Land Use Targets Methodology

This is the documentation and methodology for the Land Use Targets, a component of the 2013 PSRC forecast products package. This document describes the step-wise approach by which the targets product is created, including its major assumptions.

What is the Land Use Targets ?

The Land Use Targets is a disaggregation of 2025/2030/2031/2035 jurisdictional population, housing and employment targets to smaller geographies (Census Tracts & FAZs). It is intended as a companion product to the 2013 Land Use Baeline, and represents an alternative future land use dataset that is aligned with local growth targets developed (or being developed) to be consistent with the VISION 2040 regional growth strategy.

The basis for the disaggregation comes from estimates of local planned development capacity as well as overarching VISION 2040 policy objectives regarding desired future development patterns. The goal of this product is not to model where population and employment growth is forecasted to occur (as the Land Use Baseline product does), but to provide an alternative future land use modeling dataset that offers a reasonable interpretation baof what a targets-consistent future population and employment distribution might look like. The final product is intended to serve as a starting point for analysis that requires future population and employment distributions

LUT Methodology (this document):

- The methodology may be a useful resource for understanding the decision rules that were used to allocate local growth targets
- While the methodology and some assumptions for calculating capacity are similar to those used for Buildable Lands analysis, this product is not intended to reproduce or reflect Buildable Lands.

LUT Control Targets (containted in this document):

- The process begins with locally developed and adopted targets for each of the region's four counties:
  - King County: 2006-2031 housing and employment targets
  - Pierce County: 2008-2030 population, housing and employment targets
  - Kitsap County: 2000-2025 population targets; employment targets were developed for this exercise
  - Snohomish County: 2011-2035 population and employment targets, and draft initial housing targets
- The final LUT dataset contains the following key variables – housing units, households, population (household and group quarters), and total employment
  - PSRC worked with its Land Use Technical Advisory Committee (LUTAC) to convert housing targets to population, and vice versa, where necessary.
  - PSRC converted all employment targets to reflect total employment, including the Const/Res sector and uniformed military personnel,
  so jurisdictional targets might look different than adopted.
  - In the final results, uniformed military personnel is placed in its own column.

Land Use Targets Dataset (separate excel workbook):

- Results are at the Cemsus Tract, FAZ, and jurisdiction level.
- A field list is provided with the results. The dataset provides housing units, household population, group quarters, and employment by sector.
- Allocations were developed using a set of generalized decision rules laid out in this Methodology document
- There are two main drivers of the allocation process:
  - Available net development capacity (Maximum capacity developed from FLU densities - existing 2010 development from Assessor data)
  - A series of policy-based weights that give preferential status to certain types of places, e.g. designated regional and sub-regional centers
- The methodology also took into consideration major planned developments that are slated to occur during the estimation period
- These generalized decision rules were intended to produce a reasonable distribution of growth within each jurisdiction, but can in no way substitute for local knowledge and expertise about how future growth is being planned for and is likely to occur

The method and assumptions are intended to be applied consistently across jurisdictions, and the generalized results will not always capture unique local circumstances and planning knowledge.

PSRC plans to update the Land Use Targets product after Kitsap and Snohomish jurisdictions have completed updating their local targets to align with VISION 2040. .

This Document

This workbook contains a number of tabs for your review and understanding:

- Methodology: there are 2 tabs covering methodology, one for population and one for employment. Each step includes an illustrative example of how the step would work.
- Definitions: explaining jargon specific to the Land Use Targets.
- Assumptions: covered on green colored tabs, each tab displays and explains one or more of the assumptions that will be used to create the product.
- Targets: provides a summary of the jurisdictional population, housing units, and employment targets (or provisional placeholder values)that will be used to develop the Land Use Targets dataset and, where applicable, conversion processes and assumptions used to develop comparable population, housing unit, and employment values across counties.

Please forward any futher questions to Rebeccah Maskin: rmaskin@psrc.org ; 206.464.5833; 1011 Western Ave, Suite 500, Seattle, WA 98104

DEFINITIONS

Term	Definition
FLU Layer	Future Land Use Layer- The geographic representation of the land uses and maximum and minimum densities allowed on any given piece of land. The FLU was developed from each jurisdiction's adopted comprehensive plans and critical area or other environmental feature layers. Where individual comprehensive plans lacked the specific permitted densities necessary for our methods, PSRC interpolated them using zoning and other planning documents. Residential densities are expressed in dwelling units per acre; non-residential densities use floor area ratio (FAR). Each parcel is overlaid and tagged with a FLU designation and its associated development constraints.
FLU Constraints	The maximum densities allowed, by use, on each parcel, based on the FLU designation. Residential FLU constraints are in dwelling units per acre, non-residential constraints are in floor area ratio (FAR). Parcels to be withheld from development, e.g., critical areas, public spaces, hospitals, government buildings, receive FLU Constraints of 0.
General LU	The FLU layer generalizes local comprehensive plan land use designations to five general categories: single-family residential, multifamily residential, commercial, industrial and office. These uses may exist in any combination for a mixed use area. The different land uses may be interpreted as the allowed uses in a given FLU district.
Priority Areas	Sub-jurisdictional geographies that have policy-based rationale for receiving preferential weighting to receive allocated target. Priority areas include regional growth centers, mixed use areas, manufacturing/industrial centers (for industrial land/jobs), affiliated UGA, high density residential areas (> 30 DU/acre), and Seattle Urban Villages
TAZ	Traffic Analysis Zone, basic geographic level of operation and analysis for the regional travel model.
TAZ-part	TAZs intersected with jurisdiction boundaries, priority areas, and FLU districts. This geography was created to facilitate the allocation of jurisdictional targets to TAZs and other sub-jurisdictional planning districts
Mixed Use split	To calculate capacity in mixed residential/non-residential zones, each parcel has to be apportioned to both uses. Splits are percentage based (X% of parcel land to residential, 100-X% to non-residential), and were created from Buildable Land assumptions for specific types of mixed use zones for particular geographies
Fill Vacancy	The fill vacancy is a "vacancy rate assumption" to keep a portion of capacity out of allocation, in an attempt to more closely represent a reality where 100% capacity is not readily met.
Maximum Capacity	The raw maximum developable capacity on a parcel. Equal to FAR * Parcel Square feet, or Dwelling Units per Acre *(Parcel Square feet/43560)
Developable Capacity	Equals Maximum Capacity - Existing Development, calculated by parcel, then aggregated to TAZ-part. Exceptions: For residential parcels, developable capacity will only be calculated on a developed parcel if the existing development is 1/3 or less of the maximum capacity; For industrial parcels, only vacant parcels are considered developable, therefore making developable capacity = maximum capacity

POPULATION METHOD

	Step Title	Description	Geography	Assumptions	Quick Notes	Example for a Fictional City: Pleasanton	
1	Capacity - Maximum	Calculate maximum development capacity in housing units by parcel using the FLU constraints associated with each parcel.	Parcel	Dwelling Units/Acre (From FLU) * Parcel Size (from Parcel DB) = Maximum Capacity	Critical areas are in the FLU, as un-developable parcels	Maximum capacity by parcel is calculated from each parcel's maximum DU/acre designation contained in the FLU. A 5,000 SF parcel in a single-family 8 DU/acre zone has a capacity of 1 unit. There are 20 developable 1/2 acre parcels in the TAZ-part representing Pleasanton's 8 DU/acre zone, providing a maximum capacity of 4 housing units per parcel.	1
1a	Capacity - Mixed Use	For parcels with a mix of residential and non-residential FLU constraints, apply a percentage split to apportion land to residential use for capacity calculation.	Parcel	See Mixed Use Splits tab for more detail on splits and capacity calculation		Maximum Built SqFt is split to residential and non-residential uses on mixed use parcels by a percentage based on the type of MU area. Parcels in Pleasanton's city center mixed use zone are split 50/50% between multifamily and commercial uses. On a 25,000 SF parcel, with an FAR of 3, 37,500 SF will be devoted to multifamily use. On this parcel, there are 38 units of developable capacity.	1a
2	Capacity - Existing	Sum the existing development in housing units by parcel using data from the 2010 parcel database.	Parcel	Assessor data is aggregated to census block and scaled to match census block housing units and jurisdiction 2010 totals.		The 2010 parcel database contains data on the existing development on each parcel in the region, and provides the number of units existing on each parcel. In the 8 DU/acre TAZ-part in Step 1, 10 of the parcels contain 2 homes, while 2 parcels contain 1 home, and the rest are vacant.	2
3	Capacity - Developable	Subtract the existing development from the maximum capacity. Do not include developable capacity from parcels where existing development/max capacity >1/3.	Parcel	See "other assumptions" tab for more information on 1/3 redevelopment ratio. assumption		Although there is capacity remaining on the 10 2-home parcels in step 2, the ratio of existing development to maximum capacity is greater than 1/3, so the capacity is not considered developable. The 6 units of capacity on the 2 parcels with one home will contribute capacity, and the 8 vacant parcels will contribute 32 units of capacity.	3
4	Capacity - Final	Aggregate developable capacity by TAZ-part.	TAZ-part			The developable capacity calculated by parcel is aggregated to TAZ-parts, representing planning districts and priority areas within the city, intersected with TAZs. Developable DU/acre is aggregated by the FLU representations of single-family and multifamily. in our example zone from steps 1, 2, and 3, the TAZ-part has 38 units of SF capacity.	4
5	Capacity - Apply Fill Vacancy	A vacancy rate is applied to the residual capacity to hold off maximum capacity at a realistic level.	TAZ-part	See fill Vacancy rate on "other assumptions" tab for more information		Even though some developable capacity will remain out of development from the redevelopment ratio assumption applied in step 3, the fill vacancy rate is applied to ensure that in places where maximum capacity is reached, a reasonable amount of vacancy is retained. The fill vacancy rate is 15% for all TAZ-parts. Therefore in our example TAZ-part, 32 units of capacity remain.	5
6	Targets - Prep for allocation	Targets express growth for different time periods (e.g., 2006-31, 2008-30) subtract actual growth between targets baseyear and 2010. Then, remove MPDs	Jurisdiction	The 2010 baseyear is created in the control targets, not in the LUT. MPDs are removed from target/capacity when the total MPD HU< Jurisdiction. If MPD>Target, MPD units are added to capacity for TAZpart	This is the total that will be allocated to TAZs	Pleasanton's target is given as a total number of housing units in 2030. The city's 2010 count of housing units will be subtracted from the 2030 total to achieve the targeted housing units to allocate. Pleasanton had 15,000 housing units in 2010, and a target of 18,000 in 2030. 3,000 housing units will need to be distributed.	6
7	Allocate - Compare Capacity + Target	Compare the aggregated capacity to the jurisdictional target: separate allocations will occur depending whether Target > Capacity or Capacity> Target.	Jurisdiction		mark C > T or T> C	The capacity for HU by TAZ-part is aggregated to the city level. Pleasanton is calculated to have capacity for 4,500 housing units Compared to its target of 3,000, there is sufficient capacity to absorb the employment target in Pleasanton.	7
8	Allocate - Weight Capacity	Capacity in TAZ-parts is weighted by whether or not it exists in a priority area. This varies by Geography and capacity/target relationship.	TAZ-part	Weights are assigned in 4 groups: Cities, Urban Uninc., Rural, and Industrial areas. See weights tab for more detail.		Capacity in Pleasanton's mixed use city center and outlying office-residential zone is weighted 1.5. A 45 unit/acre TAZ-part is weighted 1.25, and all other areas with residential capacity without priority designations are weighted by 1. for every 100 units allocated to other residential areas, 150 will be allocated to each of the mixed use areas, and 125 to the high density residential areas.	8
9	Allocate - Target > Capacity	Fill TAZ-parts to their maximum allowed capacities.	TAZ-part			Had Pleasanton less capacity than target, all residential TAZ-parts would be filled to capacity. The remaining target to be allocated would be apportioned to TAZ-parts in the ratio expressed by the weights in step 11.	9

