



King County

**KING COUNTY
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2008**

**Technical Appendix D
Growth targets and the Urban Growth Area**

March 1, 2008

King County Department of Development and Environmental Services
900 Oakesdale Avenue Southwest
Renton, WA 98057-5212
<http://www.metrokc.gov/permits/codes/CompPlan/2008/>

Growth Targets and the Urban Growth Area

Table of Contents

- I. Abstract
- II. Background
- III. Size of the Urban Growth Area
 - A. Growth to be Accommodated
 - 1. Projected Countywide Household Growth
 - 2. Allocation of Projected Household Growth to Cities
 - B. Land Capacity in the UGA
 - 1. Countywide
 - 2. Subareas
- IV. Conclusion

I. Abstract

This appendix provides an analysis of growth trends in order to review the size and location of the King County Urban Growth Area (UGA). The appendix discusses the factors that contribute to review of the drawing of the UGA to accommodate projected population growth by 2022 pursuant to the state Growth Management Act (GMA). The relevant information for this study came from reports of the various technical committees assigned to provide data for the UGA, the Countywide Planning Policies, the Environmental Impact Statements of the Countywide Planning Policies and the King County Comprehensive Plan, the Buildable Lands amendment to the GMA, and a review of the work of other jurisdictions developing similar policies throughout the country.

Appendix D was originally prepared in 1994 and updated in 2004. This Appendix D-2008 supplements the original with new information. The analysis was updated in 2004 to reflect four changes since 1994:

- Growth of population, housing units and jobs in the years since 1994;
- New population forecasts prepared by Washington State in early 2002;
- The King County Buildable Lands Report, completed in September 2002 pursuant to the 1997 Buildable Lands amendment to the GMA; and
- New principles for allocating growth, specifically that each jurisdiction accommodate a share of the forecasted growth and that population and job growth should be in balance.

This Appendix D-2004 incorporates the original Appendix D by reference, but does not address issues already covered by the original, such as delineation of the UGA. Therefore, it supplements but does not replace Appendix D. This revised Appendix describes modifications to the assumptions and methodology used to extend the original growth targets ten years to 2022.

In 2002, King County and its cities compiled land supply, land capacity and density data and submitted an evaluation report under the Buildable Lands amendment to the GMA. This report contained current measures of land capacity, revised to represent adopted plans and zoning throughout King County. This updated, more accurate land Supply information was combined with the updated land Demand information from State forecasts, in order to review the size and adequacy of the UGA.

The King County UGA is sized to adequately accommodate projected growth while also accounting for unpredictable circumstances that could alter the calculated supply of buildable land or the number of households needed to accommodate projected population growth. The location of the UGA takes in areas of the County that already have urban services or have solid commitments for urban services, and as a result, would be inconsistent with the criteria for rural land. A second round of Buildable Lands information, completed in September 2007, affirms the adequacy of the existing UGA to accommodate all of the county's projected growth through 2022. This is true both for the entire Urban Growth Area and for the unincorporated portions of the UGA.

II. Background

The Countywide Planning Policies established a framework UGA for King County. King County designated a final UGA in its 1994 Comprehensive Plan based on this framework. Each city within King County is responsible for determining, through its comprehensive plan, land use within its borders. King County is responsible for establishing land use in the unincorporated portion of the UGA through its comprehensive plan.

Key factors used in setting the UGA include population forecasts, growth targets, and land capacity. **Population forecasts** are predictions about future behavior based on past trends. **Growth targets** are a jurisdiction's policy statement on how many net new households it intends to accommodate in the future based on population forecasts and the expected size of the average household. **Land capacity** is derived from an estimate of vacant land plus the redevelopment potential of land already partially developed or underutilized. **Discount factors** are applied to the estimate of land capacity to account for probable constraints to actually developing the land.

Forecasts are useful as an indicator of the potential future demand for land. Targets follow the development of specific goals and objectives for future growth and, under the GMA, they must be supported by commitment of funds, incentives, and regulations. Discounted capacity is a realistic estimate of how much growth may be accommodated in a geographic area.

