



## A. INTRODUCTION

The scope of work for the 2020 study identified statistics related to the following conditions as appropriate measures of socio-economic indicators in both the study area cities and other jurisdictions north of Seattle-Tacoma International Airport:

- Demographic profile
- Income including poverty status
- Housing profile
- Education-related characteristics
- Economic and land use development
- Employment
- Municipal tax revenues.

The discussion that follows includes a description and analyses of: each of the above indicators; positive, neutral and negative socio-economic effects; comments received from individuals and representatives involved in the study process, along with clarifying responses; and recommendations for ongoing investigation, as well as possible strategies to mitigate adverse influences.

## B. DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE

To establish a context and order of magnitude for several of the measures of quality of life, this discussion begins with a summary of key demographic characteristics.

The study area is composed of six cities, all in south King County. King County, with a population of approximately 2.2 million residents, is the largest of three counties that comprise the Seattle Metropolitan Area (Metro Area) and is composed of 42 cities and towns. The other two counties – Snohomish and Pierce – with approximately 720,000 and 810,000 residents respectively, comprise the remainder of the Metro Area.

Figure 13.1 presents population growth trends in the study area cities over the past 21 years, as compared to King County. (Rows shaded in blue represent the three milestone years for the 2020 study.)

As shown, population growth during the last several years of the analysis period (2009-2018) outpaced growth from 1997 to 2008 in every study area city but Tukwila. With the exception of Burien, none of the study area cities grew as fast as King County overall during the past 21 years. In addition, Burien is the only study area city that grew at an average annual rate of greater than 1.0% since 2008. As noted in Section 2, Burien grew much faster in 2010 as a result of an annexation of the southern portion of the North Highline area, adding 14,292 new residents and 1,600 acres.

**Figure 13.1**  
**Population of Study Area Cities and King County: 1997-2018**

Year	Burien	Des Moines	Federal Way	Normandy Park	SeaTac	Tukwila	King County
1997	29,139	27,692	79,237	6,517	24,123	16,416	1,659,106
ok1998	29,123	27,948	80,964	6,477	24,768	16,672	1,686,266
1999	31,346	28,906	81,999	6,434	25,259	16,905	1,712,122
2000	31,881	29,267	83,259	6,392	25,496	17,181	1,737,046
2001	31,957	29,558	83,965	6,376	25,537	17,321	1,755,487
2002	32,161	29,530	84,022	6,358	25,514	17,487	1,777,514
2003	31,995	29,193	83,723	6,260	25,444	17,477	1,788,082
2004	31,780	29,133	83,833	6,383	25,558	17,575	1,800,783
2005	31,839	29,074	86,263	6,336	25,714	17,560	1,814,999
2006	32,020	29,166	86,944	6,347	25,930	18,486	1,845,209
2007	32,567	29,291	87,823	6,338	26,329	18,655	1,871,098
2008	32,847	29,443	88,548	6,298	26,654	18,814	1,891,125
2009	33,314	29,613	89,001	6,314	26,643	18,939	1,909,205
2010	33,313	29,673	89,306	6,335	26,909	19,107	1,931,249
2011	47,660	29,680	89,370	6,345	27,110	19,407	1,908,379
2012	47,730	29,700	89,460	6,521	27,210	19,677	1,940,977
2013	48,030	29,730	89,720	6,562	27,310	19,765	1,974,567
2014	48,240	30,030	90,150	6,633	27,620	19,921	2,008,997
2015	48,810	30,100	90,760	6,694	27,650	19,300	2,045,756
2016	50,000	30,570	93,670	6,700	27,810	19,540	2,079,550
2017	50,680	30,860	96,350	6,698	28,850	19,660	2,118,119
2018	51,908	32,364	97,044	6,660	29,239	20,294	2,233,163

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, ESRI, and Ricker Cunningham

ESRI's Updated Demographics include current-year estimates and 5-year projections of U.S. demographic data. ESRI develops the annual demographic datasets using a variety of sources, beginning with the latest base, then adding a mixture of administrative records and private sources to capture changes.

Figure 13.2 presents the concentration of persons under the age of 18, as compared to King County. Population under 18 years of age is an indicator of family households.

**Figure 13.2**  
**Population Under 18 Years in Study Area Cities and King County: 2013-2017**

xxx lower than King County    
 xxx equal to King County    
 xxx higher than King County

City	2013- 2017
City of Burien	23.6%
City of Des Moines	20.1%
City of Federal Way	23.6%
City of Normandy Park	17.0%
City of SeaTac	22.6%
City of Tukwila	23.1%
King County	20.7%

Source: American Community Survey and Ricker Cunningham

As shown, Burien (23.6%), Federal Way (23.6%), SeaTac (22.6%) and Tukwila (23.1%) have higher populations under the age of 18 than King County (20.7%). Des Moines (20.1%) and Normandy Park (17.0%) both have populations under the age of 18 lower than King County.

Figure 13.3 presents the concentration of persons age 65 and over, as compared to King County and the state of Washington. The age 65-and-over population figures are further delineated by five-year increments.

**Figure 13.3**  
**Population Age 65 and Over in Study Area Cities, King County and Washington State: 2013-2017**

xxx lower than King County    
 xxx equal to King County    
 xxx higher than King County

Indicator	Burien	Des Moines	Federal Way	Normandy Park	SeaTac	Tukwila	King County	Washington State
% 65 to 69	4.0%	4.8%	4.2%	6.7%	4.6%	4.1%	4.4%	5.1%
% 70 to 74	3.6%	4.1%	3.3%	4.2%	2.3%	2.5%	3.0%	3.6%
% 75 to 79	2.7%	2.6%	2.3%	3.8%	1.0%	0.8%	1.9%	2.3%
% 80 to 84	1.8%	2.4%	1.5%	2.3%	1.0%	0.9%	1.4%	1.6%
% 85+	1.4%	2.9%	1.6%	5.7%	1.2%	1.5%	1.8%	1.8%
Total 65 and over	13.5%	16.8%	12.9%	22.7%	10.1%	9.8%	12.5%	14.4%
% Households with Population 65+	26.5%	30.3%	24.8%	41.6%	21.0%	20.1%	22.2%	---

Source: U.S. Census Bureau; American Community Survey; ESRI; and Ricker Cunningham

Among the study area cities, Des Moines (16.8%) and Normandy Park (22.7%) have the highest concentrations of residents age 65 and over, and both have higher concentrations than either King County or the state of Washington. Burien (13.5%) and Federal Way (12.9%) have similar populations age 65 and over as compared to King County, but both cities are lower than the state figure. Des Moines (30.3%) and Normandy Park (41.6%) also have the highest share of households that include persons age 65 and over.

Figure 13.4 presents median age estimates for the study area cities, as compared to King County and the state of Washington.

**Figure 13.4**  
**Median Age – Study Area Cities and King County: 2013-2017**

xxx lower than King County    
 xxx equal to King County    
 xxx higher than King County

City	2013-2017
City of Burien	38.4
City of Des Moines	40.5
City of Federal Way	36.4
City of Normandy Park	50.2
City of SeaTac	34.1
City of Tukwila	34.6
King County	37.2
Washington State	37.6

Source: American Community Survey and Ricker Cunningham  
Persons of Hispanic Origin may be of any race. The Diversity Index measures the probability that two people from the same area will be from different race/ ethnic groups.

Normandy Park (50.2), Des Moines (40.5) Burien (38.4) all have median ages well above those for King County (37.2) and the state of Washington (37.6).

Figure 13.5 presents the ethnic profile for the study area cities, as compared to King County.

**Figure 13.5**  
**Study Area Cities and King County Ethnicities: 2013-2017**

xxx lower than King County    
 xxx equal to King County    
 xxx Higher than King County

City	Hispanic	African-American	Asian	Native American
City of Burien	24.3%	9.3%	14.2%	3.9%
City of Des Moines	18.2%	8.5%	16.5%	3.3%
City of Federal Way	18.1%	14.3%	17.3%	3.0%
City of Normandy Park	3.8%	1.1%	7.9%	0.1%
City of SeaTac	18.3%	26.3%	19.8%	3.1%
City of Tukwila	15.0%	22.7%	26.9%	4.9%
King County	9.5%	8.1%	19.6%	2.2%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, ESRI, and Ricker Cunningham

All of the study area cities, with the exception of Normandy Park, have higher Hispanic, African American and Native American populations than King County. Burien (24.3%), SeaTac (26.3%) and Tukwila (4.9%) have the highest Hispanic, African American and Native American populations, respectively. With respect to Asian populations, only SeaTac (19.8%) and Tukwila (26.9%) have higher populations than King County. In terms of overall ethnicity (non-white) populations, all of the study area cities, with the exception of Normandy Park, have a higher degree of overall ethnicity. Tukwila and SeaTac have a significantly higher level of ethnicity than other study area cities and King County.

**Summary – Demographic profile**

The study area has grown at a slightly slower pace than the average for King County since 2000. (The exception is Burien, which showed a large growth rate, due mostly to its 2010 annexation.) But the study area is not uniform when it comes to its demographic characteristics in comparison to King County:

- Burien’s population shows higher averages for under 18 and 65-plus. It shows higher averages for residents that self-identify as Hispanic, African American, and Native American.
- Des Moines’ population skews slight older (higher averages for 65-plus). Like Burien, Des Moines shows higher averages for residents that self-identify as Hispanic, African American, and Native American.
- Federal Way’s population is close to the county average. Like Burien and Des Moines, Federal Way shows higher averages for residents who self-identify as Hispanic, African American, and Native American.
- Normandy Park’s population skews much older than the county average and has a much higher median age. It also shows a low percentage of minority residents.
- SeaTac’s population generally skews younger (higher averages for under 18), and with a higher percentage of residents that self-identify as Hispanic, African American, Asian, and Native American.
- Tukwila is similar to SeaTac, with a generally younger population (higher averages for under 18), and with a higher percentage of residents who self-identify as Hispanic, African American, Asian, and Native American.

From the data reviewed, it is not possible to determine if proximity to Seattle-Tacoma International Airport has affected the demographic composition of the study area. The study area is not monolithic and varies from an older and less diverse enclave community (Normandy Park) to younger and more diverse areas (SeaTac and Tukwila). The data was reported on a citywide level for each study area city, so there may be more diversity at the neighborhood and block levels that is not represented by the data.

## C. INCOME

Figure 13.6 presents median household income growth for the study area cities, as compared to King County and the state of Washington.

**Figure 13.6**  
**Median Household Income for Study Area Cities, King County and Washington state: 2009-2019**

xxx lower than King County    
 xxx equal to King County    
 xxx higher than King County

Year	Burien	Des Moines	Federal Way	Normandy Park	SeaTac	Tukwila	King County	Washington State
2009	\$51,846	\$59,319	\$56,980	\$80,511	\$45,595	\$44,262	\$67,246	\$56,384
2010	\$51,995	\$59,577	\$56,509	\$73,333	\$48,341	\$44,271	\$68,065	\$57,244
2011	\$51,858	\$60,762	\$55,846	\$80,333	\$48,319	\$43,887	\$70,567	\$58,890
2012	\$50,595	\$60,989	\$57,583	\$84,792	\$49,414	\$43,333	\$71,175	\$59,374
2013	\$50,805	\$59,799	\$55,872	\$84,679	\$46,328	\$43,331	\$71,811	\$59,478
2014	\$52,140	\$58,308	\$54,186	\$90,446	\$45,573	\$44,820	\$73,035	\$60,294
2015	\$53,712	\$58,057	\$55,673	\$89,736	\$45,985	\$45,923	\$75,302	\$61,062
2016	\$54,546	\$59,948	\$58,855	\$89,425	\$48,487	\$48,490	\$78,800	\$62,848
2017	\$60,732	\$60,814	\$62,086	\$95,313	\$51,025	\$51,318	\$83,571	\$66,174
2018	\$62,792	\$65,768	\$65,507	\$102,532	\$54,009	\$54,011	\$87,956	\$67,512
2019	\$64,851	\$70,722	\$68,927	\$109,751	\$56,992	\$56,703	\$92,340	\$68,876

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, ESRI, and Ricker Cunningham

Income represents the preceding year, expressed in current dollars. Household income includes wage and salary earnings, interest dividends, net rents, pensions, SSI and welfare payments, child support, and alimony.

All of the study area cities exhibited median household income growth similar to, or higher than, the state as a whole, but only Normandy Park (3.15%) had a similar growth rate as King County. Among study area cities, only Normandy Park (\$109,751) had a higher current median household income than King County (\$92,340). Tukwila (\$56,703) and SeaTac (\$56,992) have the lowest median household incomes among study area cities.

Figure 13.7 highlights the share of households that are receiving income assistance within the study area cities, as measured by public assistance, food stamps or supplemental nutrition assistance, and households with incomes below the poverty level.

**Figure 13.7**  
**Study Area Cities Households Receiving Income Assistance: 2013-2017**

Indicator	Burien	Des Moines	Federal Way	Normandy Park	SeaTac	Tukwila
% of Households with Public Assistance	13.1%	10.0%	11.4%	2.5%	3.8%	18.3%
% of Households with Food Stamps/SNAP*	3.5%	3.2%	5.4%	0.0%	19.2%	4.5%
% of Households with Income Below Poverty Level	16.8%	14.5%	19.2%	2.2%	13.3%	25.8%

\* Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, ESRI, and Ricker Cunningham

Among the study area cities, Tukwila (18.3%) had the highest share of households with public assistance, followed by Burien (13.1%) and Federal Way (11.4%). SeaTac (19.2%) had the highest share of households with food stamps or Supplemental Nutrition Assistance (SNAP), followed by Federal Way (5.4%) and Tukwila (4.5%). Lastly, Tukwila (25.8%) and Federal Way (19.2%) have the highest share of households with incomes below the poverty level. These indicators seem to somewhat reflect household incomes shown in Figure 13.6.

## Summary – Income

In 2019, the average household income in King County was \$92,340. The wealthiest community in the study area relative to the King County average was Normandy Park (\$109,751). Tukwila reported the lowest household income (\$56,703) – almost half of the Normandy Park amount. The remainder of the study area was between 23% and 38% lower than the county average. Tukwila also had the highest percentage of households receiving public assistance, with Normandy Park showing the lowest.

From the data reviewed, it is not possible to determine if proximity to Seattle-Tacoma International Airport has affected the study area’s income profile. The study area is not monolithic and varies from a more affluent and more residential community (Normandy Park) to younger and to areas with lower household incomes, but more no-residential land uses (Tukwila). Additional study would be necessary to determine the contributing factors as evidenced by the data available.

## D. EDUCATION-RELATED CHARACTERISTICS

The 1997 study cited a report prepared for the Highline School District that studied noise effects on classroom performance at Sunset Junior High School, approximately six blocks from the end of one of Seattle-Tacoma International Airport’s runways. The study was conducted in 1973, prior to construction of the third runway, but referenced in the 1997 study to explain similar effects that might result from this expansion of the airport’s facilities. While the noise study generally sought to understand the effect of airport-related noise on the ability of teachers to teach and students to learn, it compared the ability of students in insulated classrooms with those in un-insulated classrooms to concentrate and stay on-task during a math test. Findings from the study showed that students in the sound-proofed rooms performed, on average, 10% to 18% better than the students in the non-sound proofed rooms.

In order to gauge the quality and health of education in the study area cities, the following indicators were analyzed:

- Early childhood enrollment (preschool and kindergarten)
- Educational attainment (bachelor’s degree or higher)
- Student test scores
- Student demographics (race/ethnicity, language spoken at home, socio-economic status)
- Student health (overweight or obese, physical activity, screen time, and mental health).

Figure 13.8 presents the enrollment status of preschool- and kindergarten-age children for the study area cities, as compared to King County. Children enrolled in early education are generally believed to be better prepared for academic achievement in later school years.

**Figure 13.8**  
**Population 3+ Years Enrollment Status in the Study Area Cities and King County: 2013-2017)**

xxx higher than King County    
 xxx equal to King County    
 xxx lower than King County

Indicator	Burien	Des Moines	Federal Way	Normandy Park	SeaTac	Tukwila	King County
% Enrolled in Preschool	1.4%	1.2%	0.9%	1.8%	1.3%	1.1%	1.7%
% Enrolled in Kindergarten	1.7%	1.6%	1.4%	0.3%	1.1%	1.5%	1.3%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, ESRI, and Ricker Cunningham

Burien (3.1%) was the only study area city whose share of preschool- and kindergarten-age children enrolled in school compares favorably to that of King County. Normandy Park (2.1%) has the lowest enrollment share but has a significantly lower school age population than other study area cities.

Figure 13.9 presents educational attainment figures for the study area cities, as compared to King County and the state of Washington.

**Figure 13.9**  
**Percent of Population Holding a Bachelor’s Degree or Higher – Study Area Cities, King County**  
**and Washington State: 2009-2019**

xxx lower than King County    
 xxx equal to King County    
 xxx higher than King County

Year	Burien	Des Moines	Federal Way	Normandy Park	SeaTac	Tukwila	King County	Washington State
2009	25.6%	23.0%	25.6%	46.8%	13.8%	17.6%	44.8%	30.8%
2010	25.3%	21.5%	25.3%	44.4%	15.3%	18.3%	45.2%	31.0%
2011	26.5%	21.4%	26.5%	46.9%	14.6%	18.8%	45.7%	31.4%
2012	24.0%	20.8%	24.0%	48.1%	16.4%	20.1%	46.0%	31.6%
2013	24.0%	22.8%	24.0%	52.1%	18.2%	21.2%	46.6%	31.9%
2014	23.1%	23.0%	23.1%	53.7%	18.8%	21.7%	47.1%	32.3%
2015	23.7%	23.5%	23.7%	53.6%	18.7%	21.4%	47.9%	32.9%
2016	24.9%	24.3%	24.9%	52.9%	19.9%	21.5%	49.1%	33.6%
2017	26.2%	25.1%	26.2%	54.6%	20.8%	21.9%	50.3%	34.5%
2018	27.3%	26.5%	27.0%	55.4%	21.7%	22.9%	51.1%	35.0%
2019	28.3%	27.9%	27.8%	56.2%	22.5%	23.9%	51.8%	35.5%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, ESRI, and Ricker Cunningham.

