



Tuesday, May 31, 2022

50-YEAR STAKEHOLDER ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Meeting at 6:00 pm

This meeting was held in a hybrid format at Scappoose City Hall via Microsoft Teams

Topic

1. Call to order

1.1. Roll call

Voting Members Present: Chair Patrick Kessi, Vice Chair Christine Turner, Tyler Miller, Kim Holmes, Jeannet Santiago (remote), Pat Turpen, Paul Vogel (remote), Jeff Weiss, Jennifer Anderson, Brian Rosenthal

Agency Partners Present: Casey Garrett, Debbie Jacob, Craig Campbell (remote), Michael Sykes, Nicole Ferreira (remote)

Staff Present: Community Development Director Laurie Oliver Joseph, Planning Department Intern N.J. Johnson

Consultants Present: C.J. Doxsee (remote), Brendan Buckley, Darci Rudzinski (remote)

Citizens Present: [None]

1.2. Approval of Agenda; May 31, 2022

Jeff Weiss: I move to approve the agenda.

Brian Rosenthal: I second.

Aye: [All present voting members]

Nay: [None]

Abstain: [None]

1.3. Approval of Minutes; May 17, 2022



Tyler Miller: I move to approve the minutes from the May 17, 2022 meeting.

Brian Rosenthal: I second.

Aye: [All present voting members]

Nay: [None]

Abstain: [None]

1.4. **Public comment**

N.J. Johnson: We had no public comment submitted.

2. **New Business**

2.1. Residential Land Needs Analysis (Brendan Buckley, Johnson Economics)

Brendan Buckley: Residential Land Needs Analysis is a comparison of demand to the final buildable land inventory. We then discuss measures to accommodate needed housing. We project Scappoose will have 1,970 new residents between 2023-2043 and need 1,041 new housing units (575 single family homes, 73 townhomes, 89 2-4 units, 213 5 or more units, 91 manufactured homes). On the land inventory side, we discussed last time how to remove development constraints to accurately determine buildable land availability. There are currently 49.77 acres of vacant land and 87.67 acres of partially vacant land in city limits. There are currently 13.48 acres of vacant land and 93.94 acres of partially vacant land in the urban growth boundary area. There are currently a total of 63.25 acres of vacant land and 181.61 acres of partially vacant land in city limits and the urban growth boundary for a grand total of 244.86 acres of land. Within the city limits, there is capacity for 258 additional housing units in vacant land and 465 additional housing units in partially vacant land. Within the urban growth boundary area, there is capacity for 63 additional housing units in vacant land and 450 additional housing units in partially vacant land. Within the city limits and the urban growth boundary area, there is capacity for a total of 321 additional housing units in vacant land and 915 additional housing units in partially vacant land for a grand total of 1,236 additional housing units. Getting into the residential land needs analysis, we compare the supply and demand of each housing type (low density, medium density, and high density). We project a surplus of 364 units or 76 acres in low density zones, a



deficit of 113 units or 15 acres in medium density zones, and a deficit of 56 units or 10 acres in high density zones.

Michael Sykes: Are these numbers for the total urban growth boundary or just city limits?

Brendan Buckley: This is the total urban growth boundary.

Brian Rosenthal: You use a slope of 25% or greater as your constraints for development but the City requires a variance if a slope is greater than 15%. Should we be considering this developable if we have to get a variance approved?

C.J. Doxsee: Even though getting a variance approved adds cost, we still consider it developable for the purposes of this study.

Brian Rosenthal: But if the variance isn't guaranteed, shouldn't we use a ratio of this slope area?

C.J. Doxsee: I would need to double check with the Department of Land Conservation & Development but I'm not aware of any precedent for using ratios of slope area.

Jeff Weiss: What percent of partially vacant land typically gets developed?

Brendan Buckley: That is a real concern, but we need to include all partial acreage in the inventory because the City needs to know how much land it has in their urban growth boundary to justify adding more.

Michael Sykes: Where are the largest areas of developable land?

C.J. Doxsee: Most of it is partially vacant land. There is a large area south of the airport. A lot of parcels fit the safe harbor rules for being partially vacant (if parcel is greater than 0.5 acres, deduct 0.25 acres and assume the rest is buildable). Often, you can get 2 or 3 additional units on those lots. In the southwest area, the parcels inside and outside the urban growth boundary are often larger and partially vacant. The partially vacant



lots outside the urban growth boundary are predictable because they're often very large. When these parcels eventually get annexed, it's likely that they'll have the capacity for 10-20 houses. However, you likely won't get subdivisions with 50-100 units in these areas. And then the partially vacant area of land in the north is slightly misleading because much of it is constrained by wetlands.

