BOARD OF DIRECTORS

The 18 cities and county government are SANDAG serving as the forum for regional decision-making. SANDAG builds consensus; plans, engineers, and builds public transit; makes strategic plans; obtains and allocates resources; and provides information on a broad range of topics pertinent to the region’s quality of life.

CHAIR
Hon. Mary Tessa Sassam

FIRST VICE CHAIR
Hon. Lon Holt Pfeifer

SECOND VICE CHAIR
Hon. Jerome Stocks

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
Gary L. Gallegos

CITY OF CARLSBAD
Hon. Matt Hall, Councilmember
(A) Hon. Bud Lewis, Mayor
(4) Hon. Ann Kulchin, Mayor Pro Tem

CITY OF CHULA VISTA
Hon. Chad C. C., Mayor
(4) Hon. Jerry Rincon, Deputy Mayor
(A) Hon. John McCain, Councilmember

CITY OF CORONADO
Hon. Phil Monroe, Councilmember
(A) Hon. Carle Downey, Mayor Pro Tem
(4) Hon. Al Ostrom, Councilmember

CITY OF DEL MAR
Hon. Crystal Crawford, Deputy Mayor
(A) Hon. David Druliner, Mayor
(A) Hon. Richard Earnest, Councilmember

CITY OF EL CAJON
Hon. Mark Lewis, Mayor
(4) Hon. Jillian Harris-Con, Councilmember

CITY OF ENCOITAS
Hon. Jerome Stow, Mayor
(A) Hon. Teresa Barth, Councilmember

CITY OF ESCONDIDO
Hon. Lori Holt Pfeifer, Mayor
(A) Hon. Ed Gallo, Councilmember
(A) Hon. Sam Abed, Mayor Pro Tem

CITY OF IMPERIAL BEACH
Hon. Jim Jimness, Mayor
(A) Hon. Frank Pantoja, Vice Mayor
(A) Hon. Maya Wicker, Councilmember

CITY OF LA MESA
Hon. Art Madrid, Mayor
(A) Hon. Mark Apodastas, Councilmember
(A) Hon. David Allen, Councilmember

CITY OF LEMON GROVE
Hon. Mary Tessa Sassam, Mayor
(A) Hon. Jerry Jones, Councilmember
(A) Hon. Jerry Selby, Mayor Pro Tem

CITY OF NATIONAL CITY
Hon. Ron Morrison, Mayor
(A) Hon. Frank Pantoja, Vice Mayor
(A) Hon. Louie Nakhcad, Councilmember

CITY OF OCEANSIDE
Hon. Jim Wood, Mayor
(A) Hon. Jerry Karn, Councilmember
(4) Hon. Jack Feiler, Councilmember

CITY OF POWAY
Hon. Mickey Callagni, Mayor
(A) Hon. Robert Emery, Deputy Mayor
(A) Hon. Don Higgen, Councilmember

CITY OF SAN DIEGO
Hon. Jerry Sanders, Mayor
Hon. Jim Madaffier, Council President Pro Tem
(A) Hon. Anthony Young, Councilmember
(4) Hon. Scott Peters, Council President
(A) Hon. Tony Atkins, Councilmember
(4) Hon. Ben Hueso, Councilmember

CITY OF SAN MARCOS
Hon. Jim Desmond, Mayor
(A) Hon. Hall Martin, Vice Mayor
(4) Hon. Rebecca Jones, Councilmember

CITY OF SANTEE
Hon. Jack Dale, Councilmember
(A) Hon. Hal Rish, Councilmember
(A) Hon. Tom Minto, Councilmember

CITY OF SANTA MARIA
Hon. Lesa Heitler, Councilmember
(A) Hon. Dave Roberts, Mayor
(4) Hon. Mike Nichols, Deputy Mayor

CITY OF VISTA
Hon. Judy Ritter, Councilmember
(A) Hon. Bob Carmelini, Councilmember
(A) Hon. Steve Atkinson, Councilmember

COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO
Hon. Greg Cox, Chairman
(4) Hon. Pam Slater-Price, Chair Pro Tem
(A) Hon. Ron Roberts, Supervisor
Hon. Diane Jacobs, Vice Chairwoman
(A) Hon. Bill Horn, Supervisor

IMPERIAL COUNTY
(Advisory Member)
Hon. Victor Cantillo, Supervisor
(A) Hon. David Guzman, Councilmember

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
(Advisory Member)
Wll Kempton, Director
(4) Pedro Ocio-Delgado, District 11 Director

METROPOLITAN TRANSIT SYSTEM
(Advisory Member)
Harry Mathis, Chairman
(A) Hon. Jerry Rincon, Vice Chairman
(A) Hon. Robert Emery, Chair Pro Tem

NORTH COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
(Advisory Member)
Hon. Ed Gallo, Chairman
(A) Hon. Jerome Stocks, Planning Committee Chair
(A) Hon. Chris Orlando, Monitoring Committee Chair

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
(Advisory Member)
CAPT Steve Yawich, USN, CEC
Southwest Division Naval Facilities Engineering Command
(4) CAPT Robert Fairley, USN, CEC
Southwest Division Naval Facilities Engineering Command

SAN DIEGO UNIFIED PORT DISTRICT
(Advisory Member)
Laurea Black, Commissioner
(A) Michael Najara, Commissioner

SAN DIEGO COUNTY WATER AUTHORITY
(Advisory Member)
Marcy Daly, Commissioner
(A) Mark Muri, Commissioner
(A) Gary Crouch, Commissioner

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA TRIBAL CHAIRMEN’S ASSOCIATION
(Advisory Member)
Chairman Robert Smith (Pala), SCTCA Chair
(A) Chairman Allen Lawson (San Pasqual)

MEXICO
(Advisory Member)
Hon. Remedios Gomez-Aman, Outgoing Secretary of Mexico
As of July 16, 2008
# Table of Contents

## Introduction
- Moving in the Right Direction ......................................................................................... 1
- Areas for Improvement ........................................................................................................ 1

## Urban Form and Transportation ......................................................................................... 5
- Share of New Housing Units and Jobs Located Within Smart Growth Opportunity Areas ............................................................... 5
- Share of New Housing Units Within County Water Authority Water Service Boundary ............................................................ 6
- Annual Transit Ridership ........................................................................................................ 6
- Commute Mode Shares .......................................................................................................... 6
- Travel Times and Volumes for Key Transportation Corridors .............................................................................................................. 7
- Miles of Deficient Roads on Congestion Management Program Network ................................................................. 12
- Annual Hours of Traffic Delay per Traveler ....................................................................... 12
- Regional Crime Rate ............................................................................................................ 13
- Conclusion ............................................................................................................................ 13

## Housing ................................................................................................................................ 15
- Housing Opportunity Index .................................................................................................. 15
- Percent of Households with Housing Costs Greater than 35 Percent of Income .................. 15
- Ratio of New Jobs to New Housing Units ........................................................................... 16
- Share of New Housing Units by Income Category ................................................................. 17
- Vacancy Rates ....................................................................................................................... 17
- Percent of Households Living in Overcrowded Conditions .................................................... 18
- Number of Households on the Waiting List for Section 8 Vouchers ........................................ 18
- Conclusion ............................................................................................................................ 18

## Healthy Environment ........................................................................................................... 19
- Habitat Conserved Within Designated Preserve Areas .............................................................. 19
- Percent of Preserve Area Actively Maintained ........................................................................ 20
- Number of Beach Mile Closure Days ...................................................................................... 20
- Beach Widths ......................................................................................................................... 21
- Lagoon Health ....................................................................................................................... 22
- Impaired Waterbodies ............................................................................................................ 22
- Air Quality Index .................................................................................................................... 22
- Conclusion ............................................................................................................................ 22
Economic Prosperity .......................................................................................................................... 25
- Labor Force Educational Attainment .................................................................................. 25
- Employment Growth in High-Wage Economic Clusters ............................................. 25
- Regional Unemployment Rate Compared to California and the United States .......... 26
- Real Per Capita Income Compared to California and the United States ....................... 26
- Regional Poverty Rate Compared to California and the United States ......................... 26
- Conclusion ...................................................................................................................... 27