With the exception of Normandy Park (56.2%), all of the study area cities exhibited lower shares of the population with a bachelor’s degree than both King County (51.8%) and the state (35.5%). While SeaTac (22.5%) and Tukwila (23.9%) have the lowest shares of the population with a bachelor’s degree, they have exhibited the fastest growth in this population over the past 10 years.

There are 19 school districts in King County, 15 of which are either within the study area cities or north of the Seattle-Tacoma International Airport. Figure 13.10 presents school district performance within the study area cities, as compared to statewide figures. Performance in this context is measured by the percent of students meeting state standards in arts and math over the past five years.

Of the school districts that are within or proximate to the study area cities, Auburn, Federal Way, Highline, Kent, Renton and Tukwila have performed at lower levels than statewide levels as a whole over the past five years. Districts located to the north of the study area cities (Seattle, Shoreline, Northshore, and Bellevue) have performed at higher levels than statewide levels as a whole, over that same time period. Vashon Island School District, located in the Puget Sound west of the study area cities, also performed at higher levels than the statewide levels.

Figure 13.11 presents student demographic characteristics for the school districts noted in Figure 13.10. Indicators evaluated include race/ethnicity, language spoken at home, and socio-economic status.

**Figure 13.10**  
**Students Meeting State Standards – Study Area, Various School Districts and State Average: 2014-2019**

xxx higher than State ave.    xxx equal to State ave.    xxx lower than State ave.

School District	2014-2015		2015-2016		2016-2017		2017-2018		2018-2019	
	Arts	Math								
Auburn	51.0%	48.7%	59.2%	48.2%	56.6%	49.5%	55.9%	49.1%	55.4%	45.7%
Bellevue	67.0%	65.3%	79.9%	65.8%	78.5%	64.2%	78.2%	73.6%	77.8%	71.7%
Federal Way	41.5%	33.7%	50.6%	34.5%	45.7%	33.8%	46.0%	34.5%	45.8%	33.4%
Highline	38.7%	36.9%	47.6%	37.4%	47.0%	36.8%	48.8%	38.6%	47.5%	34.6%
Issaquah	68.4%	65.9%	80.9%	67.5%	79.5%	67.4%	80.0%	75.6%	80.1%	76.0%
Lake Washington	72.8%	67.3%	83.2%	68.7%	82.0%	72.5%	83.0%	77.4%	83.2%	77.5%
Kent	46.9%	43.7%	58.8%	48.7%	57.7%	48.3%	57.5%	47.8%	56.2%	46.1%
Mercer Island	70.5%	69.1%	84.4%	74.8%	85.7%	72.2%	84.7%	80.9%	85.3%	81.3%
Renton	48.0%	44.6%	57.2%	45.3%	55.6%	45.7%	55.0%	47.3%	53.9%	46.0%
Seattle	55.6%	52.3%	67.0%	57.7%	67.0%	57.4%	69.0%	62.5%	69.8%	61.6%
Shoreline	68.6%	62.3%	77.6%	63.0%	76.9%	60.2%	76.2%	66.4%	74.8%	64.4%
Tahoma	65.0%	59.8%	74.3%	63.4%	73.7%	67.6%	75.4%	66.7%	74.6%	66.5%
Tukwila	39.9%	35.5%	46.9%	37.2%	44.1%	37.6%	41.5%	34.7%	39.0%	30.1%
Vashon Island	61.5%	53.6%	69.5%	57.9%	70.1%	56.0%	72.3%	59.6%	67.6%	55.7%
Washington State	50.6%	44.3%	59.8%	47.2%	58.7%	47.4%	59.4%	49.5%	59.6%	48.9%

Source: Washington Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, and Ricker Cunningham

**Figure 13.11**  
**Student Demographics – Study Area School Districts, King County and Washington State: 2012**

xxx lower than King County    xxx equal to King County    xxx higher than King County

School District	Race/Ethnicity					Language & Socio-Economic Status (SES)		
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Other	Non-English Speaking at Home	Lower SES	Moderate-Higher SES
Auburn	39.4%	6.2%	17.2%	8.0%	29.2%	28.4%	48.1%	51.9%
Federal Way	30.4%	11.1%	23.0%	14.4%	21.1%	32.2%	32.2%	67.8%
Highline	24.4%	9.5%	26.3%	16.5%	23.3%	41.2%	54.3%	45.7%
Kent	36.9%	10.2%	13.0%	16.1%	23.8%	29.3%	37.9%	62.1%
Tukwila	9.5%	15.4%	20.4%	32.1%	22.6%	60.5%	62.0%	38.0%
Renton	24.6%	13.9%	15.3%	24.7%	21.5%	35.7%	41.1%	58.9%
Seattle	39.0%	13.3%	8.4%	20.4%	18.9%	28.4%	28.4%	71.6%
King County	45.6%	7.4%	10.5%	17.1%	19.4%	25.1%	29.3%	70.7%
Washington State	52.6%	4.0%	15.0%	7.7%	20.7%	19.3%	36.5%	63.5%

Source: Assessment, Public Health – Seattle & King County, and Ricker Cunningham

All of the school districts within or proximate to the study area cities have a higher degree of ethnicity among students than either King County or the state of Washington. Tukwila, Highline and Renton school districts have the highest degree of ethnicity. These three cities also have the highest percentage of students living in non-English speaking households. Tukwila, Highline and Auburn school districts have the highest share of students who are considered to be of a lower socio-economic status.

Figures 13.12 and 13.13 present student health indicators such as obesity, physical activity and screen time, for study area school districts, as compared to King County and the state of Washington.

**Figure 13.12**  
**Student Obesity and Physical Activity – Study Area School Districts, King County and Washington State: 2012**

xxx lower than King County    
 xxx equal to King County    
 xxx higher than King County

School District	Obesity (top 5% BMI)	Overweight or Obese (top 15% of BMI)	Physical Activity ≥ 60 minutes/day	Screen Time > 3 hours/day
Auburn	9%	29%	21%	58%
Federal Way	13%	28%	22%	58%
Highline	13%	29%	23%	57%
Kent	10%	24%	24%	56%
Tukwila	13%	26%	26%	52%
Renton	12%	26%	22%	50%
Seattle	7%	19%	23%	50%
King County	8%	20%	23%	49%
Washington State	10%	24%	26%	50%

Source: Assessment, Public Health – Seattle & King County, and Ricker Cunningham

**Figure 13.13**  
**Student Health by Socio-Economic Status – Study Area School Districts: 2012**

School District	Lower Socio-Economic Status				Moderate-to-High Socio-Economic Status			
	Obesity (top 5% BMI)	Overweight or Obese (top 15% of BMI)	Physical Activity ≥ 60 minutes/day	Screen Time > 3 hours/day	Obesity (top 5% BMI)	Overweight or Obese (top 15% of BMI)	Physical Activity ≥ 60 minutes/day	Screen Time > 3 hours/day
Auburn	13%	29%	21%	58%	11%	25%	24%	46%
Federal Way	16%	33%	20%	59%	11%	24%	30%	56%
Highline	15%	31%	17%	57%	12%	29%	20%	53%
Kent	12%	28%	18%	59%	9%	21%	19%	53%
Tukwila	9%	24%	21%	56%	12%	35%	22%	63%
Renton	11%	25%	19%	59%	13%	28%	20%	58%
Seattle	11%	23%	15%	59%	5%	17%	22%	44%

Source: Assessment, Public Health – Seattle & King County, and Ricker Cunningham.

All of the school districts within or proximate to the study area cities, with the exception of Seattle and Kent, show higher shares of the student population considered obese or overweight than either King County or the state of Washington. Auburn (29%), Highline (29%) and Federal Way (28%) represent the school districts with the highest shares of obese or overweight students.

All of the school districts within or proximate to the study area cities, with the exception of Tukwila and Kent, show lower shares of the student population who perform an average of 60 minutes or more of physical activity on a daily basis, as compared to either King County or the state of Washington. Auburn (21%), Federal Way (22%) and Renton (22%) represent the school districts with the lowest shares of physically active students.

All of the school districts within or proximate to the study area cities, with the exception of Seattle, show higher shares of the student population who spend more than three hours a day of screen time, as compared to either King County or the state of Washington. Auburn (58%), Federal Way (58%) and Renton (58%) represent the school districts with the highest shares of students exhibiting excessive screen time.

When considering socio-economic status, all of the school districts show more favorable indicators for students considered to be of a moderate/high socio-economic status.

Figure 13.14 presents student mental health indicators, as measured by the following: considered suicide in last 12 months; planned suicide in last 12 months; or felt hopeless for more than two weeks in the last 12 months. These indicators are presented for study area school districts, as compared to King County and the state of Washington.

All of the school districts within or proximate to the study area cities show higher shares of the student population who have considered suicide in the last 12 months than either King County or the state of Washington. Auburn (21%) and Renton (20%) represent the school districts with the highest shares of students who have considered suicide.

Conversely, all of the school districts within or proximate to the study area cities show lower shares of the student population who have planned suicide in the last 12 months than either King County or the state of Washington. Auburn (17%) and Federal Way (17%) represent the school districts with the highest shares of students who have planned suicide.

Lastly, all of the school districts within or proximate to the study area cities show lower shares of the student population who have felt hopeless for more than two weeks in the past 12 months than either King County or the state of Washington. Federal Way (34%) and Highline (33%) represent the school districts with the highest shares of students who have felt hopeless for more than two weeks in the past 12 months.

**Figure 13.14**  
**Mental Health of Students Grade 6 Through 12 – Study Area School Districts,**  
**King County and Washington State: 2012**

xxx lower than King County    
 xxx equal to King County    
 xxx higher than King County

School District	Considered Suicide in the Last 12 Months	Planned Suicide in the Last 12 Months	Felt Hopeless for more than 2 weeks in the Last 12 Months
Auburn	21%	17%	32%
Federal Way	18%	17%	34%
Highline	19%	16%	33%
Kent	18%	16%	29%
Tukwila	19%	15%	32%
Renton	20%	16%	31%
Seattle	14%	13%	25%
King County	8%	20%	49%
Washington State	10%	24%	50%

Source: Assessment, Policy Public Health – Seattle & King County, and Ricker Cunningham

**Summary – Education**

Results were not consistent across the study area. Generally, Normandy Park fared better than other study area cities:

- Most study area cities (except for Normandy Park) had fewer percentages of children in pre-school, but higher percentages (or close to county average) in kindergarten.
- Regarding education levels of the study area (those with an undergraduate/bachelor’s degree), Normandy Park showed a percentage slightly above the King County average, while the percentages for the remaining study area cities were close to half the county average.
- For student performance, results were generally mixed with respect to state standards. Students in the Federal Way, Tukwila, and the Highline School Districts generally underperformed in arts and mathematics from 2014 to 2019. Those same students also self-identified as minority students, many of whom came from non-English speaking homes that were considered lower income.

- Student health in the Federal Way, Tukwila, and the Highline School Districts was generally poorer, with higher percentage of students listed as overweight or obese, spending longer periods of time each day with a digital device and fewer hours of physical activity. These differences also tended to fall along income lines, with lower income students having poorer health habits.
- Student mental health, however, mixed, with all districts reporting higher than average percentages of students who “considered” suicide in the past 12 months and between a quarter and a third of all students feeling hopeless for more than two weeks over the past 12 months.

From the data reviewed, it is not possible to determine if proximity to Seattle-Tacoma International Airport has negatively affected or contributed to concerns with education. Numerous other externalities may be contributing factors, including household income, a higher reliance on digital devices, a rise in bullying (both in person and online), and other elements.

## E. HOUSING PROFILE

Figure 13.15 presents household growth trends in the study area cities over the past 21 years, as compared to King County. (Shaded rows for 1997, 2009, and 2018 represent the three milestone years for the 2020 study.)

Household population includes persons not residing in group quarters. Average household size is the household population divided by total households. Persons in families include the householder and persons related to the householder by birth, marriage, or adoption. Per capita income represents the income received by all persons aged 15 years and over divided by the total population.

Households with children include any households with people under age 18, related or not. Multigenerational households are families with three or more parent child relationships. Unmarried partner households are usually classified as nonfamily households unless there is another member of the household related to the householder. Multigenerational and unmarried partner households are reported only to the tract level. ESRI estimated block group data, which is used to estimate polygons or non-standard geography.

As shown, household growth during the last several years of the analysis period (2009-2018) outpaced growth from 1997 to 2008 in every study area city but Federal Way. With the exception of Burien, none of the study area cities grew as fast as King County overall during the past 21 years. In addition, Burien is the only study area city that grew at an average annual rate of greater than 1.0% since 2008.

Figure 13.16 presents household composition indicators for the study area cities, as compared to King County and the state of Washington. Generally, a higher share of nonfamily and one- and two-person households is more indicative of a more transient community, characterized by a significant renter population.

As shown, none of the study area cities shows a higher share of nonfamily households than King County. Tukwila (39.2%), SeaTac (37.7%) and Des Moines (36.5%) are the only study area cities that show a higher share of nonfamily households than the state as a whole. With the exception of Normandy Park (66.6%), which has a population that skews significantly older, none of the study area cities has a higher share of one- and two-person households than either King County or the state of Washington.

Effects considered to adversely influence student performance and outcomes were attributed to a variety of socio-economic conditions, including: the educational attainment levels of parents in the study area; single versus two-parent households; female labor force participation; child poverty; and low household income. As explained previously, while the 2020 study agrees these factors can have a correlative effect on student outcomes, the 1997 study attributed the disproportionately high level of these characteristics to the significant number of rental properties in the subject cities at that time.

For reasons explained in the introduction to this section, the 2020 study proposes that it would be erroneous to continue to use housing tenure alone as a predictor of student outcomes. Rather, the 2020 study assumes household income, and to a certain extent, concentrations of select ethnic groups, to be a more accurate predictor of this and other circumstances.

**Figure 13.15**  
**Households in the Study Area Cities and King County: 1997-2018**

Year	Burien	Des Moines	Federal Way	Normandy Park	SeaTac	Tukwila	King County
1997	12,350	11,017	30,458	2,608	9,698	7,089	679,940
1998	12,343	11,015	30,936	2,609	9,698	7,122	690,768
1999	13,285	11,300	31,145	2,609	9,699	7,144	701,042
2000	13,399	11,377	31,437	2,609	9,708	7,186	710,918
2001	13,377	11,469	31,658	2,606	9,652	7,161	718,278
2002	13,379	11,482	31,640	2,602	9,543	7,147	727,049
2003	13,238	11,398	31,439	2,565	9,470	7,062	731,203
2004	13,080	11,419	31,421	2,619	9,429	7,022	735,653
2005	13,021	11,327	32,278	2,603	9,431	6,938	740,491
2006	13,029	11,379	32,476	2,611	9,438	7,227	752,639
2007	13,173	11,470	32,751	2,611	9,477	7,214	763,363
2008	13,213	11,539	32,976	2,598	9,588	7,198	772,474
2009	13,327	11,617	33,106	2,608	9,476	7,169	779,873
2010	13,253	11,664	33,188	2,620	9,533	7,157	789,232
2011	14,148	11,470	34,328	2,756	9,912	7,310	790,070
2012	16,477	11,314	33,866	2,672	9,794	7,300	796,555
2013	17,488	11,437	33,760	2,638	10,060	7,279	802,606
2014	18,266	11,347	34,064	2,595	9,945	7,280	808,729
2015	18,273	11,490	34,117	2,633	9,831	7,308	819,651
2016	18,609	11,702	34,447	2,688	9,922	7,193	831,995
2017	18,606	11,704	34,755	2,807	9,857	7,123	851,077
2018	19,057	12,274	35,005	2,791	9,990	7,353	897,303

Source: U.S. Census Bureau; American Community Survey; ESRI; and Ricker Cunningham

**Figure 13.16**  
**Household Composition – Study Area Cities, King County and Washington state: 2013-2017**

xxx higher than King County    
 xxx equal to King County    
 xxx lower than King County

City	% of Family Households	% of Non-Family Households	% of 1 and 2 Person Households
City of Burien	65.1%	34.9%	58.3%
City of Des Moines	63.5%	36.5%	62.0%
City of Federal Way	68.2%	31.8%	58.7%
City of Normandy Park	68.1%	31.9%	66.6%
City of SeaTac	62.3%	37.7%	56.6%
City of Tukwila	60.8%	39.2%	53.7%
King County	60.2%	39.8%	63.7%
Washington State	64.7%	35.3%	62.5%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau; American Community Survey; ESRI; and Ricker Cunningham

Figure 13.17 presents the average age of the housing inventory in each of the study area cities, as compared to King County and the state of Washington.

**Figure 13.17**  
**Housing Inventory Age – Study Area Cities, King County and Washington state: 2019**

xxx lower than King County    xxx equal to King County    xxx higher than King County

City	% of Units Built Before 1970	Median Year Built (all units)	Median Year Householder Moved In
City of Burien	62%	1964	2009
City of Des Moines	44%	1973	2009
City of Federal Way	22%	1982	2009
City of Normandy Park	54%	1967	2003
City of SeaTac	56%	1968	2011
City of Tukwila	48%	1971	2011
King County	39%	1975	2010
Washington State	49%	1970	2007

Source: U.S. Census Bureau; American Community Survey; ESRI; and Ricker Cunningham

With the exception of Federal Way (22%), all of the study area cities have higher shares of housing inventory built before 1970 than King County. When compared to the state as a whole, Burien (62%), SeaTac (56%) and Normandy Park (54%) have higher shares of housing inventory built before 1970.

