Appendix D

Updated Growth Targets, Capacity, and Transportation Assumptions

Appendix D

Growth Targets, Capacity, and Transportation Assumptions

(Final EIS updated information shown *italics*)

This appendix provides detailed demographic forecasts that address the following:

- The City of Kirkland's Assigned 2022 Household and Employment Targets from the 2003 Countywide Planning Policies for King County;
- A Land Capacity Estimate completed in 2003. It identifies existing households and employment, as well as a reasonable estimate of potential development accounting for zoning, market factors, critical areas, etc.
- Updated Transportation Model Land Use Assumptions that are based on the Land Capacity Estimate, but reduced to be closer to the assigned Household and Growth Targets.

Growth Targets from Countywide Planning Policies

In accordance with the GMA, Kirkland is required to plan for growth in the succeeding 20-year planning period. The City's growth targets are the result of a multi-jurisdictional, regional process of how each City is able to accommodate its fair share of future regional growth. State OFM population projections for King County are divided among all King County jurisdictions through an interactive process. The County chooses to measure progress towards population allocations by the number of dwellings built and occupied. The year 2012 and year 2022 **household targets** are as follows:

- No-Action: As part of its initial 1995 GMA Comprehensive Planning efforts, the City of Kirkland was allocated a household growth target of 5,837 households between 1992 and 2012. When added to 1991 existing households, the City's total households in the year 2012 was targeted at 24,501. This is a rough midpoint of a household target range of 24,258 and 25,327 housing units.
- Proposed Action: In conjunction with King County and other East King County cities, Kirkland was allocated a future growth target of 5,480 households between the years 2000 to 2022. The City's 2000 households (year 2000 of 21,831) plus target households (5,480) is estimated to lead to year 2022 households of 27,311.

In accordance with Countywide Planning Policies, Kirkland participates in regional forums to allocate employment growth for a succeeding 20-year planning period. The year 2012 and year 2022 **employment targets** are as follows:

- No Action: As part of its initial 1995 GMA Comprehensive Planning efforts, the City of Kirkland was allocated an employment growth target of 8,600 between 1992 and 2012. When added to 1991 employees of 21,864, the City's total employment in the year 2012 was targeted at 30,464 (this is roughly the mid-point of a future target employment range, 29,664 to 31,164 jobs). The City has already exceeded its 2012 employment target when compared to existing employment levels described previously.
- Proposed Action: In conjunction with King County and other East King County cities, Kirkland was allocated a future employment growth target of 8,800 jobs between the years 2000 to 2022. The City's jobs in 2000 (approximately 32,384) plus target jobs by 2022 (8,800) is estimated to lead to a year 2022 employment level of 41,184.

The City must plan for these targets in its Comprehensive Plan, and demonstrate it has the capacity to accommodate it.

Land Capacity Estimate

Land use capacity is the measure that is used to determine the ability of the City to accommodate it adopted targets. The capacity analysis is the City's best guess of what parcels are likely to development and the nature and intensity of the development at the time that the analysis is completed. As part of a countywide effort to prepare an analysis of buildable lands pursuant to GMA requirements, the City of Kirkland has estimated the capacity of vacant and underdeveloped (land not developed to full potential) lands in the City. Consistent with regionally established methods that are tailored to reflect Kirkland conditions, the total vacant and underdeveloped acres were discounted for critical areas such as wetlands, streams, and steep slopes, rights-of-way and public purpose lands, and market factors (i.e. not all property owners would want to sell or develop). The assumptions about redevelopment, densities, critical area factors, market factors, and right-of-way factors, etc. are at the discretion of the City of Kirkland. Capacity calculations are conducted regularly to 1) provide input into the city's traffic model for level of service estimates; and 2) to verify that there is enough land available for the City to accommodate its regional population and employment allocations, or targets. The information is reported at several levels, transportation analysis zone and neighborhood level.

A summary of the City's Land Capacity Analysis completed on June 17, 2003 under the section "2022 Land Capacity Related Documentation" follows this introduction. *This analysis was subsequently updated in June 2004 based on improved information about potential future development in the Totem Center Study Area within the Totem Lake Neighborhood. In general, the updated citywide growth targets and land capacity estimates are similar to those studied in the draft EIS. Between neighborhoods, the targets and capacity estimates are also similar, but provide for an increased share of growth in the Totem Lake neighborhood.*

A summary comparing updated targets and capacity is provided in the table below. Capacity exceeds targets which means assigned growth can be accommodated.

