



# City of Langley

## **PLANNING ADVISORY BOARD**

### **AGENDA**

**AUGUST 21, 2013 – 3:00-5pm**

**LANGLEY CITY HALL - 112 2<sup>nd</sup> Street, Langley WA**

---

- 1) Call to Order and Roll Call
- 2) Amplified Music Discussion and Public Input
- 3) 2016 Island County Population Projection
- 4) Adjourn

*Next Regular Meeting: September 4, 2013*



## Staff Report

To: Planning Advisory Board  
From: Jeff Arango, AICP – Director of Community Planning  
Date: August 15, 2013

Re: **August 21, 2013 Public Meeting**

### **Revision to Amplified Music Restrictions for Properties Adjacent to Single Family Residential Zoning Districts**

With the passage of ordinance 989 in early 2013 the city relaxed the prohibition for amplified music on commercial properties adjacent to single-family residential zoning districts by allowing amplified music performances up to six times a year with a special permit. Prior to the passage of ordinance 989 all amplified music was prohibited.

Recently the owners of Mo's Pub and Eatery, which falls under the restrictions on amplified music because of its location adjacent to a single family residential zoning district has requested further amendments to ordinance 989 to allow additional low intensity amplified music performances.

At the June PAB meeting the board expressed a desire to see a specific proposal to allow additional opportunities for amplified music performances before deciding whether or not support the changes. Staff has prepared the attached proposal that includes the following:

- Live amplified music is allowed until 8:30pm on Weeknights and 9:00pm on weekends
- Purpose statement makes it clear the intent is to allow low-intensity amplified music to provide ambiance at the business establishment such as during dinner services
- Music shall not be audible at the property line.
- Proposal would be adopted as an interim ordinance (up to six months) to ensure that it does not adversely impact the neighborhood.

#### *Recommendation*

If the PAB intends to recommend adoption of the amendments to ordinance 989 to the city council staff recommends it be as an interim ordinance that may be in place for up to six months with a public hearing to be held within 60 days following adoption including the adoption of findings of fact.

### **2016 Island County Population Project**

As part of the Island County and Langley 2016 Comprehensive Plan updates the county must choose a population projection that will provide the basis for planning under the Growth Management Act (GMA) for the plan updates. At this stage only a population project for the entire county must be selected with regional and local allocations to follow later in the process. The county has selected a population project that is below the medium range population projection that is published by the Washington State Office of Financial Management. A population project that is lower than the medium range project from OFM was selected because the analysis by Island County Planning indicated the assumptions with

respect to fertility rates and in-migration were overly generous. The project also accounts for an expected increase in military personnel the Whidbey Naval Air Station (NAS). The selected population project is for 87,917 for an increase of 9,411 persons compared to the 2010 census. For more detail on the recommended population project see the attached report from Island County.

*Recommendation*

Staff recommends the PAB pass a motion in support of a countywide population projection of 87,917 persons by 2036.

## 4. 2036 Population Projection

---

### Introduction & Overview:

The GMA requires that counties designate Urban Growth Areas (UGAs). The purpose of a UGA is to accommodate urban development and services. Counties are also required to adopt policies and regulations which prohibit urban development outside of designated UGAs, as well as policies and regulations that encourage urban development and services within UGAs.

In determining the size of UGAs, counties are required to utilize the official population projections issued by the Washington State Office of Financial Management (OFM). These projections include three distinct ranges; a low, medium, and high. In accordance with RCW 43.62.035, the medium range represents OFM's most likely estimate of a county's population. Counties must select a population projection that falls within these ranges to determine their fundamental GMA planning decisions.

