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Introduction
Work Program Overview

Step 1: Evaluate methodological issues and review recent development trends.

Step 2: Identify and describe options for updating methods and assumptions and the trade-offs associated with each option.

Step 3: Develop a proposed methodology for updating the County's buildable lands analysis
SCT PAC Subcommittee Meetings

- **Meeting 1: Project Orientation**
  - Overview of work program
  - Identify key issues to address

- **Meeting 2: Issue Identification**
  - Review previous capacity methods
  - Present preliminary data analysis on development trends.

- **Meeting 3: Methods Alternatives Review**
  - Present proposed options
  - Refine approaches to updating the methodology

- **Meeting 4: Methods Implementation**
  - Review proposed revisions to methodology and reasonable measures
Other Stakeholder Outreach

- **Stakeholder Workshop**
  - Timed with SCT PAC subcommittee meeting 2
- **Elected Official Briefing**
  - After SCT PAC subcommittee meeting 4
Previous Methods and Updated Guidelines
1. What land in the UGAs could be developed?

2. What density actually happens in each zone?

3. What is the land capacity as of 2011?

4. How much of the land capacity is likely to be available for development by 2025?

5. What are the growth targets?

6. Is there enough land capacity?

Background

- Legislature passed updates to the Review and Evaluation Program in 2017 (E2SSB-5254)
- Dept. of Commerce developed updated Buildable Lands Guidelines
- Snohomish County needs to update buildable lands methodology to meet new requirements
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2012 BLR Step</th>
<th>Updated Guidance?</th>
<th>Potential Updates for Snohomish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Buildable Lands Inventory</td>
<td>Considerations for redevelopment/changes in growth patterns</td>
<td>Refine approach to redevelopable (under-utilized) land classification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Development History</td>
<td>Increase overall accuracy of predicted vs. achieved results</td>
<td>Continue validation work; Consider updating employment density surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Capacity Calculation</td>
<td>Increase overall accuracy of predicted vs. achieved results</td>
<td>Continue validation work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 BLR Step</td>
<td>Updated Guidance?</td>
<td>Potential Updates for Snohomish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Reductions for Uncertainty</td>
<td>Capital Facilities Availability</td>
<td>Address infrastructure gaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 BLR Step</td>
<td>Updated Guidance?</td>
<td>Potential Updates for Snohomish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4. Reductions for Uncertainty | Refine market supply factor through additional considerations. | *Proposed approach:* Focus on empirical measures including:
- Characteristics of urban land that has not developed.
- Assessor data for sales and improvements.
- Geographic differences that may influence market factors.

*Additional approaches:* Conduct property owner surveys or interviews, advisory committee input, real estate expert input, etc.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2012 BLR Step</th>
<th>Updated Guidance?</th>
<th>Potential Updates for Snohomish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5/6. UGA Growth Target/Capacity Comparisons</td>
<td>“Develop reasonable measures to use in reducing the differences between growth and development assumptions and targets contained in the countywide planning policies and county and city comprehensive plans, with the actual development patterns”</td>
<td>Before completion of 2021 BLR: Update/expand current list of reasonable measures based on outcomes of this process After completion of 2021 BLR: Develop reasonable measures if necessary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Issues and Potential Approaches

- Validation of Previous Buildable Lands Results
  - Continued work by Buildable Lands Team
  - ECONorthwest to review specific areas of interest

DRAFT results of Snohomish County 2012 Buildable Lands Report Validation Study (Single-Family)
Key Issues and Potential Approaches

- Review Redevelopable Lands Methods
  - ECONorthwest to analyze land classification status and provide recommended approach

Example from Pierce County:

*Redeveloped Parcels by 2010 BLI Classification and Use.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Built</th>
<th>Platted and Built</th>
<th>Total Redeveloped Parcels</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Built Out/Undevelopable</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>67.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underutilized</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Pierce County; ECONorthwest*
Key Issues and Potential Approaches

Review
Market
Factor
Assumptions

Potential Additional Data Sources & Refinement

- Property Owner Advisory Input
- Unconverted Property Owner Survey: All or Representative Sample (Group)
- Survey of Comparable Jurisdictions' Market Factors: Factors Assumed and/or Methodology
- Real Estate Industry Input

Local Market Supply Factor Analysis & Calculations

Final Market Supply Factor Assumptions

Source: Dept. of Commerce. Buildable Lands Guidelines. 2018
Key Issues and Potential Approaches

- Review Infrastructure Gaps
  - Focused research on areas where urban development has not occurred.
  - Interview planners and public works staff
  - Review facility plans

- Review Reasonable Measures
  - Use initial results to recommend potential reasonable measures.
  - Complete a literature review, including case studies from other jurisdictions.
Next Steps
Proposed Schedule

Key milestones:
- Draft report by December 2019
- Presentation to elected officials early 2020
- Final deliverables by February 2020
The following schedule assumes future SCT PAC Subcommittee meetings will continue to occur on Tuesdays.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Proposed date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting 1: Project Orientation</td>
<td>September 17, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting 2: Issue Identification</td>
<td>November 12, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder workshop on same day as Meeting 2?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting 3: Methods Alternatives Review</td>
<td>December 10, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting 4: Methods Implementation</td>
<td>January 28, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected official briefing, early Feb.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>