


Schroader, Kathy



From: Orjiako, Oliver
Sent: Thursday, November 05, 2015 3:27 PM
To: Schroader, Kathy, Anderson, Colete, Kamp, Jacqueline
Subject: FW: welcomed revisions

FYI and for the record Thanks

From: Madore, David
Sent: Wednesday, November 04, 2015 5:07 PM
To: Orjiako, Oliver; Madore, David
Subject: RE: welcomed revisions

Oliver,

Thank you for your recommendations. I was able to incorporate some of them within the limited time. The updated document (revision 1.03) is attached. I will plan to collaborate further with you.

Thank you,

David



From: Orjiako, Oliver
Sent: Wednesday, November 04, 2015 1:35 PM
To: Madore, David; Horne, Chris
Cc: Cook, Christine; McCauley, Mark
Subject: RE: welcomed revisions

Hello Councilor:

You saw us as a team reviewing your proposal yesterday. The PA's Office are providing input as well. I believe you will soon see staff comment soon. Thank you.

Oliver

From: Madore, David
Sent: Wednesday, November 04, 2015 1:27 PM
To: Orjiako, Oliver; Horne, Chris
Subject: RE: welcomed revisions

Oliver,

Just a quick note before I step into our Board Time meeting I have not heard anything from you and therefore assume that you have no problems with the document I submitted I am appealing to you to be one united team that can work together I can stay late if need be

Thanks

David

From: Orjiako, Oliver
Sent: Wednesday, November 04, 2015 12:06 PM
To: Madore, David
Cc: Cook, Christine; Horne, Chris
Subject: RE: welcomed revisions

Hello Councilor.

Staff reviewed the planning assumptions proposal yesterday and the PA's Office are working on it and will have it ready today for your consideration Thank you.

Best,

Oliver

From: Madore, David
Sent: Tuesday, November 03, 2015 3:04 PM
To: Orjiako, Oliver
Subject: welcomed revisions

Oliver,

I have a 4 pm RTC meeting and have heard any feedback from you that could offer improvements to the Planning Assumptions document that I emailed you earlier Since I am nearly out of time, I am emailing you the attached version that simply incorporated the minor suggestions that I did receive so far (from Peter Silliman) They are not substantive, just a little better form

I can still respond this evening or tomorrow if you like

<< File Planning Assumption Choices rev101.docx >>
Thank you,

David

From: Orjiako, Oliver
Sent: Tuesday, November 03, 2015 1:42 PM

To: Madore, David
Subject: Phone call

Hello Councilor:

I got your voice message and the email to me, Ken , and Bob relating to the "Planning Assumption Choices" I will review and provide any comment if any Staff (Sonja), schedule two open houses and here at the date and time

Monday, 11/16/15 – 5:30-7.00 p.m. – Hockinson High School

Tuesday, 11/17/15 – 5:30-7:00 p m – Ridgefield High School

Please, let me know if you have questions Thanks

Oliver

Clark County

2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan Update



CHECKING IN ON OUR FUTURE

Proposed Changes to Planning Assumptions

An Evidence Based Proposal by Councilor David Madore

11/4/2015

This document focuses primarily on the rural components of the Comp Plan, particularly Alternative 1 and Alternative 4. The proposal contrasts existing choice A with the proposed choice B and provides the factual basis for each. Table 1 provides the assumptions that define the methods for calculating the capacity for rural parcels to accommodate population growth. Table 2 provides the general planning assumptions for population growth, accommodate that growth, GMA considerations, and logical conclusions. The Reference Section provides relevant evidence, the historical basis, and supporting calculations for the two tables. The purpose of this document is to present decision makers with the compelling need to revise the original draft assumptions with more accurate, appropriate, realistic, and evidence based foundations and to apply the insight gained from staff, cities, citizens, the GIS database, and actual historical records.

