Study Purpose and Approach

- Understand city funding sources
- Assess funding gaps and future needs
- Make recommendations

The purpose is not to
- Calculate city-level estimate of need
- Generate an impractical demand for additional funding

- Analyze data
- Develop case studies
- Examine practices in other states

Proviso available in Appendix.
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Staff Workgroup

- Cities and Association of Washington Cities
- WSDOT Local Programs Division
- Transportation Improvement Board
- MPO/RTPO Coordinating Committee
- OFM, House, and Senate

(see full list in Appendix)
City streets carry over 25% of statewide travel. Most trips begin and end on city streets. City streets are 17,000 miles or just over 20% of the statewide transportation network.
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What are cities responsible for?
“The street” is more than what’s paved and striped

- Streets include multimodal infrastructure for:
  - Vehicles
  - Pedestrians
  - Bicycles
- They interface with:
  - Utilities
  - Built and natural environments
- Some city streets are state highways
An increasingly complex operating environment

Construction inflation and right-of-way acquisition costs

**ADA Access.** Cities estimate ADA can increase preservation project costs by 30-40%

Environmental mitigation

Multimodal mobility

---

Social and environmental investments + increasing costs = fewer miles rehabilitated with the same dollars.
Asset management optimizes lifecycle costs

When cities can’t invest enough in preserving the existing system, lifecycle costs compound over time.

Deep pavement failure; expensive reconstruction; repairs necessary to remain functional; ~$4 to 5 million per mile.

Damage to underlying structure; wear and tear to vehicles.

Surface wear only; costly to repair before damage; ~$1 million per mile.

Minimal deterioration.

Regular preservation activities minimize life-cycle costs.

Costs to preserve and maintain infrastructure accelerate rapidly without preservation.

High costs to rebuild infrastructure upon failure.

Failure ($$$$$)
Very Poor ($$$)
Poor ($$)
Fair ($) Good ($) Excellent

Age of Infrastructure

Pavement Condition (Maintenance and Preservation Costs)

Who are Washington’s cities?
281 cities and towns: categorized in 4-part typology

Categories based on:

a) length of road network
b) total assessed property value
c) 2018 population (OFM)

(list of cities by typology in Appendix)
Case studies

- Bellingham
- Camas
- Pasco
- Ritzville
- Tacoma
- Twisp
Washington’s cities face common challenges

- **Competition for scarce resources.** Cities provide a broad range of local services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Safety 40%</th>
<th>General Government 19%</th>
<th>Transportation 11%</th>
<th>Environment &amp; Development 7%</th>
<th>Misc. &amp; Debt 7%</th>
<th>Education &amp; Libraries 4%</th>
<th>Health and Human Services 4%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Source: SAO LGFRS 2017, General Fund and Special Revenue Fund Expenditures
Washington’s cities face common challenges

- **A structural challenge.** Growth of property tax, a key revenue source, is less than construction inflation.
- Some cities have enacted new taxes and fees, but face community pressure to keep taxes low.
Washington’s cities face common challenges

- Competition for scarce resources.
- A structural gap. Growth of property tax, a key income source, is less than the rate of inflation.

What does this mean?
- There is a potential misalignment between local resources and transportation investment needs.

Twisp
- 9 centerline miles
- State direct distribution: $22,000/year
- 72% of Twisp voters supported a Transportation Benefit District sales & use tax: $50,000/year
- Twisp dedicates 35% of property tax to Street Fund
- Needed to fully catch up: ~$2M, or 10x annual transportation budget
How do cities fund their investments in streets?
Despite challenges, city investment has increased

Federal, State, and Local City Transportation Revenues Adjusted for Construction Inflation*


Cities have stepped up.
Investment comes from local, state, and then federal sources

79% of city transportation investment comes from local sources.

86% of this is from unrestricted sources.
Local unrestricted funding

79% of city transportation investment comes from local sources.

86% of this is from unrestricted sources.
Local transportation-restricted funding

79% of city transportation investment comes from local sources.