Again, with the exception of Federal Way (1982), all of the study area cities have older housing stocks than King County. When compared to the state as a whole, Burien (1964), Normandy Park (1967) and SeaTac (1968) have older housing stocks.

Lastly, with the exception of Normandy Park, the most established of the study area cities, all have similar measures of the median year that the current householder moved in, when compared to both King County and the state.

Figure 13.18 presents housing tenure indicators for each of the study area cities, as compared to King County and the state of Washington.

As shown, only Normandy Park (72.0%) and Des Moines (57.9%) have higher shares of owner-occupied households than King County (57.4%). Normandy Park is the only study area city with a higher share of owner-occupied households than the state as a whole.

**Figure 13.18**  
**Housing Occupancy – Study Area Cities, King County and Washington state: 2019**

xxx higher than King County    xxx equal to King County    xxx lower than King County

City	% of Owner-Occupied Households	% of Renter-Occupied Households
City of Burien	53.5%	46.5%
City of Des Moines	57.9%	42.1%
City of Federal Way	57.1%	42.9%
City of Normandy Park	72.0%	28.0%
City of SeaTac	48.5%	51.5%
City of Tukwila	38.3%	61.7%
King County	57.4%	42.6%
Washington State	62.7%	37.3%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau; American Community Survey; ESRI; and Ricker Cunningham

Figure 13.19 presents housing cost burden by type of household for each of the study area cities, as compared to King County and the state of Washington. The indicator used is the percentage of households spending 30% or more of their income for housing.

**Figure 13.19**  
**Housing Cost Burden – Percentage of Households Spending 30% or More of**  
**Income on Housing – Study Area Cities, King County and Washington State: 2017**

xxx lower than King County    
 xxx equal to King County    
 xxx higher than King County

City	% of Owner-Occupied Households	% of Renter-Occupied Households	% of All Occupied Households
City of Burien	30.3%	51.8%	40.3%
City of Des Moines	25.5%	47.9%	35.0%
City of Federal Way	28.1%	51.9%	38.3%
City of Normandy Park	22.2%	44.6%	28.4%
City of SeaTac	29.3%	57.8%	43.9%
City of Tukwila	26.0%	58.4%	46.0%
King County	25.9%	44.3%	33.8%
Washington State	25.1%	46.2%	32.9%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau; American Community Survey; ESRI; and Ricker Cunningham

With the exceptions of Normandy Park (22.2%) and Des Moines (25.5%), all of the study area cities have higher shares of owner-occupied households spending 30% or more of their income for housing, when compared to King County and the state as a whole. This trend is duplicated among renter-occupied households. Cities with the highest housing cost burden are Tukwila (46.0%), SeaTac (43.9%) and Burien (40.3%).

Figure 13.20 presents growth in residential building permits for the study area cities over the past 10 years.

Federal Way (185), Burien (106) and Des Moines (75) have shown the highest growth in residential building permits over the past 10 years. Des Moines (120) and Tukwila (105) had the highest number of permits in 2018.

**Figure 13.20**  
**Housing Development Activity – Study Area Cities Residential Building Permits: 2009-2018**

xxx above average annual    
 xxx average annual    
 xxx below average annual

Year	Burien	Des Moines	Federal Way	Normandy Park	SeaTac	Tukwila
2009	17	14	36	5	49	5
2010	18	5	50	0	125	1
2011	54	5	57	3	0	6
2012	46	15	78	1	7	11
2015	418	147	773	7	19	32
2014	42	38	557	6	2	16
2013	51	23	111	11	22	18
2016	243	21	56	2	52	30
2017	128	366	62	15	9	14
2018	41	120	65	0	35	105
<b>Average Annual (2009-2018)</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>185</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>24</b>

Source: Puget Sound Regional Council and Ricker Cunningham

Figure 13.21 presents median home sale prices for the study area cities over the last 10 years, as compared to the Seattle Metro Area as a whole.

**Figure 13.21**  
**Median Existing Home Sale Price – Study Area Cities and Seattle Metro Area: 2009-2018**

xxx higher than Metro ave.    xxx equal to Metro ave.    xxx lower than Metro ave.

Year	Burien	Des Moines	Federal Way	Normandy Park	SeaTac	Tukwila	Seattle Metro
2009	---	---	\$227,200	---	---	---	\$296,500
2010	---	---	\$241,200	---	---	---	\$288,900
2011	---	---	\$162,000	---	\$193,200	---	\$245,600
2012	\$225,400	---	\$197,700	---	\$165,700	---	\$292,900
2013	\$241,900	\$211,400	\$224,100	---	\$212,300	\$166,300	\$308,300
2014	\$264,100	\$255,600	\$240,900	\$337,000	\$216,300	\$188,300	\$320,800
2015	\$316,700	\$281,900	\$278,200	\$420,700	\$259,500	\$242,300	\$346,200
2016	\$346,800	\$324,800	\$304,200	\$470,100	\$300,100	\$298,800	\$375,900
2017	\$417,700	\$388,200	\$341,200	\$570,300	\$361,200	\$354,400	\$423,900
2018	\$407,300	\$385,900	\$360,100	\$539,100	\$371,000	\$332,800	\$439,600

Source: Zillow, Inc. and Ricker Cunningham

With the exception of Normandy Park, all study area cities have lower median home sale prices than Seattle Metro Area as a whole. In terms of annual sale price growth, all cities but Federal Way outpaced the overall Metro Area. Tukwila (14.9%), Des Moines (12.8%), and Normandy Park (12.5%) had the highest annual growth rates among study area cities. Federal Way maintains the newest inventory of residential units as measured by median age of total inventory yet commands the second lowest sale prices among the study area cities.

Figures 13.22, 13.23 and 13.24 summarize multi-family market conditions for the study area cities, as compared to King County. Indicators include: rental rates per square foot; vacancy rates; and absorption, which is the amount of available space that is newly occupied as a percentage of total inventory.

**Figure 13.22**  
**Multi-Family Rental Rates Per Square Foot – Study Area Cities and King County: 2000-2019**

xxx higher than King County    xxx equal to King County    xxx lower than King County

Year	Burien	Des Moines	Federal Way	Normandy Park	SeaTac	Tukwila	King County
2000	\$0.93	\$0.84	\$0.88	\$0.97	\$0.84	\$0.87	\$1.08
2001	\$0.97	\$0.88	\$0.90	\$1.02	\$0.88	\$0.92	\$1.10
2002	\$0.95	\$0.86	\$0.91	\$1.00	\$0.85	\$0.89	\$1.08
2003	\$0.94	\$0.86	\$0.87	\$0.98	\$0.84	\$0.88	\$1.06
2004	\$0.96	\$0.87	\$0.86	\$0.99	\$0.84	\$0.89	\$1.06
2005	\$0.99	\$0.88	\$0.87	\$1.03	\$0.87	\$0.92	\$1.09
2006	\$1.04	\$0.94	\$0.92	\$1.09	\$0.93	\$0.99	\$1.17
2007	\$1.11	\$1.01	\$0.99	\$1.16	\$1.00	\$1.07	\$1.28
2008	\$1.15	\$1.02	\$1.02	\$1.19	\$1.12	\$1.08	\$1.32
2009	\$1.09	\$0.97	\$0.96	\$1.10	\$1.04	\$1.03	\$1.21
2010	\$1.13	\$1.02	\$0.98	\$1.14	\$1.07	\$1.05	\$1.24
2011	\$1.15	\$1.05	\$0.99	\$1.15	\$1.08	\$1.07	\$1.29
2012	\$1.19	\$1.09	\$1.03	\$1.18	\$1.12	\$1.10	\$1.37
2013	\$1.25	\$1.13	\$1.07	\$1.21	\$1.17	\$1.16	\$1.47
2014	\$1.30	\$1.20	\$1.14	\$1.29	\$1.23	\$1.21	\$1.56
2015	\$1.43	\$1.36	\$1.25	\$1.41	\$1.36	\$1.32	\$1.72
2016	\$1.57	\$1.46	\$1.33	\$1.44	\$1.45	\$1.43	\$1.83
2017	\$1.67	\$1.50	\$1.40	\$1.49	\$1.48	\$1.49	\$1.90
2018	\$1.73	\$1.53	\$1.47	\$1.52	\$1.55	\$1.69	\$1.97
2019	\$1.75	\$1.60	\$1.54	\$1.62	\$1.59	\$1.72	\$2.06

Source: CoStar, Inc. and Ricker Cunningham

**Figure 13.23**  
**Multi-Family Vacancy Rate – Study Area Cities and King County: 2000-2019**

xxx lower than King County    xxx equal to King County    xxx higher than King County

Year	Burien	Des Moines	Federal Way	Normandy Park	SeaTac	Tukwila	King County
2000	4.6%	4.9%	3.9%	5.0%	3.6%	3.4%	5.4%
2001	7.0%	7.7%	6.1%	6.8%	5.9%	6.6%	7.7%
2002	7.8%	8.7%	7.6%	8.2%	7.2%	7.4%	8.2%
2003	7.6%	8.3%	7.7%	8.4%	6.6%	7.0%	7.9%
2004	7.3%	7.9%	7.5%	8.4%	6.2%	6.5%	7.6%
2005	6.5%	6.5%	6.8%	7.1%	5.2%	6.1%	6.3%
2006	4.8%	4.9%	5.2%	6.2%	3.3%	4.4%	5.5%
2007	4.6%	4.5%	5.1%	6.0%	3.5%	4.4%	5.4%
2008	5.8%	6.2%	7.5%	6.9%	5.0%	5.7%	6.5%
2009	6.8%	7.0%	7.7%	7.8%	6.2%	6.7%	7.4%
2010	6.1%	6.2%	6.2%	7.3%	7.7%	5.5%	6.6%
2011	6.1%	6.5%	6.4%	7.4%	6.2%	5.7%	6.7%
2012	5.1%	6.0%	5.1%	8.2%	5.1%	5.2%	6.3%
2013	4.5%	5.7%	4.7%	7.7%	4.2%	4.2%	5.7%
2014	4.2%	4.9%	4.1%	6.8%	3.5%	3.7%	5.8%
2015	4.1%	5.3%	4.7%	4.5%	3.6%	3.2%	5.6%
2016	4.1%	4.1%	4.5%	5.1%	4.5%	3.4%	5.4%
2017	4.5%	4.0%	4.4%	4.7%	3.9%	3.5%	5.8%
2018	5.0%	3.4%	4.3%	4.1%	3.8%	3.9%	5.5%
2019	5.2%	6.1%	4.2%	4.1%	4.1%	3.6%	4.9%

Source: CoStar, Inc. and Ricker Cunningham

**Figure 13.24**  
**Multi-Family Absorption Rate (Percentage of Inventory) – Study Area Cities and King County: 2000-2019**

xxx higher than King County    xxx equal to King County    xxx lower than King County

Year	Burien	Des Moines	Federal Way	Normandy Park	SeaTac	Tukwila	King County
2000	0.1%	0.0%	-0.4%	2.7%	-0.2%	0.1%	2.0%
2001	-2.0%	-2.9%	-2.1%	-2.7%	-2.4%	-3.2%	-0.2%
2002	-0.8%	-1.0%	-1.1%	-1.4%	-1.3%	-0.8%	0.5%
2003	0.3%	0.4%	2.3%	0.0%	0.5%	0.4%	1.2%
2004	0.4%	0.3%	0.3%	0.0%	3.1%	0.6%	1.1%
2005	3.3%	1.4%	0.7%	1.4%	1.0%	0.5%	2.2%
2006	1.7%	1.6%	1.5%	0.0%	2.0%	1.7%	2.3%
2007	0.4%	0.4%	0.2%	0.0%	1.5%	0.0%	0.9%
2008	-1.2%	-1.7%	-1.5%	-0.7%	-1.5%	-1.4%	0.4%
2009	-1.0%	-0.8%	0.2%	-0.7%	-2.3%	-1.0%	0.7%
2010	-5.2%	0.8%	1.5%	0.0%	7.1%	1.2%	1.8%
2011	-0.1%	-0.3%	-0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	-0.2%	0.7%
2012	1.1%	0.2%	1.3%	0.0%	1.2%	0.6%	1.8%
2013	0.6%	0.3%	0.3%	0.0%	0.9%	-1.4%	2.2%
2014	1.5%	0.8%	0.6%	0.7%	0.7%	0.5%	3.1%
2015	3.2%	-0.5%	3.1%	2.7%	-0.1%	0.6%	3.3%
2016	0.0%	1.1%	0.3%	-1.4%	-0.9%	-0.3%	2.7%
2017	5.1%	0.0%	2.0%	0.0%	0.5%	-0.1%	2.4%
2018	-0.5%	4.7%	0.2%	0.0%	0.1%	11.6%	3.4%
2019	-0.2%	4.7%	0.1%	0.0%	-0.3%	0.3%	2.7%

Source: CoStar, Inc. and Ricker Cunningham

As shown, average monthly rents in the study area cities range from \$1.54 to \$1.75 per square foot, all of which are lower than King County's (\$2.06). Burien (\$1.75) and Tukwila (\$1.72) are at the top of the market, with Federal Way (\$1.54) and Des Moines (\$1.60) at the lower end of the market. In terms of annual rental rate growth, only Tukwila (3.7%) rents grew at a rate higher than King County's (3.5%).

Also reflected, overall vacancy rates in the study area cities range from 3.6% to 6.1%. Only two cities, Des Moines (6.1%) and Burien (5.2%), have higher vacancy rates than King County's (4.9%). Tukwila (3.6%), SeaTac (4.1%) and Normandy Park (4.1%) have the lowest vacancy rates. Normandy Park and King County are the only markets that have shown a decrease in vacancy rate over the past 19 years.

With respect to absorption of multi-family units, only Des Moines is currently outperforming King County. Over the past two decades, King County has outperformed all of the study area cities, with Tukwila and SeaTac exhibiting the highest absorption rates among those cities.

### **Summary – Housing**

The study area is uniformly composed of more family households (consistently over 60.8%), which is higher than the average for King County. It also tends to have an older housing stock than the county with the exception of Federal Way. Burien and Federal Way have generated 60% of the reported the residential building permits, on average, for the previous 10 years. Normandy Park has reported the fewest building permits (on average).

The study area city homes were generally more owner-occupied in Des Moines, Federal Way, and Normandy Park, and renter occupied in Burien, SeaTac, and Tukwila. The relative cost of housing in the study area (as a percentage of household income) tracks closely with King County for owners but is more expensive for renters.

Housing values are a relative bargain compared to the King County average, generally 8% to 25% lower than the county average. But given the Seattle metropolitan area's relative housing costs, these figures may be artificially influenced by the market. Normandy Park, on the other hand, was 122% more expensive than the county average.

Rental rates for study area multi-family units were generally below county averages, vacancy rates were lower, indicating more stable multi-family market.

From the data reviewed, it is not possible to determine if proximity to Seattle-Tacoma International Airport has affected the study area's housing market. Normandy Park seems to be the most stable and affluent of the study area cities. Given the currently active and expensive housing market in the Seattle metropolitan area, it may also be a contributing factor to housing and rental rates. Additional study would be necessary to determine if airport proximity is artificially depressing home values.

## **F. ECONOMIC AND LAND USE DEVELOPMENT**

According to the Urban Land Institute, in the past, it was assumed that the competitive advantage of airport cities as office locations was air connectivity and proximity to the airport terminal. But while air service was widely acknowledged as a locational advantage for more than 70% of the interviewed companies, most did not see direct proximity to an airport as a decisive location criterion.

Rather, air connectivity in general was desired, but companies consider a travel time up to 30 minutes to the airport to be more than adequate. In addition, hub airports were seen as slightly more advantageous than regional or smaller airports. Air connectivity, however, was just one important siting consideration. As important as connections by air were regional connection accessibility by all modes of transport.

After connectivity, non-aviation related companies stressed the importance of business agglomeration, either in terms of proximity to a specialized business cluster or to a more generalized commercial environment. Proximity to a specialized industry cluster delivers networking advantages and a more efficient supply chain, and amenities are more likely to fit their needs in areas with a concentration of like-minded businesses.

Among manufacturing businesses, financial incentives, including those often offered through economic zones are an advantage, both administratively and from a regulatory standpoint. Foreign companies in particular gravitate to zones where 100% foreign-ownership is permitted.

Finally, and for many a factor more important than convenient air access, was access to an urban center. Companies want to be in areas with amenities such as dining, recreational centers, medical facilities, and retail for day-to-day needs (ATMs, supermarkets, convenience stores and dry cleaners). Companies participating in the research indicated they would not move to an airport city location that was far away from a city center or that did not offer certain amenities. In fact, they would rather locate in the central business district than in an isolated business park near the airport.

### **Summary – Economic and land use development**

Proximity to Seattle-Tacoma International Airport does not seem to be either an advantage or a hindrance for development in the study area. Other factors included regional access by a variety of modes, proximity to an urban center (large or small), proximity to other corporations, and financial incentives offered to attract (or retain) companies.

The study area cities seem to understand the importance of developing a “center.” For example:

- Burien has developed a walkable mixed-use district surrounding its city hall/library complex.
- Des Moines has preserved its downtown area close to Puget Sound.
- Federal Way has an active shopping district in the vicinity of South 320th Street and U.S. Highway 99.
- Normandy Park developed a small mixed-use development (Normandy Park Towne Center, at First Avenue South and Southwest 200th Street).
- Tukwila has the region’s largest shopping destination (Southcenter Mall).
- While the city of SeaTac is the “front door” to Seattle-Tacoma International Airport, it has not diversified its development along U.S. Highway 99. The area is predominantly hotels, off-airport parking lots, and a few fast-food restaurants.

