LAND USE APPENDIX

Population Trends

Between 1996 and 2009 the population of the City of Orting more than doubled in size, increasing from 2,940 to 6,135 people (See Table LU-1).

Table LU-1

Population 1996-2007

Year	Population	Annual % change	5-year % change	10-year % change
1996	2,940			
1997	3,304	12.4%		
1998	3,493	5.7%		
1999	3,742	7.1%		
2000	3,931	5.1%		
2001	4,186	6.5%	42.3%	
2002	4,060	3.0%		
2003	4,295	5.8%		
2004	4,440	3.4%		
2005	4,820	8.6%		
2006	5,560	15.3%	32.8%	89.1%
2007	5,940	6.8%		
2008	6,075	2.3%		
2009	6,135	1.0%		
Average Annual Growth Rate		**6.6%**		

Source: Washington State Office of Financial Management

Population & Employment Targets

Under the Growth Management Act (GMA), Pierce County and the City of Orting are required to work collaboratively to determine the projected 20-year population and employment growth targets for the City. Orting has a current population target of 7,900 and an employment target of 900 jobs by 2022.

Subdivisions at various stages of permit approval and construction currently within the City of Orting are expected to add approximately 1,030 units or an estimated 2,936 residents. This growth accounts for more than 80% of the City's current 20-year population growth target.

Existing Land Use Inventory

The following existing developable land use inventory data will be used to establish whether the City of Orting currently has enough land to satisfy its future (20-year) land use requirements or whether an Urban Growth Area (UGA) will be needed to ensure capacity to accommodate the estimated growth (see Table LU-2 and Figure LU-1). The inventory includes the current acreage of all existing land use and vacant lands within the City, excluding undevelopable areas, such as public right-of-way.

Table LU-2
Existing Developable Land Use Inventory

	Acres	% Total
Single-Family Residential	811.5	51.3%
Duplex/Triplex/4plex	8.8	0.6%
Multi-Family Residential (5 units or more)	.6	0.1%
Mobile Home	33.6	2.1%
Commercial	14.5	0.9%
Industrial	5.9	0.4%
Quasi-Public Facilities (churches)	5.2	0.3%
Public Facilities	197.6	12.5%
Education	168.8	10.7%
Resource Land	79.4	5.0%
Open Space/Recreation	91.6	5.8%
Utilities	16.2	1.0%
Vacant	147.0	9.3%
TOTAL	**1,580.7**	**100.00%**

Source: Pierce County GIS & City of Orting

Environmental Constraints

Environmental constraints to development in the City of Orting are associated with the Puyallup and Carbon rivers and include wetland areas and flood hazard areas. Figure LU-2 shows the approximate location and extent of these areas.

Land Capacity Analysis

Residential Land Capacity. The analysis of vacant land and redevelopment potential provides an estimate of the capacity of the City to accommodate new growth. The following steps were involved in calculating the additional land capacity for the City's residential zoning districts.

1. Calculate the acreage available for infill development for each residential zoning district within the City.
2. Reduce the acreage to account for:
   - Critical Areas – assumed at 7%
   - Streets and Stormwater Facilities – assumed at 25%
   - Parks and Open Space – assumed at 6%
   - Market Factor – assumed at 10%. This accounts for buildable land that won't be on the market for development over the next 20 years.

A total of 252 acres of vacant land and 175 acres of underdeveloped land currently exists in residential zones within the City of Orting (See Table LU-3). Underdeveloped land is land that is occupied by a use that is consistent with zoning but contains enough land to be further subdivided. For example, a single house on a 10 acre parcel, where 4 dwelling units per acre is permitted, is underdeveloped See Table LU-4 for a summary of infill potential.

