

KING COUNTY BENCHMARKS

Metropolitan King County *Countywide Planning Policies* Benchmark Program
1999 King County Benchmark Report



Acknowledgments

Benchmark Staff


Cynthia Moffitt, Project Manager
Rose Curran, Lead Analyst and Editor
Steve Cohn, City of Bellevue Representative
Tom Hauger, City of Seattle Representative
Rob Odle, Suburban Cities Representative

The Benchmark Team wants to thank the following persons for their contributions to the Benchmark Report.

Norm Abott
Eileen Bleeker
Sarah Bohlen
Larry Burris
Mark Busher
Jean Carpenter
Darald Christensen
Margaret Clark
Doug Clinton
Georgia Conti
Tom Cropp
Elsie Crossman
Owen Dennison
Martin Dicker
Bill Eckel
Deborah Eddy
Chandler Felt
Mark Finch
Bruce Florey
Steve Foley
Rebecca Fox
Kate Galloway
Villamor Gamponia
David George
Gavin Gray
Carol Gregory

Gary Grieve
Azim Sheikh Hari
Gary Hassler
John Haws
Jeff Haymes
Trish Heinonen
Gayle Hendensten
Aaron Hoard
Mary Hoffman
George Horning
Clair Impett
Lynae Jacobson
Randy Jeffrey
Eric Jensen
Les Johnson
Rick Judd
Neil Kilgren
Don Largen
Roberta Lewendowski
Janet Lewine
Rebecca Lind
Linda Longmire
Nanette Morales
Ray Moser
Beth Mountsier
Steve Munson

Brad North
Kevin O'Neill
Kate O'Laughlin
Lori Peckol
Joel Pfundt
Linda Pierce
Ray Pullar
Cynthia Ricks-Maccotan
Jim Record
Karen Reed
Labh Sachdev
Michael Scarry
Mark Sharp
William Shaw
Carol Smith
Laurie Smith
Bill Starkey
Pat Talton
Nancy Tosta
Cynthia Stewart
Bill Tweit
Donna Velasco
Mitch Wasserman
Dave White
Pat Whittaker
Janna Wilson



Outcomes and Indicators

Outcome: The ultimate goal or objective. *Example: Increase Income and Reduce Poverty.*

Indicator: The item that is measured to show progress toward achieving the vision of the Countywide Planning Policies. *Example: Percentage of population below the poverty level.*

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.

KING COUNTY BENCHMARKS



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

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

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.

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.

KING COUNTY
BENCHMARKS

Metropolitan King County *Countywide Planning Policies* Benchmark Program
1999 King County Benchmark Report



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.