10% of this is from restricted sources.
Investment comes from local, state, and federal sources

13% of city transportation investment comes from state sources.
State transportation revenues are challenged to keep up

Unadjusted Gross Fuel Tax Revenue

Fuel tax collections are below forecasts due to lower consumption.

Source: Transportation Revenue Forecast Council March 2019 Summary
Cities receive ~8% of the State’s transportation investment

$9.8B STATE TRANSPORTATION FUNDING

$9.3B STATE TRANSPORTATION BUDGET + $0.5B
DIRECT DISTRIBUTIONS (MVFT + MULTIMODAL FUNDS)
FY2017-19 (2018 Supplemental)

$736M TO CITIES

2-year distribution to
local transportation projects

DIRECT DISTRIBUTION
Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax + Multimodal Funds
$223M Cities $337M Counties

STATE COMPETITIVE PROGRAMS
TIB, FMSIB, Commerce, WSDOT Safe Routes to
School, Pedestrian + Bicyclist Program
$330M Cities ($20M Loans) $36M Counties $9 Other

LOCAL PROJECT APPROPRIATIONS
$183M Cities $11M Counties $18 Other

= OTHER STATEWIDE TRANSPORTATION DISTRIBUTION
State accounts + non-city accounts, including: County Road Administration Board; State Highway Accounts; Washington State Ferries;
Washington State Patrol; Department of Licensing; WSDOT Highway Maintenance, Public Transportation, Rail, Traffic Operations, etc.
Cities use state and federal resources in different ways

- **Smaller cities** are reliant on state resources for basic maintenance and preservation.

- **Larger cities** rely on state and federal support for big projects, including bridges.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Micro</th>
<th>Small</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Large</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012-2017 annual average</td>
<td>$7 million</td>
<td>$71 million</td>
<td>$426 million</td>
<td>$1.406 billion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Federal Grants
- State - TIB
- State Shared Revenues
- State Grants
- State - Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax
- Local - Transportation-restricted
- Local - Unrestricted
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There are additional state investments made in small cities through TIB via counties and the state that are not reflected in city revenues.
What is the resource gap?
For this assessment, we include the following **asset management** expenditures:

- **Admin and Operations**
  Regular overhead for department activities (vehicle fleet, office staff, etc.)

- **Maintenance**
  Minor repairs: filling potholes, etc.

- **Preservation**
  Rehabilitating pavement to maximize its condition and minimize life cycle costs

- **Construction** that preserves the existing system

This estimates does not include **construction** that expands system capacity (e.g., new roads)
Local, state, & federal resources: not enough for asset management

There is maintenance & preservation gap of approximately $1 billion per year.

This is generally equivalent to:

- Increasing local revenue from taxes and fees by $190 per person per year.
- Increasing the distribution of gas tax shared with cities by 28 cents per gallon.
- Diverting an additional 18% of all local tax receipts and state-shared local revenue.
Beyond this base gap, there are **additional costs** that are difficult to assess statewide:

1. Deferred roadway maintenance and preservation.
2. System capacity needs.
   - Statutory requirements (concurrency)
   - Policy-based needs (levels of service)
3. Additional expenditures related to other obligations:
   - Comprehensive multimodal infrastructure
   - Full ADA Transition Plan implementation
   - Environmental mitigation, including fish passage barriers
1) Deferred maintenance leads to higher lifecycle costs

Social and environmental investments + increasing costs = fewer miles rehabilitated with the same dollars. = lifecycle costs compound over time.
### 1) Deferred maintenance leads to higher lifecycle costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>To fully catch up for roadways</th>
<th>Annual transportation budget</th>
<th>~x annual transportation budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tacoma</strong></td>
<td>$348M</td>
<td>$90M</td>
<td>~4x annual transportation budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bellingham</strong></td>
<td>$60M</td>
<td>$22M</td>
<td>~3x annual transportation budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Twisp</strong></td>
<td>$2M</td>
<td>$190,000</td>
<td>~10x annual transportation budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ritzville</strong></td>
<td>$8M</td>
<td>$770,000</td>
<td>~10x annual transportation budget</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2) The need to address growth

Cities are required by GMA to respond to growth with adequate transportation improvements.