Table LU-3
Residential Zones –
Vacant and Underdeveloped Land

Zone	Total Acreage Zoned	Vacant Acres*	Underdeveloped Acres
Residential Conservation	203	58	20
Residential Suburban	340	138	42
Residential Urban	370	56	110
Residential Multi-family	26	0	3
Mixed Use – Town Center	46	2.22	0
Mixed Use – Town Center North	68/59 ROW	67/58 ROW	1
TOTAL	**939**	**252**	**175**

Source: Pierce County GIS & City of Orting

**Note: A significant amount of the currently vacant land is under development permitting review.*

Table LU-4
Residential Infill Potential

Zoning District	Gross Acreage Available	Net Acreage	Projected Dwelling Units	Projected Population*
Residential Conservation (1du/2Acre)	117	65.4	33	89
Residential Suburban (5 dus/acre)	84	51	204-255	551-689
Residential Urban (6 dus/acre)	76	42.6	256-341	691-921
Residential Multi-family (8 dus/acre)	--	--	--	--
Mixed Use – Town Center	63	46		
Mixed Use – Town Center North	68	59	500-600	1,000-1,200
TOTAL	**408**	**264**	**993-1,229**	**2,331-2,899**

**Assumed 2.70 people per dwelling unit. 2.0 people per dwelling unit was used for the mixed use zones.*

Commercial & Light Manufacturing Land Capacity. Existing commercial land uses amount to about 66 acres within the City of Orting. Existing light manufacturing uses in Orting amount to less than 1 percent of the City's total land use inventory. The only area of industrially zoned land is located in the southwest portion of the City and includes about 0.75 acres of land.

Development Feasibility in the Downtown Core

Developers, investors, owners, and tenants can only reasonably consider projects which are financially feasible, whether the project includes an expansion of an existing building to accommodate current businesses, an infill development to create new space for new businesses, or a larger-scale mixed-use project designed for multiple lot developments. This section describes the findings a general feasibility analysis for the downtown core, and the following table introduces the characteristics of downtown (See Table LU-5).

Table LU-5
Characteristics of Downtown Orting

Characteristic s		Notes
Total Area	40.3 A	**Not including street rights-of-way**
Number of Parcels	140	
Largest Parcel	5.83 A	**Pioneer Village (total project acreage is 7.1 A)**
Smallest Parcel	0.03 A	**(1,309 ft^2)**
Average Parcel	0.288 A	**(12,545 ft^2)**
Total Assessed Land Value	$11,658,500	**($2,493,300 @ Pioneer Village - $8.06/ ft^2.)**
Total Assessed Improvement Value	$24,595,700	**($6,969,800 @ Pioneer Village)**
Total Assessed Value	$31,184,600	**($9,578,300 @ Pioneer Village)**
Average Parcel Value*	$160,050	***Not including Pioneer Village**
Average Land Value	$6.64/ ft^2	
Average Total Value	$17.76/ ft^2	
Single Family Parcels*	59	***Some may include businesses**
Other Residential Parcels	6	
Vacant Parcels*	25	***Parcels with no improvements – generally, parking**

		lots serving adjacent businesses
Vacant Parcel Area	4.67 A	**(Average = 0.19A, or 8,137 ft^2)**
Largest Vacant Parcel	0.85 A	**(37,026 ft^2)**
Smallest Vacant Parcel	0.03 A	**(1,309 ft^2)**
Redevelopable Parcels	44	**Improvement value is less than land value**
Area of Redevelopable* Parcels	**10.7 A**	**(466,090 ft^2 - *includes vacant parcels)**

- The average parcel developed to current zoning maximum capacity would be result in a 12,000 ft^2 ground floor leasable space and 24,000 ft^2 of offices or residences on two upper floors. At an average gross floor area of 750 ft^2 per dwelling unit, two floors of residences would be about 30 units. Parking requirements for a retail/office building per code or a retail/residential building would be about 100 spaces. This would require about an acre of land, or a total site area of 55,000 – 60,000 ft^2

- Development of the vacant parcels would result in a maximum of buildout of about 200,000 ft^2 of ground floor space and 400,000 ft^2 of upper floor space (office or 200-300 dwelling units). This would generate a need for about 1,600 parking spaces, per code.

- Development of the redevelopable parcels would result in a buildout of about 450,000 ft^2 of ground floor space and 900,000 ft^2 of upper floor space (office or 1,000-1,500 dwelling units). This would generate a need for about 3,600 parking spaces.