Kim Holmes: How does our ratio of vacant to partially vacant land compare to other similar communities?

Brendan Buckley: You can see a wide range of results. That said, your partially vacant land is comparatively high but not unheard of. It's very expected for a community like Scappoose with a large amount of rural residential land, where the lots are bigger and therefore, count towards partially vacant. Depending on where they are, you might see people be willing to sell if their house is older and not worth very much. But you also see long-time, generational property owners who are much less likely to sell.

Christine Turner: What happens if we get to the end of the vacant land supply and nobody with partially vacant land wants to sell?

Brendan Buckley: The housing measures look at what to do if the predicted buildable lands won't be developed. If the community feels that any of these areas are not going to develop, we would go through the process of removing it from the urban growth boundary.

Christine Turner: Someone like Michael Sykes could probably accurately predict which people are going to give up their property in the near future.

Brendan Buckley: If you decide to do that, you'd have to take it out of the urban growth boundary and swap it one-for-one with other land.

Laurie Oliver Joseph: The 50-Year Plan project will look at the prospect of an urban growth boundary swap. This portion of the project with MIG | APG and Johnson Economics is looking at a 20-year window. Then ECONorthwest will expand out to have a 50-year look. After we look at all of the land needs, we'll have a better look. For this



component, it's just the 20-year look to understand what land we're starting with. This shows that we have a zoning deficit, based on what's allowed in each zone. There is going to have to be policy choices from this process.

Brian Rosenthal: Would it constitute a property taking if the City decided to remove someone from the urban growth boundary without their consent?

Laurie Oliver Joseph: That is a great question, Brian. I don't know the answer to that. C.J. or Darci, do you know?

C.J. Doxsee: I don't know about that specifically. I do know that there is a very public process to go through to do an urban growth boundary swap. I would have to double check the property takings aspect of it though.

Darci Rudzinski: If they were taken out of the urban growth boundary, private property owners would be forgoing the opportunity to develop their land and receive the profits from that.

Michael Sykes: The biggest constraint to developing around Raymond Creek is that it doesn't have sewer. It is in the urban growth boundary. I think it's in an R-5 zone with Columbia County.

Debbie Jacob: The only provision Columbia County has for rural residential zones is properties greater than 2 acres are allowed to have one accessory dwelling unit of 900 square feet or less. There are other provisions but that's the only way we can get more than one house on the property.

Michael Sykes: There are people in the urban growth boundary that wanted to annex but wouldn't be contiguous to city limits, so it would be cost-prohibitive to provide them with services. A lot of that area on the east probably won't develop. Providing services up Raymond Creek Road is going to be expensive. This whole exercise gives us a good sense of our challenges as we head into the future.



Patrick Kessi: This is good feedback for the consultants too because they will take this information and share it with the City Council/Planning Commission when they update them on the project.

Brendan Buckley: Yes, this is very good feedback and questions for us to follow up on. There is an appendix to the official housing needs analysis report that discusses alternative growth rates. I want to remind everyone that we are required to use the most recent growth rate provided by the Portland State University Population Research Center. The baseline growth rate that we have to use is 1% per year, which yields a population of 10,764 in 2043. Under this, we will need 1,041 new housing units and we will have 52 more acres than needed. The first alternative growth rate is 1.3%, which yields a population of 11,402 in 2043. Under this, we will need 1,317 new housing units and 3 more acres to accommodate that. The second alternative growth rate is 1.8%, which yields a population of 12,564 in 2043. Under this, we will need 1,818 new housing units and 92 more acres to accommodate that.

Patrick Kessi: When was the baseline growth rate calculated and when was it adjusted?

Brendan Buckley: Portland State University adopted the baseline population forecast in 2020 but their current population estimate was lower than what the Census confirmed it to be. The growth rate decreased to 1% because the population forecast of 10,764 did not change but the starting population with the update from the Census did change.

Brian Rosenthal: If some of the land in the buildable lands inventory isn't actually developable because people aren't selling their properties, could we declare it as unbuildable so that we can justify adding additional land?

Laurie Oliver Joseph: There may be different ways that land inventories are done between an economic opportunities analysis and a housing needs analysis.