**Pasco**
- 12% average 5-year population growth
- Residential and commercial development brings congested corridors

**Camas**
- 17% average 5-year population growth
- High growth drives up capital and operations/maintenance costs
Recap of key findings and recommendations
A summary of what we’ve found.

- Cities have stepped up, providing about 80% of transportation funding.
- Social and environmental investments + increasing costs = fewer miles rehabilitated with the same budget.
  - When cities can’t invest in preservation, lifecycle costs compound over time.
- There is a gap in funding for system maintenance and preservation of approximately $1 billion/year.
- Beyond this base gap, there are additional costs difficult to assess statewide:
  - Deferred roadway maintenance and preservation.
  - System capacity needs.
  - Additional expenditures including comprehensive multimodal infrastructure, full ADA Transition Plan implementation, and environmental mitigation, including fish passage barriers
- It is reasonable to conclude that we are investing about half of what we should.
What will happen if we make no changes?

- Inequities in local wealth and disproportionate local investment needs means that some cities will not be able to make all desired investments in:
  - ADA access.
  - Fish passage removal.
  - Multimodal infrastructure.
  - Bridge preservation.
  - Roadway preservation.
  - System capacity needs.

- The result will be a patchwork system with investment gaps, deteriorating infrastructure, and escalating catch-up costs.
Guiding Principles

- Maintain the whole system, with equitable consideration of potential misalignments between local investment needs and resources.
- Achieve high continuity of improvements to reduce unintended gaps in condition, nonmotorized systems, ADA accessibility, and environmental mitigation.
- Collaborate for efficiencies across levels of government and boundaries.
- Focus capital support at all levels on fully funding projects.
- Provide local flexibility and incentivize asset management.
## Two Priority Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1. Increase support for preservation through new or focused funding, incentives, and services to reduce lifecycle costs.** | This will require additional local and state resources. Options for state investment include:  
  - Fund other entities to preserve the street systems of Micros and some Small cities at the lowest possible cost.  
  - Increase funding and eligibility threshold for TIB preservation programs.  
  - Incentivize investments by Large cities with a sliding match scale.  
  - Explore using small dollar amounts of shared revenue to collectively fund larger paving initiatives or buy seal coat services from counties or other cities. |
| **2. Provide better paths to reach full funding of large-scale local projects that outstrip local and regional resources.** | Two options include:  
  - Increase grant program resources.  
  - Concentrate legislative appropriations on high-cost projects that outstrip local and regional funding capacity. |
A. Funding: strengthen local funding options

A1. Enhance existing Transportation Benefit District authority

A2. Increase flexibility and clarity of the Motor Vehicle and Special Fuel Tax

A3. Create a local option Rental Car Local Option
B. Efficiency: work together to capture greater value

B1. Rethink how to use federal funding most efficiently.

B2. Fine tune city responsibilities for state highways that function as main streets and streets that function as state highways.

B3. Collaborate across levels of government to achieve best systemwide outcomes.
C. Programs: increase program support and collaboration

C1. Facilitate access to pavement management systems to help cities make optimal investments.

C2. Consider measures to ensure and encourage fully funded projects.

LARGER CITIES
Likely have a fully-developed Pavement Management System.

MEDIUM CITIES
May or may not have a Pavement Management System.
For those that have, system may or may not be fully developed.

SMALLER CITIES
Pavement management is provided by TIB.
Thank you.
$360,000 of the motor vehicle account—state appropriation, from the cities' statewide fuel tax distributions under RCW 214.66.8110(2), is for the joint transportation committee to conduct a study to assess the current state of city transportation funding, identify emerging issues, and recommend funding sources to meet current and future needs. As part of the study, the joint transportation committee shall:

- Identify current city transportation funding responsibilities, sources, and gaps;
- Identify emerging issues that may add additional strain on city costs and funding capacity;
- Identify future city funding needs;
- Evaluate alternative sources of funding; and
- Recommend sources of funding to address those needs and gaps

In considering alternative sources of funding, the study shall evaluate sources available outside of the state of Washington that currently are not available in Washington.
In conducting the study, the joint transportation committee must consult with:

(i) City representatives;
   - City of Camas, Steve Wall
   - City of Olympia, Rich Hoey
   - City of Tacoma, Josh Diekmann

(ii) A representative from the department of transportation local programs division;
   - Kathleen Davis

(iii) A representative from the transportation improvement board;
   - Ashley Probart

(iv) A representative from the department of transportation/metropolitan planning organization/regional transportation planning organization coordinating committee; and
   - Skagit Council of Governments and MPO/RTPO Coordinating Committee, Kevin Murphy

(vi) Others as appropriate
   - Office of Financial Management, Alyssa Ball
   - House Democratic Caucus, David Bremer
   - House Republican Caucus, Dana Quam
   - House Transportation Committee, Mark Matteson
   - Senate Democratic Caucus, Hannah McCarty
   - Senate Republican Caucus, Martin Presley
   - Senate Transportation Committee, Bryon Moore

The association of Washington cities and the department of transportation shall provide technical support to the study

- Association of Washington Cities, Logan Bahr and Brandon Anderson

The joint transportation committee must issue a report of its findings and recommendations to the transportation committees of the legislature by June 30, 2019

- Joint Transportation Committee Project Managers, Dave Catterson and Paul Neil
Transportation system policy goals.

(1) It is the intent of the legislature to establish policy goals for the planning, operation, performance of, and investment in, the state’s transportation system. The policy goals established under this section are deemed consistent with the benchmark categories adopted by the state's blue ribbon commission on transportation on November 30, 2000. Public investments in transportation should support achievement of these policy goals:

(a) Economic vitality: To promote and develop transportation systems that stimulate, support, and enhance the movement of people and goods to ensure a prosperous economy;

(b) Preservation: To maintain, preserve, and extend the life and utility of prior investments in transportation systems and services;

(c) Safety: To provide for and improve the safety and security of transportation customers and the transportation system;

(d) Mobility: To improve the predictable movement of goods and people throughout Washington state, including congestion relief and improved freight mobility;

(e) Environment: To enhance Washington's quality of life through transportation investments that promote energy conservation, enhance healthy communities, and protect the environment; and