It is not possible to determine from the data reviewed if proximity to Seattle-Tacoma International Airport has been advantageous or a challenge for the study area cities. There is currently a significant expansion of Alaska Airlines corporate headquarters in Des Moines, while the city of Burien would like to attract a hotel that leverages its proximity to Seattle-Tacoma International Airport. Additional study would be necessary to determine if airport proximity has had any effect on economic development and land use decisions.

## **G. NON-RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT**

The 1997 study stated that:

“Many of the adverse impacts of the third runway and related airport facilities have to do with the direct, indirect or induced relative declines in property values that occur when airport operations increase. One strategy for mitigating these property value impacts is to direct to the maximum extent, feasible airport economic functions into the five impacted cities.”

For example, if Seattle-Tacoma International Airport’s proposed new hotel were located in Burien or Des Moines instead of on airport lands there would be a positive (mitigating) result. Equally, if the airport were to construct a haul road for all air cargo movements that exited on the west side of the airport, it is highly likely that new warehousing and distribution facilities would spring up, and the increased value of resulting economic activity would mitigate the third runway’s otherwise adverse effects.

In order to understand the health of the real estate market within the study area cities, particularly in terms of how they may or may not be positioning themselves to be a supportive business environment for the airport, several indicators were analyzed and are presented here. Figure 13.25 presents a 10-year history of total assessed value per capita for the study area cities, as compared to King County.

**Figure 13.25**  
**Total Assessed Property Value Per Capita – Study Area Cities and King County: 2008-2018**

xxx higher than King County    
 xxx equal to King County    
 xxx lower than King County

Year	Burien	Des Moines	Federal Way	Normandy Park	SeaTac	Tukwila	King County
2008	\$117,062	\$99,722	\$101,757	\$203,063	\$172,825	\$236,539	\$180,314
2009	\$129,174	\$110,355	\$111,029	\$230,287	\$184,256	\$273,953	\$202,644
2010	\$110,036	\$92,973	\$96,556	\$183,031	\$168,322	\$260,766	\$177,073
2011	\$97,080	\$90,865	\$92,518	\$190,143	\$156,636	\$246,738	\$173,139
2012	\$88,527	\$82,823	\$86,329	\$174,659	\$166,283	\$237,619	\$164,588
2013	\$83,392	\$77,067	\$79,615	\$167,216	\$144,453	\$235,223	\$159,400
2014	\$85,195	\$74,913	\$81,930	\$161,081	\$146,170	\$238,762	\$169,559
2015	\$94,985	\$89,578	\$92,284	\$186,126	\$152,430	\$261,869	\$189,719
2016	\$103,200	\$94,851	\$95,071	\$204,646	\$177,467	\$276,117	\$205,013
2017	\$111,746	\$104,623	\$98,498	\$215,299	\$188,271	\$293,166	\$222,583
2018	\$123,020	\$118,135	\$106,151	\$232,088	\$210,860	\$304,767	\$239,419

Source: King County Assessor and Ricker Cunningham

Higher per capita assessed values in Tukwila is likely the result of higher concentrations of retail and industrial property, rather than value of residences. Tukwila and Federal Way reported the highest number of employees at 33,688 and 33,822, respectively. Normandy Park’s per capita values are affected by its small population, yet it still reported the highest median home sale price in 2018 (\$539,100). When crime statistics among the cities are compared with per capita assessed values, it appears that Tukwila real estate is maintaining its value, despite this adverse condition. Most of the cities report a per capita assessed value that is lower than King County as a whole.

### Retail Market

Figures 13.26, 13.27 and 13.28 summarize retail market conditions for the study area cities as compared to King County. Indicators used to measure current and past market conditions include rental rates per square foot; vacancy rates; and absorption, which is the amount of available space that is newly occupied as a percentage of total inventory.

As shown, average monthly rents in the study area cities range from \$17.20 to \$25.98 per square foot. Normandy Park (\$25.98) and Tukwila (\$23.95) are the only study area cities that have rates higher than King County’s (\$20.63). Normandy Park (\$25.98) and Tukwila (\$23.95) are at the top of the market, with Burien (\$17.20) and SeaTac (\$18.04) at the lower end of the market. In terms of annual rental rate growth, Burien, Des Moines and Normandy Park rents grew at a rate higher than King County’s.

**Figure 13.26**  
**Retail Rental Rate Per Square Foot – Study Area Cities and King County: 2006-2019**

xxx higher than King County    
 xxx equal to King County    
 xxx lower than King County

Year	Burien	Des Moines	Federal Way	Normandy Park	SeaTac	Tukwila	King County
2006	\$14.90	\$16.20	\$21.03	\$20.00	\$19.24	\$35.79	\$21.39
2007	\$12.95	\$21.07	\$24.51	\$29.35	\$18.16	\$31.53	\$22.11
2008	\$13.85	\$19.64	\$17.34	\$27.53	\$25.04	\$31.47	\$21.38
2009	\$15.04	\$16.02	\$15.32	\$24.20	\$20.60	\$21.77	\$18.66
2010	\$14.40	\$17.66	\$16.12	\$21.80	\$20.57	\$19.71	\$17.61
2011	\$15.96	\$19.53	\$15.38	\$19.06	\$20.00	\$19.15	\$17.70
2012	\$16.62	\$16.92	\$15.90	\$19.08	\$17.19	\$19.10	\$17.45
2013	\$15.71	\$16.61	\$15.93	\$20.18	\$17.83	\$18.66	\$17.30
2014	\$15.29	\$18.57	\$16.57	\$24.69	\$14.93	\$19.56	\$17.60
2015	\$15.22	\$15.96	\$17.99	\$24.43	\$21.04	\$20.07	\$17.55
2016	\$17.84	\$20.42	\$20.08	\$22.18	\$19.79	\$23.07	\$18.60
2017	\$15.93	\$18.64	\$21.14	\$20.17	\$22.75	\$21.00	\$19.22
2018	\$15.97	\$15.21	\$22.00	\$24.03	\$22.14	\$23.80	\$20.11
2019	\$17.20	\$19.57	\$19.02	\$25.98	\$18.04	\$23.95	\$20.63

Source: CoStar Inc. and Ricker Cunningham

**Figure 13.27**  
**Retail Vacancy Rate – Study Area Cities and King County: 2006-2019**

xxx lower than King County    
 xxx equal to King County    
 xxx higher than King County

Year	Burien	Des Moines	Federal Way	Normandy Park	SeaTac	Tukwila	King County
2006	3.5%	7.0%	6.8%	3.1%	5.6%	4.2%	4.6%
2007	3.3%	3.4%	8.6%	33.9%	9.6%	5.5%	4.3%
2008	6.5%	3.5%	9.8%	36.4%	7.9%	5.5%	5.0%
2009	6.8%	6.3%	11.4%	39.6%	3.5%	6.7%	6.6%
2010	6.5%	7.8%	13.7%	36.6%	3.9%	5.5%	6.8%
2011	8.6%	8.7%	13.6%	33.7%	15.4%	4.3%	6.6%
2012	6.1%	3.9%	9.4%	26.2%	9.4%	4.3%	5.7%
2013	4.9%	4.6%	7.7%	20.3%	6.3%	5.7%	5.8%
2014	5.2%	3.2%	5.0%	6.3%	1.8%	4.0%	4.6%
2015	5.7%	3.0%	4.8%	3.6%	2.9%	3.3%	4.0%
2016	6.0%	4.4%	6.1%	4.5%	2.2%	2.8%	3.5%
2017	5.6%	1.5%	5.1%	0.0%	1.1%	1.3%	3.4%
2018	3.1%	3.8%	2.9%	8.4%	2.1%	2.5%	3.1%
2019	2.5%	1.1%	3.1%	5.3%	3.1%	2.5%	2.9%

Source: CoStar Inc. and Ricker Cunningham

In addition, overall vacancy rates in the study area cities range from 1.1% to 5.3%. Three cities – Normandy Park (5.3%), SeaTac (3.1%) and Federal Way (3.1%) – have higher vacancy rates than King County (2.9%). Des Moines (1.1%), Tukwila (2.5%) and Burien (2.5%) have the lowest vacancy rates. Normandy Park is the only market that has shown an increase in vacancy rate over the past 19 years.

With respect to absorption of retail space, Des Moines, Federal Way and Normandy Park are currently outperforming King County. Over the past two decades, four cities (Normandy Park, SeaTac, Federal Way and Burien) have outperformed King County, with Normandy Park and SeaTac exhibiting the highest absorption rates among those cities.

**Figure 13.28**

**Retail Absorption Percentage of Inventory – Study Area Cities and King County: 2006-2019**

xxx higher than King County    
 xxx equal to King County    
 xxx lower than King County

Year	Burien	Des Moines	Federal Way	Normandy Park	SeaTac	Tukwila	King County
2006	5.7%	6.7%	7.3%	1.6%	3.4%	2.2%	4.0%
2007	2.6%	3.3%	9.3%	17.3%	1.1%	5.7%	5.2%
2008	3.2%	0.8%	2.7%	10.3%	16.2%	8.7%	5.0%
2009	5.9%	2.9%	3.2%	11.2%	15.5%	1.7%	4.3%
2010	3.8%	1.1%	1.9%	4.1%	2.1%	5.0%	3.2%
2011	5.5%	4.3%	4.9%	6.9%	3.0%	3.0%	3.8%
2012	5.6%	12.8%	4.3%	8.8%	8.0%	3.9%	3.7%
2013	3.5%	0.5%	2.4%	5.9%	3.3%	1.2%	2.9%
2014	3.3%	1.4%	4.9%	30.0%	4.8%	3.4%	3.3%
2015	1.5%	4.3%	2.1%	4.2%	0.3%	1.1%	3.2%
2016	3.0%	1.4%	2.1%	1.9%	1.7%	1.7%	3.1%
2017	2.3%	4.4%	4.1%	6.2%	1.3%	2.7%	3.0%
2018	4.4%	0.2%	3.7%	0.0%	0.2%	0.5%	2.7%
2019	1.8%	2.6%	2.6%	4.5%	1.3%	1.6%	1.8%

Source: CoStar Inc. and Ricker Cunningham

**Office market**

Figures 13.29, 13.30 and 13.31 summarize office market conditions for the study area cities, as compared to King County. Indicators used to measure current and past market conditions include rental rates per square foot; vacancy rates; and absorption, which is the amount of available space that is newly occupied as a percentage of total inventory.

As shown, average monthly rents in the study area cities range from \$20 to \$25.94 per square foot. None of the study area cities has rates higher than King County (\$34.53). SeaTac (\$25.94) and Burien (\$24.66) are at the top of the market, with Des Moines (\$21.45) and Normandy Park (\$20) at the lower end of the market. In terms of annual rental rate growth, only SeaTac rents grew at a rate higher than King County.

Overall vacancy rates in the study area cities range from 0% to 19.6%. Four cities – Federal Way (19.6%), Tukwila (11.4%), Burien (7.4%) and SeaTac (6.5%) – have higher vacancy rates than King County (2.9%). Normandy Park (0%) and Des Moines (5.1%) have the lowest vacancy rates. Normandy Park is the only market that has shown an increase in vacancy rate over the past 19 years.

With respect to absorption of office space, Des Moines is the only city currently outperforming King County. Over the past two decades, only Des Moines has outperformed King County.

**Figure 13.29**  
**Office Rental Rates Per Square Foot – Study Area Cities and King County: 2000-2019**

xxx higher than King County    xxx equal to King County    xxx lower than King County

Year	Burien	Des Moines	Federal Way	Normandy Park	SeaTac	Tukwila	King County
2000	\$0.93	\$0.84	\$0.88	\$0.97	\$0.84	\$0.87	\$1.08
2001	\$0.97	\$0.88	\$0.90	\$1.02	\$0.88	\$0.92	\$1.10
2002	\$0.95	\$0.86	\$0.91	\$1.00	\$0.85	\$0.89	\$1.08
2003	\$0.94	\$0.86	\$0.87	\$0.98	\$0.84	\$0.88	\$1.06
2004	\$0.96	\$0.87	\$0.86	\$0.99	\$0.84	\$0.89	\$1.06
2005	\$0.99	\$0.88	\$0.87	\$1.03	\$0.87	\$0.92	\$1.09
2006	\$1.04	\$0.94	\$0.92	\$1.09	\$0.93	\$0.99	\$1.17
2007	\$1.11	\$1.01	\$0.99	\$1.16	\$1.00	\$1.07	\$1.28
2008	\$1.15	\$1.02	\$1.02	\$1.19	\$1.12	\$1.08	\$1.32
2009	\$1.09	\$0.97	\$0.96	\$1.10	\$1.04	\$1.03	\$1.21
2010	\$1.13	\$1.02	\$0.98	\$1.14	\$1.07	\$1.05	\$1.24
2011	\$1.15	\$1.05	\$0.99	\$1.15	\$1.08	\$1.07	\$1.29
2012	\$1.19	\$1.09	\$1.03	\$1.18	\$1.12	\$1.10	\$1.37
2013	\$1.25	\$1.13	\$1.07	\$1.21	\$1.17	\$1.16	\$1.47
2014	\$1.30	\$1.20	\$1.14	\$1.29	\$1.23	\$1.21	\$1.56
2015	\$1.43	\$1.36	\$1.25	\$1.41	\$1.36	\$1.32	\$1.72
2016	\$1.57	\$1.46	\$1.33	\$1.44	\$1.45	\$1.43	\$1.83
2017	\$1.67	\$1.50	\$1.40	\$1.49	\$1.48	\$1.49	\$1.90
2018	\$1.73	\$1.53	\$1.47	\$1.52	\$1.55	\$1.69	\$1.97
2019	\$1.75	\$1.60	\$1.54	\$1.62	\$1.59	\$1.72	\$2.06

Source: CoStar Inc. and Ricker Cunningham

**Figure 13.30**  
**Office Vacancy Rates – Study Area Cities and King County: 2000-2019**

xxx lower than King County    xxx equal to King County    xxx higher than King County

Year	Burien	Des Moines	Federal Way	Normandy Park	SeaTac	Tukwila	King County
2000	4.6%	4.9%	3.9%	5.0%	3.6%	3.4%	5.4%
2001	7.0%	7.7%	6.1%	6.8%	5.9%	6.6%	7.7%
2002	7.8%	8.7%	7.6%	8.2%	7.2%	7.4%	8.2%
2003	7.6%	8.3%	7.7%	8.4%	6.6%	7.0%	7.9%
2004	7.3%	7.9%	7.5%	8.4%	6.2%	6.5%	7.6%
2005	6.5%	6.5%	6.8%	7.1%	5.2%	6.1%	6.3%
2006	4.8%	4.9%	5.2%	6.2%	3.3%	4.4%	5.5%
2007	4.6%	4.5%	5.1%	6.0%	3.5%	4.4%	5.4%
2008	5.8%	6.2%	7.5%	6.9%	5.0%	5.7%	6.5%
2009	6.8%	7.0%	7.7%	7.8%	6.2%	6.7%	7.4%
2010	6.1%	6.2%	6.2%	7.3%	7.7%	5.5%	6.6%
2011	6.1%	6.5%	6.4%	7.4%	6.2%	5.7%	6.7%
2012	5.1%	6.0%	5.1%	8.2%	5.1%	5.2%	6.3%
2013	4.5%	5.7%	4.7%	7.7%	4.2%	4.2%	5.7%
2014	4.2%	4.9%	4.1%	6.8%	3.5%	3.7%	5.8%
2015	4.1%	5.3%	4.7%	4.5%	3.6%	3.2%	5.6%
2016	4.1%	4.1%	4.5%	5.1%	4.5%	3.4%	5.4%
2017	4.5%	4.0%	4.4%	4.7%	3.9%	3.5%	5.8%
2018	5.0%	3.4%	4.3%	4.1%	3.8%	3.9%	5.5%
2019	5.2%	6.1%	4.2%	4.1%	4.1%	3.6%	4.9%

Source: CoStar Inc. and Ricker Cunningham

**Figure 13.31**

**Office Absorption Percentage of Inventory – Study Area Cities and King County: 2000-2019**

xxx higher than King County    xxx equal to King County    xxx lower than King County

Year	Burien	Des Moines	Federal Way	Normandy Park	SeaTac	Tukwila	King County
2000	0.1%	0.0%	-0.4%	2.7%	-0.2%	0.1%	2.0%
2001	-2.0%	-2.9%	-2.1%	-2.7%	-2.4%	-3.2%	-0.2%
2002	-0.8%	-1.0%	-1.1%	-1.4%	-1.3%	-0.8%	0.5%
2003	0.3%	0.4%	2.3%	0.0%	0.5%	0.4%	1.2%
2004	0.4%	0.3%	0.3%	0.0%	3.1%	0.6%	1.1%
2005	3.3%	1.4%	0.7%	1.4%	1.0%	0.5%	2.2%
2006	1.7%	1.6%	1.5%	0.0%	2.0%	1.7%	2.3%
2007	0.4%	0.4%	0.2%	0.0%	1.5%	0.0%	0.9%
2008	-1.2%	-1.7%	-1.5%	-0.7%	-1.5%	-1.4%	0.4%
2009	-1.0%	-0.8%	0.2%	-0.7%	-2.3%	-1.0%	0.7%
2010	-5.2%	0.8%	1.5%	0.0%	7.1%	1.2%	1.8%
2011	-0.1%	-0.3%	-0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	-0.2%	0.7%
2012	1.1%	0.2%	1.3%	0.0%	1.2%	0.6%	1.8%
2013	0.6%	0.3%	0.3%	0.0%	0.9%	-1.4%	2.2%
2014	1.5%	0.8%	0.6%	0.7%	0.7%	0.5%	3.1%
2015	3.2%	-0.5%	3.1%	2.7%	-0.1%	0.6%	3.3%
2016	0.0%	1.1%	0.3%	-1.4%	-0.9%	-0.3%	2.7%
2017	5.1%	0.0%	2.0%	0.0%	0.5%	-0.1%	2.4%
2018	-0.5%	4.7%	0.2%	0.0%	0.1%	11.6%	3.4%
2019	-0.2%	4.7%	0.1%	0.0%	-0.3%	0.3%	2.7%

Source: CoStar Inc. and Ricker Cunningham

**Industrial Market**

Figures 13.32, 13.33 and 13.34 summarize industrial market conditions for the study area cities, as compared to King County. Indicators used to measure current and past market conditions include: rental rates per square foot; vacancy rates; and absorption, which is the amount of available space that is newly occupied as a percentage of total inventory.

