs. In 2012, SGOAs experienced a net gain of 20,020 jobs. This net increase of nearly four percent is greater than the one percent net increase for total jobs in the region, indicating faster job growth in SGOAs than in the region as a whole.

**Share of Net Change in Housing Units within County Water Authority Water Service Boundary**

As shown in Figure 2, the change in the number of housing units in the Water Authority service boundary accounted for almost all of the change in housing units in the San Diego region between 2005 and 2013. The number of new housing units built in the Water Authority service boundary was 3,277 during 2013, comprising 98 percent of the total increase. 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. The greater than 100 percent figures shown for 2005 and 2008 represent new units plus rebuilt units following major wildfires.

**Figure 2**

Share of Net Change in Housing Units in the County Water Authority Service Area, 2005 to 2013

Source: SANDAG Current Estimates Program
Annual Transit Ridership

Regional transit ridership has fluctuated in recent years. As shown in Figure 3, transit boardings in San Diego County increased dramatically between 2007 and 2009 and were followed by a 10 percent drop in boardings between 2009 and 2010. Transit ridership saw improvement in 2011 through 2012.¹

Figure 3
Annual Transit Boardings, 2005 to 2013

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

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

The percent of commuters by primary mode of commute to work is provided below by looking at the American Community Survey (ACS) commute data. As presented in Figures 4 and 5, the primary transportation mode for a work commute includes those that drive alone, with about three-quarters of commuters driving to work alone. Alternative primary commute modes are also popular, with about 10 percent of commuters car- or vanpooling, seven percent working at their place of residence, five percent walking, biking, or taking alternative modes, and three percent taking transit, as displayed in Figures 4 and 6. Both drive-alone and alternative commute modes remained stable since 2005, with no statistically significant changes.

**Figure 4**

Regional Commute Mode Shares, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of Commuters by Primary Mode of Commute to Work</th>
<th>Percent of Commuters by Primary Mode of Commute to Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drive Alone, 76%</td>
<td>Walk, Bike, or Other, 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car or Vanpool, 10%</td>
<td>Transit, 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work at Place of Residence, 7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding.*

*Source: American Community Survey, 1-Year Estimate. United States Census Bureau*
While this information provided through the ACS is helpful in discerning high-level commuting trends, it only captures the “primary mode” used by the commuter, and doesn’t consider multimodal work trips or the use of different modes during the course of the work week. Further, there is no distinction between the following:

- Individuals who primarily work from home and thus do not create daily commute-related trips
• Employees who telework and normally commute to their employer’s workplace on non-telework days

In this regard, the data is not useful for accurately measuring trip reduction resulting from teleworking. To fill this gap, SANDAG conducted a Commute Behavior Survey in 2013 in which a total of 2,000 residents from the San Diego region who work at least 30 hours per week were asked about their commute behavior for each day of the week.

Most notable from the 2013 Commute Behavior Survey is the large number of individuals who report that they telework (5%) or “work at home” (8%). When combining these individual categories, the total (13%) is nearly two times larger than reported through the ACS (7%).

This survey also reflects the ever-growing complexities of the commute to work. Residents who indicated that they primarily carpooled, vanpooled, or used transit at least one day per week to get to and from work were asked about the modes of transportation used to access their primary commute mode and their final destination (e.g., the first and last mile of their commute trip).

Among the commuters who do not start their primary commute at home:

• 30 percent walked
• 22 percent drove alone
• 10 percent were dropped off
• 4 percent used a form of transit
• 3 percent used a bicycle

Among the commuters who did not end their primary commute at the final destination:

• 44 percent walked
• 2 percent used a bicycle
• 2 percent used a form of transit
• 2 percent got picked up

**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 Caltrans 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.

Improvements to PeMS has been an ongoing statewide effort since its initial development and release 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 developed for the San Diego region under the PeMS multimodal project will allow the PeMS to incorporate real-time transit and arterial data. This additional data will better approximate “door-to-door” travel times. The Arterial PeMS (A-PeMS) Module and Transit PeMS (T-PeMS) Module were completed in 2011. Current efforts are underway that include the design and implementation of a Corridor PeMS that combines the freeway, arterial, and transit modules. As arterial detection is introduced and transit vehicles in the region are outfitted with Automated Passenger Counters (APC) and Automated Vehicle Location (AVL) units, the A-PeMS, T-PeMS, and Corridor PeMS modules will serve as the regional platform to analyze and assess freeway, arterial, and transit performance data. These statistics will be incorporated into the established and on-going performance monitoring reports.2

Travel times shown in Table 2 differ from those presented in the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan and its Sustainable Communities Strategy (2050 RTP/SCS) for the following reason:

- 2050 RTP/SCS travel times are model based, whereas the reported travel times represent actual observed data. 2050 RTP/SCS 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 2050 RTP/SCS door-to-door travel times for future reports.

---

2 Additionally, travel times and volumes reported for previous years in the 2012-13 Monitoring Report may differ from those reported in previous reports as loop detection capability has been enhanced and now more accurately reflects the start and end points of the designated freeway segments.
Between 2007 and 2009, commute times decreased in most corridors due in part to the economic downturn. Since 2009, commute times in the region generally have been increasing at a modest rate as the regional economy continues to recover.

### Table 2
**Travel Times in Key Auto Corridors, 2005 to 2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corridor</th>
<th>Length (miles)</th>
<th>AM Peak (0800 Departure)</th>
<th>PM Peak (1700 Departure)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td>I-5 Oceanside to Downtown SD</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>55 54 55 43 39 44 43 41 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td>I-15 Escondido to Downtown SD</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>46 47 41 36 34 34 36 31 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td>SR-78 Escondido to Carlsbad</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>16 17 16 16 16 16 16 16 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td>SR-94 El Cajon to Downtown SD</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>16 16 14 13 14 14 15 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td>I-8 El Cajon to Downtown SD</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>18 20 17 14 16 19 19 19 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td>SR-52 Santee to Kearny Mesa</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>12 14 14 13 11 12 13 14 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td>I-805 Mid-City to Sorrento Valley</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>17 18 14 14 12 14 15 15 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td>I-805 Chula Vista to Sorrento Valley</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>40 39 36 32 28 32 32 33 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td>I-805 Chula Vista to Downtown SD</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>22 20 19 17 17 18 17 17 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td>I-5 San Ysidro to Downtown SD</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>14 16 16 14 14 15 16 16 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td>I-8 El Cajon to Sorrento Valley</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>29 31 27 24 20 23 25 25 30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
(a) The a.m. peak period is based on a departure time of 8 a.m., and the p.m. peak period is based on a departure time of 5 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; and (d) data are reported for commutes on Tuesdays, Wednesdays, and Thursdays.

