

2.12 Population and Housing

This section reviews existing population, housing, and employment conditions in unincorporated San Diego County and surrounding areas, provides an assessment of the current and forecasted population in the County and describes the forecasted growth in the County's population. Changes in population, employment, and housing demand can have direct social and economic effects as well as indirect environmental impacts. According to CEQA, social and economic effects should be considered in an EIR only to the extent that they create adverse impacts on the physical environment. According to Section 15382 of the CEQA Guidelines, "An economic or social change by itself shall not be considered a significant impact on the environment." The discussion of existing population and housing conditions, policies and regulations provided below is based on the County of San Diego General Plan, Housing Element Background Report (DPLU 2008b), U.S. Census Bureau 2000 Census information (Census 2000), and data from the SANDAG Data Warehouse (SANDAG 2008c). Refer to Section 1.13, County Population Forecast Model and Projected Growth, regarding the differences between the SANDAG population forecasts and how they compare to other data produced for the General Plan Update.

A summary of the population and housing impacts identified in Section 2.12.3 is provided below.

Population and Housing Summary of Impacts

| Issue Number | Issue Topic | Project Direct Impact | Project Cumulative Impact | Impact After Mitigation |
|--------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1 | Population Growth | Less Than Significant | Less Than Significant | Less Than Significant |
| 2 | Displacement of Housing | Less Than Significant | Less Than Significant | Less Than Significant |
| 3 | Displacement of People | Less Than Significant | Less Than Significant | Less Than Significant |

2.12.1 Existing Conditions

This section of the EIR consists of an analysis of demographic, housing, and employment data that helps identify and illustrate the housing needs in the unincorporated area.

2.12.1.1 *Population Trends*

Population in the unincorporated area has experienced growth since 1990, and is forecasted to continue to grow in the next few decades. However, growth varies among CPAs and Subregions, as described below. As discussed in previous sections of the EIR, the unincorporated area of the County is divided into 24 planning areas. Fifteen of the planning areas are CPAs and nine areas are Subregions. Pepper Drive/Bostonia will be merged into the Lakeside CPA with the adoption of the General Plan Update to reduce the total to 23 planning areas. For the purpose of this EIR, Pepper Drive/Bostonia is included in Lakeside CPA. All impact analysis regarding Lakeside includes Pepper Drive/Bostonia.

Population Growth

In 2008, the unincorporated area of the County was estimated by SANDAG to contain a population of 491,764, comprising approximately 16 percent of the total County population. Between 2000 and 2008, population in the unincorporated area grew by 11 percent, from 442,919, which is slightly lower than the countywide growth rate of 12 percent. As a result, the unincorporated area's portion of the County population has remained at approximately 16 percent between 2000 and 2008. Included in the population of the unincorporated area are several areas that provide housing for residents but are not subject to County land use authority. There are 18 Native American reservations within the CPAs and Subregions of the unincorporated County. United States Marine Corps (USMC) Base Camp Pendleton, a large military base covering over 125,000 acres, encompasses part of the Pendleton/De Luz CPA; however, most of this land is under the jurisdiction of the federal government. In addition, the vast majority of the population in the Otay CPA comes from three correctional facilities: East Mesa Detention Facility, George F. Bailey Detention Facility, and Donovan Correctional Facility.

Table 2.12-1 shows population by CPA or Subregion. In 2008, the CPAs and Subregions with the highest populations included Fallbrook, Lakeside, North County Metro, Spring Valley, Ramona, and Valle de Oro. Pendleton/De Luz also has a relatively large population but group quarters at Camp Pendleton (18,000 beds in 2008) account for nearly half of the total population. CPAs with the lowest populations in 2008 included County Islands, Rainbow, North Mountain, and Julian. CPAs that experienced the highest percentage of population growth between 2000 and 2008 were San Dieguito (144 percent) and Valley Center (18 percent). However, some planning areas experienced significant decreases in population, such as the North Mountain Subregion (-15 percent).

Forecasted Population

Table 2.12-2 shows the forecasted population in the unincorporated area at 10-year increments between 2000 and 2030 as forecasted by SANDAG in 2008. By 2030, SANDAG forecasts that the population in the unincorporated area will increase to over 723,392 people or 63 percent growth compared to year 2000 population levels. CPAs and Subregions that are likely to experience the highest percentage of population growth between 2000 and 2030 include Desert (481 percent), Mountain Empire (155 percent), North Mountain (180 percent), San Dieguito (187 percent), and Valley Center (162 percent). Several CPAs are forecasted to experience limited population growth. These include Valle de Oro (17 percent) and Spring Valley (15 percent).

2.12.1.2 Household Profile

This section will discuss the different types of households, household tenure, and household income.

Household Type and Size

There are two types of households: family and non-family. Family households generally include married couples with and without children and non-family households generally describe single-person households, including elderly persons, and multi-person households not related by birth, marriage, or adoption. Table 2.12-3 shows that the unincorporated area has 143,871 households in 2000, representing a 13 percent increase from 1990. Based on U.S. Department

of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) dataset (HUD 2006) and SANDAG Data Warehouse, 2010 Forecast (SANDAG 2008c), the unincorporated area is forecasted to have 163,272 households by 2010. This is an increase of approximately 14 percent from 2000. The vast majority (78 percent) of the households in 2000 were families. From 1990 to 2000, the number of married couples without children increased almost 13 percent, while married couples with children showed little change. The proportion of single-person households increased nearly 25 percent, which included a nearly 30 percent increase in elderly persons living alone. The combined effect of these household trends resulted in an overall decrease in the average household size from 2.92 to 2.89 persons per household between 1990 and 2000.

Household Tenure and Occupancy

Tenure refers to the type of occupancy, whether a unit is owner-occupied or renter-occupied. Furthermore, an occupied housing unit is equivalent to a household. Since the majority of the housing units in the unincorporated area are single-family homes, the tenure split of the occupied units is primarily owner-occupied (70 percent), as shown in Table 2.12-4. In comparison, region-wide, only 58 percent of the occupied units were owner-occupied.

In most cases, the tenure split in individual CPAs reflects the composition of the housing stock. CPAs with high proportions of single-family homes have high proportions of owner-occupants. CPAs with high proportions of multi-family housing and mobile homes have high proportions of renter-occupants. However, County Islands is an exception, where a large proportion of the single-family homes are actually used as rentals. According to the 2006 HUD data, renter-occupied households had a higher proportion (58 percent) of Extremely Low, Very Low, and Low Income households, described below, compared to owner-occupied households (24 percent).

Household Income

Income level is considered a useful indicator of the housing market, because income levels influence the range of housing prices within a community and the ability of households to afford housing. As household income decreases, the number of households paying a disproportionate amount (more than 30 percent) of their income on housing increases. Consequently, this often leads to an increase in overcrowding and inadequate living conditions.

For planning and funding purposes, the State Department of Housing and Community Development (State HCD) categorizes households into five income groups based on the County Area Median Income (AMI):

- Extremely Low Income – at or below 30 percent AMI
- Very Low Income – 31 to 50 percent of AMI
- Low Income – 51-80 percent of AMI
- Moderate Income – 81 to 120 percent of AMI
- Above Moderate Income – greater than 120 percent of AMI

Table 2.12-5 presents household income for San Diego County and the unincorporated region from the 2000 Census and HUD data. Of the total households in the unincorporated area, approximately 8 percent were classified as Extremely Low Income; 10 percent were classified

as Very Low Income; 16 percent were classified as Low Income; and 67 percent were classified as Moderate or Above Moderate Income.

2.12.1.3 Residents with Special Needs

Certain special needs groups may have a significant impact on housing demand. Due to the shortage of affordable housing, these groups often compete for the same housing. Identifying residents with special needs is necessary to understanding regional housing needs and devising appropriate programs and actions. The eight special needs groups are elderly persons, large households, single-parent households, persons with disabilities, farmworkers, homeless persons, military personnel, and students.

Elderly

Elderly persons are considered special needs residents because they may not be able to care for themselves, desire to live alone, have difficulty maintaining their homes, or prefer smaller homes or rental housing. Many elderly persons are also living on fixed incomes, which may require spending increasingly larger proportions of income on housing, health care, and food.

