

Appendix II-B

Capacity Analysis Method

Appendix II-B

Comparison of Methodological Factors Used for 2002 Buildable Lands Report and 2005 Draft UGA Land Capacity Analysis

Methodological Issue	2002 BLR Scenario A	2002 BLR Scenario B	2005 Draft Land Capacity Analysis
Market availability reduction factor	15% for vacant land 30% for partially-used and redevelopable land (originally developed for 20-year timeframe)	30% for vacant land 40% for partially-used and redevelopable land (developed for 10-year timeframe)	15% & 30% used. Because the plan horizon is now 20 years once again, this is consistent with both Scenario A & B (extended over 20 years). Results of a recent property owner survey conducted by Gilmore Research support reductions used for both 20-year (Scenario A) and 10-year (Scenario B) timeframes. [See pages 16-17 of report.]
Miscellaneous public purpose reduction	5% to account for land area needed for public and institutional uses not specifically addressed in separate parcel review and removal process	10% to account for land area needed for public and institutional uses not specifically addressed in separate parcel review and removal process	5% used. Data analysis shows that for land developed between 1995 and 2000, slightly less than 1% was for miscellaneous uses. A 10% reduction would result in an allocation of land to miscellaneous uses that is in excess of recent county experience. [See pages 15-16 of report.]
“Outer” 150 ft portion of the ESA Habitat Management Zone (County)	Not considered; only first 150 ft buffer area considered unbuildable	Second 150 ft portion of HMZ (prohibition on “effective impervious surface”) also considered unbuildable	Analysis of plats recorded since 1999 that intersect the 2 nd 150 ft area shows that all use this area for either residential building lots or open space for density transfer credit. Recent development experience therefore indicates this area should be treated as buildable. [See page 18 of report.]
CC&Rs (Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions)	Not considered	Removal required when they prohibit future subdivision (as of Jan. 2003, no parcels with CC&R restrictions have been identified)	If CC&Rs effectively prohibit future subdivision on parcels that the capacity analysis indicates have additional development potential, then these parcels should be removed from the inventory. To date, no parcels in the inventory fit this description. [See page 18 of report.]
Transportation concurrency	Areas within UGA potentially affected by arterial units in arrears over next 10 years were tabulated for reduced capacity scenario (excluding known projects)	75% of the additional capacity in areas within UGA currently affected by arterial units in arrears was removed (excluding known projects)	No reduction factor was used for concurrency since the plan horizon now extends to 2025. The updated transportation element is intended to address long-term concurrency problems. [See page 18 of report.]
2012 Population	CPP/SCT revised 2012 population targets	Updated 2012 population allocation, using the Jan. 2002 OFM high/low population forecast range for Snohomish County	Not applicable – 2025 growth targets are now being used