(f) Stewardship: To continuously improve the quality, effectiveness, and efficiency of the transportation system.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albion</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>Ione</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>Reardan</td>
<td>575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almira</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>Kahlotus</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bucoda</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>Krupp</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Rock Island</td>
<td>1,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbonado</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>LaCrosse</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>Rockford</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathlamet</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>Lamont</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Rosalia</td>
<td>560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colton</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>Latah</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>Roy</td>
<td>815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conconully</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>Lind</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>Skykomish</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coulee City</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>Lyman</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>South Cle Elum</td>
<td>530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creston</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>Malden</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>South Prairie</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cusick</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>Mansfield</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>Spangle</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmer City</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>Metaline Falls</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>Sprague</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endicott</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>Marcus</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>Springdale</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>Mesa</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>St. John</td>
<td>505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmington</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>Metaline</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Starbuck</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garfield</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>Mossyrock</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>Naches</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>Uniontown</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>Nespelim</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>Vader</td>
<td>610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrah</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>Northport</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>Washtucna</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrington</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>Oakesdale</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>Waverly</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartline</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>Oakville</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>Wilkeson</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatton</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>Pe Ell</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>Wilson Creek</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>Prescott</td>
<td>330</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Cities by typology: Small Cities (90 communities)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Algona</td>
<td>3,180</td>
<td>Darrington</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>Mabton</td>
<td>2,315</td>
<td>Ritzville</td>
<td>1,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asotin</td>
<td>1,275</td>
<td>Davenport</td>
<td>1,715</td>
<td>Mattawa</td>
<td>4,900</td>
<td>Roslyn</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benton City</td>
<td>3,405</td>
<td>Dayton</td>
<td>2,560</td>
<td>McClary</td>
<td>1,760</td>
<td>Royal City</td>
<td>2,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bingen</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>Deer Park</td>
<td>4,240</td>
<td>Medical Lake</td>
<td>4,990</td>
<td>Ruston</td>
<td>990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Diamond</td>
<td>4,360</td>
<td>Eatonville</td>
<td>2,955</td>
<td>Millwood</td>
<td>1,790</td>
<td>Soap Lake</td>
<td>1,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brewster</td>
<td>2,405</td>
<td>Electric City</td>
<td>1,030</td>
<td>Montesano</td>
<td>4,155</td>
<td>South Bend</td>
<td>1,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgeport</td>
<td>2,480</td>
<td>Elma</td>
<td>3,360</td>
<td>Morton</td>
<td>1,125</td>
<td>Stevenson</td>
<td>1,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckley</td>
<td>4,765</td>
<td>Entiat</td>
<td>1,205</td>
<td>Moxee</td>
<td>4,020</td>
<td>Tekoa</td>
<td>770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnation</td>
<td>2,155</td>
<td>Everson</td>
<td>2,730</td>
<td>Napavine</td>
<td>1,940</td>
<td>Tenino</td>
<td>1,785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cashmere</td>
<td>3,095</td>
<td>Forks</td>
<td>3,615</td>
<td>Newport</td>
<td>2,170</td>
<td>Tieton</td>
<td>1,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Rock</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>Friday Harbor</td>
<td>2,345</td>
<td>Nooksack</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>Tonasket</td>
<td>1,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelan</td>
<td>4,210</td>
<td>Gold Bar</td>
<td>2,175</td>
<td>North Bonneville</td>
<td>1,015</td>
<td>Twisp</td>
<td>975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chewelah</td>
<td>2,670</td>
<td>Goldendale</td>
<td>3,530</td>
<td>Odessa</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>Waitsburg</td>
<td>1,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cle Elum</td>
<td>1,875</td>
<td>Grand Coulee</td>
<td>1,055</td>
<td>Okanogan</td>
<td>2,620</td>
<td>Warden</td>
<td>2,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colfax</td>
<td>2,820</td>
<td>Granger</td>
<td>3,945</td>
<td>Omak</td>
<td>4,935</td>
<td>Waterville</td>
<td>1,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colville</td>