Table 1. 2000, 2003 and Future Population, Housing, and Employment Growth – Kirkland

Population – City of Kirkland [1]

2000	2003	2012	2022
45,054	45,630	50,756	*54,790*

Housing Units – City of Kirkland

2000	2003 [5]	2012 Target [2]	2012 Capacity	2022 Target [3]	Capacity[6]
21,831	22,120	24,890	24,501	27,311	*28,751*

Employment – City of Kirkland

2000 [3]	2003 [5]	2012 Target [4]	2012 Capacity	2022 Target [3]	Capacity[6]
32,384	34,843	30,464	38,600	41,184	*54,565*

[1] Population sources – State OFM 2000 and 2003; Kirkland Comprehensive Plan Update, 2004.

[2] Year 2012 net household target added to Year 1991housedholds = 5,837 representing 1992-2012 targets.

[3] Year 2000--2022 net household target equals 5,480 households. Year 2000--2022 net employment target equals 8,800 jobs. Year 2000 employment is based on City estimates for 2001. State Employment Security Department/PSRC year 2000 estimate of employment was 38,828, which was later found to have significant discrepancies (corporate jobs identified in Kirkland sometimes actually occur in separate store/vendor locations outside of Kirkland).

[4] Year 1991 employment of 21,864 plus net employment target of 8,600 for years 1992-2012.

[5] Based on 2003 Capacity Analysis, as documented later in this appendix. OFM Housing estimates for comparison are 22,577. State Employment Security Department numbers for 2003 are not available at this time.

[6] City estimate as of June 2004.

Transportation Model Assumptions

The City's transportation forecast model is part of the Bellevue/Kirkland/Redmond (BKR) Model used to account for vehicle trips between the three adjacent jurisdictions, to provide a consistent model between the neighboring cities and to encourage intergovernmental coordination. The BKR model covering the three jurisdictions has established a common database to support traffic impact review for local development as well as mid- and long-range transportation planning within the planning area.

The BKR model is directly tied to each jurisdiction's land use within the planning area. The BKR model integrates elements of the regional model developed by Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC); and land use updates are done to provide accurate travel demand forecasts for the planning area.

In the adopted Transportation Element, the 2012 No Action on the 2012 Network (see Table 2), was based on a trend line growth forecast analysis. This type of analysis resulted in a higher estimated 2012 capacity for both households and employment than the 2022 Proposed Action. The trend line approach completed for the 2002 Comprehensive Plan Update was based on an estimated growth pattern experienced between 1991 and 2000, whereas the 2003 land capacity analysis done for the proposed 2004 Comprehensive Plan considers such factors as site conditions (sensitive areas and right-of-ways), market factors and likelihood of development and redevelopment. The capacity analysis methodology is likely to be more accurate than the trend line approach since it looks at actual conditions and factors rather than a general estimate of growth based on a nine year growth period when growth was unusually aggressive compared to what we are currently experiencing.

In both land capacity approaches, estimated capacity for each land use is calculated for each transportation analysis zone (TAZ- see Figure D-1). The City's future available capacity for each land use (office, commercial, industrial, multi-family, and single-family) is determined by summing the individual TAZ capacities.

The future employment for office, commercial, and industrial land uses were determined by the proportioning of the City's 2022 total target employment (less the employment forecast from special generators and institutions) into the relative proportion of available capacity for each land use. The resulting 2022 employment (number of employees) was converted into square footages needed to accommodate the target employment. The employment (square footages) and housing targets for each land use were distributed into each TAZ proportionally based to their capacity. Institutions were assumed to remain the same in the future. With the exception of the Evergreen Healthcare Center, special generators were assumed to also remain the same in the future. It was assumed that Evergreen Healthcare Center's current Master Plan would be completed by 2022.

Table 2 describes the Transportation Plan assumptions for 2003, 2012, and 2022.

Table 2. Transportation Model Land Use Assumptions

Land Use	Units	2003 Inventory (as of 1/2003)	2012 No Action with 2012 Network	2022 No Action with 2012 Network	2022 Proposed Action with 2022 Network
Single-family	Dwelling Units	10,195	10,985	12,312	*12,473*
Multi-family	Dwelling Units	11,925	14,423	15,144	*16,564*
Office	Square Feet	5,059,417	7,059,667	5,778,050	*5,905,028*
Commercial	Square Feet	3,269,000	4,204,660	3,800,398	*3,732,534*
Industrial	Square Feet	3,296,747	3,105,513	3,365,423	*3,201,961*

Note: Does not include special generator land uses in the employment square feet.

