YOU EITHER PLAN FOR GROWTH OR . . .

GROWTH PLANS FOR YOU!

City Council, 03.13.18
Where can I build something?
Where can I build something?

It is very limited and niche oriented

• Smaller lots
• Redevelopment
• Tough Infill
• Unwilling property owners
• Lease Only
Ok, what type of land do you think can be annexed?
Do you think the UGB could be amended to include this?
WHERE/HOW DO YOU THINK WE SHOULD GROW?
PLANNING FOR GROWTH IS . . . .

- VITAL for successful communities
- a COMMUNITY DIALOGUE
- RELIANT upon thoughtful visioning, data gathering and financial analysis
- sets the STAGE for the community’s future
- our LEGACY for the next generation

And last but not least:
- MANDATED by Oregon State Law
PLANNING FOR GROWTH IS NOT . . . .

- ONE PERSON’S vision or decision
- Born of a group’s political AGENDA
- a WASTE of resources
- INCREMENTAL

And last but not least:
- EASY
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TONIGHT’S WORKSESSION

- LAY THE FOUNDATION OF OUR CURRENT SITUATION
- PROVIDE OPTIONS FOR MOVING FORWARD
- STAFF WILL PROVIDE A RECOMMENDATION TO CONSIDER
- ESTABLISH NEXT STEPS
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>AGRs</th>
<th>Acres Recalling from a UGAT Amendment</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>13,849</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>15,875</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>Joe Lanier Park 76 acres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>15,400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>17,110</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>Evergreen 1.2 acres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>17,854</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>Industrial 53 acres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>18,404</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>Weapons Training Facility 71 acres,  Industrial 38 acres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>20,125</td>
<td>117.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>20,955</td>
<td>32.86</td>
<td>School 35 acres, Park 17 acres, Commercial 20 acres, Industrial 31 acres, Evergreen Industrial 5 acres, Hwy 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>22,140</td>
<td>21.26</td>
<td>Evergreen Campus 21 acres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>24,283</td>
<td>27.53</td>
<td>Commercial 22 acres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>24,450</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>35,500</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>36,200</td>
<td>35.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>37,200</td>
<td>40.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>38,300</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>Evergreen 35.8 acres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>39,500</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>School 42 acres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>40,600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>School 42 acres, Evergreen Campus 35 acres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>41,685</td>
<td>123.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>42,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>School 10 acres, Commercial 13 acres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>42,200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>42,300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>42,900</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>43,200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>43,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>43,700</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>43,900</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>44,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Total UGAT expansion 163.8 acres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 30 Years Population Growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population Growth</th>
<th>AGRs 2.8%</th>
<th>17,045</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

These figures include the Evergreen Museum, Complex, School sites, Polo,Parks, Weapons Training Facility, Floodplain land, and yet undeveloped Residential, Commercial, Industrial and Park spaces.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Acquired Acres</th>
<th>New Acres per Year</th>
<th>New Acres per New Resident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,288.76</td>
<td>40.56</td>
<td>0.247</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Acres acquired from a UGAT Amendment, 1984 - 2015:
- 40.56 acres in the years 2000 through 2015
- 0.247 acres in the year 2016
McMINNVILLE UGB HISTORY

- **1993-1995**: Residential and Industrial inventory and projections
- **1994-1995**: Commercial land inventory and projection
- **1995-1997**: HB 2709 retrofit to Residential inventory and needs
- **1999**: Community Growth and Land Use Analysis project
- **2000-2002**: Residential BLI, adoption, DLCD appeal, LUBA remand
- **2001-2003**: Economic Opportunities Analysis
- **2003-2013**: Continued defense of Growth and Expansion plan
- **2013**: Remand by Oregon Circuit Court of Appeals
- **2013**: Repeal and “unwinding” of prior UGB work from Comp Plan and Zoning Ordinance
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EXISTING CONDITIONS

Current UGB is: 7,552 acres

Current county EFU acreage is: 192,088 acres

4% of overall county acreage

Population has grown by over 200% and UGB has grown by 3%
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Statewide Planning Goal 14 – Urbanization

- Requires the establishment and maintenance of UGB by local governments
- Requires the UGB to accommodate long range urban population needs

OAR Chapter 660 - Division 24 (Urban Growth Boundaries)

- Process and analysis required to carry out UGB requirements of Goal 14
ISSUES WITH CONSTRAINED GROWTH