Table 1: GIS Rural Vacant Buildable Lands Model (VBLM) Assumptions

Ref	A (existing)	B (proposed)
1	Remainder lots of already developed cluster developments with permanent covenants prohibiting further development shall be counted as rural parcels that will develop.	Parcels that cannot reasonably be expected to develop should not be counted as likely to develop. Those include remainder lots of already developed cluster developments that are prohibited from further development.
2	Parcels located in areas far from any infrastructure with continuous long term commercial forestry operations are counted as rural parcels that will develop.	Parcels located in areas far from any infrastructure with continuous long term commercial forestry operations likely to continue should not be counted as likely to develop.
3	Rural parcels including 100% of environmentally constrained areas that lack the necessary area for septic systems and well clearances shall be counted as rural parcels that will develop.	Rural parcels that have less than 1 acre of environmentally unconstrained land necessary for septic systems and well clearances should not be counted as likely to develop.
4	The adopted "Never to Convert" deductions used by the VBLM inside the Urban Growth Boundaries shall be omitted outside the Urban Growth Boundaries. All built and all vacant rural parcels shall be counted as rural parcels that will develop.	The adopted VBLM used for urban areas assumes that a percentage of properties that have an existing residence will likely not divide further. That same 30% "Never to Convert" assumption should apply to already built rural parcels as well. The adopted VBLM used for urban areas assumes that a percentage of vacant properties will likely not divide further. That same 10% "Never to Convert" assumption should apply to vacant rural parcels as well.
5	Lots that are up to 10% smaller than the minimum lot size should be considered as conforming lots and counted as likely to develop as provided by current county code.	Same
6	All nonconforming parcels with 1 acre shall be counted as rural parcels that will develop.	10% of nonconforming parcels with at least 1 acre of unconstrained area will likely develop at the same rate indicated by historical records.
7	The 15% Market Factor used for urban parcels to provide some margin for the law of supply and demand to satisfy the GMA affordable housing goal inside the UGB shall not apply outside the UGB.	A deduction of up to 7.5% is appropriate to provide some margin for the law of supply and demand of rural parcels to help satisfy the GMA affordable housing goal.
8	A 27.7% infrastructure deduction is use for urban parcels. But because rural parcels are larger, the rural infrastructure deduction is assumed to be small. No deduction shall be used for rural parcels for any infrastructure such as roads, storm water, parks, schools, fire stations, conservation areas, lakes, streams, protected buffers, Etc.	Same

Table 2: Planning Assumptions

Planning Assumption	A (existing)	B (proposed)
1	The 20 year urban population is forecasted to increase by 116,609.	Same
2	The actual historical urban/rural split has consistently been 86/14. But a 90/10 split shall be used instead to lower the rural population growth forecast to only 12,957 persons.	The actual historical urban/rural split that has consistently been 86/14 should be used as the factual basis to forecast a realistic rural population growth of 16,325 persons.
3	The annual county-wide population growth rate is forecasted to be 1.25%. Increasing from 447,865 in 2015 to 577,431 in 2035 is a total increase of 129,566 persons which is 1.279% per year.	The county-wide population with the 86/14 split is forecasted to increasing from 447,865 in 2015 to 580,799 in 2035 for a total increase of 132,934 persons which is 1.308% per year. (0.029% higher than A). 580,799 is 0.58% higher than 577,431.
4	The above assumptions assert that Alternative 1 can accommodate 18,814 new persons which is 45% too high in the rural areas. (18,814 / 12,957)	The above updated assumptions show that Alternative 1 can only accommodate 8,182 new persons which is 50% too low. Thus Alternative 1 is not viable since it cannot comply with the GMA requirement to provide for the forecasted growth. (8,182 / 16,325)
5	The above assumptions assert that Alternative 4 can accommodate 32,987 new persons which is 155% too high and therefore stated by the SDEIS to have too much impact. (32,987 / 12,957)	The above assumptions assert that Alternative 4 can accommodate 16,332 new persons to fit the forecasted rural population growth nearly exactly.
6	The Alternative 4 map without mitigation revisions does not preserve large parcels near the UGBs for future employment, removes 20 acre AG zoning, and is said by the SDEIS to change the rural character.	The Alternative 4 updated map includes mitigation that increases the variety of parcels, preserves large parcels near the UGBs for future employment, and better preserves the rural character by including 20 acre AG minimum lot sizes.
7	Cluster options may be but are not necessarily included in any Alternative and therefore may not be available to preserve open space or large areas of habitat.	Rural cluster options are to be integrated into Alternative 4 per previous direction given by the Board for all rural zones to preserve open space and to better provide for large areas of habitat.
8	Alternative-1 defines 60% of existing R parcels as nonconforming, 70% of existing AG parcels as nonconforming, and 80% of existing FR parcels as nonconforming.	The updated Alternative-4 definition and map should be adopted to correct the mismatch between Alternative 1 and the actual ground truth, to respect predominant lots sizes, to resolve some spot zoning problems, and to best accommodate the forecasted population.