Under the GMA, each county is required to accommodate 20 years of population growth. Counties are to establish UGAs "within which urban growth shall be encouraged and outside of which growth can occur only if it is not urban in nature" (RCW 36.70A.110(1)). Further based on OFM population projections, the GMA requires the UGA to "include areas and densities sufficient to permit the urban growth that is projected to occur in the county for the succeeding twenty-year period" (RCW 36.70A.110(2)). As specified in RCW 36.70A.110(1), all cities are places for urban growth and, by law, must be included within the Countywide UGA. In addition, unincorporated areas may be included within the UGA "only if such territory already is characterized by urban growth or is adjacent to territory already characterized by urban growth". Each UGA also shall include greenbelt and open space areas (RCW 36.70A.110(2)).

Several GMA goals, such as those dealing with affordable housing, economic development, open space, recreation, and the environment, have an important bearing on these UGA requirements. These goals need to be balanced with those which encourage efficient urban growth and discourage urban sprawl.

The so-called "concurrency" goal for public facilities and services directs jurisdictions to ensure that "those public facilities and services necessary to support development shall be adequate to serve the development at the time the development is available for occupancy without decreasing current service levels below locally established minimum standards" (RCW 36.70A.020(12)). Ensuring adequate land for industrial and commercial development and providing enough land to allow for choices in where people live will help advance economic development and maintain housing affordability. If the UGA is adequately sized, then pressures to develop on environmentally constrained land and on areas set-aside for open space are reduced. These factors must be balanced with the goal of reducing urban sprawl when determining the UGA.

III. Size of the Urban Growth Area

A. Growth to be Accommodated

1. Projected Countywide Household Growth

The Growth Management Act (GMA), adopted in 1990, requires Washington State counties to accommodate forecasted growth, to allocate that growth among their jurisdictions and to designate Urban and Rural areas. In King County, the allocation takes the form of “growth targets” for household and job growth over a 20-year or 22-year Growth Management period. The first set of growth targets was enacted by King County through the Countywide Planning Policies in 1994. For the period 1992 to 2012, the targets specified a range of household and job growth each city and the unincorporated area were expected to accommodate. These targets allowed King County jurisdictions collectively to accommodate the 293,100 additional people forecasted for the period 1992 to 2012.

The GMA requires a ten-year update of Growth Management plans. During the period since the first set of targets were adopted, six new cities have incorporated in King County, and other cities have annexed large areas. By the time of the 2000 Census, King County had 173,000 more residents than in 1994. Furthermore, in January 2002, the Washington State Office of Financial Management (OFM) promulgated a new set of population forecasts for whole counties, out to beyond 2020. The new forecast began from a year-2000 US Census base, and indicated a most likely growth of 311,500 persons in King County during the 22-year period 2000 to 2022. These changes prompted an 18-month process in King County to develop new growth targets for each jurisdiction.

It is important to note that the 2002 OFM forecast ratified the accuracy of earlier forecasts, of the adopted targets, and of the 1994 delineation of the Urban Growth Area (UGA). King County population growth since 1994 has tracked well against OFM’s 1992 forecast which was the basis for the 1994 Comprehensive Plan targets and UGA. Therefore, no radical change to the targets is necessary – only an extension to accommodate another ten years of growth.

Land use decisions are more closely dependent on the expected growth in households and dwelling units than on simple population forecasts. As a result, the OFM population forecast of an additional 311,500 people by 2022 must be translated into a number of additional households in order to be meaningful for purposes of land use planning. Household size is an estimate of the number of people expected to live in each dwelling unit and is used to calculate how many new households will be needed to accommodate the expected increase in population. The paragraphs below explain how analysis of forecasts and household sizes resulted in the translation of the OFM population forecast into new household and job growth targets for 2022.

The Growth Management Planning Council, made up of elected officials representing King County jurisdictions, appointed a committee of planning directors and other city and county staff to plan methodology and develop new targets. The committee began its work in 2001 even before the new OFM forecasts were prepared. By the time OFM released the new numbers in January 2002,

principles and a methodology had already been agreed upon. The methodology grew out of two principles: that each jurisdiction would take a share of the County’s required growth, and there would be an earnest attempt to balance household and job growth in broad subareas of the County.