- No increase in tax base to support continued provision of city services (COGs vs. Revenue)
- Decrease levels of service or increase taxes
- Increased disparity in housing affordability
- Increased density and infill development
- Change in historic development pattern of McMinnville
- Sprawling development on surrounding county land
HIGHER LAND COSTS

Reduces Affordability of Housing

Forces workers to live in outlying cities and commute
  Increased traffic
  Increased Pollution from Cars
  Reduction in Livability for average citizen

These results are not consistent with Smart Growth principles
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HIGHER LAND COSTS

Forces Higher Density

- Density can have aesthetic and social impacts if not done right
- Density can limit housing choices
PLANNING VERSUS LAND USE

THERE IS A DIFFERENCE . . . .

State land-use system is all about resource land protection.

Local planning is all about building community within smart growth principles.
SMART GROWTH PRINCIPLES

Appropriate mix of Land Uses:

- Compact, mixed-use, pedestrian friendly
- Complete neighborhoods with Civic amenities, commercial centers, schools and parks within walking distance
- Concentrated Commercial / Mixed-use Centers
- Integrate land uses so people can work and play near where they live
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Mix of Housing Types and Income Levels

- Affordable housing evenly distributed, each neighborhood with a broad range of housing types and price levels
- Variety of housing types and sizes within zones so young to old can find suitable housing for their life-stage
- Range of housing choices: apartments, townhomes, traditional suburban single family home with range of lot sizes
PLANNING – MISSING PIECES
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PLANNING – BUILDING A PUZZLE

HOUSING
SCHOOLS
TRAILS
SAFETY
SEWER
JOBS
STORES
LANDSCAPE
WATER
PARKS
ART
TREES
ROADS
SIDEWALKS
LIGHTS
FREIGHT
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PLANNING – BUILDING A PUZZLE
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PLANNING – BUILDING A PUZZLE

QUALITY OF LIFE:
PEOPLE
ENDURING VALUE
PUBLIC HEALTH
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PLANNING – BUILDING A PUZZLE

QUALITY OF LIFE:
- PEOPLE
- ENDURING VALUE
- PUBLIC HEALTH

BUSINESS MODEL:
- INFRASTRUCTURE

SUPPLY VS. DEMAND

GROWTH FUNDS SERVICES
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FUNDING SERVICES

$ \hspace{1cm} \text{Time}

\text{Cost of Goods} = \text{General Fund} \hspace{1cm} 6-7\%
\text{Public Services (Police, Fire,}
\text{Library, Parks, Planning, Admin)}
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FUNDING SERVICES

Cost of Goods = General Fund
Public Services (Police, Fire, Library, Parks, Planning, Admin)

Property Tax Revenue

6–7%

3% + Growth

TIME
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FUNDING SERVICES

Cost of Goods = General Fund
Public Services (Police, Fire, Library, Parks, Planning, Admin

Property Tax Revenue

DEFICIT = REDUCED LOS

6 - 7%
3% + Growth

TIME
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VALUE CHOICES - IT IS NOT ALL OR NOTHING

BIG LOTS
LAND
CONSUMPTIVE
EXPENSIVE

SMALL LOTS
QUALITY OF LIFE
RESILIENCY
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OUR CURRENT SITUATION

CONSTRAINED LAND SUPPLY IS LEADING TO:

• Higher Land Costs
• Lack of Affordable Housing Opportunities
• Lack of Overall Housing Opportunities
• Loss of Economic Opportunities
• Falsely Constrained Population Growth
• More Population Growth in Unincorporated versus McMinnville
• Deficit in Tax Revenue to Fund Public LOS
• Infill in a Vacuum
• Pressure to Efficiently Use Land w/out Long-Term Consideration
• Paralysis to Move Forward
OUR CURRENT SITUATION

CONSTRAINED LAND SUPPLY IS LEADING TO:

• Higher Land Costs

And we are meant to continue to grow in population by the state population forecast . . . .

2035 = 44,122
2067 = 62,804

• Pressure to Efficiently Use Land w/out Long-Term Consideration
• Paralysis to Move Forward
POPULATION FORECAST
HISTORIC TRENDS
Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, 1930 to 2010 Censuses. Calculated by Population Research Center (PRC).

