In my rush to get this information out, I made a mistake and sent the wrong version of Issue Paper #4. Attached is the version that I will make changes too.

Now, this will make sense......

4. Issue Paper 4 (we added more text under countywide population allocation on page 2).

Apologies for the confusion and extra emails.

Gary

From: Albrecht, Gary  
Sent: Monday, June 16, 2014 2:33 PM  
To: McCaill, Marilee; 'Amanda Smeller-Woodland'; Snodgrass, Bryan; Eiken, Chad; 'Eric Eisemann-Consultant'; 'Jeff Sarvis-La Center'; 'Lee Knottnerus-Ridgefield'; 'Mitch Kneipp-Washougal'; James Weldon; 'Phil Bourquin-Camas'; 'Robert Maul-Camas'; 'Sam Cummett-Battle Ground'; Towne, Sandra; 'Steve Stuart-Ridgefield'; 'erin.erdman@cityofbg.org'; Hermin, Matt; 'sfox@cityofcamas.us'  
Cc: Alvarez, Jose; Anderson, Colete; Euler, Gordon; Kamp, Jacqueline; Lebowski, Laurie; Niten, Jeff; O'Donnell, Mary Beth; Orjiako, Oliver  
Subject: RE: City-County Coordination Meeting Agenda - FRIDAY June 13 from 10-12 in Ridgefield  

Our 1:00 p.m. with the City of Vancouver staff went well. We mainly discussed redevelopment.

We are going to pull forward footnote #2 from Issue Paper #1.

Total potential jobs not captured by the vacant lands model increase the capacity for jobs on vacant lands by 16,775 (jobs from redevelopment), and 6,600 public sector jobs, thus increasing the total potential job capacity from 94,458 to 117,833.

Do you have any redevelopment jobs to add to the footnote?

Please submit by 4:30 today.
From: Albrecht, Gary  
Sent: Friday, June 13, 2014 5:17 PM  
To: McCall, Marilee; 'Amanda Smeller-Woodland'; Snodgrass, Bryan; Eiken, Chad; 'Eric Eisemann-Consultant'; 'Jeff Sarvis-La Center'; 'Lee Knottnerus-Ridgefield'; 'Mitch Kneipp-Washougal'; James Weldon; 'Phil Bourquin-Camas'; 'Robert Maul-Camas'; 'Sam Crummert-Battle Ground'; Towne, Sandra; 'Steve Stuart-Ridgefield'; 'erin.erdman@cityofbg.org'; Hermen, Matt; 'sfox@cityofcamas.us'  
Cc: Alvarez, Jose; Anderson, Colete; Euler, Gordon; Kamp, Jacqueline; Lebowsky, Laurie; Niten, Jeff; O'Donnell, Mary Beth; Orjiako, Oliver  
Subject: RE: City-County Coordination Meeting Agenda - FRIDAY June 13 from 10-12 in Ridgefield

Greetings:

We had a very good discussion at today's meeting. I am attaching a couple of charts showing how we arrived at the allocation; the charts also show how market factors are applied.
Please review and provide us comments/thoughts.

On Monday, we will further revise Issue Paper #4 to expand on methodology #3 including the attached 2.66 pph table, supply demand table for employment, and any further clarification.

Thank you for working with us.

Gary

From: McCall, Marilee
Sent: Monday, June 09, 2014 3:35 PM
To: 'Amanda Smeller-Woodland'; Snodgrass, Bryan; Eiken, Chad; 'Eric Eisemann-Consultant'; 'Jeff Sarvis-La Center'; 'Lee Kottnerus-Ridgefield'; 'Mitch Kneipp-Washougal'; James Weldon; 'Phil Bourquin-Camas'; 'Robert Maul-Camas'; 'Sam Crummett-Battle Ground'; Towne, Sandra; 'Steve Stuart-Ridgefield'; 'erin.erdman@cityofbg.org'; Hermen, Matt; 'sfox@cityofcamas.us'
Cc: Albrecht, Gary; Alvarez, Jose; Anderson, Colete; Euler, Gordon; Kamp, Jacqueline; Lebowsky, Laurie; Niten, Jeff; O'Donnell, Mary Beth; Orjiako, Oliver
Subject: City-County Coordination Meeting Agenda - FRIDAY June 13 from 10-12 in Ridgefield

Reminder and copy of agenda with attachment of DRAFT Issue Paper #4 for review.
Minutes from last month’s meeting are also included for your review.

Thank you! Have a great afternoon!

Marilee McCall | Administrative Assistant
Community Planning | "Planning for Clark County’s promising future"
tel: 360.397.2280 ext. 4558 | fax: 360.759.6762
P.O. Box 9810 | Vancouver WA 98666
www.clark.wa.gov/planning
Clark County Comprehensive Plan 2016 Update
Planning for growth 2015 – 2035

Purpose
This memorandum provides a basic framework and starting point from which the county and its cities may consider population and employment allocation.

Background
In July 2013, Clark County began the process of updating its comprehensive Growth Management Plan to meet the 2016 periodic update requirement of Chapter 36.70A.140 RCW. Several issue papers have already been prepared to allow the Board to make decisions about the update:

In “Issue Paper 1 – Comprehensive Plan Overview”, Community Planning presented a summary of the county’s Planning Assumptions, the 2013 vacant and buildable lands model (VBLM) inventory, and population and employment projections.


