CITY OF BURIEN
AGENDA BILL

Agenda Subject: Discussion on Initiative Measure No. 1183 Concerning Liquor: Beer, Wine and Spirits		**Meeting Date:** October 3, 2011
Department: City Manager **Contact:** Lisa Clausen, Government Relations Specialist **Telephone:** (206) 248-5515	**Attachments:** 1. Office of Financial Management Fiscal Impact Statement for Initiative 1183 (I-1183) 2. Association of Washington Cities Information on I-1183 3. City of Auburn Recommendation to Suburban Cities Association on I-1183	**Fund Source:** N/A **Activity Cost:** N/A **Amount Budgeted:** N/A **Unencumbered Budget Authority:** N/A
Adopted Initiative: Yes No X	**Initiative Description:** N/A	

PURPOSE/REQUIRED ACTION:
The purpose of this agenda bill is to provide the City Council an opportunity to discuss Initiative 1183, which would privatize liquor sales and distribution in Washington State.

BACKGROUND (*Include prior Council action & discussion*):

Initiative 1183 is on the November 2011 statewide ballot. If enacted it would privatize the sale and distribution of liquor in Washington state, effective in March 2012 (distribution) and June 2012 (sales). The City Council has offered the public the opportunity to provide "pro" and "con" input on I-1183 at the October 3 Council meeting.

The attachments provide background information on the initiative. Attachment 1 contains the Washington State Office of Financial Management (OFM) Fiscal Impact Statement for I-1183, which describes the potential fiscal impacts but with a caveat that the actual impact cannot be estimated because the private market will determine the actual cost and mark-up for liquor if privatization occurs.

Attachment 2 provides information from the Association of Washington Cities (AWC). The AWC states that the Association has not taken a position on this ballot initiative.

Attachment 3 is from the Suburban Cities Association's Public Issues Committee (PIC) materials for the PIC's meeting of September 14, 2011. The City of Auburn has asked that the PIC recommend that the SCA support I-1183. The source of the data in the "Our Estimate" column came from the "Yes" campaign for I-1183, according to the Mayor of Auburn. The PIC will vote on Auburn's request at their October 12 meeting. If the Burien Council wishes to have its PIC reprentative vote "yes" or "no" on the Auburn recommendation then the Council would need to provide that direction prior to October 12.

OPTIONS (*Including fiscal impacts*):

Administrative Recommendation: Discuss Initiative 1183.

Committee Recommendation: N/A

Advisory Board Recommendation: N/A

Suggested Motion: None needed at this time.

Submitted by:
Administration ___________ **City Manager** ___________

Today's Date: September 27, 2011

File Code: R:\CC\Agenda Bill 2011\100311cm-5-Initiative1183.docx

Fiscal Impact Statement for Initiative 1183

The fiscal impact cannot be precisely estimated because the private market will determine bottle cost and markup for spirits. Using a range of assumptions, total State General Fund revenues increase an estimated $216 million to $253 million and total local revenues increase an estimated $186 million to $227 million, after Liquor Control Board one-time and ongoing expenses, over six fiscal years. A one-time net state revenue gain of $28.4 million is estimated from sale of the state liquor distribution center. One-time debt service costs are $5.3 million. Ongoing new state costs are estimated at $158,600 over six fiscal years.