Public Facilities .................................................................................................................. 29
- Water Consumption ........................................................................................................ 29
- Diversity of Water Supply ............................................................................................... 29
- Recycled Water Use ........................................................................................................ 30
- Per Capita Electricity Consumption and Peak Demand ................................................ 30
- Share of Energy Produced in the Region Versus Imported ........................................... 31
- Share of Energy Produced from Renewable Resources ................................................ 31
- Percent of Solid Waste that is Recycled ........................................................................ 32
- Landfill Space Available ................................................................................................. 33
- Conclusion ...................................................................................................................... 33

Borders ................................................................................................................................. 35
- Interregional Traffic Volumes into San Diego from Surrounding Counties and Baja California ................................................................. 35
- Border Wait Times ........................................................................................................ 36
- Participation in SENTRI Lanes, Pedestrian Commuter Program, Free and Secure Trade Program ................................................................. 36
- Conclusion ...................................................................................................................... 36

Summary and Conclusions .............................................................................................. 37
- Moving in the Right Direction ...................................................................................... 37
- Areas for Improvement ................................................................................................. 37
# List of Figures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Figure 1</td>
<td>Share of New Housing Units in Smart Growth Opportunity Areas, 2004 to 2006</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 2</td>
<td>New Housing Units in the County Water Authority Service Area, 2006 to 2007</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 3</td>
<td>San Diego Regional Annual Transit Boardings, 2000 to 2007</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 4</td>
<td>Regional Commute Mode Shares, 2000 to 2006</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 5</td>
<td>Percent of CMP Network That is Deficient, 2001, 2003, 2005, and 2007</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 6</td>
<td>Annual Hours of Traffic Delay per Traveler During Peak Periods, 2000 to 2005</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 7</td>
<td>FBI Index Crimes per 1,000 People, 2000 to 2007</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 8</td>
<td>Housing Opportunity Index, 2000 to 2007</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 9</td>
<td>Percent of Households Paying 35 Percent or More of Income for Housing, 2000 to 2006</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 10</td>
<td>Annual Income Needed to Afford Fair Market Rent</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 11</td>
<td>Total New Jobs per New Housing Unit Ratio, 2001 to 2007</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 12</td>
<td>Vacancy Rates, 2000 to 2007</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 13</td>
<td>Overcrowding in the Region, 2000 to 2006</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 14</td>
<td>MSCP South County and MHCP Land Conservation by Year, 1997 to 2031</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 15</td>
<td>Weather-Adjusted Beach Mile Closure Days, 2000 to 2007</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 16</td>
<td>Impaired Waterbodies, 2002 and 2006</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 17</td>
<td>Labor Force Educational Attainment, 2000 to 2006</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 18</td>
<td>Employment in San Diego’s High-Wage Economic Clusters, 2002, 2003, and 2005</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 19</td>
<td>Unemployment in San Diego, California, and the United States, 2000 to 2007</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 20</td>
<td>Real Per Capita Income in San Diego, California, and the United States in Inflation-Adjusted 2007 Dollars, 2000 to 2007</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 21</td>
<td>Percent of Residents Living In Poverty in San Diego, California, and the United States, 2000 to 2006</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 22</td>
<td>Water Consumption, 2000 to 2006</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 23</td>
<td>San Diego Water Supply by Source, 2003 to 2007</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 24</td>
<td>Amount of Recycled Water Used, 2000 to 2007</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 25</td>
<td>San Diego Annual Per Capita Electricity Consumption, 2000 to 2007</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 26</td>
<td>San Diego Annual Per Capita Electricity Peak Demand, 2000 to 2007</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 27</td>
<td>Share of Energy Produced In-County as Compared to Total County Requirement, 2000 to 2007</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 28</td>
<td>SDG&amp;E Share of Energy Produced from Renewable Resources, 2000 to 2007</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 29</td>
<td>Energy Sources in the San Diego Region, 2008</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 30</td>
<td>Percent of Solid Waste Diverted from Landfills, 2000 to 2006</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 31  San Diego Region Average Weekday Traffic Volumes to and from Orange, Imperial, and Riverside Counties and Tijuana, Baja California, 2000 to 2006 .......................................................... 35
Figure 32  Pedestrian Border Crossings from Tijuana into San Diego, 1997 to 2007.................................................. 35
Figure 33  Average Border Wait Times – Northbound into San Diego from Tijuana, 2004 to 2006......................... 36
Figure 34  SENTRI Participants, 2006 to 2008............................................................................................................... 36
List of Tables

Table 1  Population, Housing Units, and Job Growth in the San Diego Region, 2000 to 2007 ........................................ 2
Table 2  Travel Times in Key Auto Corridors, 2005 to 2007 ................................................................................... 8
Table 3  Travel Volumes in Key Auto Corridors, 2005 to 2007 ................................................................................. 10
Table 4  Transit Passenger Volumes in Key Transit Corridors at Specific Screenline Locations, 2005 to 2007 .... 11
Table 5  Share of New Housing Units by Income Category, July 1, 2005 – December 31, 2007 ....................... 17
Table 6  Beach Widths and Targets of Shoreline Segments San Diego Region, 2000 to 2007 ......................... 21

List of Maps

Map 1  Key Auto Corridor Travel Times, San Diego County, 2007 .............................................................................. 9
Map 2  San Diego Region Habitat Conservation Planning Areas ................................................................................. 20
Introduction

The Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP), adopted by the SANDAG Board of Directors in 2004, is the long-term planning framework for the San Diego region. It defines a vision and lays out goals, key issues, and needed actions in areas ranging from urban form and transportation to public facilities and borders. It summarizes where we were in 2004, where we want to be by 2030, and what we need to do to get there. The RCP also calls for ongoing monitoring to track progress toward meeting the goals outlined in the Plan.

In 2006, SANDAG released the Regional Comprehensive Plan: Establishing a Baseline for Monitoring Performance (Baseline Report), to be used to benchmark progress on an annual basis. The 2008 Regional Comprehensive Plan Annual Performance Monitoring Report (2008 Monitoring Report) is the second since the Baseline Report was accepted by the Board in October 2006.

The 2008 Monitoring Report includes the most recent data available for each indicator, typically from 2007. For some indicators, there is a one year delay in reporting; in these cases, data from 2006 are included. For all indicators, the most recent data are provided and related to the Baseline Report.

Based on the data collected for the 2008 Monitoring Report, the indicators illustrate those areas in which the region appears to be moving in the right direction and those in which improvement is needed.

Moving in the Right Direction

• The share of new housing units built in Smart Growth Opportunity Areas increased.
• Annual hours of traffic delay per traveler have decreased.
• Transit ridership continued to increase.
• The regional crime rate continued to decrease.
• The percent of solid waste that was recycled was close to achieving the state-mandated target.¹
• Recycled water use continued to increase substantially.

Areas for Improvement

• Housing production in the very low, low, and moderate income categories did not keep pace with above-moderate housing production: 42 percent of the above-moderate income housing goal identified in the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) has been met, while less than 10 percent of the very low-, low-, and moderate-income housing goal has been met. Overall, only 21 percent of the RHNA housing production goal has been met during the first half of the housing element cycle.
• Regionwide, the share of commutes made by transit, walking, bicycling, and carpool/vanpool have not increased substantially.
• Following beach width increases at all beaches in 2006, beach widths declined in 2007; for multiple beaches, widths are even smaller in 2007 than they were in 2005.
• Unemployment increased for the first time in three years.

