

## **Section 3.3**

### **HOUSING, POPULATION, & EMPLOYMENT**

This section is based in part on the updated *Fiscal Assessment* (February 2023) prepared by ECONorthwest (see **Appendix E**).

#### **3.3.1 Affected Environment**

---

##### **2020 / 2021 SEIS**

The SEIS describes the existing housing, population, and employment conditions on and in the vicinity of the 47° North site as of 2020/2021 (see Draft SEIS Section 3.9 for details). Selected information from the Draft SEIS is described in context below; please consult the SEIS document for more detailed information.

##### **2022 Revised Proposal**

Changes that have occurred in housing, population, and employment conditions in the 47° North site vicinity since issuance of the SEIS are described below.

##### **Kittitas County**

The following information on housing and population trends in unincorporated Kittitas County over the last decade is included to provide additional context on local growth trends. In 2022 there were approximately 12,748 housing units in unincorporated Kittitas County, compared to 11,430 in 2010. The unincorporated County's current population is approximately 21,045 compared to 18,063 in 2010. (Washington OFM 2022)

##### **City of Cle Elum**

In 2022, there were approximately 1,175 housing units in the City of Cle Elum, about 5% more than at the time of the SEIS (Washington OFM 2022). The majority of housing in the city continues to be single family units (approximately 76%). In 2020, Cle Elum's Median Household Income (MHI) was \$46,989, a slight decrease from that documented in the SEIS. In 2020, approximately 20% of Cle Elum's population was living below the poverty level, compared to 17% in the County, and 10% of all persons in the state. For comparison, the 2020 federal poverty threshold for a family of four was \$26,200 (2020 ACS 5-year Estimates). In June 2022, the median value of all owner-occupied housing in Cle Elum was \$676,000, about 62% greater than in 2020 (June 2022 data from Zillow Home Value). Similar to the documentation in the SEIS, the increase in MHI did not grow as rapidly as the increase in median home value.

Since the SEIS was prepared, Cle Elum's population increased from 2,157 people (2020 Census) to an estimated population of 2,250 in 2022, an increase of 93 persons (18%) (Washington OFM 2022).

In 2020, there were approximately 1,154 people working in the City of Cle Elum, approximately 22% fewer employees than at the time of the SEIS (2020 ACS 5-year Estimates).

### **City of Roslyn and Town of South Cle Elum**

Data on housing and population trends in the City of Roslyn and Town of South Cle Elum was not included in the SEIS but is presented here for informational purposes and to provide a context for potential indirect and cumulative impacts. Growth in these jurisdictions is also accounted for in several other sections of this Addendum (e.g., **Appendix B**, Utilities, **Appendix C**, Transportation; Section 3.7, **Public Services**).

In 2010, there were approximately 648 housing units in the City of Roslyn and approximately 271 housing units in the Town of South Cle Elum. Since that time, both jurisdictions have seen a slight decrease in the number of housing units. In 2022, the City of Roslyn contains approximately 5% fewer housing units, while the Town of South Cle Elum has approximately 3% fewer housing units than in 2010. Most of the housing units in these jurisdictions are single family housing units (93% in Roslyn and 66% in South Cle Elum) (Washington OFM, 2022).

Both the City of Roslyn and Town of South Cle Elum have experienced slight increases in their population since 2010. In 2010, Roslyn had a population of approximately 893 people and the South Cle Elum had a population of approximately 532 people. By 2022, Roslyn's population had increased by approximately 8% in this 12-year period, and the South Cle Elum's population had increased by approximately 6% (Washington OFM, 2022). The increase in population is due, at least in part, to an increasing rate of occupancy. The 2037 Growth Management Act (GMA) planning target for Roslyn population is 1,203, and for South Cle Elum a population of 1,059 (Kittitas County Comprehensive Plan, 2019).

### **Cumulative Impact Projects**

Development of the cumulative impact projects (i.e., Suncadia Resort, City Heights, and Cle Elum Pines) has continued since the issuance of the SEIS. There have been no new vested projects in the City since 2020. Over the last two years, about 218 building permits have been issued for the Suncadia Master Planned Resort in the unincorporated Kittitas County, and about six permits in City of Cle Elum. This additional data is presented for informational purposes and is not used in a quantitative analysis because it represents a relatively short period of time. The data used in the cumulative impact analysis was collected over an extended period (up to 20 years). The recent data does indicate, however, that minimal growth has occurred in the City.