**Source:** Freeway Performance Measurement System (PeMS) Version 12.3, Caltrans
Map 1
Key Auto Corridor Travel Times, 2013

1 I-5 Oceanside to Downtown SD
   North Bound: 45 minutes
   South Bound: 43 minutes

2 I-15 Escondido to Downtown SD
   North Bound: 32 minutes
   South Bound: 32 minutes

3 SR 78 Escondido to Carlsbad
   East Bound: 24 minutes
   West Bound: 16 minutes

4 SR 94 El Cajon to Downtown SD
   East Bound: 11 minutes
   West Bound: 16 minutes

5 I-8 El Cajon to Downtown SD
   East Bound: 15 minutes
   West Bound: 21 minutes

6 SR 52 Santee to Kearny Mesa
   East Bound: 20 minutes
   West Bound: 15 minutes

7 I-8 Mid City to Sorrento Valley
   North Bound: 18 minutes
   South Bound: 21 minutes

8 I-805 Chula Vista to Sorrento Valley
   North Bound: 37 minutes
   South Bound: 37 minutes

9 I-805 Chula Vista to Downtown SD
   North Bound: 17 minutes
   South Bound: 13 minutes

10 I-5 San Ysidro to Downtown SD
    North Bound: 18 minutes
    South Bound: 16 minutes
As shown in Table 3, travel volumes continued to fluctuate in 2013. 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 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitoring Point at</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 I-5 Oceanside to Downtown SD</td>
<td>192,900</td>
<td>183,700</td>
<td>178,000</td>
<td>176,500</td>
<td>183,900</td>
<td>182,800</td>
<td>184,300</td>
<td>186,300</td>
<td>186,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 I-15 Escondido to Downtown SD</td>
<td>276,000</td>
<td>273,800</td>
<td>274,400</td>
<td>263,800</td>
<td>266,800</td>
<td>271,100</td>
<td>266,700</td>
<td>293,500</td>
<td>309,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 SR-78 Escondido to Carlsbad</td>
<td>138,200</td>
<td>136,600</td>
<td>134,700</td>
<td>130,300</td>
<td>130,600</td>
<td>129,800</td>
<td>131,100</td>
<td>129,300</td>
<td>130,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 SR-94 El Cajon to Downtown SD</td>
<td>152,700</td>
<td>159,200</td>
<td>158,000</td>
<td>156,000</td>
<td>157,300</td>
<td>156,900</td>
<td>155,500</td>
<td>155,200</td>
<td>157,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 I-8 El Cajon to Downtown SD</td>
<td>232,100</td>
<td>233,800</td>
<td>232,500</td>
<td>227,200</td>
<td>228,000</td>
<td>227,400</td>
<td>220,700</td>
<td>217,400</td>
<td>221,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 SR-52 Santee to Kearny Mesa</td>
<td>81,800</td>
<td>82,700</td>
<td>81,800</td>
<td>83,100</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>89,000</td>
<td>97,200</td>
<td>105,700</td>
<td>109,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 I-805 Mid-City to Sorrento Valley</td>
<td>209,500</td>
<td>212,300</td>
<td>210,900</td>
<td>206,100</td>
<td>204,400</td>
<td>206,800</td>
<td>205,900</td>
<td>204,600</td>
<td>200,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 I-805 Chula Vista to Sorrento Valley</td>
<td>209,500</td>
<td>212,300</td>
<td>210,900</td>
<td>206,100</td>
<td>204,400</td>
<td>206,800</td>
<td>205,900</td>
<td>204,600</td>
<td>200,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 I-805 Chula Vista to Downtown SD</td>
<td>193,000</td>
<td>190,700</td>
<td>187,400</td>
<td>180,900</td>
<td>181,600</td>
<td>181,400</td>
<td>180,300</td>
<td>174,900</td>
<td>183,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 I-5 San Ysidro to Downtown SD</td>
<td>174,500</td>
<td>178,300</td>
<td>175,200</td>
<td>149,900</td>
<td>151,600</td>
<td>152,300</td>
<td>149,600</td>
<td>146,100</td>
<td>150,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 I-8 El Cajon to Sorrento Valley</td>
<td>232,100</td>
<td>233,800</td>
<td>232,500</td>
<td>227,200</td>
<td>228,000</td>
<td>227,400</td>
<td>220,700</td>
<td>217,400</td>
<td>221,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 Interstate 805 (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; (c) Historical data have been adjusted to reflect current information available.

Source: Freeway PeMS Version 12.3, Caltrans
As mentioned above, as the PeMS continues to be developed and refined, it will eventually incorporate real-time transit data. In the meantime, the 2012 to 2013 Monitoring Report includes transit volume information from FY 2005 through FY 2013 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 be partially related to the economic recession as well as changes in state and federal funding.

### Table 4
Transit Passenger Volumes in Key Transit Corridors at Specific Screenline Locations, 2005 to 2013

<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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>Oceanside to Downtown SD</td>
<td>5,183</td>
<td>5,276</td>
<td>5,184</td>
<td>6,267</td>
<td>5,112</td>
<td>4,901</td>
<td>5,365</td>
<td>5,188</td>
<td>5,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COASTER</td>
<td>Del Mar</td>
<td>4,591</td>
<td>4,620</td>
<td>4,568</td>
<td>5,501</td>
<td>4,192</td>
<td>4,093</td>
<td>4,527</td>
<td>4,291</td>
<td>4,552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Route 101</td>
<td>Camino del Mar and Del Mar Heights</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>808</td>
<td>838</td>
<td>897</td>
<td>853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>Escondido to Downtown SD - Poway*</td>
<td>1,789</td>
<td>1,914</td>
<td>1,563</td>
<td>1,911</td>
<td>1,712</td>
<td>1,864</td>
<td>2,062</td>
<td>2,170</td>
<td>2,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Route 20</td>
<td>Rancho Penasquitos Blvd and Calle De Las Rosas</td>
<td>871</td>
<td>857</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>809</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>1,040</td>
<td>1,092</td>
<td>1,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Route 810</td>
<td>Escondido Blvd and Felecta Ave</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Route 820</td>
<td>Poway Rd and Pomerado Rd</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Route 850</td>
<td>Carmel Mountain Rd and Penasquitos Dr</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Route 860</td>
<td>W Bernardo Rd and Poblado Rd</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Escondido to Downtown SD - Mira Mesa*</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,147</td>
<td>2,250</td>
<td>1,741</td>
<td>1,997</td>
<td>2,236</td>
<td>2,436</td>
<td>2,660</td>
<td>2,805</td>
<td>2,816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Route 20</td>
<td>Mira Mesa Blvd and Black Mountain Rd</td>
<td>1,118</td>
<td>1,071</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>1,110</td>
<td>1,261</td>
<td>1,372</td>
<td>1,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Route 210</td>
<td>Mira Mesa Blvd and Black Mountain Rd</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Route 810</td>
<td>Escondido Blvd and Felecta Ave</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Route 820</td>
<td>Sabre Springs/ Penasquitos Transit Center</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Route 850</td>
<td>Carmel Mountain Rd and Paseo Cardiel</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Route 860</td>
<td>Rancho Carmel Dr and Provencal Pl</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Route 880</td>
<td>Mira Mesa Blvd and Black Mountain Rd</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4 (continued)
Transit Passenger Volumes in Key Transit Corridors at Specific Screenline Locations, 2005 to 2013