POPULATION METHOD

	Step Title	Description	Geography	Assumptions	Quick Notes	Example for a Fictional City: Pleasanton	
10	Allocate - Capacity > Target	Fill TAZ-parts according to weights, until target is exhausted.	TAZ-part			5 TAZ-parts in Pleasanton will receive residential target. The 2 mixed use parts have been weighted as priority areas with a weight of 1.5, the high-density residential area has a priority weight of 1.25, and 2 other TAZ-parts receive a weight of 1. 48% of the target would go to the 2 mixed use areas, while 20% would go to the high density area, and 32% to the other TAZ-parts. Of the 3000 HU to be allocated, 1,440 units would be allocated to the MU TAZ-parts, but perhaps these TAZ-parts only have capacity for 700 units. In this case, 700 units would be allocated to the mixed use TAZ-parts, and the left over 740 over-capacity would be allocated among the other 3 TAZ-parts with capacity, with the same priority weighting scheme	10
11	Allocate - Overcapacity	For jurisdictions where target > capacity, assign remaining target over capacity to TAZ-parts with priority weights.	TAZ-part			Following from step 9, the units left over capacity would be split among the 5 TAZ-parts with residential capacity, according to the weighting scheme for cities where target exceeded capacity. The MU city center and office-residential zone would receive 30% of the remaining jobs target each. The high-density residential zone would receive ~27%, while the remaining TAZ-parts would receive ~13% each, of the remaining target.	11
~~12~~	Characteristics - Assign SF-MF proportions	This Step is no longer performed. A single set of assumptions is used to convert HU to Households and HHPop. Households and HHPop are controlled to jurisdictional targets.	~~TAZ-part~~	~~SF/MF split will come from underlying density of development; DU/acre > 12 = MF development. See "other assumptions" tab for more information~~		~~TAZ parts have a single designation as multifamily or single-family based on their density. Pleasanton's high density residential zone is 45 units/acre and all housing units would be designated as multifamily. All units in the 8 units/acre TAZ-part would be designated single-family.~~	~~12~~
12	Characteristics - Households	Apply a vacancy rate to the housing units to estimate households.	TAZ-part	Vacancy rate for 2030/31/35 from 2010 Census		Pleasanton's county vacancy rates are 7% for multifamily and 4% for single-family. Following from step 10 above, if 350 units were allocated to Pleasanton's city center mixed use zone, the 7% vacancy rate would be applied to yield 326 households	13
13	Characteristics - Control Households to Jurisdiction	Adjust allocated households to match the targeted 2010-30/31/35 households	TAZ-part/Jurisdiction				
14	Characteristics - Household Population	Apply average household size to households to estimate household population.	TAZ-part	Ave household size from 2010 Census		In this example the average HH size by type is 2.3 for single-family and 1.6 for multifamily. Continuing from step 14 above, applying this to the number of households in the city center MU TAZ-part yields 521 people in multifamily households.	14
15	Characteristics - Control Population to Jurisdiction	Adjust allocated household population to match the net targeted 2010-30/31/35 household population.	TAZ-part/Jurisdiction	Group quarters % of population and targeted population change is from county targets conversion work		In this step we remove the share of group quarters population from Pleasanton's targeted growth between 2010 and 2030. If Pleasanton's targeted population growth between 2010 and 2030 is 7600, and the percent of group quarters population is 1.3%, the targeted household population would be 7501. This number is compared to the TAZ-part household population aggregated to jurisdiction. and TAZ-parts are scaled to aggregated to the targeted HH population.	15
16	Characteristics - TAZ Total Population	Sum TAZ-part household population to TAZ, and create group quarters estimates for TAZs	TAZ	County HH Population from targets conversion work. TAZ shares of county GQ pop from 2010 Census. JBLM population from Pierce County Targets.		2010 census group quarters and total population are aggregated by TAZ, and compared to derive a share % that can be applied to the county GQ population growth 2010-30 to achieve total population. For example, if in 2010, TAZ 2 contained 1.3% of the county's GQ population, this percentage would be applied to the total county GQ population growth 2010-30. The resulting GQ population would be added to the allocated 2010-30 HH population and 2010 total population for 2030 TAZ total population.	16
17	Characteristics - Income Quartiles	Apply income quartiles to households.	TAZ	Income Quartiles based on data from Economic Forecast		TBD - % for each quartile is applied to total households.	17
18	Interim Years	Create interim years 2020 and 2030 from absolute average annual growth.	TAZ			Average annual growth will be calculated for each characteristic, by TAZ (Growth/# years). 10*avg. annual growth will be added to the base to achieve 2020, 20*avg. annual growth will be added to the base to achieve 2030 (if necessary).	18

EMPLOYMENT METHODS

	Step Title	Description	Geography	Assumptions	Quick Notes	Example for a Fictional City: Pleasanton	
1	Quantify Existing Employment	Calculate Total Employment by sector for 2010.	TAZ-part	sectors allocated: FIRE, manufacturing, retail, services, WTU, and Construction/Resource (Kitsap/Pierce only) jobs. Edu, gov, and C/R (King/Snohomish) jobs are scaled in place.		From the PSRC total employment estimates, Pleasanton has 5,000 employees in 2010	1
2	Scale and Remove Public Sector and Construction/Resource Employment	Scale these jobs in place to 2030/31/35 amounts. Public sector jobs, and if present in target, Con/Res jobs will be subtracted from the 2030/31/35 targeted employment.	TAZ-part	Construction/resource in King and Snohomish Counties only, Government, and Education jobs are scaled in place (not allocated). The % these jobs are scaled up by (i.e. their growth is provided in the control targets spreadsheet.	This step is performed in the creation of targets, not the LUT itself.	The 2030 employment targets for these sectors have been created in the targets conversion process. Of the overall target of 7,500 jobs, 200 are proportionally disaggregated as government jobs, 200 as education, and 100 as resource/construction. 100 of the government jobs and 13 of the resource/construction jobs will be allocated to non-residential space. The remaining government and resource jobs, along with all of the education jobs, will be scaled in place.	2
3	Fill Employment Losses	Compare 2008 and 2010 employment, and identify TAZ-parts with losses. Add the loss increment back in as already allocated employment.	TAZ-part	Assumes employment would return to areas where it was lost. Remove jobs lost from target to allocate		Pleasanton lost 100 jobs between 2008 and 2010. these jobs will be re-apportioned to the TAZ-parts from which they were lost, and subtracted from to Pleasanton's target to allocate.	3
4	Targets - Prep for allocation	Remove employment losses and MPDs from the target to allocate and MPDs from capacity	Jurisdiction/TAZ-part	If jobs loss is > target to allocate, target becomes 0, if MPD > target, MPD is added to capacity	This step creates the target increment to be allocated to TAZ	Existing employment = 2010 employment + 2008-2010 losses; Employment to Allocate = 2030 target - 2030 gov/ed jobs - Existing employment. **Existing employment =** 5000 +100 = **5,100**. **Target to Allocate =** 7500 - 387 - 5100 = **2,013**	4
5	Capacity - Maximum	Calculate maximum development capacity in square feet by general land use by parcel using the FLU constraints associated with that parcel.	Parcel	FAR * Parcel Size = Maximum Developable SqFt General Land uses: Commercial, Office, Industrial		Maximum capacity by parcel is calculated from each parcel's maximum FAR designation contained in the FLU. A 5,000 SF parcel in a SF, 8 DU/acre zone has a capacity of 1 unit. A 15,000 SF parcel in a 0.5 FAR Commercial zone has a capacity of 7,500 SF.	5
5a	Capacity - Mixed Use	For parcels with a mix of residential and non-residential FLU constraints apply a percentage split to apportion land to non-residential use for capacity calculation.	Parcel	See Mixed Use Splits tab for more detail on splits and capacity calculation		Built SqFt is split to residential and non-residential uses on mixed use parcels by a percentage based on the type of MU area. Pleasanton's city center receives a 50/50% split on each MU parcel. The parcel has multifamily and commercial uses. On a 25,000 SF parcel with a FAR of 3, there will be 37,500 SF of developable capacity.	5a
6	Capacity - Existing	Calculate the square feet of existing development by general land use from assessor data in the 2010 parcel database.	Parcel			The 2010 parcel database has assessor data on he development on all parcels throughout the region. The amount of built square feet per parcel is contained here.	6
7	Capacity - Developable	Subtract the existing development from the maximum capacity. Do not include developable capacity from parcels where existing development/max capacity >1/3.	Parcel	See "other assumptions" tab for more information on 1/3 redevelopment ratio assumption.		For non-industrial parcels. Existing development is compared to maximum capacity on each parcel. Existing development is subtracted from developable capacity. In a TAZ-part with 0.5 FAR, a 40,000 SqFt parcel will have a maximum capacity of 20,000 SqFt. If this parcel is vacant all 20,000 SqFt will count towards developable capacity. If a 10,000 SqFt commercial building exists on the parcel, the ratio of existing development to maximum capacity is greater than 1/3, so the undeveloped 10,000 SqFt would not count towards developable capacity.	7
8	Capacity - Final area	Aggregate parcel developable SqFt to TAZ-part.	TAZ-part		jobs will not be assigned to existing SF	Developable capacity is aggregated to TAZ-parts, representing planning districts and priority areas within the city, intersected with TAZs. Developable SqFt is aggregated by the FLU representations of commercial, office, and industrial zones within Pleasanton. Non-residential SF in MU areas is classified according to its allowed uses.	8
9	Capacity - Convert to Jobs	Convert the developable SqFt to jobs by sector based on sector-by-land-use split.	TAZ-part	See the employment assumptions tab for sector proportions by general land use and square feet per job ratios.		SqFt is converted to jobs based on assumptions regarding the sectors of employment that tend to locate in office, commercial and industrial zones. E.g., in an office TAZ-part with 400,000 SqFt of developable capacity, 80% of the jobs associated with this space are FIRE jobs, 10% are service, and 10% are retail. Eight times as many jobs will be in the FIRE sector than retail or service. Assuming 250 SqFt/FIRE job, and 500 SqFt/service or retail job, there will be capacity for 1333 jobs. Formula: 400,000 = 250(FIRE jobs) + 500(service) +500(retail); substitute: FIRE = 8(service) , service = retail; rewrite equation: 400,000 = 2000(service) + 250(service) + 250(service); 133 = service jobs, 133 = retail, 1067 = FIRE. Although capacity is developed by sector, jobs will be not be assigned by sector. Sector will be re-applied after allocation.	9

