

BEFORE THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
FOR COLUMBIA COUNTY, OREGON

In the Matter of Amending the Columbia County)
Comprehensive Plan Regarding Population)
Projections and Associated Amendments) Ordinance No. 98-05

The Board of County Commissioners ordains as follows:

SECTION 1. TITLE.

This ordinance shall be known as Ordinance No 98-9.

SECTION 2. AUTHORITY.

This ordinance is adopted pursuant to the authority of ORS 203.035, and 197.628 through 197.646.

SECTION 3. PURPOSE.

The purpose of these amendments is to adopt population projections pursuant to the County Periodic Review Revised Work Program; Task III, "Population Projections", Subtasks a, b, c.; and Oregon Revised Statutes ORS 195.036. The amendments include low, intermediate, and high population projections, and amendments to the text of the Comprehensive Plan.

SECTION 4. FINDINGS.

1. The Board of Commissioners finds that the amendments are consistent with the provisions of ORS 195.036.
2. The Board of Commissioners finds that the amendments comply with the provisions of the Columbia County Periodic Review Revised Work Task Item 3, and subtasks a, b, c.
3. The Board of Commissioners adopts the findings of fact and conclusions of law found in the amended staff report dated July 7/8/98, which is attached hereto, labeled Attachment "A" and incorporated herein by this reference.
4. The Board of Commissioners finds and concludes that the amendments attached will implement County Periodic Review Revised Work Program; Task III, "Population Projections", Subtasks a, b, c.; and Oregon Revised Statutes ORS 195.036.

SECTION 5. ADOPTION AND REPEALER.

1. The amendments as shown in Attachment "A" are adopted and shall be incorporated into the Columbia County Comprehensive Plan.
2. The provisions of the Columbia County Comprehensive Plan which are shown in Attachment "A" to be deleted from the plan text are hereby repealed.

SECTION 6. APPEALS.

Appeals of this ordinance shall be to the Oregon Land Conservation and Development Commission, as an appeal of a periodic review work program task, pursuant to ORS 197.197.644(2).

SECTION 7. SEVERABILITY.

The provisions of this ordinance are severable. If any provision of this ordinance is determined to be invalid by a review body of competent jurisdiction, such provision shall be considered a separate, distinct and independent provision and the decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions hereof.

DATED this twenty second day of July, 1998.

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
FOR COLUMBIA COUNTY, OREGON

Approved as to form:

By: Ann Cooney Briggs
Office of County Counsel

By: Joe K. Garbar
Chair

By: [Signature]
Commissioner

Attest:

By: Jan Suenkelgh
Recording Secretary

By: Jack R. Peterson
Commissioner

First Reading: July 8, 1998

Second Reading: July 22, 1998

Effective Date: October 20, 1998

ORDINANCE NO. 98-05

Page 2

ATTACHMENT A

COLUMBIA COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
Comprehensive Plan Amendment
TA 98-7
Staff Report
Amended 7/8/98

FILE NUMBER: TA 98-7

APPLICANT: Columbia County Land Development Services

REQUEST: Amend County Comprehensive Plan Population Projections

BACKGROUND: The County is required to establish and maintain a population forecast for the entire area of jurisdiction in response to House Bill 2709 as codified in ORS 195.036 and as indicated in Task 3 of the County Periodic Review Revised Work Program.

TIMELINE:

- 12/21/94 Periodic Review Work Program Approval (Order #00104) was given by DLCD for Columbia County to begin work on the periodic review of its comprehensive plan. Task 5 of this approved work program includes "Economic development and population growth inventories, analysis & updates."
- 5/96 House Bill 2709 was passed during the 1995 Oregon Legislative Session. "A Summary of Key Provisions" dated May of 1996 and produced as an informational handout by DLCD states that, "In 1995, the Oregon Legislature adopted legislation concerning planning for needed housing. The legislation, called House Bill 2709, requires regional coordination of population forecasts. This Coordination of Population Forecasts, requires the coordinating body for an area to establish and maintain a population forecast for the area. The coordinating body must also coordinate the forecast with local governments within its boundary. This requirement has been codified in ORS 195.036. The Oregon State Economist is working to provide a 20 year statewide forecast and coordinated regional forecasts. We expect this information to be available in mid-October 1996."
- 5/10/96 The County TSP and TSP population forecast for modeling purposes was started by the planning consulting firm of CH2M Hill in May of 1996.
- 1/1/97 The Office of Economic Analysis publishes "Long Term Population and Employment Forecasts

for Oregon". In this 50 year forecast document are found population forecasts for each county in the state for 5 year intervals from 1970 through 2040. The introduction to this document states, "This effort provides a framework and a link between the county level forecasts called for in HB 2709 and a statewide total."

