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As of February 22, 2007
The 2006 Mission Valley Corridor Crime Study assesses the public safety impacts of the recent Green Line Trolley extension in July 2005. This study has three parts: a survey of Mission Valley Corridor residents and businesses, a survey of Green Line Trolley passengers, and an analysis of crime data in the eastern portion of the corridor. The results of this study will be used to estimate the public safety impacts of the upcoming trolley extension in the Mid-Coast Corridor.
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INTRODUCTION
INTRODUCTION

The 2006 Mission Valley Corridor Crime Study’s goal was to evaluate the recently implemented Green Line Trolley extension’s impact on crime and perceptions of crime in the eastern part of the Mission Valley Corridor (MVC). The Green Line Trolley was extended into eastern MVC (from the Mission San Diego Station through the 70th Street Station) in July 2005. Previously, the service started at Old Town and ended at the Mission San Diego Station; it was called the Blue Line then. Since the Green Line extension was recently implemented, it provided an opportunity to examine the perceived and actual public safety and crime changes resulting from newly implemented trolley service.

The results of this study will be used to assess potential public safety impacts of the proposed trolley extension into the Mid-Coast Corridor (MCC). As shown in the next section, the two corridors have similar demographic characteristics. Therefore, evaluating changes in crime in the eastern portion of the MVC due to the Green Line trolley extension is an appropriate proxy for estimating the public safety or crime consequences of extending the trolley into the MCC.

CORRIDOR COMPARISON

Although the Mid-Coast Corridor (MCC), shown in Map 1 (page 7), is larger than the Mission Valley Corridor (MVC), shown in Map 2 (page 8), the two corridors have similar characteristics. The total population of the MCC is 93,878, while the MVC has 59,928 people living in it. Both corridors are home to a major university. University of California San Diego (UCSD) is in the MCC and San Diego State University (SDSU) is the MVC. The following paragraphs highlight the demographic, employment, and land use similarities between the two corridors. A more thorough comparison can be found in Appendix A.

The demographic characteristics of the two corridors resemble each other. As shown in Figure 1, the age distributions are almost identical. The only exception is that the MVC has a slightly higher percentage of 20 to 24 year olds (9%). Additionally, while there are small differences between the corridors within the non-White ethnic groups (please see Appendix A), both corridors have a predominantly White population (67% each). There are differences in their household income, though. The median household income for MCC is $53,993 while it is $44,212 the MVC (adjusted for inflation, 1999 dollars).

The two corridors also have similar housing characteristics. Both corridors have a notable percentage of residents living in group quarters (MCC = 9% and MVC = 8%) because of the universities. The universities also contribute to the majority of housing stock being multi-family for both corridors (MCC = 66% and MVC = 64%, Figure 2) and a higher percentage of renter-occupied households (51% each) than the region (45%).
The biggest difference between the two corridors is their employment (2004). The MCC has more Manufacturing and Goods Production jobs (6% versus 2%) and more Government jobs (25% versus 12%). The MVC, on the other hand, has more Trade jobs (wholesale and retail) with 16 percent compared to 9 percent; and it has more Other Services jobs with 64 percent compared to 53 percent. Other Services includes jobs in education, health, and leisure and hospitality.

Figure 1
Age Distribution is Comparable
Mid-Coast Corridor and Mission Valley Corridor, 2006

Figure 2
Housing Stock is Similar
Mid-Coast Corridor and Mission Valley Corridor, 2006
The two corridors have comparable land uses when compared to the region as a whole. Over a third of the developed acres for both corridors (MCC = 35% and MVC = 37%) are devoted to residential uses. They both have a higher percentage of business land use (MCC = 14% and MVC = 22%), which includes industrial, commercial/services, and office uses, than the region (4%). Additionally, they both have more land devoted to schools and roads and freeways than the region; and they both have less agricultural and parks and military land use than the region. Please see Appendix A for more detail.

Overall, the two corridors are comparable to one another. Their demographic and housing characteristics reveal similar populations living in the corridors. Additionally, even though there are some differences in employment and land use, the two corridors are analogous when compared to the region as a whole.

**PROJECT DESIGN**

The project was designed to get the most complete picture of the Green Line extension’s perceived and actual impact on public safety. As such, the project has three main components: 1) a survey of residents and business owners/managers to learn about current and changing crime perceptions as a result of the Green Line Trolley extension, 2) analysis of the 2006 Green Line Trolley Survey to gather trolley rider opinions about safety and to determine who and why people are riding it, and 3) analysis of crime data for the eastern portion of the MVC (Mission Valley East) compared to the City of San Diego and the County of San Diego.

---

1 The 2006 Green Line Trolley Survey was conducted separately from this study even though the results are used in this report.
Map 1
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Map 2
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The goal of the 2006 Mission Valley Corridor Crime Study was to assess any public safety impacts of the recently implemented Green Line Trolley extension into the Mission Valley Corridor (MVC). The results of this study will be used to estimate potential public safety impacts of the future Mid-Coast Corridor (MCC) trolley extension. As shown in the Introduction, the two corridors have similar demographic and land use characteristics; thus, evaluating changes in perceived and actual crime in the eastern portion of the MVC due to the Green Line Trolley extension is an appropriate proxy for estimating any public safety or crime consequences of extending the trolley into the MCC.

This project has three components:

- A survey of residents and business owners/managers to learn about current and changing crime perceptions as a result of the Green Line Trolley extension,

- An analysis of the 2006 Green Line Trolley Passenger Survey to gather trolley rider opinions about safety and to determine who and why people are riding it\(^2\), and

- An analysis of crime data for the eastern portion of the MVC (Mission Valley East) compared to the City of San Diego and the County of San Diego.

SURVEY OF MVC RESIDENTS AND BUSINESSES

Surveys were conducted to assess perceptions of safety and crime for residents and businesses located in Mission Valley. Residents and businesses of Mission Valley were asked to respond to a variety of questions concerning crime and safety in the area since the Green Line Trolley extension opened for service in July 2005. The primary objective was to gauge any perceived changes in crime and safety that are directly related to the implementation of the Green Line Trolley extension. The results were broken down by Mission Valley West (MV West) and Mission Valley East (MV East) (Map 2, page 8).

Overall, the survey results show that most residents and business owners/managers do not feel the Green Line extension has impacted public safety. They generally feel that it has not made the area less safe or caused crime to increase.

\(^2\) The 2006 Green Line Trolley Survey was conducted separately from this study even though the results are used in this report.
Resident Surveys

General Perceptions of Safety

- Residents in MV West and the MV East tend to feel safe when walking alone in their community during the day or night.
  - Almost all of the respondents of MV West (98%) and MV East (97%) feel very safe or reasonably safe during the day.
  - Eighty-eight percent of MV West and 79 percent of MV East respondents feel very or reasonably safe when walking alone at night.

Perceptions of Changes in Crime/Safety within the Last Two Years

The Green Line extension opened in July 2005. This section’s purpose was to assess how residents feel crime has changed since the Green Line extension opened by asking questions comparing the present time (fall 2006) to two years ago (fall 2004).

- The majority of residents in MV West (72%) and MV East (74%) feel that safety in their community is about the same as it was before the Green Line extension.
- A majority of residents feel that crime in their community has stayed the same over the last two years.
  - Almost two-thirds of the respondents (MV West – 64%, MV East – 65%) perceive crime in their community to be the same as it was two years ago.
- Of those who felt crime has increased, only a small percentage felt it was because of the trolley (MV West – 16% (4% of all respondents), MV East – 6% (2% of all respondents)). A large portion attributed the change to the increased population and housing in the area (MV West – 31%, MV East – 30%).
- Overall, residents feel that the Green Line extension has not had a negative impact on safety and security in Mission Valley.
  - Fifty-nine percent of MV West respondents and 43 percent of MV East respondents think that the Green Line extension has not changed safety and security in the Mission Valley. An additional 14 percent (MV West) and 10 percent (MV East) feel it has made the area safer.
- More than two out of three residents are either less concerned or concerned about the same as they were before the Green Line extension for all crime types (graffiti, vandalism, violent crime, car theft, burglary/robbery, and drug related), with the exception of car theft in MV West. While 46 percent of MV West are more

---

3 The proxy of “two years ago” was used for most questions to prevent causing possible bias by associating the trolley with crime.
concerned about car theft, the majority (55%) are either less concerned or concerned about the same.

**Business Surveys**

**General Perceptions of Safety**

- The vast majority of business owners/managers in both the MV West (88%) and MV East (83%) think their businesses are located in very safe or reasonably safe locations.

**Perceptions of Changes in Crime/Safety within the Last Two Years**

Like in the resident survey, the goal of this section was to assess how businesses feel crime has changed since the Green Line extension began by asking questions comparing the present time (fall 2006) to two years ago (fall 2004).

- Most business owners/managers feel safety is about the same or better than it was two years ago (MV West – 80%, MV East – 66%).

- The majority of business owners in MV West (64%) and MV East (51%) think that crime in Mission Valley has stayed the same over the last two years.

- Of the business owners/managers who think crime has increased, many of them attribute the change to the increase in population and housing (MV West - 53%, MV East - 43%). Only a small share of them thinks the trolley is causing crime to increase (MV West - 7% (2% of all respondents), MV East - 10% (4% of all respondents)).

- Most businesses think the Green Line extension has not affected safety and security in their area.
  - The majority of businesses in both the MV West (58%) and the MV East (51%) said there was no change.

- Most businesses feel the Green Line trolley extension has not negatively impacted their business.
  - The majority of them said it had no impact (MV West - 56%, MV East - 60%).

- More than two out of three businesses are either less concerned or concerned about the same as they were before the Green Line extension for most crime types (graffiti, vandalism, violent crime, car theft, shoplifting, burglary, robbery, and drug related) than they were two years ago, with the exception of vandalism, car theft, and burglary in MV East. While there was more concern for vandalism, car theft, and

---

4 The proxy of “two years ago” was used for most questions to prevent possible bias caused by associating the trolley with crime.
burglary, the majority of businesses are still either less concerned or concerned about the same.

SURVEY OF GREEN LINE PASSENGERS

SANDAG and the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) conducted a survey of Green Line passengers in the fall of 2006 to evaluate the service from the perspective of passengers. This survey was designed separately from the 2006 Mission Valley Corridor Crime Study, but its results are relevant to this crime study as well. While only one safety question was asked, the survey gives insight into why people are traveling on the Green Line Trolley and who is riding it.

- Most Green Line Trolley passengers feel safe waiting at Green Line Trolley stations. Passengers were asked to give their opinions on safety while waiting at stations.
  - Fifty-one percent said safety was “good,” and 39 percent felt safety was “okay.” Ten percent felt safety was “poor.”