### **47°North Site**

No development has occurred on the 47° North site since issuance of the SEIS, and the site does not contain any housing, population, or employment.

### 3.3.2 Impacts

---

#### 2020 / 2021 SEIS

As described in the SEIS, SEIS Alternative 5 and 6 would develop the 47° North site with new residential units, in a range of housing types (single family and multi-family) and densities. Both would also reserve a 6.8-acre undeveloped property that would be dedicated to the city and developed by others in the future with 50 units of affordable housing. An RV resort was also proposed with SEIS Alternative 6 but would not include permanent residential units.

While the RV sites are not considered permanent, and would not generate permanent residents, an equivalent or “proxy” population<sup>1</sup> was calculated for these sites and used to estimate potential impacts to public services and other elements of the environment attributable to transient/recreational visitors. As discussed further in the Public Services section, and based on updated data, the proxy RV population estimate is considered to be conservative and likely overestimates or double counts some types of impacts.

Under SEIS Alternative 5 and 6, development of the project would involve a combination of local and non-local construction workers. Development of the residential and recreational areas onsite, as well as the RV resort, would generate new employees for operation of the site. Future development of the commercial area could also generate new employment on the site.

The anticipated housing, population, and employment from SEIS Alternatives 5 and 6 is discussed further below in comparison to the Revised Proposal.

#### 2022 Revised Proposal

As in the SEIS, new development under the Revised Proposal would create new housing and generate new population and employees on the 47° North site. **Table 3.3-1** summarizes the proposed residential units, associated permanent population, and employees under SEIS Alternative 6 and the Revised Proposal; SEIS Alternative 5 is also noted for comparison purposes. Targets for additional housing and population in Cle Elum by 2037 from the City’s Comprehensive Plan are also shown.

---

<sup>1</sup> The proxy population calculated for the RV sites was based on an assumed average RV resort occupancy of 50% and three people per site, based on data provided by the Applicant reflecting occupancy at other projects throughout the U.S.

**Table 3.3-1  
PERMANENT HOUSING, POPULATION & EMPLOYMENT –  
SEIS ALTERNATIVE 6 & REVISED PROPOSAL (2037)<sup>1</sup>**

	Residents/ Household <sup>1</sup>	Occupancy Rate <sup>2</sup>	Proposed Additional Housing (units)	City of Cle Elum 2037 Addt'l Housing Target	Proposed Additional Permanent Population	City of Cle Elum 2037 Addt'l Population Target	Proposed Commercial or Business Park Dev. (sq. ft.) <sup>1</sup>	Proposed Commercial or Business Park Employees <sup>1</sup>	Proposed RV Resort Permanent/ Seasonal Employees	Proposed Total Employees
SEIS Alt. 5	2.34	90%	1,334	<b>1,460</b>	2,809	<b>1,808</b>	950,000	1,900 <sup>1</sup>	0	1,900
SEIS Alt. 6	2.34	90%	707	<b>1,460</b>	1,489	<b>1,808</b>	150,000	300	30 – 35/ 70 – 90 <sup>2</sup>	400 - 425
Revised Proposal	2.37	88%	757	<b>1,460</b>	1,579	<b>1,808</b>	150,000	300 <sup>5</sup>	30 – 35/ 70 – 90 <sup>6</sup>	400 - 425
Revised Proposal w/o Affordable Hsg.	2.37	88%	707	<b>1,460</b>	1,475	<b>1,808</b>	150,000	300 <sup>5</sup>	30 – 35/ 70 – 90 <sup>2</sup>	400 - 425

**Source: 2020/2021 SEIS, Sun Communities 2020, ECONW, 2020.**

Note: Household sizes and occupancy rates for the Revised Proposal are based on the U.S. Census Bureau, 2016-2020, American Community Survey, 5-Year Estimates. The permanent residential units and associated residents are those at buildout of the residential area in 2028.

<sup>1</sup> The residents per household for SEIS Alt. 5 and 6 varies from that for the Revised Proposal because 2020 census data was used for the Revised Proposal.

<sup>2</sup> The occupancy rate for SEIS Alt. 5 and 6 varies from that for the Revised Proposal because 2020 census data was used for the Revised Proposal.