Reference Section – the factual basis for assumptions

The following table documents the actual urban / rural split for the last 20 years:

Year	County-wide Population	Rural Population	Percent Rural Population	Urban / Rural Split
1995	279,522	43,254	15.5	84/16
1996	293,182	44,882	15.3	85/15
1997	305,287	46,409	15.2	85/15
1998	319,233	48,104	15.1	85/15
1999	330,800	49,429	14.9	85/15
2000	346,435	51,182	14.8	85/15
2001	354,870	52,002	14.7	85/15
2002	369,360	53,548	14.5	85/15
2003	375,394	54,146	14.4	86/14
2004	384,713	54,869	14.3	86/14
2005	395,780	56,009	14.2	86/14
2006	406,124	57,551	14.2	86/14
2007	414,743	58,608	14.1	86/14
2008	419,483	59,042	14.1	86/14
2009	424,406	59,623	14.0	86/14
2010	427,327	59,858	14.0	86/14
2011	432,109	60,544	14.0	86/14
2012	435,048	60,845	14.0	86/14
2013	443,277	61,489	13.9	86/14
2014	446,785	61,948	13.9	86/14

Source: Clark County Assessor GIS records:

The following table documents the actual capacity of the rural area to accommodate the potential population increase for Alternative-1 and Alternative-4 using proposed choice B assumptions compared to the existing choice A assumptions considered in the DSEIS.

	Alt-1 Capacity per DSEIS Choice A (existing)	Alt-1 Actual Capacity Choice B (proposed)	Alt-4 Capacity per DSEIS Choice A (existing)	Alt-4 Actual Capacity Choice B (proposed)
Rural Zone	5,684	2,570	9,880	4,710
Agriculture Zone	970	286	1,958	733
Forest Zone	419	162	563	1,097
Nonconforming likely		183		74
Other Rural Zones		124		124
Gross potential growth home sites	7,073	3,325	12,401	6,638
7,5% Market Factor deduction	0	-249	0	-498
Net potential growth of home sites	7,073	3,076	12,401	6,140
Potential population growth	18,814	8,182	32,987	16,332

Source: Clark County GIS:

The following table provides the forecasted population for choices A and B.

ref	Year	County-wide Population A	County-wide Growth A	Urban Growth A & B	Rural Growth B	County-wide Growth B	County-wide Population B
0	2015	447865	0	0	0	0	447865
1	2016	453591	5726	5153	721	5874	453739
2	2017	459391	11526	10373	1452	11825	459690
3	2018	465265	17400	15660	2192	17852	465717
4	2019	471213	23348	21013	2942	23955	471820
5	2020	477238	29373	26436	3701	30137	478002
6	2021	483340	35475	31928	4470	36398	484263
7	2022	489520	41655	37490	5249	42739	490604
8	2023	495779	47914	43123	6037	49160	497025
9	2024	502118	54253	48828	6836	55664	503529
10	2025	508538	60673	54606	7645	62251	510116
11	2026	515040	67175	60458	8464	68922	516787
12	2027	521626	73761	66385	9294	75679	523544
13	2028	528295	80430	72387	10134	82521	530386
14	2029	535050	87185	78467	10985	89452	537317
15	2030	541891	94026	84623	11847	96470	544335
16	2031	548819	100954	90859	12720	103579	551444
17	2032	555837	107972	97175	13605	110780	558645
18	2033	562943	115078	103570	14500	118070	565935
19	2034	570141	122276	110048	15407	125455	573320
20	2035	577431	129566	116609	16325	132934	580799

Thus the 2035 rural population growth forecasted using assumptions choice B is 16,325 that leaves the forecasted urban growth rate the same but updates the urban/rural split to 86/14.

Correcting the population growth planning assumptions:

The planning assumptions published on Table S-1 on page of the SDEIS show the following:

Total population projection for 2035 = 577,431

Projected new residents = 129,566

The 2015 population = $577,431 - 129,566 = 447,865$

Annual population growth rate = 1.25%

Urban/rural population growth split = 90% urban, 10% rural

Thus the 2035 urban population growth = $129,566 * 0.9 = 116,609$

Thus the 2035 rural population growth = $129,566 * 0.1 = 12,957$

The more precise annual population growth rate using the original choice A assumptions is calculated as follows:

$577,431 / 447,865 = 1.2893$

The 20th root of 1.2893 = 1.279 which translates to a 1.279% annual growth rate.

The corrected annual population growth rate is calculated as follows:

$580,799 / 447,865 = 1.29682$

The 20th root of 1.29682 = 1.01308 which translates to a 1.308% annual growth rate.

Thus, the forecasted annual population growth rate using choice A assumptions is 0.029% higher than the forecast of choice A assumptions.

$(1.308\% - 1.279\% = 0.029\%)$

The proposed planning assumptions for choice B are as follows:

Total population projection for 2035 = 580,799 (0.58% different)

Total county-wide increase = 132,934 persons (2.6% different, $132,934 / 129,566$)

Annual county-wide population growth rate = 1.308% (0.029% different)

Urban/rural population growth split = 86% urban, 14% rural (updated from 90/10)

Thus the 2035 urban population growth = 116,609 persons (same)

Additional details will be provided.