



# ***Marion County***

## **OREGON**

### **PLANNING COMMISSION**

#### **PLANNING COMMISSION**

George Grabenhorst - Chair  
Mike Fischer - Vice Chair  
Stanley Birch  
Mike Long  
Carla Mikkelson  
Gary Monders  
(vacant)  
(vacant)  
(vacant)

#### **AGENDA**

**DATE:** November 3, 2008

**TIME:** 6:30 p.m.

**PLACE:** Senator Hearing Room, Courthouse Square Bldg.

Present: Board of Commissioners Brentano and Milne and Planning Commission members Grabenhorst, Fischer, Long, Mikkelson, Birch and Monders

1. Work Session on the County Population Forecast Project.
  - o Introduction by Commissioner Brentano

Commissioner Brentano commented when he started his first term, two cities were suing Marion County over population projection numbers. He asked that the cities let the County know if they want to be aggressive with numbers, unhappy with projections, etc. so that doesn't happen this time. Commissioner Milne agreed and added each city has its own personality and challenges which the County understands and the Board looks forward to working with them through this project.

- o Planning staff background information

Brandon Reich, Associate Planner, explained the County is undertaking this project to coordinate a population forecast for itself and the 20 cities. The last forecast was for 2020 and this project is to 2030. Mr. Reich added good data is important as the County and cities use the information for planning projects and for future forecasts. He concluded the County contracted with Portland State University to conduct the data collection using agreed-upon methodology.

- o Presentation by Portland State University's Population Research Center on Year 2030 population forecasts

Charles Reinerson explained he is with the Center for Urban Studies and this center works each year with the state's cities and counties to collect population projections. He stated this information is important as it is used for taxing information, state and

federal funding, etc. Mr. Reinerson presented a slide show that outlined:

- how Marion County has grown through the decades through growth periods and periods of decline;
- the current decade falls between slow growth of the 80's and fast growth of the 90's;
- the average annual growth rate is a 1.2%
- PSU uses cohort components as a model for forecasting, including age trends, mortality and fertility rates, and migration;
- how to account for cycle factors which result in high and low series (forecasts) and that the middle, or average series is then used.

Mr. Reinerson reviewed various tables from the report showing the County and its 5 largest cities (Silverton, Woodburn, Salem, Keizer and Stayton) and the cohort components. For small cities, housing unit methods are used as the cohort methodology doesn't work well. He added this information is currently available on the Planning Division website. Mr. Reinerson explained the difference between population forecasting versus projections, which is important when reviewing information for the small cities.

- Questions and comments from the Planning Commission and Board of Commissioners

Commissioner Brentano asked how the current economic situation impacts the forecasting? Mr. Reinerson replied they take a long-term approach but take into consideration high and low periods, such as the 80's and 90's. The real problem occurs if the high or low comes at the beginning of a decade but he reminded everyone it is forecasting. Commissioner Milne asked about the unincorporated area population, outside city limits, which is quite large? Mr. Reinerson replied that was correct. Les Sasaki, Principal Planner, added this number includes a majority of northeast Salem residents. Commissioner Milne reiterated there are a significant number of people living outside city limits. The group concurred. Mr. Reinerson stated the Center feels this number will continue to decline in the future and that number is growing at a slower rate than the number for cities, partly due to land use laws. Mr. Birch asked about migration from Portland to more rural areas? Mr. Reinerson replied this issue has been taken into consideration, particularly for areas such as Aurora and Hubbard with people commuting. He added there have been recent changes in this factor with the increased gas prices and fewer people seem interested in moving further away from their jobs.

- Questions and comments from the audience

David Sawyer, City of Turner, went on the record as indicating Turner wants to be aggressive with numbers. The City feels it is important in order to get a better tax base, infrastructure, etc. which is based on a greater population. He added the addition of their sewer system greatly changed their numbers and wants that noted as part of the individual differences between the smaller cities. Mr. Sawyer stated there are developments connected with Salem that will happen in the near future that will positively impact Turner's population. He asked about the next steps and the schedule, slated for 9 months, and that Turner is concerned with "getting lost" among the bigger cities. Commissioner Brentano asked what the City thought about the number currently listed for Turner? Mr. Sawyer replied it is a high figure, but based on these other factors that will create a sustainable growth in Turner, the City would like to stick to a high number. He added the proximity to Salem is an important factor. Commissioner Brentano asked about the overall strategy for working out the numbers with the cities? Mr. Reich replied it is up to the County to

determine the numbers, based on this methodology. There is some flexibility, but it must have a basis to be changed, such as Turner's sewer addition. Planning staff is looking for more discussions with the cities as the project moves along and the numbers are changed.

