

MOTION NO. 4945

1 A MOTION relating to the Housing and Community
2 Development Block Grant and adopting amendments
3 to the Plan for Community Development 1981-83.
4 for King County Block Grant Consortium.

5 WHEREAS, King County is a member of the Community Development
6 Block Grant Consortium, and

7 WHEREAS, all members of the Community Development Block
8 Grant Consortium are required to adopt a Three Year Plan for
9 Community Development, and

10 WHEREAS, King County has adopted the Three Year Plan for
11 Community Development 1980-82 by Motion No. 4311, and

12 WHEREAS, the Joint Policy Committee has approved the Block
13 Grant Consortium Plan for Community Development 1980-82 for
14 King County, and

15 WHEREAS, the Department of Housing and Urban Development
16 required that entitlement jurisdictions prepare a three year
17 strategy for community development funds, and

18 WHEREAS, the Department of Housing and Urban Development
19 requires an updated plan to be submitted for the period 1981-83,
20 and

21 WHEREAS, the King County Executive has submitted the amend-
22 ments to the adopted Block Grant Consortium Three Year Plan for
23 Community Development 1981-83, and

24 WHEREAS, the Council concurs in the Executive's major
25 emphasis in the plan on housing and housing rehabilitation,

26 NOW THEREFORE, BE IT MOVED by the Council of King County:

27 The attached amendments to the Block Grant Consortium
28 Three Year Plan for Community Development 1981-83 are hereby
29 adopted to update the existing plan and to govern the planning
30 process and development of the 1981-83 Community Development
31 Program, PROVIDED THAT, the following changes are made:
32
33

1 A. Page 3, sub-paragraph 2:

2 2. Close review of proposed projects will determine if
3 the nature of the project is appropriate in scale to
4 the area it would serve. That is, urban-type services
5 or urban development type capital projects will be focused
6 in urban ~~((service))~~ and suburban areas. ~~((Such urban
7 services or capital projects will only be funded in
8 suburban or reserve areas when there is a clear county
9 policy that "transition" should be accelerated or
10 encouraged.))~~

11 B. Page 21, sub-paragraph 2:

12 2. No cost overruns will be funded with block grant,
13 except that ~~((cities))~~ jurisdictions may choose to use their
14 own Population funds for this purpose.

15 C. Page 22, sub-paragraph 1:

16 1. Not more than ~~((ten percent (10%))~~ fifteen percent
17 (15%) of the total amount of block grant funds in any given
18 year shall be allocated to public services.

19 D. Page 22, sub-paragraph 5:

20 5. All unspent public service funds for continuing projects
21 will be recaptured at the end of each program year, except
22 that ~~((cities))~~ jurisdictions may choose to extend public
23 service project funds with their own Population funds.

24 PASSED this 7th day of July, 1980.

25 KING COUNTY COUNCIL
26 KING COUNTY, WASHINGTON

27 Bill Reams
28 Chairman

29
30 ATTEST:

31
32 Janet M. Owens
33 Deputy Clerk of the Council

THREE YEAR PLAN
FOR
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

1981 - 1983

King County, Washington
in consortium with:

Algona
Auburn
Beaux Arts
Black Diamond
Bothell
Carnation
Clyde Hill
Des Moines
Duvall
Enumclaw
Hunts Point
Issaquah
Kent
Kirkland
Lake Forest Park
Medina
Mercer Island
Normandy Park
North Bend
Pacific
Redmond
Renton
Skykomish
Snoqualmie
Tukwila
Yarrow Point

PLAN FOR COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT 1981-1983

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE	1
II. BLOCK GRANT AS LOCAL POLICY IMPLEMENTATION	3
III. PLAN FORMATION AND OPERATION	4
The Block Grant Partnership.	4
Citizen Participation.	4
Funding Process.	6
IV. PLAN STRATEGIES.	8
Neighborhood Support Program	8
Economic Development	9
Housing.	12
Energy Conservation.	15
Environmental Quality.	16
Streets, Pathways, Architectural Barriers.	17
Parks, Recreation and Open Space	19
Fire Protection.	19
Historic Preservation.	20
Community Centers.	20
Public Services.	21
Planning and Management Activities	22
V. UNINCORPORATED KING COUNTY DESIGNATED PLANNING AREAS . .	24
Community Planning Districts	25
Bear Creek	25
Enumclaw	27
Federal Way.	29
Highline	32
Newcastle.	35
Northshore	37
Raven Heights.	41
Sammamish.	44
Shoreline.	46
Snoqualmie	48
Soos Creek	50
Tahoma	54
Vashon-Maury	56

I. INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE

King County receives block grant funds under the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended. The funds are shared with a consortium of 26 cities and towns in the county, not including Seattle and Bellevue. This Three Year Plan for Community Development sets forth a comprehensive strategy for the use of block grant funds within the Block Grant Consortium.

Block grant is a limited resource. Congress mandates that these funds provide needed capital improvements and community development services in low and moderate income areas. Such areas are mainly comprised of people whose annual income is less than 80% of the county's median income. There are some areas of King County which clearly qualify as principally low and moderate income. There are also many low and moderate income people dispersed through the county who need services and capital improvements in their neighborhoods. The Block Grant Consortium seeks to improve the living conditions of all low and moderate income people through a variety of project activities which concentrate limited resources in areas of greatest need while providing some programs to meet dispersed need.

Block grant originally replaced several categorical programs, and was conceived as a locally run program. Since its inception in 1974, block grant has seen a series of increasingly specific federal rules and regulations. These limitations have been added by Congress to increase the impact of the program in low and moderate income areas. Congress makes block grant funds available each year to meet the following major purposes:

1. Maintain and upgrade current housing and provide new housing for people with low and moderate incomes.
2. Get rid of conditions causing health, safety, and public welfare problems.
3. Aid public services that improve the communities in which low and moderate income people live.
4. Use land and other natural resources better.
5. Lower the artificial barriers that stand between people of different incomes.
6. Save historic buildings and other properties of special value to a community.

It is the intent of Congress that funds made available under the Housing and Community Development Act, as amended, are not used to reduce substantially the amount of local financial support. In other words, block grant funds cannot be used to absorb community development activities that have been supported by other local funds. Congress also specified that block grant funds are not to be used to support the regular ongoing responsibilities of local general governments.

Congress views block grant as an additional but limited resource to pay for improvements that help low and moderate income people or reduce slum or blight. Examples of the kind of activities block grant can pay for are:

1. Buying land for parks, public buildings and other uses.
2. Building or fixing up senior and community centers and other public facilities.
3. Improving streets and utilities such as sewers.
4. Providing public services that help low and moderate income communities become better places to live.
5. Aiding economic development.
6. Fixing up houses.
7. Saving and fixing up historic buildings.
8. Installing wheelchair ramps and other improvements that make it easier for senior and handicapped people to get around.
9. Matching other grants.

Although there are many activities that block grant can fund, there are also projects that are not eligible. King County's Division of Housing and Community Development can help in making determinations of eligible activities that either principally benefit low and moderate income people or reduce slum or blight.

The block grant program also serves as a vehicle for federal housing policy, simultaneously offering local government more control over housing issues, and more responsibility for assuring an adequate supply of housing for low and moderate income persons.

II. BLOCK GRANT AS LOCAL POLICY IMPLEMENTATION

The previous section outlines the federal view of the block grant program. Although these federal rules must be strictly followed, local policy can still guide the use of block grant funds.

King County's share of block grant funds are used in accordance with existing and emerging county policy. Such policy statements are articulated through documents like the Comprehensive Plan of 1964 and the pending General Development Guide. Specific policy documents like the Sewage General Plan and adopted Community Plans provide detailed guidelines for the use of resources available to the county. Throughout this Three Year Plan, funding strategies recognize existing and emerging county policies. Block grant funded activities will reinforce these county policies to the greatest feasible extent.

Therefore, this plan follows these basic principles:

1. Priority will be given to funding projects which positively reinforce county policies as set forth in the functional portions of the Comprehensive Plan, in the Sewage General Plan, and in several Community Plans. In practical terms, this means placing priority on prevention of deterioration of older inner urban and suburban neighborhoods.
2. Close review of proposed projects will determine if the nature of the project is appropriate in scale to the area it would serve. That is, urban-type services or urban development type capital projects will be focused in urban service areas. Such urban services or capital projects will only be funded in suburban or reserve areas when there is a clear county policy that "transition" should be accelerated or encouraged.

Likewise, the block grant enables municipal governments within King County to use these funds as a means of bringing about positive community development programs within their own boundaries. The basic principles and strategies of this plan apply to all jurisdictions in the Block Grant Consortium unless otherwise indicated. Detailed strategies for use of block grant funds within municipal boundaries are described in a separate section at the end of this plan, prepared cooperatively by the member jurisdictions and the county staff.

III. PLAN FORMATION AND OPERATION

THE BLOCK GRANT PARTNERSHIP

The total of all the citizens living in unincorporated King County and the smaller cities and towns outside of Seattle and Bellevue represents a population of 656,660.* It is these people, representing 51.2% of the total population of King County, who are served by the block grant partnership between King County, the cities and towns. This partnership constitutes what the Federal Department of Housing and Urban Development calls an "urban consortium".

This consortium is governed by a partnership agreement which establishes a six-member Joint Policy Committee charged with recommending all policy decisions including allocation of funds to the County Council. The membership of the Joint Policy Committee consists of three mayors selected by the Suburban Mayor's Association; the King County Executive; and two King County Councilpersons. This committee reviews goals, objectives, plans, strategies, and program guidelines. It reviews specific projects submitted by the member jurisdictions.

The consortium is organized in such a fashion that overall guidance is provided by the Joint Policy Committee while still allowing member jurisdictions flexibility to allocate the funds in a manner most designed in their judgement to meet the needs of their own local community. Actions of the Joint Policy Committee are subject to ratification by the County Council. The County remains responsible to HUD for the operation of the program in accordance with federal law and regulations.

The Cooperation Agreement was signed originally by all of the twenty-eight participating jurisdictions for a period of three years, with the provision that any jurisdiction could opt out at the end of any given program year. All twenty-eight jurisdictions stayed in for the first three years of the program. In the fourth program year, the Muckleshoot Indian Tribe decided to receive separate block grant funds available to Indian tribes. There are now twenty-seven block grant partners, including all the cities and towns in King County except Seattle and Bellevue, which receive separate entitlement grants.

CITIZEN PARTICIPATION

It is a policy of King County government and the Block Grant Consortium to improve the quality and quantity of citizen involvement in the county decision-making process. The block grant program is an ideal place to put that county policy in action.

In addition, new HUD regulations are very explicit in requiring active citizen involvement in all states of the block grant process. King County has prepared a Block Grant Citizen Participation Plan which meets the requirements of the HUD regulations, but constant efforts to improve the process are ongoing. The following paragraphs summarize the Citizen Participation Plan:

* Official OPPFM figures, November 30, 1979.

Scope of Participation

Citizens are involved in all phases of the block grant program: planning, implementation, and evaluation. The most active participation occurs in the summer and fall when the Three Year Plan, Housing Assistance Plan, and annual program are being developed. Citizens receive notices of the following year's funding, attend community meetings to express their concerns and priorities, and submit applications for project funding. As the next year's program is developed in each local jurisdiction, citizens participate in public hearings to set priorities. Throughout the year, citizens are involved in program implementation by serving on project boards and advisory committees. The county's citizen advisory group, the Policy Development Commission, provides overall direction to the citizen involvement process, and the Housing Rehabilitation Advisory Committee performs a similar function for housing programs. Citizens have an opportunity to evaluate project results and submit comments or complaints to their elected representatives and jurisdiction staff.

Beyond citizen involvement directly focused on the block grant there is the larger citizen involvement process that accompanies the development of each community plan. The block grant program is responsive to this involvement when block grant is used to implement the recommendations developed in community plans.

Response to Citizen Complaints

King County and Consortium jurisdictions provide written responses to citizen comments and complaints within reasonable periods of time.

