



**PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA**  
**November 12, 2015 7:00 PM**  
**NEWBERG PUBLIC SAFETY BUILDING**  
**401 EAST THIRD STREET**

**I. CALL MEETING TO ORDER**

**II. ROLL CALL**

**III. PUBLIC COMMENTS** (5-minute maximum per person – for items not on the agenda)

**IV. CONSENT CALENDAR** (items are considered routine and are not discussed unless requested by the commissioners)

1. Approval of September 28, 2015 Joint Planning Commission and City Council Meeting Minutes
2. Approval of October 8, 2015 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

**VI. LEGISLATIVE PUBLIC HEARING** (complete registration form to give testimony - 5 minute maximum per person, unless otherwise set by majority motion of the Planning Commission)

1. **Comprehensive Plan Amendment– Population Amendments:** Comprehensive Plan amendment to provide updated information in the historic population and population projections sections of the plan.

FILE NO.: CPTA-15-001                      RESOLUTION NO.: 2015-308

**VII. ITEMS FROM STAFF**

1. Newberg Downtown Improvement Plan update
2. Update on Council items
3. Other reports, letters or correspondence
4. Next Planning Commission meeting: December 10, 2015 7:00 PM

**VIII. ITEMS FROM COMMISSIONERS**

**IX. ADJOURNMENT**

FOR QUESTIONS PLEASE STOP BY, OR CALL 503-537-1240, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPT. – P.O. BOX 970 – 414 E. FIRST STREET

**ACCOMMODATION OF PHYSICAL IMPAIRMENTS:** *In order to accommodate persons with physical impairments, please notify the City Recorder's Office of any special physical or language accommodations you may need as far in advance of the meeting as possible as and no later than 48 business hours prior to the meeting. To request these arrangements, please contact the City Recorder at (503) 537-1283. For TTY services please dial 711.*

**NEWBERG CITY COUNCIL and PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES  
TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLAN WORKSHOP  
SEPTEMBER 28, 2015, 6:00 PM  
PUBLIC SAFETY BUILDING (401 E. THIRD STREET)**

**CALL MEETING TO ORDER**

The Mayor and Planning Commission Chairman called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

**ROLL CALL**

Council Members Present:

Mayor Bob Andrews	Scott Essin	Stephen McKinney	Lesley Woodruff
Denise Bacon	Mike Corey	Tony Rourke	

Planning Commission Members Present:

Chair Gary Bliss	Jason Dale	Matthew Fortner	Patrick Johnson
Philip Smith	Cathy Stuhr		

Staff Present: Stephen Rhodes, City Manager Pro Tem

Sue Ryan, City Recorder

Doug Rux, Community Development Director

Jessica Pelz, Associate Planner

Kaaren Hofmann, City Engineer

Truman Stone, City Attorney

Garth Appanaitis, DKS Associates

Carl Springer, DKS Associates

Terry Cole, ODOT

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:** None

**TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLAN UPDATE WORKSHOP:**

CDD Rux said tonight was about the update to the Transportation System Plan (TSP) and not on the Council's action on September 21 regarding Wilsonville Road. There had been discussions between ODOT and DKS Associates and the TSP contract would be extended until the end of June 2016 instead of February.

**PRESENTATION – TSP OVERVIEW:**

AP Pelz introduced DKS Associate Garth Appanaitis who would lead the discussion on the TSP update. She said this evening was meant to be a discussion on the goals, overall TSP draft, project list, project maps, and draft Code amendments. All transportation related issues would be resolved before the TSP would be adopted.

Mr. Appanaitis, DKS Associates, gave an overview of the process that had taken place so far, major elements and key assumptions of the Plan, and project list. Stakeholder interviews were done as well as holding an Open House and people could continue to submit comments. In general people liked the mix of projects, wanted staff to revisit the project costs, the CPRD projects were likely not going to be funded as they did not have funding, and should look at downtown opportunities, and map the future bypass phases.

Councilor McKinney asked if right-of-way had been purchased for the aspirational bypass. Terry Cole, ODOT, said no protective right-of-way had been purchased outside of the Phase 1 corridor and it was not in the budget within the planning horizon. Four lanes had been acquired for Phase 1.

PC Stuhr asked how this plan interfaced with the County plan for projects outside of the UGB. Mr. Appanaitis discussed how the projects could be put in the plan and would require ongoing staff coordination between the agencies. Project E-19 was an example, and could come off the map.

PC Stuhr suggested putting it on a separate map and any other projects like it.

Councilor Essin asked about the likely and unlikely funding, was the City going to be responsible for the funding sources? How did they know what was likely and unlikely?

Mr. Appanaitis said by being on the list it did not require or commit any entity to fund a project. It was looking at opportunities and what would most likely occur. Mr. Cole said the funding estimates had been developed with the help of city staff based on historical expenditures. They had looked at resources around the region and what share might come to Newberg. It was based on the current revenue stream, and was a conservative estimate for the future.