<td>4,745</td>
<td>Granite Falls</td>
<td>3,615</td>
<td>Oroville</td>
<td>1,705</td>
<td>Westport</td>
<td>2,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>Ilwaco</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>Palouse</td>
<td>1,060</td>
<td>White Salmon</td>
<td>2,505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cosmopolis</td>
<td>1,665</td>
<td>La Conner</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>Pateros</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>Wilbur</td>
<td>890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coulee Dam</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>Langley</td>
<td>1,175</td>
<td>Pomeroy</td>
<td>1,395</td>
<td>Winlock</td>
<td>1,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coupeville</td>
<td>1,905</td>
<td>Leavenworth</td>
<td>2,030</td>
<td>Rainier</td>
<td>2,020</td>
<td>Winthrop</td>
<td>465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td>1,445</td>
<td>Republic</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>16,760</td>
<td>Des Moines</td>
<td>31,140</td>
<td>Lake Stevens</td>
<td>32,570</td>
<td>Ocean Shores</td>
<td>6,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airway Heights</td>
<td>9,085</td>
<td>DuPont</td>
<td>9,385</td>
<td>Liberty Lake</td>
<td>10,390</td>
<td>Orting</td>
<td>8,105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anacortes</td>
<td>16,990</td>
<td>Duvall</td>
<td>7,655</td>
<td>Longview</td>
<td>37,710</td>
<td>Othello</td>
<td>8,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington</td>
<td>19,300</td>
<td>East Wenatchee</td>
<td>13,670</td>
<td>Lynden</td>
<td>14,160</td>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>6,915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battle Ground</td>
<td>20,890</td>
<td>Edgewood</td>
<td>10,990</td>
<td>Lynnwood</td>
<td>38,260</td>
<td>Port Angeles</td>
<td>19,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blaine</td>
<td>5,315</td>
<td>Ellensburg</td>
<td>19,660</td>
<td>Maple Valley</td>
<td>25,280</td>
<td>Port Orchard</td>
<td>14,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonney Lake</td>
<td>20,940</td>
<td>Enumclaw</td>
<td>11,660</td>
<td>Mercer Island</td>
<td>24,270</td>
<td>Port Townsend</td>
<td>9,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bremerton</td>
<td>41,500</td>
<td>Ephrata</td>
<td>8,130</td>
<td>Mill Creek</td>
<td>20,470</td>
<td>Pouslbo</td>
<td>10,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brier</td>
<td>6,605</td>
<td>Ferndale</td>
<td>13,640</td>
<td>Milton</td>
<td>7,900</td>
<td>Prossier</td>
<td>6,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>9,025</td>
<td>Fife</td>
<td>10,100</td>
<td>Monroe</td>
<td>18,860</td>
<td>Pullman</td>
<td>33,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camas</td>
<td>23,770</td>
<td>Fircrest</td>
<td>6,710</td>
<td>Moses Lake</td>
<td>23,660</td>
<td>Quincy</td>
<td>7,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centralia</td>
<td>17,060</td>
<td>Gig Harbor</td>
<td>10,320</td>
<td>Mount Vernon</td>
<td>35,180</td>
<td>Ridgefield</td>
<td>7,705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chehalis</td>
<td>7,215</td>
<td>Grandview</td>
<td>11,180</td>
<td>Mountlake Terrace</td>
<td>21,560</td>
<td>SeaTac</td>
<td>29,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheney</td>
<td>12,200</td>
<td>Hoquiam</td>
<td>8,560</td>
<td>Mukilteo</td>
<td>21,320</td>
<td>Sedro-Woolley</td>
<td>11,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarkston</td>
<td>7,205</td>
<td>Issaquah</td>
<td>37,110</td>
<td>Newcastle</td>
<td>12,410</td>
<td>Selah</td>
<td>7,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Place</td>
<td>9,590</td>
<td>Kelso</td>
<td>12,080</td>
<td>Normandy Park</td>
<td>6,595</td>
<td>Sequim</td>
<td>7,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connell</td>
<td>5,460</td>
<td>Kenmore</td>
<td>22,920</td>
<td>North Bend</td>
<td>6,825</td>
<td>Shelton</td>
<td>10,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covington</td>
<td>20,080</td>
<td>Lake Forest Park</td>
<td>13,090</td>
<td>Oak Harbor</td>
<td>22,780</td>
<td>Snohomish</td>
<td>10,150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Cities by typology: Large Cities (29 communities)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auburn</td>
<td>80,615</td>
<td>Pasco</td>
<td>73,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bainbridge Island</td>
<td>24,320</td>
<td>Puyallup</td>
<td>41,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellevue</td>
<td>142,400</td>
<td>Redmond</td>
<td>64,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellingham</td>
<td>88,500</td>
<td>Renton</td>
<td>103,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bothell</td>
<td>45,260</td>
<td>Richland</td>
<td>55,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burien</td>
<td>51,850</td>
<td>Sammamish</td>
<td>63,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonds</td>
<td>41,820</td>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>730,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everett</td>
<td>111,200</td>
<td>Shoreline</td>
<td>55,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Way</td>
<td>97,440</td>
<td>Spokane</td>
<td>220,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennewick</td>
<td>81,850</td>
<td>Spokane Valley</td>
<td>95,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>128,900</td>
<td>Pasco</td>
<td>73,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkland</td>
<td>87,240</td>
<td>Tacoma</td>
<td>209,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacey</td>
<td>50,170</td>
<td>Vancouver</td>
<td>183,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakewood</td>
<td>59,350</td>
<td>Yakima</td>
<td>94,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marysville</td>
<td>67,040</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympia</td>
<td>52,490</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakewood</td>
<td>59,350</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Cities by typology: Outlier Communities (6 communities)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMUNITY</th>
<th>POPULATION</th>
<th>COMMUNITY</th>
<th>POPULATION</th>
<th>COMMUNITY</th>
<th>POPULATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beaux Arts Village</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>Hunts Point</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>Woodway</td>
<td>1,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clyde Hill</td>
<td>3,045</td>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>3,245</td>
<td>Yarrow Point</td>
<td>1,065</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>