- Most of the passengers (80%) ride the Green Line Trolley regularly (three or more times a week) and use it to commute to work or school (77%).
  - More than three out of four passengers riding the Green Line Trolley are traveling for work (43%) or school (34%) purposes.

- Half of the people riding the Green Line did so out of necessity.
  - Forty percent did not have a vehicle available and ten percent were not able to drive.

ANALYSIS OF CRIME DATA

Crime rates and numbers were analyzed to determine if any changes occurred in the Fiscal Year following the July 2005 Green Line extension into the MV East study area and how any changes in that area compared to changes in crime patterns in the City of San Diego and County of San Diego. Additional data for the MVC (as a whole) and MV West can be found in Appendix D.

- The FBI Index crime rate has shown little change since the Green Line extension.\(^5\)
  - The FBI Index crime rate per 1,000 residents in the MV East was 39.1 in FY 2005-06, which represents a one percent increase from 38.5 in the previous Fiscal Year before the Green Line extension. However, the rate has

---

\(^5\) The FBI Index of crimes (also referred to as Part I offenses) represents the compilation of crime data based on the standardized national system of classifying and counting reported crimes.
fluctuated since FY 2000-01; thus, the slight increase cannot be directly associated with the Green Line extension.⁶

- In comparison, the FBI Index crime rates for FY 2005-06 in the City of San Diego and the San Diego Region were 39.7 and 35.7, respectively. Both of these areas experienced slight rate declines in the most recent Fiscal Year (down 2% in each area).

**Changes in Violent Crime**

- Violent crime rates were similar in FY 2005-06 for the three areas (4.5 per 1,000 residents in MV East, 5.0 in the City of San Diego and 4.6 in the County).

  - While the one-year increase in the violent crime rate was greatest in the MV East (up 7%, compared to 0% and 3% for the City and County of San Diego, respectively), there were a relatively small number of violent crimes reported in MV East (12). As noted in Footnote 6 below, small increases can inflate percent changes when there are initially a small number of crimes. The MV East violent crime rate also fluctuated between FY 2000-01 and FY 2005-06. Therefore, the increase may not be statistically associated with the Green Line extension.

**Changes in Property Crime**

- The property crime rate has not changed significantly since the opening of the Green Line extension.

  - The property crime rate in the MV East was 34.6 per 1,000 residents in the most recent fiscal year, while rates in the surrounding City and County were 34.7 and 31.1, respectively.⁷

  - In the one-year period following the inception of the Green Line extension, this rate increased one percent in the MV East and declined slightly in the City and County (down 2% and 3%, respectively). Again, the MV East property crime rate fluctuated between FY 2000-01 and FY 2005-06 and the change is not statistically significant.

---

⁶ Mission Valley East FBI Index crime rates may be sensitive to small changes because of its relatively small number of crimes reported (as compared to the County for example); thus, its rates have a tendency to fluctuate more than larger areas.

⁷ The majority of incidents reported in the FBI Index of offenses are property crimes; therefore, changes in the number of property crimes have the most impact on the FBI Index crime rate, overall.
CONCLUSION

The results of this study suggest that the Green Line Trolley extension has not negatively impacted public safety in the Mission Valley Corridor. Both residents and business owners/managers feel safe in their communities. Mission Valley Corridor residents, in both the West and the East, feel as safe as they did before the Green Line extension and feel that crime has not increased since then. Likewise, business owners/managers, in both the West and the East, feel that the trolley extension has not negatively affected safety or their businesses. People who ride the Green Line also tend to feel safe while waiting at trolley stations. Additionally, the results of the crime analysis show that the trolley extension has not significantly impacted crime in MV East.

Since the Mid-Coast Corridor and the Mission Valley Corridor are relatively similar, albeit not identical, this study is a good proxy for estimating the public safety impacts that the trolley will have in the MCC. Based on these results, it is unlikely that the upcoming trolley will significantly impact crime in the MCC. The MCC trolley passengers will likely be work and school commuters. Furthermore, the survey results suggest that residents, business owners/managers, and passengers will not perceive the area to be less safe either.
SURVEY OF MISSION VALLEY CORRIDOR RESIDENTS AND BUSINESSES
SURVEY OF MVC RESIDENTS AND BUSINESSES

Surveys were conducted to assess perceptions of safety and crime for residents and businesses located in Mission Valley. Residents and businesses of Mission Valley were asked a variety of questions concerning crime and safety in the area since the Green Line Trolley extension in July 2005. The purpose of the study was to secure feedback from the general public and business representatives regarding perceived changes in crime and safety since the start of the Green Line Trolley service. Specific objectives of the research included:

- Estimating the Green Line Trolley extension’s effect on public safety, and assessing other possible causes of the changes in crime and safety within the area.

- Evaluating respondents’ current perceptions of crime and safety, and to what extent it has changed over the past two years.

- Understanding which specific crimes are of the greatest concern to residents and businesses, and to what extent they are perceived to have changed.

Strategic Consulting & Research (SCR) conducted the study for the San Diego Association of Governments in the months of September and October of 2006. This section of the report summarizes key findings from the study.

METHODOLOGY

Resident Surveys

Five hundred and ten telephone surveys were conducted for the residential portion of the survey. This sample size provides a statistical accuracy of +/- 2.6-4.4 percent at a 95 percent confidence level. These surveys also were balanced by gender to avoid biased results.

SCR conducted 15 surveys for the pre-test. Language and skip patterns were adjusted to improve clarity, fluidity, and the participation rate of the survey based on pretest results.

ZIP Codes were used to approximate the Mission Valley Corridor study area. The resident sample design was stratified into two target areas – Mission Valley West (MV West) and Mission Valley East (MV East). The corridor was broken down into MV East and MV West to isolate the changes in the eastern part of the Mission Valley Corridor due to the Green Line
Map 3
Mission Valley Corridor (Resident Survey Study Area)
extension. As shown in Map 3, MV West was approximated by ZIP Code 92108 and ZIP Codes 92115 and 92120 approximated MV East.

Random Digit Dialing (RDD) and a listed sample were used to gather the sample. RDD was initially attempted for all three ZIP Codes. It was effective in MV East where the ZIP Codes were contiguous and relatively round in shape resulting in a reasonable percentage of potential respondents contacted using the RDD sample living in the two target ZIP Codes. Accordingly, the surveys for the eastern half of the corridor were completed using RDD. The sample in the MV East includes 138 surveys in ZIP Code 92115 and 114 in ZIP Code 92120. In the MV West, however, the only target ZIP Code (92108) is unusually long and thin and there was a very low correlation between the best possible list of RDD working blocks used to generate random numbers and actual residency in the ZIP Code. With less than 10 percent of the numbers producing valid residences, it was necessary to replace the RDD approach with a listed sample for ZIP Code 92108.

The listed sample for ZIP Code 92108 was not large enough to complete the targeted quota of 250 surveys for the MV West. The 92108 listed sample was supplemented with households located on streets just north of ZIP Code 92108 that were within one mile of an MV West trolley station. The final MV West sample was composed of 207 residents from within ZIP Code 92108 and 51 residents from just north of the ZIP Code, but within a mile of an MV West station.

**Business Surveys**

A total of 107 business owners and managers completed surveys. This sample size provides statistical accuracy of +/- 5.9-9.8 percent at a 95 percent confidence level for this portion of the survey.

A sample of businesses within a half-mile radius of Mission Valley Corridor transit stations were generated from a list of businesses for ZIP Codes 92108, 92120, 92182, and 92115. Surveys were balanced evenly between MV West and MV East and distributed across the individual stations generally in proportion to the number of businesses located within a half-mile radius of each station. Business respondents also were monitored by type of business operation to approximate the distribution of businesses in the corridor. The following table shows the number of respondents for each business type.

---

8 The Green Line extension started at the Mission San Diego trolley station and extended into Santee. This study analyzes the Mission Valley Corridor portion, extending from the Mission San Diego station to the 70th Street station.
9 Phone numbers for ZIP Code 92182, San Diego State University (SDSU), could not be generated using RDD.
Business managers and/or owners were surveyed by phone. The businesses were randomly selected from the list of businesses, which included phone numbers, within a half-mile of trolley stations. The contacted business had the option of responding to the survey during the initial call or setting up an appointment for the interviewer to call back.
SURVEY RESULTS

Resident Surveys

As mentioned in the Methodology, households within the ZIP Codes of 92108, 92115, and 92120 were asked to complete the Mission Valley Trolley Corridor Survey. The full study area was broken down into two sections: Mission Valley West (MV West), which consisted of ZIP Code 92108 and the closely surrounding area, and Mission Valley East (MV East), which consisted of 92120 and 92115. The responses were broken down by the two areas, because the Green Line extension occurred in MV East. Thus, the breakdown enabled a better measurement of how the extension affected the section (MV East) of Mission Valley that received new trolley service in 2005.

The survey questionnaire was composed of 36 questions (Appendix B). Respondents were asked to provide information on their current perception of crime and safety in their area and how they believe it has changed in the past two years, including whether they believe the trolley or other factors impacted these changes. The questionnaire can be broken down into three parts: 1) questions about general perceptions of safety, 2) questions about respondents' views on changes in crime/safety in the area within the last two years, and 3) demographic questions.

General Perceptions of Safety

Residents in MV West and the MV East tend to feel safe when walking alone in their community during the day or night. As shown in Figure 3, almost all of the respondents of MV West (98%) and MV East (97%) feel very safe or reasonably safe during the day. More notably, a majority of respondents also feel safe when walking alone at night, which is a good indicator of how safe people feel in their neighborhood. Figure 4 shows that 88 percent of MV West and 79 percent of MV East respondents feel very or reasonably safe when walking alone at night.
Figure 3
Residents of Mission Valley Feel Safe when Walking Alone during the Day
(Question 8)

Figure 4
Residents of Mission Valley Feel Safe when Walking Alone during the Night
(Question 7)
Perceptions of Changes in Crime/Safety within the Last Two Years

As mentioned in the Introduction of this report, the Green Line extension opened in July 2005. A key goal of the survey was to assess how residents feel crime has changed since the Green Line extension opened by asking questions comparing the present time (fall 2006) to two years ago (fall 2004). One question, intentionally placed towards the end of the questionnaire, did specifically ask about the impact of the trolley.

The majority of residents in MV West (72%) and MV East (74%) feel that safety in their community is about the same as it was before the Green Line extension (Figure 5). Likewise, a majority of residents feel that crime in their community has stayed the same over the last two years. Figure 6 shows that almost two-thirds of the respondents (MV West – 64%, MV East – 65%) perceive crime in their community to be the same as it was two years ago.

While a notable percentage of residents do feel that safety has changed for the worse (MV West– 21%, MV East – 18%) and that crime has increased (MV West – 27%, MV East – 25%), only a small percentage of those felt it was because of the trolley (MV West – 16% (4% of all respondents), MV East – 6% (2% of all respondents)). A large portion of the respondents who think crime has increased attribute the change to the increased population and housing in the area (MV West – 31%, MV East – 30%).

