

# Urban Growth Boundary RAC

---

Meeting 6; October 16, 2014

Attendees: Marilyn Worrix (chair); Erin Doyle; Stephan Lashbrook; Jon Chandler; Pamela Barlow-Lind; Eric Havig; Peggy Lynch; Mary Kyle McCurdy\*; John VanLandingham\*; Damian Syrnyk\*; Nick Lelack\*; Alissa Hansen\*; Terry Moore\*; Invited Guests: Bob Parker; Rebecca Lewis

Staff: Gordon Howard; Bob Rindy; Carrie MacLaren; Matt Spangler; Jim Rue; Sadie Carney; Rob Hallyburton; Casaria Taylor

Also in the Audience participating: Jim Hendryx; Brandon Reich; Mia Nelson\*

## Welcome and Introductions

Carrie MacLaren introduced Sadie Carney as the department's new rural Rural Policy Analyst and Communications Manager.

Chair Worrix suggested that as homework the group might find it helpful to look back at the legislation (HB 2254) and reflect on it now that we have come some way down the road in trying to follow it, and have some of the data it requires us to use in our work.

## University of Oregon Research - Rebecca Lewis and Bob Parker

The UO Team presented preliminary results of research related to land use efficiency. U of O had been asked to give an overview of data showing the average and range densities of multifamily development, the impact from constraints (e.g., floodways, 100-year floodplains, slopes and wetlands), and the density of employment overall, and on lands in commercial and industrial uses. U of O indicated the cities that were chosen and the rationale behind the choice they made.

### Multifamily

Bob P and Rebecca summarized data for six counties representing 26 cities pertaining to multifamily. Bob P reminded that the study excluded cities under 5,000 population with growth rates of less than 1%. The research team focused on Tier 3 cities (cities where they could conduct analysis at the tax lot level). Due to data limitations, the sample represents 26 cities from counties for which U of O could obtain tax lot data with necessary fields. Most assessors do not include counts of multifamily dwellings in their assessment data bases. Multifamily development in the 26 cities averaged about 12 dwelling units per net acre. Density was highest in cities over 10,000. Table 2 shows data for four regions. Density was highest in the Willamette Valley. Several regions have very small samples, making it difficult to generalize about trends in densities.

## Constraints –

The RAC had asked whether constraints have measureable effects on housing density. Bob Parker indicated Tables 3-4 of the U of O materials are more valuable to the group than the other tables. They found that the average density per acre for fully constrained land is higher than that of unconstrained land (with the exception of cities over 10,000). To better understand this result, the research team reviewed several cities and found that most of the fully constrained development was in older areas of the communities which were platted at higher densities. As such, this is apparently a legacy effect; especially in flood plain areas that were zoned (and continue to infill) at much higher density than might be expected today for these constrained areas.

Overall, Marilyn asked that, if the committee isn't comfortable with the numbers and the response (for constraints and housing), to state what they would like to have happen: (Peggy) has concerns over the limited data; (Damian) asked if this is the only data we have available to us. Bob Parker responded, yes, but the committee might use the data that Bend has gathered through their studies in addition. Rebecca stated they did the best they could with the address and assessors data they have available.

Carrie asked if the U of O could look at 40 or so studies they have and come back and give an assessment if that is better data than they are able to provide here. Mia thinks it is a good idea. Erin agrees that this should be done. She wouldn't be comfortable making policy decisions with the current data. Jon Chandler said if there is an obvious outlier we should see why it is there (e.g., is there a problem with the assessor's work or the city's work?). He wants to be sure they are not simply looking for the number we want rather than accept the number the data shows.

## Employment –

U of O reminded that this is an overview, informational item. Largely the tier 2 analyses, table 7 shows what you would expect to see: 2005 is the earliest year that there is a consistent UGB and employment layer. That's why the data only goes back that far. Unsure how to account for businesses that are in private homes and thus don't show up in this data.

Task - Erin suggested seeing a breakdown in region by size – there should be better data pools for coast, I-5 corridor, central (hood river to Klamath Falls), and eastern to give a good rough sketch to prove or disprove, seeing if there really is no regional difference by cutting it this way (transportation regions). Bob Parker said that is pretty straight forward and doable. Would continue the above 10k below 10k criteria. UO will pull out general contractor issues as requested by Jon Chandler.

Mia had an overall concern with the density study, that there is no way to take into account parts of industrial areas that are vacant. She's also concerned that there is a lot of built space where there used to be workers but aren't now – could push density down. Bob Parker can show data that takes into account the covered/uncovered issue.

Another presentation by U of O will be made at the November meeting. BP noted that as long as these requests are being made it will continue to push out the final report. Carrie asked the group to think about how important it is that U of O to wrap up their research or keep going. The group agreed to let U of O continue their research.

## Residential Need Path/Buildable Lands Inventory

Bob Rindy introduced this topic: the attachment shows the combined need and BLI paths that were discussed at the previous RAC meeting; the group had suggested we combine them. Bob indicated that we would like to determine whether we have a general consensus on this path and if not, determine areas where we still need more discussion.

Discussion: MKM thinks there needs to be more work done on how to account for vacation homes, 2<sup>nd</sup> homes, vacation rentals, etc. She would suggest we add it later in step 6 or so (maybe or maybe not at all). But she believes this shouldn't be part of the residential land need. Mia followed up asking if vacation/2<sup>nd</sup> home persons are counted in PSU's forecast. The group agreed they didn't believe so. Erin added that even though they are not "residential" they are in residential zoned areas and thus there must be room in those areas to allow for this because there definitely are cities who have a high vacation home history and potential.

MKM is willing to see (from research that hasn't been done yet) if cities can add this on in a later step. Schools and parks are already accommodated for in residential zones but they are an add-on. Might be a separate category but shouldn't be a factor that goes into determining the housing mix. Stephan said we need to save a place for it in the process. Otherwise, a city like manzanita would show up with a 50 percent vacancy rate.

It was suggested that 1D (calculate redevelopment, accessory dwelling units, mixed use, using a range) should be flagged for additional discussion at a future time. It is not clear how to accomplish that step at this point.

Q re Box 2 – we need further discussion on push factor – determine from research? Clarify efficiencies. Slope – was noted that this complication gets complicated (how to determine slope).

Peggy Q regarding step 6B; she thinks the 25% factor for streets, parks, and other public facilities should be less than 25%; suggests we should go back to review information on this and ensure its accuracy.

Overall except as noted was agreed that we have a general understanding of this path, but need to do more work on items flagged.

## Impracticable to Serve

Task - The group ran out of time to fully discuss this agenda item and it was agreed that we would hold the impracticability discussion to the next meeting.

Any comments on the memos included in the materials should be emailed to Casaria.

## Next Meeting

November 20, 2014, 1pm-4pm, DLCD Basement Hearing Room