<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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SR-78 Escondido to Carlsbad - Vista*</td>
<td>Route 320 Vista Transit Center</td>
<td>951</td>
<td>937</td>
<td>941</td>
<td>3,339</td>
<td>3,118</td>
<td>3,347</td>
<td>3,195</td>
<td>3,832</td>
<td>3,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SPRINTER Vista Transit Center</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>3,339</td>
<td>3,118</td>
<td>3,347</td>
<td>3,195</td>
<td>3,832</td>
<td>3,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Escondido to Carlsbad - San Marcos *</td>
<td>862</td>
<td>882</td>
<td>879</td>
<td>3,063</td>
<td>3,012</td>
<td>3,087</td>
<td>3,109</td>
<td>3,772</td>
<td>3,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Route 320 Palomar College</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>3,063</td>
<td>3,012</td>
<td>3,087</td>
<td>3,109</td>
<td>3,772</td>
<td>3,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SPRINTER Palomar College</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SR-94 El Cajon to Downtown SD</td>
<td>Orange Line Euclid Avenue</td>
<td>10,311</td>
<td>10,324</td>
<td>9,969</td>
<td>10,033</td>
<td>11,175</td>
<td>10,917</td>
<td>11,195</td>
<td>11,200</td>
<td>12,661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Green Line Fashion Valley</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>8,045</td>
<td>8,935</td>
<td>9,513</td>
<td>10,159</td>
<td>9,536</td>
<td>8,912</td>
<td>8,900</td>
<td>12,729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Route 11 University Ave and 3rd Ave</td>
<td>1,224</td>
<td>1,382</td>
<td>1,391</td>
<td>1,372</td>
<td>1,463</td>
<td>1,421</td>
<td>1,343</td>
<td>1,329</td>
<td>1,369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Route 14 Fashion Valley Transit Center</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>El Cajon to Downtown SD - SDSU/Grantville*</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>7,080</td>
<td>8,611</td>
<td>9,140</td>
<td>10,080</td>
<td>9,178</td>
<td>8,482</td>
<td>8,421</td>
<td>10,682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Green Line SDSU</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>6,261</td>
<td>7,434</td>
<td>8,046</td>
<td>9,027</td>
<td>8,183</td>
<td>7,498</td>
<td>7,498</td>
<td>9,678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Route 11 Campanile Dr and Montezuma Rd</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>884</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Route 14 College Ave/SDSU Transit Center</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>SR-52 Santee to Kearny Mesa</td>
<td>Route 870 Clairemont Mesa Blvd and Overland Ave</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Route 870 Clairemont Mesa Blvd and Overland Ave</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I-805 Mid-City to Sorrento Valley</td>
<td>Route 50 Genessee Ave and Clairemont Mesa Blvd</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Route 105 Clairemont Mesa Blvd and Clairmont Dr</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Route 150 Gilman Dr and Via La Jolla</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>1,304</td>
<td>1,486</td>
<td>1,553</td>
<td>1,243</td>
<td>1,866</td>
<td>1,881</td>
<td>2,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Route 960 Clairemont Mesa Blvd and Overland Dr</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I-805 Chula Vista to Sorrento Valley</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I-805 Chula Vista to Downtown SD</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4 (continued)
Transit Passenger Volumes in Key Transit Corridors at Specific Screenline Locations, 2005 to 2013

<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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Blue Line Iris Ave</td>
<td>21,037</td>
<td>20,961</td>
<td>21,310</td>
<td>23,408</td>
<td>21,309</td>
<td>22,471</td>
<td>22,471</td>
<td>17,938</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Route 929 Iris Ave</td>
<td>1,434</td>
<td>1,521</td>
<td>1,486</td>
<td>2,456</td>
<td>2,145</td>
<td>2,084</td>
<td>1,535</td>
<td>1,550</td>
<td>1,439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Route 932 Iris Ave</td>
<td>2,348</td>
<td>2,339</td>
<td>2,145</td>
<td>2,251</td>
<td>2,657</td>
<td>2,208</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>San Ysidro to Downtown SD -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12th and Imperial*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Blue Line 12th and Imperial</td>
<td>21,773</td>
<td>20,907</td>
<td>21,561</td>
<td>22,829</td>
<td>23,717</td>
<td>21,585</td>
<td>22,989</td>
<td>22,989</td>
<td>19,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Route 929 12th and Imperial</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>1,036</td>
<td>1,290</td>
<td>1,361</td>
<td>1,301</td>
<td>1,271</td>
<td>1,017</td>
<td>1,244</td>
<td>1,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I-8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Monitoring at two screenlines along corridor.

Notes: Total for both directions. The transit screenline locations for individual routes may not represent peak passenger load locations nor total ridership on the route.

Source: SANDAG Passenger Counting Program 2013

Annual Hours of Traffic Delay per Traveler

Annual hours of traffic delay per traveler decreased from 2005 through 2009, as shown in Figure 7. After 2009, the annual hours of delay has remained stable at 37 hours. 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, 2005 to 2011

Source: Annual Urban Mobility Report, Texas Transportation Institute
Regional Crime Rate
As shown in Figure 8, while the rate of crime in the region declined from 2005 through 2011, there was a slight increase in 2012 and stabilizing at 26 crimes per 1,000 people in 2013.

Figure 8
FBI Index Crimes Per 1,000 People, 2005 to 2013

Source: SANDAG Criminal Justice Research Division

Conclusion
As of 2013, the region continued to make progress toward achieving some of the urban form and transportation goals listed in the RCP, but not others. The proportion of total housing units within Smart Growth Opportunity Areas has increased and the number of jobs in these areas is growing faster than overall employment. Commute times are generally decreasing or remaining stable in the region, with annual hours of delay in the peak period also remaining stable. Future monitoring is required to fully understand our progress toward improving mobility.
The limited supply of affordable housing to meet the region’s demand continues to be one of the major issues facing the San Diego region today. Building permit issuance was nearly 15,000 units in 2005, fell to just over 5,000 units in 2011, and is climbing back slowly to 7,300 units in 2012 and 9,200 units in 2013. The Regional Comprehensive Plan (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 (GHG) reduction emission targets set by the California Air Resources Board.

In October 2011, SANDAG adopted the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan and its Sustainable Communities Strategy (2050 RTP/SCS) and the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) Plan for the fifth housing element cycle (2013 to 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, and is reflected in the local general, community, and specific plans that have been adopted since 2004.

