

## OVERVIEW

A key issue in the implementation of the buildable lands work program is project cost. The primary costs will be for labor at the county and city level. To estimate costs for this project, ECO developed a spreadsheet that allocates hours of effort by task, and then turns that into dollars based on assumptions about wage rates. The spreadsheet has three sections (tabs) in addition to this overview:

- Effort By Task shows the estimates of hours, by task, by jurisdiction. It distinguishes between Technical Hours and Meeting Hours. The body of the matrix shows estimated hours for one jurisdiction in each class; the two right-most columns and the bottom row sum for all jurisdictions (cities, County, consultants).
- Hourly Rate shows estimate hourly rates, by labor class, by jurisdiction. It calculates a melded hourly rate (a weighted average rate based on the percentage of each labor type, and its costs, that is expected to work on the project. [For this version of the spreadsheet, hourly rates by labor class for all cities and the County are assumed the same. The spreadsheet allows the rates to be different.]
- Cost Budget shows the costs of the project, by jurisdiction, and the budget allocated to each jurisdiction. It reads hours from Effort By Task and rates from Hourly Rate to calculate cost. At the bottom it has a section that allows a budget allocation, which is blank in this version.

For the estimates, Consultant Hours (and therefore, Consultant Budget) is set to zero. We assume that the County will do all the technical work that a consultant could be hired to do. The County will decide as part of Phase I, Start-up, whether to shift some of its staff hours to a consultant. The spreadsheet would then calculate costs at a different rate. Based on the current estimates, for every hour shifted from the County to a consultant, costs would increase by about \$75. Thus, for example, consultant contracts for 600 hours of work (shifted from the County), would add about \$45,000 to the cost.

City estimates are tricky. We have tried to make realistic estimates for cities based on the assumptions that (1) the County is doing most of the work, and (2) every city in a class will be equally involved. Our experience with the TAC suggest that cities, even in the same size class, will have different levels of commitment and involvement. Thus, even if the estimates are approximately correct for a given city, the total for all cities in that class will be overestimated because some cities will participate little, if at all.

Because the County is the designated coordinating entity for this project, and because they will be responsible for a substantial amount of the technical work, 61% of total project cost is allocated to the County. The TAC recommends that the small cities in “Group 4” be eligible for buildable lands funding, but that they be given the option of participating in the buildable lands data collection effort as a condition of receiving the funding. For Group 4 cities that decide not to participate, the County agrees to do the necessary buildable lands work for them. Funds initially allocated to the small cities that “opt out” in this way would be retained by the County to help cover the costs of doing their work.

This appendix also includes a summary of city and county responsibilities by task. This is intended to serve as a quick reference to the work program.

## **CLASSIFICATION OF CITIES**

We assumed that the amount of effort (staff time) any city would be required to contribute would be a function of (1) size (population), (2) amount and capabilities of staff, and (3) resources (primarily the availability of staff). Based on these considerations we placed the cities in four groups:

### **Group 1 Largest Cities with Full GIS Capabilities**

- Everett
- Edmonds
- Lynnwood

### **Group 2 Mid-size Cities with Some GIS Capabilities**

- Mountlake Terrace
- Marysville
- Mukilteo
- Bothell
- Mill Creek
- Monroe
- Snohomish
- Arlington

### **Group 3 Smaller Cities with no GIS and Very Small Staff**

- Brier
- Lake Stevens
- Stanwood
- Sultan

### **Group 4 Smallest Cities with No Planning Staff**

- Granite Falls
- Gold Bar
- Darrington
- Woodway

- Index

In general, we allocated fewer hours to small jurisdictions on the assumption that they had:

- Less staff and staff time available
- Less to do (smaller area, less complicated analysis)
- More help from the County

The following tables summarize the cost estimates.