¹ The percent of solid waste that was recycled in 2006 is based on a preliminary estimate; it is anticipated that when this estimate is revised, it will be higher than originally estimated and show that the region actually has achieved or exceeded the state-mandated target.
Per capita energy usage in the region continued to increase, moving further away from the target established in the Regional Energy Strategy.

Plans estimate that the region will reach physical landfill capacity in 2016, but unless proposed permit changes are implemented, permitted capacity could be reached prior to 2016.

Throughout the 2008 Monitoring Report, indicator data are in certain cases related to growth in population, housing, or jobs, as shown in Table 1. Between 2006 and 2007, the region grew by 34,156 people, and added 13,466 housing units, and 6,500 jobs.

Table 1
Population, Housing Units, and Job Growth in the San Diego Region, 2000 to 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population</strong></td>
<td>2,813,833</td>
<td>3,064,113</td>
<td>3,098,269</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing Units</strong></td>
<td>1,040,149</td>
<td>1,118,283</td>
<td>1,131,749</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jobs</strong></td>
<td>1,205,200</td>
<td>1,312,500</td>
<td>1,319,000</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: SANDAG Annual Population and Housing Estimates; California Department of Finance; California Employment Development Department; Bureau of Labor Statistics

Many of the indicators included in this report use the American Community Survey (ACS) as their data source. ACS is the United States (U.S.) Census Bureau’s new program for collecting and disseminating demographic, socio-economic, and housing data on an annual basis. Approximately one out of 40 addresses (2.5 percent of the population) is surveyed each year, which equals about three million addresses a year. In San Diego County, one out of 40 equates to about 28,800 addresses each year.

Please note that ACS is not designed to count the population, but rather to collect person and household characteristic information. The official Census (short form), which counts the entire population, still will be conducted every ten years, with the next Census taking place in 2010.
### Annual Indicators for Monitoring the Regional Comprehensive Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban Form and Transportation</th>
<th>1. Share of new housing units and jobs located in Smart Growth Opportunity Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Share of new housing units within County Water Authority water service boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Annual transit ridership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Commute mode shares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Travel times and volumes for key transportation corridors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Miles of deficient roads on Congestion Management Program network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Annual hours of traffic delay per traveler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Regional crime rate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing</th>
<th>9. Housing Opportunity Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. Percent of households with housing costs greater than 35 percent of income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. Ratio of new jobs to new housing units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. Share of new and existing housing units by structure type and income category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. Vacancy rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14. Percent of households living in overcrowded conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15. Number of households on the waiting list for Section 8 vouchers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16. Habitat conserved within designated preserve areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17. Percent of preserve areas actively maintained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18. Number of beach mile closure days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19. Impaired waterbodies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20. Beach widths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21. Lagoon health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22. Air Quality Index</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Healthy Environment</th>
<th>23. Labor force educational attainment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24. Employment growth in high-wage economic clusters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25. Regional unemployment rate compared to California and the United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26. Real per capita income compared to California and the United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27. Regional poverty rate compared to California and the United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28. Water consumption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29. Diversity of water supply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30. Recycled water use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31. Per capita electricity consumption and peak demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32. Share of energy produced in the region versus imported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33. Share of energy produced from renewable resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34. Percent of solid waste that is recycled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35. Landfill space available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Prosperity</th>
<th>36. Interregional traffic volumes into San Diego from surrounding counties and Baja California</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37. Border wait times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38. Participation in SENTRI Lanes, Pedestrian Commuter Program, Free and Secure Trade (FAST) Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Our land use and urban design decisions determine how well our communities serve us in our daily lives, including the quality of our travel choices and our personal safety. The Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) encourages urban development with an appropriate mix of uses designed to create safe and healthy communities. In addition, the relationship between regional transportation plans and local land use plans and policies is crucial to ensuring that the region’s transportation system efficiently connects our communities. The Urban Form and Transportation indicators track progress toward achieving these goals.

**Share of New Housing Units and Jobs Located Within Smart Growth Opportunity Areas**

In 2006, 19,000 new housing units were built in the region. Of these, almost 6,000, or 31 percent, were built in Smart Growth Opportunity Areas, as shown in Figure 1. This represents an increase in the share of new housing units built in Smart Growth Opportunity Areas, from 13 percent in 2005.

At the time of publication, new data regarding job growth in Smart Growth Opportunity Areas are unavailable. The Smart Growth Opportunity Areas experienced a net loss of 2,394 jobs, representing a 5 percent decrease between 2004 and 2005, while the region as a whole experienced an increase of 21,500 jobs during the same time period. As of 2005, 33 percent of the region’s jobs were located in Smart Growth Opportunity Areas.

With only three years of data for this indicator, it is unclear how many new housing units and jobs can be anticipated annually in Smart Growth Opportunity Areas, and which factors may be influencing growth in these areas. Continued monitoring is required to identify trends.

**Figure 1**

**Share of New Housing Units in Smart Growth Opportunity Areas, 2004 to 2006**

---

2 SANDAG, working closely with the local jurisdictions, developed a Smart Growth Concept Map in 2006, that includes approximately 200 existing, planned, and potential locations for smart growth development based upon land use density and associated transportation service targets in the RCP. The Smart Growth Concept Map was used in the development of the 2007 Regional Transportation Plan, and to determine eligibility for participation in the TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program.
Share of New Housing Units Within County Water Authority Water Service Boundary

In 2007, the share of new housing units built within the San Diego County Water Authority service boundary increased slightly, to 97.3 percent, as shown in Figure 2. These data signify progress toward the RCP goal of focusing population and job growth away from rural areas and closer to existing and planned job centers and public facilities.

Figure 2
New Housing Units in the County Water Authority Service Area, 2006 to 2007

Regional transit ridership continued to increase, continuing an upward trend since 2003; ridership grew 2 percent between 2006 and 2007. There were 97 million transit riders in the San Diego region in 2007, as shown in Figure 3.

This upward trend over the past three years is expected to continue in the near future with the opening of the SPRINTER rail line this year and increasing gas prices.

Figure 3
San Diego Regional Annual Transit Boardings, 2000 to 2007

Commute Mode Shares

As shown in Figure 4, the regional mode split remains stable. The share of commuters driving alone to work has not significantly changed. Year-to-year fluctuations in the data may be the result of sample differences and may not reflect true year-to-year changes.
The data suggest that the proportion of workers driving alone has dropped, and that working at home and bicycle or walk commutes have increased. However, these trends may be as much a result of new data collection methods in the American Community Survey (ACS) as they are of actual trends. Beginning in 2006, the ACS includes data on residents of group quarters facilities, whose commute patterns may differ from those of the household population. Therefore, data from prior years are not directly comparable. Trends may be better analyzed in next year’s report.

In future years, this data will be reported at a corridor level. Corridor-level reporting in future years will likely demonstrate substantial transit mode share in specific corridors that are well-served by transit. For example, the 2000 Census found that Downtown San Diego and City Heights had transit commute mode shares of 20 percent and 11 percent, respectively.

Figure 4
Regional Commute Mode Shares, 2000 to 2006

Travel Times and Volumes for Key Transportation Corridors

The RCP includes the goals of reducing traffic congestion on freeways and arterials and developing a network of fast, convenient, high-quality transit services that are competitive with drive-alone travel times during peak periods. Progress toward these goals can be measured by evaluating travel times and volumes for key auto and transit corridors.

Travel time and volume data on freeways are provided by the Performance Measurement System (PeMS), a Web-based tool used for reporting and monitoring the performance of the freeway system. Freeway detector stations collect volume and lane occupancy information every 30 seconds.

The data presented in Map 1 and Table 2 do not represent “door-to-door” commute times, but rather, trip time once on the freeway. Travel times are representative only of a freeway trip; average travel times are computed from an aggregation of freeway loop detector data. Accordingly, travel time monitoring currently is limited to freeway segments and the availability of freeway loop detector stations; thus, all segments shown in Map 1 and Table 2 are confined to each respective freeway.