Target Assumptions for Totem Center, Private Amendment Study Areas and City Neighborhoods

Totem Center Study Area and the Private Amendment Study Areas A and B are smaller than the defined TAZ boundaries. To develop area-specific land use, housing, and employment estimates, the *2004* Capacity Analysis, which is based on parcel-level review, was used. The selected parcels in the study areas were identified. 2003 existing land use and projected land use capacity were summarized for the Totem Center Study Area. *Capacity estimates for Private Amendment Study Areas A and B were not re-calculated for this Final EIS.* Since the Transportation numbers were intended to proportionally reduce capacity to "target" levels, area specific targets were derived by assuming that the proportion of development capacity in the study areas in relation to the relevant TAZ development capacity would be consistent when applied to TAZ data at the "target" level.

The original 1991 capacity analysis for the No Action was not available at the TAZ or study area level. In order to determine No Action "targets" the 2003 Capacity Analysis without the Totem Center zoning amendments (under consideration) and without the proposed Private Amendments was proportionally reduced to the City's 2022 target level. A straight-line projection between 2003 land use (existing) and 2022 No Action Target was made to obtain year 2012 information.

Summary and spreadsheet charts are included in this Appendix illustrating the methodology described.

Updated 2022 Land Capacity Related Documentation

City of Kirkland Capacity Analysis
Query Definitions and Assumptions
2004 Comprehensive Plan Update Edition
FINAL – May 19, 2004

The Capacity Analysis is created from the Land Use Master File, which is maintained in an Access database. The Land Use Master File contains land use by parcel, as well as other Assessor's file information. The multi-family data has been field verified. Using the GIS, we have added parcel area, TAZ, zoning, comprehensive plan designation, and neighborhood.

Each piece of the analysis is done in Access Queries that are derived from the original database. If assumptions change, then the individual queries and formulae can be modified as necessary. The basic formula for calculating the capacity comes from the "King County Land Capacity Task Force Recommendations", dated November 1995. The assumptions about redevelopment, densities, critical area factors, market factors, ROW factors etc. are at the discretion of the City.

The Task Force cautions that redevelopable parcels should not be counted twice, as they apparently were in some previous Capacity Analyses. That is, they should not be included in the count of units or square footage in the Capacity numbers if they are redeveloped in the analysis. This happened in some previous capacity calculations for the City.

1 Input

Land Use Master File (Landuse.mdb) with added fields from the GIS and other tables

This is the main land use database, containing the following fields for Capacity Analysis.

- Land Use Code - 3 digit
- City of Kirkland Summary of the 3 digit code (SF, MF etc.)
- Assessed Value Land
- Assessed Value Improvements
- Improvement Area
- Number of Units (from assessor or field checked)
- TAZ Number
- Zoning
- Comprehensive Plan Designation
- Neighborhood
- Parcel Size in Acres and Square Feet
- Units / Acre for each Residential Zone

- FAR's for Non-Residential Zones

2 Extract from Input

- Publicly Owned Properties
- Special Generators from the Traffic Model – need to add those employees back in later for now and capacity
- Parcels completely contained in the 50 foot buffer around wetlands and streams

3 Subsets for Calculations

3.1 Single Family

Vacant

- Zoning = Low Density Residential
- Land Use = Vacant

Developed

- Land Use = Single Family
- lot size / min. lot size (zoning) < 2 and Land Use = Single Family
- Subtract the redevelopable from the total number of SF units to get capacity

Redevelopable

- lot size / minimum lot size (zoning) > = 2 and min. lot size > 3600 and Land Use = Single Family.
- Zoning = low density residential

3.2 Multi-Family

(NOTE: Totem Lake, CBD, North Rose Hill and Rose Hill Assumptions will add Multi-Family units as well)

Vacant

- Zoning = Medium or High Density Residential
- Land Use = Vacant

Developed

- Land Use = Multi-Family
- density is > .75 of the allowable density under current zoning
- Subtract the redevelopable from the total units to get capacity

Redevelopable

- Land Use = Multi-Family
- density is < .75 of the allowable density under current zoning
- Condos - is it realistic to redevelop considering multiple ownerships of the property? We didn't redevelop condos.