Technical Assistance

King County and Consortium jurisdictions make staff available to assist citizen groups in preparing proposals for funding. This includes providing information on policy and regulatory matters, as well as specifics on fund availability and application process.

Adequate and Timely Information

Planning for the next program year begins with the published notification in local papers of the total amount of funds available, the range of eligible activities, and schedule of community meetings. Formal notice of each public hearing is also published. In addition, key documents such as the Three Year Plan are available at local libraries, and all program records and documents are available for review during regular business hours. An annual report is distributed widely each year, describing program activity.

Public Hearings

Prior to local jurisdiction decisions on project to be funded, at least one public hearing is held by King County and each Consortium city to review program performance and set current priorities. Another formal hearing is held by the King County Council prior to submission of the annual application.

FUNDING PROCESS

Proposals submitted for funding are reviewed against policies established by the Joint Policy Committee. The goals, objectives and strategies contained in the Three Year Plan for Community Development provide the framework for these policies. Recognizing the importance of community support to the success of a community project, and given the standing policy to not fund cost overruns, proposals are also looked at in terms of how thoroughly the up-front planning has been done. In light of current HUD concern with expenditure rates, it is especially important that anticipated timing and costs are realistic.

Proposals may be submitted for funding from one or more of the following "pots":

Joint Funds

Ten percent of the total block grant entitlement is reserved for Joint projects. These are projects which involve and are supported by more than one jurisdiction. Innovation and leveraging ability are key determinants in allocation of these funds. Joint projects funded by the Joint Policy Committee are subject to final ratification by the County Council.

All Joint project applications involving King County are due August 15, 1980. Interjurisdictional proposals involving only cities will be due November 14, 1980.

Needs Funds

Forty percent of the entitlement is placed into a competitive Needs fund, from which project allocations are made by the Joint Policy Committee, subject to ratification by the County Council. The unincorporated area and the cities and towns compete for Needs funds. Cities are collectively guaranteed a threshold amount of needs funds, however. Project applications from the unincorporated areas are due August 15, 1980. Proposals from the cities and towns are due at King County no later than November 14, 1980.

Population Funds

Fifty percent of the entitlement grant is allocated to Consortium partners on a per capita basis. The interlocal cooperation agreement which provides a framework for the Consortium's operation states that each cooperating jurisdiction will have considerable flexibility in programming funds from the Population category. Nonetheless, these funds must be used in a way which conforms with federal rules and regulations and is consistent with this Plan and local community development strategies. The individual jurisdictions proposed use of Population funds must be approved by the Joint Policy Committee as consistent with law and plans, and ratified by the County Council.

It is proposed that the traditional earmarks again be used for the distribution of population funds into regional earmarks.

It is also proposed that 20% of the population funds be designated for housing repair activities within each region. Specifically these funds would go into designated neighborhood support program areas, which are discussed in the next section. Within each earmark this distribution is the same general formula used for the past two years.

	Original Earmarks		NSP Increase for housing repair		Regional Earmark
North	204,000	+	110,687	=	314,687
East	104,000	+	11,674	=	115,674
Southeast	263,000	+	96,851	=	359,851
Southwest	666,000	+	213,159	=	879,159
					1,669,371
			Countywide		492,483
			Total county pop.		2,161,854

Examples of NSP within each region are:

North:	Rose Hill, Ridgecrest, Briarcrest
East:	Riverbend
Southeast:	Timberlane, Benson Highway Area
Southwest:	White Center, Country Lanes, Jovita

IV. PLAN STRATEGIES

The strategies contained in this Three Year Plan direct the expenditure of block grant funds throughout the Block Grant Consortium. Strategies are organized by functional area: streets, housing, utilities, and so forth. Within each subject area some of the policies will apply to all such projects. These strategies will be listed first. Other policies apply within certain jurisdictions in addition to general policies. County projects must adhere to those policies which are specified for the unincorporated area. City strategies which apply to funding of projects through their community development program are in addition to the general strategies, and are located later on in the document under each Consortium member's plan.

This document contains numerous strategies for various subject matter and geographic areas. While the strategies provide guidelines for the overall direction of the block grant program, there may be new ideas developed that do not neatly fit within the Plan's strategies. Innovation is indeed encouraged and proposals which cross categorical lines or take new approaches will be given sympathetic consideration so long as they are within the block grant regulations and represent a significant benefit to low and moderate income persons or reduction in blighting conditions.

Over the six years of administration of the block grant program, federal regulations and policies have become increasingly fine tuned. The impact of this at the county level is the necessity to address issues such as expenditure rate and benefit to low and moderate income people in a manner that is both flexible and effective. Methods to accomplish HUD directives through the use of incentives will be investigated and developed in an effort to avoid having to reprogram funds due to programmatic or budget issues. Incentives will also be developed to encourage local improvement districts and other methods of raising funds at the local or neighborhood level and the employment of other cost savings measures.

NEIGHBORHOOD SUPPORT PROGRAM

In 1978, after the county-wide Needs Survey identified pockets of poverty where need is not readily displayed by traditional census data, the King County Council set aside amounts for each region to ensure that needs in these pockets were addressed with suitable projects. In cases where not enough proposals were submitted to assure adequate and appropriate activity in these areas, the Council allocated funds from which specific projects could be developed. This is the basis of the Neighborhood Support Program, which includes citizens at the neighborhood level in the development of block grant community development projects to meet their identified needs.

Neighborhood Support Program areas tend to be in the urban/suburban zones. Rural areas are characterized by other kinds of community development problems and needs which are also addressed through this Plan's strategies. Rural areas by definition are not plagued by concentrated populations which compound problems and needs.

NSP areas frequently will be suburban communities. Many suburbs were developed hastily to provide inexpensive housing for families who also wished to avoid city taxes and regulations. That inexpensive housing has in many places become the deteriorated housing that signals bigger problems in the area, such as with the infrastructure and sometimes general lack of economic wellbeing of the residents.

Deteriorating suburban areas fall into four general categories. Examples of each type can be found in King County and will be described in the plan under Section V, Unincorporated King County Designated Planning Areas, Community Needs Survey. The following paragraphs summarize the four types of suburban communities which largely comprise the Neighborhood Support Program.

Older communities close to incorporated borders typically suffer from deteriorating housing and infrastructure problems: e.g., sewer, water systems and sidewalks. Often the homes are close together on small lots. Streets are narrow and often times underground storm drainage facilities and safe pedestrian walkways are virtually non-existent.

A second kind of problem suburban neighborhood is the older once rural community now surrounded by new development. The surrounding development has often increased demands beyond what existing drainage, sewage and transportation systems are able to accommodate. These problems with inadequate public facilities as well the age of the original housing have contributed to the deterioration of much of the housing in these once rural areas.

Communities which border on industrial or commercial areas are often the areas not annexed because they offer no tax base incentive. Consequently, services and infrastructure systems are not offered, maintained or improved. Deteriorating housing may be due to relocation of homeowners and a large percentage of renters. Landlords may have little motivation to maintain property since they perceive a transition in land use that will allow a "higher or better" use for their property.

A fourth suburban problem is the newer but poorly built development. Again, these areas are populated by lower income persons who were attempting to avoid city taxes and regulations. Many times these areas are a good distance from urban centers and services. The economic inability of homeowners to maintain their homes, coupled with the initial poor construction has caused a rapid deterioration.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Economic development strategies are usually considered in terms of how many jobs they create or how much they increase the tax base of a community. As important as these two considerations are, there are other factors to think about when preparing economic development strategies. These factors might include: strengthening the identity of a business center and surrounding community; increasing the capacity of the local business organization to initiate projects; helping business owners improve their operations; and improving the appearance and functioning of a business district. Public organizations and govern-

mental agencies or jurisdictions engage in a variety of programs to assist the private sector in retaining existing or generating new business activity in such a way that these factors are given full consideration. These programs are usually directed toward improving one or more of the following sectors of economic activity: the retail section of a downtown, suburb or rural town center; a downtown or designated office complex; tourism/convention business; housing; neighborhood commercial development; and retention or attraction of new industries.

With the limited resources available, a jurisdiction involved in economic development must make two decisions before designing economic development strategies. First, which sector(s) of economic activity has the greatest need in their community; and second, in which of these sectors can they have the greatest positive impact in partnership with the private business community. Once these two decisions are made, they must be examined in relation to other community development needs so that the jurisdiction can design complimentary community development strategies.

The economic development needs of the county can be grouped into five categories: managing growth; encouraging new employment opportunities; revitalizing community business districts; strengthening rural town centers; and revitalizing local agriculture.

As a tool for the county to use in managing the growth that will be taking place in King County over the next twenty years, the county is updating the 1964 Comprehensive Plan through preparation of the General Development Guide. One section of the guide deals with employment centers and includes new or revised business, commercial and industrial land use policies promoting energy-efficient employment centers to accommodate economic growth. Although the majority of new employment opportunities will be located within city limits and established employment centers, there will be some need for public capital improvements in the form of streets, sewers, and other utilities to service expanded or new employment centers. Funding of these improvements will need to come from multiple sources. Block grant funds could be appropriately used in those instances where these centers are located close to pockets of unemployment and persons with low or moderate incomes. Along with managing this new growth, a major need of the county, at this time, is to take actions which are in support of long term employment opportunities that will minimize the dislocations of our historically cyclical economy.

With the local economy operating at a high level, there is a tendency to assume that all residents are benefiting from this growth. However, there are currently many residents of the county outside the city of Seattle below the poverty level. Because of such conditions as the slumps in the housing and forest products industries, and the large number of Southeast Asian refugees who are coming into the county, it is likely that the number of people unemployed, and with lower incomes will rise at least in the near future. This means there is a strong need to continue to support and encourage policies that aid the private sector in creating new job opportunities for people most in need of them.

Many of the unemployed and people with low and moderate incomes live in the first suburbs that were developed in the unincorporated areas outside of Seattle. Many of the communities have reached a point of stagnation and are in the beginning stages of deterioration. Two evidences of this deterioration are the physical condition of the business districts, and the level of business activity. In these business districts, a large number of the businesses are operating only marginally and many of the buildings are in need of some repair. It is important to meet the needs of these inner suburban business districts before the severity of the problems increase and the cost of solving them becomes prohibitive. It is also important to deal with this need because the business district often reflects the image of the entire community.

The rural communities of the county have many of the same needs for employment opportunities and revitalization of their town centers as do inner suburbs. In addition, there are the needs of preserving farmlands, providing opportunities for people interested in farming and strengthening the local agriculture industry.

Economic development activities have expanded from job creation related to block grant funded housing and capital improvement programs, to additional efforts focused on assisting declining neighborhood business districts. Efforts now include identification of deteriorating or declining neighborhood business districts, assistance to those areas to determine causes of deterioration and projects aimed at reversing this trend, and assistance in securing funding for these projects. These efforts are in both urban and rural areas, with recognition of the different needs of business districts in those two areas.

Some cities in the Block Grant Consortium have also undertaken economic development activities. Coordinated activities to revitalize town centers is being done with block grant and other funds in several consortium cities.

Based on needs and economic development experience to date, the county will pursue the following economic development strategies over the next three years:

1. Economic development projects will be consistent with county growth management policies and in support of the expansion or development of designated employment centers.
2. Physical improvement planning and economic development assistance will be provided to community business districts in the older suburbs that are showing signs of stagnation or deterioration. The strategy is important because it deals with a need in the early stages prior to it becoming a major problem. There may be exceptions, but normally business districts and communities receiving this planning assistance will be expected to make a financial contribution to show support for this effort to improve the community. This approach will help stretch and increase the impact of limited block grant dollars.

