

II. The Benchmark System for the *Countywide Planning Policies*

Background

In 1990 the Washington State Legislature passed the Growth Management Act (GMA). For the first time in the State's history, all urban counties and their cities were required to develop and adopt comprehensive plans and regulations to implement the plans. To achieve an interjurisdictional coordinated countywide plan, GMA further required that King County and its 35 cities first develop framework policies, the King County *Countywide Planning Policies*, to guide the development of the jurisdictions' plans.

The *Countywide Planning Policies* (CPPs) define the countywide vision for the county and cities' plans. The policies were developed by the Growth Management Planning Council, a group of 15 elected officials, representing all King County citizens, adopted by the Metropolitan King County Council and ratified by the cities in 1994.

Purpose

The *Countywide Planning Policies* are primarily goals that, if properly implemented, should improve the quality of life in King County during the next twenty years.

When the members of the Growth Management Planning Council (GMPC) approved the policies, they expressed an interest in creating a system that would tell future decision makers whether or not the policies are achieving their intended outcomes. The 1998 Benchmark Report is the third annual account to monitor the CPPs.

The purpose of creating a benchmark system is to provide the GMPC, other policy makers and the public with a method for evaluating jurisdictions' progress in implementing the *Countywide Planning Policies*. The system for the Benchmark Report was established by stating the outcomes of the CPPs; selecting relevant Indicators for each outcome, and then identifying quantifiable levels of achievement, or targets, for some of the Indicators.

Why a Benchmark Report for the Countywide Planning Policies?

Generally, the Indicators that the Benchmark Committee has produced should be used as the GMPC originally intended: to enable future decision makers to determine whether or not the *Countywide Planning Policies* are being implemented in a way which achieves their intended outcomes.

The Benchmark System, which includes these Indicators, should also provide early warning if the policies are not having their desired effects. In that case, the system should provide sufficient information to enable policy-makers to determine whether different actions to implement the policies are needed, or whether minor or major revisions to the policies are required.

More specifically, the Benchmark System should be used to help the jurisdictions of King County establish priorities, take joint actions, and direct resources to solve problems identified in the *Countywide Planning Policies*.

Data Sources in the Benchmark Report

The Benchmark Committee strives to provide the best data available for the Indicators to track the *Countywide Planning Policies* as adopted in 1994. In order to ensure data reliability, the Benchmark Committee will revise and, if necessary, correct data on an annual basis, when new and better sources become available.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Outcomes

PROMOTE FAMILY-WAGE JOBS
INCREASE INCOME AND REDUCE POVERTY

INCREASE BUSINESS FORMATION, EXPANSION AND
RETENTION

CREATE JOBS THAT ADD TO KING COUNTY'S ECONOMIC
BASE
INCREASE EDUCATIONAL SKILL LEVELS

Indicators

1. Real wages per worker.
2. Personal and median household income: King County compared to the United States.
3. Percentage of population below the poverty level.
4. New businesses created.
5. New jobs created by employment sector.
6. Employment in industries that export from the region.
7. Educational background of adult population.
8. High school graduation rate.

ENVIRONMENT

Outcomes

PROTECT AND ENHANCE NATURAL ECOSYSTEMS

IMPROVE AIR QUALITY

PROTECT WATER QUALITY AND QUANTITY

PROTECT WETLANDS
PROTECT THE DIVERSITY OF PLANTS AND WILDLIFE

INCREASE SALMON STOCK
DECREASE NOISE LEVELS

DECREASE WASTE DISPOSAL AND INCREASE RECYCLING

Indicators

9. Land cover changes in urban and rural areas over time.
10. Air quality.
11. Energy consumption.
12. Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) per year.
13. Surface water and groundwater quality.
14. Water consumption.
15. Change in groundwater levels. *
16. Change in wetland acreage and functions.
17. Continuity of terrestrial and aquatic habitat networks.
*
18. Change in number of salmon.
19. Rate of increase in noise from vehicles, planes and yard equipment.
20. Pounds of waste disposed and recycled per capita.

AFFORDABLE HOUSING

Outcomes

PROVIDE SUFFICIENT AFFORDABLE HOUSING FOR ALL KING COUNTY RESIDENTS

PROMOTE AFFORDABLE HOME OWNERSHIP OPPORTUNITIES

PROMOTE EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION OF AFFORDABLE LOW-INCOME HOUSING THROUGHOUT KING COUNTY

Indicators

21. Supply and demand for affordable housing
22. Percent of income paid for housing.
23. Homelessness.
26. Apartment vacancy rate.
24. Home purchase affordability gap for buyers with (a) median renter household income and (b) median household income.
25. Home ownership rate.
27. Trend of housing costs vs. income
28. Public dollars spent for low income housing.
29. Housing units affordable to low income households.