According to 2008 SANDAG data, approximately 12 percent of the residents in the unincorporated area were age 65 and older in 2008 (SANDAG 2008c). According to 2000 Census data, approximately 31,258 households in the unincorporated area were headed by elderly persons in 2000 and the majority (88 percent) lived in owner-households. Compared to other household types, a larger proportion of elderly households, particularly renter-households, were impacted by lower incomes.

The elderly population is expected to increase in the next couple of decades. Associated with this change is an increase in a variety of senior housing needs, which include retirement communities, independent living, assisted living and nursing homes, shared housing, and other housing-related services.

Large Households

A large household is defined as one with more than five members. Large households are considered a special needs group because of the general lack of adequately sized, affordable housing. On a per-capita basis, large households also tend to have lower disposable incomes for housing compared to other household types. According to the 2000 Census data, approximately 12 percent of households in the unincorporated County area in 2000 were considered to be large households. Among these households, the majority (74 percent) were owner-occupied households. After elderly households, large households were also more impacted by lower incomes compared to other household types.

Single-Parent Households

Single-parent households require special consideration and assistance because they tend to have lower incomes and a greater need for affordable day care, health care, and other related services. Single female-headed households are of particular concern because they tend to earn lower wages. Table 2.12-6 shows that in 2000, approximately 14 percent of the total

households were single-parent households. Specifically, 7 percent of the total households in the unincorporated area were female-headed households with children.

Furthermore, 12 percent of the male-headed households with children and 25 percent of the female-headed households with children were living below the poverty line.

Persons with Disabilities

The U.S. Census defines disability as a long-lasting physical, mental, or emotional condition (Census 2000). Affordability, design, location, and discrimination often limit the supply of housing for persons with disabilities. According to the 2000 Census, 66,138 persons with disabilities were residing in the unincorporated area, representing almost 15 percent of the total population. In comparison, within the entire County of San Diego, approximately 16 percent of the population is considered to be disabled (Census 2000).

Farmworkers

As traditionally defined, farmworkers are persons whose primary incomes are earned through permanent or seasonal agricultural labor. Due to the year-round agricultural production and the relatively low incomes of farmworker households, affordable rental housing for farmworkers constitutes a critical housing need in the unincorporated area. According to the 2000 Census, approximately 36 percent of the region's agricultural workforce was employed in the unincorporated area.

Determining the actual number of farmworkers in a region is difficult due to the various definitions used by government agencies. According to the 2000 Census, 1,812 workers in the unincorporated area reported farming as their occupation (28 percent of the region's agricultural workforce). CPAs and Subregions with the highest level of agricultural activities included: Fallbrook, North County Metro, Pala/Pauma Valley, Ramona, and Valley Center. Farmworkers accounted for 1 percent of the employed population of the unincorporated area. Countywide, 0.5 percent of employment was related to agriculture. Although the 2000 Census shows the countywide number of farmworkers as 6,378, estimates provided by the State Employment Development Department (EDD) placed the number of farmworkers at 11,400 in 2000, which declined to approximately 10,400 as of November 2006 (EDD 2008a). This discrepancy can be attributed to those workers who are employed within the County but reside outside the County in areas such as Imperial County or southern Orange County.

Homeless Persons

A person is considered homeless if he or she is not imprisoned and:

- Lacks a fixed, regular, and adequate night-time residence; or
- Has a primary night-time residence that is:
 - A supervised publicly or privately operated shelter designed to provide temporary living accommodations (including welfare hotels, congregate shelters, and transitional housing);
 - An institution that provides a temporary residence for individuals intended to be institutionalized; or

- A public or private place not designed for, or ordinarily used as, a regular sleeping accommodation.

The Regional Task Force on the Homeless (RTFH) is a non-profit organization specializing in disseminating homeless information, sponsored by the City and County of San Diego and other local jurisdictions. The RTFH identified 1,037 rural homeless persons in the unincorporated area in 2006. In 2008, the RTFH published the Regional Homeless Profile (RHP), an enumeration of the homeless population in the region, which identified an increase of 27 percent in homeless persons in the geographic region outside the City of San Diego, including the unincorporated area of the County (RTFH 2008). These homeless persons are primarily farmworkers and day laborers.

The two types of housing commonly developed for and used by homeless persons are transitional housing and emergency shelters. Transitional housing is a type of supportive housing used to facilitate the movement of homeless individuals and families to permanent housing. Transitional housing offers case management and support services to return people to independent living, usually between six and 24 months. An emergency shelter is a facility that provides basic shelter and support services to homeless individuals and families on a short-term basis. Most shelter and housing facilities for the homeless within the County are located in the City of San Diego and other more urbanized communities where public transportation is easily accessible. Homeless shelters and housing facilities serving the unincorporated area include 48 beds in four emergency shelters and 206 beds in four transitional housing facilities.

Military Personnel

The presence of military personnel in the region adds to the demand for low-cost rental housing. Although the need is partially met by the supply of military housing, the demand outweighs the supply. The majority of the military personnel in the unincorporated area are stationed at USMC Camp Pendleton, located just north of the City of Oceanside, with approximately 37,000 active duty Marine and Navy personnel. A smaller military population in the unincorporated area is also stationed at the Naval Weapons Station in Fallbrook. Currently, USMC Camp Pendleton offers a total of 6,195 family housing units on base (USMC 2008). In addition to family housing, USMC Camp Pendleton also offers approximately 18,000 beds in group quarters. Based on the number of housing units provided on base, approximately 13,000 families occupy housing off-base. A portion of these families live in the Fallbrook CPA; however, many seek housing in the neighboring cities of San Clemente, Oceanside, Vista, Carlsbad, San Marcos, and Escondido (USMC 2008).

Students

The need for student housing is another unique factor that affects housing demand in the San Diego region. Typically, students have low incomes, are transient, and require affordable housing within easy commuting distances from campus. Although the majority of colleges and universities provide on-campus housing, they usually cannot accommodate the entire student population. Students not housed on campus must seek rental/shared housing opportunities in nearby areas.

San Diego State University, the largest university in the region, has an enrollment of approximately 33,000 students, with on-campus housing that accommodates 3,136 students. The University of California at San Diego has an enrollment of approximately 27,000 students

and provides on-campus housing for 4,290 students. Similarly, the University of San Diego has an enrollment of 7,000 students, but provides on-campus housing for only 2,400 students. Regionally, smaller universities and colleges also have similar on-campus housing shortages. Although most major universities and colleges are located within incorporated communities, off-campus student housing needs impact the demand for affordable rental housing in the unincorporated area. Furthermore, the lack of affordable housing influences the choice students make after graduation, often with a detrimental effect to the region's labor force and economy. College graduates provide a pool of skilled labor that is vital to the economic well being of the region. However, the lack of affordable housing options may lead to their departure to other less expensive housing markets.

2.12.1.4 Housing Profile

The Census Bureau defines a housing unit as a house, apartment, mobile home, group of rooms, or single room that is occupied (or if vacant, is intended for occupancy) as a separate living quarter. Separate living quarters are those in which the occupants live separately from any other individuals in the building and have direct access from outside the building or through a common hall.

Housing Types and Growth Trends

As shown in Table 2.12-7, the majority of housing units in the unincorporated area are single-family homes (74 percent), which is a higher percentage than for the region as a whole. Multi-family homes represent 19 percent of the housing stock, which is about half of the regional proportion. Mobile homes and other housing types represent a significant housing option in the unincorporated area, representing 7 percent of the housing stock, which is approximately double that of the regional proportion. According to the 2008 SANDAG Data, 12,374 mobile homes and other housing types are located in the unincorporated area. SANDAG defines a mobile home or other home as mobile homes in mobile home parks, boats, and other housing not elsewhere classified. According to County building permit data, 578 mobile homes were constructed in the unincorporated area between January 2003 and November 2006.

Due to differences in community character, as well as unique constraints and opportunities, several CPAs have higher proportions of multi-family housing compared to other parts of the unincorporated area. These include the Lakeside, Spring Valley, and Valle de Oro CPAs. In rural/semi-rural communities where there is a lack of sewer system, mobile homes on septic systems become a viable housing option.

Between 1990 and 2000, housing stock in the unincorporated area increased by 12 percent, almost two percentage points higher than the San Diego region as a whole, as shown in Table 2.12-8. Based on SANDAG forecasts, growth in housing stock in the unincorporated area is expected to slow, with a 13 percent increase anticipated between 2000 and 2010, similar to the forecasted 13 percent increase for the region during the same period.

Housing Cost

The cost of housing often correlates with the extent of housing problems experienced by lower and moderate income households.

