

**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN**

**Appendix 5**

**HOUSING  
NEEDS  
ASSESSMENT**

**March 2009**

## Executive Summary:

- ❖ There are a number of different methods of identifying the total number units necessary to meet future housing needs. None of these methods are fool proof, nor will they produce projections that are irrefutable or even beyond reasonable debate. They are based on a variety of premises any or all of which may be disputed. The projections, however, do represent a reasoned best estimate upon which governmental policy may be based. In the case of San Juan County, the projection of housing needs is further complicated by the existence of a large number of second homes.
- ❖ By 2025, the minimum of an additional **2,969** housing units will need to be constructed to house the projected population increase. Of these units, approximately **1,095** must be affordable to households earning \$100,000 or less (1 ½ x median household income).
- ❖ Even if the minimum **2,969** housing units are built, by 2025, an additional 3,000+ workers will need to be brought to the islands daily to meet the projected labor shortfall.
- ❖ By 2025, the projected population will not contain enough working age people to fill the expected jobs in the county. In order to reverse this trend, a further **1,594** housing units will need to be built.
- ❖ To house the entire projected workforce in 2025, **2,689** affordable housing units will be need to be built.
- ❖ The total number of units that would need to be constructed to house both working and other income groups would be **4,563 units**. This indicates a potential 40% increase in the overall number of housing units in the County.
- ❖ Median income earners in the county cannot afford to buy a house in the county.

- ❖ In order to purchase a median priced house in the county, a family, would need to be earning \$150,000 a year, almost 2 ½ x the median family income, and possess a further \$100,000 for a down payment.
- ❖ Wages in San Juan County are approximately 30% lower than they are on the mainland.
- ❖ Housing in San Juan County is the least affordable in the state.
- ❖ The structure of the housing market implies that those groups who traditionally need the greatest degree of housing support, such as the victims of domestic violence, the mentally ill, the aged and those in need of emergency housing will find it increasingly difficult to obtain the services they require over the planning period.
- ❖ Working families which do not have access to affordable housing currently provided by non-profits are consistently cost burdened.
- ❖ It is expected that the 2010 Census will show a decline in the overall numbers of very low, low and moderate income earners in the county.

**Introduction:**

RCW 36.70A.070 (2) details the mandatory requirements of the Comprehensive Plan Housing Element. This regulation states that in order to be compliant the Housing Element:

(a) Includes an inventory and analysis of existing and projected housing needs that identifies the number of housing units necessary to manage projected growth; (b) includes a statement of goals, policies, objectives, and mandatory provisions for the preservation, improvement, and development of housing, including single-family residences; (c) identifies sufficient land for housing, including, but not limited to, government assisted housing, housing for low-income families, manufactured housing, multifamily housing and group homes and foster care facilities; and (d) makes adequate provisions for existing and projected needs of all economic segments of the community.

In addition to the requirements of the GMA above, WAC 365-195-310 details very similar requirements for a compliant comprehensive plan element.

WAC 365-195-310 states that the County’s housing element must contain:

1. Requirements. This element shall contain at least the following features:
  - a. An inventory and analysis of existing and projected housing needs.

- b. A statement of the goals, policies, and objectives for the preservation, improvement, and development of housing.
- c. Identification of sufficient land for housing, including, but not limited to, government assisted housing, housing for low income families, manufactured housing, multifamily housing, and group homes and care facilities.

The remainder of the WAC text is made up of recommendations for meeting the requirements listed above.

In order to determine the range of housing needs facing county residents currently and in the future, at the most basic level it's vital to determine the extent of the potential demand for housing for all economic sectors. The primary elements of the housing needs equation are; Land Availability, Affordability and Population Projections.

The current population of the county in 2008 is approximately 16,100 people and will reach 22,513<sup>1</sup> by 2025, an increase of about 40% or 6,413 people, or 2,969 households

Each of the three elements above can be further refined into increasingly precise subsections of the broader element. For example, a price for housing that's affordable for a millionaire is quite different from what is affordable for a physics teacher at the local high school, (unless, of course, the high school teacher is also a millionaire).

### **Land Availability:**

The county currently includes two non-municipal Urban Growth Areas and one municipal UGA, Eastsound, Lopez Village and Friday Harbor, respectively. Only the Friday Harbor UGA is currently compliant with the GMA. Subject to compliance, Eastsound and Lopez Village UGAs contain sufficient land to meet 50% of the respective islands projected population growth to 2020. The Friday Harbor UGA is currently being revised to meet the projected 50% population increase. It is expected that the Eastsound and Lopez Village UGAs will be found compliant in the near future and subsequent to that finding, increased development activity in these areas will occur. These UGAs allow dense development within the expressed aesthetic preferences of the respective communities, provide space for a variety of housing types, and the zoning actively encourages the development of affordable housing units. Over the planning horizon, it is expected that these UGAs will become both larger and more densely populated.

---

<sup>1</sup> Since the County's adoption of the population projection in 2005, the OFM has revised the 2025 total downwards slightly from 22,534 to 22,513.

The Rural Residential and Rural Farm Forest zones have historically provided the space for the majority of the new homes in the county. Current analysis suggests that, providing there are subdivisions of remaining large lots and further density downzones from greater than 1 unit in five acres to 1 unit in five acres, there will be sufficient land within these zones to meet at least 1/3<sup>rd</sup> of the total demand for housing or over 1/2 of the demand for housing for non working families.

While it appears that at the most basic level, there's more than enough land in the county to meet the potential long term demand for housing, such a statement must be qualified with a consideration of the provision of housing affordable to members of the community earning something in the vicinity of the area median income, or, as is commonly the case for those working in the county, something considerably lower.

The build out analysis adopted by the county in Ordinance 15-2005 notes that within all the current zoning and density patterns, the residential land capacity of the county is approximately 20,449 units,<sup>2</sup> of which just over half have been built. Therefore, there is space in the county for another 8,935<sup>3</sup> units.

### **Breakdown By Island:**

In 2005, San Juan County updated its population projections in Ordinance 15-2005. These projections will be used as a base from which to develop further, more refined numbers. Table 5-1 provides an overview of the relationships between overall population increase, percentage increase by island and the resulting need for housing units. The procedure used below entailed dividing the total population growth attributed to the islands by the average household size of the county. It must be stressed that ultimately there is no, single, right answer, merely a range of probabilities.

---

<sup>2</sup> Table 29, San Juan County Comprehensive Plan, Appendix 1, Population Projections, Buildout Analysis and Land Use Inventory, November 29, 2005. P. 34.

<sup>3</sup> OFM determination of Housing Units in San Juan County in 2008, 11,514. 20,449 minus 11,514=8,935

Table 5-1<sup>4</sup>

| <b>Island</b>             | <b>2005 Population</b> | <b>% Population By Island</b> | <b>2025 Population By Island</b> | <b>Pop Growth by Island</b> | <b>Total# New Housing Units<sup>5</sup></b> | <b>Housing units UGA</b> |
|---------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|---|--------------------------|
| San Juan                  | 5,214                  | 30.6%                         | 6,885                            | 1671                        | 774   |                          |
| Friday Harbor             | 2,150                  | 17%                           | 3,821                            | 1671                        | 774   | 774                      |
| Sub Total                 |                        |                               |                                  | 3,342                       | 1,548                                       |                          |
|                           |                        |                               |                                  |                             |   |                          |
| Orcas                     | 4,894                  | 31.6%                         | 7,115                            | 2,221                       | 1,028                                       | 514                      |
| Lopez                     | 2,396                  | 15.5%                         | 3,483                            | 1087                        | 503   | 252                      |
| Shaw                      | 245                    | 1.6%                          | 356                              | 111                         | 56  |                          |
| Total ferry served island | 14,899                 | 96.1%                         | 21,660                           | 6761                        | 3,130                                       |                          |
| Total Non Ferry Served    | 601                    | 3.9%                          | 874                              | 273                         | 126   |                          |
| Total                     | 15,500                 | 100%                          | 22,534                           | 7,034                       | 3,261                                       | 1,540                    |
|                           |                        |                               |                                  |                             |   |                          |

Using both the above figures and following the 2008 update of the population projections from the Office of Financial management it's possible to extrapolate the increased population per island slightly differently, to account for the population growth in the intervening 3 years.

The projections in these tables are based on the following premises:

1. That the population distribution among the different islands remains the same over the planning period.
2. That the OFM population projection is correct.
3. That the average household size will not change significantly.

<sup>4</sup> Table 8, San Juan County Comprehensive Plan, Appendix 1, Population Projections, Buildout Analysis and Land Use Inventory, November 29, 2005. P.7.

<sup>5</sup> Total # of Units divided by 2.16 (San Juan County Average Household).

4. That the number of units necessary to house the projected population is equal to population growth divided by average household size (2.16).
5. That the different economic sectors retain the same percentages of the total population as in the 2000 Census.
6. That the number of second homes in the county will increase at the same rate as the population does over the planning period.
7. That the regulatory status quo prevails and no specific action is taken to either restrict or increase the numbers of units available.
8. That the UGAs of Eastsound, Lopez Village and Friday Harbor will house 50% of the projected population growth for San Juan, Lopez and Orca.

