


KING COUNTY BENCHMARKS



Metropolitan King County *Countywide Planning Policies* Benchmark Program 2000 King County Benchmark Report

Mission

The Growth Management Planning Council or its successor shall recommend to the Metropolitan King County Council a monitoring and benchmarks program to assess progress in meeting Countywide Planning Policies.

- a. The Growth Management Planning Council or its successor shall establish a growth management monitoring advisory committee which shall recommend information to be reported annually to serve as indicators and benchmarks for growth management policies. The annual reporting shall incorporate the economic development policy indicators developed by the Fiscal Impact Analysis and Economic Development Task Force and other indicators as adopted by the Growth Management Planning Council or its successor, and shall consider housing indicators specified in policy AH-5. King County shall report the adopted growth management benchmarks annually.
- b. The Growth Management Planning Council or its successor should conduct a comprehensive evaluation to assess implementation of the Countywide Planning Policies. The evaluation should be initiated as indicated by results of the monitoring program, but no earlier than five years after adoption of the Phase II Amendments to the Countywide Planning Policies. The evaluation shall include opportunities for public involvement.
- c. If the purposes of these Planning Policies are not being achieved as evidenced by results of benchmarks and monitoring reports, the Growth Management Planning Council or its successor will reconvene at the request of a party to discuss, evaluate and recommend actions to achieve the purposes of the Policies.

Metropolitan King County Countywide Planning Policies: Framework Policy 1; Step 6.

For information about the **Benchmark Report** or the Benchmark Program, please contact Cynthia Moffitt, Project Manager (206) 205-0709, FAX (206) 205-0719; e-mail: cynthia.moffitt@metrokc.gov. The Benchmark Program address is King County Office of Regional Policy and Planning, Room 420, King County Courthouse, Seattle, WA 98104. 2000 Benchmark Report publication date: August 2000.

The **King County Countywide Planning Policies Benchmark Report** is a product of the Metropolitan King County Growth Management Planning Council. The **Report** is published annually by the King County Office of Regional Policy and Planning. A companion to this **Report**, is the **King County Annual Growth Report**. Both reports are available on the Internet at <http://www.metrokc.gov/exec/orpp/>.

King County Growth Management Planning Council Members

Chair

Ron Sims, King County Executive

King County Council Caucus Representative

Pete Von Reichbauer, Councilmember, King County

Suburban Caucus Representative

Judy Clibborn, Mayor, City of Mercer Island

Seattle Caucus Representative

Richard Conlin, Councilmember, City of Seattle

GMPC Members

Trish Borden, Councilmember, City of Auburn

Howard Botts, Mayor, City of Black Diamond

Terry Brazil, Mayor, City of Des Moines

Walt Canter, Commissioner, Special Purpose Districts (Ex-Officio)

Mike Creighton, Councilmember, City of Bellevue

Bob Edwards, Commissioner, Port of Seattle (Ex-Officio)

David Irons, Councilmember, King County

Nick Licata, Councilmember, City of Seattle

Larry Phillips, Councilmember, King County

Paul Schell, Mayor, City of Seattle

Joan Simpson, Mayor, City of North Bend

Cynthia Sullivan, Councilmember, King County

Shirley Thompson, Councilmember, City of SeaTac

Chris Vance, Councilmember, King County

Alternate Members

Jeanne Burbidge, Councilmember, City of Federal Way

Richard Cole, Councilmember, City of Redmond

Grant Degginger, Mayor, City of Bellevue

Richard Gaines, Commissioner, Port of Seattle

Jane Hague, Councilmember, King County

Scott Jepson, Mayor, City of Shoreline

Louise Miller, Councilmember, King County

Judy Nicastro, Councilmember, City of Seattle

Margaret Pageler, Councilmember, City of Seattle

George Rossman, Mayor, City of Enumclaw

Peter Steinbrueck, Councilmember, City of Seattle

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 2000 Benchmark Report is the fifth 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 desired 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.

Table of Contents

Page Number

Mission i
The Benchmark System iii
Map: King County 20 Year Growth Plan vi



Economic Development Summary 1
Indicators:
 #1 Real wages per worker 7
 #2 Personal and median household income: King County compared to the United States 9
 #3 Percentage of population below the poverty level 11
 #4 New businesses created 13
 #5 New jobs created by employment sector 15
 #6 Employment in industries that export from the region 18
 #7 Educational background of adult population 20
 #8 High school graduation rate 22



Environment Summary 25
Indicators:
 #9 Land cover changes in urban and rural areas over time 33
Map: Development and Land Cover in the Tri-County Region 35
 #10 Air quality 37
 #11 Energy consumption 39
 #12 Vehicle miles traveled (VMT) per year 42
 #13 Surface water and groundwater quality 44
Map: Tri-County Watersheds and Major Streams 49
 #14 Water consumption 51
 #15 Change in groundwater levels 53
 #16 Change in wetland acreage and functions 54
Map: Wetlands and other Land Cover in King County 55
Map: Wildlife Habitat Network 57
 #17 Continuity of terrestrial and aquatic habitat networks 59
 #18 Change in number of salmon 60
 #19 Rate of increase in noise from vehicles, planes and yard equipment 66
 #20 Pounds of waste disposed and recycled per capita 69



Affordable Housing Summary 71
Background: 1999 H.U.D. Median Income Levels by Household Size 76
Indicators:
 #21 Supply and demand for affordable housing 77
 #22 Percent of income paid for housing 81



Affordable Housing, continued

Indicators:

#23 Homelessness 84
 #24 Home purchase affordability gap for buyers 86
 #25 Home ownership rate 90
Map: King County Home Ownership Rate 92
 #26 Apartment vacancy rate 94
 #27 Trend of housing costs vs. income 95
 #28 Public dollars spent for low income housing 97
 #29 Housing affordable to low-income households 102
Maps: Affordable Housing in King County 107



Map: Parks, Rural and Resource Lands 111
Land Use Summary 113

Indicators:

#30 New housing units in Urban Areas and Rural/Resource Areas, and in Urban Centers 118
Map: Urban Centers 121
 #31 Employment in Urban and Rural/Resource Areas, Urban and Manufacturing/Industrial Centers 122
 #32 New housing units built through redevelopment 124
 #33 Ratio of land consumption to population growth 126
 #34 Ratio of achieved density to allowed density of residential development 127
 #35 Ratio of land capacity to 20-year job and household targets 129
 #36 Land with 6 years of infrastructure capacity 131
 #37 Acres of urban parks and open space 132
 #38 Ratio of jobs to housing in Central Puget Sound counties, and King County subregions 134
 #39 Acres in forest land and farm land 136
 #40 Number and average size of farms 138



Transportation Summary 139

Indicators:

#41 Percent of residents who commute one way within 30 minutes 143
 #42 Transit trips per person 144
 #43 Percent of residents who use alternatives to the single occupant vehicle 146
 #44 Ability of goods and services to move efficiently and cost effectively through the region 148
Map: Freight and Goods Transportation Systems Map 149
 #45 Number of lane miles of city, county and state roads in need of repair and preservation 153

Appendix

Acknowledgments 157
 List of Outcomes and Indicators 158

Replace this page with the 20 Year Growth Plan Map.