10 The proxy of “two years ago” was used for most questions to prevent causing possible bias by associating the trolley with crime.
Most residents feel that the Green Line extension has not had a negative impact on safety and security in Mission Valley. The survey specifically asked them “what effect do you think it [trolley extension] has had on safety and security...” As shown in Figure 7, 59 percent of MV West respondents and 43 percent of MV East respondents think that the Green Line extension has not changed safety and security in the Mission Valley. Furthermore, some respondents (MV West - 14%, MV East – 10%) feel it has made Mission Valley safer/much safer.
Residents also were asked about changes in specific crime problems since two years ago. Again, the goal was to gauge whether residents felt specific crimes have increased since the Green Line extension. Interviewers asked respondents about five types of crime: graffiti, vandalism, violent crime, car theft, burglary/robbery, and drug related crimes.\(^\text{11}\)

At least two out of three residents are either less concerned or concerned about the same as they were before the Green Line extension for all crime types, with the exception of car theft in MV West. As shown in Table 2, the largest portion of respondents, in both MV East and MV West, replied that they were concerned about the same as two years ago for all categories.

A considerable percentage of respondents are more concerned about car theft than they were two years ago. Forty-six percent of MV West respondents are more concerned about it. A third of MV East respondents (33\%) also are more concerned about it; however, as mentioned above, most MV East respondents are either less concerned or concerned about the same.

The majority of respondents (51\%) based their opinions about these crime types on personal experience. Respondents’ opinions also were influenced by Newspapers (29\%), Word of Mouth (26\%), Radio or Television (24\%), and the Experience of a Friend (19\%).\(^\text{12}\)

### Table 2

**Most Residents are Not More Concerned about Specific Crime Types than Two Years Ago (Before Green Line Extension)**

(Questions 11 - 15)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Crime</th>
<th>Less Concerned</th>
<th>About the Same</th>
<th>More Concerned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MV East</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graffiti</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car Theft</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary/Robbery</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Related</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MV West</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graffiti</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car Theft</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary/Robbery</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Related</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{11}\) Robbery is defined as the taking or attempting to take anything of value from the care, custody, or control of a person or persons by force or threat of force or violence and/or by instilling fear. Burglary is defined as the unlawful entry of a structure to commit a felony or a theft (includes attempted burglary).

\(^{12}\) This question allowed multiple answers. Therefore, the percent of respondents exceeds 100%.
Demographics

The last section of the survey questionnaire asked demographic questions, like age and gender. As shown in Table 3, males and females were almost equally represented in both the MV West and MV East. MV West had slightly more males (51%) and MV East had slightly more females (51%). The average surveyed household size for MV West was 2.00 persons and 2.54 persons for MV East. Income and ethnicity are very similar for both areas. The only identifiable differences between the two are that the MV West has a larger percentage in the 25-34 age group and it has a higher percentage of owner-occupied households, while the MV East has a larger percentage of people in the 65 and older category and of renter-occupied households.

Table 3
Respondent Demographics
(Questions 30 - 34, Question 36)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>MV East</th>
<th>MV West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 +</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;$15,000</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000 - $44,999</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$45,000 - $59,999</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60,000 - $74,999</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000 - $99,999</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 +</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>MV East</th>
<th>MV West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tenure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Business Surveys

A sample of 107 business owners and managers in ZIP Codes 92108, 92115, 92120, and 92182 that were within a half mile radius of trolley stations were asked to give their opinions of crime in the area and the effect that the Green Line extension has had on their business.

Like the resident survey, business locations also were split into two groups, MV West and MV East, depending on which station was closest to their business address. MV West includes Morena/Linda Vista, Fashion Valley, Hazard Center, Mission Valley Center, Rio Vista, Fenton Parkway, Qualcomm Stadium and Mission San Diego stations. MV East includes the Grantville, San Diego State University (SDSU), Alvarado, and 70th Street stations.

The business survey questionnaire was very similar to the resident questionnaire. It was composed of 36 questions (Appendix B) and it can be broken down into two parts: 1) one question about general perceptions of safety, and 2) questions regarding business respondents’ views on changes in crime/safety in the area within the last two years.

General Perceptions of Safety

The vast majority of business owners/managers in both the MV West (88%) and MV East (83%) think their businesses are located in very safe or reasonably safe locations.

Figure 8
Most Businesses Feel they are in a Safe Location
(Question 3)

![Bar chart showing percentage of businesses feeling safe in MV West and MV East.]

- **Very Safe**: MV West 44%, MV East 39%
- **Reasonably Safe**: MV West 44%, MV East 39%
- **Somewhat Unsafe**: MV West 16%, MV East 12%
- **Very Unsafe**: MV West 2%, MV East 0%
Perceptions of Changes in Crime/Safety within the Last Two Years

Like in the resident survey, the goal of this survey was to assess how businesses feel crime has changed since the Green Line extension by asking questions comparing the present time (fall 2006) to two years ago (fall 2004). One question, intentionally placed towards the end of the questionnaire, did specifically ask about the impact of the trolley.

While a noticeable percentage of businesses owners/managers in MV West and MV East think safety is worse in Mission Valley than it was two years ago, most of them feel safety is about the same or better than it was two years ago (MV West – 80%, MV East – 66%).

Many of the businesses who think crime in Mission Valley has increased attribute the change to the increase in population and housing (MV West – 53%, MV East – 43%). Only a small share of them think the trolley is causing crime to increase (MV West – 7% (2% of all respondents), MV East – 10% (4% of all respondents)). Likewise, most businesses who think crime in San Diego County has increased feel it also is caused by the increase in population and housing (MV West – 41% MV East – 43%).

Businesses owners/managers tended to be more optimistic about crime in Mission Valley than San Diego County as a whole. As shown in Figure 10, the majority of business owners

---

\(^{13}\) The proxy of “two years ago” was used for most questions to prevent possible bias caused by associating the trolley with crime.
in MV West (64%) and MV East (51%) think that crime in Mission Valley has stayed the same over the last two years, but not in the County. The largest portion of them think crime has increased in the County (47%), while 46 percent think it has stayed the same.

**Figure 10**

*Most Businesses Feel Crime is the Same in Mission Valley as Two Years Ago (Before Green Line Extension) (Question 24 & Question 27)*

Most businesses think the Green Line extension has not affected safety and security in their area. They were specifically asked “what effect do you think it [trolley extension] has had on safety and security...” The majority of businesses in both the MV West (58%) and the MV East (51%) said there was no change (Figure 11). A percentage of businesses felt that the trolley made the area safer (MV West – 18%, MV East – 11%). Fewer than one out of four businesses did feel it made the area less safe (MV West – 14%, MV East – 25%).

Additionally, most businesses feel the Green Line trolley extension has not negatively impacted their business. Survey participants were specifically asked “What impact do you think that the Mission Valley trolley extension has had on your business?” While a large percentage of them felt the extension had positively impacted their business (MV West – 42%, MV East – 37%), most of them said it had no impact (MV West – 56%, MV East – 60%). Only two percent of MV West businesses and four percent of MV East businesses said it had a negative impact.
Mission Valley business owners and managers were asked if compared to two years ago they are more concerned, less concerned or concerned about the same for each of several specific crime categories: graffiti, vandalism, violent crime, car theft, shoplifting, burglary, robbery, and drug related crimes. The results are summarized in Table 4.

Most businesses are not more concerned about specific crime types than they were two years ago. At least two out of three businesses are either less concerned or concerned about the same as they were before the Green Line extension for most crime types, with the exception of vandalism, car theft, and burglary in MV East. Even for those exceptions, a majority of businesses still are not more concerned about those specific crime types than they were two years ago.

A considerable percentage of business respondents are more concerned about car theft than they were two years ago. Forty-four percent of MV East respondents are more concerned about it. Almost a third of MV West respondents (30%) also are more concerned about it; however, as mentioned above, most MV West respondents are either less concerned or concerned about the same. Interestingly, this is the opposite of the resident survey where a higher percentage of MV West residents were more concerned about car theft than in MV East.

\[14\] Robbery is defined as the taking or attempting to take anything of value from the care, custody, or control of a person or persons by force or threat of force or violence and/or by instilling fear. Burglary is defined as the unlawful entry of a structure to commit a felony or a theft (includes attempted burglary).
The majority of businesses (58%) based their opinions about these crime types on personal experience. Respondents’ opinions also were influenced by Radio or Television (22%), Newspapers (21%), Word of Mouth (21%), and the Experience of a Friend (12%).

Table 4
Most Businesses are Not More Concerned about Specific Crime Types than Two Years Ago (Before Green Line Extension)
(Questions 6 - 12, Question 23)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Crime</th>
<th>MV East</th>
<th>MV West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less Concerned</td>
<td>About the Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graffiti</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car Theft</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoplifting</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Related</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15 This question allowed multiple answers. Therefore, the percent of respondents exceeds 100%.
Conclusion

Mission Valley residents and businesses owners/managers tend to feel safe in their Mission Valley neighborhoods. For the most part, they do not think the Green Line extension has made the area less safe or caused crime to increase. Furthermore, there are very few statistically significant differences between respondents in MV West and MV East (where the extension was built). The results of both surveys suggest that the Green Line extension has not negatively impacted crime or public safety in MV East or MV West.
SURVEY OF GREEN LINE PASSENGERS
SURVEY OF GREEN LINE PASSENGERS

SANDAG and the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) conducted a survey of Green Line passengers in the fall of 2006 to gather rider opinions about the service and to learn how it is being used. This survey was designed separately from the 2006 Mission Valley Corridor Crime Study, but its results are relevant to this crime study as well. While only one safety question was asked, the survey gives insight into why people are traveling on the Green Line Trolley and who is riding it. This section of the report includes select questions from the survey. Please contact SANDAG if you would like a copy of the entire survey report.

METHODOLOGY

The Green Line Trolley Survey was conducted over a period of four days in December 2006. One car was surveyed for each trolley trip, with all passengers over 12 years old offered a questionnaire. The questionnaire was available in both English and Spanish. The survey garnered 2,232 respondents.

SURVEY RESULTS

The survey questionnaire asked 22 questions, some with sub-questions, about where people were traveling to and from, the purpose of their trip, their need for service, their impressions of the Green Line, including safety, and their demographics. This analysis only includes select questions that are relevant to the overall crime study, like why people are riding and who they are. The entire questionnaire can be found in Appendix C.
**Safety at Transit Stations**

Most Green Line Trolley passengers feel safe waiting at Green Line Trolley stations. Passengers were asked to give their opinions on safety while waiting at stations (Figure 12). Fifty-one percent said safety was “good,” and 39 percent felt safety was “okay.” Ten percent felt safety was “poor.”