3. Economic development proposals will be evaluated to ensure that direct or secondary benefits such as increased employment opportunities will accrue to low and moderate income persons. Proposals will also need to demonstrate potential for reducing, preventing or eliminating slum and blight.
4. The county will work to strengthen the economy of rural areas by:
 - Providing technical assistance to groups undertaking a community based economic development project.
 - Assisting individuals or groups seeking funds from federal agencies such as the Farmers Home Administration for a variety of purposes such as housing, water and sewer systems, small business development or farm improvements.
 - Providing physical improvements planning and economic development assistance to rural town centers.
 - Supporting and initiating projects that will aid in revitalizing local agriculture.
5. Block grant funds will be used as the catalyst for economic development projects with the majority of funds being generated in the private sector.
6. Priority will go to using block grant funds in conjunction with other public funds when needed to complete the funding for a project.

HOUSING

The overall goals of the county's housing program are found in Ordinance 2555, adopted in December, 1975. This section of the Three Year Plan is designed to provide a broad overview of the county's housing activities and program development directions. More specific information and policies can be found in the Three Year Housing Assistance plan and the Annual Housing Action Plan, which are approved by the Joint Policy Committee and the County Council.

King County's housing assistance capacity has grown at a rapid rate since it began its federal Community Development Block Grant Program in 1975. Initially, the county's block grant funded housing activities were limited to single-family owner-occupied home repair. Three repair programs are now offered by King County to owner-occupied homeowners: the block grant deferred payment, no-interest loan program; the Unified Weatherization Program which combines Block Grant, Department of Energy (DOE), and Community Services Administration (CSA) funds; and the federal Section 312 substantial rehabilitation low-interest loan program. The county coordinates all three programs to ensure that the needs of each applicant are properly matched with the appropriate program. Since federal funds are being reduced for homeowner

rehabilitation assistance, the county will make efforts to use some block grant funds to leverage private lender participation as a means of expanding the number of households that can be served.

A limited amount of non-block grant federal funds are available for rehabilitation of multi-family rental housing. Section 8 Substantial Rehabilitation Assistance will be used in the Auburn and Renton Neighborhood Strategy Areas and in similar communities with deteriorated multi-family housing.

The county participates in the Areawide Housing Opportunity Plan (AHOP) which is administered by the Puget Sound Council of Governments (PSCOG). The Plan provides data for each housing assistance plan in the region which, in turn, determines a jurisdiction's regional fair share of available federal HUD rental assistance. In the last few years, participation in the AHOP has resulted in extra allocations of Section 8 Rental Payment Assistance and bonus block grant funds for use with programs which increase low and moderate income family housing opportunities. King County has taken a leadership role among the four counties in the region in a bonus block grant land cost writedown program for new family assisted rental housing. The county serves as liaison with PSCOG and HUD, and provides technical assistance to program participants. The county also has used bonus block grant funds to support the relocation of airport noise clearance zone homes for homeownership opportunities for low income families.

The county has made special efforts to ensure more affordable senior housing for elderly persons on fixed incomes since federal resources are inadequate to meet current needs. King County recently received an Innovative Grant from HUD to purchase condominiums for rental by the King County Housing Authority to elderly persons. The county has also committed \$2 million in block grant funds over the next two-year period to develop and begin implementation of a locally sponsored Senior Housing Program, including tax-exempt mortgage financing and provision of sites for housing. The county has also funded a pilot program to develop mobile home parks for elderly persons.

During the next three years, King County will build on its previous experience in housing and pursue the following strategies:

1. Expand and improve the quality of homeowner repair, rehabilitation and weatherization programs to reduce housing maintenance and fuel costs, and to enable low income people to remain in their current dwellings.
 - a. Maintain or increase the level of past block grant funding of home repair, weatherization and rehabilitation programs. Areas with larger concentrations of older houses needing repair will receive special consideration for program services.
 - b. Provide assistance to local governments to evaluate the quality and level of home repair services provided.

- c. Undertake efforts to link private sector financing with the block grant Home Repair Program to compensate for anticipated reductions in the federal Section 312 Program.
 - d. Increase use of Farmers Home Administration Section 504 Rehabilitation Loan and Grant Program.
 - e. Produce and distribute educational publications and programs to increase public awareness of ways to maintain existing housing and to conserve energy.
2. Provide more affordable rental housing for senior citizens on fixed incomes.
 - a. Use block grant funds (creative financing, and encourage donations of sites) to support the county sponsored Senior Housing Program.
 - b. Encourage programs which purchase condominiums on a scattered site basis to be used as low income housing for elderly persons. Other projects which serve to ease the adverse effects of condominium conversions will also be supported.
 3. Programs which provide innovative means to produce shelter in less expensive ways will be supported, such as mobile home parks, and airport homes relocation. Although there often are structural problems to offset, analysis of the feasibility of converting existing public facilities (such as closed schools) to residential use will be considered.
 4. The county will work to reduce the isolation of income groups and disperse housing opportunities for low income persons through:
 - a. Land writedowns and utility subsidies which improve the quality of low income family housing constructed in King County. This assistance improves the residential environment for housing occupants and assures greater acceptance of the housing by the surrounding community.
 - b. Encouragement of new family housing for low income persons through the Annual Housing Action Plan, and insistence that family housing be constructed in scattered locations, at a low ratio of subsidized housing to non-subsidized housing in each location as specified in the HAP Site and Location Criteria.
 - c. Formal opposition to proposals to add new units of subsidized housing where an over concentration or an appropriate balance of subsidized to non-subsidized housing now exists.
 - d. Maximum use of federal housing subsidies to provide additional, deconcentrated low income housing.
 5. Alternative mechanisms will be explored to determine the best means for the county to pursue its housing policies, including

public corporations, private sector relationships, and the role of King County.

6. Comprehensive Plan policies will guide the use of county or federal funds to avoid housing developments outside of existing town centers and already developed areas. Wherever possible, these policies have been and will be included in the Housing Assistance Plan.
7. Opportunities will be sought to utilize block grant funds to support "infill" housing efforts and to address housing deterioration problems in older suburban communities.
8. Assistance will be provided to support the county Neighborhood Strategy Program, a program under which HUD provides assistance to tenants in rental buildings. Block grant funds will be used to pay for the administration of a Neighborhood Strategy Program and for relocation costs associated with upgrading of apartments.
9. Means will be sought to address the limited amount of housing available to meet emergency housing. The assistance will not include ongoing program support.

ENERGY CONSERVATION

Rising energy costs are commonplace, and impact low and moderate income people the most. Not only are home energy costs increasing, but transportation costs are as well. Energy conservation efforts are aimed at helping low and moderate income people remain in their current dwellings. Such efforts include housing programs designed to save energy, and economic development strategies to provide jobs in low and moderate income areas.

Housing programs offer an array of services for low and moderate income people. The programs are coordinated so that each homeowner receives the greatest possible impact of appropriate services. That means a home can be rehabilitated to correct structural problems like leaky roofs, and also be weatherized to save even more energy.

The following strategies recognize the increasing importance of energy conservation, and will guide programs and funding in this area:

1. Each home served by housing rehabilitation and weatherization programs will be retrofitted to the greatest extent possible with available funding to reduce housing fuel costs.
2. The King County Energy Code will be used to determine necessary energy saving measures for new construction done with block grant funds.
3. Quality materials such as those which meet the standards set forth in the proposed Residential Conservation Services Program will be used in all rehabilitation programs.

4. Consideration will be given to using appropriate technology in block grant funded construction and rehabilitation projects. Cost benefit to low and moderate income people will be considered as well as the appropriateness to the individual homeowner.

ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

The block grant program replaces several earlier federal programs that provided financial assistance for utilities relating to environmental quality. HUD regulations allow block grant funds to be used for utilities, water and sewer projects (although not for sewage treatment), flood and drainage facilities (where other support is not available), and solid waste disposal activities (in connection with other community development activities.) As with other uses of block grant funds, utility projects must principally benefit low and moderate income persons or reduce/prevent slum and blight.

Because utilities are very expensive, and because they can trigger growth and development, this plan proposes great selectivity in the use of block grant funds for utility projects. A series of strategies have been developed to provide the means for being selective.

1. Block Grant assistance for new construction, rehabilitation, or replacement of utility systems will only be considered for use in relationship to that portion of the system which serves existing populations, unless the system is to accompany construction of assisted housing or provision of low income housing.
2. All utility projects will be consistent with King County's Comprehensive Plan, community plans, and growth management policies.
3. Sanitary sewer projects will only be considered in local service areas (LSAs) as identified in the King County Sewerage General Plan. The maximum amount of block grant subsidy to any sanitary sewer project shall be 50% of the total actual cost of the project (exclusive of the hookup charge for users.) Initial funding will be based on engineering cost estimates. If actual costs are higher than this estimate, funding will not be increased automatically. Additional funds may be requested although the timing and availability of more funds is not guaranteed. If the actual cost is less than the engineering estimate, then block grant funds will automatically be reduced to 50% of the actual cost.

Additional policies exist for sewer projects funded from the county's share of the block grant funds. One fourth of the block grant funds will be a direct grant to the sewer district or municipality for construction, and the remainder of the block grant funds will be made available for no-interest deferred payment loans to low and moderate income homeowners to cover the cost of their assessments. Repayment of loans will not occur until the home changes ownership. Loan payments will be used with other block grant program revenues to benefit low and moderate income persons and reduce/prevent slums and blight. Hook-ups to sewer for low and moderate income homeowners will be considered pursuant to Ordinance No. 3269, governing the Housing Repair Program.

Projects using developer extensions of sewer lines will be evaluated on a case by case basis, with priority consideration given to the number of low and moderate income people benefitting and the impact on decentralization of that group.

4. Drainage projects will only be considered in already urbanized areas, town centers, or in areas where serious property damage is likely to occur without such drainage improvements. Drainage projects may be allowed in other areas if they are in conjunction with other block grant activities and if it can be demonstrated that they will not encourage development in conflict with other county policy. No fund commitments will be made for drainage land acquisition or construction projects until a detailed feasibility study has been conducted which includes careful cost estimates, cost benefit analysis for low and moderate income persons, and progress of application to other appropriate funding sources such as Economic Development Administration (EDA), Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Department of Ecology (DOE), Farmers' Home Administration (FmHA), for at least part of the funding.
5. The use of block grant funds for solid waste facilities will only be considered in rare cases, where the facility would serve an isolated population and solve a major community problem. Block grant assistance will not exceed 50% of the total cost of such a project.
6. The use of block grant funds for water supply will generally be considered only where there is a threat to public health because of poor water quality. Upgrading systems to improve fire flow may be considered, but only if the benefitting population is unable to assess themselves, and exhausts all other funding sources such as Department of Ecology (DOE), Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Economic Development Administration (EDA), Farmers' Home Administration (FmHA), and the Department of Social and Health Services (DSHS). Block grant funds will be limited to 50% of the total cost of water supply projects. The approval of projects involving construction of public water supply will require the availability of a water district, municipality, or private water company to contract for the project and to assume responsibility for ongoing maintenance and repair. Any construction of public water supply must meet Comprehensive Plan Approval Requirements as set forth in King County Code 13.24.

STREETS, PATHWAYS, ARCHITECTURAL BARRIERS

Block grant funds may be used for street improvements (excluding expressways and other limited access use and their appertenances) pathways, parkways, and the removal of architectural barriers in buildings and within the public right-of-way. Because a variety of other funding sources, both public and private, are specifically designed for various street improvements, street proposals will have to demonstrate that block grant is the appropriate source of funds. Projects relating to a package of other community development activities make the most sense from a community development standpoint. For example, funding

a pathway is most effective when it links low and moderate income housing or housing rehab areas to a business district, park or school, and relates to a drainage project or economic development activity.

The following strategies should govern the use of block grant funds for the general subject area of streets, pathways and architectural barrier removal, within the overall context of a particular community's package of improvements.