Note 1: Average annual growth rate is used for simplicity. In actuality the rate is an annualized rate calculated with this formula: [LN(Year1/Year2)/10]

Note 2: The 2000 total population does not reflect Count Question Resolution (CQR) revisions made by the U.S. Census Bureau. Revised total population numbers are used for the “County and Incorporated City Population” table.
Yamhill County—City Share of Population
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### Yamhill County and Incorporated Cities—Population and Average Annual Growth Rate (AAGR) (2000-2010 and 2010-2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yamhill County</td>
<td>84,992</td>
<td>99,193</td>
<td>103,630</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amity</td>
<td>1,478</td>
<td>1,614</td>
<td>1,620</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlton</td>
<td>1,514</td>
<td>2,007</td>
<td>2,125</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton</td>
<td>2,119</td>
<td>2,534</td>
<td>2,590</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dundee</td>
<td>2,598</td>
<td>3,162</td>
<td>3,185</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lafayette</td>
<td>2,586</td>
<td>3,742</td>
<td>3,905</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>McMinnville</strong></td>
<td>26,499</td>
<td>32,187</td>
<td>33,080</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td><strong>31.2%</strong></td>
<td><strong>32.4%</strong></td>
<td><strong>31.9%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newberg</td>
<td>18,064</td>
<td>22,068</td>
<td>22,900</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheridan</td>
<td>5,561</td>
<td>6,127</td>
<td>6,115</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willamina (part)</td>
<td>1,128</td>
<td>1,180</td>
<td>1,197</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yamhill</td>
<td>794</td>
<td>1,024</td>
<td>1,070</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated</td>
<td>22,651</td>
<td>23,548</td>
<td>25,843</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources:** U.S. Census Bureau, April 1, 2000 and 2010 Censuses. Population Research Center, July 1, 2015 Annual Intercensal Estimate. Calculated by Population Research Center (PRC).

**Note:** The 2000 total population reflects Count Question Resolution (CQR) revisions made by the U.S. Census Bureau.

**Note:** Willamina’s population in Yamhill County is 58% of Willamina’s total population in 2010 and 59% in 2015.

---
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2010 – 2015
McMinnville = 0.5%
Unincorporated = 1.9%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yamhill County</td>
<td>84,992</td>
<td>99,193</td>
<td>103,630</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amity</td>
<td>1,478</td>
<td>1,614</td>
<td>1,620</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlton</td>
<td>1,514</td>
<td>2,007</td>
<td>2,125</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton</td>
<td>2,119</td>
<td>2,534</td>
<td>2,590</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dundee</td>
<td>2,598</td>
<td>3,162</td>
<td>3,185</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lafayette</td>
<td>2,586</td>
<td>3,742</td>
<td>3,905</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMinnville</td>
<td>26,499</td>
<td>32,187</td>
<td>33,080</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newberg</td>
<td>18,064</td>
<td>22,068</td>
<td>22,900</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheridan</td>
<td>5,561</td>
<td>6,127</td>
<td>6,115</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willamina (part)</td>
<td>1,128</td>
<td>1,180</td>
<td>1,197</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yamhill</td>
<td>794</td>
<td>1,024</td>
<td>1,070</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated</td>
<td>22,651</td>
<td>23,548</td>
<td>25,843</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Note: The 2000 total population reflects Count Question Resolution (CQR) revisions made by the U.S. Census Bureau.

Note: Willamina’s population in Yamhill County is 58% of Willamina’s total population in 2010 and 59% in 2015.
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2010 – 2015
McMinnville = 0.5%
Unincorporated = 1.9%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>AAGRs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>15,480</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>15,875</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>16,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>17,115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>17,894</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>18,840</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>19,125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>20,070</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>20,995</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>22,140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>22,880</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>23,485</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>23,485</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>24,450</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>20,469</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>27,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>28,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>28,890</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>29,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>30,020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>30,950</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>31,665</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>32,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>32,760</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>32,187</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>32,240</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>32,435</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>32,610</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>32,705</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>33,080</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>33,405</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30 year Population Growth: AAGR 2.6% 17,945
Residential Permit Comparison

- Newberg Total Residential Permits
- Grants Pass Total Residential Permits
- Redmond Total Residential Permits
- Oregon City Total Residential Permits
- Keizer Total Residential Permits
- McMinnville Total Residential Permits