**Table D-1. Level of effort, by task, by jurisdiction, TAC recommendation**

City labor Budget = \$129,000; Tech budget allocated based on average of per capita and growth % estimated hours

		HOURS										Direct Cost (allocated by city % in \$000)			
		Tech	Meet	Tech	Meet	Tech	Meet	Tech	Meet	Tech	Meet	TOT HRS	\$ (000)	% City	\$ (000)
Group 1															
	Everett	751	78					751	78			829	\$24.5	19%	\$1.33
	Edmonds	221	78					221	78			299	\$8.8	7%	\$0.48
	Lynnwood	280	78					280	78			358	\$10.6	8%	\$0.57
Group 2															
	Mountlake Terrace			134	78			134	78			212	\$6.3	5%	\$0.34
	Marysville			232	78			232	78			310	\$9.2	7%	\$0.50
	Mukilteo			164	78			164	78			242	\$7.1	6%	\$0.39
	Bothell			284	78			284	78			362	\$10.7	8%	\$0.58
	Mill Creek			100	78			100	78			178	\$5.2	4%	\$0.28
	Monroe			189	78			189	78			267	\$7.9	6%	\$0.43
	Snohomish			70	78			70	78			148	\$4.4	3%	\$0.24
	Arlington			135	78			135	78			213	\$6.3	5%	\$0.34
Group 3															
	Brier					37	78			37	78	115	\$3.4	3%	\$0.18
	Lake Stevens					54	78			54	78	132	\$3.9	3%	\$0.21
	Stanwood					71	78			71	78	149	\$4.4	3%	\$0.24
	Sultan					32	78			32	78	110	\$3.2	3%	\$0.18
Group 4															
	Granite Falls							23	78	23	78	101	\$3.0	2%	\$0.16
	Gold Bar							20	78	20	78	98	\$2.9	2%	\$0.16
	Darrington							9	78	9	78	87	\$2.6	2%	\$0.14
	Woodway							5	78	5	78	83	\$2.5	2%	\$0.13
	Index							1	78	1	78	79	\$2.3	2%	\$0.13
TOTAL		1252	234	1308	624	194	312	59	390	2813	1560	4373	\$129.0	100%	\$7.00

**Table D-2. Basis for Calculating level of effort, by task, by jurisdiction, TAC recommendation**

	1999 Pop	% City Pop	New Hsng Permits (DU's) 95-99	Ratio of City Total to City Mean	New Comm & Ind Permit Value 95-99	Ratio of City Total to City Mean	Sum of Ratios	% of City Hsng, Comm & Ind Growth
Group 1								
Everett	86730	29.6%	3368	4.4	135,530,758	5.2	9.5	23.8%
Edmonds	38610	13.2%	576	0.7	7,197,881	0.3	1.0	2.5%
Lynnwood	33140	11.3%	789	1.0	63,146,138	2.4	3.4	8.6%
Group 2								
Mountlake Terrace	20270	6.9%	162	0.2	21,932,182	0.8	1.0	2.6%
Marysville	20680	7.1%	1799	2.3	38,176,502	1.5	3.8	9.5%
Mukilteo	17180	5.9%	1161	1.5	21,280,469	0.8	2.3	5.8%
Bothell	13310	4.5%	1143	1.5	125,487,069	4.8	6.3	15.7%
Mill Creek	11110	3.8%	897	1.2	4,114,085	0.2	1.3	3.3%
Monroe	11450	3.9%	1620	2.1	45,289,989	1.7	3.8	9.6%
Snohomish	8250	2.8%	411	0.5	8,851,786	0.3	0.9	2.2%
Arlington	7350	2.5%	1472	1.9	24,352,350	0.9	2.8	7.1%
Group 3								
Brier	6350	2.2%	135	0.2	0	0.0	0.2	0.4%
Lake Stevens	6100	2.1%	530	0.7	455,454	0.0	0.7	1.8%
Stanwood	3380	1.2%	534	0.7	23,092,716	0.9	1.6	3.9%
Sultan	2955	1.0%	337	0.4	1,703,442	0.1	0.5	1.3%
Group 4								
Granite Falls	2010	0.7%	264	0.3	1,247,058	0.0	0.4	1.0%
Gold Bar	1810	0.6%	221	0.3	803,777	0.0	0.3	0.8%
Darrington	1245	0.4%	34	0.0	1,393,899	0.1	0.1	0.2%
Woodway	990	0.3%	14	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0%
Index	140	0.0%	1	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0%
TOTAL ALL CITIES	293060	100%	15468	20	524,055,555	20	40	100.0%
TOTAL WITHOUT SMALL CITIES	288675						39	
SNOHOMISH COUNTY	583300							
Unincorporated	290240							
Incorporated	293060							