LAND USE

Outcomes

ENCOURAGE A GREATER SHARE OF GROWTH IN URBAN AREAS AND URBAN CENTERS; LIMIT GROWTH IN RURAL/RESOURCE AREAS

MAKE EFFICIENT USE OF URBAN LAND

ACCOMMODATE RESIDENTIAL AND JOB GROWTH IN URBAN AREAS

ENCOURAGE LIVABLE, DIVERSE COMMUNITIES
BALANCE JOB AND HOUSEHOLD GROWTH

MAINTAIN QUALITY AND QUANTITY OF NATURAL RESOURCE LANDS

Indicators

30. New housing units in Urban Areas and Rural/Resource areas, and in Urban Centers.
31. Employment in Urban Areas, Rural/Resource Areas, Urban Centers and Manufacturing/Industrial Centers.
32. New housing units built through redevelopment.
33. Ratio of land consumption to population growth.
34. Ratio of achieved density to allowed density of residential development.
35. Land capacity as a percent of 20 year household and job targets.
36. Land with 6 years of infrastructure capacity. *
37. Acres of urban parks and open space.
38. Ratio of jobs to housing in Central Puget Sound Counties, and King County sub-regions.
39. Acres in forest land and farm land.
40. Number and average size of farms.

TRANSPORTATION

Outcomes

TRANSPORTATION AND LAND USE LINKAGE

AVAILABILITY OF MODES OTHER THAN SINGLE OCCUPANT VEHICLE
MODE SPLIT

REDUCE COMMERCIAL TRAFFIC CONGESTION

PROTECT AND IMPROVE TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE

Indicators

41. Percent of residents who commute one-way within 30 minutes.
42. Transit trips per person.
43. Percent of residents who walk or use transit, bicycles or carpools as alternatives to the single occupant vehicle.
44. Ability of goods and services to move efficiently and cost effectively through the region.
45. Number of lane miles of city, county, and state roads and bridges in need of repair and preservation.

* Data for these Indicators were not collected for the 1998 Benchmark Report.

Economic Development Indicators

The key outcomes of the Countywide Planning Policies' (CPPs) economic development policies are to:

- Promote Family-Wage Jobs
- Increase Income and Reduce Poverty
- Increase Business Formation, Expansion and Retention
- Create Jobs that Add to King County's Economic Base
- Increase Educational Skills

Key Observations

Indicator #1 Real wages per worker.

- Real wages rose 5.3% from 1994 to 1996, after largely stagnating between 1980 and 1994. A slight increase in 1995 was followed by a more significant increase in 1996, bringing real wages in King County to their highest level in seventeen years.

Indicator #2 Personal and median household income: King County compared to the United States.

- King County personal income exceeded the nationwide average income by 38% in 1995 and by 41% in 1996. For the period from 1980 to the present, the difference between King County personal income and nationwide income has increased by approximately 11%.

Indicator #3 Percentage of population below the poverty level.

- From 1980 to 1990 there was an increase in the percentage of people living in poverty for all ethnic groups, except whites. Data for this indicator speaks to the income gap, in which the rich have been getting richer and the poor have been getting poorer. This phenomenon has been reported nationally, and our regional data confirm this trend.
- The highest rates of poverty are among Native Americans and Blacks, particularly among children. One-third of people in these ethnic groups live in poverty. Smaller percentages of Asian and Hispanic children are below the poverty level. Yet in terms of total numbers, over half of King County's 32,600 poverty-level children are White.

Indicator #4 New businesses created.

- In the late 1980s, new businesses were formed at a rate of almost five percent per year. Since 1990, the rate has been variable, declining in 1995 and rising again in 1996 by 1,249 new businesses. This rather volatile indicator is one which deserves careful monitoring.

Indicator #5 New jobs created by employment sector.

- From 1995 to 1996 overall employment opportunity has increased substantially with 38,800 new jobs added, a rise of 4.1% in one year.

Indicator #6 Employment in industries that export from the region.

