O’Donnell, Mary Beth

From: Albrecht, Gary
Sent: Thursday, April 30, 2015 9:51 AM
To: McCall, Marilee; Amanda Smeller-Woodland; Snodgrass, Bryan; Eiken, Chad; Elizabeth Decker-Consultant; Eric Eismann-Consultant; Erin Erdman-Battle Ground; Jeff Niten-Ridgefield; Jeff Sarvis-La Center; Lee Knottnerus-Ridgefield; Mitch Kneipp-Washougal; Pete Roberts-Yacolt; Phil Bourquin-Camas; Ransom, Matt; Robert Maul-Camas; Sam Crummett-Battle Ground; Towne, Sandra; Sara Fox-Camas; 'Steve Stuart-Ridgefield'
Cc: Alvarez, Jose; Anderson, Colete; Euler, Gordon; Herman, Matt; Kamp, Jacqueline; Lebowsky, Laurie; O'Donnell, Mary Beth; Orjiako, Oliver
Subject: RE: VBLM Report for Discussion at Friday's meeting

Hello All:
Oliver and myself met with Bryan yesterday to go over the BLR. He wanted more detailed information on residential permits, so here it is. Out of fairness, I am sharing with everyone.

Gary

From: McCall, Marilee
Sent: Tuesday, April 28, 2015 5:01 PM
To: Amanda Smeller-Woodland; Snodgrass, Bryan; Eiken, Chad; Elizabeth Decker-Consultant; Eric Eismann-Consultant; Erin Erdman-Battle Ground; Jeff Niten-Ridgefield; Jeff Sarvis-La Center; Lee Knottnerus-Ridgefield; Mitch Kneipp-Washougal; Pete Roberts-Yacolt; Phil Bourquin-Camas; Ransom, Matt; Robert Maul-Camas; Sam Crummett-Battle Ground; Towne, Sandra; Sara Fox-Camas; 'Steve Stuart-Ridgefield'
Cc: Albrecht, Gary; Alvarez, Jose; Anderson, Colete; Euler, Gordon; Herman, Matt; Kamp, Jacqueline; Lebowsky, Laurie; Niten, Jeff; O'Donnell, Mary Beth; Orjiako, Oliver
Subject: VBLM Report for Discussion at Friday's meeting

FYI. Please call Gary with any questions.

Gary Albrecht 360.397.2280 ext. 4318
gary.albrecht@clark.wa.gov

From: Albrecht, Gary
Sent: Tuesday, April 28, 2015 4:53 PM
To: McCall, Marilee
Subject: RE: Issue Paper 6 for Discussion at Friday's meeting

Marilee,
Attached is the 2015 BLR for review.
Gary

<< File: 2015 BUILDABLE LANDS REPORT.pdf >>

_____________________________________________________
From: McCall, Marilee  
Sent: Monday, April 27, 2015 4:31 PM  
To: Amanda Smeller-Woodland; Snodgrass, Bryan; Eiken, Chad; Elizabeth Decker-Consultant; Eric Eismann-Consultant;  
Erin Erdman-Battle Ground; Jeff Niten-Ridgefield; Jeff Sarvis-La Center; Lee Knottnerus-Ridgefield; Mitch Kneipp-Washougal; Pete Roberts-Yacolt; Phil Bourquin-Camas; Ransom, Matt; Robert Maul-Camas; Sam Crummett-Battle Ground; Towne, Sandra; Sara Fox-Camas; Steve Stuart-Ridgefield  
Cc: Albrecht, Gary; Alvarez, Jose; Anderson, Colete; Euler, Gordon; Hermon, Matt; Kamp, Jacqueline; Lebowsky, Laurie; Niten, Jeff; O'Donnell, Mary Beth; Orjiako, Oliver  
Subject: Issue Paper 6 for Discussion at Friday's meeting

Attached is Issue Paper 6 for discussion at Friday's meeting.