Table 5-2

| <b>Island</b>             | <b>2008 Population</b> | <b>% Population By Island</b> | <b>2025 Population By Island</b> | <b>Pop Growth by Island</b> | <b>Total# New Housing Units<sup>6</sup></b> | <b>Housing units UGA<sup>7</sup></b> |
|---------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|
| San Juan                  | 5,232                  | 33% 2008<br>-30.5%-<br>2025   | 6,866                            | 1,634                       | 703   |                                      |
| Friday Harbor             | 2,425                  | 14% 2008-<br>17% 2025         | 3,827                            | 1,402                       | 703   | 703                                  |
| Sub Total                 | 7,657                  |                               | 10,693                           | 3,036                       | 1,406                                       |                                      |
|                           |                        |                               |                                  |                             |   |                                      |
| Orcas                     | 5,073                  | 31.5%                         | 7,091                            | 2,018                       | 934   | 467                                  |
| Lopez                     | 2,495                  | 15.5%                         | 3,489                            | 994                         | 460   | 230                                  |
| Shaw                      | 257                    | 1.6%                          | 360                              | 103                         | 48  |                                      |
| Total ferry served island | 15,368                 | 96.1%                         | 21,633                           | 6,151                       | 2,848                                       |                                      |
| Total Non Ferry Served    | 631                    | 3.9%                          | 878                              | 247                         | 126   |                                      |
| <b>Total</b>              | <b>16,100</b>          | <b>100%</b>                   | <b>22,513</b>                    | <b>6,413</b>                | <b>2,969</b>                                | <b>1,400</b>                         |
|                           |                        |                               |                                  |                             |   |                                      |

In table 5-2 it is shown that the total population increase will require approximately 2,969 housing units.

**Affordability:**

“In San Juan County you either have 3 houses or 3 jobs,” is an often repeated aphorism, which while not strictly true, does highlight the central shift in the structure of life in the County over the last 15 years. As recently as 2000, a person or family earning close to the area median income could afford to buy a house in the County.

The essential point is that the differential between housing cost and household income is the nexus of the affordability issue. Determining the divergence between the cost and income brings into consideration both the structure of the local economy and the demographic profile of the County.

<sup>6</sup> Total # of Units = new population divided by 2.16 (San Juan County Average Household).

<sup>7</sup> 50% of population growth attributed to Eastsound, Lopez Village and Friday Harbor divided by 2.16

While the nature of any county's economy is the result of a complex interplay of local, state, national and international factors, it's clear that the local economy is marked by some significant contrasts such as the high per capita income level and relatively low wages, the high levels of income derived from transfer payments such as rents and dividends and the relative inelasticity in the rental market. In addition, it's clear that the local economy is currently unable to generate enough jobs that offer sufficient pay to allow for the majority of the people currently renting living space to transition into home ownership.

As will be shown below, the county's current economy is dominated by the relatively low paying service sector activities that are common within resort destinations.

### **The County's Economic Structure:**

The best and most complete data available for considering the diversity of the economy and levels of income is available from the Washington Office of Employment Security.<sup>8</sup> While much of this information is pertinent, the reader must recognize its limitations. The table below, for example, only includes non-farm jobs that are covered by unemployment insurance and does not consider the self employed people, of which there are a substantial number in the county. The most recent statistics compiled by the OFM are less detailed than those of 2006, however, the implications of Table 5-3 are amplified in Table 5-4.

---

<sup>8</sup> Taken from the Office of Financial Management, San Juan County Profile, 2006, <http://www.workforceexplorer.com/cgi/mywi/?PAGEID=mywi>.

Table 5-3

Nonagricultural Wage and Salary Employment in  
San Juan County  
Not Seasonally Adjusted/\*Updated with \*\*\*QCEW Data: March 2008

| **NAICS Industry Title                      | Prelim<br>Aug-08 | Revised<br>Jul-08 | Revised<br>Aug-07 | Change           |                  |
|---|------------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------------|------------------|
|   |                  |                   |                   | Jul-08<br>Aug-08 | Aug-07<br>Aug-08 |
| Total Nonfarm <sup>9</sup>                  | 6,810            | 6,830             | 6,830             | -20              | -20              |
| Total Private                               | 5,800            | 5,740             | 5,840             | 60               | -40              |
| Goods Producing                             | 1,260            | 1,270             | 1,230             | -10              | 30               |
| Natural Resources, Mining, and Construction | 1,020            | 1,010             | 980               | 10               | 40               |
| Manufacturing                               | 250              | 250               | 250               | 0                | 0                |
| Services Providing                          | 5,550            | 5,560             | 5,600             | -10              | -50              |
| Trade, Transportation, and Utilities        | 1,110            | 1,090             | 1,100             | 20               | 10               |
| Information and Financial Activities        | 320              | 320               | 310               | 0                | 10               |
| Government                                  | 1,010            | 1,090             | 990               | -80              | 20               |
| Workers in Labor/Management Disputes        | 0                | 0                 | 0                 | 0                | 0                |

As can be seen from the table above, the economy of the county is dominated by the service sector, a sector that makes up 81.5% of the county’s covered jobs and local government is the county’s largest single employer.

Table 5-4 below provides a detailed breakdown of the economic activity in the county and the wages paid by the respective industries. The table is extensive, however, Table 5-5 provides a more concise version.

Table 5-4<sup>10</sup>

**Average Annual Wage by Industry  
San Juan County  
2006**

| NAICS Code | Industry                                   | Average Annual Wage |
|------------|--|---------------------|
|            | Total                                      | \$27,563            |
| 11         | Agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting | \$30,198            |
| 111        | Crop production                            | \$24,508            |
| 112        | Animal production                          | *                   |
| 113        | Forestry and logging                       | \$0                 |
| 114        | Fishing, hunting and trapping              | *                   |

<sup>9</sup> Excludes proprietors, self-employed, members of the armed services, workers in private households and agriculture. Includes all full and part-time wage and salary workers receiving pay during the pay period including the 12<sup>th</sup> of the month. Columns may not add due to rounding.

\*Prepared by the Labor Market and Economic Analysis Branch using a Quarterly Benchmark process. This process uses the most recent quarter from the Unemployment Insurance Tax Reports (currently 1<sup>st</sup> quarter 2008) and estimates employment from that point to present.

\*\*North American Industry Classification System.

\*\*\*QCEW=Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages.

<sup>10</sup> Taken from the Office of Financial Management’s San Juan County Profile, 2006.

|       |   |          |
|-------|---|----------|
| 115   | Agriculture and forestry support activities   | *        |
|       | Other industries                              | \$45,519 |
| 21    | Mining  | *        |
| 211   | Oil and gas extraction                        | \$0      |
| 212   | Mining, except oil and gas                    | *        |
| 213   | Support activities for mining                 | \$0      |
|       | Other industries                              | *        |
| 22    | Utilities                                     | \$53,457 |
| 221   | Utilities                                     | \$53,457 |
|       | Other industries                              | \$0      |
| 23    | Construction                                  | \$31,410 |
| 236   | Construction of buildings                     | \$33,143 |
| 237   | Heavy and civil engineering construction      | \$25,762 |
| 238   | Specialty trade contractors                   | \$30,104 |
|       | Other industries                              | \$0      |
| 31-33 | Manufacturing                                 | \$35,526 |
| 311   | Food manufacturing                            | \$13,117 |
| 312   | Beverage and tobacco product manufacturing    | *        |
| 313   | Textile mills                                 | \$0      |
| 314   | Textile product mills                         | *        |
| 315   | Apparel manufacturing                         | \$0      |
| 316   | Leather and allied product manufacturing      | \$0      |
| 321   | Wood product manufacturing                    | \$32,418 |
| 322   | Paper manufacturing                           | \$0      |
| 323   | Printing and related support activities       | *        |
| 324   | Petroleum and coal products manufacturing     | \$0      |
| 325   | Chemical manufacturing                        | *        |
| 326   | Plastics and rubber products manufacturing    | \$0      |
| 327   | Nonmetallic mineral product manufacturing     | \$30,215 |
| 331   | Primary metal manufacturing                   | \$0      |
| 332   | Fabricated metal product manufacturing        | *        |
| 333   | Machinery manufacturing                       | *        |
| 334   | Computer and electronic product manufacturing | \$0      |
| 335   | Electrical equipment and appliance mfg.       | \$0      |
| 336   | Transportation equipment manufacturing        | \$0      |
| 337   | Furniture and related product manufacturing   | \$19,560 |
| 339   | Miscellaneous manufacturing                   | *        |
|       | Other industries                              | \$52,670 |
| 42    | Wholesale trade                               | \$33,528 |
| 423   | Merchant wholesalers, durable goods           | \$28,924 |
| 424   | Merchant wholesalers, nondurable goods        | \$29,583 |
| 425   | Electronic markets and agents and broker      | \$91,069 |
|       | Other industries                              | \$0      |
| 44-45 | Retail trade                                  | \$26,269 |
| 441   | Motor vehicle and parts dealers               | \$44,070 |
| 442   | Furniture and home furnishings stores         | *        |
| 443   | Electronics and appliance stores              | *        |
| 444   | Building material and garden supply stores    | \$25,877 |
| 445   | Food and beverage stores                      | \$30,133 |