Improvement of PeMS has been ongoing since its initial development and the release of the first PeMS system version in the late 1990s. Key PeMS enhancements generally have focused on assessing and improving the quality of the data and performance measures that PeMS provides. Specific enhancements
currently being developed for the San Diego region under the PeMS multimodal project will allow PeMS to incorporate real-time transit and arterial data. Through this effort, PeMS will have the ability to measure usage and travel time data for both transit and arterials, including the estimation of on-ramp wait times. This additional data will better approximate “door-to-door” travel times. PeMS analysis of key performance measures also will be enhanced by reporting an estimated travel time reliability factor. Once these PeMS enhancements are completed, they will be incorporated in future monitoring reports.3

Travel times shown in Table 2 differ from those presented in the 2007 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) for two reasons:

- RTP travel times are model-based, whereas the reported travel times represent actual observed data. The San Diego Regional Transportation Model estimates travel time on each arterial or freeway link, taking into account the configuration of the road, volume of traffic assigned, and any intersection controls. The modeled travel times are not observed data, as they are derived from a series of programs designed to forecast travel demand on the transportation system.

- RTP travel times represent “door-to-door” commute times that include trip time on arterial streets, whereas the travel times listed below only include trip time once on the freeway. However, as indicated above, PeMS will have the ability to measure arterial travel times, to approximate RTP door-to-door travel times for future reports.

Travel times have not increased nor decreased substantially in most corridors. The Interstate 15 (I-15) southbound a.m. and I-805 southbound p.m. commutes experienced the greatest decrease in travel time, dropping seven minutes, respectively from 2006 to 2007. Between 2006 and 2007, commute times in most corridors either decreased slightly or remained the same.

Table 2
Travel Times in Key Auto Corridors, 2005 to 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Corridor</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Average Trip Time (minutes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A.M. Peak Period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>Oceanside to Downtown San Diego (SD)</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>Escondido to Downtown SD</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SR 78</td>
<td>Escondido to Carlsbad</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SR 94</td>
<td>El Cajon to Downtown SD</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>El Cajon to Downtown SD</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>SR 52</td>
<td>Santee to Sorrento Valley</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>Mid-City to Sorrento Valley</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>Chula Vista to Sorrento Valley</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>Chula Vista to Downtown SD</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>San Ysidro to Downtown SD</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>El Cajon to Sorrento Valley</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Freeway Performance Measurement System (PeMS Version 9.0), Caltrans
Notes: (a) The a.m. peak period is based on a departure time of 7:30 a.m., and the p.m. peak period is based on a departure time of 4:00 p.m. (b) The a.m. direction is listed; the p.m. is the reverse direction of travel. (c) Corridor limits are listed for the a.m. direction and are approximately the same for the p.m. direction. (d) Data are reported for commutes on Tuesdays, Wednesdays, and Thursdays.

3 Additionally, travel times and volumes reported for previous years in the 2008 Monitoring Report may differ from those reported in last year’s report, as recent enhancements to PeMS include improved travel time calculations that more accurately reflect the start and end points of the designated freeway segments. Travel volumes for specific corridors may reflect different monitoring stations from previous reports in order to better reflect the travel characteristics or modal services within that corridor. Also, a different monitoring station may be used for a given report if a station is unavailable or unreliable due to highway construction, maintenance, or roadway incidents that might otherwise skew the data.
Map 1
Key Auto Corridor Travel Times, San Diego County, 2007
As shown in Table 3, travel volumes decreased slightly in most corridors in 2007. Observed decreases in travel times, and travel volumes in particular in 2007, may likely be attributed to the increase in gas prices and the state of the economy. However, a number of freeway improvements have been completed since 2005, which also may account for subsequent increases in mobility. For example, declining traffic on northbound I-5 may be the result of the opening of the northbound I-5/I-805 bypass lanes in spring 2005. These new bypass lanes divert traffic from the general purpose lanes, decreasing delay, and improving overall corridor travel times. It is anticipated that southbound traffic on I-5 also will decrease with the opening of the southbound bypass lanes in summer 2007; this anticipated decrease may be reflected in next year’s monitoring report. More detailed analysis relative to these improvements and specific corridor monitoring will be provided in the SANDAG State of the Commute Report, to be published in spring 2009.

### Table 3

**Travel Volumes in Key Auto Corridors, 2005 to 2007**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Corridor</th>
<th>Source: Freeway Performance Measurement System (PeMS Version 9.0), Caltrans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average Number of Vehicles Passing Monitoring Stations on a Weekday</td>
<td>Notes: (a) Data are reported for commutes on Tuesdays, Wednesdays, and Thursdays. (b) Traffic data obtained from monitoring stations may be subject to atypical operating conditions due to active highway construction. Volumes for I-805 Mid-City to Sorrento Valley and I-805 Chula Vista to Sorrento Valley are the same as those for Chula Vista to Downtown San Diego because they share the same screenline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northbound/Eastbound</td>
<td>Southbound/Westbound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I-5 Oceanside to Downtown SD</td>
<td>108,000 98,100 93,300 84,900 85,600 84,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I-15 Escondido to Downtown SD</td>
<td>97,000 99,400 114,100 113,700 114,400 114,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SR 78 Escondido to Carlsbad</td>
<td>77,300 76,300 75,600 79,700 79,000 79,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SR 94 El Cajon to Downtown SD</td>
<td>75,500 81,600 81,000 77,200 77,600 77,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I-8 El Cajon to Downtown SD</td>
<td>114,900 115,800 114,700 117,200 118,000 117,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>SR 52 Santee to Kearny Mesa</td>
<td>39,200 39,100 40,600 39,500 39,300 32,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I-805 Mid-City to Sorrento Valley</td>
<td>104,200 106,600 106,200 105,300 105,700 104,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I-805 Chula Vista to Sorrento Valley</td>
<td>104,200 106,600 106,200 105,300 105,700 104,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I-805 Chula Vista to Downtown SD</td>
<td>108,200 107,600 106,100 104,800 104,500 103,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I-5 San Ysidro to Downtown SD</td>
<td>83,200 87,400 79,200 91,800 89,000 91,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I-8 El Cajon to Sorrento Valley</td>
<td>114,900 115,800 114,700 117,200 118,000 117,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As PeMS continues to be developed and refined, it will eventually incorporate real-time transit data. In the meantime, the 2008 Monitoring Report includes transit volume information from FY 2005 through FY 2007 based on SANDAG Passenger Counting Program data. Transit passenger volumes are measured at key locations (screenlines) selected within each corridor. For each corridor, transit passenger volumes are listed by screenline in Table 4.

