

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

APPENDIX B

Housing Needs Assessment



King County
December 2024

Table of Contents

28		
29		
30	I. Executive Summary.....	4
31	II. Background	11
32	A. Policy Context	11
33	B. Subarea Planning.....	12
34	C. Data Sources, Methodology, and Limitations	12
35	III. Community Profile	17
36	A. Section Summary.....	17
37	B. Population Characteristics.....	18
38	C. Household Characteristics.....	33
39	III. Workforce Profile	70
40	A. Section Summary.....	70
41	B. Local Workforce Characteristics	71
42	C. Jobs to Housing Ratio	74
43	D. Employment Trends and Projections	75
44	IV. Housing Supply	76
45	A. Section Summary.....	76
46	B. General Housing Inventory.....	77
47	C. Housing Market Conditions	85
48	Special Housing Inventory	94
49	V. Racially Disparate Impact Analysis.....	99
50	A. Historical Policies with an Explicit Racial Discriminatory Intent.....	100
51	B. Policies with a Racially Disparate Impact	106
52	C. Displacement.....	124
53	D. Undoing Racially Disparate Housing Policies in the Comprehensive Planning Process	
54	127	
55	VI. Housing Needs Analysis.....	129
56	A. Section Summary.....	129
57	B. Housing Needs of People who Need Supportive Services or Accessible Units	131
58	C. Housing Needs of Communities Experiencing Disproportionate Harm of Housing	
59	Inequities.....	134
60	VII. Land Capacity Analysis.....	139
61	A. Section Summary.....	139
62	B. Permanent Housing.....	140
63	C. Emergency Housing	141

64	D.	Percentage of Residential Land Zoned for and Geographic Distribution of Medium-	
65		and High-Density Housing	143
66	E.	Housing Development Capacity within a Half-Mile Walkshed of High-Capacity or	
67		Frequent Transit Service.....	146
68	VIII.	Evaluating Effectiveness of Strategies to Meet Housing Need	151
69	A.	Section Summary.....	151
70	B.	Net New Housing Units Needed, 2019 through 2044.....	152
71	C.	Housing Production Gap Analysis.....	152
72	D.	Emergency Housing Production Gap Analysis	155
73	E.	Affordable Housing Funding Gap Analysis.....	155
74	IX.	Making Adequate Provisions for Housing Needs of All Economic Segments of the	
75		Community	156
76	A.	Section Summary.....	156
77		Identifying Barriers to Development.....	157
78	B.	Considering Employment Locations.....	159
79	C.	The Role of ADUs in Meeting Housing Need.....	159
80	X.	Existing Strategies Summary	160
81	A.	Section Summary.....	160
82	B.	Funding.....	160
83	C.	Local Funds	161
84	D.	State Funds.....	165
85	E.	Federal Funds	165
86	F.	Programs	166
87	G.	Policies and Regulations.....	168
88	H.	Countywide Policies	169
89	I.	Unincorporated King County Policies and Regulations	169
90	J.	Partnerships	171
91	XI.	Existing Strategies Gap Analysis	172
92	A.	Section Summary.....	172
93	B.	Funding.....	173
94	C.	Programs	175
95		Policies and Regulations	177
96			
97			

98

I. Executive Summary

99 *Background*

100 This analysis is guided by Revised Code of Washington 36.70A.070(2) and King County Countywide
101 Planning Policies (CPPs) H-3, H-4, and H-5.¹ In 2021, Washington State amended the Growth Management
102 Act (GMA) through House Bill 1220. The changes to the GMA require cities and counties plan for the
103 development of sufficient housing to meet the needs of all income levels in their jurisdiction.

104

105 The beginning of each section of this appendix references the relevant CPPs and other requirements it
106 fulfills. The CPPs create a consistent framework for King County and each jurisdiction to develop a
107 Comprehensive Plan. This assessment is also guided by VISION 2050, the region's long-range plan for
108 growth developed by the Puget Sound Regional Council. For more information about each requirement and
109 guiding plans, see *II. Background*.

110

111 This Housing Needs Assessment provides data and analysis for all of King County and unincorporated King
112 County. This information helps guide the 2024 King County Comprehensive Plan regarding:

- 113 • King County population and household characteristics;
- 114 • housing supply;
- 115 • racially disparate impacts from land use and housing practices;
- 116 • housing needs for specific populations;
- 117 • existing strategies and gaps in meeting housing needs
- 118 • zoning and land capacity for housing; and
- 119 • making adequate provisions for housing needs of all economic segments of the community.

120

121 *Data Sources, Methodology, and Limitations*

122 This assessment utilizes data primarily from the U.S. Census Bureau, the Washington State Office of Financial
123 Management, the Washington State Department of Commerce, the King County Department of Community
124 and Human Services (DCHS), the King County Permitting Division, and the King County Regional
125 Homelessness Authority. This assessment also cites news, research, and historical publications to support
126 qualitative data analysis. Community members impacted by housing inequities provided input to inform this
127 assessment through various forms of engagement, including participation in the Equity Work Group, 18
128 interviews with housing providers and community-based organizations, surveys, and findings from reports.

129

130 This assessment primarily discusses race and ethnicity using the descriptors used in the associated source.
131 For example, the U.S. Census has seven race categories: White, Black or African American, American Indian
132 or Alaska Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, Other Race, and Two or Multiple Races,
133 and defines ethnicity as determining whether someone is Hispanic or Latino or not Hispanic or Latino.² This
134 assessment uses the term Latin(a)(o)(x).

135

136 However, there are gaps and limitations in the available data, which limits this assessment's ability to:

- 137 • determine the underlying cause of housing needs and disparities;
- 138 • compare small population subcategories using demographic data;
- 139 • compare the most recent available data from sources that provide different time ranges and different
140 geographies; and

¹ King County Ordinance 19384 (2021), amended by Ordinance 19553 (2022) and Ordinance 19660 (2023). [\[link\]](#)

² United States Census Bureau. (2021). *Measuring Racial and Ethnic Diversity for the 2020 Census*. [\[link\]](#)

- 141 • comprehensively document racial housing discrimination and discriminatory policies and practices in
142 unincorporated King County.
143

144 *Community Profile*

145 The Community Profile section of the Housing Needs Assessment conducts an inventory and analysis of:

- 146 • household characteristics, by race/ethnicity;
147 • current population characteristics; and
148 • projected population growth.
149

150 As of 2021, the Census Bureau estimates a population of 2,215,173 individuals and 924,763 households in
151 King County.³ King County became more diverse over previous decades as the population steadily grew,
152 with most population growth occurring from residents moving to King County from another country.⁴
153 Between 2000 and 2020, the number of individuals experiencing homelessness also increased in King
154 County. While many are in shelter or transitional housing programs, more than half of those experiencing
155 homelessness in King County are unsheltered.⁵
156

157 The data in this section reveal significant differences between households in King County and
158 unincorporated King County. Approximately 8.6 percent (77,761) of the county's households live in
159 unincorporated King County, and about two-thirds (54,177) of unincorporated King County households live
160 in the rural area.⁶ While King County's population increased over the previous decades, unincorporated
161 King County's has not, primarily due to annexations and zoning restrictions in the rural area. Households in
162 unincorporated King County are more likely to be older, White, and own their homes than countywide.⁷
163

164 Significant disparities exist between households of different incomes, races, ages, and tenure. Households
165 with lower incomes are significantly more likely to be renters and cost burdened, with most extremely low-
166 income households severely cost burdened, meaning they spend more than 50 percent of their income on
167 housing costs.⁸ Homeowner households in King County are older on average and have a median income
168 nearly twice that of renter households.⁹ In 2020, Asian and White households earned nearly two times more
169 than Black and American Indian/Alaska Native households countywide. Most households own their homes
170 in King County and unincorporated King County, but Black households are more likely to rent than own.¹⁰
171 Approximately half of Black households and nearly 40 percent of Hispanic households in King County and
172 unincorporated King County are cost-burdened or severely cost-burdened. In comparison, only 30 percent
173 of White and Asian households are cost-burdened or severely cost-burdened.
174

175 *Workforce Profile*

176 The Workforce Profile section identifies significant wage disparities between residents in King County and
177 unincorporated King County and conducts an analysis of the ratio of housing to jobs in each jurisdiction.
178 Significant wage disparities exist between residents in King County and unincorporated King County. Wage
179 gaps exist between people with lower and higher levels of education and between industries in King
180 County.¹¹ There are also stark wage differences by race and ethnicity in King County. This disparity is likely
181 partly due to income gaps between sectors. However, people of different races and ethnicities also have

³ U.S. Census Bureau. (2021). 1-year ACS 2021.

⁴ Washington State Office of Financial Management Intercensal Population Estimates for King County, 2000 to 2020.

⁵ King County Regional Homelessness Authority. 2022 *Point in Time Count*. [\[link\]](#)

⁶ U.S. Census Bureau. (2022). *Tenure by Household Size, 5-year ACS 2016-2020*.

⁷ U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2021) *Overcrowding, CHAS 2014-2018*.

⁸ U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2021). *Cost Burden and Severe Cost Burden by Income, CHAS 2014-2018*.

⁹ U.S. Census Bureau. (2022). *Median Household Income by Tenure, 5-year ACS 2016-2020*.

¹⁰ U.S. Census Bureau. (2022). *Age Range by Tenure, 5-year ACS 2016-2020*.

¹¹ Washington State Employment Security Department. (2022). *Wages by education level, July 2022*. [\[link\]](#)

182 wage disparities within the same sector.¹² Asian and White households have the highest median incomes in
183 King County.¹³

184
185 Since 2010, housing production has not kept pace with job growth in King County.¹⁴ King County's jobs to
186 housing ratio increased from 1.29 in 2010 to 1.48 in 2020. Unincorporated King County's jobs to housing
187 ratio increased from 0.36 to 0.43 in the same period. A ratio higher than 1.5 indicates there may be more
188 workers commuting into the area due to a lack of housing.¹⁵

189
190 *Housing Supply*

191 The Housing Supply section conducts an inventory and analysis of the number of:

- 192 • existing housing units by housing type, age, number of bedrooms, condition, tenure, and area median
193 income limit (for income-restricted units);
- 194 • existing emergency housing, emergency shelters, and permanent supportive housing facilities and units
195 or beds, as applicable; and
- 196 • income-restricted units in unincorporated King County and the income-restricted units within a half-mile
197 walkshed of high-capacity (including transit systems such as rail and bus rapid transit) or frequent transit
198 service and in the North Highline and Skyway unincorporated activity centers, which are candidates for
199 "countywide center" designation.

200
201 King County has a total of 952,344 housing units, with 89,296 in unincorporated King County.
202 Approximately half of housing units in King County are single detached residences. In unincorporated King
203 County, less than 10 percent of housing units are multiunit housing units.¹⁶ Approximately 45 percent of
204 housing units in King County and 51 percent in unincorporated King County were built prior to 1980.¹⁷
205 Older housing is more likely to have physical problems, health risks associated with lead paint, and
206 earthquake vulnerability.^{18,19,20}

207
208 Housing construction rates decreased significantly after 2000 compared to earlier decades in both King
209 County and unincorporated King County. This is likely due in part to the establishment of the urban growth
210 area and the recession of 2008. Since 2011, large multiunit projects have made up a bulk of housing
211 construction.²¹ The number of housing units is expected to increase by approximately 25 percent and 10
212 percent in King County and unincorporated King County, respectively, by 2044.²²

213
214 The housing vacancy rate for King County and unincorporated King County is about 5.5 percent, lower than
215 the statewide rate of 6.5 percent and much lower than the countrywide rate of 10.5 percent.²³ A low vacancy
216 rate is likely to result in a more competitive and expensive housing market.

217
218 Home prices increased by about 50 percent from 2016 to 2022 in King County, and the price of single
219 detached residences increased at the highest rate.²⁴ From 2015 to 2020, the median rent in King County

¹² U.S. Census Bureau, Center for Economic Studies, LEHD. *QWI Explorer*. [\[link\]](#)

¹³ U.S. Census Bureau. (2022). *Median Household Income by Race, 5-year ACS 2016-2020*.

¹⁴ PSRC Covered Employment Estimates. Housing data: US Census Bureau Decennial Census.

¹⁵ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, EnviroAtlas. (2021). *Employment to Housing Ratio*. [\[link\]](#)

¹⁶ Washington State Office of Financial Management. (2022). *April 1 official population estimates*. [\[link\]](#)

¹⁷ U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2021). *Housing Stock by Tenure and Year Built, CHAS 2014-2018*.

¹⁸ Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2021). *Populations at Higher Risk*. [\[link\]](#)

¹⁹ Boiko-Weyrauch, A. (2018). How many Seattle buildings would be doomed in a big earthquake? *KUOW*. [\[link\]](#)

²⁰ Washington Department of Natural Resources. (2012). *Modeling a Magnitude 7.2 Earthquake on the Seattle Fault Zone in Central Puget Sound*. [\[link\]](#)

²¹ BERK Consulting, Inc. (2020). *Affordable housing incentives analysis: North Highline and Skyway-West Hill*. King County Home and Hope Initiative. [\[link\]](#)

²² PSRC Macroeconomic Forecast; Washington State Office of Financial Management, *Population and Housing Estimates*; and U.S. Census Bureau, *American Community Survey*.

²³ U.S. Census Bureau. (2020). *Occupancy Status/Vacancy Rate, 5-year ACS 2016-2020*.

²⁴ Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis. (2022). *Median Listing Price in King County, WA*. [\[link\]](#)

220 increased by about 40 percent.²⁵ Median gross rent is unaffordable for people earning 50 percent of area
221 median income and below. At the same time, most income-restricted units in unincorporated King County
222 are for households between 51 to 80 percent area median income.²⁶

223

224 *Racially Disparate Impact Analysis*

225 The Racially Disparate Impact Analysis discusses historical and contemporary exclusive and discriminatory
226 land use and housing policies and practices that lead to racially disparate impacts in unincorporated King
227 County. This section primarily focuses on urban unincorporated areas as they have larger populations and
228 have a higher concentration of Black, Indigenous, and People of Color communities than rural
229 unincorporated areas. This section does not analyze all discriminatory policies and programs that existed in
230 King County but represents a best effort on the part of the County to analyze its policies for their
231 contribution to racially disparate housing impacts and exclusion over the course of its history.

232

233 Some of the policies and practices known to have been historically enforced or practiced in unincorporated
234 King County include Indigenous land dispossession, Chinese exclusion, the Alien Land Law, Japanese
235 internment, racial restrictive covenants, and discriminatory lending practices that led to disproportionate
236 access to homeownership and a widening racial wealth gap. While many of these overtly racist housing
237 practices were made illegal in the twentieth century, their legacy lives on through seemingly race-neutral
238 policies such as exclusionary zoning, lack of funding, patterns of annexation, lack of tenant protections, and
239 other land use issues. Many of these issues lead to displacement, which is also discussed. This section
240 analyzes the racially disparate impacts of contemporary policies and discusses policies in the 2024
241 Comprehensive Plan update designed to undo the harms done to Black, Indigenous, and People of Color
242 communities.

243

244 *Housing Needs Analysis*

245 The Housing Needs Analysis section identifies the housing needs of:

- 246 • people who need supportive services or accessible units, specifically people experiencing
247 homelessness, people with disabilities, people with medical conditions, and people aged 65 years and
248 older; and
- 249 • communities experiencing disproportionate harm of housing inequities, specifically Black, Indigenous,
250 and People of Color and immigrant communities.

251

252 The 2022 Point-in-Time Count found that the number of individuals experiencing homelessness in King
253 County increased nearly 14 percent from 2020 to 2022.²⁷ Black, Hispanic/Latin(a)(o)(x), American Indian,
254 Alaska Native, or Indigenous, and Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander individuals were overrepresented in
255 this group compared to King County's overall demographics.²⁸ People experiencing homelessness need
256 access to shelter and supportive services, such as case management, to quickly transition to permanent
257 housing. Expanding access to stable housing and care can directly improve health outcomes for people
258 experiencing homelessness.²⁹

259

260 Over ten percent of King County residents live with a disability.³⁰ People living with disabilities face
261 challenges in searching, applying for, and relocating into accessible, affordable housing near supportive

²⁵ U.S. Census Bureau. (2016). *Median Gross Rent by Bedroom Size, 5-year ACS 2011-2015*.

²⁶ King County Department of Community and Human Services. (2020). *King County Income-Restricted Housing Database*.

²⁷ KCRHA 2022 Point in Time Count. [\[link\]](#)

²⁸ King County Department of Community and Human Services Performance Measurement and Evaluation. (2022). *King County's Homeless Response System*. [\[link\]](#)

²⁹ National Low Income Housing Coalition (2021). *Low-Income Older Adults Face Unaffordable Rents, Driving Housing Instability and Homelessness*. Justice in Aging. [\[link\]](#)

³⁰ U.S. Census Bureau. (2022). *Households by Disability, 5-year ACS 2016-2020*.

262 services.^{31,32} Implementing universal design standards and increasing access to housing navigators and
263 vouchers would help meet the need for this population.³³

264
265 People aged 65 years and older who wish to remain in their homes and communities may face difficulties
266 because of rising housing costs. Homeowners who have paid off their mortgage may struggle to afford
267 property taxes, utilities, and maintenance costs.³⁴ More affordable housing options, such as accessory
268 dwelling units and financial assistance programs for people aged 65 years and older, would help them
269 remain in their homes and communities.

270
271 Housing quality, cost, and stability impacts people’s physical and mental health. Individuals receiving
272 housing assistance who are recovering from medical conditions or with persisting conditions may need
273 additional support, such as occupational therapy or chore services. People with medical conditions,
274 particularly individuals who are unstably housed or experiencing homelessness, need access to care and a
275 safe place to recover after leaving the hospital, such as recuperative housing.³⁵

276
277 Black, Indigenous, and People of Color households, particularly Black and Hispanic households, are more
278 likely to experience housing problems such as incomplete kitchen and plumbing facilities, overcrowding,
279 and cost burden. Black households are also more likely to be renters and face higher rates of denial for
280 home loans compared to White households. Black, Indigenous, and People of Color residents need greater
281 access to homeownership opportunities and diverse housing types, such as middle housing and down
282 payment assistance programs. Black, Indigenous, and People of Color households need investments in
283 affordable housing and anti-displacement strategies, such as community preference programs and
284 inclusionary housing policies, to remain in their communities.

285
286 Immigrants and refugees, especially those with limited English proficiency, may have difficulties
287 communicating with landlords, finding stable employment, building a credit history, and understanding
288 their rights.^{36,37} Immigrants and refugees who are undocumented face additional barriers to accessing
289 housing. Immigrants and refugees need greater access to low-barrier affordable housing and information
290 regarding tenant protections and housing rights.³⁸ Many immigrants and refugees need increased access to
291 large, affordable rental units.³⁹

292
293 LGBTQ+ people experience systematic disparities in Washington State, including higher rates of housing
294 instability, homelessness, cost burden, poverty, and less access to care and other services.⁴⁰ LGBTQ+
295 residents in King County need access to affordable housing in neighborhoods where they feel safe and
296 connected to the community. Stronger enforcement of fair housing laws and expanded access to tenant
297 protections would increase access to safe, stable housing for LGBTQ+ residents.⁴¹ LGBTQ+ community
298 members note it is important to find information about housing from a trusted source, such as a queer
299 housing group.⁴²

300

³¹ ECONorthwest. (2022). *Housing Needs for Individuals with Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities in Washington State*. Washington State Department of Social and Health Services. [\[link\]](#)

³² 2019 King County Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice. [\[link\]](#)

³³ Community Feedback on Housing. (2022). *2023 Developmental Disabilities Legislative Committee*. King County Department of Community and Human Services.

³⁴ U.S Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2017). *Housing for Seniors: Challenges and Solution*. [\[link\]](#)

³⁵ King County Regional Homelessness Authority. (2023). *Draft Five-Year Plan (2023-2028)*. [\[link\]](#)

³⁶ Community Feedback on Housing. (2022). *2023 Developmental Disabilities Legislative Committee*. King County Department of Community and Human Services.

³⁷ 2019 King County Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice. [\[link\]](#)

³⁸ King County. (2022). *Tenant Protection Access Plan*. [\[link\]](#)

³⁹ Comprehensive Plan Equity Work Group Meeting. (2023, February 10). King County.

⁴⁰ Goldsen, K. F. et. al. (2020, November). *Washington State LGBTQ+ Equity and Health Report 2020*. [\[link\]](#)

⁴¹ LGBTQ Allyship. (2019). *2018-2019 South King County Housing Listening Sessions Report of the LGBTQ+ Community*.

⁴² LGBTQ Allyship. (2021, September). *Affirmative Housing Marketing Strategies for LGBTQ+ Communities in South King County*.

301 In addition to systems-level barriers and housing needs, community input and housing discrimination
302 testing conducted in King County found that individual-level discrimination based on disability, familial
303 status, national origin, religion, and source of income is still prevalent in King County.^{43,44} Community
304 members noted experiencing discrimination as part of their search for and while living in affordable
305 housing.⁴⁵ Communities need expanded legal support to enforce their rights.⁴⁶

306
307 *Land Capacity Analysis*

308 The Land Capacity Analysis section determines whether unincorporated King County has the zoning
309 capacity to meet housing needs at each income level.⁴⁷ The analysis evaluates what current zoning and
310 development regulations allow to determine the ability of the jurisdiction to meet future housing needs.
311 King County must plan to accommodate 5,412 permanent housing units and 1,034 emergency housing
312 units in unincorporated King County by 2044.⁴⁸ The land capacity analysis found that unincorporated King
313 County's projected permanent housing needs can be accommodated under current recommended zoning.
314 The analysis found a deficit of 116 emergency housing units in commercial zones. To address this deficit,
315 King County added permanent supportive and emergency housing types as allowed uses in the
316 development code to reduce barriers to producing permanent supportive and emergency housing. These
317 types of housing will now be allowed in the higher density residential zones, most commercial zones, and
318 the office zone.

319
320 This section also finds that 94 percent of the land in the urban unincorporated area that allows residential
321 housing is zoned for eight dwelling units per acre or less. Urban unincorporated King County has a total
322 development capacity of 4,173 housing units within a half mile walkshed of high-capacity or frequent transit.
323 North Highline and Skyway-West Hill contain 86 percent of the parcels identified.

324
325 *Evaluating Effectiveness of Strategies to Meet the Housing Need*

326 This section conducts a housing production, emergency housing production, and affordable housing
327 funding gap analysis to project the potential surplus or deficit for the housing needs at each income level
328 through 2044 as determined by Countywide Planning Policy H-1.

329
330 The housing production gap analysis finds that the total amount of housing constructed through 2044,
331 regardless of income level, is projected to be more than double the total net new need allocated to urban
332 unincorporated King County. This estimate may be skewed by two major projects completed during the
333 previous 2016 through 2024 planning period: Redmond Ridge and Greenbridge in White Center. There is a
334 significant housing production gap for households earning less than 50 percent area median income and a
335 significant surplus for households earning 50 to 80 percent area median income. The analysis finds a deficit
336 of 608 units for permanent supportive housing and 984 units of non-permanent supportive housing
337 affordable to households with incomes at the extremely low-income level. This same analysis projects a
338 deficit of 403 housing units affordable to households with very low incomes and 415 housing units
339 affordable to households with moderate incomes.

340
341 The emergency housing production gap analysis projects that urban unincorporated King County will have
342 less than half of the 1,034 emergency housing beds needed by 2044.

343
344 The affordable housing funding gap analysis identifies a need for approximately \$451 million more than
345 current funding levels to meet the housing needs of unincorporated King County households with incomes
346 at or below 80 percent area median income over the 2025 through 2044 planning period. On an annual

⁴³ 2019 King County Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice. [\[link\]](#)

⁴⁴ Fair housing Testing. Fair Housing Center of Washington Contract.

⁴⁵ Comprehensive Plan Equity Work Group Meeting (2023). King County.

⁴⁶ King County. (2022). *Tenant Protection Access Plan*. [\[link\]](#)

⁴⁷ Growth Management Services. (2022). *Guidance for Evaluating Land Capacity to Meet All Housing Needs*. Washington State Department of Commerce. [\[link\]](#)

⁴⁸ Ordinance 19384 (2021), amended by Ordinance 19553 (2022) and Ordinance 19660 (2023). [\[link\]](#)

347 basis, the funding gap is approximately \$10,524,000 beginning in 2025. Adjusting for inflation, the average
348 annual gap is approximately \$22,547,000.

349
350 *Making Adequate Provisions for the Housing Needs of All Economic Segments of the Community*
351 This section identifies several key barriers to housing development, including:

- 352 • barriers and lack of clarity permitting emergency housing;
- 353 • increased time and risk from applying for a Conditional Use Permit;
- 354 • delays and increased costs to comply with requirements related to the State Environmental Policy Act;
355 and
- 356 • permitting timelines and staffing challenges.

357
358 This section finds that King County’s zoning and land use policies will focus growth in the urban areas, which
359 are contained and are closer to employment centers. Finally, this section identified the owner-occupancy
360 requirement a potential barrier in using accessory dwelling units in meeting housing need. The 2024
361 Comprehensive Plan adopted code changes that remove the owner occupancy requirement for accessory
362 dwelling units.

363
364 *Summary of Existing Strategies*

365 This section discusses funding sources, policies, programs, and partnerships in King County and
366 unincorporated King County. King County receives federal and state funding that can be used to meet
367 different housing needs, including providing capital for development, acquisition, and rehabilitation of
368 housing. Most housing projects are funded by a mix of funds from government programs and philanthropic
369 organizations, tax credits, private debt, and rent from residents. Public sector housing funds serve
370 households at or below 80 percent area median income. Homeownership funds generally serve households
371 at least at 50 percent area median income or higher. King County serves as both the local government for
372 unincorporated areas and as a regional funder of affordable housing. Most of King County’s programs serve
373 both incorporated and unincorporated areas of the county.

374
375 The existing strategies section also discusses policies enacted and programs administered by King County
376 since the 2016 Comprehensive Plan that address homelessness and housing needs for King County
377 residents. Lastly, this section provides a description of King County partnerships with other governments,
378 housing providers, advocates, and members of the public. These partnerships further King County’s effort to
379 provide and preserve affordable housing.

380
381 *Existing Strategies Gap Analysis*

382 King County staff reviewed the findings and analysis from the previous sections in this assessment and
383 recommendations from previous plans and reports to identify gaps in funding, programs, policies, and
384 partnerships. Beyond the overall affordable housing funding gap, this section identifies funding gaps for:

- 385 • affordable housing for 0 to 50 percent area median income households;
- 386 • affordable homeownership;
- 387 • permanent supportive housing;
- 388 • flexibility for equitable community-driven development; and
- 389 • affordable two-, three-, and four-bedroom units.

390
391 The following programs were recommended in previous King County plans and reports but have not been
392 implemented:

- 393 • Equitable Development Initiative;
- 394 • rental inspections;
- 395 • relocation assistance for tenants;

- 396 • redevelopment assistance; and
- 397 • fair housing testing, education, and enforcement.

398
399 The King County Code Interim Loan Program includes language that creates barriers to community-driven
400 equitable development, and the Inclusionary Housing Program has only been implemented in North
401 Highline and Skyway-West Hill.

402 403 *2024 King County Comprehensive Plan Code Changes and Work Plan Actions*

404 The 2024 King County Comprehensive Plan adopted code changes or directed a Work Plan Action item to
405 research and evaluate the following topics.

406
407 Code changes for housing include:

- 408 • middle housing;
- 409 • inclusionary housing;
- 410 • permanent supportive housing; and
- 411 • emergency housing.

412
413 Work plan items for housing include:

- 414 • multifamily tax exemption;
- 415 • mandatory inclusionary housing; and
- 416 • community preference programs.

417 II. Background

418 A. Policy Context

419 This section outlines the current law, initiatives and plans that establish requirements and provide guidance
420 for this assessment.

421 422 *Washington State Growth Management Act*

423 The Growth Management Act (GMA), first adopted in 1990, establishes legal requirements for cities and
424 counties to develop a Comprehensive Plan to manage their population growth. Jurisdictions must create
425 housing and land use elements that provide an inventory and analysis of housing needs, land capacity, and
426 similar information to inform the Comprehensive Plan.⁴⁹ In 1992, the King County Council approved the
427 urban growth area, focusing growth primarily in cities and the western portion of King County, and limiting
428 future housing development in the rural unincorporated areas.⁵⁰ The boundaries of the urban growth area
429 remain relatively unchanged to this day.

430 431 *House Bill 1220*

432 Washington state amended the GMA in 2021 through House Bill 1220. The legislation required jurisdictions
433 to plan for and accommodate, rather than just encourage the availability of affordable housing. The
434 Washington State Department of Commerce is required to provide jurisdictions with an inventory of existing
435 and projected housing need by income level, as well as emergency housing, emergency shelters, and
436 permanent supportive housing. Jurisdictions must also identify and begin to undo local policies and
437 regulations that create racially disparate impacts, displacement, and exclusion in housing. The legislation

⁴⁹ Chapter 36.70A Revised Code of Washington. [[link](#)]

⁵⁰ King County Ordinance 10450 (1992). [[link](#)]

438 also put significant limits on the ability of local jurisdictions to prohibit transitional housing, permanent
439 supportive housing, or emergency shelters.

440
441 *VISION 2050*

442 VISION 2050 is the region's long-range plan for growth. The vision for 2050 is to provide exceptional quality
443 of life, opportunity for all, connected communities, a spectacular natural environment, and an innovative,
444 thriving economy. VISION 2050 establishes the Multicounty Planning Policies (MPPs), which provide for
445 consistency across the metropolitan counties in the Central Puget Sound Region. The Puget Sound Regional
446 Council (PSRC) led the development of VISION 2050, tracks its implementation, and provides guidance to
447 local jurisdictions.⁵¹

448
449 *Growth Management Planning Council*

450 The King County Growth Management Planning Council (GMPC) is a formal body established by an
451 interlocal agreement in 1992. The council consists of elected officials from King County, Seattle, Bellevue,
452 other cities and towns in King County, special purpose districts, and the Port of Seattle. The GMPC develops
453 and recommends the King County Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs) for adoption to King County
454 Council. The CPPs provide a countywide vision and serve as a framework for King County and each
455 jurisdiction to develop its own Comprehensive Plan. Each Comprehensive Plan must be consistent with the
456 overall vision for the future of King County.

457
458 *King County Countywide Planning Policies*

459 The Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs) create a shared and consistent framework for growth management
460 planning for all jurisdictions in King County.⁵² State law requires the legislative authority of a county to adopt
461 countywide planning policies in cooperation with cities located in the county.⁵³

462
463 *Affordable Housing Committee*

464 The Affordable Housing Committee serves as a regional advisory committee to the GMPC, with the goal of
465 recommending action and assessing progress toward implementation of the King County Regional
466 Affordable Housing Task Force Five Year Action Plan. The committee functions as a point of coordination
467 and accountability for affordable housing efforts across King County. The AHC recommends amendments
468 to the Countywide Planning Policies, among other chartered responsibilities.

469 **B. Subarea Planning**

470 Subarea plans address locally specific issues in subarea geographies. They establish visions, goals, and
471 policies to guide development decisions and are guided by community interests and available funding.
472 Subarea plans must be consistent with the King County Comprehensive Plan, the Growth Management Act,
473 and focus on long-range community needs. King County leads a subarea planning process for the six rural
474 Community Service Areas and for the five remaining large urban unincorporated potential annexation
475 areas.⁵⁴ Subarea planners use resources developed by the King County Office of Equity and Racial and
476 Social Justice to develop subarea plans, address equity impacts, implement land use and zoning updates,
477 and more.

478 **C. Data Sources, Methodology, and Limitations**

479 This section outlines the key data sources used as the foundation of this assessment, the methodology King
480 County staff took to collect and analyze the data, and the limitations of the data and the types of conclusions
481 staff can make with the data available.

⁵¹ Puget Sound Regional Council. *Vision 2050*. [\[link\]](#)

⁵² Ordinance 19384 (2021), amended by Ordinance 19553 (2022) and Ordinance 19660 (2023). [\[link\]](#)

⁵³ Revised Code of Washington 36.70A.210. [\[link\]](#)

⁵⁴ King County. *2016 King County Comprehensive Plan* (updated 2022, December). [\[link\]](#)

482 **1. Quantitative Data Sources**

483 *U.S. Census Bureau - American Community Survey*

484 The American Community Survey (ACS) is an ongoing survey conducted by the U.S. Census Bureau that
485 provides information about the United States and people.⁵⁵ This assessment primarily uses 2016-2020 5-
486 year ACS data to describe the demographics and trends in King County and unincorporated King County.
487 The U.S. Census Bureau combines the data collected over those five years to increase the sample size,
488 reliability, and consistency of the data as compared to data collected in one year.

489 *U.S. Census Bureau - Public Use Microdata Sample*

490 The U.S. Census Bureau provides Public Use Microdata Sample (PUMS) data from the ACS to allow data
491 users to create custom data tabulations.⁵⁶

492 *U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development - Consolidated Housing Affordability Survey*

493 The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) receives custom tabulations of ACS data
494 from the U.S. Census Bureau, known as Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) data.⁵⁷ These
495 tabulations calculate housing problems and needs in more detail.

496 *Other*

497 This assessment also includes footnote references to other sources, such as government publications,
498 academic research, and news reporting, to inform qualitative analysis. Other key data sources include
499 information from the:

- 500 • Washington State Office of Financial Management;
- 501 • King County Urban Growth Capacity Report;
- 502 • Puget Sound Regional Council; and
- 503 • King County Regional Homelessness Authority.

504 **2. Methodology**

505 This assessment compiles data and conducts analysis on the demographic and economic characteristics of
506 King County residents, the local housing stock, and its ability to serve the housing needs of County residents
507 now and in the future. King County serves as a regional convener and funder of affordable housing. At the
508 same time, King County serves as the local government for unincorporated King County. This assessment
509 therefore includes data and analysis regarding both King County as a whole and, when available,
510 unincorporated King County. King County staff also researched and analyzed history, background, and
511 partnerships, programs, policies, resources, and funding King County has implemented to address housing
512 need, and in particular:

- 513 • the racially disparate impact of past and current housing and land-use related laws and policies;
- 514 • the housing needs of people experiencing homelessness, persons with disabilities, people with medical
515 conditions, and older adults;
- 516 • the housing needs of communities experiencing disproportionate harm of housing inequities including
517 Black, Indigenous, and People of Color; and
- 518 • areas that are at higher risk of displacement from market forces that occur with changes to zoning
519 development regulations and public capital investments.

⁵⁵ U.S. Census Bureau. (2022). *About the American Community Survey*. [\[link\]](#)

⁵⁶ U.S. Census Bureau. (2022). *Public Use Microdata Sample (PUMS)*. [\[link\]](#)

⁵⁷ Office of Policy Development and Research. (2022). *Consolidated Planning/CHAS Data*. U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. [\[link\]](#)

524 This assessment is also informed through engagement with community members and service providers
525 across the County, with an emphasis on those who have been historically excluded and harmed by planning
526 processes and housing inequities. This analysis reflects input from the following community engagement
527 processes.

- 528 • The 2024 Comprehensive Plan Equity Work Group served as an advisory group to Executive staff in
529 incorporating equity considerations into the Executive Recommended Comprehensive Plan. The group
530 was composed of 15 people from historically underrepresented communities.
- 531 • DCHS staff conducted 18 interviews as of September 2023 with housing providers and community-
532 based organizations in 2023 to understand the barriers people across the County are facing when trying
533 to access and sustain housing that is affordable, safe, and culturally relevant, as well as their priorities
534 and ideas for addressing these barriers.
- 535 • King County solicited feedback from the broader community on early concepts of the 2024
536 Comprehensive Plan update through a survey in 2022. DCHS staff compiled housing-related feedback
537 to understand priorities people have for the Comprehensive Plan.
- 538 • King County solicited public comment on early conceptual proposals in early 2023 and the Public
539 Review Draft of the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update in summer 2023.
- 540 • Findings from the 2021 Skyway-West Hill and North Highline Anti-displacement Strategies Report
541 informed the analysis.
- 542 • Findings from the 2019 King County Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice report informed
543 the analysis.

544 545 *Determining the Cause of Housing Need or Disparities*

546 Much of the data in this assessment identifies significant disparities between groups. While identifying
547 disparities is a critical first step to pursuing equitable outcomes, it is difficult to determine the causes of a
548 given disparity, especially in a complex system such as housing. This assessment's analysis includes
549 potential factors that may influence the data when relevant. However, discussion of potential factors or
550 causes are not a definitive or complete explanation of a given disparity.

551 552 *Limitations to Intersectional Analysis Due to Small Population Sizes*

553 When measuring demographics using multiple variables, such as measuring the rate of housing cost burden
554 by race, age, and tenure, American Community Survey results can be small or, in some cases, zero. The
555 smaller population sizes lead to greater variability, increasing the margin of error. This limits this assessment
556 in comparing population subcategories using the available demographic data.

557 558 *Comparing Data Across Different Sources*

559 The American Community Survey data used in this analysis is from 2016 to 2020, while the CHAS data is
560 from 2014 to 2018. Both are the most recent data available. The total King County and unincorporated King
561 County population or households will vary in different tables because the data sets are from different time
562 ranges. The U.S. Census Bureau's PUMS dataset is available at a PUMA (Public Use Microdata Area)
563 geographic level. PUMAs are areas with populations of at least 100,000 people. There are 16 PUMAs that
564 make up King County. Given the coarse geographic scale, it is difficult to use PUMAs to estimate
565 unincorporated King County, as the PUMAs are drawn to include various cities. Any data point in this
566 assessment using PUMS data will only provide countywide data.

567 568 *Racially Disparate Impact Analysis in Unincorporated King County*


569 Most research available on King County racial housing discrimination centers Seattle, while less
570 documented research exists in areas currently unincorporated. Unincorporated King County areas changed
571 throughout history with annexations, so some of this analysis discusses areas that are currently incorporated.
572 When displaying historical quantitative data, unincorporated King County is defined based on current
573 Census geographies and incorporation status in order to display the history of the current areas in
574 unincorporated King County. In addition, historical Census data from prior to 1980 is inaccurate for most
575 unincorporated areas, and thus was not included. Zoning atlases that captured rezones between the mid-

576 1970s to the mid-1990s were lost during a records transfer, which limits the ability to understand the
577 rezones that occurred throughout that period. The Seattle Times Archives were used to conduct historical
578 research. However, many communities discriminated against may not have had access or leverage to
579 document and publish stories in mainstream sources, which is another limitation to this analysis.

580 3. Geographic Area

581 This Housing Needs Analysis covers all of King County and provides specific data on unincorporated King
582 County. *Map 1: Land Use 2024* shows boundary lines of various land use designations within King County,
583 including the urban growth area, incorporated cities, unincorporated areas, the rural area, and more.

584 Map 1: Land Use 2024



586

III. Community Profile

587

A. Section Summary

588

This section fulfills King County CPP H-3f, H-3g, and H-3h.

589

590

CPP H-3f, H-3g, and H-3h require jurisdictions to:

591

Conduct an inventory and analysis in each jurisdiction of existing and projected housing needs of all segments of the population and summarize the findings in the housing element. The inventory and analysis shall include:

592

593

594

f) Household characteristics, by race/ethnicity:

595

1) Income (median and by area median income bracket);

596

2) Tenure (renter or homeowner); and

597

3) Housing cost burden and severe housing cost burden.

598

g) Current population characteristics:

599

1) Age by race/ethnicity; and

600

2) Disability

601

h) Projected population growth.

602

603

As of 2021, the Census Bureau estimates a population of 2,215,173 individuals and 924,763 households in King County.⁵⁸ King County became more diverse over previous decades as the population steadily grew, with most population growth occurring from residents moving to King County from another country.⁵⁹

604

605

606

607

608

Between 2000 and 2020, the number of individuals experiencing homelessness also increased in King County. While many are in shelter or transitional housing programs, more than half of those experiencing homelessness in King County are unsheltered.⁶⁰

609

610

The data in this section reveal significant differences between households in King County and unincorporated King County. Approximately 8.6 percent (77,761) of the county's households live in unincorporated King County, and about two-thirds (54,177) of unincorporated King County households live in the rural area.⁶¹ While King County's population increased over the previous decades, unincorporated King County's has not, primarily due to annexations and zoning restrictions in the rural area. Households in unincorporated King County are more likely to be older, White, and own their homes than countywide.⁶²

616

617

Significant disparities exist between households of different incomes, races, ages, and tenure. Households with lower incomes are significantly more likely to be renters and cost burdened, with most extremely low-income households severely cost burdened, meaning they spend more than 50 percent of their income on housing costs.⁶³ Homeowner households in King County are older on average and have a median income nearly twice that of renter households.⁶⁴ In 2020, Asian and White households earned nearly two times more than Black and American Indian/Alaska Native households countywide. Most households own their homes in King County and unincorporated King County, but Black households are more likely to rent than own.⁶⁵ Approximately half of Black households and nearly 40 percent of Hispanic households in King County and

618

619

620

621

622

623

624

⁵⁸ U.S. Census Bureau. (2021). 1-year ACS 2021.

⁵⁹ Washington State Office of Financial Management Intercensal Population Estimates for King County, 2000 to 2020.

⁶⁰ KCRHA 2022 Point in Time Count. [\[link\]](#)

⁶¹ U.S. Census Bureau. (2022). *Tenure by Household Size, 5-year ACS 2016-2020*.

⁶² U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2021) *Overcrowding, CHAS 2014-2018*.

⁶³ U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2021). *Cost Burden and Severe Cost Burden by Income, CHAS 2014-2018*.

⁶⁴ U.S. Census Bureau. (2022). *Median Household Income by Tenure, 5-year ACS 2016-2020*.

⁶⁵ U.S. Census Bureau. (2022). *Age Range by Tenure, 5-year ACS 2016-2020*.

625 unincorporated King County are cost burdened or severely cost burdened, while only 30 percent of White
626 and Asian households are cost burdened or severely cost burdened.⁶⁶

627 B. Population Characteristics

628 This section discusses the demographics of individual residents in King County, including:

- 629 • population count;
 - 630 • population by age group;
 - 631 • race and ethnicity;
 - 632 • languages spoken;
 - 633 • immigration status;
 - 634 • disability status; and
 - 635 • people experiencing homelessness.
- 636

637 *Count of Population*

638 As of 2022, the estimated population for King County is 2,317,700 people, with 10.7 percent (248,160) of
639 the county's residents living in unincorporated King County. Unincorporated King County is the second
640 largest jurisdiction in the county, after Seattle (762,500 residents).⁶⁷ Almost one-third of Washington's
641 population resides in King County. Thirty one percent of the state's population growth occurred in King
642 County. The next largest shares of growth occurred in Snohomish County and Pierce County (9.8 percent
643 and 9.4 percent, respectively).⁶⁸

644

645 King County has grown steadily in population over the last two decades. From 2000 to 2020, King County
646 population grew 30.7 percent. Most of this growth occurred in incorporated areas of King County.⁶⁹ The
647 unincorporated King County population decreased by 29.5 percent from 2000 to 2020. This population
648 decrease is mainly due to annexation of unincorporated areas into cities. Since 2008, seven ballot measures
649 approved annexing unincorporated areas to Renton, Auburn, Burien, Kent, Kirkland, Bellevue, and
650 Sammamish, representing over 117,000 residents.⁷⁰ Figure 1 shows the steady population growth in King
651 County as a whole and incorporated King County jurisdictions as well as the population decline in
652 unincorporated King County.

653

⁶⁶ U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2021). *Cost Burden and Severe Cost Burden by Tenure, CHAS 2014-2018*.


⁶⁷ Washington State Office of Financial Management. (2022, April 1). *April 1 Population of Cities, Towns, and Counties*. [\[link\]](#)

⁶⁸ Washington State Office of Financial Management. Forecasting & Research Division. (2022, November). *State of Washington 2022 Population Trends*. [\[link\]](#)

⁶⁹ Washington State Office of Financial Management Intercensal Population Estimates for King County, 2000 to 2020.

⁷⁰ King County Office of Performance, Strategy, and Budget. (2018). *King County Unincorporated Urban Area Annexation Area Databook*. [\[link\]](#)

654 **Figure 1: Population Growth in King County from 2000 to 2020**




655 Source: Washington State Office of Financial Management Intercensal Population Estimates for King County, 2000 to 2020.
 656

657 *Forecasted Population Growth*

658 The Washington State Office of Financial Management projects King County's population to grow by 24.6
 659 percent from 2,317,700 residents in 2022 to 2,887,137 in 2044. Unincorporated King County's population is
 660 projected to grow more slowly at a rate of 7.3 percent from 248,160 residents in 2022 to 266,301 in
 661 2044.^{71,72} Figure 2 shows the actual and forecasted population growth in King County.
 662

663 **Figure 2: Actual and Projected Population Growth in King County and Unincorporated King**
 664 **County from 2000 to 2044**




665 Source: Washington State Office of Financial Management Intercensal Population Estimates for King County, 2000 to 2020 and
 666 Washington State Office of Financial Management Growth Management Act Population Projections for Counties: 2020 to 2050.
 667

⁷¹ The estimate for unincorporated King County does not take future annexation into account, which would likely result in a reduction in population.

⁷² Washington State Office of Financial Management Intercensal Population Estimates for King County, 2000 to 2020 and Washington State Office of Financial Management Growth Management Act Population Projections for Counties: 2020 to 2050.

668 *Population by Age Group*
 669 Most of King County’s residents are of working age, with the largest share of residents (17.2 percent) being
 670 30 to 39 years old. Approximately 20.2 percent (449,242) of King County’s population is 17 years old or
 671 younger. Unincorporated King County residents are older on average than King County residents, with the
 672 largest share of unincorporated King County residents (16.8 percent) being 50 to 59 years old.
 673 Unincorporated King County also has a larger share of people aged 65 years old and older (17.1 percent)
 674 compared to King County (13.2 percent).⁷³ Figure 3 shows the number of King County residents by age
 675 range and Figure 4 shows the number of unincorporated King County residents by age range.
 676


677 **Figure 3: King County Population by Age Range**



678 Source: U.S. Census Bureau. (2022). *Population by Age, 5-year ACS 2016-2020*.
 679

⁷³ U.S. Census Bureau. (2022). *Population by Age, 5-year ACS 2016-2020*.

680 **Figure 4: Unincorporated King County Population by Age Range**




681
 682 Source: U.S. Census Bureau. (2022). *Population by Age, 5-year ACS 2016-2020*.

683 As shown in Figure 5, urban unincorporated King County skews younger than rural unincorporated King
 684 County. Urban unincorporated King County has a higher rate of 20- to 29-year-old residents and 30- to 39-
 685 year-old residents (11.7 percent and 15.3 percent, respectively) compared to rural unincorporated King
 686 County (6.2 percent and 11.1 percent, respectively). Most unincorporated King County residents are 40
 687 years old or older (58.2 percent) whereas less than half of urban unincorporated King County residents fall
 688 in that age range (48.8 percent).⁷⁴

⁷⁴ U.S. Census Bureau. (2022). *Population by Age, 5-year ACS 2016-2020*.

689 **Figure 5: Urban and Rural Unincorporated King County Population by Age Range**



690
691 Source: U.S. Census Bureau. (2022). Population by Age, 5-year ACS 2016-2020.

692 *Race and Ethnicity*


693 Race and ethnicity have a strong connection to where people live in King County, how likely they are to be
694 housing cost burdened, and whether they own or rent their homes. Understanding the size and differences
695 between racial and ethnic groups in King County and unincorporated King County is a first step to
696 understanding housing needs for these groups.

697
698 The U.S. Census has seven race categories: White, Black or African American, American Indian or Alaska
699 Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, Other Race, and Two or Multiple Races.⁷⁵ The U.S.
700 Census defines ethnicity as determining whether someone is Hispanic or Latin(a)(o)(x) or not Hispanic or
701 Latin(a)(o)(x). A person could be any race and be considered Hispanic or Latin(a)(o)(x). While high-level
702 population data can be presented in a combined race/ethnicity format because the Census provides race
703 and ethnicity data combined, for almost all other variables this is not possible. Thus, for most sections of this
704 report race and ethnicity are reported as separate demographic categories due to the limitations set by the
705 U.S. Census.
706

⁷⁵ United States Census Bureau. (2021). *Measuring Racial and Ethnic Diversity for the 2020 Census*. [\[link\]](#)

707 *Count of Population by Race and Ethnicity*
 708 As shown in Figures 6 and 7, most residents in King County and unincorporated King County are White, not
 709 Hispanic or Latin(a)(o)(x) (54 percent and 64 percent respectively). Unincorporated King County has
 710 proportionately more White residents and American Indian/Alaska Native residents than the County as a
 711 whole. This higher proportion of White residents in unincorporated King County is likely due, in part, to the
 712 older population and comparative lack of housing and population growth in unincorporated areas over
 713 recent decades. Multiunit developments are more likely to house the racially and ethnically diverse newer
 714 King County residents. The higher proportion of American Indian/Alaska Native residents is likely due to the
 715 location of the Snoqualmie and Muckleshoot reservations.
 716


717 **Figure 6: King County Population by Race/Ethnicity**



AI/AN is American Indian and Alaska Native
 NH/PI is Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islander

718 Source: U.S. Census Bureau. (2022). *Population by Race, 5-year ACS 2016-2020*.
 719

720 **Figure 7: Unincorporated King County Population by Race/Ethnicity**



AI/AN is American Indian and Alaska Native
 NH/PI is Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islander

721
 722


Source: U.S. Census Bureau. (2022). Population by Race, 5-year ACS 2016-2020.