These examples are very general and are not intended to truly reflect actual market demand that will drive actual business decisions. They do illustrate the type of questions that need to be explored for an informed discussion about the future of Downtown Orting.

Project Feasibility Analysis

To analyze the development opportunities in downtown Orting, BHC Consultants and Property Counselors prepared financial feasibility studies (proformas) for 12 vacant and redevelopable properties (properties where the ratio of the value of the building to the value of the land is low). While the properties differed in size, location, and layout, the results showed similar trends among them. This analysis allowed for an identification of the feasibility of development under the current zoning requirements for three different uses:

- ground floor retail with apartments above,
- ground floor retail with condominiums above, and
- ground floor retail with offices above.

Next we analyzed different scenarios that do not meet current zoning requirement for onsite parking and/or building height. These scenarios assumed that the building would cover more of the property because parking would be provided off-site. The scenarios were building heights of two, three, or four stories. Therefore, with three different uses and four development scenarios, there are 12 different development alternatives for each site. We will explain the assumptions used in the proformas for each alternative, the proforma calculations, the results of the proformas, and our conclusions about how the City could act to promote development in downtown Orting.

The most common tool used by developers to assess the feasibility of a project is the proforma. The proforma has two parts: the income proforma and the cost proforma. The income proforma is an estimate of the value (V) of a development based on the income it will produce. The cost proforma is an estimate of the total project cost (TPC) to construct the building. The difference between the value and the total project cost of the development is the profit (P) for the developer (P = V – TPC). To get the profit margin (PM), or the return on investment, you divide the profit by the total project cost (PM = P/TPC). The profit margin needs to fairly compensate the developer for the risk that he or she is taking. For a development to be feasible, the developer typically wants a profit margin of at least 10%.

Proforma Assumptions

We made a number of assumptions about the rents and construction prices. The assumptions fall into two groups: value and cost shown in the table below. The value assumptions include the income from condo sales and the value of the apartments and office determined by dividing the net operating income (rent minus vacancy and operating expenses) by a capitalization rate (a basic measure for return that is used to determine a property's value). The cost assumptions include the value of the land, the construction costs, and "soft" costs (design, permitting, financing, developer's fee, marketing, and insurance). Different value and cost assumptions are used for each use.

Value Assumptions	$ Per Square Foot (except as noted)	$ Per Unit
Apartment Rent Market	$17.20	$1,290.00
Apartment Expenses	$4.50	$337.50
Condo Sales Price Market	$275.00	$247,500.00
Condo Sales Costs (% of Price)	8.0%	($19,800.00)
Retail Rent	$20.00	
Office Rent	$20.00	
Capitalization Rate		
Apartments	6.00%	
Retail/Office	7.00%	
Parking Rent		
Apartments (space /mo)	$50.00	
Cost Assumptions	$ Per Square Foot	$ Per Unit
Construction Cost		
Apartments	$125.00	
Condominiums	$140.00	
Office	$180.00	
Retail	$120.00	
Streetscape (/lineal ft.)	$750.00	
Surface Parking (/space)	$2,500	
Soft Costs		
Apartments (% of construction)	28%	
Condominiums (% of construction)	37%	
Retail/Office (% of construction)	31%	
Land Cost	$15.00	

Project Feasibility Calculations
After the assumptions were made, we calculated the income (value) proforma and the cost proforma for each use. The income and the costs for each use are added together for a total project value and a total project cost. The land cost was the same for each use at $15 per square foot of land.

Apartments are assumed to rent for $17.20 per square foot per year or $1,290 per apartment per month. The net operating income (NOI) is calculated by taking the gross rents for all units and subtracting the vacancy (5%) and expenses ($4.50 per square foot per year). The NOI is divided by a cap rate of 6% to get the apartment's value (approximately $197 per square foot). The cost of constructing the apartments is $125 per square foot plus 28% of construction in soft cost ($35 per square foot).

Condominiums are assumed to sell for $275 per square foot or $247,500 per unit (minus 8% for marketing). The construction cost for condos is $140 per square foot and the soft cost are 37% of construction or $51.80 per square foot.