**Table D-3. Cost and Budget**

<b>Jurisdiction type</b>	<b>Staff Hours</b>	<b>Labor Cost</b>	<b>Direct Cost</b>	<b>Total Cost</b>	<b>% of Total Cost</b>
Snohomish County	7,128	\$210	\$4	<b>\$214</b>	61%
Consultants	0	\$0	\$0	<b>\$0</b>	0%
Group-1 Cities (3)	1,486	\$44	\$2	<b>\$46</b>	13%
Group-2 Cities (8)	1,932	\$57	\$3	<b>\$60</b>	17%
Group-3 Cities (4)	506	\$15	\$1	<b>\$16</b>	4%
Group-4 Cities (5)	448	\$13	\$1	<b>\$14</b>	4%
Subtotal All Cities	4,372	\$129	\$7	<b>\$136</b>	39%
<b>Total County, Consultant, All Cities</b>	<b>11,500</b>	<b>\$339</b>	<b>\$11</b>	<b>\$350</b>	<b>100%</b>

Source: ECONorthwest, 2000

## Table D-4. Costs and rates

### Rates for Group-1 Cities

Position	Hourly Rate	Percent Effort
Planning Manager	\$40	15%
Senior Planner	\$35	20%
Associate Planner	\$30	20%
Assistant Planner	\$25	30%
Research Assistan	\$20	10%
Clerical	\$20	5%
		100%
<b>Melded Public Rate/Hour:</b>		<b>\$29.50</b>

### Rates for Group-2 Cities

Position	Hourly Rate	Percent Effort
Planning Manager	\$40	15%
Senior Planner	\$35	20%
Associate Planner	\$30	20%
Assistant Planner	\$25	30%
Research Assistan	\$20	10%
Clerical	\$20	5%
		100%
<b>Melded Public Rate/Hour:</b>		<b>\$29.50</b>

### Rates for Group-3 Cities

Position	Hourly Rate	Percent Effort
Planning Manager	\$40	15%
Senior Planner	\$35	20%
Associate Planner	\$30	20%
Assistant Planner	\$25	30%
Research Assistant	\$20	10%
Clerical	\$20	5%
		100%
<b>Melded Public Rate/Hour:</b>		<b>\$29.50</b>

### Rates for Group-4 Cities

Position	Hourly Rate	Percent Effort
Planning Manager	\$40	15%
Senior Planner	\$35	20%
Associate Planner	\$30	20%
Assistant Planner	\$25	30%
Research Assistan	\$20	10%
Clerical	\$20	5%
		100%
<b>Melded Public Rate/Hour:</b>		<b>\$29.50</b>

### Rates for Snohomish County

Position	Hourly Rate	Percent Effort
Planning Manager	\$40	15%
Senior Planner	\$35	20%
Associate Planner	\$30	20%
Assistant Planner	\$25	30%
Research Assistan	\$20	10%
Clerical	\$20	5%
		100%
<b>Melded Public Rate/Hour:</b>		<b>\$29.50</b>

### Rates for Consultants

Position	Hourly Rate	Percent Effort
Planning Manager	\$130	30%
Senior Planner	\$100	10%
Associate Planner	\$85	30%
Assistant Planner	\$60	40%
Research Assistant	\$50	5%
Clerical	\$40	5%
		120%
<b>Melded Private Rate/Hour:</b>		<b>\$103.00</b>

This worksheet allows the estimation of a different **melded rate** for four city types, the County, and a (hypothetical) consultant.