723 *Change in Population by Race and Ethnicity*

724 Figure 8 shows King County’s population by Race and Ethnicity from 2005 to 2019. White residents make up
 725 most of King County’s population, but since 2005, the Black, Indigenous, and People of Color population in
 726 King County has grown by 81 percent, creating a more diverse community. The number of Asian residents
 727 increased the most, from 233,028 (13.3 percent of King County) in 2005 to 408,078 in 2019 (18.9 percent of
 728 King County).⁷⁶

729

730 **Figure 8: King County Population by Race/Ethnicity from 2005 to 2019**




731 Source: U.S. Census Bureau. (2021). Population by Race/Ethnicity, 1-year ACS 2021.
 732

733

⁷⁶ U.S. Census Bureau. (2021). Population by Race/Ethnicity, 1-year ACS 2021.

734 Figure 9 shows the change in King County’s population by race and ethnicity, excluding White and Asian to
 735 show more detail for the remaining groups. Multi-racial residents grew at the fastest rate, with a 42.75
 736 percent population increase from 58,756 multi-racial people in 2005 (3.3 percent of King County) to 83,892
 737 people in 2019 (6.3 percent of King County). Although the Hispanic or Latin(a)(o)(x) population has
 738 increased from 2005 to 2019, there is a notable decrease in the population beginning in 2013.⁷⁷
 739

740 **Figure 9: King County Population by Race/Ethnicity, without White and Asian, from 2005 to**
 741 **2019**




742 Source: U.S. Census Bureau. (2021). Population by Race/Ethnicity, 1-year ACS 2021.
 743

⁷⁷ U.S. Census Bureau. (2021). Population by Race/Ethnicity, 1-year ACS 2021.

744 *Age by Race and Ethnicity*

745 As shown in Figure 10, Black, Indigenous, and People of Color King County residents are significantly
746 younger than White King County residents. The median age of a White resident is 40.8 years old, whereas
747 the median age of other racial groups is between five to 17 years younger. People of multiple races are the
748 youngest population in King County, with a median age of 23.8 years old.⁷⁸
749

750 **Figure 10: Median Age by Race in King County**




751 Source: U.S. Census Bureau. (2022). *Median Age by Race, 5-year ACS 2016-2020*.
752

⁷⁸ U.S. Census Bureau. (2022). *Median Age by Race, 5-year ACS 2016-2020*.

753 Figure 11 compares the median age of the King County population by Hispanic or Latin(a)(o)(x) Ethnicity.
754 The median age of the Hispanic or Latin(a)(o)(x) population is 28 years old, approximately 10 years younger
755 than the Not Hispanic/ Latin(a)(o)(x) population, which has a median age of 38 years old.
756

757 **Figure 11: King County Median Age by Hispanic and Latin(a)(o)(x) Ethnicity**



758
759 Source: U.S. Census Bureau. (2021). Median Age by Hispanic and Latin(a)(o)(x) Ethnicity, 5-year ACS Public Use Microdata
760 Sample (PUMS) 2016-2020.


761 *Immigration Status*

762 The U.S. Census and other data sources provide limited data on citizenship and immigration status, none of
763 which is specific to unincorporated King County. Approximately 23.7 percent of King County residents were
764 born outside of the United States.⁷⁹ Since 2010, King County has had the third largest increase in residents
765 born outside the United States among all counties in the country. The most common countries these
766 residents were born in are India, China, and Mexico.⁸⁰ In 2019, 6.5 percent of refugees coming to the United
767 States (1,947) resettled in Washington, the second most common state for refugees.⁸¹ Approximately half of
768 refugees who come to Washington settle in King County.⁸²

770 Approximately 28.3 percent (158,727 residents) and 20.8 percent (41,410 residents) of King County and
771 unincorporated King County speak languages other than English at home, respectively.⁸³ Most residents
772 who speak languages other than English at home have English proficiency. Approximately 5.8 percent of
773 King County residents and 3.9 percent of unincorporated King County residents have limited English
774 proficiency.⁸⁴

776 As shown in Figures 12 and 13, Spanish is the second most common language spoken at home after English
777 in both King County (6.6 percent) and unincorporated King County (5.7 percent). A higher proportion of
778 King County residents (4.4 percent) speak Chinese, including Mandarin and Cantonese, than in
779 unincorporated King County (1.9 percent). A higher proportion of unincorporated King County residents
780 speak Vietnamese (2 percent) and Slavic languages (2.1 percent) compared to King County (1.7 percent and
781 1.9 percent, respectively).


783 **Figure 12: Population by Languages Other than English Spoken at Home in King County**



784 Source: U.S. Census Bureau. (2022). *Population by Language Spoken at Home, 5-year ACS 2016-2020*.
785

⁷⁹ U.S. Census Bureau. (2022). *Native and Foreign-Born Populations, 5-year ACS 2016-2020*.
⁸⁰ Balk, G. (2019, January 14). New milestone in King County: Immigrant population tops 500,000. *The Seattle Times*. [\[link\]](#)
⁸¹ U.S. Department of State. (2020). *Report to Congress on Proposed Refugee Admissions for Fiscal Year 2021*. [\[link\]](#)
⁸² Syed, M. (2022, May 6). Beyond Afghans and Ukrainians, who are WA refugees? *Crosscut*. [\[link\]](#)
⁸³ U.S. Census Bureau. (2022). *Population by Language Spoken at Home, 5-year ACS 2016-2020*.
⁸⁴ U.S. Census Bureau. (2022). *Households by English Proficiency, 5-year ACS 2016-2020*.

786 **Figure 13: Population by Languages Other than English Spoken at Home in Unincorporated**
787 **King County**



788
789 Source: U.S. Census Bureau. (2022). *Population by Language Spoken at Home, 5-year ACS 2016-2020*.

790 **Disability Status**


791 Approximately 9.8 percent (215,852) and 10.8 percent (22,909) of residents in King County and
792 unincorporated King County have a disability, respectively. For the purposes of this analysis, disability is
793 categorized in five ways:

- 794 1. hearing difficulty, meaning an individual is deaf or has serious difficulty hearing;
- 795 2. vision difficulty, meaning an individual is blind or has serious difficulty seeing even when wearing
796 glasses;
- 797 3. cognitive difficulty, meaning an individual has a serious difficulty concentrating, remembering, or
798 making decisions due to a physical, mental, or emotional condition;
- 799 4. ambulatory difficulty, meaning an individual has a serious difficulty walking or climbing stairs; or
- 800 5. self-care difficulty, meaning an individual has difficulty dressing or bathing.⁸⁵

801 As shown in Figures 14 and 15, King County residents and unincorporated King County residents with
802 disabilities (99,525 and 10,187 residents, respectively) are most likely to have ambulatory difficulty.⁸⁶
803 Cognitive disabilities are the second most common disability type in both King County and unincorporated
804 King County. The least common disability type in both King County and unincorporated King County is
805 vision difficulty. Urban unincorporated King County has a higher rate of residents with disabilities compared
806 to rural unincorporated King County (12.1 percent and 10.3 percent of residents, respectively).
807

⁸⁵ U.S. Census Bureau. (2020). *American Community Survey and Puerto Rico Community Survey 2020 Subject Definitions*. [\[link\]](#)
⁸⁶ U.S. Census Bureau. (2022). *Disability Characteristics, 5-year ACS 2016-2020*.


808 **Figure 14: King County Population with Disabilities by Disability Type**



809 Disability categories are not mutually exclusive, meaning someone can be included in multiple categories.

810 Source: U.S. Census Bureau. (2022). *Disability Characteristics, 5-year ACS 2016-2020*.

811 **Figure 15: Unincorporated King County Population with Disabilities by Disability Type**



812 Disability categories are not mutually exclusive, meaning someone can be included in multiple categories.

813 Source: U.S. Census Bureau. (2022). *Disability Characteristics, 5-year ACS 2016-2020*

814 **Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer (LGBTQ+) Communities**

815 The 2020 U.S. Census does not provide a significant amount of data about the LGBTQ+ community. The
 816 2020 Census only asked respondents about their sex, with two answers: male or female, which does not
 817 necessarily reflect respondents' gender identity.⁸⁷ According to the Census, 106,176 (50.1 percent) of
 818

⁸⁷ U.S. Census Bureau. (2020). *2020 Census Questionnaire*. [\[link\]](#)

819 unincorporated King County residents identified as female and 105,722 (49.9 percent) of unincorporated
820 King County identified as male.⁸⁸

821
822 The 2020 Census did not directly ask respondents about their sexual orientation and instead asked if they
823 were in a same-sex relationship.⁸⁹ Unincorporated King County had a lower rate of people in same-sex
824 relationships (1.1 percent) compared to King County as a whole (2.8 percent).⁹⁰ This is likely an undercount
825 of the rate of people who identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, or queer because this data does not capture
826 single people or LGBTQ+ people in opposite sex relationships.

827 *People Experiencing Homelessness*

828
829 The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) requires jurisdictions to do a Point-in-Time
830 (PIT) count to determine the number of people experiencing sheltered and unsheltered homelessness in a
831 single night.⁹¹ This is an undercount of the total homeless population over a given year, as it is only
832 recorded on a single night, but reveals important demographic information about who experiences
833 homelessness in King County. While the PIT has traditionally been conducted as a one-night census by
834 volunteers in January, in 2022, the King County Regional Homelessness Authority received a
835 methodological exception to conduct the count differently. They relied on respondent driven sampling and
836 multiple list methods, which were used by their statisticians to calculate the number of people experiencing
837 unsheltered homelessness. The 2022 PIT found 13,368 individuals experiencing homelessness, a 13.8
838 percent increase from the 2020 PIT count (11,751 individuals). The 2022 PIT revealed 57 percent of people
839 experiencing homelessness were unsheltered, a 10 percent increase from the 2020 PIT.

840
841 In 2021, King County analyzed newly integrated data systems that collect information from people served
842 by social services to assess the number of people experiencing homelessness more accurately than the PIT.
843 Using this data, King County estimated that approximately 40,800 people in 2020 and 45,300 people in
844 2019 experienced homelessness at some point in the year. Approximately 33.1 percent of these individuals
845 in 2020 and 43 percent of these individuals in 2019 entered the homeless response system for the first
846 time.⁹² The King County Regional Homelessness Authority (KCRHA) uses the homelessness count from King
847 County, not the PIT, to plan their work.

848 C. Household Characteristics

849 This section provides information about King County and unincorporated King County households,
850 including:

- 851 • household count, size, and tenure;
- 852 • demographics of renters and homeowners;
- 853 • household types;
- 854 • overcrowding;
- 855 • income;
- 856 • cost burden; and
- 857 • poverty level.

⁸⁸ U.S. Census Bureau. (2022). *Sex, 5-year ACS 2016-2020*.

⁸⁹ U.S. Census Bureau. (2020). *2020 Census Questionnaire*. [\[link\]](#)

⁹⁰ U.S. Census Bureau. (2022). *Relationship Status of Household Heads, 5-year ACS 2016-2020*.


⁹¹ KCRHA 2022 Point in Time Count. [\[link\]](#)

⁹² King County Department of Community and Human Services, Performance Measurement and Evaluation Division. (2021). *Integrating Data to Better Measure Homelessness*. [\[link\]](#)

858 *Household Count, Size, and Tenure*

859 As of 2021, King County has 924,763 households.⁹³ Unincorporated King County households represent 8.6
860 percent of these households (77,761). Figures 16 and 17 show the number of households by size and tenure
861 in King County and unincorporated King County. The largest share of households in both King County and
862 unincorporated King County live in two-person households (34 percent and 37.4 percent respectively).
863 One-person households in King County are more likely to be renters rather than homeowners. King County
864 households with two or more people are more likely to be homeowners than renters. Unincorporated King
865 County residents are more likely to be homeowners, regardless of the size of their household. Most King
866 County households own their home (56.5 percent) rather than rent (43.5 percent). Homeownership rates are
867 much higher in unincorporated King County than the county as a whole, with 63,777 households living in a
868 home they own (82.1 percent) and only 13,894 households renting (17.9 percent).⁹⁴
869

870 **Figure 16: King County Households by Household Size and Tenure**




871
872 Source: U.S. Census Bureau. (2022). *Tenure by Household Size, 5-year ACS 2016-2020*.

⁹³ U.S. Census Bureau. (2021). *1-year ACS 2021*.

⁹⁴ U.S. Census Bureau. (2022). *Tenure by Household Size, 5-year ACS 2016-2020*.

873 **Figure 17: Unincorporated King County Households by Household Size and Tenure**




874
 875 Source: U.S. Census Bureau. (2022). *Tenure by Household Size, 5-year ACS 2016-2020*.

876 Most unincorporated King County households (54,177) live in the rural area and approximately a third of
 877 unincorporated King County households (23,494) live in urban areas. As shown in Figure 18, urban
 878 unincorporated King County has a higher rate of homeowner households that consist of one, six, or seven
 879 person households (21.6 percent, 2.8 percent, and 2.2 percent, respectively) compared to rural
 880 unincorporated King County (14.7 percent, two percent, and 1.7 percent, respectively). Rural King County
 881 has a higher rate of homeowner households that consist of two, three, four, and five person households (41
 882 percent, 17.2 percent, 16.9 percent, and 6.5 percent respectively) compared to urban unincorporated King
 883 County (37.1 percent, 17.1 percent, 13 percent, and 6.2 percent respectively).⁹⁵
 884

⁹⁵ U.S. Census Bureau. (2022). *Tenure by Household Size, 5-year ACS 2016-2020*.


885 **Figure 18: Urban and Rural Unincorporated King County Homeowner Households by Size**



886
 887 Source: U.S. Census Bureau. (2022). Tenure by Household Size, 5-year ACS 2016-2020.

888 Figure 19 shows the share of renter households by household size divided between the rural and urban
 889 areas. Rural unincorporated King County has a higher rate of one person renter households (32.6 percent)
 890 than urban unincorporated King County (29.1 percent). This may be because of a combination of several
 891 factors. On average, rural unincorporated King County residents are older than in urban unincorporated
 892 areas. Additionally, rent is lower in rural unincorporated King County than urban unincorporated King
 893 County. Residents may be able to both afford to live alone and not have children or other family members
 894 that live with them. Rural unincorporated King County has a higher rate of three- and four-person renter
 895 households than urban unincorporated King County. Urban unincorporated King County has a higher rate
 896 of five, six, and seven-person renter households.⁹⁶
 897

898 **Figure 19: Share of Renters by Household Size in Unincorporated King County**



899 Source: U.S. Census Bureau. (2022). *Tenure by Household Size, 5-year ACS 2016-2020*.
 900

⁹⁶ U.S. Census Bureau. (2022). *Tenure by Household Size, 5-year ACS 2016-2020*.


901 *Household Types*

902 For the purposes of the CHAS data analysis, HUD categorizes household types into the following:⁹⁷

- 903 • elderly family households which contain two related people, with either or both 62 years old or older;
- 904
- 905 • small family households which contain two people with neither person 62 years old or older or three or four people;
- 906
- 907 • large family households which contain five or more family members;
- 908 • elderly non-family households which contain two non-related people who are 62 years old or older;
- 909 and
- 910 • other households which contain non-related people.

911 As shown in Figures 20 and 21, the largest household type in both King County as a whole and
912 unincorporated King County are small family households (42.3 percent and 48.4 percent respectively).
913 Other households consist of more than a quarter of King County households.⁹⁸ The cost of housing, as well
914 as the large student body of University of Washington (60,081 students) likely contributes to the number of
915 households consisting of unrelated roommates.⁹⁹ Unincorporated King County's population is older than
916 the countywide population, so unincorporated King County households are more likely to consist of elderly
917 family or non-elderly family households and less likely to consist of other households than in King County as
918 a whole.
919

920 **Figure 20: Household Types in King County**




921
922 Source: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2021). *Household Types, CHAS 2014-2018*.

⁹⁷ U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2021). *CHAS Data Documentation* [link]
⁹⁸ U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2021). *Household Types, CHAS 2014-2018*.
⁹⁹ University of Washington. (2022, October 14). *UW's 2022 entering class is largest and most diverse*. [link]

923

924 **Figure 21: Household Types in Unincorporated King County**



925
926

Source: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2021). Household Types, CHAS 2014-2018.

927 **1. Demographics of Renters and Homeowners**


928 *Age of Renters and Homeowners*

929 The U.S. Census Bureau collects information on the age of the person in whose name the housing unit is
930 owned or rented by, known as the "householder." As shown in Figures 22 and 23, householders over 35
931 years old countywide and over 25 years old in unincorporated King County are more likely to be
932 homeowners. Homeownership peaks for householders aged 60 to 64 years old countywide, with 75.3
933 percent of householders in this age range owning a home. As householders age in unincorporated King
934 County, they are more likely to be homeowners, peaking at 94.1 percent of unincorporated King County
935 householders aged 85 years old or older owning a home. King County householders over the age of 85 are
936 significantly more likely to be renters (42.6 percent) than householders within the same age range in
937 unincorporated King County (5.9 percent).¹⁰⁰ This disparity may be explained a smaller sample size in
938 unincorporated King County and the relative lack of multiunit housing designed for people aged 65 years
939 and older in unincorporated King County.

940
941 Countywide, householders 15 to 34 years old are more likely to rent than own, while only householders 15
942 to 24 are more likely to rent in unincorporated King County. Approximately 62 percent of householders 25
943 to 34 years old own their home in unincorporated King County, a rate twice as high as the homeownership
944 rate among householders in the same age range in King County.
945

¹⁰⁰ U.S. Census Bureau. (2022). Age Range by Tenure, 5-year ACS 2016-2020.


946 **Figure 22: King County Age Range by Tenure**



947 Source: U.S. Census Bureau. (2022). Age Range by Tenure, 5-year ACS 2016-2020.

949

950 **Figure 23: Unincorporated King County Age Range by Tenure**



951 Source: U.S. Census Bureau. (2022). Age Range by Tenure, 5-year ACS 2016-2020.

953 *Race and Ethnicity of Renters and Homeowners*


954 As shown in Figures 24 and 25, across all races, households are more likely to own their homes in
 955 unincorporated King County than in King County as a whole. In King County and unincorporated King
 956 County, most White households (61.2 percent and 88 percent, respectively) and Asian households (57.7
 957 percent and 74.9 percent of households) own their homes. In King County and unincorporated King County,

958 Black households (72.2 percent and 56.8 percent, respectively) and households of races not listed (68.1
959 percent and 60.5 percent) are more likely to rent than own their homes.¹⁰¹

960
961 Most American Indian/Alaska Native, Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, and Multi-Racial households in
962 unincorporated King County own their homes (52.5 percent, 81.2 percent, and 66.4 percent, respectively).
963 Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander households are nearly four times more likely to own their home in
964 unincorporated King County than countywide. Unincorporated King County skews older than the
965 countywide population, so it is possible unincorporated King County households bought their homes
966 before housing costs increased significantly in the region.¹⁰² In addition, there was significant immigration
967 from Hawaii and Samoa before and during the mid-20th century, when homes were more affordable and
968 before much of the rental housing in this region was constructed, which may be a factor in the
969 unincorporated King County homeownership rate of these communities.^{103,104}

970

971 **Figure 24: Tenure by Race in King County**




AI/AN is American Indian/Alaska Native
NH/PI is Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander

972 Source: U.S. Census Bureau. (2022). *Tenure by Race, 5-year ACS 2016-2020*.
973

¹⁰¹ U.S. Census Bureau. (2022). *Tenure by Race, 5-year ACS 2016-2020*.
¹⁰² U.S. Census Bureau. (2022). *Age Range by Tenure, 5-year ACS 2016-2020*.
¹⁰³ Barman, Jean and McIntyre Watson, Bruce. (2006). *Leaving Paradise: Indigenous Hawaiians in the Pacific Northwest, 1787-1898*.
¹⁰⁴ Kemezis, K. (2010, November 29). *Samoa Community (Seattle)*. *Historylink*. [\[link\]](#)

974 **Figure 25: Tenure by Race in Unincorporated King County**




AI/AN is American Indian/Alaska Native
 NH/PI is Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander

975
 976 Source: U.S. Census Bureau. (2022). Tenure by Race, 5-year ACS 2016-2020.

977 Figures 26 and 27 compare King County and unincorporated King County tenure by Hispanic and
 978 Latin(a)(o)(x) ethnicity. Approximately 65 percent of Hispanic or Latin(a)(o)(x) King County residents rent, a
 979 higher rate than the 42 percent of Not Hispanic or Latin(a)(o)(x) King County residents who rent. More than
 980 half of Not Hispanic or Latin(a)(o)(x) King County residents (58 percent) own a home, compared to only 35
 981 percent of Hispanic or Latin(a)(o)(x) King County residents who own a home. Hispanic or Latin(a)(o)(x)
 982 unincorporated King County residents have a higher rate of homeownership than Hispanic or Latin(a)(o)(x)
 983 residents countywide (49 percent compared to 35 percent).¹⁰⁵
 984


985 **Figure 26: Tenure by Hispanic and Latin(a)(o)(x) Ethnicity in King County**



986 Hispanic or Latin(a)(o)(x) ethnicity of household determined by ethnicity of householder.
 987 Source: U.S. Census Bureau. (2022). *Tenure by Race, 5-year ACS 2016-2020*.

¹⁰⁵ U.S. Census Bureau. (2022). *Tenure by Race, 5-year ACS 2016-2020*.

988 **Figure 27: Tenure by Hispanic and Latin(a)(o)(x) Ethnicity in Unincorporated King County**



989
 990 Source: U.S. Census Bureau. (2022). *Tenure by Race, 5-year ACS 2016-2020*.

991 *Disability Status of Renters and Homeowners*


992 Tens of thousands of households in King County and unincorporated King County have a household
 993 member with a disability. Disability categories are not mutually exclusive, so it is possible the following data
 994 has people in multiple categories. Figures 28 and 29 show the tenure by disability status in King County and
 995 unincorporated King County, respectively. Among all disability types, the rate of homeownership is
 996 significantly higher in unincorporated King County than in King County. In 2018, approximately 11.8 percent
 997 of the households that have a member with a disability in King County live in unincorporated King County, a
 998 rate higher than the overall 8.6 percent of King County households that live in the unincorporated areas.¹⁰⁶
 999

1000 Most unincorporated King County households with a household member that has a disability are
 1001 homeowners. The second most common disability type in both King County and unincorporated King
 1002 County is cognitive difficulty. Individuals with a cognitive difficulty have serious difficulty concentrating,
 1003 remembering, or making decisions due to a physical, mental, or emotional condition. Households with a
 1004 member that has a cognitive limitation are the most likely out of all disability types to rent in King County
 1005 and unincorporated King County (53.1 percent and 46.9 percent, respectively).
 1006

1007 Among households with a member that has a disability, unincorporated King County households are more
 1008 likely than King County households to have a household member with a hearing or vision impairment (28.3
 1009 percent and 25.2 percent, respectively). This may reflect the higher percentage of people aged 62 years
 1010 and older residing in unincorporated King County. Households with a member who has a hearing or vision
 1011 impairment have a higher homeownership rate than the general population in both King County and
 1012 unincorporated King County.
 1013


¹⁰⁶ U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2021). *Tenure by Disability Status, CHAS 2014-2018*.

1014 **Figure 28: Tenure by Disability Status in King County**



1015
 1016 Source: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2021). Tenure by Disability Status, CHAS 2014-2018.

1017 **Figure 29: Tenure by Disability Status in Unincorporated King County**



1018 Source: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2021). *Tenure by Disability Status, CHAS 2014-2018*.
 1019

1020 **Overcrowding Estimates**

1021 HUD defines an overcrowded housing unit as one occupied by more than one person per room, excluding
 1022 bathrooms and kitchens. Severe overcrowding is more than 1.5 persons per room, excluding bathrooms
 1023 and kitchens.¹⁰⁷ Approximately 31,715 (3.6 percent) King County households are overcrowded or severely
 1024 overcrowded. The rate of overcrowding or severe overcrowding is significantly lower in unincorporated
 1025 King County, at 2.2 percent (1,446 households). The rate of overcrowding in unincorporated King County
 1026 may be lower than countywide because housing units in unincorporated King County are larger on average
 1027 than countywide, there is more rental housing countywide, and unincorporated King County's older
 1028 population may be less likely to have children so may need less space. Approximately 4.9 percent of urban
 1029 unincorporated King County households are overcrowded, compared to only 1.3 percent of rural
 1030 unincorporated King County households (1,119 households and 887 households, respectively).¹⁰⁸

1031
 1032

¹⁰⁷ U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2021). *CHAS: Background*. [\[link\]](#)

¹⁰⁸ U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2021). *Overcrowding, CHAS 2014-2018*.

1033 *Household Income*

1034 The area median income is the midpoint income for an area, where half the people have incomes greater
 1035 than the median and half the people have incomes below the median.¹⁰⁹ HUD uses the area median income
 1036 for a specific metropolitan region to calculate income limits for affordable housing programs based on
 1037 household size using a set formula developed by the agency.¹¹⁰ Area median income fluctuates annually
 1038 based on inflation, economic changes, and other factors. Table 1 shows the income levels by family size. In
 1039 2023, the overall median family income for the King County region is \$134,600. Households earning less
 1040 than 30 percent area median income, 50 percent area median income, and 80 percent area median income
 1041 are classified as extremely low income, very low income, and low income, respectively.
 1042

1043 **Table 1: 2023 King County Income Levels by Family Size¹¹¹**


Family Size	30% AMI (Extremely Low Income)	50% AMI (Very Low Income)	80% AMI (Low Income)
1 Person	\$28,800	\$47,950	\$70,650
2 People	\$32,900	\$54,800	\$80,750
3 People	\$37,000	\$61,650	\$90,850
4 People	\$41,100	\$68,500	\$100,900
5 People	\$44,400	\$74,000	\$109,000
6 People	\$47,700	\$79,500	\$170,050
7 People	\$51,000	\$84,950	\$125,150
8 People	\$54,300	\$90,450	\$133,200

1044
 1045 Figure 30 shows the change in number of households in King County by area median income level over
 1046 time. The area median income levels are calculated using the income limits for different income levels. The
 1047 population of King County households earning greater than 100 percent area median income has increased
 1048 approximately 33.3 percent, from about 375,000 households in 2011 to about 500,000 households in 2018.
 1049 In the same period, the number of households earning less than or equal to 100 percent area median
 1050 income remained at about the same level.^{112,113} The increase in the number of higher income households is
 1051 explained both by new, higher income residents, as well as current residents making more income. More
 1052 than half of all households can be above the median household income because HUD uses a series of
 1053 adjustments and older household income data to set the median income, which causes the median figure
 1054 used in their area median income band definitions to be lower than the un-adjusted median.¹¹⁴
 1055

1056 This increase in higher income households is one of the biggest factors to explain the loss of affordable
 1057 housing over about the past ten years. Demand for housing increases as the population increases. An
 1058 increase in higher income households means there are more people who can pay more to live in the area
 1059 and type of housing of their choice. Private landlords and home sellers respond to this increase in high
 1060 income households by raising prices, especially if the housing supply is limited.
 1061

¹⁰⁹ U.S. Census Bureau. (2022). *Median Household Income*. [\[link\]](#)
¹¹⁰ U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2022). *Methodology for Determining Section 8 Income Limits*. [\[link\]](#)
¹¹¹ U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2023). *FY 2023 Income Limits Summary*.
¹¹² U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2014). *Household Distribution by AMI levels, King County, CHAS 2007-2011*.
¹¹³ U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2021). *Household Distribution by AMI levels, King County, CHAS 2014-2018*.
¹¹⁴ U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2022). *Income Limits*. [\[link\]](#)

1062 **Figure 30: King County Household Distribution by Area Median Income Levels**




1063
 1064 Source: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2014). Household Distribution by AMI levels, King County, CHAS
 1065 2007-2011, 2014-2018.

1066 Figure 31 shows the change in number of households in unincorporated King County by area median
 1067 income level over time. The population of unincorporated King County households earning greater than
 1068 100 percent area median income decreased since 2011 to 55,802 households in 2018.^{115,116} This decrease
 1069 in higher income households in unincorporated King County is explained in part by the annexation of
 1070 wealthier unincorporated areas into Kirkland, Bellevue, and Sammamish.¹¹⁷
 1071

1072 **Figure 31: Household Distribution by Area Median Income Levels in Unincorporated King**
 1073 **County**

Unincorporated King County Household Distribution by Area Median Income Levels

CHAS 2007-2011 to CHAS 2014-2018



1074 Source: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2021). Household Distribution by AMI Levels, CHAS 2007-2011,
 1075 2014-2018.
 1076


¹¹⁵ U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2014). Household Distribution by AMI Levels, CHAS 2007-2011.

¹¹⁶ U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2021). Household Distribution by AMI Levels, CHAS 2014-2018.

¹¹⁷ King County Unincorporated Urban Area Annexation Area Databook. [\[link\]](#)

1077 As shown in Figures 32 and 33, between 2014 and 2018, more than half of households in King County and
 1078 unincorporated King County earned greater than 100 percent area median income, as defined by HUD in
 1079 their Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) dataset. Approximately 12.2 percent and 8.4
 1080 percent of households in King County and unincorporated King County, respectively, are extremely low
 1081 income, earning less than or equal to 30 percent area median income. In 2018, nearly 10 percent of
 1082 households in King County and unincorporated King County are very low-income, earning between 30 to
 1083 50 percent area median income (85,540 and 8,693 households, respectively). There were similar
 1084 proportions of households earning between 30 percent and 50 percent area median income, 50 percent
 1085 and 80 percent area median income, and 80 percent to 100 percent area median income, in King County
 1086 and unincorporated King County.¹¹⁸
 1087

1088 **Figure 32: Household Distribution by Area Median Income Levels in King County**




1089 Source: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2021). Household Distribution by AMI Levels, CHAS 2014-2018.
 1090

¹¹⁸ U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2021). Household Distribution by AMI Levels, CHAS 2014-2018.

1091

1092 **Figure 33: Household Distribution by Area Median Income Levels in Unincorporated King**
1093 **County**




1094
1095

Source: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2021). Household Distribution by AMI Levels, CHAS 2014-2018.

1096 *Household Income of Renters and Homeowners*
1097 In 2020, the median household income for homeowners (\$128,737) was nearly twice that of renters
1098 (\$67,990) in King County.¹¹⁹ As shown in Figure 34, the rate of homeownership increases with area median
1099 income levels in King County, and most households below 100 percent area median income are more likely
1100 to rent than own their home. Extremely low-income households are significantly more likely to be renters
1101 (72.9 percent) than homeowners (27.1 percent) in King County. The proportion of homeowners among
1102 households earning greater than 100 percent area median income(69.5 percent) is significantly larger than
1103 households earning between 80 percent to 100 percent area median income (49.6 percent).¹²⁰
1104

1105 **Figure 34: Households by Tenure and Area Median Income Band in King County**




1106
1107 Source: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2021). Household Distribution by AMI Levels, CHAS 2014-2018.

¹¹⁹ U.S. Census Bureau. (2022). Median Household Income by Tenure, 5-year ACS 2016-2020.

¹²⁰ U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2021). Household Distribution by AMI Levels, CHAS 2014-2018.

1108 As shown in Figure 35, only extremely low-income households in unincorporated King County are more
1109 likely to be renters than owners, with approximately 51.4 percent (3,876) of these households renting. The
1110 rate of homeownership increases as area median income level increases in unincorporated King County,
1111 from 48.6 percent (3,661) of extremely low-income households to 89.5 percent (49,937) of households
1112 earning greater than 100 percent area median income. Lower-income households are more likely to own
1113 their homes in unincorporated King County than countywide.¹²¹ This may be because unincorporated King
1114 County residents tend to be older than people throughout the county, so they may have paid their
1115 mortgage and retired, resulting in lower income relative to their assets, or bought their homes prior to the
1116 drastic increase in housing cost over the past decade.
1117

1118 **Figure 35: Households by Tenure and Area Median Income Band in Unincorporated King County**




1119 Source: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2021). *Household Distribution by AMI Levels, CHAS 2014-2018*.
1120

¹²¹ U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2021). *Household Distribution by AMI Levels, CHAS 2014-2018*.

1121 *Household Income by Age Status*

1122 Approximately 17.2 percent (54,945) and 19.9 percent (3,630) of renter households in King County and
 1123 unincorporated King County, respectively, have at least one person 62 years old or older.¹²² As shown in
 1124 Figures 36 and 37, renter households with incomes at or below 30 percent area median income are the
 1125 most likely to include a person aged 62 years or older in unincorporated King County (32.8 percent) and
 1126 King County (30 percent), likely because some of these households rely on programs such as Social Security
 1127 for their sole source of income rather than wages. The average monthly Social Security retirement benefit
 1128 was \$1,657 in January 2022.¹²³ Renters who rely only on these types of benefits likely would not be able to
 1129 maintain housing in the private market without additional financial support.¹²⁴
 1130

1131 **Figure 36: Renters by Income Level by Household Age Status in King County**



1132


1133 Source: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2021). *Renters by Income Level by Household Age Status, CHAS*
 1134 2014-2018.

¹²² U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2021). *Renters by Income Level by Household Age Status, CHAS 2014-2018*.

¹²³ Social Security Administration. (2022). *What is the estimate monthly benefit for a retired worker?* [[link](#)]

¹²⁴ U.S. Census Bureau. (2022). *Median Gross Rent by Bedroom Size, 5-year ACS 2016-2020*.

1135 **Figure 37: Renters by Income Level by Household Age Status in Unincorporated King County**




1136
 1137
 1138

Source: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2021). Renters by Income Level by Household Age Status, CHAS 2014-2018.

1139 *Household Income by Race and Ethnicity*

1140 The connection between race and median income is a key factor in explaining racial disparities throughout
 1141 the data in this assessment. As shown in Figure 38, there are drastic income disparities between different
 1142 racial groups in all of King County. In 2020, the median American Indian/Alaska Native and Black household
 1143 earned less than half that of the median Asian household.¹²⁵ Black and American Indian/Alaska Native
 1144 households have the lowest median income, earning \$53,961 and \$52,281 annually, respectively. Asian and
 1145 White households earn nearly twice that amount, with annual incomes of \$144,303 and \$103,793,
 1146 respectively. A factor driving this racial income gap is the demographics of different industries as well as
 1147 income gaps between different demographics in the same sectors (see *III. Workforce Profile*).
 1148

1149 **Figure 38: Median Household Income by Race in King County**




1150 Source: U.S. Census Bureau. (2022). *Median Household Income by Race, ACS 2016-2020*.
 1151

¹²⁵ U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2021). *Household Distribution by AMI Levels, CHAS 2014-2018*.

1152 Figure 39 compares the median income of all King County households by Hispanic or Latin(a)(o)(x) ethnicity
1153 to the countywide median household income. Hispanic or Latin(a)(o)(x) households earn almost \$30,000
1154 less than Not Hispanic or Latin(a)(o)(x) households (\$70,000 compared to \$98,000 respectively). These two
1155 median household income figures are both estimated using 5-year PUMS 2016-2020 data, which is an
1156 anonymized individual level dataset using a subsample of the 5-year ACS 2016-2020 data. As the PUMS
1157 data is a subsample, it differs slightly from the ACS data, which explains why both the Not Hispanic or
1158 Latin(a)(o)(x) and Hispanic or Latin(a)(o)(x) categories are slightly lower than the countywide median income
1159 reported in the ACS data.
1160

1161 **Figure 39: Median Household Income by Hispanic and Latin(a)(o)(x) Ethnicity in King County**




Hispanic or Latin(a)(o)(x) ethnicity of household determined by ethnicity of householder.

1162
1163 Source: U.S. Census Bureau. (2021). Median Income by Hispanic and Latin(a)(o)(x) Ethnicity, 5-year ACS Public Use Microdata
1164 Sample (PUMS) 2016-2020.


1165 **Cost Burden**
 1166 As shown in Figures 40 and 41, nearly one-third of households in King County (31.5 percent) and
 1167 unincorporated King County (28.5 percent) are cost burdened. Households are considered cost burdened if
 1168 they pay more than 30 percent of their gross income on housing costs, including utilities, and severely cost
 1169 burdened if they pay more than 50 percent.¹²⁶
 1170

1171 **Figure 40: Cost Burdened Households in King County**



1172 Source: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2021). Cost Burden, CHAS 2014-2018.
 1173

1174 **Figure 41: Cost Burdened Households in Unincorporated King County**




1175 Source: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2021). Cost Burden, CHAS 2014-2018.
 1176

¹²⁶ U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. CHAS: Background. [\[link\]](#)

1177 *Cost Burden by Area Median Income Level*
1178 As shown in Figures 42 and 43, most extremely low-income households, or those earning less than or equal
1179 to 30 percent area median income, are severely cost burdened in King County and unincorporated King
1180 County (69.3 percent and 67.4 percent, respectively). In 2018, there was a higher proportion of cost
1181 burdened or severely cost burdened households at the 30 to 50 percent area median income and 50 to 80
1182 percent area median income ranges in King County than in unincorporated King County.¹²⁷ This may be
1183 because the rate of homeownership is higher in unincorporated than countywide, so unincorporated King
1184 County households are more likely to have stable housing costs. Because cost burdened, and especially
1185 severely cost burdened, households spend more of their income on housing, they are more likely to
1186 experience a material hardship, such as food insecurity, delaying or not seeking medical care, difficulty
1187 paying other bills, and eviction.¹²⁸
1188

1189 **Figure 42: Cost Burden and Severe Cost Burden by Income in King County**




1190
1191 Source: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2021). *Cost Burden and Severe Cost Burden by Income, CHAS*
1192 2014-2018.

¹²⁷ U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2021). *Cost Burden and Severe Cost Burden by Income, CHAS 2014-2018*.

¹²⁸ Shamsuddin, S. and Campbell, C. (2021, March 29). Housing Cost Burden, Material Hardship, and Well-Being. *Housing Policy Debate*, 32(3), 413-432.


1193 **Figure 43: Cost Burden and Severe Cost Burden by Income in Unincorporated King County**



1194
 1195 Source: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2021). Cost Burden and Severe Cost Burden by Income, CHAS
 1196 2014-2018.

1197 *Renter and Homeowner Cost Burden*
 1198 Homeowner and renter occupied households have significant disparities in housing cost burden, which are
 1199 key to understanding the different types of housing need for King County residents. Figures 44, 45, and 46
 1200 show the cost burden by tenure in King County, unincorporated King County, and urban and rural
 1201 unincorporated King County. Renter households (19.8 percent) countywide are almost twice as likely as
 1202 homeowner households (9.3 percent) to be severely cost burdened.¹²⁹ Over 40 percent of renter
 1203 households in King County (41.6 percent) and unincorporated King County (45.7 percent) are cost
 1204 burdened or severely cost burdened. Less than a quarter of homeowners are cost burdened in King County
 1205 (23.8 percent) and unincorporated King County (24.2 percent).
 1206


1207 **Figure 44: Share of Households Cost Burdened by Tenure in King County**



1208 Source: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2021). *Cost Burden and Severe Cost Burden by Tenure, CHAS*
 1209 2014-2018.
 1210

¹²⁹ U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2021). *Cost Burden and Severe Cost Burden by Tenure, CHAS 2014-2018.*

1211 **Figure 45: Share of Households Cost Burdened by Tenure in Unincorporated King County**




1212
 1213 Source: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2021). *Cost Burden and Severe Cost Burden by Tenure, CHAS*
 1214 2014-2018.

1215
 1216 Approximately 24.5 percent of urban unincorporated King County renters are either cost burdened or
 1217 severely cost burdened, slightly higher than rural renters in the jurisdictions (21.2 percent).¹³⁰
 1218

¹³⁰ U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2021). *Cost Burden and Severe Cost Burden by Tenure, CHAS 2014-2018*.

1219
 1220

Figure 46: Burden and Severe Cost Burden by Tenure in Urban and Rural Unincorporated King County



1221

1222
 1223


Source: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2021). Cost Burden and Severe Cost Burden by Tenure, CHAS 2014-2018.

1224 *Cost Burden by Race and Ethnicity*

1225 Figures 47 and 48 show the percent of households that are not cost burdened, cost burdened, and severely
1226 cost burdened by race and ethnicity in King County and unincorporated King County. Most Black
1227 households in unincorporated King County are cost burdened or severely cost burdened (51.6 percent);
1228 while 26 percent of White, not Hispanic or Latin(a)(o)(x) households, are cost burdened or severely cost
1229 burdened. More than one-fifth of American Indian/Alaska Native households are severely cost burdened in
1230 King County and unincorporated King County (21.6 percent and 20.8 percent, respectively). Except for
1231 American Indian/Alaska Native households, all other race and ethnicity groups are more likely to be cost
1232 burdened countywide than in unincorporated King County.¹³¹

1234 Unlike other race and ethnicity groups, there is a significant disparity in cost burden rates for Pacific
1235 Islanders between King County and unincorporated King County. Approximately 40 percent of Pacific
1236 Islanders are cost burdened in King County, compared to about 24 percent of Pacific Islanders in
1237 unincorporated King County. This could be explained by Pacific Islanders being much more likely to own
1238 their home in unincorporated King County as compared to countywide.

1240 **Figure 47: Cost burden and Severe Cost Burden by Race/Ethnicity in King County**




1241 Source: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2021). *Cost Burden and Severe Cost Burden by Race/Ethnicity*,
1242 CHAS 2014-2018.
1243

¹³¹ U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. *Cost Burden and Severe Cost Burden by Race/Ethnicity*, CHAS 2014-2018.

1244

1245 **Figure 48: Cost Burden and Severe Cost Burden by Race/Ethnicity in Unincorporated King**
 1246 **County**



1247
 1248
 1249

Source: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2021). Cost Burden and Severe Cost Burden by Race/Ethnicity, CHAS 2014-2018.

1250 *Poverty Rate*

1251 To determine federal poverty thresholds, the U.S. Health and Human Services Department uses a set of
1252 income thresholds that vary by family size and age of the household members. The calculation does not
1253 include capital gains or losses, noncash benefits such as food stamps/SNAP or housing subsidies, or tax
1254 credits. Each year, the Department of Health and Human Services develops poverty guidelines, or levels,
1255 using the Census Bureau’s official thresholds. The guidelines are adjusted for inflation using the Consumer
1256 Price Index for All Consumers (CPI-U).

1257
1258 Table 2 shows the poverty level by family size in 2023. Poverty levels are used to determine eligibility for
1259 federal programs, like Medicaid and the Children’s Health Insurance Program. These limits do not
1260 accurately reflect the number of people struggling financially, particularly in King County, because the
1261 federal poverty thresholds are not adjusted for regional cost of living. In 2020, approximately 8.4 percent
1262 and 6.3 percent of King County and unincorporated King County residents lived below the poverty line,
1263 respectively (184,895 and 13,382 residents).¹³²

1264
1265 **Table 2: 2023 Poverty Guidelines for the 48 Contiguous States and the District of Columbia**¹³³

Persons in family/household	Poverty guideline
1	\$14,580
2	\$19,720
3	\$24,860
4	\$30,000
5	\$35,140
6	\$40,280
7	\$45,420
8	\$50,560

1266 *For families/households with more than eight persons, add \$5,140 for each additional person.*


¹³² U.S. Census Bureau. (2022). *Poverty Status by Race, 5-year ACS 2016-2020*.

¹³³ U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation. (2023). *U.S. Federal Poverty Guidelines Used to Determine Financial Eligibility for Certain Programs*. [\[link\]](#)

1267 As shown in Figures 49 and 50, there are stark differences in the poverty rate by race in King County and
1268 unincorporated King County. The only demographics with poverty rates below 10 percent in both
1269 unincorporated King County and countywide are White and Asian residents. Approximately one-fifth of
1270 Black and American Indian/Alaska Native residents lived below the poverty line in King County (27,133 and
1271 2,737 residents, respectively).¹³⁴

1272
1273 In unincorporated King County, 14.6 percent of Black residents (1,582 residents) lived below the poverty
1274 line, a rate more than three times greater than that of White (4.4 percent) residents. The greatest disparity in
1275 poverty rate in unincorporated King County is between Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander and American
1276 Indian/Alaska Native populations, of which 0 percent and 38.7 percent live below the poverty line in
1277 unincorporated King County, respectively. The margin of error is greater whenever a data set is smaller,
1278 which is the case for both American Indians/Alaska Natives and Native Hawaiians/Pacific Islander, who
1279 constitute 0.8 percent and 1.2 percent of the population of unincorporated King County, respectively.¹³⁵
1280 This margin of error could explain, in part, the more disparate statistics for the unincorporated area, which
1281 has a much smaller population as compared to countywide.
1282


1283 **Figure 49: Poverty Status by Race in King County**



1284
1285 Source: U.S. Census Bureau. (2022). Poverty Status by Race, 5-year ACS 2016-2020.

¹³⁴ U.S. Census Bureau. (2022). Poverty Status by Race, 5-year ACS 2016-2020.
¹³⁵ U.S. Census Bureau. (2022). Population by Race, 5-year ACS 2016-2020.

1286 **Figure 50: Poverty Status by Race in Unincorporated King County**




1287
 1288

Source: U.S. Census Bureau. (2022). Poverty Status by Race, 5-year ACS 2016-2020.


1289 Figures 51 and 52 show the poverty rate by Hispanic or Latin(a)(o)(x) ethnicity for King County and
 1290 unincorporated King County households. In King County, Hispanic or Latin(a)(o)(x) households have a
 1291 poverty rate almost twice as high as Not Hispanic or Latin(a)(o)(x) households (16 percent compared to nine
 1292 percent respectively). The poverty rate among Hispanic or Latin(a)(o)(x) households in unincorporated King
 1293 County is 14 percent, slightly lower than the poverty rate of Hispanic or Latin(a)(o)(x) households
 1294 countywide.

1295 **Figure 51: Poverty Status by Hispanic and Latin(a)(o)(x) Ethnicity in King County**



1296 Source: U.S. Census Bureau. (2022). Poverty Status by Hispanic and Latin(a)(o)(x) Ethnicity, 5-year ACS 2016-2020.
 1297

1298 **Figure 52: Poverty Status by Hispanic and Latin(a)(o)(x) Ethnicity in Unincorporated King County**



1299 Source: U.S. Census Bureau. (2022). Poverty Status by Hispanic and Latin(a)(o)(x) Ethnicity, 5-year ACS 2016-2020.
 1300

1301 III. Workforce Profile

1302 A. Section Summary

1303 This section fulfills King County CPP H-3j.

1304 CPP H-3j requires jurisdictions to:
 1305

1306 *Conduct an inventory and analysis in each jurisdiction of existing and projected housing needs of all*
 1307 *segments of the population and summarize the findings in the housing element. The inventory and analysis*
 1308 *shall include:*

- 1309 j) Ratio of housing to jobs in the jurisdiction.

1310 The data and analysis in this section identify significant wage disparities between residents in King County
 1311 and unincorporated King County. Wage gaps exist between people with lower and higher levels of
 1312 education and between industries in King County.¹³⁶ There are also stark wage differences by race and
 1313 ethnicity in King County.¹³⁷ This disparity is likely, in part, due to income gaps between sectors. However,
 1314 people of different races also have wage disparities within the same sector. Asian and White households
 1315 have the highest median income in King County.¹³⁸
 1316
 1317

¹³⁶ Washington State Employment Security Department. (July 2022). *Wages by education level, July 2022*. [\[link\]](#)

¹³⁷ U.S. Census Bureau, Center for Economic Studies, LEHD. (2022). *QWI Explorer*. [\[link\]](#)

¹³⁸ U.S. Census Bureau. (2022). *Median Household Income by Race, 5-year ACS 2016-2020*.