Councilor Essin said the bypass map ended at Highway 219, was there no consideration of where the traffic would go until Phase 2? Mr. Cole said this was to show the Phase 1 segment, the rest of the corridor had been analyzed and the alignment up to 99W had been identified.

**CODE AMENDMENT DISCUSSION:**

AP Pelz reviewed the Development Code amendments proposed that would refine the language to provide clarity and modernization and would reorganize the layout of Chapter 15. Sections were added to address existing policies and the public utilities and storm water sections had been bulked up. The Comprehensive Plan amendments removed redundancy and also reflected the current bypass and outdated policies were removed.

PC Stuhr suggested adding words “provide for safe, efficient, and equitable” in the street standards purpose. Under construction of new streets it stated “the adjoining land abutting the opposite side of the street was in the city limits and Urban Growth Boundary” and she thought they should say “or Urban Growth Boundary”. Regarding the Comprehensive Plan, some of the “shoulds” had been changed to “shalls” and vice versa in Comprehensive plan. AP Pelz thought it should be “should” in the Comprehensive Plan.

CDD Rux said the general rule of thumb was for the Comprehensive Plan the word “should” was used and for the implementing regulations the word “shall” was used. Staff was trying to correct any broken links among the documents and streamline the language to make it easier to understand and be more transparent.

PC Stuhr thought all the “shoulds” and “shalls” should be corrected.

**WRAP UP AND NEXT STEPS:**

AP Pelz said staff would take Council comments as they reviewed the materials. The draft would be finalized and brought to the Planning Commission first, and then the Council. It would not be brought back until the Wilsonville Road issue was resolved.

Mayor Andrews asked for an update on the bicycle and pedestrian project on College Street. CE Hofmann said the next phase of the bicycle and pedestrian project on N College Street was scheduled to start design in 2017.

Councilor Rourke said some charts did not have dollar signs attached to them. Mr. Appanaitis said they would go through and review those charts.

**ADJOURNMENT:** The meeting was adjourned at 7:00 p.m.

**Approved by the Newberg Planning Commission this 12th day of November, 2015.**

---

Sue Ryan, City Recorder

---

Gary Bliss, Planning Commission Chair

**NEWBERG PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES**  
**October 8, 2015, 7:00 PM**  
**PUBLIC SAFETY BUILDING (401 E. THIRD STREET)**

Chair Gary Bliss called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

**ROLL CALL**

Members Present:	Gary Bliss, Chair	Jason Dale	Patrick Johnson
	Philip Smith	Matthew Fortner	Allyn Edwards
	Cathy Stuhr	Luis Saavedra/student	

Staff Present: Jessica Pelz, Associate Planner  
Doug Rux, Community Development Director  
Bobbie Morgan, Planning Secretary

CDD Doug Rux introduced Patrick Johnson, new Planning Commissioner.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

Stan Halle, Director of the Ladd Hill Neighborhood Association and Chair of the Bypass Impact Committee, alerted the Commission to a letter they had submitted to the City which presented a sound legal basis to treat ODOT's proposed TSP amendment regarding Wilsonville Road as a quasi-judicial rather than a legislative matter. He introduced Brent Ahrend, Traffic and Civil Engineer, who had been hired by the Ladd Hill Neighborhood Association. It was Mr. Ahrend and his staff that found ODOT had not done the proper analysis for Wilsonville Road and had violated the National Environmental Protection Act. It was on this basis that ODOT came up with the proposal for the no-through design.

Mr. Ahrend wanted to rebut some comments made by Chair Bliss at the last City Council meeting.

CDD Rux was concerned about comments on an issue that the Commission would be holding a public hearing on, especially since Mr. Halle raised a question about the process for that hearing. If the process was a quasi-judicial hearing, there would be an appropriate time and place to take public testimony in a public hearing. There was a question of ex parte contact that may be occurring that would not be part of the record for a proceeding that would come forward in the future.

Chair Gary Bliss agreed and said Mr. Ahrend could submit his written testimony, which would be more appropriate for the upcoming public hearing.

PC Philip Smith was torn as he did not want to mess in any way with the proper procedure for the upcoming hearing, yet he did not want to stop open public comments.

AP Jessica Pelz wanted to make the commenters aware that any testimony they provided would not be part of the record for the application.

PC Cathy Stuhr thought it would put the Commission in an awkward position when it came to the hearing and they had to disclose it as ex parte contact.

PC Allyn Edwards recommended Mr. Ahrend submit written comments to be included in the public hearing process.

PC Patrick Johnson said many people wanted to talk to him about this issue, but he had avoided it because it would be ex parte contact. It was an open land use application and they needed to be careful about information they received.

**MOTION: PC Philip Smith/PC Cathy Stuhr** moved to encourage Mr. Ahrend to submit written comments and participate in the process when it came in front of the Planning Commission. Motion carried (7 Yes/0 No).