- 12/5/97 Columbia County holds the first of three population forecast coordination meetings with incorporated cities within the county.
- 12/16/97 Executive Order No. EO 97-22 signed by the Governor states that the Governor's Community Solutions Team including ODOT and DLCD shall do the following, as part of the Implementation of "Quality Development Objectives", C(6): "Each Community Solutions Team Agency shall use the population and employment forecasts developed or approved by the Department of Administrative Service's Office of Economic Analysis in coordination with Oregon's 36 counties to plan and implement activities.
- 2/3/98 A DLCD memo from Elaine Smith to interested persons regarding Goal 14 analysis states about issues that resulted from the Cogan Owens Cogan report, Working paper: Goal 14 Analysis, High Priority Issues;

" Issue #1: The state has not provided guidance to local jurisdictions regarding coordination of population projections or what constitutes an adequate factual base for developing population projections."

Background. Legislation adopted in 1995 (ORS 195.036, adopted as part of HB 2709) requires each county to coordinate population projections for the cities within its territory. Recently, the state developed population projections for each county at five year intervals. Counties do not have to adopt the state's projections. However, a county must coordinate with the state in developing different population projections and the county projections must be based on an adequate factual base.

FINDINGS:

This request is being processed in accordance with Columbia County Comprehensive Plan Administrative Policy Procedures for plan revision and amendment; Oregon Administrative Rules (OARs), and the Oregon Revised Statutes. Pertinent sections of the policies, rules, and statute are as follows:

Columbia County Comprehensive Plan

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES

POLICIES:

5. Provide a framework by which the Comprehensive Plan may be reviewed, revised and amended. Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan and its implementing ordinance(s) shall be in accordance with the following procedures and guidelines:
 - A. Amendments may be initiated by the Board of Commissioners, the Planning Commission, the Planning Director or the owner(s) of the affected property.
 - B. A Citizen Planning Advisory Committee may, upon a majority vote of its members, formally request either the Board of Commissioners or the Planning Commission initiate an amendment.
 - C. Revisions or amendments will follow the same process as initial adoption - CPAC review, Planning Commission public hearing and recommendation, and Board hearing and adoption of revisions or amendments.
 - D. For quasi-judicial amendments, all property owners within two hundred and fifty (250) feet of the affected area shall be notified of the hearing date and the requested amendment at least ten (10) calendar days prior to the first scheduled public hearing.
 - E. For legislative amendments, notice of the public hearing and a copy of the proposed amendment, will be mailed to all Citizen Planning Advisory Committees and interested parties at least ten (10) days prior to the first scheduled public hearing.

Finding 1: The Board of County Commissioners initiated this process by directing Land Development Services to do periodic review of the County Comprehensive Plan. Periodic Review Amendments of the Comprehensive Plan will follow the same process as initial adoption of the Comprehensive Plan. Notice of these legislative amendments was mailed to CPACs and interested parties at least 10 days prior to the hearing scheduled for May 4, 1998. Population Forecast work is being performed under the auspices of the Columbia County Periodic Review Revised Work Program; Task III, "Population Projections"; Subtasks a,b,c.

Following with **House Bill 2709 "A Summary of Key Provisions"**

"In 1995, the Oregon Legislature adopted legislation concerning planning for needed housing. The legislation, called House Bill 2709, requires regional coordination of population forecasts... This Coordination of Population Forecasts, requires the coordinating body for an area to establish and maintain a population forecast for the area. The coordinating body must also coordinate the forecast with local governments within its boundary. This requirement has been codified in ORS 195.036..."

Following with Oregon Revised Statutes:

ORS 195.036 Area population forecast; coordination. The coordinating body under ORS 195.025(1) shall establish and maintain a population forecast for the entire area within its boundary for use in maintaining and updating comprehensive plans, and shall coordinate the forecast with local governments within its boundary.

Finding 2: Columbia County Land Development Services scheduled and conducted a series of three population forecast coordination meetings that were held on December 5, 1997; January 8, 1998; and February 12, 1998. City Managers and Planning Staff from the cities of Clatskanie, Columbia City, Scappoose, St. Helens, Rainier, and Vernonia were present for one or all of the meetings. In addition, representatives from DLCD were invited to attend meetings two and three. Jon Jinnings and Jim Hinman of DLCD attended meeting two, while Jon Jinnings of DLCD attended meeting three. Tricia Campos, a planning consultant for three of the cities was also voluntarily in attendance for meetings one and two. The County Transportation Planner and County Engineer also attended population forecast coordination meeting two.