1318 Since 2010, housing production has not kept pace with job growth in King County.¹³⁹ King County's jobs to
1319 housing ratio increased from 1.29 in 2010 to 1.48 in 2020. Unincorporated King County's jobs to housing
1320 ratio increased from 0.36 to 0.43 in the same period. A ratio higher than 1.5 indicates there may be more
1321 workers commuting into the area due to a lack of housing.¹⁴⁰

1322 B. Local Workforce Characteristics

1323 King County is the largest labor market in the state and a national hub for high-tech jobs, with some of the
1324 world's largest technology companies, such as Amazon and Microsoft, based in the region. The COVID-19
1325 pandemic disrupted all industries in King County. The King County unemployment rate reached a high of
1326 15.3 percent in April 2020. The leisure and hospitality industry lost 65,100 jobs from February to May 2020,
1327 the most jobs of any industry in this region. As of March 2022, leisure and industry jobs are still down about
1328 30 percent (44,000 jobs) from pre-pandemic levels. Industries that were able to adopt telecommuting
1329 policies had fewer long-term job losses due to the pandemic, and some of these sectors even added jobs
1330 during the pandemic. The unemployment rate fell as King County recovered from the pandemic, falling to
1331 three percent in October 2022.¹⁴¹

1332 The following industries either have the same number or more jobs as of March 2022 compared to March
1333 2020:
1334

- 1335 • Professional and business services (+15,600 jobs)
- 1336 • Information (+15,500 jobs)
- 1337 • Retail trade (+9,000 jobs)
- 1338 • Financial activities (+4,000 jobs)
- 1339 • Construction (+1,400 jobs)

1340
1341 Over the same timeframe, the follow industries did not recover from pandemic job losses:¹⁴²

- 1342 • Leisure and hospitality (-19,400 jobs)
- 1343 • Manufacturing (-9,900 jobs)
- 1344 • Government (-9,200 jobs)
- 1345 • Other services (-8,600 jobs)
- 1346 • Wholesale trade (-3,700 jobs)
- 1347 • Transportation, education, and health services (-2,800 jobs)
- 1348 • Warehousing and utilities (-1,400 jobs)

1349
1350 The King County 2020 median wage was \$38.86 an hour, higher than the state's median wage of \$29.28.
1351 More than half of King County residents (53.4 percent) have a bachelor's degree or higher education; this
1352 rate is significantly higher than in Washington state (36.7 percent) or the country (32.9 percent).

1353
1354 There are large wage gaps between industries. The information sector, which includes telecommunications,
1355 web search portals, and similar data producing, collecting, and processing companies, has significantly
1356 higher wages than other industries.^{143,144} In 2021, the average monthly wage for the information sector was

¹³⁹ PSRC Covered Employment Estimates. Housing data: US Census Bureau Decennial Census.

¹⁴⁰ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, EnviroAtlas. (2021). *Employment to Housing Ratio*. [\[link\]](#)

¹⁴¹ Washington State Employment Security Department. (2022). *Labor Market Info King County Profile*. [\[link\]](#)

¹⁴² Washington State Employment Security Department. (2022). *Labor Market Info King County Profile*. [\[link\]](#)

¹⁴³ U.S. Census Bureau, Center for Economic Studies, LEHD. (2022). *QWI Explorer*. [\[link\]](#)

¹⁴⁴ U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. (November 22, 2022). *Industries at a Glance Information: NAICS 51*. [\[link\]](#)

1357 \$23,257. The accommodation and food services sector, the lowest paying industry, paid an average of
1358 \$3,273 monthly.

1359
1360 As shown in Table 3 there is a significant wage gap between people with lower and higher levels of
1361 education.¹⁴⁵ People of all levels of education in King County earn more than Washington state residents
1362 with equivalent levels of education. King County residents with a doctoral or professional degree make over
1363 two times as much in hourly pay as residents with less than a high school diploma. King County as a whole
1364 has a higher rate of jobs with a college graduate or higher level of education in incorporated jurisdictions
1365 compared to unincorporated King County.¹⁴⁶

1366
1367 **Table 3: Wages by Education in King County and Washington State**

Education Level	King County Hourly	Washington State Hourly	King County Salary	Washington State Salary
Less than high school diploma	\$27.57	\$23.73	\$57,337.76	\$49,356.55
High school diploma or equivalent	\$30.40	\$26.44	\$63,236.62	\$54,992.52
Some college but no degree	\$36.17	\$30.44	\$75,230.48	\$63,305.29
Associate degree	\$39.15	\$33.21	\$81,434.94	\$69,087.10
Bachelor's degree	\$50.60	\$43.25	\$105,244.82	\$89,957.92
Master's degree	\$53.83	\$46.91	\$111,973.24	\$97,566.48
Doctoral or professional degree	\$62.59	\$56.79	\$130,178.72	\$118,117.44


1368
1369 *Race and Ethnicity of Workforce*
1370 The stark difference in wages between different sectors in King County explains, in part, the income gaps
1371 between different races and ethnicities. The wages shown in Figure 53 are an average of all workers within
1372 an industry, including managers and lower-level employees, by race, which may skew the data for industries
1373 with larger gaps between workers within the same industry. In King County, Asian and White households
1374 have the highest median incomes, largely because the top sectors that employ Asian and White people
1375 have high wages. The top five sectors that employ White workers have an average monthly salary for White
1376 workers that range from \$5,916 to \$23,297, while the top five sectors that employ Black workers have an
1377 average monthly salary for Black workers that range from \$3,957 to \$5,642.¹⁴⁷

1378
1379 As shown in Figure 53, even within the same sector, people of different races earn different average
1380 monthly salaries. The retail trade and health care/social assistance sectors are the top two sectors that
1381 employ White, Black, American Indian or Alaska Native, and Multi-Racial workers. The retail trade is the
1382 second most common job sector for Asian workers. Health care/social assistance is the second most
1383 common sector for Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander workers. Asian and White workers make a
1384 monthly average wage of \$13,602 and \$8,633 in the retail trade, respectively, whereas Multi-Racial, Black,
1385 and American Indian or Alaska Native earn a monthly average wage of \$6,410, \$5902, and \$5,561,
1386 respectively. White workers and Multi-Racial workers earn on average \$5,961 and \$5,152 monthly in the
1387 health care/social assistance sector compared to American Indian or Alaska Native, Native Hawaiian or
1388 Other Pacific Islander, and Black workers who earn on average \$4,238, \$4,228, and \$4,210 monthly in the
1389 same sector, respectively.

¹⁴⁵ Washington State Employment Security Department. (July 2022). *Wages by education level, July 2022*. [\[link\]](#)
¹⁴⁶ King County Office of Performance, Strategy, and Budget. (2022). *2022 Comprehensive Plan Performance Measures Report*.
[\[link\]](#)
¹⁴⁷ U.S. Census Bureau, Center for Economic Studies, LEHD. (2022). *QWI Explorer*. [\[link\]](#)

1390 **Figure 53: Average Monthly Wages by Employment Sector and Race**

Only Five Most Common Employment Sectors For Each Race Shown



This plot displays the five most common employment sectors for each race. For each group these five sectors comprise from 49-67% of workers.


Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Center for Economic Studies, LEHD. (2022). QWI Explorer.

1391
1392

1393 As shown in Figure 54, there is also a significant wage gap between Hispanic or Latin(a)(o)(x) workers and
1394 Non-Hispanic or Latin(a)(o)(x) workers in King County. The top two sectors for both Hispanic or Latin(a)(o)(x)
1395 and Non-Hispanic or Latin(a)(o)(x) workers in King County are the retail trade and health care and social
1396 assistance. Hispanic or Latin(a)(o)(x) workers earn significantly less than Non-Hispanic or Latin(a)(o)(x)
1397 workers within the same sectors. Hispanic or Latin(a)(o)(x) workers earn an average monthly wage of \$6,387
1398 and \$4,439 in the retail and health care and social assistance sectors respectively, compared to Non-
1399 Hispanic or Latin(a)(o)(x) workers who earn a monthly wage of \$9,880 and \$5,922 respectively.¹⁴⁸
1400

1401 **Figure 54: Average Monthly Wages in 2021 by Employment Sector and Ethnicity**

Only Five Most Common Employment Sectors For Each Ethnicity Shown



This plot displays the five most common employment sectors for each ethnicity. These five sectors comprise 53% of Hispanic or Latin(a)(o)(x) workers and 55% of workers who are not Hispanic or Latin(a)(o)(x).

1402
1403 Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Center for Economic Studies, LEHD. (2022). QWI Explorer.

1404 C. Jobs to Housing Ratio

1405 The number of jobs in King County increased approximately 30.1 percent from 1,099,720 jobs in 2010 to
1406 1,430,940 jobs in 2020. Over the same period, the number of housing units in King County increased 13.9
1407 percent, from 851,261 housing units in 2010 to 969,234 housing units in 2020. The jobs to housing ratio
1408 increased from 1.29 to 1.48 jobs per housing unit. In 2019, Puget Sound Regional Council measured a jobs
1409 to housing ratio for King, Kitsap, Pierce, and Snohomish counties as 1.35.¹⁴⁹ A ratio higher than 1.5 indicates
1410 there may be more workers commuting into the area due to a lack of housing.¹⁵⁰
1411

1412 The number of jobs in unincorporated King County have increased by 25.8 percent, from 31,742 jobs in
1413 2010 to 39,939 jobs in 2020. The number of housing units in unincorporated King County has increased by
1414 four percent from 89,034 housing units in 2010 to 92,937 housing units in 2020. The jobs to housing ratio

¹⁴⁸ U.S. Census Bureau, Center for Economic Studies, LEHD. (2022). QWI Explorer. [\[link\]](#)

¹⁴⁹ PSRC Covered Employment Estimates. Housing data: US Census Bureau Decennial Census.

¹⁵⁰ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, EnviroAtlas. (2021). *Employment to Housing Ratio*. [\[link\]](#)

1415 increased from 0.36 to 0.43 jobs per housing unit.¹⁵¹ With the exception of the rural towns, rural
1416 unincorporated King County is much more likely to have housing than jobs. This contributes to the
1417 significant difference between the countywide and unincorporated King County jobs to housing ratio.

1418 D. Employment Trends and Projections

1419 The Washington State Employment Security Department (ESD) estimates King County will have 1,678,000
1420 nonfarm jobs in 2030, a 19.7 percent increase from the estimated 1,401,300 nonfarm jobs in 2020.¹⁵² By
1421 2044, King County is projected to have over 1.9 million jobs. High-tech companies will likely remain the
1422 economic drivers of King County for the foreseeable future.¹⁵³ Most industries will grow annually over the
1423 next decade. The information industry will be the leading driver in employment growth, with a 4.36 percent
1424 and 3.57 percent average annual employment growth rate between 2020 to 2025 and 2025 to 2030
1425 respectively. The ESD projects the wholesale trade, manufacturing, and natural resources and mining
1426 industries will decrease in average annual employment growth rate between 2020 to 2025. The ESD
1427 projects the wholesale trade and manufacturing industries to have a slight increase in average annual
1428 employment growth rate in 2025 to 2030.¹⁵⁴

1429
1430 As shown in Figure 55, over the next two decades, employment will increase in unincorporated King County
1431 at a slower rate than in King County as a whole. In 2044, unincorporated King County is projected to have
1432 42,483 total jobs, a 10.6 percent increase from the 38,425 unincorporated King County jobs in 2021.¹⁵⁵ The
1433 plurality of unincorporated King County jobs are service jobs (15,380). Unincorporated King County has a
1434 greater rate of resource and construction sector jobs (6,600) than the county as a whole due to the resource-
1435 based industries in the rural area. Public education sector jobs (6,070) are the third most common job in
1436 unincorporated King County.¹⁵⁶
1437

¹⁵¹ PSRC Covered Employment Estimates. Housing data: US Census Bureau Decennial Census.

¹⁵² Washington State Employment Department. (2022). *Occupational projections 2022*. [\[link\]](#)

¹⁵³ Vedantam, K. (2022, November 18). Tech Layoffs in 2022: The U.S. Companies That Have Cut Jobs. *Crunchbase*. [\[link\]](#)


¹⁵⁴ Washington State Employment Department. (2022). *Occupational projections 2022*. [\[link\]](#)

¹⁵⁵ King County Ordinance 19384 (2021), amended by King County Ordinance 19553 (2022) and King County Ordinance 19660 (2023). [\[link\]](#)

¹⁵⁶ King County Comprehensive Plan Performance Measures Report. [\[link\]](#)

1438
 1439

Figure 55: Actual and Forecasted Job Growth from 2000 to 2044 in King County and Unincorporated King County



1440
 1441

Source: PSRC, Covered Employment Estimates. PSRC, Regional Macroeconomic Forecast. U.S. Census Bureau.

1442

IV. Housing Supply

1443

A. Section Summary

1444
 1445
 1446

This section fulfills King County CPP H-3b, H-3c, and H-3e.
 CPP H-3b, H-3c, and H-3e require jurisdictions to:

1447
 1448
 1449

Conduct an inventory and analysis in each jurisdiction of existing and projected housing needs of all segments of the population and summarize the findings in the housing element. The inventory and analysis shall include:

1450
 1451
 1452
 1453
 1454
 1455
 1456

- b) Number of existing housing units by housing type, age, number of bedrooms, condition, tenure, and area median income limit (for income-restricted units);
- c) Number of existing emergency housing, emergency shelters, and permanent supportive housing facilities and units or beds, as applicable;
- e) Number of income-restricted units and, where feasible, total number of units, within a half-mile walkshed of high-capacity or frequent transit service where applicable and regional and countywide centers.

1457
 1458

King County has a total of 952,344 housing units, with 89,296 in unincorporated King County. Approximately half of housing units in King County are single detached residences. In unincorporated King

1459 County, less than 10 percent of housing units are multiunit housing units.¹⁵⁷ Approximately 45 percent of
1460 housing units in King County and 51 percent in unincorporated King County were built prior to 1980.¹⁵⁸
1461 Older housing is more likely to have physical problems and health risks associated with lead paint and
1462 earthquake vulnerability.^{159, 160, 161, 162}
1463
1464 Housing construction rates decreased significantly after 2000 compared to earlier decades in both King
1465 County and unincorporated King County.¹⁶³ This is likely due in part to establishing the urban growth area
1466 and the recession of 2008. Since 2011, large multiunit projects have made up a bulk of housing
1467 construction.¹⁶⁴ The Washington State Office of Financial Management expects the number of housing units
1468 to increase by approximately 25 percent and 10 percent in King County and unincorporated King County,
1469 respectively, by 2044.¹⁶⁵
1470
1471 The housing vacancy rate for King County and unincorporated King County is about 5.5 percent lower than
1472 the statewide rate of 6.5 percent and much lower than the countrywide rate of 10.5 percent.¹⁶⁶ A low
1473 vacancy rate is likely to result in a more competitive and expensive housing market.
1474
1475 Home prices increased by about 50 percent from 2016 to 2022 in King County, and the price of single
1476 detached residences increased at the highest rate.¹⁶⁷ From 2015 to 2020, the median rent also in King
1477 County increased by about 40 percent.^{168, 169} Median gross rent is unaffordable for people earning 50
1478 percent of area median income and below. At the same time, most income-restricted units in
1479 unincorporated King County are for households between 51 to 80 percent area median income.¹⁷⁰

1480 B. General Housing Inventory

1481 *Housing Units and Vacancy*

1482 As of 2020, King County has 952,344 total housing units and unincorporated King County has 82,196
1483 housing units.¹⁷¹ King County has 391,715 and unincorporated King County has 13,894 total rental units.
1484 Approximately 63.2 percent and 36.2 percent of unincorporated King County rentals are in urban and rural
1485 areas, respectively.¹⁷²

1486
1487 The overall housing vacancy rate in both King County as a whole and unincorporated King County in 2020
1488 was approximately 5.5 percent, lower than the statewide rate of 6.5 percent and nearly half the countrywide
1489 rate of 10.5 percent. Figure 56 shows the rental vacancy rate from 2005 to 2019 in King County. The rental
1490 vacancy rate has fluctuated over the past two decades. The rental vacancy rate decreased 31.7 percent from
1491 2005 to 2019 (6 percent to 4.1 percent). A low vacancy rate is likely to result in a more competitive and
1492 expensive housing market. The rental vacancy rate in King County and unincorporated King County is
1493 slightly lower than the overall vacancy rate (4.99 percent and 4.24 percent, respectively). The vacancy rate in

¹⁵⁷ Washington State Office of Financial Management. (2022). *April 1 official population estimates*. [\[link\]](#)

¹⁵⁸ U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2021). *Housing Stock by Tenure and Year Built, CHAS 2014-2018*.

¹⁵⁹ Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2022). *Lead in Paint*. [\[link\]](#)

¹⁶⁰ Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2021). *Populations at Higher Risk*. [\[link\]](#)

¹⁶¹ Boiko-Weyrauch, A., "Seattle buildings."

¹⁶² Washington Department of Natural Resources, "Modeling a Magnitude."

¹⁶³ PSRC Macroeconomic Forecast; Washington State Office of Financial Management, *Population and Housing Estimates*; and U.S. Census Bureau, *American Community Survey*.

¹⁶⁴ BERK Consulting, Inc., "Affordable housing incentives analysis: North Highline and Skyway-West Hill." [\[link\]](#)

¹⁶⁵ PSRC Macroeconomic Forecast; Washington State Office of Financial Management, *Population and Housing Estimates*; and U.S. Census Bureau, *American Community Survey*.

¹⁶⁶ U.S. Census Bureau. (2020). *Occupancy Status/Vacancy Rate, 5-year ACS 2016-2020*.

¹⁶⁷ Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis. (2022). *Median Listing Price in King County, WA*. [\[link\]](#)

¹⁶⁸ U.S. Census Bureau. (2016). *Median Gross Rent by Bedroom Size, 5-year ACS 2011-2015*.

¹⁶⁹ U.S. Census Bureau. (2022). *Median Gross Rent by Bedroom Size, 5-year ACS 2016-2020*.


¹⁷⁰ King County. (2020). *King County Income-Restricted Housing Database*.

¹⁷¹ U.S. Census Bureau. (2020). *Occupancy Status/Vacancy Rate, 5-year ACS 2016-2020*.

¹⁷² U.S. Census Bureau. (2020). *Rental Unit Occupancy Status/Vacancy Rate, 5-year ACS 2016-2020*.

1494 rural unincorporated King County (6.35 percent) is about twice as high as the vacancy rate in urban
 1495 unincorporated King County (3.01 percent).
 1496

1497 **Figure 56: Rental Vacancy Rate in King County**




Rental unit vacancy rate is computed by dividing the number of vacant units for rent by the sum of the renter-occupied units, vacant units that are for rent, and vacant units that have been rented but not yet occupied. Seasonal/recreational use and migrant units that are vacant are not included as vacant units.

1498
 1499 Source: U.S. Census Bureau. (2020). *Rental Vacancy Rate, 1-year ACS 2005-2019*.

1500 *Housing by Type*
 1501 Figure 57 shows the total housing units by type in King County in 2022. About half of housing units in King
 1502 County (52 percent) are single detached residences. Figure 58 shows the total housing units by type in
 1503 unincorporated King County in 2022. Housing units in unincorporated King County are overwhelmingly
 1504 single detached residences (84.9 percent).¹⁷³ Unincorporated King County has a higher rate of
 1505 manufactured housing and other types of housing units, such as recreational vehicles or boats (6.2 percent),
 1506 than housing units countywide (1.8 percent). Unincorporated King County has a significantly lower rate of
 1507 multiunit housing units (9.0 percent) compared to countywide (46.2 percent).
 1508


1509 **Figure 57: Total Housing Units by Type in King County**



1510
 1511 Source: Washington State Office of Financial Management. (2022). April 1 Postcensal Estimates of Housing Units.

¹⁷³ Washington State Office of Financial Management. (2022). April 1 Postcensal Estimates of Housing Units. [\[link\]](#)

1512 **Figure 58: Total Housing Units by Type in Unincorporated King County**




1513
1514

Source: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2021). *Housing Stock by Tenure and Year Built, CHAS 2014-2018*.

1515 *Housing Age and Condition*

1516 Figures 59 and 60 show the number of housing units built by tenure and over time in King County and
1517 unincorporated King County, respectively. Over half (53.9 percent) of all housing units in King County were
1518 built between 1960 and 1999. There was a 26.9 percent decrease in housing construction from 2000 to
1519 2018, compared to the previous two decades.¹⁷⁴

1520 **Figure 59: Housing Units by Tenure and Year Built in King County**



1521
1522 Source: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2021). *Housing Stock by Tenure and Year Built, CHAS 2014-2018*.

1523 Approximately 10.4 percent (89,601) of King County’s housing units are in unincorporated King County.
1524 Housing construction in unincorporated King County slowed significantly, more than the countywide
1525 construction rate, after 2000. Annexation of areas planned for growth is likely the primary factor in the
1526 housing construction reduction in unincorporated King County. This may be due to the reduced
1527 development capacity established as part of the Urban Growth Area, the Growth Management Act (GMA) in
1528 the rural unincorporated King County, and the recession of 2008.

1529
1530 Approximately 45.2 percent (32,302) and 50.7 percent (9,219) of housing units were built prior to 1980 in
1531 King County and unincorporated King County, respectively. Older housing units may have more physical
1532 problems than newer units due to wear and tear over the decades because most jurisdictions adopted
1533 modern building codes in the 1970s, with most regulations being uniformly implemented by 1980.¹⁷⁵
1534 Housing built before 1978 is likely to have lead paint which can lead to health problems such as anemia,
1535 weakness, brain damage, and or death, especially for children.^{176, 177} Older buildings are also vulnerable to
1536 extensive damage in an earthquake, with approximately 58 percent of King County buildings estimated to

¹⁷⁴ U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2021). *Housing Stock by Tenure and Year Built, CHAS 2014-2018*.


¹⁷⁵ Li, S. (2021). *Where is the Aging Housing Stock in the United States?* Freddie Mac. [\[link\]](#)

¹⁷⁶ Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2022). *Lead in Paint*. [\[link\]](#)

¹⁷⁷ Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2021). *Populations at Higher Risk*. [\[link\]](#)

1537 be damaged in a significant earthquake and approximately six percent of King County buildings expected
 1538 to completely collapse.^{178, 179}
 1539

1540 **Figure 60: Housing Units by Tenure and Year Built in Unincorporated King County**



1541
 1542 Source: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2021). *Housing Stock by Tenure and Year Built, CHAS 2014-2018.*

1543 **Housing size**


1544 As shown in Figure 61, smaller housing units in King County are much more likely to be rented than owned,
 1545 with 93.8 percent (54,542) and 86.4 percent (129,549) of studios and one-bedroom units occupied by a
 1546 renter household, respectively. The gap between renter and homeowner households in two-bedroom units
 1547 is smaller, with 59.7 percent (129,479) and 40.3 percent (87,421) of these units occupied by renters and
 1548 homeowners, respectively. Over three-quarters of three-, four-, and five or more-bedroom units are
 1549 occupied by homeowners.¹⁸⁰
 1550

¹⁷⁸ Boiko-Weyrauch, A., "Seattle buildings."

¹⁷⁹ Washington Department of Natural Resources, "Modeling a Magnitude."

¹⁸⁰ U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2021). *Housing Units by Tenure and Unit Size, CHAS 2014-2018.*

1551 **Figure 61: King County Units by Tenure and Unit Size**




1552 Source: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2021). *Housing Units by Tenure and Unit Size, CHAS 2014-2018*.
 1553

1554 These trends are also reflected in unincorporated King County, as shown in Figure 62. Over 90 percent (713)
 1555 of studios and 62 percent (1,969) of one-bedroom units in unincorporated King County are occupied by
 1556 renters. However, homeowners in unincorporated King County are more likely to occupy units with more
 1557 than one bedroom than in the county as a whole. In unincorporated King County, approximately 60.9
 1558 percent (7,903) of two-bedrooms, 88.4 percent (28,972) of three-bedrooms, 90.5 percent (20,421) of four-
 1559 bedrooms, and 96 percent (5,207) of units with five or more bedrooms are occupied by homeowners.¹⁸¹
 1560
 1561

¹⁸¹ U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2021). *Housing Units by Tenure and Unit Size, CHAS 2014-2018*.

1562 **Figure 62: Housing Units by Tenure and Unit Size in Unincorporated King County**



1563
 1564 Source: U.S. Census Bureau. (2022). *Housing Units by Tenure and Size, 5-year ACS 2016-2020.*


1565 **C. Housing Market Conditions**

1566 *Housing Production*

1567 Housing construction in King County has changed since 2000, as shown in Figure 63 using Puget Sound
 1568 Regional Council Residential Building Survey data. In the first decade of the new millennium, housing
 1569 permits peaked in 2007, right before the 2008 economic crisis. The number of residential housing units
 1570 permitted significantly decreased during the Great Recession. Housing construction hit a low in 2009 but
 1571 recovered, peaking at the highest number in the past two decades in 2015. From 2016 to 2020, King
 1572 County jurisdictions issued approximately 85,294 residential building permits for new construction.¹⁸² After
 1573 the Great Recession, single detached residences represented a smaller percentage of residential permitted
 1574 units than before the recession. Since 2009, the number of multiunit permitted properties with 50 or more
 1575 units increased significantly, becoming the dominant form of housing construction beginning in 2011. This
 1576 is likely due to multiple factors, including but not limited to¹⁸³ [redacted]

- 1577
- a reduction in available land for single detached residential housing projects;
 - a market response to major employment growth in the urban core of King County, which can only accommodate significant increases in housing units through multiunit projects; and
 - larger multiunit projects often being more profitable than smaller projects.

1581 **Figure 63: Net Housing Units Permitted by Unit Type in King County, 2000 to 2020**



1582 Source: Puget Sound Regional Council. Residential Building Permit Survey, 2000-2020.
 1583

1584 Table 4 and Figures 64 and 65 show the number of housing units completed in King County and
 1585 unincorporated King County by type from 2020 to 2022. Approximately 62,357 residential buildings were
 1586

¹⁸² University of Washington Center for Real Estate Research. (2022). *Permits and Completions*. [\[link\]](#)

¹⁸³ BERK Consulting, Inc., "Affordable housing incentives analysis: North Highline and Skyway-West Hill." [\[link\]](#)

1587 constructed in King County between April 1, 2016, and April 1, 2021.¹⁸⁴ Since 2020, housing production in
1588 King County and unincorporated King County has shifted towards multiunit housing units, but single
1589 detached residences still make up a large portion of the housing units constructed in both jurisdictions.
1590 More manufactured housing units and other unit types have been demolished than constructed since 2020.
1591


1592 **Table 4: Total Housing Units Completed in King County and Unincorporated King County¹⁸⁵**

Jurisdiction	2020-2021			2021-2022		
	Single Detached Residence	Multiunit	Manufactured Housing / Other	Single Detached Residence	Multiunit	Manufactured Housing / Other
King County	2,258	13,028	-63	1,864	15,262	-6
Unincorporated King County	351	190	-9	235	265	-13

1593

1594 **Figure 64: Total Housing Completed by Type in King County**

1595




1596
1597

Source: Washington State Office of Financial Management. (2022). April 1 Postcensal Estimates of Housing Units.

¹⁸⁴ University of Washington Center for Real Estate Research. (2022). Permits and Completions. [\[link\]](#)

¹⁸⁵ Washington State Office of Financial Management. (2022). April 1 Postcensal Estimates of Housing Units. [\[link\]](#)

1598 **Figure 65: Total Housing Units Completed by Type in Unincorporated King County**




1599
 1600 Source: Washington State Office of Financial Management. (2022). April 1 Postcensal Estimates of Housing Units.

1601 *Forecasted Housing Growth*

1602 Figure 66 shows the actual and forecasted growth of housing units in King County. The Washington State
 1603 Office of Financial Management (OFM) projects the number of housing units in King County will increase
 1604 approximately 25.1 percent, from 1,001,577 housing units in 2022 to 1,252,908 housing units in 2044. The
 1605 OFM projects the number of housing units in unincorporated King County will increase approximately 9.6
 1606 percent, from 93,957 housing units to 103,014 housing units in 2044.¹⁸⁶ These projections do not take
 1607 annexation into account. It is possible that housing units decrease or stay stable over the next two decades
 1608 in unincorporated King County due to annexation. Housing growth in unincorporated King County will be
 1609 focused on urban areas to meet King County’s environmental and climate goals and will account for four
 1610 percent of housing growth in King County.¹⁸⁷

1611

1612 **Figure 66: Actual and Forecasted Housing Growth in King County and Unincorporated King**
 1613 **County from 2000 to 2044**



1614
 1615
 1616


Source: Puget Sound Regional Council Macroeconomic Forecast; Washington State Office of Financial Management, Population and Housing Estimates; and U.S Census Bureau, American Community Survey.

¹⁸⁶ Washington State Office of Financial Management, *Population and Housing Estimates*.
¹⁸⁷ King County 2022 Comprehensive Plan Performance Measures Report. [\[link\]](#)

1617 *Housing Costs*

1618 As shown by Figure 67, the median price for a home in King County has increased dramatically since 2016;
 1619 the median home listing price increased by about 50 percent between July 2016 and March 2022, from
 1620 \$565,000 to \$850,000. This significantly increases wealth for existing homeowners but puts homeownership
 1621 out of reach for many residents in King County. A 30-year mortgage for an \$850,000 home with a 20
 1622 percent down payment of \$170,000 and an interest rate of five percent would lead to a monthly payment of
 1623 about \$4,000, including property taxes and homeowners' insurance. A household would need an income of
 1624 about \$160,000 per year for that monthly payment to be affordable, which is higher than the region's overall
 1625 median family income of \$134,600.¹⁸⁸ Racial disparities in wages, as discussed in the Workforce
 1626 Characteristics section, contribute to the racial disparities in homeownership in the region.
 1627

1628 **Figure 67: Median Listing Price in King County**




1629 Source: Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis. (2022). Median Listing Price in King County, WA.
 1630

¹⁸⁸ U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2022). FY 2022 Income Limits Summary.

1631 Figure 68 shows that the sales prices of vacant single detached residences increased at the highest rate,
 1632 more than doubling in price from 2016 to 2021. The sales prices for townhomes increased at the slowest
 1633 rate, indicating that this housing type may become a more affordable option over time, but also has less
 1634 potential for building wealth.¹⁸⁹ Figure 68 shows that triplexes are the most expensive property type; this
 1635 figure measures the sale price of triplex buildings rather than units within a triplex.
 1636

1637 **Figure 68: Median Sale price by Property Present Use in King County**



Only includes residential properties with sale or warranty deeds. Excludes properties that were sold through a quit claim deed. Present use types with less than 35 sales in a year are not included.


1638 Source: King County Assessor's Office, 2016 to 2021.
 1639

¹⁸⁹ King County Assessor's Office, 2016 to 2021.

1640 *Rental Rates*

1641 Figure 69 shows the median gross rent by unit size in King County. The median rent for a studio unit in King
 1642 County is \$1,414. The most expensive units are four-bedrooms, with a median rent of \$2,466. It is not clear
 1643 why five or more-bedroom rentals are slightly less expensive than four-bedroom units, but these units are
 1644 less common, creating a larger margin of error.¹⁹⁰ Rentals with five or more bedrooms available for rent on
 1645 Zillow are located throughout the county but heavily clustered around the University of Washington,
 1646 indicating that these units are marketed towards students. Many landlords with large single detached
 1647 residences in this area rent individual rooms out to students or put multiple students on one lease, with
 1648 rents for each room ranging from \$900 to \$1,250, lower than the average rent of a studio. These rentals are
 1649 also older buildings, pushing down the by-room rent compared to newer apartment buildings.¹⁹¹
 1650

1651 **Figure 69: Median Gross Rent by Unit Size in King County**



1652
 1653 Source: U.S. Census Bureau. (2022). *Median Gross Rent by Unit Size, ACS 2016-2020*.

1654
 1655 The minimum wage in King County was \$14.49 per hour in 2022. This wage converts to an annual salary of
 1656 about \$30,100 for someone working full-time, assuming paid or no vacation time.¹⁹² Based on that income,
 1657 an affordable monthly rent would be about \$750, about half the cost of the median one-bedroom
 1658 apartment. A single person with an income of 50 percent of King County's area median income in 2022
 1659 (\$41,720) can afford a monthly rent of about \$1,040, almost \$400 less than the median gross rent for a
 1660 studio apartment. A household of four with an income of 50 percent area median income (\$59,560) can
 1661 afford a monthly rent of about \$1,490, about the median cost of a one-bedroom apartment.
 1662


¹⁹⁰ U.S. Census Bureau. (2022). *Median Gross Rent by Unit Size, 5-year ACS 2016-2020*.

¹⁹¹ Zillow. (Retrieved 2022, December 27). *Rental Listings*. [\[link\]](#)

¹⁹² Washington State Department of Labor & Industries. (2022). *Minimum Wage*. [\[link\]](#)

1663 Figure 70 shows the gross median rent in King County from 2015 to 2021. King County's gross median rent
 1664 increased significantly in this time: 33.8 percent, from \$1,354 to \$ 1,811.¹⁹³
 1665

1666 **Figure 70: Median Gross Rent in King County from 2015 to 2021**



2020 data not available due to the impacts of the pandemic on ACS data collection.

1667
 1668 Source: U.S. Census Bureau. (2022). *Median Gross Rent by Bedroom Size, 1-year ACS 2015-2021*.

1669 *Housing Affordability and Availability*


1670 Figure 71 shows the inventory of housing units that are affordable, but not available, and affordable and
 1671 available by tenure and income range, for King County. Units that are affordable, but not available mean
 1672 that the unit is occupied by a household at a higher income bracket than what the housing cost is affordable
 1673 to, such as a unit with rent affordable to households at or below 30 percent area median income occupied
 1674 by a household that earns the median income. Units that are affordable and available mean the unit is
 1675 occupied by a household at the same income bracket in which the unit is affordable to, such as a unit
 1676 affordable to households at or below 80 percent area median income occupied by a household in that
 1677 income bracket. The homeownership data does not include households with incomes less than or equal to
 1678 30 percent area median income because it is such a small subset of the population.

1679
 1680 The greatest disparity between number of households and units available in King County is for incomes at
 1681 or below 30 percent area median income. There are 81,250 cost burdened or severely cost burdened
 1682 households with incomes less than or equal to 30 percent area median income in King County, but only
 1683 22,235 units that are affordable and available to that population. Lower income households outnumber the
 1684 number of affordable and available units in unincorporated King County.¹⁹⁴ To account for down-renting,
 1685 there need to be more units than households in lower-income brackets to ensure every low-income
 1686 household can live in a unit affordable to their income.
 1687

¹⁹³ U.S. Census Bureau. (2022). *Median Gross Rent by Bedroom Size, 5-year ACS 2015-2021*.

¹⁹⁴ U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2021). *Units Affordable and Available in King County and Unincorporated King County, CHAS 2014-2018*.

1688 **Figure 71: Affordable and Available Units by Area Median Income and Tenure in King County**




1689
 1690 Source: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2021). Units Affordable and Available in King County and
 1691 Unincorporated King County, CHAS 2014-2018.

1692 **Special Housing Inventory**

1693 *Income-Restricted Housing*

1694 Figure 72 shows the number of income-restricted housing units in King County that are affordable to
 1695 different income ranges. King County has about 65,900 income-restricted housing units, including
 1696 permanent supportive housing, which is about 6.4 percent of all housing units in King County. Some units
 1697 are produced through regulatory incentives, but the significant majority are funded through a mix of local,
 1698 state, federal, and philanthropic funding, tax credits, private debt, and rent from residents. Generally, units
 1699 restricted at or below 60 percent area median income are rental units, while units restricted to 60 to 100
 1700 percent area median income are a mix of homeownership and rental units. Over half of King County
 1701 income-restricted units are for households between 51 to 80 percent area median income. Approximately
 1702 25 percent of income-restricted housing units serve households at or below 30 percent area median
 1703 income.¹⁹⁵

1705 **Figure 72: Income-restricted Housing Units in King County**



Data current as of December 31, 2021. Includes homeownership units, care facilities, and group homes. Units in the development pipeline that were not yet in service at that time are not included.

1706 Source: King County Department of Community and Human Services. (2021). *King County Income-Restricted Housing Database*.
 1707


1708 Figure 73 shows the number of income-restricted housing units in unincorporated King County that are
 1709 affordable to different income ranges. Unincorporated King County has approximately 3,388 units for
 1710 households at 0 to 80 percent area median income. That makes up a significantly smaller portion of income-
 1711 restricted units in unincorporated King County (9.4 percent) compared to King County as a whole (25
 1712 percent). Approximately 73.3 percent of income-restricted units in unincorporated King County are for
 1713 households between 51 to 80 percent area median income.^{196,197}

¹⁹⁵ King County Department of Community and Human Services. (2021). *King County Income-Restricted Housing Database*.

¹⁹⁶ King County. (2021). *King County Income-Restricted Housing Database*.

¹⁹⁷ U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2021). *Housing Units by Tenure and Unit Size, CHAS 2014-2018*.

1715 **Figure 73: Income-restricted Housing Units in Unincorporated King County**



1716 Data current as of December 31, 2021. Includes homeownership units, care facilities, and group homes. Units in the develop
 1717 Source: King County Department of Community and Human Services. (2021). King County Income-Restricted Housing Database.

1718 *Income Restricted Housing in Unincorporated King County within ½ mile of Transit and Countywide Centers*

1719 Of all income-restricted housing units in unincorporated King County, 49 percent, or 1,660 units, are
 1720 located within one half mile of frequent or high-capacity transit. The overwhelming majority of these units
 1721 are in North Highline and Skyway-West Hill. Maps 2 and 3 show the affordable housing projects within the
 1722 half mile walkshed in North Highline and Skyway-West Hill, respectively.
 1723

1724 The North Highline and Skyway Unincorporated Activity Centers are identified in the Countywide Planning
 1725 Policies as candidates for possible designation as "countywide centers," a new designation from Puget
 1726 Sound Regional Council's Regional Centers Framework, as of April 2023. In North Highline, Coronado
 1727 Springs Apartments, Coronado Springs Cottages, and Unity Village are in the current activity center, totaling
 1728 506 units. In Skyway, the Greentree Apartment Homes and Park Hill Apartments are in the activity center,
 1729 total 205 units.

1730 **Map 2: Income Restricted Housing in North Highline within 1/2 Mile Walkshed of Frequent Transit**

NORTH HIGHLINE INCOME RESTRICTED HOUSING

*In Unincorporated KC within a half mile of
 High Capacity or Frequent Transit*

- ◆ Income Restricted Housing
- High Capacity & Frequent Transit Stops
- Half Mile Walk-Shed of High Capacity & Frequent Transit Stops
- Residential Land in Unincorporated King County
- North Highline Community Service Area
- Urban Growth Area Boundary
- Incorporated City
- City in Rural Area
- Tribal Lands
- King County Boundary

Data Sources:


King County Department of Local Services
 King County Department of Assessments
 King County Department of Natural Resources and Parks
 King County Office of the Executive: Performance, Strategy and Budget
 King County Department of Community and Human Services
 Puget Sound Regional Council

Notes:

Residential zoned property in unincorporated KC carries any of the following zoning base zoning designations:
 R-24, R-48, CB, RB, O - High Density
 R-12, R-18 - Moderate Density
 R-1, R-4, R-6, R-8, NB, UR, - Low Density
 A-10, A-35, RA-2.5, RA-5, RA-10 - Rural Density

Properties with the following characteristics are not deemed Residential zoned property:
 Owned by King County government and determined not to be feasible for housing
 Owned by the United States Forest Service
 Owned by Washington State Parks
 Owned by Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife
 Owned by Vashon Park District
 Sending sites for the King County Transfer of Development Rights program
 Enrolled in the Farmland Preservation Program
 Have conservation easements owned by King County Parks
 Open water parcels that do not have a valid parcel number

The information included on this map has been compiled by King County staff from a variety of sources and is subject to change without notice. King County makes no representations or warranties, express or implied, as to accuracy, completeness, timeliness, or rights to the use of such information. King County shall not be liable for any general, special, indirect, incidental, or consequential damages including, but not limited to, lost revenues or lost profits resulting from the use or misuse of the information contained on this map. Any sale of this map or information on this map is prohibited except by written permission of King County.



Date: 7/24/2023
 \\gis\projects\kcgis\client_services\OCHS\2024_CompPlan_Housing_Needs_Assessment\In.RestrictHng\In.RestrictHng.aprx
 mccombp

1731
 1732

1733 **Map 3: Income Restricted Housing in Skyway-West Hill within 1/2 Mile Walkshed of Frequent Transit**

SKYWAY/WEST HILL INCOME RESTRICTED HOUSING

*In Unincorporated KC within a half mile of
 High Capacity or Frequent Transit*


- ◆ Income Restricted Housing
- High Capacity & Frequent Transit Stops
- Half Mile Walk-Shed of High Capacity & Frequent Transit Stops
- Residential Land in Unincorporated King County
- Skyway/West Hill Community Service Area
- Urban Growth Area Boundary
- Incorporated City
- City in Rural Area
- Tribal Lands
- King County Boundary

Data Sources:
 King County Department of Local Services
 King County Department of Assessments
 King County Department of Natural Resources and Parks
 King County Office of the Executive: Performance, Strategy and Budget
 King County Department of Community and Human Services
 Puget Sound Regional Council

Notes
 Residential zoned property in unincorporated KC carries any of the following zoning base zoning designations:
 R-24, R-48, CB, RB, O - High Density
 R-12, R-18 - Moderate Density
 R-1, R-4, R-6, R-8, NB, UR, - Low Density
 A-10, A-35, RA-2.5, RA-5, RA-10 - Rural Density

Properties with the following characteristics are not deemed Residential zoned property:
 Owned by King County government and determined not to be feasible for housing
 Owned by the United States Forest Service
 Owned by Washington State Parks
 Owned by Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife
 Owned by Washon Park District
 Sending sites for the King County Transfer of Development Rights program
 Enrolled in the Farmland Preservation Program
 Have conservation easements owned by King County Parks
 Open water parcels that do not have a valid parcel number

The information included on this map has been compiled by King County staff from a variety of sources and is subject to change without notice. King County makes no representations or warranties, express or implied, as to accuracy, completeness, timeliness, or rights to the use of such information. King County shall not be liable for any general, special, indirect, incidental, or consequential damages including, but not limited to, lost revenues or lost profits resulting from the use or misuse of the information contained on this map. Any sale of this map or information on this map is prohibited except by written permission of King County.



**King County
 GIS CENTER**

Date: 7/24/2022
 \\gis\projects\kcgis\client_services\DCHS2024_CompPlan_Housing_Needs_Assessment\InRestrctHng\InRestrctHng.aprx
 mccombp

1734
 1735


1736 *Permanent Supportive Housing*

1737 Many of the housing units reserved for the lowest income households are for households exiting
 1738 homelessness. King County has 6,266 housing units for permanent supportive housing,¹⁹⁸ which is a project
 1739 that offers permanent housing and services to households that are homeless on entry, where the individual
 1740 or a household member has a condition of disability, such as mental illness, substance abuse, chronic health
 1741 issues, or other conditions that create multiple and serious ongoing barriers to housing stability. King
 1742 County has 1,594 other permanent housing units that either do not require a member of the household to
 1743 have a disability or do not have additional services. Unincorporated King County does not have any
 1744 permanent supportive housing.

1746 *Emergency Shelter*

1747 In 2021, King County had approximately 6,038 year-round emergency housing beds, which consisted of
 1748 emergency shelter (4,070 beds), safe haven (84 beds), and transitional housing (1,884 beds), as shown in
 1749 Figure 74. Approximately 75 emergency housing beds are in unincorporated King County. Emergency
 1750 shelter provides temporary shelter for people experiencing homelessness, either for the general population
 1751 or for a specific population such as youth, families, and survivors of domestic violence. Safe haven beds are
 1752 for people experiencing homelessness with severe mental illness who have been unwilling or unable to
 1753 participate in services. Safe haven beds provide 24-hour residence for these individuals for an unspecified
 1754 period. Transitional housing provides temporary lodging, for no longer than 24 months, for people
 1755 experiencing homelessness with the goal of transitioning the household into permanent housing.¹⁹⁹

1756 **Figure 74: Emergency Housing and Permanent Housing Inventory in King County**



1757
 1758 Source: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2021). HUD 2021 Continuum of Care Homeless Assistance
 1759 Programs Housing Inventory Count Report.

1760 *Group Homes and Retirement Facilities*

1761 King County has 264 group homes and 208 retirement facilities. Unincorporated King County has seven
 1762 group homes and four retirement facilities. Approximately 2.7 percent of King County’s group homes and

¹⁹⁸ Permanent supportive housing units are included in the total number of income-restricted units in King County (61,821).
¹⁹⁹ U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2021). FY 2022 HMIS Data Standards (Manual). [\[link\]](#)

1763 1.9 percent of retirement facilities are in unincorporated King County, based upon King County Assessor
1764 data.²⁰⁰
1765

V. Racially Disparate Impact Analysis

1766
1767 In alignment with requirements of the Washington State Growth Management Act, King County's
1768 Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs), and the Puget Sound Regional Council VISION 2050, this analysis
1769 documents and examines the local history of racially exclusive and discriminatory land use and housing
1770 practices that lead to racially disparate housing outcomes for residents in unincorporated King County. This
1771 section also analyzes current policies that could be perpetuating harms to Black, Indigenous, and People of
1772 Color communities and identifies the 2024 Comprehensive Plan policy and code changes that are helping
1773 to undo those harms as required by state law and the CPPs. Revised Code of Washington 36.70A.070(2)(e)
1774 requires jurisdictions to identify "local policies, regulations, and practices that have resulted in racially
1775 disparate impacts, displacement, and exclusion in housing, including: i) zoning that may have a
1776 discriminatory effect; ii) disinvestment; and iii) infrastructure availability." This analysis also fulfills CPP H-5,
1777 CPP H-3n, and CPP H-9.

1778
1779 CPP H-5 requires jurisdictions to:

1780
1781 *Document the local history of racially exclusive and discriminatory land use and housing*
1782 *practices, consistent with local and regional fair housing reports and other resources. Explain the*
1783 *extent to which that history is still reflected in current development patterns, housing conditions,*
1784 *tenure, and access to opportunity. Identify local policies and regulations that result in racially*
1785 *disparate impacts, displacement, and exclusion in housing, including zoning that may have a*
1786 *discriminatory effect, disinvestment, and infrastructure availability. Demonstrate how current*
1787 *strategies are addressing impacts of those racially exclusive and discriminatory policies and*
1788 *practices. The County will support jurisdictions in identifying and compiling resources to support*
1789 *this analysis.*

1790
1791 CPP H-3n requires jurisdictions to:

1792
1793 *Conduct an inventory and analysis in each jurisdiction of existing and projected housing needs of all*
1794 *segments of the population and summarize the findings in the housing element. The inventory and*
1795 *analysis shall include:*

1796 *n) Areas in the jurisdiction that may be at higher risk of displacement from market forces that*
1797 *occur with changes to zoning development regulations and public capital investments.*

1798
1799 CPP H-9 requires jurisdictions to:

1800
1801 *Adopt intentional, targeted actions that repair harms to Black, Indigenous, and other People of*
1802 *Color households from past and current racially exclusive and discriminatory land use and*
1803 *housing practices (generally identified through Policy H-5). Promote equitable outcomes in*
1804 *partnership with communities most impacted.*

1805
1806 This analysis also aligns with Puget Sound Regional Council's VISION 2050, which is the region's long-range
1807 plan for growth. The vision for 2050 is to provide exceptional quality of life, opportunity for all, connected
1808 communities, a spectacular natural environment, and an innovative, thriving economy.
1809

²⁰⁰ King County Assessor's Office. (2022). Parcels with Present Use Defined as Group Home or Retirement Facilities, King County and Unincorporated King County.

1810 The first section within this analysis outlines historic government actions and policies with an explicit racial
1811 discriminatory intent. The second section explores 20th and 21st century government policies and practices
1812 that contribute to or create racially disparate outcomes in housing. The third section details displacement
1813 occurring in unincorporated King County. The fourth section examines how current King County policies,
1814 and the 2024 Comprehensive Plan updates, aim to undo past racially exclusive and discriminatory land use
1815 and housing practices and identify where policies might be perpetuating harms to Black, Indigenous, and
1816 People of Color communities.

1817
1818 This analysis primarily focuses on urban unincorporated areas in King County because they have larger
1819 populations and a higher concentration of Black, Indigenous, and People of Color communities than rural
1820 unincorporated areas. Understanding the past and current policies that contribute to ongoing harms against
1821 Black, Indigenous, and People of Color communities and racially disparate impacts in housing is critical to
1822 identifying root causes and undoing these systemic injustices. However, this analysis does not analyze *all*
1823 discriminatory policies and programs that existed in unincorporated King County, and rather represents a
1824 best effort on the part of the County to analyze its policies for their contribution to racially disparate housing
1825 impacts, displacement, and exclusion over the course of its history. Skyway-West Hill and North Highline are
1826 referenced more often than other unincorporated areas in this section due to recent planning efforts such as
1827 the Skyway-West Hill and the North Highline Anti-displacement Strategies Report, the North Highline
1828 Community Service Area Subarea Plan, and the Skyway-West Hill Community Service Area Subarea
1829 Plan.^{201,202}

1830
1831 Historically, private property owners, lending institutions, and federal, state, and local governments
1832 implemented strategies to restrict access to housing and neighborhoods to people based on their race and
1833 sometimes religion.²⁰³ These strategies perpetuated racial segregation throughout the country, including in
1834 unincorporated King County.^{204,205} King County as a jurisdiction has both played a direct role in
1835 perpetuating racially disparate outcomes, such as not enforcing the first open housing ordinance it passed,
1836 as well as not always taking an explicit stand against these types of policies or reversing them, as shown in
1837 this section.