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 2000s, 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. The state legislature is considering several ways of funding affordable housing including a permanent source of funding (Senate Bill 391) and the use of cap and trade funds.
Housing Opportunity Index

As shown in Figure 9, data from 2013 suggests that the upward trend in housing affordability since 2007 may have reversed. The percent of homes sold that are affordable to households earning the regional median income has declined to 35 percent in 2013 after reaching a high of 55 percent in 2011 and 2012.

Figure 9
Housing Opportunity Index, 2005 to 2013

Source: National Association of Home Builders
As Table 5 shows, although housing became more affordable from 2005 through 2011, home prices remained out of reach for many households in the region, and began increasing again starting in 2012. Historically, the median price of a home has been considered to be affordable at three to four times the median income. Even at the lowest median home price point in December 2008, the annual income needed to afford a home priced at $300,000 would be between $75,000 and $100,000, well above the regional median household income. The December 2012 median home price ($366,000) is nearly 5.5 times the regional median income of $67,753 (SANDAG 2013 Current Estimates Program); and the December 2013 median home price ($420,000) is about six times the regional median income. With increasing mortgage interest rates, tighter lending requirements, and current median income, owning a home in the San Diego region continues to be a challenge.

Table 5  
Median Home Prices, 2005 to 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month/Year</th>
<th>Median Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December 2005</td>
<td>516,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2006</td>
<td>483,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2007</td>
<td>430,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2008</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2009</td>
<td>330,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2010</td>
<td>333,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2011</td>
<td>315,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2012</td>
<td>366,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2013</td>
<td>420,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:  Includes all resale homes and condominiums, new homes and condominiums, and condominium conversions.

Source:  DataQuick: http://www.dataquick.com/about/news/industrynews/
Percent of Households with Housing Costs Greater Than 35 Percent of Income

As shown in Figure 10, the percentage of households paying more than 35 percent of their income toward housing costs has been relatively stable since 2005, ranging from 37 percent to 41 percent in 2009 and 2010. In 2012, 39 percent of households paid more than 35 percent of income on housing.

Figure 10
Percent of Households Paying 35 Percent or More of Income for Housing, 2005 to 2012

Source: American Community Survey, 1-Year Estimates. United States Census Bureau
Another indicator 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 most recent Fair Market Rent of $1,382 for a two-bedroom unit (note this is a decrease from a high of $1,418 in 2009). As Figure 11 shows, in 2013, that amount was $55,280 annually or about $27 per hour (assuming that no more than 30 percent of income is spent on housing). However, the income needed in the San Diego region is $1,653 more than for the state ($53,627); the upward trend in annual income needed since 2000 is fairly consistent for both the state and the region.

In 2013, the minimum wage in California was $8.00 per hour. Therefore, a household would need to include more than three minimum wage earners working forty hours per week to make a two-bedroom fair market rent affordable in the San Diego region.

**Figure 11**
Annual Income Needed to Afford Fair Market Rent, 2005 to 2014

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 2005 to 2012, and Table 6 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 2005 and 2012. This ratio is similar to most of the other major metropolitan areas of the state (see California Regional Progress Report, 2007).

**Figure 12**
Total New Jobs Per New Housing Unit Ratio, 2005 to 2012

![Graph showing the ratio of new jobs to new housing units from 2005 to 2012.]

*Source: SANDAG Annual Population and Housing Estimates; California Employment Development Department*
As shown in Table 6, over the past few years, growth in the number of new housing units increased significantly in 2011 and slowed again in 2012. Regarding new jobs, the net job losses associated with the economic recession in 2008, 2009, and 2010 has reversed with increases in 2011 and 2012. As a result, the ratio of new jobs to new housing units reached a high of 2.47 in 2012.

Table 6
Total Jobs Per Housing Unit Ratio, 2005 to 2012

<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>2005</td>
<td>1,107,985</td>
<td>1,292,800</td>
<td>12,908</td>
<td>21,300</td>
<td>1.65</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>1.91</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>0.53</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1,140,349</td>
<td>1,310,000</td>
<td>8,600</td>
<td>-9,700</td>
<td>-1.13</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1,145,548</td>
<td>1,251,000</td>
<td>5,199</td>
<td>-59,000</td>
<td>-11.35</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1,149,426</td>
<td>1,223,000</td>
<td>3,878</td>
<td>-28,000</td>
<td>-7.22</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1,161,720</td>
<td>1,239,300</td>
<td>12,294</td>
<td>16,300</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1,165,970</td>
<td>1,249,800</td>
<td>4,250</td>
<td>10,500</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{1}\) Does not include military and self-employed

Note: The 2010 Housing Unit estimate in Table 6 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.

Source: SANDAG Current Estimates Program, California Employment Development Department.
Although the fourth housing element cycle ended in June 2010, information for this cycle is included in this report to provide historical housing production data. 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 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 7. Based on the 2003 to 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 were exceeded, while the housing needs for very low, low, and moderate income households fell short of their respective goals, due in part to the high cost of land and lack of subsidies to build very low, low, and moderate income housing.

Table 7
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.
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 to 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 by Income Category, 2005-2013*

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

A total of 9,810 building permits for new housing units were issued in the region between January 1, 2012, to December 31, 2013 (four years out of the 11-year RHNA projection period for the fifth housing element cycle), including 1,950 very low income, 2,151 low income, 950 moderate income, and 21,288 above moderate income housing units, as shown in Table 8.

Based on the 2010 to 2020 RHNA Plan adopted by the SANDAG Board of Directors in October 2011, the region has achieved 5 percent of the very low income, 8 percent of the low income, 3 percent of the moderate income, and 32 percent of the above moderate income regional housing needs established for the RHNA projection period. Because the data collected through December 31, 2013, reflects the first four years of an 11-year RHNA cycle (36% of the 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 four years of the 11-year RHNA projection period.

As shown in Figure 13, total building permit issuance for homes affordable to above moderate income households increased from 2012 to 2013, while homes affordable for very low, low, and moderate income households were built at much lower rates. (Note: The data in Tables 7 and 8 overlap by one year – from January 1, 2010, to December 31, 2010).

Table 8
Share of New Housing Units by Income Category, January 1, 2010, through December 31, 2013

<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>1,950</td>
<td>2,151</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>21,288</td>
<td>26,339</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units Left to Permit</td>
<td>34,500</td>
<td>25,549</td>
<td>29,660</td>
<td>45,932</td>
<td>135,641</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**

Housing vacancy rates in the region were stable at around 4.4 percent between 2005 and 2008. However, vacancy rates began to climb in 2009 and 2010 (to 5.8% and 6.1%, respectively) and continued to decline slightly to 5.5 percent in 2013, as shown in Figure 14.

