

MetroScope Scenario for 2015-40 TAZ Distributed Forecast Distribution

November 2015 (revised) – codename: “WILLIAM-scenario #1610”

Metro Research Center

Theme	Major category	Subcategory	Scenario Assumption
DEMAND (FORECAST)	Forecast control totals for Portland-Hillsboro-Vancouver, OR-WA, MSA (7 counties) <i>Source: MARIO14.xlsx</i>	Households	2010: 867,794 (Census 2010) – MSA control total 2040: 1,244,000 (Metro Council) – MSA control total 2010-35: 376,200 %APR: 1.21%
		Employment	2010: 968,830 (BLS 2010 estimate) – MSA control total 2040: 1,571,300 (Metro Council) – MSA control total 2010-40: 602,500 %APR: 1.6%
		Income Bracket	Update regional income to Census based 2010 dollars (HIA distr.) 2010 forecast base year
SUPPLY (CAPACITY)	Metro UGB	Vacant Buildable Land	2013 vacant land based on aerial photography, permit data, and assessor records and amended by local review. Environmental constraints based on latest 2010 data and major known utility easements (methodology described in 2014 UGR draft, App. 2)
		Damascus	Utilized the capacity in the disincorporation scenario, i.e., western part phased in at new urban densities per Damascus zoning concepts and eastern part remains as currently rural zoning by Clackamas County (i.e., No Damascus scenario is described in the 2014 UGR, App. 15)
		Redevelopment and Infill	Tax lots are eligible for redevelopment if the total real market value (land + improvements) per square foot is less than a “strike price”, estimates overseen by the local BLI review process (methodology described in 2014 UGR draft, App. 2)
		Recent UGB Expansions	Post-1994 expansion areas are a combination of local zoning, comp plans, and concept plans. New areas inside the UGB as a result of HB 4078 are assumed to follow the Metropolitan Housing Rule (50% capacity in multi-family)
		Prospective UGB Expansions	Expansion locations based on the 2011 Urban Reserves decision and HB 4078. Timing of infrastructure availability informed by local jurisdiction review from “gamma forecast”
	Tri-County Outside UGB	Urban Areas	Buildable capacity assumed to be twice the 2000 Census household counts, except where information was provided by local jurisdictions.
		Rural Residential	Exception land, excluding public ownership and high-value properties. Dwelling unit capacity calculated from minimum lot size of county zoning.
		Measure 49	Assumes three dwelling units per Measure 49 claims
	Clark County	Vacant and Developed Land	2013 VBLM - provided by Clark County GIS, using Clark County methodology to estimate future capacity (includes redevelopment)
		Rural Residential	2012 Draft rural residential study
		Urban Growth Area Expansions	Clark Co. urban reserve areas in effect in 2009. Zoning is based on latest available comp. plans
	Columbia, Yamhill, Marion Counties	Urban Areas	Buildable capacity assumed to be twice the 2000 Census households, except where information was provided by local jurisdictions.
OTHER FORECAST INPUTS	Residential Construction Costs (SDC fees)		Per unit construction costs based on Metro and Homebuilders Association surveys.
	Residential Neighborhood Score		Neighborhood score is an input that describes the relative desirability of different neighborhoods based on statistical analysis of historic residential sales data; updated with 2010 data (calibration year = forecast years) Other adjustments? => WCTFS assumptions modified for WILLIAM
	Transportation & Accessibility		Transportation networks from the Metro 2014 RTP update (Harold): 2015 forecast year: No-build network 2010 forecast year: (interpolation) 2025 forecast year: 2017 AQ network 2030 forecast year: (interpolation) 2035 & 2040 forecast year: 2040 Financially Constrained network + Climate Smart Communities 2040 transit network assumptions
	Incentivized Redevelopment (e.g. Urban Renewal Subsidies)		Three tiers of location specific incentives (\$50,000, \$25,000 and \$10,000 per new redeveloped unit) which reflect locations with active residential urban renewal or represent other incentives, such as vertical housing tax credits. Capacity varies for specific areas receiving subsidies in accord with program boundaries and the units estimated from BLI analysis (please refer to the schedule for incentivized redevelopment in the 2014 UGR, App. 11)

2015-40 Distributed Forecast: Ground Rules for Redistribution of Growth

Preliminary estimates of employment and household growth distributions (by TAZ) are prepared carefully using the latest information we have on hand based on variables within our control and understanding. Metro will provide a preliminary estimate of TAZ growth allocations that will incorporate the following growth management and transportation forecast inputs:

- A jurisdiction reviewed buildable land inventory
- A regionally accepted regional forecast
- Best available inputs from Metro's in-house transportation demand model
- Current regional land use policies and local zoning codes and regulations (at time of forecast)

But even so, socio-economic conditions can change quickly or episodic growth occurs in locations and situations that trend expectations would not have foreseen. The economy is comprised of individual businesses and households all growing and responding to socio-economic stimuli and dealing with regulations and rules, but sometimes the actors in the economy may make an idiosyncratic decision that ripples across the region in significant and unpredicted fashion. As a result, the local review of growth allocations is very important to the process.

Metro will provide "preliminary" TAZ-level growth allocations to be reviewed. General ground rules for adjusting these TAZ level growth projections:

1. Cities / jurisdictions will be given a "control" total for the amount of growth expected in jobs and households between 2015 and 2040. If cities / jurisdictions accept their totals, they may adjust their TAZ allocations within their own single city / jurisdiction as they see fit. (Some cities may have urban service boundaries and agreements to perform the planning on behalf of the unincorporated area or adjacent jurisdiction(s). This can be accommodated with the consent of the jurisdictions in order to avoid "double counting".)
2. Cities who want to adjust the total growth (increase or decrease) assigned as a whole must identify the desired change in growth totals and seek county and Metro guidance to make any cross-jurisdiction adjustment(s). It is important to the allocation process that regional and county growth totals match with accepted regional figures handed down from the Metro Council. To the extent possible, mutual agreement is desirable.
3. The county may choose to adjust (increase or decrease) rural or unincorporated growth by swapping growth with incorporated cities from within their own county if the city(s) agree. The county is responsible for maintenance of its assigned unincorporated county growth total and the sum of growth distributed to incorporated cities. If the county feels that its growth total assigned to it needs to be adjusted (increase or decrease), but wants to hold its cities "harmless", it should seek guidance with Metro and the other counties to determine if cross-county redistribution is agreeable. The county is responsible (under state law) for the distribution of growth to cities outside the Metro boundary, but Metro is not. To the extent possible, mutual agreement is desirable for maintaining the county and regional growth totals in this distribution process.
4. Growth allocations with Clark County will be handled outside of this process due to different state rules and regulations. RTC will be submitting information to Metro.