To comply with these requirements and calculate a population projection, Planning & Community Development has undertaken a rigorous examination of Island County's demographic characteristics, economic conditions, and past growth trends, as well as data from the State of Washington and the U.S Census Bureau. Based on this research Planning & Community Development arrived at the following conclusions:

- In the year 2036 Island County will have a population of 87,917. The 2010 census determined that Island County had a population of 78,506; so this represents a total projected increase of 9,411 over a 26 year period.
- While Island County has previously experienced periods of rapid growth, the growth rate has decreased in every period since 1980.
- The median age of Island County is higher than the state as a whole and is increasing at a faster rate. This increase in the median age will limit future population growth resulting from natural increase.
- In many of Island County's planning areas, population growth was previously driven by an in-migration of working age people who commuted to jobs on the mainland. Increasing transportation costs, transportation capacity constraints, and changing consumer housing preferences may negatively impact the future in-migration of commuters
- The in-migration of retirees which has historically been a significant component of Island County's population growth will continue, but at an uncertain rate.
- Island County's 1998 and 2005 population projections significantly overestimated future population growth

- Naval Air Station Whidbey indicates that they will add seven squadrons over the next 20 year planning period. Planning and Community Development added 2,530 people to account for the military expansion.

### Past Population Projections

Island County adopted its first Comprehensive Plan in 1998 and updated the Comprehensive Plan in 2005. Planning & Community Development reviewed previous OFM population ranges and assessed how the selection of a population for the County tracked with census data. Island County overestimated the rate of growth during both review periods. We used the 1998 and 2005 population projections to provide context on the methodology for selecting a projection within the OFM range. Because the medium series represents OFM’s best estimate for population projections, our analysis started from the medium series and applied a more detailed examination of the inputs of OFMs projection model.

#### *1998 Population Projection*

In 1998 Island County assessed OFM’s 1995 population projections and selected the high series as the likely projection. Although the County selected the high series, Planning and Community Development generated an independent forecast which exceeded the OFM high series in 2000 and in 2010 (see table 4.1). The record indicates that the Board of County Commissioners adopted the high series because the growth rate of OFM’s high series was consistent with the County’s growth rate over the previous twenty years (Island County Planning, 2003). Census counts from 2000, 2005, and 2010 revealed that the OFM high series and Island County’s 1998 projection significantly overestimated future growth. OFM’s entire projection overestimated Island County’s future growth as the census counts tracked below the OFM low series in each five year period.

Table 4.1			
	2000	2005	2010
1995 OFM High Projection	78,651	88,628	98,667
1995 OFM Low Projection	75,180	80,982	86,171
Island County Population (based on census data)	71,558	75,951	78,506
Island County 1998 Projection	81,500	88,628	98,700

#### *2005 Population Projection*

In 2005 Island County utilized OFM’s 2002 projections to develop a revised twenty-year population estimate for the County. The County selected a population forecast which tracked at the midpoint between the high and medium OFM projections. Census counts in 2005 and 2010 demonstrate that the projection implemented in 2005 overestimated future growth, but by a smaller margin than the 1998 projection (see table 4.2). Planning and Community Development recognized a demographic shift and the

implications that shift would have on natural increase; however, the analysis incorporated assumptions regarding building permit data that appear problematic in hindsight (Island County Planning, 2003). Housing or building permits represent a response to market demand, and using that information for projections, particularly at the height of the housing bubble, created an overestimate of future population.

	2005	2010
2002 OFM Low Projection	69,693	72,988
2002 OFM Med. Projection	74,738	80,650
2002 OFM High Projection	79,783	88,312
Island County Population (based on census data)	75,951	78,506
Island County 2005 Projection	77,261	84,481

The next 20-30 years in Island County will likely differ from any preceding period. The increase in military personnel will support moderate growth in the North Whidbey planning area; however, there is a possibility that the other planning areas may experience limited population growth due to the lack of a natural increase in population in coming years. It should be noted that a declining population may still result in significant housing development due to a larger number of smaller (non-family) households.

**Process and Methodology:**

The selection of a population projection is a critical step in the development of a GMA-compliant comprehensive plan. Population projections are used to ensure that UGAs are adequately sized. These projections are also used in the development of required comprehensive plan elements such as the transportation element and the capital facilities element.

Island County will employ a systematic process for estimating population growth and allocating designated urban growth areas. The first step in this process is to estimate the population growth for the planning period (2016 – 2036). After this initial step is completed, Planning & Community Development, in cooperation with our planning partners, will allocate this population to each of Island County’s planning areas. Each planning area’s estimated population will then be divided into an urban component and a rural component; and the urban components will be assigned to designated UGAs. Finally, based on a buildable lands analysis, adjustments will be made to UGA boundaries (UGBs) to ensure that they are no larger or smaller than needed to accommodate the projected population increase.