1. Highest priority for streets shall be given to local roads and streets that improve low and moderate income residential communities, except that a high priority will also be given to streets supporting an economic development project or assisted housing listed in the Annual Housing Assistance Plan.
2. Lower priority shall generally be given to collectors and minor arterials, unless a particular project would be the key to a package of other community development activities.
3. Major arterials will generally not be considered for block grant funding unless they support economic development projects in a community or municipal business district. Proposals must be submitted to traditional transportation funding sources including Federal Highway Administration programs and State Urban Arterial Board programs, as well as to Federal Air, Federal Railroad, and the Urban Mass Transit Administration, when appropriate, prior to the award of the block grant funds.
4. Where an RID is appropriate to assist with a right-of-way improvement project, such as in a business district or a residential neighborhood where a mix of incomes exist, block grant will be limited to 50% of the total. Ways to assist low and moderate income participants with their assessments will be investigated.
5. Priority for pathways or sidewalks will be in low and moderate income neighborhoods where the pathways will link to other community or municipal improvement projects or to commercial or service nodes.
6. Pathway projects which benefit the elderly or lower income youth will be given extra consideration.
7. Parkway and beautification projects along the public right-of-way will be evaluated in the context of their benefit to an overall package of community or municipal improvements.
8. Projects to remove architectural barriers will be prioritized based on the density of elderly and handicapped populations that will be served.
9. Projects to remove architectural barriers will first have to be refused or not be eligible to apply for DSHS Referendum 37 funds to be funded with block grant.

PARKS, RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE

Block grant funds can be used to provide park and recreation facilities and open space to principally benefit low and moderate income persons or to eliminate blighting conditions. Parks and open space are important elements of healthy neighborhoods. The following strategies set forth the way in which block grant funds will be used to support park and recreation opportunities and the provision of open space.

1. No park or open space project will be funded without a realistic plan for ongoing maintenance and operation of the project. HUD regulations prohibit the use of block grant funds for ongoing maintenance and operation.
2. Neighborhood parks that serve existing low and moderate income populations will generally be given priority over large scale park, recreation and open space projects. Where the latter is clearly part of a community plan and would serve substantial numbers of low and moderate income persons who are without access to other recreation facilities, block grant funding could be allowed.
3. The need to preserve existing parks in low and moderate income areas is recognized. Requests must show the need for rehabilitation of the existing park, and identify the means by which such improvements will be maintained.
4. Acquisition and development of land for parks will only be considered to the extent that existing low and moderate income populations will benefit, and not in anticipation of growth.
5. Applications for waterfront parks must first be submitted to IAC before block grant will be considered as a funding source. Other park projects involving other funding such as IAC, HCRS, or local bonds will be given priority consideration.
6. For land acquisition projects to provide open space as a benefit to low or moderate income people, or in addressing slums and blight, priority will be given to those projects which seek to preserve lands threatened by urbanization in urban, suburban and transitional areas; where public access is desirable for scenic or recreation purposes; or where public ownership is necessary to mitigate environmental problems or to maintain or control wildlife habitat.

FIRE PROTECTION

Fire protection facilities and equipment are eligible for funding when they are provided in conjunction with an overall package of community development activities. It must be demonstrated that using block grant funds for fire protection will principally benefit low and moderate income people. The following strategies will apply in meeting fire protection needs:

1. 100% grants for fire protection will be made up to a maximum of \$5,000. Grants beyond \$5,000 will have to be matched dollar for

dollar by the local community, municipality or fire district, or from a different grant-in-aid source.

2. Highest priority for block grant support of fire protection in the unincorporated areas will go to those areas with the greatest concentrations of low and moderate income persons.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION

The Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 states that historic properties, whether publicly or privately owned, are eligible for block grant funding. Present federal administrative rulings state that a clear benefit to low and moderate income persons must also be demonstrated. If the structure is dilapidated to a degree that it constitutes a blighting condition, activities to eliminate the specific conditions causing the blight may be undertaken.

The regulations also require that any site or structure to be eligible for historic preservation with block grant funds must be either listed in or eligible to be listed in the National Register of Historic Places, listed in a State or local inventory of Historic Places, or designated as a State or local landmark or historic district by appropriate law or ordinance.

Current block grant historic preservation strategies are:

1. Historic preservation activities proposed for block grant funding will be reviewed in light of Ordinance 2991 which amends the King County Comprehensive Plan and sets forth recommendations for the coordinated use of historic sites in park and open space projects.
2. Efforts will be made to utilize historic structures to house block grant funded activities when such structures can reasonably serve the needs of the activities they are to house.
3. When feasible, consideration will be given to the use of historic structures to provide for the housing needs of low and moderate income persons through repair and rehabilitation programs.

COMMUNITY CENTERS

The provision of community center or senior center facilities is an eligible block grant activity. While recognizing the importance of community centers as a focal point for community services and identity the following strategies are somewhat cautious. The continuing concern is that long term financial support and stability of these centers be assured, without setting up a major new liability for the county's current expense fund which would have to be funded from a tax increase or require a cutback in basic services or county government. Community or senior centers inside city limits must adhere to local policies pertaining to ongoing costs. The following strategies will guide the expenditure of block grant funds for the provision of community center facilities:

1. Prior to funding any new community or senior center, the following studies will be required:
 - a. a study to identify the low and moderate income population to be served by the center and to determine the cost of providing the center per person served.
 - b. an inventory of existing sites which could be acquired and/or renovated for use as a center, including cost per square foot of each alternative.
 - c. a project plan showing the total amount of funds needed to complete the project and identifying the sources of funds which have been committed to complete the project.
 - d. a self-sufficiency plan describing in detail how the operational and maintenance cost of the center will be met, without recourse to county current expense funds and without using block grant funds for routine operating costs.
 - e. where centers are constructed in an incorporated jurisdiction, local strategies for block grant assistance will also apply.
2. No cost overruns will be funded with block grant, except that cities may choose to use their own Population funds for this purpose.
3. Priority in funding community and/or senior centers will go to those serving the greatest density of population in need, or to those bringing services to geographically isolated groups in a cost effective manner. In all cases, the scale of the proposed center will have to correspond to the size of the low and moderate income benefitting population.
4. Additional consideration will be given to funding community and/or senior centers where multiple sources of funds are being used or where cost-cutting measures such as rehabilitation of existing structures or long term leases are employed.
5. Projects to expand existing community and/or senior centers will be subject to the same policies as provision of new centers.

PUBLIC SERVICES

Supporting social and health services may be provided with block grant funds, but the regulations are very specific about the conditions under which the provision of these services is eligible. Public services can only be provided in Neighborhood Strategy Areas (NSAs). NSA's are areas designated for a program of concentrated community development activity. Public services must be in areas where concentrated physical development activity is underway, and the service can be extended no more than three years after the completion of those activities. Additionally, eligible public services must support the physical development activities in the NSAs. Public service projects cannot be funded with block grant unless other federal funds have been applied for and denied or not made available.

Following are the strategies relating to the provision of social and health services with block grant:

1. Not more than ten percent (10%) of the total amount of block grant funds in any given year shall be allocated to public services.
2. Any new social or health service program must present a self-sufficiency plan describing in detail how the ongoing operational and maintenance costs of offering the service will be met without recourse to county current expense when block grant funding is no longer available.

Municipal funding strategies for block grant assistance to public services will also apply.

3. Transportation programs will be considered for block grant funding. Priority will be given to those which serve block grant assisted facilities and which include other funds.
4. Public service projects will be reviewed in the terms of the density of benefitting low and moderate income persons.
5. All unspent public service funds will be recaptured at the end of each program year, except that cities may choose to extend public service project funds with their own Population funds.

PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES

Planning and management activities are a logical and useful component of the block grant program. It is appropriate to use block grant for development of overall strategies and program administration, project plans, and feasibility and other types of studies leading to capital projects and other revitalization programs. Block grant can also be used to accomplish comprehensive plans, when other planning assistance is not available or adequate. No routine planning, ongoing zoning administration or other planning efforts that are general government responsibility are allowable under federal regulations. Block grant cannot pay for ongoing government services nor can it supplant local dollars. In accordance with HUD regulations, the combined total cost of planning and administration activity cannot exceed 20% of the total block grant resources available in any program year.

As the population of King County grows, there are more requests for public funds to provide services in existing and growing communities. Examples of such services include sewers, streets, parks, water and drainage improvements. Since public funds are limited, not all requested services can be provided. Block grant can fund studies which analyze the adequacy of existing public services, and assess the long range impact of such improvements. Priority for funding will be for improvements which mitigate existing problems or ones that prevent future problems.

The following strategies will guide the expenditure of block grant for planning and management activity:

1. Ongoing staff positions to manage the block grant programs in the cities will only be considered for funding with Population funds.
2. Proposals to provide studies and other planning activities will be reviewed in terms of potential principal benefit to low and moderate income persons and reduction or prevention of slum and blight.
3. Applicants requesting block grant to accomplish or have accomplished comprehensive plans must apply for HUD 701 planning funds or be ineligible to do so.
4. Block grant funds allocated for planning activities but unspent 18 months after the start of the program year in which they were made available will be recaptured.

V. UNINCORPORATED KING COUNTY DESIGNATED PLANNING AREAS

The following are descriptions of the county's Designated Planning Area's (DPA's). In addition to a description of land use, housing stock, and a general population profile, for each DPA there is a list of community issues and needs that have been identified through the community planning process and/or the block grant citizen participation process. There is also a summary of the major planning concepts that are addressed in the individual community plans. For those DPA's in which block grant projects have been completed, or are funded for the coming program year, a brief description of those projects appears. Finally, there is a brief discussion of areas of specific and concentrated community development needs as identified in the Community Needs Survey. This section of the Three Year Plan is intended to provide a comprehensive statement of area needs and to explain how, via both the community and block grant planning process, the county has and will continue to address those needs.

Community Needs Survey

The following descriptions of each Designated Planning Area (DPA) have been updated with information from the Community Needs Survey.

More specifically, the survey methodology includes the collection of primary data by a "windshield survey" rating of observable indicators of community characteristics, and the use of secondary data from traditional sources such as the Census, government reports, unemployment counts, and public assistance data. Data from these sources is integrated and analyzed, and subsequently housed in data files and reports for each DPA.

References are made in the following DPA descriptions to conditions in windshield survey areas. These areas represent portions of a DPA which merited detailed attention by the survey team. Areas for windshield surveys were identified by a trained team of four CETA employees who drove through all unincorporated portions of each DPA. Sub-areas of the DPA were identified for more detailed observation based on general conditions which typically exist in low and moderate income areas. These sub-areas were then surveyed by the team with extensive detail and rated on a standardized form. The survey form notes specific conditions or problems in three main categories: physical and environmental factors, housing conditions, and access to public services and facilities. Results of the windshield surveys are included in the DPA descriptions.

COMMUNITY PLANNING DISTRICT OF BEAR CREEK

General Description of Land Usage

Bear Creek is approximately 46 square miles in size. Located generally northeast of Redmond, it extends north to the Snohomish County line, east to Snoqualmie Valley and south to the Redmond-Fall City Road. The area is a rolling plateau with the east edge dropping to the Snoqualmie Valley floor.

Bear Creek is primarily rural in character and forest land is the predominant use. Neighborhoods of single-family houses are clustered around Cottage Lake in the northwest and Ames Lake in the southeast corner. There are few multi-family, commercial or industrial uses.

In percentage terms, the trend of Bear Creek has been rapid growth, but the absolute numbers of people involved have been small. The role of utilities and roads may be crucial in determining whether Bear Creek is an area of moderate growth or rapid suburbanization.

Housing Stock

There are approximately 4,056 housing units in the area occupied by approximately 11,307 people. Growth is rapid and on-going. Average age of housing is 13 years. Almost all housing is single family. In 1970 70% of all units were owner-occupied and this percentage has probably increased since that time. Median housing value is about the same as that for the rest of the suburban county. According to the Community Needs Survey, 21.8 sq. miles of the 46 sq. miles in Bear Creek DPA were surveyed with 6.7% of the houses in need of repair. Areas of this DPA which were not surveyed are basically uninhabited.

General Population Profile

Median family income is about equal to the county-wide median. In 1970 4.1% of Bear Creek families had an income less than poverty level with 2.6% on public assistance. Approximately 1,500 residents were in the labor force with 92% working in King County, 28% in Seattle. Fewer than 700 jobs were available in the area.