A melded rate is a weighted average cost per hour for labor. Hourly rates and the percent of effort by labor type, by jurisdiction, are set in this spreadsheet. The resulting melded rate is reference in the worksheet *EffortByTask* to estimate total labor costs by jurisdiction.

Public sector hourly rates include salary and burden (benefits + taxes). Benefits (vacation, sick, health, retirement, other) estimated at 20-25% of salary; employer payroll taxes estimated at 10% of salary. Position titles may vary: The main idea is that each matrix shows up to five levels of technical analysts (planners, GIS specialists, etc.) plus clerical.

Highlighted cells are assumptions. They are variables that may be adjusted by users.

**Table D-5. COUNTY RESPONSIBILITIES**

Phase I: Startup		
1.1	Assignment of County Project Manager	Lead role.
1.2	Project Organization	Lead role.
1.3	TAC Kick-Off Meeting	Lead role.
1.4	Consultant Selection	Lead role.
1.5	Final Agreements on Scope	Lead role.
Phase II: Data Analysis		
2.1	Standardized Comprehensive Plan Categories	Lead role – prepare draft for city review.
2.2	Buildable Lands Inventory	
	2.2.1 Land Evaluation	
	2.2.1.1 Generalized land classification system	Lead role – prepare draft for city review.
	2.2.1.2 Land-use classification	Lead role – prepare draft for city review.
	2.2.1.3 Inventory and map constraints and critical areas	Lead role – assemble existing data and convert to GIS format for unincorporated areas and incorporated areas where necessary.
	2.2.1.4 Comp plan designations and zoning	Lead role – assemble existing data and convert to GIS format for unincorporated areas and incorporated areas where necessary.
	2.2.1.5 Other tax lot attributes (sewer and water services, market availability assumptions)	Lead role – assemble existing data and convert to GIS format for unincorporated areas and incorporated areas where necessary.
	2.2.2 Preliminary inventory and mapping	Lead role – produce maps for city and county local review.
	2.2.3 Local review and proofing	Responsible for local review and proofing for unincorporated areas.
	2.2.4 Review and update GIS	Lead role – incorporate necessary changes from local review into GIS.
2.3	Growth And Development History	
	2.3.1 Population growth trends	Lead role – prepare draft for city review.
	2.3.2 Employment growth trends	Lead role – prepare draft for city review.
	2.3.3 Annexations/incorporations	Lead role – prepare draft for city review.
	2.3.4 Residential development trends	
	SFR – Recorded formal plats	Lead role – currently maintain countywide list for GMR back to 1995.
	Add comp plan designations	Prepared for unincorporated areas and for cities that provided this historic info for previous GMR efforts.
	Add zoning	Prepared for unincorporated areas and for cities that provided this historic info for previous GMR efforts.
	Add condos w/ segregated lots	To be conducted for unincorporated areas.
	SFR – Recorded short plats	Lead role – currently maintain countywide list for GMR back to 1995.
	Add comp plan designations	If needed, to be prepared for cities that provided this info for GMR.
	Add zoning	If needed, to be prepared for cities that provided this info for GMR.
	Add critical areas	
	Add road dedications	