As shown, average monthly rents in the study area cities range from \$9.11 to \$19.27 per square foot. Three of the study area cities – Federal Way (\$19.27), Des Moines (\$11.40) and Tukwila (\$10.48) have rates higher than King County’s (\$10.20). Federal Way (\$19.27) and Des Moines (\$11.40) are at the top of the market, with SeaTac (\$9.11) and Burien (\$10.20) at the lower end of the market. In terms of annual rental rate growth, only Federal Way rents grew at a rate higher than King County’s.

Vacancy rates in the study area cities range from 0% to 23.5%. Three cities – Des Moines (23.5%), Burien (20.6%) and Tukwila (5.4%) have higher vacancy rates than King County’s (5.0%). SeaTac (1.8%) has the lowest vacancy rate. Federal Way and SeaTac are the only markets which have shown a decrease in vacancy rate over the past 19 years.

With respect to absorption of industrial space, Federal Way is the only city currently outperforming King County. Over the past 2 decades, only Federal Way has outperformed King County.

**Figure 13.32**  
**Industrial Rental Rate Per Square Foot – Study Area Cities and King County: 2000-2019**

xxx higher than King County    xxx equal to King County    xxx lower than King County

Year	Burien	Des Moines	Federal Way	Normandy Park	SeaTac	Tukwila	King County
2000	\$11.00	---	\$5.38	---	\$7.72	\$6.33	\$5.33
2001	\$11.00	---	\$5.95	---	\$6.72	\$6.81	\$5.24
2002	\$11.40	---	\$5.32	---	\$7.19	\$5.42	\$5.09
2003	\$11.40	---	\$5.08	---	\$6.93	\$5.50	\$5.33
2004	\$11.40	---	\$5.66	---	\$8.04	\$5.37	\$5.63
2005	\$11.40	---	\$8.06	---	\$8.14	\$5.33	\$5.64
2006	\$12.00	---	\$10.65	---	\$8.59	\$5.65	\$5.74
2007	\$9.00	---	\$6.15	---	\$8.77	\$6.22	\$6.09
2008	\$10.33	---	\$6.30	---	\$9.52	\$6.16	\$6.39
2009	\$10.71	---	\$6.12	---	\$7.18	\$5.72	\$6.00
2010	\$7.80	---	\$8.05	---	\$5.12	\$5.06	\$5.70
2011	\$6.00	---	\$8.07	---	\$6.09	\$5.69	\$5.81
2012	\$6.72	---	\$6.02	---	\$5.25	\$6.15	\$5.99
2013	\$6.00	\$6.84	\$5.78	---	\$6.86	\$5.87	\$6.12
2014	\$6.00	\$6.00	\$5.70	---	\$7.68	\$6.17	\$6.26
2015	\$6.00	\$7.44	\$4.82	---	\$7.19	\$6.31	\$6.44
2016	\$12.00	\$6.96	\$4.89	---	\$9.23	\$6.78	\$7.08
2017	\$12.00	---	\$8.69	---	\$7.47	\$7.87	\$8.55
2018	\$12.00	---	\$11.20	---	\$8.34	\$9.43	\$9.16
2019	\$10.20	\$11.40	\$19.27	---	\$9.11	\$10.48	\$10.20

Source: CoStar Inc. and Ricker Cunningham

**Figure 13.33**  
**Industrial Vacancy Rates – Study Area Cities and King County: 2000-2019**

xxx lower than King County    xxx equal to King County    xxx higher than King County

Year	Burien	Des Moines	Federal Way	Normandy Park	SeaTac	Tukwila	King County
2000	3.3%	0.0%	8.9%	0.0%	5.4%	5.2%	5.5%
2001	3.3%	0.0%	14.5%	0.0%	5.3%	6.9%	6.8%
2002	28.2%	0.0%	10.1%	0.0%	5.9%	7.0%	8.9%
2003	28.2%	0.0%	9.9%	0.0%	5.3%	8.7%	8.5%
2004	13.9%	0.0%	6.9%	0.0%	6.9%	3.4%	6.7%
2005	7.5%	0.0%	5.1%	0.0%	7.4%	6.8%	6.1%
2006	4.3%	0.0%	2.7%	0.0%	6.8%	3.9%	5.9%
2007	10.4%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	4.0%	4.3%	5.5%
2008	18.3%	0.0%	2.3%	0.0%	13.0%	2.6%	5.8%
2009	11.9%	0.0%	2.3%	0.0%	13.7%	6.3%	8.0%
2010	8.6%	0.0%	3.7%	0.0%	7.8%	6.1%	8.1%
2011	10.5%	0.0%	11.0%	0.0%	7.5%	5.5%	7.1%
2012	5.0%	0.0%	10.2%	0.0%	7.2%	3.6%	5.7%
2013	7.6%	0.0%	10.2%	0.0%	5.9%	4.8%	5.1%
2014	5.0%	0.0%	11.6%	0.0%	4.4%	3.5%	4.3%
2015	4.5%	82.6%	6.0%	0.0%	5.2%	2.9%	4.0%
2016	4.5%	0.0%	3.6%	0.0%	3.2%	2.4%	3.2%
2017	0.3%	0.0%	4.0%	0.0%	1.7%	3.4%	2.5%
2018	58.5%	0.0%	7.6%	0.0%	2.5%	2.6%	3.4%
2019	20.6%	23.5%	5.0%	0.0%	1.8%	5.4%	5.0%

Source: CoStar Inc. and Ricker Cunningham

**Figure 13.34**  
**Industrial Absorption Percentage of Inventory – Study Area Cities and King County: 2000-2019**

xxx higher than King County    xxx equal to King County    xxx lower than King County

Year	Burien	Des Moines	Federal Way	Normandy Park	SeaTac	Tukwila	King County
2000	0.0%	0.0%	1.7%	0.0%	6.6%	6.9%	5.2%
2001	0.0%	0.0%	14.1%	0.0%	6.2%	6.1%	6.9%
2002	0.0%	51.4%	7.7%	0.0%	3.9%	4.7%	5.5%
2003	0.0%	0.0%	4.3%	0.0%	5.7%	5.6%	6.4%
2004	0.0%	9.8%	9.5%	0.0%	5.3%	8.3%	6.8%
2005	0.0%	0.0%	3.6%	0.0%	6.2%	2.4%	7.0%
2006	0.0%	0.0%	4.8%	0.0%	8.4%	7.8%	8.0%
2007	0.0%	0.0%	4.8%	0.0%	6.1%	5.2%	7.3%
2008	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	2.5%	4.1%	6.1%
2009	0.0%	0.0%	1.8%	0.0%	7.2%	2.0%	4.0%
2010	0.0%	0.0%	3.5%	0.0%	10.2%	5.0%	4.4%
2011	0.0%	0.0%	6.1%	0.0%	3.2%	5.0%	5.4%
2012	0.0%	1.5%	3.6%	0.0%	3.4%	5.2%	5.9%
2013	0.0%	6.2%	4.2%	0.0%	4.4%	3.0%	4.6%
2014	0.0%	7.0%	5.4%	0.0%	4.4%	6.3%	4.7%
2015	0.0%	5.2%	11.5%	0.0%	5.8%	5.0%	5.0%
2016	0.0%	89.5%	8.1%	0.0%	6.3%	3.0%	5.1%
2017	0.0%	48.6%	9.1%	0.0%	4.1%	3.5%	4.7%
2018	0.0%	27.3%	5.1%	0.0%	3.5%	6.5%	4.3%
2019	0.0%	0.0%	6.8%	0.0%	2.5%	6.5%	4.1%

Source: CoStar Inc. and Ricker Cunningham

### Hotel Market%

Figure 13.35 summarize hotel market conditions for the study area cities, as compared to King County. Indicators used to measure current and past market conditions include: occupancy rate; average room rate; and revenue per available room.

**Figure 13.35**  
**Hotel Occupancy Rates, Average Room Rates, and Revenue per Available Room (PAR) – Seattle Metro Subareas: 2017 and 2018**

xxx lower than King County    xxx equal to King County    xxx higher than King County

Submarket	Occupancy Rate		Average Room Rate		Revenue Per Available Room (PAR)	
	2017	2018	2017	2018	2017	2018
Arlington/Marysville	66.8%	65.2%	\$130	\$131	\$87	\$85
Bellevue CBD	72.3%	70.9%	\$201	\$202	\$145	\$143
East King County	72.2%	73.2%	\$242	\$238	\$174	\$174
Federal Way	71.8%	71.3%	\$129	\$134	\$93	\$96
Kent	76.5%	74.4%	\$109	\$113	\$83	\$84
SeaTac Midscale	78.7%	80.3%	\$125	\$127	\$98	\$102
SeaTac Upscale	83.5%	82.0%	\$136	\$139	\$114	\$114
Seattle CBD Midscale	85.6%	85.8%	\$222	\$227	\$190	\$195
Seattle CBD Upscale	83.3%	84.3%	\$265	\$270	\$221	\$228
South Lake Union	85.6%	83.4%	\$206	\$209	\$176	\$174
King County	77.6%	77.1%	\$176	\$179	\$137	\$138

Source: Kidder Mathews and Ricker Cunningham

The submarkets within or proximate to the study area cities include the following (remaining submarkets are included for comparative purposes only):

- Bellevue CBD.
- East King County.
- Federal Way.
- Kent.
- SeaTac Midscale.
- SeaTac Upscale.

As shown, annual hotel occupancy rates in or near the study area cities range from 70.9% to 82.0%. Only the SeaTac submarkets have higher occupancy rates than King County’s (77.1%). SeaTac Upgrade (82.0%) and SeaTac Midgrade (80.3%) have the highest occupancy rates. The SeaTac submarkets and East King County are the only markets which have shown increases in occupancy rates over the past 2 years.

Average room rates in or near the study area cities range from \$113 to \$238. Two submarkets - East King County (\$238) and Bellevue CBD (\$202) - have average room rates higher than King County’s (\$179). These submarkets are at the top of the market, with Kent (\$113) and SeaTac Midscale (\$127) at the lower end of the market. East King County is the only submarket which did not show a room rate increase over the past 2 years.

Hotel revenues per available room in or near the study area cities range from \$84 to \$174. Two submarkets - East King County (\$174) and Bellevue CBD (\$143) - have hotel revenues per available room higher than King County’s (\$138). These submarkets are at the top of the market, with Kent (\$84) and Federal Way (\$96) at the lower end of the market. Bellevue CBD is the only submarket which showed a decrease in revenues per available room over the past 2 years.

### Household Travel Expenditures

Figure 13.36 presents household travel expenditures among residents in the study area cities. Indicators analyzed include: average expenditures per household; percentage of total expenditures; and a spending potential index (SPI – a household-based metric which represents the amount spent for a product or service relative to a national average of 100).

**Figure 13.36**  
**Household Travel Expenditures – Study Area Cities: 2019**

City	Average per Household	Percentage of Total Expenditures	Spending Potential Index (SPI)
City of Burien	\$2,349	3.1%	105
City of Des Moines	\$2,427	3.0%	108
City of Federal Way	\$2,322	3.0%	103
City of Normandy Park	\$4,033	3.3%	180
City of SeaTac	\$1,879	3.0%	84
City of Tukwila	\$1,902	2.9%	85

Source: ESRI, Inc. and Ricker Cunningham

As shown, average household travel expenditures for the study area cities range from \$1,879 (SeaTac) to \$4,033 (Normandy Park). SeaTac and Tukwila are at the lower end of the range, while Burien, Des Moines and Federal Way are in the middle. Similar relationships exist for the percent of total expenditures and spending potential index indicators.

These figures tie closely to average household incomes within each of the study area cities. Whereas travel is considered a discretionary expense, given the comparatively lower median household incomes in the study area cities, spending indices are close to or less than the national index.

### **Summary – Non-Residential Development**

The Study Area is not monolithic when it comes to non-residential development:

- **Property Values per Capita**  
These tend to be below County averages except for Tukwila (which has a significant amount of retail and commercial development) and Normandy Park (which has the wealthiest residential neighborhoods of the Study Area).
- **Retail**  
Rental rates trended close to and slightly lower than County average in Burien, Des Moines Federal Way, and SeaTac. Retail vacancy rates are close to or above average generally in Burien, Federal Way, Normandy Park, and SeaTac.
- **Office**  
Office rates are uniformly below County averages in the entire Study Area, although vacancy rates are fairly low in all areas except for Normandy Park. (This may be due to the relatively low number of office space in Normandy Park, which may be artificially skewing the percentage.)
- **Industrial**  
Industrial rates are close to or below County averages in the entire Study Area, while vacancy rates are above County averages in Burien, Federal Way and SeaTac. (Normandy Park is not ranked because there are no reported industrial land uses.
- **Hotel**  
Room rates and revenues are generally lower than County averages.
- **Household Travel Expenditures**  
SeaTac and Tukwila reported lower than average Spending Potential Indices (SPI), with higher rates elsewhere in the Study Area – the highest being in Normandy Park.

It is not possible to determine from the data reviewed if proximity to Seattle-Tacoma International Airport has affected non-residential development in the Study Area. Non-residential development has generally followed the pattern of land use development as included in the various comprehensive plans in the Study Area. Although some cities have expressed a desire for some land uses not currently present (a hotel in Burien, and more dining and retail choices in SeaTac). Additional study is required to determine if the non-residential growth patterns have been influenced by proximity to Seattle-Tacoma International Airport.

## **H. EMPLOYMENT**

Figures 13.37 and 13.38 present employment characteristics for each of the study area cities, as compared to King County and the State of Washington. Employment by industry and daytime population are the indicators used to examine each city's job market.

As shown, most of the study area cities have the highest concentration of employees in the educational and health services industries. SeaTac and Tukwila have the highest concentrations of employees in the trade, transportation and utilities industries, while the majority employed in leisure and hospitality reside in Tukwila and Federal Way, as opposed to other communities located closer to the airport. These employment concentrations

are also reflected in daytime population estimates, as SeaTac and Tukwila have the highest shares of workers versus residents.

**Figure 13.37**  
**Employment by Industry – Study Area Cities, King County and Washington State: 2018**

Industry Category	Burien	Des Moines	Federal Way	Normandy Park	SeaTac	Tukwila	King County	Washington State
Natural Resources, Mining and Construction	926	263	2,295	53	370	1,903	76,205	309,338
Manufacturing	452	83	781	39	192	3,328	102,110	284,094
Trade, Transportation and Utilities	2,682	710	7,058	164	7,267	12,396	268,945	621,690
Information	297	36	688	14	215	937	110,306	133,091
Financial Activities	852	364	3,537	51	950	2,354	69,852	147,948
Professional and Business Services	866	333	2,156	93	686	2,428	229,338	414,866
Educational and Health Services	4,596	2,720	8,493	250	834	2,063	176,367	465,737
Leisure and Hospitality	1,701	1,109	4,852	190	3,126	5,336	142,585	335,734
Other Services	1,443	992	2,768	107	752	1,597	45,152	99,103
Government	417	220	1,138	59	392	701	170,287	561,343
Unclassified	31	30	56	12	36	645	2,270	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>14,263</b>	<b>6,860</b>	<b>33,822</b>	<b>1,032</b>	<b>14,820</b>	<b>33,688</b>	<b>1,393,417</b>	<b>3,372,944</b>

Source: ESRI, Inc.; Washington Employment Security Department; and Ricker Cunningham

**Figure 13.38**  
**Daytime Population – Study Area Cities and King County: 2018**

xxx more than King County   
 xxx equal to King County   
 xxx less than King County

Indicator	Burien	Des Moines	Federal Way	Normandy Park	SeaTac	Tukwila	King County
% Workers	41.1%	34.8%	46.3%	29.5%	56.4%	80.6%	62.9%
% Residents	58.9%	65.2%	53.7%	70.5%	43.6%	19.4%	37.1%

Source: ESRI, Inc. and Ricker Cunningham

Figure 13.39 presents unemployment rates for the study area cities over the last 21 years, as compared to King County as a whole.

As shown, although all of the study area cities have historically maintained higher current unemployment rates than King County’s (3.5%). Over the past two decades, unemployment rates in the study area cities have increased, while King County’s has decreased. All of the study area cities and King County experienced higher unemployment rates through the Great Recession (2008) and the subsequent recovery (2012).

As presented in the Community Comment portion of this Section, several individuals expressed opinions (favorable and negative) regarding the number of Study Area residents that were employed at the airport. The majority seemed to assume actual totals had declined over the past two decades, while some thought the Port was not doing what it could to hire area-residents first.