Planning & Community Development used OFM’s medium series projection as a base to estimate the projected population growth in Island County. The OFM medium series projection is a logical starting point because OFM believes that this number represents the most accurate or likely outcome (OFM, 2012). Planning & Community Development

then analyzed the assumptions of OFM's forecasting model. In those instances where OFM's assumptions seemed to contradict our own research, we made corresponding adjustments to the medium series projection.

To understand the process of developing a population projection it is necessary to understand the components which drive population change. Population change is driven by three fundamental components:

- *Mortality* – OFM's assumptions are based on a national life expectancy study prepared by the Center for Disease Control (CDC) (Zhao, 2012). Using this study, OFM calculates the projected life expectancy based on characteristics within a given population. This data can then be used to determine the number of deaths that are likely to occur during the planning period.
- *Fertility* – According to OFM, population growth due to births is projected based on forecasted changes to the Total Fertility Rate (TFR) (Zhao, 2012). The TFR is calculated by dividing the number of women of childbearing age by the average number of births (OFM, 2012); the resulting number reflects the number of children that an average woman can be expected to have during her lifetime. It is important to note that the number of women of childbearing age in a given population can significantly impact the rate of population change resulting from child birth.
- *Migration* – Migration is essentially an expression of the number of people who can be expected to move to Island County during the planning period. Of all the factors affecting population growth, migration is perhaps the most difficult to predict because it requires assumptions about future economic conditions and consumer housing preferences. OFM uses a "top down" population forecast model (OFM, 2012), whereby migration is first estimated statewide. County migration numbers are then extrapolated from the state estimate based on historic trends and growth rates.

## **Analysis and Findings:**

### Overview

Our analysis indicates that OFM's medium series population projection is slightly optimistic in several key areas. Notably, OFM assumes a higher than average Total Fertility Rate (TFR) for Island County and holds this rate constant for the entire planning period. Planning and Community Development believes that the TFR used by OFM is not consistent with our demographic characteristics because the TFR can be expected to decline as the median age increases. Finally, we believe that OFM's assumptions regarding in-migration are overly generous. Whereas OFM believes past in-migration trends are likely to continue unabated into the future, we believe that in-migration may decline in coming years due to changing consumer preferences in the housing market, increasing transportation costs, and changing demographic characteristics.

## Natural Increase

Population changes due to deaths and births are frequently expressed using the term “natural increase”. Natural increase is a composite measure which expresses the net affects of births and deaths on a population. On the whole, Island County appears to have a declining rate of natural increase due to an aging population as well as a decline in in-migration. These concepts are discussed in more detail below.

## *Mortality Rate*

Mortality forecasts are generated by analyzing the anticipated life expectancy within an area and adjusting this number up or down based on the presence or absence of factors which positively or negatively affect life expectancy. OFM’s mortality assumptions are based on data from the Center for Disease Control and the Social Security Administration. These numbers are adjusted either up or down for the State, and also at the County level to reflect local circumstances. Table 4.3 illustrates the mortality and life expectancy assumptions for Island County.

Year	2010	2015	2020	2025	2030	2035	2040
Life Expectancy	78.8	79.6	80.3	81.1	81.8	82.6	83.3
Deaths (Forecast)	3,055	3,725	4,468	5,035	5,534	6,016	6,365

There are essentially three factors used by OFM to adjust mortality rates to local circumstances; historic trends, racial composition, and education levels. OFM notes that life expectancies have historically been higher in Washington than in the nation as whole. Accordingly, OFM adjusts the national average by 1.5 years per decade to account for this trend (OFM, 2012).

The racial composition of a population also tends to be reflected in average life expectancies. Because life expectancy is higher for Hispanic populations, OFM increases the life expectancy by 1.2 years in counties where more than 25 percent of the population is Hispanic (OFM, 2012); however, this is not a factor in Island County. Evidence also shows that people with higher levels of educational attainment have greater life expectancies than those with lower educational levels (OFM, 2012). Accordingly, OFM increases the life expectancy by .75 years in counties where more than 31 percent of the population has at least a bachelor’s degree, and decreases the life expectancy by .75 years in counties where less than 15 percent of the population over 25 has a bachelor’s degree. In Island County approximately 30 percent of the population has a bachelor’s degree, so this is not a factor.