<sup>3</sup> SEIS Alt. 5 included business park development on a 75-acre site. SEIS Alt. 6 analyzed and the Revised Proposal includes commercial development on a 25-acre. There would be more employees in the business park development under SEIS Alt. 5 than the commercial development under SEIS Alt. 6 and the Revised Proposal because there would be a substantially larger site and developed space and different types of uses that generate different numbers of employees (e.g., there could be light industrial uses under SEIS Alt. 5).

<sup>4</sup> Sun Communities provided estimates for the anticipated employment numbers for the recreational facilities.

## **Construction**

Like SEIS Alternative 6, construction of the Revised Proposal would involve a combination of local and non-local construction workers. Residential units would be constructed offsite as under SEIS Alternative 6, potentially in the Pacific Northwest. Proposed recreational buildings would be constructed onsite.

## **Operation**

### **Housing**

Under the Revised Proposal, 50 affordable housing units (rather than dedication of a site for future development of 50 affordable units by others) would be integrated into and dispersed on the project site to be developed by Sun Communities. The affordable housing would be located in the multi-family housing area onsite and would be developed and maintained by Sun Communities. For analysis purposes in this SEIS Addendum, housing and population are analyzed for the Revised Proposal with and without the 50 affordable housing units to help distinguish the impacts attributable to this element of the proposal.

The Revised Proposal would include a total of 757 new housing units (527 single family units and 230 multi-family units) at buildout in 2028; this total is 50 units greater (about 7%) than SEIS Alternative 6 and is attributable to the 50 units of affordable housing (see **Table 3.3-1**). The total planned residential units would fall within the City of Cle Elum's GMA 2037 planning target of an additional 1,460 housing units.

Without the affordable housing, the Revised Proposal would include the same number of units as SEIS Alternative 6, but a slightly higher population due to the revised occupancy estimate (see **Table 3.3-1**).

As with SEIS Alternative 6, it is assumed that except for the 50 affordable units, all housing under the Revised Proposal would be market rate. All the multi-family units are assumed to be rental units. Based on the Applicant's prior experience at other of its communities, it is expected that approximately 50% of the single family units would initially be rentals and 50% purchased, with an assumed 10% of the rental units being purchased each year. At full buildout, it is anticipated that approximately 10% of the single family homes would be rented (consistent with other communities in Sun Communities' portfolio).

The Revised Proposal would include the same number of RV/glamping sites as SEIS Alternative 6. As described in the SEIS, the RV sites are not considered permanent residential units and they would not be allowed to be used as housing of permanent residents (see the discussion of *Population* below for details).

The RV sites would generate temporary visitors to the site and the area. The following demographic information about RV users (PeakClub 2021) is provided for informational purposes:

- RV sales, and in turn RV site rentals, are greatest among those in the 55 to 64 age group (20% of sales), followed by the 65+ age group.
- RV purchasers are most likely to be middle class economically, making up about 2/3 of all owners and purchasers. This is largely because RVs represent a significant investment, with the average price of an RV currently at \$89,500;
- The majority of RV owners/purchasers tend to be college educated, married, and from households with average incomes of \$65,000 or greater.

The Revised Proposal would not directly result in the construction of any new housing in the City Roslyn or Town of South Cle Elum. It is possible that visitors to the RV resort could decide to relocate to Roslyn or South Cle Elum for their residence. This potential in-migration is speculative, however, and therefore the magnitude is unknown.

Overall, the incremental change in housing and its associated impacts under the Revised Proposal (as compared to SEIS Alternative 6) is not significant.

### Population

The Revised Proposal could result in approximately 6% more population than SEIS Alternative 6 at buildout in 2028; this increase is due to updated assumptions for average residents per household and occupancy rates, and the integration of affordable housing by 2028 rather than development at some undetermined future date (see **Table 3.3-1**). Note that SEIS Alternative 5 (and the Bullfrog Flats approval) did not include or evaluate the 50 units of affordable housing that would be developed on the site dedicated to the city. The impacts of those 50 housing units would have been evaluated at some time in the future, whereas the Revised Proposal includes and evaluates those impacts as occurring by 2028. Without the additional affordable housing, the Revised Proposal's population would essentially be the same as SEIS Alternative 6 at residential buildout; any differences are explained by changes to assumptions about persons per household and occupancy rates based on 2020 census data used for the Revised Proposal). No additional population would be generated after 2028. The new permanent residents under the Revised Proposal would be within the City of Cle Elum's GMA 2037 planning target for population growth.