- Industries that have a significant export component bring income into our local area as they export goods outside of our area. Growth in export sectors has been strong over the long term, but shows cyclical variability.
- These industries form our economic base. We are used to thinking of that base as manufacturing industries, but now it is increasingly driven by service-oriented businesses. About 40% of our export base involves business, professional, and financial services. Business services include Microsoft and many of the other high technology firms that do software related work.
- The number of jobs in manufacturing is about the same as it was in 1980. Currently the manufacturing sector still accounts for 30% of King County's jobs in export sectors.

Indicator #7 Educational background of adult population.

- About 88% of the County's adult population are high school graduates, compared to 77% nationally. Data continues to show that those who do not complete high school earn only about 42% of what is earned by college graduates. Male dropouts earn only 39% of males with bachelor's degrees. From 1991 - 1995 the real earnings of males who did not finish high school fell almost 10%.
- A full 33% of King County adults have a college degree compared with 21% nationally. Nevertheless, other research indicates we are importing college graduates to meet our labor force needs.

Indicator #8 High school graduation rate.

- The overall graduation rate has remained fairly stable around 84% from 1988 to 1994, but dropped to 79.7% in 1996.
- In the 1991/1992 school year (the most recent for which race/ethnic breakdowns are available), the graduation rate for Asian students was 88.7%; for Black students, 73.7%; for Native American students, 76.6%; for White students, 84%; and for Hispanic students, 74.5%.

Environmental Indicators

The key outcomes of the Countywide Planning Policies' (CPPs) environmental policies are to:

- Protect and Enhance Natural Ecosystems
- Improve Air Quality
- Protect Water Quality and Quantity
- Protect Wetlands
- Increase Salmon Stock
- Decrease Waste Disposal and Increase Recycling

Key Observations

Indicator #9 Land cover changes in urban and rural areas over time.

- King County has the smallest percent increase in developed land area by county between 1984 and 1992 compared to Pierce, Snohomish and Kitsap counties. King County has the largest percent of its total land area developed at 11.6% in 1992 compared to the above three counties.

Indicator#10 Air quality

- The number of good air quality days has increased from 73 in 1980 to 321 in 1997 and the number of unhealthful days has decreased from 18 days in 1980 to no unhealthful days in 1997.

Indicator #11 BTU consumption per capita

- Total energy consumption has increased 28.2% since 1986 mainly due to population growth and economic growth, but also due to higher per capita usage.
- Per capita automotive consumption rose a sharp 3.6% from 1996 to 1997 after a declining trend of almost 9% from 1990 - 1996.

Indicator #12 Vehicle miles traveled per year

- Vehicle miles traveled *per capita* has increased 47% between 1985 and 1997 and total vehicle miles traveled has increased by 81% in the same period while the population grew by 21%.
- The continued suburbanization of new population and employment in the county can mean a higher use of motor vehicles for all travel purposes. Autos are generally the mode of choice in the suburbs.

Indicator #13 Surface water and groundwater quality

- Among all the monitored lakes in the region, about 31% have the lowered water clarity, higher chlorophyll a values and higher total phosphorus values typical of aging lakes. This is a natural process. However, deterioration of trophic status during a short period of time may indicate that human activity is hastening the decline in a lake's water quality.

- Over half of King county's monitored streams are considered seriously or moderately degraded based on their Benthic Index of Biotic Integrity (B-IBI) score.

Indicator #14 Water consumption

- In the period from 1985 - 1997 water consumption declined from a high of 130 gallons per capita per day in 1985 to just 106 gallons per capita in 1997, a drop of 18%. Although most of the decline was gradual, the 1992 drought brought about a dramatic one-year drop in water consumption.

Indicator #16 Change in wetland acreage and functions.

- Tracking trends in wetland losses is complicated by several factors. Definitions and classifications of wetlands vary among jurisdictions. It is highly unlikely that wetlands will be completely inventoried. Data are not available to estimate the amount of wetlands that existed at different periods in time in order to conduct comparisons. In order to track acreage gains or losses more accurately, a representative sample of known wetlands within incorporated and unincorporated King County should be monitored over time.
- Although tracking wetland acreages is useful in order to determine net gains or losses, tracking changes in wetland functions is a more critical measure for evaluating wetland health.

Indicator #18 Change in number of wild stock and hatchery-raised salmon.