Staff met with the representative from the Office of Economic Analysis (OEA) in Salem during the month of March of 1998. A memorandum from the OEA was received April 17, 1998. This memo stated, "It is reasonable to assume that the County's actual population in 2015 is going to be different from the OEA's projection. The actual population can be higher or lower than the projected number. If the difference is within acceptable margin, we should leave it alone for now. However, if the difference is deemed to be significant (say greater than + or -5%), then appropriate documentation of assumption is needed..."

Staff also had several conference calls with representatives from DLCD. In early June of 1998 DLCD suggested, as the OEA memo of 4/17/98 discussed, that the County population projections would be more acceptable to OEA if the intermediate projection #2 number was within 5% of the OEA total population number that the County was using for the "low" projection #1 number. The County amended the intermediate population projection number to reflect the 5% over low OEA number as suggested.

The Center for Population Research at Portland State University officially estimated the population of Columbia County to be 41,500 persons as of July 1, 1997. The OEA "Long Term Population and Employment Forecasts for Oregon" indicate that Columbia County's population in the year 2000 will be 41,780 persons. If the OEA population growth rate of 1.02% for the years 1995 - 2000 is applied to the Official PSU estimate of 41,500 then the population will be 42,330 for 1998, 43,176 for 1999, and 44,040 for the year 2000. Utilizing this method and comparing the OEA year 2000 number of 41,780 to the modified PSU year 2000 number of 44,040 indicates that the OEA number used for projection #1 "Low" may be too low and may add credence to the County using the "intermediate" projection #2 number for Land Use Planning Purposes.

The Oregon Employment Department was contacted by County staff to obtain employment projections for Columbia County. An Economist with the Employment Department sent "Employment Projections by Industry 1996 - 2006" and "Occupational Projections 1996 - 2006". The "Nonfarm Payroll Employment" employment projections by industry indicate an 18.5% Change between the years 1996 and 2006 or a 1.85%

crease in employment each year for the 10 year period.

The Office of Economic Analysis "Long Term Population and Employment Forecasts for Oregon" indicate that Annual Average Non-Agricultural Employment Growth Rates for Columbia County in the period 1995 to 2015, averaged, will be approximately 1.01% while the Annual Average Population Growth Rates for Columbia County averaged for the same period will be .95%. The OEA Employment and Population forecasts indicate a parallel growth rate of near 1% for the period when the OEA "low" projection of the three projection series is used. The County will use the "intermediate" projection for planning purposes since the number of County residents that travel outside the county for employment purposes is significant and staff believes that OEA numbers for employment and population only represent growth inside the County. The Spring 1997 Columbia County Economic Profile by the State of Oregon Employment Department indicates that, based upon 1990 census figures, approximately 40.6% of the County Workforce commutes outside the county to work thus adding support to staff's use of the intermediate projection for land use planning purposes. Population growth will also be directed towards cities due to recent restrictions on rural residential lands.

Following with Oregon Statewide Planning Goals & Guidelines, Goal 2: Land Use Planning:

"...All land use plans and implementation ordinances shall be adopted by the governing body after public hearing and shall be reviewed and, as needed, revised on a periodic cycle to take into account changing public policies and circumstances, in accord with a schedule set forth in the plan. Opportunities shall be provided for review and comment by citizens and affected governmental units during preparation, review and revision of plans and implementation ordinances."

Finding 3: A series of three population forecast/allocation coordination meetings as part of the County's Periodic Review process to update the comprehensive plan were held with city managers, planners, and consultants who represented the cities in Columbia County. A copy of the population coordination meetings summary is available upon request. This summary includes what was discussed and alternatives considered at the coordination meetings. Opportunities for review and comment were provided to citizens and affected governmental units during the preparation of the population allocation for incorporated and unincorporated areas of Columbia County. All CPACs were sent a copy of this staff report and provided the opportunity for comment. Representatives from DLCD attended two of the coordination meetings. Staff made a trip to Salem to discuss the county population projections with the Office of Economic Analysis (OEA) representative and asked that OEA send written comments for inclusion in the staff report and consideration by staff and the Planning Commission.

COMMENTS:

No other comments have been received as of the date of this staff report (June 12, 1998).