3.3 Non Residential –– do separately for the 3 Categories

(Not CBD, certain Totem Lake districts, certain Rose Hill districts)

FAR's

Office: .75
Commercial: .57
Industrial: .58
(Based on actual FAR's in these zones).

Vacant

- Zoning = Industrial, Office, Commercial
- Zoning not = CBD
- Land Use = Vacant

Developed

- Zoning = Industrial, Office, Commercial
- Zoning not = CBD
- Assessed Value of Improvements / Assessed Value of Land > .5
- Subtract the redevelopable from the capacity

Redevelopable

- Zoning = Industrial, Office, Commercial
- Zoning not= CBD
- Assessed Value of Improvements / Assessed Value of Land < .5
- Subtract the redevelopable from the capacity

3.3.1 Industrial

The redevelopable properties (based on method above) in LIT were developed 50% as office, with a .75 FAR and 50% as industrial, with a .58 FAR. PLA 17B properties were developed as commercial, with a .57 FAR.

3.3.2 CBD

The CBD was treated separately from the other zoning categories. Mixed Use is planned for the CBD, therefore capacity was calculated 3 times on each redevelopable parcel. Redevelopable parcels were determined same as for non-CBD.

- Total FAR of 2.25 (.9 commercial, .45 office, .9 residential)
- Residential calculated assuming units of 1000 sq. ft average
- After these calculations, each total was added back into the residential and non-residential databases
- Subtract the redevelopable from the capacity.

CBD 5 – For Park Place, it was developed according to current plans: Office 629,483 sq. ft. (.85), Residential 129,211 sq. ft.(.17), Commercial 209,162 sq. ft. (.28)

3.3.3 Lake and Central Property

City-owned but will be developed. Removed from Public Properties and developed according to CBD assumptions for 2.25 FAR mixed use.

3.3.4 JBD 1

Juanita Village was developed according to plans – 88,000 sq feet of retail and 580 units. The rest of JBD 1 was treated separately from the other zoning categories. Mixed Use of residential and retail is planned for JBD 1, therefore capacity was calculated 2 times on each redevelopable parcel, for each type of use to total a 1.4 FAR. Redevelopable was determined same as for non-CBD.

- FAR's were calculated for each sub-area. 1.4 was the total.
- Commercial - FAR .2
- Residential - FAR 1.2
- Residential calculated assuming units of 1000 sq. ft average
- After these calculations, each total was added back into the residential and non-residential databases
- Subtract the redevelopable from the capacity.

3.3.5 NE 85th Street Subarea

(NOTE: Unit size of 1000 sq ft – rather than the units per acre - was used with those zones that had a total FAR apportioned)

Land Use District	**Land Use**	**FAR**	**Dwelling Units per Acre** (as incentive)	**Notes**
RH 8	Office	.75		
RH 7 Rosehill V.	Commercial	2 Total .5 Retail .75 Office .75 MF		"Wasn't likely to redevelop" but we did
RH 6A	MF	.57	24	
RH 6B	Office	.75		
RH 5 A-B (BC/BCX)	Commercial	.57		
RH 4	Office	.75		
RH 3 (Rosehill Shopping Center)	Commercial	2 Total .5 Retail .75 Office .75 MF		
RH 2A (Lee Johnson)	Commercial	2 Total .5 Retail .75 Office .75 MF	50 – use 1000 sq ft units instead	Wasn't "likely to redevelop" but we did
RH 2B	Commercial	2 Total .5 Retail .75 Office .75 MF	50 – use 1000 sq ft units instead	
RH 2C	Office	.75		
RH 1A (Costco)	Commercial	.58		Wasn't "likely to redevelop"
RH 1B (Parking Lot for Costco)	Commercial	.58		Do Not Redevelop

3.3.6 Totem Lake

District (Future Zoning):	Assumptions
TL 1A	Office (2.0 FAR) All parcels with land/value ratio of 2.5 or less redeveloped[1]
TL 1B	Residential – 100 Units/Acre All parcels with land/value ratio of 2.5 or less redeveloped[2]
TL 2 (Totem Lake Mall)	office: 85,000 and retail: 475,000 and residential: 200 units[3]
TL 3 (Evergreen Hospital)	1.7 million square feet[4]
TL 4, TL 5, TL 8	100% commercial (.57 FAR)
TL 6	100% commercial (.57 FAR) and residential (50 d.u./acre)
TL 7	Retail .57 FAR
TL 9	50% commercial, 50% industrial
TL 10A	100% office (.8 FAR)
TL 10B and TL 10C	50% office (standard .75 FAR) and 50% residential (50 d.u./acre)
TL 10D	75% office (standard FAR) 25% residential (50 d.u./acre)
TL 11	office (highest use)