General Assumptions

- The initiative uses the term "spirits" to describe alcoholic beverages that are distilled instead of fermented. For purposes of the fiscal impact statement, the term "liquor" is used for "spirits" to maintain consistent terminology. Beer and wine are not spirits or liquor.
- Estimates are described using the state's fiscal year (FY) of July 1 through June 30.
- New liquor distributor licenses and new liquor retailer licenses are available beginning Feb. 8, 2012. There is no limit on the number of licenses that can be issued.
- Liquor distributor licensees can begin making sales of liquor March 1, 2012. Liquor retailer licensees can begin making sales of liquor June 1, 2012.
- By June 15, 2012, the state will no longer operate the state liquor distribution center or state liquor stores.
- Estimates assume 1,428 licensed liquor retailers based on research from implementation of Substitute Senate Bill 6329 that authorized beer and wine tasting at grocery stores with a fully enclosed retail area of 9,000 square feet and the current number of state-operated and contract-operated liquor stores (328). The number of licenses is assumed to be constant for each fiscal year.
- Estimates assume 184 licensed liquor distributors, based on the number of current Washington State Liquor Control Board (LCB) licensed beer and wine distributors, wine distributors, distilleries and liquor importers. The number of licenses is assumed to be constant for each fiscal year.
- Estimates of impacts are measured against the June 2011 LCB revenue forecast (forecast).
- Retail liquor liter sales are estimated to grow 5 percent from increased access to liquor. This assumption is based on an academic study and growth experienced in Alberta, Canada, after converting from state-operated liquor stores to private liquor stores. A decrease in liquor liter sales is estimated using the forecast price elasticity assumption of 0.49 percent. Price elasticity is a method used to calculate the change in consumption of a good when price increases or decreases. For every 1 percent increase/decrease in price, liquor liter sales increase/decrease 0.49 percent. Growth from increased access and price elasticity is in addition to normal 3 percent growth in liquor liter sales assumed in the forecast.

State and Local Revenues

Actual fiscal impacts depend on liquor bottle cost in the private market and the markup applied by both private liquor distributors and retailers. Therefore, there is a wide range of potential fiscal impacts.

To estimate gains or losses to the state and local governments, the fiscal impact statement used a model developed for prior initiatives, adjusted to reflect the content of this initiative. The model measures the difference between LCB forecasted liquor revenues and the sum of the revenue gains and losses generated under the initiative using the set of assumptions set forth below.

Total Estimated State General Fund Revenues

Fiscal Year	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	TOTAL
Low Markup	$5,404,000	$51,373,000	$52,007,000	$36,083,000	$35,669,000	35,244,000	$215,780,000
High Markup	$8,777,000	$59,054,000	$58,372,000	$42,164,000	$42,204,000	$42,260,000	$252,831,000

Total Estimated Local Government Revenues

Fiscal Year	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	TOTAL
Low Markup	$6,012,000	$56,913,000	$42,500,000	$27,973,000	$26,757,000	$25,492,000	$185,647,000
High Markup	$8,361,000	$63,034,000	$50,741,000	$35,770,000	$34,949,000	$34,098,000	$226,953,000

State and Local Government Revenue Assumptions

- LCB's forecasted average bottle price for a liter of liquor (before taxes and markup) is used to estimate both state and private market bottle price.
- State's markup on liquor is 51.9 percent during FY 2012 and FY 2013, and 39.2 percent thereafter.
- Total private distributor/retailer markup for liquor sold in stores is set at a low of 52 percent and a high of 72 percent from March 1, 2012, to March 1, 2014. Thereafter, the private market markup is assumed to be a low of 47 percent and a high of 67 percent. The selected range was based on the following sources:
  - Low markup — 25 percent — is based on U.S. Internal Revenue Service data (sales revenue minus cost of goods) of retail food, beverage and liquor stores throughout the United States.
  - High markup — 45 percent — is the total liquor markup contained in the Washington State Auditor review and is based on information from the Distilled Spirits Council of the United States.
  - To these percentages, 27 percent is added through Feb. 28, 2014, and 22 percent is added thereafter. These percentages represent the total amount of new liquor distributor and retailer license fees under the initiative. While individual distributor and retailer actions will vary, academic research supports an assumption that, in the aggregate statewide, the value of the new liquor distributor and retailer license fees will be passed on to the consumer in the private market markup.