- The average number of wild adult Chinook salmon returning to spawn in the Lake Washington system during the 1990s has been only about one-half of the average size of runs in the 1980s. Chinook have been declining in the Snoqualmie/Snohomish basin since 1970.
- Wild Coho and wild Sockeye returns are also depressed, especially in the Cedar River/Lake Washington basin.

Indicator #20 Pounds of waste disposed and recycled per capita.

- The amount recycled per capita has steadily increased from 1990 - 1997.
- Solid waste disposal per capita has decreased since 1990, but is expected to rise slightly in 1997.
- Although solid waste disposal per capita has decreased, total waste generated (sum of total disposed and total recycled) per capita has steadily increased. Waste reduction programs have been in place and might reduce waste disposed per capita in the future.

Affordable Housing Indicators

The key outcomes of the Countywide Planning Policies' affordable housing policies are to:

- Provide Sufficient Affordable Housing for all King County Residents
- Promote Affordable Home Ownership Opportunities
- Promote Equitable Distribution of Affordable Low-Income Housing throughout King County

Key Observations

Indicator #21 Supply and demand for affordable housing.

- Households in the lowest income category, who make up 11% of King County's total households, have vastly fewer affordable housing options than higher income groups. In particular, home ownership opportunities are extremely rare.
- In the 1990 Census, there were 68,327 households with incomes less than 30% of median, or \$10,850. Affordable housing for this income range is \$275 per month. There were only 34,695 existing rental units in this range.

Indicator #22 Percent of income paid for housing.

- The lower a household's income is, the more likely they are to pay a higher percentage of their income for housing costs. This is true for renters as well as homeowners.
- When low income families pay more than 30% of their income for housing, resources are often diverted from other essentials -- clothing, food and utilities. These households may also be at greater risk of homelessness.

- Almost 80% of *renter* households in the two lowest income categories paid more than a third of their income to housing costs in 1990. Low income renters are especially vulnerable to high housing costs. They have no protection from rising monthly rents and build no equity in their homes.
- Approximately 45% of *homeowner* households in the two lowest income categories paid more than a third of their income to housing costs in 1990.

Indicator #23 Homelessness.

- Existing estimates of total persons homeless in King County are in the range of 5,500; this number includes an educated guess of the unsheltered population outside Seattle. The unsheltered population that is dispersed outside Seattle is the least documented segment of the homeless. The 5,500 estimate is used as a minimum rather than a true estimate of the magnitude of the problem.

Indicator #24 Home purchase affordability gap for buyers with (a) median renter household income and (b) median household income.

- Fannie Mae surveys have shown that over 80% of renters nationwide would like to own their own home.
- Home ownership is not an affordable option for King County households with typical renter incomes. Factors contributing to this problem include stagnating incomes, rising home prices, and increasing ancillary costs such as fees, taxes and insurance.
- In 1997, the median renter household had an income of \$30,373, or 67% of the County median income. With low down payment financing, this household could afford to purchase a home for \$90,600. The median home price was \$184,800.
- The household earning 100% of the County median income could purchase the median home in 1993 and 1994, but faced an affordability gap from 1995 to 1997. This gap, about \$18,000 in 1997, is expected to increase over the next few years as a local economic boom exerts greater pressure on house prices.

Indicator #25 Home ownership rate.

- Home ownership rates are declining in the Puget Sound region. Decreasing affordability is one factor. Declines in home ownership have been concentrated among specific groups, including married couples with young children and single heads of households.
- The national home ownership policy goal is a 67% home ownership rate.
- In 1995 the home ownership rate for the Seattle Metropolitan Area, which encompasses King, Snohomish and Island Counties, was 61%. The Portland metropolitan area's home ownership rate was 60.3%; Salt Lake City 74.4%; and Denver 65.9%. The San Francisco area's rate was 53.8%.

Indicator #26 Apartment vacancy rate.

- Low vacancy rates suggest demand for new units and upward pressure on rents. High rates suggest excess capacity and downward pressure on rents. A vacancy rate of 5% is generally regarded as a normal market rate.
- King County's average vacancy rates for 1994 and 1995 showed a downward trend from 5.8% to 4.95%. The County's vacancy rate for 1997 fell to 2.8%, hitting a six-year low.

Indicator #27 Trend of housing costs vs. income.

- Average house prices have increased more dramatically than median household income in the past three years. Increases in average rent have correlated more closely with changes in median income.
- Single family home prices reached their maximum rate of increase in the late 1980s -- the annual average increase was 12.5% per year in 1985 through 1990. The rate of increase was slower in the first half of the 1990s, at 3% or less each year. Although the rate of increase was slower in the first half of the 1990's, home prices have again increased rapidly in 1996, 1997 and the beginning of 1998, fueled by a regional economic boom.