VBLM numbers are coming up next.
Thank you!

Marilee McCall | Administrative Assistant
Clark County Community Planning
360-397-2280 ext. 4558
1300 Franklin Street | Vancouver, WA 98660
P.O. Box 9810 | Vancouver, WA 98666
www.clark.wa.gov/planning

_____________________________________________________
From: Orjiako, Oliver  
Sent: Monday, April 27, 2015 4:26 PM  
To: McCall, Marilee  
Subject: Issue_Paper_6_CWPP_draft1_(2).docx

<< File: Issue_Paper_6_CWPP_draft1_GE (2).docx >>

Hi Marilee:

Please, another document for discussion at the County-City Coordination meeting. Need to send out when you can or with the BLR. Thank you very much!

Oliver
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
The Growth Management Act (GMA) requires the county and its cities to provide sufficient land to accommodate specific population and employment targets. This is the third buildable lands report since 1990. It presents a series of basic, quantifiable indicators in Clark County and tracks how they are changing each year.

Clark County coordinated with its cities to compile data that shows the progress of each community’s comprehensive plan toward the goals of sprawl reduction and concentrated urban growth identified in the Growth Management Act. Each community collects development data, which is forwarded to the county and added to a central database located at this webpage:
http://www.clark.wa.gov/planning/comp_plan/monitoring.html#capacity

The primary sources of data are new commercial, industrial and residential building permits, subdivisions and short plats, and site plan reviews from July 1, 2006 through December 31, 2014. Clark County’s Geographic Information System (GIS) was used to link parcel serial numbers taken from new building permits issued to identify parcels within city and urban growth area boundaries, acreage and critical lands coverage. In this report, residential, commercial and industrial acres developed are shown as net acreage. It does not reflect the following types of infrastructure: public right-of-way, private streets, public utility easements, open space tracts, or parks.

Following are the major observations presented in this report:

• During the analysis period (2006-2014) Clark County achieved a split of 66% single-family development and 34% multi-family development. Within the Vancouver city limits, the split is 38% single-family and 62% multi-family.

• New residential development within urban growth areas of Clark County consumed 1,245 acres with an average-density of 5.74.7-dwelling units per acre. Based on the inventory of vacant and buildable land (vblm), there are 7,513 net buildable acres that can accommodate 51,436 households. At 2.66 persons per household urban growth areas can accommodate 136,820 new persons. (5.7 is from table 6 in report)

The residential density average includes some new housing construction on larger previously established properties, and on properties which are zoned Urban Holding, which prohibits urban level densities. The median density of new residential development in urban areas during the analysis period was? The median lot size of newly created single family residential lots in urban zones during the period was ?, suggesting future development may average moderately higher densities.

• There were 1,387 building permits issued in the rural area on 7,799 acres. Given the underlying zoning, the total vacant and development potential in the rural area is 9,390 lots. Assuming 2.66 persons per household, there is potential for additional rural capacity of 24,977 persons. Overall, the county can accommodate 161,797 new persons.

• The review and evaluation has indicated that commercial and industrial development in the UGAs during the period consumed 3,372 acres of land. Commercial uses consumed 2,704 acres and industrial uses consumed 668 acres. Based on the 2015 VBLM inventory there are 2,057 net buildable commercial acres and 3,982 net buildable industrial acres.

Review of development indicates that 43% of all residential development occurred on land with some environmental constraint, although it is assumed development took place on the portions of such properties outside of environmentally sensitive features. More importantly, this percent does not imply that development is occurring on lands with critical areas, because in general environmentally constrained lands are not being developed.
Kaleden commercial employment density appears to be on target with 10.5 employees per acre, and Battle Ground at 23.7 and Vancouver at 11.1 employees per acre are exceeding the industrial employment density of nine units per acre.

- Despite the county’s observed employment density not being on target, the total number of new employees has grown since 2006. Jurisdictions are likely to have added more employees on existing and built commercial and industrial buildings without adding new square footage.

