

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 1999 Benchmark Report is the fourth 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 CPPs.

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. Ratio of land capacity to 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 1999 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 per worker rose 24% from 1994 to 1998, after largely stagnating between 1980 and 1994. A slight increase in 1995 was followed by more significant increases from 1996 - 1998, bringing real wages in King County well above their highest level during the past twenty years. This past year (1997 - 1998) real wages rose 8.2%.

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

- King County personal income exceeded the nationwide average income by 41% in 1996 and by 46% in 1997. For the period from 1980 to the present, the difference between King County personal income and nationwide income has increased by approximately 16%.

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. The highest rates of poverty are among Native Americans and Blacks, particularly among children. One-third of people in these ethnic groups lives 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 poverty-level children are White.

Indicator #4 New businesses created.

- Business growth was particularly strong in 1998 with a 5.1% increase in new business. Since 1990, the rate of business growth has varied somewhat, declining in 1995 and rising again in 1996 to 1998. Over the long term, business growth appears fairly steady with a 2.5% average annual growth rate for new businesses from 1990 through 1998.

Indicator #5 New jobs created by employment sector.

- From 1996 to 1998 overall employment opportunity increased substantially with over 105,000 new jobs added in two years. New job creation from 1990 - 1998 was approximately 19%, or an average of 2.2% per year.
- In the 1990s Services comprise by far the largest share (59%) of new jobs created. Business Services, which includes the subsector of Computer Software and Services, accounted for 30% of all new jobs in the 1990s.

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

- About 42% 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. Employment in the Business Services sector grew by 93% between 1990 and 1998.
- In 1998, the number of jobs in manufacturing was the highest it has been since 1992, and 15% higher than 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. Nationwide data continues to show that those who do not complete high school earn only about 42% of what is earned by college graduates. In 1996 male dropouts earn only 40% of what is earned by males with a college degree. From 1991 - 1996 the real earning of males who did not finish high school fell 7.6%, while the real earnings of female dropouts fell 22.3%.
- 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 dropped to 79.7% in 1996, and to 78.8% in 1997 after remaining fairly stable at around 84% from 1988 to 1994. The current rate represents a drop of 6 percentage points in the graduation rate since 1994.
- 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 343 in 1998 and the number of unhealthful days has decreased from 18 days in 1980 to no unhealthful days in 1998.

Indicator #11 BTU consumption per capita

- Total energy consumption has increased 27.7% since 1986, mainly due to population growth and economic growth, but also due to higher per capita usage of all energy sources.
- Per capita consumption of all energy sources increased 6% from 1986 to 1993. Despite minor fluctuations over the last five years, per capita consumption in 1998 is nearly the same as it was in 1993.

Indicator #12 Vehicle miles traveled per year

- Vehicle miles traveled per capita has increased 48% between 1985 and 1998 and total vehicle miles traveled has increased by 85% in the same period while the population grew by just 24% during this time. The continued suburbanization of new population and employment has meant a higher use of motor vehicles for all travel purposes.

Indicator #13 Surface water and groundwater quality

- Among all monitored lakes in the region, about 35% have the lowered water clarity, more algae, 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 Biotic Integrity score.

Indicator #14 Water consumption

- Water consumption per capita has decreased overall since 1985. 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%. There was a sharp drop in 1992 as a result of that year's drought. In 1998, however, consumption rose slightly from 106 to 109 gallons per capita.

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 acreage 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 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, but in recent years there are signs of recovery. In 1998 over 6000 adult Chinook returned to that basin, the highest number since 1980.
- Wild Coho and Wild Sockeye returns are also depressed, especially in the Cedar River/Lake Washington basin. In 1998 less than 500 adult Coho returned to the Lake Washington watershed.

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

- The amount recycled per capita has steadily increased from 1990 - 1997 at an average rate of 8.2%. However, the 1997-1998 recycling estimates for King County show a leveling off in the amount recycled per person.
- Solid waste disposal per capita decreased from 1990 to 1996. As expected, it rose slightly in 1997, and leveled off in 1998.
- While the eight year trend has been toward a higher amount of total waste generated per capita, 1998 actually brought a decline of two pounds per person in the amount generated, compared to the 1997 amount.

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.

- There are approximately 95,200 renters in King County who earn less than 50% of median income.

- About 52,080 renter households earn less than 30% of median income (\$15,930 for a family of three). For these, there are virtually no market-rate rental units available.
- Approximately 30,000 of these 52,080 households are currently living in assisted rental housing. This leaves approximately 22,000 of the lowest income rental households who will necessarily be housed in higher cost units than they can afford.
- Compounding the problem, these low-income renters must compete with each other and with higher income renters for the limited number of market-rate low-cost units.
- Only 3.5% of single-family rental units (rental houses) are affordable to those with incomes below 50% of the median (\$20,700 - \$29,500).
- An additional 5,500 individuals in the County are homeless

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.
- Nearly 80% of *renter* households in the two lowest income categories (less than 50% of median income) paid more than a third of their income to housing costs in 1990. Low income renters 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 Crisis Clinic's Community Information Line is a key referral source for homeless people. The clinic has experienced a 41% increase from 1996-1998 in callers seeking emergency shelter.
- Operation Nightwatch assisted a total of 16,615 persons in 1993 and a total of 45,821 persons in 1998 - nearly three times as many as five years ago.