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION:

The Planning Commission forwards a **recommendation of approval** to the Board of County Commissioners to adopt high, intermediate, and low population forecasts/projections and the methodology used to reach these numbers; for this legislative amendment to amend the population projection section of the County Comprehensive Plan as part of County Periodic Review of the Comprehensive Plan and to meet the intent of ORS 195.036.

The following amendment to the "Economy" (page 79), and "Urbanization" (pages 64-75) sections of the Columbia County Comprehensive Plan includes language that is proposed to be deleted, shown as ~~strikeout~~; and language that is proposed to be added shown in **bold**.

ECONOMY

POPULATION:

The population of Columbia County ~~in at the time of the 1970 1990~~ census was ~~28,700~~ **37,557**. The ~~1983 1997~~ County population **estimated by the Center for Population Research at PSU** is certified at ~~36,000~~ **41,500**. During the period from 1960 to 1982, the County's population grew by more than half. This growth figure is slightly higher than that experienced by the State. In 1982, the County represented 1.3% of the total population of Oregon. **More than one-half of the population lies in the unincorporated areas (Approximately 44.3%) while the remainder is found in the incorporated areas (Approximately 45.7%) of the County.**

St. Helens is the County seat and population center with an estimated population of ~~7,190~~ **8,555** (1983 1997). Columbia City, two miles to the north, has a **an estimated** population of ~~710~~ **1,550** and Scappoose, eight miles to the south of St. Helens, has a **an estimated** population of ~~3,270~~ **4,650**. Other cities include Vernonia (~~1,750~~ **2,345**), Prescott (~~70~~ **60**), Rainier (~~1,590~~ **1780**), and Clatskanie (~~1,600~~ **1880**). The remaining residents are scattered throughout the County, largely among the major roadways, and along the Nehalem River.

URBANIZATION

PURPOSE

The goal of the Columbia County Comprehensive Plan is to provide for an orderly and efficient transition from rural to urban land use. In addition, it is the goal of the County to provide for an efficient method of managing urban growth so that the needs of all citizens of the County are met. A major consideration in the management of urban growth is the reduction of the costs associated with uncontrolled and scattered development. These costs are measured both in terms of wasted resources and in the expense of providing services to far-flung residences. The purpose is not to prevent growth from occurring, but to minimize the conflicts between land uses. When growth is directed into identifiable and desirable communities, people are able to enjoy a pleasant environment at a reasonable cost, while still conserving the County's resource base.

BACKGROUND

There are two types of residential lands in Columbia County. These are rural lands and urban lands.

Rural Lands, as defined by the Statewide Planning Goals, “are those (lands) which are outside the Urban Growth Boundary and are: a) non-urban agriculture, forest or open space lands, or b) other lands suitable for sparse settlement, small farms, or acreage home sites with no, or hardly any, public services, and which are not suitable, necessary, or intended to urban use.”

Urban Lands, as defined by the Statewide Planning Goals, “are those places which must have an incorporated city. Such areas may include lands adjacent to and outside the incorporated city and may also: a) have concentrations of persons who generally reside and work in the area, and b) have supporting public facilities and services.”

Urban lands in this plan are those lands which are contained within a mutually adopted Urban Growth Boundary. These boundaries have been developed as a result of the combined efforts of Columbia County and its incorporated communities.

The boundaries themselves were developed using the seven (7) criteria listed in Goal 14. ~~and~~ The same criteria will be used in judging any expansion of these boundaries. These criteria are:

1. Demonstrated need to accommodate long-range urban population growth requirements consistent with LCDC goals;
2. Need for housing, employment opportunities, and livability;
3. Orderly and economic provision for needed public facilities and services;
4. Maximum efficiency of land uses within and on the fringe of the existing urban area;
5. Environmental, energy, economic, and social consequences;
6. Retention of agricultural land as defined with Class I being the highest priority for retention and Class VI the lowest priority; and
7. Compatibility of the proposed urban uses with nearby agricultural activities.

The seven (7) incorporated cities have been asked to address Goal 14 by identifying sufficient amounts of land to accommodate their future expansion, taking into account: the growth policy of the area; the projected population needs by the year ~~2000~~ 2015; the carrying capacity of the planning area; and open space and recreational needs. For some cities, there may be sufficient land to meet their needs already within their city limits while other cities may require additional land. In either case, an Urban Growth Boundary must be defined which focuses on the areas that will become urban - the future part of these communities. The

Establishment of this boundary, and any later changes, are to be made after consideration of the following factors which are outlined in the Goals and Guidelines:

1. Orderly, economic provisions for public facilities and services;
2. Availability of sufficient land for various uses to insure choices in the market place;
3. LCDC goals; and
4. Encouragement of urban development within urban areas before conversion of urbanizable areas.