**CONSENT CALENDAR:**

Approval of August 13, 2015 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

**MOTION: PC Cathy Stuhr/PC Matthew Fortner** moved to approve the August 13, 2015 Planning Commission meeting minutes. Motion carried (6 Yes/0 No/1 Abstain [Johnson]).

**LEGISLATIVE PUBLIC HEARING:** Chair Gary Bliss called to order at 7:23 pm

**1. Comprehensive Plan Amendment – Population Forecast & Safe Harbor Employment**

**Forecast:** Adopt the coordinated population forecast for Yamhill County and an associated safe harbor employment forecast. FILE NO.: CPTA-15-001 RESOLUTION NO.: 2015-308 (continued from 06/25/15 PC meeting)

**Call for Abstentions and Objections to Jurisdiction:** None.

**Staff Report:** AP Jessica Pelz said staff was requesting to continue the hearing as some issues had come up that required more research. The purpose of the resolution was to re-adopt the coordinated population forecast because the City was repealing it as part of the industrial UGB amendment. By repealing the amendment, it took them back to the 2006 forecast. However, because of new Administrative Rules regarding population forecasts, there was no mechanism in the rule that allowed a City to adopt something older than what the rule envisioned. The rule laid out how the population forecast would be done going forward and in the meantime cities would rely on what was adopted, but Newberg just repealed what had been adopted. The County had an acknowledged forecast from 2012 and the City could rely on it without adopting it. She explained the options for the Commission. She discussed a letter from 1,000 Friends who were concerned about the employment safe harbor forecast starting from 2012 instead of more recent data. The City was applying for a grant to conduct an economic opportunity analysis which would include an employment forecast, but it would not be completed until 2017.

There was discussion regarding the options and implications for using the 2012 data.

**MOTION: PC Matthew Fortner** moved to adopt nothing right now and rely on County numbers. Motion died for lack of a second.

PC Allyn Edwards asked what considerations were included in the County projections.

AP Jessica Pelz thought it was done comprehensively, and used the same methodology that the new forecast would use. The State decided that the new process would be conducted by Portland State University for all new forecasts for all counties and cities, and Portland State University did one in 2012 for the County.

PC Cathy Stuhr said whatever numbers they started with, they had to know there would not be a challenge to that starting number. She thought they would need more time to discuss it. AP Jessica Pelz read the Administrative Rule stating that the City could use the County's forecast.

PC Philip Smith read a section of the letter from 1,000 Friends where they thought no forecast could be used as the basis for a future UGB expansion until a new forecast was done.

CCD Doug Rux responded that DLCD informed the City they could use the County's numbers, but after receiving this letter things got more complicated. They were recommending continuing the hearing in order to continue dialogue with DLCD and 1,000 Friends. They needed to know what numbers they could use in order to move forward.

PC Jason Dale thought no matter what they did, 1,000 Friends would oppose them if it was not what they wanted. The City needed to follow the regulations.

There was no public testimony.

**MOTION: PC Philip Smith/PC Matthew Fortner** moved to continue the hearing for Resolution No. 2015-308 to November 12, 2015, in order to continue dialogue with DLCD and 1,000 Friends and move forward with a grant proposal for coordinating a population and employment needs forecast. Motion carried (7 Yes/0 No).

**ITEMS FROM STAFF:**

CDD Doug Rux gave an update on City Council items.

PC Allyn Edwards referred to the letter from 1,000 Friends and asked how often did the Oregon Employment Department update their statistics and would that be a consideration in preparation for the next meeting? CDD Doug Rux replied one of the provisions in the new Administrative Rule for the streamlined UGB process was an Oregon Employment Department component.

PC Cathy Stuhr was concerned there was no arrow or signage showing the right turn in and right turn out only onto Springbrook for the apartments being constructed on Fernwood.

CDD Doug Rux answered that project was still under construction and staff would make sure all of the improvements would be done by the end of the project.

Chair Gary Bliss thought that was a staff issue and the Planning Commission did not need to be concerned about it.

**ITEMS FROM COMMISSIONERS:** None.

Chair Gary Bliss adjourned the meeting at 8:05 p.m.

**Approved by the Newberg Planning Commission this 12<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2015.**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Bobbie Morgan, Planning Secretary

\_\_\_\_\_  
Gary Bliss, Planning Commission Chair



Community Development Department  
P.O. Box 970 ▪ 414 E First Street ▪ Newberg, Oregon 97132  
503-537-1240 ▪ Fax 503-537-1272 ▪ www.newbergoregon.gov

## Planning Commission Staff Report

### Comprehensive Plan Amendment – Population Amendments

**File No.:** CPTA-15-001

**Proposal:** Comprehensive Plan amendment to provide updated information in the historic population and population projections sections of the plan.