1838
1839 This analysis uses terms such as Black, Indigenous, and People of Color, White, Black, Asian, and
1840 Indigenous, when referring to racial groups today and in the past. Several historical texts cited in this
1841 analysis use language to describe racial groups that are not appropriate today. These terms are used within
1842 this section when pulling direct quotes and in citations.

1843 A. Historical Policies with an Explicit Racial Discriminatory 1844 Intent

1845 Public policies that have contributed to the racially disparate impact of the current housing crisis are rooted
1846 in the explicitly racist practices of the early United States. Some of these policies and practices known to
1847 have been enforced or practiced in unincorporated King County include Indigenous land dispossession, the
1848 Alien Land Law, Japanese internment and incarceration, racial restrictive covenants, and discriminatory
1849 lending practices that led to disproportionate access to homeownership. While federal, state, and local
1850 governments outlawed many of these overtly racist housing practices in the twentieth century, their legacy
1851 lives on through zoning, underinvestment in BIPOC neighborhoods, lack of annexation, lack of tenant
1852 protections, and other land use patterns and practices.

1853

²⁰¹ King County Skyway-West Hill and North Highline Anti-displacement Strategies Report. (2021). [\[link\]](#)

²⁰² King County Ordinance 19555 (2022). [\[link\]](#)

²⁰³ University of Washington's Seattle Civil Rights and Labor History Project (2004-2020). *Racial Restrictive Covenants*. [\[link\]](#)

²⁰⁴ Rothstein, R. (2018). *The Color of Law*. New York, NY: Liveright Publishing Corporation.

²⁰⁵ University of Washington's Seattle Civil Rights and Labor History Project (2004-2020). *Racial Restrictive Covenants*. [\[link\]](#)

1854 *Broken Treaties, Indigenous Expulsion, and Indigenous Land Dispossession (early 1800's - early 1900's)*
1855 The Puyallup, Muckleshoot, Snoqualmie, Suquamish, Tulalip, and Duwamish Indigenous tribes have lived
1856 and stewarded the lands, waters, and resources in and around King County since time immemorial.²⁰⁶ Early
1857 settlers, people mostly of European descent who moved to the region with the intention to stay, arrived in
1858 the early 1800s. Upon arrival, they occupied land and consumed resources of importance to Indigenous
1859 communities, by claiming hunting and fishing rights and disrupting the tribes' way of living and impacting
1860 their survival.²⁰⁷ Many of these actions violated rights that tribes had reserved unto themselves by terms of
1861 treaties with the U.S. including dislocating tribes from their lands.^{208,209} The federal government perpetuated
1862 such violations by denying the signatory tribes their fishing and hunting rights in much of modern-day
1863 Washington State for over a century. The first "land laws" in Washington occurred in 1855 where U.S.
1864 government used treaties to restrict Indigenous people to reservations to use the rest of Washington
1865 territory for White settlements.²¹⁰

1866
1867 The U.S. Congress enabled other forms of land acquisition through methods created by the Homestead Act
1868 and Dawes Act.²¹¹ The Homestead Act in 1862 offered settlers "free" land that was acquired through
1869 coercive acts of Indigenous dispossession.²¹² In 1865, the Seattle Board of Trustees banned Native people
1870 from Seattle for about two years after the passage of Ordinance 5.^{213,214} In 1887 the federal government
1871 passed the Dawes Act,²¹⁵ allowing the government to divide Native reservations to individual tribal
1872 members with the intention to assimilate them as "responsible farmers."²¹⁶ It was not culturally relevant for
1873 many Indigenous communities to use land in this way, so they frequently either denied their allotments or
1874 used the land in ways the government deemed unsatisfactory. If Indigenous communities did not use their
1875 land in a way intended by the federal government, the federal government could determine Native families
1876 to be "incompetent" and take their allotted land. For example, the federal government took a significant
1877 amount of land from Port Madison Reservation, which had been created by the Treaty of Point Elliott in
1878 1855, through this process. By the early 1900's, the Port Madison Reservation became a "checkerboard"
1879 reservation with some land owned by the Suquamish and some land owned by non-Natives or the federal
1880 government, making building housing difficult. The federal government claimed part of this land and sold it
1881 to developers, who then used racial restrictive covenants to only allow for White homebuyers.²¹⁷

1882
1883 By 1910, Seattle's settler population surged and about 1,000 to 3,000 Native people experienced
1884 homelessness, and some starved to death. Today, King County government exists on and exerts power over
1885 land that is expropriated from Indigenous people. Despite being the original stewards of this land, and
1886 bearing unfair treatment for centuries, Indigenous people continue to be uniquely burdened today.²¹⁸

1887 1888 *Chinese Exclusion (1864-mid 1880s)*

1889 In 1864, the Washington Territory passed an alien land law that allowed non-citizens to own land, but this
1890 was designed to use White immigrants to displace Indigenous communities. During this time, Chinese
1891 populations and immigration grew in the region, including in a bustling enclave in Seattle called

²⁰⁶ Native Land Digital. (2023). *Native Land Map*. [\[link\]](#)

²⁰⁷ Ishisaka, N. (2022, October 17). Why we should transfer 'land back' to Indigenous people. *The Seattle Times*.

²⁰⁸ Governor's Office of Indian Affairs. *Treaty of Point Elliot, 1855*. [\[link\]](#)

²⁰⁹ Governor's Office of Indian Affairs. *Treaty of Medicine Creek, 1854*. [\[link\]](#)

²¹⁰ Grant, N. (2021). *White Supremacy and the Alien Land Laws of Washington State*. The Seattle Civil Rights and Labor History Project. [\[link\]](#)

²¹¹ Wilma, D (2000). *Dawes Severalty Act divides Indian reservations among individual members on February 8, 1887*. History Link. [\[link\]](#)

²¹² Wilma, J. (2023). *Homesteading and Indigenous Dispossession*. American Panorama. [\[link\]](#)

²¹³ Ott, J. (2014). *Seattle Board of Trustees passes ordinance, calling for removal of Indians from the town, on February 7, 1865*. History Link. [\[link\]](#)

²¹⁴ King County (2015). *Reflecting on an act of discrimination: County Council recognizes Native American Expulsion Remembrance Day*. [\[link\]](#)

²¹⁵ Also referred to as the General Allotment Act

²¹⁶ Canby, W. C. (2019). *American Indian Law in a Nutshell*. 7th Edition 2020. pgs. 24-28.

²¹⁷ Reyna, L. (2023). Suquamish use federal cash to build housing, bring citizens back. *Crosscut*. [\[link\]](#)

²¹⁸ Land, T. (2020, November 9). For the Duwamish tribe, Seattle's first people, injustice echoes today. *King 5*. [\[link\]](#)

1892 Chinatown.²¹⁹ Anti-Chinese sentiment grew in the region during the hard economic times of the 1870's and
1893 mid-1880's as White workers viewed Chinese residents as economic competition because businesses
1894 generally paid Chinese workers less than White workers.²²⁰ The federal government passed the Chinese
1895 Exclusion Act in 1882, halting nearly all Chinese immigration for ten years.²²¹ After this law passed, Seattle
1896 Mayor Henry Yesler and Judge Thomas Burke advocated for the expulsion of Chinese residents in Seattle. In
1897 the mid-1880's, the anti-Chinese sentiment began to turn violent with the goal of pushing Chinese residents
1898 out of the region.²²² On September 28, 1885, labor organizations and other community members from
1899 multiple cities in Western Washington met in Seattle to organize to drive Chinese residents from the
1900 Washington Territory, advocating for the use of force if necessary. In the months following this meeting,
1901 Chinese residents were attacked in and driven out from Squak (renamed Issaquah in 1899), the Black
1902 Diamond area, and Tacoma.²²³

1903
1904 By February 1886, about 400 Chinese residents, approximately half of the Chinese residents who had lived
1905 in Seattle and nearly five percent of the City's population, left the area due to the threats of violence. In
1906 February 1885, a violent mob of Seattle residents used force to push nearly 300 Chinese residents onto
1907 ships leaving Seattle. Gradually, the remaining Chinese residents also left the area, only leaving a few dozen
1908 Chinese residents in Seattle. The Chinese population in Seattle did not return to the 1885 population levels
1909 of 950 people for twenty years. In 1889, Washington adopted a state constitution that restricted non-citizens
1910 from owning land in most situations. Due to the federal government's Immigration Act of 1790, Asian
1911 people were prohibited from becoming naturalized citizens during this time.²²⁴

Alien Land Laws and Japanese Internment and Incarceration (early 1900s-1967)

1913 By the early 1900's, the Japanese community grew significantly in the United States. The Japanese
1914 community found significant economic success, with one Japanese-owned business for every 22 Japanese
1915 residents. Hostility from White Washingtonians grew significantly in reaction to the economic success of the
1916 Japanese community. In 1921, Washington adopted the Alien Land Law, which went further than the state
1917 constitutional prohibition of non-citizen land ownership by barring non-citizens from leasing or renting land.
1918 This was passed after Japanese people became prominent farmers in the region, including on Vashon
1919 Island, Renton and South King County.^{225,226}

1920
1921
1922 After the 1941 bombing of Pearl Harbor, the American government forcibly removed and imprisoned
1923 110,000 people of Japanese ancestry, two-thirds of whom were American citizens from the West Coast.²²⁷
1924 The U.S. interned and incarcerated far more Japanese people than people of other ancestries connected to
1925 the Axis powers, such as German and Italian residents. Seattle news coverage during World War II shows
1926 that non-Japanese residents felt more intense racial animosity towards Japanese people than German or
1927 Italian people.²²⁸

1928
1929 Japanese residents who were interned or incarcerated during World War II often lost their homes,
1930 businesses, and farms.²²⁹ After Japanese people were interned and incarcerated, a group of farmers and
1931 businessmen from the Auburn Valley stole their property and advocated against their return to the West

²¹⁹ Grant, N., "Alien Land Laws." [\[link\]](#)

²²⁰ Dougherty, P. (2013). *Mobs forcibly expel most of Seattle's Chinese residents beginning on February 7, 1886*. Historylink. [\[link\]](#)

²²¹ Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882, Pub. L. No. 47-71, 22 Stat. 58 (1882). [\[link\]](#)

²²² Dougherty, P., "Mobs." [\[link\]](#)

²²³ Dougherty, P., "Mobs." [\[link\]](#)

²²⁴ Grant, N., "Alien Land Laws." [\[link\]](#)

²²⁵ Haulman, B, and Larson, A. (2005). Mary Matsuda Gruenawald. *Vashon History*. [\[link\]](#)

²²⁶ Boba, E. (2020). *Japanese growers in the Renton area are among families ordered incarcerated on May 5, 1942*. History Link. [\[link\]](#)

²²⁷ Takami, D. (1998). *World War II Japanese American Internment—Seattle/King County*. History Link. [\[link\]](#)

²²⁸ Krona, R. (2004-2020). *World War II and Japanese Internment in the Seattle Star*. The Seattle Civil Rights & Labor Project History. [\[link\]](#)

²²⁹ Krona, R., "Japanese Internment." [\[link\]](#)

1932 Coast.^{230,231} For those who did return, the league advocated for boycotting Japanese-grown produce and
1933 were against landowners renting or selling their land to former internees. Most Japanese farmers from the
1934 Renton area and Vashon Island did not return after they were released from incarceration.^{232,233} For those
1935 that did return, the Alien Land Laws continued restricting their access to land until the law's repeal in 1967.
1936 While the Alien Land Law was passed by Washington State, King County did its due diligence in enforcing it.
1937 A 1923 newspaper article explains how a King County Superior Court Judge fined a realtor \$750 for aiding
1938 and abetting M. Miyagawa in owning farmland on Vashon Island.²³⁴

1939

1940 *Racial Restrictive Covenants (1920s-1960s)*

1941 Racial restrictive covenants refer to various types of documents such as deeds, plats, and homeowner's
1942 association's bylaws, used by property owners to restrict the sale of a property to someone based on their
1943 race and sometimes religion. Property owners recorded racial restrictive covenants with the King County
1944 auditor's office to protect the legal validity of the documents.²³⁵ In the early 20th century, the use of racial
1945 restrictive covenants increased in King County as the region's Black population increased.^{236,237} Private land
1946 development companies, homeowners, and neighborhood groups utilized these covenants to block Black
1947 and other people of color (and sometimes Jewish) households from moving into certain neighborhoods.²³⁸
1948 The federal government endorsed the practice, with the Federal Housing Administration (FHA)
1949 recommending the use of racial restrictive covenants to safeguard neighborhoods from declining property
1950 values because they believed the presence of non-White residents in a neighborhood would lower its
1951 property values. The FHA's 1935 *Underwriting Manual* states, "If a neighborhood is to retain stability it is
1952 necessary that properties shall continue to be occupied by the same social and racial classes. A change in
1953 social or racial occupancy generally leads to instability and a reduction in values."²³⁹ Racial restrictive
1954 covenants were an enforceable contract and homeowners risked forfeiting their property if they violated it
1955 by selling their home to a restricted party.

1956

1957 Deeds with racial restrictive covenants have been found in several properties and neighborhoods
1958 throughout unincorporated King County, such as Fall City, Vashon Island, and White Center. For example,
1959 Boulevard Park's Cedarhurst Division 1 & 2, covering 208 parcels, had a covenant that read:

1960 *No part of said property shall ever be used or occupied by any person of the Ethiopian,*
1961 *Malay, of any Asiatic race, and the grantees, their heirs, personal representatives or assigns,*
1962 *shall never place any such person in the possession or occupancy of said property, or any*
1963 *part thereof, nor permit the said property, or any part thereof, ever to be used or occupied*
1964 *by any such person excepting only employees in the domestic service on the premises of*
1965 *persons qualified hereunder as occupants and users and residing on the premises.*²⁴⁰

1966

1967 Racial Restrictive covenants heavily impacted the racial makeup of a neighborhood because excluded
1968 households were forced to live in areas that did not have such covenants. For example, in Seattle, this
1969 confined Black, Indigenous, and People of Color households to the Central District and the International
1970 District, as they were considered among the very few "open neighborhoods." Black and other households of
1971 color were forced into the rental market because racial restrictive covenants blocked homeownership
1972 opportunities during a time when home prices were much more affordable for first time homebuyers than

²³⁰ Hobbs, A. (2017, February). *75 Years Ago, Japanese Internment Sparked Economic and Cultural Fears*. The Olympian. [\[link\]](#)

²³¹ Small, A. (1945, August 12). Outsider looks at Pacific Northwest. *The Seattle Times*. Accessed via the Seattle Public Library Archives.

²³² Boba, E., "Japanese Growers." [link](#)

²³³ Densho (2023). *Terminology*. [link](#)

²³⁴ Seattle Daily Times (1923, June 3). Realty Man Convicted Under Alien Land Law. *Seattle Daily Times*. [link](#)

²³⁵ Racial Restrictive Covenants Project Washington State (2022). *Understanding Racial Restrictive Covenants and their Legacy*. Civil Rights and Labor History Consortium / University of Washington. [link](#)

²³⁶ Silva, C. (2009). *Racial Restrictive Covenants History*. The Seattle Civil Rights and Labor History Project. [link](#)

²³⁷ Abe, D., Taylor, Q. (2014). From Memphis and Mogadishu: The History of African Americans in King County, Washington, 1858-2014. *BlackPast*. [link](#)

²³⁸ Silva, C., *Racial Restrictive Covenants History*. [link](#)

²³⁹ Rothstein, R., *Color of Law*.

²⁴⁰ University of Washington's Seattle Civil Rights and Labor History Project (2004-2020). *Racial Restrictive Covenants*. [link](#)

1973 they are today. This significantly impeded on their ability to build equity and generational wealth.²⁴¹ These
1974 racial restrictive covenants significantly lowered the housing supply available to Black and other residents of
1975 color, leading to an increase in rental prices for those communities.²⁴²
1976
1977 In 1917, the Supreme Court ruled in *Buchanan v. Warley* that the U.S. Constitution prohibited racial
1978 segregation ordinances. This ended state-sponsored racial restrictions on property, but the Court did not
1979 stop the private market's use of certain segregationist tools.²⁴³ This led to the proliferation of racial restrictive
1980 covenants across King County between the 1920s through 1948 adopted by the private market. In 1948, the
1981 Supreme Court ruled in *Shelley v. Kraemer* that racial restrictive covenants violate the Fourteenth
1982 Amendment and were legally unenforceable by the government. While this served as a milestone against
1983 the use of racial restrictive covenants, it did not end their use. While they were not legally enforceable, they
1984 also were not illegal to establish and enforce privately.²⁴⁴ King County did not pass fair housing legislation
1985 that prohibited racial restrictive covenants until 1964.²⁴⁵
1986
1987 Through the 1960s, Black communities continued to be blocked and excluded from housing in Washington
1988 because of their race. According to a 1961 Washington Law Review article, large portions of the housing
1989 market exclude Black, Indigenous, and People of Color communities "for reasons apart from their personal
1990 worth or ability to pay."²⁴⁶ This report stated that new housing went to White residents, who already had a
1991 larger housing supply available to them.²⁴⁷ This led to Black, Indigenous, and People of Color communities,
1992 particularly Black residents, paying more for housing compared to White residents.
1993
1994 Nationally, Black households who managed to purchase a home despite racist barriers, paid interest rates
1995 far beyond what White households paid.²⁴⁸ Nationally and locally, disparities in interest rates were common
1996 throughout much of the 20th century and continue to occur today.^{249,250,251} Black households were willing to
1997 pay these high housing costs because the housing supply available to them was so limited.²⁵²
1998
1999 Housing discrimination became illegal for both private and public market actors when the federal
2000 government passed the 1968 Fair Housing Act.²⁵³ Locally, the legacy of racial restrictive covenants lives on
2001 through sustained patterns of segregation and lack of Black, Indigenous, and People of Color, namely Black,
2002 household wealth.^{254,255,256}
2003
2004 *Long-Term Economic Impact of Explicitly Racist Discriminatory Policies (1950s-Present)*
2005 Private and public actors' enforcement of explicit racial discriminatory policies and practices that blocked
2006 homeownership opportunities for Black, Indigenous, and People of Color residents critically contributed to

²⁴¹ Racial Restrictive Covenants Project Washington State (2022). *Homeownership by race 1960-2020 - King County*. Civil Rights and Labor History Consortium/University of Washington. [\[link\]](#)

²⁴² Up for Growth and ECONorthwest (2020). *Housing Underproduction in Washington State*. Up for Growth. [\[link\]](#)

²⁴³ Majumdar, R. (2007). Racially Restrictive Covenants in the State of Washington: A Primer for Practitioners. *Seattle University Law Review*: 30 (1095-1117). [\[link\]](#)

²⁴⁴ Silva, C., *Racial Restrictive Covenants History*. [\[link\]](#)

²⁴⁵ King County Resolution 27544 (1964).

²⁴⁶ Morris, A. & Ritter, D. (1962). *Racial Minority Housing in Washington*. (Volume 37). Washington Law Review. [\[link\]](#). Page 132.

²⁴⁷ King County Department of Community and Human Services. (2021). *Initial Health through Housing Implementation Plan 2022-2028*. [\[link\]](#)

²⁴⁸ Rothstein, R., *Color of Law*.

²⁴⁹ Hanifa, R. (2021). *High-income Black homeowners receive higher interest rates than low-income white homeowners*. Joint Center for Housing Studies of Harvard University. [\[link\]](#)

²⁵⁰ Central Seattle Community Council Federation. (1975). *Redlining and Disinvestment in Central Seattle: How Banks are Destroying our Neighborhoods*. Seattle Archives. [\[link\]](#)

²⁵¹ Logani, I. (2021). *The Racial Wealth Gap is the Housing Gap*. The Office of Lieutenant Governor Denny Heck. [\[link\]](#)

²⁵² Rothstein, R., *Color of Law*.

²⁵³ Racial Restrictive Covenants Project Washington State, *Understanding Racial Restrictive Covenants and their Legacy*. [\[link\]](#)

²⁵⁴ Silva, C. (2009). *Racial Restrictive Covenants History*. The Seattle Civil Rights and Labor History Project. [\[link\]](#)

²⁵⁵ Logani, I., "Racial Wealth Gap." [\[link\]](#)

²⁵⁶ 2019 King County Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice. [\[link\]](#)

2007 the racial wealth gap. Homeownership has consistently been the primary, most effective mechanism for
2008 wealth building in the U.S.²⁵⁷
2009
2010 In 1950, the King County homeownership rate for Black, Indigenous, and People of Color households was
2011 nearly 30 percent less than the White homeownership rate reflecting the impact of racial restrictive
2012 covenants, redlining, and other discriminatory housing practices, in addition to employment and wage
2013 discrimination.^{258,259} Between 1960 to 1970, there was a slight increase in Black, Indigenous, and People of
2014 Color homeownership rates in King County. Between 1970 to 1980, Black, Indigenous, and People of Color
2015 homeownership rates decreased from 50 percent to 45 percent, never surpassing the 50 percent peak,
2016 likely reflective of the exponential increase in housing prices at the time.^{260,261} As described in the *Household*
2017 *Characteristics* section, Black households in unincorporated King County are still far more likely to be
2018 renters, whereas White and Asian households in unincorporated King County are more likely to own their
2019 home.²⁶²
2020
2021 Home values began exponentially increasing in the 1970's, pushing homeownership out of reach for many
2022 Black families. By the time federal, state, and local governments outlawed explicitly racist housing policies in
2023 the mid-twentieth century, White Americans had already built substantial wealth from appreciating home
2024 values that Black families had been previously blocked from buying due to their race.²⁶³ According to
2025 estimates by ECONorthwest, King County Black, Indigenous, and People of Color households lost between
2026 \$12 billion and \$34 billion intergenerationally since 1950. ECONorthwest based this estimate on the loss of
2027 wealth from not realizing home value appreciation over time, rental payments that never turned into wealth,
2028 and wealth lost to lower home value appreciations for Black, Indigenous, and People of Color-owned homes
2029 compared to White-owned homes. Black households were the most disproportionately impacted by this
2030 loss of wealth. Black households lost a range of \$105,000 to \$306,000 per household, compared to other
2031 non-White households who lost between \$32,000 and \$85,000 per household. In addition to the housing
2032 barriers imposed by this racial wealth gap, post-1970s practices such as exclusionary zoning,
2033 underinvestment, lack of housing stability policies, and displacement contribute to racial housing injustices
2034 that exist currently.
2035
2036 While the racially discriminatory housing policies discussed in this analysis significantly contribute to the
2037 racial wealth gap, racial discrimination in other sectors, such as education and employment, intersect and
2038 compound racial economic injustices. As described in the *Workforce Profile* section, wage gaps exist
2039 between people with lower and higher levels of education and there are stark wage differences by race and
2040 ethnicity in King County. Due to barriers of access, large percentages of Black, Native, and Latin(a)(o)(x)
2041 people in the Seattle region do not have college degrees which hinders one's ability to secure a living wage
2042 job. However, increasing educational attainment alone will not alleviate racial workforce inequities. In the
2043 Seattle region, White workers without a high school diploma earn about the same income on average as
2044 Black workers with an associate degree.²⁶⁴ Discrimination in housing, education, employment, and other
2045 institutions, interact with and compound one another to result in certain racial groups having significantly
2046 lower incomes than others.²⁶⁵ As a result, many Black, Indigenous, and People of Color households have
2047 lower levels of wealth and can be systematically excluded from neighborhoods with higher housing prices.

²⁵⁷ Logani, I., "Racial Wealth Gap." [\[link\]](#)

²⁵⁸ ECONorthwest. (2023). *Redlining and Wealth Loss: Measuring the Historical Impacts of Racist Housing Practices in King County*, Appendix B to *Impact of Redlining and Racist Real Estate Practices on King County Residents - Wastewater Capacity Charge Exemption Recommendations*. [\[link\]](#)

²⁵⁹ ECONorthwest analysis of National Historical GIS data (IPUMS, 1940-2000 and American Community Survey 5- Year, 2019)

²⁶⁰ ECONorthwest, "Redlining and Wealth Loss." [\[link\]](#)

²⁶¹ ECONorthwest analysis of National Historical GIS data (IPUMS, 1940-2000 and American Community Survey 5- Year, 2019)

²⁶² U.S. Census Bureau. (2022) *Age Range by Tenure, 5-year ACS 2016-2020*

²⁶³ Racial Restrictive Covenants Project Washington State (2022). *Homeownership by race 1960-2020 - King County*. Civil Rights and Labor History Consortium/University of Washington. [\[link\]](#)

²⁶⁴ Langston, et al. (2021). *Advancing Workforce Equity In Seattle A Blueprint for Action*. PolicyLink and USC Equity Research Institute. [\[link\]](#)

²⁶⁵ Mineo, L. (2021). A look at how and why we got there and what we can do about it. *The Harvard Gazette*. [\[link\]](#)

2048 B. Policies with a Racially Disparate Impact

2049 The 20th century civil rights movement made great strides toward eliminating explicitly racist housing
2050 policies through laws like the Fair Housing Act. At the same time, however, jurisdictions continued to
2051 exacerbate racially disparate impacts in housing through seemingly race-neutral policies, such as zoning,
2052 lack of investment in communities of color, and lack of housing stability policies. This section summarizes
2053 the County's fair housing law, tenant protections, and policies that contribute to racial disparities in housing
2054 in unincorporated King County.

2055 *Weaknesses in Fair Housing Protections*

2056 In 1964, King County prohibited explicit racial discrimination in the housing market in response to the
2057 activism of the civil rights movement.²⁶⁶ Over time, the federal, state, and many local governments, including
2058 King County, have adopted strong fair housing protections. In practice, however, these laws do not fully
2059 prevent racially disparate outcomes in the housing market. Black, Indigenous, and People of Color residents
2060 in unincorporated King County have been more likely to rent than own compared to White residents over
2061 the past several decades. Research has found racial discrimination in the rental market, in particular racial
2062 discrimination against Black tenants.^{267,268,269} Fair housing laws are difficult to enforce, especially without
2063 other tenant protections in place.^{270, 271,272} In addition, the effectiveness of fair housing protections is
2064 reduced if housing regulations and policies, such as zoning and investment decisions, are not designed to
2065 ensure housing access to every income level.

2066 *King County's First Fair Housing Law*

2067 In the mid-twentieth century, Washington State and local governments began considering legislation to
2068 prohibit racial discrimination in the real estate market. In 1957, unincorporated King County residents were
2069 covered by limited fair housing protections through the passage of the state Law Against Discrimination.²⁷³
2070 Under this law, tenants could not be denied publicly assisted housing because of race, creed, color, or
2071 national origin, but the law did not apply to private-market housing.²⁷⁴ In the 1959 case *O'Meara v. Board of*
2072 *Discrimination*, the Washington State Supreme Court struck down the provision of the law relating to
2073 housing because the law did not apply the anti-discrimination requirements equally to both publicly
2074 assisted and private housing.²⁷⁵ In 1962, President John F. Kennedy signed Executive Order 11063 which
2075 prohibited discrimination because of race, color, creed, or national origin in federally owned and assisted
2076 housing.²⁷⁶ Washington State and King County did not adopt any protections against racial discrimination in
2077 private housing for unincorporated King County residents until 1964.

2080 In 1964, King County was the first jurisdiction in Washington State to pass a law prohibiting discrimination in
2081 private real estate transactions, four years before the federal Fair Housing Act of 1968.²⁷⁷ The law prohibited
2082 discrimination in the public and private housing market in unincorporated King County based on race,
2083

²⁶⁶ King County Resolution 27544 (1964).
²⁶⁷ Schwemm, R.G. (2007). Why Do Landlords Still Discriminate (and What Can Be Done About It)?, *The John Marshal Law Review*, 40(2), 455-511. [\[link\]](#)
²⁶⁸ Johnson, O. (2011). The last plank: rethinking public and private power to advance fair housing. *University of Pennsylvania Journal of Constitutional Law*, 13(5), 1191-1234.
²⁶⁹ Rosen, E., Garboden, P. M. E., & Cossyleon, J. E. (2021). Racial Discrimination in Housing: How Landlords Use Algorithms and Home Visits to Screen Tenants. *American Sociological Review*, 86(5), 787-822.
²⁷⁰ Routhier, G. The Case for Considering Renter Insecurity as an Indicator of Federal Fair Housing Progress. *J. Hum. Rights Soc. Work* 6, 287-297 (2021).
²⁷¹ Tighe, J. R., Hatch, M. E., & Mead, J. (2017). Source of Income Discrimination and Fair Housing Policy. *Journal of Planning Literature*, 32(1), 3-15.
²⁷² Oyama, R. (2009). Do not (re)enter: the rise of criminal background tenant screening as violation of the fair housing act. *Michigan Journal of Race & Law*, 15(1), 181-222.
²⁷³ Washington State Legislature (1957). Session Laws of the State of Washington Regular Session, Thirty-Fifth Legislature. Chapter 37. p. 107.
²⁷⁴ Washington State Legislature (1949) Senate Bill 12. [\[link\]](#)
²⁷⁵ *O'Meara v. Board Against Discrimination*. 58 Wn.2d 793 (1961). [\[link\]](#)
²⁷⁶ Executive Order 11063, 3 C.F.R. 652 (1962) [\[link\]](#)
²⁷⁷ Smith, L. (1965, December 12). Statewide Parley: United Effort to Solve Race Issues Urged. *Seattle Daily Times*.

2084 color, religion, ancestry, or national origin. The law was very controversial when it was passed, with 543
2085 people delivering petitions to the County in opposition to the law.²⁷⁸ This fair housing law also had
2086 significant support, including from the King County School District Superintendent Donald L. Kruzner, East
2087 Shore Unitarian Church, and Clyde Hill Baptist Church.^{279, 280, 281}
2088

2089 The County law was adopted a day before Seattle voters voted down a similar fair housing measure.²⁸² At
2090 the time, unincorporated King County residents were unable to pursue referendums, preventing the law
2091 from being overturned on the ballot.²⁸³ King County Prosecutor Charles O. Carroll claimed the ordinance
2092 was adopted in an illegal manner, so he refused to enforce the measure.²⁸⁴ Between the time this law was
2093 passed and the federal Fair Housing Act of 1968 was adopted, no complaints were filed, likely because the
2094 County Prosecutor publicly refused to investigate complaints.²⁸⁵ Even if there were no housing
2095 discrimination complaints filed under this law, Black, Indigenous, and People of Color residents, especially
2096 Black residents, clearly faced housing discrimination during this time period, including violence. For
2097 example, soon after several Black families moved to an unincorporated area near Kent, someone shot at
2098 their homes in the middle of the night.^{286,287} Soon after this incident, another Black resident's home in the
2099 area was bombed.^{288,289}
2100

2101 *Adding Additional Protected Classes to Fair Housing Laws*

2102 The County's early fair housing laws made significant progress towards racial justice by prohibiting
2103 discrimination based on race, color, religion, ancestry, and national origin. These first fair housing laws did
2104 not include sex and familial status.²⁹⁰ When multiple historically underrepresented identities intersect, the
2105 difficulty in attaining housing compounds, especially for Black, Indigenous, and People of Color residents.²⁹¹
2106 In addition, these anti-discrimination laws provided Black, Indigenous, and People of Color residents with
2107 limited protections because government and private actors continued to adopt policies with a racially
2108 discriminatory impact without overtly discriminating based on race.^{292, 293}
2109

2110 In 1974, the federal government amended the Fair Housing Act to add sex as a protected class.²⁹⁴ King
2111 County revisited the open-housing law in 1980.²⁹⁵ The most controversial part of the proposed County
2112 ordinance was prohibiting discrimination based on parental status.^{296,297} During the 1970's, many Puget

²⁷⁸ Williams, F. (1964, March 7). Petition Hist County's Open Housing Act. *Seattle Post-Intelligencer*.

²⁷⁹ Buckingham, M., Board Chairman of Missions for Clyde Hill. (1964, January 22). *Letter to King County Commissioners*. Puget Sound Regional Archives. King County Miscellaneous Filing 8262.

²⁸⁰ Logan, G. President of Board of Trustees for East Shore Unitarian Church. (1964, February 10). *Letter to King County Commissioners*. Puget Sound Regional Archives. King County Miscellaneous Filing 8270.

²⁸¹ Kruzner, D., King County Schools Superintendent. (1964, March 4). *Letter to King County Commissioners*. Puget Sound Regional Archives. King County Miscellaneous Filing 8282

²⁸² (1964, March 11). Braman Elected; Open Housing, Transit Amendment Are Swamped. *Seattle Post-Intelligencer*.

²⁸³ Washington State Attorney General. (1964, March 13). *Counties -Legislative Power - County Commissioners - Initiative and Referendum - No Constitutional or Statutory Provision Providing for Direct Legislation by County Residents*. AGO 63-64 No. 91.

[\[link\]](#)

²⁸⁴ Williams, F. (1964, March 17). County Open Housing Held Not Subject to Referendum. *Seattle Post-Intelligencer*.

²⁸⁵ Bergsman, J. (1968, April 18). County Has Not Had to Invoke Its Housing Law. *Seattle Daily Times*.

²⁸⁶ Wright, D. (1963, October 27). Shotgun Fired at 2 Negro Homes. *Seattle Daily Times*.

²⁸⁷ As noted in the introduction, some terms to describe racial groups throughout history are not appropriate. This section includes citations that use this language, to portray the historical context as accurately as possible.

²⁸⁸ Youths Bomb Negro Home in Kent Area. (1963, November 1). *Seattle Daily Times*.

²⁸⁹ As noted in the introduction, some terms to describe racial groups throughout history are not appropriate. This section includes citations that use this language to portray the historical context as accurately as possible.

²⁹⁰ King County Resolution 27544 (1964).

²⁹¹ Beltran, T., Allen, A. M., Lin, J., Turner, C., Ozer, E. J., & Wilson, E. C. (2019). Intersectional Discrimination Is Associated with Housing Instability among Trans Women Living in the San Francisco Bay Area. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 16(22), 4521.

²⁹² Davidson, M., & Turner, W. (1970). Fair housing and federal law: where are we. *Human Rights*, 1(1), 36-58.

²⁹³ Glasser, G. (1975). The fair housing act of 1968: its success and failure. *Suffolk University Law Review*, 9(4), 1312-1339.

²⁹⁴ United States Senate Bill 3066 (1974) *Housing and Community Development Act of 1974* [\[link\]](#)

²⁹⁵ King County Proposed Ordinance 80-246 (1980).

²⁹⁶ King, W. (1981, January 6). Council delays housing-bias revisions. *Seattle Daily Times*.

²⁹⁷ King, W. (1981, January 13). Housing: County Council bans bias against children. *Seattle Daily Times*.

2113 Sound families, including in unincorporated King County, were discriminated against in the rental market for
2114 having children, ranging from being evicted due to children, charged higher rent, or denied
2115 housing.^{298,299,300,301,302,303,304}
2116
2117 Research performed in the 1970's and 1980's found that exclusionary policies against families with children
2118 were more prevalent in tight rental markets and that these policies affected Black, Indigenous, and People
2119 of Color and female-headed families more than White and male-headed families.³⁰⁵ According to the *Seattle*
2120 *Daily Times*, the vacancy rate in unincorporated King County while the Council was deliberating the
2121 ordinances ranged between two to four percent, indicating a tight market that put families with children at a
2122 disadvantage compared to households without children, likely creating a racially disparate impact.³⁰⁶
2123 Unincorporated King County residents delivered a petition with hundreds of signatures opposed to the
2124 ordinance to the King County Council, similarly to the petition opposing the County's first fair housing
2125 law.³⁰⁷
2126
2127 After a year of deliberation, the King County Council passed Ordinance 5280 in 1981 which expanded the
2128 law to include prohibitions against discrimination based on age, sex, marital status, sexual orientation,
2129 disability, and some limited prohibitions on discrimination based on family status. Under this law,
2130 apartments with an adults-only policy prior to the adoption of the ordinance could maintain that policy
2131 under the ordinance. The ordinance also allowed apartments with 40 or more units to consider familial
2132 status so long as at least half of the units were rented out without regard to familial status. The King County
2133 Code was amended again in 1986 to define marital status and amend enforcement procedures.³⁰⁸ In 1991,
2134 the code was amended to allow for housing for people 55 years of age and older as an exception to the
2135 protections for families with children.³⁰⁹
2136
2137 In 1988, the federal government passed the Fair Housing Amendments Act which added disability and
2138 familial status to classes protected against housing discrimination and created administrative enforcement
2139 authority for HUD. This law also significantly limited adults-only policies allowed in housing projects.³¹⁰ In
2140 1992, King County Executive Tim Hill transmitted an ordinance to amend the County's fair housing laws to
2141 be substantially equivalent to the federal Fair Housing Act so the County could continue to receive federal
2142 funding for fair housing activities.³¹¹
2143
2144 Later that year, the King County Council passed the ordinance which, in addition to aligning with the federal
2145 law, also made participation in the Section 8 program (called Housing Choice Vouchers today) a protected
2146 class, 26 years before Washington state.^{312,313} The County added Section 8 program participation as a
2147 protected class to increase access to housing for low-income households.³¹⁴ Black, Indigenous, and People

²⁹⁸ Fancher, M. (1979, March 9). Royer, Hildt seek broad open-housing law. *Seattle Daily Times*.

²⁹⁹ Suffia, D. (1979, January 3). St. Albion tenants take battle to court. *Seattle Daily Times*.

³⁰⁰ Reiner, C. (1979, March 16). City Council hearts testimony on renting bias. *Seattle Daily Times*.

³⁰¹ Lane, P. (1979, March 18). Fair housing for families? Well... *Seattle Daily Times*.

³⁰² Rental Classifieds. (1970, January 10.) 2 WEEKS RENT FREE. *Seattle Post-Intelligencer*.

³⁰³ Rental Classifieds. (1973, January 11). DELUXE large 2-Bedroom \$170. *Seattle Post-Intelligencer*.

³⁰⁴ 232 Houses, Unfur., Gen. Classifieds. (1970, January 19). LAKE Washington, 2 ½ bedrooms. *Seattle Daily Times*.

³⁰⁵ Golubock, C. (1983, September 26-27). *Housing Discrimination Against Families with Children: A Growing Problem of Exclusionary Practices*. [Paper presentation]. A Sheltered Crisis: The State of Fair Housing in the Eighties, United States Commission on Civil Rights, Washington, D.C.

³⁰⁶ King, W. (1981, January 6). Council delays housing-bias revisions. *Seattle Daily Times*.

³⁰⁷ Residents of Silverwood Park Apartments. (1981) *Petition to Oppose Ordinance 80-246 in its entirety*. King County Archives. Series 305, Box 105.

³⁰⁸ King County Ordinance 07816 (1986). [\[link\]](#)

³⁰⁹ King County Ordinance 10153 (1991). [\[link\]](#)

³¹⁰ United States House Bill 1158 (1988) *Fair Housing Amendments Act of 1988*. [\[link\]](#)

³¹¹ King County Executive. (1992). *Transmittal to Council to Amend the Fair Housing Ordinance*. King County Archives Series 305, Box 297.

³¹² King County Ordinance 10469 (1998). [\[link\]](#)

³¹³ Revised Code of Washington 59.18.255

³¹⁴ Lee, M. Administrator of King County Office of Civil Rights and Compliance. (1992). *Fair Housing Ordinance Amendments Memorandum*. King County Archives. Series 663, Box 7.

2148 of Color residents, women, and people with disabilities are disproportionately represented among Housing
2149 Choice Voucher recipients, so prohibiting discrimination against these program participants improves
2150 housing access for these individuals.^{315,316}

2151
2152 King County amended the fair housing law to update enforcement provisions in 1998 and reflect County
2153 departmental reorganization in 2001.^{317,318} In 2006, Washington State amended state laws against
2154 discrimination to include sexual orientation, which was defined to also include gender identity.³¹⁹ King
2155 County then added gender identity to its housing, employment, and public accommodation laws.³²⁰ In
2156 2018, King County amended the housing anti-discrimination protections for Section 8 program participants
2157 to include all alternative sources of income, such as Social Security benefits and child support.³²¹ The
2158 County's fair housing law was most recently updated in 2019 when the County passed an ordinance to
2159 ensure the definition of service animal aligned with the State's definition and sexual orientation and gender
2160 identity were separated into distinct protected classes.³²²

2161 The Fair Housing Act applies to policies that have a discriminatory effect on protected classes, not just
2162 explicitly discriminatory policies and actions. Soon after the federal government passed the Fair Housing
2163 Act, civil rights activists throughout the country pushed the legal theory through lawsuits that policies that
2164 create a disparate impact, even if not overtly discriminating against a protected class, could violate the Fair
2165 Housing Act.³²³ In 1974, the 8th Circuit Court of Appeals in St. Louis ruled that policies with a discriminatory
2166 effect, even if not overtly discriminatory, could violate the Fair Housing Act of 1968.³²⁴ Over the years,
2167 different federal circuits adopted different standards for plaintiffs to prove discriminatory effect, making it
2168 difficult for people to bring cases relying on this concept. In 2015, the Supreme Court ruled that disparate
2169 impact claims could be brought under the Fair Housing Act, however, the plaintiff's burden of proof is
2170 incredibly high.³²⁵

2171
2172 *Just-Cause Eviction Protections and Fair Housing*

2173 King County adopted local fair housing protections often before the federal and state governments, but the
2174 lack of tenant protections such as just-cause eviction protections significantly reduced the effectiveness of
2175 these ordinances.³²⁶ Just-cause eviction protections, which limit the reasons a landlord could evict a tenant,
2176 did not exist statewide or in unincorporated King County until 2021.³²⁷

2177
2178 Prior to these tenant protections, a landlord could evict an unincorporated King County tenant with no
2179 cause, making it difficult for any tenant to prove racial discrimination led to the eviction.³²⁸ In 2019,
2180 unincorporated King County had more no-cause evictions filed than any other jurisdiction countywide.³²⁹
2181 That year, 19.8 percent of all no-cause evictions in King County were in unincorporated King County, even
2182 though only 3.5 percent of King County renter households lived in unincorporated King County (13,894

³¹⁵ Tighe, J. R., Hatch, M., and Mead, J. (2016, October 7). Source of Income Discrimination and Fair Housing Policy. *Journal of Planning Literature*, 32(1), 3-15.

³¹⁶ Fasanelli, A. and Tegeler, P. (2019, November 30). Your Money's No Good Here: Combatting Source of Income Discrimination in Housing. *American Bar Association Human Rights Magazine*. 44(3).

³¹⁷ King County Ordinance 10469 (1998). [[link](#)]

³¹⁸ King County Ordinance 14199 (2001). [[link](#)]

³¹⁹ Washington State Legislature (2006) House Bill 2661 [[link](#)]

³²⁰ Chan, S. (2006, March 28). Civil-rights protection OK'd for transgender individuals. *Seattle Times*.

³²¹ King County Ordinance 18708 (2018) [[link](#)]

³²² King County Ordinance 19026 (2019) [[link](#)]

³²³ Ahrend, K. (1996). Effect, or No Effect: A Comparison of Prima Facie Standards Applied in "Disparate Impact" Cases Brought Under the Fair Housing Act (Title VIII). *Washington and Lee Journal of Civil Rights and Social Justice*. (2)1.

³²⁴ *United States v. City of Black Jack, Missouri*, 508 F.2d 1179 (8th Cir. 1974)

³²⁵ *Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs v. Inclusive Communities Project, Inc.* 576 U.S. ___ (2015)

³²⁶ Vasquez, J. and Gallagher, S. (2022). *Promoting Housing Stability Through Just-Cause Eviction Legislation*. National Low Income Housing Coalition. [[link](#)]

³²⁷ King County Ordinance 19311(2021). [[link](#)]

³²⁸ Smith, R. (2019, February 8). Landlord Goes Off on Racist Ramble at Hearing for Eviction Reform. *The Stranger*. [[link](#)]

³²⁹ King County Bar Association Housing Justice Project. *2019 - A Year of Evictions*. [[link](#)]

2183 households) and only 6.9 percent of all the evictions in the County happened in unincorporated areas.^{330,331}
2184 Evictions disparately impact Black households as they are more likely to be renters than any other racial
2185 group in unincorporated King County.³³²

2186
2187 King County first considered just-cause eviction protections in 1989. That year, King County Executive Tim
2188 Hill transmitted a just-cause eviction ordinance to the Council, but the Council did not adopt the
2189 ordinance.³³³ Tenant advocates pushed for the ordinance to protect tenants from discrimination and
2190 retaliation. King County Councilmember Cynthia Sullivan introduced a just-cause ordinance five times
2191 between 1989 and 1993, but the proposed ordinance was not passed.

2192
2193 During this time, unincorporated tenants raised concerns with King County councilmembers that no-cause
2194 notices were used by landlords as a form of retaliation against tenants who tried to enforce their rights. For
2195 example, in 1992, a property manager in Shoreline, which was unincorporated at the time, sent no-cause
2196 eviction notices to several tenants after they raised concerns about apartment rule changes, filed complaints
2197 with the County about code violations, and filed complaints with HUD about fair housing violations.³³⁴
2198 Tenants sent a letter to their County councilmember regarding the situation, who did reach out to the
2199 property manager, but the Council did not pass a just-cause eviction ordinance.

2200 2201 *2021 Tenant Protections*

2202 In 2021, Washington state passed just-cause eviction statewide.³³⁵ Soon after, the County passed a suite of
2203 tenant protections to help tenants maintain stable housing.³³⁶ The County ordinance:

- 2204 • reduced barriers to housing by limiting upfront charges required at move-in and allowing longer move-
2205 in costs payment plans than what is required in state law;
- 2206 • created more housing stability by providing stronger protections against eviction and requiring a longer
2207 rent increase notice period than what is prescribed in the state law;
- 2208 • protected undocumented tenants by prohibiting landlords from requiring prospective tenants to
2209 provide a Social Security Number; and
- 2210 • adopted other tenant protections.

2211
2212 Since this law passed, landlords will not be able to use no-cause eviction notices to get around fair housing
2213 protections. King County has led both locally and nationally on fair housing protections, such as passing the
2214 first fair housing law in Washington state and providing anti-discrimination protections for Section 8 voucher
2215 participants in 1992 – when most states still do not have this protection in 2023.³³⁷ Fair housing laws have
2216 had some success in reducing overt racial discrimination in housing and housing financing but have not
2217 reduced segregated housing patterns. The success of fair housing protections depends heavily on housing
2218 regulations, such as those that govern the landlord-tenant relationship.³³⁸

2219 2220 *Exclusionary Zoning*

2221 Zoning is a practice used by planners to divide land into different categories based on their designated use
2222 and purpose.³³⁹ In the late 1800s, Germany created the concept of zoning to keep nuisances, such as
2223 polluting industries, away from incompatible land uses such as residential areas.³⁴⁰ Beginning in the early

³³⁰ King County Bar Association Housing Justice Project. *2019 - A Year of Evictions*. [\[link\]](#)

³³¹ U.S. Census Bureau. (2022). *Tenure by Household Size, 5-year ACS 2016-2020*.

³³² U.S. Census Bureau. (2022) *Age Range by Tenure, 5-year ACS 2016-2020*.

³³³ King County Council. (1989, September 13). *Proposed Ordinance 89-740*. King County Archives, Series 307, Box 15.

³³⁴ Pryne, E. (1992, April 24). Tenants Fight Eviction – Seven Families Accuse Manager of Retaliation. *The Seattle Times*.

³³⁵ Washington State Legislature. (2021). House Bill 1236. [\[link\]](#)

³³⁶ King County Ordinance 19311 (2021). [\[link\]](#)

³³⁷ Poverty & Race Research Action Council. (2023). *Expanding Choice: Practical Strategies for Building a Successful Housing Mobility Program*. [\[link\]](#)

³³⁸ Jargowsky, P. (2019). The Fair Housing Act at 50: Successes, Failures, and Future Directions. *Housing Policy Debate*. (29)5.