EMPLOYMENT METHODS

	Step Title	Description	Geography	Assumptions	Quick Notes	Example for a Fictional City: Pleasanton	
10	Allocate - Compare Capacity + Target	Compare the aggregated capacity to the jurisdictional target: separate allocations will occur depending whether Target > Capacity or Capacity> Target.	Jurisdiction		mark C > T or T> C	The capacity for jobs by TAZ-part is aggregated to the city level. Pleasanton is calculated to have remaining capacity for 3,000 jobs. Compared to its target of 2,013, there is sufficient capacity to absorb the employment target in Pleasanton.	10
11	Allocate - Weight Capacity	Capacity in TAZ-parts is weighted by whether or not it exists in a priority area. This varies by Geography and capacity/target relationship.	TAZ-part	Weights are assigned in 3 groups: Urban areas, Uninc. areas, and Industrial areas. See weights tab for more detail.		TAZ parts are weighted to receive targeted employment. Capacity in Pleasanton's mixed use city center and outlying office-residential zone is weighted 1.5, all other employment areas (because they do not have other priority designations) are weighted by 1. for every 100 jobs allocated to other employment areas, 150 will be allocated to each mixed use area.	11
~~12~~	~~Allocate - Industrial Lands~~	~~Establish jurisdictional controls for industrial jobs. Once control has been reached, Do not place jobs on industrial lands.~~	~~TAZ-part~~	~~non-industrial jobs on industrial lands would also cease being placed on industrial land.~~		~~A sub-target will be created for each jurisdiction for industrial lands to prevent too many jobs being associated with these lands and inflating the amount of industrial employment within a jurisdiction. Based on historical trends and the economic forecast, Pleasanton receives a sub-targeted growth of 200 industrial jobs. Developable capacity on industrial lands is 450. Jobs are allocated to industrial lands until sub-target is reached. Industrial lands then do not receive additional employment target.~~	~~12~~
13	Allocate - Capacity > Target	Fill TAZ-parts according to weights, until target is exhausted.	TAZ-part			8 non-industrial TAZ-parts in Pleasanton will receive employment target. 2 have been weighted as priority areas, with a weight of 1.5, 6 others receive a weight of 1. 1/3 of the target would go to the 2 mixed use areas, while 11% would go to each of the other TAZ-parts. 700 jobs would be allocated to the MU TAZ-parts, but perhaps these TAZ-parts only have capacity for 500. In this case, 500 would be allocated to the mixed use TAZ-parts, and the remaining 200 jobs would be allocated among the other 6 TAZ-parts in relatively even amounts (as they are equally weighted), depending on their capacities.	14
14	Allocate - Target > Capacity	Fill TAZ-parts to their maximum capacities.	TAZ-part			Had Pleasanton less capacity than target, all non-industrial TAZ-parts would be filled to capacity. The remaining target to be allocated would be apportioned to TAZ-parts in the ratio expressed by the weights in step 15.	13
15	Allocate - Overcapacity	For jurisdictions where target > capacity, assign remaining target over capacity to TAZ-parts with priority weights.	TAZ-part			Continuing from **step 13:** of the jobs left over capacity, among the 8 non-industrial TAZ-parts that had employment capacity, the MU city center and office-residential zone (each weighted 2.25) would receive ~21% of the remaining jobs target each. the other TAZ-parts would receive ~9.5% each, of the remaining target.	15
16	Allocate - Assign Sector	Based on sector by land use splits, assign sector to employment.	TAZ-part	See "employment assumptions" tab for detail on sectors by LU ratios.		1,000 jobs were allocated to the TAZ-part representing Pleasanton's office zone. Office zones have a 80% FIRE, 10% services, and 10% retail sector split. 800 jobs will be assigned to the FIRE sector, and 100 each to the services and retail sectors.	16
17	Characteristics - Control to totals	Compare the employment totals by sector to the regional economic forecast. Adjust job-sector assignments as necessary to meet sector proportions.	TAZ-part	Sector splits by region from the Regional Economic Forecast		TAZ-level Employment is aggregated by county and sector, and percent shares are calculated for each TAZ. The aggregated totals are compared to county totals from the regional economic forecast, and scaled. The proportion of jobs by sector will be adjusted to match the proportion, by county, in the regional forecast, but not the actual number of jobs.	18
18	Allocate - Aggregate	Add baseyear employment, public sector employment growth, and if applicable, construction/resources employment growth (results of step 4) back to TAZ-parts. Aggregate TAZ-part allocations to TAZ.	TAZ			TAZ-parts are then summed by TAZ, including for TAZs that overlap Pleasanton and neighboring jurisdictions.	17
~~20~~	~~Characteristics - Military~~	Military employment is included in total employment/government. ~~Add military personnel to TAZs with bases~~	~~TAZ~~	~~JBLM 2030 employment from Pierce County targets, Everett, Bangor, and PSNB to come from respective counties or base estimates.~~			~~20~~

Table A. Local Growth Targets or Alternative Growth Assumptions by County
(Starting point for developing the LUT Control Targets, see Table B)