**Planning Commission Hearing Date:** November 12, 2015

**Summary of Proposal:** Oregon Administrative Rule (OAR) 660-024-0030 requires counties to adopt and maintain a coordinated 20-year population forecast for the county and for each urban area within the county. Yamhill County contracted with the Portland State University Population Research Center (PRC) to prepare the 20-year coordinated population forecast for the county and all of its cities. The PRC report was released in October 2012 and adopted by the Yamhill County Board of Commissioners in November 2012 through Board Order 878.

Newberg had previously adopted the coordinated population forecast as part of the south industrial urban growth boundary amendment and Economic Opportunities Analysis code amendments. However, City Council repealed these items on October 5, 2015, through adoption of Ordinance No. 2015-2786, which also voided adoption of the coordinated population forecast. In 2015, the State of Oregon adopted new administrative rules for population forecasts, which specify that the PRC will be doing new population forecasts for the regions of the state. Newberg is expected to receive new updated population projections in 2017 as part of the new forecasting schedule, and will adopt the new projections at that time. Due to the recent state rulemaking, there is not currently a mechanism for the city to adopt the previous 2012 coordinated forecast. Although the city cannot adopt the previous forecast, the new rules do specify that the city may rely upon the acknowledged 2012 county forecast for planning purposes until the new regional projection is adopted [OAR 660-032-0040].

A comprehensive plan amendment is still necessary at this time to provide updated information in the historic population and population projections sections of the plan.

**Attachments:**

1. OAR 660-032

Planning Commission Resolution 2015-308 with:

Exhibit "A": Comprehensive Plan text amendment

Exhibit "B": Findings





► **The Oregon Administrative Rules contain OARs filed through September 15, 2015** ◄

**QUESTIONS ABOUT THE CONTENT OR MEANING OF THIS AGENCY'S RULES?**  
**CLICK HERE TO ACCESS RULES COORDINATOR CONTACT INFORMATION**

## DEPARTMENT OF LAND CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT

### DIVISION 32

#### POPULATION FORECASTS

##### 660-032-0000

##### Purpose and Applicability

(1) The rules in this division provide standards and procedures to implement ORS 195.033 to 195.036 and statewide planning Goals regarding population forecasts for land use planning purposes.

(2) The rules in this division do not apply to a review of a final land use decision or periodic review work task adopted by a local government and submitted to the Department of Land Conservation for review under ORS 197.626 or 197.633 prior to the effective date of this rule.

Stat. Auth.: ORS 197.040 & 195.033(10)

Stats. Implemented: ORS 195.033, 195.036 & OL 2013 Ch. 574, Sec. 3

Hist.: LCDD 1-2015, f. & cert. ef. 3-25-15

##### 660-032-0010

##### Definitions

(1) For purposes of this division, the definitions in ORS 197.015 and the Statewide Land Use Planning Goals (OAR chapter 660, division 15) apply, except as provided in sections (4) and (8) of this rule.

(2) "Final Forecast" means the final population forecast issued by the Portland State University Population Research Center (PRC) for land use purposes as required by ORS 195.033 and as provided in OAR 577-050-0030 to 577-050-0060.

(3) "Initiates" means that the local government either:

(a) Issues a public notice specified in OAR 660-018-0020, including a notice to the department, for a proposed plan amendment that concerns a subject described in 660-032-0040(2); or

(b) Receives the Director's approval, as provided in OAR 660-025-0110, of a periodic review work program that includes a work task concerning a subject described in 660-032-0040(2).

(4) "Local Government" means a city, county or Metro.

(5) "Metro" means a metropolitan service district organized under ORS chapter 268.

(6) "Metro boundary" means the boundary of a metropolitan service district.

(7) "PRC" means the Portland State University Population Research Center.

(8) "Special district" means any unit of local government, other than a city, county or metropolitan service district formed under ORS chapter 268, authorized and regulated by statute and includes but is not limited to water control districts, domestic water associations and water cooperatives, irrigation districts, port districts, regional air quality control authorities, fire districts, school districts, hospital districts, mass transit districts and sanitary districts.

(9) "Urban area" means the land within an urban growth boundary.

(10) "Urban Growth Boundary" shall have the meaning provided in ORS 197.295(7).

Stat. Auth.: ORS 197.040 & 195.033(10)

Stats. Implemented: ORS 195.033, 195.036 & OL 2013 Ch. 574, Sec. 3

Hist.: LCDD 1-2015, f. & cert. ef. 3-25-15



**660-032-0020****Population Forecasts for Land Use Planning**

(1) A local government with land use jurisdiction over land that is outside the Metro boundary shall apply the most recent final forecast issued by the PRC under OAR 577-050-0030 through 577-050-0060, when changing a comprehensive plan or land use regulation that concerns such land, when the change is based on or requires the use of a population forecast, except that a local government may apply an interim forecast as provided in 660-032-0040.

(2) A local government within the Metro boundary shall apply the Metro forecast described in OAR 660-0032-0030 when changing a regional framework plan, comprehensive plan or land use regulation of the local government, when the change is based on or requires the use of a population forecast.