Markup Assumptions

Fiscal Year	2012	2013	July 1, 2013, to Feb. 28, 2014	March 1, 2014, to June 30, 2014	2015	2016	2017
State Markup	51.9%	51.9%	39.2%	39.2%	39.2%	39.2%	39.2%
Low Markup	52%	52%	52%	47%	47%	47%	47%
High Markup	72%	72%	72%	67%	67%	67%	67%

- The initiative imposes a new liquor distributor license fee of 10 percent of total liquor revenues from March 1, 2012, to March 1, 2014; the fee decreases to 5 percent thereafter. The initiative imposes a new liquor retailer license fee of 17 percent of total liquor revenues beginning June 1, 2012.

- Based on inventory information from the Retail Owners Institute®, private liquor stores are estimated to maintain two months of liquor inventory. In contrast, state-operated liquor stores maintain 1.2 months of liquor inventory. Therefore, an additional 0.8 month of liquor liter sales to liquor retailers is assumed during FY 2012.
- If the new liquor distributor license fee totals less than $150 million by March 31, 2013, these licensees must pay the difference between $150 million and actual receipts by May 31, 2013. The model estimates that $84 million to $91 million will be paid by licensees during FY 2013 due to this requirement.
- The initiative sets a $1,320 license fee for each liquor distribution location and a $166 license fee for each liquor retailer license. Both fees are due at the time of license renewal.
- Liquor distributor licensees are assumed to be subject to the wholesaling business and occupation (B&O) tax. Liquor retailer licensees are assumed be subject to the retailing B&O tax.
- Liquor liter taxes and liquor sales taxes are amended by the initiative, but these changes are assumed not to increase, create or eliminate any tax.
- Except for the loss of sales in state-operated liquor stores, estimates do not assume any change in pricing or volume of sales of beer and wine.
- State-operated liquor stores sell Washington State Lottery products to the public. The estimate assumes 25 percent of these sales will be lost and remaining sales will occur in other outlets selling Washington State Lottery products. This revenue loss is estimated to be $1.8 million over six years.
- Estimates of sales by current restaurant licensees who sell liquor at retail are limited to changes from price elasticity and the loss of the state's 15 percent quantity price discount to these licensees.
- Estimates do not assume any change in sales by liquor stores operated on military bases. Such sales are assumed not to be subject to liquor liter taxes, liquor sales taxes or B&O tax.
- Estimates do not assume any change in sales by liquor stores operated by tribes. Such sales are assumed to be subject to liquor liter taxes and liquor sales taxes based on current agreements between tribes and LCB, but are not subject to B&O tax.
- No additional change is assumed for tax avoidance/non-compliance by consumers or migration of sales in and out of state by consumers. These items are assumed in the forecast price elasticity assumption.
- Revenue from the state markup used to pay for the state liquor distribution center and state liquor store costs are netted to zero. The initiative eliminates both the revenue (markup) and the costs (state liquor distribution center and state liquor stores), which results in no additional revenue to the state.
- The initiative requires new liquor distributor and retailer fees to be deposited into the Liquor Revolving Fund. The Liquor Revolving Fund is distributed by statute in the following order:
    1. Payment of LCB administrative costs;
    2. Distributions to state accounts for specific purposes (such as drug and alcohol research at the University of Washington and Washington State University);
    3. Border areas (cities, towns and counties adjacent to the Canadian border); and
    4. The remainder after these distributions: a) 50 percent to the State General Fund; b) 10 percent to counties; and 3) 40 percent to cities and towns.

Therefore, the model first reduces the Liquor Revolving Fund by LCB costs, one-time and ongoing, to determine total revenues distributed to the State General Fund and local governments. Other revenues (beer taxes, wine taxes, penalties, etc.) deposited into the Liquor Revolving Fund are assumed to be unaffected by the initiative and continue to be shared between the state and local governments.