Retail is assumed to rent for $20 per square foot per year. The NOI equals gross rent minus the vacancy (5%) and the operating expense ($1 per square foot per year). This NOI is divided by a cap rate of 7% to calculate the value (approximately $257 per square foot). The costs to construct the retail is $120 per square foot in construction costs (including tenant improvements), and soft costs are 31% of the construction costs or $37.20 per square foot.

Office is assumed to rent for $20 per square foot per year. The NOI equals gross rent minus the vacancy (5%) and the operating expense ($1 per square foot per year). This NOI is divided by a cap rate of 7% to calculate the value (approximately $257 per square foot). The costs to construct the office is $180 per square foot in construction costs (including tenant improvements), and soft costs are 31% of the construction costs or $55.80 per square foot.

After each individual component of the development is analyzed based on its value and its cost, the numbers from each use are totaled to get a total project value and a total project cost. The difference between the two numbers is the profit which can be used to calculate the profit margin for the project.

Project Feasibility Results
One measure for development feasibility is profit margin (profit divided by total project cost). We used the profit margin to compare and contrast the 12 development alternatives for the 12 properties (three examples are shown in the following table). There are a number of trends that emerge from the different development alternatives.

First, development is not feasible under the current zoning requirements based on these assumptions. The profit margins are below the 10% that a developer would require as compensation for risk. Some of the scenarios even have a negative profit margin (this means the building would be worth less than the cost to construct it).

Second, retail is the most profitable use based on our assumptions. Retail produces good value at

a low construction cost. The higher retail profit margins lifted the profits for the other uses to make the project feasible. That is why in some cases the profit margins declined from a 2-story to a 3-story building because a lower percent of the overall development was retail. One issue is that there might not be a market for all of this retail (one site we looked at could have over 22,000 square feet of retail).

Third, office and apartments are profitable, while condominiums almost never provide at least a 10% profit margin. The reason for this is the assumptions that were used. Condo sales were assumed to be $80 per square foot more than the construction and soft costs. If you include the cost of land, parking, streetscapes, marketing, and other costs, there is no profit. Office and apartments provided some profit, but much of the profit margin was driven by the retail portion of the development.

Fourth, increasing the building height provided some additional return (in most cases) but not that much. A developer can get more revenue from a taller building because he or she has more area to rent (or sell as condos), but this also increases the construction cost and can be riskier because there is more space to rent or sell. Therefore, increasing the building height limits does not have much impact on the developer's return on investment.

The following are samples of the conclusions of the financial analysis (profit margins):

9,030 Square Foot Site	Condominiums	Apartments	Office
Base Zoning	-2.4%	1.0%	2.3%
Off-site Parking (2-stories)	11.4%	14.6%	13.5%
Off-site Parking (3-stories)	9.4%	13.8%	12.8%
Off-site Parking (4-stories)	2.9%	13.7%	15.2%

11,650 Square Foot Site	Condominiums	Apartments	Office
Base Zoning	-13.5%	-10.4%	-9.0%
Off-site Parking (2-stories)	6.8%	9.7%	9.5%
Off-site Parking (3-stories)	6.2%	10.6%	10.0%
Off-site Parking (4-stories)	2.3%	11.0%	13.2%

24,520 Square Foot Site	Condominiums	Apartments	Office
Base Zoning	-6.3%	-3.1%	-1.9%
Off-site Parking (2-stories)	9.1%	12.4%	11.8%
Off-site Parking (3-stories)	7.8%	12.5%	11.5%
Off-site Parking (4-stories)	5.3%	12.4%	14.5%

Project Feasibility Conclusions

The analysis provides insight on how developers might consider undertaking projects in downtown Orting. They identify issues that limit the development potential of downtown. There are some things that can be done to make development in Orting more feasible. Some changes

that could improve the development climate in Orting would be to reduce or eliminate the on-site parking requirements, expedite or ease the requirements for permits, and reduce impact fees and development exactions.