The Revised Proposal would include the same number of RV/glamping sites as SEIS Alternative 6. These sites would generate temporary visitors to the site and vicinity; no permanent residents would be allowed. For analysis purposes, a proxy RV site population has been calculated (the same proxy population as SEIS Alternative 6) to help estimate possible impacts associated with temporary visitors. The visitor population would vary with the season (see **Table 3.3-1**). This proxy population is used for analysis purposes in other sections of this SEIS Addendum (e.g., Section 3.7, **Public Services**, and **Appendix B**, Utilities). As noted previously and discussed further in the Public Services section, the proxy RV population estimate is considered to be conservative and likely overestimates or double counts some types of impacts.

The Revised Proposal would not directly add any new population to the City of Roslyn or Town of South Cle Elum or unincorporated Kittitas County. However, some of the visitors to the RV resort could possibly decide to relocate to neighboring jurisdictions, which would indirectly add to their population. This indirect population impact is considered speculative, however, and the magnitude and significance of any impact is unknown.

Population change in itself is not an adverse impact and overall, the incremental change in population and its associated impacts under the Revised Proposal (compared to SEIS Alternative 6) is not considered significant. The population increase associated with the approved Bullfrog UGA Master Site Plan, as evaluated in both the original EIS and the SEIS under SEIS Alternative 5, would be substantially greater (see **Table 3.3-1**).

**Employment**

Like SEIS Alternative 6, construction of the project would involve a combination of local and non-local construction workers.

Under the Revised Proposal, the 25-acre commercial property would be integrated into the project area developed by Sun Communities. It could include the same building area as SEIS Alternative 6 by buildout in 2031, although the types and amounts of uses would differ slightly. The commercial development is estimated to generate the same number of employees as SEIS Alternative 6 (see **Table 3.3-2**).

**Table 3.3-2  
ESTIMATED COMMERCIAL AREA EMPLOYEES –  
REVISED PROPOSAL (2028, 2031)**

	2028	2031
Grocery (sf)	50,000	50,000
Retail (sf)	42,000	56,000
Restaurant (sf)	18,000	24,000
Office (sf)	10,000	20,000
<b>Total Employees<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>240</b>	<b>300</b>

**Source:** Sun Communities, ECONW, 2022.

<sup>1</sup> Assumes one employee per 500 square feet for each commercial development type and 100% occupancy, the same assumption as in the SEIS.

The same numbers of year-round employees and seasonal employees would work in the RV resort under the Revised Proposal at buildout of the recreational areas in 2027 as under SEIS Alternative 6. Seasonal employees would be employed onsite during the peak RV resort season (typically June through August) (see **Table 3.3-1**).

**Indirect and Cumulative Impacts**

Similar to SEIS Alternative 6, cumulative housing and population impacts would occur with the Revised Proposal together with approved/vested development in the City of Cle Elum, unincorporated Kittitas County, and surrounding cities. Housing and population under the



Revised Proposal would be slightly greater than SEIS Alternative 6 — due to the addition of affordable housing units and some changes in underlying assumptions — but substantially less than Alternative 5 at buildout.

The additional housing units and associated population in Suncadia, together with the Revised Proposal, would result in cumulative housing and population in Kittitas County, similar to SEIS Alternatives 5 and 6. Likewise, the additional housing and associated population in City Heights and Cle Elum Pines, together with the Revised Proposal, would result in cumulative housing and population in the City of Cle Elum, similar to SEIS Alternatives 5 and 6. (See Draft SEIS Section 3.9 for details.) This cumulative development in the City of Cle Elum would exceed the City’s current housing and population targets, which again are not considered caps/limits on growth.

While the Revised Proposal would have slightly more residential units and population than SEIS Alternative 6, population growth is not per se an adverse impact and the incremental increase in population is not significant. To the extent that growth is properly planned for, and adequate housing, infrastructure, and services are provided, significant housing, population, and employment impacts can be avoided or reduced. Housing and population growth would be substantially less than with SEIS Alternative 5. As noted earlier in this section, between 2010 and 2022, population in unincorporated Kittitas County increased by almost 3,000 persons while the City of Cle Elum grew by 93. Other things being equal, a smaller project in the City, and one with a smaller employment component, would be likely to be a smaller impetus to indirect growth.