Planning and Community Development believes that the mortality and life expectancy assumptions used by OFM are accurate and track closely with our demographic

characteristics. It should be noted that Island County’s population is significantly older than average. In Island County, approximately 19 percent of the population is 65 or older, as opposed to 13 percent in the State of Washington. Because this segment of the population has a significantly higher mortality risk than younger population groups, this trend will lead to a steady increase in the number of deaths. Importantly, by the year 2025 Island County will have more deaths than births, leading to a negative rate of natural increase.

*Fertility Rate*

Population growth due to births is projected based on forecasted changes to the Total Fertility Rate (TFR) (OFM, 2012). TFR is a measure of the total number of children that each woman will have during her lifetime. In calculating their 2012 population projections, OFM calculated a statewide TFR by averaging the total number of births in the state during 2009, 2010, and 2011, this number was then divided by the number of women aged 15-49. As a final step, the resulting number is adjusted at the County level to reflect local circumstances. Fundamentally there are four factors which influence TFRs (Zhao, 2012):

- Foreign immigrants tend to have higher TFRs than native born women. Among immigrants, Hispanic women have higher TFRs than those from Asian or European countries.
- Second generation Hispanic women tend to have lower TFRs than first generation immigrants; however, their TFRs are still generally higher than other racial/ethnic groups.
- Populations with high levels of female participation in the labor force, or where a large percentage of the female population is attending college have lower overall TFRs. Female populations with higher educational attainment also tend to have lower TFRs.
- TFRs tend to be lowest in counties with a high proportion of females in their pre-retirement and retirement years relative to females in their child bearing years.

It appears that the methods used by OFM in determining the TFRs of individual counties are relatively crude. In the case of Island County, OFM assigned a TFR of 2.1 and held this figure constant for the entire planning period (Zhao, 2012). OFM employs this method in counties with diverse characteristics that make generalizations difficult. Table 4.3 illustrates the anticipated population growth resulting from this TFR.

Table 4.3 – Fertility Factors & Forecast							
Period	2005-2010	2010-2015	2015-2020	2020-2025	2025-2030	2030-2035	2035-2040
Total Fertility Rate (TFR)	2.1	2.1	2.1	2.1	2.1	2.1	2.1
Births (Forecast)	4,745	4,632	4,819	4,836	4,838	4,966	5,228

Planning and Community Development believes the TFR used by OFM to calculate future births in Island County is overly optimistic. The TFR for Washington State as a whole is estimated by OFM to be approximately 1.98 (OFM, 2011). Taking the factors identified above into consideration, the TFR for Island County should be less than the TFR for Washington State and should gradually decrease over time, rather than remaining constant. Of the four factors listed above, Island County either tracks closely with the State, or diverges in ways which should suggest a lower than average TFR.

Based on information from the American Community Survey, roughly seven percent of Island County residents are immigrants from foreign countries, as opposed to 12.8 percent of Washington residents. Approximately 5.5 percent of Island County's population is Hispanic; the same figure for the State is 11.2 percent (U.S Census Bureau). Both Washington and Island County have similar levels of female educational attainment (30 percent of Island County women have at least a bachelor's degree), and Island County's female labor force participation rate is nearly identical to the State figures - with 57.6 percent of all jobs held by women (U.S Census Bureau, 2013). Finally, based on figures from the 2010 census, the proportion of Island County's population that is 65 or older is significantly higher than the State of Washington (19 percent as opposed to 13 percent).

In conclusion, it appears that Island County should have a TFR which is lower than the TFR for Washington State; and further, this rate should gradually decline as our population continues to age. Absent a major influx of young people, particularly women of child bearing age, the proportion of future population growth that will result from natural increase is likely significantly less than that forecasted by OFM. Therefore, an adjustment to OFM's medium series projection is warranted to account for this discrepancy.