Specific Local Government Revenue Assumptions

- New liquor distributor and retailers license fees must be used to maintain, in the aggregate, Liquor Revolving Fund distributions to counties, cities, towns, border areas and the Municipal Research Service Center in an amount no less than the amount received in comparable periods. For purposes of the model, comparable period is measured by funds forecasted for calendar year 2011. The model estimates that local distributions will exceed the maintenance level required by the initiative each fiscal year.
- An additional $10 million is also provided to counties, cities, towns and border areas.
- Approximately 38 cities and towns impose a local B&O tax. Using data from the Washington State Department of Revenue's 2008 Tax Reference Manual, total local B&O tax is approximately 10 percent of total state B&O tax. Assuming this ratio, $3 million is estimated as new local B&O taxes from liquor sales over six fiscal years.
- Total local government revenues are the sum of the increased Liquor Revolving Fund distributions, the additional $10 million and local B&O tax.

Specific State Asset Assumptions

The sale of the state liquor distribution center is estimated to generate a potential net $28.4 million in revenue. Because the sale date cannot be precisely determined, this revenue is stated separately and excluded from the total State General Fund revenue estimates in the first table above. The value of the state liquor distribution center is estimated to be $20.4 million, based on the King County Assessor's Office 2011 assessed value of the property. The sale of the equipment in the state liquor distribution center is estimated to be $8 million, based on the 2010 Washington State Auditor review, which assumed the sale of $16 million in assets would return about $8 million. Costs to sell the state liquor distribution center are estimated to total $1 million at the time of sale.

The initiative requires LCB to sell by public auction the right — at each state-owned store location — to operate a liquor store upon the premises without regard to the size of the premises if the applicant otherwise qualifies for a liquor retailer license. All state-operated liquor stores are leased and cannot be transferred or assigned. In addition, of the 166 state-operated liquor stores, 127 are located within one block of a grocery store. Because these factors (location, competition and lessor) will vary by state-operated liquor store and will affect the value of each operating right, revenue generated from the auction is indeterminate and not assumed in the model.

The initiative would repeal Engrossed Substitute Senate Bill 5942 (ESSB 5942), which directed the Office of Financial Management to conduct a competitive process for the selection of a private sector entity to lease and modernize the state's liquor warehousing and distribution facilities. Under ESSB 5942, if a proposal is determined to be in the best interests of the state by the Office of Financial Management after consultation with LCB and an advisory board created through the legislation, LCB may contract with that private entity for the lease of the state's liquor warehousing and distribution facilities. Because it is not known if LCB will enter into a contract, no revenue is assumed in the model.

State and Local Expenditure Estimate Assumptions

Revenue gains will accrue to existing accounts, the largest being the State General Fund, which may be used for any governmental purpose as appropriated by the Legislature.

Washington State Lottery proceeds in excess of expenses are deposited into the State Opportunity Pathways Account to support programs in higher education and early learning. Due to the loss of some lottery product sales in state liquor stores, it is estimated that funds to this account will decrease $1.8 million over six fiscal years.

Each county and city is required to spend 2 percent of its share of liquor revenues on alcohol and chemical dependency services, and these expenditures will increase. The additional $10 million distributed to cities, towns, counties and border areas are for enhancing public safety programs. The remaining revenue can be used for any allowable local government purpose.

State and Local Cost Estimate Assumptions
The fiscal impact statement does not estimate state costs or state savings due to social impacts from approval of the initiative. No costs are assumed for local governments.

Liquor Control Board Costs
Estimated one-time and ongoing LCB costs are assumed to be paid by the Liquor Revolving Fund. Therefore, payment of the following costs is reflected in the State General Fund revenue estimate.

LCB ongoing costs for licensing, enforcement and administration are estimated to increase by $350,000 for new fee-collection costs and implementing the "responsible vendor program." No state costs from increased enforcement activities are assumed in the estimate.

Assuming a closure date of June 15, 2012, LCB will incur one-time state costs associated with managing the closure of the state liquor distribution center and state liquor stores. There will be additional one-time costs for issuing new licenses. These state costs are estimated to total $28.7 million during FYs 2012 and 2013:

- Unemployment, sick leave and vacation buyout costs for state employees estimated at $11.8 million.
- Information technology changes and staff to issue new licenses estimated at $2.7 million.
- Staffing costs to coordinate the sale of existing inventory, termination of contract store leases, surplus of store fixtures and auction of state-operated store operating rights estimated at $11 million.
- Final audits of each state and contract liquor store estimated at $1.9 million.
- Project management and additional human resource staff estimated at $1.3 million.

