

**NEWBERG 2030 URBAN GROWTH BOUNDARY
CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
SEPTEMBER 20, 2018, 3:30 PM
NEWBERG CITY HALL (414 E FIRST STREET)**

ROLL CALL

Members Attending: Sid Friedman, Claudia Stewart, Brian Doyle, Todd Engle, Curt Walker

Members Not in Attendance: Fred Gregory, Ryan Howard, Lisa Rogers, Curt Walker, and Larry Hampton

Staff, Consultant Team, and Project Management Team: Doug Rux, Brett Musick, Bob Parker (EcoNW), Margaret Raimann (EcoNW), and Meabon Burns (Jacobs)

Public: Students from University of Calgary

WELCOME/INTRODUCTIONS

Doug Rux opened the meeting at 3:30 p.m.

Motion to approve minutes. Approved.

Introductions were made.

Overview of Progress Since Meeting #1

Bob Parker provided a review of the Division 38 rule and the steps required. There are a number of steps before completing a serviceability analysis. ECONorthwest and Jacobs drafted methodologies about how to approach this process, and Bob Parker reminded the committee that Newberg is the first to go through the Division 38 process.

After the last meeting, the consultants looked at two study areas to test the methodology for a high-level serviceability analysis. Jacobs evaluated these based on the factors that the rule requires: water, wastewater, and transportation.

Meabon Burns provided an overview of the Jacobs analysis, which was provided to the CAC in the meeting packet. The current analysis shows how each area would be evaluated if the committees approve of the approach. She noted that the preliminary serviceability analysis is blank right now, because all of the areas need to be looked at first. This analysis would be a description of relative serviceability of each area based on exclusions in Division 38—that would be the baseline for excluding areas in the final study area. Then, the analysis would be followed by a high-level qualitative assessment of relative ease of serviceability. This is similar to how a feasibility study would be done.

Opened to comments from CAC

Sid Friedman commented that we shouldn't be making choices purely on ease of serviceability. This should be more detailed, and more about impracticability to service. Meabon Burns noted that this is just a qualitative ranking, not a recommendation. Bob Parker confirmed that it's not a prioritization

ranking. Doug Rux talked about the intent of this analysis—to test out what it would take to service the area, with no numbers attached. The goal of the meeting is to walk out with the CAC's approval of the methodology.

Todd Engle asked about how areas A and B were determined, and Claudia Stewart asked about the boundaries for Area B where the bypass comes through. Doug and Bob explained that they are within areas in Exception lands and topographical features. Sid Friedman ask about the land between the UGB. Doug confirmed that there is resource land between the UGB and Area B.

Sid Friedman had a few comments prepared after reviewing the analysis before the meeting:

1. Area B: Only portions of Area B could not be served by future pressure zones. Not all of it. Would it make sense to refine the analysis to look at areas within?
 - Meabon Burns commented that there might be something in the zone for the entire area that could provide a reason to include it. She suggested that this step could happen after looking at the Division 38 exclusions.
 - Bob Parker added that if after going through the assessment there is less than twice the amount of land needed, then they would potentially review those areas that were initially excluded due to pressure zones.
2. Area A: There are some portions of certain taxlots where the UGB does extend past the stream. These are mostly close to the highway.
3. Overall it was a good qualitative analysis of the various service factors.

Bob Parker asked about the process for dividing up the study areas. ECONorthwest and Jacobs will work with the City to divide study areas based on drainage basins and other physical considerations. He asked if the CAC would like those divided study areas to be circulated to CAC members. Doug Rux added that they cannot answer certain questions at this point because the BLI is not finished yet—this is the reason for completing two rounds of serviceability. Bob Parker and Doug Rux reiterated that they are looking for approval from the CAC on this approach as a next step. CAC members agreed that the approach seems reasonable.

If there are any other comments that come up, CAC members can send to City staff.

Land Need Estimates

Bob Parker described the calculator that DLCD developed for the Simplified UGB process. Most of the calculations are fixed based on data for Newberg, but some values are at the discretion of the City. These assumptions do not require findings, but the City wants to bring this to the CAC now to start a discussion. Doug Rux explained further that he wants feedback from the TAC and CAC before taking to the PC and CC. The committees' comments will help advise the Council for policy decisions.