(3) When a state agency or special district adopts or amends a plan or takes an action which, under Statewide Planning Goal 2 or other law, must be consistent with the comprehensive plan of a local government described in section (1) of this rule, and which is based on or requires the use of a population forecast, and if the local government has not adopted the most recent PRC final forecast as part of the plan, the most recent PRC final forecast shall be considered to be the long range forecast in the comprehensive plan, except as provided in OAR 660-032-0040.

(4) When applying a PRC forecast for a particular planning period, the local government shall use the annual increments provided in the applicable forecast, and shall not adjust the forecast for the start-year or for other years of the planning period except as provided in PRC's interpolation template described in OAR 577-050-0040.

(5) If a local government outside the Metro boundary initiates a periodic review or any other legislative review of its comprehensive plan that concerns an urban growth boundary or other matter authorized by OAR 660-032-0040(2) after the Portland State University Population Research Center issues a final population forecast for the local government, but prior to the issuance of a final forecast by PRC in the subsequent forecasting cycle described in OAR 577-050-0040(7), the local government may continue its review using the forecast issued in PRC's previous forecasting cycle.

Stat. Auth.: ORS 197.040 & 195.033(10)

Stats. Implemented: ORS 195.033, 195.036 & OL 2013 Ch. 574, Sec. 3

Hist.: LCDD 1-2015, f. & cert. ef. 3-25-15

**660-032-0030****Metro Area Population Forecasts**

(1) Metro, in coordination with local governments within its boundary, shall issue a coordinated population forecast for the entire area within its boundary, to be applied by Metro and local governments within the boundary as the basis for a change to a regional framework plan, comprehensive plan or land use regulation, when such change must be based on or requires the use of a population forecast.

(2) Metro shall allocate the forecast to the cities and portions of counties within the Metro boundary for land use planning purposes.

(3) In adopting its coordinated forecast, Metro must follow applicable procedures and requirements in this rule and ORS 197.610 to 197.650, and must provide notice to state agencies and all local governments in the Metro area. The forecast must be adopted as part of the applicable regional or local plan.

(4) The Metro forecast must be developed using commonly accepted practices and standards for population forecasting used by professional practitioners in the field of demography or economics. The forecast must be based on current, reliable and objective sources and verifiable factual information, and must take into account documented long-term demographic trends as well as recent events that have a reasonable likelihood of changing historical trends. Metro must coordinate with the PRC in the development and allocation of its forecast.

(5) The population forecast developed under the provisions of (1) through (4) of this rule is a prediction which, although based on the best available information and methodology, should not be held to an unreasonably high level of precision. For a forecast used as a basis for a decision adopting or amending the Metro regional urban growth boundary submitted to the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) under ORS 197.626, the director of DLCD or the Land Conservation and Development Commission may approve the forecast provided it finds that any failure to meet a particular requirement of this rule is insignificant and is unlikely to have a significant effect on the determination of long term needs for the Metro urban area under OAR 660-024-0040.

Stat. Auth.: ORS 197.040 & 195.033(10)

Stats. Implemented: ORS 195.033, 195.036 & OL 2013 Ch. 574, Sec. 3

Hist.: LCDD 1-2015, f. & cert. ef. 3-25-15

**660-032-0040**

### Interim Forecasts

(1) If a local government outside the Metro boundary initiates a periodic review or other legislative review of its comprehensive plan that concerns an urban growth boundary or a matter authorized by section (2) of this rule before the date the PRC issues a final population forecast for the local government in the first forecasting cycle described in OAR 577-050-0040(7), the local government may continue its review using the population forecast that was acknowledged before the review was initiated, provided the forecast was:

(a) Adopted by the local government not more than 10 years before the date of initiation, as a part of the comprehensive plan, consistent with the requirements of ORS 195.034 and 195.036 as those sections were in effect immediately before July 1, 2013, and

(b) Acknowledged as provided in ORS 197.251 or 197.625 prior to the effective date of this rule.

(2) The authorization to use the forecast described in section (1) applies only to a periodic review or a legislative review of the comprehensive plan that concerns:

(a) An urban growth boundary review or amendment as provided in Goal 14 and OAR 660, div 24;

(b) Economic development (Goal 9);

(c) Housing needs (Goal 10);

(d) Public facilities (Goal 11); or

(e) Transportation (Goal 12).

(3) For purposes of section (1) of this rule, if the acknowledged forecast was adopted by the applicable county, and if the forecast allocates population forecasts to the urban areas in the county but has not been adopted by a particular city in that county, the city may apply the allocated forecast as necessary for the purposes described in section (2) of this rule.

(4) If the forecast is consistent with sections (1)(a) and (1)(b) of this rule but does not provide a forecast for the entire applicable planning period for a purpose described in section (2), the local government may apply an extended forecast for such purpose. The extended forecast shall be developed by applying the long term growth trend that was assumed in the acknowledged forecast, for the particular planning area, to the current population of the planning area.