[1] Based on revised land capacity analysis for the Totem Center Study Area dated May 2004.
[2] Based on revised land capacity analysis for the Totem Center Study Area dated May 2004.
[3] Based on estimates provided by representatives of Totem Lake Mall for anticipated development (2002)
[4] Estimate based on projection from EHMC of 1.9 million by 2025. Reduced projection for 2022.

3.3.7 North Rose Hill

NRH 1A, 1B -

2.0 FAR
.5 Commercial
1.5 Multi-Family
1000 Sq ft per unit

3.3.8 2004 Comprehensive Plan Private Amendments[1]

Sauder Door – redeveloped parcels 7882600220, 7882600170, 7882600602 north and south of Sedorco as:

50% office at .75 FAR
50% residential at 24 units per acre.

PLA 6B – redeveloped parcels built at less than 50% improvements to land value ratio at 24 units per acre.

3.3.9 Misc. Pipeline Projects

TAZ 261 – added 15,000 sq ft of office on 6th (completed in 2002 but not yet occupied)

4 Factors

Factors are applied to all categories described in Section 1.

4.1 Single Family

- ROW - .95 (per advice from Rob Jammerman)
- Critical Areas – The GIS was used to redevelop properties within 50 feet of wetlands or streams. Totally contained in the buffer were not redeveloped. 50% or more wet were developed at 50% capacity. Less than 50% wet were redeveloped at 85% capacity.
- Public Lands - 5% – based on planners knowledge of how development is likely to be in the future, knowing that only parks property is likely to increase. Schools, public offices etc. are already built. King County recommendation is also 5%.

[1] Based on revised land capacity analysis for the Totem Center Study Area dated May 2004.

4.2 Multi-Family

- ROW – 2% (per advice from Rob Jammerman)
- Critical Areas – The GIS was used to redevelop properties within 50 feet of wetlands or open streams. Totally contained in the buffer were not redeveloped. 50% or more wet were developed at 50% capacity. Less than 50% wet were redeveloped at 85% capacity.
- Public Lands – 5% – based on planners knowledge of how development is likely to be in the future, knowing that only parks property is likely to increase. Schools, public offices etc. are already built. King County recommendation is also 5%.

4.3 Non-Residential

- ROW – 5% (per advice from Rob Jammerman)
- Critical Areas – The GIS was used to redevelop properties within 50 feet of wetlands or streams. Totally contained in the buffer were not redeveloped. 50% or more wet were developed at 50% capacity. Less than 50% wet were redeveloped at 85% capacity.
- Public Lands – 5% – based on planners knowledge of how development is likely to be in the future, knowing that only parks property is likely to increase. Schools, public offices etc. are already built. King County recommendation is also 5%.
- FAR's-
  Office: .75
  Commercial: .57
  Industrial: .58
  (Based on actual FAR's in these zones).

4.4 Market Factors

- 5% for vacant residential
- 10% for redevelopable residential
- From Bellevue -10% for office
- From Bellevue - 5% for retail
- From Bellevue - 7.5% for Industrial

4.5 Employees per 1000 sq ft

- Office – 4
- Retail – 2
- Industrial – 1.7

Based on numbers from City of Bellevue

4.6 Vacancy Rate

- 5% for all non-residential uses

5 Calculations

MF Residential (for vacant and redevelopable parcels)

(lot size in acres / zoned density) x ROW factor x Public Lands factor = Units

SF Residential (for vacant and redevelopable parcels)

(lot size in SQ FT / minimum lot size) x ROW factor x Public Lands factor = Units

Non-Residential(for vacant and redevelopable parcels)

lot size in square feet x FAR x ROW factor x Public Lands factor = Square Feet

Add Additional Capacity to Existing Development to get Capacity:

Remember to take out the redevelopable parcels from the capacity, so that parcels aren't counted twice in the Capacity total.