For-Sale Housing Market

Housing costs in the unincorporated communities vary significantly. In general, communities in the northern part of the County closer to the coast had higher home prices, compared to communities farther east. As shown in Table 2.12-9, in 2007 the median values of homes ranged from \$332,000 in Julian to \$834,500 in Bonsall. Home prices also vary significantly by type of housing. Median prices for condominium units were below \$400,000 while single-family homes were sold at much higher prices. Mobile homes are generally sold at prices below \$100,000, as shown in Table 2.12-10. Between 2005 and 2007, median home prices in San Diego generally decreased with most communities experiencing lower housing prices due to slowing of the housing market.

Rental Housing Market

Information on rental rates in the unincorporated area was obtained through review of rental listings and is presented in Table 2.12-11. Given the suburban and semi-rural character of some CPAs, rental housing has limited availability. Apartments and second units/granny flats (such as guesthouses and cottages) represent the most affordable rental options. These are usually small units with one or two bedrooms, appropriate for small households, including seniors. In comparison, large units, typically comprised of townhomes or single-family homes, typically command significantly higher rents.

Issues Affecting Housing Availability

Age of Housing and Substandard Housing Conditions

Housing age is frequently used as an indicator of housing condition. In general, residential structures over 30 years of age require minor repairs and modernization improvements, while units over 50 years of age are likely to require major rehabilitation such as roofing, plumbing, and electrical system repairs. A unit is generally deemed to have exceeded its useful life after 70 years of age.

According to the 2000 Census, approximately 30 percent of the overall housing stock in the unincorporated area was built prior to 1970 (greater than 30 years old), as shown in Table 2.12-12. Three percent (4,895 units) of the housing stock was more than 70 years old (SANDAG 2008c). In addition, according to the County DPLU, 1,101 units in the unincorporated area lacked complete plumbing facilities and 1,117 units lacked complete kitchen facilities (DPLU 2008b). These units may potentially require substantial rehabilitation.

Overcrowding

Overcrowding is typically a combined effect of high housing costs, low incomes, and insufficient supply of adequately sized units at affordable rates. In California, overcrowding is defined as a housing unit occupied by more than one person per room (including bedrooms, living rooms, dining rooms, but excluding bathrooms, kitchens, porches, and hallways). Severe overcrowding is defined as a housing unit occupied by more than 1.5 persons per room.

Overall, 11,624 occupied units (8 percent of all households) in the unincorporated area were considered overcrowded in 2000, inclusive of 4 percent that were considered severely overcrowded, as shown in Table 2.12-13. Overcrowding tends to affect renter-households

disproportionately, with 17 percent of all renter-households in the unincorporated area being overcrowded compared to 4 percent of owner-households. In general, overcrowding and severe overcrowding was less prevalent in the unincorporated area (12 percent) than Countywide (19 percent).

Cost Burden

Cost burden, also known as “overpayment,” is defined as a household paying more than 30 percent of its gross household income on housing costs, including utilities, taxes, and insurance. Overall, 32 percent of the households in the unincorporated area experienced housing cost burden in 2000, as shown in Table 2.12-14. While overall, owner-households and renter-households were similarly impacted by cost burden, the income distributions of the impacted households were very different. For owner-households, the impacted households were primarily moderate or above moderate incomes. In contrast, the majority of the impacted renter-households were lower incomes.

2.12.1.5 Employment

Analyzing employment growth is useful in projecting housing demand. In the San Diego County region, employment growth slightly outpaced population growth during the last 15 years. According to the State EDD, employment has grown at a higher rate than population. Between 1990 and 2000, civilian employment in San Diego County increased 14 percent while population increased by 13 percent. Between 2000 and 2007, civilian employment increased 11 percent while population increased by five percent between 2000 and 2006. The employment base in the San Diego region is forecasted to increase another eight percent between 2007 and 2014 while population is forecasted to increase by 14 percent from 2000 to 2010 and by 11 percent from 2010 to 2020 (EDD 2008b). Table 2.12-15 shows the percentage of unincorporated area employees in different industries as compared to the entire San Diego County.

2.12.2 Regulatory Framework

2.12.2.1 Federal

Federal Fair Housing Laws

Several federal laws are in place that prohibit discrimination as it relates to housing. These laws are summarized below, based on information from the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights Education Fund (LCCREF 2008).

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964

Title VI prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, or national origin in programs receiving federal financial assistance.

Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968

Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act, the Fair Housing Act, prohibits discrimination in the sale, rental, and financing of dwellings, and in other housing-related transactions, based on race, color, national origin, religion, sex, familial status (including children under the age of 18 living with

parents of legal custodians, pregnant women, and people securing custody of children under the age of 18), and handicap (disability).

Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973

Section 504 prohibits discrimination based on disability in any program receiving federal financial assistance.

Section 109 of Title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974

Section 109 prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex or religion in programs and activities receiving financial assistance from HUD's Community Development and Block Grant Program.

Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990

Title II prohibits discrimination based on disability in programs, services, and activities provided or made available by public entities. HUD enforces Title II when it relates to State and local public housing, housing assistance and housing referrals.

Architectural Barriers Act of 1968

The Architectural Barriers Act requires that buildings and facilities designed, constructed, altered, or leased with certain federal funds after September 1969 must be accessible to and useable by handicapped persons.

Age Discrimination Act of 1975

The Age Discrimination Act prohibits discrimination on the basis of age in programs receiving federal financial assistance.

Executive Order 11063

Executive Order 11063 prohibits discrimination in the sale, leasing, rental, or other disposition of properties and facilities owned or operated by the federal government or provided with federal funds.

Executive Order 11246

Executive Order 11246, as amended, bans discrimination in federal employment because of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin.

Executive Order 12892

Executive Order 12892, as amended, requires federal agencies to affirmatively further fair housing in their programs and activities, and provides that the Secretary of HUD will be responsible for coordinating the effort. The Order also establishes the President's Fair Housing Council, which will be chaired by the Secretary of HUD.

Executive Order 12898

Executive Order 12898 requires that each federal agency conduct its program, policies, and activities that substantially affect human health or the environment in a manner that does not exclude persons based on race, color, or national origin.

Executive Order 13166

Executive Order 13166 eliminates, to the extent possible, limited English proficiency as a barrier to full and meaningful participation by beneficiaries in all federally assisted and federally conducted programs and activities.

Executive Order 13217

Executive Order 13217 requires federal agencies to evaluate their policies and programs to determine if any can be revised or modified to improve the availability of community-based living arrangements for persons with disabilities.

2.12.2.2 State**California Planning and Zoning Law**

The legal framework in which California cities and counties exercise local planning and land use functions is provided in the California Planning and Zoning Law (Sections 65000 through 66499.58 of the Government Code). Under State planning law, each City and County must adopt a comprehensive, long-term general plan. State law gives cities and counties wide latitude in how a jurisdiction may create a general plan, but there are fundamental requirements that must be met. These requirements include the inclusion of seven mandatory elements described in the Government Code. Each of the elements must contain text and descriptions setting forth objectives, principles, standards, policies, and plan proposals; diagrams and maps that incorporate data and analysis; and mitigation measures.

State Housing Element Law

Pursuant to Section 65580 of the Government Code, a Housing Element of a General Plan must contain local commitments to:

- Provide sites with appropriate zoning and development standards and with services and facilities to accommodate the jurisdiction's Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) for each income level. The RHNA is the only population and/or housing requirement that applies to the General Plan Update. The County's RHNA is 12,358 residential units for the 2005 – 2010 Housing Element Cycle.
- Assist in the development of adequate housing to meet the needs of lower and moderate income households.
- Address, and where appropriate and legally possible, remove governmental constraints to the maintenance, improvement, and development of housing, including housing for all income levels and housing for persons with disabilities.
- Conserve and improve the condition of the existing affordable housing stock.

- Promote housing opportunities for all persons regardless of race, religion, sex, marital status, ancestry, national origin, color, familial status, or disability.
- Preserve assisted housing developments for lower income households.