(5) If the local government initiates a periodic review or other legislative review that concerns an urban growth boundary or other matter authorized by section (2) of this rule before the issuance by PRC of a final population forecast for the local government, and if that review would be based on a population forecast that was adopted and submitted to the department prior to the effective date of this rule as provided in OAR 660-032-0000 (2), but which is not acknowledged by the effective date of this rule, the local government may continue its review using that forecast provided the forecast is acknowledged prior to the local government's adoption of any final land use decision or periodic review task resulting from such review.

(6) If the local government does not have a forecast that meets the requirements of sections (1) (a) and (1)(b) or section (5) of this rule, the local government may adopt an interim forecast for purposes described in section (2) of this rule. The interim forecast must be based on the average annual (annualized) growth rate for the planning period in the most recent population forecast for the county issued by the Oregon Office of Economic Analysis (OEA), consistent with section (7) of this rule. The local government shall adopt the interim forecast following the procedures and requirements in ORS 197.610 to 197.650 and shall provide notice to all local governments in the county.

(7) The interim forecast described in section (6), for a particular planning area, must be developed by applying the annualized growth rate in the most recent OEA forecast, to the current population of the planning area.

(8) For purposes of this rule:

(a) "Annualized growth rate" means the forecasted average annual (annualized) growth rate determined from the most recent published OEA forecast, calculated from 2015 to the 5-year time interval nearest the end of the planning period.

(b) "Apply the annualized growth rate to the current population of the planning area" means to multiply the current population of the planning area by annualized growth rate.

(c) "Current population of the planning area" for a county means the estimated population of the county issued by PRC for the year that the review described in section (1) of this rule is initiated.

(d) "Current population of the planning area" for an urban area means the PRC estimate of population of the city at the time the review is initiated, plus the population for the area between the urban growth boundary and the city limits as determined by the most recent Decennial Census published by the U.S. Census Bureau.

Stat. Auth.: ORS 197.040 & 195.033(10)

Stats. Implemented: ORS 195.033, 195.036 & OL 2013 Ch. 574, Sec. 3  
Hist.: LCDD 1-2015, f. & cert. ef. 3-25-15

---

The official copy of an Oregon Administrative Rule is contained in the Administrative Order filed at the Archives Division, 800 Summer St. NE, Salem, Oregon 97310. Any discrepancies with the published version are satisfied in favor of the Administrative Order. The Oregon Administrative Rules and the Oregon Bulletin are copyrighted by the Oregon Secretary of State. [Terms and Conditions of Use](#)

[State Agency Directory](#) [System Requirements](#) [Privacy Policy](#) [Accessibility Policy](#) [Oregon Veterans](#) [Oregon.gov](#)

**Oregon State Archives** • 800 Summer St. NE • Salem, OR 97310



## **PLANNING COMMISSION RESOLUTION 2015-308**

---

### **A RESOLUTION RECOMMENDING CITY COUNCIL ADOPT A COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT TO UPDATE THE HISTORIC POPULATION AND POPULATION PROJECTIONS SECTIONS OF THE PLAN**

---

#### **RECITALS:**

1. Oregon Administrative Rule (OAR) 660-024-0030 requires counties to adopt and maintain a coordinated 20-year population forecast for the county and for each urban area within the county. Yamhill County contracted with the Portland State University Population Research Center (PRC) to prepare the 20-year coordinated population forecast for the county and all of its cities. The PRC report was released in October 2012 and adopted by the Yamhill County Board of Commissioners in November 2012 through Board Order 878.
2. Newberg had previously adopted the coordinated population forecast as part of the south industrial urban growth boundary amendment and Economic Opportunities Analysis code amendments, which were then repealed by City Council adoption of Ordinance No. 2015-2786. Due to recent state rulemaking and creation of Oregon Administrative Rule OAR 660 Division 32 related to population forecasts, there is not currently a mechanism for the city to adopt the previous 2012 coordinated forecast. Newberg is expected to receive new updated population projections for adoption in 2017 as part of the new forecasting schedule, and will rely upon the acknowledged Yamhill County coordinated population forecast for planning purposes until that time [OAR 660-032-0040].
3. A comprehensive plan amendment is necessary at this time to provide updated information in the historic population and population projections sections of the plan.
4. After proper notice, the Newberg Planning Commission held a hearing on November 12, 2015 to consider the proposal.

**NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** by the Planning Commission of the City of Newberg that it recommends the City Council adopt the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment as shown in Exhibit "A". This recommendation is based on the staff report, the findings in Exhibit "B", and testimony.

**Adopted by the Newberg Planning Commission this 12<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2015.**

ATTEST:

---

Planning Commission Chair

---

Planning Commission Secretary

Attached:

Exhibit "A": Comprehensive Plan text amendment

Exhibit "B": Findings

**DRAFT Comprehensive Plan Amendment – CPTA-15-001**

**POPULATION GROWTH**

**A. HISTORIC POPULATION**

Newberg grew over 400 percent from 1960 to ~~2004~~ 2010. This population growth was due to a variety of factors: regional population growth, expansion of industry and business in the area, proximity to other employment centers, and the high quality of life in the area.