Transit volumes largely have remained consistent since 2005 along most corridors. The largest increase, in the I-8 El Cajon to Downtown San Diego corridor, is associated with the opening of the Green Line Trolley in 2005. The Green Line Trolley opening resulted in the addition of more than 4,000 passengers each way along the corridor, on an average weekday. A similar increase is expected along the SR 78 Escondido to Carlsbad corridor in FY 2008 due to the SPRINTER line opening in March 2008.
## Table 4
Transit Passenger Volumes in Key Transit Corridors at Specific Screenline Locations, 2005 to 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Corridor</th>
<th>Screenline(s) and Corresponding Transit Service</th>
<th>Northbound/Eastbound</th>
<th>Southbound/Westbound</th>
<th>Total – Both Directions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I-5 (Oceanside to Downtown SD)</td>
<td>Sorrento Valley</td>
<td>2,852</td>
<td>2,945</td>
<td>2,762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>COASTER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Route(s): 101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I-15 (Escondido to Downtown SD)</td>
<td>Poway</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Route(s): 20, 810, 820, 850, 860</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Miramar</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>958</td>
<td>797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Route(s): 20, 210, 810, 820, 850, 860</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SR 78 (Escondido to Carlsbad)</td>
<td>Vista</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Route(s): 320</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Route(s): 320</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SR 94 (El Cajon to Downtown SD)</td>
<td>Euclid Trolley Station</td>
<td>4,888</td>
<td>4,780</td>
<td>4,703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Orange Line Trolley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I-8 (El Cajon to Downtown SD)</td>
<td>Fashion Valley Trolley Station</td>
<td>1,224</td>
<td>5,396</td>
<td>6,372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Green Line Trolley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Route(s): 11, 14, 44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SDSU</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>3,043</td>
<td>3,737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Green Line Trolley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Route(s): 11, 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>SR 52 (Santee to Kearny Mesa)</td>
<td>Santee</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Route(s): 870</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I-805 (Mid-City to Sorrento Valley)</td>
<td>University City</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>1,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Route(s): 50, 105, 150, 960</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I-805 (Chula Vista to Sorrento Valley)</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I-805 (Chula Vista to Downtown SD)</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I-5 (San Ysidro to Downtown SD)</td>
<td>San Ysidro/Tijuana Trolley Station</td>
<td>13,234</td>
<td>13,835</td>
<td>13,941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Blue Line Trolley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Route(s): 929 and 932</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I-8 (El Cajon to Sorrento Valley)</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SANDAG Passenger Counting Program
It is anticipated that systemwide transit travel volumes likely will continue to increase, while freeway travel times and volumes likely will continue to decrease in 2008. These predictions are made in light of multiple factors, such as the economic slowdown, further increases in gas prices, as well as infrastructure improvements, such as the opening of the SPRINT light rail service along the SR 78 corridor and freeway improvements that should improve mobility within specific segments.

**Miles of Deficient Roads on Congestion Management Program Network**

Between 2005 and 2007, the miles of Congestion Management Program (CMP) deficient arterials, highways, and freeways decreased. Improvement was most pronounced among the region’s arterials: only 8 percent of the CMP network arterials were considered deficient in 2007, as compared to 22 percent in 2005. The miles of deficient freeways on the CMP network also decreased, from 36 percent in 2005 to 23 percent in 2007, as shown in Figure 5.

**Figure 5**


![Bar chart showing the percent of CMP network that is deficient for different years.](source)


**Annual Hours of Traffic Delay per Traveler**

Annual hours of traffic delay per traveler increased in 2004, and then decreased slightly in 2005, as shown in Figure 6. Delay is defined as the extra travel time it takes travelers to complete a trip during peak periods (6 to 9 a.m. and 4 to 7 p.m.) as a result of congestion.

**Figure 6**

**Annual Hours of Traffic Delay per Traveler During Peak Periods, 2000 to 2005**

![Line chart showing annual hours of traffic delay per traveler from 2000 to 2005.](source)

*Source: Annual Urban Mobility Report, Texas Transportation Institute*
Regional Crime Rate

As shown in Figure 7, the rate of crime in the region continues to decline, and in 2007 reached its lowest rate since 2000.

Figure 7
FBI Index Crimes per 1,000 People, 2000 to 2007

Conclusion

As of 2007, the region made progress toward achieving some of the urban form and transportation goals listed in the RCP, but not others. The continued increase in annual transit ridership is an encouraging sign that the region’s residents increasingly are traveling by public transit. It is anticipated that this trend likely will continue in light of increasing gas prices and with the opening of the SPRINT rail line. Future monitoring is required to fully understand our progress toward improving mobility. When examining travel times and volumes in key auto and transit corridors, this indicator suggests that the region is reasonably managing congestion, as freeway travel times and volumes mostly have decreased between 2006 and 2007.
Despite the sharp fall in housing prices during the last year, the lack of affordable housing continues to be one of the major issues facing the San Diego region today. The Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) calls for more housing choices—more apartments, condominiums, and single family homes in all price ranges. How much housing we build, what type of housing we build, and where we build it are some of the most important decisions we can make in shaping our region’s future. The Smart Growth Opportunity Areas located on the Smart Growth Concept Map identify 200 sites throughout the region where new housing can be located near jobs and transit—thus providing more housing and transportation choices.

**Housing Opportunity Index**

Data from 2007 indicates that the downward trend in housing affordability since 2000 finally may be reversing. During 2007, there was a doubling (from 5% in 2005 and 2006 to 10% in 2007) in the percentage of homes sold that are affordable to a household earning the regional median income, as shown in Figure 8. This change is likely the result of the mortgage lending crisis and increase in foreclosures that have affected the region, as well as the country as a whole. Housing, however, is still out of reach for many households in the region. The median price of all homes (resale houses, resale condominiums, and new houses/condominiums and condominium conversions) dropped by 25 percent from $495,500 in June 2007, to $370,000 in June 2008 (DataQuick Information Systems). The current median home price is almost six times the regional median household income of $68,388. Historically, the median price of a home has been three to four times the median income.

**Figure 8**

Housing Opportunity Index, 2000 to 2007

---

**Percent of Households with Housing Costs Greater than 35 Percent of Income**

Since 2000, an increasing percentage of households in the region have been paying more than 35 percent of their income toward housing costs. This trend may be stabilizing, because the change between 2005 and 2006 is not statistically significant, as shown in Figure 9. Year-to-year fluctuations in the data may be the result of sample differences and may not reflect true year-to-year changes.
Another indicator of affordability problems in the region is the income a household must earn to afford the rent for an apartment at the Department of Housing and Urban Development's Fair Market Rent of $1,355 for a two-bedroom unit. In 2007/2008 that amount was $54,200 annually or $26 per hour (assuming that no more than 30 percent of its income is spent on housing), as shown in Figure 10.

In California, the minimum wage in 2008 is $8.00 per hour; the average wage earned by renters in the San Diego region is $15.64 per hour. Therefore, a household must include over three minimum wage earners working forty hours per week year-round, to make a two-bedroom fair market rent affordable.

**Ratio of New Jobs to New Housing Units**

The ratio of new jobs to new housing units has fluctuated since 2001, and in 2007 experienced a threefold decline compared to 2006. In 2007, there were 0.5 new jobs for every new housing unit in the region, indicative of the economic slowdown and associated decline in job growth, as shown in Figure 11.
Share of New Housing Units by Income Category

A total of 22,816 building permits for new housing units were issued in the region between July 2005 and December 2007 (2.5 years of the five-year housing element cycle), including 1,250 very low-income, 1,475 low-income, 1,258 moderate-income, and 18,833 above moderate-income housing units, as shown in Table 5. Based on the 2005 – 2010 Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) adopted by SANDAG in February 2005, the region achieved 5 percent of the very low-income, 8 percent of the low-income, 6 percent of the moderate-income, and 42 percent of the above moderate-income housing needs established in the RHNA. The data show that the above moderate-income housing needs established in the RHNA are closer to being met, while the housing needs for very low-, low-, and moderate-income households are not. The subsidies needed to build very low-and low-income housing in the region are inadequate to meet the region’s lower income RHNA goals despite the approval of the statewide affordable housing bonds in 2002 and 2006. Few moderate income units were built because of the high costs associated with land and construction materials and the requirement to use most financial resources to build lower income units. Building permit issuance has dropped off during the past year, so the construction of above moderate-income units may slow over the next two years.

Overall, the region has met only 21 percent of its RHNA housing goal of 107,301 units during the first half of the housing element cycle.