State Housing Element law mandates specific topics and issues that must be addressed in the Housing Element. These include:

- An analysis of population and employment trends, documentation of projections, and quantification of existing and projected housing needs for all income levels.
- An analysis and documentation of household characteristics, such as the age of housing stock, tenancy type, overcrowded conditions, and the level of payment compared to ability to pay.
- An analysis and documentation of special needs, such as female-headed households, homeless individuals, persons with disabilities, large households, farmworkers, and the elderly.
- A regional share of the total regional housing need for all income categories.
- An inventory of land suitable for residential development, including vacant land and infill/redevelopment opportunities. This analysis also looks at potential residential sites and their accessibility to adequate infrastructure and services.
- Identifying actual and potential governmental and non-governmental constraints that could potentially impede the maintenance, improvement, and development of housing for all income groups.
- Identifying and analyzing opportunities for energy conservation in residential developments.
- An inventory of at-risk affordable units that have the possibility of converting to market rate.
- A statement of goals, policies, quantified objectives, financial resources, and scheduled programs for the improvement, maintenance, and development of housing.

State law requires that adequate opportunity for participation be solicited from all economic segments of the community towards preparation of the Housing Element. Specifically, the jurisdiction must reach out to lower and moderate income persons and persons with special needs. Preparation of the Housing Element must also be coordinated with other local jurisdictions within the regional housing market area.

Article 34

Article 34 of the California Constitution requires a majority vote of the electorate to approve the development, construction, or acquisition by a public body of any "low rent project" within that jurisdiction. In other words, for any project to be built and/or operated by a public agency where at least 50 percent of the occupants are low income and rents are restricted to affordable levels, the jurisdiction must seek voter approval (Article 34 authority).

California Building Standards Code

In 2001, the State of California consolidated the Uniform Building, Plumbing, Electrical, and Mechanical codes into the California Building Standards Code, which is contained in Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations. The California Building Standards Code contains eleven parts: Electrical Code, Plumbing Code, Administrative Code, Mechanical Code, Energy Code, Elevator Safety Construction Code, Historical Building Code, Fire Code, and the Code for Building Conservation Reference Standards Code. These codes promote public health and safety and ensure that safe and decent housing is constructed in the County unincorporated area. The codes serve to protect residents from hazards and risks, and are not considered to be undue constraints to housing production. The 2007 California codes became effective January 2008.

2.12.2.3 Local

San Diego County Board of Supervisors (BOS) Policy A-68, Expediting Permit Processing for Lower Income Housing Developments

The purpose of BOS Policy A-68 is to reduce the time required to exercise the regulatory function with regard to low-income housing developments. This policy is designed to expedite the permit processing of all lower income housing projects in order to produce such housing in the shortest possible time and to reduce development costs to the greatest extent.

San Diego County BOS Policy I-79, Housing Affordable to Elderly Households

The purpose of BOS Policy I-79 is to set guidelines for the implementation of San Diego County Zoning Ordinance, Section 4120, regarding affordable housing for the elderly. The BOS recognizes that current costs of land and financing make it difficult for the private sector to build housing affordable to elderly households. Therefore, San Diego County Zoning Ordinance, Section 4120, was adopted to authorize density bonuses in designated areas of the Land Use Element of the General Plan for projects that provide housing for very low-income elderly households under certain conditions. As described in Section 1.8, Other Project Components, of Chapter 1.0, Project Description, several BOS Policies and the San Diego County Zoning Ordinance are being updated as part of the proposed project, including BOS Policy 1-79 and San Diego County Zoning Ordinance, Section 4120. BOS Policy 1-79 would be incorporated into the San Diego County Zoning Ordinance and San Diego County Zoning Ordinance, Section 4120, would be updated.

2.12.3 Analysis of Project Effects and Determination of Significance

2.12.3.1 Issue 1: Population Growth

Guidelines for Determination of Significance

Based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the proposed County General Plan Update would have a significant impact if it would induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure).

Impact Analysis

The General Plan Update is the long range, comprehensive land use plan that establishes guidance for future growth and development patterns in the unincorporated County. It proposes areas for development of residential and commercial land uses, as well as roads and other infrastructure, to accommodate forecasted population growth in the unincorporated area. As such, the General Plan Update would induce population growth; however, growth would not be considered substantial unless the General Plan Update induced growth beyond State and regional projections.

As described in Section 1.12.2.1, Regional Land Use Planning and Projected Growth, in Chapter 1.0, Project Description, the entire County of San Diego has the second highest countywide population in the State and is anticipated to remain the second most populated county in 2030. The entire State of California is anticipated to grow approximately 30 percent between 2008 and 2030, to 49,240,891 (DOF 2008c). The Department of Finance forecasts that San Diego County will grow approximately 26 percent between 2008 and 2030 to a population of 3,950,757 in 2030. The County would represent approximately eight percent of the Statewide population in 2030. SANDAG forecasts a Countywide population of 3,984,753 in 2030. This would represent approximately 8 percent of the forecasted Statewide population. Therefore, the SANDAG forecast for the entire County is consistent with forecasts for the State and the entire County is anticipated to accommodate its forecasted share of Statewide growth. Regional growth consistent with the County's forecasted population for 2030 would not induce substantial Statewide population growth.

The unincorporated County is forecasted by SANDAG to have a population of 723,392 in 2030, approximately 18 percent of the forecasted regional population. This forecast is based on the General Plan Update draft land use maps. Therefore, the land use development and infrastructure proposed under the General Plan Update is anticipated to accommodate this growth. As discussed below, the General Plan Update would not induce additional growth beyond what is forecasted for the unincorporated area. New and expanded development and infrastructure would be needed to accommodate future population growth, the construction of which could have physical impacts on the environment, including impacts to biological resources, air quality, noise, or traffic. The environmental impacts of this growth are analyzed in the other issue topics of Chapter 2.0.

General Plan Update Land Use Framework

The Land Use Element of the General Plan Update provides a framework to accommodate future development in an efficient and sustainable manner that is compatible with the character of unincorporated communities and the protection of valuable and sensitive natural resources. Currently, the County of San Diego is faced with both significant growth pressures and severe environmental constraints. While population continues to grow, the supply of land capable of supporting development continues to decrease. In order to accommodate this growth, the General Plan Update encourages the provision of diverse housing choices, commercial facilities, and infrastructure to accommodate forecasted growth while protecting the established character of existing urban and rural neighborhoods.

In general, the majority of new development, approximately 80 percent, is planned within the SDCWA boundary. This development pattern directs future growth to areas where existing or planned infrastructure and services can support the growth within or adjacent to existing

communities. By giving priority to development within areas identified for village residential densities, which range from two to 30 dwelling units per acre, the General Plan Update would avoid inducement of growth in the rural areas of the unincorporated County.

Primarily, substantial growth in rural areas would be inappropriate due to the character of these areas, development constraints such as topography and groundwater resources, and environmental constraints such sensitive habitats. Increased road access and infrastructure, such as water and sewer service, would occur under the General Plan Update; however, it would be limited in the rural areas of the County to be consistent with the natural and human-made environment, as described in the other environmental topic sections in Chapter 2.0. Planned development in the semi-rural and rural areas focuses development in and around existing unincorporated community town centers which allows the County to maximize existing infrastructure, provide for efficient service delivery, and strengthen town center areas while preserving the rural landscape.

Federal, State, and Local Regulations and Existing Regulatory Processes

General plans and specific plans would be the applicable regulations pertaining to population growth. The County reviews development projects for conformance with such plans prior to approvals. For regulations pertaining to potential environmental impacts of growth in the unincorporated County, please refer to other sections of Chapter 2.0 of this EIR.

Proposed General Plan Update Goals and Policies

All of the goals and policies in the General Plan Update guide future development; however, a few goals include specific policies that reiterate the land use framework's ability to avoid development and infrastructure that would induce unplanned population growth. The Land Use Element contains Goal LU-1, which is the preparation of a land use plan that sustains the intent and integrity of the land use framework established by the General Plan Update. This goal is supported by Policy LU-1.2, which prohibits leapfrog development which is inconsistent with the land use plan and community plans. Leapfrog development consists of village densities located away from established villages or outside established water and sewer service boundaries that would require new infrastructure and would develop new housing that would directly or indirectly induce growth. Policy LU-9.4 supports Goal LU-9, which requires well defined, planned, and developed community cores. This policy prioritizes infrastructure improvements and the provision of public facilities for villages and community cores, consistent with the intensity of development allowed by the proposed land use map. Consistency with the proposed land use map avoids providing more infrastructure than is necessary to accommodate planned growth, since additional infrastructure could indirectly induce population growth. Goal LU-14 is to ensure that communities and development are served with adequate wastewater disposal that addresses potential hazards to human health and the environment. In support of this goal, Policy LU-14.4 prohibits sewer facilities that would induce unplanned growth. Sewer systems would be planned, developed, and sized to serve the land use pattern on the proposed land use map.