This issue paper (Issue Paper 4) will discuss 2016 population and employment allocations.

Methodology
Allocation of population and jobs is a key step in the planning process. There are three options for allocating that can be used by the Board:

1) placing growth where it has historically occurred within the urban growth areas (UGA) as documented by U.S. Census;
2) allocating growth by UGA based on the vacant and buildable lands model plus the potential capacity for jobs and population by considering factors such as FPIAs, redevelopment, filling vacancies, etc.; or
3) allocating growth by UGA according to the proportion of the total county identified vacant and buildable lands (used since 1994).
The following are essential to the outcome regardless of which method is used:

- Maintain coordination and consistency with local comprehensive plans;
- Use official state population forecasts from OFM (already adopted);
- Use the employment projections from ESD (already adopted);
- Use estimates of the existing VBLM capacity for growth of the UGAs to inform decisions on allocation of growth targets;
- Continue using the inventory of available VBLM inventory information; a practice since 1994;
- Allow for flexibility where necessary;
- Consider impacts of the recent stormwater regulations on infrastructure needs. Identified vacant and buildable residential lands reflect a 27.7% infrastructure deduction;
- Carrying capacity is assumed on vacant or underutilized single family and multifamily lands, at 4-5 units per acre for urban low, and 9-16 units per acre for urban high, and 4-18 units per acre of mixed use; and,
- The urban/rural growth percentage split remains at 90/10.

Countywide Population Allocation

Table 1 below shows the current population estimate, 2014 vacant lands model capacity, and the 2035 population forecast should the Board use allocation option number 3 as listed above. Option 3 is the methodology we are proposing. The cities have concerns that the allocation shows a reduction in capacity from the 2007 Comprehensive Plan.

The 2035 population allocation to UGA's is based on determining the potential population that can be accommodated by the 2014 Vacant Lands Model yield potential (151,764 based on a yield of 57,054 housing units at 2.66 persons per unit) and figuring the share of the total potential VLM population by UGA. The 2014 to 2035 growth allocation by UGA is calculated by applying the UGA share of the VLM to the total population for the urban area (113,004 = 125,560 - 12,556). The 12,556 represents the 10% rural allocation. The 125,560 is the total growth expected between 2014 (436,647) to 2035 OFM Medium Projection of 562,207. For example, the Battle Ground UGA accounts for about 15.5% of the VLM Population yield (23,560/151,764). So they were allocated 15.5% of the 2014-2035 urban area population growth. (113,004/15.524% = 71,543)
Table 1: 2035 Population Forecast by UGA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Battle Ground</td>
<td>20,163</td>
<td>17,543</td>
<td>37,705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camas</td>
<td>22,049</td>
<td>12,361</td>
<td>34,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaCenter</td>
<td>3,163</td>
<td>3,551</td>
<td>6,714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridgefield</td>
<td>6,150</td>
<td>14,374</td>
<td>20,523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver</td>
<td>307,767</td>
<td>57,976</td>
<td>365,743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washougal</td>
<td>15,502</td>
<td>6,615</td>
<td>22,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodland</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yacolt</td>
<td>1,653</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>1,986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>60,112</td>
<td>12,556^</td>
<td>72,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>436,647</td>
<td>125,560</td>
<td><strong>562,207</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Clark County, Geographic information System and Community Planning
Note: *10% based on 90/10 urban/rural planning assumption

Countywide Employment Allocation
The GMA does not dictate a data source that must be considered in planning for future employment. For the 1994, 2004, and 2007 planning efforts, the number of anticipated new jobs in Clark County was developed by the Washington State Employment Securities Department. The forecasts were based on anticipated population growth, workforce participation, unemployment, and percentage of Clark County employees who commute to Oregon for work.

Table 2 below shows the number of net new jobs based on allocation method number 3 as listed above. The Board chose to plan for a total of 91,200 net new jobs. According to the 2014 vacant land model, the county has capacity for 85,452 net new jobs. Public sector employment is not accounted for in the model. ESD estimates up to 7,400 new public sector jobs over the next twenty years. We anticipate that most of those public sector jobs will occur on existing facilities, and therefore will not require new lands.

Table 2: 2015-2035 Employment Forecast by UGA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UGA</th>
<th>2014 VBLM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Battle Ground</td>
<td>11,635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camas</td>
<td>12,503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Center</td>
<td>1,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridgefield</td>
<td>11,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver</td>
<td>42,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washougal</td>
<td>4,766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yacolt</td>
<td>513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodland</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>85,452</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Clark County, Geographic information System and Community Planning
*Note: the potential jobs not captured by the vacant lands model increase the capacity on vacant lands up to 7,400 jobs. Thus, increasing the total job capacity from 85,452 to 92,852.
Conclusion and Recommendation
Much has changed since Clark County first adopted its Comprehensive Plan in 1994. The county’s demographic characteristics have continued to change. Community Planning recommends that population and employment lands be allocated to each UGA based on the above methodology.

NEXT STEPS
With respect to individual UGA allocations, a limited number of alternative land use scenarios should be identified. The scenarios should be used to inform the county on transportation modeling and a SEPA Threshold Determination. Proposals from the cities should also be considered.