Table 5
Share of New Housing Units by Income Category, July 1, 2005 – December 31, 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Above Moderate</th>
<th>Total for All Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Housing Units Produced</strong></td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>1,475</td>
<td>1,258</td>
<td>18,833</td>
<td>22,816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Housing Units Permitted</strong></td>
<td>24,143</td>
<td>18,348</td>
<td>20,280</td>
<td>44,530</td>
<td>107,301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent of Goal Permitted</strong></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Units Left to Permit</strong></td>
<td>22,893</td>
<td>16,873</td>
<td>19,022</td>
<td>25,697</td>
<td>84,485</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Vacancy Rates

Vacancy rates have remained relatively stable since 2000, at approximately 4.5 percent as shown in Figure 12. Year-to-year fluctuations in the data may be the result of sample differences and may not reflect true year-to-year changes.
Figure 12
Vacancy Rates, 2000 to 2007

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

Percent of Households Living in Overcrowded Conditions

As shown in Figure 13, the percentage of households living in overcrowded conditions in the region continues to decline. Fluctuations in the data between 2005 and 2006 may be the result of sample differences and may not reflect true year-to-year changes.

Figure 13
Overcrowding in the Region, 2000 to 2006

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

Number of Households on the Waiting List for Section 8 Vouchers

In 2008, there are approximately 49,700 households on the Section 8 waiting list, down from approximately 65,600 households in 2007 and 73,500 households in 2006. The reduction is likely the result of the periodic purging of the lists undertaken by the Section 8 jurisdictions. The jurisdictions that issue Section 8 vouchers are Carlsbad, Encinitas, National City, Oceanside, the City of San Diego, and the County of San Diego.

Conclusion

Housing affordability continues to be a problem for the region; however, the above data indicate that the rapid decline in affordability (i.e., increase in housing costs) may have slowed for the time being. Much of this change has been due to the decline in housing prices, resulting from the large number of foreclosures experienced both in the region and nationwide. Nevertheless, progress toward meeting RHNA goals has been slow, particularly in the lower and moderate income categories.
Healthy Environment

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

Habitat Conserved Within Designated Preserve Areas

Of the jurisdictions with approved conservation plans and signed implementing agreements, 58 percent of land has been conserved within the habitat preserve system, as shown in Figure 14. This includes 6,090 acres preserved to date within the City of Carlsbad.

Additionally, the City of San Diego and County of San Diego have indicated that an additional 15,400 acres and 12,200 acres, respectively, have been obligated for habitat conservation under approved discretionary development entitlements or conservation banks, but have not yet been conserved through formal legal mechanisms (e.g., easement, dedication in fee title to jurisdictions).

Figure 14
MSCP South County and MHCP Land Conservation by Year, 1997 to 2031

The region is engaging in the implementation or development of four subregional habitat conservation plans: the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) South, finalized in 1998; the Multiple Habitat Conservation Program (MHCP), finalized in 2003; the North County MSCP, anticipated for completion in 2009; and the East County MSCP, anticipated for completion in 2010. Map 2 shows the location and boundaries of these plans.
Six jurisdictions, including a portion of the unincorporated area of the County, have approved habitat conservation plans and signed implementing agreements (covering 20% of the region). Seven jurisdictions are working on approval of their implementing agreements, (covering 73% of the region), and seven jurisdictions are not pursuing implementing agreements due to limited habitat in their jurisdictions (covering 1% of the region). The remaining area (covering 6% of the region) consists of land owned by the U.S. military.

**Percent of Preserve Area Actively Maintained**

Based upon the estimates of land conserved in the region described in the previous section, over one million acres in the region are managed as open space with dedicated land managers. This includes land in North and East County MSCP that are federal, state, and locally owned and conserved for open space and habitat. There is currently no regional database that tracks the lands under active management or the activities that have been conducted on these lands. As part of SANDAG participation in regional habitat conservation planning, a conserved lands database is being developed to serve as a baseline for tracking this information. SANDAG currently is working to provide the draft data to local jurisdictions and federal and state land managers for verification. Updated data should be available within six to nine months.

**Number of Beach Mile Closure Days**

The number of beach mile closure days fluctuated between 2000 and 2004, but has been relatively stable since 2004, as shown in Figure 15. The number of beach mile closure days increased slightly from 2006 to 2007.

Despite the slight increase, the Beach Report Card 2007-2008, published by Heal the Bay, reported that 96 percent of San Diego county beaches attain grades of “A” or “B” during dry weather, compared to 87 percent of beaches statewide. Heal the Bay’s findings regarding wet weather trends in 2006 and 2007 for San Diego beaches appear consistent with the beach closure data reported above—during wet weather, 70 percent of San Diego beaches received grades of “A” or “B” in 2006, and in 2007 this number dropped to 67 percent.
Figure 15
Weather-Adjusted Beach Mile Closure Days, 2000 to 2007

Sources: Annual Beach Closure and Advisory Report, County of San Diego Department of Environmental Health; Western U.S. Historical Summaries, Western Regional Climate Center

Beach Widths

Despite all beaches having more sand in 2006 than they did in 2005, likely due to wave conditions, all beaches lost sand in 2007, as shown in Table 6. Wave conditions in the summer of 2006 were more conducive to the onshore transport of sand than those in the summers of 2005 and 2007. As predicted in last year’s report, the unanticipated increase in beach width that occurred between 2005 and 2006 quickly was reversed by less favorable wave conditions. At the time of the 2005 survey, three consecutive years of shoreline retreat had diminished the beach widths at most locations to such an extent that they were equal to or less than pre-Regional Beach Sand Project values (prior to 2001). The area-wide shoreline advance that occurred in 2006 was sufficient to restore the beach widths to levels not observed since the first two years following the Regional Beach Sand Project (RBSP). In 2007, some beaches exceeded their target widths.

Table 6
Beach Widths and Targets of Shoreline Segments San Diego Region (in feet), 2000 to 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall Averages</th>
<th>1998</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2010 Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Silver Strand Littoral Cell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Beach</td>
<td>300.0</td>
<td>218.0</td>
<td>218.0</td>
<td>308.0</td>
<td>218.0</td>
<td>217.0</td>
<td>221.0</td>
<td>229.0</td>
<td>307.0</td>
<td>234.0</td>
<td>238.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver Strand State Beach</td>
<td>427.0</td>
<td>461.0</td>
<td>448.0</td>
<td>451.5</td>
<td>451.6</td>
<td>449.0</td>
<td>434.5</td>
<td>438.5</td>
<td>486.0</td>
<td>453.5</td>
<td>210.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronado</td>
<td>759.0</td>
<td>758.0</td>
<td>767.0</td>
<td>784.0</td>
<td>767.0</td>
<td>768.0</td>
<td>764.0</td>
<td>737.0</td>
<td>750.0</td>
<td>784.0</td>
<td>232.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Beach Littoral Cell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean Beach</td>
<td>278.0</td>
<td>282.0</td>
<td>274.0</td>
<td>283.0</td>
<td>295.0</td>
<td>259.0</td>
<td>264.0</td>
<td>260.0</td>
<td>305.0</td>
<td>284.0</td>
<td>220.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific and Mission Beaches</td>
<td>238.5</td>
<td>273.0</td>
<td>286.0</td>
<td>277.7</td>
<td>279.3</td>
<td>282.3</td>
<td>283.7</td>
<td>268.3</td>
<td>301.7</td>
<td>254.0</td>
<td>200.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Jolla</td>
<td>182.0</td>
<td>141.0</td>
<td>192.0</td>
<td>213.0</td>
<td>183.0</td>
<td>229.0</td>
<td>219.0</td>
<td>224.0</td>
<td>223.0</td>
<td>183.0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>194.3</td>
<td>192.0</td>
<td>226.0</td>
<td>265.5</td>
<td>250.5</td>
<td>209.3</td>
<td>217.8</td>
<td>216.0</td>
<td>236.0</td>
<td>182.5</td>
<td>228.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Mar</td>
<td>185.5</td>
<td>227.0</td>
<td>166.0</td>
<td>133.3</td>
<td>167.3</td>
<td>157.3</td>
<td>120.7</td>
<td>102.3</td>
<td>158.0</td>
<td>106.0</td>
<td>232.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solana Beach</td>
<td>134.0</td>
<td>123.0</td>
<td>108.0</td>
<td>171.0</td>
<td>141.0</td>
<td>138.0</td>
<td>130.0</td>
<td>157.0</td>
<td>116.0</td>
<td>232.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encinitas</td>
<td>157.5</td>
<td>134.0</td>
<td>152.3</td>
<td>183.0</td>
<td>177.3</td>
<td>181.3</td>
<td>175.0</td>
<td>150.3</td>
<td>201.8</td>
<td>140.8</td>
<td>240.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiff</td>
<td>161.3</td>
<td>171.5</td>
<td>182.8</td>
<td>190.4</td>
<td>210.2</td>
<td>212.8</td>
<td>189.4</td>
<td>177.2</td>
<td>205.8</td>
<td>178.4</td>
<td>216.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside</td>
<td>283.0</td>
<td>278.3</td>
<td>287.3</td>
<td>287.0</td>
<td>254.7</td>
<td>302.7</td>
<td>265.0</td>
<td>277.7</td>
<td>300.7</td>
<td>248.0</td>
<td>232.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The SANDAG Regional Beach Sand Project nourished 12 of the region’s beaches in 2001.
Source: SANDAG Regional Beach Monitoring Program, Annual Report 2008