|       |   |          |
|-------|---|----------|
| 446   | Health and personal care stores               | \$24,966 |
| 447   | Gasoline stations                             | \$20,055 |
| 448   | Clothing and clothing accessories stores      | \$11,955 |
|       | Sporting goods, hobby, book and music stores  | \$11,359 |
| 451   | General merchandise stores                    | \$0      |
| 452   | Miscellaneous store retailers                 | \$13,931 |
| 453   | Nonstore retailers                            | *        |
| 454   | Other industries                              | \$24,099 |
| 48-49 | Transportation and warehousing                | \$20,983 |
| 481   | Air transportation                            | *        |
| 482   | Rail transportation                           | \$0      |
| 483   | Water transportation                          | \$0      |
| 484   | Truck transportation                          | \$32,998 |
| 485   | Transit and ground passenger transportation   | *        |
| 486   | Pipeline transportation                       | \$0      |
| 487   | Scenic and sightseeing transportation         | \$17,604 |
| 488   | Support activities for transportation         | \$15,715 |
| 491   | Postal service                                | \$0      |
| 492   | Couriers and messengers                       | *        |
| 493   | Warehousing and storage                       | \$0      |
|       | Other industries                              | \$21,341 |
| 51    | Information                                   | \$32,251 |
| 511   | Publishing industries, except Internet        | *        |
| 512   | Motion picture and sound recording industries | \$7,230  |
| 515   | Broadcasting, except Internet                 | \$0      |
| 516   | Internet publishing and broadcasting          | *        |
| 517   | Telecommunications                            | *        |
| 518   | ISPs, search portals, and data processing     | \$31,958 |
| 519   | Other information services                    | \$0      |
|       | Other industries                              | \$54,695 |
| 52    | Finance and insurance                         | \$36,061 |
| 521   | Monetary authorities - central bank           | \$0      |
| 522   | Credit intermediation and related activities  | \$34,879 |
| 523   | Securities, commodity contracts, investments  | *        |
| 524   | Insurance carriers and related activities     | *        |
| 525   | Funds, trusts, and other financial vehicles   | \$0      |
|       | Other industries                              | \$38,907 |
| 53    | Real estate and rental and leasing            | \$17,276 |
| 531   | Real estate                                   | \$16,848 |
| 532   | Rental and leasing services                   | \$19,194 |
| 533   | Lessors of nonfinancial intangible asset      | \$0      |
|       | Other industries                              | \$0      |
| 54    | Professional and technical services           | \$35,198 |
| 541   | Professional and technical services           | \$35,198 |
|       | Other industries                              | \$0      |
| 55    | Management of companies and enterprises       | *        |
| 551   | Management of companies and enterprises       | *        |
|       | Other industries                              | *        |
| 56    | Administrative and waste services             | \$21,138 |

|     |  |          |
|-----|--|----------|
| 561 | Administrative and support services          | \$20,571 |
| 562 | Waste management and remediation service     | \$27,841 |
|     | Other industries                             | \$0      |
| 61  | Educational services                         | \$36,976 |
| 611 | Educational services                         | \$36,976 |
|     | Other industries                             | \$0      |
| 62  | Health care and social assistance            | \$24,663 |
| 621 | Ambulatory health care services              | \$27,009 |
| 622 | Hospitals                                    | \$0      |
| 623 | Nursing and residential care facilities      | \$26,071 |
| 624 | Social assistance                            | \$18,511 |
|     | Other industries                             | \$0      |
| 71  | Arts, entertainment, and recreation          | \$15,315 |
| 711 | Performing arts and spectator sports         | *        |
| 712 | Museums, historical sites, zoos, and parks   | *        |
| 713 | Amusements, gambling, and recreation         | \$14,442 |
|     | Other industries                             | \$0      |
| 72  | Accommodation and food services              | \$17,656 |
| 721 | Accommodation                                | \$20,817 |
| 722 | Food services and drinking places            | \$13,799 |
|     | Other industries                             | \$0      |
| 81  | Other services, except public administration | \$24,553 |
| 811 | Repair and maintenance                       | \$24,539 |
| 812 | Personal and laundry services                | \$17,758 |
| 813 | Membership associations and organization     | \$25,690 |
| 814 | Private households                           | \$26,815 |
|     | Other industries                             | \$0      |
|     | Government                                   | \$35,177 |
|     | Federal Government                           | \$44,235 |
|     | State Government                             | \$26,061 |
|     | Local Government                             | \$36,162 |

|  |                          |          |
|--|--------------------------|----------|
|  | NOT ELSEWHERE CLASSIFIED | \$49,804 |
|--|--------------------------|----------|


\* Employment and wages not shown to avoid disclosure of data for individual employer.

The table below illustrates the average wage for the jobs and sectors in the county detailed in the table above.

Table 5-5<sup>11</sup>

| All Sectors                       | Average  |
|-----------------------------------|----------|
| All Industries                    | \$27,563 |
| Ag, Forestry, Fishing & Hunting   | \$30,198 |
| Mining                            | *        |
| Utilities                         | \$53,457 |
| Construction                      | \$31,410 |
| Manufacturing                     | \$35,526 |
| Wholesale Trade                   | \$33,528 |
| Retail Trade                      | \$26,269 |
| Transportation & Warehousing      | \$20,983 |
| Information                       | \$32,251 |
| Finance & Insurance               | \$36,061 |
| Real Estate & Rental & Leasing    | \$17,276 |
| Professional & Technical Serv     | \$35,198 |
| Mgmt of Companies & Enterprises   | *        |
| Administrative & Waste Services   | \$21,138 |
| Educational Services              | \$36,976 |
| Healthcare & Social Asst          | \$24,663 |
| Arts, Entertainment, & Recreation | \$15,315 |
| Accommodation & Food Serv         | \$17,656 |
| Other Services, ex Public Admin   | \$24,553 |
| Government                        | \$35,177 |

Table 5-6<sup>12</sup>



<sup>11</sup> Taken from the Office of Financial Management, San Juan County Profile, 2006  
<http://www.workforceexplorer.com/cgi/mywi/?PAGEID=mywi>.

<sup>12</sup> Taken from the Office of Financial Management, San Juan County Profile, 2006

As can be seen in the graph above, the annual average wage in San Juan County has been significantly lower than that of the state consistently for the last 20 years. Table 5-7 below, shows that average annual wage for the county has over the past 3 years has been just over 30% lower than the state average and is amongst the lowest in the state (35<sup>th</sup> out of 39).

Hourly wages and annual incomes are only one portion of the overall economic equation. It's also important to understand how the wealth within the economic system is distributed. In comparing the wages to the median household income, it's obvious that wage earning households generally must include at least two people that are employed full time.

While the pay rates and wage earnings are, for most activities, among the lowest in the State, its anomalous that per capita income in the county is relatively high, almost \$10,000 inflation adjusted dollars higher than either state or national rates. Tables 5-7, 5-8 and 5-9 clearly show the disparities between earned and non earned incomes and imply the distortion is the result of the county becoming a site for wealthy retirees.

Table 5-7<sup>13</sup>

|                                | 2003          | 2004          | 2005          | 2006          |
|--------------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Employment                     | 5,089         | 5,309         | 5,314         | 5,394         |
| Payroll                        | \$126,251,998 | \$135,634,314 | \$138,844,850 | \$148,676,215 |
| <b>Average Annual Wage</b>     |               |               |               |               |
| San Juan                       | \$24,809      | \$25,549      | \$26,128      | \$27,563      |
| State                          | \$39,020      | \$39,689      | \$40,704      | \$42,881      |
| Less King                      | \$32,095      | \$33,258      | \$34,322      | \$35,715      |
| <b>Adjusted for inflation:</b> |               |               |               |               |
| U.S.                           | \$40,968      | \$41,597      | \$41,793      | \$42,521      |
| Metropolitan Division          | \$49,001      | \$48,266      | \$47,909      | \$49,440      |
| Metropolitan Area              | \$34,190      | \$34,349      | \$34,435      | \$34,746      |
| Micropolitan Area              | \$29,718      | \$30,097      | \$30,040      | \$30,613      |
| Rural                          | \$26,390      | \$26,802      | \$26,948      | \$27,292      |
| State                          | \$42,330      | \$41,952      | \$41,821      | \$42,881      |
| State Less King                | \$34,817      | \$35,154      | \$35,264      | \$35,715      |
| San Juan                       | \$26,913      | \$27,006      | \$26,845      | \$27,563      |
| Rank Among Counties            | 30            | 34            | 36            | 35            |

<sup>13</sup> Taken from the Office of Financial Management, San Juan County Profile, 2006

Table 5-8<sup>14</sup>

## Personal Income San Juan

| Nominal Data (in \$1,000s except where indicated)                         | 1999      | 2000      | 2001      | 2002      | 2003      | 2004      | 2005      |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Personal income   | \$508,872 | \$532,664 | \$549,896 | \$560,884 | \$591,258 | \$636,955 | \$670,273 |
| Population (persons)  | 13,762    | 14,160    | 14,369    | 14,609    | 14,815    | 15,143    | 15,215    |
| Per capita personal income (dollars)                                      | \$36,977  | \$37,618  | \$38,270  | \$38,393  | \$39,909  | \$42,063  | \$44,053  |
| Earnings by place of work   | \$205,325 | \$210,779 | \$219,699 | \$216,703 | \$229,558 | \$247,533 | \$259,890 |
| less: Contributions for government social insurance                       | \$24,469  | \$25,669  | \$25,809  | \$26,220  | \$28,313  | \$30,854  | \$32,695  |
| Employee & self-employed contrib. for govt. soc. ins.                     |           |           | \$13,116  | \$13,087  | \$13,919  | \$15,027  | \$16,220  |
| Employer contributions for govt. social insurance                         |           |           | \$12,693  | \$13,133  | \$14,394  | \$15,827  | \$16,475  |
| plus: Adjustment for residence equals: Net earnings by place of residence | \$30,248  | \$33,336  | \$32,437  | \$34,483  | \$36,027  | \$38,709  | \$40,307  |
| plus: Dividends, interest, and rent                                       | \$246,682 | \$258,375 | \$261,065 | \$268,794 | \$283,482 | \$307,316 | \$323,849 |
| plus: Personal current transfer receipts                                  | \$51,086  | \$55,843  | \$62,504  | \$67,124  | \$70,504  | \$74,251  | \$78,922  |
| Wage and salary disbursements   | \$123,732 | \$131,036 | \$138,131 | \$139,604 | \$148,263 | \$158,889 | \$165,706 |
| Supplements to wages and salaries   | \$25,114  | \$27,060  | \$27,910  | \$30,008  | \$33,121  | \$36,619  | \$38,564  |
| Employer contrib. for employee pension & insur. funds                     |           |           | \$15,217  | \$16,875  | \$18,727  | \$20,792  | \$22,089  |
| Employer contributions for govt. social insurance                         |           |           | \$12,693  | \$13,133  | \$14,394  | \$15,827  | \$16,475  |
| Proprietors' income   | \$56,479  | \$52,683  | \$53,658  | \$47,091  | \$48,174  | \$52,025  | \$55,620  |
| Farm proprietors' income  | -\$543    | -\$662    | -\$514    | -\$213    | \$243     | -\$120    | (L)       |
| Nonfarm proprietors' income   | \$57,022  | \$53,345  | \$54,172  | \$47,304  | \$47,931  | \$52,145  | \$55,640  |
| Farm earnings   | -\$218    | -\$266    | \$470     | \$872     | \$1,089   | \$951     | \$1,441   |
| Nonfarm earnings  | \$205,543 | \$211,045 | \$219,229 | \$215,831 | \$228,469 | \$246,582 | \$258,449 |
| Private earnings  | \$170,277 | \$175,739 | \$181,512 | \$178,417 | \$188,381 | \$204,827 | \$214,533 |
| <b>Per Capita Income</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |
| U.S.  | \$27,939  | \$29,845  | \$30,574  | \$30,810  | \$31,463  | \$33,090  | \$34,495  |
| State   | \$30,037  | \$31,779  | \$32,274  | \$32,528  | \$33,105  | \$34,956  | \$35,479  |
| San Juan  | \$36,977  | \$37,618  | \$38,270  | \$38,393  | \$39,909  | \$42,063  | \$44,053  |
| <b>Inflation-Adjusted Per Capita Income</b>                               |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |
| San Juan  | \$42,251  | \$41,941  | \$41,793  | \$41,341  | \$42,137  | \$43,274  | \$44,053  |
| State   | \$31,924  | \$33,275  | \$33,389  | \$33,176  | \$33,220  | \$34,043  | \$34,495  |
| US  | \$34,321  | \$35,431  | \$35,245  | \$35,026  | \$34,953  | \$35,962  | \$35,479  |