Perhaps the greatest limiting factor for development is the current parking requirements. For a three story building, approximately 2/3 to 3/4 of the site area must be devoted to parking. This limits the amount of the site that can be used for the building that provides most of the income for the developer. In other cities, underground parking is a solution because of the high cost of land. In Orting, the land values are not high enough to justify spending ten times more for underground parking (as opposed to surface parking).

There are solutions that can help alleviate the impact on developers having to provide on-site surface parking. Each solution has cost and benefits that the community must weigh. These solutions are not independent and can be used in conjunction with each other.

Solution	Costs	Benefits
Eliminate onsite parking requirements	Could overwhelm street parking and severely limit new spaces developed	No cost to developer or city – increases development potential
Reduce onsite parking requirements	Would reduce new space spaces built and could limit availability of street parking	Limit cost to developer with increased development potential
Implement shared parking programs	Developers purchase use of adjacent parking – only good for 15-25% of required space	Make more efficient use of available parking – no cost to city, little cost to developer
Off-site parking fee (purchase shared lot)	Developers pay for off-site parking to be constructed by city	Developers have “full” use of their property
Local Improvement District for parking lots downtown	Downtown landowner or businesses pay for fee to provide parking – no way to opt out if already have parking	Provides parking for all downtown businesses (not just new ones)
Meter downtown parking	Enforcement – upset business owners/residents used to free parking	Increases turn-over of spaces and provides income
Reduce maximum parking times	Enforcement – may upset business owners/residents	Increases turn-over of spaces

Another measure that could increase the feasibility of development in downtown Orting is to reduce the development review timeline. The faster the review, the sooner construction can begin, can be completed, and can earn income. The City should dedicate resources to work with developers to assist them in understanding Orting’s development code review process and application requirements. Often developments get held up because the application is not complete.

One item that has direct cost to the developer is exactions that developers have to pay to help mitigate the negative impacts of the development. The exactions include things like dedication of land for right-of-way, impact fees for traffic, schools, and parks, and street frontage improvements, as well as utility connection fees and street frontage improvements. These exactions can add to the cost of the development without any related increase in income. Limiting the impact fees can reduce the cost of the development which will make development more feasible, but this simply moves the burden of mitigating the impacts to the City.

Orting Downtown Vision Plan

In 2008, the City and Chamber of Commerce conducted a community-wide process to formulate a Vision for a revitalized downtown core. This included gathering public input about through an online survey and during a day-long Vision charette. The charette brought together downtown business owners, property owners, city officials, consultants, and experts in downtown planning, business development, retailing, transportation, and real estate. The group discussed current conditions and potential market demand for Orting's downtown and performed a SWOT analysis, a discussion of Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats. The details of the SWOT can be found in the *Orting Draft Downtown Vision Plan June 2008 Status Report*, but the results of the analysis are listed below

Leveraging the Strengths and Opportunities:

Marketing/Networking

- Cross marketing and networking of community activities and businesses
- Recruit more core businesses
- Strengthen existing businesses
- Coordinate businesses with special events
- Market and build off of the trail, and active recreation attractions
- More grass roots marketing to the residents ("Buy Orting")
- Recruit volunteers and include more families and kids – particularly from newcomers
- Use Orting's history to raise awareness of and market the area

Enhance Existing Assets

- Concentrate on Orting's natural assets (trails, rivers, Mt. Rainer, etc.) and promote the use of existing facilities for events
- Make our community more inviting
- Provide small business training and assistance programs
- Study the feasibility of and staffing options for a business development coordinator (grants, intern, college students interested in a professional project)
- Partner with Soldier's Home for tournaments on their ball fields or theater productions on their stage

New Events and Businesses

- Increase tourist activities
- Recruit new businesses such as: hair salon, medical office, specialty/health food store, kid and teen clothing stores, bank or credit union, and hotel or bed and breakfast

- Get families with kids involved through free acting or arts workshops/events for kids

Community Survey

An online survey was conducted for three months during the Vision process. The survey was accessible through the City website and was advertised in the local paper. The purpose of the survey was to learn how shoppers and Orting residents use downtown: how often they visit; how they get there; what they like and do not like; and what they would like to see in Downtown. Nearly 120 people responded. The survey responses are summarized below. Please note that this was not a random sampling of Orting residents, so this survey is not valid as a statistical representation of the entire community. More details about survey demographics can be found in the *Draft Downtown Orting Vision Plan June 2008 Status Report*.