³³⁹ Municipal Research and Services Center of Washington (2023). *Development Regulations and Zoning*. MRSC. [\[link\]](#)

³⁴⁰ Talen, E. (2012). *Zoning and Diversity in Historical Perspective*. (Volume 11, Issue 4) Sage Journals. [\[link\]](#)

2224 1900's, cities throughout the U.S. adopted zoning policies which were soon leveraged to maintain
2225 segregation.³⁴¹

2226
2227 In 1917, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled in *Buchanan v. Warley* that cities could not explicitly use zoning to
2228 divide cities by race. However, contemporary exclusionary zoning can create the same patterns of
2229 segregation as policies pre- *Buchanan v. Warley*.³⁴² Exclusionary zoning laws restrict the types of homes that
2230 can be built in specific areas. Examples of this include minimum lot size requirements, base densities per
2231 dwelling unit, minimum square footage requirements, building height limits, and disallowing multiunit
2232 homes.³⁴³ Single detached residence zoning, which is prominent in some jurisdictions within King County,
2233 and low-density zoning, which is prominent in unincorporated King County, are considered exclusionary.³⁴⁴
2234 Large minimum lot size requirements are considered a form of exclusionary zoning as they reduce
2235 affordability by restricting the number of dwellings that can exist on a certain sized property.³⁴⁵ Urban
2236 minimum lot area requirements are considered large, and thus exclusionary, when they are at or above
2237 5,000 square feet.³⁴⁶ From 1963-1993, King County's minimum lot area requirements were above 5,000
2238 square feet, in both rural and urban areas.^{347,348}

2239
2240 In the wake of *Buchanan v. Warley*, some planners were explicit in their segregationist goals for zoning.³⁴⁹
2241 The City of Seattle hired St. Louis city planner Harlan Bartholomew as a consultant for Seattle's first zoning
2242 ordinance in 1923. Bartholomew previously stated that his goals in St. Louis's plan were to "preserve the
2243 more desirable residential neighborhoods," and to prevent movement into "finer residential districts ... by
2244 colored people."³⁵⁰ The strategy employed to achieve this was the use of single detached residence zoning,
2245 as Black people often could not afford those homes. However, zoning ordinances did not explicitly use
2246 racial terms such as "Black neighborhoods," so the practice was and is deemed legal under the 1917
2247 *Buchanan v. Warley* Supreme Court ruling.³⁵¹ In the years that followed the 1917 *Buchanan v. Warley*
2248 Supreme Court decision, cities across the country adopted Bartholomew's zoning methods.³⁵²

2249
2250 The Federal Housing Administration (FHA) was established in 1934 to facilitate homeownership throughout
2251 the country, primarily through providing mortgage insurance so banks and other private lenders would offer
2252 more loans to prospective homebuyers. Fueled by FHA-backed programs and subsidies, homeownership
2253 rates dramatically increased for primarily White families residing in single detached residences.³⁵³ The FHA
2254 created a manual for developers which stated that racial restrictive covenants were "more effective than a
2255 zoning ordinance in providing protection from adverse influences," since zoning codes by themselves, "are
2256 seldom complete enough [...] to assure a homogenous and harmonious neighborhood."³⁵⁴ While words
2257 such as "harmonious" are not explicitly racist, they do connote racial and economic segregation.³⁵⁵ The FHA
2258 incentivized single detached residence zoning by prioritizing mortgage insurance for developments with
2259 racial restrictive covenants in areas with predominantly single detached residences.^{356,357} By the 1950's,

³⁴¹ Freeman, L. (2021). *Build race equity into zoning decisions*. Brookings. [\[link\]](#)

³⁴² Rigsby, E. (2016). *Understanding Exclusionary Zoning and Its Impact on Concentrated Poverty*. The Century Foundation. [\[link\]](#)

³⁴³ Rouse, C., Bernstein, J., Knudsen, H. Zhang, J. (2021). *Exclusionary Zoning: Its Effect on Racial Discrimination in the Housing Market*. The White House. [\[link\]](#)

³⁴⁴ Lens, M. (2021). *Low-Density Zoning, Health, And Health Equity*. Health Affairs. [\[link\]](#)

³⁴⁵ Jaffe, E. (2020). *Why minimum lot sizes are a growing affordability problem*. Medium. [\[link\]](#)

³⁴⁶ Gray, N. (2019). *Do Minimum Lot Size Rules Matter?* Strong Towns. [\[link\]](#)

³⁴⁷ King County (1963, April). Resolution 25789. *Journal of Proceedings of County Commissioners*. [\[link\]](#)

³⁴⁸ King County (1988). 21.08.080 Zoning Code Book. Accessed via King County Council Clerk.

³⁴⁹ Rothstein, R. (2014). *The Making of Ferguson: Public Policies at the Root of its Troubles*. Economic Policy Institute. [\[link\]](#)

³⁵⁰ Cohen, J (2018). Rectifying Seattle's racist past requires a denser future, says report. *Crosscut*. [\[link\]](#)

³⁵¹ Rothstein, R., *Making of Ferguson*. [\[link\]](#)

³⁵² Castilho Barone, A.C. (2018). *Harland Bartholomew and Racially Informed Zoning: The Case of St. Louis*. [\[link\]](#)

³⁵³ Fritz, J. (2016). *Federal Housing Administration (FHA)*. Britannica. [\[link\]](#)

³⁵⁴ Kimble, J. (2007). *Insuring Inequality: The Role of the Federal Housing Administration in the Urban Ghettoization of African Americans*. *Law and Social Inquiry* 32:2 (399-343).

³⁵⁵ *Bradley v. Milliken*, 338 F. Supp. 582 (E.D. Mich. 1971)

³⁵⁶ Majumdar, R. (2007). Racially Restrictive Covenants in the State of Washington: A Primer for Practitioners. *Seattle University Law Review*: 30 (1095-1117). [\[link\]](#)

³⁵⁷ Fritz, J., "Federal Housing Administration (FHA)." [\[link\]](#)

2260 about 98 percent of FHA-backed homes were owned and occupied by White households.³⁵⁸ FHA programs
2261 and subsidies gave rise to low-density suburbs on the outskirts of cities, as they had the space for
2262 developers to build single detached residences that only White families could access.³⁵⁹

2263
2264 *Zoning Conducive to Single Detached Residences*

2265 Each city within King County has jurisdiction over their own zoning code, while King County has jurisdiction
2266 over the zoning for unincorporated areas. Since King County's first zoning code in 1937, most of its urban
2267 residential areas have been zoned low- or medium-density, which are predominantly developed with single
2268 detached residences. Low-density zones generally refer to areas where only one dwelling unit per acre is
2269 permitted, medium density refers to four-12 dwelling units per acre or more, and high density refers to 12
2270 units or more per acre. Since housing density is restricted to specific areas, per the Growth Management
2271 Act's goal in reducing sprawl, the preponderance of single detached residences reduces the area's housing
2272 supply.³⁶⁰ Lack of housing supply leads to an increase in housing price if there is not enough housing
2273 available to meet the needs of the population.³⁶¹

2274
2275 Zoning conducive to single detached residences limits housing choice by restricting a diversity of housing
2276 types. Building and lot size regulations limit the type of housing that can be built in an area by impacting the
2277 buildable area of a lot. For example, King County's current zoning code has limitations on the number of
2278 dwelling units per acre, a minimum lot width, a minimum street setback, and limits on building height. While
2279 lot development standards have many benefits including furthering environmental and public health, the
2280 combined effect of these standards can be exclusionary. To meet environmental and public health goals,
2281 King County will need to continue to utilize traditional zoning regulations. However, the County will consider
2282 the racially disparate impacts of such regulations and work toward mitigating them.

2283
2284 Interviewees in a 2018 community outreach effort facilitated by King County identified expansion of housing
2285 types and changing restrictive zoning as a priority way to increase affordable housing.³⁶² Zoning that is more
2286 conducive to multiple dwelling units per land parcel allows for more density and housing types. Zoning that
2287 allows for higher levels of density provide opportunities for private and nonprofit developers to increase the
2288 housing stock with units at a larger spectrum of affordability than areas with only single detached
2289 residences. The availability of multiple housing types can reduce racial disparities in the housing market
2290 because it allows people of a wider spectrum of income levels to access housing. Households of American
2291 Indian/Alaska Native, Black, Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, and Two or Multiple Races on average, have
2292 lower incomes compared to White and Asian households.

2293
2294 King County zoning updates and some accompanied demographic changes are summarized below.

2295
2296 *1937-1964*

2297 Prior to 1937, all unincorporated King County areas were designated as an "unclassified use district" where
2298 almost all uses were permitted.^{363,364} The 1937 zoning code, King County's first, extended over a large
2299 geographic area because only 17 cities and towns were incorporated in the County at this time, compared
2300 to the 39 incorporated cities within King County today. In this first zoning code, King County introduced and
2301 applied low-density zoning (R-1 Residence District) which allowed up to two dwellings on one, one-acre
2302 sized lot. However, there were distance requirements between the dwellings, which made the use of
2303 duplexes prohibitive. R-2 districts allowed for multiple dwellings, flats, apartments, lodging houses, and
2304 boarding houses so long as front, side and rear yard spatial requirements were met. The renting of rooms
2305 for lodging was permitted but could not exceed five people in a one-family dwelling.³⁶⁵ Family, across the

³⁵⁸ Brown, D. (2021). Your Home's Value is Based on Racism. *The New York Times*.

³⁵⁹ Dougherty, C. (2020, February 18). Why Suburban American Homeowners Were Accused of Being a 'Profit-Making Cartel' in the 1970s. *Time*. [\[link\]](#)

³⁶⁰ MSRC (2023). *Growth Management Act*. [\[link\]](#)

³⁶¹ Rouse, et al., "Exclusionary Zoning." [\[link\]](#)

³⁶² 2019 King County Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice. [\[link\]](#)

³⁶³ King County (2022). *Historical Building, Property, and Land Use Records*. [\[link\]](#)

³⁶⁴ Oldham, K. (2006). *King County adopts a comprehensive zoning plan on August 11, 1958*. History Link. [\[link\]](#)

³⁶⁵ King County (1937). Resolution No. 6493. *Journal of Proceedings of County Commissioners*. [\[link\]](#)

2306 1937 zoning code, was defined as "one person living alone, or two or more persons living together, whether
2307 related to each other or not. Eight unrelated persons is the limit of a so-called family." Restrictions on
2308 density, the number of renters permitted to occupy a dwelling, and putting limitations on the definition of
2309 "family," can be exclusionary to Black, Indigenous, and People of Color households, who are often over-
2310 represented among low-income households.^{366,367}

2311
2312 In 1958, the King County Superior Court ruled that King County's 1937 zoning code was invalid because the
2313 County had not created a comprehensive zoning plan.³⁶⁸ Shortly after this ruling, the King County Board of
2314 County Commissioners enacted a comprehensive zoning plan. This plan introduced districts where only
2315 single detached residences were permitted.³⁶⁹

2316
2317 The next zoning update occurred in 1964, accompanied by the first King County comprehensive plan to
2318 include a statement of general policy in addition to zoning code. This plan adopted an "Urban Center
2319 Development Concept" which aimed to focus economic activity and cultural services in existing cities and
2320 towns, with low density development and open space between them. Seattle would remain the major urban
2321 center, but this plan encouraged growth in other cities and towns as well. An intention for this concept was
2322 to centralize density to reduce suburban sprawl and protect rural and natural areas by limiting where denser
2323 housing could be built.^{370,371} The 1964 Comprehensive Plan states, "To superimpose even a diluted
2324 centralized form on King County now would mean that all future outward growth would have to be
2325 discouraged completely and development allowed only within the existing urbanized area by filling up
2326 vacant land and redeveloping other land at increasing densities." King County does exhibit the intention of
2327 accommodating density within urbanized areas in their 1964 Comprehensive Plan; however, exceptions
2328 were made. The plan also reads that "Some areas of the County should be kept at a lower density even
2329 though close to an urban center. These areas include locations where a pattern of large lot sizes is already
2330 established or is desired and where residents need the assurance that the character of their neighborhood
2331 will be stabilized." While the 1937 zoning code allowed one- and two-family dwellings on lots zoned R-1, the
2332 1964 zoning code restricted it to only one-family dwelling and read that the purpose of the classification was
2333 to "create a living environment of the highest standards for single detached residences."^{372,373} Minimum lot
2334 size requirements became more restrictive in 1964 than they were in 1937. In the 1937 zoning code, the
2335 residential minimum lot area for each one- and two-family dwelling was 4,800 square feet. In the 1964
2336 zoning code, minimum required lot area standards for residential zones ranged from 7,200 square feet to
2337 15,000 square feet, which is far more exclusionary.

2338
2339 *1980-1990*

2340 In the 1980's, Skyway-West Hill and the surrounding areas went from being a predominately White suburb
2341 to a burgeoning hub of racial diversity. Figure 75 reveals an increase in racial diversity across all
2342 unincorporated King County beginning in the 1980s.³⁷⁴ In Skyway-West Hill, the Black population increased
2343 from seven percent in 1980 to 20 percent in 1990, and the Asian population increased from eight percent in
2344 1980 to 13 percent in 1990. The second largest wave of population growth in Skyway-West Hill came in the
2345 early 1990s and consisted of mostly Black and Asian people who were attracted to the area's location,
2346 affordability, and growing racial and ethnic diversity.³⁷⁵ White Center became racially diverse after federal

³⁶⁶ Mehrotra, A., Bealore, L., Montoya-Boyer, A. (2022). *Zoning In: How inclusionary Zoning Increases Affordable Housing for Communities of Color to Build Wealth*. Prosperity Now Scorecard. [\[link\]](#)

³⁶⁷ Gabobe, N. (2021, April). *Housemates Welcome: Washington Strikes Down Household Size Caps*. Sightline Institute. [\[link\]](#)

³⁶⁸ Oldham, K. (2006, May 2). *King County adopts a comprehensive zoning plan on August 11, 1958*. History Link. [\[link\]](#)

³⁶⁹ King County Planning Commission Resolution No. 18801 (1958). [\[link\]](#)

³⁷⁰ Oldham, K. (2006). *County Commissioners approve new Comprehensive Plan for King County on October 13, 1964*. History Link. [\[link\]](#)

³⁷¹ King County Planning Department (1964). *The Comprehensive Plan for King County, Washington*. King County. [\[link\]](#)

³⁷² King County (1963). Resolution 25789. *Journal of Proceedings of County Commissioners*. [\[link\]](#)


³⁷³ King County (1937). Resolution No. 6493. *Journal of Proceedings of County Commissioners*. [\[link\]](#)

³⁷⁴ Wilson, G. (1992, February 20). At The End of The Rainbow -- Skyway: A Community Of Color, Conflict And Cooperation. *The Seattle Times*.

³⁷⁵ Wilson, G. (1992, February 20). At The End of The Rainbow -- Skyway: A Community Of Color, Conflict And Cooperation. *The Seattle Times*.

2347 housing projects for World War II workers turned into homes for low-income households and immigrant
 2348 families in the 1970s.³⁷⁶
 2349

2350 **Figure 75: Population by Race in Unincorporated King County**




Data for Two or More Races category not collected prior to 2000 Census

2351 Source: U.S. Census Bureau. Population by Race, Decennial Census 1980-2010.
 2352

2353
 2354 As the Skyway-West Hill and White Center areas were racially diversifying and growing in population, long-time
 2355 residents in unincorporated King County began to fight density and upzoning.^{377,378} As shown in Figure 76,
 2356 Black households made up the largest percentage of renters in the 1980s (and continue to today) in
 2357 unincorporated King County, so blocking apartments reduced the housing supply available to these
 2358 households. In 1981, members of the Seahurst Community Club in Burien fought the plans for a HUD-financed
 2359 38-unit apartment building for low-income elderly people, arguing it was spot zoning in their single detached
 2360 residential neighborhood. In 1978, White Center residents organized themselves to fight against the
 2361 development of a 22-unit apartment building after the King County Council approved a zoning change to
 2362 accommodate the project. In some cases, the areas were upzoned or lot sizes were adjusted, and in others, the
 2363 King County Council appeased homeowners by retracting their plans for upzoning or retained larger minimum
 2364 lot sizes.^{379,380} For example, the McMicken Community Club residents successfully pressured Council to reverse
 2365 a dozen upzones to protect their single detached residential neighborhood in North Highline. North Highline
 2366 residents successfully opposed a zoning change proposed by the King County Council from the existing 7,200-
 2367 square foot minimum lot size to a 5,000 square foot minimum lot size.
 2368

³⁷⁶ Richardson, R. (2008). *White Center - Thumbnail History*. History Link. [\[link\]](#)
³⁷⁷ Reiner, C. (1981, June 3). Group fights apartment zoning. *The Seattle Times*.
³⁷⁸ Temple, S. (1978, March 1). 'People power' floored in Top Hat rezoning fight. *Seattle Times*.
³⁷⁹ Reiner, C. (1981, April 29). North Highline lot size kept at 7,200 feet. *Seattle Times*.
³⁸⁰ Reiner, C. (1981, June 3). Group fights apartment zoning. *The Seattle Times*.

2369 **Figure 76: Percent of Occupied Housing units by Tenure and Race of Households in**
2370 **Unincorporated King County**



2371 Data for Two or More Races category not collected prior to 2000 Census, and thus not shown here.

2372 Source: U.S. Census Bureau. *Percent of Occupied Housing Units by Tenure and Race of Householder, Decennial Census 1980-*
2373 *2010; 5-year ACS 2016-2020.*

2374 Note: Due to changes in how the decennial census tracked race over the years, race data shown here is presented differently than
2375 in the ACS data found in the rest of this document. In addition, the 2000 census was the first to allow individuals to self-identify
2376 with more than one race, and thus data for 1990 is only available for single-race categories.

2377
2378 The next major comprehensive plan and zoning update in 1985 aimed to accommodate new population
2379 growth. Building off the "Urban Center Development Concept," this plan added specificity about where
2380 housing and urban growth should exist and where open space, rural, and resource lands should be
2381 preserved.³⁸¹ This resulted in most new growth occurring in designated urban areas (later referred to as an
2382 Urban Growth Area by the GMA). To guide this growth pattern, zoning for residential development in the
2383 rural area decreased from one dwelling unit per acre to one dwelling unit per 2.5 to 10 acres.³⁸² This follows
2384 the overarching trend of each zoning update adding more requirements that limit *where* housing densities
2385 can go for environmental reasons without also increasing minimum lot sizes for urban residential zones to
2386 accommodate population growth. The minimum lot area for residential zones between 1979 to 1988 are
2387 almost identical to that of 1964's zoning code, except with the addition of a residential zoning category
2388 allowing a minimum lot requirement of 5,000 square feet, which can allow for some level of increased
2389 density.^{383,384,385} Limiting density in specified areas through zoning and the Urban Growth Area (UGA) has
2390 vast environmental and human benefits such as preserving open spaces, farmland and environmentally
2391 sensitive areas. In addition to accessing these benefits, it is also crucial that King County accommodates a
2392 growing population across the income spectrum.

³⁸¹ Oldham, K. (2006). *County Council unanimously approves new King County Comprehensive Plan on April 8, 1985.* History Link. [\[link\]](#)

³⁸² Robinson, L. and Newell, J. and Marzluff, J. (2004). *Twenty-five years of sprawl in the Seattle region: growth management responses and implications for conservation.* Elsevier. [\[link\]](#)

³⁸³ King County (1963). Resolution 25789. *Journal of Proceedings of County Commissioners.* [\[link\]](#)

³⁸⁴ King County (1979). 21.08.050 Zoning Code Book.

³⁸⁵ King County (1988). 21.08.080 Zoning Code Book.

2393
2394 In 1986, in attempt to accommodate the growing population, the King County Council proposed a plan to
2395 upzone five percent of Federal Way, which was unincorporated at the time, to allow for multiunit
2396 development.³⁸⁶ The plan was adopted against significant disapproval from Federal Way residents.³⁸⁷ In
2397 deep opposition to additional apartment buildings, Federal Way residents ran their fourth campaign to
2398 incorporate.^{388,389} In 1989, Federal Way residents voted in a landslide to incorporate.³⁹⁰

2399
2400 *Adoption of the Growth Management Act (1990s)*
2401 The Growth Management Act (GMA), enacted in 1990, adopted King County's Urban Growth Area strategy
2402 and required all fast-growing counties to establish their own UGAs in collaboration with the cities in each
2403 county. UGAs are designed to prevent sprawling and uncontrolled development by focusing growth in
2404 designated areas where urban services can efficiently be provided. By limiting most housing growth to
2405 specified UGAs, jurisdictions within the UGA that had a growing population needed to plan for more density
2406 and housing production. Many of these jurisdictions did not make significant upzones or increase their
2407 infrastructure investments, resulting in an underproduction in housing. This contributed to an increase in
2408 prices for existing housing, which has disproportionately impacted Black, Indigenous, and People of Color
2409 communities for decades.³⁹¹

2410
2411 *Current Zoning (1993-current)*
2412 Prior to King County's 1993 zoning code, King County used minimum lot size requirements to determine the
2413 square footage needed per dwelling unit. Beginning with the 1993 update, the zoning code provides a
2414 base density of dwelling units per acre instead of minimum lot sizes. While base density of dwelling units
2415 per acre is slightly more flexible than minimum lot size requirements, they impose very similar restrictions.
2416 For example, areas zoned R-4 have a base density of four dwelling units per acre, which generally allows for
2417 one home per 10,890 square feet of lot size (though the actual configuration may vary by parcel).

2418
2419 King County's 1993 zoning code has many of the same restrictions as the current zoning code. As shown in
2420 Map 4, most of unincorporated King County's urban residential land is zoned R-1 through R-12, which are
2421 considered low and medium densities. Zones R-1 through R-8 provide for predominantly single detached
2422 homes. The current zoning code has a minimum lot width of 30 feet, and a minimum street setback of 10
2423 feet for the R-4 through R-48 residential zones. King County limits building base height to 35 feet for all
2424 buildings in R-1 through R-8 zones. These are the same requirements listed in the 1993 zoning code,
2425 resulting in minimum lot requirements that have not become conducive to higher densities since 1993.

2426
2427 Notable changes that occurred between 1993 and the current zoning code involve inclusionary housing and
2428 the Residential Density Incentive Program. Buildings within zones R-18, R-24, R-48, Neighborhood Business,
2429 Commercial Business, Regional Business, and Office, are permitted, with additional setbacks, to have
2430 increased height through the inclusionary housing program. The inclusionary housing program applies to
2431 zones within Skyway-West Hill and North Highline, and the Residential Density Incentive Program generally
2432 applies to the rest of urban unincorporated King County, though cannot be applied to R-1 zones. Through
2433 the inclusionary housing program, buildings may use maximum height which is 75-80 feet in high density
2434 zoning classifications. The Residential Density Incentive Program provides a density bonus in exchange for
2435 providing some affordable units. Although, the program has been utilized only to a limited extent. For more
2436 information on inclusionary housing and the Residential Density Incentive Program, see the *Unincorporated*
2437 *King County Policies* subsection in *X. Existing Strategies*.

2438

³⁸⁶ Schulz, B. (1986, February 19). Residents Dispute Community Plan - Committee Members Want County to Reduce Multifamily Sites. *The Seattle Times*.

³⁸⁷ The Seattle Times (1987, December 30). Community Activism was Rife Throughout South End - And 2 Murder Cases Rocked Auburn, Federal Way. *The Seattle Times*.

³⁸⁸ Parrish, M. (1990, February 28). The History. *The Seattle Times*.

³⁸⁹ The Seattle Times (1987, December 27). The Year in Review - New Cities Rise; So Does Crime Toll. *The Seattle Times*.


³⁹⁰ Parrish, M. (1990, February 28). The History. *The Seattle Times*.

³⁹¹ ECONorthwest, "Redlining and Wealth Loss." [[link](#)]

2439 Map 4 displays current zoning for unincorporated King County, divided into four categories: low density (R-
2440 1),³⁹² medium density (R-4, R-6, R-8, R-12), high density (R-18, R-24, R-48), and areas zoned commercial
2441 which is mixed-use and generally allows for high-density residential housing. Each zoning category is
2442 accompanied by the race of residents living within them. This map reveals the previously mentioned
2443 preponderance of low- and medium-density zoning in unincorporated King County.


³⁹² The R-1 zone is generally used for 1) urban separators to protect critical areas in the interface between rural and urban areas 2) urban park lands such as the large red areas on the map above in northern Bellevue for Bridle Trails Park and southern Redmond for Marymoor Park, and 3) schools, such as the larger red areas north of Covington and Maple Valley.

2444 **Map 4: Zoning and Race in Urban Unincorporated King County and Rural Towns**



2446 Figure 77 shows that White and Asian households in unincorporated King County are slightly more likely to
2447 live in medium- to low-density neighborhoods, whereas Black, American Indian/Alaska Native, and other
2448 races not listed households are slightly more likely to live in commercial and high-density neighborhoods.³⁹³
2449 As previously described, White and Asian households, on average, have higher incomes than households of
2450 American Indian/Alaska Native, Black, Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, and Two or Multiple Races. Many
2451 Black, Indigenous, and People of Color residents have lower incomes, on average, than White residents due
2452 to discrimination in housing, education, and employment. While the zoning designation may not have been
2453 racially motivated, it does impact who can afford to live there. By systematically driving housing prices up in
2454 certain neighborhoods with mechanisms such as zoning, some level of racial segregation occurs.
2455

2456 **Figure 77: Race by Zoning Type in Unincorporated King County**



2457 Source: U.S. Census Bureau. (2022). Population by Race, 5-year ACS 2016-2020; King County Geographic Information Systems.
2458

2459 **Housing Supply**

2460 King County's continued retention of lot development standards that are conducive to single detached
2461 houses coincided with other drivers of housing cost increases, such as an influx of jobs and a growing
2462 population. As described in the following section, King County is also hampered from fully providing the
2463 necessary infrastructure to meet the urban unincorporated areas' housing needs because funding
2464 mechanisms allowed under state law prevent counties from stewarding urban areas in the same way as
2465 cities, which have more flexible revenue tools.³⁹⁴ From 2010 to 2019, 2.57 jobs were created in King County
2466 for every housing unit produced.³⁹⁵ While this job growth occurred outside of unincorporated King County,

³⁹³ If all races were evenly distributed between the four different zoning categories, they would all match the gray dotted line perfectly.

³⁹⁴ King County Unincorporated Urban Area Annexation Area Databook. [\[link\]](#)

³⁹⁵ ECONorthwest, "Redlining and Wealth Loss." [\[link\]](#)

2467 the housing pressure it creates extends across jurisdictions.^{396,397} This underproduction in housing supply,
2468 coupled with an influx of high earners moving to the region, led to higher housing costs.³⁹⁸
2469 Not only is general housing supply an issue, but the number of rental homes affordable to low- and
2470 moderate-income families decreased by 36,000 between 2008 and 2019.³⁹⁹ This dramatic increase in
2471 housing price and decrease in affordable housing for lower-income residents has a disproportionate impact
2472 on households of American Indian or Alaska Native, Black, Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, and Two or
2473 Multiple Races, as they, on average, have lower incomes and are more likely to be renters, compared to
2474 White and Asian households.⁴⁰⁰

2475
2476 *Lack of Funding, Underinvestment, and Pattern of Annexation*

2477 For the purposes of growth management, annexation is the process of transferring unincorporated land
2478 from a county's jurisdiction into incorporated land in a city's jurisdiction. The GMA requires that cities
2479 coordinate with their respective county to identify an UGA, as annexation can only occur within the
2480 designated UGA. The GMA states that cities are more appropriately situated than counties to provide urban
2481 governmental services because cities have the infrastructure, organizational structure, and finance tools to
2482 serve an urban area.⁴⁰¹ This construct presumes that counties are primarily designed to provide local
2483 services to the rural area with dispersed, low-density resource uses and regional services throughout the
2484 county. As outlined in the 1998 CPPs, all unincorporated Urban Growth Areas were encouraged to annex or
2485 incorporate by 2012, which did not occur.

2486
2487 While Washington state has attempted to incentivize urban unincorporated areas to annex into a city, King
2488 County still has six large unincorporated urban areas. Many of the remaining portions of urban
2489 unincorporated King County are home to lower-income and racially diverse communities compared to the
2490 whiter, higher-income areas on the edge of the UGA that have been annexed in recent decades. Excluding
2491 East Renton Highlands, all remaining urban unincorporated areas have a median household income below
2492 the King County average.⁴⁰²

2493
2494 *Lack of Revenue Tools*

2495 In general, King County has a limited ability to invest in all unincorporated areas because of the taxing
2496 structure imposed by the state.^{403,404} King County's taxing authority generally only includes property and
2497 sales taxes, whereas cities' taxing authority includes property, sales, business and occupation, and utility
2498 taxes. This structure allows cities to collect more taxes and in turn provide urban-level services for their
2499 residents.

2500
2501 King County does not have the finance streams to provide urban-level services within urban unincorporated
2502 areas. Modern urban infrastructure such as sewers, sidewalks, maintained roadways, trails and parks, are
2503 needed to both accommodate higher densities and to attract annexation of these areas by surrounding
2504 jurisdictions.⁴⁰⁵ For example, parts of North Highline and Skyway-West Hill are still on septic systems, instead

³⁹⁶ As described in the *Jobs to Housing Ratio* subsection, jobs per housing ratio decreased in unincorporated King County between 2010 and 2020, likely due to the annexation of commercial cores.

³⁹⁷ Tu, J. (2015, August 30). Low pay, costly commute often go hand in hand. *The Seattle Times*.

³⁹⁸ ECONorthwest, "Redlining and Wealth Loss." [\[link\]](#)

³⁹⁹ King County (2019). *2019 King County Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice*. Equal Housing Opportunity. [\[link\]](#)

⁴⁰⁰ See *Household Characteristics* subsection in *III. Community Profile*.

⁴⁰¹ King County Unincorporated Urban Area Annexation Area Databook. [\[link\]](#)

⁴⁰² U.S. Census Bureau. (2015-2019) *5-year ACS 2015-2019*

⁴⁰³ Senate Ways and Means Committee (2020). *A Legislative Guide to Washington's Tax Structure*. [\[Link\]](#)

⁴⁰⁴ King County (2021, December). *Unincorporated King County Fiscal Sustainability Plan*. [\[link\]](#)

⁴⁰⁵ *Service Delivery and Facilities Provided by King County in the Five Potential Annexation Areas*, appendix to the *Skyway-West Hill Land Use Subarea Plan*. [\[link\]](#)

2505 of the sewer systems that most urban areas such as Seattle and Renton use.^{406,407} Septic systems require a
2506 minimum lot size and can cause serious public health hazards if not maintained properly.^{408,409}
2507

2508 The 2022 North Highline Subarea Plan notes, "Like other urban unincorporated areas, there has been
2509 insufficient investment in North Highline's transportation system..."⁴¹⁰ Underinvestment in urban services in
2510 higher density zoned areas disincentivizes annexation because of additional costs required to serve more
2511 intense development.

2512
2513 *Pattern of Annexation*

2514 Areas that have a strong commercial core and homes with high assessed values are attractive for cities to
2515 annex because these areas can increase their tax base and cover the cost of servicing that new area.
2516 Unincorporated areas without strong commercial cores are less appealing for cities to annex because these
2517 areas do not have a large tax base.⁴¹¹ Since 1990, partly because of King County's success in implementing
2518 the GMA, the areas that have been incorporated or annexed held 85 percent of unincorporated area jobs
2519 and only 69 percent of unincorporated area residents.^{412,413} This left behind a very small number of jobs and
2520 commercial land in the remaining unincorporated areas. Unincorporated areas only have one percent of
2521 countywide employment, and five percent of countywide population. This pattern of annexation and
2522 incorporation continues to reduce tax generating resources, such as sales tax, away from King County which
2523 further impacts the County's already limited financial capacity to support services in the remaining urban
2524 unincorporated areas. This contributes to a widening deficit between growing service maintenance costs
2525 and the reduced amount of revenue received by the County, which limits King County's ability to invest in
2526 unincorporated areas.⁴¹⁴

2527
2528 Due to discriminatory practices, Black, Latin(a)(o)(x), and Indigenous communities are less likely to be
2529 homeowners, and those that are, have homes with lower median values than homes owned by White
2530 people.⁴¹⁵ Assessed property values provide a metric for cities to determine annexation; so, if an area with a
2531 higher proportion of Black, Latin(a)(o)(x), and Indigenous residents has lower assessed property values,
2532 cities may not want to annex the area.^{416,417} For example, in 1991, Burien proposed annexation boundaries
2533 to include parts of Shorewood, an upper middle-class neighborhood, while leaving White Center, an
2534 ethnically diverse neighborhood with low-income housing, unincorporated. A 1991 *Seattle Times* article
2535 stated that, "...no one's vying to annex Skyway/Bryn Mawr or White Center, both of which are relatively
2536 developed but include working-class neighborhoods with comparatively low property values - and low
2537 property-tax revenues."⁴¹⁸

2538
2539 *Skyway-West Hill PAA, North Highline PAA, and Fairwood PAA*

2540 Skyway-West Hill, North Highline, and Fairwood PAAs, outlined in Map 5, are all home to a significantly
2541 higher percentage of Black, Indigenous, and People of Color residents than the King County average and

⁴⁰⁶ King County Department of Assessments (2022). Assessment Data.

⁴⁰⁷ King County on-site sewage systems (OSS) and social vulnerability dashboard. [\[link\]](#)

⁴⁰⁸ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. (2022). Septic System Impacts on Water Sources. EPA. [\[link\]](#)

⁴⁰⁹ Washington State Department of Health Wastewater Management Program (2002). *Rule Development Committee Issue Research Report - Lot Size (Minimum Land Area)*. [\[link\]](#)

⁴¹⁰ North Highline Subarea Plan, page 44

⁴¹¹ Austin, D.A. (1999). Politics vs. Economics: Evidence from Municipal Annexation. *Journal of Urban Economics*.

⁴¹² King County (2021). *Unincorporated King County Fiscal Sustainability Plan*. [\[link\]](#)

⁴¹³ King County Unincorporated Urban Area Annexation Area Databook. [\[link\]](#)

⁴¹⁴ King County (2021). *Unincorporated King County Fiscal Sustainability Plan*. [\[link\]](#)

⁴¹⁵ Racial Restrictive Covenants Project Washington State (2022). *Homeownership by race 1960-2020 - King County*. Civil Rights and Labor History Consortium/University of Washington. [\[link\]](#)

⁴¹⁶ American Society of Planning Officials (1958, September). Information Report No. 114, *Annexation Studies*. APA. [\[link\]](#)

⁴¹⁷ Racial Restrictive Covenants Project Washington State (2022). *Homeownership by race 1960-2020 - King County*. Civil Rights and Labor History Consortium/University of Washington. [\[link\]](#)

⁴¹⁸ Ortegaleon, B. (1991, December 2). Incorporation frenzy leaves 'orphans' in S. King. *Seattle Times*.


2542 have lower median incomes than the King County average.⁴¹⁹ This pattern, combined with the County's
2543 limited taxing authority highlights the need for annexation to advance racial justice.^{420,421}

⁴¹⁹ U.S. Census Bureau. (2015-2019) 5-year ACS 2015-2019.

⁴²⁰ Beekman, D. (2022, August 13). Skyway fights for housing, parks and community at 'critical moment.' *Seattle Times*.

⁴²¹ King County Unincorporated Urban Area Annexation Area Databook. [\[link\]](#)

2544 **Map 5: King County's Urban Potential Annexation Areas and City in Rural Area Potential**
 2545 **Annexation Areas**



2547 Institutionalized racism contributed to underinvestment in affordable housing projects in Skyway-West Hill
2548 and North Highline neighborhoods. For example, redlining, displacement from Seattle’s Central District, as
2549 well as the widening of the racial wealth gap partially resulted in the relatively lower real estate values in
2550 Skyway-West Hill and North Highline.^{422,423} However, areas in close proximity to Seattle grew rapidly which
2551 drove home prices up, creating the conditions for gentrification.⁴²⁴ For at least a decade, King County did
2552 not invest in affordable housing in Skyway-West Hill, aside from housing repair assistance. King County has
2553 only recently started investing housing funds in Skyway-West Hill after years of community advocacy and
2554 organizing.^{425,426,427} In 2022, King County awarded two projects from a \$5 million request for proposal (RFP)
2555 to support affordable housing development in the Skyway-West Hill neighborhood that align with
2556 community identified anti-displacement priorities.^{428,429,430} In the 2023-24 King County biennial budget, an
2557 additional \$5 million has been earmarked for affordable housing capital investments in Skyway-West Hill.

2558 C. Displacement

2559 The history of racially exclusive, discriminatory land use and housing practices, and seemingly race-neutral
2560 policies that perpetuate the racial wealth gap, patterns of segregation, and exclusion, and underinvestment
2561 in neighborhoods of color culminates in an increased risk of displacement for Black, indigenous, and People
2562 of Color communities. Displacement describes a pattern in which households move involuntarily as a result
2563 of aforementioned factors.⁴³¹ Displacement can increase the risk of homelessness and have lasting negative
2564 effects on health, education, earnings, and cultural connections.⁴³² While homeowners build equity and
2565 typically have a fixed monthly payment, renters make monthly payments they will never recoup, and rental
2566 prices typically increase over time. As rental costs increase, many households, especially cost-burdened
2567 households, cannot save money to buy a home.⁴³³ This stems from and exacerbates the pre-existing racial
2568 wealth gap, which is a result from the legacy of mechanisms used to block Black, Indigenous, and People of
2569 Color households from buying homes, such as racial restrictive covenants.⁴³⁴

2570
2571 Map 6 was created using the Puget Sound Regional Council’s (PSRC) Displacement Risk Mapping Tool. This
2572 map identifies census tracts that are at low, moderate, and higher risk of displacement.⁴³⁵ North Highline
2573 and a small area of unincorporated Kent are at higher risk of displacement.⁴³⁶ East Federal Way, Fairwood,
2574 and South Park are at risk of moderate displacement. Skyway-West Hill has all three levels of displacement
2575 risk with the western most area at moderate risk and the eastern most area, adjacent to Renton, at higher
2576 risk of displacement.

2577
2578

⁴²² Skyway-West Hill and North Highline Anti-displacement Strategies Report. [\[link\]](#)

⁴²³ University of Washington’s Seattle Civil Rights and Labor History Project. *Segregated Seattle*. [\[link\]](#)

⁴²⁴ Groover, H. (2021, April 8) Seattle-area housing market is ‘on steroids’; see what’s happening near you. *The Seattle Times*. [\[link\]](#)

⁴²⁵ Zahilay, G. (2020, February 17). We failed the Central District, but we must do right by Skyway. *The Seattle Times*. [\[link\]](#)

⁴²⁶ Beekman, D. (2022, August 13). Skyway fights for housing, parks and community at ‘critical moment’. *The Seattle Times*. [\[link\]](#)

⁴²⁷ Trumm, D. (2017, May 3). Meet Skyway: Seattle’s unincorporated Neighbor To The South. *The Urbanist*. [\[link\]](#)

⁴²⁸ King County (2022, January). Skyway \$5M Fund for Affordable Housing | RFP Summary.

⁴²⁹ King County (2022, May). *King County Announces Funding Awards for Two Affordable Housing Projects in Skyway-West Hill*. DCHS Blog. [\[link\]](#)

⁴³⁰ King County (2022, January). *New Funding Opportunity: \$5 million to support equitable, community-driven affordable housing in the Skyway-West Hill (SWH) neighborhood*. DCHS Blog. [\[link\]](#)

⁴³¹ University of Texas at Austin Uprooted Project. *Understanding Gentrification and Displacement*. [\[link\]](#)

⁴³² Urban Displacement Project. *Pushed Out: Displacement Today and Lasting Impacts*. [\[link\]](#)


⁴³³ ECONorthwest, “Redlining and Wealth Loss.” [\[link\]](#)

⁴³⁴ Logani, I., “Racial Wealth Gap.” [\[link\]](#)

⁴³⁵ Puget Sound Regional Council. *Displacement Risk Mapping Tool*. [\[link\]](#)

⁴³⁶ Only about 10 homes in the Kent census tract are in unincorporated King County.

2579 **Map 6: Displacement Risk by Census Tract**




2580 Housing costs in Skyway-West Hill and North Highline have risen faster than the countywide average.
2581 Between 2012 and 2020, the average annual rent increase in King County was 3.8 percent; in Skyway-West
2582 Hill and North Highline the average annual increases were four percent and 4.9 percent, respectively.
2583 Median incomes in both areas remain significantly lower than the countywide average, placing residents at
2584

2585 increased risk of displacement. Fifty-three percent of renter households in North Highline were cost
 2586 burdened and 26 percent were severely cost burdened in 2017. Nearly one-third of all renters and two-
 2587 thirds of extremely low-income renters in Skyway-West Hill were severely cost burdened, spending more
 2588 than 50 percent of their income on rent.⁴³⁷ For more analysis on cost burden, see *III. Community Profile*.
 2589

2590 Black, Indigenous, and People of Color households are twice as likely as White households to be housing
 2591 cost burdened in Skyway-West Hill and North Highline.⁴³⁸ In North Highline, most White households owned
 2592 their homes, while 13 percent of Black households and 49 percent of Asian households owned their homes.
 2593 Most Black and Latin(a)(o)(x) renter households in North Highline were cost burdened in 2017 (72 percent
 2594 and 64 percent, respectively). An analysis found there were enough affordable units across most income
 2595 groups in Skyway-West Hill, but housing could only meet the needs of about 37 percent of households with
 2596 incomes below 30 percent area median income. There are also housing gaps in North Highline to meet the
 2597 needs of households with incomes below 30 percent area median income. The combination of rising
 2598 housing prices, the high rate of cost-burdened households, and lower than average incomes put residents
 2599 who live in places like Skyway-West Hill and North Highline at increased risk of displacement.⁴³⁹ Figure 78
 2600 show the decrease in concentration of Black residents in Skyway-West Hill from 2000, to 2010, to 2020. As
 2601 the maps indicate, and community members report, Black residents were displaced from Seattle’s Central
 2602 District and moved further south, which then puts housing pressure on the places they move to, such as
 2603 Skyway-West Hill, which then forces people to move even further south.
 2604

2605 **Figure 78: Black/African American Concentration of Population 2000, 2010, and 2020**



2606 Source: U.S. Census Bureau. (2020). Decennial Census.
 2607

2608 Skyway-West Hill and North Highline community members have noted that gentrification can lead to the
 2609 deterioration of the cultural character of a community. This can lead to cultural displacement, which takes
 2610 place when existing residents move out of a neighborhood because their social or cultural connections have
 2611 declined due to gentrification. Displaced residents may lose connections to community establishments and
 2612 faith-based organizations that provide direct support or connect people to support systems. In Skyway,
 2613 residents who are displaced are often not able to find housing in Skyway again because of a lack of
 2614 affordable, available housing located in walkable areas or near other accommodations.⁴⁴⁰
 2615
 2616

2617 **Conclusion**

2618 Policies that do not explicitly discriminate based on race can and do lead to racially disparate outcomes.
 2619 Low-density zoning and large minimum lot requirements, lack of investment in urban unincorporated areas,

⁴³⁷ BERK Consulting, Inc., "Affordable housing incentives analysis: North Highline and Skyway-West Hill. [[link](#)]

⁴³⁸ King County Affordable Housing Committee Dashboard. (2021). *Jurisdictional Data for Download*.

⁴³⁹ Skyway-West Hill and North Highline Anti-displacement Strategies Report. [[link](#)]

⁴⁴⁰ Comprehensive Plan Equity Work Group Meeting. (2023).

2620 and lack of tenant protections have contributed to displacement and other racial disparities in housing in
2621 unincorporated King County. While not explicitly limited to single detached housing, King County's zoning
2622 code does not sufficiently incentivize other, allowable types of high- and middle-density housing. This limits
2623 housing supply and housing choice by not having a diversity of housing types, which leads to prices that
2624 aren't affordable to low-income communities, of which Black, Indigenous, and People of Color are most
2625 overly represented in.^{441,442} Urban unincorporated areas have higher proportions of Black, Indigenous, and
2626 People of Color populations and have historically been underinvested in compared to other unincorporated
2627 areas with higher proportions of White populations. Investment is needed in order to accommodate more
2628 density and encourage cities to annex PAAs.⁴⁴³ The next section details the policies and codes King County
2629 has either recently passed or is exploring through the 2024 Comprehensive Plan update to address the
2630 policies and actions discussed in this analysis that have created racially disparate housing outcomes in
2631 unincorporated King County.

2632 D. Undoing Racially Disparate Housing Policies in the 2633 Comprehensive Planning Process

2634 This section identifies the actions that have been and will be taken by King County in the 2024
2635 Comprehensive Plan to undo racially disparate housing outcomes.

2636 *Barriers in Undoing Racially Disparate Impacts*

2637 Multiple barriers prevent King County from fully remedying harms inflicted on Black, Indigenous, and
2638 People of Color communities. Racial wealth inequities result from exclusive housing practices and policies,
2639 in addition to other injustices such as discrimination in employment and education. Despite understanding
2640 that race-neutral policies can perpetuate harm due to pre-existing access inequities, there are multiple
2641 policies in King County's Comprehensive Plan that are, indeed, race-neutral. While providing financial
2642 resources to specific Black, Indigenous, and People of Color communities could reduce racially disparate
2643 impacts in housing, the Fair Housing Act prohibits the prioritization of funds or programs based on a
2644 protected class, such as race. The updates to the Comprehensive Plan policies and codes center on actions
2645 King County has leverage over, such as building partnerships, implementing policies to reduce
2646 displacement, and adopting code changes that could diversify the housing stock and increase the supply of
2647 affordable housing.

2648
2649 Revenue is critical to implement many of the King County Comprehensive Plan policies. While King County
2650 has put forward new levies to meet the needs of different communities throughout the county, the funding
2651 raised is not enough to solve the housing crisis. King County has significant limits imposed by the state on
2652 raising revenue. For decades, King County has advocated for increased revenue from the state and federal
2653 government to address structural revenue problems and the affordable housing crisis. King County has yet
2654 to receive either the taxing authority or the resources at a scale needed to meaningfully and effectively do
2655 so.

2656 *Summary of 2024 Comprehensive Plan Updates*

2657 To promote equitable outcomes in partnership with communities most impacted by racially disparate
2658 housing policies, King County has intentionally solicited engagement from members of underrepresented
2659 communities through a broad, community survey and the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Equity Work Group.
2660 The Equity Work Group is an advisory group composed of 15 people from historically underrepresented
2661 groups who worked closely with Executive staff to incorporate equity considerations into the
2662 Comprehensive Plan update. The Comprehensive Plan includes new policies, edits to former policies, and
2663 code changes to reflect the new GMA and CPP requirements and community feedback.
2664
2665

⁴⁴¹ Rouse, et al., "Exclusionary Zoning." [\[link\]](#)

⁴⁴² Mehrotra, A., Bealore, L., Montoya-Boyer, A. (2022, September). *Zoning In: How inclusionary Zoning Increases Affordable Housing for Communities of Color to Build Wealth*. Prosperity Now Scorecard. [\[link\]](#)

⁴⁴³ King County Clerk of the Council (2019). *Skyway-West Hill Land Use Subarea Plan*, Appendix D: Service Delivery and Facilities Provided by King County in the Five Potential Annexation Areas. [\[link\]](#)

2666
2667 King County is committed to addressing past and current racially exclusive and discriminatory land use and
2668 housing practices that resulted in disparate impacts on Black, Indigenous, and People of Color households.
2669 The County aims to repair these harms and promote equitable outcomes in partnership with impacted
2670 communities through intentional, targeted actions and support for affordable housing initiatives. King
2671 County's 2024 Comprehensive Plan incorporates new policies and updates to existing policies to begin to
2672 undo the racially disparate impacts caused by the policies and practices discussed in the Racially Disparate
2673 Impact Analysis which found:

- 2674 • explicitly racist policies and practices existed in unincorporated King County and contributed to long-
2675 term economic racial disparities;
- 2676 • the lack of tenant protections for unincorporated King County undermined the effectiveness of fair
2677 housing protections;
- 2678 • exclusionary zoning laws in unincorporated King County limit the availability of more affordable housing
2679 options for low- and moderate-income households who are disproportionately Black, Indigenous, and
2680 People of Color;
- 2681 • King County has historically underinvested in urban unincorporated areas with higher Black,
2682 Indigenous, and People of Color populations; and
- 2683 • the combination of rising housing prices, the high rate of cost-burdened Black, Indigenous, and People
2684 of Color households, and lower than average incomes put Black, Indigenous, and People of Color
2685 residents who live in places like Skyway-West Hill and North Highline at increased risk of displacement.
2686

2687 To begin rectifying these harms, the 2024 King County Comprehensive Plan included changes that commit
2688 King County to:

- 2689 • participate in regional solutions to address critical housing needs;
- 2690 • engage historically and currently underrepresented communities in the development and
2691 implementation of affordable housing programs to ensure the County's investments and policies are
2692 culturally relevant and meet the needs of communities most in need;
- 2693 • invest in programs and policies that help tenants stay housed and assert their rights, reducing racial
2694 disproportionality among households who experience housing stability;
- 2695 • adopt code changes to allow middle housing and create an inclusionary housing program to encourage
2696 the creation of more affordable and diverse housing options so more low- and moderate-income
2697 households can access homeownership and generate long-term wealth for their families;
- 2698 • prioritize funding for affordable housing projects that are community-driven, promote access to
2699 opportunity, and create wealth-building opportunities for communities at-risk of displacement; and
- 2700 • take actions to prevent and mitigate residential and cultural displacement for unincorporated
2701 communities at risk of displacement to address racial disparities in housing, such as implementing
2702 programs to create affordable homeownership opportunities and investing in equitable development
2703 projects.
2704

2705 These new and updated housing policies demonstrate King County's commitment to addressing racial
2706 disparities in housing and promoting equitable access to affordable and culturally relevant housing options
2707 for all residents, particularly those historically underserved and disproportionately impacted by
2708 discriminatory practices. The equity analysis of the 2024 Comprehensive Plan details specific proposals
2709 prioritized by the Equity Work Group.
2710

2711 *Current and Future Actions of King County*

2712 King County is committed to undoing policies that result in racially disparate outcomes in housing and is
2713 taking several future actions to achieve this goal. King County is currently developing and exploring
2714 programs such as:

- 2715 • investing in rental assistance and eviction prevention programs to keep tenants housed;
- 2716 • launching a community preference program to prevent displacement;
- 2717 • investing in equitable development to support community-driven priorities;
- 2718 • preserving manufactured home communities and affordable housing to prevent displacement; and
- 2719 • expanding affordable homeownership programs to increase wealth-building opportunities for low- and
2720 moderate-income households.