Year:
- 1990
- 1995
- 2000
- 2005
- 2010
- 2015

Permits:
- 0
- 250
- 500
- 750
- 1000
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Yamhill County—Age Structure of the Population (2000 and 2010)

- **2000**
  - Older than 65 years old: 22.2%
  - Ages 15 to 64 years old: 66.1%
  - Younger than 14 years old: 11.7%

- **2010**
  - Older than 65 years old: 20.6%
  - Ages 15 to 64 years old: 66.1%
  - Younger than 14 years old: 13.4%
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Yamhill County—Age Structure of the Population (2000 and 2010)
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Yamhill County and Oregon—Age Specific Migration Rates (2000 to 2010)
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Yamhill County—Components of Population Change (2015-2065)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Net In/Out Mig.</th>
<th>Nat. Inc./Dec.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>3,001</td>
<td>1,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>6,433</td>
<td>1,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>7,749</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>8,264</td>
<td>-199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>8,628</td>
<td>-937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td>8,769</td>
<td>-1,553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2045</td>
<td>8,768</td>
<td>-1,929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2050</td>
<td>8,784</td>
<td>-2,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2055</td>
<td>8,754</td>
<td>-2,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2060</td>
<td>8,772</td>
<td>-2,413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2065</td>
<td>8,742</td>
<td>-2,599</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Forecast by Population Research Center (PRC)
Yamhill County—Average Annual Natural Increase/Decrease

Sources: Oregon Health Authority, Center for Health Statistics. Calculations and Forecast by Population Research Center (PRC).
Note: The years signify the end of the period for which average annual numbers were calculated. The average annual numbers for "2010" were calculated for the 2000-2010 period, with the remaining years calculated for their preceding five-year periods.
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Yamhill County—Age Structure of the Population

Source: Forecast by Population Research Center (PRC)
Larger Sub-Areas—Average Annual Net In/Out-Migrants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>McMinnville</th>
<th>Newberg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000-2010</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-2035</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035-2065</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>529</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The average annual numbers were calculated for the 10 year period (2000-2010), the 20 year period (2015-2035), and the 30 year period (2035-2065)
### Historical and Forecast Populations for Yamhill County and its Sub-Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Historical</th>
<th>AAGR (2000-2010)</th>
<th>Forecast</th>
<th>AAGR (2017-2035)</th>
<th>AAGR (2035-2067)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yamhill County</td>
<td>84,992</td>
<td>99,193</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>106,555</td>
<td>135,096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amity UGB</td>
<td>1,481</td>
<td>1,623</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>1,642</td>
<td>1,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlton UGB</td>
<td>1,514</td>
<td>2,007</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>2,229</td>
<td>3,013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton UGB</td>
<td>2,244</td>
<td>2,708</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>2,837</td>
<td>3,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dundee UGB</td>
<td>2,672</td>
<td>3,162</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>3,243</td>
<td>4,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaston UGB (Yamhill)</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lafayette UGB</td>
<td>2,586</td>
<td>3,742</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>4,083</td>
<td>5,717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMinnville UGB</td>
<td>26,709</td>
<td>32,527</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>34,293</td>
<td>44,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newberg UGB</td>
<td>18,558</td>
<td>22,572</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>24,296</td>
<td>34,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheridan UGB</td>
<td>5,581</td>
<td>6,210</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>6,340</td>
<td>6,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willamina UGB (Yamhill)</td>
<td>1,128</td>
<td>1,180</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>1,227</td>
<td>1,272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yamhill UGB</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>1,024</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>1,077</td>
<td>1,338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside UGBs</td>
<td>21,604</td>
<td>22,284</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>25,132</td>
<td>28,880</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000 and 2010 Censuses; Forecast by Population Research Center (PRC).
# PSU POPULATION FORECASTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2035</th>
<th>2067</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yamhill County</td>
<td>84,992</td>
<td>99,193</td>
<td>106,555</td>
<td>135,096</td>
<td>177,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMinnville UGB</td>
<td>26,709</td>
<td>32,527</td>
<td>34,293</td>
<td>44,122</td>
<td>62,804</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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HOW DO WE ACCOMMODATE THAT POPULATION
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>GROWTH VS. NO-GROWTH</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Growth</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased Tax Base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to Continue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levels of City Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased Land Supply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides Opportunity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for Affordable Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide Variety of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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WHERE DO THE PEOPLE GO