Dan Fleishman, City of Stayton, commented these numbers seem more realistic than the numbers from the last forecast. Stayton has increased infrastructure but with the economic downturn it may not have an impact at this time. He asked about change in school enrollment being used as a factor? Mr. Reinerson explained this data is used to correlate population data, city boundaries, and school enrollment to get a better idea of the migration factor. It helps determine migration of families, where they're going, migration of young adults, etc. Mr. Fleishman stated there are private schools with enrollment levels of 10-15% and were those counted? Mr. Reinerson replied that data would not have been included and agreed Stayton has a higher number of privately enrolled schools, but it appeared the private school enrollment wasn't growing at a higher rate than public schools.

Rinata (no last name given), City of Aurora, stated Planning staff has been very cooperative. She has not yet met with city officials to discuss their view of the draft forecasting. She had one question about why census data is not used? Mr. Reinerson replied city boundaries change making it difficult to correlate with the census data. Rinata asked about PSU numbers used from 2005 versus 2007? Mr. Reinerson replied 2007 numbers were considered but they are not yet certified. He added Aurora is a bit different as it had a period of slow growth but quite a bit of development over the last couple of years. This creates difficulty in viewing housing capacity, infrastructure, proximity to Portland and land use constraints.

Mr. Reich commented Marion County has more cities than any other county in the state. He added the study has a lot of information for both the large and smaller cities. All jurisdictions can use this information as we go through the forecasting project. Mr. Reich stated more information was gathered for this study in order to help all jurisdictions go through the process. He added staff hopes to have meetings with staff for each city, town hall meetings, to go over all of the information. Meeting format and schedule will be up to each city and reps from the state and the Board will attend. Feedback from these meetings will be used to adjust the forecast numbers. All of this information will go to the Board for at least one public hearing, with final adoption in the late spring of 2009. Mr. Reich indicated there is plenty of time for meetings with the cities and coordinating. Mr. Sasaki added staff hopes to get each city's endorsement of the final numbers or even to know if they disagree, then staff could meet and discuss the basis for a potential change (higher or lower). He added these numbers are subject to change and are used for comprehensive planning changes, urban growth boundary expansions, and this is a 2030 forecast. If a city comes in for a comprehensive plan change in the next few years, they may be looking at 2020 or 2025 numbers. This 2030 forecast may not always be used as cities come to the County for updates. Mr. Sasaki stated there is flexibility in the forecasts and changes will occur as we coordinate with the cities as they update their plans or have a need for a forecasting number.

Mr. Sasaki stated it will be a little difficult to schedule these city meetings as they tend to meet on the same night but staff will work it out based on a city's need to meet sooner than others. Some have an immediate need for the information as they are in the process of doing plan updates. Staff will send out a letter to each city asking for feedback on when they would like to meet and then schedule accordingly.

Mr. Sawyer encouraged the County to move the process along as they have waited a long time to get the data and Turner has held off on certain projects as they waited. He feels this

is a priority and wants the County to avoid a problem in April if the larger cities show up and demand more numbers. Commissioner Brentano asked if tentative adoption of numbers could be given to a city if they need one right away – a smaller city with a small number that wouldn't impact others? Mr. Reich replied staff will determine the need to resolve a city's number and try and give them a number for some planning purposes. Mr. Sasaki added the problem is there are 22 cities and the numbers must be coordinated and add up to a total number. He concurred, though, shifting numbers for the smaller cities may not be an issue like it would be for a larger city and there will be some flexibility.

Ms. Mikkelson asked about the public involvement process? Commissioner Milne asked whether there will be individual hearings or one large hearing? Mr. Sasaki reviewed the past City of Woodburn process for the last forecast. He added this is a legislative amendment to the County's Plan so there will be a public hearing held to obtain public testimony which can be on the County's forecast number or a city number. There won't be a hearing for each city. Mr. Reich added staff will go out to each city to provide information and work with each city to provide more coordination ahead-of-time. He explained staff will work with each city on employment and transportation numbers, for example, that are a bit different than the population forecast number, and can be a bit more flexible. A lot of this coordination will be based on each city's needs. Commissioner Milne commented the Board wants a thorough process since it hasn't been done since 1999, but we have to be careful not to get too scattered around with the various cities and the numbers getting out of kilter. She supports staff getting out to the cities and determining those needs as quickly as possible and not waiting for the hearings until late spring. The group discussed meeting with the cities, scheduling, etc.

### 3. Adjournment

There being no further questions or comments, Commissioner Brentano thanked everyone for coming to the meeting and adjourned.