Revised Summary of Existing and Available Capacity for Household Units and Employees

2001 Existing

Total	29,591
Special Generators	
Institutions	2,736
Institutions	57
Grand Total	**32,384**

SF:	9,787
MF:	11,555
Total:	**21,342**

2001 Capacity

Employees

Total	38,015
Special Generators	2,736
Institutions	57
Grand Total	**40,808**

SF:	11,949
MF:	12,705
Total:	**24,654**

2003 Existing

Total	31,781
Special Generators	2,959
Institutions	103
Total	**34,843**

SF:	10,195
MF:	11,925
Grand Total:	**22,120**

Revised 2003 Capacity (does not include private amendment requests**)**

Total	*50,215*
Special Generators	*4,200*
Institutional	*150*
Grand Total	***54,565***
SF:	*12,473*
MF:	*16,278*
Total:	***28,751***

source: Thang Nguyen, City of Kirkland Public Works Department, 2004.

Targets and Difference Between Targets and New Capacity #'s

	Target	2001 Existing	Additional Capacity
Residential Target:	27,311	21,342	5,480
Our 2003 Capacity #:	28,751		
Difference:	**1,440**		
Employee Target:	41,184	32,384	8,800
Our 2003 Capacity #:	54,565		
Difference:	**13,381**		

Updated 2022 Transportation Model Assumptions

TAZ	Neighborhood	Multi-family Existing	Multi-family Capacity	Multi-family 2022	Single family Existing	Single family Capacity	Single family 2022
236	Lakeview	342	342	344	14	17	17
237	Lakeview		0	0	1	1	1
238	Lakeview	51	69	63	123	132	130
239	Lakeview	45	45	45		0	0
240	Lakeview	196	196	197	2	2	2
241	Central	553	587	578	46	46	46
242	Lakeview	77	80	80	167	176	174
243	Central Houghton	3	3	3	191	298	272
244	Central Houghton	57	57	57	174	227	215
245	Central Houghton	75	106	93	292	368	351
246	Central Houghton	239	246	245	352	373	368
247	Bridle Trails	2	2	2	168	205	197
248	Bridle Trails	2	2	2	264	299	291
249	Bridle Trails	131	131	132	291	395	371
250	Central	198	221	213	60	66	64
251	Central	73	92	85	5	5	5
252	Central	250	271	297	24	26	26
253	Central	427	584	582	113	117	116
254	Central	155	230	202	7	7	7
255	Central	120	250	200		0	0
256	Central	234	342	301		0	0
257	Central	353	640	530		0	0
258	Central	68	88	81	19	19	19
259	Central	358	378	373	5	5	5
260	Everest			73			0
261	Everest	340	383	367	104	125	120
261.5	Everest	64	64	64	127	127	127
262	Everest	46	99	78	167	272	248
263	South Rose Hill	10	14	13	758	1042	979
264	South Rose Hill	54	248	172	71	91	86
265	North Rose Hill	141	164	156	5	7	6
266	North Rose Hill		24	14	3	3	3
267	North Rose Hill		82	50	7	7	7
268	South Rose Hill	204	204	205	731	780	769
269	Market	91	111	104	97	111	108
270	Norkirk	182	215	203	71	75	74
271	Norkirk	15	15	15	485	543	530
272	Norkirk	4	5	5	103	111	109
273	Norkirk	7	7	7	457	511	498
274	Norkirk	122	163	148	852	980	951
275	Highlands	207	252	236	78	111	103
276	North Rose Hill		0	0	435	718	655
277	North Rose Hill	163	366	282	133	267	236
278	North Rose Hill	2	2	2	924	1121	1077
279	North Rose Hill	482	495	493	2	2	2
280	North Rose Hill	571	791	709	1	1	1
281	North Rose Hill	496	551	531	31	76	65
282	Norkirk	4	12	9	501	630	601
283	South Juanita	265	268	268	656	791	760

TAZ	Neighborhood	Multi-family			Single family		
		Existing	Capacity	2022	Existing	Capacity	2022
284	South Juanita	761	775	775	1	1	1
285	South Juanita	635	1131	940	5	5	5
286	South Juanita	280	286	285	142	167	162
287	South Juanita	379	388	387	429	463	456
288	North Juanita	363	373	372	293	298	297
289	North Juanita	173	173	174	175	211	202
290	North Juanita		177	107	29	37	35
291	Highlands		44	26		0	0
292	Totem Lake	202	202	203	3	3	3
293	Totem Lake		105	64		0	0
294	Totem Lake		0	0		0	0
295	Totem Lake		53	32	1	1	1
296	Totem Lake	574	574	578		0	0
297	Totem Lake		15	9		0	0
298	North Juanita	28	196	204		0	0
299	Totem Lake	3	32	20		0	0
300	Totem Lake	200	1257	843		0	0
301	Totem Lake	200	341	287		0	0
302	Totem Lake	648	658	659		0	0
Total Existing		**11925**	**16278**	**14872**	**10195**	**12473**	**11954**