Department of Revenue Costs
The Washington State Department of Revenue will administer the collection of liquor excise tax from licensed liquor distributors and retailers. Costs include additional staff, information technology changes, rule-making and policy activities, taxpayer mailings and workshops, supplies and materials. Total one-time state costs are estimated to total $120,100 during FY 2012. Ongoing costs are estimated to be $38,500 each fiscal year beginning FY 2013.

State Indebtedness
There is $5.3 million in debt service costs for a Certificate of Participation bond for the state liquor distribution center that is scheduled to be paid by Dec. 1, 2013. This one-time state cost is assumed in FY 2014.

ATTACHMENT 2

August 2011

The Privatization of Liquor

ASSOCIATION OF WASHINGTON CITIES

If approved by voters, I-1183 would fully privatize liquor sales and distribution. The measure is sponsored by a group of retailers and restaurants, including Costco, Trader Joe's, the Northwest Grocery Association, and the Washington Restaurant Association.

How much liquor revenue do cities receive?

State and local governments get two types of revenue from liquor sales: liquor profits and liquor taxes

- Liquor board profits are revenues from permits, licenses, and liquor store sales. The state first pays for the activities of the Liquor Control Board (administration, sales staff, leases, etc.). The remaining profits are shared: 50% to the state, 40% to cities, and 10% to counties. (Border areas receive an additional distribution.)
- Liquor excise taxes come from a state tax to consumers and restaurant licensees. The tax rates include a basic rate plus surcharges. Revenues from the basic rates of 15% for consumers and 10% for restaurants are shared: 65% to the state, 28% to cities, and 7% to counties. The state retains all surcharge revenue.

The Municipal Research and Services Center's *Budget Suggestions for 2012* estimates revenue distributions to cities as follows:

Distributions to cities	2010	2011
Liquor profits	$33,276,498	$29,471,000
Per capita profits	$7.93	$6.85
Liquor tax	$20,622,713	$21,341,000
Per capita liquor tax	$4.91	$4.96

What impact would I-1183 have on local revenue?

The initiative specifies that local governments are to continue to receive, in the aggregate, no less liquor revenue than comparable periods plus an additional $10 million per year for public safety.

In general, liquor taxes would remain. The current liquor markup – the primary source of revenue for liquor profits – would end. However, the initiative provides a new annual license fee for liquor retailers (17% of its liquor sales) and distributors (10% of its liquor sales for the first two years; 5% of its liquor sales after that), which would be distributed as the markup currently is. During the first year, distributors must collectively pay $150 million in license fees.

continued

Key provisions of I-1183

- Private stores must be at least 10,000 square feet with limited exceptions.
- Local government, the public, churches, and schools may object to issuance of local liquor licenses.
- Employees selling liquor must complete compliance training every five years.
- Fines and license suspensions for liquor violations will double for some retailers.

Key dates in I-1183

- Private liquor distribution begins: March 1, 2012
- Private liquor stores open: June 1, 2012
- State liquor stores must close: June 1, 2012
- State liquor distribution & liquor markup ends: June 1, 2012

Association of Washington Cities
1076 Franklin St SE, Olympia, WA 98501
www.awcnet.org

The Office of Financial Management (OFM) estimates the liquor license fees will increase revenue for local and state governments if the initiative passes. Over six years, local governments would receive an additional $186 to $227 million over current projections. The State General Fund would receive an additional $216 and $253 million. OFM assumes that an estimated 1,428 retailers would begin selling liquor, and sales would increase 5% due to increased availability. OFM further assumes that the liquor markup would increase under a private system. In an analysis partially funded by Costco, the Washington Research Council estimated that liquor revenue to local governments would increase by $279 million over six years if the initiative passes.