Additionally, the General Plan Update goals and policies included in the other sections of Chapter 2.0 mitigate the impacts of planned growth in the County to the extent feasible. For example, Section 2.3, Air Quality, lists the goals and policies that would reduce air quality impacts associated with planned growth under the General Plan Update. Section 2.16, Utilities,

lists the goals and policies pertaining to the additional demand on utilities to serve the growth accommodated by the General Plan Update.

Summary

The development and infrastructure proposed under the General Plan Update would directly and indirectly induce population growth; however, this growth is consistent with forecasted growth for the unincorporated County. The General Plan Update is a comprehensive plan to guide future growth and includes a framework for land use and development, as well as goals and policies, to prevent unanticipated or inappropriate population growth in the unincorporated County. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the direct or indirect inducement of unplanned population growth and a significant impact would not occur.

2.12.3.2 Issue 2: Displacement of Housing

Guidelines for Determination of Significance

Based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the proposed County General Plan Update would have a significant impact if it would displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

Impact Analysis

The General Plan Update is the long range, comprehensive land use plan that establishes guidance for future growth and development patterns in the unincorporated County including the provision of housing. New land use development or infrastructure accommodated by the proposed project would have the potential to displace existing housing, and would result in a significant impact if replacement housing would be required elsewhere outside of the unincorporated County.

In order to address concerns related to housing capacity, three types of analyses were conducted to determine whether the proposed land use map would produce adequate levels of dwelling units to house future population growth. The three models are summarized briefly below.

- **Population Model:** The County utilized a population forecast model that predicts growth at a regional level and does not provide project-level analysis. In order to make its forecast as accurate as possible, the County expanded the seven variables utilized by SANDAG to 24 development constraints. The County's constraints-based predictive model forecasts a total of 71,540 new dwelling units to be accommodated by the General Plan Update by buildout, compared to 2008 conditions, for a total of 238,512 dwelling units in the unincorporated area.
- **Available Vacant Land Analysis:** Staff performed an analysis of development potential on the approximately 630,500 acres of privately owned vacant land that is available for future development in the unincorporated County. This analysis revealed that the degree to which the predictive model constrains development (and reduces yield) varies dramatically between the regional categories.

- **Building Permit Trends Analysis:** An analysis of the number and type of building permits issued from 1990 through 2001 revealed that, if building continues at this rate, the plan provides enough capacity for the next 31 years. Even if the rate climbs by 20 percent, the proposed plan would support construction of new dwellings beyond 2027.

These analyses confirm that the proposed land use map would allow for an adequate number of dwelling units to meet the projected population, and additional housing outside the unincorporated County would not be required to keep up with demand.

As described in Section 2.1, Aesthetics, implementation of proposed General Plan Update would generally retain the existing land use pattern of the unincorporated County. However, displacement of existing housing would occur through the conversion of residential areas to other uses. Some areas that currently contain residences are designated for commercial or other non-residential land uses under the General Plan Update and future construction of these non-residential land uses would have the potential to displace the existing housing. However, increases in residential density in other areas of the unincorporated County would sufficiently offset displaced housing so that replacement housing elsewhere would not be necessary.

Consistent with State law, the County's land use plan provides adequate capacity to exceed its RHNA of 12,358 new residential units by accommodating up to 71,540 new residential units. Therefore, the General Plan Update would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

Federal, State, and Local Regulations and Existing Regulatory Processes

The State Housing Element Law, Section 65580 of the Government Code, requires that the Housing Element of a General Plan contain local commitments to provide sites with appropriate zoning and development standards and with services and facilities to accommodate the jurisdiction's RHNA for each income level. The RHNA is the only population and/or housing requirement that applies to the General Plan Update. As stated above, the County's land use plan provides adequate capacity to exceed its RHNA of 12,358 residential units.

Proposed General Plan Update Goals and Policies

The General Plan Update includes Goal H-4 to conserve housing currently available, especially affordable housing. This goal is supported by Policy H-4.1, which is to promote and support rehabilitation and revitalization strategies aimed at preserving the existing supply of affordable housing.

Summary

The General Plan Update would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

2.12.3.3 Issue 3: Displacement of People

Guidelines for Determination of Significance

Based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the proposed County General Plan Update would be considered to have a significant impact if it would displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

Impact Analysis

As described above in Section 2.12.3.2, Issue 2: Displacement of Housing, the proposed project would have the potential to result in the displacement of people from the conversion of residential areas to other uses. Some areas that currently contain residences are designated for commercial or other non-residential land uses under the General Plan Update and future construction of these non-residential land uses would have the potential to displace the existing housing (and people). However, also described in Section 2.12.3.2, increases in residential density in other areas of the unincorporated County would sufficiently offset displaced housing (and people) so that replacement housing elsewhere would not be necessary. Therefore, the General Plan Update would not displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

Federal, State, and Local Regulations and Existing Regulatory Processes

As described above in Section 2.12.3.2, Issue 2: Displacement of Housing, the RHNA is the only population and/or housing requirement that applies to the General Plan Update. The County's land use plan provides adequate capacity to exceed its RHNA of 12,358 residential units.

Proposed General Plan Update Goals and Policies

The General Plan Update does not contain goals and policies directly related to the displacement of people. However, the Housing Element was prepared in accordance with the State Housing Element Law.

Summary

The General Plan Update would not displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Therefore, the General Plan Update would not result in a potentially significant impact.

2.12.4 Cumulative Impacts

The geographic scope of cumulative impact analysis for population and housing includes the entire County, including incorporated cities, and the surrounding Counties of Riverside, Orange, and Imperial, and Baja California, Mexico.

2.12.4.1 Issue 1: Population Growth

The cumulative projects in the San Diego region would have the potential to result in a significant cumulative impact if they would, in combination, directly or indirectly induce substantial population growth. The planning documents, such as general plans prepared by the adjacent jurisdictions, would be subject to regional plans such as the RCP and RTP, similar to the General Plan Update. The general plans of adjacent jurisdictions have been prepared to be consistent with the population forecast of the regional planning documents. Thus, these projects would accommodate anticipated future growth, not induce new growth, similar to the proposed project. Projects in Baja California, Mexico would not contribute to cumulative population growth in the San Diego County due to immigration restrictions. However, the private projects identified in the cumulative analysis in Table 1-11, Projects Not Included In the Proposed General Plan Update Land Use Map, propose dwelling units and, therefore, have the potential to induce population growth. For example, the Jacumba Valley Ranch project in Mountain Empire Subregion proposes over 2,000 dwelling units in a very rural area of the County. The Warner Ranch project proposes 900 dwelling units in the Pala/Pauma Valley Subregion, which is also a relatively rural and undeveloped planning area. However, in order to be approved, these projects would be required to comply with the applicable general plan in their jurisdiction and would therefore be consistent with the forecasted growth for the jurisdiction. The General Plan Update accommodates less growth than the existing General Plan. The proposed General Plan Update would be adequate to accommodate planned growth through 2030, though it is possible that beyond 2030 this reduction in capacity would induce population growth in surrounding jurisdictions. However, this impact is speculative and by 2030 it is reasonably foreseeable that the County and/or surrounding jurisdictions would update their general plans to accommodate updated population forecasts for years beyond 2030. Therefore, because cumulative projects would be required to comply with applicable land use plans governing regional growth, a significant cumulative impact would not occur. Therefore, the proposed project, in combination with the identified cumulative projects, would not contribute to a significant cumulative impact.

2.12.4.2 Issue 2: Displacement of Housing

The cumulative projects in the San Diego region would have the potential to result in a cumulative impact if they would, in combination, displace a substantial amount of housing that would necessitate replacement housing elsewhere. The general plans and other planning documents prepared by the adjacent cities and counties would be required to supply their share of the RHNA, similar to the General Plan Update. The planning documents prepared by adjacent jurisdictions would be required to include a land use plan to provide adequate housing within the jurisdiction and displaced housing would be replaced primarily within the jurisdiction. The replacement of housing outside the jurisdiction that it's displaced in would be a rare occurrence and would not result in a cumulative impact. Projects in Baja California, Mexico would not contribute to cumulative population growth in the San Diego County due to immigration restrictions. In addition, private development projects, such as those identified in Table 1-11, Projects Not Included In the Proposed General Plan Update Land Use Map, would be required to be consistent with the applicable general plan and other land use plans governing the project site in order to be approved. Because cumulative projects would comply with all applicable land use plans to provide adequate housing within a jurisdiction, a significant cumulative impact would not occur. Therefore, the General Plan Update, in combination with the identified cumulative projects, would not contribute to a significant cumulative impact.