![Figure 12: Majority of Passengers Feel Safe Waiting at Trolley Stations (Question 16h)](image)
Trip Purpose/Reasons for Using Green Line Trolley

Most of the passengers (80%) ride the Green Line Trolley regularly (three or more times a week) and use it to commute to work or school (77%). As shown in Figure 13, more than three out of four passengers riding the Green Line Trolley are traveling for work (43%) or school (34%) purposes. Most of those people are beginning or ending their trip at home. A small percentage of passengers (9%, not shown in Figure 13) were traveling for recreational purposes, like visiting friends.

Half of the people riding the Green Line did so out of necessity; forty percent did not have a vehicle available and ten percent were not able to drive. Seventeen percent wanted to avoid traffic. Eleven percent chose the trolley because of the driving and another eleven percent wanted to circumvent parking issues. Another 12 percent listed other reasons, like saving natural resources or time to read/study.

Figure 13
Most Passengers Ride for Work or School Purposes (Questions 1 & 4)
Rider Demographics

Fifty-two percent of respondents were females. Almost a third of the passengers (31%) are young adults age 19 to 25 years old (Figure 14). The other age groups, except those age 60 years or older, are almost evenly distributed, ranging from 14 to 17 percent.
ANALYSIS OF CRIME DATA
ANALYSIS OF CRIME DATA

As mentioned in the Introduction, this study’s purpose was to estimate how a proposed light rail extension in the Mid-Coast Corridor (MCC) would impact public safety and crime trends. Because the light rail was extended through the eastern portion of the Mission Valley Corridor (MV East) in July 2005 and that area is comparable demographically to the MCC, as described previously in this report, this area was determined to be the most appropriate study area. The previous two chapters analyzed perceptions of safety and crime. This chapter looks at actual crime data from MV East to estimate potential impacts. Crime rates and numbers in that area were analyzed and compared over time to crime figures in the (1) City of San Diego and (2) the County of San Diego. (The analysis in this chapter compares MV East to the City of San Diego and the County using them as a baseline. Additional data for the entire Mission Valley Corridor (MVC) and the western portion (MV West) can be found in Appendix D.) Specifically, this chapter describes what types of crimes occurred in these three areas during six fiscal years (FY 2000-01 through FY 2005-06) and uses this information to inform how a similar extension may affect crime in the MCC in the future.

METHODOLOGY

SANDAG staff compiled the following crime-related information for the MV East, the City of San Diego, and San Diego County utilizing data available through SANDAG’s Criminal Justice Research Division (CJRD) along with assistance from the San Diego Police Department. Specifically, the San Diego Police Department provided information regarding the number of crimes reported for the MV East and MV West sections of the MVC by census tract (Map 4). Crime information for the City of San Diego and San Diego County were available through the clearinghouse function of the CJRD. The data for San Diego County represent crimes reported in the 18 incorporated cities, as well as the unincorporated areas of the county.

All crime data presented here were compiled according to guidelines set forth by the Federal Bureau of Investigation’s (FBI) Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) Program. The law enforcement agencies in San Diego County report crimes to the FBI through the UCR Program. The FBI Index of crimes (also referred to as Part I offenses) represents the compilation of crime data based on the standardized national system of classifying and counting reported crimes (UCR), which helps to make it possible to compare crime levels across jurisdictions. The Index includes four violent offenses (willful homicide, forcible rape, robbery, and aggravated assault) and three types of property crime (burglary, larceny theft, and...
Map 4
Mission Valley Corridor (Crime Data Study Area)
and motor vehicle theft). The offenses included in the FBI Index were selected (in 1930) due to their serious nature and/or volume, as well as the probability that those crimes will be reported by citizenry to the police. Both completed and attempted crimes are counted. Additionally, the UCR guidelines state that only one crime per event can be included in the total count. For example, if a homicide occurred during a robbery, only the most serious offense (in this case, the homicide) would be counted in the FBI Index data for that event.

Crime rates represent the approximate number of people out of each 1,000 residents who have reported being a victim in a particular crime or offense category. The crime rate is calculated by dividing the number of reported incidents by the population, which has been divided by 1,000.

The following analysis focuses on changes in crime numbers and rates over the one- and five-year periods before and after the Green Line extension opened in MV East. More detailed tables can be found in the Appendix D, including data for the whole MVC and MV West. Definitions of crime types can be found in Appendix E.

Changes between small numbers may result in large percentage differences. Therefore, if comparison numbers in tables are 30 or fewer, percent changes are omitted.

ANALYSIS OF CRIME

As previously noted, crime rates and numbers were analyzed to determine if any changes occurred in the Fiscal Year following the July 2005 Green Line extension into the MV East study area and how any changes in that area compared to changes in crime patterns in the City of San Diego and County of San Diego. Comparisons also are made for the five-year period. The following section includes key findings.

The FBI Index crime rate has shown little change since the Green Line extension. The FBI Index crime rate per 1,000 residents in the MV East was 39.1 in FY 2005-06, which represented a one percent increase from 38.5 in the previous fiscal year before the Green Line extension. In comparison, the FBI Index crime rates for FY 2005-06 in the City of San Diego and San Diego County were 39.7 and 35.7, respectively. Both of these areas experienced slight rate declines in the most recent Fiscal Year (down 2% in each area).

As shown in Figure 15, the MV East FBI Index crime rate has fluctuated since FY 2000-01. Therefore, the slight increase between FY 2004-05 and FY 2005-06 cannot be directly associated with the start of the Green Line trolley extension. MV East crime rates are more sensitive to small changes than City of San Diego or the County, because of its relatively small number of crimes (as compared to the County for example).

---

17 As part of the UCR Program, law enforcement agencies also compile arrest data for Part II offenses, which consist of many crime classifications that are not included in the Part I category. Part II offenses are not included in this analysis because the information is not readily available for the study area.

18 While the addition of light rail into an area can impact crime, a number of other factors should be considered to fully understand changes in crime numbers and rates including demographic changes, economic factors, and the implementation of crime prevention strategies.
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Figure 15
FBI Index Crime Rate per 1,000 Population

NOTES: FBI Index includes homicide, rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny and motor vehicle theft. Percent changes for crime rates are based on computations rounded to one decimal place and may vary from changes computed using more detailed rounding convention.

SOURCES: California Department of Finance; San Diego Police Department; SANDAG.

Changes in Violent Crime

Violent crime rates, shown in Figure 16, were similar in FY 2005-06 for the three areas (4.5 in MV East, 5.0 in the City of San Diego and 4.6 in the County). The one-year increase in the violent rate was greatest in the MV East (up 7%, compared to 0% and 3% for the City and County of San Diego, respectively). It should be noted that there were a relatively small number of violent crimes reported in MV East. Small increases or decreases can inflate percent changes. Specifically, the actual number of violent incidents in MV East rose by 12 in the one-year period (from 160 in FY 2004-05 to 172 in FY 2005-06). Again, the MV East violent crime rate fluctuated between FY 2000-01 and FY 2005-06 and the increase in FY 2005-06 cannot be directly associated with the implementation of the Green Line Trolley extension.

Tables 5 through 7 show the specific offense types within the violent crime category. Robberies contributed to the increase in the violent crime rate in MV East over the one-year period (up 30%). Robbery also increased in the City of San Diego by 10 percent and the region by 12 percent during this period. Homicides increased in the City (up 16%) (Table 7) and in the County (up 20%) between FY 2004-05 and FY 2005-06, while there was a decline in the number of homicides in the MV East (from two incidents to zero). It should be noted that while robberies did increase between FY 2004-05 and FY 2005-06, there is variability in
the annual number of robberies over the previous five years. Thus, the increase cannot be tied directly to the trolley extension.

**Table 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2000-01</th>
<th>FY 2001-02</th>
<th>FY 2002-03</th>
<th>FY 2003-04</th>
<th>FY 2004-05</th>
<th>FY 2005-06</th>
<th>Change Five Year</th>
<th>Change One Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Violent Crime</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homicide</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated Assault</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Violent Crimes</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Property Crime</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larceny</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MV Theft</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>-8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Property Crimes</td>
<td>1,328</td>
<td>1,238</td>
<td>1,195</td>
<td>1,488</td>
<td>1,323</td>
<td>1,332</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FBI Index Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,484</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,408</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,489</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,667</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,483</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,504</strong></td>
<td><strong>1%</strong></td>
<td><strong>1%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES: FBI Index violent crime rates includes homicide, rape, robbery, and aggravated assault.
SOURCE: San Diego Police Department; SANDAG.
Table 6
Number of Crimes by Offense Type
City of San Diego

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Five Year</td>
<td>One Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent Crime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homicide</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>1,638</td>
<td>1,695</td>
<td>1,709</td>
<td>1,587</td>
<td>1,757</td>
<td>1,940</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated Assault</td>
<td>5,011</td>
<td>5,189</td>
<td>5,243</td>
<td>5,215</td>
<td>4,295</td>
<td>4,171</td>
<td>-17%</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Violent Crimes</td>
<td>7,039</td>
<td>7,270</td>
<td>7,378</td>
<td>7,274</td>
<td>6,463</td>
<td>6,525</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Crime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>6,610</td>
<td>7,606</td>
<td>8,131</td>
<td>7,648</td>
<td>7,227</td>
<td>7,334</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larceny</td>
<td>23,744</td>
<td>25,477</td>
<td>24,738</td>
<td>25,876</td>
<td>24,948</td>
<td>24,274</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MV Theft</td>
<td>9,878</td>
<td>10,779</td>
<td>11,704</td>
<td>12,456</td>
<td>13,887</td>
<td>13,913</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Property Crimes</td>
<td>40,232</td>
<td>43,862</td>
<td>44,573</td>
<td>45,980</td>
<td>46,062</td>
<td>45,521</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBI Index Total</td>
<td>47,271</td>
<td>51,132</td>
<td>51,951</td>
<td>53,254</td>
<td>52,525</td>
<td>52,046</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: SANDAG

Table 7
Number of Crimes by Offense Type
San Diego County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Five Year</td>
<td>One Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent Crime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homicide</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>848</td>
<td>861</td>
<td>822</td>
<td>787</td>
<td>773</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>3,179</td>
<td>3,408</td>
<td>3,448</td>
<td>3,430</td>
<td>3,729</td>
<td>4,161</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated Assault</td>
<td>9,553</td>
<td>10,015</td>
<td>9,584</td>
<td>10,075</td>
<td>8,806</td>
<td>8,927</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Violent Crimes</td>
<td>13,619</td>
<td>14,354</td>
<td>13,995</td>
<td>14,471</td>
<td>13,422</td>
<td>13,981</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Crime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>15,555</td>
<td>18,087</td>
<td>18,978</td>
<td>18,178</td>
<td>16,969</td>
<td>17,558</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larceny</td>
<td>48,654</td>
<td>53,194</td>
<td>53,488</td>
<td>55,756</td>
<td>54,975</td>
<td>52,719</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MV Theft</td>
<td>17,915</td>
<td>19,930</td>
<td>21,602</td>
<td>23,312</td>
<td>25,516</td>
<td>25,151</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Property Crimes</td>
<td>82,124</td>
<td>91,211</td>
<td>94,068</td>
<td>97,246</td>
<td>97,460</td>
<td>95,428</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBI Index Total</td>
<td>95,743</td>
<td>105,565</td>
<td>108,063</td>
<td>111,177</td>
<td>110,882</td>
<td>109,409</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: SANDAG
Changes in Property Crime

The property crime rate has not changed significantly since the opening of the Green Line extension (Figure 17). The property crime rate in the MV East was 34.6 in the most recent fiscal year, while rates in the surrounding City and County were 34.7 and 31.1, respectively. In the one-year period following the opening of the Green Line extension, this rate increased one percent in the MV East and declined slightly in the City and County (down 2% and 3%, respectively), but this was not a statistically significant difference.