What happens to the state's plan to contract out liquor distribution if I-1183 passes?

In 2011, the Legislature passed a bill requiring the state to seek proposals to contract out liquor warehousing and distribution. The proposals must demonstrate a positive financial benefit to both the state and local governments. I-1183 specifically repeals any law adopted in 2011 regarding liquor warehousing and distribution, and as Governor Gregoire signed the bill into law, she said she did not expect the state to enter into a distribution contract prior to November's election.

What is AWC's role?

AWC will continue to provide our members with educational materials. Please visit our website for links to OFM's fiscal note, campaign websites, initiative text, and more at www.awcnet.org/initiatives.

AWC has not taken a position for or against this ballot initiative. AWC's role is to provide its members with educational materials that can be shared with elected officials, staff and the community.

AWC
ASSOCIATION OF WASHINGTON CITIES
1076 Franklin St SE
Olympia, WA 98501
www.awcnet.org

Initiative 1183:
The Privatization of Liquor

I-1183 would fully privatize liquor sales and distribution.

Key Provisions of I-1183

- Private stores must be at least 10,000 square feet, with limited exceptions.
- Local government, the public, churches, and schools may object to issuance of local liquor licenses.
- Employees selling liquor must complete compliance training every five years.
- Fines and license suspensions for liquor violations will double for some retailers.

an estimated 1,428 stores would sell liquor—up from the current 328 state and contract liquor stores.

Adds increased training and enhanced penalties for private liquor retailers.

Key Dates in I-1183

- Private liquor distribution begins: March 1, 2012
- Private liquor stores open: June 1, 2012
- State liquor stores must close: June 1, 2012
- State liquor distribution & liquor markup ends: June 1, 2012

Private stores open and state stores close on same day.

How much liquor revenue do cities currently receive?

State and local governments get two types of revenue from liquor sales: liquor profits and liquor taxes.

- Liquor board profits are revenues from permits, licenses, and liquor store sales. The state first pays for the activities of the Liquor Control Board (administration, sales staff, leases, etc.). The remaining profits are shared: 50% to the state, 40% to cities, and 10% to counties. (Border areas receive an additional distribution.)
- Liquor excise taxes come from a state tax to consumers and restaurant licensees. The tax rates include a basic rate plus surcharges. Revenues from the basic rates of 15% for consumers and 10% for restaurants are shared: 65% to the state, 28% to cities, and 7% to counties. The state retains all surcharge revenue.

Liquor sales have provided revenue to Washington cities since Prohibition ended.

Budget Suggestions for 2012 from the Municipal Research & Services Center (MRSC) estimates revenue distributions to cities as follows:

DISTRIBUTIONS TO CITIES	2010	2011
Liquor profits	$31,276,498	$29,471,000
Per capita profits	$7.93	$6.85
Liquor tax	$20,622,713	$21,341,000
Per capita liquor tax	$4.91	$4.96

The state markup on liquor currently is 51.9%; two analyses concluded that private retailers initially would have a liquor markup between 52% and 72%.

What impact would I-1183 have on local revenue?

The initiative specifies that local governments and MRSC are to continue to receive, in the aggregate, no less liquor revenue than in comparable previous periods plus an additional $10 million per year for public safety. In general, liquor taxes would remain. The current liquor markup—the primary source of revenue for liquor profits—would end. However, the initiative provides a new annual license fee for liquor retailers (17% of a retailer's liquor sales) and distributors (10% of a distributor's liquor sales for the first two years; 5% of its liquor sales after that), which would be distributed as the markup currently is. During the first year, distributors must collectively pay $150 million in license fees.

The state estimates that new license fees would generate an additional $186-$227 million for local government over six years.

When talking to your community, don't forget PDC guidelines.

AWC has not taken a position for or against this ballot initiative. AWC's role is to provide its members with educational materials that can be shared with elected officials, staff, and the community.