**Table III-1. Newberg City Population – 1960-2004**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Population</b>
1960	4,204
1970	6,507
1980	10,394
1990	13,086
2000	18,064
<del>2004</del>	<del>19,910</del>
<u>2010</u>	<u>22,068</u>

Sources: U.S. Census; ~~Population Research Center, Portland State University~~

~~In addition, approximately 374 people live in the area between the city limits and the urban growth boundary, making the 2004 Newberg UGB population about 20,284.~~

**B. POPULATION PROJECTIONS**

Population projections are the basis of comprehensive land use planning. To maintain a high quality of living and fulfill the community vision of Newberg as a place to live, work, play, and grow, the community must plan for its future population. Population growth will require sufficient land and services.

Many of the same factors that have contributed to Newberg’s historic population growth will contribute to its future growth: employment opportunities both in Newberg and nearby, high quality of life, and regional population growth. Newberg is already experiencing a great amount of population growth due to ~~the lack of buildable land within the Portland area.~~ population growth throughout the region, regional tourism opportunities, local employment opportunities, and quality of life factors.

Future population projections for the City of Newberg were prepared in 2004 by Barry Edmonston, Portland State University, Population Research Center,<sup>1</sup> using two different methodologies: a ratio method and a cohort component method. While the two methods produced similar results, City staff and the Ad Hoc Committee on Newberg's Future felt that the cohort component method more accurately projected the future population of Newberg. In addition, projected population growth for the area outside the city limits but inside the UGB was added to the City population projections to yield Urban Area population projections. Table III-1 presents the resulting population forecasts through 2040.

**Table III-2. Future Population Forecast – Newberg Urban Area**

Year	Population Forecast
2000 <sup>2</sup>	18,438
2005	21,132
2010	24,497
2015	28,559
2020	33,683
2025	38,352
2030	42,870
2035	48,316
2040	54,097

Sources: Johnson Gardner, Barry Edmonston

This population forecast was used to determine future land needs within the Newberg urban area.

Oregon Administrative Rule (OAR) 660-024-0030 requires counties to adopt and maintain a coordinated 20-year population forecast for the county and for each urban area within the county. Yamhill County contracted with the Portland State University Population Research Center (PRC) to prepare the 20-year coordinated population forecast for the county and all of its cities. The PRC report was released in October 2012 and adopted by the Yamhill County Board of Commissioners in November 2012 through Board Order 878. In 2015, the State of Oregon adopted new administrative rules for population forecasts, which specify that the PRC will be doing new population forecasts for the regions of the state. Newberg is expected to receive new updated population projections in 2017 as part of the new forecasting schedule, and will adopt the new projections at that time. In the interim, Newberg will rely upon the acknowledged 2012 Yamhill County coordinated population forecast for planning purposes as permitted by OAR 660-032-0040.

<sup>1</sup> Barry Edmonston, Director, Population Research Center, Portland State University, Portland, Oregon. "Population Projection for Newberg, Yamhill County, Oregon: 2000 to 2040." March 25, 2004.

<sup>2</sup> 2000 Population is the U.S. Census estimate for Newberg plus the estimate of population outside City limits but within the UGB.

## Exhibit “B”

# Comprehensive Plan Amendment – CPTA-15-001 - Findings

Comprehensive Plan amendments must comply with applicable statewide planning goals (SPG) and Newberg Comprehensive Plan (NCP) goals and policies.

### **NCP: A. Citizen Involvement/SPG 1: Citizen Involvement**

*NCP/SPG GOAL: To maintain a Citizen Involvement Program that offers citizens the opportunity for involvement in all phases of the planning process.*

**FINDING:** Newberg has a Citizen Involvement Program, including citizens appointed to decision making committees and several opportunities for the public to comment on proposed applications during review of planning applications. This proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment will go before both the appointed Planning Commission and the elected City Council for local decisions. This goal is met.

### **NCP: B. Land Use Planning/SPG 2: Land Use Planning**

*NCP GOAL: To maintain an on-going land use planning program to implement statewide and local goals. The program shall be consistent with natural and cultural resources and needs.*

*NCP POLICIES: 2. The Comprehensive Plan and implementing ordinances shall be reviewed continually and revised as needed. Major reviews shall be conducted during the State periodic review process.*

*SPG GOAL: To establish a land use planning process and policy framework as a basis for all decision and actions related to use of land and to assure an adequate factual base for such decisions and actions.*

**FINDING:** Newberg has an ongoing land use planning program, which includes using the adopted Comprehensive Plan, Development Code, and related plans to guide planning activities within the city. This proposed amendment to the Comprehensive Plan will help keep the Plan relevant and current. This goal is met.