2.12.4.3 Issue 3: Displacement of People

The cumulative projects in the San Diego region would have the potential to result in a cumulative impact if they would, in combination, displace substantial number of people that would necessitate replacement housing elsewhere. The general plans and other planning documents prepared by the adjacent cities and counties would be required to develop a land use plan that would accommodate the existing and forecasted population, similar to the General Plan Update. Consistent with State law, these planning documents would be required to include a land use plan to provide adequate housing to accommodate forecasted numbers of people within the jurisdiction, and displaced development would be replaced primarily within the jurisdiction, so that housing would not need to be provided outside of the jurisdiction. Projects in Baja California, Mexico would not contribute to cumulative population growth in the San Diego County due to immigration restrictions. In addition, private development projects, such as those identified in Table 1-11, Projects Not Included In the Proposed General Plan Update Land Use Map, would be required to be consistent with the applicable land use plans governing the project site. Because cumulative projects would comply with all applicable land use plans to provide adequate development within a jurisdiction, a significant cumulative impact would not occur. Therefore, the General Plan Update, in combination with the identified cumulative projects, would not contribute to a significant cumulative impact.

2.12.5 Significance of Impact Prior to Mitigation

The proposed project would not result in a potentially significant direct or cumulative impact associated with population growth, displacement of housing, or displacement of people.

2.12.6 Mitigation

2.12.6.1 Issue 1: Population Growth

The proposed project would not result in the direct or indirect inducement of unplanned population growth. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required. Refer to the other sections of Chapter 2.0 regarding the environmental impacts of planned growth and development occurring under the General Plan Update.

2.12.6.2 Issue 2: Displacement of Housing

The proposed project would not result in a potentially significant displacement of housing. No mitigation is required.

2.12.6.3 Issue 3: Displacement of People

The proposed project would not result in a potentially significant displacement of people. No mitigation is required.

2.12.7 Conclusion

The discussion below provides a synopsis of the conclusion reached in each of the above impact analyses.

2.12.7.1 Issue 1: Population Growth

Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would not directly or indirectly induce unplanned population growth. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a potentially significant direct impact. Additionally, the proposed project would not contribute to a significant cumulative impact associated with population growth.

2.12.7.2 Issue 2: Displacement of Housing

Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would not displace a substantial amount of housing. Therefore, the proposed project would result not in a significant impact. In addition, the proposed project would not contribute to a significant cumulative impact associated with displacement of housing.

2.12.7.3 Issue 3: Displacement of People

Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would not displace a substantial amount of people. Therefore, the proposed project would result not in a significant impact. In addition, the proposed project would not contribute to a significant cumulative impact associated with displacement of people.

Table 2.12-1. Population Trends: 1990-2007

| CPA | Population in 1990 | Population in 2000 | Percent of Population in Unincorporated Area in 2000 | Percent Change from 1990 to 2000 | Population Estimate in January 2008 | Percent of Population in Unincorporated Area in 2008 | Percent Change from 2000 to 2008 |
|----------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|----------------------------------|
| Alpine | 12,593 | 16,542 | 4 | 31 | 17,350 | 4 | 5 |
| Bonsall | 8,261 | 8,880 | 2 | 7 | 9,890 | 2 | 11 |
| Central Mountain | 4,285 | 4,880 | 1 | 14 | 4,646 | 1 | -5 |
| County Islands | 1,967 | 1,986 | <1 | 1 | 2,098 | 0 | 6 |
| Crest/Dehesa | 8,975 | 9,365 | 2 | 4 | 10,211 | 2 | 9 |
| Desert | 3,079 | 3,262 | 1 | 6 | 3,520 | 1 | 8 |
| Fallbrook | 32,239 | 39,599 | 9 | 23 | 44,378 | 9 | 12 |
| Jamul/Dulzura | 8,509 | 9,218 | 2 | 8 | 9,915 | 2 | 8 |
| Julian | 2,364 | 3,104 | 1 | 31 | 3,049 | 1 | -2 |
| Lakeside ⁽¹⁾ | 65,183 | 72,568 | 16 | 11 | 75,447 | 15 | 4 |
| Mountain Empire | 5,363 | 6,402 | 1 | 19 | 6,472 | 1 | 1 |
| North County Metro | 38,083 | 38,253 | 9 | 0 | 42,639 | 9 | 11 |
| North Mountain | 2,763 | 2,830 | 1 | 2 | 2,416 | 0 | -15 |
| Otay | 4,134 | 6,804 | 2 | 65 | 4,690 | 1 | -31 |
| Pala/Pauma Valley | 4,761 | 6,176 | 1 | 30 | 5,618 | 1 | -9 |
| Pendleton/De Luz | 36,450 | 36,927 | 8 | 1 | 43,792 | 9 | 19 |
| Rainbow | 1,891 | 1,836 | <1 | -3 | 1,815 | 0 | -1 |
| Ramona | 28,302 | 33,940 | 8 | 20 | 36,723 | 7 | 9 |
| San Dieguito | 9,905 | 12,516 | 3 | 26 | 30,489 | 6 | 144 |
| Spring Valley | 55,267 | 59,324 | 13 | 7 | 62,377 | 13 | 5 |
| Sweetwater | 13,247 | 12,951 | 3 | -2 | 13,187 | 3 | 2 |
| Valle de Oro | 37,184 | 40,031 | 9 | 8 | 42,743 | 9 | 7 |
| Valley Center | 12,960 | 15,525 | 4 | 20 | 18,269 | 4 | 18 |
| Unincorporated Area | 397,763 | 442,919 | 100 | 11 | 491,764 | 100 | 11 |
| San Diego County | 2,498,016 | 2,813,833 | - | 13 | 3,146,274 | - | 12 |

⁽¹⁾ Lakeside CPA includes former Pepper Drive/Bostonia CPA

Note: Data has been rounded to nearest whole number.

Source: SANDAG 2008c

Table 2.12-2. SANDAG Population Forecast: 2000-2030

| CPA | Census Data Population | Population Forecast | | | Approximate Percent Change | | | |
|----------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| | 2000 | 2010 | 2020 | 2030 | 2000-2010 (percent) | 2010-2020 (percent) | 2020-2030 (percent) | 2000-2030 (percent) |
| Alpine | 16,542 | 17,734 | 23,678 | 28,075 | 7 | 34 | 19 | 70 |
| Bonsall | 8,880 | 10,739 | 14,676 | 16,249 | 21 | 37 | 11 | 83 |
| Central Mountain | 4,880 | 4,858 | 5,987 | 8,288 | 0 | 23 | 38 | 70 |
| County Islands | 1,986 | 2,178 | 2,086 | 2,450 | 10 | -4 | 17 | 23 |
| Crest/Dehesa | 9,365 | 10,048 | 10,647 | 12,026 | 7 | 6 | 13 | 28 |
| Desert | 3,262 | 5,251 | 12,520 | 18,968 | 61 | 138 | 52 | 481 |
| Fallbrook | 39,599 | 43,148 | 57,446 | 69,833 | 9 | 33 | 22 | 76 |
| Jamul/Dulzura | 9,218 | 10,943 | 13,416 | 20,153 | 19 | 23 | 50 | 119 |
| Julian | 3,104 | 3,194 | 4,287 | 4,994 | 3 | 34 | 16 | 61 |
| Lakeside ⁽¹⁾ | 72,568 | 78,057 | 87,383 | 97,365 | 8 | 12 | 11 | 70 |
| Mountain Empire | 6,402 | 7,530 | 9,453 | 16,340 | 18 | 26 | 73 | 155 |
| North County Metro | 38,253 | 49,660 | 69,729 | 82,381 | 30 | 40 | 18 | 115 |
| North Mountain | 2,830 | 3,270 | 4,200 | 7,923 | 16 | 28 | 89 | 180 |
| Otay | 6,804 | 7,448 | 12,857 | 14,240 | 9 | 73 | 11 | 109 |
| Pala/Pauma Valley | 6,176 | 6,676 | 8,201 | 13,937 | 8 | 23 | 70 | 126 |
| Pendleton/De Luz | 36,927 | 36,739 | 37,718 | 39,770 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 8 |
| Rainbow | 1,836 | 2,230 | 3,429 | 4,546 | 21 | 54 | 33 | 148 |
| Ramona | 33,940 | 40,261 | 55,024 | 57,545 | 19 | 37 | 5 | 70 |
| San Dieguito | 12,516 | 23,210 | 31,722 | 35,900 | 85 | 37 | 13 | 187 |
| Spring Valley | 59,324 | 62,958 | 65,854 | 68,503 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 15 |
| Sweetwater | 12,951 | 13,979 | 15,262 | 16,366 | 8 | 9 | 7 | 26 |
| Valle de Oro | 40,031 | 43,851 | 44,066 | 46,836 | 10 | 0 | 6 | 17 |
| Valley Center | 15,525 | 20,757 | 37,501 | 40,704 | 34 | 81 | 9 | 162 |
| Unincorporated Area Total | 442,919 | 504,719 | 627,142 | 723,392 | 14 | 24 | 15 | 63 |
| San Diego County | 2,813,833 | 3,245,279 | 3,635,855 | 3,984,753 | 15.33 | 12.04 | 9.60 | 41.61 |