To account for the discrepancy between the high per capita income and low wages, it's necessary to look at non-earned income sector. The table below shows the levels non earned income on a per capita basis for each county in Washington. With a level of non earned income that is the highest in the state, almost double that of the second highest, Jefferson County, the extremely high level of non earned income in the county drives the levels of per capita income and median income higher than average wage levels would suggest as likely or even possible. Obviously this is both a product and reflection of the changing demographic profile of the county, which shows an influx of relatively wealthy retirees over the last 20 years.

<sup>14</sup> Taken from the Office of Financial Management, San Juan County Profile, 2006

Table 5-9

| <b>Dividends, Interest and Rental Income 2006</b> |                     |                   |                    |
|---|---------------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| <b>Area Name</b>                                  | <b>2006</b>         | <b>Population</b> | <b>Per Capita</b>  |
| Washington  | \$42,640,374.00     | 6,375,600         | \$6,688.06         |
| Adams   | \$75,259.00         | 17,300            | \$4,350.23         |
| Asotin  | \$99,560.00         | 21,100            | \$4,718.48         |
| Benton  | \$630,631.00        | 160,600           | \$3,926.72         |
| Chelan  | \$378,798.00        | 70,100            | \$5,403.68         |
| Clallam   | \$554,642.00        | 67,800            | \$8,180.56         |
| Columbia  | \$19,522.00         | 4,100             | \$4,761.46         |
| Cowlitz   | \$355,948.00        | 96,800            | \$3,677.15         |
| Douglas   | \$139,244.00        | 35,700            | \$3,900.39         |
| Ferry   | \$24,152.00         | 7,500             | \$3,220.27         |
| Franklin  | \$166,267.00        | 64,200            | \$2,589.83         |
| Garfield  | \$13,169.00         | 2,400             | \$5,487.08         |
| Grant   | \$299,853.00        | 80,600            | \$3,720.26         |
| Grays Harbor                                      | \$258,173.00        | 70,400            | \$3,667.23         |
| Island  | \$627,618.00        | 77,200            | \$8,129.77         |
| <b>Jefferson</b>                                  | <b>\$352,933.00</b> | <b>28,200</b>     | <b>\$12,515.35</b> |
| King  | \$20,158,767.00     | 1,835,300         | \$10,983.91        |
| Kitsap  | \$1,757,838.00      | 243,400           | \$7,222.01         |
| Kittitas  | \$170,170.00        | 37,400            | \$4,550.00         |
| Klickitat   | \$107,943.00        | 19,800            | \$5,451.67         |
| Lewis   | \$262,188.00        | 72,900            | \$3,596.54         |
| Lincoln   | \$58,424.00         | 10,200            | \$5,727.84         |
| Mason   | \$262,811.00        | 53,100            | \$4,949.36         |
| Okanogan  | \$154,835.00        | 39,800            | \$3,890.33         |

|   |                     |               |                    |
|---|---------------------|---------------|--------------------|
| Pacific   | \$105,515.00        | 21,500        | \$4,907.67         |
| Pend Oreille  | \$40,239.00         | 12,300        | \$3,271.46         |
| Pierce  | \$3,243,455.00      | 773,500       | \$4,193.22         |
| <b>San Juan</b>   | <b>\$406,370.00</b> | <b>15,700</b> | <b>\$25,883.44</b> |
| Skagit  | \$732,104.00        | 113,100       | \$6,473.07         |
| Skamania  | \$50,131.00         | 10,600        | \$4,729.34         |
| Snohomish   | \$2,892,271.00      | 671,800       | \$4,305.26         |
| Spokane   | \$2,095,644.00      | 443,800       | \$4,722.05         |
| Stevens   | \$151,208.00        | 42,100        | \$3,591.64         |
| Thurston  | \$1,206,670.00      | 231,100       | \$5,221.42         |
| Wahkiakum   | \$20,322.00         | 3,900         | \$5,210.77         |
| Walla Walla   | \$276,702.00        | 57,900        | \$4,778.96         |
| Whatcom   | \$1,100,075.00      | 184,300       | \$5,968.94         |
| Whitman   | \$174,066.00        | 42,800        | \$4,066.96         |
| Yakima  | \$854,349.00        | 231,800       | \$3,685.72         |
| Source: Regional Economic Information System, Bureau of Economic Analysis, U.S.Department of Commerce |                     |               |                    |
| Source: <a href="http://www.bea.gov">http://www.bea.gov</a> - Table CA30                              |                     |               |                    |
| Population: Office of Financial Management  |                     |               |                    |

Standard area economic analyses often draw upon studies that detail different facets of the locale’s economic structure such as taxable sales, area median income, per capita income, economic structural diversity, average wages per economic sector, median house prices and so on. Even the most cursory analysis of economic data for San Juan County amply reflects the anomalous population of the islands.

When discussing housing affordability, it’s impossible not to bring the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) into the debate. Annually, HUD delineates the Area Median Income (AMI) levels that qualify for federal assistance by county for the U.S.A. While the numerical incomes change by region, the populations of the sectors are determined by the percentage of the AMI they obtain. Throughout the U.S., these sectors are generically known by their AMI grouping. Currently, only those within the Very

Low to Moderate Income groups (0%-80% AMI) qualify for HUD assistance. While based on the census data, the HUD figures are aggregated and for the sake of analysis a base level of a four person household is used below.

Both Federal and State governments offer a variety of programs that address different aspects of the affordable housing issue. Addendum 2 of this report contains a complete description of the majority of these programs. This Addendum is taken from the Jefferson County and Town of Port Townsend 2006 Housing needs assessment.

The table below is derived from data included in the 2000 Census and shows the projected percentages of each income sector resident in San Juan County in 2008<sup>15</sup>.

Table 5-10.

| Area Median Income Household Groups <sup>16</sup> per HUD Standards |                       |                             |   |   |                             |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------------|---|---|-----------------------------|
| AMI Sectors   | % of Income           | % of SJC Households in 2000 | # of SJC Households in 2008 <sup>17</sup> | # of SJC Households in 2025 <sup>18</sup> | # of new Households in 2025 |
| Very Low Income   | 0 to 50% of Median    | 23%                         | 1,714                                     | 2,397                                     | 683                         |
| Low Income  | 50% to 80% of Median  | 16%                         | 1,192                                     | 1,667                                     | 475                         |
| Moderate Income   | 80% to 95% of Median  | 16%                         | 1,192                                     | 1,667                                     | 475                         |
| Middle Income   | 95% to 120% of Median | 17%                         | 1,267                                     | 1,771                                     | 504                         |
| Upper Income  | 120%-150% of Median   | 13%                         | 969                                       | 1,355                                     | 386                         |
| Total   |                       | 85%                         | 6,334                                     | 8,857                                     | 2,523                       |
| Beyond 150%   | 150%+ of Median       | 15%                         | 1,118                                     | 1,563                                     | 445                         |

The current HUD income figures for the County are below.

<sup>15</sup> These numbers are approximate. Census data does not consider single people, living alone as a household thereby excluding many elderly residents living on a fixed income, and the number of households in each sector is derived by taking the percentage of the population and dividing by the average household size in the county, 2.16. Most limiting, is the fact that as affordable housing became rarer at the lower end of the market over the last 8 years, many of the people who fell into these categories will have had to leave the county.

<sup>16</sup> See San Juan County Comprehensive Plan, Appendix 5, Housing, 2<sup>nd</sup> Draft, December 22, 2005, Table 12, P.15. Data derived from Census 2000.

<sup>17</sup> Assuming that the ratios remain the same over time.

<sup>18</sup> Assuming that the ratios remain the same.