Table A-1. King County Housing Unit and Employment Targets 2006-2031

	Population Targets	Housing Units 2006	Housing Units 2031	Housing Targets 2006-2031	Employment 2006	Employment 2031	Employment Targets 2006-2031
Metropolitan Cities	n/a	340,870	443,870	103,000	630,899	830,599	199,700
Bellevue	n/a	52,095	69,095	17,000	126,432	179,432	53,000
Seattle	n/a	288,775	374,775	86,000	504,467	651,167	146,700
Core Cities	n/a	242,843	321,478	78,635	421,431	589,771	168,340
Auburn	n/a	23,999	33,619	9,620	39,701	59,051	19,350
Bothell	n/a	7,182	10,182	3,000	11,374	16,174	4,800
Burien	n/a	19,325	23,765	4,440	13,399	18,359	4,960
Federal Way	n/a	34,551	42,651	8,100	32,837	45,137	12,300
Kent	n/a	44,361	53,631	9,270	66,316	79,596	13,280
Kirkland	n/a	35,699	44,269	8,570	36,858	57,708	20,850
Redmond	n/a	22,726	32,926	10,200	85,814	108,814	23,000
Renton	n/a	36,643	51,478	14,835	56,198	85,198	29,000
SeaTac	n/a	10,373	16,173	5,800	31,734	57,034	25,300
Tukwila	n/a	7,985	12,785	4,800	47,200	62,700	15,500
Larger Cities	n/a	86,650	114,700	28,050	74,101	116,901	42,800
Des Moines	n/a	11,856	14,856	3,000	5,909	10,909	5,000
Issaquah	n/a	10,723	16,473	5,750	19,551	39,551	20,000
Kenmore	n/a	8,159	11,659	3,500	4,216	7,216	3,000
Maple Valley	n/a	7,193	8,993	1,800	3,014	5,014	2,000
Mercer Island	n/a	9,016	11,016	2,000	7,092	8,092	1,000
Sammamish	n/a	13,816	17,816	4,000	5,013	6,813	1,800
Shoreline	n/a	21,668	26,668	5,000	17,262	22,262	5,000
Woodinville	n/a	4,218	7,218	3,000	12,044	17,044	5,000
Small Cities	n/a	37,843			24,292		
Small Cities (excl Rural Cities)	n/a	25,068	30,805	5,737	12,737	16,860	4,123
Algona	n/a	985	1,175	190	1,959	2,169	210
Beaux Arts	n/a	125	128	3	54	57	3
Black Diamond	n/a	1,591	3,491	1,900	409	1,459	1,050
Clyde Hill	n/a	1,067	1,077	10	693	693	0
Covington	n/a	5,647	7,117	1,470	3,600	4,920	1,320
Hunts Point	n/a	192	193	1	45	45	0
Lake Forest Park	n/a	5,209	5,684	475	1,583	1,793	210
Medina	n/a	1,166	1,185	19	330	330	0
Milton	n/a	108	158	50	28	188	160
Newcastle	n/a	3,793	4,993	1,200	1,762	2,497	735
Normandy Park	n/a	2,796	2,916	120	688	753	65
Pacific	n/a	2,001	2,286	285	1,499	1,869	370
Yarrow Point	n/a	388	402	14	87	87	0
Rural Cities							
Carnation	n/a	653	n/a	n/a	849	n/a	n/a
Duvall	n/a	2,123	n/a	n/a	1,035	n/a	n/a
Enumclaw	n/a	4,637	n/a	n/a	4,911	n/a	n/a
North Bend	n/a	2,319	n/a	n/a	2,700	n/a	n/a
Skykomish	n/a	158	n/a	n/a	61	n/a	n/a
Snoqualmie	n/a	2,884	n/a	n/a	1,999	n/a	n/a
Urban Unincorporated	n/a	44,617			14,682		
Urban Uninc (excl Rural City PAAs)	n/a	42,861	55,331	12,470	14,602	23,662	9,060
Potential Annexation Areas							
Bellevue PAA	n/a	2,117	2,407	290	236	236	0
Seattle PAA	n/a	103	103	0	97	97	0
Auburn PAA	n/a	76	76	0	0	0	0
Bothell PAA	n/a	2,908	3,718	810	756	956	200
Federal Way PAA	n/a	7,100	9,490	2,390	1,419	1,709	290
Kent PAA	n/a	179	269	90	132	342	210
Redmond PAA	n/a	915	1,555	640	196	196	0
Renton PAA	n/a	16,073	19,968	3,895	4,118	4,588	470
Tukwila PAA	n/a	53	103	50	1,068	3,118	2,050
Issaquah PAA	n/a	4,001	4,291	290	876	876	0
Maple Valley PAA	n/a	4	1,064	1,060	152	152	0
Sammamish PAA	n/a	134	484	350	0	0	0
Black Diamond PAA	n/a	58	58	0	233	233	0
Covington PAA	n/a	4	4	0	0	0	0
Milton PAA	n/a	462	552	90	8	8	0
Newcastle PAA	n/a	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pacific PAA	n/a	292	427	135	18	18	0
Rural City PAAs							
Carnation	n/a	34	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	n/a
Duvall	n/a	18	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	n/a
Enumclaw	n/a	344	n/a	n/a	19	n/a	n/a
North Bend	n/a	890	n/a	n/a	19	n/a	n/a
Skykomish	n/a	0	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	n/a
Snoqualmie	n/a	471	n/a	n/a	42	n/a	n/a
North Highline	n/a	6,883	7,703	820	4,516	6,686	2,170

Bear Creek Urban Planned Dev	n/a	688	1,598	910	579	4,159	3,580
Unclaimed Urban Unincorp	n/a	811	1,461	650	198	288	90
Rural	n/a	50,146	55,520	5,374	16,124	16,124	0
Rural	n/a	50,146	55,520	5,374	16,124	16,124	0
King County Total	n/a	802,970	1,041,421	238,451	1,181,529	1,609,597	428,068
Rural Cities including PAAs	n/a	14,531	19,716	5,185	11,635	15,680	4,045
Carnation	n/a	687	1,017	330	849	1,219	370
Duvall	n/a	2,141	3,281	1,140	1,035	1,875	840
Enumclaw	n/a	4,981	6,406	1,425	4,930	5,665	735
North Bend	n/a	3,210	3,875	665	2,719	3,769	1,050
Skykomish	n/a	158	168	10	61	61	0
Snoqualmie	n/a	3,356	4,971	1,615	2,041	3,091	1,050

Table A-2. Kitsap County Population Distribution 2005-2025

	Population 2000	Population 2025	Population Targets 2005-2025*	Housing Targets	Employment Targets
Metropolitan City	37,259	52,017	14,759	n/a	n/a
Bremerton [2]	37,259	52,017	14,759	n/a	n/a
Core City	15,276	23,335	8,059	n/a	n/a
Silverdale [1]	15,276	23,335	8,059	n/a	n/a
Larger City	20,308	28,660	8,352	n/a	n/a
Bainbridge Island [2]	20,308	28,660	8,352	n/a	n/a
Small Cities	14,506	21,845	7,339	n/a	n/a
Port Orchard [2]	7,693	11,293	3,600	n/a	n/a
Poulsbo [2]	6,813	10,552	3,739	n/a	n/a
Urban Unincorporated	46,189	83,377	37,188	n/a	n/a
Bremerton East UGA [1]	5,412	7,622	2,210	n/a	n/a
Bremerton Port (SKIA) UGA [2]	68	0	-68	n/a	n/a
Bremerton West UGA [1]	3,229	5,246	2,017	n/a	n/a
Central Kitsap UGA [1]	21,743	30,476	8,733	n/a	n/a
Gorst UGA [1]	154	227	73	n/a	n/a
Kingston UGA [3]	1,871	5,006	3,135	n/a	n/a
P.O. UGA Expansion Study Area [3]	0	6,334	6,334	n/a	n/a
Port Orchard UGA [2]	11,570	14,945	3,375	n/a	n/a
Poulsbo UGA [2]	901	4,256	3,355	n/a	n/a
South Kitsap/ULID6 UGA [2]	1,241	9,265	8,024	n/a	n/a
Rural	98,432	122,337	23,905	n/a	n/a
Non-UGA	98,432	122,337	23,905	n/a	n/a
Kitsap County Total	231,969	331,571	99,602	n/a	n/a

Table A-3. Pierce County 2030 Population, Housing, and Total Employment Targets

	Population 2008	Population 2030	Population Targets 2008-2030	Housing Units 2008	Housing Units 2030	Housing Targets 2008-2030	Employment 2008	Employment 2030	Employment Targets 2008-2030
Metropolitan City	202,700	281,300	78,600	85,780	129,030	43,250	112,717	176,930	64,213
Tacoma	202,700	281,300	78,600	85,780	129,030	43,250	112,717	176,930	64,213
Core Cities	102,315	129,950	27,635	44,779	60,529	15,750	54,946	73,437	18,491
Auburn	6,605	7,950	1,345	3,244	3,634	390	628	834	206
Lakewood	58,780	72,000	13,220	25,904	34,284	8,380	29,051	38,336	9,285
Puyallup	36,930	50,000	13,070	15,631	22,611	6,980	25,267	34,267	9,000
Larger Cities	38,965	48,965	10,000	17,215	23,155	5,940	21,604	28,893	7,289
Fife	7,525	9,425	1,900	3,767	4,457	690	15,011	19,300	4,289
University Place	31,440	39,540	8,100	13,448	18,698	5,250	6,593	9,593	3,000
Small Cities	83,760	112,500	28,845	34,389	49,964	15,600	40,343	67,985	27,642
Bonney Lake	16,220	21,640	5,420	5,828	8,498	2,670	4,307	5,448	1,141
Buckley	4,560	7,500	2,940	1,690	2,930	1,240	2,805	3,033	228
Carbonado	655	800	145	218	298	80	63	68	5
DuPont	7,390	11,900	4,510	3,191	5,291	2,100	3,158	9,078	5,920
Eatonville	2,375	3,120	745	943	1,353	410	901	2,335	1,434
Edgewood	9,595	13,700	4,105	3,803	6,003	2,200	1,664	3,094	1,430
Fircrest	6,315	6,950	635	2,811	3,351	540	1,427	1,544	117
Gig Harbor	6,910	10,500	3,590	3,301	5,431	2,130	8,351	9,954	1,603
Milton	5,710	5,750	40	2,539	2,779	240	1,893	2,337	444
Orting	6,075	8,000	1,925	2,241	3,121	880	1,170	2,370	1,200
Pacific	105	0	0	45	0	0	2,529	6,505	3,976
Roy	875	1,070	195	307	487	180	178	342	164
Ruston	755	1,450	695	365	775	390	222	494	272
South Prairie	440	750	310	161	281	120	84	307	223
Steilacoom	6,255	6,830	575	2,795	3,385	590	688	788	100
Sumner	9,060	11,970	2,910	3,973	5,743	1,770	10,828	20,135	9,307
Wilkeson	465	570	105	178	238	60	75	153	78
Urban Unincorporated	204,265	265,265	61,000	76,273	104,573	28,300	80,214	111,649	31,435
Unincorporated Urban P.C.	174,965	234,965	60,000	71,563	99,563	28,000	49,325	65,893	16,568
McChord/Fort Lewis	29,300	30,300	1,000	4,710	5,010	300	30,889	45,756	14,867
Rural	173,392	176,992	3,600	65,447	73,360	7,910	21,784	22,834	1,050
Rural	173,392	176,992	3,600	65,447	73,360	7,910	21,784	22,834	1,050
Pierce County Total	805,397	1,014,972	209,680	323,883	440,588	116,750	331,608	481,728	150,120

Table A-4. Snohomish County 2035 Population and Employment Growth Targets and Draft 2035 Initial Housing Targets