**Figure 13.39**  
**Unemployment Rate - Study Area Cities and King County: 1997-2018**

xxx lower than King County    xxx equal to King County    xxx higher than King County

Year	Burien	Des Moines	Federal Way	Normandy Park	SeaTac	Tukwila	King County
1997	4.0%	---	3.4%	---	---	--	3.6%
1998	3.6%	3.4%	3.1%	---	---	---	3.3%
1999	3.6%	3.4%	3.1%	---	3.1%	---	3.3%
2000	3.3%	5.1%	4.4%	---	5.5%	---	3.7%
2001	4.3%	6.6%	5.7%	---	7.1%	---	4.8%
2002	5.5%	8.4%	7.3%	---	9.0%	---	6.1%
2003	5.5%	8.3%	7.3%	---	9.0%	---	6.1%
2004	4.5%	6.8%	6.0%	---	7.3%	---	5.0%
2005	5.0%	5.2%	4.8%	---	5.5%	---	4.4%
2006	4.3%	4.4%	4.0%	---	4.5%	---	3.7%
2007	3.5%	3.8%	3.4%	---	3.9%	---	3.2%
2008	4.2%	4.7%	4.3%	---	4.6%	---	3.9%
2009	8.8%	9.6%	8.9%	---	9.8%	---	8.0%
2010	8.2%	10.6%	10.7%	---	11.6%	---	9.0%
2011	7.4%	9.3%	9.3%	---	10.0%	---	7.9%
2012	6.2%	7.8%	7.6%	---	8.3%	---	6.3%
2013	5.1%	6.1%	6.1%	---	6.4%	---	5.1%
2014	4.7%	5.6%	5.5%	---	5.7%	---	4.7%
2015	4.3%	5.1%	5.0%	---	5.4%	---	4.3%
2016	4.5%	4.7%	4.5%	---	5.1%	---	3.9%
2017	4.2%	4.3%	4.3%	---	4.5%	---	3.6%
2018	4.1%	4.1%	4.1%	---	4.3%	---	3.5%

Source: ESRI, Inc. and Ricker Cunningham

**Figure 13.40**  
**Airport Employment and Labor Force by City of Residence: 2017**

City	airport Employment	Percent of Total Employment	Labor Force	Share of Labor Force <sup>1</sup>
City of Burien	540	4.9%	26,040	2.7%
City of Des Moines	740	6.7%	16,670	1.7%
City of Federal Way	1,500	13.6%	49,640	5.1%
City of Normandy Park	100	0.9%	3,710	0.4%
City of SeaTac	1,050	9.5%	14,850	1.5%
City of Tukwila	1,030	9.3%	10,730	1.1%
Total – Study Area	4,960	44.8%	121,640	12.8%
Total – Outside Study Area	6,110	55.2%	845,020	87.2%
<b>airport Employment</b>	<b>11,070</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>966,660</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

<sup>1</sup> Figures calculated in source material

Source: Seattle-Tacoma International Airport Economic Impacts Study, January 2018 and Ricker Cunningham

Information presented in Figure 13.41 reveals the mode of transportation used by employees in each of the study area cities, as well as the distances traveled. As shown, the preferred method for travel to work is either by personal vehicle or a shared carpool within all of the communities, as well as King County and Washington State. Far fewer travel by public transportation, but among those that do, the most are residents of SeaTac. Among those individuals who work at home, the highest rates were reported in Federal Way and Normandy Park. These figures correlate fairly consistently with travel times to work. For example, those communities with a comparatively higher number of individuals who either bike, walk or work at home, also travel the shortest distances.

**Figure 13.41**  
**Workers 16+ Years by Travel to Work – Study Area Cities, King County and Washington State: 2013-2017**

xxx lower than King County    
 xxx equal to King County    
 xxx higher than King County

Indicator	Burien	Des Moines	Federal Way	Normandy Park	SeaTac	Tukwila	King County	Washington State
<b>Means of Transportation</b>								
Drove Alone or Carpooled	81.2%	83.8%	84.2%	88.4%	78.4%	78.5%	77.6%	87.3%
Public Transportation	9.7%	8.5%	7.8%	2.9%	12.8%	12.3%	14.0%	6.7%
Bicycle	1.0%	0.5%	0.2%	0.8%	0.4%	0.5%	1.0%	0.3%
Walked	1.7%	0.8%	1.6%	1.3%	5.0%	4.4%	5.4%	0.5%
Worked at Home	4.5%	5.8%	4.8%	5.0%	2.8%	2.9%	5.2%	4.4%
<b>Travel Time</b>								
Less than 5 minutes	1.3%	1.1%	0.9%	2.2%	0.6%	1.7%	1.2%	2.0%
5 to 9 minutes	6.8%	4.5%	4.4%	8.8%	8.7%	10.4%	6.1%	9.9%
10 to 14 minutes	12.9%	11.0%	9.1%	6.4%	15.1%	13.2%	9.9%	12.9%
15 to 19 minutes	16.0%	17.4%	10.6%	17.3%	13.0%	16.8%	13.4%	15.2%
20 to 24 minutes	13.7%	15.3%	15.5%	17.5%	13.8%	14.0%	15.1%	14.4%
25 to 29 minutes	5.7%	4.9%	6.8%	5.6%	6.0%	5.7%	7.3%	6.5%

Source: American Community Survey and Ricker Cunningham

### Summary – Employment

The Cities of SeaTac and Tukwila have the highest concentrations of employees in the trade, transportation and utilities industries, while the majority employed in leisure and hospitality reside in Tukwila and Federal Way. The City of SeaTac had the third highest number of hospitality workers, an unexpected result given the large number of hotels in SeaTac.

All of the study area cities – except for Tukwila – have a higher than average percentage of daytime residents, indicating these cities “export” their residents to work in other area cities. But the unemployment rates for Burien, Des Moines, Federal Way, and SeaTac were higher than the County average (no unemployment figures were reported for Normandy Park or Tukwila). These numbers were highest between 2008 and 2011, the same period of the Great Recession. Most people in the Study Area drove to work (around 80%) with most commutes taking between 5 and 30 minutes. That would rule out many jobs being located in Downtown Seattle or Bellevue that are filled by Study Area residents.

## I. MUNICIPAL TAX REVENUES

Figures 13.42 and 13.43 summarize taxable sales figures used to calculate municipal sales and use tax revenues.

Considering annual growth in taxable sales used for municipal sales tax purposes, Des Moines, SeaTac and Burien outpaced King County’s annual growth over the past 13 years. Tukwila, despite the presence of Southcenter Mall, along with Federal Way, experienced the lowest annual growth in taxable sales. As for taxable sales used for municipal use tax purposes, all of the study area cities, with the exception of Normandy Park, had higher growth rates than King County, which actually experienced a slight decline in sales.

**Figure 13.42**  
**Total Taxable Sales for Sales Tax – Study Area Cities and Balance of King County: 2005-2018**

Year	Burien	Des Moines	Federal Way	Normandy Park	SeaTac	Tukwila	Rest of King County
2005	\$466,317,848	\$196,847,032	\$1,290,164,509	\$41,835,540	\$938,960,134	\$1,917,878,233	\$1,429,443,619
2006	\$509,825,194	\$214,786,724	\$1,401,412,482	\$33,911,414	\$996,297,232	\$2,045,733,563	\$1,482,847,537
2007	\$577,001,629	\$242,860,668	\$1,474,686,404	\$47,295,313	\$964,539,050	\$2,189,941,072	\$1,619,744,902
2008	\$557,065,786	\$209,624,058	\$1,354,503,450	\$52,292,542	\$932,175,133	\$1,999,860,023	\$1,639,361,663
2009	\$470,116,653	\$189,510,992	\$1,208,587,158	\$55,668,050	\$866,894,747	\$1,637,751,905	\$1,468,084,325
2010	\$460,924,502	\$216,100,241	\$1,195,494,759	\$34,527,622	\$878,958,880	\$1,634,524,060	\$1,439,610,340
2011	\$501,989,452	\$185,172,249	\$1,216,636,090	\$34,095,994	\$901,469,281	\$1,711,714,074	\$1,531,923,952
2012	\$535,798,328	\$176,434,358	\$1,220,710,322	\$38,816,152	\$888,906,520	\$1,685,474,338	\$1,558,852,485
2013	\$594,006,494	\$199,509,462	\$1,299,073,826	\$51,212,171	\$951,192,942	\$1,764,572,994	\$1,663,957,663
2014	\$665,312,052	\$227,729,378	\$1,397,097,268	\$49,260,539	\$1,100,075,514	\$1,856,552,535	\$1,744,836,624
2015	\$690,158,279	\$279,429,639	\$1,527,015,663	\$54,358,277	\$1,186,178,372	\$2,073,592,985	\$1,785,421,582
2016	\$816,803,110	\$328,801,622	\$1,616,664,109	\$60,315,125	\$1,294,303,276	\$2,037,232,519	\$2,010,968,660
2017	\$867,752,925	\$388,224,637	\$1,632,540,331	\$62,967,270	\$1,528,180,600	\$2,051,982,936	\$2,114,953,121
2018	\$875,025,340	\$422,766,036	\$1,671,698,212	\$71,626,821	\$1,818,240,385	\$2,255,439,002	\$2,472,417,146

Source: Washington Department of Revenue and Ricker Cunningham

**Figure 13.43**  
**Total Taxable Sales for Use Tax – Study Area Cities and Balance of King County: 2005-2018**

Year	Burien	Des Moines	Federal Way	Normandy Park	SeaTac <sup>1</sup>	Tukwila	Rest of King County
2005	\$8,819,672	\$2,667,206	\$34,983,697	\$1,279,448	\$145,475,359	\$50,891,997	\$77,220,588
2006	\$8,990,786	\$3,434,989	\$35,851,925	\$1,180,107	\$161,801,239	\$56,759,995	\$73,107,072
2007	\$9,204,914	\$2,760,698	\$37,350,863	\$745,845	\$186,453,671	\$82,475,866	\$92,377,747
2008	\$12,072,895	\$2,807,432	\$30,441,152	\$842,434	\$240,829,712	\$86,162,027	\$79,441,868
2009	\$6,372,073	\$2,604,310	\$22,571,150	\$986,921	\$143,124,192	\$57,172,631	\$48,268,246
2010	\$6,603,638	\$2,781,337	\$26,987,461	\$1,085,039	\$155,787,182	\$63,457,189	\$46,734,204
2011	\$8,344,780	\$3,314,380	\$27,302,847	\$711,775	\$223,216,867	\$68,140,679	\$55,258,767
2012	\$7,672,114	\$2,803,489	\$29,798,847	\$412,747	\$204,944,215	\$83,824,266	\$82,680,090
2013	\$7,279,407	\$3,043,058	\$31,607,334	\$312,980	\$224,959,228	\$81,863,841	\$81,552,759
2014	\$11,987,415	\$2,495,048	\$33,777,127	\$446,441	\$235,868,953	\$72,879,280	\$89,986,985
2015	\$11,817,872	\$2,988,248	\$39,276,919	\$292,145	\$184,000,037	\$101,122,865	\$67,976,973
2016	\$10,367,530	\$4,102,495	\$41,896,313	\$410,354	\$181,759,788	\$90,967,686	\$69,351,053
2017	\$11,378,198	\$5,586,092	\$31,476,577	\$544,584	\$191,868,179	\$62,803,506	\$52,148,744
2018	\$11,507,928	\$3,125,513	\$36,438,900	\$956,742	\$237,977,874	\$74,853,326	\$70,029,432

<sup>1</sup> Total taxable sales for the City of SeaTac are likely understated given revenue-sharing agreements in-place, yet inaccessible as of the date of this report.

Source: Washington Department of Revenue and Ricker Cunningham

### Summary – Municipal Tax Revenues

From 2005 to 2018, the Cities of Burien, Des Moines, and SeaTac outpaced King County’s annual growth for taxable sales. The Cities of Federal Way and Tukwila (the latter, despite the presence of Southcenter Mall) experienced the lowest annual growth in taxable sales. But taxable sales (for municipal use tax purposes) in all study area cities except for Normandy Park had higher growth rates than King County. Normandy Park’s performance is due to the fact that it has a much smaller sales tax base than the other study area cities.

The Study Area has enjoyed a higher growth rate in sales tax revenues than the County's growth rate. But it is unknown how much of this growth is attributable to activity at Seattle-Tacoma International Airport and how much is due to natural growth patterns within the Study Area. Additional research would be required to determine the direct municipal revenue benefits due to airport proximity.

## **J. WHAT WE HEARD FROM THE PUBLIC**

During this study, the consultant team heard comments from the public during community meetings, stakeholder interviews, and monthly Technical Advisory Committee meetings. The following is a summary of this citizen input by topic area.

### ▪ **Relationship with Port Varies by Community**

In terms of Port communications with the study area cities, one community member said they were good at responding to noise complaints, but not as effective outside government channels. A SeaTac respondent described the Port as pro-growth, pro-economic development and pro-community concerns, and another thought the Port's business plan was to improve the economy of the region, including the surrounding communities. People on the other side of this issue thought the airport was not effective at coordinating with the local communities, particularly regarding future plans (i.e., taking down trees, pursuing certain international carriers, etc.). Regardless, a "no surprises clauses" requires airports to regularly communicate with the host city where they are located. Whereas these were individual and subjective comments, they were neither confirmed nor refuted.

An additional community member reported the Port "plans to take out a park to accommodate employee parking." While this contention could be neither confirmed nor denied, Section 4(f) of the U.S. Department of Transportation Act of 1966 requires that projects that receiving funding or approval by any U.S. DOT agency must avoid impacts to Section 4(f) properties.

These properties are reported to include public parks and recreation lands, wildlife and waterfowl refuges, and historic sites. When a project cannot avoid Section 4(f) properties, they are required to provide documentation and seek approval by the federal lead USDOT agency.

### ▪ **Concerns that airport Revenues are not Shared with South King County**

With regard to airport revenues, several comments were received regarding how revenues generated at the airport were distributed. For instance, one commenter noted that "12% of sales and parking tax revenue, as well as hotel room sales collected inside SeaTac went to the County and State rather than staying within the city;" while others thought they were the only community to directly benefit from these resources. Other comments suggested that "a significant share of sales tax revenues generated by the airport goes to the cities of Seattle and Bellevue, while South King County gets far less." And finally, another said SeaTac was unable to generate a reasonable level of taxable sales since "42% of its land mass was owned by the Port for airport operations;" while still others expressed a belief that "the positives outweighed the negatives, and would continue to do so as long as the ILA remained in place (reportedly \$30 million over 10 years, renegotiated after 10 years)." These statements were not confirmed nor disputed in the context of the 2020 Study but should be part of a supplemental investigation.

In terms of factors of other economic effects, some residents of Federal Way didn't believe these extended to their community, but that perhaps they benefit from business promotion and recruitment by the Port. For example, they acknowledged that organizations like World Vision (a non-profit) located there because of access to the airport.

The most favorable comments regarding their partnerships with the Port came from residents of Federal Way, SeaTac, and Normandy Park. A review of community plans for these and the other study area cities supported this trend whereby these largely spoke favorably about the advantages of having the airport “in their backyard,” so to speak, while discussions in the others were largely about how to mitigate adverse circumstances. For example, Burien recently passed a resolution regarding airport growth, noise, and health effects. Regarding growth, one person commented that while Sound Transit intended to extend their services to IH-5 and South 320th by 2024, they were confident that the growth this might bring would be widely supported by local residents. Whereas these were individual and subjective comments, they were neither confirmed nor refuted.

▪ **Most Vulnerable Groups are Being the Most Adversely Affected**

Community members who shared opinions during the study process expressed concern regarding the income levels of residents, disproportionately high poverty levels, rates of illness and life expectancy, and less access to healthcare (the latter two which were addressed in the previous section). Others commented on the increasing number of immigrant families, but primarily in the context of how the Port limits their communications with these groups by not presenting information in more than one language. Finally, a learned resident referenced the potential eligibility of broad sections of the community for environmental justice. (Environmental justice seeks to ensure the fair treatment of all people from different races, ethnicities, and income from the laws, regulations, and policies that affect their environment.)

Based on research regarding this topic, while the State of Washington has considered establishing a statutory definition of environmental justice, those efforts have failed, as recently as 2019. Regardless, based on criteria established by other states, and review of demographic characteristics presented here, it appears several of the study area cities could in-fact potentially qualify. Regardless of a lack of legislation, the Port and member communities could still elect to employ similar practices in a pursuit of equitability.

▪ **Positive and Negative Effects Vary Among the study area cities**

Based on comments received, there seems to be a fairly unified consensus that among the study area cities, the benefits and liabilities associated with proximity to the airport are experienced differently. Opinions seemed to differ, however, with regard to their origin and the Port’s role in either mitigating or amplifying them. For instance, some Tukwila residents thought they were at a competitive disadvantage for new investment because of what they described as a higher percentage of multi-family residential units (60% multi-family, 40% single family), and that the Port had done little to assist through economic development promotion. Conversely, others thought that Port grants had led to “spin-off economic development opportunities.” Whereas these were individual and subjective comments, they were neither confirmed nor refuted.

▪ **Housing Most Adversely Affected Real Estate Near airport**

The receipt of numerous comments regarding housing-related issues and concerns was consistent with the focus on mitigating adverse effects on housing and neighborhoods following construction of the third runway. Several individuals spoke about the devaluation of their homes due to increased air traffic, and regardless of whether or not they received a Port package. Residents of Normandy Park thought their home values had “remained fairly steady, even during the Great Recession;” while residents of Des Moines described their city as “one of the last affordable communities in the area with some increase in value, but not at the same rate as Seattle and Bellevue.”

The most comments received expressed the belief that air operation-related noise had suppressed values, despite high levels of demand throughout the Seattle Metro Area. Specifically, South King County home values were thought to be lower than Seattle’s, as well as those on the east side of Bellevue, and that they hadn’t increased proportionately with most northern and eastern

neighborhoods. Based on a review of new home construction and resale information, along with data regarding the age of existing inventories, it appears accurate to conclude that despite a more established register of homes, both South King County and Pierce County | Tacoma were still destinations for area residents, if for no other reason than price alone.

Another dimension of housing in the study area cities commented on by Study participants related to past mitigation efforts, including: the process for qualifying, limitations on eligible contractors, and market perception regarding their sustained value. Among those received, the majority believed that houses in receipt of a Port package were less desirable and viewed in the same vain as homes affected by flight paths. A different, yet related comment said that flight paths gave preference to higher income neighborhoods, especially those to the north of the airport. Again, whereas these were individual and subjective comments, they were neither confirmed nor refuted; however, since this issue speaks directly to potential ongoing effects that could not be addressed with a one-time Port package, they should be investigated in the context of a supplemental study.