The most common way of getting downtown is by car. Almost 80% of the respondents drive to downtown Orting. Most of the remaining respondents (17%) walk to downtown and a few people bike.

The primary reasons why the respondents go downtown (over 50% of the responses) are for shopping and errands (groceries, hardware, laundry, services, and pharmacy), dining, and to visit the post office. Other reasons why people go downtown (over 30% of the responses) are because they live there or to visit the library. The least popular reasons why respondents go downtown (less than 10% of the responses) are for church, entertainment, or to visit a non-medical office. None of the respondents go to downtown for appliances, electronics, and jewelry. Less than 5% of the people go downtown for home furnishings, fine dining, office/school supplies, and clothing. Puyallup/Sumner/Bonney Lake area is the other major destination for most these services

Over 40% of the respondents go downtown daily and an additional 40% go downtown multiple times per week. Almost 90% of the respondents visit downtown Orting at least once per week, and 98% go downtown at least once a month.

The respondents were dissatisfied with the following aspects of downtown Orting: the traffic flow, the types of businesses, and the variety of business. However, the responds were generally neutral to favorable to the other aspects of downtown: value received, business hours, quality, appearance of streets and the appearance of the building. The respondents were most satisfied with the safety and parking in downtown Orting.

Almost 40% of the respondents want a bakery in downtown Orting. At least 25% of the respondents want the following types of businesses: clothing store, family dining, other, a book store, and entertainment and nightlife. The types of stores that did not get much support (less than 7.5% of the responses) includes: a jewelry store, appliance store, day care, pharmacy, personal care, and convenience store

Mixed Use-Town Center Parking Study

A study of parking spaces within the downtown Orting Mixed Use-Town Center Zone was conducted as part of the Vision process. Parking use surveys were not conducted, but during

most of the business week, there do not appear to be shortages. The following numbers summarize the results.

1,840 spaces total (approx.), including:

710 on-street parking spaces - counted on all streets from Whitesell to Bridge and from Eldredge to Varner, both market spaces counted on the ground and unmarked spaces estimated from aerial photos)

1,130 off-street parking spaces - counted at 58 different sites including all businesses, senior housing, and government sites; not including the school site, single family homes, or apartment buildings. Ownership breaks down as follows:

270 Government Owned spaces (City buildings, park, post office, library, and school district building)

125 Non-Profit Owned (churches, fraternal organizations)

760 Business Owned

Based on current zoning requirements,

- 710 on-street parking spaces can support:
  - 213,000 ft^2 retail
  - 284,400 ft^2 office
  - 355 residential units
- 1,130 off-street parking spaces can support:
  - 338,700 ft^2 retail
  - 451,600 ft^2 office
  - 565 residential units

As with most downtowns and malls, parking may not always be available within a short distance of a shopping destination. This is true for Orting and is a function of the "split" configuration of Downtown with businesses located on both sides of the Park. A bigger issue is the code requirement for off-street parking associated with renovation of existing buildings and new development. This is creates hardships for smaller projects, since their scale does not make structured parking financially feasible, and surface parking would require too much of the project lot to be devoted to cars. Further, this is a disadvantage for "new" development since many existing businesses do not have enough off-street parking.

Future Land Use Needs

According to the 1990 Guidebook from the Washington State Department of Community Development titled *Shaping Your Future: A Guide to Designating an Urban Growth Area* a method to project commercial/light manufacturing needs for small to medium sized communities may be determined by applying the standard ratio of approximately 12 acres of commercially developed land per 1,000 population.

Applying this assumption about commercial and light industrial land use needs to the City of Orting's 2022 current population target of 7,900 as well as to the City's build out population estimate of around 8,900 results in an estimated need for about 100 acres of land for

commercial/light manufacturing uses.