### Migration

Historically a significant percentage of Island County's growth was driven by in-migration; however, recent indicators suggest this trend may be waning. There are three primary factors which drive in-migration:

- Island County job growth
- Commuters who live in Island County and commute to jobs in other counties
- Retirees

### *Island County Job Growth*

The job market in Island County is heavily influenced by Naval Air Station Whidbey (NAS). Based on a study conducted by the State of Washington in 2004, NAS Whidbey employed approximately 10,066 uniformed and civilian people, representing 68 percent

of the total employment in Island County (OFM, 2004). To put this in perspective, the next three largest employment sectors in Island County (retail, health care, and accommodation/food service) represent only 6,664 jobs combined (U.S Census Bureau, 2007). As service industries, job growth in these sectors is likely driven, to a large extent, by changes in employment or spending at NAS Whidbey. If the indirect impacts of military employment are taken into consideration, NAS Whidbey is responsible for over 17,500 Island County jobs and 88 percent of all wage disbursements in the County (OFM, 2004).

Because staffing levels at NAS Whidbey significantly affect economic activity and population growth in Island County, the City of Oak Harbor and Island County coordinated with Navy officials to try and estimate the population impacts of future operational changes at NAS Whidbey. In the future, The Navy plans on stationing seven new squadrons at NAS Whidbey. These squadrons will require approximately 1,245 additional personnel. The City of Oak Harbor has calculated that approximately 80 percent of these personnel will live in the North Whidbey planning area. Assuming an average household size of approximately 2.53 (based on the 2010 census), the total population growth resulting from Navy's planned expansion will be 2,530.

In order to account for the planned expansion at NAS Whidbey, Island County Planning and Community Development adjusted the initial 20 year population projection to include an additional 2,530 people. Planning and Community Development's original forecasting methodology did not account for the planned expansion, and this represented a logical adjustment to the initial projection which planning staff from the other municipalities in Island County agreed on.

### *Off-Island Commuters*

A large number of Island County residents commute to work in other counties. According to data prepared by the U.S. Census Bureau, there are approximately 35,543 employed people (workers) in Island County. Of these workers 20 percent, or 7,010, commute to work in other counties (U.S Census Bureau). This study analyzed data from the American Community Survey collected between 2006 and 2010. Previous census data from 2000 indicated that a total of 9,268 Island County residents worked in Snohomish, King, and Skagit counties (OFM, 2003). It should be noted that there is a difference of 2,258 workers between these studies. This discrepancy could be the result of the economic downturn, differences in survey methodology, or both; however, it is clear that historically off-island commuting has been a significant driver of population growth in Island County.

A number of important factors may limit or reduce the prevalence of off island commuting in the future. Notably, trends indicate that people are increasingly driving less and this phenomenon is particularly noticeable in the Puget Sound where the number of vehicle miles traveled per capita has decreased over the past decade (Frontier Group, 2013 & PSRC, 2010). Alternatively, some studies have documented an increase in the number of "mega commuters", who travel more than 50 miles or 90

minutes to work (Moss & Quing, 2012). For many off island commuters, the trip to work involves both the use of a ferry and at least one transit connection. Fares on the Washington State ferry system have significantly increased in the recent past, and further fare increases are likely in the future. While transit service to and from Mukilteo is relatively frequent and serves a large number of regional destinations, numerous cutbacks have been made in the recent past (Lindblom, 2011, Gutierrez, 2010, & Sheets, 2012) and no significant service improvements are planned in the future (Community Transit, 2011, Community Transit, 2012, Sound Transit, 2008, & Sound Transit, 2005,).

Throughout history the average commute time (as opposed to distance) has remained relatively constant at about 20 minutes (Pacione, 2001). According to Census data, the average commute time for a Washington resident is currently 26 minutes. For Island County residents the picture is considerably different. Although residents of the North and Central Whidbey planning areas enjoy relatively short average commute times (19 minutes and 30 minutes respectively), the average commute time for a South Whidbey commuter is 38 minutes. For Camano commuters this time is even longer at 42 minutes (U.S. Census Bureau & New York Public Radio).

Island County residents endure longer commutes than other Washington residents due to the lack of major employers in Island County as well as the distance between Island County’s residential areas and major employment centers on the mainland. The ferry crossing from South Whidbey to Mukilteo imposes an additional delay for many commuters. Table 4.4 illustrates the approximate distance from each of Island County’s planning areas to major employment centers in neighboring counties.