		Add existing SFRs	If needed, to be prepared for cities that provided this info for GMR.
		MFR – Issued building permits	Lead role – currently maintain countywide building permit database.
		Add gross site area	To be prepared for unincorporated areas and for cities that have this info on their building permits.
		Add critical areas	To be prepared for unincorporated areas.
		Add comp plan designations	To be prepared for unincorporated areas.
		Add zoning	To be prepared for unincorporated areas and for cities that have this info on their building permits.
		Add road dedications	To be prepared for unincorporated areas.
	2.3.5	Housing market trends	Lead role – prepare draft for city review.
	2.3.6	Commercial and industrial development trends	
		Comm/Ind – Issued building permits	Lead role – currently maintain countywide building permit database.
		Add gross site area	To be prepared for unincorporated areas and for cities that have this info on their building permits.
		Add critical areas	To be prepared for unincorporated areas.
		Add gross floor area of improvements	To be prepared for unincorporated areas and for cities that have this info on their building permits.
		Add comp plan designations	To be prepared for unincorporated areas.
		Add zoning	To be prepared for unincorporated areas and for cities that have this info on their building permits.
		Add road dedications	To be prepared for unincorporated areas.
	2.4	Development Pipeline	Provide annual subdivision and short subdivision data for unincorporated areas for GMR effort.
	2.5	Estimate of Land Demand and Capacity	
	2.5.1	Population and employment forecasts	Lead role – prepare draft for city review.
	2.5.2	Land needed for residential uses	Lead role – prepare draft for city review.
	2.5.3	Land needed for employment uses	Lead role – prepare draft for city review.
	2.5.4	Land needed for other uses	Lead role – prepare draft for city review.
	2.5.5	Estimate of Land Capacity	Lead role – prepare draft for city review.
Phase III: Consolidation and Reporting			
	3.1	Consolidation	
	3.1.1	Analysis of actual vs. target densities	Lead role – prepare draft for city review.
	3.1.2	Comparison of capacity (supply) and need (demand)	Lead role – prepare draft for city review.
	3.2	Five-Year Growth Monitoring Report	
	3.2.1	Draft five-year growth monitoring report	Lead role – prepare draft for city review.
	3.2.2	Final five-year growth monitoring report	Lead role – prepare draft for city review.

Note:

GMR = Growth Monitoring Report

**Table D-6. City responsibilities**

Phase I: Startup		
1.1	Assignment of County Project Manager	Participation on TAC.
1.2	Project Organization	Participation on TAC.
1.3	TAC Kick-Off Meeting	Participation on TAC.
1.4	Consultant Selection	Participation on TAC.
1.5	Final Agreements on Scope	Participation on TAC.
Phase II: Data Analysis		
2.1	Standardized Comprehensive Plan Categories	Review assumptions and results.
2.2	Buildable Lands Inventory	
	2.2.1 Land Evaluation	Review assumptions and results.
	2.2.1.1 Generalized land classification system	Review assumptions and results.
	2.2.1.2 Land-use classification	Review assumptions and results.
	2.2.1.3 Inventory and map constraints and critical areas	Provide pertinent data to County for GIS conversion (optional, since the County will convert other existing data for cities if necessary)
	2.2.1.4 Comp plan designations and zoning	Provide pertinent data to County for GIS conversion.
	2.2.1.5 Other tax lot attributes (sewer and water services, market availability assumptions)	Provide pertinent data to County for GIS conversion.
	2.2.2 Preliminary inventory and mapping	To be performed by the County.
	2.2.3 Local review and proofing	Significant review and validation activities by city staff.
	2.2.4 Review and update GIS	To be performed by the County.
2.3	Growth And Development History	
	2.3.1 Population growth trends	Review assumptions and results.
	2.3.2 Employment growth trends	Review assumptions and results.
	2.3.3 Annexations/incorporations	Review assumptions and results.
	2.3.4 Residential development trends	
	SFR – Recorded formal plats	
	Add comp plan designations	Review master list from the County and fill-in missing values.
	Add zoning	Review master list from the County and fill-in missing values.
	Add condos w/ segregated lots	To be conducted by city staff, if applicable (e.g., Everett).
	SFR – Recorded short plats	Analysis by city staff if a significant percentage of total lots created in the city is through short platting (e.g., above 25% -- this would include Woodway, Edmonds, Everett, Brier, Darrington and Mountlake Terrace. See list below.).
	Add comp plan designations	If needed, review master list from the County and fill-in missing values.
	Add zoning	If needed, review master list from the County and fill-in missing values.
	Add critical areas	If needed, add to master list.