Base year information from the 2000 Census was available for King County jurisdictions. The committee determined that a ten-year extension of targets to 2022 was needed, so a 22-year time frame was agreed upon. The methodology began by removing “group quarters” (institutional) population from consideration, since such population does not constitute households living in housing units. The methodology also removed Rural areas from consideration as locations of growth. This assumed Rural areas will gain only a small share of total household growth – 6,000 new households or four percent of total growth – consistent with recent trends. Remaining steps of the methodology focused on the Urban Growth Area, in order to accommodate the projected growth there.

| Table 1 | Population 2000 | Population 2022 | 22-year Change | Notes |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------|
| Total Population | 1,737,000 | 2,048,500 | + 311,500 | a. |
| less Group Quarters | - 37,600 | - 55,400 | - 17,800 | b. |
| = Pop. in households | 1,699,400 | 1,993,100 | 293,700 | |
| less Rural population | - 137,000 | - 148,700 | - 11,700 | c. |
| = Urban pop. to allocate | 1,562,400 | 1,844,400 | 282,000 | d. |
| Notes: a. Population forecast for 2022 from WA State OFM, Jan 2002. b. Group quarters (institutional population) forecasted to increase approx. 50%. c. Rural areas forecasted to take 4% of countywide household growth. d. Urban population growth to allocate over 22-year period 2000 - 2022. All numbers are rounded. Sources: WA State Office of Financial Management 2002, US Census and King County. | | | | |

The Urban Growth Area (UGA) was divided into three contiguous subareas (Seattle-Shoreline; the Eastside; South King County) and a fourth subarea consisting of six Rural Cities and their immediate surroundings. [See map on page D-12] Shares of population and household growth were equated to shares of forecasted job growth in each of the three contiguous Urban subareas.

Specifically, the methodology consists of the following steps:

1. Utilize PSRC jobs forecast by subarea
2. Distribute population to subareas in proportion to jobs forecast
3. Predict future household size in each King County subarea
4. Use household size to calculate new households needed to accommodate 2001-2022 population in each subarea
5. Assign household targets among the jurisdictions within each subarea.

Each of these steps is detailed below, with references to tables in the text.

Table 2

| Job Forecast by KC Subarea | | |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Subarea | Change in jobs 2001-2022 | Percentage distribution |
| SeaShore | 95,850 | 33% |
| East KC | 103,250 | 35% |
| South KC | 89,500 | 30% |
| Rural Cities | 5,250 | 2% |
| Total | 293,850 | 100% |

Table 3

| Population Distribution by KC Urban Subarea | | | | |
|---------------------------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| Subarea | Percentage distribution | Population distribution* | 2000 existing population | Total 2022 population |
| SeaShore | 33% | 91,985 | 633,200 | 725,200 |
| East KC | 35% | 99,086 | 385,100 | 484,200 |
| South KC | 30% | 85,891 | 520,800 | 606,700 |
| Rural Cities | 2% | 5,038 | 23,500 | 28,500 |
| Total | 100% | 282,000 | 1,562,600 | 1,844,600 |

*Net 22-year population growth in Urban households.

1. Forecasts of job growth from the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) were used to determine shares of job growth in each Urban subarea. The most recent forecast available was PSRC's "Working Draft Forecast, 2001." The forecast indicated a countywide total growth of almost 294,000 jobs, with shares by subarea as shown in Table 2 above.
2. The table displays the percentage of job growth each subarea is predicted to receive. The same percentage was applied to population growth for each subarea, in order to maintain a rough balance of workers and jobs in each subarea. See Table 3.
3. The committee undertook detailed analysis of household size trends. Household size declined rapidly during the 1970s and 1980s, with the effect that the number of housing units and households grew at a faster rate than population. That required many new households to hold a given amount of population growth. During the 1990s, household sizes stabilized at about 2.39. If such stability were to continue, fewer new households would be needed to accommodate a given future population. The committee concluded a middle path, that average household size would edge downward from the current 2.39 to 2.30 by the forecast year 2022. The committee further concluded that it was reasonable to expect each of the four Urban subareas to experience a similar slight decrease in household size of about 3.8% over the 22 year forecast period. See Table 4.
4. The predicted future household sizes by subarea were applied to the forecasted subarea populations (see Table 5 below) to derive future predicted households in each subarea. The 2022 Urban population can be housed in 811,000 households – an increase of 148,600 over the current number of households. The right-hand column of Table 5 shows the minimum number of added households required in each Urban subarea. Including the Rural and Group Quarters population, the 2022 OFM forecast of 2,048,000 can be accommodated in 866,500 households – an increase of 156,000 from the 2000 Census and only 36,000 households more than the original 2012 target number.
5. The last step was to allocate the subarea growth targets to individual jurisdictions in each subarea. The subarea household growth totals (Table 5) were used as a guide except in the Rural Cities subarea, whose jurisdictions agreed that a larger household growth target was more realistic. The Rural Cities total from the original targets, 5,563 households, was used instead, resulting in an Urban King County total of 151,932 households to be accommodated over the 22-year Growth Management period.

