Schroader, Kathy

From: Tilton, Rebecca
Sent: Wednesday, July 08, 2015 9:53 AM
To: Madore, David; Stewart, Jeanne; Mielke, Tom; Silliman, Peter; Orjiako, Oliver; Schroader, Kathy
Subject: Comments re: Comp Plan
Attachments: Carol Levanen comments_07-07-15.pdf; Susan Rasmussen_07-07-15.pdf

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

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

739378

WASHINGTON RESEARCH COUNCIL

Special Report

SR 08-02
January 16, 2008

2007 Buildable Lands Process
Part II: County Results

BRIEFLY

This report provides brief analyses of the six individual countywide Buildable Lands reports. The Buildable Lands process provides valuable tools that remain incomplete and imperfect. Staff and elected leaders who use these reports need to be aware of their limitations and seek additional information and input before making crucial land use decisions.

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 Housing development 2000-2006, Cark County

UGA	Single family		Multi-family		Total
	Units	Percent	Units	Percent	
Battle Ground	1084	87%	160	13%	1,244
Camas	1460	95%	82	5%	1,542
La Center	254	98%	4	2%	258
Ridgefield	600	98%	14	2%	614
Vancouver	11268	74%	4053	26%	15,321
Washougal	1408	93%	104	7%	1,512
Yacolt	2899	100%	0	0%	2,899
Total urban	18973	81%	4,417	19%	23,390

Source Clark County Buildable Lands Report August 2007

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 picture here is not promising, with the county as a whole showing 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 simi-

WASHINGTON RESEARCH COUNCIL
108 S Washington St, Suite 406
Seattle WA 98104-3408
206-467-7088
fax 206-467-6957
www researchcouncil org

lar densities to the past six years

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 Comprhensive Growth Management Plan Tentative Land Use Map, July 5, 2007 indicates there is sufficient land within the proposed UGAs to accommodate the population *if 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 2024, requiring about 25,000 new housing units.

Figure 2· Housing capacity and targets, Clark County

UGA	Capacity	2024 target	Surplus/deficit
Battle Ground	9,378	9,744	(366)
Camas	7,623	5,101	2,522
La Center	2,143	705	1,438
Ridgefield	8,203	4,670	3,533
Vancouver	35,660	43,036	(7,376)
Washougal	3,697	3,431	266
Yacolt	163	248	(85)
Total urban	66,867	66,935	(68)

Source: Clark County Buildable Lands Report, August 2007

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 3 shows the migration patterns from the top ten 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.

Figure 3: Clark County migration 2006

	In-Migrants		Out-Migrants		Net Migration	
	HH size	Avg AGI	Ex per HH	Avg AGI	Households	People
Multnomah	2 0	$51,384	1 6	$36,813	660	1816
Washington	2 0	$68,257	1 8	$46,983	166	467
Clackamas	2 0	$62,904	1 9	$49,390	103	229
Cowlitz	1 9	$39,585	2 3	$49,107	-319	-964
King	1 6	$60,102	1 7	$48,724	-72	-132
Los Angeles	2 1	$50,184	1 4	$35,628	129	339
Maricopa	2 0	$47,316	2 1	$60,117	-34	-84
Pierce	2 0	$39,665	2 2	$37,836	-1	-35
San Diego	1 9	$61,464	1 7	$48,758	39	92
Lane	1 7	$52,642	1 9	$38,805	57	79

Source: Internal Revenue Service

Clark County leaders have good reason to question the assertion of sufficiency in their current Buildable Lands report.

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 [illegible]ity 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 hou[illegible] been about another 60,000 housing units built in King County during this period Pierce and Snohomish counties made up the difference, by adding [illegible] indicate (see WRC 2008, Figure 13).

Figure 4 [illegible] from 2000 to 2006. Con[illegible] ment has been evenly split between single family and multi-family construction. Multi-family development has been a dominant feature not only [illegible]

As noted above, however, the consumer preference for detached, single family housing has not changed significantly in the broader region, the [illegible] 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 [illegible] housing built in Snohomish County and 78 percent of the housing built in Pierce County was single family.

Figure 5 shows the capacity and target figures 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 [illegible] but the bulk of that surplus is in multi-family capacity, much of that in Seattle. It is clear that King County will have no difficulty meeting de[illegible] urban center housing.