2721
2722 For more information about the inventory of existing and proposed partnerships, strategies and funding
2723 aimed at meeting countywide housing need, especially for Black, Indigenous, and People of Color
2724 populations disparately impacted by discriminatory land use and housing practices, see X. *Existing*
2725 *Strategies Summary*.

2726 VI. Housing Needs Analysis

2727 A. Section Summary

2728 This section fulfills, in part, King County CPP H-3l and H-3m.

2729
2730 CPP H-3l and H-3m require jurisdictions to:

2731 *Conduct an inventory and analysis in each jurisdiction of existing and projected housing needs of all*
2732 *segments of the population and summarize the findings in the housing element. The inventory and analysis*
2733 *shall include:*

- 2734 l) *The housing needs of people who need supportive services or accessible units, including but not*
2735 *limited to people experiencing homelessness, persons with disabilities, people with medical*
2736 *conditions, and older adults;*
- 2737 m) *The housing needs of communities experiencing disproportionate harm of housing inequities*
2738 *including Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC).*

2739
2740 The 2022 Point-in-Time Count found that the number of individuals experiencing homelessness in King
2741 County increased nearly 14 percent from 2020 to 2022.⁴⁴⁴ Black, Hispanic/Latin(a)(o)(x), American Indian,
2742 Alaska Native, or Indigenous, and Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander individuals were overrepresented in
2743 this group compared to King County’s overall demographics.⁴⁴⁵ Shelter and case management can help
2744 people experiencing homelessness find resources and housing.⁴⁴⁶ Expanding access to stable housing and
2745 care can directly improve health outcomes for people experiencing homelessness.⁴⁴⁷

2746
2747 Over ten percent of King County residents live with a disability.⁴⁴⁸ People living with disabilities and
2748 disability rights advocacy organizations have shared that many people living with disabilities face challenges
2749 in searching, applying for, and relocating into accessible, affordable housing near supportive services.^{449,450}

⁴⁴⁴ KCRHA 2022 Point in Time Count. [\[link\]](#)

⁴⁴⁵ King County Department of Community and Human Services Performance Measurement and Evaluation. (2022). *King County’s Homeless Response System*. [\[link\]](#)

⁴⁴⁶ National Health Care for the Homeless Council. (2016 April). Vital Role of Case Management for Individuals Experiencing Homelessness. *A Quarterly Research Review of the National HCH Council* 4(1). [\[link\]](#)

⁴⁴⁷ Prunhuber, Pratti and Vivian Kwok. (2021, February). *Low-Income Older Adults Face Unaffordable Rents, Driving Housing Instability and Homelessness*. Justice in Aging. National Low Income Housing Coalition. [\[link\]](#)

⁴⁴⁸ U.S. Census Bureau. (2022). *Households by Disability, 5-year ACS 2016-2020*.

⁴⁴⁹ ECO Northwest. (2022, December 1). *Housing Needs for Individuals with Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities in Washington State*. Washington State Department of Social and Health Services. [\[link\]](#)

⁴⁵⁰ 2019 King County Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice. [\[link\]](#)

2750 The availability of accessible housing units and increasing access to housing navigators and vouchers would
2751 help meet the need for this population.⁴⁵¹
2752

2753 People aged 65 years and older who wish to remain in their homes and communities may face difficulties
2754 because of rising housing costs. Homeowners who have paid off their mortgage may struggle to afford
2755 property taxes, utilities, and maintenance costs. People aged 65 years and older with low or fixed incomes
2756 need more affordable housing options to help them age in place.⁴⁵²
2757

2758 Housing quality, cost, and stability impacts people's physical and mental health. Individuals receiving
2759 housing assistance who are recovering from medical conditions or with persisting conditions may need
2760 additional support, such as occupational therapy or chore services. The King County Regional Homeless
2761 Authority's Draft Five-Year Plan found that people with medical conditions, particularly individuals who are
2762 unstably housed or experiencing homelessness, need access to care and a safe place to recover after
2763 leaving the hospital, such as recuperative housing.⁴⁵³
2764

2765 Black, Indigenous, and People of Color households, particularly Black and Hispanic households, are more
2766 likely to experience housing problems such as incomplete kitchen and plumbing facilities, overcrowding,
2767 and cost burden. Black households are also more likely to be renters and face higher rates of denial for
2768 home loans compared to White households.⁴⁵⁴ The Black Home Initiative, a coalition of organizations
2769 working to increase and sustain Black homeownership, identified a need for greater access to
2770 homeownership opportunities and diverse housing types.⁴⁵⁵ Black, Indigenous, and People of Color
2771 residents living in unincorporated King County shared with the Department of Community and Human
2772 Services that many Black, Indigenous, and People of Color households face displacement due to rising
2773 housing costs, so these households need access to affordable housing and homeownership opportunities
2774 as well as support in preventing and mitigating displacement.⁴⁵⁶
2775

2776 Some immigrants and refugees, especially those with limited English proficiency and low-incomes, may
2777 have difficulties communicating with landlords, finding stable employment, building a credit history, and
2778 understanding their rights.⁴⁵⁷ Immigrants and refugees who are undocumented face additional barriers to
2779 accessing housing, such as landlords requiring Social Security Numbers for prospective tenants, though this
2780 requirement is not allowed under County code. The King County Comprehensive Plan Equity Work Group
2781 shared that immigrants and refugees need increased access to large, affordable rental units.⁴⁵⁸
2782

2783 The National LGBTQ+ Health and Longevity Center and Goldsen Institute found that LGBTQ+ people
2784 experience systematic disparities in Washington State, including higher rates of housing instability,
2785 homelessness, cost burden, and poverty and less access to care and other services.⁴⁵⁹ LGBTQ+ community
2786 organizations reported that LGTBQ+ residents in King County need access to affordable housing in
2787 neighborhoods where they feel safe and connected to the community.⁴⁶⁰ LGBTQ+ community members
2788 report that it is important to find information about housing from a trusted source, such as a queer housing
2789 group.⁴⁶¹

⁴⁵¹ Community Feedback on Housing. (2022, September). *2023 Developmental Disabilities Legislative Committee*. King County Department of Community and Human Services.

⁴⁵² U.S Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2017). *Housing for Seniors: Challenges and Solution*. [\[link\]](#)

⁴⁵³ King County Regional Homelessness Authority. (2023, January 18). *Draft Five-Year Plan (2023-2028)*. [\[link\]](#)

⁴⁵⁴ *2019 King County Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice*. [\[link\]](#)

⁴⁵⁵ Black Home Initiative. (2022, February 7) *Increasing Black Homeownership in the Puget Sound Region*.[\[link\]](#)

⁴⁵⁶ *Skyway-West Hill and North Highline Anti-displacement Strategies Report*. [\[link\]](#)

⁴⁵⁷ Community Feedback on Housing. (2022, September). *2023 Developmental Disabilities Legislative Committee*. King County Department of Community and Human Services.

⁴⁵⁸ Comprehensive Plan Equity Work Group Meeting. (2023, February 10). King County.

⁴⁵⁹ Goldsen, K. F. et. al. (2020, November). *Washington State LGBTQ+ Equity and Health Report 2020*. [\[link\]](#)

⁴⁶⁰ LGBTQ Allyship. (2019). *2018-2019 South King County Housing Listening Sessions Report of the LGBTQ+ Community*.

⁴⁶¹ LGBTQ Allyship. (2021, September). *Affirmative Housing Marketing Strategies for LGBTQ+ Communities in South King County*.

2790
2791 In addition to systems-level barriers and housing needs, community input and housing discrimination
2792 testing conducted in King County found that individual-level discrimination based on disability, familial
2793 status, national origin, religion, and source of income is still prevalent in King County.^{462,463} Community
2794 members noted experiencing discrimination as part of their search for and while living in affordable
2795 housing.⁴⁶⁴ Housing discrimination needs to be eliminated to ensure all King County residents can access
2796 housing.⁴⁶⁵

2797
2798 As of September 2023, King County is conducting interviews with various housing providers and
2799 community-based organizations across King County to understand barriers to accessing housing for people
2800 of a housing protected class status. These interviews are part of an outreach effort for the 2025 update to
2801 the Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice report. Preliminary findings indicate that barriers to fair
2802 housing choice include high cost of rent, high cost of deposit, steep rent increases, long waitlists for
2803 affordable housing units, an eviction on a person's record, area median income inequities, and
2804 discrimination based on source of income, race, country of origin, sexual orientation, and gender. Other
2805 findings are discussed in this section.

2806 B. Housing Needs of People who Need Supportive Services 2807 or Accessible Units

2808 *People Experiencing Homelessness*

2809 In 2020, the Department of Community and Human Services (DCHS) found that more than 40,000 people
2810 experienced homelessness in King County.⁴⁶⁶ DCHS found that homelessness in King County
2811 disproportionately impacts certain populations in King County; Black, Hispanic/Latin(a)(o)(x), American
2812 Indian, Alaska Native, or Indigenous, and Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander individuals were all
2813 overrepresented in this group compared to King County's overall demographics. Veterans are also
2814 overrepresented among the group who received homelessness services compared to the rate of veterans
2815 countywide.⁴⁶⁷ The 2022 Point in Time count found that more than half of households experiencing
2816 homelessness in King County are unsheltered (57 percent).⁴⁶⁸

2817
2818 In September 2022, 9,636 households experienced homelessness and received services from the homeless
2819 response system. Most of the households who received services (58 percent) were sheltered in some way.
2820 Approximately a quarter (26 percent) of households who received services were unsheltered and 17
2821 percent of households had an unknown shelter status. Households who are sheltered may be more aware of
2822 services so they may be overrepresented among people who access homelessness services.

2823
2824 Approximately 60 percent of households who entered the homeless response system in King County were
2825 households of color. Black households are more likely than White households to return to the homeless
2826 response system after being permanently housed within the previous two years.⁴⁶⁹ The King County
2827 Regional Homelessness Authority Five Year Plan identifies a need for culturally competent services to meet
2828 the needs of people experiencing homelessness.⁴⁷⁰

2829

⁴⁶² 2019 King County Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice. [\[link\]](#)

⁴⁶³ Fair housing Testing. Fair Housing Center of Washington Contract.

⁴⁶⁴ Comprehensive Plan Equity Work Group.

⁴⁶⁵ King County. (2022, June 30). *Tenant Protection Access Plan*. [\[link\]](#)

⁴⁶⁶ King County Department of Community and Human Services, Performance Measurement and Evaluation Division. (December 2021). *Integrating Data to Better Measure Homelessness*. [\[link\]](#)

⁴⁶⁷ King County Department of Community and Human Services Performance Measurement and Evaluation. (2022). *King County's Homeless Response System*. [\[link\]](#)

⁴⁶⁸ KCRHA 2022 Point in Time Count. [\[link\]](#)

⁴⁶⁹ King County Department of Community and Human Services Performance Measurement and Evaluation. (2022). *King County's Homeless Response System*. [\[link\]](#)

⁴⁷⁰ King County Regional Homelessness Authority. (2023, January 18). *Draft Five-Year Plan (2023-2028)*. [\[link\]](#)

2830 The King County Regional Homelessness Authority finds that experiencing homelessness is traumatic, and
2831 can create or exacerbate health conditions, disability, or substance use disorders. More than half (51
2832 percent) of individuals experiencing homelessness in 2022 identified as having a disability, and more than
2833 one-third identified as having a mental health or substance use disorder (31 percent and 37 percent,
2834 respectively). Interviews for the 2022 Point in Time Count found that navigating the complex health care
2835 system and accessing supportive services is difficult for people experiencing homelessness. Expanding
2836 access to stable housing and care can directly improve health outcomes for people experiencing
2837 homelessness.⁴⁷¹ People experiencing homelessness may need support to meet health needs and manage
2838 their care (see the *People with Medical Conditions* subsection in VI. *Housing Needs Analysis* for information
2839 about medical respite care and recuperative housing).

2840
2841 The King County Regional Homeless Authority's Five-Year Plan finds that people experiencing
2842 homelessness need access to shelter and supportive services, such as case management, to quickly
2843 transition to permanent housing. Shelters that provide people with personal space and safety, secure
2844 storage, and a consistent place to live are linked to increased resident health and wellbeing. The Health
2845 Through Housing (HTH) Initiative found that single room shelter settings, like in hotels, increased feelings of
2846 stability, reduced interpersonal conflict, and decreased the volume of 911 emergency calls compared to
2847 congregate settings. HTH also found that moving individuals from congregate shelters to hotel rooms
2848 increased exits to permanent housing.⁴⁷²

2849 *People Living with Disabilities*

2850 Households with a member that has a cognitive limitation are the most likely out of all disability types to rent
2851 countywide.⁴⁷³ Urban unincorporated King County has a higher rate of residents with disabilities compared
2852 to rural unincorporated King County.⁴⁷⁴ This may be because cultivating community support and finding
2853 housing in areas with access to healthcare providers and other services can be more difficult in the rural
2854 area compared to the urban area.⁴⁷⁵ Community members report there is less housing for people with
2855 intellectual and developmental disabilities (IDD) in the rural area.⁴⁷⁶

2856
2857
2858 Disability advocacy organizations have shared with King County that people living with disabilities need
2859 housing that is accessible, near supportive services, and in the community of their choice.⁴⁷⁷ Housing choice
2860 is limited for people living with disabilities due to a lack of available, accessible, affordable housing, as well
2861 as discrimination. Providing reasonable accommodations for people with disabilities, such as adding a ramp
2862 or grab bars, is more likely to carry a financial burden to a landlord.⁴⁷⁸ This may mean that a landlord is less
2863 likely to rent to someone, even with fair housing laws in place. Under federal and state law, landlords must
2864 make reasonable accommodations for tenants with disabilities to ensure they have equal opportunity to use
2865 and enjoy the unit.^{479, 480} A reasonable accommodation is a change, exception, or adjustment so a person
2866 with a disability can live and enjoy the premises, such as installing a wheelchair ramp, allowing a service
2867 animal in the unit or adjusting a rent payment schedule. Tenants who need an accommodation due to a
2868 disability can request that the landlord make the accommodation.

2869
2870 Landlords can deny the accommodation request because:

⁴⁷¹ Prunhuber, Pratti and Vivian Kwok. (2021, February). *Low-Income Older Adults Face Unaffordable Rents, Driving Housing Instability and Homelessness*. Justice in Aging. National Low Income Housing Coalition. [\[link\]](#)

⁴⁷² King County Department of Community and Human Services. (2021, November). *Initial Health through Housing Implementation Plan 2022-2028*. [\[link\]](#)

⁴⁷³ U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2021). *Tenure by Disability Status, CHAS 2014-2018*.

⁴⁷⁴ U.S. Census Bureau. (2022). *Households by English Proficiency, 5-year ACS 2016-2020*.

⁴⁷⁵ ECO Northwest. (2022, December 1). *Housing Needs for Individuals with Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities in Washington State*. Washington State Department of Social and Health Services.

⁴⁷⁶ Community Feedback on Housing. (2022, September). *2023 Developmental Disabilities Legislative Committee*. King County Department of Community and Human Services.

⁴⁷⁷ *2019 King County Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice*. [\[link\]](#)

⁴⁷⁸ *2019 King County Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice*. [\[link\]](#)

⁴⁷⁹ U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (Retrieved 2023, September 15). *Reasonable Accommodations and Modifications*. [\[link\]](#)

⁴⁸⁰ Revised Code of Washington 49.60.222. [\[link\]](#).

- 2871 • the tenant does not have a disability;
2872 • there is no nexus between the disability and the accommodation; or
2873 • the accommodation request creates an undue burden on the landlord.

2874
2875 A landlord is supposed to engage with the request in a meaningful way, such as considering requests on a
2876 case-by-case basis and not adopting a blanket policy against reasonable accommodations or not unduly
2877 burdening a tenant with excessive documentation requirements to submit an accommodation request.
2878

2879 King County staff heard in interviews with housing providers and community-based organizations that some
2880 tenants with disabilities believe they experience discrimination from landlords when making reasonable
2881 accommodation requests. Interviewees explained that landlords oftentimes do not understand what is
2882 required of them when asked to make a reasonable accommodation and refuse to do so. Interviewees
2883 described how challenging it is for people with disabilities to find accessible housing units.
2884

2885 Additionally, staff from the King County Developmental Disability and Early Childhood Supports division
2886 identified a need for family-sized affordable rental units with appropriate accommodations, like roll-in
2887 showers or laundry in the unit, for families with at least one individual living with a disability in King County.
2888 Disabilities can also pose an inherent barrier to searching, applying for, and moving into housing.⁴⁸¹ Rising
2889 costs and a competitive housing market further exacerbate these barriers.⁴⁸² Community feedback identified
2890 a need for affordable housing and increased support in navigating and accessing the housing market to
2891 reduce or eliminate these barriers for individuals with disabilities and their families.⁴⁸³
2892

2893 *People Aged 65 Years and Older*

2894 People aged 65 years and older who wish to remain in their homes and communities may face difficulties
2895 because of rising housing costs. While many people aged 65 years and older in King County and
2896 unincorporated King County own their homes, even homeowners who have paid off their mortgage may
2897 struggle to afford housing costs, like property taxes or maintenance costs.⁴⁸⁴ Although the Seniors, Persons
2898 with Disabilities, and Disabled Veterans Property Tax Exemption program provides some property tax relief,
2899 not all eligible households are enrolled, and enrolled households in unincorporated King County with
2900 incomes between 55 and 65 percent area median income still pay thousands of dollars per year in property
2901 taxes.⁴⁸⁵ Research has shown that senior renters, particularly those with disabilities, are more likely to have
2902 difficulty accessing housing suited to their needs. Black, Indigenous, and People of Color renters 65 years
2903 and older with lower incomes are disproportionately cost burdened and are at increased risk of housing
2904 instability and homelessness. Individuals who are severely cost burdened may have to choose between
2905 housing costs and other necessities, like medication.⁴⁸⁶
2906

2907 Older adult renters are more likely to spend a significant portion of their income on rent.⁴⁸⁷ Extremely low-
2908 income renter households are most likely to include a resident aged 62 years or older countywide, likely
2909 because some of these households rely on programs such as Social Security for their sole source of income
2910 rather than wages.⁴⁸⁸ These households would likely have difficulty maintaining housing in the private
2911 market without additional financial support. Community members shared with King County staff that many
2912 people aged 62 years and older fear rent increases and there is a growing population of people aged 62

⁴⁸¹ 2019 King County Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice. [\[link\]](#)

⁴⁸² Washington State Department of Social and Health Services. (2022, October 1). *Developmental Disabilities Administration Housing fund priority study report*.

⁴⁸³ Community Feedback on Housing. (2022, September). *2023 Developmental Disabilities Legislative Committee*. King County Department of Community and Human Services.

⁴⁸⁴ U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2017). *Housing for Seniors: Challenges and Solution*. [\[link\]](#)

⁴⁸⁵ *Skyway-West Hill and North Highline Anti-displacement Strategies Report*. [\[link\]](#)

⁴⁸⁶ Prunhuber, Pratti and Vivian Kwok. (2021, February). *Low-Income Older Adults Face Unaffordable Rents, Driving Housing Instability and Homelessness*. Justice in Aging, National Low Income Housing Coalition. [\[link\]](#)

⁴⁸⁷ Prunhuber, Pratti and Vivian Kwok. (2021, February). *Low-Income Older Adults Face Unaffordable Rents, Driving Housing Instability and Homelessness*. Justice in Aging, National Low Income Housing Coalition. [\[link\]](#)

⁴⁸⁸ U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2021). *Renters by Income Level by Household Age Status, CHAS 2014-2018*.

2913 years and older on fixed incomes experiencing homelessness.⁴⁸⁹ People aged 65 years and older need
2914 more affordable housing options and financial assistance programs to help them remain in their homes and
2915 communities.⁴⁹⁰ King County staff heard in interviews with housing providers and community-based
2916 organizations that more affordable housing types conducive to multi-generational living would also help
2917 people aged 62 years and older age in their communities and with their families. As explained by a
2918 representative from African Community Housing and Development, "When family-sized homes exist, the
2919 family stays together longer, people can age in place, and there is less youth homelessness." These
2920 interviews indicated that community members considered middle housing as a model that supports multi-
2921 generational living.⁴⁹¹

2922
2923 *People with Medical Conditions*

2924 Housing quality, cost, and stability impacts people’s physical and mental health. Individuals receiving
2925 housing assistance who are recovering from medical conditions may need additional support to restabilize,
2926 such as occupational therapy. People living in supportive housing with a persisting medical condition may
2927 need to be offered chore service to maintain their unit. Medical conditions can lead to households falling
2928 behind on rent, due to medical costs or because they are unable to work, and eventually facing eviction.
2929 People who have experienced eviction report that eviction can lead to worsening or new mental and
2930 physical health problems.⁴⁹² People with medical conditions that impact their ability to pay their housing
2931 costs need support to keep their housing.

2932
2933 People with medical conditions, particularly individuals who are unstably housed or experiencing
2934 homelessness, need access to care and a safe place to recover after leaving the hospital. The King County
2935 Regional Homelessness Authority has found that experiencing homelessness can create and exacerbate an
2936 individual’s physical, mental, and behavioral health conditions, and many people experiencing
2937 homelessness develop complex medical needs. The King County Regional Homelessness Authority Five
2938 Year Plan finds that people experiencing homelessness with medical conditions often need recuperative
2939 housing or medical respite programs. Recuperative housing or recuperative shelter beds are designed to
2940 support people who do not need to remain in a hospital and have medical needs or a follow up medical
2941 appointment and need support in the short term. Recuperative housing prevents emergency room visits
2942 and can improve the health, safety, and stability of residents.⁴⁹³

2943 **C. Housing Needs of Communities Experiencing**
2944 **Disproportionate Harm of Housing Inequities**

2945 *Discrimination Against Housing Protected Classes*

2946 Despite being illegal for over 55 years, individual-level housing discrimination is still ongoing throughout
2947 King County, based on community feedback and housing discrimination testing. The Civil Rights Act of
2948 1968, Title VIII through IX, or Fair Housing Act, banned discrimination in housing nationwide against certain
2949 protected classes. Washington State and King County have also established other protected classes that
2950 may not be discriminated against regarding housing. Table 5 shows the different groups that are protected
2951 at different levels of government, excluding protected classes that are already protected at a higher level of
2952 government.

2954 **Table 5: Housing Protected Classes**

Federal	State of Washington	King County
---------	---------------------	-------------

⁴⁸⁹ Comprehensive Plan Equity Work Group Meeting. (2023, January 20). King County.
⁴⁹⁰ Metropolitan Center for Applied Research & Extension. (2018). *Moving Towards Age-Friendly Housing in King County*. [\[link\]](#)
⁴⁹¹ King County DCHS staff interviews with multiple housing providers and community-based organizations (June-August 2023).
⁴⁹² Cookson, T., Margaret Diddams, Xochitl Maykovich, Edmund Witter. (2018, September). *Losing Home: The Human Cost of Eviction in Seattle*. Seattle Women’s Commission and the Housing Justice Project. [\[link\]](#)
⁴⁹³ King County Regional Homelessness Authority. (2023, January 18). *Draft Five-Year Plan (2023-2028)*. [\[link\]](#)

Race	Creed	Age
Color	Marital Status	Ancestry
National Origin	Veteran/Military Status	
Religion	Use of Service or Assistive	
Sex	Animal	
Disability	Source of Income	
Familial Status		

2955
2956 King County and partner cities contracted with the Fair Housing Center of Washington to conduct testing to
2957 understand the nature and extent of housing discrimination by protected class status in 2019 and 2022. The
2958 contracts tested for discrimination based on disability, familial status, national origin, race, religion, and
2959 source of income. The Fair Housing Center of Washington found evidence of discrimination in 69 of the 135
2960 tests conducted throughout King County. The Fair Housing Center of Washington conducted 11 tests in
2961 unincorporated King County and found evidence of discrimination in eight tests.⁴⁹⁴ Although this number of
2962 tests is too small to be statistically significant, the results indicate that individuals and households who are
2963 members of protected classes continue to face barriers to accessing housing at both a systemic and
2964 individual level.

2965
2966 In interviews between King County staff and organizational representatives, members that their clients
2967 experienced discrimination as part of their search for housing. They also shared that community members
2968 experienced discrimination while living in affordable housing.

2969
2970 Communities need increased access to education and legal support to enforce their rights. Renters in
2971 unincorporated King County are less likely than homeowners to have financial resources to enforce their
2972 rights, such as hiring a private attorney, because renters are more likely to be lower income.⁴⁹⁵ King County
2973 staff heard in multiple interviews with housing providers and community-based organizations that people
2974 are frequently deterred from filing fair housing complaints, because the system for doing so is not effective
2975 in securing housing in the short- and immediate-term.

2976
2977 *Families and Large Households*

2978 Approximately 2,006 households are overcrowded in unincorporated King County.⁴⁹⁶ Community members
2979 from Skyway-West Hill and North Highline, two urban unincorporated areas, have raised the need for more
2980 affordable, large rental units to accommodate large families and multigenerational families.⁴⁹⁷ Urban
2981 unincorporated King County has a higher rate of five-, six-, and seven-person renter households than rural
2982 unincorporated areas.⁴⁹⁸ Most three-, four-, and five or more-bedroom units are occupied by homeowners
2983 in unincorporated King County.⁴⁹⁹ Larger lower-income households, who are disproportionately Black,
2984 Indigenous, and People of Color, are most impacted by the lack of family-sized rental units. King County
2985 staff heard through interviews with multiple housing providers and community-based organizations that
2986 most new housing units have less than four bedrooms, making it even more challenging for households to
2987 find family-sized units.⁵⁰⁰

2988
2989 Large families are more likely to experience housing problems in King County compared to small families,
2990 primarily due to overcrowding and the cost of larger housing.⁵⁰¹ The Equity Work Group shared that families
2991 and large households need access to affordable rental units that accommodate their needs. The lack of
2992 larger, affordable units can lead to overcrowding and displacement. Community members report that
2993 families in King County share homes because they cannot afford to live separately. They shared concerns

⁴⁹⁴ Final Testing Report for King County. (2022). Fair Housing Center of Washington Contract and King County.
⁴⁹⁵ King County. (2022, June 30). *Tenant Protection Access Plan*. [\[link\]](#)
⁴⁹⁶ U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2021). *Overcrowding, CHAS 2014-2018*.
⁴⁹⁷ *Skyway-West Hill and North Highline Anti-displacement Strategies Report*. [\[link\]](#)
⁴⁹⁸ U.S. Census Bureau. (2022). *Tenure by Household Size, 5-year ACS 2016-2020*.
⁴⁹⁹ U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2021). *Housing Units by Tenure and Unit Size, CHAS 2014-2018*.
⁵⁰⁰ King County DCHS staff interviews with multiple housing providers and community-based organizations (June-August 2023).
⁵⁰¹ *2019 King County Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice*. [\[link\]](#)

2994 that recent immigrant and refugee families are often unable to find rental units large enough to
2995 accommodate their needs so multiple families will rent a single home so they can stay together.
2996

2997 Multiple housing providers and community-based organizations shared with King County staff through
2998 interviews that it is not uncommon for eight people to crowd into a two-bedroom apartment because that is
2999 all they could afford. Families and large households need access to affordable rental units that
3000 accommodate their needs. Representatives from the Eastside Legal Assistance Program explained that
3001 landlords have enforced occupancy standards as a means to evict larger families. There are instances where
3002 one household extends their home to a recently evicted household, and then gets evicted themselves for
3003 exceeding occupancy standards.
3004

3005 *Black, Indigenous, and People of Color*

3006 Black, Indigenous, and People of Color households disproportionately experience housing problems,
3007 including incomplete kitchen facilities, incomplete plumbing facilities, overcrowding, and cost burden. In
3008 King County, more than half of Hispanic and Black households experience at least one housing problem.
3009 During the community engagement for the Skyway-West Hill and North Highline Anti-Displacement
3010 Strategies Report, residents identified a need for more publicly subsidized affordable housing for
3011 households below 60 percent area median income. These community members also noted the need for
3012 more affordable, family-sized housing units and culturally specific housing for elders.⁵⁰²
3013

3014 Black households and households of races not listed are significantly more likely to be renters than White
3015 and Asian households.⁵⁰³ In 2016 and 2017, Black households were more than twice as likely to be denied
3016 and half as likely to apply for a home loan than White households in King County. Native American
3017 households were also significantly more likely to be denied a loan than White households.⁵⁰⁴
3018

3019 Racial restrictive covenants and other discriminatory housing practices blocked homeownership and wealth
3020 building opportunities for residents of color in King County (see the discussion in *V. Racially Disparate*
3021 *Impacts Analysis*). The racial wealth gap is exacerbated by a lack of affordable housing. Increasing the
3022 supply of middle housing will increase homeownership opportunities because these housing types are
3023 more affordable than new single detached homes. Middle housing types, like duplexes, triplexes, and
3024 townhomes, are the main housing type purchased by Black and Hispanic homeowners.⁵⁰⁵
3025

3026 Some Black, Indigenous, and People of Color and low- and moderate-income households may have
3027 difficulty saving for a down payment due to high rent prices and disproportionate rates of cost burden and
3028 severe cost burden. Saving for down payment is a leading barrier to homeownership. Down-payment
3029 assistance programs provide more opportunities for homeownership for households at or below 80 percent
3030 area median income who have been historically excluded from building generational wealth through
3031 homeownership. In Skyway-West Hill and North Highline, most renter households are 80 percent area
3032 median income or below.⁵⁰⁶
3033

3034 The Equity Work Group noted that the displacement happening in Skyway is visible, and that Black,
3035 Indigenous, and People of Color communities that have lived in areas for generations are being displaced.
3036 They also reported that households at risk of displacement are often those that were displaced from other
3037 neighborhoods, such as Black residents in Skyway who were displaced from the Central District or Rainier
3038 Valley. The Equity Work Group also raised concerns that residents who are displaced are unable to find new
3039 housing in their communities, particularly housing located in walkable areas near grocery stores and other
3040 necessities.
3041

⁵⁰² Skyway-West Hill and North Highline Anti-displacement Strategies Report. [[link](#)]

⁵⁰³ U.S. Census Bureau. (2022). *Age Range by Tenure, 5-year ACS 2016-2020*.

⁵⁰⁴ 2019 King County Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice. [[link](#)]

⁵⁰⁵ Logani, I., "Racial Wealth Gap." [[link](#)]

⁵⁰⁶ Skyway-West Hill and North Highline Anti-displacement Strategies Report. [[link](#)]

3042 Skyway-West Hill and North Highline residents shared that displacement impacts local businesses and that
3043 cultural displacement takes place when community members lose social and cultural connections in their
3044 community because of gentrification factors.⁵⁰⁷ Displaced residents may lose connections to community
3045 establishments and faith-based organizations that provide direct support or connect people to support
3046 systems (see the discussion of displacement in the *V. Racially Disparate Impacts Analysis* for more
3047 information about displacement in King County). The Equity Work Group reported that Black, Indigenous,
3048 and People of Color residents need affordable housing near accommodations that reflect community
3049 members' needs and in communities of their choice.

3050
3051 *Immigrant Communities*

3052 In 2019, approximately 6.5 percent of refugees coming to the United States resettled in Washington, and
3053 about half of refugees who come to Washington settle in King County.⁵⁰⁸ Approximately 5.8 percent of King
3054 County residents and 3.9 percent of unincorporated King County residents have limited English
3055 proficiency.⁵⁰⁹ Immigrant households with limited English proficiency may face additional barriers to finding
3056 housing, as rental postings and applications may not be readily available in languages other than English.
3057 Residents and organizations that serve immigrants and refugees informed King County staff about
3058 misunderstandings about housing rights, responsibilities, and protections for residents with limited English
3059 proficiency.⁵¹⁰

3060
3061 Refugees face barriers when transitioning from temporary cash assistance. Through a Washington State
3062 program, refugees receive eight months of temporary cash assistance upon arrival.⁵¹¹ Households can have
3063 difficulty finding stable employment and obtaining affordable housing before their assistance expires.
3064 Refugees who find stable employment still face difficulties building credit history before their assistance
3065 period ends, which presents a barrier to securing housing.

3066
3067 Immigrants and refugees who are undocumented face barriers to accessing affordable housing, even if the
3068 housing does not require documentation of citizenship status. Requirements such as documentation of pay
3069 create difficulties for households who are paid only in cash. Community members also shared that credit
3070 scores, requiring social security numbers at the time of application, and source of income can be used as
3071 tools to discriminate against housing applicants.⁵¹² King County staff heard through community
3072 engagement efforts that some landlords have taken advantage of someone's undocumented status by
3073 charging them substantially higher move-in costs.

3074
3075 Housing providers and community-based organizations interviewed by King County staff shared that
3076 undocumented workers are recurrently too fearful to make a formal discrimination complaint out of fear of
3077 landlord retaliation.

3078
3079 The King County Tenant Protections Access Plan recommended that the County provide greater access to
3080 information regarding tenant protections and housing rights for immigrant and refugee residents by
3081 providing tenant rights information in multiple languages. The Comprehensive Plan Equity Work Group
3082 identified a need for increased access to large, affordable rental units for immigrant and refugee residents.
3083 Affordable rental units with two or more bedrooms or middle housing types can accommodate these needs.
3084 Middle housing is conducive to multi-generational living, as large or multi-generational families can reside
3085 in the same building. King County staff heard in interviews with housing providers and community-based
3086 organizations that immigrants oftentimes arrive in the area with their extended families and need housing
3087 that will accommodate that. The Equity Work Group also shared that studio apartments are often not

⁵⁰⁷ King County Comprehensive Plan Equity Work Group.

⁵⁰⁸ Washington State Department of Social and Health Services. (2021). *Office of Refugee and Immigrant Assistance*. [\[link\]](#)

⁵⁰⁹ U.S. Census Bureau. (2022). *Households by English Proficiency, 5-year ACS 2016-2020*.

⁵¹⁰ *2019 King County Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice*. [\[link\]](#)

⁵¹¹ Washington State Department of Social and Health Services. *Refugee Cash Assistance*. Economic Services Administration. [\[link\]](#)

⁵¹² *2019 King County Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice*. [\[link\]](#)

3088 culturally appropriate; however, most new affordable housing units in recently funded projects are studios
3089 or one-bedroom units.

3090
3091 *LGBTQ+ Communities*

3092 LGBTQ+ people experience systematic disparities in Washington State, including higher rates of housing
3093 instability and poverty and less access to care and other services. LGBTQ+ people in Washington
3094 disproportionately experience bias, traumatic events, and social isolation. LGBTQ+ adults in Washington
3095 have higher rates of disability, frequent mental distress, and poorer general health compared to cisgender
3096 and straight people. Black, Indigenous, and People of Color LGBTQ+ adults experience greater health
3097 disparities.⁵¹³ Research finds that 10.7 percent of Seattle and 5.5 percent of the Seattle-Tacoma metro area
3098 identified as LGBTQ+, the third highest rate among the 15 largest metro areas in the U.S.⁵¹⁴

3099
3100 In a 2019 survey of LGBTQ+ adults in Washington, participants were renters (54 percent), and one-third
3101 lacked confidence about staying in their current housing. More than half of participants were cost burdened
3102 (60 percent), and 27 percent had experienced homelessness. More than one-fifth of trans and gender
3103 diverse participants experienced repeated homelessness or moved two or more times within the previous
3104 year. Trans and gender diverse participants also reported the highest rate of housing insecurity (39 percent).
3105 Nearly half (47 percent) of LGBTQ+ participants residing in King County reported having difficulty securing
3106 food, and 42 percent noted difficulty paying bills due to income instability.⁵¹⁵

3107
3108 LGBTQ+ community organizations shared that LGBTQ+ residents in King County need access to affordable
3109 housing in neighborhoods where they feel safe and connected to the community.⁵¹⁶ Community members
3110 report that the quality, safety, and diversity of the neighborhood are important to finding housing⁵¹⁷
3111 Community engagement indicated that LGBTQ+ people aged 62 years and older will sometimes hide their
3112 LGBTQ+ identity in order to feel safe in housing. LGBTQ+ community members in South King County
3113 identified the need for expanded access to services in the rural area of South King County. LGBTQ+
3114 residents in South King County reported that the most common reason they moved to South King County
3115 was due to affordability. Often, these residents moved out of Seattle and further south due to increasing
3116 housing costs.⁵¹⁸

3117
3118 LGBTQ+ residents of South King County reported experiencing housing discrimination based on their
3119 sexual orientation and gender identity. A representative from Queer Power Alliance, formerly LGBTQ
3120 Allyship, shared with King County staff that the use of a chosen name that does not match identification
3121 records has been leveraged by landlords and property owners to deny an application. LGBTQ+ residents
3122 believe it is important that housing organizations have inclusivity in statements, use inclusive terminology
3123 and images, have experience working with trans people, and have LGBTQ+ staff. Community members
3124 share that they need to feel like they can trust their landlords or other housing service providers. They also
3125 note that finding information about housing from a trusted source, such as a community-based organization
3126 or queer housing group, is important.⁵¹⁹ Stronger enforcement of fair housing laws and expanded access to
3127 tenant protections would increase access to safe, stable housing for LGBTQ+ residents.

⁵¹³ Goldsen, K. F. et. al. (2020, November). *Washington State LGBTQ+ Equity and Health Report 2020*. [\[link\]](#)

⁵¹⁴ Balk, G. (2020, October 10). More than 10% of Seattle residents identify as LGBTQ+ - on par with San Francisco. *The Seattle Times*. [\[link\]](#)

⁵¹⁵ Goldsen, K. F. et. al., *Washington State LGBTQ+ Equity and Health Report 2020*. [\[link\]](#)

⁵¹⁶ LGBTQ Allyship. (2019). *2018-2019 South King County Housing Listening Sessions Report of the LGBTQ+ Community*.

⁵¹⁷ LGBTQ Allyship. (2021). *Affirmative Housing Marketing Strategies for LGBTQ+ Communities in South King County*.

⁵¹⁸ LGBTQ Allyship, *2018-2019 South King County Housing Listening Sessions*.

⁵¹⁹ LGBTQ Allyship, *Affirmative Housing Marketing Strategies*.

VII. Land Capacity Analysis

A. Section Summary

This section conducts the land capacity analysis as required by CPP H-11 and the Growth Management Act (GMA) as amended by House Bill 1220. This section also fulfills CPP H-3d and H-3i.

CPP H-11 requires jurisdictions to:

Identify sufficient capacity of land for housing including, but not limited to income-restricted housing; housing for moderate-, low-, very low-, and extremely low-income households; manufactured housing; multiunit housing; group homes; foster care facilities; emergency housing; emergency shelters; permanent supportive housing; and within an urban growth area boundary, duplexes, triplexes, and townhomes.

CPP H-3d and H-3i requires jurisdictions to:

Conduct an inventory and analysis in each jurisdiction of existing and projected housing needs of all segments of the population and summarize the findings in the housing element. The inventory and analysis shall include:

- d) Percentage of residential land zoned for and geographic distribution of moderate- and high-density housing in the jurisdiction; and*
- i) Housing development capacity within a half-mile walkshed of high-capacity or frequent transit service, if applicable.*

This land capacity analysis follows guidance from the Washington State Department of Commerce.⁵²⁰ The guidance assumes certain urban zone categories match to different housing types and affordability levels. Although these assumptions may appear simplified, King County's comprehensive plan must identify a quantifiable and sufficient capacity of land to accommodate all projected housing needs, per the Growth Management Act. Table 6 shows the analysis and assumptions for urban unincorporated King County. These assumptions reflect the current economic conditions of King County's housing market.

This land capacity analysis finds sufficient urban zoning capacity to accommodate permanent housing needs at all income levels and special housing types. However, this analysis finds there is insufficient capacity in urban commercial zones to meet unincorporated King County's emergency housing need of 1,034 beds by 2044. The analysis found a deficit of 116 emergency housing units in urban commercial zones. To address this deficit, King County added permanent supportive and emergency housing types as allowed uses in the development code to reduce barriers to producing permanent supportive and emergency housing. These types of housing will now be allowed in the higher density residential zones, most commercial zones, and the office zone. See emergency housing analysis in *IX. Making Adequate Provisions to meet the Housing Needs of All Economic Segments of the Community*, which identifies barriers for emergency housing in unincorporated King County.

Approximately 94 percent of the land in the urban unincorporated area that allows residential housing is zoned for eight dwelling units per acre or fewer. Except for accessory dwelling units, moderate or high-density housing is unlikely to be constructed in these areas.

Urban unincorporated King County has a total development capacity of 4,173 housing units within a half mile walkshed of high-capacity or frequent transit. North Highline and Skyway-West Hill contain 86 percent of the parcels identified.

⁵²⁰ Growth Management Services. (2022, December). Guidance for Evaluating Land Capacity to Meet All Housing Needs. Washington State Department of Commerce. [\[link\]](#)

3173 **B. Permanent Housing**

3174 King County must plan to accommodate 5,412 permanent housing units in unincorporated King County by
3175 2044. King County staff conducted a land capacity analysis to determine if there is sufficient capacity to
3176 meet future permanent housing needs in unincorporated King County under current zoning and
3177 development regulations. This analysis first identifies the net developable acres and planned density in each
3178 land use zone to determine total capacity in zone categories. Land use zones, for this analysis, are grouped
3179 into the following four zone categories:

- 3180 • Low density: single detached homes;
- 3181 • Middle density: townhomes, duplex, triplex, quadplex;
- 3182 • Low rise: apartments or condominiums up to three floors; and
- 3183 • Mid rise: apartments or condominiums up to six floors.

3184
3185 Table 6 compares the aggregated housing needs of each income level to the total capacity in each zone
3186 category. The land capacity analysis finds there is sufficient capacity to meet projected permanent housing
3187 needs at all income levels in unincorporated King County under current zoning and development
3188 regulations. The analysis identifies a land capacity surplus of 27,965 permanent housing units.
3189

3190

Table 6: Comparison of Projected Housing Needs to Capacity

Income Level (%AMI) and Special Housing Needs	Projected Housing Need	Zone Categories Serving These Needs	Aggregated Housing Needs	Total Capacity in Zone Category	Capacity Surplus or Deficit
0-30% PSH	608	Low rise, mid rise, and ADUs	2,628	15,114	12,486
0-30% Other	1,157				
>30-50%	571				
>50-80%	292				
>80-100%	366	Middle density	781	8,595	7,814
>100-120%	415				
>120%	2,003	Low density	2,003	9,668	7,665
Total	5,412		5,412	33,377	27,965

3191

C. Emergency Housing

3192

Emergency Housing Land Capacity in Commercial Zones

3193

King County must plan to accommodate 1,034 emergency housing units in unincorporated King County by 2044. Emergency housing is non-permanent housing types such as shelters and tiny homes. King County staff analysis found there is insufficient capacity to meet projected emergency housing needs in commercial zones under current zoning and development regulations. The analysis found a land capacity deficit in commercial zones of 116 emergency housing and shelter beds/units in unincorporated King County. The 2024 Comprehensive Plan adopted code changes that clarify which emergency housing types are allowed in which zones and streamline permitting, thereby increasing the zoning capacity and reducing barriers to developing emergency housing (see the emergency housing analysis in IX. *Making Adequate Provisions for Housing Needs of All Economic Segments of the Community*).

3194

3195

3196

3197

3198

3199

3200

3201

3202

3203

Table 7 compares the total land capacity to the total projected emergency housing need in commercial zones in unincorporated King County. The analysis calculates the capacity by totaling the acres in the 117 parcels identified as potential sites for emergency housing or shelter in Commercial Business (CB), Regional Business (RB), and Office (O) zones. Potential parcels are those which are larger than half an acre and within ¼ mile of a transit stop. The analysis identifies the average density based on the densities of existing emergency housing projects.

3204

3205

3206

3207

3208

3209

3210

Table 7: Surplus or Deficit for Emergency Housing and Emergency Shelter in Commercial Zones

Site Grouping	Assumed Density	Average Density	Total Acres	Total Capacity	Total Need	Capacity Surplus or Deficit
Emergency Shelter: Congregate Shelter	40	53	17.22	918	1,034	(116)
Emergency Housing: Tiny House Villages	60					
Emergency Housing: Existing Housing Conversion	60					

3211

3212

3213 *Emergency Housing Land Capacity in Residential Zones*
 3214 Some emergency housing types could be permitted outside commercial zones in unincorporated King
 3215 County. King County staff therefore conducted an additional analysis and found there is sufficient land
 3216 capacity in urban residential zones to meet projected emergency housing needs in unincorporated King
 3217 County.⁵²¹ This analysis identified a land capacity surplus in residential zones of 4,728 emergency housing
 3218 and shelter beds/units in unincorporated King County.

3219 Table 8 compares the total land capacity to the total projected emergency housing need in unincorporated
 3220 King County. This analysis calculates the zoning capacity by totaling the acres in the 2,235 parcels identified
 3221 as potential sites for emergency housing or shelter in residential zones. Potential parcels are those which are
 3222 larger than half an acre and within ¼ mile of a transit stop.

Table 8: Surplus or Deficit for Emergency Housing and Emergency Shelter in Residential Zones

Site Grouping	Assumed Density	Average Density	Total Acres	Total Capacity	Total Need	Capacity Surplus or Deficit
Emergency Shelter: Congregate Shelter	40	53	108	5,760	1,034	4,726
Emergency Housing: Tiny House Villages	60					
Emergency Housing: Existing Housing Conversion	60					

Total acres include potential parcels in land use zones: R-4, R-6, R-8, R-12, R-18, and R-24.

3223

⁵²¹ Residential zones include R-4, R-6, R-8, R-12, R-18, and R-24; this analysis excludes R-48.

3224 **D. Percentage of Residential Land Zoned for and Geographic**
 3225 **Distribution of Medium- and High-Density Housing**

3226 This section analyzes the zoning and land use for unincorporated King County to understand how much
 3227 land is zoned for different levels of residential density. See Table 9 for King County’s land use zones
 3228 organized by category. Staff classified R-8, which allows up to eight dwelling units per acre under base
 3229 density, as low-density housing, as developers are unlikely to construct "middle housing" types, such as
 3230 townhomes, rowhouses, or duplexes, triplexes or quadplexes, in this zone. Developers could build middle
 3231 housing types at eight dwelling units per acre, but it would require a significant percentage of the property
 3232 remain open space.
 3233

3234 **Table 9: King County Zones Categorized by Residential Density Allowed**

Zone	Category
R-24, R-48, CB, RB, O	High Density
R-12, R-18	Moderate Density
R-1, R-4, R-6, R-8, NB	Low Density
A-10, A-35, RA-2.5, RA-5, RA-10, UR	Rural Density
F, M, I	Excluded

3235 Table 10 shows that 94 percent of the land in the urban area that allows residential housing is zoned for low
 3236 density. Although King County’s zoning code does not exclude multiunit housing types in the zones
 3237 identified as low density in this assessment, the dwelling units allowed per acre effectively make single
 3238 detached housing the most likely form of development.
 3239
 3240

3241 **Table 10: Low, Moderate, and High-Density Residential Zoning in Unincorporated King County**

522

	Urban	Rural
Acres of High Density	627	186
Percent of Zoned for High Density	3.4	0.1
Acres of Medium Density	448	31
Percent of Zoned for Medium	2.4	0
Acres of Low Density	17,103	759
Percent of Zoned for Low Density	94.2	0.4
Acres of Rural Zoning	0	181,442
Percent Zoned for Rural	0	99.5
Total	18,197	182,419

3243 Map 7 shows the geographic distribution of land zoned for moderate and high density residential in
 3244 unincorporated King County. The majority of the land in the urban area zoned for moderate and high
 3245 density is in North Highline, Skyway West-Hill, and Fairwood. About 90 percent of the land, by area, that
 3246 allows residential development is rural, or outside the urban growth area, and therefore is not targeted for
 3247 residential growth. In the rural area, almost all parcels that allow residential development are zoned for low
 3248

⁵²² Land Use data collected July 2022.

3249 density. The rural towns of Fall City, Snoqualmie, and Vashon account for most of the land outside the urban
3250 areas that are zoned for moderate or high density.

3251 **Map 7: Moderate and High Density Zoning**

MODERATE AND HIGH DENSITY ZONING


Residential land in unincorporated King County zoned for moderate and high density housing.