**Buildable Land Needs & Capacity Analysis (page 30)**

In 1992, Clark County began the Vacant Lands analysis to determine the potential capacity of urban growth areas to accommodate projected growth for the next 20 years to the year 2012. County staff met with interested parties from the development and environmental community to collectively examine criteria to be used to compute the supply of land available for development within each urban growth boundary. From the process, a methodology was developed using Clark County’s Department of Geographic Information System (GIS) as the primary data source.

The evaluation component of the RCW 36.70A.215 Review and Evaluation Program, at a minimum, shall: “Determine whether there is sufficient suitable land to accommodate the countywide population projection established for the county pursuant to RCW 43.62.035 and the subsequent population allocations within the county and between the county and its cities and the requirements of RCW 36.70A.110.”

The amount of land needed to accommodate projected growth through the 2035 planning horizon is the subject of this section. The amount of buildable land needed will be instrumental in the update of the comprehensive plan and provide a framework for addressing the land supply needs of a new 20-year planning horizon.

The two tables below indicate the amount of residential land needed to accommodate the projected population based on (1) the 2015 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan baseline assumptions; and (2) the densities observed since 2006. Each table provides the 2015 population (January 1st), the remaining population for planning horizon 2035, and the residential units and acres needed.

**Table 28: 2035 Residential Land Need Based on 2015 Comprehensive Plan Baseline Assumptions**

*(fix totals row to indicate 102888 remaining population. Carry math thru other columns in this row)*
### Table 29

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015 Population</th>
<th>Remaining Population for Planning Horizon</th>
<th>Residential units needed</th>
<th>Observed units per acre</th>
<th>Residential acres needed</th>
<th>Deficit</th>
<th>Surplus</th>
<th>2015 Vacant and Buildable Land inventory in net acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Battle Ground</td>
<td>20871</td>
<td>15972</td>
<td>6005</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1820</td>
<td>-750</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camas</td>
<td>22943</td>
<td>11255</td>
<td>4231</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1209</td>
<td>-317</td>
<td>892</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Center</td>
<td>3209</td>
<td>3233</td>
<td>1215</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>-437</td>
<td>373</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridgefield</td>
<td>6575</td>
<td>13087</td>
<td>4920</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1367</td>
<td>-358</td>
<td>1009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver</td>
<td>315460</td>
<td>52786</td>
<td>19844</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2835</td>
<td>787</td>
<td>3622</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washougal</td>
<td>15932</td>
<td>6023</td>
<td>2264</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>477</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodland</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yacolt</td>
<td>1661</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All UGAs, based on countywide urban capacity and past countywide averages</td>
<td>365770</td>
<td>86916</td>
<td>32675</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5732</td>
<td>1780</td>
<td>7512</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All UGAs, based on projected UGA allocations and past individual UGA density averages</td>
<td>386641</td>
<td>102888</td>
<td>38680</td>
<td>8557</td>
<td>-1045</td>
<td>7512</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In conclusion, based on observed average densities and the 2015 VBLM, the existing UGAs show a collective surplus 1780 acres beyond the level needed to accommodate the urban portion of the adopted countywide growth forecast. This countywide land surplus becomes a deficit of 1,045 acres, if new growth is allocated among the UGA as projected, due to the fact that proportionately higher levels of population growth are allocated to some UGAs which reported comparatively low past densities based on a small number of developments.

If residential development continues to develop at the observed densities, then this deficit might become true by 2035. It is important to note that the observed densities occurred at a period of a deep recession having a significant impact to development occurring in the housing sector. However, Battle Ground, Camas, La Center, Ridgefield, Vancouver, Washougal and Clark County have adopted local development regulations and revitalization of downtown areas that may reflect higher density development within the planning horizon. The market and economy might regulate development and density possibly delaying UGAs seeing on the ground development with higher densities. For exact development regulations, please see the assessment of reasonable measures section.