**Figure 14**

**Vacancy Rates, 2005 to 2013**

Source: SANDAG Current Estimates Program
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 2012. The Census definition of overcrowded is more than one person per room, which constituted 6 percent of households in the San Diego region for 2012.

Figure 15
Overcrowding in the Region, 2005 to 2012

![Overcrowding in the Region, 2005 to 2012](source: American Community Survey, 1-Year Estimates., United States Census Bureau)

Number of Households on the Waiting List for Section 8 Vouchers

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. At the end of 2013, collectively the region had approximately 133,500 households on Section 8 waiting lists. In 2011, the combined waiting lists totaled about 92,600, while 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.) The increase in the number of people on the waiting lists in 2013 reflects the need for more affordable housing in the region, and is partially due to the economic recession and sequestration (no additional Section 8 vouchers). Also, some households may sign up for multiple waiting lists causing some duplication.

Conclusion

Housing affordability continues to be a significant issue in the San Diego region. While the proportion of affordable homes sold (based on the regional median income) rose during the recession, the most recent data indicate that this trend is reversing as the price of homes rises. The percent of households paying 35 percent or more for housing remains relatively unchanged. As in the past, fair market rent requires three times the minimum wage. Although building permits for above moderate income (market rate) homes exceeded the RHNA goals in the fourth housing element cycle, 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) virtually complete, and the generally accepted need for
financial subsidies and/or regulatory measures to construct very low and low income units, the region will need to consider new ways to provide housing for families and individuals whose incomes fall into these categories, as well as those within the moderate income category.
Healthy Environment

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

Habitat Conserved Within Designated Preserve Areas

The region is engaging in the development and implementation of the following four subregional habitat conservation plans:

1. Multiple Species Conservation Program Plan (MSCP) South, finalized in 1998
2. Multiple Habitat Conservation Program (MHCP), finalized in 2003
3. MSCP North, sent for public review in 2009 with comments received through this review used to revise the Plan for future consideration by the County Board of Supervisors
4. East County Plan, delayed until further notice as a result of budget and staffing constraints

Map 2, provided below, shows the location and boundaries of these plans.

Map 2
Habitat Conservation Planning Areas

Six jurisdictions, including a portion of the unincorporated area of the County, have approved habitat conservation plans and signed implementing agreements (covering 20% of the region). Seven jurisdictions are working on approval of their implementing agreements (covering 73% of...
the region), and seven jurisdictions are not pursuing implementing agreements due to limited habitat in their jurisdictions (covering 1% of the region). The remaining area (covering 6% of the region) consists of military lands which have their own integrated natural resource management plans.

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. In 2014, the database underwent a quality assurance and quality control process. It is available to the public at http://gis.sandag.org/ConservedLand/. The database will be maintained and serve as the basis for Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) monitoring for regional habitat conservation, as well as provide information to the public on the tracking of these regional planning efforts. 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, 2005 to 2012, with 2020 and 2030 Targets

![Graph showing the conservation of land within designated preservation areas from 2005 to 2012 with 2020 and 2030 goals.](source)

Source: SANDAG Conserved Land Database, 2013

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, SANDAG acquired 25 habitat conservation properties totaling 3,334 acres of open space under the EMP, with much of the acquired land previously slated
for development. 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), Rancho Lilac (902 acres acquired in 2011), and Hidden Valley (953 acres acquired in 2012). The status of acquisition under the EMP can be viewed at http://keepsandiegomoving.com/EMP/EMP-intro.aspx.

One successful project in the TransNet EMP is the Hidden Valley property in Jamul, which connects the San Diego National Wildlife Refuge to the State of California’s Rancho Jamul Ecological Reserve. This key acquisition was jointly procured by the United States Department of Interior and SANDAG with the assistance of the Nature Conservancy. SANDAG acquired 953 acres on the site with an additional 952 acres funded by the United States Border Patrol (negotiated through the Nature Conservancy) for a total of 1,905 acres. The land that will be added to the national refuge system will be managed by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service for endangered and threatened species such as the Quino checkerspot butterfly, the California gnatcatcher, and other rare plant and animal species. This project has been the largest acquisition completed under the TransNet EMP and will be used to mitigate transportation-related infrastructure impacts south of State Route 56.
Percent of Preserve Area Actively Maintained

Once conserved, property owners are 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 1.28 million acres in the region are managed as open space with dedicated land managers (Figure 17). This area includes land in the North and East County MSCP that are federal, state, and locally owned and conserved for open space and habitat (e.g., State Parks, United States Forest Service Lands, Bureau of Land Management areas).

Figure 17
Land Management by Source, 2013

Conserved Land by Ownership (Acres)

Source: SANDAG Conserved Land Database 2013

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 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 2012 was to assist the database managers to make these independent databases able to share data and collaborate in future data gathering efforts. This centralized database is now available to the public at http://www.sdmmp.com/reports_and_products/databases.aspx. Future work will include upgrades for a more user friendly public interface.

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, United States 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 State Route 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

Beach-Mile Days (BMDs) is a standardized measure indicating the scale of a beach closure. 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.

Beginning with this 2012 to 2013 Monitoring Report, closure BMDs do not include closures in the region’s south county beaches due to sewage-contaminated runoff from the Tijuana River. When closure events related to the Tijuana River are excluded, the trend of closure BMDs due to sanitary sewer overflow in the rest of the region is more accurately reflected. The previous source for BMD data, San Diego County Annual Beach Closure and Advisory Report, is no longer available as of 2008. Instead, the Beach and Bay Water Quality Monitoring Program Brochure provides an overview of the program and beach water quality data from 2008 to 2013, including closure BMDs.
As shown in Figure 18, BMD closures have fluctuated over the years, with 54.3 in 2005 and 3.57 in 2013. The lower level of closures in recent years may be partially attributed to better maintenance of sewer lines and better containment of spills by municipal water agencies.

**Figure 18**
Closure Beach Mile Days, 2005 to 2013

*Increase associated with a regionwide power outage when pumps could not move storm water and waste water through the treatment process.

*Source: San Diego County Department of Environmental Health, Land and Water Quality Division*
**Beach Widths**

The San Diego shoreline consists of narrow beaches backed by steep cliffs and dense urban development. As a result of development, there have been deficits in the sand supply flowing to the region’s beaches while there has been increasing demand for beach recreation.

In 2001, SANDAG implemented the first-of-its-kind regional sand restoration project in the western United States. The 2001 Regional Beach Sand Project (RBSP) placed a total of 2.1 million cubic yards of clean, beach-quality sand on 12 sites from Oceanside to Imperial Beach. In the initial year following the 2001 RBSP, beach widths increased in all three Littoral Cells in the region Oceanside, Mission Beach, and Silver Strand. As expected, these gains were followed by gradual shoreline retreat and shorezone volume losses through 2006, with an unusual increase in 2007 due to mild wave conditions, which was then followed by continued losses.