Table 5-11

| 2008            |               |                            |                 |                 |                 |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |
|-----------------|---------------|----------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Area            | Median Income | 2008 Income Limit Category | 70%<br>1 person | 80%<br>2 person | 90%<br>3 person | BASE<br>4 person | 108%<br>5 person | 116%<br>6 person | 124%<br>7 person | 132%<br>8 person |
| San Juan County | \$ 65,000     | Extremely Low 30%          | 13,650          | 15,600          | 17,550          | 19,500           | 21,060           | 22,620           | 24,180           | 25,740           |
|                 |               | Very Low 50%               | 22,750          | 26,000          | 29,250          | 32,500           | 35,100           | 37,700           | 40,300           | 42,900           |
|                 |               | Low 80%                    | 36,400          | 41,600          | 46,800          | 52,000           | 56,160           | 60,320           | 64,480           | 68,640           |
|                 |               | Moderate 95%               | 43,225          | 49,400          | 55,575          | 61,750           | 66,690           | 71,630           | 76,570           | 81,510           |
|                 |               | Middle 120%                | 54,600          | 62,400          | 70,200          | 78,000           | 84,240           | 90,480           | 96,720           | 102,960          |
|                 |               | 150%                       | 68,250          | 78,000          | 87,750          | 97,500           | 105,300          | 113,100          | 120,900          | 128,700          |

If the ratios of extremely low, very low, low, moderate, middle and lower upper income groups remain the same over the planning period there will be 2,523 households that are likely to suffer some degree of housing cost burden.

Both HUD and County define Affordable housing as that which does not cost more than one third of gross household income, based on the above median income figures it's possible to delineate the housing costs that are affordable and compare that to the cost of a median house in the county, and from there calculate the difference between income and cost.

Table 5-12


| Maximum Affordable Housing Costs |                         |                                     |   |                                 |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|
|                                  | 2008 Median Income p.a. | Max Monthly Housing Costs per month | Max Affordable Purchase Price <sup>19</sup> | Shortfall to median House Price |
| Extremely Low                    | \$0-\$19,500            | \$0 - \$488                         | \$58,500                                    | \$504,800                       |
| Very low                         | \$19,500-\$32,500       | \$488 - \$813                       | \$97,500                                    | \$465,800                       |
| Low                              | \$32,500 - \$52,000     | \$813 - \$1,300                     | \$156,000                                   | \$407,300                       |
| Moderate                         | \$52,000-\$61,750       | \$1,300 - \$1,544                   | \$185,250                                   | \$378,050                       |
| Middle                           | \$61,750 - \$78,000     | \$1,544 - \$1,950                   | \$234,000                                   | \$329,300                       |
| Lower Upper                      | \$78,000 - \$97,500     | \$1,950 - \$2,438                   | \$292,500                                   | \$270,800                       |

<sup>19</sup> This is premised on acquiring a loan of no more than 3x of gross household income and a median house price of \$563,300.

As can be seen in the table above, the distance between median house price and mortgage is extensive and all but unbridgeable for any household earning less than \$100 K.

Figure 5-1 below, graphically displays the disparity between median wages and median home prices in the county.

Figure 5-1.



As can be seen above, the cost of housing in the county increased by about 125% between 2000 and 2007 while the median income rose approximately 14% over the same period. That said, the 2000 Census showed that San Juan County residents had an abnormally high rate of homeownership at approximately 73%.

The Housing Market and Housing Affordability analysis carried out by WSU's Center for Real Estate Research described the current situation in stark terms;

Housing in San Juan County is less affordable than any other community in the state by a wide margin. Resort Communities in other parts of the country experience similar frustrations with housing markets driven more by wealth from individuals coming from outside the community rather than income generated locally.<sup>20</sup>

<sup>20</sup> Glen E. Crellin. Housing Market and Housing Affordability, Washington Center for Real Estate Research, Autumn 2008. P. 4

When considering housing affordability, it's vital to analyze the different factors that contribute to the extreme differential between the price of homes and regional income. Due to the costs of transportation and skilled local labor, construction costs in the county are about 28% higher than they are on the mainland. Assuming that these costs remain relatively constant, and even allowing for a slight proportional rise in the costs of site planning, site preparation work and permitting, the minimal cost of construction is approximately \$200 per square foot and if the cost of land is included its approximately \$300 per square foot<sup>21</sup>.

Families or individuals paying more than 30% of their gross income for their housing needs are considered to be cost burdened and as the percentage of gross income required to pay for minimal housing requirements rises, so does the extent of the cost burden. People considered cost burdened and are likely to have difficulty paying for other essentials such as insurance, food, heating, car payments etc.

In the absence of substantial equity, affordable homeownership then would equate to a mortgage base of approximately 3 times the annual income, an additional 20% of the total mortgage as a down payment, interest rates at less than 8% and monthly payments for taxes, insurance, utilities and mortgage that do not exceed 30% of income.

This would mean that a person or family earning the median county income, \$61,600 in 2007, could hope to get a mortgage for approximately \$180,000, which with a 20% down payment would put them into the price range of \$210,000. If the prospective buyer had 20% of the median house price on hand, \$113,000, then they might have access to the lowest rungs of the housing market in San Juan County<sup>22</sup>.

There is an obvious corollary to the above, the possession of a \$100,000+ down payment presumes a considerable amount of equity in either the county or elsewhere, the capital of which can be brought into the market. Given that subsequent to 2000, households earning the median income or less have had very limited access to the ownership market, it is unlikely that households that are currently renting living space, will ever possess sufficient resources to move into the housing market. This means the very structure of the county's housing market requires that a resident's child or working families, if they wish to own a home here, move out of the county with the aim of developing sufficient funds to reenter the islands' homeownership market at some point in the future.

---

<sup>21</sup> Personal interview with building professionals, January 2009

<sup>22</sup> At the time of writing, this situation is changing. A brief search of the available units on the market in November, 2008 shows that of approximately 300 units for sale, between 15-20 were at \$300,000 or less.

Within the realm of homeownership first time home buyers are almost non-existent within the county. In fact, the county has the lowest first time home buyer affordability index in the state.<sup>23</sup> Currently the average first time home buyer can afford just ¼ of the median price of a home in the county, this compares unfavorably with the next lowest, King County, where the average first time homebuyer can afford about ½ the median price of a home in the county.

In the closing months of 2008, the median house prices have dropped precipitously, however, the Washington Center of Real Estate Research report on the fourth quarter of 2008 shows that the median resale price of a home in the county is \$452,000 and is still the least affordable in the state.

The rental market in the county is harder to quantify. Officially, rental units make up approximately 27% of the total market in San Juan. Beyond multifamily rental units and individual houses there is a substantial 'grey' market made up of rooms, in shared accommodations, cabins, accessory dwelling units, converted sheds, travel trailers used as permanent residences etc. which currently house a significant portion of the low, moderate, and middle income populations. The rental market is particularly susceptible to both fluctuations in the broader market and seasonality, with a lot of owners preferring to rent units for very high rates during the summer months rather than year round at less exuberant prices. In 2005, it was determined that 72% of wage earning renters outside the boundaries of the Low to Moderate income categories (who may have access to the rent controlled apartments), are likely to spend more than 30% of their income on rent, marking the income groups earning between 80% and 120% of median income as particularly cost burdened by their housing options<sup>24</sup>.

A report by Community Development and Planning, published in August 2007, holds that the grey rental market will house approximately "one third of the middle income category and one quarter of the moderate income category will find affordable housing in the unincorporated area."<sup>25</sup> This proposition would indicate that approximately 272<sup>26</sup> of the new households could find affordable rentals within the Non-UGA areas of the County.

Within the county there are a number of different groups who have been working to address the lack of affordable housing since the late 1980's, these groups include; Of People and Land (OPAL), the San Juan Community Land Trust, Lopez Community Land Trust and Homes For Islanders. These groups have specific models to achieve their goals and rely on different formulas to delineate the accrual of equity by the homeowner. Altogether these groups

---

<sup>23</sup> See Glenn E. Crellin. Housing Market and Housing Affordability, Washington Center For Real Estate Research. Autumn, 2008. P.5. In this report it is stated that the average first time homebuyer can afford approximately 25% of the cost of a house in San Juan County and is the lowest in the state.

<sup>24</sup> San Juan County Comprehensive Plan, Appendix 5, Housing, 2<sup>nd</sup> Draft. December 22, 2005. Table 13, P.16.

<sup>25</sup> Expansion of the Friday Harbor Urban Growth Area, August 24, 2007. P. 4


<sup>26</sup> Total pop increase minus 72% (4617) 17%/3.3 and 16%/4, 1093 and 1029 respectively, divided by 2.16.

have created approximately 326 housing units<sup>27</sup>. In addition there are also 198 affordable apartments in the county.

Land prices fluctuate over time, however, it is clear that for primarily aesthetic and social reasons, the price of land in San Juan County is likely to remain inflated beyond the reach of many economic sectors for the foreseeable future. This fact, in the absence of a concerted effort to combat its effects, is likely to have significant consequences on the demographic profile of the community and the county’s social fabric by hastening the increasing proportion of the population that are elderly, decreasing the proportion of youth and young parents and ultimately, hastening the demise of the remaining strands of traditional island culture.

Simultaneously, and by no means, coincidentally, over the past 15-20 years there have been significant changes in the demographic profile, the total number of full and part-time residents, the structure of the county’s economy and perceived quality of life for many of the county’s residents.

Figure 5-2.<sup>28</sup>



<sup>27</sup> See Addendum 1. San Juan County Affordable Housing Inventory


<sup>28</sup> Taken from San Juan County Economic Almanac, September 2008.

## **Demographics:**

For the majority of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, the islands were home to a relatively small and stable population which slowly increased from approximately 3000 in 1930 to almost 4,000 in 1970. The slow population growth rate, even in the post WWII period, indicates both the relative strength and weakness of the resource based economy that dominated the county at the time. The economy was strong in the sense that it provided employment in the fishing, farming and logging sectors and weak because these industries increasingly could not compete with similar activities on the mainland. As farming in mainland Washington increased in complexity and capitalization, there was a simultaneous improvement in the transportation facilities and thus the mainland farmer's connection with the markets, which had the effect depressing the viability of farming on the islands. The absence of secondary processing for almost all of the resource based industries increasingly limited their profitability by the beginning of the 1960's.