Land needed to support new residents includes streets, parks, employment, schools and other public facilities. For estimating purposes, the following assumptions have been made:

- Streets and stormwater facilities – 0.25 A per net A of residential or 1,600-2,200 s.f. per DU
- Parks - 980 s.f. per DU
- Schools – 400 s.f. per DU
- Other public facilities – 100 s.f. per DU
- Commercial/Industrial – 800 s.f. per DU
- Market factor – 10% accounting for buildable land that is not available for development

Therefore, for each acre of net residential land, between 0.7 and 0.8 additional net acres of developable land is needed to provide for these other uses. For the recommended 2022 target, this would result in a demand for between 342 and 479 acres of developable land to accommodate the above demands.

For comparative purposes, the September, 2002 *Pierce County Buildable Lands Report* estimates Orting will need to see 1,526 new DUs by 2017 to reach a population of 8,000. This growth would occupy about 340 net acres at 4.5 DU/A. This would likely consume more than 400 acres of buildable land after infrastructure is included, leaving less than 170 acres for further residential growth. However, since these calculations have been made, at least 100 acres have been removed from the inventory (middle school site), leaving about 70. While the Report shows the City's employment target to be 450 new jobs, the likelihood of achieving this depends upon a wide range of variables. (This calculates at 0.3 new jobs per new DU, a relatively low ratio.) It is clear that the City currently has an extremely limited capacity for economic development. Only 4 acres of land are available. About 20 acres would be necessary to provide for the development of establishments employing 450 persons using this methodology.

In summary, Orting is expected to use its remaining land capacity during the next 18 years, and probably before. This consumption would be almost entirely attributable to residential uses, resulting in virtually no growth in commercial and industrial uses. In order to assure that adequate land for all uses is available to accommodate balanced and sustainable growth, the City should plan for a future urban growth area of more than 300 acres of buildable land that can be adequately serviced with city water, sanitary sewer, stormwater management, access, parks, and other facilities as growth occurs over the next 15-20 years.

Urban Growth Areas – where should growth go?

Under the provisions of the GMA, counties must identify Urban Growth Areas (UGAs) around existing cities within the County to accommodate planned growth. A UGA defines the area around the city that is available for its expansion during the 20 year planning period. It is based upon the notion that development that is urban in type and intensity are most appropriate in the city.

UGA locational criteria. The Pierce County Countywide Planning policies state that the location of municipal urban growth boundaries shall be determined with consideration for the following factors:

- Geographic, topographic, and manmade features
- Public facility and service availability, limits and extensions
- Jurisdictional boundaries including special improvement districts
- Location of designated natural resource lands and critical areas
- Avoidance of unserviceable islands of County land surrounded by other jurisdictional entities
- The Vision 2020 Plan
- The carrying capacity of the land considering natural resources, agricultural land and environmentally-sensitive land
- Population and employment projections
- Financial capabilities and urban service capabilities
- Consistency and compatibility with neighborhood, local and regional plans
- The existing land use and subdivision pattern

The City of Orting's goals and policies also establish similar criteria for establishing urban growth area(s).

UGA Expansion Study Areas. The Alderton-McMillen Community Plan process ~~has~~ identified potential receiving sites for transfer of development rights from agricultural lands that the City hopes to be considered for a UGA expansion through a joint study with Pierce County.

Hazard Mitigation Planning

The Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 established a new federal priority for pre-disaster planning and mitigation as opposed to post-disaster assistance. The Federal Emergency Management Administration is leading this program through the provision of planning guidelines and grants. The state of Washington Department of Emergency Services manages the program. Orting adopted a Comprehensive Flood Hazard Mitigation Plan under the program and is proceeding with a setback levee preliminary design process for the Puyallup River between the Calistoga Bridge and Village Green Wetland Park.

The City supports the efforts of the "Bridge for Kids" organization, a local non-profit that is seeking funds to design and construct a pedestrian bridge across the Carbon River near the city wastewater treatment plant and a related grade-separated crossing of SR 162. This would create an emergency evacuation route from the Orting schools to higher ground east of the River in the event of a volcanic eruption and lahar. On behalf of the organization, the Pierce County Department of Public Works has completed a feasibility study and preliminary plan for the facilities, resulting in an estimated cost of $12.7 million.