⁽¹⁾ Lakeside CPA includes former Pepper Drive/Bostonia CPA

Note: Data has been rounded to nearest whole number.

Source: SANDAG 2008c

Table 2.12-3. Household Characteristics in the Unincorporated Area: 1990-2000

| Household Type | 1990 | | 2000 | | Percent Change from 1990 to 2000 |
|------------------------|------------|-----------------------------|------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|
| | Households | Percent of Total Households | Households | Percent of Total Households | |
| Households | 127,200 | 100 | 143,871 | 100 | 13 |
| Family Households | 101,283 | 80 | 111,654 | 78 | 10 |
| Married With Children | 42,501 | 33 | 42,596 | 30 | 0 |
| Married No Children | 43,159 | 34 | 48,691 | 34 | 13 |
| Other Families | 15,623 | 12 | 20,367 | 14 | 30 |
| Non-Family Households | 26,382 | 21 | 30,237 | 21 | 15 |
| Singles | 19,358 | 15 | 24,153 | 17 | 25 |
| Elderly Living Alone | 7,616 | 6 | 9,895 | 7 | 30 |
| Other Non-Families | 7,024 | 6 | 6,084 | 4 | -13 |
| Average Household Size | 3 | | 3 | | |

Note: Data has been rounded to nearest whole number.

Sources: SANDAG 2005

Table 2.12-4. Type of Occupancy: 2000

| CPA | Total Number of Units | Number of Occupied Units | Percent of Owner-Occupied Units | Percent of Renter-Occupied Units |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Alpine | 6,108 | 5,853 | 71 | 29 |
| Bonsall | 3,367 | 3,206 | 79 | 21 |
| Central Mountain | 2,389 | 1,753 | 79 | 21 |
| County Islands | 588 | 558 | 51 | 49 |
| Crest/Dehesa | 3,333 | 3,239 | 88 | 13 |
| Desert | 2,887 | 1,441 | 76 | 25 |
| Fallbrook | 14,046 | 13,476 | 69 | 31 |
| Jamul/Dulzura | 3,180 | 3,029 | 86 | 14 |
| Julian | 1,822 | 1,265 | 74 | 27 |
| Lakeside | 20,819 | 20,177 | 71 | 29 |
| Mountain Empire | 2,632 | 2,187 | 70 | 30 |
| North County Metro | 14,388 | 13,805 | 83 | 17 |
| North Mountain | 1,706 | 1,129 | 74 | 26 |
| Otay ⁽¹⁾ | 3 | 2 | 100 | 0 |
| Pala/Pauma Valley | 2,071 | 1,802 | 62 | 38 |
| Pendleton/De Luz | 6,689 | 6,104 | 8 | 92 |
| Pepper Dr/Bostonia | 5,805 | 5,627 | 44 | 56 |
| Rainbow | 707 | 668 | 73 | 27 |
| Ramona | 11,352 | 10,957 | 75 | 25 |
| San Dieguito | 5,025 | 4,597 | 89 | 11 |
| Spring Valley | 19,503 | 19,114 | 65 | 35 |
| Sweetwater | 4,458 | 4,354 | 78 | 22 |
| Valle De Oro | 14,540 | 14,269 | 76 | 25 |
| Valley Center | 5,529 | 5,259 | 84 | 16 |
| Unincorporated Area | 152,947 | 143,871 | 70 | 30 |
| San Diego County | 1,040,149 | 994,677 | 58 | 42 |

⁽¹⁾ Nearly all of the population of Otay is composed of inmates from the three large correctional facilities in the CPA. These correctional facilities are not included in housing data (BOS 2004).

Note: Data has been rounded to nearest whole number.

Source: Census 2000

Table 2.12-5. Household Income: 2000

| Households | Households | Percent Extremely Low Income (0-30 AMI) | Percent Very Low Income (31-50 AMI) | Percent Low Income (51-80 AMI) | Percent Moderate/Above Income (81+ AMI) |
|-------------------|----------------|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------|---|
| Owner-Households | 99,515 | 5 | 6 | 12 | 77 |
| Renter-Households | 41,394 | 14 | 18 | 25 | 42 |
| Total | 140,909 | 8 | 10 | 16 | 67 |

Notes:

1) AMI = Area Median Income

2) 2000 Census sample data (long form) was used to prepare the CHAS dataset. Characteristics were based on 5 percent sample and then extrapolated to 100 percent; depending on the weighting used, total numbers do not always match the 100 percent data.

3) Data has been rounded to nearest whole number.

Source: HUD 2006

Table 2.12-6. Single-Parent Household Characteristics: 2000

| Region | Total Single-Parent Households | Percent of Total Households | Single-Parent Households with Children | | Single-Parent Households with Children Living Below Poverty | |
|---------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|----------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| | | | Percent Male-Headed Households | Percent Female-Headed Households | Percent Male-Headed Households | Percent Female-Headed Households |
| Unincorporated Area | 20,367 | 14 | 3 | 7 | 12 | 25 |
| San Diego County | 172,565 | 17 | 2 | 7 | 15 | 30 |

Note: Data has been rounded to nearest whole number.

Source: Census 2000

Table 2.12-7. Housing Type: 2008

| CPA | Total Number of Units | Percent Single-Family Homes | Percent Multi-Family Home | Percent Mobile Homes and Other |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Alpine | 6,444 | 70 | 25 | 5 |
| Bonsall | 3,837 | 80 | 15 | 5 |
| Central Mountain | 2,127 | 77 | 12 | 7 |
| County Islands | 619 | 99 | 1 | 0 |
| Crest/Dehesa | 3,530 | 90 | 7 | 3 |
| Desert | 3,140 | 69 | 7 | 24 |
| Fallbrook | 15,665 | 74 | 21 | 5 |
| Jamul/Dulzura | 3,167 | 86 | 11 | 3 |
| Julian | 1,686 | 92 | 7 | 1 |
| Lakeside | 27,411 | 56 | 25 | 19 |
| Mountain Empire | 2,694 | 80 | 15 | 5 |
| North County Metro | 15,970 | 84 | 11 | 6 |
| North Mountain | 1,515 | 60 | 13 | 27 |
| Otay ⁽¹⁾ | 5 | 60 | 40 | 0 |
| Pala/Pauma Valley | 1,929 | 84 | 4 | 12 |
| Pendleton/De Luz | 6,667 | 89 | 7 | 4 |
| Pepper Dr/Bostonia | 5,821 | 31 | 51 | 18 |
| Rainbow | 683 | 72 | 13 | 15 |
| Ramona | 11,997 | 81 | 16 | 4 |
| San Dieguito | 10,854 | 79 | 21 | 0 |
| Spring Valley | 20,512 | 71 | 22 | 7 |
| Sweetwater | 4,519 | 86 | 14 | 0 |
| Valle De Oro | 15,477 | 74 | 26 | 1 |
| Valley Center | 6,513 | 83 | 10 | 8 |
| Unincorporated Area | 166,972 | 74 | 19 | 7 |
| San Diego County | 1,140,349 | 60 | 36 | 4 |

⁽¹⁾ Nearly all of the population of Otay is composed of inmates from the three large correctional facilities in the CPA. These correctional facilities are not included in housing data (County of San Diego 2004).