▪ **School Performance Has Suffered Due to Adverse Effects**

Community comments regarding the status of school districts in the study area and the Port’s possible effect on them ranged from believing the airport had “spent a lot of money improving schools, for example Highline Community College” to, “the rate of absences in the Highline School District is high, and in-part due to noise and emissions which also cause sleep and hearing issues.” Fairly consistently, members expressed a belief that the Highline School District was “one of the poorest in the state,” reportedly due to the influence air operation-related noise has had on learning, along with a lack of financing. This assumption could not be confirmed nor disputed given the scope of this assignment, but potentially warrants further investigation.

▪ **Airport Employment Levels for Area Residents Are Not What They Used to Be**

As referenced earlier in this section, many community members have spoken favorably about the airport’s role in providing jobs for area residents; however, several expressed a belief that actual number have declined over time (over 14% of Federal Way’s population once worked at the airport, and now closer to 7% do), and that the Port “hasn’t tried hard enough to choose area residents first, when positions have become available.” With regard to where employees of the Area live today, they thought they primarily resided in Des Moines, Federal Way, and Burien; with very few living in SeaTac. In addition, others thought proximity to work provided a “huge benefit” for employees. Based on the findings presented in this Section, Seattle-Tacoma International Airport continues to employ a fairly significant number of area residents (30% of the area labor force, and 45% of total employment); and residents in the vicinity of the airport strongly preferred using a personal vehicle to get to work, thereby suggesting that while proximity might pose a quality of life advantage, it was not a necessity with regard to their reliance on either public transportation or other mode of transportation. Collectively, this information seems to refute comments received regarding this topic.

## **K. SOCIO-ECONOMIC EFFECTS ATTRIBUTABLE TO AVIATION ACTIVITY**

### **Positive Socio-Economic Effects**

Positive aspects affecting the study area cities include:

- Seattle-Tacoma International Airport is a source of employment for residents in the study area cities (30% of the area labor force, and 45% of total employment). Based on an analysis of the modes used by area residents to travel to work, it appears that the vast majority use a personal vehicle or carpool alternative. This could suggest that proximity does not necessarily provide a transportation advantage; however, it still provides a quality-of-life advantage.

- Revenue from hotel rooms and supporting businesses in the vicinity of Seattle-Tacoma International Airport, along with established agreements between the Port and host communities, have a significant, yet disproportionate economic effect. The cities of SeaTac and Tukwila have the greatest number of hotel rooms in the study area, followed by Des Moines and Federal Way. (As of the 2020 study, there were no known hotels in the cities of Burien or Normandy Park – hospitality offerings such as Airbnb were not included as hotel revenue.)
- Proximity to air service provides a locational advantage for companies located within a 30-minute drive of Seattle-Tacoma International Airport – particularly those also served by the commercial elements of an urban center.
- Seattle-Tacoma International Airport provides a regional advantage addressing the travel needs of business and leisure travelers and visitors. It also enables the efficient movement of people and goods across distances, strengthening ties between communities, regions, and countries and encouraging economic growth. It also plays an integral role in shipping time-critical and high-value cargo.

### **Neutral Socio-Economic Effects**

Aspects that are neither favorable nor adverse, affecting the study area cities include:

- Burien and SeaTac maintain the oldest housing inventory among the study area cities and King County, as reflected in the percent of units built before 1970 and median age of the housing inventory.
- With the exception of Normandy Park, all of the study area cities have lower median home sale prices than the Seattle Metro Area as a whole. Even Federal Way, despite maintaining the newest inventory of residential ownership units, only commands the second lowest prices in the Study Area.
- Overall multi-family vacancy rates in the study area cities range from 3.6% to 6.1%, with only Des Moines and Burien reporting higher rates than King County. Further, Normandy Park and King County are the only markets which have shown a decrease in their vacancy rate over the past 19 years. Despite vacancy rates which would otherwise indicate a condition of pent-up demand or at a minimum, room to increase rental rates; average monthly multi-family rents in the study area cities are all lower than King County’s rate, and only Tukwila’s rate grew at a rate higher than King County’s.
- As evidenced by market indicators for employment uses, the study area communities located farthest from Seattle-Tacoma International Airport are considered relatively more valuable, commanding higher rental rates and absorbing space at a higher rate. This is consistent with the findings of an Urban Land Institute Survey of industry professionals who explained that direct proximity to an airport facility is less desirable than a site closer to an urban center with airport access within a 30-minute drive.
- All of the study area cities have commercial vacancy rates well below equilibrium, a consistent trend being experienced in many cities since the Great Recession; however, in terms of rental rates, they are relatively modest, particularly given their proximity to the airport, a location that in many markets would be able to command disproportionately higher rates.

### **Negative Socio-Economic Effects**

Negative aspects affecting the study area cities include:

- All of the study area school districts have a reported “lower socio-economic profile” than that of King County.
- These school districts have performed at comparatively lower levels in math and the arts than statewide levels as a whole. (Conversely, districts located to the north of the study area cities –

Seattle, Shoreline, Northshore, and Bellevue – have performed at higher levels than statewide levels as a whole, over that same time period.)

- All of the study area cities, with the exception of Normandy Park, have lower median household incomes below the average for King County, and in most instances lower than the state average, as well.
- With the exception of Normandy Park and Des Moines, all of the study area cities have higher shares of owner-occupied households spending 30% or more of their income for housing.
- Over the past two decades, unemployment rates in the study area cities have increased, while King County’s unemployment rates have decreased. In 2019, the study area cities maintained higher unemployment rates than King County’s 3.5% unemployment rate. (Unemployment data was not available for the Cities of Normandy Park and Tukwila.)

### Data Gaps

Information regarding the indicators for which there was either a lack of data, incomplete data, or data that was unavailable at the municipal level includes:

- Small business growth data at either a municipal or county level.
- Wage information at a municipal level (compounding difficulties related to wage information was the lack of information regarding actual job types held by residents in the study area cities at the airport or its affiliates).

### Summary of Socio-Economic Effects Attributable to Aviation Activity

Figure 13.44 details the various socio-economic effects in the study area. These exhibited a mix of results:

- **Housing**

Home values and home sale prices in the study area ranked below the King County average, except in Normandy Park. Study area apartment rental rates per square foot were also below the King County average, but vacancy rates were lower than the County, except in Burien and Des Moines. Apartment absorption rates were relatively flat across the study area, except in Des Moines, which was significantly higher than the county average. Most study area residents spent more than 30% of their income on housing, except for Normandy Park (an affluent and mostly single-family residential community).

- **Economic Development**

The retail and office markets in the study area exhibited rental rates below King County averages, with mixed results for absorption and vacancy rates. The city of Tukwila, however, is a regionally significant retail destination including a large mall, many surrounding stand-alone and inline retail centers, hotels, and office/warehouse developments. The Industrial market in the study area commanded rental rates at or above the county average. With the exception of the cities of SeaTac (slightly below the County average) and Normandy Park (no industrial data reported).

The daytime worker was also lower than the King County average, with the exception of the city of Tukwila (due to its aforementioned concentration of retail and office/warehouse uses). The study area’s unemployment rate was also slightly above the King County average, although no data was available for the cities of Normandy Park or Tukwila.

There were few indicators of how the above metrics may have been influenced by aviation activity. This section previously referenced research from the Urban Land Institute citing direct proximity to an airport facility as being less desirable than a site closer to an urban center that also has airport access within a 30-minute drive. However, public input was of the opinion that aviation activity was negatively affecting home values.

Additional study is recommended to determine the extent that Seattle-Tacoma International Airport is influencing property values, rental rates, and absorption/vacancy rates.

**Figure 13.44**  
**Summary of Socio-Economic Effects – Study Area Cities Compared To King County**

xxx better than King County    xxx equal to King County    xxx worse than King County

Housing	King County	Burien	Des Moines	Federal Way	Normandy Park	SeaTac	Tukwila
Median Household Income	\$92,340	\$64,851	\$70,722	\$68,927	\$109,751	\$56,992	\$56,703
Median Existing Home Sale Price	\$439,600	\$407,300	\$385,900	\$360,100	\$539,100	\$371,000	\$332,800
Apartment Rental Rate (per square foot)	\$2.09	\$1.75	\$1.80	\$1.54	\$1.82	\$1.59	\$1.72
Apartment Vacancy Rate	4.9%	5.2%	6.1%	4.2%	4.1%	4.1%	3.6%
Apartment Absorption Rate	2.7%	-0.2%	4.7%	0.1%	0.0%	-0.3%	0.3%
HH Spending 30% or Higher on Housing	33.8%	40.3%	35.0%	38.3%	28.4%	43.9%	46.0%
<b>Economic Development</b>							
Total Assessed Property Value (per capita)	\$239,419	\$123,020	\$118,135	\$106,151	\$232,088	\$210,860	\$304,767
Retail Rental Rate (per square foot)	\$20.63	\$17.20	\$19.57	\$19.02	\$25.98	\$18.04	\$23.95
Retail Vacancy Rate	2.9%	2.5%	1.1%	3.1%	5.3%	3.1%	2.5%
Retail Absorption Rate	1.8%	1.8%	2.6%	2.6%	4.5%	1.3%	1.6%
Office Rental Rate (per square foot)	\$2.06	\$1.75	\$1.60	\$1.54	\$1.62	\$1.59	\$1.72
Office Vacancy Rate	4.9%	5.2%	6.1%	4.2%	4.1%	4.1%	3.6%
Office Absorption Rate	2.7%	-0.2%	4.7%	0.1%	0.0%	-0.3%	0.3%
Industrial Rental Rate (per square foot)	\$10.20	\$10.20	\$11.40	\$19.27	---	\$9.11	\$10.48
Industrial Vacancy Rate	5.0%	20.6%	23.5%	5.0%	---	1.8%	5.4%
Industrial Absorption Rate	4.1%	0.0%	0.0%	6.8%	---	2.5%	6.5%
Daytime Worker Population	62.9%	41.1%	34.8%	46.3%	29.5%	56.4%	80.6%
Unemployment Rate	3.5%	4.1%	4.1%	4.1%	---	4.3%	---

In Figure 13.44, the six study area cities ranked as follows (from the highest number of metrics worse than the King County average to fewest):

- Burien & SeaTac (tie) .....15 of 18 metrics (83.3%) metrics worse than the King County average
- Des Moines & Federal Way (tie).....13 of 18 metrics (72.2%) metrics worse than the King County average
- Tukwila.....9 of 18 metrics (50.0%) metrics worse than the King County average
- Normandy Park.....7 of 18 metrics (38.9%) metrics worse than the King County average

The number of negative metrics does not necessarily prove a connection to aviation activity, since additional data is necessary to augment missing information. It does, however, point to a general trend regarding how some area residents may value these in measuring their individual quality of life.

Figure 13.45 presents a general assessment of the socio-economic effects in the study area attributable to aviation activity, categorized into four effect types:

- Positive effect attributable to aviation activity.
- Negative effect attributable to aviation activity.
- Neutral or no effect attributable to aviation activity.
- Inconclusive data/needs additional study.

**Figure 13.45**  
**Summary of Socio-Economic Effects Attributable to Aviation Activity – 1997 to 2019**



SOCIO-ECONOMIC METRIC	STUDY AREA CITY																	
	Burien			Des Moines			Federal Way			Normandy Park			SeaTac			Tukwila		
	1997	2009	2019	1997	2009	2019	1997	2009	2019	1997	2009	2019	1997	2009	2019	1997	2009	2019
Housing	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	■	■	■
Employment	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	○	○	○	■	■	■	■	■	■
Retail Market	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	■	■	■	■	■	■
Office Market	○	○	○	■	■	■	○	○	○	■	■	■	■	■	■	○	○	○
Industrial Market	■	■	■	■	■	■	○	○	○	■	■	■	○	○	○	○	○	○
Hotel Revenue	■	■	■	■	■	■	○	○	○	○	○	○	■	■	■	■	■	■
Tax Revenues	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	■	■	■	○	○	○

There are a variety of data gaps and limited information that inhibit the ability to determine the effect aviation activity has on the study area’s socio-economics:

- Burien may benefit due to its airport adjacency for airport employment and Industrial development, but it has not yet leveraged this proximity for hotel development. More study is needed to determine the effects aviation activity has on Burien’s retail and office markets.
- Des Moines may benefit in aviation-related employment and the development of the office and industrial markets, but the retail and hotel market benefits are less obvious (since retail may benefit more from access from U.S. Highway 99).
- Federal Way may benefit in aviation-related employment and the development of the office and industrial markets, but other metrics need further study, since parts of Federal Way are located the farthest from Seattle-Tacoma International Airport.
- Normandy Park has seemingly few benefits, as it has developed as a predominantly single-family community. More recent developments have brought some attached residential, retail, and more office to Normandy Park, but it is not clear how (or if) these developments have a linkage to aviation activity.
- The city of SeaTac is the most closely connected community, with about 40% of its area composed of airport land. The city of SeaTac also has an interlocal agreement with the Port of Seattle that brings some financial benefit to the city. The city also benefits from airport employment, retail and office development, hotel development and tax revenues. Additional study is recommended to determine the extent of aviation activity effects on the housing and industrial markets.
- Tukwila benefits from its robust retail and office/warehouse markets, and its hotels benefit from both the retail and nearby airport location. But other benefits in Tukwila from aviation activity are not as clear and warrant further study.

## L. RECOMMENDATIONS

To address the principal issues identified in this section, the following recommendations are proposed.

- **Socio-Economic Recommendation #1 – All Parties Should Commit to a Shared Objective**

This is essentially evolving the airport and the study area cities together. An airport city (as defined herein) is the “inside the fence” airport area of a large airport, including the airport (terminals, apron, and runways) and on-airport businesses such as air cargo, logistics, offices, retail, and hotels. The airport city is at the core of the “aerotropolis,” a new urban form evolving around many major airports. (Source: Wikipedia.) Conversely, an aerotropolis is the “airport city” and outlying corridors and clusters of aviation-linked businesses and associated residential development that feed off each other and their accessibility to the airport. The aerotropolis is analogous in shape to the traditional metropolis made up of a central city and its rings of commuter-linked suburbs.

These definitions are significant in that historically, airports have largely focused on the airport city, those areas and uses within them that comprise the principal functions of their operations. Beginning a few decades ago, and now in full swing in more than 40 major metropolitan areas around the world, are development of aerotropolis facilities, which are actually more micro-cities than airports. Given their extent, which can encompass as much as 20 or more miles around the airport itself, these are almost exclusively evolving in what is often described as greenfield locations, or in other words, areas on the edge of cities where the land is largely undeveloped. For infill airports such as SeaTac, where certain uses were already established, and new uses have continued to fill in around them, this type of evolution can be much more difficult, but not necessarily impossible. While airports and the cities that host them have often had conflicting goals, many airport operators have realized the benefits of partnering with their host community, jointly planning for compatibility, mitigating adversity, and growing as an extension of each other. As such, they are becoming joint economic engines that benefit from the success of the other.

Seattle-Tacoma International Airport, like many other infill airports, needs to see the communities around it as its partner, and best opportunity to evolve into an “aerotropolis.” In order to do this, several things must happen, a few of which include common understanding of desired outcomes, equal commitment to a healthy whole (airport and all affected communities), regulatory alignment, consistent marketing and shared oversight.

A recent article in The Guardian Magazine about potential effects resulting from construction of a third runway at Heathrow Airport in London mirrored much of what has been written about the addition of the third runway at Seattle-Tacoma International Airport. Unlike the Seattle-Tacoma International Airport, experience, however, was the decision to work together (community members and airport operators) to define criteria for growth by which all actions would be measured. Ultimately, four tests were identified: commitment to delivering of increased capacity; compliance with UK climate change obligations; graduated targets for minimizing local noise and air quality effects; and continually working toward what was best for the UK economy, as a whole.

While there are multiple models for how this could occur, a few specific elements might include: modification of the Port of Seattle Board to include equal geographic representation; revised protocols for new development and redevelopment projects that engages various referral agencies including those involved in mitigating adverse air, water and noise effects; joint planning initiatives with representation from all relevant governmental and quasi-governmental entities: enhanced communication and transparency among public, private, non-profit, neighborhood and other organizations represented in the study area cities (multi-lingual); and shared messaging and promotion across all business sectors. (The Council of Governments used to have a designated aviation planning specialist, but when the position was last vacated, it was never refilled. This type of professional could potentially provide oversight to all joint planning efforts between the Port and study area cities.) One such example is the Metro Denver Network Model.

▪ **Socio-Economic Recommendation #2 – Consider a “Study Area-Wide” Overlay District**

This concept was mentioned in Section 11 in the context of public safety. While this type of organizational framework could provide the structure from which to advance the recommendations presented above in the context of an “aerotropolis,” is not essential. The idea behind an airport Overlay District evolved from discussions with community members regarding perceived inequities between and among the study area cities, particularly as they relate to positive and negative effects resulting from airport operations. The intention is to establish a mechanism whereby revenues and expenses could be shared equitably (if not equally), and comparative inequities could be neutralized. For example, if one community is deemed more appropriate for a certain airport-supporting business or land use, facilitate its development in that location, but allow all of the communities to share in its economic contribution.

As explained earlier, the actual boundaries of the district could be determined after a second level study (assuming there is one), in order to ensure that communities most, or even partially affected, are included. Also, reparation levels could be graduated by distance and/or effect level, depending on the ability to isolate monetary advantages and disadvantages in the different geographies. This could replace any existing agreements (or ILAs) depending on the desires of the interested parties.