For more information:
www.awcnet.org

The City of Auburn is recommending that SCA support the passage of state-wide initiative 1183. This initiative will significantly increase revenues to state and local government and to local public safety programs. In these difficult times additional funding for local government services is needed. The initiative states it will prevent loss of funding to the cities through continuation of liquor proceeds and goes further to state that it will increase these proceeds distributed to cities. This will provide for the reliable funding of basic services needed by cities from the Municipal Research and Service Center. It states that it will strengthen regulations governing the sale of liquor and includes resources for law enforcement while providing appropriate restrictions to ensure a reasonable number and size of retail sites and maintain authority for local government zoning control to prevent inappropriate location of retail sites.

Additional Estimated Distributions to Local Government Over Six Years From I-1183

County Municipality	Census 2010	Estimate 2011	Our Estimate	OFM High	OFM Low
King	**1,931,249**	**1,942,600**	**92,327,700**	**75,038,800**	**61,381,500**
Unincorporated	325,000	285,265	6,490,400	5,275,100	4,315,000
Incorporated	1,606,249	1,657,335	85,837,300	69,763,700	57,066,500
Algona	3,014	3,055	158,200	128,600	105,200
Auburn part	62,761	63,050	3,265,500	2,654,000	2,171,000
Beaux Arts Village	299	300	15,500	12,600	10,300
Bellevue	122,363	123,400	6,391,200	5,194,400	4,249,000
Black Diamond*	4,153	4,160	215,500	175,100	143,200
Bothell part	17,090	17,150	888,200	721,900	590,500
Burien	33,313	47,660	2,468,400	2,006,200	1,641,100
Carnation	1,786	1,780	92,200	74,900	61,300
Clyde Hill	2,984	2,985	154,600	125,700	102,800
Covington	17,575	17,640	913,600	742,500	607,400
Des Moines	29,673	29,680	1,537,200	1,249,300	1,022,000
Duvall	6,695	6,715	347,800	282,700	231,200
Enumclaw part	10,669	10,920	565,600	459,700	376,000
Federal Way	89,306	89,370	4,628,700	3,761,900	3,077,300
Hunts Point	394	390	20,200	16,400	13,400
Issaquah	30,434	30,690	1,589,500	1,291,900	1,056,700
Kenmore	20,460	20,780	1,076,200	874,700	715,500
Kent	92,411	118,200	6,121,900	4,975,500	4,069,900
Kirkland	48,787	49,020	2,538,900	2,063,400	1,687,900
Lake Forest Park	12,598	12,610	653,100	530,800	434,200
Maple Valley	22,684	22,930	1,187,600	965,200	789,500
Medina	2,969	2,970	153,800	125,000	102,300
Mercer Island	22,699	22,710	1,176,200	956,000	782,000
Milton part	831	835	43,200	35,100	28,800
Newcastle	10,380	10,410	539,200	438,200	358,400
Normandy Park	6,335	6,345	328,600	267,100	218,500
North Bend	5,731	5,830	301,900	245,400	200,700
Pacific part	6,514	6,520	337,700	274,500	224,500
Redmond	54,144	55,150	2,856,400	2,321,500	1,899,000
Renton	90,927	92,590	4,795,500	3,897,500	3,188,100
Sammamish	45,780	46,940	2,431,100	1,975,900	1,616,300
SeaTac	26,909	27,110	1,404,100	1,141,200	933,500
Seattle	608,660	612,100	31,702,100	25,765,700	21,076,300
Shoreline	53,007	53,200	2,755,400	2,239,400	1,831,800
Skykomish	198	195	10,100	8,200	6,700
Snoqualmie	10,670	10,950	567,100	460,900	377,000
Tukwila	19,107	19,050	986,600	801,900	655,900
Woodinville	10,938	10,940	566,600	460,500	376,700
Yarrow Point	1,001	1,005	52,100	42,300	34,600