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 to 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 cubic yards of nourishment material placed at Mission Beach by the United States 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 9).

Building upon the success of the RBSP in 2001, SANDAG completed a second RBSP during the fall of 2012. By the start of the 2012 RBSP, the Oceanside and Silver Strand Littoral Cells were below the pre-2001 RBSP beach widths. Initial monitoring results show that as with the 2001 RBSP, there have been initial beach width gains at the receiver sites where sand was placed, followed by losses. However, net benefits resulting from the 2012 RBSP thus far include beach width gains at adjacent beaches and a surplus of sand within the region’s overall system. Through the 2012 RBSP, SANDAG has continued the process of restoring the region’s eroded beaches by implementing measures to protect and enhance the quality of our coastline.
### Table 9
Beach Widths and Targets of Shoreline Segments (in feet), 2005 to 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall Averages</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2010 Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Silver Strand Littoral Cell</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Beach</td>
<td>114.5</td>
<td>168.5</td>
<td>151.0</td>
<td>152.5</td>
<td>162.5</td>
<td>117.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>229.0</td>
<td>174.0</td>
<td>238.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver Strand State Beach</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>425.0</td>
<td>429.0</td>
<td>431.0</td>
<td>210.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronado</td>
<td>737.0</td>
<td>790.0</td>
<td>784.0</td>
<td>767.0</td>
<td>766.0</td>
<td>736.0</td>
<td>692.0</td>
<td>736.0</td>
<td>756.0</td>
<td>232.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mission Beach Littoral Cell</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean Beach</td>
<td>225.0</td>
<td>273.0</td>
<td>248.0</td>
<td>242.0</td>
<td>266.0</td>
<td>227.0</td>
<td>236.0</td>
<td>237.0</td>
<td>213.0</td>
<td>220.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific/Mission Beaches</td>
<td>240.8</td>
<td>255.0</td>
<td>226.5</td>
<td>244.5</td>
<td>244.5</td>
<td>294.3</td>
<td>254.5</td>
<td>230.0</td>
<td>229.5</td>
<td>200.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oceanside Littoral Cell</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Jolla</td>
<td>193.3</td>
<td>202.0</td>
<td>169.8</td>
<td>197.5</td>
<td>188.5</td>
<td>193.3</td>
<td>179.0</td>
<td>168.8</td>
<td>186.5</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>160.5</td>
<td>185.0</td>
<td>144.0</td>
<td>165.5</td>
<td>163.5</td>
<td>125.0</td>
<td>143.0</td>
<td>109.0</td>
<td>147.5</td>
<td>228.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Mar</td>
<td>119.0</td>
<td>158.0</td>
<td>106.0</td>
<td>125.5</td>
<td>118.5</td>
<td>102.5</td>
<td>135.0</td>
<td>102.5</td>
<td>118.5</td>
<td>232.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solana Beach</td>
<td>130.0</td>
<td>157.0</td>
<td>116.0</td>
<td>155.0</td>
<td>157.0</td>
<td>163.0</td>
<td>136.0</td>
<td>212.0</td>
<td>196.0</td>
<td>232.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encinitas</td>
<td>158.4</td>
<td>181.8</td>
<td>156.8</td>
<td>176.0</td>
<td>180.3</td>
<td>165.1</td>
<td>174.3</td>
<td>180.7</td>
<td>196.1</td>
<td>240.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlsbad</td>
<td>113.6</td>
<td>131.2</td>
<td>117.0</td>
<td>131.6</td>
<td>129.0</td>
<td>118.7</td>
<td>115.8</td>
<td>134.1</td>
<td>140.1</td>
<td>216.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside</td>
<td>226.0</td>
<td>251.0</td>
<td>204.0</td>
<td>194.5</td>
<td>209.8</td>
<td>188.3</td>
<td>190.5</td>
<td>242.8</td>
<td>221.3</td>
<td>232.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:  (a) Based on average fall beach widths, derived from 44 transects established in 2000, allowing for comparisons over time. This method was not utilized previously. Therefore, the information presented in prior reports do not match this table; (c) SANDAG implemented Regional Beach Sand Projects in 2001, which nourished 12 of the region’s beaches, and again in 2012, which nourished 8 of the region’s beaches.

Source: SANDAG Regional Beach Monitoring Program, Annual Report 2013
**Impaired Waterbodies**

Data for this indicator are published every four years by the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board. Therefore, the analysis remains unchanged since the last report, as presented below.

Between 2006 and 2010, impaired waterbodies in the region decreased. Impaired waterbodies are those that do not meet Clean Water Act standards. 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 (Figure 19). 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 was available from the Water Board and outside agencies that makes comparisons among the years difficult due to changing data collection 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*

*Miles of rivers, streams, creeks, and other waterways that are considered impaired based on federal 303(d) criteria

**Acres of lakes, bays, lagoons, and other bodies of water that are considered impaired based on federal 303(d) criteria

Source: San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board
Air Quality

The Air Quality Index (AQI) data suggest that air quality continues to improve in the San Diego region. As shown in Figure 20, air quality appeared to have been at its cleanest in 2013. The increases in the AQI index 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 stricter standards for PM$_{2.5}$ in 2006 and ozone in 2008. The data shown report on performance relative to the revised standard from 2005 to 2013. It also should be noted that the data exclude days during the 2007 wildfire when PM$_{2.5}$ and carbon monoxide exceeded their respective standards.

**Figure 20**

Number of Days AQI More Than 100, 2005 to 2013

Source: San Diego Air Pollution Control District
Conclusion

The region continues to make progress on habitat conservation, and further progress is anticipated as the North County MSCPs is refined based on public input. With respect to beach mile closure days, sewer line maintenance and containment of spills have contributed a lower level in recent years. While beach widths do not meet or exceed 2010 targets for every beach, there is a surplus of sand within the overall system, in part due to the SANDAG Regional Beach Sand Project. For air quality, 2013 had the fewest number of unhealthy days since 2005. 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 regional 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**

- 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, 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 for infrastructure investment and public policy support in order to strengthen the region’s economic foundation.

Another important component of the RCP 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, SANDAG has completed four cluster reports.

**Labor Force Educational Attainment**

Labor force educational 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, 34 percent of the labor force reported having a bachelor’s degree or higher in 2012 with 32 percent having some college education, 19 percent having only a high school degree, and 14 percent with no high school education. Overall, educational attainment generally remained stable since 2005.

**Figure 21**

Labor Force Educational Attainment, 2005 to 2012

![Chart showing labor force educational attainment from 2005 to 2012.]