Through a process of analysis and negotiation within each subarea, household and job numbers were agreed upon that reflected each jurisdiction's ability to accommodate population and job growth. The primary resource for this analysis was the Buildable Lands information on residential and commercial-industrial land capacity completed in mid-2002.

Table 4

| Household Size by KC Subarea | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Subarea | Persons/HH 2000 | Persons/HH 2020 |
| SeaShore | 2.14 | 2.06 |
| East KC | 2.47 | 2.38 |
| South KC | 2.59 | 2.49 |
| Rural Cities | 2.61 | 2.51 |
| Total | 2.39 | 2.30 |

Table 5

| New Households Needed to Accommodate 2000-2022 Population | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------|---------|---------------------|------------------|
| Subarea | Total 2022 Population | Persons/HH | 2022 HH | 2000 existing HH | New HH growth |
| SeaShore | 725,200 | 2.06 | 352,569 | 296,200 | 56,369 |
| East KC | 484,200 | 2.38 | 203,445 | 155,800 | 47,645 |
| South KC | 606,700 | 2.49 | 243,655 | 201,300 | 42,355 |
| Rural Cities | 28,500 | 2.51 | 11,355 | 9,100 | 2,255 |
| Total | 1,844,600 | 2.30 | 811,024 | 662,400 | 148,624 |

Throughout the process, city and county staff collaborated effectively to reach agreeable conclusions. The whole process was marked by collegiality and regionwide thinking, and culminated in a set of recommended new household and job growth targets which were unanimously adopted on November 25, 2002 by the Growth Management Planning Council.

See table of 2001-2022 targets on page D-11. The table shows 22-year household growth targets for each city and for unincorporated areas within the UGA. Unincorporated subarea targets add to only 13,406 households, less than 9% of the Urban-area total target. Most of the remaining Urban growth is expected to occur in cities. In addition, the adopted targets provide for annexation of the remaining Urban area by specifying the number of households in potential annexation areas (PAAs). These numbers are shown as "PAA HH target" in the table. As cities annex territory, the responsibility to accommodate that specific share of growth goes with the annexation, and would shift from unincorporated target into a city target. Before 2022, all of King County will be within city limits except for designated Rural and Resource areas.

For the entire county, the Countywide Planning Policies adopted a 22-year target of 157,932 new households (LU-67). This household growth target is based upon the assumption that the average household size in King County in 2022 will be 2.30 people. Applying this average household size of 2.3 to the OFM forecast of 1,993,100 people projected to be living in King County households in 2022 yields a total of about 868,000 households in 2022, up by 157,900 from the 2000 Census total.

At the end of 2007, Washington State OFM released a new set of population forecasts. Before the next update of this Comprehensive Plan, King County jurisdictions will collaborate to extend the growth targets again, in a process similar to that described above.

2. Allocation of Projected Household Growth to Cities and Unincorporated King County

The Urban-area household growth target of 151,900 households was allocated to each of King County's 39 cities and to the County's Urban unincorporated area by the Countywide Planning Policies.¹ These targets are *estimates* of the number of new households that jurisdictions expect to receive during the period. The targets for each of the cities and the unincorporated area are intended as a guide with some flexibility to reflect the limited capability of individual jurisdictions to determine their precise levels of growth. It is essential that each jurisdiction adopt policies and regulations that allow the jurisdiction to accommodate that targeted amount.

¹ King County Countywide Planning Policies, Policy LU-67. King County Council Ordinance No. 11446, August 15, 1994.

The allocation of households to jurisdictions is connected to the allocation of estimated future jobs. Although not required by the GMA, the Countywide Planning Policies adopted a 22-year employment target in addition to the household target and also allocated the employment target to the cities and unincorporated King County. The Countywide employment growth target of 293,850 (Table 2) was based on job forecasts prepared by the Puget Sound Regional Council and was allocated to the cities and the county based upon factors listed in Countywide Planning Policy LU-68. The cities' household targets are tied in part to their employment targets because of the relationship between household and employment growth and the need to support Urban Centers while balancing local employment opportunities in activity centers and neighborhoods in the urban area.