Total Existing = 22120
Total Capacity = 28751
Total 2022 = 26826

TAZ	Neighborhood	Office			Commercial			Industrial			Institutions
		Existing	Capacity	2022	Existing	Capacity	2022	Existing	Capacity	2022	
236	Lakeview	485645	487479	486071		0	0		0	0	0
237	Lakeview	599212	700677	622776	16208	16208	16208		0	0	0
238	Lakeview		0	0		0	0		0	0	0
239	Lakeview	924635	948450	930166	6220	43404	14401		0	0	1520
240	Lakeview		0	0		0	0		0	0	0
241	Lakeview		5675	1318	19038	42931	24295		0	0	0
242	Lakeview		0	0		0	0		0	0	0
243	Central Houghton		0	0		0	0		0	0	6528
244	Central Houghton		0	0		0	0		0	0	0
245	Central Houghton	8271	8271	8271	57303	127675	72786		0	0	0
246	Central Houghton	60723	60723	60723	1480	5932	2460		0	0	9071
247	Bridle Trails		0	0	72295	72295	72295		0	0	4800
248	Bridle Trails	35586	35586	35586		0	0		0	0	0
249	Bridle Trails	5000	5000	5000	148489	149100	148623		0	0	3557
250	Moss Bay		0	0		0	0		0	0	0
251	Moss Bay		0	0		0	0		0	0	0
252	Moss Bay	21357	101752	24783	13652	21421	15366		0	0	17708
253	Moss Bay	34872	251540	60357	32310	67096	39985	151476	144807	150005	36812
254	Moss Bay	16555	93932	33626	61768	104228	71136		0	0	10121
255	Moss Bay	137041	240837	159941	218361	284579	232970		0	0	0
256	Moss Bay	51814	213530	87493	192679	235350	202093		0	0	0
257	Moss Bay	209011	723579	322538	321581	540559	369893		0	0	0
258	Moss Bay	36000	36000	36000		0	0	28532	28532	28532	0
259	Moss Bay	262846	277768	266311		0	0		0	0	0
260	Everest	30355	305122	117735	44158	78092	51624	262937	273120.8777	111501	0
261	Everest	90414	215263	119409	6224	15543	8274	107749	152217.7923	117797	0
261.5	Everest	190916	190916	190916		0	0	85142	85142	85142	0
262	South Rose Hill		1191	277		0	0		946.677375	214	0
263	South Rose Hill		0	0	17450	44573	23417		0	0	50625
264	South Rose Hill	26586	163139	58299	48532	270060	97271	12270	12270	12270	7416
265	North Rose Hill	18059	40633	23302	191535	263392	207345	15647	15647	15647	1484
266	North Rose Hill		0	0	36149	168360	65237		0	0	0
267	North Rose Hill	50912	229420	92368	111369	199393	130736	43478	55183.74088	46123	0
268	Market	175278	308876	206305	54599	79203	60012		0	0	0
269	Norkirk		0	0	5184	5184	5184		0	0	16560
270	Norkirk	1536	1536	1536		0	0		0	0	0
271	Norkirk		0	0		0	0		0	0	6904
272	Norkirk	33805	132618	56753	3168	3168	3168	352712	427557.1147	369624	0
273	Norkirk		0	0		0	0		0	0	0
274	Highlands		0	0		0	0		0	0	0
275	North Rose Hill		89332	20746		0	0		0	0	16582
276	North Rose Hill	4271	4271	4271		0	0		0	0	42443
277	North Rose Hill	99154	159277	113117	14563	64267	25499		0	0	0
278	North Rose Hill		49092	11401		0	0		0	0	5613
279	North Rose Hill	4560	11497	6171	25060	25060	25060	48740	48740	48740	0
280	Totem Lake		0	0		37958	8351	38575	38575	38575	0
281	Norkirk		0	0		0	0		0	0	0
282	Market		0	0		0	0		0	0	8541
283	South Juanita		0	0		0	0	816	816	816	0
284	South Juanita		0	0		0	0		0	0	14825