GROW UP

City Council, 03.13.18
WHERE DO THE PEOPLE GO

GROW OUT
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WHERE DO THE PEOPLE GO

OR SOMEWHERE IN BETWEEN
WHERE DO THE PEOPLE GO

OR SOMEWHERE IN BETWEEN
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WHERE DO THE PEOPLE GO

OR SOMEWHERE IN BETWEEN
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PSU POPULATION FORECASTS

- McMinnville growth by 2035: **9,829 New Residents**
  - Increase of 29%
  - 3,765 new households* (700 Acres)
    - 10% Land Addition – City, 0.4% EFU Land Subtraction)
  - 34.4% of Yamhill County population growth in McMinnville

- McMinnville growth by 2067: **28,511 New Residents**
  - Increase of 83%
  - 10,923 new households* (1900 Acres)
    - 30% Land Addition - City, 0.99% EFU Land Subtraction)
  - 40.4% of Yamhill County population growth in McMinnville

*2010 Decennial Census: Average Household Size of 2.61
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OREGON LAND USE – PLAN FOR GROWTH

- Long-Term planning for land-use efficiencies, fiscally prudent public infrastructure (How to grow, pay for growth and manage growth to protect unique quality of life values).

- Future Land-Use Planning for Quality of Life

- Public Facility Master Planning

- Funding Mechanisms

- City Limits for Urban Development
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OREGON URBAN PLANNING

Public Facility Planning in UGB:

- Transportation
- Wastewater
- Water
- Parks
- Housing
- Employment
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GROWTH PLANNING

1) URBAN RESERVE AREA
   (50 YEAR LAND SUPPLY)

2) STANDARD URBAN GROWTH BOUNDARY
   (20 YEAR LAND SUPPLY)

3) SIMPLIFIED URBAN GROWTH BOUNDARY
   (14 YEAR LAND SUPPLY)

4) INCREMENTAL AMENDMENTS
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STANDARD UGB PROCESS

Step 1: Land Inventory
Buildable Lands Inventory (BLI) for Housing & Employment Lands

Step 2: Determine Needs
Housing Needs Analysis (HNA) & Economic Opportunities Analysis (EOA)

Step 3: Compare Needs with Inventory
If inadequate development capacity within UGB, amend plans and potentially expand UGB

Step 4: Analyze Development Capacity within UGB
Cities that were recently successful in expanding UGBs (Bend, Grants Pass) have adopted efficiency measures

Step 5: Evaluate Land for UGB Expansion
Create study area, and exclude lands if impracticable to develop

Step 6: Evaluate Land in Study Area for Inclusion in UGB
Apply priorities to land, and identify suitable lands for inclusion
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RESIDENTIAL INVENTORY & NEED

- **Buildable Lands Inventory**
  - Identify vacant, partially vacant, undevelopable and developed lands within existing UGB
  - Can include residential and employment lands
  - Result: Determination of buildable acreage by plan designation (zoning district)

- **Housing Needs Analysis**
  - Identify housing needs using projected growth rates and local/regional trends in housing
  - Compare demand to supply - Apply needed housing types to buildable lands to determine capacity within existing UGB
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EMPLOYMENT LAND NEEDS

- Economic Opportunity Analysis
  - Similar to Housing Needs Analysis but for employment land
  - Determine needs for employment land and capacity within existing UGB
  - McMinnville has acknowledged EOA completed Nov. 2013
    - Identified surplus in industrial lands (235.9 acres) and deficit in commercial lands (35.8 acres)

City Council, 03.13.18
STANDARD UGB AMENDMENT

PROCESS ASSUMPTIONS

- Standard BLI process allows for application of local plan policies to vacant & partially vacant lands

- “Safe Harbors” exist that define specific assumptions to be used in projecting housing need and future land development
  - Assumptions include: Household size, vacancy rate, housing densities, housing type mix
  - These “safe harbors” would not be appealable
RESPONSE TO LAND DEFICIENCY

- If inventory and needs analysis demonstrate inadequate development capacity within UGB, city must:
  - “Amend the plan to satisfy the need deficiency, either by increasing the development capacity of land already inside the city or by expanding the UGB, or both…” *

- Cities recently successful in UGB expansions (Bend, Grants Pass) first analyzed land within existing UGB and adopted “efficiency measures”
  - Explored up-zoning, increased densities, allowable uses, etc.