Targets represent a commitment by the jurisdiction to accommodate growth. The Countywide Planning Policies require jurisdictions to plan for their targeted growth and to adopt a regulatory framework and the necessary infrastructure funding to achieve the targeted growth. The way each jurisdiction achieves its targets is within its discretion. It is the responsibility of each jurisdiction to determine how best to accomplish its growth targets. The jurisdictions will impose a variety of regulatory measures, appropriate to their area, to achieve their goals. It is the responsibility of King County to implement its growth targets through zoning decisions and other policies in the unincorporated areas.

Under this methodology, new cities are treated the same way as annexations. In this way, the entire Urban unincorporated allocation can be distributed among the annexing and new cities as they absorb an unincorporated community in pieces over time. The Rural target allocation remains in unincorporated King County because it is not annexed or incorporated. Annexations to six Rural Cities are not subject to these adjustments because their target allocation already includes their UGA expansion area.

The unincorporated growth targets are accommodated through a variety of zoning densities appropriate to the respective geographic areas of the County. The Executive Proposed King County Comprehensive Plan directs that development in the UGA should occur at an average of seven to eight dwelling units per acre. Within the Urban Area, growth is targeted to go first to the Full Service Planning Areas where urban services are currently available, and second to the Service Planning Areas in which one or more urban service is not currently available.

B. Land Capacity in the UGA

1. Countywide

King County is required by the GMA to ensure sufficient land is available to accommodate the expected number of households by 2022. Most of the anticipated growth will occur in the UGA, including cities and unincorporated areas. Estimating land capacity involves much more than merely adding up all vacant and redevelopable land available in the county. Land capacity is an estimate of the amount of buildable land that is likely to be actually available; that means taking the base, or raw, number and subtracting out land that is unbuildable due to environmental and other constraints.

A 1997 amendment to the GMA required King County and its cities to measure "Buildable Land" capacity, to verify that the Urban Growth Area has sufficient land capacity to accommodate our targeted growth. In 2002, King County jurisdictions conducted an inventory of land supply

(measured in acres) and land capacity (measured in housing units and jobs that can be accommodated) as of January 2001. The Buildable Lands Evaluation Report, published in September, 2002, concluded that the King County UGA contains 26,900 acres of land suitable for residential growth. The UGA can accommodate more than 263,000 new housing units. This capacity is sufficient to absorb the 2000 – 2022 target of 151,932 new housing units. Furthermore, each of the four Urban subareas has sufficient capacity to accommodate the growth targets specified in Table 5 above.

In September, 2007, a second five-year Buildable Lands Report was completed and transmitted to Washington State. The 2007 Buildable Lands Report affirms that there exists sufficient residential capacity in the King County UGA to accommodate the entire county's growth forecast through 2022. Based on this updated information, it is clear that no change to the UGA is necessary.

2. Subareas

The Buildable Lands Evaluation Report measured land capacity in each of King County's four Urban subareas. Detailed information is available from that Report, which is incorporated here by reference (see www.metrokc.gov/budget/buildland/bldlnd02.htm). Nearly half of the Urban King County total is in the Sea-Shore subarea, primarily Seattle. The East and South King County subareas each contain about one quarter of the total capacity, and the Rural Cities subarea has limited capacity. Unincorporated Urban King County as a whole can accommodate less than 25,000 new households, only nine percent of the Urban King County total, but sufficient to accommodate the unincorporated Urban target of 13,400 households. Each of the King County subareas has sufficient capacity to accommodate its subarea growth target, which in turn is proportionate to the subarea forecast of job growth, in order to maintain balance of jobs and housing growth. Updated Buildable Lands data published in 2007 at www.metrokc.gov/budget/buildland/bldlnd07.htm reaches the same conclusion, that each subarea contains sufficient capacity to accommodate growth through 2022.