Of course, throughout the 20<sup>th</sup> century, but particularly from the mid-1960's onwards, the tourism sector of the economy grew in importance. Just as the traditional activities were in an irretrievable decline, tourism, retirement and second homes became an increasingly important sector of the economy. The 1970's saw the county's single largest period of population growth, as the population more than doubled. The population spike in the 1970's was not mirrored in Washington or the US as whole, and marks the point at which the sinews of the service economy became apparent. From the 1970's onwards, the median age of the population trended upwards, until reaching the point in 2007 where approximately half the population of the county was over the age of 50. While the population increased in both age and number, the percentage of the total population that is part of the workforce remained relatively static.

Figure 5-3.<sup>29</sup>



The stability of the workforce in relation to the rise in population<sup>30</sup> implies both that there are an increasing number of people in the County who are not working, (the retiree population), and that a significant number of those working are increasingly older. As shown in Figure 5-2, approximately 60% of the county’s population is 45 years old or older.

The rapidly advancing age of the working population is particularly troubling because a significant portion of them arrived in the County prior to the rapid price rises of recent years and purchased a home here. When they retire, however, regardless of whether they remain in place or leave, the cost of those units is still going to be beyond the reach of the vast majority of people hoping to fill the jobs they vacated.

As was shown above, in order to develop an appropriate estimate of the housing needs required for the county’s projected population growth overall and more particularly in this respect, the projected workforce, it’s necessary to make a number of presumptions, primarily that previously established demographic patterns documented by the 2000 Census are valid, such as home ownership percentages, that the ratio of the working versus non-working populations remains the same and that the ratio of 2<sup>nd</sup> homes versus full time residences remains similar to the established rates. In addition to the demographic patterns, it’s also necessary to make a number of presumptions about the continuity of economic trends and patterns, such as the high percentage of income from dividends and rents, the low percentage of income

<sup>29</sup> Taken from San Juan County Economic Almanac, 2008.

<sup>30</sup> Between 1990-2006, the total population increased by about 60% while the workforce increased by 33%.

from wages, the relation between median income and the median house price and so on.

Of specific interest to us here, is to delineate the impact on housing and the economic structure of the county of the large number of currently working folks who will retire over the planning period. The central issue here is to determine the percentages of those residents over 50 that have already retired or are still working. The 2000 census showed that in 1999, 50% of the county's population over 16 reported doing no work at all that year.<sup>31</sup> In 2000 the total population of working age (16-65) was approximately 9,200 people or 65%.

In 2008, the average annual workforce was approximately 8,000<sup>32</sup> out of a working age population of approximately 10,236<sup>33</sup> or 62% of the total population of 16,100. Simultaneously the average annual workforce constituted only 79% of the working age population. Currently then, there are a minimum of 3,704 housing units occupied by working folks, of which approximately 2,704 are owner occupied and 1000 are rented.

Of the current working age population, approximately 5,100 of them, or 49%, are between the ages of 50 and 65. If we further assume that only a very small number of residents below the age of 50 can afford to do no work whatsoever and we then assume that a full half of the 50 to 65 age group are retired, we are faced with a situation in which there are approximately 2,550 people that are 50 years old or above and still working in the County. Given that these people will retire over the planning horizon, in housing terms, these numbers mean that approximately 1,181 housing units currently providing homes for working folks, will no longer do so.

According to the OFM, of the projected 22,513 population in 2025, fully 13,035 will be over the age of 50, and 3,287 people will be under 19 years old, of which approximately 75% of those between 15 and 19 (572) are likely to leave the county following their graduation from high school. This creates a working age population of approximately 9,982<sup>34</sup>. This means that should the ratio of working to non working folks remain the same in 2025 as it is in 2008, there will be an active workforce of approximately 7,814<sup>35</sup> people. The projected working population of the county will require a minimum of 3,618 units in 2025.

When the existing stock of workforce housing is reduced by the number of units whose owners are retiring, then in 2025 there will be 2,523 owner occupied units that will remain occupied by the working population. If we presume that the 1,000 units currently rented remains the same, then, this

---

<sup>31</sup> Quoted in San Juan County , Economic Development Element, September 2007, p.19

<sup>32</sup> See [http://www.choosewashington.com/counties/Labor\\_Force.asp?county\\_id=63](http://www.choosewashington.com/counties/Labor_Force.asp?county_id=63)

<sup>33</sup> See OFM population estimates by Age and Sex 1980-2008, September 2008.

<sup>34</sup> Population of working age derived from remainder of 15-19 cohort not leaving after graduation, and adding the remaining 2025 cohorts between 20 and 64. See pages 29-31 of this report.

<sup>35</sup> 79% of the working age population of 9,982

means that the County is facing a shortage of approximately 1,095<sup>36</sup> housing units for the projected working age population by 2025.

|             | Working Age Pop | % Working Age Pop Employed | # of Working Age Working | # of Working Age Pop over 50 | # of Working Age Pop over 50 not working | # of Units for working pop | # Units Lost to Retirement between 2008 and 2025 |
|-------------|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|--|----------------------------|--|
| <b>2008</b> | 10,236          | 79                         | 8,000                    | 5,100                        | 2,550                                    | 3704                       |  |
| <b>2025</b> | 9,982           | 79                         | 7,814                    | 3,871                        | 1,936                                    | 3,618                      | 1095   |

The total projected population increase, however, will consist of significant portion of non working people. It is presumed that the market will not offer a significant barrier to them. Along with the units required for housing folks in very low to 150% of the AMI there will be an additional demand for a further 972 units and if the 2<sup>nd</sup> home rate grows at the same rate as the population, there will be a further 1,333 units constructed.

**Demographic Profile and Economic Health:**

The scenario above is premised upon both the working age population shrinking as well as the total number of people actually employed. In 2008 there were approximately 10,236 people of working age in the county, of whom approximately 8,000 or 50% of the total population were actively working. Extrapolating on existing trends the OFM projects that by 2025 the total working age population in the county will be approximately 9,982 and of those, all other things being equal, only 7,814 of them will be working. This indicates a decrease in the working population of -2 and a ½ % that occurs over the same period as the total population increases by approximately 40%. Simultaneously, the number of jobs in the county is roughly equivalent half the total population, so if this remains the same over time, then in 2025 there'll be 11,257 jobs in the county.

The implications of these trends are obvious. Either the number of jobs in the county decreases by approximately 30% or approximately 3,443<sup>37</sup> people will need to commute to the islands to fill the expected positions. Simply put, assuming that the ratio of jobs to population remains more or less constant, the projected demographic profile of the county in 2025 cannot provide the workforce required to fill the projected positions.

One of the causes of the increasingly skewed and age heavy demographic profile of the county is the absence of housing for the first time homebuyer segments of the population and the subsequent absence of people within the 20-45 age groups. Currently approximately 15% of the county's population

<sup>36</sup> 2,704 -1,181=1,523+1000 rentals=2523


<sup>37</sup> 11,257=50% of projected population minus employed working age pop 7,814 = 3,443

falls into that demographic sector, in comparison, that age group makes up about 28% of the State's population. Conversely 57% of the county's population is 45 and above while that sector makes up approximately 36% of the states population. In 2025, the 20-45 cohorts are expected to make up 21% of the population while the 45 and above groups will make up 63%. In order to reverse this trend, the county would have to provide an additional 1,594 affordable housing units, for a total of 2,689 affordable units.

Local businesses have long noted the difficulty to attract workers to a place offering relatively low wages and very limited housing choices. The OFM's population projections, in this context, actually show the logical and expected outcome of current housing policies.

If the projected workforce housing needs are not met over the planning horizon, the diverse character of the island community will be irredeemably altered.

Figure 5-4.



Excluding the 2<sup>nd</sup> home market, to meet the projected demand for housing, 2,969 units, approximately 64 affordable units per year and 110 market rate units will need to be constructed. If, however, an attempt is made to develop housing sufficient to meet the potential demand from all the different income groups, approximately 110 market rate units and 158 affordable units will need to be constructed per year.

**Population Projections:**

San Juan County adopted 25 year population projections in 2005 as part of that year's Comprehensive Plan Population element update. These numbers represent the County's official population projections and are the rock upon which planning for future development must be based. These population projections are derived from numbers handed down from the Washington State Office of Financial Management (OFM) from which all GMA planning must proceed.

While cultural change is a relatively slow process, marking its course over generations, economic change is increasingly rapid, extremely volatile and can destroy personal fortunes almost as fast as they can be generated<sup>38</sup>. The unpredictability of the economic environment has a measurable impact on the validity of population projections for this County because, the combination of excessively high land prices, distinctly low wages and the relative inaccessibility of the islands themselves, have coalesced into an locale that requires the possession of considerable personal wealth for the majority of people who wish to move here.

Despite one of the lowest real estate tax rates in the state, the lower income homeowners of the current population are severely impacted by the rising costs related to the increased value of land and the heightened cost of living while the tenants are severely impacted by rising rents which are again tied to the increased value of the land and windfall profits available to landlords through seasonal rentals.

This means that the standard natural increase/decrease population nexus is compounded and exacerbated by the fluctuations in capital markets. The OFM projections take into account the in and out migration of people as the table below natural increase accounts for little of the County's population growth.