As shown in Tables 5 through 7 on the previous pages, the number of larcenies, which represents about half of all property crimes, did increase over one year in the MV East (5%), compared to a decrease of three percent in the City and four percent in the County. Again, there is variability in the annual number of larcenies over the five years and the increase cannot be directly associated with the trolley extension. Also noteworthy, the number of motor vehicle thefts in the MV East declined more in the one-year period (8%) compared to the County (down 1%) while the City of San Diego saw a slight increase of less than one percent.

![Figure 17](image-url)

**Figure 17**
FBI Index Property Crime Rates per 1,000 Population

NOTES: FBI Index property crime rates include burglary, larceny, and motor vehicle theft.
SOURCE: San Diego Police Department; SANDAG.

The majority of incidents reported in the FBI Index of offenses are property crimes; therefore, changes in the number of property crimes have the most impact on the FBI Index crime rate, overall.
CONCLUSION

Results from the crime analysis suggest that there was little change in crime numbers or rates in the MV East during the one-year period after the opening of the Green Line Trolley extension. While there were slight increases in crime rates for the MV East, the fluctuation in the number of crimes and the rates over the previous five years show that the one year changes are not significant and cannot be directly associated with the implementation of the Green Line Trolley.
The Mid-Coast Corridor (MCC) is larger than the Mission Valley Corridor (MVC), but it has similar characteristics to it. The total population of the MVC is 59,928, while the MCC has 93,878 people living in it. Both corridors are home to a major university. University of California, San Diego (UCSD) is in the MCC and San Diego State University (SDSU) is in the MVC. Demographic, employment, and land use data were collected for both corridors and compared to one another. Overall, the two corridors are fairly similar. The largest difference is seen in their employment. This section shows the results of the comparison analysis.

Demographics

Age
The age distribution of Mid-Coast Corridor residents is similar to the age distribution of residents in the Mission Valley Corridor. Figure 1 shows the age breakdown for both corridors. The percentage of people in each age group is almost identical for the two corridors. The only exception is that the MVC has a slightly higher percentage of 20 to 24 years old (9%) - than the MCC (6%). Likewise, the median age is almost identical. The median age of MCC is 35 years old and the median age of MVC is 35.1 years old.

Figure 1
Age Distribution, Total Population
Mid-Coast Corridor and Mission Valley Corridor, 2006

Ethnicity

Two-thirds of the residents in both the MCC (67%) and the MVC (67%) are White. There are small differences between the corridors within the non-White ethnic groups. As shown in Figure 2, the MVC has a slightly higher percentage of Hispanics (15%) and Blacks (5%) than MCC (12% and 2%, respectively). The MCC has a higher percentage of Asians and Pacific Islanders (16%) than MVC (8%).

![Figure 2: Ethnicity Breakdown, Total Population Mid-Coast Corridor and Mission Valley Corridor, 2006](image)

Household Income

Household Incomes tend to be higher in the Mid-Coast Corridor than the Mission Valley Corridor. In 2006, the median household income for the MCC was $53,993 while it was $44,212 for the MVC (adjusted for inflation). Likewise, the MCC has a higher percentage of households with $100,000 or greater income (21%) than the MVC (13%); and the MCC has a smaller percentage of households with less than $30,000 income (27%) than the MVC (34%). (Figure 3)

Figure 3
Household Income Distribution, Total Households
Mid-Coast Corridor and Mission Valley Corridor, 2000

Source: SANDAG. Constructed from U.S Census Bureau’s 2000 Census SF1 and SF3.
Housing

The two corridors have similar housing characteristics. While most of the population in both corridors live in households, they both have a substantial percentage of people living in group quarters (MCC = 9% and MVC = 8%) because of the universities. The majority of housing stock is multi-family for both corridors. Figure 4 shows the type of housing stock in both corridors. Sixty-six percent of the housing stock in the MCC is multi-family and 33 percent is single family. Similarly, 64 percent of MVC’s housing stock is multi-family and 35 percent is single family. Both corridors have a higher percentage of renter-occupied households (51% each) than the region (45%). The average household size for the MCC (2.17) and the MVC (2.12) is lower than the region’s (2.77).

Figure 4

Housing Units by Type, Total Housing Units
Mid-Coast Corridor and Mission Valley Corridor, 2006

Employment
The biggest difference between the two corridors is their employment. Figure 5 shows employment by industry. The MCC has more Manufacturing and Goods Production jobs (6% versus 2%) and more Government jobs (25% versus 12%). The MVC, on the other hand, has more Trade jobs (wholesale and retail) with 16 percent compared to 9 percent; and it has more Other Services jobs with 64 percent compared to 53 percent. Other Services includes jobs in education, health, and leisure and hospitality.

Figure 5
Employment by Industry, Total Employment
Mid-Coast Corridor and Mission Valley Corridor, 2004

Land Use
The two corridors have slight differences in their land uses. As shown in Table 1, the MCC (8%) has a higher percentage of land developed for Industrial uses than the MVC (2%); and it has a smaller percentage of Commercial/Services land (5%) than the MVC (16%). The MCC also has a greater percentage of Parks and Military Use lands, with 23 percent compared to 15 percent. The MCC (36.7) has a slightly lower employment density than the MVC (40.3). The residential densities are comparable, with 9.2 for the MCC and 9.4 for the MVC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Developed Acres</th>
<th>MCC</th>
<th>MVC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Density Single Family</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Family</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Homes</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Residential</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial/Services</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads and Freeways</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural and Extractive</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Military Use</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HELLO, THIS IS _____ _____ CALLING ON BEHALF OR THE SAN DIEGO ASSOCIATION
OF GOVERNMENTS. WE'RE CONDUCTING A BRIEF SURVEY ON CRIME AND SAFETY
IN YOUR COMMUNITY. CAN YOU PLEASE TAKE A FEW MINUTES TO HELP US OUT?

OK GREAT.

1. FIRST OF ALL, ARE YOU 18 OR OLDER?
   1. YES
   2. NO

2. AND HOW MANY YEARS HAVE YOU LIVED IN YOUR COMMUNITY?
   1. LESS THAN 1 YEAR
   2. 1 YEAR
   3. 2 YEARS
   4. 3-5 YEARS
   5. 6-10 YEARS
   6. MORE THAN 10 YEARS

3. WHAT IS THE ZIP CODE THERE?
   1. 92108
   2. 92115
   3. 92120
   4. OTHER

OTHER LINE = 49

63
4. WHAT IS THE NAME OF THE COMMUNITY WHERE YOU LIVE?

SKIP BEFORE Q4 IF Q<3> NE 1 THEN GO 5

5. WHAT IS THE NAME OF THE COMMUNITY WHERE YOU LIVE?

1. MID-CITY
2. OAK-PARK
3. ROLANDO
4. TALMADGE
5. OTHER

OTHER LINE = 50

SKIP BEFORE Q5 IF Q<3> NE 2 THEN GO 6

6. WHAT IS THE NAME OF THE COMMUNITY WHERE YOU LIVE?

1. ALLIED GARDENS
2. DEL CERRO
3. GRANTVILLE
4. NAVAJO
5. OTHER

OTHER LINE = 48

(PROMPT ONLY IF NO ANSWER)

SKIP BEFORE Q6 IF Q<3> NE 3 THEN GO 7

7. OK, WHEN WALKING ALONE IN YOUR COMMUNITY AT NIGHT, DO YOU FEEL . . . ?

1. VERY SAFE
2. REASONABLY SAFE
3. SOMEWHAT UNSAFE, OR
4. VERY UNSAFE

(READ PRE-CODED RESPONSES-EXCEPT FOR 'DON'T KNOW', 'REFUSED', ETC)

8. AND WHEN WALKING ALONE IN YOUR COMMUNITY DURING THE DAY, DO YOU FEEL . . . ?

1. VERY SAFE
2. REASONABLE SAFE
3. SOMEWHAT UNSAFE, OR
4. VERY UNSAFE

(READ PRE-CODED RESPONSES-EXCEPT FOR 'DON'T KNOW', 'REFUSED', ETC)
9. THINKING OF SAFETY IN YOUR COMMUNITY NOW COMPARED TO TWO YEARS AGO, WOULD YOU SAY THINGS HAVE . . . ?

1. CHANGED FOR THE BETTER
2. ARE ABOUT THE SAME, OR
3. CHANGED FOR THE WORSE

(READ PRE-CODED RESPONSES-EXCEPT FOR 'DON'T KNOW', 'REFUSED', ETC)

********************************************************************************

10. NOW I'M GOING TO READ YOU A LIST OF POTENTIAL CRIME PROBLEMS. FOR EACH ONE I WOULD LIKE YOU TO TELL ME IF COMPARED TO TWO YEARS AGO, YOU ARE MORE CONCERNED, LESS CONCERNED, OR CONCERNED ABOUT THE SAME.