Specific provisions relating to the process of changing an Urban Growth Boundary are outlined under the administrative provision of this plan.

Until annexed, the lands between the boundary and the city limits remain the responsibility of the County. To assure that the urbanizable lands will be managed in a coordinated manner, a Joint Management agreement between each city and the County has been adopted. The urban growth area joint Management Agreements are included in the appendix. In addition, Oregon law requires that special districts enter into a cooperative agreement with the city or County within those boundaries the district operates.

Throughout most of its history, Columbia County has increased in population by "natural" means (that is, by the difference between births and deaths). However, during the last several years, there has been a consistent rise in the population by migration into the County. For example, the net population change in the County between 1976 and 1977 totaled 900 people. Of these, 627 (69.7%) moved into the County, while only 273 (30.3%) were born here during the same period. The amount of annual population gain in the County attributable to immigration has averaged 70% since 1974.

DECENNIAL CENSUS OF POPULATION 1920 - 1990

Decennial Census Year	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990
Clatskanie	1,171	739	708	901	797	1,286	1,648	1,629
Prescott				119	129	105	73	63
Rainier	1,287	1,353	1,183	1,285	1,152	1,731	1,655	1,674
Columbia City		310	327	405	423	537	678	1,003
St. Helens	2,220	3,994	4,304	4,711	5,922	6,212	7,064	7,535
Scappoose		248	336	659	923	1,859	3,213	3,529
Vernonia	142	1,625	1,412	1,521	1,095	1,643	1,785	1,808
Incorporated County	4,820	8,269	8,270	9,601	10,441	13,373	16,116	17,241
Unincorporated County	9,140	11,778	12,701	13,366	11,938	15,417	19,530	20,316

Total County	13,960	20,047	20,971	22,967	22,379	28,790	35,646	37,557
---------------------	---------------	---------------	---------------	---------------	---------------	---------------	---------------	---------------

(Source: PSU Center for Population Research)

(TABLE 18)

One of the primary factors in this growth has been the pressure of suburbanization from Portland. In the southeastern section of the County many residents who live in St. Helens or Scappoose commute to Portland or Washington County to work. Many of Vernonia residents and those who live in the Nehalem River Valley in the southwestern portion of the County are also commuting to the Tualatin Valley to work. Scappoose increase at an average annual rate of 3.5% between 1970 and 1982, compared to 1.7% for the County as a whole. In the northern section of the County, workers from many of those who work in Longview, Washington, who prefer to commute from the Oregon side of the river, and have strongly affected the residential development of Rainier and other nearby communities.

From 1970 to 1978 In the 1990's, there was a general tendency for the seven (7) incorporated cities to attract most of the population increase. The combined growth rates for the cities during that period averaged 3.4% per year, compared to 0.93% for the unincorporated area of the County. From 1978 to 1982, the trend toward urban migration changed. During this four (4) year period, the population for the cities decreased an average of 7.3% per year compared to an average yearly increase of 16.6% for the unincorporated areas. Columbia County has been averaging 30 to 50 new dwelling units per year in forest lands, as well as many new units in rural residential exception areas. Although there will continue to be growth in the rural centers Communities, such as Alston-Delena, Birkenfeld, Mist, and Quincy, movement into the cities should be encouraged to protect the County from random subdivisions and a deterioration of the resource base. Growth should be directed onto ban lands, defined as: "Those places which must have an incorporated city."

The development of population projections for the urban and rural areas of the County has been is a complex task involving changing multiple state mandates implemented at the county and local levels across a changing range of time. Columbia County has conducted a series of population projection coordination meetings with local jurisdictions to allocate population. This allocation will be updated every time the State Office of Economic Analysis updates their Long-Term Population and Employment Forecasts for Oregon. The next update is scheduled for the year 2000. In order to obtain a growth projection for the County as a whole, it has been necessary to develop two (2) sets of populations, one for the rural areas (outside UBG's). A detailed analysis of the rural area projection is included in the Goal 3 and 4 exception statement. Each p Considering these factors, projections was were developed and assumptions made with a low, medium intermediate, and high range of growth as follows:

The rural area projections were worked on from utilizing three (3) different starting methods. These methods are:

Projection #1 (Low):

This projection is based upon an average number of building permits being issued each year for the next twenty (20) years. This projection was based on an analysis of the building permit records from 1970 - 1980. These records show an average growth of 234 new dwellings per year. The State Office of Economic Analysis (OEA) in their Long-term Population and Employment Forecasts for Oregon

determined a County total population number of 47,954 persons in the year 2015. Population was then allocated to each city based upon that city's percentage or ratio of county total population established in the 1990 census. The County assumes that each city's ratio of total county population as derived from the 1990 census of population will be applied to the 2015 number for allocation purposes. The State mandated that Projection #1, Low, total number for the County be used to provide a benchmark for indicating consistency with state population allocated at the County level.