Indicator #28 Public dollars spent for low income housing

- The purpose of Indicator #28 is to track the individual contributions each King County jurisdiction is making toward affordable housing for King County citizens at or below 80% of the median income. In 1997 \$25 million was spent for low income housing. These public dollars also leverage a significant amount of federal and state funds.

Indicator #29 Housing affordable to low-income households.

- Overall, Rural and South King County cities have the highest proportion of affordable housing. Cities on the Eastside have the lowest proportion of affordable housing.

Land Use Indicators

The key outcomes of the Countywide Planning Policies' land use policies are to:

- Encourage a Greater Share of Growth in Urban Areas and Urban Centers; Limit Growth in Rural Resource Areas.
- Make Efficient Use of Urban Land.
- Accommodate Residential and Job Growth in Urban Areas
- Encourage Livable, Diverse Communities.
- Balance Job and Household Growth
- Maintain Quality and Quantity of Natural Resource Lands.

Key Observations

Indicator #30 New housing units in Urban Areas and Rural/Resource Areas, and in Urban Centers.

- An estimated 12,278 new residential units were added in King County in 1997. The number of new units normally varies widely from year to year. In order to accommodate the County's 20 year target of 172,000 to 223,000 new households, an average of 8,600 to 11,150 units should be built each year.
- 91% of King County's new housing units were built in Urban Areas in 1997. 9%, or 1,081 units, were built in Rural and Resource Areas. This is part of a declining rural trend since 1992. In order to achieve the 20 year target growth of only 6,000 to 8,000 new units in rural areas, the annual growth rate would need to fall further, to an average of approximately 350 units per year.
- Eight Cities have designated a total of 12 Urban Centers. 1,761 new housing units were built in the Urban Centers in 1997. This represents 14% of the County's total new units for 1997. The Countywide Planning Policy household targets call for 25% of new housing units to be in Urban Centers over the 20 year planning period. This translates to an average of between 2,200 and 2,800 new units in the Centers per year.
- There are approximately 700,000 existing housing units in the County as a whole; 93% are in Urban Areas. An estimated 61,300 existing housing units are in the Urban Centers. This represents 9% of King County's total housing stock.

Indicator #31 Employment in Urban Areas, Rural/Resource Areas, Urban Centers and Manufacturing/Industrial Centers.

- 98.6% of King County's jobs are located in Urban Areas, and 1.4% are located in Rural or Resource Areas.
- Fully 30% of jobs countywide are located within the designated Urban Centers.
- Historical data are available on employment changes between 1990 and 1994. This period mostly predates the adoption of the CPPs. During these years, total employment in the Urban and Manufacturing/Industrial Centers fell by 6.6% or 30,000 jobs, while total employment outside the Centers grew by 8.8% or almost 40,000 jobs. Most of the job losses were concentrated in two or three cities and can be attributed to workforce reductions at Boeing and their secondary effects on the economy.

Indicator #32 New housing units built through redevelopment.

- In 1997, the suburban and rural cities' overall redevelopment rate was 15%. Seattle's rate is not included.
- Over 25% of new units were built through redevelopment in Unincorporated King County. The overall redevelopment rate, which includes the suburban and rural cities, (but not Seattle), and Unincorporated King County, was 19%.
- Redevelopment is defined as the development of new residential units or new employment opportunities on land that already had significant improvements, as opposed to development on vacant land. The 1996 Benchmark Report measures only residential units in redevelopment, not employment opportunities.
- This Indicator is important because up to half of King County's remaining land capacity is expected to come from redevelopment. In less urbanized portions of the County, where more vacant land is currently available, it is likely that vacant land will be used before new development occurs on already developed land.

Indicator #33 Ratio of land consumption to population growth.

- Puget Sound Regional Council's analysis found that a 19% increase in population between 1980 and 1990 was accompanied by a 37% increase in developed land.

Indicator #34 Ratio of achieved density to allowed density of residential development.

- Thirteen cities reported on achieved density for new housing during 1997. Depending on the zone type, these cities are achieving from 66% to 91% of maximum allowed density, based on aggregated data.

Indicator #37 Acres of urban parks and open space.

