

Adam Zack

From: jmc779@rockisland.com
Sent: Tuesday, November 19, 2019 8:34 PM
To: Adam Zack
Cc: Paul Kamin EWUA; brian wiese; Terry Gillespie; Leith Templin; Charles Toxey; joAn Mann; Fred Klein; Rick Hughes
Subject: Land Capacity Analysis
Attachments: Scenario D.xlsx

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Adam,

Rummaging thru my records, I do not find that I have sent you my concern about the conclusions on page 2 of the November 2 Second Draft LCA. Specifically that the Eastsound UGA has sufficient developable land available for 472 dwelling units **and** 594,362 sf of commercial development. Leaving aside the issues of innumeracy and methodology, it simply isn't so. Each of those numbers is based upon a different, mutually exclusive "Scenario".

The residential capacity, 472 according to scenario C, assumes that all the Village Commercial and Marina districts as well as all other residential districts develop residentially to 100% of capacity. This is an inconceivable and most undesirable eventuality.

The commercial capacity, 594,362 sf according to scenario A, assumes that the Village Commercial and Marina districts develop commercially to 100% of capacity. While this scenario is more plausible, it is incompatible with scenario C. The two scenarios are mutually exclusive alternatives. The scenarios do however provide some useful numbers of capacities to plan with.

The primary point of this LCA initiative is to determine whether there is sufficient appropriately zoned land in the Eastsound UGA to accommodate the projected residential growth under the present goals, policies and zoning. That target, from the current Comp Plan Housing Needs Assessment, is 252 dwelling units. So, it is time to do some planning and evaluate these numbers in light of what the present plan allows and the EPRC can reasonably expect of these zones and designations in the light of past experience. to do that , consider a Scenario D as follows:

1. Village Commercial (VC) and Marina zones develop 5% residential and 95% commercial, about what has occurred over the past decade.
2. Village Institutional/Residential (VI/R) develops 75% residential and 25% commercial, again about what exists.
3. Residential zones, ER1 etc., develop 95% residential and 5% other uses, again about what has historically occurred.

In other words, what may reasonably be expected under current land use designations. Attached is that tabulation under the present LCA methodology. Note that the qualifying "factors" for public use, recreational use and market factor are unchanged and are added, not multiplied, together.

The result is a capacity of 239 units to meet a demand for 252 units, a shortfall of 13 units. Commercial capacity works out to be 455,253 compared to 594,362 previously reported.

In allevents, scenario D, or something like it, seems a far more reasonable "scenario" upon which to evaluate whether Eastsound meets the requirements of Growth Management.

None of the above deals with the basic innumeracy of adding the various factor instead of multiplying them nor does it reflect the factors themselves particularly the recreational use factor, 35%, to reflect a 200% recreational development reality. On the principal of confining my communications to one subject and one page, I will make that case in another message.

John Campbell
360-376-2035

specifically, that Eastsound has sufficient available land capacity for

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
1	Scenario D											
2	Land Use	Gross Residential	Gross com'l	commercial		Gross residential	Gross commercial	Public	Market	Rec. home	Net res.	
3		capacity from	from Scenario A	multiplier	residential	capacity	capacity	use Factor	Factor	factor	capacity	
4	Designation	Scenario C	A		multiplier			5%	25%	35%		
5												
6	ER1	1.49			0.95	1.42		0.07	0.35	0.50	0.50	
7	ER1P	16.25			0.95	15.44		0.77	3.86	5.40	5.40	
8	ER2	37.22			0.95	35.36		1.77	8.84	12.38	12.38	
9	ER2P	45.45			0.95	43.18		2.16	10.79	15.11	15.11	
10	ER412	20.47			0.95	19.45		0.97	4.86	6.81	6.81	
11	ER4P	158.43			0.95	150.51		7.53	37.63	52.68	52.68	
12	VC	498.99	167,248	0.95	0.05	24.95	158,885.60	1.25	6.24	8.73	8.73	
13	M	62	311,966	0.95	0.05	3.08	296,367.70	0.15	0.77	1.08	1.08	
14	SLI	0			0	0.00			0.00			
15	EAD	0			0	0.00			0.00			
16	EN	0			0	0.00			0.00			
17	VR	519.12			0.75	389.34	455,253.30	19.47	97.34	136.27	136.27	
18												
19	TOTAL	1359.08				682.717				capacity	239	
20												
21		Required capacity from Housing Needs Analysis (Table 5.1, pg 8) is 252 units minus										
22		239 available equals a shortfall of 13 units under this scenario.										