Table 5-14

|                  | 2000-01 | 2001-02 | 2002-03 | 2003-04 | 2004-05 | 2005-06 | 2006-07 | Average<br>1990-2007 |
|------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|----------------------|
| Total Change     | 323     | 200     | 200     | 300     | 400     | 200     | 200     | 345                  |
| Births           | 101     | 110     | 86      | 88      | 101     | 110     | 113     | 103                  |
| Deaths           | 115     | 130     | 120     | 113     | 106     | 102     | 105     | 104                  |
| Natural Increase | -14     | -20     | -34     | -25     | -5      | 7       | 8       | -1                   |
| Net In-migration | 337     | 220     | 234     | 325     | 405     | 193     | 192     | 346                  |

The current population of the county in 2008 is approximately 16,100 people and will reach 22,513<sup>39</sup> by 2025, an increase of about 40% or 6,413 people.

<sup>38</sup> At the time of writing, the credit industry in the US and the world is in a crisis that could, if prolonged, spark a recession that will obviate the demand for much more housing in the county, conceivably at least until 2018.

<sup>39</sup> Since the County's adoption of the population projection in 2005, the OFM has revised the 2025 total downwards slightly from 22,534 to 22,513.

Below are the OFM San Juan County population projections broken down by cohort.

Table 5-15.

|              | <b>2008</b>  |
|--------------|--------------|
| <b>Age</b>   | <b>Total</b> |
| <b>Total</b> | 16,100       |
| 0-4          | 565          |
| 5-9          | 717          |
| 10-14        | 923          |
| 15-19        | 786          |
| 20-24        | 494          |
| 25-29        | 528          |
| 30-34        | 533          |
| 35-39        | 814          |
| 40-44        | 1,076        |
| 45-49        | 1,519        |
| 50-54        | 1,824        |
| 55-59        | 1,733        |
| 60-64        | 1,518        |
| 65-69        | 1,004        |
| 70-74        | 692          |
| 75-79        | 569          |
| 80-84        | 403          |
| 85+          | 402          |

Table 5-16.

|              | <b>2015</b>  |
|--------------|--------------|
| <b>Age</b>   | <b>Total</b> |
| <b>Total</b> | 19,150       |
| 0-4          | 665          |
| 5-9          | 717          |
| 10-14        | 777          |
| 15-19        | 713          |
| 20-24        | 535          |
| 25-29        | 794          |
| 30-34        | 950          |
| 35-39        | 961          |
| 40-44        | 941          |
| 45-49        | 947          |
| 50-54        | 1,289        |
| 55-59        | 1,600        |
| 60-64        | 1,932        |
| 65-69        | 2,078        |
| 70-74        | 1,582        |
| 75-79        | 1,134        |

|       |     |
|-------|-----|
| 80-84 | 715 |
| 85+   | 820 |

Table 5-17.

|            | <b>2020</b>  |
|------------|--------------|
| <b>Age</b> | <b>Total</b> |
| Total      | 20,857       |
| 0-4        | 709          |
| 5-9        | 807          |
| 10-14      | 844          |
| 15-19      | 699          |
| 20-24      | 477          |
| 25-29      | 700          |
| 30-34      | 1,040        |
| 35-39      | 1,165        |
| 40-44      | 1,112        |
| 45-49      | 1,049        |
| 50-54      | 1,044        |
| 55-59      | 1,386        |
| 60-64      | 1,823        |
| 65-69      | 2,148        |
| 70-74      | 2,227        |
| 75-79      | 1,558        |
| 80-84      | 1,023        |
| 85+        | 1,046        |

Table 5-18.

|              | <b>2025</b>  |
|--------------|--------------|
| <b>Age</b>   | <b>Total</b> |
| <b>Total</b> | 22,513       |
| 0-4          | 707          |
| 5-9          | 863          |
| 10-14        | 955          |
| 15-19        | 762          |
| 20-24        | 469          |
| 25-29        | 634          |
| 30-34        | 927          |
| 35-39        | 1,289        |
| 40-44        | 1,355        |
| 45-49        | 1,247        |
| 50-54        | 1,160        |
| 55-59        | 1,120        |
| 60-64        | 1,591        |
| 65-69        | 2,037        |
| 70-74        | 2,309        |
| 75-79        | 2,211        |

|       |       |
|-------|-------|
| 80-84 | 1,423 |
| 85+   | 1,454 |

The coarsest analysis would suggest that a total population of 22,513 will require approximately 10,423<sup>40</sup> dwelling units.

The OFM estimates that in 2008 there are a total of 11,514<sup>41</sup> housing units in the county.

Table 5-19.

|                | Total  | 1 Unit | 2+ Units | Spec  |
|----------------|--------|--------|----------|-------|
| San Juan       | 11,514 | 9,502  | 815      | 1,197 |
| Unincorporated | 10,339 | 8,941  | 309      | 1,089 |
| Incorporated   | 1,175  | 561    | 506      | 108   |
| Friday Harbor  | 1,175  | 561    | 506      | 108   |

This indicates that there is a surfeit of housing units within the County. Standard economic theory would suggest that the abundance of housing units would put a downward pressure on prices, however, in San Juan County the housing price trajectory over the last decade has been almost exactly the opposite.

Given the vagaries of the County's records, for the purpose of this report, OFM's estimated number of units is assumed to be an accurate description of the existing housing situation in the county.

One of the prominent reasons for this counter intuitive impact of surplus housing units on the local pricing mechanisms is the market distortion generated by the large percentage of second or third homes in the County. The 2000 Census held that approximately 29% of the houses in San Juan County were second homes, or approximately 3,339 units. These units are marked by part time residencies and long term vacancy rates.

If the current OFM housing unit estimate (11,514), is reduced by the approximate number of 2<sup>nd</sup> homes, the total number of occupied residential housing units is 8,177, which would imply that there will be a need for approximately 2,248<sup>42</sup> additional units to meet the demand of the projected population in 2025. If the sole consideration in determining the number of units that are necessary to house the projected population increase, 6,413 the number of needed units would be 2,969. If, however, we divide the existing population 16,100 by 2.16, then apparently there are only 7,454 occupied

<sup>40</sup> Total population divided by average household of 2.16

<sup>41</sup> In 2025 this would mean a surplus of 1082 housing units.

<sup>42</sup> There is no single ideal method of determining these unit numbers. This option takes the total population in 2025, divides by 2.16 and adds that to the number of non-second homes in the county (8,177). A further option, would be to simply assume that 25% of the currently existing second home owners become full time residents over the planning horizon, then the new units needed would be 2,969-835=2134 new units.

units in the county, which implies an even greater 2<sup>nd</sup> home rate (35% rather than 29%). .

In order to meet the need identified above, approximately 175 units must be built per year.

Beyond the information provided by the 2000 Census, received wisdom and anecdotes, there is little hard data to determine the true extent, and thus evaluate the impact of the 2<sup>nd</sup> home phenomena. Sufficed to say, housing units that are, for the most part, uninhabited which remove the acreage from the stock of available land, appears put an upward pressure on prices by increasing the scarcity of the land, while the essential character of the market itself presumes the existence of individual capital reserves which would allow the 2<sup>nd</sup> home purchaser to outbid those with limited reserves which in turn also puts an upward pressure on the cost of land. The rapid land price rise over the last decade has also encouraged both speculation while further raising the perceived value and social exclusivity of the islands. There is no evidence available at the moment to suggest that 2<sup>nd</sup> homes are less likely to come upon the market than primary residences, however, if these owners do have considerable assets at their disposal, then it seems unlikely that during a pricing downturn, they would be keen to sell off their units. The impact of this may be softened by the number of people who, when finished working elsewhere retire to their home on the island.

Adding to the constraints on the amount of land available for construction is the fact that approximately 20% of the county's territory is held for conservation purposes.

The implication of table 5-10 is that if the proportions of the different income groups remain the same over the planning horizon, 85% of the potential new households or approximately 2,523<sup>43</sup> new households will require housing that is cheaper than that which is currently available.

It is misleading to presume that the proportions of the different income groups will remain constant because all new additions to existing population would require the provision of affordable housing to all income groups in the appropriate proportions over the planning horizon in order to actually live in the County in 2025. If housing that is affordable to the different income groups is not developed over the planning horizon than it is reasonable to assume that both total numbers and relative percentages of very low income to middle income earners will decline dramatically relative to the upper income groups.

### **Options:**

Decisions made today, particularly in relation to housing, will have long term consequences for the county and community. While some may argue that

---

<sup>43</sup> 72% of projected population increase of 6,413.

activities in the market place are the only real solution to the housing crisis and associated community issues, however, it's clear that the market place has not addressed the needs of working and other low to middle income residents, therefore only a truly community based political solution will be sufficient to meet the challenge. There is no single strategy best suited to tackle the issue of the lack of affordable housing. Every possible strategy and tactic, from down payment assistance and credit counseling, density bonuses and clustered developments, through private enterprise options and direct government intervention must be brought to bear on solving the problem. Ultimately, the residents of the county must decide the shape of the social, economic and cultural structure of the community that they prefer and then determine what they are willing to pay for it.

Within the framework of the housing needs assessment, the broad outlines of three alternative development patterns emerge as a result of the choices made by the community today.

Alternatives:

1. Do Nothing.

This option presumes that neither County nor Town governments will adopt any measures that will have any appreciable impact, either positive or negative, on the availability of housing that working or other low to middle income people can afford.

Over the planning horizon, the existing non profit housing groups will struggle to develop housing options for significant numbers of very low to middle income earners. If these groups maintain their previous form then it's possible that up to 300 units may be constructed by 2025. It is expected that should land prices continue to climb, the access of non profits to building sites will decrease.

Private enterprise solutions to the lack of workforce housing may arise haphazardly in the form of a much greater reliance on both a full time and seasonal commuter workforce.

It's possible that a cartel of the different tourism dependent industries may seek to develop some kind of dormitory option. It is assumed that a group of this nature would probably seek to develop a communal campsite with amenities rather than bricks and mortar buildings to provide living space for their seasonal workers. It's also possible that another mobile home park like the Oaks could be developed.