### **NCP: H. The Economy/SPG 9: Economic Development**

*NCP GOAL: To develop a diverse and stable economic base.*

*NCP POLICIES: 1. General Policies. b. The City shall encourage economic expansion consistent with local needs.*

*SPG GOAL: To provide adequate opportunities throughout the state for a variety of economic activities vital to the health, welfare, and prosperity of Oregon’s citizens.*

**FINDING:** The proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment is to update the historic population section and to reference the Yamhill County 2012 coordinated population forecast for the county and its cities in the population projections section. Newberg had previously adopted the coordinated population forecast as part of the south industrial urban growth boundary amendment and Economic Opportunities Analysis code amendments. However, City Council repealed these items on October 5, 2015, through adoption of Ordinance No. 2015-2786, which also voided adoption of the coordinated population forecast. In 2015, the State of Oregon adopted new administrative rules for population forecasts, which

specify that the Portland State University Population Research Center (PRC) will be doing new population forecasts for the regions of the state. Newberg is expected to receive new updated population projections in 2017 as part of the new forecasting schedule, and will adopt the new projections at that time. Due to the recent state rulemaking, there is not currently a mechanism for the city to adopt the previous 2012 coordinated forecast. Although the city cannot adopt the previous forecast, the new rules do specify that the city may rely upon the acknowledged 2012 county forecast for planning purposes until the new regional projection is adopted [OAR 660-032-0040].

The purpose of these amendments is to help the city plan for the future, including the ability to help develop a diverse and stable economic base and to provide a variety of economic opportunities. Without an accurate population and employment forecast, the city would not be as prepared to plan for future needs. This goal is met.

**NCP: I. Housing/SPG 10: Housing**

*NCP GOAL: To provide for diversity in the type, density and location of housing within the City to ensure there is an adequate supply of affordable housing units to meet the needs of City residents of various income levels.*

*SPG GOAL: To provide for the housing needs of the citizens of the state.*

**FINDING:** Newberg uses the Comprehensive Plan and related adopted plans to guide future land use planning efforts. The proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment will reference the updated population forecast for the city, enabling future planning efforts to plan for adequate housing for the current and future citizens of the city. This goal is met.

**NCP: L. Public Facilities And Services/SPG 11: Public Facilities and Services**

*NCP/SPG GOAL: To plan and develop a timely, orderly and efficient arrangement of public facilities and services to serve as a framework for urban development.*

**FINDING:** Newberg needs to have an updated population and employment forecast in order to effectively plan future needs for public facilities and services. By updating the Comprehensive Plan, Newberg can more effectively plan for public facility needs. This goal is met.





Community Development Department  
P.O. Box 970 ▪ 414 E First Street ▪ Newberg, Oregon 97132  
503-537-1240 ▪ Fax 503-537-1272 ▪ [www.newbergoregon.gov](http://www.newbergoregon.gov)

## MEMORANDUM

---

TO: Newberg Planning Commission  
FROM: Steve Olson, Associate Planner  
SUBJECT: **Update on the Newberg Downtown Improvement Plan**  
DATE: November 3, 2015

---

The city staff and the consultant team have been hard at work on the Newberg Downtown Improvement Plan, and we wanted to give the Planning Commission an update on our progress.

The consultant team is led by Parametrix, Inc. and Leland Consulting Group, and includes JLA Public Involvement, Greenworks PC, DKS Associates, Rick Williams Consulting, and Cogan Owens Greene.

The Project Management Team held a kick-off meeting on 8/27/15 to review the project schedule, the scope of work, and tour the downtown study area.

The 15-member Advisory Committee has been appointed, representing an array of businesses, institutions, government agencies and non-profits. The first Advisory Committee meeting was held on 8/27/15, where they discussed expectations for the project, ground rules for the meetings, and selected Jennifer Sitter and Ben Jaquith as co-chairs.

Stakeholder interviews: Community Development Department staff, with the assistance of Mike Ragsdale, Newberg Downtown Coalition (NDC), interviewed 19 stakeholders to discover their perceptions of downtown's assets, issues, and opportunities. Staff is writing a summary report of the interviews for the next Advisory Committee meeting.

The consultant team prepared a draft Existing Conditions memorandum, with technical appendices on Transportation, Public Facilities, Parking, Land Use, and Urban Design. They also prepared a draft Market Conditions memorandum. City staff, with the assistance of Mike Ragsdale, NDC, reviewed the drafts and provided a coordinated set of comments to the consultant team. The team will be finalizing these reports for the next Advisory Committee meeting.

The Advisory Committee will meet on 11/4/15 at the Public Safety Building at 4 PM to discuss the Existing Conditions and Market Conditions memorandum, and the summary of the interviews.

The first Open House will be on December 9<sup>th</sup>, from 4:30 – 6:30 PM, at the Chehalem Cultural Center ballroom. This open house will be a chance to share the Existing Conditions and Market Conditions information with the public, answer questions, and brainstorm with the public on some proposed improvements and changes for downtown.