Bob Parker walked through the residential calculator. Bob and Doug mentioned that they have a question into DLCD about the planning period, since the numbers are fixed.

Sid Friedman asked if Newberg's population goes over 25,000 by 2019 then will there be different requirements for the estimates and study area requirements? Bob Parker said that ECO will check if the rule specifies this or check with DLCD.

Bob Parker walked through the housing need assumptions—ADUs and Mixed-Use and Redevelopment. Doug Rux added that the City has revised policies on ADUs. Bob Parker asked for committee to dialog on these assumption ranges.

Claudia Stewart asked whether the Census in 2020 would change the implications of these numbers. Doug Rux explained that it depends when the City adopts, and they might have to work with DLCD. Bob Parker also noted that Census numbers might not be available until after this process is over.

Sid Friedman recommended more mid-range numbers overall. Both of the policy changes should result in an upward trend compared to what has happened. This will happen more with mixed-use than redevelopment, since Springbrook Master Plan has mixed use. Doug Rux noted that the village area was previously modeled on C-3 standards and there is 10 acres of neighborhood commercial that could be used as mixed use. Sid Friedman said regardless of what is in the BLI, what is on the ground will be a lot of mixed use units.

Bob Parker moved on to the next set of assumptions in Housing Mix and Land Need—housing mix change and future housing mix. Bob Parker reviewed the assessment in the memo, noting that there may be some shifts in a mix, but over this type of period the City would need to take dramatic steps to incentivize more density and shift the mix more than a few percentage points.

Sid Friedman asked if the increase is for new development only or the entire land base? Bob Parker said he will check with DLCD. Doug Rux reviewed what the city needs to do to meet ranges for dwelling units per acre in low and medium density.

Sid asked how the percentages match up with what the last HNA stated for needed units. Todd Engle asked the same question—does this represent the need for low, medium, high densities? Doug Rux said he will have to revisit what the projected need was in the last HNA. He reminded the committee about the recent policy change for annexations (10% for HDR), and the same for UGB expansions over 15 acres. This will result in HDR dispersed in the community. Doug Rux needs to figure out if this is factored into the mix already. Bob Parker noted that the BLI will help figure this out as well.

Sid Friedman mentioned that looking closer to the mid-range for dwellings per acre might be worthwhile. Todd Engle noted that there is an aging population, with a growing need for caregivers and senior housing, so it makes sense for more high-density housing. Sid Friedman also agreed that the demographic needs have changed. Claudia Stewart noted that the jobs in the hospital are not always high paying jobs.

Bob Parker reviewed the employment calculator estimates. Efficiency gain is the only assumption required. He explained that 20% of jobs will be assumed to be jobs on non-employment lands, due to factors such as home occupations and residential zoned businesses. Efficiency gain can vary widely across cities. Bob Parker mentioned that next time ECONorthwest can run a sensitivity analysis with the CAC to see how each percentage would change the results. (This requires the BLI to be finished.)

Todd Engle mentioned that there will be an increase in retired populations in the City. Bob Parker noted that the PSU forecasts try to account for that—as more retirees move in the population to jobs ratio may go up.

Sid Friedman asked about the industrial 1% and whether it is a fixed number. Bob Parker confirmed that it is a fixed number. Sid Friedman asked about other things that the City can do to provide more efficiency, such as reducing parking requirements. He also asked for a translation of efficiency gain and whether it is an increase to the existing figure. If so, then the range in the assumption would not make a large difference. Bob Parker said he will check with the rule and DLCD on this question.

Bob Parker mentioned that DLCD said they will have revisions to the rule by January. After that time, ECO can update the BLI and finish the calculator inputs.

Bob asked for any other comments. There were none.

Adjournment

Brett Musick adjourned the meeting at 4:33pm.

Approved by the Newberg 2030 Citizen Advisory Committee this 20th day of September, 2018.



Larry Hampton, Vice Chair



Cheryl Caines, Senior Planner