- Together, City and County owned urban parks and open space provide nearly 22,725 acres, or over 15 acres per thousand urban residents. See map on page 85 of the Benchmark Report.
- In addition to City and County-owned Urban parks and open space, King County residents have access to an estimated 110 miles of County-owned trails, over 550 acres of rural local parks, and over 8,000 acres of rural regional parks and open space, including some city-owned parks and watersheds.
- King County also contains thousands of acres of state parks and forest land, and hundreds of thousands of acres of federally owned National Forest and Wilderness Areas. Policymaking on the city or county level can do little to affect the management of state and federal lands.

Indicator #38 Ratio of jobs to housing in Central Puget Sound counties, and King County subregions.

- A balance of jobs and housing within a community has been associated with shorter and faster commutes and more use of alternatives to the single occupancy vehicle. Future work for this Indicator will identify jobs/housing balance in subareas of King County, including the ratio of new jobs to new housing.

Indicator #39 Acres in forest land and farm land.

- King County has over 931,000 acres in Forest Production Districts (FPDs) and over 37,500 acres in Agricultural Production Districts (APDs). As a proportion of King County's land area, approximately 68.2% is in FPDs and 2.75% is in APDs. See map on page 85 of the Benchmark Report.
- Future work for this Indicator will focus on those lands deemed most vulnerable to development pressure and will measure acres leaving and acres coming into forest and farm use.

Indicator #40 Number and average size of farms.

- The total number of farms in King County declined between 1982 and 1992 from 1,719 to 1,221, a loss of nearly 30%. Total acres in farms also declined 30% from 59,813 to 42,290.
- The average size farm in King County is small: 35 to 36 acres, compared with a statewide average farm size of over 500 acres. Forty-two percent of King County farms are 9 acres or less.

Transportation

The key outcomes of the Countywide Planning Policies' land use policies are to:

- Transportation and Land Use Linkage
- Availability of Modes other than Single Occupant Vehicle
- Reduce Commercial Traffic Congestion
- Protect and Improve Transportation Infrastructure

Key Observations

Indicator #41 Percent of residents who commute one-way within 30 minutes.

- About 79% of Puget Sound commuters travel less than thirty minutes to or from work.
- Because commute times have not yet reached extremes, residential location will not be greatly affected by transportation conditions.

Indicator #42 Transit trips per person.

- Transit ridership has fluctuated a small amount over the last ten years, but shows no pronounced trend. Ridership is generally keeping pace with population growth, but overall vehicle miles traveled (VMT) in the county has grown much faster than either population or transit ridership.
- Transit ridership for 1997 was 48.3 trips per person.

Indicator #43 Percent of residents who walk or use transit, bicycles or carpools as alternatives to the single occupant vehicle.

- In 1997 the breakdown by mode for all day travel was: Transit: 5.7%; high-occupancy vehicle (HOV)/Carpool: 33%; Non-Motorized/Other: 6.9%; single-occupant vehicle (SOV): 54.4%.
- The high proportion of trips using the HOV mode (33% in 1997) is characteristic of daily travel, when family members frequently accompany the adult driver on shopping, recreation, and other trip types.
- The 1990 U.S. Census reports the county's mode split for work trips as 74% SOV, 12% HOV, 9% transit, and 5% by non-motorized modes. These figures apply to peak hour travel, and cannot be compared to the all day data reported in the table for this Indicator. About one third of daily household travel is made by high occupancy vehicle, and one half by single occupant vehicle.

Indicator #44 Ability of goods and services to move efficiently and cost effectively through the region.

- At all three King County sites investigated: I-5 at 185th St., SR 18 at Auburn, and SR 522 at Woodinville, truck traffic has increased substantially between 1993 and 1997. During this time, average daily truck traffic has expanded at a 4.6% annual rate at the I-5 site and by 10% and 10.3% annual rate at the SR 18 and SR 522 sites respectively.
- Volume of traffic exceeds capacity during at least one period of the day at each of these three sites, causing severe congestion.

Indicator #45 Number of lane miles of city, county, and state roads and bridges in need of repair and preservation.

- The total countywide lane miles in need of repair and preservation is 8,151.

Indicator #12 Vehicle miles traveled per year

- Vehicle miles traveled *per capita* has increased 47% between 1985 and 1997 and total vehicle miles traveled has increased by 81% in the same period while the population grew by 21%.
- Since 1994, total vehicle miles traveled has grown more slowly than in previous years, at a rate closer to total population growth.