4 In 2001, the RBSP nourished twelve of the region’s beaches. Since the completion of the RBSP, little to no sand has been placed on area beaches.
Lagoon Health

Data are unavailable for this indicator.\(^5\)

Impaired Waterbodies

There are no new data for this indicator. Between 2002 and 2006, impaired waterbodies in the region increased, as shown in Figure 16. Impaired waterbodies are those that do not meet Clean Water Act standards. This list is prepared every four years by the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board.

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

Figure 16
Impaired Waterbodies, 2002 and 2006

Air Quality Index

UPDATED AIR QUALITY INDEX DATA WILL BE INCLUDED WHEN THE REPORT IS BROUGHT TO THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE IN DECEMBER.

Conclusion

The region continues to make progress on habitat conservation, and further progress is anticipated as the North and East County MSCPs are adopted. As of 2007, the region has been experiencing mixed results with regard to water quality. The number of beach mile closure days has stabilized in recent years, but has not decreased overall. In addition, pollution in our region’s lakes, streams, rivers, bays, and lagoons has gotten worse. Mixed results also are observed with regard to shoreline preservation and air quality. In large part, beach widths have decreased since the region’s beach sand replenishment project in 2001;

\(^5\) The City of Encinitas is charged with overseeing the collection of data regarding bacterial levels in the region’s lagoons. Their data methodology is being finalized. Once this data is available, SANDAG may utilize it to report on this indicator.
an increase in 2006 was followed by further decreases in 2007. In FY 2009, SANDAG is evaluating strategies to fund improvements to water quality, habitat preservation, and beach nourishment.
The Regional Economic Prosperity Strategy (REPS), originally developed in 1998, was updated this year. REPS identifies strategic goals and recommends actions that call for infrastructure investment and public policy support in order to strengthen the region’s economic foundation. REPS is based upon the premise that investments in human and physical infrastructure will lead to stronger businesses and a well-trained workforce, ultimately leading to improvements in the regional standard of living.

**Labor Force Educational Attainment**

Labor force educational attainment remains stable, as shown in Figure 17. Year-to-year fluctuations in the data may be the result of sample differences and may not reflect true year-to-year changes.

**Figure 17**

Labor Force Educational Attainment, 2000 to 2006

![Labor Force Educational Attainment Chart](source)

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

**Employment Growth in High-Wage Economic Clusters**

There are no new data available for this indicator. In 2005, there was a slight increase in employment in high-wage economic clusters over 2002 and 2003, as shown in Figure 18.

**Figure 18**


![Employment Growth Chart](source)

*Source: SANDAG Cluster Inventory*
Regional Unemployment Rate Compared to California and the United States

After three years of improvement, San Diego’s unemployment rate increased in 2007, and matched that of the United States for the first time in seven years, as shown in Figure 19.

Figure 19
Unemployment in San Diego, California, and the United States, 2000 to 2007

Real Per Capita Income Compared to California and the United States

In 2006, San Diego’s real per capita income increased. It remains above that of California and the United States, though it is not increasing as quickly in San Diego as it is in California and the United States, as shown in Figure 20.

Figure 20
Real Per Capita Income in San Diego, California, and the United States in Inflation-Adjusted 2007 Dollars, 2000 to 2007

Regional Poverty Rate Compared to California and the United States

The San Diego region’s poverty rate remains stable and below that of California and the United States, as shown in Figure 21. Year-to-year fluctuations in the data may be the result of sample differences and may not reflect true year-to-year changes.
Conclusion

Unemployment increased in 2007 in the San Diego region, paralleling California’s increase in unemployment. However, the region continues to experience a rising standard of living, as measured by real per capita income, though it is not keeping pace with California or the United States as a whole. Other indicators of economic prosperity in the region appear to be stable. San Diego’s REPS contains strategic goals and recommended actions to help improve the condition of the local economy. It calls for infrastructure investment and public policy support to strengthen the region’s economic foundation and make it more competitive. These policy efforts and infrastructure investments will ensure that the region reinforces its status as one of the most desirable places in the nation to work and live. Above all, the strategic goals and recommended actions are designed to expand and create high- and middle-income jobs, which will ensure a rising standard of living for the region’s residents. Future monitoring reports will measure the success of these strategies.
Water Consumption

As reported previously, water consumption continues to fluctuate, but increased in 2006, as shown in Figure 22.

Figure 22
Water Consumption, 2000 to 2006

![Water Consumption Chart](chart)

Source: San Diego County Water Authority Annual Reports (fiscal year Water Supply by Source)

Diversity of Water Supply

The diversity of the region’s water supply has been increasing in recent years, but reliance on the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California as a source increased slightly in 2007. However, the share of water that is recycled has shown a slight increase, as shown in Figure 23.

Figure 23

![Water Supply Chart](chart)

1 IID Transfer refers to water conveyed to the region from the Imperial Irrigation District. Canal Lining Transfer refers to water conserved as a result of the concrete lining of the All-American and Coachella canals in the Imperial Valley.

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

As predicted in last year’s report, the amount of recycled water used continues to increase as the region continues to invest in infrastructure and consumer awareness, as shown in Figure 24. Recycled water use has fluctuated since 2000, but increased 29 percent in 2007, following an 18 percent increase in 2006. These increases may be due to a few new larger water recycling facilities that have begun serving new customers in the region. In addition, agencies have been providing recycled water retrofit assistance to existing customers in order to expedite hook-ups to their recycled water systems. It is anticipated that the amount of recycled water used will continue to increase as the region continues to invest in infrastructure and consumer awareness.

Figure 24
Amount of Recycled Water Used, 2000 to 2007

Per Capita Electricity Consumption and Peak Demand

Per capita electricity consumption continues to increase and move further away from the target established in the 2003 Regional Energy Strategy (RES), as shown in Figure 25. Figure 26 illustrates that peak demand is increasing as well.

Figure 25
San Diego Annual Per Capita Electricity Consumption, 2000 to 2007

Source: San Diego Gas & Electric
Share of Energy Produced in the Region Versus Imported

In 2006, the region reached the target established in the 2003 RES for share of energy produced in the region versus imported, but this share declined slightly in 2007, as shown in Figure 27.

Figure 27
Share of Energy Produced In-County as Compared to Total County Requirement, 2000 to 2007

Share of Energy Produced from Renewable Resources

Five percent of the region’s electricity comes from renewable resources. In 2003, the RES called for 15 percent from renewable resources\(^6\) by 2010. Subsequently, state law was enacted requiring 20 percent renewable energy resources by 2010. An Executive Order calls for 33 percent renewable resources by 2020. Thus far, the region’s primary electric utility, San Diego Gas & Electric (SDG&E), has slowly increased the percentage of renewable resources in its overall portfolio. Additional renewable resources will be needed to meet the 20 percent by 2010 requirement, as shown in Figure 28.

