# AGENDA

**Snohomish County Buildable Lands**  
**SCT PAC Subcommittee Meeting #2**  
11/12/2019  
1:00 to 3:00 p.m.

**Location:**  
Snohomish County Planning and Development Services, 2nd floor, County Administrative Building, West (Conference Room 2B)

**Attendees:**  
- Members of the Snohomish County Tomorrow (SCT) Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) subcommittee  
- Steve Toy and members of the Snohomish County Buildable Lands Team  
- Morgan Shook and Ryan Ulsberger, ECONorthwest

**Purpose:**  
Review the preliminary results and findings of ECONorthwest’s analysis of the methodological issues identified in Task 2 of the scope of work. These issues include validation of previous BLRs, redevelopable land classification methods, market factor assumptions, reasonable measures updates, and infrastructure gap identification.

**Meeting objectives:**  
- Review and discuss preliminary results  
- Identify and discuss issues the updated methodology should address

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:00–1:05 p.m.</td>
<td>Introductions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1:05–1:25 p.m. | Review of County’s validation study results  
Review and compare estimates from the 2012 Buildable Lands Report with recent development history data. Discuss potential issues to consider for an updated methodology. |
| 1:25–1:50 p.m. | Redevelopable land analysis  
Evaluate definitions for vacant, redevelopable, and partially used land based on recent development history data. Discuss potential issues to consider for an updated methodology. |
| 1:50–2:15 p.m. | Market factor evaluation  
Evaluate market factor assumptions for vacant and underutilized land (redevelopable and partially-used). |
Discuss potential issues to consider for an updated methodology.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2:15 – 2:35 p.m.</td>
<td>Infrastructure gap analysis</td>
<td>Discuss how Snohomish County’s methodology should approach determination of infrastructure gaps and discuss implications for the capacity estimates in the BLR and/or reasonable measures, using two case study examples. Discuss other locations that could be considered an infrastructure gap and the process that should be used to address this in the BLR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:35 – 2:55 p.m.</td>
<td>Reasonable measures</td>
<td>Review and discuss potential updates to Snohomish County's list of reasonable measures in the CPPs, including aligning the categories for reasonable measures defined in the guidance with the measures matrix. Provide thoughts on how jurisdictions could address analysis of determination of reasonable measures required, including a process for providing a rationale as part of determining the need for reasonable measures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2:55 - 3:00 p.m. | Next Steps                     | - Evaluate methodological approaches alternatives  
|                  |                                 | - Draft proposed approaches and methodological changes                                       |