Projection #2 (Intermediate): This projection is based upon the average number of new residents in the rural area each year. This is based on an analysis of the population centers — certified populations and shows an average growth of 230 residents per year. This projection utilizes a total number 5% above Projection #1, the low number in this projection series, which is the Office of Economic Analysis number. The Incorporated cities population number is the arithmetic mean half way between the low, Projection #1 number and the high, Projection #3 number. The remainder of the population in the unincorporated areas of the County is reduced so the projection total will remain within 5% of the Low Projection #1 OEA number and because growth will be directed towards cities due to recent restrictions on rural residential lands. Projection #2, Intermediate, will be used for land use planning purposes.

Projection #3 (High): This projection is based upon an average growth rate for rural population using the period 1970 - 1980 as a base. The average growth rate in this time period was 1.5%. The County Transportation System Plan (TSP) assumes that year 2016 population of the County will exceed 55,600 persons if the comprehensive plan for each city and the county are implemented. The TSP 2016 population total county population number is assumed to be the 2015 number for purposes of this projection. Population was then allocated to each city based upon that city's percentage or ratio of county total population established in the 1990 census. The Transportation System Plan, Chapter 3, "Future Conditions and Alternative Scenarios" assumptions are included as an attachment. Projection #3, High, will be used to implement the current Transportation Systems Plan. Future studies or projects may use lower numbers if necessary.

TABLE-18

CITY AND COUNTY POPULATION
1870-1980

1870	1880	1890	1900	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980
------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------

Helena	220	258	742	2,220	3,994	4,304	4,711	5,022	6,212	7,055
Leppopose					248	336	659	923	1,879	3,225
Rainier	238	522	1,359	1,287	1,353	1,183	1,285	1,159	1,731	1,640
Prescott							119	129	105	70
Glatskanie		311	749	1,171	739	708	901	797	1,286	1,640
Vernonia		62	69	142	1,625	1,412	1,521	1,089	1,643	1,775
Columbia City					310	327	405	423	537	680
Total City	458	1,153	2,919	4,820	8,369	8,370	9,601	9,542	13,393	16,090
Unincorporated County Population	2,042	4,733	5,084	7,661	9,140	11,778	12,701	13,366	12,837	15,397

POPULATION FORECAST FOR 2015

LOW	INTERMEDIATE	HIGH
Office of Economic Analysis	5% Above Low With Arithmetic Mean for Cities	Transportation System Plan
47954	50351	55600

(TABLE 19)

These projections yield the following amount of rural growth by the year 2000:

TABLE 19

COUNTY PROJECTIONS

LOW MEDIUM HIGH

Projection #1 21,718 23,303 27,111

Projection #2 20,898 22,338 23,778

Projection #3 21,644 23,890 26,358

Further review of these projections has determined that Projection #1 has the most sound statistical base and is the projection on which the rural growth will be based. The projected population for rural Columbia County for the year 2000 is 23,303 persons. In projecting population for the cities, the County did not have a good data base to work from. It was decided that the best method of projecting growth for the cities was to use an average

percentage of growth based upon an analysis of past records and city expectations. Using this method, the total projected population for all cities was determined to be:

TABLE 20

CITY PROJECTIONS (TOTAL)

LOW MEDIUM HIGH

29,364 38,288 43,985

The total projection for the County as a whole is:

TABLE 21

CITY - COUNTY TOTALS

LOW MEDIUM HIGH

Projection #153,243 61,591 71,096

TABLE 22

The certified population for Columbia County and the incorporated cities as of July 1983 are:

County	36,000 (Total)
Clatskanie	1,600
Columbia City	710
Preseott	70
Rainier	1,590
St. Helens	7,190
Seappoose	3,270

TABLE 23

ANNUAL GROWTH RATES 1970 - 1982

	1970	1982	Average Growth Average	Projections of Future Growth Rates
Clatskanie	1,286	1,675	1.9%	4.0
Columbia City	537	700	1.9%	3.5
Prescott	105	70	4.1%	
Rainier	1,731	1,610	0.5%	3.0
St. Helens	6,212	7,200	1.1%	3.5
Seappoose	1,859	3,285	3.6%	6.0
Vernonia	1,643	1,760	0.5%	2.5
Incorporated Total	<u>13,373</u>	<u>16,300</u>	<u>1.5%</u>	<u>na</u>
COUNTY TOTAL	28,790	36,200	1.7%	3.0