Table 4.4 - Commute Times			
Planning Area (From)	Employment Center* (To)	Miles	Time
South Whidbey (Langley)	Payne Field	14	51 min
	Downtown Everett	16	57 min
	Lynnwood	19	58 min
	Seattle (UW)	32	1 hr-13 min
	Seattle (Downtown)	35	1 hr-14 min
	Marysville	26	1hr
Camano	Marysville	29	36 min
	Arlington	23	33 min
	Mt. Vernon	22	36 min
	Burlington	26	43 min
	Anacortes	38	58 min
	Bayview (UGA)	30	47 min
North Whidbey (Oak Harbor)	Bayview (UGA)	25	35 min
	Anacortes	20	29 min
	Mt. Vernon	29	41 min
	Burlington	29	41 min
	Arlington	50	1 hr-5 min

\* employment centers based on planning designations assigned by neighboring jurisdictions

There are two ways of looking at the commuting trends outlined above. Island County could experience a dramatic drop in the number of people moving to Island County with the intention of commuting to mainland jobs. This drop would correspond with the

reductions in per capita vehicle miles traveled in Washington over the past decade; and would also be consistent with increasing fuel costs, traffic congestion, and ferry fares. Alternatively, Island County could capitalize on the growing number of mega commuters in search of a rural lifestyle or lower pressure small town atmosphere. In this scenario Island County compares quite favorably with other similar areas in rural Skagit County, Snohomish County, or King County.

Although in the past a significant component of Island County's population growth could be attributed to a growth in the number of off-island commuters, this trend may decline slightly as the commute becomes less convenient and more expensive. Ultimately, Planning & Community Development believes that while off-island commuters will continue to move to Island County, they will contribute less to overall population growth in the future. This is somewhat at odds with OFM's assumptions regarding migration. It appears that OFM projects a steady growth in migration across the entire planning period based solely on past growth rates and statewide trends. We believe this difference justifies a reduction in OFM's medium series projection. If Island County decides that attracting off-island commuters is an important economic development consideration it will be important to diligently protect the quality of life and rural atmosphere that draws these people to Island County.

### *Retirees*

As previously noted, Island County's population is aging rapidly. This increase in median age can, at least partially, be attributed to Island County's historic role as a destination for retirees. The Seattle metropolitan area experienced a 20 percent increase in the 65 and over population between 2000 and 2010 (Urban Land Institute, 2012), so this trend is likely to continue. However, there are a number of factors which could influence continued growth in the retirement population.

It is believed that many of Island County's retired residents begin their move to Island County by constructing a vacation home which they then move into upon retirement. An analysis conducted by the Planning Department in 2003 revealed a steady decline in the number of seasonally occupied housing units (Island County Planning, 2003). This generally corresponds with a period of rapid increase in the County's median age. In 1980 it was estimated that 20.4 percent of housing units were seasonally occupied; by 1990 the number had dropped to 11.8 percent, representing an 8.7 percent reduction in the number of vacation homes. Between 1990 and 2000 there was a further 2.2 percent reduction in the number of seasonally occupied housing units in Island County. While this trend has facilitated a growth in Island County's retired population, it may not continue at the same rate in the future.

Additionally, the financial resources of future retirees will likely play a large role in their ability to move. The previous generations of retirees, often referred to as the "Silent Generation" (born 1925-1945) were able to finance vacation or retirement homes by cashing out their existing homes at the peak of the housing market and benefited from generous pensions and retirement plans (Plotz, 2013). These individuals also represent

the age cohort with the highest net worth in America (Plotz, 2013). However, the picture is somewhat different for the “Baby Boomers” who are currently reaching retirement age. Importantly, 25 percent of baby boomers are reported to have no personal savings (beyond a 401k) and many members of this generation find themselves unable to sell their homes due to the collapse of the housing market, losing on average 33 percent of their household net worth as they approached retirement age (Plotz, 2013). Current economic conditions have also led to a rise in the number of children living with their parents. The percentage of young adults between 24 and 34 living with their parents has doubled since 1980, growing from 11 percent to 22 percent, making it more difficult to cash out and move.