	Population 2011	Population 2035	Population Targets 2011-2035	Housing Units 2010	Housing Units 2035	Housing Targets 2010-2035	Employment 2011	Employment 2035	Employment Targets 2011-2035
Metropolitan City	103,100	164,812	61,712	44,609	70,067	25,458	91,313	140,000	48,687
Everett	103,100	164,812	61,712	44,609	70,067	25,458	91,313	140,000	48,687
Core Cities	52,430	77,914	25,484	21,641	32,622	10,981	37,882	60,805	22,923
Bothell	16,570	23,510	6,940	6,702	9,782	3,080	13,616	18,576	4,960
Lynnwood	35,860	54,404	18,544	14,939	22,840	7,901	24,266	42,229	17,963
Larger Cities	222,657	286,293	63,636	88,462	114,003	25,541	63,330	107,109	43,779
Arlington	17,966	24,937	6,971	6,929	9,654	2,725	8,659	20,829	12,170
Edmonds	39,800	45,550	5,750	18,378	21,168	2,790	11,679	13,948	2,269
Lake Stevens	28,210	39,340	11,130	10,414	14,883	4,469	3,932	7,412	3,480
Marysville	60,660	87,589	26,929	22,363	32,876	10,513	11,664	27,419	15,755
Mill Creek	18,370	20,196	1,826	7,923	8,756	833	4,625	6,310	1,685
Monroe	17,351	22,102	4,751	5,306	6,526	1,220	7,662	11,456	3,794
Mountlake Terrace	19,990	24,767	4,777	8,602	10,928	2,326	6,740	9,486	2,746
Mukilteo	20,310	21,812	1,502	8,547	9,211	664	8,369	10,250	1,881
Small Cities	34,536	50,400	15,864	13,922	20,045	6,123	10,405	17,290	6,885
Brier City	6,201	7,011	810	2,220	2,550	330	319	405	86
Darrington Town	1,345	1,764	419	644	764	120	498	800	302
Gold Bar City	2,060	2,424	364	837	924	87	218	661	443
Granite Falls City	3,370	7,842	4,472	1,344	3,179	1,835	759	2,275	1,516
Index Town	180	220	40	116	127	11	20	25	5
Snohomish City	9,200	12,289	3,089	3,959	5,269	1,310	4,415	6,291	1,876
Stanwood City	6,220	10,116	3,896	2,584	4,179	1,595	3,258	4,688	1,430
Sultan City	4,655	7,345	2,690	1,752	2,581	829	862	2,077	1,215
Woodway Town	1,305	1,389	84	466	472	6	56	68	12
Urban Unincorporated	182,990	235,737	52,747	69,265	91,234	21,969	28,941	47,746	18,805
Unincorporated UGA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Arlington UGA	523	1,065	541	198	364	166	1	55	54
Darrington UGA UGA	75	397	322	38	184	146	2	86	84
Gold Bar UGA	849	895	47	373	380	7	5	5	0
Granite Falls UGA	147	675	528	64	337	273	1	1	0
Index UGA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lake Stevens UGA	5,008	7,040	2,032	1,738	2,424	686	71	409	338
Marysville UGA	209	209	0	60	74	14	652	694	42
Monroe UGA	1,455	2,652	1,197	512	917	405	117	325	208
Snohomish UGA	1,359	2,204	846	531	846	315	456	650	194
Stanwood UGA	133	969	836	48	398	350	198	1,035	837
Sultan UGA	314	1,048	733	135	422	287	4	4	0
Unincorporated MUGAs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bothell MUGA	23,190	29,607	6,418	8,786	11,284	2,498	1,380	1,696	316
Brier MUGA	1,998	2,315	317	818	882	64	69	71	2
Edmonds MUGA	3,620	4,024	405	1,493	1,615	122	156	200	44
Everett MUGA	42,084	47,156	5,072	16,394	18,428	2,034	5,250	8,324	3,074
Lynnwood MUGA	24,772	34,180	9,408	10,163	15,347	5,184	3,506	5,882	2,376
Mill Creek MUGA	36,377	47,744	11,367	13,257	17,298	4,041	2,747	3,969	1,222
Mountlake Terrace MUGA	20	30	10	9	15	6	0	0	0
Mukilteo MUGA	12,235	14,641	2,407	4,565	5,554	989	2,797	5,029	2,232
Woodway MUGA	0	2,972	2,972	0	1,532	1,532	14	178	164
Other Uninc Southwest UGA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Paine Field	0	0	0	0	0	0	4,622	8,010	3,388
Larch Way Overlap	3,370	5,007	1,637	1,130	2,047	917	1,630	2,051	421
Lake Stickney Gap	7,161	9,786	2,625	2,822	3,640	818	694	694	0
Meadowdale/Norma Beach Gap	2,695	3,437	742	956	1,185	229	68	114	46
Silver Firs Gap	15,398	17,683	2,285	5,104	5,989	885	1,311	1,891	580
Unincorporated Maltby UGA	0	0	0	71	71	0	3,190	6,374	3,184
Rural	121,287	140,125	18,838	48,760	55,816	7,056	14,693	23,323	8,630
Rural	121,287	140,125	18,838	48,760	55,816	7,056	14,693	23,323	8,630
Snohomish County Total	717,000	955,281	238,281	286,659	383,787	97,128	246,564	396,273	149,709

Table B. Control Targets for Land Use Targets (LUT) Allocation

ACS Method-Based LUT Control Totals

Table B-1. King County "Control Targets" for LUT Allocation 2010-2031

Horizon Yr Population 2031	Population Control Targets 2010-2031	Household Population Control Targets 2010-2031	Scaled GQ Population 2010-2031	Horizon Yr Housing Units 2031	Housing Control Targets 2010-2031	Household Control Targets 2010-2031	Horizon Yr Total Emp 2031	Total Emp Control Targets 2010-2031	Adjusted^ Emp Control Targets 2010-2031	Scaled C/R Emp 2010-2031	Scaled Gov (Civ) Higher Ed Emp 2010-2031	Scaled K-12 Education Emp 2010-2031
873,846	142,827	137,854	4,973	443,870	79,805	89,738	875,050	252,428	206,676	31,149	12,240	2,363
149,849	27,486	27,236	249	69,095	13,544	15,130	189,705	62,151	52,435	8,249	795	672
723,997	115,341	110,617	4,723	374,775	66,261	74,608	685,345	190,277	154,240	22,900	11,446	1,691
760,943	152,556	150,717	1,839	325,052	73,612	77,063	646,236	234,853	199,024	29,422	3,897	2,511
82,877	20,137	19,923	214	33,619	8,938	9,302	65,406	26,199	20,636	4,879	309	375
22,291	5,201	5,147	54	10,182	2,629	2,738	17,669	4,548	3,224	1,060	172	92
56,233	8,218	8,150	68	23,765	3,853	4,493	19,539	7,076	6,072	729	83	192
104,298	14,992	14,853	140	42,651	7,207	7,972	47,643	16,142	14,266	1,226	247	403
135,081	16,492	16,261	230	53,631	8,232	8,934	88,816	22,759	15,843	5,939	499	478
93,465	12,862	12,707	155	44,269	7,383	7,970	67,211	27,660	20,552	6,111	723	274
78,000	23,663	23,543	119	36,500	12,242	11,817	129,726	47,836	42,336	5,119	192	188
117,742	26,087	25,890	197	51,478	12,297	13,202	89,433	31,952	27,851	2,798	1,004	299
41,038	14,093	13,563	530	16,173	5,802	5,891	56,730	31,085	30,365	371	215	134
29,918	10,811	10,680	131	12,785	5,030	4,743	64,062	19,597	17,878	1,190	454	75
269,618	33,484	33,079	405	114,700	18,070	19,625	135,639	55,274	42,746	10,350	984	1,195
34,269	4,597	4,505	92	14,856	2,269	2,641	12,089	5,518	4,779	455	170	114
34,100	3,685	3,631	54	16,473	2,596	2,444	41,380	20,791	19,015	1,568	90	118
27,190	6,730	6,689	40	11,659	3,090	3,283	9,067	4,352	3,561	623	67	100
24,446	1,762	1,762	0	8,993	996	1,109	6,598	2,699	1,871	712	44	72
24,767	2,068	2,062	6	11,016	1,086	1,445	9,968	2,003	1,090	735	46	131
48,665	2,445	2,440	5	17,816	1,944	1,805	8,849	2,622	1,651	676	32	263
59,943	6,897	6,713	184	26,668	3,866	4,315	24,647	6,158	4,211	1,119	510	318
16,238	5,300	5,277	23	7,218	2,222	2,581	23,042	11,131	6,567	4,462	24	78
76,948	7,950	7,942	8	30,805	4,003	4,629	21,441	5,574	3,531	1,719	94	229
3,368	354	353	1	1,175	157	178	2,287	201	164	12	25	0
311	12	12	0	128	10	12	69	41	41	0	0	0
8,359	4,206	4,206	0	3,491	1,805	1,760	1,837	1,257	1,047	192	8	10
2,884	-100	-100	0	1,077	-22	27	993	106	0	99	0	7
19,897	2,332	2,328	4	7,117	1,039	1,180	5,991	755	160	433	27	135
421	27	27	0	193	12	20	74	5	4	0	1	0
13,058	499	495	4	5,684	431	522	2,565	349	0	330	7	12
2,978	9	9	0	1,185	23	69	497	4	0	0	4	0
361	-470	-470	0	158	-199	-182	193	175	175	0	0	0
11,791	1,411	1,406	4	4,993	766	829	3,061	798	664	90	6	37
6,482	146	146	0	2,916	77	226	1,294	336	88	228	6	14
6,061	-452	-446	-5	2,286	-91	-26	2,413	1,544	1,176	344	9	15
977	-24	-24	0	402	-5	14	166	4	12	-8	0	0
n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
143,521	19,087	19,008	79	57,342	9,398	10,341	29,566	10,774	8,148	2,326	66	235
6,110	572	562	9	2,407	280	345	466	-141	-52	-89	0	0
226	23	23	0	103	14	15	98	97	97	0	0	0
175	-140	-140	0	76	-56	-50	0	-29	-29	0	0	0
8,576	2,237	2,221	16	3,718	1,011	1,089	1,104	180	65	33	8	74
25,496	4,571	4,556	15	9,490	2,009	2,110	2,935	1,129	135	847	6	140
710	242	242	0	269	95	102	336	151	151	0	0	0
4,218	1,414	1,404	10	1,555	583	569	360	94	0	86	1	7
49,775	4,198	4,180	17	19,968	2,423	2,672	6,234	991	419	323	34	215
238	209	209	0	103	92	85	3,377	2,250	2,102	148	0	0
10,997	74	74	0	4,291	251	270	1,309	-133	-197	64	0	0
1,959	1,957	1,957	0	1,064	1,063	1,039	152	134	132	0	2	0
1,442	630	630	0	484	228	218	71	-81	-81	0	0	0
136	-178	-178	0	58	-83	-64	232	-9	-7	0	0	-2
11	11	11	0	4	4	4	0	-208	0	0	0	-208
1,661	592	592	0	552	218	214	18	-2	-2	0	0	0
0	-6	-6	0	0	-2	-2	0	0	0	0	0	0
991	253	250	3	427	119	123	128	66	-10	76	0	0
n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
18,899	1,503	1,494	9	7,703	803	993	7,865	3,090	2,336	614	31	109

