

**From:** [Kangaroo House B&B](#)  
**To:** [jmc779@rockisland.com](mailto:jmc779@rockisland.com); [Adam Zack](#); [Erika Shook](#); ["Rick Hughes"](#)  
**Cc:** ["Terry Gillespie"](#); ["Leith Templin"](#); ["joAn Mann"](#); ["brian wiese"](#)  
**Subject:** RE: New Data projecting housing growth to 2036  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 29, 2020 11:35:08 AM  
**Attachments:** [Modified Scenario D 01292020.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.

John,

Thank you for pointing out the new State projections.

I looked at public use percentages in R land use designations and the Marina residential percentages. EPRC had already gone over recent residential build out in VC (40%) which didn't get changed in the calculations.

Public uses are currently around 1% residential areas (less in several areas). Marina is 30% residential, VC 40% residential development in the last 10 years. If you use those numbers for Scenario you get available land for 754 residential units without increasing allowed density - still a deficit of 117 units.

Charles

---

**From:** [jmc779@rockisland.com](mailto:jmc779@rockisland.com) <[jmc779@rockisland.com](mailto:jmc779@rockisland.com)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 28, 2020 11:42 PM  
**To:** [adamz <adamz@sanjuanco.com>](mailto:adamz@sanjuanco.com); [Erikas <Erikas@sanjuanco.com>](mailto:Erikas@sanjuanco.com); [Rick Hughes <starwave96@hotmail.com>](mailto:Rick Hughes <starwave96@hotmail.com>)  
**Cc:** [Charles Toxey <innkeeper@kangaroohouse.com>](mailto:Charles Toxey <innkeeper@kangaroohouse.com>); [Paul Kamin EWUA <pkamin@rockisland.com>](mailto:Paul Kamin EWUA <pkamin@rockisland.com>); [Terry Gillespie <terrywg57@gmail.com>](mailto:Terry Gillespie <terrywg57@gmail.com>); [Leith Templin <leithtemplin@hotmail.com>](mailto:Leith Templin <leithtemplin@hotmail.com>); [joAn Mann <jo.an.a.mann@gmail.com>](mailto:joAn Mann <jo.an.a.mann@gmail.com>); [brian wiese <brian\\_wiese@outlook.com>](mailto:brian wiese <brian_wiese@outlook.com>)  
**Subject:** New Data projecting housing growth to 2036

All, Reading the new revised (12-17-2019) Housing Needs Analysis, see in attachment, page 8-9, we will find the projected housing growth for San Juan County to 2036 is **4,180 dwelling** units based upon State data.

Page 12 tells us that Orcas Island constitutes 33.1% of that growth and assuming one half is allocated to Eastsound, **the projected growth for Eastsound is 4,180 x .331 x 0.5 = 690 dwelling units.** That sounds about right to me allowing for "recreational growth.

Adjusting for liquidity @ 25% and public use @ 5% we get a need for a total capacity of  $690 \times 1.25 \times 1.05 = 905$  units.

So the question is then, which capacity scenario to use?

A -100% commercial with 764 units

B 50-50% " " 1,300 "

C - 100% residential " 1,363 " or

D - w/ graded units of 627 units Gross adjusted residential capacity, i.e. 905-627 = 278 units short.

Notwithstanding that scenarios A,B, and C are " theoretically possible", under the existing boundaries and zoning, only scenario D has any basis for projection of future growth or compliance with the Goals and Policies of the Eastsound Plan. Scenario D is the only scenario with any relation to historic growth patterns and any basis for projected growth.

Does this make sense? It certainly avoids any argument over Recreational Use Factors.

.....jmc



















short. See attachment D.

This calculation has the merit of eliding the argument around "Recreational Home Factor" and relying on the State housing growth projection.