TABLE 24

POPULATION PROJECTIONS 1990-2000 (Middle Projection)

	% Annual Growth Rate	1990	2000
Clatskanie	4.00	2,493	4,215
Columbia City	3.50	1,000	1,410
Prescott	0.00	96	97
Rainier	3.00	2,924	4,329
St. Helens	3.50	11,095	15,651
Seappoose	6.00	5,700	10,000

Armonia	2.50	2,427	3,107
Incorporated Total	3.59	25,735	38,288
Unincorporated Total	—	20,639	23,827
COUNTY TOTAL	3.0	46,374	62,115

The most optimistic population projections from the County indicate the population could nearly double by the year 2000. The expectation is for the cities to grow at a faster rate, due to the availability of the needed city services. The seven (7) incorporated cities have addressed Statewide Planning expansion. The city of Prescott determined there was sufficient land to meet their needs within their city limits. The other cities, having determined future needs for additional urban lands, have prepared comprehensive plans designating certain areas for urban expansion. The County has adopted the comprehensive plans of the six (6) incorporated cities and will apply them to the unincorporated areas within the urban growth boundaries of each city, as appropriate.

POPULATION UPDATE

The County's November 2, 1984 Acknowledgment of Compliance Report contained a Goal 2 In Order to Comply which suggested the County must:

- Amend the plan's analysis and projections of future rural population growth to ensure they are:
 1. — Based on a methodology consistent with plan policies which direct future growth away from rural areas; and
 2. — Coordinated and consistent with the Urban Growth Boundary population projections contained in each of the Comprehensive Plans of the County's seven incorporated cities.
- To satisfy this requirement, the Department suggests that the County adopt the PSU year-2000 projection and the projections contained in each city plan for its UGB, the "rural" projection being the difference between the PSU projection and the total of the city projections.

The PSU year-2000 projection referred to by the DLCD staff was released in June 1984 and at 45,700 is 15,891 smaller than the County's projection of 61,591.

In analyzing the Goal 2 IOTC, County staff determined that applying the methodology suggested by DLCD staff to the population projections contained in the cities' and county's plans would not provide a legitimate projection for the rural areas of the County. This determination was based upon three factors — One, subtracting

~~One~~ total of the cities' year-2000 rural populations (39,512) from the PSU year-2000 projection (45,700) would leave a year-2000 rural population of 6,188. The County currently has a rural population of 19,820. Two, the County has over 24,000 acres of acknowledged built and committed lands which are capable of supporting development on 2 and 5 acre parcels. It is anticipated that the majority of the County's rural population growth will occur in built and committed areas and may be greater or small than projections contained in the plan. Three, from 1978 to 1983 all of the cities in the County, with the exception of Seappoose, realized a negative average annual grow rate ranging from a minus 0.8% in Columbia City to a minus 5.2% in Rainier. During this same period the unincorporated portions of the County grew at an average yearly rate of 3.2%.

From this analysis, it becomes clear that the only way the County can generate a meaningful population projection, based upon the PSU figure, will be if it is done in concert with the seven incorporated cities.

Most of the cities' plans are already acknowledged and a change in any or all of their projections would be an extremely involved process. Because of this, the County staff has suggested to the DLCD that the current projections be retained and that the County, in conjunction with all incorporated cities, update their projections on or before the first periodic review. Such an update would be based upon the most current population forecasts available at the time and include an allocation to the seven incorporated cities. The DLCD has accepted the County's approach with a condition that Urbanization Policies 18 and 19 be added.

the low, intermediate, and high projection allocations follow:

POPULATION PROJECTION CITY/COUNTY ALLOCATION FOR 2015

Using 1990 city to county census population percentage applied to OEA (Low) and TSP (high) population totals, and intermediate 5% above OEA low with cities receiving arithmetic mean between high and low. County receives remainder.