An overlay district could also maintain design and development standards and regulations in order to ensure consistency across municipal lines. Several community members mentioned inconsistencies not only between the Federal Aviation Administration’s rules and requirements and the Port’s, but between the rules and regulations of these entities and those of the local jurisdictions. For example, if a new building or building retrofit is proposed near a public airport, it must comply with Federal Aviation Administration rules outlined in Part 77 of their Regulatory manual that addresses methods for addressing safety concerns such as height restrictions and building setbacks. While insulation from noise and other environmental factors are also addressed, some communities have elected to rely on local policies and standards, leading to inconsistencies and comparative disparities. (The Vision 100-Century of Aviation Reauthorization Act (Public Law 108-176) required the Federal Aviation Administration to “make noise exposure and land use information from noise exposure maps [prepared under 14 CFR Part 150] available to the public via the Internet on its website in an appropriate format.”)

▪ **Socio-Economic Recommendation #3 – Conduct Additional Analyses**

This has been mentioned in previous sections of this report but consider amending work completed for this effort with similar analyses of other jurisdictions potentially equally affected by airport operation. These analyses should also be supplemented with review of various reports that were ongoing while this one was being prepared (i.e., Draft NEPA/SEPA due fall 2019); and additional research into areas omitted from the scope of this assignment. Additional areas of investigation might include: cost-benefit analysis of percent of SeaTac City landmass owned and operated by the Port; update to airport trip origins research relied on in the 1997 study; surveys of local commercial and residential brokers regarding the perceived effect of airport operations on real estate in the study area cities; and market feasibility studies for land uses and real estate product types that are either absent or under-serving local markets (i.e., hotel development in Burien, greater variety of commercial operators and restaurants, and others); and the housing inventory in order to understand the actual effect Port packages have, absent age, condition, and location.

## M. THE FUTURE

Myriad factors may influence a community over time. These can range from changes in infrastructure and traffic congestion, to innovations in employment of workplace options, to potentially disruptive technologies in personal transportation. The one commonality linking these is that no one can say for sure when (or if) they will become reality and to what extent they will influence community development.

An aspect of the socio-economic development of communities that has remained constant is the desire to maintain a certain “quality of life” – a metric that is often subjective and may vary from one community to another. An area that many communities tend to desire is to have a “center,” a place that identifies the core of the community. Burien, Des Moines, Federal Way, Normandy Park and Tukwila have all developed these centers (of varying sizes and land use composition). The city of SeaTac has not yet identified a location for its center, although U.S. Highway 99/Pacific Highway seems to be serving as a *de facto* center.

There have been recent changes in consumer preferences for housing. A return to pre-WW II patterns of walkable neighborhoods and mixed-use buildings has been increasing nationwide for most than a decade. Evidence of this pattern can also be seen in Downtown Burien’s growth in an around its City Hall/Library complex.

Should King County and the Seattle MSA continue to grow, two patterns are expected to emerge. One is the continuing expansion of the metropolitan area to the north, south, and east. The other is the desire to “backfill” the core of the region and increase density where it can be accommodated which provides more walkable mixed-use neighborhoods.

Should the region continue to grow, it may also become poly-nodal, with numerous additional employment centers and destinations beyond downtown Seattle. This can be seen in the growth of the downtown core of Bellevue. With its key location between Seattle and Tacoma, the study area has the potential to become a financially attractive alternative to areas that may be economically unattainable, especially when serviced by the expansion of the Sound Transit Link light rail line and provision of other services (such as bus rapid transit). The study area has the potential to “reverse commute,” creating employment destinations south and southeast of downtown Seattle.

Over time, it is hoped that the study area cities will continue to grow consistent with their unique characters, including Des Moines coastal downtown, Burien’s Southwest 152nd Street corridor, Normandy Park’s heavily treed residential neighborhoods, etc.

## N. SUMMARY

There are a variety of socio-economic effects evidenced in the study area, but most cannot be directly attributed to the proximity of Seattle-Tacoma International Airport. These include:

- **Demographic Profile**

The study area has grown at a slightly slower pace than the average for King County since 2000. It is a demographically diverse area, except for Normandy Park, which has the lowest percentage of minority population.

- **Income**

The study area’s average household income was general lower than King County with the exception of Normandy Park, which was higher than the county average.

- **Education**

Results were not uniform across the study area. For those with an undergraduate/bachelor’s degree, Normandy Park showed a percentage slightly above the King County average, while the percentages for the remaining study area cities were close to half the county average. Student performance in public schools was generally mixed with respect to state standards. Student health in the Federal Way, Tukwila, and the Highline school districts was generally poorer as well, with higher percentage of students listed as overweight or obese. All districts reported a higher than average percentage of students who “considered” suicide in the past 12 months and between a quarter and a third of all students feeling hopeless for more than two weeks over the past 12 months.

- **Housing**

The study area is uniformly composed of more family households than non-family households. It also tends to have an older housing stock that is owner-occupied more often than renter-occupied. Homes tended to be more affordable, but rental units were reporting higher than average rent rates, making it more expensive for renters than owners. Housing values were 8% to 25% lower than the county average – Normandy Park was the exception, with a more expensive housing stock.

- **Economic and Land Use Development**

Proximity to Seattle-Tacoma International Airport has not seemed to give the study area any unique competitive advantage regionally. Most of the study area cities have developed (or continued to develop) centers unique to their communities, including Burien, Des Moines, and Normandy Park.

- **Non-Residential Development**

The study area is not monolithic when it comes to non-residential development. Property values per capita are lower across the study area except for Tukwila and Normandy Park. Retail rental rates were higher in than the county average in Burien, Des Moines Federal Way, and SeaTac, although office and industrial rental rates were generally average to below average (there are not large portions of the study area developed as industrial). Hotel room rates were lower than the county average, despite having a concentration of hotel rooms in SeaTac and Tukwila. And only SeaTac and Tukwila had lower than average Spending Potential Indices (lower than 100).

- **Employment**

The cities of Federal Way, SeaTac and Tukwila have the highest concentrations of employees in the trade, transportation, utilities, and hospitality industries, while the majority employed in leisure and hospitality reside in Tukwila and Federal Way. Despite proximity to Seattle-Tacoma International Airport, the share of the labor force working at the airport was relatively low – between 2.1% (Burien) and 9.6% (Tukwila). All of the study area cities – except for Tukwila – have a higher than average percentage of daytime residents, indicating they “export” their residents to work in other area cities. But the unemployment rates for Burien, Des Moines, Federal Way, and SeaTac were higher than the county average (no unemployment figures were reported for Normandy Park or Tukwila).

- **Municipal Tax Revenues**

The cities of Burien, Des Moines, and SeaTac outpaced King County’s annual growth for taxable sales. The cities of Federal Way and Tukwila experienced the lowest annual growth in taxable sales. But taxable sales (for municipal use tax purposes) in all study area cities except for Normandy Park had higher growth rates than King County.

Given the readily available data and noted data gaps, it was not possible to draw a conclusion between existing socio-economic metrics and the study area’s proximity to Seattle-Tacoma International Airport. Additional research is required to determine the magnitude of this effect (if any) upon the study area.

## O. REFERENCES

- American Community Survey. (2013-2017). *Community Facts: King County and State of Washington*.
- An Economic Development Strategy, Some Assembly Required (2015, January). City of Federal Way.
- APP-400, Office of airport Planning & Programming, Planning & Environmental Division. *Noise Control and Compatibility Planning for airports*. (1983) (pp. 1-72). Retrieved from [https://www.faa.gov/documentLibrary/media/Advisory\\_Circular/AC\\_150\\_5020-1.pdf](https://www.faa.gov/documentLibrary/media/Advisory_Circular/AC_150_5020-1.pdf).
- APP-400, Office of airport Planning & Programming, Planning & Environmental Division. (2006). *National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Implementing Instructions for airport Actions* (Chapter 2, pp. 1–16).
- APP-400, Office of airport Planning & Programming, Planning & Environmental Division. (2006). *National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Implementing Instructions for airport Actions* (Chapter 6, pp. 1–16).
- APP-400, Office of airport Planning & Programming, Planning & Environmental Division. (2006). *National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Implementing Instructions for airport Actions* (Chapter 7, pp. 1–16).
- APP-400, Office of airport Planning & Programming, Planning & Environmental Division. (2006). *National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Implementing Instructions for airport Actions* (Chapter 9, pp. 1–16).
- Asencio , R. (2018). *Facilities Master Plan 2018 Update* (pp. 1–102). Seattle , WA: Seattle Public Schools. Retrieved from [https://www.seattleschools.org/UserFiles/Servers/Server\\_543/File/District/Departments/Capital%20Projects%20and%20Planning/facilities\\_master\\_plan/FacilityMasterPlan\\_update\\_2018\\_web.pdf](https://www.seattleschools.org/UserFiles/Servers/Server_543/File/District/Departments/Capital%20Projects%20and%20Planning/facilities_master_plan/FacilityMasterPlan_update_2018_web.pdf).
- Assessment, Policy Development & Evaluation Unit. School District Health Profiles. Seattle, WA: Public Health - Seattle & King County, 2013. Retrieved from: <https://www.kingcounty.gov/depts/health/data/school-district-health-profiles.aspx>.
- Black, W. R. (1999, December). Social and Economic Factors in Transportation. A1C06: Committee on Social and Economic Factors in Transportation.
- Black, W. R. (n.d.). *Social and Economic Factors in Transportation* (pp. 1–6). Retrieved from <http://onlinepubs.trb.org/onlinepubs/millennium/00100.pdf>.
- Booz-Allen & Hamilton, Inc., *The Effect of airport Noise on Housing Values*, Federal Aviation Administration, Office of Environment and Energy, September 1994. (reference from 1997 Study)
- Bråthen, S & Halpern, N. (2010). *Journal of Transport Geography* 19 (2011) 1145–1154.
- Burger, R. (2015, February 20). Open for Business: airports as Real Estate Developer and Strategic Partner. Retrieved from <https://www.areadevelopment.com/logisticsInfrastructure/Intermodal-Sites-Q1-2015/airports-strategically-developing-surrounding-lands-2626766.shtml>
- Butler, Stewart E. Butler & Kiernan, Laurence J. Kiernan. September 1992. *Estimating the Regional Economic Significance of airports*, Federal Aviation Administration Document DOT/FAA/PP-92-6, Department of Transportation, Washington, DC. (reference from 1997 Study)
- CDM Smith, Cincinnati, Ohio 45249. (2014, September). The Economic Impact of Commercial airports in 2013.
- CIA Site Redirect. (2010, November 30). Retrieved from <http://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/rankorder/2102rank.html>.

City of Burien, Washington. December 14, 2009, Revised December 2018. Comprehensive Plan: The Burien Plan.

City of Des Moines, Washington. 2015. City Council Vision Statement, Mission Statement and Goals.

City of Des Moines, Washington. Adopted June 25, 2015 by Ordinance No. 1623. Charting Our Course for a Sustainable Future 2035.

City of Des Moines, Washington. Washington Economic Development Policy.

City of Federal Way, Washington. Revised 2015. Comprehensive plan.

City of Normandy Park, Washington. January 2016. Comprehensive plan.

City of SeaTac, Washington. Adopted December 1994, amended annually through 2013, this update completed in 2015. Comprehensive Plan: SeaTac 2035.

City of SeaTac, Washington. January 12, 2018. Economic Development Update; Economic Forecast Luncheon Presentation.

City of Tukwila, Washington. 2015. Comprehensive Plan.

City of Tukwila, Washington. 2019. Washington Economic Development Plan Snapshot.

CoStar, Inc. (2019). *Multifamily, Office, Retail and Industrial Market Data*.

Crowly, R.W. 1973 "A Case Study of the Effects of an airport on Land Values," *Journal of Transportation Economics*. (reference from 1997 Study)

Eaton, A. F. (1977). The Socio-Economic Impact of the airport Upon the Community. Retrieved from [https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk\\_gradthes/3068/](https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_gradthes/3068/).

Economic Development Plan (n.d), City of Tukwila.

Employment Security Department/LMEA; US Bureau of Labor Statistics; Local Area Unemployment Statistics. (2019, August 20). Historical resident labor force and employment, not seasonally adjusted.

Employment Security Department/LMEA; US Bureau of Labor Statistics; Local Area Unemployment Statistics. (2019, August 20). Historical resident labor force and employment, not seasonally adjusted.

ESRI, Inc. (2019). *ACS Housing Summary: Cities of Burien, Des Moines, Federal Way, Normandy Park, SeaTac, and Tukwila*.

ESRI, Inc. (2019). *Community Profile: Cities of Burien, Des Moines, Federal Way, Normandy Park, SeaTac, and Tukwila*.

ESRI, Inc. (2019). *Housing Profile: Cities of Burien, Des Moines, Federal Way, Normandy Park, SeaTac, and Tukwila*.

Fayazbakhsh, M. (1996, January 1). Environmental impacts of airports: a study of airport development and its impact on the social, environmental and economic well-being of the community. Retrieved from <http://usir.salford.ac.uk/id/eprint/14809/>.

Federal Aviation Administration Advisory Circular AC 150/5020-1, *Noise Control & Compatibility Planning for airports*. (reference from 1997 Study)

- Federal Aviation Administration, airport Master Plans, Advisory Circular No. 150/5070-6A, US DOT. (reference from 1997 Study)
- Federal Aviation Administration, Southern Region. (2002, July). Land Use Compatibility and airports.
- Folger, J. (2020, February 5). Buying a House Near an airport? Consider These Factors. Retrieved from <http://www.investopedia.com/articles/investing/011317/buying-house-near-airport-consider-these-factors.asp>.
- Green Bay, WI, Wisconsin Department of Transportation, Bureau of Aeronautics. (2017). Economic Impact Green Bay - Austin Straubel International airport.
- Green, M. (2014). The Impact of airport Development on Economic Development. *Urban Economics*. Retrieved from <https://sites.duke.edu/urbaneconomics/?p=1248>.
- Halpern, N., & Bråthen, S. (2011, June 30). Impact of airports on regional accessibility and social development. Retrieved from <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0966692310001882>.
- Hellmuth, Obata + Kassabaum, Inc., Raytheon Infrastructure Services, Inc., and Thomas Lane & Associates, Inc. February 1997. Sea-Tac International airport Impact Mitigation Study Initial Assessment and Recommendations. Prepared under a grant from the State of Washington for the: Cities of Burien, Des Moines, Federal Way, Normandy Park, and Tukwila; Highline School District; Highline Community Hospital.
- International Civil Aviation Organization. (2013, September). Assembly – 38th Session, Executive Committee Agenda Item 17, Environmental Protection.
- King County Assessor’s Office. (2019). *Assessed Valuations and Taxes, 2009 to 2019*.
- Marcus & Millichap. (n.d.). Retrieved from: <https://www.marcusmillichap.com/research/researchreports/reports/2019/02/07/special-report-office-investment-forecast-2019>.
- Martin O’Connell Associates. 31 May 1994. *The Local and Regional Economic Impacts of the Port of Seattle* (prepared for the Port of Seattle). (reference from 1997 Study)
- McDonald, A. (2016, October 16). Heathrow or not, have we resolved the human impacts of the third runway? Andy McDonald. Retrieved from: <http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2016/oct/16/heathrow-or-not-human-impacts-third-runway>
- National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. 2008. *airport Economic Impact Methods and Models*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. <https://doi.org/10.17226/23267>.
- NEPA Collection, Transportation Library, Northwestern University Library, Evanston, IL. (1978, July 24). Final Environmental Impact Statement, New G.A. airport - West Mesa Site, Albuquerque, New Mexico.
- Planning the airport Environment*. (1968). Retrieved from: <https://www.planning.org/pas/reports/report231.htm>.
- Puget Sound Regional Council, Seattle, WA. (2019). *Industrial Lands Analysis, 2015*.
- Puget Sound Regional Council, Seattle, WA. (2019). *Residential Building Permit Summaries, 2009 to 2017*.

- Report Card – Washington State Report Card. (n.d.). Retrieved from:  
<https://washingtonstatereportcard.ospi.k12.wa.us/ReportCard/ViewSchoolOrDistrict/100243>.
- Rodrigue, D. J.-P. (n.d.). Transportation and the Environment . Retrieved from  
<https://transportgeography.org>.
- Runway Developments: The Challenges of Building Near airports. (2017, July 7). Retrieved from  
<http://www.fmjlaw.com/challenges-building-near-airports/>.
- Shapiro and Associates. April 1994. *SeaTac airport Vicinity Land Use Inventory Project* (Aviation Planning Division, Port of Seattle).
- Sheridan, M. (2017, March 29). Strong In-Migration Boosting Economies of the Pacific Northwest. Retrieved from <https://urbanland.uli.org/planning-design/special-section-pacific-northwest/>.
- Shifley, S. (2020, January 5). Comprehensive Study. Seattle, Washington.
- Sunshine Coast Council & Sunshine Coast airport. (n.d.). *B13 airport and Surrounds Social Impact* (pp. 572–599).
- Thomas/Lane & Associates. June 1991. *airport Economic Benefits* (Aeronautic Division, Washington State Department of Transportation).
- Urban Land Institute (ULI), Emerging Trends in Real Estate (2019).
- Using GIS for Collaborative Land Use Compatibility Planning Near airports. (n.d.). Retrieved from  
<http://www.trb.org/Main/Blurbs/179097.aspx>.
- Washington State Department of Revenue. (2019). *Taxable Retail Sales by City*. Retrieved from  
<https://dor.wa.gov/about/statistics-reports/>
- Wiedmann, M. (2014, March). airport Cities: Can ‘airport Cities’ Close the Deal?: Site Selection Online. Retrieved from <https://siteselection.com/issues/2014/mar/airport-cities.cfm>.
- Zillow, Inc. (2019). *Housing Data, 2008 to 2019*. Retrieved from <https://www.zillow.com/research/data/>