Note: Data has been rounded to nearest whole number.

Source: SANDAG 2008c

Table 2.12-8. Housing Unit Trends: 1990-2010

| Region | Number of Housing Units | | | Percent Change | |
|---------------------|-------------------------|-----------|-----------|----------------|-----------|
| | 1990 | 2000 | 2010 | 1990-2000 | 2000-2010 |
| Unincorporated Area | 137,100 | 152,947 | 172,443 | 12 | 13 |
| San Diego County | 946,240 | 1,040,149 | 1,174,180 | 10 | 13 |

Note: Data has been rounded to nearest whole number.

Source: SANDAG 2008c

Table 2.12-9. Median Home Values in Unincorporated Area: 2005-2007

| CPA ⁽¹⁾ | 2007 | | | 2005 | | |
|--------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------|----------------|--------------------------|
| | Total Number of Sales | Single-Family Median (Resale) | Condo Median (Resale) | Overall Median (New and Resale) | Overall Median | Percent Change 2005-2007 |
| Alpine | 176 | \$622,500 | \$270,000 | \$569,500 | \$611,000 | -7 |
| Bonsall | 68 | \$834,500 | \$365,000 | \$629,500 | \$610,000 | 3 |
| Fallbrook | 545 | \$540,000 | \$301,250 | \$510,000 | \$587,000 | -13 |
| Jamul/Dulzura | 77 | \$677,500 | --- | \$677,500 | \$769,000 | -12 |
| Julian | 67 | \$334,000 | --- | \$332,000 | \$306,000 | 9 |
| Lakeside | 309 | \$459,750 | \$190,000 | \$425,000 | \$434,000 | -2 |
| Ramona | 371 | \$511,000 | \$314,000 | \$508,000 | \$523,000 | -3 |
| Spring Valley | 541 | \$410,000 | \$271,250 | \$375,000 | \$438,000 | -14 |
| Valley Center | 149 | \$630,000 | --- | \$663,250 | \$706,000 | -6 |

⁽¹⁾ Median home value information not available for all CPAs. CPAs with limited sales might produce highly skewed data.

Note: Data has been rounded to nearest whole number.

Source: DQ News 2008

Table 2.12-10. Manufactured/Mobile Home Value: November 2006

| CPA | Number of Sales | Median | Range |
|---------------|-----------------|-----------|--------------------|
| Alpine | 2 | \$72,000 | \$49,000-\$95,000 |
| Fallbrook | 34 | \$117,250 | \$29,500-\$370,000 |
| Jamul/Dulzura | 1 | \$35,000 | \$35,000 |
| Lakeside | 21 | \$219,000 | \$45,900-\$450,000 |
| Ramona | 15 | \$75,500 | \$48,800-\$454,000 |
| Spring Valley | 32 | \$94,500 | \$13,450-\$169,000 |
| Valley Center | 16 | \$85,450 | \$45,000-\$194,900 |

Note: Manufactured/mobile home information is not available for all CPAs. Typically mobile homes at the high end of the price range are anomalies, as evident in the modest median values. These higher-priced homes are often located on large lots. In addition, data has been rounded to nearest whole number
Source: NAR 2006

**Table 2.12-11. Average Rental Rate by Type in Unincorporated Area:
March through May 2008**

| CPA | Apartment | Condo/ Townhouse | Cottage/ Guest House | Single Bedroom | Studio | House | Overall Average |
|---------------|-----------|---------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|---------|---------|--------------------|
| Julian | \$1,230 | --- | --- | \$862 | \$1,050 | \$1,437 | \$1,333 |
| Fallbrook | | \$1,200 | --- | --- | | \$1,300 | \$1,250 |
| Lakeside | \$923 | \$1,196 | | --- | \$904 | \$2,054 | \$1,085 |
| Ramona | \$969 | \$1,264 | \$830 | \$801 | \$830 | \$2,070 | \$1,327 |
| Bonsall | \$1,090 | \$1,434 | | \$790 | \$947 | \$2,507 | \$1,382 |
| Valley Center | \$950 | --- | --- | --- | --- | \$2,800 | \$1,875 |
| Jamul | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | \$1,200 | \$1,200 |
| Spring Valley | \$1,049 | \$1,529 | \$1,365 | \$1,178 | \$804 | \$1,691 | \$1,269 |

Note: Rental rate information is not available for all CPAs. Data has been rounded to nearest whole number.
Sources: Rentslicer 2008

Table 2.12-12. Age of Housing: 2000

| Region | Year Constructed (no. years old) | | |
|---------------------|---|---------------------------------------|---|
| | 1949 or Earlier 50+ Years (percent) | 1950-1969 30-50 Years (percent) | 1970 or After <30 Years (percent) |
| Unincorporated Area | 7 | 24 | 69 |
| San Diego County | 10 | 28 | 62 |

Note: Data has been rounded to nearest whole number.
Source: Census 2000

Table 2.12-13. Overcrowding by Region: 2000

| Region | Total Occupied Overcrowded Units | | | Total Renter-Occupied Overcrowded Units | | | Total Owner-Occupied Overcrowded Units | | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|-----------------------------|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| | Units | >1.0 prs/rm ⁽¹⁾ (percent) | >1.5 prs/rm (percent) | Units | >1.0 prs/rm (percent) | >1.5 prs/rm (percent) | Units | >1.0 prs/rm (percent) | >1.5 prs/rm (percent) |
| Unincorporated Area | 11,624 | 8 | 4 | 7,334 | 17 | 9 | 4,290 | 4 | 2 |
| San Diego County | 117,426 | 12 | 7 | 85,316 | 19 | 11 | 32,110 | 6 | 3 |

⁽¹⁾ prs/rm = persons/room

Note: Data has been rounded to nearest whole number.
Source: Census 2000

Table 2.12-14. Cost Burden by Household Type and Income: 2000

| Households | Total Cost Burdened Households | Percent of Total Households | Percent Extremely Low Income (0-30 AMI) | Percent Very Low Income (31-50 AMI) | Percent Low Income (51-80 AMI) | Percent Moderate or Above (>80 AMI) |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Owner-Households | | | | | | |
| Elderly | 775 | 28 | 22 | 23 | 22 | 33 |
| Small Families | 15,051 | 31 | 7 | 7 | 18 | 68 |
| Large Families | 3,952 | 31 | 8 | 10 | 24 | 58 |
| Others | 4,178 | 40 | 19 | 12 | 19 | 50 |
| Total Owners | 30,840 | 31 | 12 | 12 | 20 | 56 |
| Renter-Households | | | | | | |
| Elderly | 1,976 | 51 | 38 | 35 | 20 | 7 |
| Small Families | 7,266 | 33 | 28 | 36 | 27 | 9 |
| Large Families | 2,268 | 32 | 31 | 40 | 23 | 6 |
| Others | 3,128 | 38 | 31 | 25 | 35 | 10 |
| Total Renters | 14,622 | 35 | 30 | 34 | 27 | 8 |
| Total | 45,430 | 32 | 18 | 19 | 22 | 41 |

Notes:

1) AMI = Area Median Income

2) 2000 Census sample data (long form) was used to prepare the CHAS dataset. Characteristics were based on 5 percent sample and then extrapolated to 100 percent; depending on the weighting used, total numbers do not always match the 100 percent data.

Totals do not add up due to rounding errors that occurred during the extrapolation of data from general proportions.

3) Data has been rounded to nearest whole number.

Source: HUD 2006

Table 2.12-15. Employment by Industry: 2000

| CPA | Total Population | Total Employed | Agriculture (percent) | Construction/Transportation/Utilities (percent) | Manufacturing (percent) | Wholesale/Retail Trade (percent) | Services (percent) | Professional (percent) | Government (percent) |
|---------------------|------------------------|----------------|-----------------------|---|-------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------|------------------------|----------------------|
| Unincorporated Area | 442,919 ⁽¹⁾ | 180,036 | 2 | 14 | 9 | 15 | 43 | 11 | 6 |
| San Diego County | 2,813,833 | 1,232,739 | 1 | 10 | 11 | 14 | 45 | 13 | 5 |

⁽¹⁾ This number represents total population of unincorporated San Diego County, not total employable population.

Note: Data has been rounded to nearest whole number.

Source: Census 2000