Brendan Buckley: C.J. is going to preview possible measures to accommodate housing needs.



SCAPPOOSE
50 YEAR PLAN

C.J. Doxsee:

Category	Housing Strategy
Land Supply	1. Urban growth boundary expansion or adjustment
	2. Rezone land
Policy and Development Code	3. Increase allowed densities
	4. Variety of housing types
	5. Minimum density standards
	6. Accessory dwelling units
	7. Regulatory incentives for affordable/workforce housing
	8. Reduce regulatory barriers to housing
Incentives	9. System development charges
	10. Tax exemptions or abatements
	11. Land use permit fee reductions
	12. Expedited development review



SCAPPOOSE
50 YEAR
 PLAN

Funding Sources and Programs	13. Tax increment financing
	14. Subsidized affordable housing
	15. Land acquisition and banking
	16. Construction excise tax
	17. Public private partnerships
	18. Financial assistance and homebuyer education
	19. Tenant protection programs and policies

Patrick Kessi: When was the last time we looked at #3-8?

Laurie Oliver Joseph: As a result of the last housing needs analysis in 2018, we made quite a few changes to the Scappoose Development Code.

C.J. Doxsee: It is still a useful exercise to look at all of the changes that were recently made and consider how they worked and if more adjustments are needed.

Christine: I'm concerned that we're going to try to stack as many units as possible and it makes me sad for Scappoose. I never thought of Scappoose as urban but when C.J. was going through the changes, it made me think of downtown Portland.

Laurie Oliver Joseph: Not quite. The majority of housing units will still be single family residential detached.

Christine Turner: Do we have a minimum lot size requirement?

Laurie Oliver Joseph: Of course. We reduced the minimum lot sizes for all residential zones in 2018 so I don't anticipate a huge appetite to make them even smaller.



Patrick Kessi: Reviewing everything we did in 2018 is a great opportunity for us all to evaluate what worked and what didn't accomplish what we wanted.

Brian Rosenthal: Are tenant protection programs rent control?

Brendan Buckley: Rent control is a type of program that would fall under tenant protection. It would also include eviction protections.

C.J. Doxsee: It could also include notification of no-cause evictions, rental relocation assistance, rental registration for inspections, things like that.

Jennifer Anderson: It's my understanding that if a city waives systems development charges that they have to backfill it from another part of their budget, so I'm surprised to see it on this list as an incentive.

Laurie Oliver Joseph: The City has been historically reluctant to consider waiving system development charges because we rely on them so much. Looking at this list, I know that there are some that simply won't work in Scappoose. This list is best understood as a big bucket of all our options.

Patrick Kessi: Are any of these concepts new since 2018?

C.J. Doxsee: I'm not sure.

Brendan Buckley: It's important to add that this is not an exhaustive list of proposals. Please let us know if you have any additional suggestions.

Michael Sykes: A lot of these proposals have been looked at by the City Council and they passed on pretty much all of them. To me, it seems our problem isn't the need to encourage housing but rather if we have the land for it.

Laurie Oliver Joseph: To your point, my desk is buried in applications, so they are coming! What we're trying to do is incentivize people who have partially vacant land to be more apt to develop. We need to know how much of that partially vacant land is



going to develop. Remember also that we can update our studies if we need to over the course of 2023-2043.

Brian Rosenthal: It seems that another one of our biggest challenges is affordable housing. The way to reduce housing costs is to have more land. Having more land would get at a lot of our problems.

Michael Sykes: If we can figure out ways to incentivize folks to annex into the city, that would help too. I've seen this work well in other places.

Patrick Kessi: Having a process that has clear and objective standards will reduce the time and costs. That's really important too.

Debbie Jacob: When is the City looking into capacity for expanding water and sewer?

Laurie Oliver Joseph: We'll be looking at "other land needs" (e.g. parks, schools, etc.) in December. We'll look at urban reserves and urban growth boundary analysis in February-March 2023 which will include a look at infrastructure.

3. Announcements

3.1. Next meetings

- July 19, 2022 – to review draft 50 Year Plan Vision Statement

3.2. Upcoming events

- June 6, 2022 – City Council/Planning Commission check-in (MIG/APG)
- July 18, 2022 – City Council/Planning Commission check-in (ECONW/3J)
- July 23, 2022 – Farmers Market Open House

4. Adjourn

Patrick Kessi: I adjourn the meeting at 7:17pm.