		Add road dedications	If needed, add to master list.
		Add existing SFRs	If needed, review master list from the County and fill-in missing values.
		MFR – Issued building permits	
		Add gross site area	Review master list from the County and fill-in missing values (currently, only Everett has this item coded on the County's master list, and it is only partially complete).
		Add critical areas	Add to master list.
		Add comp plan designations	Add to master list.
		Add zoning	Review master list from the County and fill-in missing values (based on info provided on building permits, zoning is partially available in the master list for the following cities: Everett, Granite Falls, Lake Stevens, Marysville, Stanwood and Woodway).
		Add road dedications	Add to master list.
2.3.5		Housing market trends	Review assumptions and results.
2.3.6		Commercial and industrial development trends	
		Comm/Ind – Issued building permits	
		Add gross site area	Review master list from the County and fill-in missing values (currently, only Everett has this item coded on the County's master list, and it is only partially complete).
		Add critical areas	Add to master list.
		Add gross floor area of improvements	Review master list from the County and fill-in missing values (this item is already mostly complete on the master list, using information obtained from each city's issued building permit).
		Add comp plan designations	Add to master list.
		Add zoning	Review master list from the County and fill-in missing values (based on info provided on building permits, zoning is partially available in the master list for the following cities: Everett, Granite Falls, Lake Stevens, Marysville, Stanwood and Woodway).
		Add road dedications	Add to master list.
2.4		Development Pipeline	Continue providing annual subdivision and short subdivision data for annual SCT growth monitoring.
2.5		Estimate of Land Demand and Capacity	
	2.5.1	Population and employment forecasts	Review assumptions and results
	2.5.2	Land needed for residential uses	Review assumptions and results
	2.5.3	Land needed for employment uses	Review assumptions and results
	2.5.4	Land needed for other uses	Provide pertinent data, review assumptions and results
	2.5.5	Estimate of Land Capacity	Review assumptions and results
Phase III: Consolidation and Reporting			
3.1		Consolidation	
	3.1.1	Analysis of actual vs. target densities	Review assumptions and results
	3.1.2	Comparison of capacity (supply) and need	Review assumptions and results

	(demand)	
3.2	Five-Year Growth Monitoring Report	
3.2.1	Draft five-year growth monitoring report	Review draft report
3.2.2	Final five-year growth monitoring report	Review final report

Table D-7. Percentage of total lots recorded 1995-99 through short platting by city

	1995 to 1999			
	FP Lots	SP Lots	Total Lots	% SP
<b>Woodway</b>	0	3	3	<b>100%</b>
<b>Edmonds</b>	56	197	253	<b>78%</b>
<b>Everett</b>	299	669	968	<b>69%</b>
<b>Brier</b>	74	59	133	<b>44%</b>
<b>Darrington</b>	12	6	18	<b>33%</b>
<b>Mountlake Terrace</b>	76	30	106	<b>28%</b>
<b>Mukilteo</b>	250	43	293	<b>15%</b>
<b>Lynnwood</b>	192	29	221	<b>13%</b>
<b>Gold Bar</b>	78	11	89	<b>12%</b>
<b>Granite Falls</b>	168	23	191	<b>12%</b>
<b>Marysville</b>	934	127	1061	<b>12%</b>
<b>Sultan</b>	349	47	396	<b>12%</b>
<b>Stanwood</b>	315	35	350	<b>10%</b>
<b>Bothell</b>	178	19	197	<b>10%</b>
<b>Lake Stevens</b>	455	48	503	<b>10%</b>
<b>Monroe</b>	1316	131	1447	<b>9%</b>
<b>Uninc SW</b>	4857	376	5233	<b>7%</b>
<b>Arlington</b>	1067	50	1117	<b>4%</b>
<b>Snohomish</b>	160	6	166	<b>4%</b>
<b>Mill Creek</b>	597	10	607	<b>2%</b>
<b>Index</b>	0	0	0	<b>0%</b>