### **Conclusion and Recommendation:**

After reviewing all relevant factors, Planning and Community Development has concluded that slight reductions should be made to OFM’s medium series projection to account for an anticipated drop in Total Fertility Rates (TFRs), trends which indicate a decline in Island County’s growth rate over the last 30 years, and small reductions in the number of retirees and off-island commuters who can be expected to move to Island County in coming years.

OFMs medium series projection indicates that Island County will have a 2036 population of 90,848. Planning and Community Development reviewed the population estimates between OFM’s medium and low series and determined that the 2036 population would likely fall between the medium series and the midpoint between OFM’s low and medium series. Based on this narrow range, we calculated the midpoint and recommended an initial population for 2036 of 85,387 people. These calculations did not take into account the expected increase of military personnel and their families due to an increase in squadrons. As a result, Planning and Community Development added the estimated population resulting from an increase in squadrons (2,530) and added that to our initial forecast. Thus, our final recommendation for a population selection in 2036 is 87,917 people.

## References:

- Badger, E. (2013, March 5). The Great Senior Sell-Off Could Cause the Next Housing Crisis. *The Atlantic Cities (online)*.
- City of Oak Harbor. (2013). Email from Cak Kamak, Senior Planner, RE Navy Population Information.
- Community Transit. (2012). *2013-2018 Transit Development Plan (draft)*.
- Community Transit. (2011). *Community Transit, Long Range Transit Plan, Final Report (draft)*.
- Frontier Group. (2013). *A New Direction, Our Changing Relationship with Driving and Implications for Americas Future*.
- Greenblatt, A. (2011, June 21). Will Housing Take Another Hit As Boomers Sell?. *National Public Radio (online)*.
- Gutierrez, S. (2010, September 22). Sound Transit must cut back: south King hurt most. *Seattle P.I. (online)*.
- Island County Planning & Community Development. (2003). *CPA 155/04 – Population Projections/Urban Growth Area Updates*.
- Lindblom, M. (2011, April 7). Community Transit to cut bus service by another 20%. *Seattle Times (online)*.
- Moss, M., & Qing, C. (2012). The Emergence of the Super-Commuter”. *Rudin Center for Transportation, New York University*.
- Pacione, M. (2001). *Urban Geography*
- Plotz, M. (2013). Bracing for the Silver Tsunami. *Project for Public Spaces (online)*.
- Puget Sound Regional Council. (2010). *Puget Sound Trends, Vehicle Miles Traveled*.
- Puget Sound Regional Council. (2011). *Designation Criteria for New Regional Growth and Manufacturing Industrial Centers*.
- Sheets, B. (2012, April 25). Everett Transit plans cuts; routes, fares may change. *Everett Herald (online)*.
- State of Washington Office of Financial Management. (2012). *Growth Management Act 2012 Provisional County Population Projection*.

- State of Washington Office of Financial Management. (2012). *2012 Projections, County Growth Management Population Projections by Age and Sex: 2010 – 2040*.
- State of Washington Office of Financial Management. (2011). *Forecast of the State Population, November 2011 Forecast*.
- State of Washington Office of Financial Management. (2012). Untitled memo from Yi Zhao, Washington State Chief Demographer to Island County Planning.
- State of Washington, Island County Data Book. *Island County Profile*
- State of Washington Office of Financial Management. (2004). *Economic Impacts of Military Bases in Washington*.
- State of Washington Office of Financial Management. (2003). *County to County Worker Flows*.
- State of Washington Employment Security Department. (2012). *Island County Profile*.
- Sound Transit. (2008). *Sound Transit 2, A Mass Transit Guide, The Regional Transit System Plan for Central Puget Sound*.
- Sound Transit. (2005). *Sound Transit, Regional Long Range Plan*
- Urban Land Institute. (2012). *Housing in America, The Baby Boomers Turn 65*.
- U.S Census Bureau. (2013). *Sex by Educational Attainment for the Population 25 Years and Over*. American Fact Finder Website.
- U.S Census Bureau. (2007). *2007 Economic Census*. Employment by sector in Island County.
- U.S Census Bureau. (undated). *Commuter-Adjusted Population Estimates: ACS 2006-2010, Journey to Work Migration Statistics Branch*.
- U.S. Census graphic prepared by New York Public Radio
- U.S Census Bureau. (2013). County-to-County Commuting Flows: 2006-2010.