Percentages calculated based on total Unincorporated KC Residential Zoned Parcels

GMA	High Density Residential Acres	Moderate Density Residential Acres	Low Density Residential Acres	Rural Density Residential Acres	Uninc. KC Total Residential Acres
Rural	187	0.1%	31	0.0%	759
Urban	641	0.3%	760	0.4%	17,002
Grand Total	828	0.4%	791	0.4%	17,762

Percentages calculated based on Urban Designated Unincorporated KC Residential Zoned Parcels

GMA	High Density Urban Residential	Moderate Density Urban Residential	Low Density Urban Residential Acres	Rural Density Urban Residential Acres	Uninc. KC Urban Residential Acres
Urban	641	3%	760	4%	17,002
Grand Total	641	3%	760	4%	17,002



3253 E. Housing Development Capacity within a Half-Mile
3254 Walkshed of High-Capacity or Frequent Transit Service

3255 This section analyzes the development capacity in unincorporated King County and Sound Transit and King
3256 County Metro and Sound Transit service to estimate the potential new housing units that could be
3257 constructed within a half mile walkshed of high-capacity or frequent transit. High-capacity transit includes
3258 transit systems such as rail and bus rapid transit. King County staff used the criteria established by the King
3259 County Urban Growth Capacity Report⁵²³, and the Affordable Housing Report: Inventory and Feasibility
3260 Analysis of Affordable Housing on County-owned Properties⁵²⁴ to identify parcels as having potential
3261 development capacity. The Urban Growth Capacity Report identified parcels that are vacant and re-
3262 developable and calculated the potential capacity to construct new housing under existing zoning using
3263 data from the King County Assessor's Office. King County staff used the following definitions to identify
3264 parcels in unincorporated King County as having growth capacity:

- 3265 • vacant: parcels identified as vacant or the "improvement value" is less than \$10,000;
- 3266 • re-developable (Single and Multiunit): parcels with zoning capacity that is 2.5 times greater than the
3267 existing units and the "improvement value" is less than half the land value; and
- 3268 • re-developable (Mixed-Use and Non-residential): parcels with an improvement value less than half the
3269 land value.

3270
3271 The Affordable Housing Report: Inventory and Feasibility Analysis of Affordable Housing on County-owned
3272 properties identified parcels that met the following criteria as potentially developable:

- 3273 • within the Urban Growth Area;
- 3274 • greater than 5,000 square feet;
- 3275 • at least 5,000 square feet unencumbered by critical areas, including streams, lakes, rivers, wetlands, or
3276 landslide risk;
- 3277 • at least 5,000 square feet unencumbered by operational stormwater ponds or public right-of-way;
- 3278 • less than 50 percent of the parcel is used as a park, airport runway, wastewater treatment plant, or
3279 pumping station;
- 3280 • if in a census tract with greater than 49.5 percent of its population with incomes at or below 80 percent
3281 of area median income, within a ¼ mile walk to a bus stop;
- 3282 • within 200 feet of a public sewer and road;
- 3283 • a developable shape (an area to perimeter ratio greater than 0.2); and
- 3284 • if a non-residential zoning category (industrial/manufacturing, commercial), a parcel or combination of
3285 adjacent parcels that are greater than 20,000 square feet.


3286
3287 Map 8 shows the identified parcels in red below. The results of the analysis found a total development
3288 capacity of 13,596 housing units. North Highline and Skyway-West Hill contain 91 percent of the capacity
3289 identified. Maps 9 and 10 show the total housing development capacity within a half-mile of high-capacity or
3290 frequent transit in North Highline (6,918 housing units) and Skyway West-Hill (5,388 housing units),
3291 respectively. Map 11 shows the total housing development capacity within a half-mile of high-capacity or
3292 frequent transit in North Federal Way, Kent North Green River Park, and Klump PAA (1,263 housing units).

⁵²³ Ordinance 19369 (2021). [\[link\]](#)

⁵²⁴ *Affordable Housing Report: Inventory and Feasibility Analysis of Affordable Housing on County-owned Properties*. [\[link\]](#)

3293
 3294

Map 8: Housing Development Capacity within a half mile of high-capacity or frequent transit, Unincorporated King County



3295

3296 **Map 9: Housing Development Capacity within a half mile of high-capacity or frequent transit, North Highline**

NORTH HIGHLINE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT CAPACITY

In Urban Unincorporated KC within a half mile of High Capacity or Frequent Transit

- High Capacity & Frequent Transit Stops
- Half Mile Walk-Shed of High Capacity & Frequent Transit Stops
- Residential Land in Unincorporated King County
- Potential Annexation Area
- Incorporated City
- Urban Growth Area Boundary
- Parcels with Housing Development Capacity
 - Source: Land Capacity Analysis
 - Source: King County-Owned Parcels Potentially Feasible for Development of Affordable Housing


Data Sources:
 King County Department of Local Services
 King County Department of Assessments
 King County Department of Natural Resources and Parks
 King County Office of the Executive, Performance, Strategy and Budget
 King County Department of Community and Human Services
 Puget Sound Regional Council

Notes
 Residential zoned property in unincorporated KC carries any of the following zoning base zoning designations:
 R-25, R-48, CB, BB, Q - High Density
 R-12, R-18 - Moderate Density
 R-1, R-4, R-6, R-8, N8, UR - Low Density
 A-10, A-35, RA-25, RA-5, RA-10 - Rural Density
 Properties with the following characteristics are not deemed Residential zoned property:
 Owned by King County government and determined not to be feasible for housing
 Owned by the United States Forest Service
 Owned by Washington State Parks
 Owned by Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife
 Owned by National Park District
 Siting sites for the King County Transfer of Development Rights program
 Enrolled in the Federal Preservation Program
 Have conservation easements owned by King County Parks
 Open water parcels that do not have a valid parcel number

The information indicated on this map has been compiled by King County staff from a variety of sources and is subject to change without notice. King County makes no representations or warranties, express or implied, as to accuracy, completeness, timeliness, or rights to the use of such information. King County shall not be liable for any general, special, indirect, incidental, or consequential damages including, but not limited to, lost revenues or lost profits resulting from the use or misuse of the information contained on this map. Any sale of this map or information on this map is prohibited except by written permission of King County.

Data Source	Potential Annexation Area	Development Capacity
KCOPFDAH	North Highline	65
Land Capacity Analysis	North Highline	6,741
Land Capacity Analysis	Sliver by the River	112
Total		6,918

Land Capacity Analysis: Data provided by KC PSB
 KCOPFDAH: Data provided by KC DC&H



Date: 3/12/24
 Source: https://data.kingcounty.gov/arcgis/DC-IP2024-CompPlan-HousingNeedsAssessment/Map2/Capacity2028?app=f60d4

3297 **Map 10: Housing Development Capacity within a half mile of high-capacity or frequent transit, Skyway West-Hill**

**SKYWAY/WEST HILL
 HOUSING
 DEVELOPMENT CAPACITY**

*In Urban Unincorporated KC within a half mile of
 High Capacity or Frequent Transit*


- High Capacity & Frequent Transit Stops
- Half Mile Walk-Shed of High Capacity & Frequent Transit Stops
- Residential Land in Unincorporated King County
- Potential Annexation Area
- Incorporated City
- Urban Growth Area Boundary
- Parcel with Housing Development Capacity
 - Source: Land Capacity Analysis
 - Source: King County-Owned Parcels Potentially Feasible for Development of Affordable Housing

Data Sources:
 King County Department of Local Services
 King County Department of Bioscience
 King County Department of Natural Resources and Parks
 King County Office of the Executive Performance, Strategy and Budget
 King County Department of Community and Human Services
 Puget Sound Regional Council

Notes:
 Residential zoned property in unincorporated KC carries any of the following zoning base zoning designations:
 R-24, R-48, CE, RB, D - High Density
 R-12, R-18 - Moderate Density
 R-1, R-4, R-6, R-8, NS, UR - Low Density
 A-10, A-15, RA-2.5, RA-5, RA-10 - Rural Density

Properties with the following characteristics are not shown Residential zoned property:
 Owned by King County government and department, not to be listed for leasing
 Owned by the United States Forest Service
 Owned by Washington State Parks
 Owned by Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife
 Owned by Volcan Park District
 Seeding sites for the King County Transfer of Development Rights program
 Enrolled in the Farmland Preservation Program
 Have conservation easements owned by King County Parks
 Open water parcels that do not have a valid parcel number

The information included on this map has been compiled by King County staff from a variety of sources and is subject to change without notice. King County makes no representations or warranties, express or implied, as to accuracy, completeness, timeliness, or rights to the use of such information. King County shall not be liable for any general, special, indirect, incidental, or consequential damages including, but not limited to, lost revenues or lost profits resulting from the use or reliance of the information contained on this map. Any sale of this map or information on this map is prohibited except by written permission of King County.



Date: 7/12/2024
 Path: \\fs01\gis\gisdata\arcinfo\DC-PSB\DC-CompPlan_HousingNeedsAssessment\Map20-Capacity202307.aprx
 page: 4

3298 **Map 11: Housing Development Capacity within a half mile of high-capacity or frequent transit, North Federal Way, Kent North Green**
 3299 **River Park, and Klump PAA**

**NORTH FEDERAL WAY,
 KENT NORTH GREEN RIVER
 PARK, AND KLUMP PAA
 HOUSING
 DEVELOPMENT CAPACITY**

*In Urban Unincorporated KC within a half mile of
 High Capacity or Frequent Transit*


- High Capacity & Frequent Transit Stops
- Half Mile Walk-Short of High Capacity & Frequent Transit Stops
- Residential Land in Unincorporated King County
- Potential Annexation Area
- Incorporated City
- Urban Growth Area Boundary
- Parcels with Housing Development Capacity
 - Source: Land Capacity Analysis
 - Source: King County Owned Parcels Potentially Feasible for Development of Affordable Housing

Data Sources:
 King County Department of Local Services
 King County Department of Assessment
 King County Department of Natural Resources and Parks
 King County Office of the Executive Parks and Recreation Strategy and Budget
 King County Department of Community and Human Services
 Puget Sound Regional Council

Notes:
 Residential zoned property in unincorporated KC carries any of the following zoning
 lower zoning designations:
 R-24, R-48, CE, RB, O - High Density
 R-12, R-18 - Moderate Density
 R-1, R-4, R-6, R-8, NB, UR - Low Density
 A-10, A-15, RA-25, RA-5, RA-10 - Rural Density

Properties with the following characteristics are not shown Residential zoned
 property:
 Owned by King County government and its instrumentalities for the benefit for housing
 Owned by the United States Forest Service
 Owned by Washington State Parks
 Owned by Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife
 Owned by Yakima Park District
 Sending sites for the King County Transfer of Development Rights program
 Enrolled in the Farmland Preservation Program
 Have conservation easements owned by King County Parks
 Open water parcels that do not have a valid parcel number

The information included on this map has been compiled by King County staff from a
 variety of sources and is subject to change without notice. King County makes no
 representation or warranties, express or implied, as to accuracy, completeness,
 timeliness or rights to the use of such information. King County shall not be liable for any
 general, special, indirect, incidental, or consequential damages including, but not limited to,
 lost revenues or lost profits resulting from the use or reliance of the information contained
 on this map. Any sale of this map or information on this map is prohibited except by
 written permission of King County.



Data Source	Potential Annexation Area	Development Capacity
KCOPFDAH	Kent North Green River Park	48
Land Capacity Analysis	North Federal Way	1,158
Land Capacity Analysis	Klump	57
	Total	1,263

Land Capacity Analysis: Data provided by KC PSB
 KCOPFDAH: Data provided by KC DC&HS



Date: 3/12/2024
 Path: \\scc\h2\GIS\GIS\Projects\DC-492024_Comp_Plan_Housing_Needs_Assessment\Map20-Cap_Attach_202307.apr
 pscd\j

VIII. Evaluating Effectiveness of Strategies to Meet Housing Need

A. Section Summary

This section fulfills requirements in Revised Code of Washington 36.70A.070(2)(d) and King County CPPs H-3a and H-4. Revised Code of Washington 36.70A.070(2)(d) requires jurisdictions document gaps in local funding to meet housing needs.

CPP H-3a requires jurisdictions to:

Conduct an inventory and analysis in each jurisdiction of existing and projected housing needs of all segments of the population and summarize the findings in the housing element. The inventory and analysis shall include:

- a) *The number of existing and projected housing units necessary to plan for and accommodate projected growth and meet the projected housing needs articulated in Tables H-1 and H-2, including: 1. Permanent housing needs, which includes units for moderate-, low-, very low-, and extremely low-income households and permanent supportive housing 2. Emergency housing needs, which includes emergency housing and emergency shelters.*

CPP H-4 requires jurisdictions:

Evaluate the effectiveness of existing housing policies and strategies to meet a significant share of countywide need. Identify gaps in existing partnerships, policies, and dedicated resources for meeting the countywide need and eliminating racial and other disparities in access to housing and neighborhoods of choice.

This section evaluates the effectiveness of strategies and policies to meet unincorporated King County's projected housing need of 5,412 net new units needed, divided between different income levels, and emergency housing need of 1,034 beds by 2044.

Conducting the analyses in this section requires making a significant number of assumptions and projecting needs over 26 years, from 2019 through 2044. Predicting the future, particularly for complex systems like the housing market, is difficult. Changing one assumption could impact the ultimate findings for each analysis.

The housing production gap analysis projects that the housing units constructed through 2044, regardless of income level, more than double the overall net new need of 5,412 units allocated to urban unincorporated King County. This estimate may be skewed by the analysis' assumption that production from 2025 through 2044 will continue at the same rate as in 2016 through 2024, when two major projects were completed: Greenbridge in White Center and Redmond Ridge.

This analysis also projects an overall gap or deficit of 357 units for households earning at or below 80 percent area median income, with a significant gap for households earning less than 50 percent AMI and a significant surplus for households earning 50 to 80 percent area median income. There are multiple factors contributing to the gap in funding housing affordable to households earning less than 50 percent area median income. The largest single source of funding for affordable housing, nine percent and four percent Low-Income Housing Tax Credits, typically create units affordable to households earning at or below 60 percent area median income. The nine percent tax credits generally fund projects with the deepest affordability and are highly competitive. Inclusionary housing and other land-based regulatory policies also typically produce units above 50 percent area median income. The emergency housing production gap

3349 analysis projects that urban unincorporated King County will have less than half of the 1,034 emergency
 3350 housing beds needed by 2044.
 3351
 3352 King County staff also conducted an affordable housing funding gap based on the net new units needed for
 3353 households with incomes at or below 80 percent area median income.

3354 **B. Net New Housing Units Needed, 2019 through 2044**

3355 In alignment with House Bill 1220, King County updated the existing and projected housing needs using the
 3356 data and methodology provided by the Washington State Department of Commerce. State law requires all
 3357 jurisdictions plan to accommodate the housing needs of residents at every income level.⁵²⁵
 3358

3359 Table 11 shows the identified projected housing needs for extremely low-, very low-, low- and moderate-
 3360 income households, permanent supportive housing, and emergency housing.⁵²⁶
 3361

3362 **Table 11: Projected Housing Needs by Income Level in Unincorporated King County**

Income Level	% Area Median Income	Net New Units Needed, 2020-2045
Extremely low	0-30% Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH)	608
	0-30% Other (non-PSH)	1,157
Very low	>30-50%	571
Low	>50-80%	292
	>80-100%	366
Moderate	>100-120%	415
	>120%	2,003
Above Moderate		
All Income Levels		5,412
Temporary Housing Needs		Net New Beds Needed, 2020-2045
Emergency Housing/Shelter		1,034

3363 **C. Housing Production Gap Analysis**

3364 This section conducts a housing production gap analysis to project the potential surplus or deficit of
 3365 housing units that are affordable to different income levels through 2044. The analysis uses permit data
 3366 compiled by Puget Sound Regional Council and data from the programs and policies that produce income-
 3367 restricted units to meet the need for affordable housing units in unincorporated King County to estimate
 3368 production during the previous Comprehensive Plan period, from 2016 through 2024, and to project the
 3369 assumed production from 2025 through 2044.^{527,528} The analysis uses income-restricted housing production
 3370 data to calculate the gap for households with incomes at or below 80 percent area median income and
 3371 permit data for housing allocated to households with incomes above 80 percent area median income.
 3372

3373 The analysis makes the following assumptions to calculate the housing gap:

- 3374
- housing production from 2025 through 2044 will continue at the same rate as in 2016 through 2024;

⁵²⁵ Revised Code of Washington 36.70A.070.

⁵²⁶ Washington State Department of Commerce. (2023, March). *Planning for Housing in Washington: March 2023 Update*. [\[link\]](#)

⁵²⁷ PSRC Residential Building Permit Survey, 2000 to 2020. [\[link\]](#)

⁵²⁸ King County Department of Community and Human Services. (2021). *King County Income-Restricted Housing Database*.

3375 • market-rate single detached homes will serve households with incomes at or above 120 percent area
3376 median income;

3377 • market-rate multiunit, accessory dwelling units (ADUs), and manufactured homes will serve households
3378 with incomes between 80 and 100 percent area median income; and

3379 • no cities will annex portions of the unincorporated areas through 2044.

3380
3381 The gap value is calculated by crediting two-thirds of the production from 2016 through 2024 and the
3382 assumed 2025 through 2044 production toward the 2019 through 2044 allocated need.

3383
3384 Table 12 shows the actual and projected housing production and the potential deficit or surplus. The
3385 analysis finds an overall gap or deficit of 357 units for households earning at or below 80 percent area
3386 median income, with a significant gap for households earning less than 50 percent area median income and
3387 a significant surplus for households earning 50 to 80 percent area median income. Although King County
3388 has made significant investments in permanent supportive housing from 2016 through 2024 countywide, it
3389 did not fund a permanent supportive housing project located in unincorporated King County in that period.

3390
3391 There are multiple factors contributing to the gap in housing affordable to households earning less than 50
3392 percent area median income. The largest single source of funding for affordable housing, four percent Low-
3393 Income Housing Tax Credits, typically create units affordable to households earning at or below 60 percent
3394 area median income. Inclusionary housing and other land-based regulatory policies also typically produce
3395 units above 50 percent area median income.

3396
3397 The total amount of housing constructed through 2044 in unincorporated King County, regardless of
3398 income level, is projected to be more than double the total net new need. Construction of housing for
3399 households with incomes above 80 percent area median income during the previous 2016 to 2024 planning
3400 period exceeded the net new units needed by 2044.⁵²⁹ This indicates that housing developers have
3401 identified demand or opportunities beyond the goals of state and local planning. However, this analysis
3402 projects that the majority of market rate construction in unincorporated King County will be single detached
3403 housing, which is not affordable for most King County residents. These estimates may be skewed by two
3404 major projects completed during the 2016 through 2024 planning period: Greenbridge in White Center
3405 and Redmond Ridge. Similar projects may be unlikely from 2025 through 2044, which would mean the
3406 calculation for housing units affordable to households with incomes above 120 percent area median income
3407 is an overestimate of production.

3408

⁵²⁹ Puget Sound Regional Council, *Net Units Built in unincorporated King County from 2010-2020*. King County Housing Finance Program, *King County Income-Restricted Housing Database*.

3409 **Table 12: Unincorporated King County Housing Production Gap Analysis**

Income Level	Area Median Income	Net New Units Needed	Market Rate Housing Production	Assumed Market Rate Housing Production	Housing Finance Program Production	Assumed Housing Finance Program Production	Inclusionary Housing Production	Assumed Inclusionary Housing Production	Other Land-Based Unit Production	Assumed Other Land-Based Unit Production	LIHTC Projects without County funding	Assumed LIHTC Projects without County funding	Surplus /Deficit
		2019-2044	2016-2024	2025-2044	2016-2024	2025-2044	2016-2024	2025-2044	2016-2024	2025-2044	2016-2024	2025-2044	
Extremely low	0-30% (PSH)	608	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-608
	0-30% (non-PSH)	1,157	0	0	60	133	0	0	0	0	0	0	-984
Very low	>30-50%	571	0	0	40	89	18	40	0	0	0	0	-403
Low	>50-80%	292	0	0	30	67	0	0	16	36	622	1,382	1,638
Moderate	>80-100%	366	206	457	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	228
	>100-120%	415	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-415
Above Moderate	>120%	2,003	2,794	6,210	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6,113
Total		5,412	3,000	6,667	130	289	18	40	16	36	622	1,382	5,525

3410

D. Emergency Housing Production Gap Analysis

Table 13 shows the gap analysis for emergency housing production in unincorporated King County. The emergency housing production analysis makes the same assumptions as the housing production gap analysis above as well as the assumption that the emergency housing that opened since 2016 will remain open through 2045.

The 2024 King County Comprehensive Plan adopted code changes to define emergency housing and to make emergency housing an allowed use in some zones. This removes a significant barrier to meeting the need for emergency housing in unincorporated King County.

Table 13: Emergency Housing Production Gap Analysis

Net New Emergency Housing Units Needed (2020-2045)	Emergency Housing Production (2016-2024)	Assumed Emergency Housing Production (2025-2045)	Surplus/ Deficit
1,005	144	320	-589

E. Affordable Housing Funding Gap Analysis

King County staff conducted a cost modeling analysis to calculate the additional funds required to meet the projected gap in production for households with incomes at or below 80 percent area median income in unincorporated King County. The analysis makes the following assumptions:

- all net new permanent housing need at or below 80 percent area median income must be achieved through public financing of income-restricted housing;
- the per unit cost of building new affordable units averages about the same for 0 to 30 percent, 30 to 50 percent, and 50 to 80 percent and is therefore not differentiated;
- all existing revenue sources for affordable housing are renewed and the average total number of units created at 0 to 80 percent area median income continue to be produced at the same rate;
- the average cost per unit to build affordable housing is \$475,404 based on all projects funded by the King County Housing Finance program in 2022 and;
- inflation will increase annually at a rate of 7.4%, based on the average annual percentage increase in the Seattle Mortenson Construction Cost Index from 2016 through 2022.⁵³⁰ Mortenson is a national construction engineering firm that calculates the index quarterly by pricing a representative non-residential construction project in Seattle and other geographies throughout the country.

Based on the overall deficit of 357 housing units, this analysis identifies a need for approximately \$450,936,000 more than current funding levels to meet the housing needs of unincorporated King County households with incomes at or below 80 percent area median income over the 2025 through 2044 planning period. On an annual basis, the funding gap is approximately \$10,524,000 beginning in 2025. Adjusting for inflation, the average annual gap is approximately \$22,547,000.

This analysis does not account for operational costs to maintain the affordable housing or the potential new administrative costs for King County or other funders to disburse the additional funds. Additional staffing may be required if King County allocated additional funding to address this gap.

King County may need to identify external fund sources or other partners to meet this need. Affordable housing projects typically receive local, state, federal, and philanthropic funding, tax credits, and,

⁵³⁰ M.A. Mortenson Company. (2023). *Seattle Construction Cost Index, Q4 2022*. [\[link\]](#)

3450 sometimes, private debt. The King County Housing Finance program typically provides about fifteen
3451 percent of the total development costs for affordable housing projects it funds. However, this share has
3452 been much higher for projects in unincorporated King County as there is no other local government funding
3453 partner.

3454
3455 King County and other funders would need to prioritize affordable housing projects that serve lower
3456 incomes to meet unincorporated King County's housing needs. The housing production gap analysis finds
3457 an overall net new need of 357 units affordable to 0 to 80 percent area median income, but a surplus of
3458 1,638 units affordable to 50 to 80 percent area median income and a deficit of 1,995 units affordable at or
3459 below 50 percent area median income. Additionally, funding allocated to meet this need may not meet
3460 other King County affordable housing goals, such as affordable homeownership or community-driven
3461 equitable development.

3462 IX. Making Adequate Provisions for Housing 3463 Needs of All Economic Segments of the 3464 Community

3465 A. Section Summary

3466 This section fulfills Revised Code of Washington 36.70A.070(2)(d) and King County CPP H-4.

3467
3468 Revised Code of Washington 36.70A.070(2)(d) requires jurisdictions:

- 3469 • consider low-, very low-, extremely low-, and moderate-income households;
- 3470 • document programs and actions needed to achieve housing availability including gaps in local funding,
3471 barriers such as development regulations, and other limitations;
- 3472 • consider housing locations in relation to employment locations; and
- 3473 • consider the role of accessory dwelling units in meeting housing needs.

3474
3475 CPP H-4 requires jurisdictions to:

3476
3477 *Evaluate the effectiveness of existing housing policies and strategies to meet a significant share of*
3478 *countywide need. Identify gaps in existing partnerships, policies, and dedicated resources for meeting the*
3479 *countywide need and eliminating racial and other disparities in access to housing and neighborhoods of*
3480 *choice.*

3481
3482 This section fulfills the adequate provisions analysis required in Revised Code of Washington
3483 36.70A.070(2)(d) and King County CPP H-4. The process followed guidance from the Washington State
3484 Department of Commerce. The guidance provides an adequate provisions checklist for jurisdictions to
3485 utilize to review barriers to meeting housing needs goals, such as development regulations and process
3486 obstacles to housing production. Development of the 2024 Update occurred prior Commerce finalizing
3487 their guidance. Given this, King County staff used an earlier version of the adequate provisions guidance to
3488 inform the review of potential barriers to housing development in the 2024 Update. Since then, County staff
3489 reviewed the final version of the checklist to ensure compliance with the State's guidance. The only
3490 substantive difference was that final checklist now includes a list of development regulations consistent with
3491 HB 1337, such as not requiring the owner to live on the property, allowing ADUs in structures detached from
3492 the principal unit, and not requiring public street improvements as a condition of permitting. While the
3493 early version of the checklist did not include this information, the County did review and update regulations
3494 in the 2024 Update to comply with HB 1337. As such, the County is compliant with the final checklist.

3495
3496 This section identifies several key barriers to development, including:

- 3497 • barriers and lack of clarity permitting emergency housing;
- 3498 • increased time and risk from applying for a Conditional Use Permit;
- 3499 • delays and increased costs to comply with requirements related to the State Environmental Policy Act;
- 3500 and
- 3501 • permitting timelines and staffing challenges.

3502 This section finds that King County's zoning and land use policies will focus growth in the urban areas, which
3503 are closer to employment centers. Finally, this section identifies the previous owner-occupancy requirement
3504 as a past potential barrier to developing accessory dwelling units.
3505

3506 Identifying Barriers to Development

3507 Revised Code of Washington 36.70A.070(2)(d)(ii) requires jurisdictions document barriers to housing
3508 production. King County staff reviewed housing production trends and used guidance from the Washington
3509 State Department of Commerce to identify the following barriers to housing production.

3510 *Emergency Housing*

3511 Staff identified a gap and barrier in King County's code in allowing for and regulating emergency housing.
3512 Emergency housing can take multiple forms, including:
3513

- 3514 • converted existing residential units, hotels and motels, and supportive housing for people aged 62
3515 years and older;
- 3516 • congregate shelter in residential or commercial buildings;
- 3517 • tiny house villages;
- 3518 • tent cities or encampments; and
- 3519 • safe parking lots.

3520 The emergency housing projects opened in unincorporated King County since 2016 were opened using
3521 temporary use permits. King County is unlikely to meet the identified need of 1,034 beds by 2044 if each
3522 project is permitted on a temporary basis.
3523

3524 Some of the housing types above could be permitted under the current code as dormitories, community
3525 residential facilities, or simply residential. Some emergency housing types, such as tiny house villages, are
3526 designed to be temporary shelters and do not meet the County's requirements for permanent structures.
3527 Community residential facilities and dormitories have a minimum of one parking space per two bedrooms,
3528 which is a significant barrier to development for emergency shelters and likely unnecessary as people in
3529 need of an emergency shelter are much less likely to own a car.
3530

3531 The 2024 King County Comprehensive Plan adopted code changes to reduce regulatory barriers to
3532 developing emergency housing in unincorporated King County and create additional zoning capacity to
3533 address the deficit in needed beds. The zoning change will explicitly allow shelters in the R1-R48,
3534 Commercial Business, Residential Business, and Office zones.
3535

3536 *Environmental Constraints*

3537 There are multiple factors that limit development such as:
3538

- 3539 • steep slopes;
- 3540 • shoreline, streams, rivers, wetland, and floodplains;
- 3541 • seismic and erosion hazard areas; and
- 3542 • toxic/environmental contamination.

3543

3544 While regulations that limit development in these areas pose a barrier to developing housing, they meet life
3545 safety and environmental goals of King County. This assessment therefore does not recommend changes to
3546 the King County Code to address this barrier.

3547
3548 *Conditional Use Permits*

3549 The 2024 King County Comprehensive Plan adopted code changes eliminating an entitlement process for
3550 most multiunit projects, including middle housing and townhomes in low and medium zoning classifications
3551 when the proposed project exceeds base density for the zone. This will eliminate the requirement to go
3552 through a conditional use permit process, reducing zoning barriers to development.

3553
3554 In addition to the general requirements for a conditional use permit, the residential land use code also
3555 includes specific development conditions depending on the land use type and the zone.

3556
3557 Conditional use permits provide flexibility in the code. Many of the affordable housing projects constructed
3558 in unincorporated King County since 2016 required a conditional use permit.

3559
3560 *State Environmental Policy Act Process*

3561 The Washington State Environmental Policy Act process identifies and analyzes environmental impacts
3562 associated with governmental decisions. Projects undergoing the State Environmental Policy Act process
3563 are required to hold a public notice and comment period, and anyone may submit an appeal to a State
3564 Environmental Policy Act decision. The State Environmental Policy Act process can cause significant delays
3565 and increased cost for housing projects.⁵³¹ Washington State law recently changed to increase the maximum
3566 allowed exemptions for housing projects under a certain size threshold, reducing a barrier to housing
3567 construction.

3568
3569 Raising State Environmental Policy Act exemption thresholds was explored as part of the development of
3570 the 2024 King County Comprehensive. In order to raise the exemption levels, state law requires
3571 demonstration by the jurisdiction that appropriate review would be captured via other regulations. The
3572 County has previously relied on the State Environmental Policy Act to address protections for historic and
3573 cultural resources and would need to develop new regulations via a tribal consultation process prior to
3574 raising the State Environmental Policy Act exemption thresholds.

3575
3576 *Permitting Timelines and Staffing Challenges*

3577 Affordable housing developers have shared concerns about significant delays during the permitting
3578 process. Delays in the permitting process can have major impacts on the cost of a project, as developers
3579 have holding costs and prices generally increase over time.⁵³² About 75 percent of the King County
3580 Department of Local Services - Permitting Division's operating budget is supported by fees charged to
3581 permit applicants, and 17 positions were cut after construction slowed at the beginning of the pandemic.⁵³³
3582 This has impacted the Permitting Division's ability to review and respond to permit applications in a timely
3583 manner.

3584
3585 Permitting timelines are being addressed as part of the implementation of SB 5290, which requires local
3586 governments to issue permit decisions within a certain number of days. Specific measures include:

- 3587 • providing dedicated permit review resources for County-funded affordable housing development
3588 applications;
- 3589 • updating the permit application screening process;
- 3590 • making code updates to streamline permit review;
- 3591 • implementing new electronic review management software;
- 3592 • seeking additional staffing; and

⁵³¹ Sightline Institute. *Washington's State Environmental Policy Act Has Become a Bane to Sustainable Urban Development*. [\[link\]](#)

⁵³² Building Industry Association of Washington. (2022, November). *Cost of Permitting Delays*. [\[link\]](#)

⁵³³ King County Office of Performance, Strategy, and Budget. *2023-2024 Proposed Budget Book, Department of Local Services*. [\[link\]](#)

- 3593
- seeking grant funding to provide technical assistance to applicants.

3594

3595 *Permanent Supportive Housing*

3596 The 2024 King County Comprehensive Plan adopted code defining permanent supportive housing and
3597 allowing permanent supportive housing in certain zones. This removes barriers to meeting the gap between
3598 historical production and the need for 1,005 additional units. The land capacity analysis found sufficient
3599 zoning capacity for permanent supportive housing in unincorporated King County. However, there is still a
3600 significant gap between the historical production and the target number allocated to unincorporated King
3601 County due to a lack of funding. The affordable housing funding gap section explores this issue further.

3602 **B. Considering Employment Locations**

3603 This section considers the relationship between housing and employment locations as required by Revised
3604 Code of Washington 36.70A.070(d). The Economic Development chapter of the Comprehensive Plan
3605 provides more analysis of the employment needs of the local workforce.

3606

3607 The largest employment centers in unincorporated King County are the two unincorporated activity centers
3608 Skyway-West Hill and North Highline. Both neighborhoods have recently completed subarea planning
3609 processes that increased residential density in and near the commercial areas. The rural towns of Fall City
3610 and Vashon are also employment locations and allow for increased residential density in and near the
3611 commercial areas. Residential is not allowed in industrial zones to limit potential exposure to toxic or
3612 unhealthy activities.

3613

3614 At a regional scale, King County is focusing growth in the urban areas. The urban areas are closer to the
3615 major employment centers of the Eastside and City of Seattle.

3616 **C. The Role of ADUs in Meeting Housing Need**

3617 Revised Code of Washington 36.70A.070(2)(d)(iv) requires jurisdictions consider the role of ADUs in
3618 meeting projected housing needs. This section describes the role of ADUs in meeting housing needs, past
3619 regulations for ADUs, and actions King County took to reduce barriers to production.

3620

3621 The revised Code of Washington 36.70A.696 defines ADUs as dwelling units located on the same lot as a
3622 single detached housing unit, duplex, triplex, townhome, or other housing unit. Property owners can
3623 construct an ADU within or detached from the primary dwelling unit. ADUs can increase access to
3624 traditionally single detached residential neighborhoods by providing smaller, more affordable units. ADUs
3625 can also facilitate multi-generational living arrangements and allow people aged 62 years and older to age
3626 in place by moving into an ADU and renting the primary dwelling unit.⁵³⁴

3627

3628 King County permitted about 160 ADUs data during the previous planning period of 2016 through 2024.
3629 ADUs are projected to help meet unincorporated King County's overall net new units needed from 2019
3630 through 2044. King County allows for ADUs in all rural, residential, and commercial zones. King County
3631 Code previously imposed limitations on the development of accessory dwelling units which may have
3632 caused barriers to production.

3633

3634 In the 2024 Comprehensive Plan, King County adopted code changes that reduce barriers to the
3635 production of ADUs. These changes differ between urban and rural unincorporated King County. For rural
3636 unincorporated areas, King County there will no longer be an owner occupancy requirement. For urban
3637 unincorporated areas, King County made the following code changes:

- 3638
- no owner occupancy requirement;

⁵³⁴ Enterprise Community Partners. (2020, September). *New Reflections on Affordable Housing Design, Policy and Production: Overcoming Barriers to Bringing Accessory Dwelling Unit Development to Scale*. [\[link\]](#)

- 3639 • an allowance for up to two ADUs per lot;
- 3640 • no off-street parking requirement;
- 3641 • allowance to convert legal nonconforming structures to be converted into accessory dwelling units;
- 3642 and
- 3643 • not regulating entry door locations.

3644
3645 The City of Seattle eliminated the owner-occupancy requirement in 2019, among other reforms, and
3646 established pre-approved plans.⁵³⁵ ADU construction in Seattle increased by over 250 percent from 2019 to
3647 2022.^{536,537} Although there are many factors influencing the rate of construction of ADUs in the City of
3648 Seattle, the timing of the change in regulation and subsequent development indicates the owner-occupancy
3649 requirement was a factor.

3650 X. Existing Strategies Summary

3651 A. Section Summary

3652 This section fulfills King County CPP H-3k.

3653
3654 CPP H-3k requires jurisdictions:
3655 *Conduct an inventory and analysis in each jurisdiction of existing and projected housing needs of all*
3656 *segments of the population and summarize the findings in the housing element. The inventory and analysis*
3657 *shall include:*

- 3658 k) *Summary of existing and proposed partnerships and strategies, including dedicated resources, for*
3659 *meeting countywide housing need, particularly for populations disparately impacted.*

3660
3661 This section outlines the funding, programs, policies and regulations, and partnerships that seek to address
3662 the affordable housing and homelessness needs in King County. The elements described often overlap the
3663 different categories as some fund sources are dedicated to a single program and programs are often
3664 required to implement policies and partnerships.

3665 B. Funding

3666 King County receives federal and state funding that can be used to meet different housing needs, including
3667 providing capital for development, acquisition, and rehabilitation of housing. Most housing projects are
3668 funded by a mix of funds from government programs and philanthropic organizations, tax credits, private
3669 debt, and rent from residents. Most housing sources of funds serve households at or below 50 percent area
3670 median income. Federal funds serve up to 60 percent area median income for rental and 80 percent area
3671 median income for homeownership. Homeownership projects generally serve households with incomes
3672 between 50 percent area median income to 80 percent area median income. Most of the local funds for
3673 permanent supportive housing and other supportive services come from sales and property taxes.

3674
3675 *King County Housing Funding Allocated to Unincorporated King County*

3676 King County serves as the local government for unincorporated areas. However, King County also serves as
3677 a regional funder of affordable housing and most King County programs serve the whole county.

3678 Historically, King County has not made significant investments in affordable housing for unincorporated
3679 King County.

3680

⁵³⁵ Seattle Department of Construction & Inspections. *Accessory Dwelling Unit*. [\[link\]](#)

⁵³⁶ City of Seattle Ordinance 125854 (2019). [\[link\]](#)

⁵³⁷ Seattle Department of Construction & Inspections Community Engagement. (2019, October 31). *Owner Occupancy Covenant No Longer Required for Accessory Dwelling Units*. Building Connections. [\[link\]](#)

3681 In 2019, King County created the Department of Local Services (DLS) to serve the unique and diverse needs
3682 of unincorporated King County. In 2021, DLS launched a participatory budgeting process for \$11.3 million
3683 for unincorporated King County, as authorized by the 2021-2022 King County Biennial Budget. This process
3684 allocated funds to several projects and programs, including \$100,000 for a home repair fund in East Renton,
3685 \$250,000 for down payment assistance in Skyway, and \$750,000 for the White Center Community HUB
3686 Project.⁵³⁸

3687
3688 King County allocated \$5 million in the 2021-2022 King County Biennial Budget to affordable housing in
3689 Skyway-West Hill. Through this funding, Homestead Community Land Trust in partnership with Skyway
3690 Coalition was awarded \$2.5 million to develop up to 53 permanently affordable homeownership units for
3691 households at 50 to 80 percent area median income. King County awarded the Low Income Housing
3692 Institute in partnership with Childhaven \$2.5 million to develop up to 43 affordable rental units for
3693 households at 30 to 50 percent area median income.⁵³⁹ This award consisted of funding from the Short-
3694 Term Lodging Tax and HB 1406 tax. In 2021, the Low Income Housing Institute opened the Progressive
3695 Skyway Tiny House Village on a local religious facility property with funding from the County.⁵⁴⁰

3696
3697 The White Center Community HUB project is a community-driven affordable housing and community center
3698 project on County-owned property.⁵⁴¹ The project is led by the White Center Community Development
3699 Association, Community Roots Housing, Southwest Youth and Family Services, and HealthPoint. In 2021, the
3700 King County Housing Finance Program awarded the project \$3.25 million. The second omnibus
3701 supplemental budget for the 2021-2022 biennium also included a Climate Equity bond, which awarded \$5
3702 million to the White Center Community HUB project. In 2022, the King County Council approved the
3703 disposition of the County-owned property to the White Center HUB partners for transaction costs only.⁵⁴²

3704
3705 Island Center Homes is an affordable housing project by Vashon HouseHold that will serve 40 individuals on
3706 Vashon Island.⁵⁴³ The project was selected as part of the 2016 King County Comprehensive Plan's
3707 Alternative Housing Demonstration Project. In 2018, the King County Housing Finance Program awarded
3708 the project \$3.1 million.⁵⁴⁴

3709 C. Local Funds

3710 King County has several revenue sources that fund housing efforts throughout the county. Local
3711 governments can only impose taxes and levies as authorized by the state.⁵⁴⁵ Generally, counties in
3712 Washington do not have as many revenue options as cities.⁵⁴⁶ Some revenue sources require voter
3713 approval. The revenue sources listed in this section can fund projects throughout King County, including,
3714 but not limited to, unincorporated King County.⁵⁴⁷

3715 *Best Starts for Kids Levy*

3716
3717 The Best Starts for Kids Levy (BSK) was approved by King County voters in 2015, raising over \$400 million
3718 over six years. BSK was renewed in 2021 and will raise an estimated \$800 million through 2027. BSK funds
3719 support programs for pregnant people and childhood and youth development, including childhood and
3720 family homelessness prevention. King County estimates approximately \$30 million will be invested in youth
3721 and family homelessness prevention from 2022 to 2027 helping almost 2,000 families annually. When BSK
3722 revenues exceed \$822 million, approximately \$50 million in BSK funding can support building repairs,

⁵³⁸ King County Executive. (2022, August) *45 projects selected for initial King County participatory budgeting awards.* [\[link\]](#)

⁵³⁹ King County Department of Community and Human Services. (2022, March 24). *King County Announces Funding Awards for Two Affordable Housing Projects in Skyway-West Hill.* [\[link\]](#)

⁵⁴⁰ Turnbull, E. (2021). *Tiny House Village to Open in Skyway.* *South Seattle Emerald.* [\[link\]](#)

⁵⁴¹ White Center Community Development Association. *White Center HUB.* [\[link\]](#)

⁵⁴² King County Ordinance 19419 (2022). [\[link\]](#)

⁵⁴³ Vashon HouseHold. *Island Center Homes.* [\[link\]](#)

⁵⁴⁴ King County Department of Community and Human Services. *Housing Finance Program 2018 Funding Round Awards.* [\[link\]](#)

⁵⁴⁵ Municipal Research and Services Center of Washington. (2022, December). *Revenue Guide for Washington Counties.* [\[link\]](#)

⁵⁴⁶ King County Unincorporated Urban Area Annexation Area Databook. [\[link\]](#)

⁵⁴⁷ Senate Ways and Means Committee (2020). *A Legislative Guide to Washington's Tax Structure.* [\[link\]](#)

3723 renovations, new construction and expansion to improved access to high quality programs for low-income
3724 families and children as well as Black, Indigenous, and People of Color residents.⁵⁴⁸ This capital funding can
3725 support a variety of projects including housing.⁵⁴⁹

3726
3727 *Document Recording Fees*

3728 Document recording fees are one-time fees that are assessed when certain documents are filed with county
3729 auditors. Washington had several document recording fees that fund different housing and homelessness
3730 programs as well as the administrative costs incurred to manage these programs. In 2023, the Washington
3731 State Legislature passed SB 5386, combining the \$100 recorded document surcharge; \$13 Affordable
3732 Housing for all surcharge; \$62 Local Homelessness Housing and Assistance surcharge; and \$8 additional
3733 local Affordable Housing for All surcharge into a single \$183 surcharge related to affordable housing and
3734 homeless services.

3735
3736 Thirty one percent of the revenue raised from this fee is distributed to the county.⁵⁵⁰ One percent of the fee
3737 is retained by the county auditor for administrative purposes, and the remaining 30 percent may be used as
3738 follows:

- 3739 • up to 10 percent for administration and distribution of funds by the county
- 3740 • at least 75 percent to accomplish the purposes of its local homeless housing plan under the
3741 Homelessness Housing and Assistance act; and
- 3742 • at least 15 percent for:
- 3743 ○ acquisition, construction, or rehabilitation of housing projects or units within housing projects that
3744 are affordable to very low-income households;
 - 3745 ○ supporting building operation and maintenance costs of housing projects or units eligible to
3746 receive housing trust funds, that are affordable to very low-income households, and that require a
3747 supplement to rent income to cover ongoing operating expenses;
 - 3748 ○ rental assistance vouchers for housing units that are affordable to very low-income households; or
 - 3749 ○ operating costs for emergency shelters and licensed overnight youth shelters.

3750
3751 King County manages this revenue with its cities through the Regional Affordable Housing Program (RAHP)
3752 Interlocal Agreement.⁵⁵¹ For the purposes of this program, King County is divided into three subregions.
3753 Approximately 35.8 percent, 31.9 percent, and 32.2 percent are allocated to the City of Seattle, the South
3754 Subregion, and the North/East Subregion, respectively. This document recording fee raises approximately
3755 \$2,500,000 annually. Approximately \$700,000 is reserved for shelter operations and the balance for capital
3756 housing.

3757
3758 *Health Through Housing*

3759 In 2020, through HB 1590, Washington counties were authorized to implement a 0.1 percent sales tax and
3760 use the tax for affordable housing through councilmanic action rather than submitting a proposal to voters
3761 for approval. King County adopted this sales tax in October 2020.⁵⁵² The COVID-19 pandemic shaped the
3762 Health Through Housing (HTH) initiative. The pandemic forced King County to swiftly move people from
3763 congregate settings to individual rooms to reduce the spread of the virus. King County incorporated this
3764 lesson by using the HTH funds to invest in single-room settings.⁵⁵³

⁵⁴⁸ King County Department of Community and Human Services. (2021). *Best Starts for Kids Implementation Plan: 2022-2027*.
[\[link\]](#)

⁵⁴⁹ King County Ordinance 19267 (2021). [\[link\]](#)

⁵⁵⁰ King County Department of Community and Human Services. King County Regional Affordable Housing Program
Administrative Guidelines. [\[link\]](#)

⁵⁵¹ King County Ordinance 17845 (2014). [\[link\]](#)

⁵⁵² King County Ordinance 19179 (2020). [\[link\]](#)

⁵⁵³ King County Department of Community and Human Services. (2021). *Initial Health through Housing Implementation Plan
2022-2028*. [\[link\]](#)

3765
3766 The pandemic also incentivized property owners to sell hotels and apartment buildings. King County began
3767 purchasing hotels and apartment buildings to develop the HTH property portfolio. King County has
3768 partnered with local jurisdictions to convert these properties, and continues to buy new properties, to
3769 operate emergency housing and permanent supportive housing units for people experiencing chronic
3770 homelessness. King County also used several of these properties to house refugees.⁵⁵⁴

3771
3772 The HTH initiative's paramount goal is to create and support the operation of 1,600 emergency housing and
3773 permanent supportive housing units. The initiative will also invest in a mobile behavioral health intervention
3774 program and help residents enroll in and access health care services. The HTH initiative aims to annually
3775 reduce racial and ethnic disproportionality among individuals experiencing homelessness. The HTH
3776 initiative intends to increase the number of organizations operating this housing that specialize in serving
3777 communities overrepresented among the region's chronically homeless population. As of November 2022,
3778 the HTH initiative has purchased ten properties throughout the county. These properties are in Auburn,
3779 Federal Way, Kirkland, Redmond, Renton, and Seattle.⁵⁵⁵ King County will perform an in-depth evaluation of
3780 the HTH initiative by the end of 2026.

3781
3782 *House Bill 1406 Sales Tax*

3783 House Bill 1406 in 2019 allows participating Washington cities and counties to fund affordable or supportive
3784 housing using a local state-shared sales tax. The allowed use of the funds depends on the local population.
3785 All participating jurisdictions may use the funds to acquire, construct, or rehabilitate existing affordable
3786 housing and cover operating and maintenance costs of new eligible housing units. Counties with
3787 populations under 400,000 and cities with populations under 100,000 may additionally use the funding to
3788 provide rental assistance to eligible tenants. Renters eligible for assistance must earn at or below 60 percent
3789 area median income in the jurisdiction imposing the tax. Jurisdictions can determine how the funds are
3790 used based on local housing needs. There is no additional cost to consumers in participating jurisdictions,
3791 as counties, cities, and towns that enacted the ordinance receive a credit against the 6.5 percent state sales
3792 tax. King County authorized this tax in August 2019.⁵⁵⁶

3793
3794 *Mental Illness and Drug Dependency (MIDD) Behavioral Health Sales Tax*

3795 The Mental Illness and Drug Dependency (MIDD) Behavioral Health Sales Tax levies a countywide 0.1
3796 percent sales tax to fund high-quality programs and services to address mental health, substance use, and
3797 other behavioral health conditions for King County residents. The funds raised by this tax are invested in
3798 many different programs, including homelessness response and housing stability programs. The sales tax
3799 generates approximately \$136 million per two-year biennium. The economic downturn in 2020 caused by
3800 the pandemic created short-term reductions in MIDD, but these reductions reversed in 2022.⁵⁵⁷

3801
3802 The Housing Supportive Services program combines funding and resources with other government
3803 agencies to serve adults experiencing chronic homelessness who have difficulty maintaining housing. The
3804 program served 793 people in 2021 and nearly all (91 percent) program participants experienced fewer
3805 episodes of crisis. Program participants had fewer emergency department admissions, jail bookings, and
3806 psychiatric inpatient hospitalizations. In 2021, King County awarded MIDD funds to two permanent
3807 supportive housing projects in Bellevue and Burien. In Seattle, 44 permanent supportive housing units
3808 funded by MIDD completed construction and opened in 2021.⁵⁵⁸ Approximately \$300,000 of MIDD revenue
3809 funded housing vouchers and case management for Adult Drug Court participants to help these individuals
3810 achieve long-term housing stability. Approximately \$616,000 of MIDD revenues funded rapid rehousing

⁵⁵⁴ King County Executive. (2022, December 8). *King County celebrates refugee resettlement efforts helping nearly 800 refugees in the region.* [\[link\]](#)

⁵⁵⁵ King County Department of Community and Human Services. (2021). *Health through Housing.* [\[link\]](#)

⁵⁵⁶ King County Ordinance 18973 (2019). [\[link\]](#)

⁵⁵⁷ King County Department of Community and Human Services. Behavioral Health and Recovery Division. (2022). *2021 MIDD Annual Report.* [\[link\]](#)

⁵⁵⁸ King County Department of Community and Human Services. Behavioral Health and Recovery Division. (2022). *2021 MIDD Annual Report.* [\[link\]](#)

3811 vouchers for people in early recovery who are either experiencing homelessness or at risk of becoming
3812 homeless.⁵⁵⁹

3813
3814 *Regional Equitable Development Initiative*

3815 The Regional Equitable Development Initiative (REDI) Fund is a revolving loan program administered by
3816 Enterprise Community Partners and funded via a partnership of public agencies and private funders. King
3817 County, the City of Seattle, Washington State, and A Regional Coalition for Housing (ARCH) partnered with
3818 four private funders to create a \$21 million revolving acquisition loan fund to develop and preserve
3819 affordable, transit-centered communities. The fund provides low-cost financing to developers to purchase
3820 existing property or develop new housing near high-capacity transit centers in King, Pierce, and Snohomish
3821 County. The REDI fund can finance mixed-use projects and multiunit affordable rental and homeownership
3822 housing and prioritizes financing projects that serve low-income households. At the fund level, 25 percent of
3823 units built on properties acquired with REDI funding must be affordable to households earning at or below
3824 50 percent area median income.⁵⁶⁰

3825
3826 *Lodging Taxes*

3827 The Lodging Tax, sometimes referred to as the "hotel/motel tax," was created by the Washington
3828 Legislature in 1967 to fund the development of tourism activities. Participating jurisdictions charge a two
3829 percent tax on the sales related to short-term lodgings or stays less than 30 consecutive days. Some types of
3830 short-term, or transient, lodgings include camping sites, recreational vehicle parks, time shares and
3831 condominium, and hotel and motel rooms.