General Community Issues

The primary issues in this area center around the nature and the extent of growth and its impact on the natural environment.

The effects of development upon the salmon run in Bear Creek and the preservation of agricultural resources.

Dike or land fill activity may be in conflict with preserving Bear Creek in a natural state.

The proposal to use a large portion of the flat Bear Creek plateau for a regional general aviation facility.

Whether accessibility should be improved or should remain at a relatively low level.

The area presently has no sewer and has limited transportation, water and other utility services.

Existing Community Development Plan Concepts

Preserve the significant environmental characteristics of the area.

Direct population and development to those other areas of the county which can best support development.

Limit development in rural areas to uses not requiring an urban or suburban level of utilities and services.

Encourage the location of higher intensity activities in existing centers with adequate transportation and utility systems.

Introduce limited public facilities to resolve acute problems in the rural area.

Community Needs Survey

Seven windshield surveys were done in Bear Creek. Results indicate a need for housing repair in isolated parts of the DPA, but particularly along Avondale and Seidel Roads. Other conditions noted include unpaved roads onto Union Hill Road and onto 212th Ave NE. Also hazardous crossings were noted at Union Hill Road and 208th Avenue NE, and at Avondale Road and NE 165 Street.

COMMUNITY PLANNING DISTRICT OF ENUMCLAW

General Description of Land Usage

The Enumclaw area is approximately 81 square miles in size. Located in the southern extremity of King County on the plateau around Enumclaw, it is bounded on the south by the White River, on the north by the Green River and on the east by a line from the Mud Mountain Dam north to the Green River. Much of the Muckleshoot Indian Reservation is in the planning area.

Except for the city of Enumclaw itself, the area is dominated by pasture lands, croplands and forests. Farmhouse and rural non-farm residences are scattered along the plateau's roads. Commercial and urban residential uses are concentrated within the city of Enumclaw.

Growth in the total area has been moderate with much of the growth occurring within the city of Enumclaw. Little change has occurred in the agricultural areas of the plateau.

Industries in the area include agricultural processing plants and a large lumber mill. There are over 1000 acres of state and county park land, mainly concentrated along Green River Gorge. The area is served by a grid of east-west and north-south county roads and the Auburn-Enumclaw Highway.

Housing Stock

There are approximately 3,700 housing units in the area occupied by some 12,000 persons. The majority of the housing stock is moderately old with 43% being built before 1940. Values are below county median by some 12%. Median rent in the area is 26% below the total county median. The projected population increase is 33% by 1990 bringing the new total to over 16,000. The land area occupied by urban uses could double by 1990 to over 2,800 acres but the area would still be 90% undeveloped.

General Population Profile

Median family income was 11% below the county-wide median in 1970. Almost 8% of the area residents had incomes below poverty level while some 12% received public assistance income. Over 45% of the area's residents are in the labor force with 10% of those commuting to Seattle and 75% working in King County outside of Seattle.

General Community Issues

Retention of agriculture and the rural farm character of the plateau.

The financial health and viability of the dairy industry in light of recent low prices paid to dairy farmers.

Limitations on the use of and construction on the plateau due to severe drainage problems.

Water quality in Boise Creek, Newaukum Creek, and the White River, particularly as it relates to required sewage treatment facilities.

Recognition and representation of the Muckleshoot Indian Reservation within a county-wide context of governments. Efforts in this direction have begun through Housing and Community Development activities.

Appropriate uses for the Green River Gorge, whether for camping and other active uses, passive recreation, residential development, or natural systems with little human use.

The inclusion of Enumclaw within a county-wide economic, governmental, and transportation framework without damaging the independence and identity of the town.

Community Needs Survey

Three windshield surveys were done in Enumclaw, confirming the need for housing repair. High speed traffic on the highways through towns, particularly logging trucks, is also identified as a problem. Other concerns noted were lack of street lighting, lack of curb cuts, unmaintained residential streets and a high number of abandoned vehicles. A stop sign is needed at the intersection of Cumberland Way and Lake Walker Road.

COMMUNITY PLANNING DISTRICT OF FEDERAL WAY

General Description of Land Usage

Federal Way is approximately 40 square miles in size, located adjacent to the Pierce County line and between Puget Sound on the west and the Green River Valley on the east. Until 1960 it was a rural area. It has grown very rapidly in population due to the construction of Highway I-5, the expansion of the Boeing Company, the location of the Weyerhaeuser headquarters and West Campus Community complex, and the attraction for many of a suburban setting. Generally, growth has been well located and regulated, with the exception of commercial development on Pacific Highway South.

The area has better than average managed sewer, water and fire protection districts with capability of providing service and handling growth. Federal Way is partially served by Lakehaven Sewer District; Water District #56, #75, and #124; Kent Municipal, and Tacoma Municipal Water Department.

Housing Stock

There are approximately 19,000 housing units in the area of which 86% are single family residences, 9% multi-family, and 5% mobile homes. Average age of housing is 13½ years with 10% pre-dating 1950. Mean market value of housing equals the suburban county average. Low cost housing is not adequately available at this time. By 1990 it is forecast that housing units will number approximately 34,000.

General Population Profile

Current population for Federal Way is approximately 58,000. The median income of Federal Way families is 5% greater than the county median. In 1970 some 31% of the population was employed, almost 30% of them commuted to jobs in Seattle, while 57% of them worked in King County outside of Seattle. 4.1% of them had an income below poverty level as compared to an average of 5.0% for King County. 3.3% of population is on public assistance.

General Community Issues

The 1975 Federal Way Community Plan identified general community issues. Federal Way suffers the common problems of suburbia - lack of an industrial development property tax base, a young mobile population without local family ties, population with a high percentage of young children and a low percentage of elderly, and a sudden expansion of a school system. School levies have not been successful since 1973. However, Federal Way does have a strong core of citizens who are concerned with the future of their community. In recent years a stronger sense of community iden-

tity has developed from the active involvement of local citizen groups.

A revision of the Federal Way Communities Plan has been adopted by the King County Council. The revision focuses on the southern and south-eastern portions of the DPA.

Strip commercial development on Pacific Highway South has caused traffic problems, dangerous pedestrian conditions, unsightly outdoor advertising, etc.

There are some land use conflicts where some single family residential areas are exposed to commercial and industrial traffic.

The need to use modes of transportation other than the automobile is being recognized.

There is a need for developed recreational areas.

There is a need for housing rehabilitation and repair throughout Federal Way and particularly in the Country Lanes, Bethel Chapel and Trout Lake areas.

Traffic projections indicate there will be heavy overcrowding engendered by new shopping facilities and increasing population.

Several low areas require special drainage and sewer facilities if development occurs on or near them.

The population rate of growth and actual numerical increase will put a tremendous strain on local urban facilities and service districts to provide the quality of service which modern suburban residents demand.

There is a need to identify appropriate sewage disposal systems for the the Jovita subdivisions.

There is a need for improved streets and roads in the general vicinity of Trout Lake and Mirror Lake.

There is a need for reasonable housing for low income persons in the area.

Existing Community Development Plan Concepts

The development concept for Federal Way is the urban center development concept of the King County Comprehensive Plan. (1964)

It recognizes the desire of people to have a choice of various residential areas and types, convenient to cultural, educational, employment and service centers.

It seeks to preserve the natural beauty of the community by the proper conservation of land and water open space, to relieve the

monotony of continuous urban development, to provide necessary recreation area, to provide separation and identification of major activity centers, and to protect certain agriculture, flood plain, forest and mineral resource areas from urban type development.

It recognizes the concept that urban development can contribute to an attractive, safe and orderly urban landscape, and that both public and private development should be encouraged in every way possible to obtain this goal.

Federal Way is identified as a focal point for employment, commerce and cultural activities.

Federal Way policies on the following issues have been developed as part of the community's plan; walkways and bikeways, trails, transportation, housing, open space, business and industries, utilities and the general landscape.

The Block Grant Program, Citizen Participation

In the past, the Federal Way Designated Planning Area has used Housing and Community Development funds to provide meeting room space for its residents as well as a walkway for seniors.

Ideas on community plans and on specific projects have been solicited from Federal Way through community meetings and a community survey. The well organized Federal Way citizens expressed their desire for a number of different projects. If Block Grant funds are to be used for any of these projects, they will have to be shown to be of benefit to low and moderate income residents of the area.

Emergency housing programs along with a mobile health van and historic preservation, were raised as community needs to be considered for Block Grant funding. More specifically, projects for street repair, sidewalk construction, tree planting, as well as support for libraries, community centers and sheltered care facilities were identified by individual citizens and community groups. The construction of elderly housing was also requested by local citizens.

Community Needs Survey

The Community Needs Survey was conducted on 4.0% of all housing units in Federal Way with 38.7% of the houses in the surveyed area in need of repair. The survey area comprises about about 1.6 square miles out of the total 40 square miles in Federal Way.

Results of the survey reveal a need for housing repair throughout Federal Way, and particularly in the areas around Country Lanes, Bethel Chapel, and Trout Lake. Streets and roads near Trout and Minor Lake need improvement. There also are some problems in the Jovita Subdivision resulting from inadequate streets, lack of pedestrian access, limited park and recreation space, and lack of sewers and drainage facilities. These problems need to be addressed before further development of the area occurs.

COMMUNITY PLANNING DISTRICT OF HIGHLINE

General Description of Land Usage

Highline is primarily a suburban residential area whose dominant feature is the 1000 acre Seattle-Tacoma International Airport. To the south and southwest of the airport are low density, single family residential areas. To the northwest are higher density neighborhoods, to the north and east are older rural neighborhoods which have undergone transition to suburban residential, industrial and commercial use.

Each of these subdistricts contains a core of businesses surrounded by single family houses on small lots. More intensive multi-family and commercial uses are concentrated in Burien and along Pacific Highway South. Industrial use is concentrated in the north corner of the area, the Duwamish River Valley and immediately surrounding the airport.

The urban areas of Highline vary considerably in their physical form and appearance. Urban lot sizes in the White Center area contrast sharply with the estate size properties along Puget Sound or in the more southerly portions of the area. Future construction is expected to fill in many of the spaces left in the development pattern leaving only about a quarter of the area undeveloped.

Housing Stock

The average age of housing is 23 years with 31% of all housing units having been built prior to 1950. There are approximately 44,000 total housing units with a 1976 vacancy rate of 4%. The median housing value is well below that of the suburban County outside Seattle. That portion of Highline near the Seattle city limits around White Center contains some of the most deteriorated housing in the County.

General Population Profile

The median family income of Highline families is well below that of the remaining non-Seattle areas of the County. In 1970 5.6% of Highline families had an income below the poverty level. There is a high concentration of low-income families in the north and northeast of the DPA. The total Highline population in 1976 was approximately 110,000, a decline of 3% from 1970. In the past few years the area has undergone an in-migration of Spanish-speaking population, who now represent the largest minority population in Highline.

General Community Issues

The Highline Community Plan, adopted in December, 1977, emphasizes county policies concerning community issues. Citizens share concerns about the protection of the landscape, environmental quality, neighborhood stability, community identity, orderly development and economic health. Specifically these concerns include:

Saving optimum trees, ponds and greenbelts as development or re-development takes place.

Taking advantage of view potentials and using open space as a visual focus.

Improving water quality and solving area drainage problems.

Maintaining low or moderately priced housing.

Enhancing the condition and character of residential neighborhoods and the visual appearance of business districts.

Providing safe and efficient transportation including bicycle and pedestrian facilities and east-west transit service.

Providing services for the elderly, crime prevention and control, employment and job training and animal control.

Creating greater efficiency within the parks and recreation programs.

Owners of residential properties near the airport, and community residents in general, are concerned about the effects of the airport upon the area in terms of noise, property values and growth.