7,804	232	232	0	3,610	71	305	4,606	3,348	3,230	103	3	13	
4,098	694	694	0	1,461	276	306	272	-153	-141	120	-20	-113	
135,129	13,532	13,484	48	55,520	7,024	8,039	31,718	6,793	-310	7,103	0	0	
135,129	13,532	13,484	48	55,520	7,024	8,039	31,718	6,793	-310	7,103	0	0	
2,308,912	377,663	370,274	7,389	1,047,007	195,746	213,537	1,759,157	571,048	462,931	83,887	17,419	6,811	
48,907	8,227	8,189	38	19,716	3,832	4,103	19,509	5,351	3,117	1,818	138	278	
2,637	629	629	0	1,017	264	281	1,489	877	681	151	9	36	
9,022	2,154	2,142	12	3,281	910	901	2,165	803	593	159	12	39	
14,212	2,373	2,353	20	6,406	1,251	1,338	6,583	1,355	985	226	45	99	
9,359	936	930	6	3,875	487	576	4,752	1,318	828	439	20	31	
213	15	15	0	168	0	13	66	-8	-8	0	0	0	
13,464	2,120	2,120	0	4,971	922	994	4,453	1,006	38	843	51	74	

Table B-2. Kitsap County "Control Targets" for LUT Allocation 2010-2025

Horizon Yr Population 2025	Population Control Targets 2010-2025	Hhold Population Control Targets 2010-2025	Scaled GQ Population 2010-2025	Horizon Yr Housing Units 2025	Placehldr Housing Control Targets 2010-2025	Placehldr Household Control Targets 2010-2025	Horizon Yr Total Emp 2025	Placehldr Total Emp Control Targets 2010-2025	Placehldr Adj^ Emp Control Targets 2010-2025	Scaled C/R Emp 2010-2025	Scaled Gov (Civ) Higher Ed Emp 2010-2025	Scaled K-12 Education Emp 2010-2025	
51,884	14,467	12,822	1,645	23,063	5,936	6,141	41,567	8,146	7,693	n/a	313	140	
51,884	14,467	12,822	1,645	23,063	5,936	6,141	41,815	8,146	7,693	n/a	313	140	
23,342	8,507	8,424	83	10,686	3,778	3,784	18,540	6,832	6,706	n/a	42	85	
23,342	8,507	8,424	83	10,686	3,778	3,784	18,540	6,832	6,706	n/a	42	85	
28,660	5,635	5,583	52	12,839	2,255	2,558	8,796	1,870	1,696	n/a	82	92	
28,660	5,635	5,583	52	12,839	2,255	2,558	8,796	1,870	1,696	n/a	82	92	
22,090	5,067	4,757	310	9,854	2,392	2,243	15,595	3,830	3,559	n/a	146	124	
11,248	2,696	2,463	233	4,891	1,263	1,138	7,325	1,819	1,652	n/a	113	54	
10,842	2,371	2,293	78	4,963	1,129	1,105	8,270	2,011	1,907	n/a	34	70	
80,791	31,001	30,884	117	33,630	13,003	12,528	19,639	7,375	7,065	n/a	93	217	
6,582	2,093	2,090	3	2,921	920	923	687	221	216	n/a	4	0	
419	159	159	0	206	79	75	1,530	566	554	n/a	12	0	
4,850	2,297	2,297	0	2,531	1,294	1,015	936	385	363	n/a	10	12	
30,318	6,811	6,744	67	11,994	2,680	2,742	7,450	2,780	2,677	n/a	12	92	
151	0	0	0	76	6	1	339	21	20	n/a	1	0	
4,290	2,089	2,089	0	2,119	1,022	968	1,870	883	832	n/a	8	43	
6,334	6,334	6,334	0	2,511	2,511	2,385	0	0	0	n/a	0	0	
14,346	1,560	1,513	47	5,871	597	710	6,632	2,544	2,427	n/a	46	71	
3,747	2,516	2,516	0	1,532	1,039	998	63	-16	-16	n/a	0	0	
9,754	7,142	7,142	0	3,868	2,854	2,709	133	-8	-8	n/a	0	0	
124,804	15,761	15,404	357	50,786	6,127	6,825	17,487	-537	-537	n/a	0	0	
124,804	15,761	15,404	357	50,786	6,127	6,825	17,487	-537	-537	n/a	0	0	
331,571	80,438	77,873	2,565	140,858	33,491	34,079	121,872	27,516	26,181	n/a	677	658	

Table B-3. Pierce County "Control Targets" for LUT Allocation 2010-2030

Horizon Yr Population 2030	Population "Targets" 2010-2030	Hhold Population "Targets" 2010-2030	Scaled GQ Population 2010-2030	Horizon Yr Housing Units 2030	Housing "Targets" 2010-2030	Household "Targets" 2010-2030	Horizon Yr Total Emp 2030	Total Emp Control Targets 2010-2030	Adjusted^ Emp Control Targets 2010-2030	Scaled C/R Emp 2010-2025	Scaled Gov (Civ) Higher Ed Emp 2010-2030	Scaled K-12 Education Emp 2010-2030	Optional Uniformed Military 2010 2013
281,300	82,903	79,751	3,153	129,030	43,244	42,105	175,048	72,454	69,833	n/a	1,833	788	0
281,300	82,903	79,751	3,153	129,030	43,244	42,105	175,048	72,454	69,833	n/a	1,833	788	0
129,950	29,082	28,510	572	60,529	15,303	15,232	72,756	25,380	24,049	n/a	823	508	0
7,950	531	531	0	3,634	488	441	924	244	231	n/a	0	13	
72,000	13,837	13,305	532	34,284	7,736	7,986	38,122	13,077	12,154	n/a	678	246	
50,000	14,714	14,674	40	22,611	7,079	6,804	33,710	12,059	11,664	n/a	146	249	
48,965	8,780	8,780	0	23,155	5,740	5,241	28,873	10,315	10,014	n/a	106	196	0
9,425	384	384	0	4,457	615	575	18,764	6,796	6,720	n/a	45	31	
39,540	8,396	8,396	0	18,698	5,125	4,666	10,109	3,519	3,293	n/a	61	164	
112,605	25,803	24,844	959	49,989	14,046	13,189	67,462	29,649	28,798	n/a	320	531	0
21,640	4,266	4,266	0	8,498	2,104	1,959	5,543	943	847	n/a	28	68	
7,500	3,146	2,710	436	2,930	1,261	1,151	2,990	944	771	n/a	136	37	
800	190	190	0	298	80	72	76	16	9	n/a	1	6	
11,900	3,701	3,677	24	5,291	2,050	1,925	9,153	6,141	6,105	n/a	8	28	
3,120	384	381	3	1,353	305	280	2,310	1,430	1,378	n/a	10	43	
13,700	4,313	4,313	0	6,003	2,202	2,006	3,141	1,742	1,693	n/a	5	44	
6,950	453	453	0	3,351	504	426	1,581	175	146	n/a	10	19	
10,500	3,719	3,487	233	5,431	2,013	1,919	9,586	799	710	n/a	34	54	
5,750	-387	-387	0	2,779	55	38	2,449	482	434	n/a	10	38	
8,000	1,254	1,080	174	3,121	760	735	2,399	1,236	1,149	n/a	34	53	
105	13	13	0	45	0	6	6,300	4,434	4,434	n/a	0	0	
1,070	277	277	0	487	161	154	358	184	174	n/a	3	8	
1,450	701	701	0	755	325	370	498	353	351	n/a	2	0	
750	316	316	0	281	107	101	309	241	240	n/a	1	0	
6,830	845	845	0	3,385	592	603	1,012	129	71	n/a	10	47	
11,970	2,519	2,429	90	5,743	1,464	1,393	19,599	10,310	10,203	n/a	30	77	
570	93	93	0	238	63	51	158	90	82	n/a	0	8	
265,265	55,191	53,246	1,945	104,573	27,425	25,492	112,258	21,520	18,824	n/a	1,910	786	5,680
247,544	54,191	52,246	1,945	99,996	27,125	25,175	53,564	16,300	15,128	n/a	456	715	
17,721	1,000	1,000	0	4,577	300	316	58,694	5,220	3,696	n/a	1,454	71	5,680
176,992	18,093	17,909	184	73,357	9,500	9,367	25,675	5,505	4,773	n/a	195	537	0
176,992	18,093	17,909	184	73,357	9,500	9,367	25,675	5,505	4,773	n/a	195	537	
1,015,077	219,852	213,040	6,812	440,633	115,258	110,625	482,071	164,823	156,290	n/a	5,188	3,345	5,680