3832
3833 State law regulates the allowable uses for the lodging tax. At least 37.5 percent of the lodging tax must fund
3834 affordable workforce housing and services for homeless youth. At least 37.5 percent must also fund art,
3835 cultural and heritage facilities and performing arts. The remainder of the funds, 25 percent or less of the
3836 revenue, can be used towards tourism promotion, including sports stadiums and events.⁵⁶¹ In 2016, King
3837 County committed \$87 million in bonds to fund approximately 1,700 preserved and new affordable units. In
3838 2021, King County issued \$300 million in bonds for transit-oriented development in 2021.⁵⁶² Bonds are one-
3839 time, not annual or ongoing, funds. The funds must serve households earning between zero and 80 percent
3840 area median income. Projects must be located within half of a mile of a high-capacity transit station to be
3841 eligible for funding. Additionally, transit-oriented development rental projects must prioritize 10 percent of
3842 housing units for tenants referred by King County or an approved agency.⁵⁶³ These bonds will be paid off by
3843 future lodging tax revenue. The lodging tax is estimated to generate \$559 million for housing in King
3844 County between 2021 to 2045.

3845
3846 *Veterans, Seniors, and Human Services Levy*

3847 The Veterans, Seniors and Human Services Levy (VSHSL) supports veterans and older adults, and their
3848 caregivers and families, and other vulnerable populations in areas such as employment, housing, and
3849 health. VSHSL was first passed by voters in 2005 and was most recently renewed for the fourth time in
3850 2023.⁵⁶⁴ VSHSL housing stability funding invests in eight strategies to meet the housing needs of VSHSL
3851 populations. In 2022, VSHSL contracted \$20.3 million out to community organizations for housing stability
3852 programs, including:⁵⁶⁵

- 3853 • opening two affordable housing projects for VSHSL populations totaling 332 units;
3854 • awarding funding to seven affordable housing projects for VSHSL populations totaling 155 units;
3855 • serving thousands of individuals in permanent housing units and navigation centers;

⁵⁵⁹ Department of Community and Human Services. Behavioral Health and Recovery Division. (2022, July 28). *2021 MIDD Results Dashboard*. [\[link\]](#)

⁵⁶⁰ Enterprise Community Partners. (2016). *Regional Equitable Development Initiative (REDI) Fund*. [\[link\]](#)

⁵⁶¹ Revised Code of Washington 67.28.180. [\[link\]](#)

⁵⁶² King County Ordinance 19279 (2021). [\[link\]](#)

⁵⁶³ King County Department of Community and Human Services. (2016). *Transit-Oriented Bond Allocation Plan*. [\[link\]](#)

⁵⁶⁴ King County Ordinance 19707 (2023). [\[link\]](#)

⁵⁶⁵ King County Department of Community and Human Services. (2023). *VSHSL Impact in 2022*. [\[link\]](#)

- 3856 • providing thousands of households housing counseling, foreclosure prevention, and alternative dispute
3857 resolution services;
- 3858 • funding attorneys to represent over a thousand tenants to prevent eviction; and
- 3859 • performing similar housing stability work.

3860 D. State Funds

3861 The Washington State Department of Commerce grants funds for housing and homelessness services and is
3862 a key partner for funding affordable housing in King County. Most funds are awarded to projects that King
3863 County may fund and not provided directly to King County. The following funds are awarded directly to
3864 King County.

3865 *Housing and Essential Needs*

3866 The Washington State Department of Social and Human Services provides funding for the Housing and
3867 Essential Needs program to King County, which is administered by Catholic Community Services of
3868 Washington in King County. The program serves individuals who are unable to work for at least 90 days due
3869 to a physical and/or mental incapacity and have zero income. Clients receive an ORCA transportation pass,
3870 a monthly bag of hygiene and cleaning supplies, and rental and utility assistance, including back pay
3871 assistance and one-time move-in assistance.⁵⁶⁶

3873

3874 *Consolidated Homeless Grant*

3875 The Washington State Department of Commerce provides Consolidated Homeless Grant funding to King
3876 County. The grant combines state grant opportunities to provide resources to fund homeless crisis response
3877 systems to support communities in ending homelessness. Eligible uses include emergency shelter,
3878 transitional housing, rapid re-housing, permanent supportive housing, and prevention for households at
3879 imminent risk of homelessness.⁵⁶⁷

3880

3881 *Emergency Shelter Program Grant*

3882 The Washington State Department of Commerce provides Shelter Program Grant funding to King County.
3883 The grant seeks to fund equitable and creative approaches to develop or expand shelter programs and to
3884 quickly exit people from homelessness and into permanent housing and positive destinations.⁵⁶⁸

3885 E. Federal Funds

3886 The King County Department of Community and Human Services (DCHS) administers federal funds
3887 distributed from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) on behalf of the County
3888 and most cities within King County through consortia of jurisdictions. The City of Seattle manages their own
3889 federal funds. Some larger cities partner with King County for only one type of federal funding.⁵⁶⁹

3890

3891 *Community Development Block Grant*

3892 HUD provides annual grants to states, cities, and counties through the Community Development Block
3893 Grants (CDBG) Program to create thriving urban communities. Grants can support jurisdictions in
3894 developing economic opportunities for low- and moderate-income residents and must meet one of the
3895 following requirements:

- 3896 • benefit people with low- or moderate-incomes;
- 3897 • prevent or eliminate slums or blight; or

⁵⁶⁶ Catholic Community Services and Catholic Housing Services of Western Washington. *Housing and Essential Needs*. [\[link\]](#)

⁵⁶⁷ Washington State Department of Commerce. *Consolidated Homeless Grant*. [\[link\]](#)

⁵⁶⁸ Washington State Department of Commerce. *Shelter Program Grant*. [\[link\]](#)

⁵⁶⁹ King County Department of Community and Human Services. (2020). *Funding Awards and Compliance*. [\[link\]](#)

- 3898 • address urgent needs that threaten community health and welfare which cannot be resolved by other
3899 available funding.⁵⁷⁰

3900
3901 Grantees must also develop a detailed community engagement plan. In King County, a wide range of
3902 projects that benefit low- and moderate-income residents are funded through CDBGs, such as community
3903 facilities and home repairs. Public housing authorities, nonprofit organizations, and local governments may
3904 apply for CDBG non-housing capital funds.⁵⁷¹ In 2021, the King County CDBG Consortium awarded \$1.7
3905 million in CDBG funds to 100 projects throughout King County, including shelter capital improvements,
3906 sidewalk improvements, and home repairs. Annual funding is about \$5 million.⁵⁷²

3907
3908 *Home Investment Partnerships*

3909 The HOME Investment Partnerships Program (HOME) is a federal program run by HUD. HOME provides
3910 annual grants to state and local governments for a variety of housing activities, such as developing, buying,
3911 and rehabilitating affordable housing for low-income households or providing rental assistance. The
3912 program assists homeowners earning below 80 percent area median income and typically funds rental units
3913 for households earning less than 60 percent area median income. HOME income limits are set based on
3914 HUD area median income estimates.⁵⁷³ King County uses these funds to serve households with incomes at
3915 or below 80 percent area median income. Up to 15 percent of funds are awarded to community housing
3916 development organizations. Annual funding to King County is about \$3 million.

3917
3918 *Emergency Solutions Grant*

3919 HUD grants funding to King County through the Emergency Solutions Grant to assist people to quickly
3920 regain stability in permanent housing after experiencing a housing crisis or homelessness.⁵⁷⁴ King County
3921 administers the funding for the County and most of the cities in King County through the King County
3922 Consortium. Annual funding to King County is about \$300,000.

3923 **F. Programs**

3924 This section provides information regarding the programs administered by King County and other King
3925 County strategies that address homelessness and housing needs for residents.

3926
3927 *Affordable Housing on County-owned Properties*

3928 King County Code 4.56.100 regulates the disposition of surplus property and prioritizes its use for
3929 affordable housing. The Facilities Management Division coordinates with DCHS and landholding
3930 departments to consider each surplus property for affordable housing. King County transferred three
3931 County-owned properties at low or no cost for affordable housing since the beginning of the previous
3932 Comprehensive Plan planning period.

3933
3934 King County transferred surplus property in Bellevue to Polaris at Eastgate, LLC for affordable housing. The
3935 project includes affordable housing, permanent supportive housing, and an emergency shelter.⁵⁷⁵ King
3936 County also transferred land and entered into a development agreement with BRIDGE Housing Corporation
3937 and Community Roots Housing to develop a ground lease at the former Northgate Park and Pool lot in
3938 2021.⁵⁷⁶ The Northgate project will provide 232 affordable apartments at the site of the Northgate Link light
3939 rail station and include a nearly 10,000 square foot daycare on the ground floor.⁵⁷⁷ King County entered into
3940 a purchase and sale agreement to convey surplus property to the White Center Community Development

⁵⁷⁰ U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2022). *Community Development Block Grant Program*. [\[link\]](#)

⁵⁷¹ King County Department of Community and Human Services. (2022). *Community Development*. [\[link\]](#)

⁵⁷² King County Department of Community and Human Services. *King County Consortium Consolidated Housing and Community Development Plan 2020-2024*. [\[link\]](#)

⁵⁷³ U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2022). *HOME Income Limits*. [\[link\]](#)

⁵⁷⁴ U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. *Emergency Solutions Grant*. [\[link\]](#)

⁵⁷⁵ King County Ordinance 19315 (2021). [\[link\]](#)

⁵⁷⁶ King County Ordinance 19363 (2021). [\[link\]](#)

⁵⁷⁷ Community Roots Housing. (2022). *Northgate Affordable Housing*. [\[link\]](#)

3941 Association to construct the White Center Community HUB. The project will provide 76 units of affordable
3942 and a community center including a health clinic, educational space, and nonprofit office space.⁵⁷⁸ In August
3943 2023, King County released a Brooks Village Direct Negotiation Request for Proposals (RFP) to select a
3944 nonprofit developer and/or Community-Based Organization interested in developing affordable
3945 homeownership at Brooks Village, a county-owned property in Skyway.⁵⁷⁹

3946
3947 *King County Housing Finance Program*

3948 The King County Housing Finance Program administers funds for the development and preservation of
3949 affordable housing throughout King County. The Housing Finance program administers an annual request
3950 for proposals for capital construction of affordable housing, the Credit Enhancement Program, and the
3951 Interim Loan Program.

3952
3953 *King County Housing Stability Program*

3954 Previously known as the Homeless Housing Program, the King County Housing Stability Program works with
3955 public and private funders and the King County Regional Homelessness Authority to fund community-based
3956 and governmental agencies that provide housing and services to people experiencing homelessness or
3957 who are at risk of homelessness in King County. Activities funded by this program include permanent
3958 supportive housing, homelessness prevention, and rapid re-housing.

3959
3960 *King County Housing Repair Program*

3961 King County's Housing Repair Program provides funding in the form of grants and no-interest loans for
3962 housing repair services to low-income homeowners and special needs renters in most parts of King County.
3963 The funding provides for repairs such as roof replacement, installing a new septic system, repairs
3964 addressing emergency conditions, health and safety repairs, and major building preservation issues within
3965 single detached owner-occupied residences, including manufactured homes. The program also provides
3966 funding to improve accessibility for renters living with a disability. From 2016 to 2022, the most recent data
3967 available, the Housing Repair Program completed 149 projects and expended \$2,549,579 for projects in
3968 unincorporated King County.⁵⁸⁰

3969
3970 *King County Youth and Family Homelessness Prevention Program*

3971 In response to Ordinance 18088, the King County Youth and Family Homelessness Prevention Initiative
3972 (YFHPI) was launched in 2016 to assist families at imminent risk of homelessness. The Initiative is funded
3973 through the Best Starts for Kids (BSK) Levy. Annually, YFHPI works with about 2,000 families across King
3974 County. BSK awards flexible funding to numerous community partners to assist low-income families,
3975 including providing financial assistance to households to remain permanently housed. King County
3976 contracts with 18 organizations to provide case management tailored to the specific needs of clients and
3977 aims to address the root causes of housing instability for youth and families.⁵⁸¹

3978
3979 From 2017 to 2020, YFHPI services reached more than 10,000 people. Within the same period, 96 percent
3980 of households served by the program remained housed six months after exiting the program. The BSK Levy,
3981 now Best Starts 2.0, was renewed in 2021. Best Starts plans to increase investments in addressing critical
3982 community needs. The Levy will invest almost \$30 million into the YFHPI and over \$800 million in various
3983 community support programs through 2027.

3984
3985 *King County Equitable Development Initiative*

3986 In line with Motion 16062, King County began planning for an Equitable Development Initiative (EDI) in
3987 March 2022. Motion 16062 was codeveloped with community members in 2021, following a yearlong
3988 campaign led by Black, Indigenous, and People of Color-led organizations urging King County to

⁵⁷⁸ White Center Community Development Association. [\[link\]](#)

⁵⁷⁹ King County Department of Community and Human Services. (2023). Brooks Village Direct Negotiation Request for Proposals.

⁵⁸⁰ King County Department of Community and Human Services. (2022). *Housing Repair Program*. [\[link\]](#)

⁵⁸¹ King County Department of Community and Human Services. (2016). *Best Starts for Kids Youth and Family Homelessness Prevention Initiative Implementation Plan*. [\[link\]](#)

3989 implement an equitable development initiative similar to the City of Seattle program. DCHS formed the
3990 Community Planning Workgroup (CPW) to participate in the planning of the EDI in May 2022.⁵⁸² DCHS
3991 intentionally selected workgroup members based on geographic diversity and individuals' lived
3992 experiences and perspectives related to equitable development. In January 2023, King County released
3993 Phase 1 of the King County Equitable Development Initiative Implementation Plan, which included an
3994 equitable development framework consistent with community-driven development principles for county
3995 and community structure, capacity, and related resources necessary to support an equitable development
3996 initiative at King County.⁵⁸³

3997
3998 *King County Eviction Prevention and Rent Assistance Program*

3999 In 2020, King County created a new Eviction Prevention and Rent Assistance Program (EPRAP) to provide
4000 direct rental assistance and eviction prevention services to households economically impacted by COVID-
4001 19. Between August 2020 and May 2022, EPRAP provided over 37,000 tenants with back rent and, if
4002 needed, future rent obligations.⁵⁸⁴

4003
4004 Two components of EPRAP, the Outreach and Application Assistance Program and the Hub and Spoke
4005 Program, strengthened EPRAP accessibility by utilizing existing community connections to raise awareness
4006 of the program and assist eligible applicants. EPRAP minimized evictions using eviction diversion and
4007 mediation methods. As of May 2022, DCHS contracted with United Way of King County to continue the
4008 Tenant Pool Program. New participants are selected to receive rental assistance from the registered tenant
4009 pool weekly. DCHS has also continued a partnership with the Housing Justice Project (HJP) to administer the
4010 Eviction Prevention Program in 2022.⁵⁸⁵

4011
4012 *King County Interim Loan Program*

4013 King County's Interim Loan Program provides low-cost predevelopment and acquisition loans to affordable
4014 housing developers. Priority is given to permanent housing projects with at least 25 percent of units
4015 available to extremely low-income households experiencing homelessness. All units must serve households
4016 with incomes at or below 50 area median income.⁵⁸⁶ In 2020, Ordinance 19203 amended King County Code
4017 24.22 to increase the limit of the program from \$10 million to \$15 million.⁵⁸⁷

4018
4019 *King County Credit Enhancement Program*

4020 King County's Credit Enhancement Program was created to incentivize developers to build affordable
4021 housing in urban centers for vulnerable households, such as low-income households or those with a
4022 member who has a disability. Public housing authorities, government agencies, and nonprofit and for-profit
4023 organizations are eligible to receive credit enhancement. This program makes it possible for organizations
4024 to obtain lower cost interest rates which reduce financing costs for housing projects deemed financially
4025 viable. The Program prioritizes financing mixed-income or affordable housing projects that supply housing
4026 for King County workers near transit centers. Both rental and homeownership units financed through the
4027 program are to be affordable in the long term.⁵⁸⁸

4028 **G. Policies and Regulations**

4029 This section provides information about policies and regulations King County has enacted since the 2016
4030 Comprehensive Plan to address housing needs for King County residents.

⁵⁸² Department of Community and Human Services. (2022). *Community Planning Workgroup*. [\[link\]](#)

⁵⁸³ *King County Equitable Development Initiative Implementation Plan Phase 1*. [\[link\]](#)

⁵⁸⁴ King County Department of Community and Human Services. (2021). *Eviction Prevention and Rent Assistance Program (EPRAP)*. [\[link\]](#)

⁵⁸⁵ King County Department of Community and Human Services. (2022). *EPRAP Data*. [\[link\]](#)

⁵⁸⁶ King County Code Chapter 24.22.

⁵⁸⁷ Ordinance 19203 (2020). [\[link\]](#)

⁵⁸⁸ King County Code Chapter 24.28.

4031 H. Countywide Policies

4032 The following policies serve areas throughout King County.

4033

4034 *Prioritization for Equitable Community-Driven Affordable Housing Development*

4035 In 2021, the King County Housing Finance Program established a new priority to fund equitable,
4036 community-driven affordable housing development to mitigate displacement pressures and ensure that
4037 historically marginalized communities have access to affordable housing investments. This priority supports
4038 the creation of affordable housing developed by and in collaboration with communities facing displacement
4039 pressures and communities that have historically experienced policies that limit opportunities for Black,
4040 Indigenous, and People of Color residents. The program will prioritize funding projects led by impacted
4041 communities, conceived and created through inclusive community engagement processes, and driven by a
4042 place-based Community Based Organization (CBO).

4043

4044 *Climate Readiness*

4045 King County is incorporating strategies to address climate change into the 2024 Comprehensive Plan
4046 update. These policies support climate equity by ensuring that those most impacted have access and
4047 opportunity to benefit from climate solutions while not bearing an unequal burden of the impacts of climate
4048 change. This includes strategies such as:

- 4049 • *Cross-reference to the Strategic Climate Action Plan (SCAP) as the County's "comprehensive legislative*
4050 *and policy plan for climate action"* and that a subset of the policies and commitments from the plan are
4051 also reflected in the Comprehensive Plan;
- 4052 • *Commit County to reduce regional greenhouse gas emissions:* targets for reducing greenhouse gas
4053 emissions; policies committing to transparency and public reporting;
- 4054 • *Commit County to reduce government operations greenhouse gas emissions:* agency specific policies;
4055 commitments to energy efficiency, renewable energy, waste to resources;
- 4056 • *Land use and development policies that promote healthy communities:* enable walking, bicycling, and
4057 public transit use, thereby reducing greenhouse gas emissions; and
- 4058 • *Promote regional collaboration:* collaborate with partners on approaches to reduce greenhouse gas
4059 emissions.

4060 I. Unincorporated King County Policies and Regulations

4061 The following policies specifically serve areas in unincorporated King County.

4062

4063 *Alternative Housing Demonstration Project*

4064 King County began the Alternative Housing Demonstration Project as Action Item 6 in the 2016
4065 Comprehensive Plan. The King County Council approved the demonstration project ordinance in June
4066 2020.⁵⁸⁹ The project allowed for the construction of two demonstration projects, one nonprofit development
4067 on Vashon Island and one for-profit development in White Center, to test micro-housing models not
4068 currently allowed in King County Code. The project involved significant interdepartmental coordination for
4069 a Request for Information, followed by a Request for Proposals, to identify potential housing models and
4070 interested and capable developers. The eligibility for these two communities has since expired, and the
4071 Executive will explore whether to recommend permanent code changes through a report that will be
4072 completed two years after the second project is opened, in approximately 2025. In the meantime, the
4073 demonstration project is proposed to be expanded to Snoqualmie Pass Rural Town as part of the
4074 Snoqualmie Valley/Northeast King County Community Service Area Subarea Plan to help support the
4075 development of needed workforce housing in that community.

4076

⁵⁸⁹ Ordinance 19119 (2020). [\[link\]](#)

4077 *Skyway-West Hill and North Highline Anti-Displacement Strategies*

4078 Motion 15539 and the 2020 Comprehensive Plan Update⁵⁹⁰ directed the Executive branch to write a report
4079 examining a suite of anti-displacement strategies and conduct a robust community engagement process.
4080 The 2021 Skyway-West Hill and North Highline Anti-displacement Strategies Report analyzes and
4081 recommends a set of actions, policies, and programs to reduce displacement risk and increase housing
4082 stability. The report analyzes the recommendations based upon a variety of factors, including community
4083 interest, feasibility, magnitude of impact, and time and cost of implementation. The report recommended
4084 ten anti-displacement strategies. These actions intend to:

- 4085 • increase the supply of deeply affordable housing;
- 4086 • mitigate displacement and prioritize current and past residents for affordable housing; and
- 4087 • leverage the private market to generate affordable units.

4088
4089 King County engaged with community members in Skyway-West Hill and North Highline to collect input
4090 from people most impacted by displacement.

4091
4092 *King County Community Preference Program in Skyway-West Hill and North Highline*

4093 The 2024 King County Comprehensive plan adopted a Work Plan Action item to explore expanding the
4094 Community Preference Program to urban unincorporated King County. The King County Community
4095 Preference Program in Skyway-West Hill and North Highline requires affordable housing projects receiving
4096 funding from King County prioritize 40 percent of affordable units for applicants with a connection to the
4097 community.⁵⁹¹ An applicant is considered to have a connection to the community if they:

- 4098 • are, or have a parent, guardian or ancestor who is a current or former resident;
- 4099 • use, participate in, volunteer in, or work for a local organization; or
- 4100 • live within half a mile of the property.

4101
4102 The current program intends to mitigate displacement by ensuring current and former residents are more
4103 likely to benefit from investments in affordable housing in their communities. Housing developers must
4104 submit an Affirmative Marketing and Community Preference Plan to the County and coordinate with local
4105 community-based organizations to conduct outreach to community members. The 2022 Housing Finance
4106 Program funding round included the requirement for community preference in Skyway-West Hill and North
4107 Highline.

4108
4109 *King County Inclusionary Housing Program*

4110 In the 2024 Comprehensive Plan, King County adopted code changes to expand the Inclusionary Housing
4111 program to all urban unincorporated communities and the Rural Towns of Vashon and Snoqualmie Pass.
4112 This code change does not include community preference or a mandatory component. Guided by
4113 community input, the 2024 King County Comprehensive plan includes a Work Plan Action item to review
4114 and consider whether to also expand the community preference and/or the mandatory inclusionary housing
4115 program elements. This review will take place after the Comprehensive Plan is adopted.

4116
4117 The North Highline Community Service Area Subarea Plan and Skyway/West Hill Subarea Plan were
4118 adopted in December 2022 as part of the 2022 update to the 2016 Comprehensive Plan.⁵⁹² The ordinance
4119 included new inclusionary housing regulations. Inclusionary housing programs support housing choice,
4120 increase housing stability, and mitigate residential displacement. In Skyway-West Hill and North Highline,
4121 inclusionary housing is required for residential and mixed-use developments within the unincorporated
4122 activity centers and voluntary elsewhere. Inclusionary housing offers developers the option of increased
4123 allowed density if the housing provider includes affordable units in the project. Developers may provide a

⁵⁹⁰ Ordinance 19179 (2020). [[link](#)]

⁵⁹¹ King County Code 21A.48.070.

⁵⁹² King County Ordinance 19555 (2022). [[link](#)]

4124 payment in lieu of providing all affordable housing as part of the project. The payment must result in the
4125 same number, quality, and mix of affordable rental or ownership housing units as would have been
4126 provided on-site, and at least one affordable unit must be provided on-site.⁵⁹³

4127
4128 *Tenant Protections*

4129 In 2021, the County passed a suite of tenant protections for unincorporated King County to help tenants
4130 maintain stable housing.⁵⁹⁴ The ordinance:

- 4131 • reduces barriers to housing by limiting upfront charges required at move-in and allowing longer move-
4132 in costs payment plans than what is required in state law;
- 4133 • creates more housing stability by providing stronger protections against eviction and requiring a longer
4134 rent increase notice period than what is prescribed in the state law;
- 4135 • protects undocumented tenants by prohibiting landlords from requiring prospective tenants to provide
4136 a Social Security Number; and
- 4137 • adopts other tenant protections.

4138
4139 *Transfer of Development Rights Affordable Housing Pilot*

4140 In 2019, King County Ordinance 19146 established a pilot program in which transferrable development
4141 rights (TDR) are sold at the administrative cost incurred by the County or 15 percent of the fair market value,
4142 whichever is less, to developments that provide rental or ownership housing that is affordable to
4143 households with incomes at or below 40 percent area median income. The ordinance also requires the
4144 Department of Natural Resources and Parks to transmit a report when 100 units of affordable housing are
4145 constructed through the program that includes information about the use of TDR credits, lessons learned,
4146 and recommendations for potential permanent changes. As of September 2023, no units have been built
4147 using this provision.

4148 **J. Partnerships**

4149 This section provides a description of each partnership with other governments, housing providers,
4150 advocates, and members of the public King County engages in to further its efforts for affordable housing.

4151
4152 *A Regional Coalition for Housing*

4153 A Regional Coalition for Housing (ARCH) was created in 1992 through an interlocal agreement between
4154 three cities and King County to address the need for affordable housing in Eastside King County. The
4155 Coalition, now made up of 15 East King County cities and King County, has helped create more than 7,000
4156 affordable homes.

4157
4158 *Combined Funders Application*

4159 The Combined Funders Application was developed jointly by King County and the Washington State
4160 Department of Commerce to centralize the application process to receive capital funding for affordable
4161 housing projects. The application is accepted by the following funders: Washington State Housing Trust
4162 Fund, City of Seattle Office of Housing, King County Housing Finance Program, Snohomish County Office of
4163 Housing and Community Development, A Regional Coalition for Housing (ARCH), South King Housing and
4164 Homelessness Partners (SKHHP), and the Washington State Housing Finance Commission for Low-Income
4165 Housing Tax Credits.

4166
4167 *Housing Development Consortium of Seattle-King County*

4168 The Housing Development Consortium (HDC) is made up of over 190 government agencies, businesses,
4169 and organizations with a mission to develop equitable, affordable housing. The HDC facilitates cross sector

⁵⁹³ King County Code 21A.48.080.

⁵⁹⁴ King County Ordinance 19311 (2021). [[link](#)]

4170 collaboration and brings together a broad spectrum of housing advocates to address housing needs across
4171 the region.

4172
4173 *King County Affordable Housing Committee*

4174 The Affordable Housing Committee operates under the Growth Management Planning Council (GMPC) to
4175 advance housing affordability solutions in King County. The Committee of elected officials and community
4176 leaders formed in 2019 to recommend and track progress on the 2018 Regional Affordable Housing Task
4177 Force Five Year Action Plan. The Action Plan includes strategies to help meet the needs of low-income
4178 communities by creating more affordable homes.

4179
4180 *King County Consortium*

4181 The King County Housing, Homelessness, and Community Development Division administers federal funds
4182 from HUD on behalf of King County and most cities in King County. King County and these cities work
4183 together to further the goals of federal programs in an urban county consortium. There are different types of
4184 partnerships, which depend on the size and population of the city, within the consortium. Most cities in the
4185 consortium partner with King County to distribute both CDBG and HOME funds.

4186
4187 *King County Regional Homelessness Authority*

4188 The King County Regional Homelessness Authority (KCRHA) was created in 2021 to coordinate King County
4189 and the City of Seattle's homeless crisis response system. The KCRHA unifies funding, policies, and program
4190 administration across 39 cities and King County. The Authority released a draft 5-Year Action Plan in 2023,
4191 which includes seven goals and specific strategies to reduce homelessness. The plan is informed by people
4192 with lived experience of homelessness.

4193
4194 *Puget Sound Regional Council*

4195 The Puget Sound Regional Council is made up of Tribal governments, transportation agencies, cities and
4196 towns, and King, Pierce, Snohomish, and Kitsap counties. The nearly 100 members of the Council
4197 collaborate to make decisions about growth management, transportation, and economic development.

4198
4199 *Seattle King County Coalition on Homelessness*

4200 The Seattle/King County Coalition on Homelessness was created in 1979 to advocate for resources to
4201 reduce homelessness. The coalition is made up of direct providers of housing, as well as local governments,
4202 advocacy organization, professional groups, and people with lived experience of homelessness.

4203
4204 *South King Housing and Homelessness Partners*

4205 South King Housing and Homelessness Partners (SKHHP) is a joint board formed by an interlocal agreement
4206 between the ten jurisdictions and King County to coordinate approaches to increase housing stability.
4207 SKHHP provides a unified voice for South King County to increase affordable housing options for residents.

4208
4209 *Washington Low-Income Housing Alliance*

4210 The Washington Low-Income Housing Alliance is a coalition of organizations working to create and preserve
4211 affordable housing across the state. The Housing Alliance develops policy, mobilizes housing advocates
4212 across Washington, and works with national housing organizations to support strong housing policy at the
4213 federal level.

4214

XI. Existing Strategies Gap Analysis

4215

A. Section Summary

4216 This section fulfills King County CPP H-4.

4217
4218 CPP H-4 requires jurisdictions to:

4219 *Evaluate the effectiveness of existing housing policies and strategies to meet a significant share of*
4220 *countywide need. Identify gaps in existing partnerships, policies, and dedicated resources for meeting the*

4221 *countywide need and eliminating racial and other disparities in access to housing and neighborhoods of*
4222 *choice.*

4223
4224 King County staff reviewed the findings and analysis from the previous sections in this assessment and
4225 recommendations from previous plans and reports to identify funding gaps for:

- 4226 • affordable housing for households with incomes 0 to 50 percent area median income;
- 4227 • affordable homeownership;
- 4228 • permanent supportive housing;
- 4229 • flexibility for equitable community-driven development; and
- 4230 • affordable two-, three-, and four-bedroom units.

4231
4232 The following programs were recommended in previous King County plans and reports but have not been
4233 implemented:

- 4234 • Equitable Development Initiative;
- 4235 • rental inspections;
- 4236 • relocation assistance for tenants;
- 4237 • redevelopment assistance; and
- 4238 • fair housing testing, education, and enforcement.

4239
4240 The King County Interim Loan Program includes language that creates barriers to community-driven
4241 equitable development, and the Inclusionary Housing Program has only been implemented in North
4242 Highline and Skyway-West Hill.

4243
4244 This section also identifies gaps in the following policies and partnerships:

- 4245 • middle housing;
- 4246 • Multifamily Tax Exemption program; and
- 4247 • King County Regional Homelessness Authority.

4248
4249 Similar to the existing strategies summary section, the elements within the categories of funding, programs,
4250 policies, and partnerships often overlap. The gaps identified in this analysis require substantial funding
4251 beyond what King County currently has available.

4252 B. Funding

4253 This section describes gaps in King County's funding to meet unincorporated King County's housing needs.
4254 Some gaps are due to a lack of funding, while others are due to a restriction on how King County can spend
4255 existing fund sources. These gaps were identified based on the housing production gap analysis, racially
4256 disparate impact analysis, and community feedback.

4257 *Affordable Housing for 0 to 50 Percent Area Median Income Households*

4258 This assessment's affordable housing production gap analysis identified an overall gap in unincorporated
4259 King County of 357 units affordable to households with incomes at or below 80 percent area median
4260 income, but a much larger gap of 1,592 units affordable to households with incomes at or below 50 percent
4261 area median income. About 85 percent of the income-restricted units produced in unincorporated King
4262 County serve households with income between 50 and 80 percent area median income. However, nearly 90
4263 percent of the need for affordable housing is for households with incomes at or below 50 percent area
4264 median income. See *Table 12. Unincorporated King County Housing Production Gap Analysis* for more
4265 information on the housing production gap analysis.

4266
4267

4268 *Affordable Homeownership*

4269 Homeownership has been the single largest method of creating intergenerational wealth in communities
4270 across the United States but is out of reach for most renter households.⁵⁹⁵ The fund sources currently
4271 available to King County for affordable homeownership are the HOME Investment Partnership Program
4272 from HUD, Veterans, Seniors, and Human Services Levy funding, transit-oriented development bonds,
4273 Regional Affordable Housing Program funds, and Green Building Zero Energy funds. However, affordable
4274 homeownership projects typically represent a small percentage of the total units in the projects funded by
4275 the King County Housing Finance Program.

4276
4277 *Permanent Supportive Housing*

4278 Permanent Supportive Housing is permanent housing for a household that:

- 4279 • is homeless on entry;
- 4280 • has a condition of disability, such as mental illness or chronic health issues; or
- 4281 • has other conditions that create multiple and serious ongoing barriers to housing stability.

4282
4283 These households have a long-term high level of service needs in order to meet the obligations of tenancy
4284 and maintain their housing. Moving people experiencing chronic homelessness from congregate shelter to
4285 single room settings increased the residents' health, wellbeing, and feelings of stability and reduced
4286 interpersonal conflict and 911 emergency calls.⁵⁹⁶ Permanent supportive housing also gives residents more
4287 time to think about future steps, increases exits to permanent housing, and improved engagement with
4288 supportive services. This housing model requires significantly more ongoing operations, maintenance, and
4289 services funding as compared to other affordable housing models.

4290
4291 Health Through Housing is the largest local fund source dedicated to the creation of permanent supportive
4292 housing. However, it is still insufficient to meet the countywide need, and there are few, if any, properties
4293 that are good candidates for acquisition in unincorporated King County using the Health Through Housing
4294 model. It would cost about \$289 million to construct all 608 permanent supportive housing units needed in
4295 unincorporated King County through 2044, based on the 2022 average cost per unit of \$475,404 used as
4296 the cost basis for the housing finance gap analysis. This excludes costs for ongoing operations,
4297 maintenance, and services.

4298
4299 *Flexibility for Equitable Community-Driven Development*

4300 Equitable community-driven development is an approach to planning and community development paired
4301 with public and private investments and service delivery that advances equity and self-determination of
4302 communities:

- 4303 • adversely impacted by structural racism and discrimination;
- 4304 • experiencing disparities in economic and health outcomes; and
- 4305 • facing a heightened risk of displacement.

4306
4307 These communities primarily include Black, Indigenous, and People of Color, low-income, immigrants and
4308 refugees, people with disabilities, people aged 62 years and older, and LGBTQ+ communities. This
4309 approach centers the needs and visions of these groups because having opportunities to own and develop
4310 land to serve their communities needs builds power and creates wealth, opportunity, and stability by and for
4311 these communities.⁵⁹⁷ These projects are often led by smaller community-based organizations or have a less
4312 common project design, such as a community land trust or a mixed-use project. The 2023-2024 Biennial
4313 Budget includes \$25 million for equitable, community-driven affordable housing, with \$5 million allocated
4314 for affordable housing development located in Skyway-West Hill and \$5 million allocated for affordable

⁵⁹⁵ Logani, I., "Racial Wealth Gap." [\[link\]](#)

⁵⁹⁶ University of Washington and King County DHCS. (2020). *Impact of Hotels as Non-Congregate Emergency Shelters.* [\[link\]](#)

⁵⁹⁷ *King County Equitable Development Initiative Implementation Plan Phase 1.* [\[link\]](#)

4315 housing development serving households with one or more individuals with disabilities.⁵⁹⁸ However, most
4316 funding for affordable housing includes requirements that make these types of projects or applicants less
4317 competitive or ineligible.

4318
4319 *Affordable Two-, Three- and Four-Bedroom Units*

4320 As discussed in *Section IV. Housing Needs Analysis*, over 2,000 households in unincorporated King County
4321 live in overcrowded apartments and community members have raised the need for more family-sized units.
4322 The King County Housing Finance Program regularly awards funding to projects that include units with two
4323 or more bedrooms. Although the Washington State Housing Finance Commission's scoring summary does
4324 incentivize larger-sized units, it is one of many incentives in their scoring criteria.⁵⁹⁹ Additionally, nine
4325 percent Low-Income Housing Tax Credits have been focused on permanent supportive housing or deeply
4326 affordable housing for formerly homeless households, which are more likely to be studios and one-
4327 bedroom units.

4328 **C. Programs**

4329 This section describes gaps in King County's programs to meet different housing needs. The following
4330 programs were recommended in previous King County plans and reports but have not been implemented:

- 4331
- 4332 • Equitable Development Initiative;
 - 4333 • rental inspections;
 - 4334 • relocation assistance for tenants;
 - 4335 • redevelopment assistance; and
 - 4336 • fair housing testing, education, and enforcement.

4337 King County staff identified gaps in the existing King County Code Interim Loan Program includes and
4338 Inclusionary Housing Program based on previous planning efforts and community feedback. These gaps
4339 identified in this analysis require substantial funding beyond what King County currently has available.

4340
4341 *Equitable Development Initiative*

4342 The King County Executive transmitted the Equitable Development Initiative (EDI) Implementation Plan -
4343 Phase 1 in January 2023.⁶⁰⁰ The plan includes recommendations on needed resources and capacities
4344 necessary to establish and begin implementing a King County EDI capable of meeting the needs of the
4345 community. Community needs include:

- 4346
- 4347 • funding for capital investments and capacity building;
 - 4348 • clear and effective partnership and collaboration with King County staff and elected officials;
 - 4349 • an expanded approach to land banking and strategic acquisition;
 - 4350 • access to technical experts and peers; and
 - 4351 • clear expectations and compensation for those serving on Advisory Boards and community
4352 workgroups/committees.

4353 King County needs include:

- 4354
- 4355 • sustained and flexible funding;
 - access to technical experts and peers; and

⁵⁹⁸ Ordinance 19546, Section 107, ER1 Expenditure Restriction. [\[link\]](#)

⁵⁹⁹ Washington State Housing Finance Commission. (2023, April). *Scoring Summary: 2023 Multifamily Bond/Tax Credit Application Round*. [\[link\]](#)

⁶⁰⁰ King County Report 2023-RPT0006 (2023). [\[link\]](#)

- 4356 • cross sector partnerships.

4357

4358 *Fair Housing Testing, Education, and Enforcement*

4359 King County and partner cities pooled funds to contract with the Fair Housing Center of Washington in 2019
4360 and 2022 to understand the nature and extent of housing discrimination in King County. The results found
4361 evidence of discrimination in about half of tests. King County does not conduct regular housing
4362 discrimination testing and has not yet pursued additional efforts related to education and enforcement of
4363 fair housing laws.

4364

4365 The current system to address housing discrimination is complaint based, in which individuals who believe
4366 they have been discriminated against may file a complaint with the Washington State Human Rights
4367 Commission or pursue direct legal action. This imposes a significant burden on the discriminated party and
4368 is unlikely to help the harmed party find housing. The 2019 King County Analysis of Impediments to Fair
4369 Housing Choice recommends King County invest in programs that provide fair housing, education,
4370 enforcement, and testing.

4371

4372 *Inclusionary Housing*

4373 Inclusionary housing programs requires or incentivizes housing developers to include a percentage of
4374 affordable housing dwelling units in their developments, often in exchange for increased density. King
4375 County implemented an Inclusionary Housing program as part of the Skyway-West Hill and North Highline
4376 Anti-displacement Strategies Report and related subarea plans.⁶⁰¹

4377

4378 The Skyway-West Hill and North Highline Inclusionary Housing program was adopted in December 2022
4379 with the intention to address displacement risks these communities. The program became effective in
4380 January 2023. King County code mandates the Inclusionary Housing program in the Skyway West-Hill and
4381 North Highline unincorporated Activity Centers. In the remainder of the Skyway-West Hill and North
4382 Highline subarea geographies, developers may voluntarily opt into the program. This program allows for
4383 125 to 200 percent density bonuses in exchange for a percentage of affordable housing dwelling units.
4384 Households with incomes at or below 80 percent area median income are eligible for homeownership units
4385 build under the program. Households with incomes at or below 60 percent area median income are eligible
4386 for rental units built under the program.⁶⁰²

4387 In the 2024 Comprehensive Plan, King County expanded the voluntary inclusionary housing elements the
4388 rest of urban unincorporated King County and the Rural Towns of Vashon and Snoqualmie Pass. This code
4389 change does not expand the existing community preference or mandatory inclusionary housing elements of
4390 the program. Guided by community input, the 2024 King County Comprehensive plan included a Work Plan
4391 Action item to evaluate whether to expand these elements to any of these other communities as well.

4392

4393 *Interim Loan Program and Land Banking*

4394 King County Code 24.22 establishes the Interim Loan Program. The program's purpose is to facilitate
4395 acquisition of land for low-income housing. It allows King County to loan money to experienced housing
4396 developers on a short-term, interim basis to acquire property for affordable and homeless housing for
4397 households at or below 50 percent area median income.

4398

4399 Requiring the funds be loaned to "experienced housing developers" excludes community-based
4400 organizations that have less experience developing affordable housing. Additionally, requiring the resulting
4401 project on the property serve households with incomes at or below 50 percent area median income
4402 effectively excludes affordable homeownership projects, which often need to serve households with
4403 incomes at or below 80 percent area median income to be financially feasible. King County could also
4404 directly purchase land for affordable housing and conduct a public process to select an owner and
4405 developer.

4406

⁶⁰¹ King County Code Chapter 21A.48. *Inclusionary Housing*. [[link](#)]

⁶⁰² King County Ordinance 19555 (2022). [[link](#)]

4407 *Rental Inspection Program*

4408 Rental inspection programs seek to ensure that all residents live in safe and healthy housing units and can
4409 address persistent place-based and race-based inequities.⁶⁰³ The Housing and Community Development
4410 Division's asset management team and other public funders regularly inspect income-restricted affordable
4411 housing. While the Code Enforcement section of the King County Permitting Division may investigate
4412 complaints of substandard housing, it does not enforce tenant-landlord disputes.
4413

4414 There is no proactive rental inspection program for market rate rental housing in unincorporated King
4415 County. A proactive rental inspection program would remove the burden on tenants to report substandard
4416 housing to a prevention-based model.⁶⁰⁴ There are significant barriers to establishing a rental inspection
4417 program, including establishing a method to identify or register market-rate rental housing, establishing a
4418 new program with sufficient staffing, and identifying an available fund source. Implementing proactive rental
4419 inspection policies would achieve Goal 4, Strategy D, in the King County Regional Affordable Housing Task
4420 Force's Five Year Action Plan. King County does not currently have resources to implement a rental
4421 inspection program.
4422

4423 *Redevelopment Assistance Program*

4424 The Skyway-West Hill and North Highline Anti-displacement Strategies Report recommended King County
4425 implement a redevelopment assistance program that provides financial and technical assistance for
4426 homeowners with incomes at or below 80 percent area median income to build an accessory dwelling unit
4427 (ADU) or tenants with incomes at or below 60 percent area median income. The report found that a
4428 redevelopment assistance program would require at least 1.5 FTEs to manage 10 projects annually, with
4429 annual costs of \$266,000 for staffing and \$1.68 million for capital funding. The report also found that the
4430 program should be a lower priority for King County as compared to other strategies that result in a higher
4431 number of units. King County has so far not acted to implement the program due to lack of resources.
4432

4433 *Relocation Assistance Program*

4434 Relocation assistance programs provide financial assistance from the government or the landlord to tenants
4435 who are displaced for reasons outside the tenant's control. Relocation assistance for low-income households
4436 increases the likelihood a tenant will find nearby housing rather than become homeless or move far from
4437 their community.⁶⁰⁵
4438

4439 The Skyway-West Hill and North Highline Anti-displacement Strategies Report recommended King County
4440 Executive to transmit a tenant relocation assistance ordinance, after identifying sufficient resources for
4441 implementation, that provides tenants with financial assistance when the tenant is involuntarily displaced
4442 due to development-related reasons or conversion of the unit into a condominium. The report found the
4443 program would cost King County between \$30,000 to \$50,000 annual in direct costs to tenants, and
4444 between one and three full-time equivalent (FTE) staff to support enforcement and implementation of the
4445 program. King County would need to find an appropriate fund source for the County portion of the costs.
4446 DCHS and DLS are currently exploring this program.

4447 **Policies and Regulations**

4448 *Middle Housing*

4449 Middle housing refers to housing types that are denser than traditional single detached residences but less
4450 dense than apartment buildings. The data presented in this assessment show that housing production
4451 slowed significantly over the past 20 years while the population has continued to increase in King County.
4452 Middle housing types can help contribute to meeting the housing need in urban unincorporated King
4453 County by providing greater density and diversity of housing types. King County staff heard through
4454 interviews with housing providers and community-based organizations that middle housing should help
4455 increase housing affordability and choice. An interviewee explained, "We need middle housing. We come

⁶⁰³ ChangeLab Solutions. (2022). *A Guide to Proactive Rental Inspections*. [\[link\]](#)

⁶⁰⁴ National Center for Healthy Housing. (2022). *Proactive Rental Inspections*. [\[link\]](#)

⁶⁰⁵ *Skyway-West Hill and North Highline Anti-displacement Strategies Report*. [\[link\]](#)

4456 from cultures where communities are deeply connected. We did not live in massive homes, we lived in
4457 apartment communities, with a mix of ages, grandparents taking care of the children."⁶⁰⁶
4458

4459 Washington State adopted House Bill 1110 in 2023, requiring most jurisdictions allow middle housing types
4460 on current lots zoned for single detached residences, particularly in areas within a half mile walkshed of
4461 transit. However, unincorporated King County was not included in that requirement. King County adopted
4462 an ordinance to reduce barriers to developing middle housing and creating a voluntary program for a
4463 density bonus while providing some affordable housing. This aligned with the Equity Work Group
4464 discussions for middle housing in this Comprehensive Plan update.
4465

4466 The 2024 Comprehensive Plan adopted code changes that reduce regulatory barriers for and incentivize
4467 middle housing in residential zones. These zones include unincorporated urban areas and Rural Towns. The
4468 code changes streamline the development process for duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes and offer
4469 regulatory flexibilities to encourage their development.
4470

4471 *Multifamily Tax Exemption Program*

4472 Chapter 84.14 Revised Code of Washington established the Multifamily Tax Exemption program. The
4473 program authorizes local governments to exempt the value of new housing construction, conversion, and
4474 rehabilitation from property taxes for eight to twenty years, depending on the location of the project and the
4475 income levels served.
4476

4477 In 2021, Senate Bill 5287 changed the population threshold that makes counties eligible to implement the
4478 program, making King County eligible. The 2024 Comprehensive Plan adopted a Work Plan Action item for
4479 King County to conduct a study evaluating the benefit and impacts of a Multifamily Tax Exemption program,
4480 and if recommended, to propose an ordinance to adopt a Multifamily Tax Exemption program for
4481 unincorporated King County. Further community engagement to inform this recommendation will be
4482 necessary before recommending whether to allow a Multifamily Tax Exemption program.
4483

4484 *Emergency Housing*

4485 House Bill 1220 required that cities conduct a Land Capacity Analysis. King County conducted a Land
4486 Capacity Analysis and found that there was sufficient land capacity for all housing types, except for
4487 emergency and permanent supportive housing. The 2024 Comprehensive Plan adopted code changes
4488 aimed at clarifying the allowed zones these housing types are allowed in to ensure sufficient zoned capacity
4489 and to reduce barriers to their development.

⁶⁰⁶ Staff from organization focused on the Indian American community.