Existing Community Development Plan Concepts

1. Maintain the beauty and natural character of the Highline area.
2. Protect the existing streams and wetlands.
3. Reinforcement and improvement of areas already committed to business and industrial development.
4. Strengthen the identity and enhance the character of permanent neighborhoods.
5. Emphasize safe, efficient and low-cost transportation improvements that will increase utilization of transportation modes other than private automobiles.
6. Improve the functioning of local government.

The Block Grant Program, Citizen Participation

The Highline planning area, particularly the White Center area, will continue as it has in the past, to be a major focus of block grant activities. Programs to meet the needs of the large number of low and moderate income population will receive high priority.

Block grant funds have been used for drainage improvements, sewer system construction, sidewalk and pathway construction, recreation facilities, and the provision of social services. Funds have also been used to purchase and relocate homes from the airport clearance zone and make them available for purchase by low and moderate income families. The housing repair program has been used extensively by area residents and a study has been conducted to identify ways in which to reinforce the residential character of the neighborhoods to the west of Sea-Tac airport. In addition, funds have been allocated for economic development planning and activities in the White Center and Skyway business districts.

In the 1980 program year, block grant funds will continue to provide pedestrian and recreational facilities, drainage improvements in the White Center area, housing repair and weatherization, and public services. A sewer project is planned to provide service to relocated airport homes and efforts will be continued to address economic development in the area.

In past community meetings, representatives from the Highline area have identified a need for historic preservation, street improvements, sewer projects, recreational projects and youth activities. Requests have been received to develop programs to reinforce the residential character of the west side of the Seattle-Tacoma Airport. In addition, the local citizens identified the need for improvements in the Skyway area. Mentioned among the needs were funds to improve the Skyway Central Business District and to upgrade local parks. Representatives from the fire district requested funds for new construction and equipment.

Community Needs Survey

Windshield surveys were conducted on 7.9% of the approximately 44,000 housing units in Highline, with 37.8% of those needing repair. About 4.3 square miles of the 34 square miles in this DPA were surveyed.

Several problems have been identified from the windshield surveys and other secondary data. Physical and environmental problems are apparent around Sea-Tac International Airport. Housing rehabilitation and repair is needed throughout the DPA, with anywhere from 25-58% of the houses in windshield survey areas in need of repair. Several areas lack sewers. Road and sidewalk improvements are needed in several windshield survey areas. White Center, Beverly Park, and Skyway are areas within the DPA where housing and physical development needs are concentrated. The Allentown and Sunnydale areas also show signs of physical deterioration and need for improvements.

COMMUNITY PLANNING DISTRICT OF NEWCASTLE

General Description of Land Usage

Newcastle is approximately 40 square miles in size. The area is located generally south of Bellevue and east and northeast of Renton. The area's northern boundary is formed by I-90 and Bellevue corporate limits and the southern boundary is the Cedar River Bluffs. The western part of Newcastle is mostly developed in small-lot single family houses located within large subdivisions. The central and eastern parts of Newcastle are mostly forested and hilly. Cougar Mountain and part of Squak Mountain are within this study area.

Factoria Square, Newport Hills, Eastgate and Renton Highlands are the major retail/business centers.

A brick manufacturer and various quarries comprise the industrial base of Newcastle.

To the west is the heavily industrialized and commercialized Renton core. Access to urban areas is provided by Interstate 405 and Interstate 90 and the arterials which radiate from them.

Four major urban parks serve Newcastle: Coal Creek, May Creek, Tahoma/Raven Heights and East Sammamish State Park. Of these parks, only East Sammamish is developed. Half of the resource based parks and most of the neighborhood parks are also undeveloped. Of the eleven community parks, four are undeveloped.

Housing Stock

There were approximately 12,000 housing units as of June, 1978, with a population of about 38,000. Slightly less than 5% of these units are multi-family, almost 2% are mobile homes and slightly more than 93% are single family residential. Median housing values are considerably higher than the County median and over 75% of the housing units are owner occupied.

General Population Profile

The median family income for residents within the planning district is significantly higher than the county median as reflected in the fact that in some areas less than 1% of the residents have incomes below poverty level. For the area as a whole, about 2.7% have incomes below poverty level. Low income families are concentrated around the periphery of Renton. Population has increased markedly during the past decade and the trend is expected to continue especially with the increase in employment in the Renton core.

General Community Issues

Development of Cougar Mountain or retention of its natural undeveloped character.

Development of I-90 and its impacts upon the area.

The need for safety for pedestrians on county roads.

Development of recreation space within the area.

Water supply on Cougar Mountain.

Improvements in public transportation.

Development potential of land previously mined for coal.

The Block Grant Program, Citizen Participation

Block grant funds have provided for drainage improvements to Coalfield Park and for housing repair in the area. An allocation of \$75,000 of block grant funds was made in the 1979 program year to address needs identified in the community planning process. It has been determined, through a series of community meetings, that the allocation will be used to write-down land costs for the development of low and moderate income housing.

Community Needs Survey

Isolated pockets of deteriorating housing have been identified by the Community Needs Survey. About 5.9% of the housing units in Newcastle were surveyed, with 34.0% of those in need of repair. Windshield surveys were performed in about 2 square miles of the total 40 square miles in this DPA.

Key problems identified through the survey include drainage problems in May Creek valley; a need for road improvements along 138th Place SE, 136th Avenue SE, and May Valley Road; and a need for housing repair and rehabilitation particularly around SE 71st and 138th SE. Minor housing deterioration was observed along main arterials in Census Tracts 250, 251, 256, and 319 and along 136th and 144th Place SE east of Lake Boren. Public facilities and services are not immediately available in the DPA.

COMMUNITY PLANNING DISTRICT OF NORTSHORE

General Description of Land Usage

Northshore is approximately 35 square miles in size, located northeast of Lake Washington and north of Kirkland and Redmond and west of Bear Creek. Northshore has been primarily a rural area with farming having been successfully pursued for 70-80 years, but is now rapidly becoming suburban residential. It has experienced rapid population growth during the past ten years due to the development of highway I-405, the second Lake Washington Bridge and the increasing demand for a rural and suburban environment which is readily available in Northshore. Areas have been suited for urban development only because of the sanitary sewer system available.

There are five main commercial areas designed to provide goods and services on the community level, and six smaller commercial areas which serve on a neighborhood level. There are four industrial areas which provide the major tax base, and contribute to the support of necessary public facilities and services.

Speculation has raised property values for both developed and undeveloped land. Existing and planned water supply services appear to meet current and future demands for residential, commercial and industrial land uses. Sanitary sewer service is available to portions of the urbanized area, whereas others must use septic tank drainfields. Sewers are planned for most areas west of Sammamish Valley where the permitted development density is greater than 2 units per acre.

The western two-thirds of the area is in transition from rural to suburban. It is likely that one of the greatest impacts on land use will be transitions from rural areas having small acreages to suburban residential lots in neighborhoods.

Housing Stock

Most of the housing stock has been built since 1960. Values are higher than the average of King County. There are approximately 14,450 housing units in the area occupied by 45,900 residents. The 82% home ownership rate is the highest in King County. The urban centers are developed primarily as single family residences with densities of one to four dwelling units per acre, but apartment development has been growing steadily in both the Kenmore and Juanita Communities.

The Northshore Plan forecasts that the existing housing stock will increase by 1990 to approximately 20,000 dwelling units. Some areas in the older communities are undergoing a transition from minimum single family neighborhoods to new high density developments. This trend is expected to continue. Vacancy rates are low, in 1976 being less than 2%.

General Population Profile

The median income of Northshore families is higher than the county average. In 1970 only 3.8 percent of the Northshore residents had an income below poverty level. The greatest number of employed persons residing in the central and eastern portions of Northshore work inside King County. Employment is almost spread evenly across employment sectors which is indicative of a fairly broad employment base.

General Community Issues

The following issues were identified during the Communities Plan process:

Ten to eleven square miles within the area comprise the Sammamish Valley with soils highly unstable during earthquakes. The Communities Plan has identified where these are and development controls should be required to prevent future problems.

Approximately 20-25% of the land area in Northshore is steep slopes; fast runoff occurs during the wet months in the year; special construction problems are normally experienced in such areas.

A few areas undergo seasonal flooding and are unsuitable for development. These areas are in the Sammamish Valley drainage area and Swamp Creek.

Approximately 25% of the land has soils which have slow permeability, seasonal high water table and poor drainage. These areas are unsuitable for urban development utilizing septic tanks.

The rate of growth and real numerical increase in population will strain local utilities and service districts to provide residents with the quality of service they will demand.

East to West traffic flow through the Kenmore CBD is severely restricted. Most local traffic is forced to mix with high volumes of commuter traffic on SR-522. The Northshore Community Plan recognizes that the development of NE 181st will correct this major traffic circulation problem.

Some communities in Northshore have a large segment of children of school age (5-12 years) and of preschool age (0-4 years) which are inadequately served by public recreation facilities.

Low cost housing for persons living in or moving into Northshore is considered inadequate.

Forms of transportation other than private automobile have been given insufficient treatment in the overall circulation system.

A school walk-in policy in the Northshore and Lake Washington school districts was adopted (for the 1975-76 school year) causing a critical situation of inadequate, unsafe walking routes for school children.

Transit service has not heretofore been utilized by Northshore residents to the extent merited by the size population and the convenience offered.

Leapfrogging of residential areas makes for inefficient and more costly utilities.

Land in the Sammamish Valley, long utilized for agricultural pursuits, is given assessed valuations on the basis of speculative development to more intense uses causing tax burdens to the owners who decry the increasing difficulty of ownership.

Strip commercial development on Bothell Way NE has caused traffic problems, congestion, dangerous conditions for pedestrians and cyclists, air pollution and offensive advertising.

Several cities whose corporate boundaries have enveloped segments of the Northshore planning area have designated these lands for uses which are inconsistent with land use patterns and plans of the unincorporated King County areas adjacent.

Persons 65 years of age or older are a large proportion of the population in the central and eastern Kenmore residential community.

Private business and industry is very interested in investment opportunities in the Kenmore area. However, current fire flow in the area is so inadequate that the fire marshall has refused to allow further development because existing fire flows would be unable to meet the increased demand. The Northshore Community Plan recognizes the desirability of higher density commercial and retail development within the Kenmore CBD. A comprehensive urban design study is a logical starting point on which to build a capital improvement strategy that will efficiently integrate private development interests and public programs to solve those problems currently prohibiting increased development in the Kenmore CBD.

Existing Community Development Plan Concepts

The Northshore Community Development Plan has proposed three basic concepts for the area.

Population growth should slowly fill in an already partially developed suburban area to low and medium density residential use.

Development should occur along existing patterns by commercial/ industrial centers and major streets and highways.

As development occurs, agricultural uses, open space and the area's many natural amenities should be preserved as much as possible.

The Block Grant Program

In the past, block grant funds have been allocated to the Northshore DPA for drainage improvements, planning and redevelopment of the Kenmore Central business district, road right-of-way improvements and pedestrian walkways, and park land acquisition and development. Housing repair continues to be available to eligible area homeowners and this year block grant funds will provide site improvements in conjunction with an elderly housing complex. Northshore Multi-Service Center will receive block grant funds for additional construction of the facility and Youth Eastside Services will be assisted in acquiring and rehabilitating a structure for provision of services in the Rosehill area.

Community Needs Survey

Windshield surveys were conducted on 4.0% of the housing units in Northshore. Of which 43.3% showed signs of needing repair. Windshield survey areas comprise about 1.6 square miles out of the 35 square miles in the DPA.

Results of the survey show a need for housing repair and rehabilitation in isolated parts of this DPA. Some arterials, particularly Bothell Way and Juanita Drive, have heavy traffic volume and sidewalks are inadequate in some areas. Poor drainage is a problem along the Sammamish River. Specific need for housing repair and physical improvements exist in areas along Swamp Creek and in Rosehill.

COMMUNITY PLANNING DISTRICT OF RAVEN HEIGHTS

General Description of Land Usage

Located in southeast-central King County, the Green River forms the southern boundary and the Cedar River Watershed forms the northern boundary of this planning area. The eastern boundary is formed by a line running north between the Green River and the Cedar River just east of Kanaskat. The western boundary is Wax Road and the Kent-Black Diamond Road.