*OAR 660-24-0050 (4)
EVALUATE LAND FOR UGB EXPANSION

- Establish Study Area to include:
  - All land within 1 mile of existing UGB
  - All exception lands contiguous to an exception area that includes land within 1 mile of existing UGB

- Land can be excluded from study area if it is:
  - Impracticable to provide public facilities
  - Subject to significant development hazards
  - A significant scenic, natural, or cultural resource
EVALUATE LAND FOR UGB EXPANSION

Prioritize land in Study Area:
- First Priority: Urban Reserve, Exception Land, and Non-resource Land
- Second Priority: Marginal land
- Third Priority: Forest or farm land that is not predominately high-value farm land
- Fourth Priority: High-value farm land

All vacant or partially vacant land in a priority class is “suitable” to satisfy land need

City to prove certain conditions exist to not include land from lower priorities before moving to higher priorities
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>STANDARD UGB PROCESS</th>
<th>SIMPLIFIED UGB PROCESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning Horizon</td>
<td>20 Years</td>
<td>14 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLI</td>
<td>-Ability to use more accurate data</td>
<td>-Reqt. to use County assessor’s data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Use local plan policies to designate</td>
<td>-Designate smaller areas (3,000 sf) as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>buildable lots</td>
<td>vacant, buildable lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Land Need</td>
<td>-Use of Housing Needs Analysis</td>
<td>-Pre-determined formulas to project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Flexibility is assigning future housing</td>
<td>needed number of dwelling units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>densities &amp; housing type mix</td>
<td>-Use of pre-determined housing densities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-“Safe Harbors” can be used, which</td>
<td>&amp; ratios for housing type mix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>are similar to reqd. assumptions in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>simplified process, but not all are reqd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Land Need</td>
<td>-Use of acknowledged EOA</td>
<td>-Pre-determined formulas for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>projecting employment land need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expansion Land Analysis</td>
<td>-Same in both processes</td>
<td>-Same in both processes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STAFF RECOMMENDATION

- Need to initiate a discussion about growth asap.
- Pursue a substantial UGB amendment.
- Recommend a Urban Reserve Area analysis and establishment
- Recommend standard UGB Amendment process
- Minimum of 5 Years
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LONG TERM VISION - URA

Big picture 50-year growth plan.

Future certainty for growth areas.

Oversize public facilities to serve future growth area.
FRAMEWORK PLAN - UGB

Conceptual guide for future lands in the UGB holding zone.

General guidance to community form and design.

Promote residential service centers that are bike and pedestrian friendly with public spaces.
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FRAMEWORK PLAN

1. General Land Uses
2. Road Connections and Extensions
3. Mixed Use Neighborhood Centers
4. Gateways
5. View Corridors
6. Trails
7. Parks
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AREA PLANS:

- Public facilities are cohesive and adequate
- Schools
- Mix of housing units
LONG-TERM PLANNING: URA TO SITE
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CLOSE TO HOME
BY JOHN McPHERSON

"WELL, YOU KNOW WHAT THIS MEANS? NO CHRISTMAS BONUS THIS YEAR."
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CONNECTIONS ARE IMPORTANT AND NEED TO BE PREPLANNED
MAKING IT ALL WORK
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MAKING IT ALL WORK
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MAKING IT ALL WORK
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MAKING IT ALL WORK
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MAKING IT ALL WORK
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MAKING IT ALL WORK
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WHAT HAPPENS UNDERGROUND IS IMPORTANT
MAKING IT ALL WORK

YAMHILL RIVER GREENWAY – IMAGINE:
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CONNECTIVITY: BIKE/PED TRAILS
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GREAT NEIGHBORHOOD PRINCIPLES

- Walkable & Bikable
- Interconnected Streets
- Variety of Housing Choices
- Diverse Mix of Activities
- Open Spaces
- Public Art
- Scenic Views
- Environmentally-Friendly Design
- Urban-Rural Interface
- Integrated Design Elements
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WHAT ARE THE TWO THINGS MCMINNVILLIANS HATE MOST?
DENSITY
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GOLDILOCKS UGB

NOT TOO BIG
NOT TOO SMALL
BUT JUST RIGHT FOR McMINTNNGVILLE

Defined by community dialogue and values, thoughtful planning, great neighborhood principles, enduring value for future generations.
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EVERYTHING YOU’VE EVER WANTED IS ON THE OTHER SIDE OF FEAR

- George Addair