---

\(^6\) The RES will be updated in FY 2009, and the regional targets will be reevaluated at that time.
As shown in Figure 29, natural gas supplies more than half of the fuel to generate electricity for the San Diego region. Natural gas is the most environmentally benign fossil fuel and the only fossil fuel that the state permits to power electricity. The renewable resources percentage must increase significantly to meet state minimum requirements. Purchased power refers to power that is sold to SDG&E but the energy source is unknown. This unknown percentage should shrink over time as California Department of Water Resources contracts entered into during the energy crisis are phased out.

**Percent of Solid Waste that is Recycled**

The percent of solid waste that is recycled in the region increased in 2006, moving closer to the state-mandated target, as shown in Figure 30. The target calls for a 50 percent solid waste diversion rate; in 2006, 48 percent of solid waste was diverted from landfills.\(^8\)

---

\(^7\) These values are based on the California Public Utility Commission’s Renewable Portfolio Standard Rules, and thus, do not include customer-owned Photovoltaic.

\(^8\) The percent of solid waste that was recycled in 2006 is based on a preliminary estimate; it is anticipated that when this estimate is revised, it will be higher than originally was estimated and will show that the region actually has achieved or exceeded the state-mandated target.
Landfill Space Available

For the regional landfill system as a whole, there appears to be an adequate supply of physical landfill capacity in terms of land area and air space until approximately 2016, but there is a significant limiting factor because present permitted daily tonnages at the landfills will not accommodate projected tonnages in the near future. Permitted daily tonnages for each landfill are determined by environmental concerns such as traffic, noise, water quality, and odors. Based on these limitations, estimates from the San Diego County Integrated Waste Management Plan Countywide Siting Element indicate that the region actually will reach capacity in terms of permitted daily tonnage prior to 2016, unless other changes are made, such as reducing the amount of trash generated in the region, and extending the hours of operation for trash collecting and hauling. This estimate is based on existing permitted regional capacity, excluding the San Onofre and Las Pulgas landfills located in Camp Pendleton.

The estimate also was based on assumptions such as reaching a regionwide solid waste diversion rate of 50 percent by 2005, and slight increases in total disposal and exported solid waste. According to the California Integrated Waste Management Board preliminary estimates, the region reached a 48 percent solid waste diversion rate in 2006, and progress continues to be made.

The County and City of San Diego are working actively on a number of options to expand physical landfill capacity. There are current efforts underway at both Sycamore Canyon and Miramar landfills to expand the landfill area. A new landfill at Gregory Canyon also is proposed but has not received final permits.

Every year there has been some solid waste exported from San Diego County. Export tonnage has fluctuated from year to year. In 1995, the region exported 14 percent of its waste compared to 4 percent in 2001.

According to the 2005 Countywide Siting Element, if the Sycamore Canyon landfill expansion and proposed Gregory Canyon landfill are approved with proposed increases in daily permitted disposal tonnages, the region may need to export 7.2 percent of its waste in 2017 to meet the region’s disposal need of 6.1 million tons. If neither landfill proposal is approved without using other strategies, the region may export significantly more of its waste in 2017.

Conclusion

Regional water consumption continues to fluctuate, as consumption increased slightly in 2007 following declining consumption in 2006. It is particularly important to note that there continues to be a significant increase in the amount of recycled water used. Our per capita usage and the share of energy produced within the region are moving away from the targets set in the RES, and after six years of increasing our share of energy produced from renewable resources, this share declined in 2007.
Regarding solid waste management, the region almost has reached its state-mandated recycling target, but must continue moving in this direction in order to avoid running out of landfill space. Unless proposed permit changes are implemented, the region will reach permitted landfill capacity prior to 2016.
The region’s distinct characteristics present a variety of opportunities and challenges for planning and coordinating along our interregional and binational borders. Access to jobs and housing continues to be an important issue. As people move farther away from their places of employment, increased pressure is placed upon our interregional transportation systems.

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

After years of steady increases, the number of interregional trips into San Diego from Baja California, Orange County, Riverside County, and Imperial County appears to be stabilizing. The number of trips into San Diego from Riverside County continued to increase in 2006, but to a lesser extent than in previous years. In addition, the annual number of pedestrian trips into San Diego from Baja California continues to decline, as shown in Figures 31 and 32.

**Figure 31**
San Diego Region Average Weekday Traffic Volumes to and from Orange, Imperial, and Riverside Counties and Tijuana, Baja California, 2000 to 2006

![Graph showing average weekday traffic volumes](image)

*Source: Caltrans Traffic Census*

**Figure 32**
Pedestrian Border Crossings from Tijuana into San Diego, 1997 to 2007

![Graph showing pedestrian border crossings](image)

*Source: SANDAG*
Border Wait Times

There are no new data for this indicator in 2007, as the data source used in previous years has been eliminated. SANDAG is pursuing a new source of border wait times data and hopes to be able to continue reporting on this indicator in future years. As of 2006, border wait times were increasing, as shown in Figure 33.

Figure 33
Average Border Wait Times – Northbound into San Diego from Tijuana, 2004 to 2006


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

There are a total of 115,000 Secure Electronic Network for Travelers Rapid Inspection (SENTRI) participants as of 2008, which represents 18,000 more participants than were reported in 2007, as shown in Figure 34. There are no new data for the Pedestrian Commuter Program and the Free and Secure Trade Program.

Figure 34
SENTRI Participants, 2006 to 2008

Source: SANDAG Border Crossing Data

Conclusion

The volume of commutes into San Diego from surrounding counties and Baja California appears to have stabilized. Finally, there are 18,000 new participants in the SENTRI program.
Summary and Conclusions

The results of the 2008 Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) Annual Performance Monitoring Report highlight those areas in which the region appears to be moving in the right direction and those in which improvement is needed:

Moving in the Right Direction

- The share of new housing units built in Smart Growth Opportunity Areas increased.
- Annual hours of traffic delay per traveler have decreased.
- Transit ridership continued to increase.
- The regional crime rate continued to decrease.
- The percent of solid waste that was recycled was close to achieving the state-mandated target.\(^9\)
- Recycled water use continued to increase substantially.

Areas for Improvement

- Housing production in the very low, low, and moderate income categories did not keep pace with above-moderate housing production: 42 percent of the above moderate-income housing goal identified in the RHNA has been met, while less than 10 percent of the very low-, low-, and moderate-income housing goal has been met. Overall, only 21 percent of the RHNA housing production goal has been met during the first half of the housing element cycle.
- Regionwide, the share of commutes made by transit, walking, bicycling, and carpool/vanpool have not increased substantially.
- Following beach width increases at all beaches in 2006, beach widths declined in 2007; for multiple beaches, widths are even smaller in 2007 than they were in 2005.
- Unemployment increased for the first time in three years.
- Per capita energy usage in the region continued to increase, moving further away from the target established in the Regional Energy Strategy.
- Plans estimate that the region will reach physical landfill capacity in 2016, but unless proposed permit changes are implemented, permitted capacity could be reached prior to 2016.

The region would expect to experience improvements in the areas listed above as the initiatives recommended in the RCP are developed and implemented. SANDAG is involved in a number of efforts that ideally will result in improvements to the region’s quality of life and reflect progress in future monitoring reports such as:

- TransNet Early Action Program projects;
- Transit improvements, such as Bus Rapid Transit on Interstate 15;

\(^9\) The percent of solid waste that was recycled in 2006 is based on a preliminary estimate; it is anticipated that when this estimate is revised, it will be higher than originally estimated and show that the region actually has achieved or exceeded the state-mandated target.
DRAFT

- Funding for smart growth through the TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program and the Transportation Act/TransNet Bicycle and Pedestrian Funding Program;

- Strategies recommended in the Regional Economic Prosperity Strategy update earlier this year; and