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

- Despite falling interest rates and rising incomes, home ownership is not an affordable option for first-time home buyers in King County with moderate incomes
- In 1998, the median renter household had an income of \$32,000 and could afford to purchase a home for \$105,400. Fewer than 2% of homes sold for this amount or less in 1998. At 80% of median income, a household could afford a home at \$125,700. Only 6% to 7% of single family homes were priced at or below this amount. The median price for a conventional single family home was \$215,000. By February 1999, the median price for a single family home in King County had risen to \$232,000.
- Currently the median renter can afford to pay less than half the amount of the median home price.
- A household at 100% of median income could purchase the median-priced home in 1993 and 1994, but faced a growing affordability gap from 1995 - 1998. Although the median income of King County households is rising and interest rates fell slightly during 1997 - 1998, the price of homes has continued to increase at a rapid rate. The median home price in 1998 was 42% higher than in 1993.

Indicator #25 Home ownership rate.

- King County's home ownership rate of 59% remains nearly the same as it was in 1990. It is considerably lower than the national rate of 66% and the statewide rate of 63%. However, it is more appropriate to compare it to other metropolitan areas. The average home ownership rate within metropolitan areas was 63.7% in 1997.
- The home ownership rates in Washington State, and the United States have each risen over the past 7 years, although Washington State's is lower than it was in 1980.
- The rising cost of home ownership in King County has been somewhat offset by the availability of lower interest rates during the past few years. However, affordable home ownership opportunities continue to be more abundant in the neighboring counties than in King County.

Indicator #26 Apartment vacancy rate.

- After showing a marked downward trend from 1994 - 1997, King County's overall average vacancy rate rose slightly to 3.3% in 1998. Vacancy rates vary widely across King County sub-regions.
- 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.

Indicator #27 Trend of housing costs vs. income.

- The median price for a single family home was \$215,000 in 1998. The median price for condos was \$131,000. House prices have increased an average of 6.7% each year since 1990, while median household income has increased an average of 3.8%. Increases in average rent have correlated more closely with changes in median income.
- Home prices in the Puget Sound region rank among the highest in the nation. King County has the highest home prices within the region. In September 1998, the average home price (single family and condos) in King County was 55% higher than in Pierce County and 28% higher than in Snohomish County.
- Average rent for a two bedroom, 1 bathroom apartment in King County was \$708 in 1998, up 8% from \$655 in 1997.

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 1998, a total of \$19,350,912 was spent for low incoming housing in King County. \$7,928,130 was spent for low income housing outside of Seattle, and \$11,422,782 was spent within Seattle. These public dollars also leverage a significant amount of federal and state funds.

Indicator #29 Housing affordable to low-income households.

- Overall, South King County and the rural cities have the highest proportion of existing affordable housing.
- Cities on the Eastside have the lowest proportion of affordable housing. Most cities in the north end of the County also have a lower than average proportion of affordable housing.
- Seattle has a moderate percentage (19%) of affordable rental units, but a fairly low percentage of homes affordable to first-time buyers (11%).

- To meet demand, and to satisfy the goal of equitable distribution of affordable housing, at least 38% of a jurisdiction's total housing stock would need to be affordable to households earning less than 80% of median income. 10 King County cities meet this criteria. Another 6 cities have 20% - 34% of their housing stock at affordable levels. 8 cities have 10 - 20% affordable housing, while 16 more cities have less than 10% of their units affordable to either rent or buy.

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 14,249 new residential units were added in King County in 1998. 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.
- 94% of King County's new housing units were built in Urban Areas in 1998. 6% or 867 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. 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.
- Of the approx. 720,000 existing housing units in the County as a whole; 94% are in Urban Areas.

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

- 98.5% of KC's jobs are located in Urban Areas, and 1.5% are located in Rural or Resource Areas.
- 35% of jobs countywide are located within the designated Urban Centers.

Indicator #32 New housing units built through redevelopment.

- In 1998, the cities' redevelopment rate, excluding Seattle, was 15%.
- Over 32% of new units were built through redevelopment in Unincorp. King County. The overall redevelopment rate, which includes Unincorp. King County and all the cities except Seattle, 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 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.**

- Depending on the zone type, jurisdictions are achieving from 75% to 85% of maximum allowed density, based on aggregated data.
- Since high-density development helps cities to achieve their housing targets without using up all available land, reaching maximum density in the zones with higher allowed density is particularly desirable.

Indicator #37 **Acres of urban parks and open space.**

- Together, there are over 23,250 acres of City- and County-owned urban parks and open space, or over 15 acres per thousand urban residents. This exceeds the national norm of 10.5 acres per person of "close to home" open space.
- 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 forestland, and hundreds of thousands of acres of federally-owned National Forest and Wilderness Areas. Policy making 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.

Indicator #39 **Acres in forestland and farm land.**

- King County has over 931,000 acres in forestland and over 37,500 acres in Agricultural Production Districts (APDs). As a proportion of King County's land area, approximately 68.2% is in forestland and 2.8% is in APDs.

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 over the last ten years, with per capita ridership reaching a high in 1989, and a low in 1994. It increased again from 1994 to 1997, but leveled off in 1998.
- Transit ridership for 1998 was 48.2 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 mode of transportation for all day travel was: Transit: 5.7%; High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV)/Carpool: 33%; Non-Motorized/Other: 6.9%; Single Occupancy 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 U.S. 1990 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 only.

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 1998. During this time, average daily truck traffic has expanded at an average annual rate of 9.8% at the Auburn SR 18 site, by 5.5% at the I-5 site, and by 8.2% at the Woodinville SR 522 site.
- The growth rate of truck traffic has far outpaced that of autos, from twice the growth rate of auto traffic on SR 18 to 5 times the growth rate of autos on SR 522.
- The volume of traffic (both truck and auto) exceeds capacity during at least one period of the day at each of three monitored sites, resulting in 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 in 1997 was 3,841.