**ENTER "XX" TO CONTINUE**

********************************************************************************

11. WITH REGARD TO VANDALISM, ARE YOU . . . ?

1. MORE CONCERNED
2. LESS CONCERNED
3. OR CONCERNED ABOUT THE SAME

(READ PRE-CODED RESPONSES-EXCEPT FOR 'DON'T KNOW', 'REFUSED', ETC)

********************************************************************************

12. WITH REGARD TO VIOLENT CRIME LIKE ASSAULT, RAPE AND MURDER ARE YOU . . . ?

1. MORE CONCERNED
2. LESS CONCERNED
3. OR CONCERNED ABOUT THE SAME

(READ PRE-CODED RESPONSES-EXCEPT FOR 'DON'T KNOW', 'REFUSED', ETC)

********************************************************************************

13. WITH REGARD TO CAR THEFT, ARE YOU . . . ?

1. MORE CONCERNED
2. LESS CONCERNED
3. OR CONCERNED ABOUT THE SAME

(READ PRE-CODED RESPONSES-EXCEPT FOR 'DON'T KNOW', 'REFUSED', ETC)

********************************************************************************

14. WITH REGARD TO BURGLARY-ROBBERY, ARE YOU . . . ?

1. MORE CONCERNED
2. LESS CONCERNED
3. OR CONCERNED ABOUT THE SAME

(READ PRE-CODED RESPONSES-EXCEPT FOR 'DON'T KNOW', 'REFUSED', ETC)

********************************************************************************
15. WITH REGARD TO DRUG-RELATED CRIMES, ARE YOU . . . ?

1. MORE CONCERNED
2. LESS CONCERNED
3. OR CONCERNED ABOUT THE SAME

(READ PRE-CODED RESPONSES-EXCEPT FOR 'DON'T KNOW', 'REFUSED', ETC)

16. ON WHAT DO YOU BASE YOUR OPINION ABOUT ALL OF THESE CRIMES?

1. NEWSPAPER
2. RADIO OR TV
3. PERSONAL EXPERIENCE
4. EXPERIENCE OF FRIEND OR ACQUAINTANCE
5. WORD OF MOUTH
6. OTHER

OTHER LINE = 54
(Multiple Response)

(DON'T READ PRECODED RESPONSES)

17. NOW I'M GOING TO ASK YOU IF YOU, OR ANYONE IN YOUR HOUSEHOLD HAVE BEEN A VICTIM OF ANY OF THESE CRIMES.

HAVE YOU OR ANYONE IN YOUR HOUSEHOLD BEEN A VICTIM OF VANDALISM?

1. YES
2. NO

18. HAVE YOU OR ANYONE IN YOUR HOUSEHOLD BEEN A VICTIM OF VIOLENT CRIME, LIKE ASSAULT, MURDER, RAPE?

1. YES
2. NO

19. HAVE YOU OR ANYONE IN YOUR HOUSEHOLD BEEN A VICTIM OF CAR THEFT?

1. YES
2. NO

20. HAVE YOU OR ANYONE IN YOUR HOUSEHOLD BEEN A VICTIM OF BURGLARY OR ROBBERY?

1. YES
2. NO
21. HAVE YOU OR ANYONE IN YOUR HOUSEHOLD BEEN A VICTIM OF A DRUG RELATED CRIME?

1. YES
2. NO

22. DID YOU REPORT ONE OR MORE OF THESE CRIMES TO THE POLICE?

1. YES
2. SOMEONE ELSE REPORTED
3. DON'T KNOW
4. NO
5. OTHER

OTHER LINE = 55

(READ PRE-CODED RESPONSES-EXCEPT FOR 'DON'T KNOW', 'REFUSED', ETC)

SKIP BEFORE Q22 IF Q<17> EQ 2
AND Q<18> EQ 2
AND Q<19> EQ 2
AND Q<20> EQ 2
AND Q<21> EQ 2 THEN GO 23

23. WITH REGARD TO GRAFFITI, COMPARED TO TWO YEARS AGO WOULD YOU SAY YOU ARE . . . ?

1. MORE CONCERNED
2. LESS CONCERNED, OR
3. CONCERNED ABOUT THE SAME

(READ PRE-CODED RESPONSES-EXCEPT FOR 'DON'T KNOW', 'REFUSED', ETC)

24. DO YOU BELIEVE THAT OVER THE LAST TWO YEARS CRIME IN YOUR COMMUNITY HAS . . . ?

1. INCREASED
2. DECREASED, OR
3. STAYED THE SAME

(PROMPT ONLY IF NO ANSWER)

25. WHAT DO YOU THINK IS CAUSING IT TO INCREASE?

1. MORE PEOPLE OR HOUSING
2. TROLLEY
3. DON'T KNOW
4. OTHER

OTHER LINE = 56
(Multiple Response)

(DON'T READ PRECODED RESPONSES)

SKIP BEFORE Q25 IF Q<24> NE 1 THEN GO 26
26. WHAT DO YOU THINK IS CAUSING IT TO DECREASE?

SKIP BEFORE Q26 IF Q<24> NE 2 THEN GO 27

27. WITH REGARD TO THE TROLLEY EXTENSION THROUGH MISSION VALLEY THAT OPENED IN 2005, WHAT EFFECT DO YOU THINK IT HAS HAD ON SAFETY AND SECURITY - DO YOU THINK MISSION VALLEY IS . . . ?

1. MUCH SAFER
2. SAFER
3. NO CHANGE
4. LESS SAFE, OR
5. MUCH LESS SAFE, OR
6. YOU DIDN'T LIVE HERE BEFORE TROLLEY OPENED
7. DON'T KNOW

** SURVEYOR NOTE: TRY TO GET THEIR IMPRESSION EVEN IF THEY FIRST SAY THEY DON'T KNOW. ONLY TAKE DON'T KNOW AS A LAST RESORT.

(READ PRE-CODED RESPONSES-EXCEPT FOR 'DON'T KNOW', 'REFUSED', ETC)

28. HOW CLOSE DO YOU LIVE TO THE NEAREST TROLLEY STATION FOR THE TROLLEY RUNNING THROUGH MISSION VALLEY?

1. LESS THAN 1/2 A MILE (6 BLOCKS)
2. 0.6 - 1.0 MILES
3. 1.1 - 2.0 MILES
4. MORE THAN 2 MILES
5. DON'T KNOW

SKIP AFTER Q28 IF Q<28> EQ 5 THEN GO 30

29. WHAT IS THE NAME OF THAT STATION?

1. 70TH STREET
2. ALVARADO
3. FASHION VALLEY
4. FENTON PARKWAY
5. GRANTVILLE
6. HAZARD CENTER
7. MISSION SAN DIEGO
8. MISSION VALLEY CENTER
9. MORENA/LINDA VISTA
10. QUALCOMM STADIUM
11. RIO VISTA
12. SDSU TRANSIT CENTER
13. CAN'T REMEMBER
14. OTHER

OTHER LINE = 59

********************************************************************************

68
30. OK, WE'RE ALMOST DONE. JUST A FEW QUESTIONS SOLELY FOR DEMOGRAPHIC PURPOSES.

INCLUDING YOURSELF, HOW MANY PEOPLE LIVE IN YOUR HOME?

1. 1
2. 2
3. 3
4. 4
5. 5
6. 6
7. 7
8. 8
9. 9
10. 10+
11. REFUSED

(PROMPT ONLY IF NO ANSWER)

31. DO YOU OWN OR RENT?

1. OWN
2. RENT
3. REFUSED

32. IS YOUR TOTAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME . . . ?

1. < $15,000
2. $15,000 - $44,999
3. $45,000 - $59,999
4. $60,000 - $74,999
5. $75,000 - $99,999
6. $100,000 +
7. REFUSED

(READ PRE-CODED RESPONSES-EXCEPT FOR 'DON'T KNOW', 'REFUSED', ETC)

33. ARE YOU . . . ?

1. 18-24
2. 25 - 34
3. 35 - 44
4. 45 - 54
5. 55 - 64
6. 65 OR OLDER
7. REFUSED

(READ PRE-CODED RESPONSES-EXCEPT FOR 'DON'T KNOW', 'REFUSED', ETC)
34. WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING BEST DESCRIBES YOUR ETHNIC BACKGROUND?

1. CAUCASIAN
2. HISPANIC
3. AFRICAN-AMERICAN
4. ASIAN OR PACIFIC ISLANDER
5. NATIVE AMERICAN OR ALASKAN NATIVE
6. REFUSED
7. OTHER

OTHER LINE = 57

(READ PRE-CODED RESPONSES-EXCEPT FOR 'DON'T KNOW', 'REFUSED', ETC)

35. DO YOU HAVE ANY ADDITIONAL COMMENTS ON CRIME IN YOUR COMMUNITY?

1. SAFE STREETS
2. UNSAFE STREETS
3. DRUGS
4. GRAFFITI
5. GANGS
6. TROLLEY HAS INCREASED CRIME
7. TROLLEY HAS NOT MADE ANY DIFFERENCE
8. NO COMMENTS
9. OTHER

OTHER LINE = 58

(Multiple Response)

(DON'T READ PRECODED RESPONSES)

SKIP AFTER Q35 GO 37

36. GENDER: (NOT ASKED)

1. MALE
2. FEMALE

(DON'T READ PRECODED RESPONSES)

SKIP AFTER Q36 GO 1

70
QUESTIONNAIRE WITH SKIP PATTERNS
--------------------------------

QUESTIONNAIRE = MISBUS
VERSION : 1.5

****************************************
* CODE BOX *
* LT = LESS THAN ( < ) *
* GT = GREATER THAN ( > ) *
* EQ = EQUALS ( = ) *
* NE = NOT EQUAL TO ( # ) *
****************************************

HELLO, THIS IS _____ _______ WITH SCR, AN INDEPENDENT RESEARCH FIRM. WE ARE CONDUCTING A BRIEF SURVEY OF MISSION VALLEY BUSINESS ON CRIME AND SAFETY FOR SAN DIEGO ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS. IT WILL ONLY TAKE A FEW MINUTES. CAN YOU HELP ME OUT?

1. HOW MANY YEARS HAS THIS BUSINESS BEEN LOCATED IN MISSION VALLEY?
   1. < 2 YEARS
   2. 2 - 5 YEARS
   3. 6 - 10 YEARS
   4. 11 - 15 YEARS
   5. 16 - 20 YEARS
   6. 20+ YEARS
   7. OTHER

2. DO YOU OWN OR MANAGE THIS BUSINESS?
   1. OWN
   2. MANAGE

3. HOW SAFE DO YOU CONSIDER THIS LOCATION TO BE?
   1. VERY SAFE
   2. REASONABLY SAFE
   3. SOMEWHAT UNSAFE
   4. VERY UNSAFE

(READ PRE-CODED RESPONSES EXCEPT FOR 'DON'T KNOW', 'REFUSED', ETC)
4. THINKING OF SAFETY IN MISSION VALLEY NOW COMPARED TO TWO YEARS AGO, WOULD YOU SAY THINGS HAVE . . . ?

1. CHANGED FOR THE BETTER
2. ARE ABOUT THE SAME, OR
3. CHANGED FOR THE WORSE

(READ PRE-CODED RESPONSES-EXCEPT FOR 'DON'T KNOW', 'REFUSED', ETC)

5. NOW I'M GOING TO READ YOU A LIST OF POTENTIAL CRIME PROBLEMS. FOR EACH ONE I WOULD LIKE YOU TO TELL ME IF COMPARED TO TWO YEARS AGO, YOU ARE MORE CONCERNED, LESS CONCERNED, OR CONCERNED ABOUT THE SAME.