Table B-4. Snohomish County "Control Targets" for LUT Allocation 2010-2035

Horizon Yr Population 2035	Population "Targets" 2010-2035	Hhold Population "Targets" 2010-2035	Scaled GQ Population 2010-2035	Horizon Yr Housing Units 2035	Housing "Targets" 2010-2035	Household "Targets" 2010-2035	Horizon Yr Total Emp 2035	Total Emp Control Targets 2010-2035	Adjusted^ Emp Control Targets 2010-2035	Scaled C/R Emp 2010-2035	Scaled Gov (Civ) Higher Ed Emp 2010-2035	Scaled K-12 Education Emp 2010-2035
164,812	61,793	59,307	2,486	70,067	25,458	25,252	141,884	51,475	48,509	1,295	1,317	355
164,812	61,793	59,307	2,486	70,067	25,458	25,252	141,884	51,475	48,509	1,295	1,317	355
77,914	25,672	25,290	382	32,622	10,981	11,026	62,442	25,153	23,693	848	326	286
23,510	7,100	7,038	62	9,782	3,080	3,120	19,030	6,018	5,619	257	43	98
54,404	18,572	18,252	320	22,840	7,901	7,906	43,413	19,135	18,074	591	282	188
286,293	64,831	63,643	1,188	114,003	25,541	26,145	118,310	48,732	43,736	2,682	1,106	1,209
24,937	6,993	6,912	81	9,654	2,725	2,601	21,415	12,874	12,376	220	153	125
45,550	5,837	5,767	70	21,168	2,790	3,059	16,046	3,319	2,577	276	286	180
39,340	11,271	11,259	12	14,883	4,469	4,472	8,604	3,656	3,128	268	44	216
87,589	27,589	27,313	276	32,876	10,513	10,727	29,667	16,840	15,778	676	119	267
20,196	1,967	1,966	1	8,756	833	973	7,472	1,960	1,665	165	61	69
22,102	4,760	4,037	723	6,526	1,220	1,162	12,222	3,971	3,222	253	357	139
24,767	4,856	4,833	23	10,928	2,326	2,458	10,311	3,292	2,827	325	61	80
21,812	1,558	1,556	2	9,211	664	693	12,574	2,819	2,162	499	26	133
50,400	16,007	15,794	213	20,045	6,123	6,288	18,749	7,350	6,383	445	123	398
7,011	924	922	2	2,550	330	360	568	73	34	4	5	30
1,764	417	415	2	764	120	159	833	345	296	17	11	21
2,424	268	268	0	924	87	60	706	447	441	-6	3	10
7,842	4,478	4,471	7	3,179	1,835	1,865	2,354	1,495	1,410	14	11	60
220	42	42	0	127	11	15	27	1	0	0	0	1
12,289	3,204	3,093	111	5,269	1,310	1,380	7,119	2,238	1,693	376	59	111
10,116	3,889	3,798	91	4,179	1,595	1,585	4,803	1,606	1,437	23	22	123
7,345	2,703	2,703	0	2,581	829	848	2,176	1,203	1,121	26	13	43
1,389	82	82	0	472	6	16	163	-59	-49	-10	0	0
235,737	54,520	54,316	203	91,234	21,969	22,036	56,152	21,145	18,556	1,982	113	494
0	0	0	0	0	0	0						
1,065	520	520	0	364	166	171	74	62	50	13	0	0
397	322	322	0	184	146	149	86	86	86	0	0	0
895	128	128	0	380	7	53	25	-1	-1	0	0	0
675	528	528	0	337	273	259	1	1	1	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7,040	2,213	2,213	0	2,424	686	736	685	326	294	32	0	0
209	26	26	0	74	14	11	696	-9	-9	0	0	0
2,652	1,213	1,207	6	917	405	429	353	191	190	1	0	0
2,204	833	833	0	846	315	305	706	247	232	15	0	0
969	830	792	38	398	350	348	1,030	826	842	-15	0	0
1,048	724	724	0	422	287	278	5	-19	-4	-15	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0						
29,607	6,804	6,777	27	11,284	2,498	2,448	2,481	403	299	71	4	30
2,315	218	217	1	882	64	74	158	29	3	26	0	0
4,024	423	416	7	1,615	122	159	423	56	49	5	2	0
47,156	5,502	5,485	17	18,428	2,034	1,935	9,239	3,151	2,760	190	43	158
34,180	9,720	9,694	26	15,347	5,184	4,953	6,956	2,763	2,497	214	0	51
47,744	11,721	11,684	37	17,298	4,041	4,319	5,777	1,452	994	369	8	80
30	12	12	0	15	6	6	6	0	0	0	0	0
14,641	2,504	2,487	17	5,554	989	1,069	6,130	2,479	2,124	306	6	43
2,972	2,972	2,972	0	1,532	1,532	1,465	178	178	178	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0						
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7,927	3,644	3,623	6	16	0
5,007	1,693	1,682	11	2,047	917	866	2,208	475	395	61	3	16
9,786	2,689	2,679	10	3,640	818	845	832	194	142	46	0	6
3,437	742	736	6	1,185	229	234	254	75	48	27	0	0
17,683	2,314	2,313	1	5,989	885	924	2,489	698	493	92	25	87
0	-132	-132	0	71	0	0	7,434	3,838	3,271	539	5	23
140,125	19,123	19,075	48	55,816	7,056	7,745	32,341	10,532	8,630	1,443	257	201
140,125	19,123	19,075	48	55,816	7,056	7,745	32,341	10,532	8,630	1,443	257	201
955,281	241,946	237,424	4,521	383,787	97,128	98,493	429,878	164,386	149,508	8,694	3,241	2,943

Table C. Average Annual LUT Horizon Year Target Adjustments
(Used to adjust county-specific horizon year target values forward and/or backward to align with other counties)

Table C-1. King County Average Annual LUT Horizon Year Target Adjustments 2010-2031

Avg Annl Housing Change 2010-2031	Avg Annl Hholds Change 2010-2031	Avg Annl HH Pop Change 2010-2031	Avg Annl GQ Pop Change 2010-2031	Avg Annl C/R Emp Change 2010-2031	Avg Annl Gov (Civ) Higher Ed Emp Change 2010-2031	Avg Annl K-12 Education Emp Change 2010-2031	Avg Annl Adjusted^ Emp Change 2010-2035
645	720	1,297	12	393	38	32	2,497
3,155	3,553	5,267	225	1,090	545	81	7,345
426	443	949	10	232	15	18	983
125	130	245	3	50	8	4	154
183	214	388	3	35	4	9	289
343	380	707	7	58	12	19	679
392	425	774	11	283	24	23	754
352	380	605	7	291	34	13	979
583	563	1,121	6	244	9	9	2,016
586	629	1,233	9	133	48	14	1,326
276	281	646	25	18	10	6	1,446
240	226	509	6	57	22	4	851
108	126	215	4	22	8	5	228
124	116	173	3	75	4	6	905
147	156	319	2	30	3	5	170
47	53	84	0	34	2	3	89
52	69	98	0	35	2	6	52
93	86	116	0	32	2	13	79
184	205	320	9	53	24	15	201
106	123	251	1	212	1	4	313
7	8	17	0	1	1	0	8
0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
86	84	200	0	9	0	0	50
-1	1	-5	0	5	0	0	0
49	56	111	0	21	1	6	8
1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
21	25	24	0	16	0	1	0
1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
-9	-9	-22	0	0	0	0	8
36	39	67	0	4	0	2	32
4	11	7	0	11	0	1	4
-4	-1	-21	0	16	0	1	56
0	1	-1	0	0	0	0	1
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
13	16	27	0	-4	0	0	-2
1	1	1	0	0	0	0	5
-3	-2	-7	0	0	0	0	-1
48	52	106	1	2	0	4	3
96	100	217	1	40	0	7	6
5	5	12	0	0	0	0	7
28	27	67	0	4	0	0	0
115	127	199	1	15	2	10	20
4	4	10	0	7	0	0	100
12	13	4	0	3	0	0	-9
51	49	93	0	0	0	0	6
11	10	30	0	0	0	0	-4
-4	-3	-8	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	1	0	0	0	-10	0
10	10	28	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6	6	12	0	4	0	0	0
n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
38	47	71	0	29	1	5	111

3	15	11	0	5	0	1	154
13	15	33	0	6	-1	-5	-7
334	383	642	2	338	0	0	-15
13	13	30	0	7	0	2	32
43	43	102	1	8	1	2	28
60	64	112	1	11	2	5	47
23	27	44	0	21	1	1	39
0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
44	47	101	0	40	2	4	2

Table C-2. Kitsap County Average Annual LUT Horizon Year Target Adjustments 2010-2025

Avg Annl Housing Change 2010-2025	Avg Annl Hholds Change 2010-2025	Avg Annl HH Pop Change 2010-2025	Avg Annl GQ Pop Change 2010-2025	Avg Annl C/R Emp Change 2010-2025	Avg Annl Gov (Civ) Higher Ed Emp Change 2010-2025	Avg Annl K-12 Education Emp Change 2010-2025	Avg Annl Adjusted^ Emp Change 2010-2035
283	292	611	78	n/a	15	7	366
180	180	401	4	n/a	2	4	319
107	122	266	2	n/a	4	4	81
60	54	117	11	n/a	5	3	79
54	53	109	4	n/a	2	3	91
44	44	100	0	n/a	0	0	10
4	4	8	0	n/a	1	0	26
62	48	109	0	n/a	0	1	17
128	131	321	3	n/a	1	4	127
0	0	0	0	n/a	0	0	1
49	46	99	0	n/a	0	2	40
120	114	302	0	n/a	0	0	0
28	34	72	2	n/a	2	3	116
49	48	120	0	n/a	0	0	-1
136	129	340	0	n/a	0	0	0
292	325	734	17	n/a	0	0	-26

Table C-3. Pierce County Average Annual LUT Horizon Year Target Adjustments 2010-2030

Avg Annl Housing Change 2010-2030	Avg Annl Hholds Change 2010-2030	Avg Annl HH Pop Change 2010-2030	Avg Annl GQ Pop Change 2010-2030	Avg Annl C/R Emp Change 2010-2030	Avg Annl Gov (Civ) Higher Ed Emp Change 2010-2030	Avg Annl K-12 Education Emp Change 2010-2030	Avg Annl Adjusted^ Emp Change 2010-2035
2,059	2,005	3,798	150	n/a	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!
23	21	25	0	n/a	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!
368	380	634	25	n/a	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!
337	324	699	2	n/a	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!
29	27	18	0	n/a	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!
244	222	400	0	n/a	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!
100	93	203	0	n/a	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!
60	55	129	21	n/a	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!
4	3	9	0	n/a	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!
98	92	175	1	n/a	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!
15	13	18	0	n/a	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!
105	96	205	0	n/a	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!
24	20	22	0	n/a	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!
96	91	166	11	n/a	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!
3	2	-18	0	n/a	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!
36	35	51	8	n/a	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!
0	0	1	0	n/a	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!
8	7	13	0	n/a	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!
15	18	33	0	n/a	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!
5	5	15	0	n/a	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!
28	29	40	0	n/a	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!
70	66	116	4	n/a	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!
3	2	4	0	n/a	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!
1,292	1,199	2,488	93	n/a	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!
14	15	48	0	n/a	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!
452	446	853	9	n/a	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!