Source: American Community Survey, 1-Year. United States Census Bureau

**Employment Growth in High-Wage Traded Industry Clusters**

Economic industry clusters are groups of interrelated, export-oriented industries that are responsible for driving the economic growth and prosperity of the regional economy. Industries within a cluster have business transactions with one another and function interdependently. Cluster companies often participate in local industry associations and collaborate with universities and community colleges, 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 and bring in funding and spending from outside the region.

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

According to the report *Traded Industry Clusters in the San Diego Region, 2012*, 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
- Cleantech
- Entertainment and Hospitality
- Fruits and Vegetables
- Horticulture
- Information and Communication Technology
- Publishing and Marketing
- Specialty Foods and Microbreweries

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.

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
- Information and Communications Technology
- Publishing and Marketing

As shown in Figure 22, total employment in high-wage economic clusters has remained relatively steady since 2005, with 166,361 jobs in these high-wage traded industry clusters in 2012.
Employment growth in high wage clusters 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.
Regional Unemployment Rate Compared to California and the United States

As shown in Figure 23, San Diego’s unemployment rate was around 4 percent in 2005. As jobs were lost and the economy began to weaken, the unemployment rate for San Diego increased, peaking to 10.6 percent in 2010. Since 2010, unemployment rates in San Diego were steadily declining. These trends were consistent with the state and the nation.

Figure 23
Unemployment in San Diego, California and the United States, 2005 to 2013

Source: Unemployment Survey, United State Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics
Real Per Capita Income Compared to California and the United States

Real per capita income, or the income per person adjusted for inflation, is one indicator that measures the region’s standard of living. As shown in Figure 24, San Diego’s real per capita income has been relatively stable over time, showing that San Diego’s residences generally aren’t more prosperous today than they were in 2005. In 2012, real per capita income was $49,719 in San Diego, consistently higher than California and the United States.

Figure 24
Real Per Capita Income in San Diego, California and the United States in Inflation-Adjusted 2012 Dollars, 2005 to 2012

Source: United States 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 2012, San Diego’s poverty rate was 15 percent, which is slightly lower than California and the United States. Again, as with other indicators, this increase is partially attributable to the economic recession.

Figure 25
Percent of Residents Living in Poverty in San Diego, California and the United States, 2005 to 2012

Source: American Community Survey, 1-Year. United States Census Bureau

Conclusion

Economic prosperity for the region shows recent positive gains following the economic downturn. The region continues to have a well-educated labor force and unemployment is on the decline. Many of the traded industry clusters in the region provide a variety of balanced and high wage jobs for residents, though the quantity of jobs in these areas has been flat in recent years. The region’s standard of living, as measured by real per capita income, has been relatively flat over time. Further, poverty levels are lower locally than for California and the United States as a whole.
Public Facilities

Our region requires reliable supplies of water and energy, opportunities to reuse and recycle materials, and sufficient disposal options for waste. The region also needs to make more efficient use of its resources. The Regional Energy Strategy (RES), originally adopted in 1994 and updated in 2003, was again updated in 2009. It serves as an energy policy guide to support 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 2012-13 Monitoring Report reflects the indicators and targets included in the updated RES.

**Water Consumption**

As shown in Figure 26, water consumption has fluctuated over time. The decline from 2007 to 2011 has reversed with water consumption increasing in 2012 and 2013.

**Figure 26**

*Water Consumption, 2005 to 2013*

Source: San Diego County Water Authority Annual Reports
Diversity of Water Supply

The region’s water supply became more diverse between 2005 through 2011, with reliance on the Metropolitan Water District (MWD) of Southern California as a source decreasing from 79 percent in 2005 to 44 percent in 2011 (Figure 27). However, levels have remained stable since that time, with 46 percent in 2013. The San Diego County Water Authority is on track to meet its water diversification strategy target by 2020, including the 30-year contract signed by the Water Authority in June 2013 to purchase desalinated seawater from a plant that is currently under construction in Carlsbad.

Figure 27
Water Supply Diversification by Source, 2005 to 2013 with 2020 Target

<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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MWD</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Irrigation District</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canal Lining Transfer</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundwater</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sea Water</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Water</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dry-Year Transfer</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding.

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

As indicated in previous reports, the amount of recycled water use has increased over time as the region continues to invest in infrastructure and consumer awareness, as shown in Figure 28. Recycled water use has steadily increased from 2005 through 2009, with decreases in 2010 and 2011, followed by a rise through 2013. The slight declines in 2010 and 2011 may be due to the decrease in water consumption overall, see the Water Consumption previously shown in Figure 26. The goal for the region is to grow recycled water supplies to 44,000 acre-feet annually by 2020.

Several Water Authority member agencies have collaborated to obtain state and federal funding for the North San Diego County Regional Recycled Water Project, which will add approximately 30 million gallons per day of recycled water to the regional water supply portfolio. In addition to more recycled water production in the near future, there is increasing support by the public for water purification and recycling. Member agencies also have been providing recycled water retrofit assistance to existing customers in order to expedite hook-ups to their recycled water systems.

Figure 28
Amount of Recycled Water Used, 2005 to 2013

Source: San Diego County Water Authority Annual Reports
**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. Over 60 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 2005 and 2012.

**Figure 29**  
**Energy Sources, 2005 and 2012**

* In January 2012, the San Onofre Nuclear Generation Station was shutdown.  
** Other refers to power sold to SDG&E, but the energy source is unknown.  
Note: Percentages may not equal 100 due to rounding.  
Source: SDG&E Power Content Label.
Share and Types of Energy produced from Renewable Resources

As of 2012, 19 percent of the region's electricity came from renewable resources, while state and regional targets called for 20 percent as shown in Figure 30. However, this proportion is up from seven percent in 2005. 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 compares the different types of renewable energy resources used in the San Diego region 2005 to 2012. While most categories increased, the largest growth occurred for wind, followed by solar.

Figure 30
Share of Energy Produced from Renewable Resources, 2005 to 2012, with 2010, 2020, and 2030 Targets

Source: SDG&E Power Content Label.
Figure 31
Breakdown of Renewable Energy Resources, 2005 and 2012

*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.

Source: SDG&E Power Content Label.

Per Capita Peak Demand for Electricity

The region’s annual per capita electricity peak demand has been relatively steady since 2005, 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.

Figure 32
Annual Per Capita Electricity Peak Demand, 2005 to 2012

Source: California Energy Commission. California Energy Demand 2014-2024 Baseline Revised Forecast - Mid Demand Case, SDG&E Planning Area, September 2013; State of California, Department of Finance, E-8 Population and Housing Estimates
Electricity Consumption by Sector

Electricity and natural gas consumption by sector were added as performance measures in the 2009 update of the RES. 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 for years 2005 to 2012, and projected consumption for 2020; this 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
Electricity Consumption by Sector, 2005 to 2012 and 2020 Projected

Source: California Energy Commission
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 2012, the San Diego region consumed approximately 476 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.