			LOW	INTERMEDIATE	HIGH
	1990 Census	Approx. Ratio of Each City's Pop. to County Total Pop. (Census '90) & Percentage	Office of Economic Analysis (OEA) 2015 Population Forecast Allocation	5% Higher than OEA total. Incorporated cities have arithmetic mean between high & low. Unincorporated County has remainder	Transportation System Plan (TSP) Total allocated to each city as 1990 census Percentage
Clatskanie	1629	1 to 23.1 4.3%	2062	2226.5 Rounded to 2227	2391
Columbia City	1003	1 to 37.4 2.7%	*1295	1398	1501
Prescott	63	1 to 596 >1%	63	63	63
Rainier	1674	1 to 22.4 4.5%	2158	2330	2502
St. Helens	7535	1 to 5 20%	9591	10355.5 Rounded to 10356	11120
Scappoose	3529	1 to 10.6 9.4%	*4508	4867	5226
Vernonia	1808	1 to 20.8 4.8%	*2302	2485.5 Rounded to 2486	2669
Incorp. County	17178	1 to 2.2 45.7%	21979	23725.5 Rounded to 23727	25472
Unincorp. County	20379	Approximately 1 to 1.8 54.3%	25975	26625	30128
County Total	37557	1 to 1 (100%)	47954	5% Above 50351.7 Rounded to 50352	55600

NOTE: The City of Prescott percentage of population at less than 1% was not counted in total population for calculation of percentage of population for each city. Prescott's population was allocated from the total County population at 63 persons through low, medium, and high projections and counted as a part of the total.

*NOTE: Portland State University population estimate on July 1, 1997 shows many cities in Columbia County already exceeding the "Low" population projection from the Office of Economic Analysis (OEA)

(Table 20)

letion = ~~strikeout~~

Proposed Amendment = **Bold**

**NEW DWELLING UNITS BY BUILDING PERMIT ACTIVITY
1990-1997**

	1990 Census	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	Avg. Units Yr. 90-97	Persons Per Unit (1990)	Occ. Rate Per Unit
Clatskanie	1629	2	2	3	1	1	1	0	2	2	2.25	.926
Columbia City	1003	18	5	8	14	30	25	44	15	20	2.43	.966
Prescott	63	0	0	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	2.42	.955
Rainier	1674	0	4	3	0	4	9	10	2	4	2.27	.955
Scappoose	3529	12	24	18	29	47	75	136	63	51	2.42	.972
St. Helens	7535	42	38	37	57	64	67	44	179	66	2.19	.967
Vernonia	1808	0	9	28	11	37	35	38	11	21	2.35	.911
Incorp. County	17178	74	82	104	112	183	212	273	272	164		
Corp. City	20379	56	79	65	83	64	81	74	63	71	2.34	
County Total	37557	130	161	169	195	247	293	347	335	235	2.42	

(TABLE 21)

In order to provide an additional empirical reference to test the recommended population series and the use of the intermediate 5% above OEA low total with incorporated cities using the arithmetic mean with the remainder assigned to the unincorporated county, the County developed the Population Projections based on Average Units/Year 1990-1997. This empirical method's assumptions were made using the average number of dwelling units added to each city between the years 1990 to 1997. This average was then applied to the Portland State University certified estimate for each city in the county as of July 1, 1997. Population was then projected to the year 2015 by multiplying the average number of new units in the years 1990-1997; by the 1990 census "Occupancy Rate" for each city; by the 1990 census "persons per dwelling unit" for each city to arrive at the population projection for the year 2015. This projection method was not utilized as the "intermediate" in the "low, intermediate, and high" projection series because the population went down from the low to the intermediate because of occupancy rate when in a low, intermediate, and high series the population should go up through time assuming positive growth. This method yielded a total County population of 51,265 as compared to the Intermediate 5% above OEA Low number of 50,351.

POPULATION PROJECTIONS BASED ON AVERAGE UNITS /YEAR 1990-1997

Population Projections Based on Avg.Units/Year								
	PSU Pop. Est. as of 7/1/97	Avg. Pop/Yr 90-97	1998	1999	2000	2005	2010	2015
Clatskanie	1880	4.2	1884	1888	1893	1923	1944	1965
Columbia City	1550	47	1597	1644	1691	1926	2161	2396
Prescott	60	2.3	62	65	67	79	90	102
Rainier	1780	3.8	1784	1788	1791	1810	1829	1848
St. Helens	8555	139.7	8695	8834	8974	9673	10372	11070
Scappoose	4650	120	4770	4890	5010	5610	6210	6810
Vernonia	2345	45	2390	2435	2480	2705	2930	3155
Incorp. County	20820	384.1	21204	21588	21972	23893	25814	27734
Unincorp. County	20680	158.4	20838	20997	21155	21947	22739	23531
County Total	41500	542.5	42043	42585	43128	45840	48553	51265

(TABLE 22)