The planning area is primarily a hilly, heavily forested plateau. Lake Sawyer, Lake Wilderness, and a number of smaller lakes are scattered throughout the plateau. County parks at these lakes serve the urban population to the west as well as the people in the planning area.

Within the planning area are the town of Black Diamond, and the communities of Ravensdale, Lake Wilderness and Lake Lucerne. Small commercial centers within each of these communities serve the area. There is virtually no industrial use except gravel and coal mines. County arterials provide access, but there is only one bus line and most roads are oriented in a north-south direction with large, undeveloped areas of land between them.

A few subdivisions of new single-family houses have been built, mainly in the northwest portion of the area. Growth in a suburban pattern is concentrated in the west and northwest portions of the area leaving much of the eastern half of the area undeveloped and rural in character. Less than 15% of the area is developed in urban use.

Housing Stock

There are over 5,131 housing units in the planning area occupied by some 14,367 persons. The median housing value is below the county median and the median rent is also below the county median. Over 70% of the units are owner occupied, and over one-third of all the units have been constructed during the past ten years.

General Population Profile

Median income is below the county median by almost 5%. Over 8% have incomes below poverty level. Over 30% of the area's residents are in the work force with the majority of those working outside of the planning area.

General Community Issues

Flooding on the Cedar River, and the need to develop measures to reduce flooding or mitigate the damage.

Water quality and need for sewerage systems in Black Diamond and at Lake Sawyer.

Water quantity shortages in the Lake Lucerne-Lake Sawyer area.

Social needs of Black Diamond, including housing quality and income.

Capability of the town of Black Diamond to provide needed services to its residents.

Concern for possible opening of the Cedar River Watershed to some public use.

The Block Grant Program

Block grant funded activities in the DPA have been centered in the town of Black Diamond serving both residents of the town and the surrounding DPA. For example, few doctors practice in the area resulting in a need for primary health care. A block grant funded health clinic, operated by the Seattle/King County Health Department addresses this need for basic health services.

A nutrition program has been successful in this area. Meals are served to those people who cannot afford the meals they need.

The provision of transportation to the health clinic and nutrition program is essential to the people who cannot afford transportation. Volunteer drivers are reimbursed for their gas expense from the block grant. The nutrition and transportation programs will require on-going block grant support unless other funds become available from other sources.

This year block grant funds, in conjunction with funds from the Environmental Protection Agency and the State Department of Ecology, will provide for construction of a sewer system and sewage treatment facility for the town of Black Diamond. Block grant funds will continue to provide housing repair and weatherization throughout the DPA. A special allocation of funds has been made for housing repair in the Timberlane subdivision, much of which was constructed under the Federal Section 235 Program.

Community Needs Survey

Two windshield surveys were performed in the immediate vicinities of Ravensdale, Selleck, Kangley and Kanaskat/Palmer. Results of the surveys show a need for housing repair and rehabilitation, and a need for road improvements in the residential areas off the main arterials.

There is a visual and noise nuisance originating from the power line corridor in Kangley. Housing conditions, abandoned vehicles, and deteriorated properties are most severe in Selleck and Timberlane

though noticeably worse than most other areas of the County in all four survey areas. Public facilities, services and transportation other than school related are also absent.

COMMUNITY PLANNING DISTRICT OF SAMMAMISH

General Description of Land Usage

The East Sammamish planning area is approximately 43 square miles in size. Located east and southeast of Lake Sammamish the area is both transitional and rural in character. Along the shores of Lake Sammamish, Pine Lake, and Beaver Lake residential development has established a trend toward a suburban character.

Generally land use in the area is of relatively low density residential with 1 to 3 dwelling units per acre and in some areas modest agricultural uses. Growth is toward increased residential use because of the area's proximity to employment centers in Bellevue and Seattle, as well as the attraction of its scenic values and rural atmosphere. However, with 91% of the area undeveloped most land exists as open space and forest reserve.

Approximately 75% of the homes within the area are served by individual septic tanks and drainfields. The public water supply is provided by the Sahalee and Water District 82 and 121. Water District 82 and 121 were recently merged into a single district which is expected to result in improved service and facilities including a new well. Expansion of sewer and water services will be needed to meet the anticipated growth in this area.

Housing Stock

There are approximately 3,816 housing units in the area occupied by some 10,639 persons. The median value of the units is higher than the county median due to the fact that many of the units were built during the past ten years. In 1970 over 70% of the units were owner occupied with over 90% by single families. It is forecast that by 1990, population will increase to over 16,000 while housing units will increase to over 4,100.

General Population Profile

Median family income was slightly higher than the county median in 1970. Some 4.5% of the area residents had incomes below poverty level while some 2.8% received public assistance.

General Community Issues

With continued growth toward single family residential housing, need for support facilities exists.

Questions as to where residential growth should be located exist.

Majority of travel corridors are on the periphery of the area and transit service to the area is minimal.

With the largest percentage of residences served by individual septic tank drainfields, septic tank failure and pollution of lakes and streams is a concern.

The future availability of sewerage services to meet growth demands is a concern.

The location of water and sewer facilities will affect the shape of growth.

The possible need for additional water sources, storage and distribution facilities has been identified

At the present time there are no signed bicycle routes in the planning area.

Protection of the natural environment from degradation, and protection of the "rural character" of the area are other concerns.

Existing Community Development Plan Concepts

The Sammamish Community Plan was recently developed with the citizens of the area. Policies were developed for densities and locations, utilities, streets and roads, parks and sensitive slopes and drainage areas, in order to retain the very low density residential character of the area.

COMMUNITY PLANNING DISTRICT OF SHORELINE

General Description of Land Usage

As one of the earlier suburban growth areas around Seattle, Shoreline received much of its growth after World War II. Its present growth rate is about the same as the entire county.

Single-family housing covers 50% of the community; streets and right-of-ways use 20-30% of the land while parks and open space areas use about 7%. Multi-family housing, (duplexes, apartment, and condominiums), use only 1.4% of the total land area and commercial/office developments use just over 3%. Only 10% of the land is vacant. The large gap between single-family housing and the other uses emphasizes the important role Shoreline plays as a family oriented, residential community.

Housing Stock

There are approximately 20,500 housing units in Shoreline, 16% of which are multi-family and 84% detached single family dwellings. Average age of housing is 22 years, relatively old for King County. 25% of present stock was built prior to 1950. Mean sale price of housing is approximately equal to the suburban county average. Housing growth is forecast to be relatively low in Shoreline and will occur in the form of single family homes filling in vacant areas between subdivisions and in multi-family construction. By 1990 it is expected that over 80% of the DPA will be occupied by urban uses.

General Population Profile

The population of Shoreline is 62,000, down 2% from 1970. Median family income is slightly above the County median but concentrations of low income families occur, mainly in the central portion of the DPA. In 1970, 3% of the families had an income below poverty level and 3.2% were receiving public assistance. About 41% of the residents are in the labor force with the majority employed in Seattle.

General Community Issues

Issues identified during the Shoreline Communities Plan process:

Overall improvements in transportation services particularly oriented to public transportation and pedestrian and bicycle facilities.

Concerns about limiting density and maintaining single family character.

Preservation of open space and green belts.

Provision of increased police protection and emergency services.

Increased recreational facilities.

A declining or stable population after years of growth leaving remaining residents with an increasing tax burden and problems leading to a changing social character.

Rapid runoff and flooding in the area's creeks as development occurs.

The Block Grant Program, Citizen Participation

Ideas on future plans and projects for the Shoreline area have been received through community meetings and the Communities Planning process. At the meetings, various citizens and community groups have identified the need for new parks and recreation facilities. One citizen identified the need for support services for the elderly living in public housing. Several others raised the issue of cleaning up existing parks. The need for an enlarged Work Activity Center in a possible new location for the developmentally handicapped was also mentioned at the community meeting. A sports complex development at the Shoreview Park site has been identified as a more recent need. Also, there is interest in acquiring a neighborhood park site in the Hilltop area.

Community Needs Survey

Windshield surveys were done on 9.2% of the housing units in Shoreline with 23.6% of those units needing repair. About 5.7 square miles of the total 15 square miles in the DPA were surveyed by car, with secondary data collected for the DPA as a whole.

The need for housing repair and rehabilitation is apparent in isolated parts of this DPA, and especially in the portions where windshield surveys were done. The Aurora strip poses some problems for surrounding residential areas. The school crossing for Shorecrest High School is hazardous. Several areas had accumulations of abandoned vehicles. These are some street problems on 25th and 28th NE between NE 168th and NE 165th. The Ridgecrest and Briarcrest areas evidence the need for both housing repair and physical improvements such as walkways, drainage, and park facilities.

COMMUNITY PLANNING DISTRICT OF SNOQUALMIE

General Description of Land Usage

The Snoqualmie area is approximately 140 square miles in size. The area lies along the Snoqualmie River in Northeast King County from North Bend northwest to the Snohomish County line. The towns of Duvall, Carnation, Snoqualmie and North Bend are within the planning area.

The Snoqualmie area is primarily rural in character with the major topographic feature being the Snoqualmie River Valley which winds from the southeast to the northwest corner of the area. Residential activity is focused around five rural town centers with each center having a cluster of older buildings around a few commercial uses and a school and parks. Additional residential units and farm buildings are scattered through the crop and pastureland of the valley floor, and new development is occurring in the hills to the east and west of the valley.

Housing Stock

There are approximately 4,157 housing units occupied by 12,114 residents. The housing stock is predominately older units with 41% having been built before 1940. Medians for housing value and rent were substantially below the county-wide median. Between 1970 and 1975, housing units increased by over 10% while population increased by almost 5%. Moderate growth can be expected to continue.

General Population Profile

Median family income was 11% below the county median in 1970. Some 5% of the area residents had incomes below poverty level while 2.8% received public assistance. 35% of the total population in the planning area was employed. The majority (79%) of those working in King County were employed outside of Seattle.

General Community Issues

A number of different studies on the Snoqualmie Area have been carried out in the last ten years. These studies deal with such diverse issues as water resource management, forest land preservation and watershed and reservoirs as open space. A number of the general community issues evolved from these studies are as follows:

The need to retain the green, rural quality of the Valley and its farmland and concern about managing of growth.

The need for growth of the area's economic base, with concern expressed regarding the impacts of industry and commerce on the Valley lifestyle.

Impacts of the improvements of Interstate 90, especially on the economy of North Bend.

The economic and social role of small rural towns in an urban county.

The impacts, especially on Valley land use of flooding and of the proposed North Fork Snoqualmie River Dam.

Drainage, erosion, and water quality in the Snoqualmie River.

Access to medical facilities and services.

The need for social services, especially for the elderly.

Threats to the economic health of the dairy industry.

The Block Grant Program, Citizen Participation

The block grant program has funded housing rehabilitation, water system improvements, transportation and social services in the area. A social service facility has been built as has a sewer system. Community planning assistance has been provided to the area through the block grant as have a Senior Center facility, funds for Snoqualmie Railway Park, housing repair, rehabilitation, and weatherization. This year block grant funds will upgrade three area water systems and continue to provide health care and housing rehabilitation.

Ideas on community plans and on specific proposals have been solicited from the Snoqualmie area through community meetings. The range of requests from citizens have varied considerably. For seniors, the need for transportation and medical programs was raised as was the need for new housing. A number of different citizens and community groups stated a need for additional park land and recreation facilities. One group is requesting that block grant be used to complete a water project, and one citizen suggested that the county dig some swimming holes in the river for summer recreation. Other requests for more formal swimming facilities have also been made.

Community Needs Survey

Windshield surveys were done in eight sub-areas of this DPA. Housing rehabilitation and repair is needed throughout as Snoqualmie Valley has an older housing stock than most of the county.