County Municipality	Census 2010	Estimate 2011	Our Estimate	OFM High	OFM Low
Snohomish	**713,335**	**717,000**	**28,294,200**	**22,996,100**	**18,810,600**
Unincorporated	302,292	304,435	6,926,600	5,629,600	4,605,000
Incorporated	411,043	412,565	21,367,600	17,366,500	14,205,600
Arlington	17,926	17,930	928,600	754,700	617,400
Bothell part	16,415	16,570	858,200	697,500	570,600
Brier	6,087	6,100	315,900	256,800	210,000
Darrington	1,347	1,345	69,700	56,600	46,300
Edmonds	39,709	39,800	2,061,300	1,675,300	1,370,400
Everett	103,019	103,100	5,339,800	4,339,900	3,550,000
Gold Bar	2,075	2,060	106,700	86,700	70,900
Granite Falls	3,364	3,370	174,500	141,900	116,000
Index	178	180	9,300	7,600	6,200
Lake Stevens	28,069	28,210	1,461,100	1,187,500	971,300
Lynnwood	35,836	35,860	1,857,300	1,509,500	1,234,800
Marysville	60,020	60,660	3,141,700	2,553,400	2,088,700
Mill Creek	18,244	18,370	951,400	773,300	632,500
Monroe	17,304	17,330	897,600	729,500	596,700
Mountlake Terrace	19,909	19,990	1,035,300	841,500	688,300
Mukilteo	20,254	20,310	1,051,900	854,900	699,300
Snohomish	9,098	9,200	476,500	387,300	316,800
Stanwood	6,231	6,220	322,100	261,800	214,200
Sultan	4,651	4,655	241,100	195,900	160,300
Woodway	1,307	1,305	67,600	54,900	44,900

County Municipality	Census 2010	Estimate 2011	Our Estimate	OFM High	OFM Low
Pierce	**795,225**	**802,150**	**30,739,100**	**24,983,300**	**20,436,200**
Unincorporated	366,738	372,110	1 of 2 466,400	6,881,000	5,628,600
Incorporated	428,487	430,040	22,272,700	18,102,300	14,807,600
Auburn part	7,419	7,655	396,500	322,200	263,600
Bonney Lake	17,374	17,500	906,400	736,600	602,600
Buckley	4,354	4,345	225,000	182,900	149,600
Carbonado	610	610	31,600	25,700	21,000
DuPont	8,199	8,430	436,600	354,900	290,300
Eatonville	2,758	2,775	143,700	116,800	95,600
Edgewood	9,387	9,405	487,100	395,900	323,800
Enumclaw part	0	0	-	-	-
Fife	9,173	9,220	477,500	388,100	317,500
Fircrest	6,497	6,500	336,700	273,600	223,800
Gig Harbor	7,126	7,200	372,900	303,100	247,900
Lakewood	58,163	58,190	3,013,800	2,449,400	2,003,600
Milton part	6,137	6,140	318,000	258,500	211,400
Orting	6,746	6,770	350,600	285,000	233,100
Pacific part	92	85	4,400	3,600	2,900
Puyallup	37,022	37,240	1,928,700	1,567,600	1,282,300
Roy	793	795	41,200	33,500	27,400
Ruston	749	750	38,800	31,600	25,800
South Prairie	434	435	22,500	18,300	15,000
Steilacoom	5,985	6,000	310,800	252,600	206,600
Sumner	9,451	9,450	489,400	397,800	325,400
Tacoma	198,397	198,900	10,301,500	8,372,500	6,848,700
University Place	31,144	31,170	1,614,400	1,312,100	1,073,300
Wilkeson	477	475	24,600	20,000	16,400

The county and municipal populations shown for 2010 are, with a few exceptions, the 2010 federal census Public Law 94-171 counts. Some 2010 counts may differ from the federal census as noted below.

* - Census 2010 population and housing adjusted for annexations effective and approved by OFM from January 2, 2010 to April 1, 2010. Office of Financial Management - Forecasting Division / June 30, 2011