** ENTER "XX" TO CONTINUE **

QUESTIONS 6-12 ARE RANDOMLY ROTATED

6. SHOPLIFTING ?

1. MORE CONCERNED
2. LESS CONCERNED, OR
3. CONCERNED ABOUT THE SAME

(PROMPT ONLY IF NO ANSWER)

7. VANDALISM ?

1. MORE CONCERNED
2. LESS CONCERNED, OR
3. CONCERNED ABOUT THE SAME

(PROMPT ONLY IF NO ANSWER)

8. VIOLENT CRIME LIKE ASSAULT, RAPE AND MURDER ?

1. MORE CONCERNED
2. LESS CONCERNED, OR
3. CONCERNED ABOUT THE SAME

(PROMPT ONLY IF NO ANSWER)

9. CAR THEFT ?

1. MORE CONCERNED
2. LESS CONCERNED, OR
3. CONCERNED ABOUT THE SAME

(PROMPT ONLY IF NO ANSWER)
10. BURGLARY, BREAKING AND ENTERING WITH INTENT TO STEAL ?

1. MORE CONCERNED
2. LESS CONCERNED, OR
3. CONCERNED ABOUT THE SAME

(PROMPT ONLY IF NO ANSWER)

11. ROBBERY, STEALING OF PROPERTY BY FORCE OR THREAT OF FORCE ?

1. MORE CONCERNED
2. LESS CONCERNED, OR
3. CONCERNED ABOUT THE SAME

(PROMPT ONLY IF NO ANSWER)

12. DRUG RELATED CRIMES ?

1. MORE CONCERNED
2. LESS CONCERNED, OR
3. CONCERNED ABOUT THE SAME

(PROMPT ONLY IF NO ANSWER)

13. ON WHAT DO YOU BASE YOUR OPINION ABOUT ALL OF THESE CRIMES ?

1. NEWSPAPER
2. RADIO OR TV
3. PERSONAL EXPERIENCE
4. EXPERIENCE OF FRIEND OR ACQUAINTANCE
5. WORD OF MOUTH
6. OTHER

OTHER LINE = 100
(Multiple Response)

(DON'T READ PRECODED RESPONSES)

14. NOW I'M GOING TO ASK YOU IF YOUR BUSINESS HAS BEEN A VICTIM OF ANY OF THESE CRIME PROBLEMS.

** ENTER "XX" TO CONTINUE **

QUESTIONS 15-21 ARE RANDOMLY ROTATED

15. SHOPLIFTING ?

1. YES
2. NO
16. VANDALISM?
   1. YES
   2. NO

17. VIOLENT CRIME LIKE ASSAULT, RAPE, AND MURDER?
   1. YES
   2. NO

18. CAR THEFT?
   1. YES
   2. NO

19. BURGLARY?
   1. YES
   2. NO

20. ROBBERY?
   1. YES
   2. NO

21. DRUG RELATED CRIMES?
   1. YES
   2. NO

22. DID YOU REPORT ONE OR MORE OF THESE CRIMES TO THE POLICE?
   1. YES
   2. SOMEONE ELSE REPORTED
   3. DON'T KNOW
   4. NO
   5. OTHER

OTHER LINE = 101
(PROMPT ONLY IF NO ANSWER)

23. WITH REGARD TO GRAFFITI, COMPARED TO TWO YEARS AGO WOULD YOU SAY THAT YOU ARE...?
   1. MORE CONCERNED
   2. LESS CONCERNED, OR
   3. CONCERNED ABOUT THE SAME

(READ PRE-CODED RESPONSES-EXCEPT FOR 'DON'T KNOW', 'REFUSED', ETC)
24. DO YOU BELIEVE THAT OVER THE LAST TWO YEARS CRIME IN THE MISSION VALLEY AREA HAS...?

1. INCREASED  
2. DECREASED, OR  
3. STAYED THE SAME  

(READ PRE-CODED RESPONSES-EXCEPT FOR 'DON'T KNOW', 'REFUSED', ETC)  

SKIP AFTER Q24 IF Q<24> EQ 2 THEN GO 26  
SKIP AFTER Q24 IF Q<24> EQ 3 THEN GO 27  

25. WHAT DO YOU THINK IS CAUSING IT TO INCREASE ?

1. MORE PEOPLE OR HOUSING  
2. TROLLEY  
3. DON'T KNOW  
4. OTHER  

OTHER LINE = 56  

(DON'T READ PRECODED RESPONSES)  

SKIP AFTER Q25 GO 27  

26. WHAT DO YOU THINK IS CAUSING IT TO DECREASE ?

27. DO YOU BELIEVE THAT OVER THE LAST TWO YEARS CRIME IN SAN DIEGO COUNTY HAS...?

1. INCREASED  
2. DECREASED, OR  
3. STAYED THE SAME  

(READ PRE-CODED RESPONSES-EXCEPT FOR 'DON'T KNOW', 'REFUSED', ETC)  

SKIP AFTER Q27 IF Q<27> EQ 2 THEN GO 29  
SKIP AFTER Q27 IF Q<27> EQ 3 THEN GO 30  

28. WHAT DO YOU THINK IS CAUSING IT TO INCREASE ?

1. MORE PEOPLE OR HOUSING  
2. TROLLEY  
3. DON'T KNOW  
4. OTHER  

OTHER LINE = 103  

(DON'T READ PRECODED RESPONSES)  

SKIP AFTER Q28 GO 30
29. WHAT DO YOU THINK IS CAUSING IT TO DECREASE?

30. WITH REGARD TO THE TROLLEY EXTENSION THROUGH MISSION VALLEY THAT OPENED IN 2005, WHAT EFFECT DO YOU THINK IT HAS ON SAFETY AND SECURITY, DO YOU THINK THE AREA IS NOW...

1. MUCH SAFER
2. SAFER
3. NO CHANGE
4. LESS SAFE, OR
5. MUCH LESS SAFE, OR
6. YOUR BUSINESS WAS NOT HERE BEFORE THE TROLLEY OPENED
7. DON'T KNOW

(READ PRE-CODED RESPONSES-EXCEPT FOR 'DON'T KNOW', 'REFUSED', ETC)

31. WHAT IMPACT DO YOU THINK THAT THE MISSION VALLEY TROLLEY EXTENSION HAS HAD ON YOUR BUSINESS, DO YOU THINK IT HAS HAD A...

1. POSITIVE IMPACT
2. NEGATIVE IMPACT, OR
3. NO IMPACT

32. INCLUDING YOURSELF, HOW MANY EMPLOYEES WORK AT THIS LOCATION?

33. DO YOU HAVE ANY ADDITIONAL COMMENTS ON CRIME IN THE MISSION VALLEY?

34. WOULD YOU PLEASE SPELL YOUR NAME FOR ME?

35. GENDER

1. MALE
2. FEMALE

36. WHAT TYPE OF BUSINESS DO YOU RUN OR OWN?

1. AUTOMOTIVE
2. RETAIL SALES
3. RETAIL SERVICE
4. RESTAURANT
5. INDUSTRIAL
6. OFFICE
7. OTHER

OTHER LINE = 104
37. WHAT IS THE NAME OF THE COMPANY?

38. WHAT IS THE COMPANY'S ADDRESS?

39. WHAT IS YOUR TITLE?

1. OWNER
2. MANAGER
3. OTHER

OTHER LINE = 105
Welcome to the Green Line! SANDAG and MTS need your assistance to help evaluate trolley service. Over a four-day period, we will be handing out these surveys on the Green Line. Check a box or fill in the blanks. Thank you. Please fill out this form only ONCE during these four days. Return the survey before you get off the trolley.

### PLEASE ANSWER THESE 6 QUESTIONS FIRST

1. **Where are you coming from?**
   - [ ] Home
   - [ ] Work
   - [ ] School
   - Other: _____________________

2. **At what station did you get on this trolley?**
   - Station: _____________________

3. **How did you get to this trolley?**
   - [ ] Transferred from bus route ______
   - [ ] Transferred from another trolley
   - [ ] Transferred from Coaster/Amtrak
   - [ ] Transferred from MTS Access
   - [ ] Walked ______ minutes
   - Other _______

4. **Where are you going?**
   - [ ] Home
   - [ ] Work
   - [ ] School
   - Other: _____________________

5. **At what station will you get off this trolley?**
   - Station: _____________________

6. **After you get off this trolley, will you . . .**
   - [ ] Transfer to bus route ______
   - [ ] Transfer to another trolley
   - [ ] Transfer to Coaster/Amtrak
   - [ ] Transfer to MTS Access
   - [ ] Walk ______ minutes
   - Other _______

### 7. How did you make this trip a year ago?
   - [ ] I did not make this trip in December 2005
   - [ ] I rode Green Line Trolley
   - [ ] I rode Orange Line Trolley
   - [ ] I rode Blue Line Trolley
   - [ ] I rode bus route_________
   - [ ] I drove alone

### 8. How often do you typically ride public transit?
   - [ ] 1 days per week
   - [ ] 2. One to three days per month
   - [ ] 3. Less than once a month

### 9. How often do you typically ride public transit a year ago?
   - [ ] Not at all
   - [ ] 1-3 days per week
   - [ ] 4. Less than once a month

### 10. What fare type did you use on the trolley today?
   - [ ] College pass (monthly/semester)
   - [ ] Monthly pass
   - [ ] Trolley ticket
   - [ ] Other _______

### 11a. If the SDSU Station is your origin or destination, are you:
   - [ ] SDSU student
   - [ ] Student at other school
   - [ ] SDSU Faculty or Staff
   - Other _______

11b. If you are/were visiting the campus (and you are not student, faculty, or staff) what is/was the purpose of your trip?
   - Trip purpose: ____________________________________________

### 12. Do you have a personal vehicle that you could have used to make this trip?
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

### 13. If transit service were not available, would you have made this trip today?
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

### 14. Where do you usually get your transit information?
   - [ ] 1-800-Commute
   - [ ] www.sdcommute.com
   - [ ] Printed timetables
   - Other _______

### 15. How long have you been a Green Line rider?
   - [ ] This is my 1st trip
   - [ ] Less than 12 months
   - [ ] A year or more

### 16. Your impressions of the Green Line: (circle one)
   - Service:
     - Poor
     - Okay
     - Good
     - No Opinion
   - Hours of service
     - 1
     - 2
     - 3
     - N/A
   - Daytime frequency
     - 1
     - 2
     - 3
     - N/A
   - Evening frequency
     - 1
     - 2
     - 3
     - N/A
   - Seating availability
     - 1
     - 2
     - 3
     - N/A
   - Value for my money
     - 1
     - 2
     - 3
     - N/A
   - Onboard safety
     - 1
     - 2
     - 3
     - N/A
   - Transit information
     - 1
     - 2
     - 3
     - N/A
   - Safety while waiting
     - 1
     - 2
     - 3
     - N/A
   - Connections to:
     - Blue Line
     - Orange Line
     - Bus
     - Other _______