COMMUNITY PLANNING DISTRICT OF SOOS CREEK

General Description of Land Usage

The Soos Creek Plateau is a 73 square mile area located east of the cities of Renton, Kent and Auburn above the Green River Valley in the hill and ridge lands of southeast King County. The Soos Creek community planning area is bounded on the north by the northern bluffs of the Cedar River, on the east by 196th Avenue SE and Wax Road; on the south by the Green River and on the west by the Western edge of the Soos Creek Plateau.

The Soos Creek Plateau contains a mixture of suburban and rural land uses and densities. Expanding subdivisions, commercial centers and apartment clusters are found primarily in the western half of the plateau adjacent to the cities of Renton, Kent and Auburn. The eastern portions of the plateau are mostly undeveloped. Here, large acreages dominate the land pattern. Ranchettes, pastures and woodlands occupy most of the land.

Most of the developed land in the area is used for single-family housing. There are a few clusters of apartments generally located around commercial areas which are concentrated at the intersections of the main arterials. Over the past two decades population in the area has tripled as a result of the activity and growth of the Boeing plant, general economic activity and the expansion of Renton and Kent into the Soos Creek area.

Housing Stock

There were approximately 16,544 households in the Soos Creek area in 1976, occupied by some 54,000 residents. Housing stock is relatively new although there exists a substrata of older rural housing. Approximately 18% of the housing pre-dates 1950. A 1975 survey estimated that almost 10% of the housing was deteriorating. Housing values are mixed with the median falling just below the non-Seattle County median. A high rate of growth is forecast for Soos Creek with the population expected to increase to between 81,000 and 105,000 people by 1990.

General Population Profile

The median income for Soos Creek area residents is slightly less than the county average. In 1970, roughly 6% of the area residents had incomes below poverty level while 3.8% received public assistance.

General Perceived Community Issues

The following issues were developed by the Soos Creek Community Plan committee during preparation of the now adopted Community Plan.

The natural features that have made Soos Creek Plateau a pleasant place to live could be destroyed by haphazard development.

Big Soos Creek has a drainage problem which impacts surrounding land owners and potential users of Soos Creek Park.

Storm drainage in natural drainageways due to increased development is decreasing water quality and augmenting water quantity.

Large concentrations of low income housing are causing social and financial burdens on the surrounding community.

Site preparation and layout of residential areas as well as the residences themselves, are often poorly designed and not maintained, leading to conditions of blight.

The plateau is experiencing growing pains because improvements in services and facilities lag population increase.

Existing business and commercial centers do not provide convenient and aesthetic places to shop but foster poor circulation, congestion for through traffic and poor interface with surrounding residences.

Light industry and employment centers are needed in the Soos Creek Plateau, if designed and planned to be compatible and have minimal environmental impact on the predominant existing semi-rural and residential communities.

The rural character of portions of the plateau is being changed by the extension of sewers and water both as a condition of and in expectation of development.

The formation of utilities local improvement districts often forces utilities charges and services on property owners wishing neither.

Opportunities for increasing safety and security of residential street lighting as well as providing the amenity of underground wiring are being lost when not installed at the initial development because of increased costs of redevelopment or replacement.

Transit does not adequately serve the residents of the plateau.

Different phone numbers for various types of emergency calls are causing confusion on the part of the callers, delays in the reporting of emergency calls and frustration on the part of the residents.

Fire protection service does not seem well coordinated between fire districts, full time fire departments and water providers so that facilities, equipment and available water resources can be used to provide protection in new existing development.

Residents of the Soos Creek Plateau want parks that are developed so as to be useable, rather than numerous park sites.

Residents desire a voice in what types of parks they will have.

People prefer to see a neighborhood and regional park system develop as new residential development occurs, rather than being forced to play "catch-up" with a demand that has outstripped supply.

Recreation needs are not being met because of a lack of coordination between Seattle, King County, Kent, Auburn, Renton, the State school districts and individual schools.

Existing Community Development Plan Concepts

Two major plan concepts, Managed Growth and Coordination of Services, form the basis for many of the recommendations contained in the adopted Soos Creek Plan.

The Managed Growth concept will encourage growth in the more developed portions of the plateau that are already committed to suburban development by existing zoning and the presence of urban services, particularly sewers. Transitional areas adjacent to the committed lands are also identified as desirable for suburban development. The forecast 1990 population will easily be accommodated in those suburban and transitional areas. Portions of the plateau that presently have primarily a rural atmosphere and lack services are proposed to stay rural for the life of this plan. Rural density is defined, with some exceptions, as a maximum of one dwelling unit per two and one-half and five gross acres in order to retain rural character, prevent premature establishment of suburban land uses and alleviate the need for extension of suburban services.

The Coordination of Services concept recognizes that rapid population growth and residential development on the plateau is straining the ability of public agencies to provide adequate services. It also recognizes that better agency coordination is needed to most effectively provide public service.

The Block Grant Program, Citizen Participation

Block grant has funded a variety of projects in the Soos Creek DPA including providing access to a recreational facility, rehabilitation of a daycare center, park improvements and development, and housing repair. This year housing repair and park improvements will again be funded. In addition, walkway improvements and a new daycare facility will be provided.

Citizens have addressed their concerns at community meetings, identifying needs and projects to be considered under the Block Grant program. Assistance to fire departments in the form of new construction

and equipment was one form of request made. Providing support to agricultural activities and to an arboretum were also requested. Low and moderate income families will have to benefit from these projects in order to receive block grant funds.

Community Needs Survey

Windshield surveys were conducted on 6.8% of the approximate 26,741 housing units in Soos Creek, with 32.5% of the surveyed units in need or repair. About 2.9 of the 73 square miles in this DPA were surveyed, with secondary data collected for the DPA as a whole.

Some of the observable problems in this area include the need for sound buffering between Seattle International Raceway and surrounding residential areas; scattered need for housing repair and rehabilitation particularly along Kent/Kangley and Benson roads; excessive run-off into Lake Meridian; road improvements between Maple Valley Highway and the Cedar River; improvements to common area of the Lea Hills development; and park development and walkway improvements in scattered subdivisions throughout the DPA.

COMMUNITY PLANNING DISTRICT OF TAHOMA

General Description of Land Usage

Located in the east-central area of the county, Tahoma's northern boundary is formed by I-90 and its southern boundary is the Cedar River. The western boundary is formed by a line south from Issaquah to Maple Valley along 196th Avenue Southeast. The area includes the city of Issaquah and the communities of Maple Valley and Hobart.

The area is primarily undeveloped hilly forest land with some agriculture use around Issaquah and in the southeast portion of the planning district. Commercial use is concentrated in Issaquah with small commercial centers located in Maple Valley and Hobart. Virtually no industry exists within the planning area, except within the city of Issaquah.

Single-family residences are clustered in Issaquah and in subdivisions to the south, scattered the length of Maple Valley. The rugged forested peaks in the northwestern portion of the area make portions of the area inaccessible. This coupled with the Cedar River Watershed makes the eastern half of the planning district virtually undeveloped.

Housing Stock

There were approximately 4,887 housing units in the area occupied by some 13,684 persons. Median housing value was slightly below the county median while median rents were about the same as the county median. The housing stock is relatively new, however in the more rural areas housing value and condition contrasts with the newer subdivisions. The trend in the northwestern portion is from rural to suburban intensities and is probably where most future growth will occur, if current trends continue.

General Population Profile

In 1970, median family income was slightly below the county median with over 5% of the area residents having incomes below poverty level. Slightly over 35% of the area's residents were employed in 1970. Average age is slightly younger than for County as a whole.

General Community Issues

Flooding on the Cedar River, including measures which might be taken to reduce flooding or mitigate the damage.

The protection of the planning area's rural character and considerations of limits on growth.

The relation of utility extensions to growth.

The possible opening of the Cedar River Watershed for public use.

The Block Grant Program

Block grant projects in the area have been concentrated in the Maple Valley area. The focus of block grant activities has centered on the establishment of a permanent community center. A health clinic, funded by block grant operates out of the community center. The clinic may require future funding.

Two drainage studies have been initiated for the Tahoma Designated Planning Area. Implementation of recommendations from the studies may require fiscal commitments in the future.

Block grant funded a Maple Valley to Lake Wilderness Trail, Tahoma Park, and a 50% matching share on a new fire engine for F.D. #43, and a tot lot and game courts.

A community plan for Tahoma will be completed in the coming year. Part of this process will involve identifying additional block grant activities. Health care and housing repair will continue to be available to area residents.

Community Needs Survey

Windshield surveys covered 10.5% of the housing units in this DPA, with 34.0% of the units in those areas needing repair. Of the approximate 35 square miles in Tahoma, 3.2 square miles were surveyed. Secondary data was collected for the DPA as a whole.

Housing repair and rehabilitation is needed throughout this DPA, but especially in the areas where windshield surveys were done. These areas are primarily along the Renton-Maple Valley Road and in the area of Hobart. Some road improvements are needed in this vicinity as well.

COMMUNITY PLANNING DISTRICT OF VASHON-MAURY

General Description of Land Usage

The Vashon area is approximately 37 square miles in size. The area consists of Vashon and Maury Islands in Puget Sound, located at the southwestern corner of King County. The area contains several unincorporated communities but has no incorporated cities.

Vashon is primarily rural in character with scattered open fields and orchards. There are a number of distinct communities of single-family houses but most of the Islands' housing is scattered on large lots and along the shoreline. A few multi-family dwellings are located in the community of Vashon which is the island's major commercial center. Almost two-thirds of the islands are covered by forest.

Growth on the islands has been moderate and mostly due to an increase in commuter families and retired people. Growth is checked by the necessity to rely on ferry transportation as there are no highways that connect Vashon to other areas. Transportation on the island is by county roads. There are 10 public park sites, some of which are undeveloped or partially developed.

Housing Stock

There are approximately 3,200 housing units on the island occupied by 8,600 persons. About 15% of the units are second homes for recreational use, but this figure is rapidly decreasing as more of these homes become year-round residences. The housing stock is fairly old with more than 60% built before 1950. The mean market value for housing has been 10 to 15% lower than the County mean as are rents. Due to a vacancy rate approaching zero, these price differentials are declining. A reasonable rate of growth the population is not forecast to exceed 12,000 by 1990.

General Population Profile

Median family income is about 4% lower than the total county median. 30% of the area residents are in the labor force, with the majority commuting to Seattle. Only about 750 persons are employed within the area. 5.8% of the area residents had incomes below poverty level in 1970 while some 6.5% received public assistance income.

General Community Issues

The following community issues will be expanded and developed in the coming years as a community plan is developed for the Vashon-Maury Planning Area.

The age and quality of housing.

The need to expand sewer and water service on the islands with concern for consequent changes to the islands' character.

Retention of the rural character of the planning area.

Protection of natural resources on the islands, especially from landslide hazard.

Accessibility to services, particularly medical services and facilities.

The islands' high percentage of elderly people and high percentage of people receiving public assistance.

The Block Grant Program, Citizen Participation

In the past, block grant has been used to support health care on the Islands as well as housing repair. As the community plan for the Islands developed additional needs for community development projects were identified. A community allocation of \$75,000 which had been set aside for block grant projects in 1978 was allocated through the community planning process, for a nutrition program, health care, redevelopment of a former Nike Missile Site for use as a park, and expansion of childcare and development programs through addition of staff and acquisition of equipment. Block grant funds in the 1980 program year will fund improvements to an existing community facility used extensively by the elderly and for construction of a walkway in the town of Vashon that will improve access for the elderly. In addition, handicapped access and a children's play area will be funded at an existing hostel site and housing repair will continue to be available to eligible island residents.

Community Needs Survey

Windshield surveys were done on all housing units on Vashon Island, with 27% of the units needing repair. About 27.4 out of 37 square miles on the Island were surveyed, with the remainder being undeveloped.

Problems identified include the need for housing rehabilitation and repair, sewage and water system inadequacy, and inadequate transportation and fire protection. More detailed assessment of community needs will be done as part of the Vashon Communities Plan currently in progress.