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Hello,

The attached written testimony was received from Carol Levanen and Susan Rasmussen during the public comment portion of the 7/7/15 BOCC hearing.

Thank you,
Rebecca
2007 Buildable Lands Process  
Part II: County Results

Part I of this study reviewed a number of issues and concerns with the Buildable Lands process as it applies to all six counties. These overarching concerns should be kept in mind as cities and counties use the new Buildable Lands reports in their planning process.

Following are brief analyses of the six individual countywide Buildable Lands reports themselves. The data is presented as consistently as possible, but because the statute does not require any particular format, the data cannot be entirely parallel. For example, some counties present capacity and target in terms of population, and others in terms of housing units. Some counties present data by zoning designation, and others simply by average density.

This inconsistency among data and report formats is quite frustrating and should be corrected for the next iteration. Five of the six Buildable Lands counties are contiguous and represent overlapping housing markets, and it would be very helpful if measures of land capacity were comparable and able to be consolidated.

Clark County  
Over the last 50 years, Clark County grew by more than any other Washington County. Much of this growth has been driven by Clark County’s attractiveness for people working in the Portland area. As housing prices in Metro Portland have risen over the past decade, Clark County has been seen as an affordable alternative. Projecting growth and housing needs is, therefore, challenging when operating only within the context of Washington State public policy. As will be shown below, Clark County is not entirely in control of its destiny.

Figure 1 shows development activity within the urban growth areas of Clark County between 2000 and 2006. Clark County comprehensive plan policies call for “no more than 75 percent of any product type of detached/attached housing.” It is unlikely that any jurisdiction would exceed 75 percent multi-family.

All jurisdictions but Vancouver currently have more than 75 percent of their housing stock in single-family detached.

Figure 2 shows the total unit capacity for Clark County cities and their associated UGAs alongside their most recently adopted 2024 targets. The pie charts show the percentage of development capacity within each GGA’s UGA. The bars show how much new development capacity is lacking compared to the county’s adopted target. Vancouver is shown with a deficit in development capacity, and Vancouver itself showing a major deficit. And this deficit would get worse if future housing/development comes in at similar rates.
The conclusion of the report is that, despite the identified deficit of capacity during the planning period, capacity is adequate. The report states:

The preliminary analysis of current land inventory based on the Comprehensive Growth Management Plan Tentative Land Use Map, July 5, 2007 indicates there is sufficient land within the proposed UGAs to accommodate the population of densities are increased.

( emphasis added)

The report cites a number of efforts by cities under the Reasonable Measures program to increase housing densities.

The newly-released population projections from OFM show slightly greater 2025 population for Clark County compared to the 2002 projections on which the report is based. But these projections are based, in part, on projections of net-migration that are substantially lower than historical averages, as seen in Figure 11 of Part I (WRC 2008). From 1990 to 2005, Clark County averaged about 7,500 net in-migrants per year, peaking at over 9,000 in 2006. Yet the new OFM migration projections forecast only about 3,800 net in-migrants per year from 2010 through 2025, or half the historical rate. If actual in-migration during the Buildable Lands planning period is closer to the rate of the past 15 years, there would be an additional 62,000 people in Clark County by 2025, requiring about 25,000 new housing units.

To a large degree, Clark County is not in control of its growth, since the largest source of in-migrants has always been the counties of the Portland area.

Figure 2 shows the migration patterns from the top source counties for in-migrants to Clark County, with several interesting features.

First, for the Portland area counties in Oregon, the incomes of in-migrants to Clark County are much higher than the incomes of those moving from Clark County to the Portland counties. The same is true for the two California counties, and to a lesser extent, the Washington counties, except Cowlitz. Second, there is a net inflow of people from Oregon and California, and a net outflow to counties in Washington. Third, out-migrants to Oregon have smaller household sizes than corresponding in-migrants, where the reverse is true with respect to counties in Washington.

The most broad interpretation of this pattern is that Oregon families are moving to Clark County in search of affordable detached housing, while Clark County singles are moving to Portland for job opportunities and Clark County families are moving to affordable housing in Cowlitz County. If this generalization is close to true, Clark County will see increased demand for detached housing for Portland families and for those families now compelled to move north to Cowlitz County. Thus, the anticipation of higher overall densities contained in the Buildable Lands report may be optimistic.

Thus, the sufficiency of land capacity asserted in the Clark County
Buildable Lands report is predicated on a couple of dubious assumptions. First, migration must slow considerably in the next 15 years from rates of the past 15 years, despite the fact that migration is driven by the relative attractiveness and affordability of Clark County versus Metro Portland. OFM projects a major downturn in net migration to Clark County, but does not provide a reason for this expectation. Second, demand for multi-family housing must increase faster than demand for single family housing, despite the fact that it is lower priced single family housing that is so attractive to those leaving Portland. Absent a major land use policy change or an economic catastrophe in Portland, the price differential across the river is likely to remain.

Clark County leaders have good reason to question the assertion of sufficient future demand for current Buildable Lands.

King County

In contrast to Clark County, King County has been among the slowest growing of the major counties in the state in terms of population and households. This is, in large part, due to the shortage of housing in King County and the necessity for many households of moving to Pierce or Snohomish counties in search of moderately priced housing. Between 1995 and 2006, King County added about 185,000 jobs, but only about 104,000 housing units. If housing had kept pace with the growth in jobs, it would have been about another 60,000 housing units built in King County during this period. Pierce and Snohomish counties made up the difference by adding housing in in excess of what these jobs growth would indicate (see WRC 2008, Figure 13).

Figure 4 shows development activity in King County from 2006 to 2008. Construction has been evenly split between single family and multi-family construction. Multi-family development has been a dominant feature not only of Pierce and Snohomish Counties but of development on the Eastside as well.

As noted above, however, the consumer preference for detached, single family housing has not changed significantly in the broader region, the

Shoreline area. The trend is mirrored to a large degree by a shift in Pierce and Snohomish Counties toward detached housing, much of which is occupied by people who work in Seattle, but continue to live in Pierce or Snohomish County and 78 percent of the housing built in Pierce County was single family.

Figure 5 shows the capacity and rates of growth for King County and its cities (before applying the vacancy rate used in the King County report). At first glance, there appears to be a significant surplus in all capacity, but a closer look at the surplus is in multi-family capacity, much of that in Seattle. It is clear that King County will have no difficulty meeting demand in single family housing, but may face difficulties in multi-family housing.