Like SEIS Alternative 6, the Revised Proposal could result in indirect impacts from additional housing and population associated with increased demand for public services and utilities and increased traffic. These indirect impacts could occur within the City of Cle Elum, as well as potentially in the City of Roslyn, the Town of South Cle Elum, and unincorporated Kittitas County; these impacts are discussed in other sections of this SEIS Addendum (e.g., **Appendix B**, Utilities, **Appendix C**, Transportation; and Section 3.7, **Public Services**).

Overall, the incremental changes in indirect and cumulative impacts under the Revised Proposal (compared to SEIS Alternative 6) are not considered significant.

---

### **3.3.3 Mitigation Measures**

---

No new significant adverse impacts to housing, population, and employment would occur from the Revised Proposal and no additional mitigation measures are recommended. The mitigation measures identified below include those measures that have been updated for the Revised Proposal from those listed in the Final SEIS. See **Appendix F** for a complete list of the mitigation measures under the Revised Proposal. See the Introduction to **Chapter 3** for a description of the different categories of mitigation (e.g., proposed, required, other possible).



### **Proposed Mitigation Measures (Included in the Project)**

- ~~The estimated monthly mortgage payment for the proposed single family housing could be affordable to city residents, based on 60% of the city's and county's 2018 Median Household Income (MHI) and dedication of 30% or less of a household's monthly gross income to housing and utilities. This affordable housing would be located onsite throughout the proposed residential development. Note: Fifty (50) affordable housing units would be integrated into the multi-family portion of the development. These affordable housing units would be developed and maintained by Sun Communities, but it is assumed that they would be managed by a public or non-profit entity approved by the city.~~

### **Approved Bullfrog Flats Conditions of Approval (Included in the Project)**

- ~~Access, water, and sewer would be constructed, consistent with development standards, up to the affordable housing parcel boundaries, as with every other parcel in the Master Site Plan. Note: The Revised Proposal includes provision of affordable units by the Applicant in lieu of dedication of a site for future development of those units by others; the acreage shown in SEIS Alternatives 5 and 6 as being dedicated to the city for affordable housing development would be retained as undeveloped open space. The existing requirement would be duplicative of the proposal, therefore, and would be deleted or modified depending on the City Council's action on the Revised Proposal. It is also noted that the adopted Bullfrog Flats Development Agreement makes the city responsible for providing sewer and water to the affordable units; the Addendum identifies and evaluates the incremental demand for utilities associated with those units so impacts can be mitigated by the appropriate party.~~
- ~~Sun Communities, as successor to New Suncadia, would be given the option in a new or updated Development Agreement to assist in the selection process for potential owners/developers of the affordable housing parcel. This condition is no longer relevant since the affordable housing would be integrated into the master plan's residential area and not located on a separate site.~~
- A minimum of 150 residential dwelling units, not including the 50 possible affordable housing units, would remain rental units and a covenant would be recorded on the property to ensure this condition continues for 20 years. Note: This requirement would be met by the Revised Proposal. All proposed 180 multi-family housing units would be leased/rented; some of the single family housing would be leased/rented as well. A covenant may or may not be recorded to ensure this condition.

### **Required Mitigation Measures**

- A housing policy in the 2019 City Comprehensive Plan (H-1.9) requires that affordable housing be provided in projects with more than 20 units. The Revised Proposal would exceed this requirement by providing 50 affordable housing units in the multi-family area onsite.

### **Approved Bullfrog Flats Conditions of Approval Not Included in the Proposal**

- ~~A useable area of 7.5 acres is required to be conveyed to the City of Cle Elum, or another public or non-profit entity approved by the city.~~ Note: Under the Revised Proposal, a separate area for affordable housing would not be conveyed to the city because this housing would be developed by the Applicant and integrated within the multi-family residential area onsite.
- The existing supply of affordable housing in Upper Kittitas County should periodically be monitored and inventoried, and as necessary advocated for, to help ensure that a continuous supply of housing is affordable for those earning the wages paid at the Suncadia resort. Note: This requirement does not appear to be necessary for the Revised Proposal given the reduced scale of housing and employment compared to the approved Bullfrog Flats project.
- The existing labor pool should be actively recruited, hired, and contracted with to minimize in-migration employment and associated housing impacts. Note: This condition may not be relevant to 47<sup>o</sup> North since construction labor demand would be considerably less than for Bullfrog Flats due to the inclusion of manufactured housing and its construction offsite.