The absence of workforce housing on the islands will likely lead to the closure of some businesses while others will struggle to find

permanent employees. Businesses are likely to have to deal with a high turnover in staff positions as off island employees find other work on the mainland that is likely to be both better paid and involve a much shorter commute.

Along with business closures, and subsequent reduced entertainment and service options, school enrollment will continue to drop which may lead to the closure of schools on Shaw and Lopez and the consolidation of the different school districts.

The absence of workforce housing is also likely to lead to levy raises to cover the costs of paid emergency workers, such as firemen, the majority of whom are currently volunteers. As the population ages there will be fewer and fewer people that are capable of actually carrying out the tasks and so full time paid employees will need to be found.

2. Develop plans to accommodate the movement of the workforce out of the county.

Another option the community may choose is to embrace the current demographic trends.

While high prices, low wages, absence of peers and limited social opportunities already serve to curb the desirability of the county as a place to work and raise a family; it's likely that the adoption of regulations that limit the expansion of affordable housing, or curtail the public activities and services used by young families and through a variety of both regulatory and cultural means the incentives for working people to relocate to the islands may be further limited.

Limiting the on island workforce to that which is absolutely necessary for the protection of the health, safety and welfare of the residents will mean that other than firemen, sheriff's deputies and essential medical personnel, the working population will have to be brought in daily. The on island workforce could be further restricted to only those tasks that are site specific, such as teachers, construction workers and additional health care providers.

The only mass transit link to the mainland the county currently enjoys is via Washington State Ferries and there is no county wide transit system. An on island transit system will need to be developed to ensure that workers can get to their places of employment that are distant from the ferry docks.

A separate but related option may be to develop large, long term secure parking lots in the immediate vicinity of the ferry landings to provide space for workers to leave their vehicles overnight.

If no transit system is developed, then the existing ferry service carrying capacity will be quickly exceeded by workers bringing their vehicles.

Less geographically specific tasks could be accomplished on the mainland. Office space in Anacortes, Mount Vernon or Burlington could be acquired to provide workspace for the town and county government workers. Additional regulations to foreclose and restrain the development of in-house offices or other cottage enterprises will help push the less place dependent workforce from the county.

3. Develop an effective response to the shortage of affordable workforce housing.

The last option will require widespread support of the community as well as significant political and planning action to develop a long range plan that identifies ideal sites for housing, develops sufficient capital facilities to meet the prospective demands, and provides for a variety of methods by which housing goals can be achieved.

On obvious starting point would be the creation of an independent Housing Authority that is funded through some reliable method such as a real estate excise tax, affordable housing impact fees on development applications, or as a separate levy as part of the property tax. These funding mechanisms would not preclude the use of a variety of state and federal funding programs. The Housing Authority could, working in conjunction with the existing non profit organizations, begin work on the construction of housing units and would provide a direct method by which the community could achieve their goals.

At the regulatory level existing regulations could be adapted to minimize their negative impact on affordable housing provision, fees for affordable housing projects could be decreased, density bonuses for the private provision of affordable units could be increased as with height limits and density designations within the existing UGAs, the definition of affordability could be changed to include up to 150% of the area median income earners.

# Addendum 1

## **Affordable Housing inventory for San Juan County**

### **Opal Community Land Trust- Orcas Island**

Opal Commons 18 homes  
Bonnie Brae 24 homes  
Oberon Wood 11 homes  
Lahari Ridge 6 homes  
Scattered Sites 5 homes  
Wild Rose Meadow 32 homes - under development  
Orcas Village 12 homes – planned  
7 rental apartments

### **Homes for Islanders – San Juan Island**

Leward Cove 8 homes  
Rocky Bay 8 homes  
Park Plaza 9 homes - under development

### **Homes for Islanders – Orcas Island**

Woodland Estates 8 homes – breaking ground summer 2008

### **San Juan Community Home Trust – San Juan Island**

Salal 15 homes  
Buck Property – proposed 5 acres developed with potentially 50 homes (additional 10 acres with 70 homes proposed)

### **Lopez Community Land Trust – Lopez Island**

Morgan Town 8 homes  
Coho 7 homes  
Innisfree 8 homes  
Sustainable Community Homes 11 homes - under development  
2 rental apartments

### **Private Efforts – San Juan Island**

The Oaks manufactured home community has 77 homes on 1/8 acre leased parcels. In 2007 they were selling for \$110k-\$140k. The homeowner typically pays a fee of \$250-\$300 per month for land lease and upkeep, in addition to a mortgage payment.

Harbor Ridge Mobile Home Park in Friday Harbor as of 2006 had 70 units with 187 low and very low income persons living there. They also have \$300 per month land lease added to their rental cost of unit or loan (if any).

### **Summary:**

170 single family homes built or currently under development  
77 manufactured homes on leased land  
70 mobile homes on leased land  
140 proposed housing units  
9 rental apartments

**Lavendar Hollow**  
 PO Box 1058  
 Eastsound, WA 98245  
 360.376.5479

| Units | Type   | Rent  |
|-------|--------|-------|
| 12    | 1 bdrm | \$540 |
| 8     | 2 bdrm | \$595 |
| 2     | 3 bdrm | \$643 |
| 0     | 4 bdrm | \$0   |

total: 22

**USDA Rental Assistance  
 Subsidized: 17**

**Gerard Park**  
 595 Linder Street  
 Friday Harbor, WA 98250  
 360.378.5407

| Units | Type   | Rent  |
|-------|--------|-------|
| 20    | 1 bdrm | \$473 |
| 1     | 2 bdrm | \$531 |
| 0     | 3 bdrm | \$0   |
| 0     | 4 bdrm | \$0   |

total: 21

**USDA Rental Assistance  
 Subsidized: 16**      **Seniors or  
 Disabled**

**Rosewood**  
 525 Perry Place  
 Friday Harbor, WA 98250  
 360.378-3000

| Units | Type   | Rent |
|-------|--------|------|
| 4     | 1 bdrm | \$0  |
| 10    | 2 bdrm | \$0  |
| 4     | 3 bdrm | \$0  |
| 0     | 4 bdrm | \$0  |

total: 18

**USDA Rental Assistance  
 Subsidized: 18**

**Surina Meadows**  
 535 Linder Street  
 Friday Harbor, WA 98250  
 360.378.3034

| Units | Type   | Rent  |
|-------|--------|-------|
| 3     | 1 bdrm | \$580 |
| 15    | 2 bdrm | \$638 |
| 2     | 3 bdrm | \$695 |
| 0     | 4 bdrm | \$0   |

total: 20

**USDA Rental Assistance  
 Subsidized: 18**

**Westview**  
 452 Lopez Rd.  
 Lopez Island, WA 98261  
 360.468.3821

| Units | Type   | Rent  |
|-------|--------|-------|
| 6     | 1 bdrm | \$545 |
| 12    | 2 bdrm | \$600 |
| 0     | 3 bdrm | \$0   |
| 0     | 4 bdrm | \$0   |

total: 18

**USDA Rental Assistance  
 Subsidized: 10**

**Island Meadows**  
 360 Carter Ave.  
 Friday Harbor, WA 98250  
 360.378-3000

| Units | Type   | Rent  |
|-------|--------|-------|
| 17    | 1 bdrm | \$489 |
| 2     | 2 bdrm | \$524 |
| 0     | 3 bdrm | \$0   |
| 0     | 4 bdrm | \$0   |

total: 19

**USDA Rental Assistance  
 Subsidized: 10**      **Seniors or  
 Disabled**

**Harborview**  
 500 Tucker Ave.  
 Friday Harbor, WA 98250  
 360.378.3000

| Units | Type   | Rent  |
|-------|--------|-------|
| 12    | 1 bdrm | \$547 |
| 8     | 2 bdrm | \$564 |
| 0     | 3 bdrm | \$0   |
| 0     | 4 bdrm | \$0   |

total: 20

**USDA Rental Assistance  
 Subsidized: 6**

**Islewood**  
 855 Guard Street  
 Friday Harbor, WA 98250  
 360.378.3000

| Units | Type   | Rent  |
|-------|--------|-------|
| 10    | 1 bdrm | \$543 |
| 8     | 2 bdrm | \$480 |
| 0     | 3 bdrm | \$0   |
| 0     | 4 bdrm | \$0   |

total: 18

**USDA Rental Assistance  
 Subsidized: 9**

**Friday Harbor Village**  
 445 Carter Ave.  
 Friday Harbor, WA 98250  
 360.378.3000

| Units | Type   | Rent  |
|-------|--------|-------|
| 0     | 1 bdrm | \$0   |
| 8     | 2 bdrm | \$675 |
| 12    | 3 bdrm | \$775 |
| 6     | 4 bdrm | \$825 |

total: 26

**USDA Rental Assistance  
 Subsidized: 0**

**Orcas Longhouse**  
 236 Prune Alley  
 Eastsound, WA 98245  
 360.376.2023

| Units | Type   | Rent  |
|-------|--------|-------|
| 16    | 1 bdrm | \$378 |
| 0     | 2 bdrm | \$0   |
| 0     | 3 bdrm | \$0   |
| 0     | 4 bdrm | \$0   |

total: 16

**USDA Rental Assistance  
 Subsidized: 0**      **Seniors or  
 Disabled**

Total Units: 198

**Total USDA Rental Assistance: 104**      **\*Rent is limited to 30% of tenants  
 income**  
**Total Non-Subsidized: 94**      **\*Income must be 60% or less of SJC  
 AMI  
 to qualify**

## **Addendum 2**

### **Overview of State and Federal Programs Available to Aid the Development of Affordable Housing**

Taken from the Jefferson County/Town of Port Townsend 2006 Housing Plan  
Reprinted with Permission