Figure 34
Natural Gas Consumption by Sector, 2005 to 2012 and 2020 Projected

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.

Figure 35
Percent of Solid Waste Diverted From Landfills, 2005 to 2012

Source: California Integrated Waste Management Board; San Diego County Department of Public Works
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 82,086,893 cubic yards and have a total daily throughput of 17,680 tons per day. In addition to these four landfills, there 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 37.1 percent remaining capacity. Table 10 shows the remaining capacity of each landfill located in the San Diego region and their estimated date of closure.

Table 10

<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</th>
<th>% Remaining Capacity</th>
<th>Remaining Capacity Date</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>
<td>August 31, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otay Landfill</td>
<td>2/28/2028</td>
<td>5,830</td>
<td>61,154,000</td>
<td>24,514,904</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
<td>March 31, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Miramar Landfill</td>
<td>8/31/2022</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>87,760,000</td>
<td>14,846,602</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>November 30, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sycamore Landfill</td>
<td>10/1/2031</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>71,233,171</td>
<td>42,246,551</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
<td>February 28, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>17,680</strong></td>
<td><strong>220,991,171</strong></td>
<td><strong>82,086,893</strong></td>
<td><strong>37.1%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CalRecycle 2014
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 six 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. CalRecycle reported in 2010 that metals are the most commonly recycled material while lumber makes up the majority of debris that still goes to a landfill. According to CalRecycle in 2014, there are 29 C&D intermediate processing facilities in San Diego, and six inert fill-disposal operations.

With respect to additional landfill space, the proposed Gregory Canyon Landfill was planned to be operational in late 2005, but opening has been delayed. In the analysis conducted by the County of San Diego for the Countywide Five-Year Review Report of the Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan, Gregory Canyon is assumed to open in 2014, though the actual year is unclear.

**Conclusion**

Following reductions in regional water consumption from 2007 through 2011, it has risen in recent years. However, the diversity of the water supply has increased. There continues to be an increase in the amount of recycled water used. With respect to energy, the use of natural gas as an energy source has grown, as well as energy produced from renewable resources, particularly through solar and wind generators. The residential and commercial sectors continue to consume the majority of energy.
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.

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

The number of trips between San Diego County and neighboring California counties has remained stable, while trips between Northern Baja California (San Ysidro and Otay Mesa border crossings) and the region decreased from 2005 to 2010, increased in 2011, and declined in 2012, as shown in Figure 36. Specifically, there were 178,700 vehicles traveling between the region and Northern Baja California in 2005, declining to 135,200 in 2012. With respect to pedestrian trips from Baja California into San Diego, the annual number of trips is back up to pre-recession levels to 11,781,373 in 2013, as shown in Figure 37.

**Figure 36**

*Average Weekday Traffic Volumes to and from Orange, Imperial, and Riverside Counties and Northern Baja California*, Mexico, 2005 to 2012

*Note: Includes San Ysidro and Otay Mesa border crossings.*

*Source: Caltrans Traffic Census Department*
Figure 37
Northbound Pedestrian Border Crossings from Baja California into San Diego, 2005 to 2013

NOTE: Includes San Ysidro, Otay Mesa, and Tecate border crossings.
Source: United States Department of Transportation, Bureau of Transportation Statistics
**Border Wait Times**

After declining from 2008 to 2010 for both passengers and commercial vehicles, Figure 38 shows that border wait times have increased again.

**Figure 38**
Average Border Wait Times, Northbound into San Diego from Northern Baja California, Mexico, 2008 to 2013

*Includes San Ysidro and Otay Mesa border crossings.

**Includes San Ysidro, Otay Mesa, and Tecate border crossings.

***Includes Otay Mesa and Tecate border crossings.

Source: United States Customs and Border Protection, Border Wait Times: Southern Border Ports of Entry
Participation in Secure Electronic Network for Travelers Rapid Inspection Lanes

There were a total of 186,283 Secure Electronic Network for Travelers Rapid Inspection (SENTRI) participants in 2013, which represents 54,656 more participants than the prior year, as shown in Figure 39. This number excludes Global Entry enrollment. All SENTRI participants for the entire United States-Mexico border are included, and they are able to cross at any United States-Mexico border crossing.

Figure 39
SENTRI Participants, 2006 to 2013

Source: United States Customs and Border Protection

Conclusion

The volume of trips into San Diego from Baja California has slightly decreased, but the numbers of new participants in the SENTRI program have increased. Wait times have generally increased for the past three years. The volume of travel between the San Diego region and neighboring counties has remained relatively flat.
# The Regional Plan: Our Changing Future

## Regional Progress since 2004: A Review of Local Plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>General Plan Updates (Since 2004)</th>
<th>Specific/Master/Community Plan Updates (Since 2004)</th>
<th>Housing Element Compliance</th>
<th>Climate Action Plan Compliance</th>
<th>Energy Roadmap</th>
<th>Active Transportation Efforts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Del Mar</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Housing (Est. 2014)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Bicycle Master Plan (2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Pedestrian Master Plan (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-City SL 15 BRT Station Area Planning Study (2013)</td>
<td>Imperial Avenue and Commercial Street Corridor Plan (2013)</td>
<td>Hillcrest Corridor Mobility Plan (2013)</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alamitos Bay Canal CPU (Est. 2014)</td>
<td>Chula Vista Triangle Master Plan (2014)</td>
<td>Upward Street Study (Est. 2013)</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>University District Specific Plan (Amended 2014)</td>
<td>Davis Road Specific Plan (2014)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Alpine Pedestrian Area Plan (2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Lakeside Pedestrian Area Plan (2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Bike Master Plan (2014)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** = Underway  
** = Draft in Compliance
**Regional Facts and Statistics**

- 10 jurisdictions have adopted or are currently performing comprehensive General Plan updates.
- 16 jurisdictions have adopted or updated community plans, master plans, or specific plans.
- 90% of jurisdictions have housing elements found in compliance by the state.
- 96% of the region’s land area is under the jurisdiction of a plan that has been adopted or updated since 2004.

**Additional Planning Efforts**

- 13 jurisdictions have adopted or are currently developing Climate Action Plans.
- All jurisdictions have adopted or are currently developing an Energy Roadmap.
- 16 jurisdictions have adopted or are currently developing Bike and/or Pedestrian Master Plans.
- 8 jurisdictions have a General Plan Element focused on Health.

---

**Percent of Housing Elements In Compliance in the San Diego Region**

- 90% In Compliance
- 5% Draft in Compliance
- 5% Not in Compliance

**Comprehensive General Plan Updates Since 2004 by Regional Land Area**

- 96% Land Area Covered By Jurisdictions with Updated General Plan (since 2004)
- 4% Remaining Land Area

---

**Figure 1. Projected Regional Growth in 1999**

**Figure 2. Projected Regional Growth in 2013**