TAZ	Neighborhood	Office			Commercial			Industrial			Institutions
		Existing	Capacity	2022	Existing	Capacity	2022	Existing	Capacity	2022	
285	South Juanita	132396	132396	132396	116122	284681	153208	2257	2257	2257	0
286	South Juanita		0	0		0	0		0	0	0
287	North Juanita		2436	566	3703	3703	3703		0	0	0
288	North Juanita		26802	6224		0	0		0	0	6680
289	North Juanita		57379	13326		0	0		0	0	5171
290	Highlands	18480	42820	24133		0	0	564121	564121	564121	0
291	Totem Lake		19955	4634	36200	36200	36200	449991	449991	449991	0
292	Totem Lake	814784	814784	814784	11514	51130	20230		0	0	2720
293	Totem Lake	11924	63703	23949	236924	384465	269385	364619	364619	364619	0
294	Totem Lake		0	0	121763	121763	121763		0	0	0
295	Totem Lake	1350	1350	1350	293252	339901	303515	182869	182869	182869	0
296	Totem Lake		0	0		0	0		0	0	
297	Totem Lake	19681	19681	19681	165416	204869	174096	77195	77195	77195	0
298	Totem Lake	26743	145000	145000	339735	516319	473304		0	0	0
299	Totem Lake		0	0	81415	545129	183439	535923	535923	535923	0
300	Totem Lake	236905	840341	453822		0	0		0	0	0
301	Totem Lake	92771	83622	81507		0	0		0	0	28780
302	Totem Lake		86508	20090		0	0		0	0	0
	Total	***4969448***	***8429758***	***5905028***	***3125419***	***5453191***	***3732534***	***3325049***	***3460530***	***3201961***	***304461***

Totem Center

Data	City-Wide	Totem Center Study Area					
		TAZ 298	TAZ 300	TAZ 301	Sum of TAZ 298, 300, 301	Study Area	% of TAZ
2003 Existing							
Residential (DU)	22,120	28	200	200	428	200	46.7%
Office (SF)	4,969,448	26,743	236,905	92,771	356,419	308,888	86.7%
Commercial (SF)	3,125,419	339,735	0	0	339,735	329,587	97.0%
Industrial (SF)	3,325,049	182,869	0	0	182869	0	0.0%
Insititutions (SF)	304,461	0	0	28,780	28780	0	0.0%
Employees	34,843	1,097	948	2,229	4,274	1,895	44.3%
2022 Target (proposed action)							
Residential (DU)	27,311	208	862	293	1363	1210	88.8%
Office (SF)	5,905,028	145,000	453,822	81,507	680,329	568455	83.6%
Commercial (SF)	3,732,534	473,304	0	0	473,304	441954	93.4%
Industrial (SF)	3,201,961	0	0	0	0		0.0%
Insititutions (SF)	304,461	0	0	28,780	28780		0.0%
Employees	41,184	1,527	1,815	3,326	6668	3738	56.1%
2003 Capacity							
Residential (DU)	28,751	202	1257	341	1800	1598	88.8%
Office (SF)	9,038,850	145,000	956,709	81,507	1,183,216	988,647	83.6%
Commercial (SF)	5,804,755	508,694	0	0	508,694	475,000	93.4%
Industrial (SF)	3,333,790	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Insititutions (SF)	304,463	0	0	28,780	28780		0.0%
Employees*	54,565	1,597	3,827	3,326	8,750	4,905	56.1%
* Includes special generators							

Sources: Citywide target and capacity data based on transportation land use model data from Thang Nguyen updated 7/01/04. Totem Center capacity based on worksheet from Kirsty Burt dated May 19, 2004 2004_Capacity_Amendments_TL1_an. Totem Center target data estimates derived by Jones & Stokes, 2004.

Single Family/Multifamily Split
(Based on 2003 Existing Use Estimate
and Transportation Model Assumptions)

Dwellings Gross

2012	MF	SF
Total	13,448	11,197
MF %	54.6%	
2022	MF	SF
Total	15,215	12,312
MF %	55.3%	
2003	MF	SF
Total	11,925	10,195
MF %	53.9%	

Dwellings Net

2012	SF Net	1,002
	MF Net	1,523
	Total	**2,525**
MF %	60%	

2022	SF Net	2,117
	MF Net	3,290
	Total	**5,404**
MF %	61%	

MF = Multifamily
SF = Single Family

source: Jones & Stokes, based on revised transportation model data. 2004.