Table C-4. Snohomish County Average Annual LUT Horizon Year Target Adjustments 2010-2035

Avg Annl Housing Change 2010-2035	Avg Annl Hholds Change 2010-2035	Avg Annl HH Pop Change 2010-2035	Avg Annl GQ Pop Change 2010-2035	Avg Annl C/R Emp Change 2010-2035	Avg Annl Gov (Civ) Higher Ed Emp Change 2010-2035	Avg Annl K-12 Education Emp Change 2010-2035	Avg Annl Adjusted^ Emp Change 2010-2035
1,212	1,202	2,824	118	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!
147	149	335	3	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!
376	376	869	15	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!
130	124	329	4	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!
133	146	275	3	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!
213	213	536	1	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!
501	511	1,301	13	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!
40	46	94	0	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!
58	55	192	34	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!
111	117	230	1	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!
32	33	74	0	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!
16	17	44	0	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!
6	8	20	0	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!
4	3	13	0	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!
87	89	213	0	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!
1	1	2	0	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!
62	66	147	5	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!
76	75	181	4	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!
39	40	129	0	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!
0	1	4	0	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!
8	8	25	0	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!
7	7	15	0	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!
0	3	6	0	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!
13	12	25	0	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!
0	0	0	0	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!
33	35	105	0	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!
1	1	1	0	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!
19	20	57	0	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!
15	15	40	0	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!
17	17	38	2	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!
14	13	34	0	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!
119	117	323	1	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!
3	4	10	0	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!
6	8	20	0	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!
97	92	261	1	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!
247	236	462	1	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!
192	206	556	2	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!
0	0	1	0	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!
47	51	118	1	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!
73	70	142	0	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!
0	0	0	0	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!
44	41	80	1	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!
39	40	128	0	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!
11	11	35	0	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!
42	44	110	0	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!
0	0	-6	0	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!
336	369	908	2	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!	#REF!

Mixed Use Splits (provided as Res/Non-Res)

- CBDs (Major cities, like metro + core, some larger): 50/50
- Town Centers (smaller cities): 40/60
- MU in RGCs:
    - CBDs – 50/50 (except Redmond, Bellevue, Tacoma)
    - Tacoma CBD – 35/65
    - Malls – 30/70
    - Other – 75/25
- Industrial-Residential Zone: 65/35 (Tacoma)
- Office-Residential Zones: 20/80
- Seattle non-CBD MU: 80/20
- Other MU areas: 35/65
- Pierce County:
    - Cities – 10/90
    - Urban Unincorporated - 35/65
    - Taheleh - 90/10
- Redmond:
    - River Trail - 80/20
    - Carter - 80/20
    - East Hill - 80/20
    - Sammamish Trail - 80/20
    - Town Square - 80/20
    - Old Town - 80/20
    - Anderson Park - 80/20
    - River Bend - 80/20
    - Town Center - 80/20
    - Trestle - 80/20
    - Valley View - 80/20
    - Bear Creek - 80/20
    - Overlake Business and Advanced Technology - 13/87
    - Overlake Village 1 - 50/50
    - Overlake Village 2 - 25/75
    - Overlake Village 3 - 25/75
    - Overlake Village 4 - 50/50
    - Overlake Village 5 - 10/90
    - Business Park - 0/100
    - Neighborhood Commercial 1 - 50/50
    - Neighborhood Commercial 2 - 50/50
    - General Commercial - 50/50
- Bellevue:
    - Specified by City of Bellevue staff, vary by location

These assumptions center on how to apportion land in mixed use zones to residential and non-residential classes, for the purposes of calculating development capacity. Without access to local development histories, the most accessible way to determine the likely res/non-res mix of zoned capacity in varied mixed use districts would be to create an assumption of how much land or built area on a parcel would be apportioned to each allowed use. The main sources for research were County Buildable Lands reports. Applying buildable lands residential/non-residential splits in mixed use areas, as exist in King, Kitsap, and Pierce County reports, was not immediately possible due to the lack of a regional zoning layer that would relate zones to mixed use areas in the FLU. It was also advised that some generalization might also be warranted in our approach.

Mixed use areas were categorized by their geographic location and general "type," finding support in the buildable lands assumptions that, for example, many CBDs had apportioned land to residential and non-residential uses at roughly equal proportions. Of course there were individual exceptions to the rules. In cases where there was significant disagreement between the zones and the initial rules, the size of the disagreeing zones was surveyed, to measure the degree of the impact. Most often, the amount of land affected by such a disagreement was relatively small and/or the non-residential bias would be compensated for by another assumption. Through this process, a categorization of specific geographies and mixed uses with unique residential/non-residential splits was determined with the split characterizing the mixed use carried over to determine capacity.

Calculating capacity of mixed use parcels: Maximum residential DU/acre is converted to an approximate FAR using an assumption of 1000 sf/unit: (Max DU/acre*1000)/43560= max residential FAR. This approximate residential FAR is compared to the non-residential FAR, if it is larger, it will be used in the capacity calculation:
Parcel SF * maximum FAR * MU split = Max Non-residential SF Capacity
Parcel SF * maximum FAR * MU split /1000= Max Residential DU Capacity

Calculating capacity this way means that the Res/Non-res split is applied to the maximum SF that could be built on the parcel, rather than the parcel land area, which is a tad more realistic.

EMPLOYMENT ASSUMPTIONS

Square Feet per Job Ratios by Sector

Retail/Food: 500 (urban) 550 (rural)
FIRES: 250 (urban) 300 (rural)
ManWTU: 600 (urban) 875 (rural)
Construction/Resource: 250 (urban) 300 (rural)

Square feet per job ratios are necessary to convert developable capacity to jobs, to compare with employment targets. These sectors were determined in part from research in buildable lands and exist within the ranges used in the 2013 Land Use Baseline.

Sectors by Land Use

The sectors by land use assumption generalizes which sectors in what proportions will be associated with each land use. They have been taken from observations in 2010, the sectorial make up by land use remains constant through the target year.

LU_cat	Cons/Res	ManWTU	Retail/Food	FIRES
C_I	9.79%	33.88%	30.35%	25.98%
C_O	4.04%	9.14%	26.87%	59.95%
C_R	3.77%	8.35%	45.21%	42.67%
CO_R	2.24%	11.32%	26.24%	60.21%
COI	13.16%	38.91%	9.02%	38.90%
COI_R	2.69%	28.61%	2.23%	66.47%
comOnly	3.94%	11.23%	43.07%	41.75%
I_R	3.93%	30.26%	4.45%	61.36%
indOnly	10.06%	60.79%	7.08%	22.07%
locked	5.21%	19.42%	19.60%	55.76%
MX_CR	3.68%	10.89%	27.59%	57.84%
MX_NR	5.24%	8.71%	29.20%	56.85%
O_I	2.53%	29.79%	1.01%	66.68%
O_R	1.72%	28.42%	5.80%	64.06%
offOnly	3.56%	40.34%	4.45%	51.66%
resOnly	17.55%	9.23%	10.16%	63.06%

Industrial Lands

Originally, residual capacity on underdeveloped or partly developed industrial lands was not considered as capacity by Seattle's request. Other jurisdictions requested a change in this assumption, and since Seattle provided net capacity for itself, redevelopable capacity on I lands will count towards net capacity

Regional Forecast Sector Controls

County	C/R	ManWTU	Retail	FIRES
Region	0.062849555	0.169230198	0.19032261	0.5775976
King	0	0.180579542	0.2030865	0.616334
Kitsap	0.062849555	0.169230198	0.19032261	0.5775976
Pierce	0.062849555	0.169230198	0.19032261	0.5775976
Snohomish	0	0.180579542	0.2030865	0.616334

Sectors are controlled on 10-3X data regionally. County-level controls are displayed because construction/ resource jobs are allocated in 2 counties (and thus need to be controlled), while they are scaled in the other 2 counties (and already have their own target)

Priority area weights

Urban Res + NonRes

	T > C	C > T
RGCs	3	2
Seattle Urban Villages	2.5	1.75
Mixed Use (over 10 acres)	2.25	1.5
High Density Res. Areas (over 30DU/Ac)	2	1.25
Everywhere Else	1	1

Urban Unincorporated Res + NonRes

	T > C	C > T
County Designated Centers	2	1.5
Mixed Use in PAAs (over 10 acres)	1.75	1.5
Mixed Use elsewhere (over 10 acres)	1.5	1.25
PAAs	1.25	1.25
Everywhere Else	1	1

Industrial Land

	T > C	C > T
MICs	2	1.5
Everywhere Else	1	1

Rural Land

	T > C	C > T
MU	1	1
Everywhere Else	1	1

The weights influence the priority with which different TAZ-parts are allocated target. Their ranking shows the significance the priority areas have relative to one another. The values of the weights are not derived from any technical source, but were guided by the relative significance of their expressed land use types. The priority areas were determined as such by their role in policy for containing growth.

The values can be interpreted in the following way. For example, in a suburban city with a regional growth center, where capacity is greater than targets, for every 10 jobs allocated to non-priority zones, 15 are allocated to mixed use areas, and 20 are allocated to the regional growth center, dependent on capacity.

OTHER ASSUMPTIONS

Fill Vacancy Rate

- All areas: 15%

The fill vacancy rate is a “vacancy rate” to keep a portion of capacity out of allocation, in an attempt to more closely represent a reality where 100% capacity is not readily met. This assumption only applies to residential vacancy only, because we are only proposing to allocate to undeveloped capacity (i.e. maximum capacity - existing development) for the employment allocation. The fill vacancy rates were influenced by the market factors in buildable lands across the four counties.

Redevelopment Ratio

The redevelopment ratio determines whether underutilized capacity on already developed parcels is counted towards developable capacity. If the existing development on a parcel is equal to or less than one-third of maximum capacity, than the underutilized capacity will be counted towards developable capacity.

This ratio was determined from reviewer input and buildable lands inputs across the four counties.