### 17. Which best describes why you chose transit today? (check one)
   - [ ] No vehicle available
   - [ ] Avoid traffic
   - [ ] Cost of Driving
   - [ ] Avoid Parking
   - Save natural resources
   - Time to read, study, relax
   - Not able to drive
   - Other _______

### 18. Please tell us a little about yourself. Are you:
   - [ ] Male
   - [ ] Female

### 19. Your age:
   - [ ] 18 or younger
   - [ ] 19 - 25
   - [ ] 26 - 35
   - [ ] 36 - 45
   - [ ] 46 - 59
   - [ ] 60 or older

### 20. If traveling with children 12 or younger indicate how many: __________

### 21. What is the ZIP Code where you live? __________

### 22. Any comments: ____________________________________________________________
## FBI INDEX CRIME RATES PER 1,000 POPULATION BY AREA
San Diego County, FY 2000-01 through FY 2005-06

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mission Valley Total</td>
<td>84.8</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>84.7</td>
<td>84.2</td>
<td>79.8</td>
<td>84.8</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Valley East</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Valley West</td>
<td>254.2</td>
<td>230.0</td>
<td>219.9</td>
<td>199.1</td>
<td>191.9</td>
<td>205.2</td>
<td>-19%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego County</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES:** FBI Index includes homicide, rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny and motor vehicle theft. Percent changes for crime rates are based on computations rounded to one decimal place and may vary from changes computed using more detailed rounding convention.

**SOURCES:** California Department of Finance; San Diego Police Department; SANDAG
### FBI Index Violent Crime Rates Per 1,000 Population by Area
San Diego County, FY 2000-01 through FY 2005-06

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mission Valley Total</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Valley East</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Valley West</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>-35%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>-12%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego County</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** FBI Index violent crimes include homicide, rape, robbery, and aggravated assault. Percent changes for crime rates are based on computations rounded to one decimal place and may vary from changes computed using more detailed rounding convention.

**Sources:** California Department of Finance; San Diego Police Department; SANDAG
## FBI INDEX PROPERTY CRIME RATES PER 1,000 POPULATION BY AREA

San Diego County, FY 2000-01 through FY 2005-06

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mission Valley Total</td>
<td>78.1</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>77.9</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Valley East</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Valley West</td>
<td>238.1</td>
<td>217.7</td>
<td>208.9</td>
<td>188.1</td>
<td>182.1</td>
<td>194.7</td>
<td>-18%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego County</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES:** FBI Index property crimes include burglary, larceny, and motor vehicle theft. Percent changes for crime rates are based on computations rounded to one decimal place and may vary from changes computed using more detailed rounding convention.

**SOURCES:** California Department of Finance; San Diego Police Department; SANDAG
### NUMBER OF CRIMES BY OFFENSE TYPE
**Mission Valley Corridor Total, FY 2000-01, FY 2004-05, and FY 2005-06**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2000-01</th>
<th>FY 2004-05</th>
<th>FY 2005-06</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Five Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Violent Crime</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homicide</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated Assault</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Violent Crimes</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Property Crime</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary Total</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larceny Total</td>
<td>2,362</td>
<td>2,476</td>
<td>2,644</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MV Theft</td>
<td>1,020</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Property Crimes</td>
<td>3,779</td>
<td>3,904</td>
<td>4,180</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FBI Index Total</strong></td>
<td>4,101</td>
<td>4,203</td>
<td>4,505</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES:** FBI Index includes homicide, rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny, and motor vehicle theft. Percent changes are not presented for crime numbers that equal 30 or less.

**SOURCE:** SANDAG

### NUMBER OF CRIMES BY OFFENSE TYPE
**Mission Valley East Corridor, FY 2000-01, FY 2004-05, and FY 2005-06**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2000-01</th>
<th>FY 2004-05</th>
<th>FY 2005-06</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Five Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Violent Crime</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homicide</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated Assault</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Violent Crimes</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Property Crime</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary Total</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larceny Total</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MV Theft</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Property Crimes</td>
<td>1,328</td>
<td>1,323</td>
<td>1,332</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FBI Index Total</strong></td>
<td>1,484</td>
<td>1,483</td>
<td>1,504</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES:** FBI Index includes homicide, rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny, and motor vehicle theft. Percent changes are not presented for crime numbers that equal 30 or less.

**SOURCE:** San Diego Police Department; SANDAG
### Number of Crimes by Offense Type

**Mission Valley West Corridor, FY 2000-01, FY 2004-05, and FY 2005-06**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Violent Crime</th>
<th>FY 2000-01</th>
<th>FY 2004-05</th>
<th>FY 2005-06</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Five Year</th>
<th>One Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homicide</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated Assault</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>-22%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Violent Crimes</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Property Crime**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2000-01</th>
<th>FY 2004-05</th>
<th>FY 2005-06</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Five Year</th>
<th>One Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burglary Total</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larceny Total</td>
<td>1,562</td>
<td>1,754</td>
<td>1,886</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MV Theft</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Property Crimes</td>
<td>2,451</td>
<td>2,581</td>
<td>2,848</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBI Index Total</td>
<td>2,617</td>
<td>2,720</td>
<td>3,001</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES: FBI Index includes homicide, rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny and motor vehicle theft. Percent changes are not presented for crime numbers that equal 30 or less.

SOURCE: SANDAG

### Number of Crimes by Offense Type

**City of San Diego, FY 2000-01, FY 2004-05, and FY 2005-06**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Violent Crime</th>
<th>FY 2000-01</th>
<th>FY 2004-05</th>
<th>FY 2005-06</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Five Year</th>
<th>One Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homicide</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>1,638</td>
<td>1,757</td>
<td>1,940</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated Assault</td>
<td>5,011</td>
<td>4,295</td>
<td>4,171</td>
<td>-17%</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Violent Crimes</td>
<td>7,039</td>
<td>6,463</td>
<td>6,525</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Property Crime**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2000-01</th>
<th>FY 2004-05</th>
<th>FY 2005-06</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Five Year</th>
<th>One Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burglary Total</td>
<td>6,610</td>
<td>7,227</td>
<td>7,334</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larceny Total</td>
<td>23,744</td>
<td>24,948</td>
<td>24,274</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MV Theft</td>
<td>9,878</td>
<td>13,887</td>
<td>13,913</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Property Crimes</td>
<td>40,232</td>
<td>46,062</td>
<td>45,521</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBI Index Total</td>
<td>47,271</td>
<td>52,525</td>
<td>52,046</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES: FBI Index includes homicide, rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny and motor vehicle theft.

SOURCE: SANDAG
## Number of Crimes by Offense Type

San Diego County, FY 2000-01, FY 2004-05, and FY 2005-06

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense Type</th>
<th>FY 2000-01</th>
<th>FY 2004-05</th>
<th>FY 2005-06</th>
<th>Change Five Year</th>
<th>Change One Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Violent Crime</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homicide</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>787</td>
<td>773</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>3,179</td>
<td>3,729</td>
<td>4,161</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated Assault</td>
<td>9,553</td>
<td>8,806</td>
<td>8,927</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Violent Crimes</td>
<td>13,619</td>
<td>13,422</td>
<td>13,981</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Property Crime</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buglary Total</td>
<td>15,555</td>
<td>16,969</td>
<td>17,558</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larceny Total</td>
<td>48,654</td>
<td>54,975</td>
<td>52,719</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MV Theft</td>
<td>17,915</td>
<td>25,516</td>
<td>25,151</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Property Crimes</td>
<td>82,124</td>
<td>97,460</td>
<td>95,428</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FBI Index Total</strong></td>
<td>95,743</td>
<td>110,882</td>
<td>109,409</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES:** FBI Index includes homicide, rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny and motor vehicle theft.

**SOURCE:** SANDAG
## POPULATION BY AREA

San Diego County, FY 2000-01 through FY 2005-06

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mission Valley Total</td>
<td>48,386</td>
<td>50,671</td>
<td>52,293</td>
<td>52,971</td>
<td>52,657</td>
<td>53,095</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Valley East</td>
<td>38,090</td>
<td>38,643</td>
<td>38,935</td>
<td>38,934</td>
<td>38,485</td>
<td>38,468</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Valley West</td>
<td>10,296</td>
<td>12,028</td>
<td>13,358</td>
<td>14,037</td>
<td>14,172</td>
<td>14,627</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>1,241,788</td>
<td>1,256,981</td>
<td>1,282,252</td>
<td>1,295,147</td>
<td>1,300,343</td>
<td>1,311,162</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego County</td>
<td>2,863,657</td>
<td>2,920,010</td>
<td>2,971,805</td>
<td>3,010,014</td>
<td>3,039,277</td>
<td>3,066,820</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES: Population estimates are based upon January 1, 2006, Department of Finance (DOF) figures and have been adjusted to reflect the 2000 Census.

SOURCES: California Department of Finance; 2000 U.S. Census; SANDAG
GLOSSARY OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE TERMS

Crime Rate Per 1,000 Population: The number of reported crimes (willful homicide, forcible rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny theft, and motor vehicle theft) divided by the population which has been divided by 1,000.

Crimes:

FBI Index Crimes include willful homicide, forcible rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny theft, motor vehicle theft, and arson. Arson was added to the Index in 1979. In this report, the FBI Index refers to the first seven offenses, without arson data.

Violent Crimes include willful homicide, forcible rape, robbery, and aggravated assault.

Willful Homicide - the willful (non-negligent) killing of one human being by another (includes murder and non-negligent manslaughter).

Forcible Rape - the carnal knowledge of a female, forcibly and against her will (includes attempts to commit forcible rape).

Robbery - the taking or attempting to take anything of value from the care, custody, or control of a person or persons by force or threat of force or violence and/or by instilling fear.

Aggravated Assault - the unlawful attack by one person upon another for the purpose of inflicting severe or aggravated bodily injury. This type of assault usually is accompanied by the use of a weapon and/or by means likely to produce death or great bodily harm.

Property Crimes include burglary, larceny theft, and motor vehicle theft.

Burglary - the unlawful entry of a structure to commit a felony or a theft (includes attempted burglary).

Larceny Theft - the unlawful taking, carrying, leading, or riding away of property from the possession or constructive possession of another (except embezzlement, fraud, forgery, or worthless checks), including attempts.

Motor Vehicle Theft - the theft or attempted theft of a motor vehicle.