IV. Conclusion

King County population growth since 1994 has tracked well against OFM's 1992 forecast which was the basis for the 1994 Comprehensive Plan targets and UGA. Population growth since 2002 has likewise tracked well against OFM's 2002 forecast. Therefore, no radical change to the targets is necessary – only an extension to accommodate another ten years of growth. Further, no change to the UGA is necessary. The Urban Growth Area delineated in 1994 continues to be appropriately sized in order to accommodate growth expected through the year 2022.

| King County 2001-2022 Household and Employment Targets | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------|------------------|--------------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------------|----------------|
| Subareas | Household Target | Housing Capacity in PAA* | PAA HH Target | Job Target | Job Capacity in PAA* | PAA Job Target |
| South King County | | | | | | |
| Algona | 298 | | | 108 | | |
| Auburn | 5,928 | 2,635 | 926 | 6,079 | 252 | 252 |
| Black Diamond | 1,099 | | | 2,525 | | |
| Burien | 1,552 | | | 1,712 | | |
| Covington | 1,173 | | | 900 | | |
| Des Moines | 1,576 | 5 | 2 | 1,695 | | |
| Federal Way | 6,188 | 3,754 | 1,320 | 7,481 | 134 | 134 |
| Kent | 4,284 | 1,763 | 619 | 11,500 | 44 | 44 |
| Milton | 50 | 106 | 37 | 1,054 | | |
| Maple Valley | 300 | | | 804 | | |
| Normandy Park | 100 | | | 67 | | |
| Pacific | 996 | 127 | 45 | 108 | | |
| Renton | 6,198 | 5,622 | 1,976 | 27,597 | 458 | 458 |
| SeaTac | 4,478 | 14 | 5 | 9,288 | 496 | 496 |
| Tukwila | 3,200 | 13 | 5 | 16,000 | 497 | 497 |
| Unincorp King County | 4,935 | | | 2,582 | 701 | 701 |
| Total | 42,355 | 14,039 | 4,935 | 89,500 | 2,582 | 2,582 |
| East King County | | | | | | |
| Beaux Arts Village | 3 | | | - | | |
| Bellevue | 10,117 | 184 | 178 | 40,000 | 27 | 27 |
| Bothell | 1,751 | 603 | 584 | 2,000 | 174 | 174 |
| Clyde Hill | 21 | | | - | | |
| Hunts Point | 1 | | | - | | |
| Issaquah | 3,993 | 827 | 802 | 14,000 | 1 | 1 |
| Kenmore | 2,325 | | | 2,800 | | |
| Kirkland | 5,480 | 770 | 747 | 8,800 | 221 | 221 |
| Medina | 31 | | | - | | |
| Mercer Island | 1,437 | | | 800 | | |
| Newcastle | 863 | 1 | 1 | 500 | | |
| Redmond | 9,083 | 402 | 390 | 21,760 | 21 | 21 |
| Sammamish | 3,842 | | | 1,230 | | |
| Woodinville | 1,869 | | | 2,000 | | |
| Yarrow Point | 28 | | | - | | |
| Unincorp King County | 6,801 | **4222 | **4099 | 4,637 | **4193 | **4193 |
| Total | 47,645 | 7,009 | 6,801 | 98,527 | 4,637 | 4,637 |
| Sea-Shore | | | | | | |
| Lake Forest Park | 538 | | | 455 | | |
| Seattle | 51,510 | | | 92,083 | | |
| Shoreline | 2,651 | | | 2,618 | | |
| Unincorp King County*** | 1,670 | 1,670 | 1,670 | 694 | 1,544 | 694 |
| Total | 56,369 | 1,670 | 1,670 | 95,850 | 1,544 | 694 |
| Rural Cities **** | | | | | | |
| Carnation | 246 | | | 75 | | |
| Duvall | 1,037 | | | 1,125 | | |
| Enumclaw | 1,927 | | | 1,125 | | |
| North Bend | 636 | | | 1,125 | | |
| Skykomish | 20 | | | - | | |
| Snoqualmie | 1,697 | | | 1,800 | | |
| Total | 5,563 | | | 5,250 | | |
| King County Total | 151,932 | | | 289,127 | | |

*PAA: Potential Annexation Area in Unincorporated King County Urban Area; **Bear Creek UPD; ***North Highline

****The Rural Cities' targets are for the current city limits and rural expansion area for each city. Thus the methodology for adjusting targets as annexations occur is not applicable to the rural cities.

Editor's Note: Source for 2001 housing and job capacity figures for PAAs is the 2002 King County Buildable Lands evaluation. Subarea unincorporated targets were allocated to PAAs based on proportional capacity.

